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Abstract
This study investigates the relationship of different intellectual capital components on the financial reporting quality. In order to conduct this study, a sample including 184 accepted companies in Tehran Stock Exchange that work in deference industries between 2005 and 2010 have been selected. The methodology of the present study is co-relational research and has an applied purpose. Co-relational analysis and multiple linear regressions are the statistical methods are used in this study. The results from hypothesis testing demonstrated among the different components of intellectual capital, two components of capital employed efficiency and human capital efficiency have significant positive effect on the dependent variable of financial reporting quality and structural capital efficiency has a significant negative effect on the financial reporting quality. Among these three components of intellectual capital, the effect of human capital efficiency on the financial reporting quality is stronger with than the other two factors.


1. Introduction

Twenty first century is the knowledge-centered economies century. In knowledge-centered economies, knowledge or intellectual capital, gains priority as one of the factors of wealth production, in comparison to other physical and tangible assets (Bontis, 1998). So, as the most important capital knowledge has replaced financial and physical capitals of today’s global economy. With the growth of knowledge-centered economies, we are considerably witnessing the fact that in comparison with other tangible assets, intangible assets companies are significant factors in maintaining and accomplishing their stable competitive advantage (Tayles et al. 2002). Therefore, investors and creditors are interested in the intellectual capital and its components (human capital, capital employed and structural capital), thus, their revealing plays an important role in decision-makings of these two groups. By intellectual capital, we mean the development and application of sources of knowledge in the companies. Hence, in the third millennium A.D., in which intellectual capital rather than physical capital is the main foundation of the future activities and success of the company in the knowledge-centered economies (Williams, 2000), the increase of understanding and application of intellectual capital help firms to be more efficient, effective, profit-making and innovative (Chen, 2005).

On the other hand, one of the most significant resources, which the users use them to make decisions, is the group of reports called financial reports. Those accounting reports that are prepared and presented aiming to meet the informational needs of those users who are out of commercial units, are within the scope of financial reports.

Provision of financial reports with intellectual capital approach improves the quality of financial reports. The quality of financial reporting, the accuracy and validity of financial reports in expressing the data relevant to operations of companies as well as declaring all the assets of companies, including intangible assets and intellectual capital, inform the users. According to the first conceptual statement of the Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB), financial reporting needs to "provide useful data to help potential investors
make logical decisions”. Therefore, disclosure of intellectual capital in financial statements leads to usefulness of users’ decision-making and thus it will be really necessary for organizations to consider intellectual capital.

2. Theoretical Literature of the Research

Intellectual capital includes knowledge, information, intellectual asset and experience that can be used for creating wealth. Intellectual asset refers to collective intellectual capability or the key knowledge as a whole (Bontis et al. 2000).

Some researchers such as Bontis (1998), Roos et al. (1997), Brooking (1996), Stewart (1998) and others had written about intellectual capital and all had reiterated the importance of this intangible asset.

In recent decade, firms have devoted particular attention to measurement and disclosure of intellectual capital to present reports to the users. On the other hand, firms like to enhance the quality of the data that they present. The recent studies suggest that the increase in the financial reporting quality which can have important economic consequences (Healy and Palepo, 2001; Bushman and Smith, 2001; Lambert et al. 2006).

The financial reporting quality, accuracy and validity of financial reports in expressing the data regarding firms’ operations, particularly expected cash flows aim are used to notify the investors. According to the first conceptual statement of Financial Accounting Standard Board (FASB), financial reporting needs to “provide useful data to help potential investors make logical decisions”.

According to the view suggesting that accruals improve the information value of profit by decreasing the effect of unstable infatuations during cash flows, this study uses the quality index of accruals as an index for measuring the quality of financial reporting. In addition, accruals are assessments of cash flows and future earnings. Based on the studies conducted such as the one by Dechow & Dichev (2002), one of the factors affecting the financial reporting quality is the quality of accruals and thus the better quality of accruals are the better the financial reporting quality will be.

2.1. Background of the Study

Since no study was found to investigate the effect of intellectual capital on financial reporting quality, a number of studies which have covered one aspect of the present study are presented below.

Verdi (2006) in an article titled “The Relationship between Financial Reporting Quality and Efficiency of Investment” tested the relationship between financial reporting quality and efficiency of investment between 1980 and 2003. He argued that increase in the financial reporting quality can bring about significant economic consequences such as investment efficiency. The results of his study demonstrate that the quality index of financial reporting, which is called the quality of accruals, is correlated with investment.

Chen et al. (2010) have compared the quality of accounting for the firms that are members of EU before and after accepting international standards of financial reporting in 2005. Factors of smoothing, income management, quality of accruals, and timely identification of loss were considered in order to assess accounting quality.

The researchers demonstrated that the highest degree of accounting quality has been related to the period after accepting international standards of financial reporting (Barth, 2007 and 2008).

Rudez & Mihalic (2007) in the study titled “Investigation of the Effect of the Components of Intellectual Capital on the Financial Performance of Hotel Industry” discovered that there is a significant relationship between the components of intellectual capital and financial performance in this industry and also indicating the great effect of capital employed efficiency on the performance in comparison to other components of intellectual capital.

Tai & Chen (2009) in the study titled “The New Model of Assessment of Linguistic-Oriented Intellectual Capital” presented a new model to assess the performance of intellectual capital by using a combination of Fuzzy and then Tupe approaches with a multi-variant decision making technique which was tested for high-tech firms in Taiwan. The study results demonstrated the significant relationship between components of intellectual capital and performance. Bramhandkar et al. (2007) investigated the effect of intellectual capital on the performance of 139 pharmaceutical firms and concluded that there is a significant relationship between components of intellectual capital and performance of firms.

Appuhami (2007) in the study titled “The Effect of Intellectual Capital on Performance (Investors’ Profit)”, investigated the relationship between components of intellectual capital, including human capital, structural capital, and capital employed on the performance of firms in the banking and insurance industry of the country and concluded that there was a positive significant relationship between each single component of intellectual capital and performance.

Shiu (2006) also investigated that there was a significant relationship between intellectual capital and performance of 80 high-tech firms. Juma & McGee (2006) in their study indicated that there was a positive significant relationship between intellectual capital and performance of high-tech firms in the US. Richieri et al. (2008) in their study investigated that there was a significant positive relationship between the components of firms’ intellectual capital and their financial performance for the 1,000 biggest companies in Brazil for the period between 2000 and 2005.
3. Methodology

3.1. Statistical community and Sample

Statistical community of the present study included all the accepted companies in Tehran Stock Exchange between 2005 and 2010 in 6 industries as stated in table 1. Among the aforementioned industries, 184 firms that were working in the under study years were investigated, but no sampling was performed. The number of firms for each industry is stated in table 1.

< Insert Table 1 Here >

3.2. Research Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical literature and the conducted studies, research hypotheses were developed as follows. The present study has one primary hypothesis and three secondary hypotheses.

Main hypothesis: “There is a significant relationship between the components of intellectual capital and the financial reporting quality”.

Secondary hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant relationship between human capital efficiency and the financial reporting quality.

H2: There is a significant relationship between capital employed efficiency and the financial reporting quality.

H3: There is a significant relationship between structural capital efficiency and the financial reporting quality.

3.3. Research Methodology

The research methodology is comparative-deductive in which theoretical foundations related to the study have been obtained through library studies and comparative methods. The related data was collected through observation of financial statements and the accompanying notes as found on www.rdis.com.

This study is an experimental investigation that is shown the effect of intellectual capital components on the financial reporting quality in the accepted companies in Tehran Stock Exchange in particular industries. Thus, this study has an applied purpose, based on the analysis of the data collected from Tehran Stock Exchange. On the other hand, it is a co relational study which is conducted using multiple linear regressions.

3.4. Models Used in the Study

In this study, models of Dechow and Dichev (2002) and Francis et al. (2005) were used in order to calculate the quality index of financial statement and Pulic’s (2000) Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) model was used in order to measure intellectual capital, and all these models will be further described.

3.4.1. Model of measuring the quality index of Financial Statements

Quality index of accruals consistent with Dechow and Dichev’s (2002) model and Francis et al. (2005) model is used to measure the quality index of financial statements. The mentioned model has been presented in the form of the equation (1):

\[ cAc_{ij} = B_0 + B_1cF_{ij-1} + B_2cF_{ij} + B_3cF_{ij+1} + B_4\Delta S_{ij} + B_5PPE_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij} \]  

Where \( cAc \) is current accruals, \( \Delta S \) is Changes in the sales, \( CF \) is cash resulting from the operational activities of the firm in the years – it, \( t \), + it, \( PPE \) is book value of property, antpl and equipment (Cost price of property, plant and equipment minus accumulated depreciation) and \( \varepsilon - CAC \) is error of assessment of accruals.

In this model, the operating cash flow in this year, last year and next year is used in order to assess the quality of accruals.

Since accruals are not associated with cash flows, the smaller size of conreal deviation of accruals of working capital is operating cash flows, the higher quality accruals will be regarded. \( PPE \) and \( \Delta S \) have been defined as the control variables for this model.

3.4.2. The model of measuring intellectual capital index

Several methods are presented to measure intellectual capitals (Hunter, Webster and Wyatt, 2005). In this study, according to the following reasons, Value Added Intellectual Coefficient model (VAIC) (Pulic, 1998; Pulic, 2000) was used to measure intellectual capitals:

This model is based on two aspects of performance and value creation from tangible and intangible assets of a company (Tan et al., 2007). This model provides a standard and consistent measurement basis (Pulic, 1998; Sveiby, 2001).

In fact, there are limited approaches which can exactly measure intellectual capital. All data used in calculating value added intellectual coefficient are based on standard accounting and financial information which are usually listed in financial reports of companies. Therefore, purpose-based calculations can be considered and approved (Pulic, 1998; Tan et al. 2007).

Most intellectual capital methods are criticized because they measure subjectively and cause many problems during measurement (Sveiby, 2000; Williams, 2001).
Formulation of value added intellectual coefficient (VAIC) is as equation (2):

\[ VAIC_i = HCE_i + CEE_i + SCE_i \]  

Where VAIC is value added intellectual coefficient, HCE is human capital efficiency, CEE is capital employed efficiency, and SCE is structural capital efficiency.

The first step for calculating the components of IC includes HCE, CEE and SCE is calculation of value added for firm which is described as follows:

The calculation of value added \( VA_i \) for firm \( I \) is as equation (3):

\[ VA_i = I_i + DP_i + W_i + D_i + T_i + R_i \]  

Where \( I \) is total interest expenses, \( DP \) is depreciation expenses, \( W \) is payroll, \( D \) is dividends, \( T \) is corporate tax and \( R \) is profits retain for the year.

Based on Pulic’s theories, one of the indices of human capital efficiency of a firm is the sum of expenses of payroll. Thus, human capital efficiency (HCE) is obtained in equation (4):

\[ HCE_i = \frac{VA_i}{HC_i} \]  

Where HCE is human capital efficiency, \( VA \) is value added for firm and \( HC \) is investment in Human Capital during the ‘t’ period or total salary and wage include all incentives.

CEE is obtained in equation (5):

\[ CEE_i = \frac{VA_i}{CE_i} \]  

Where CEE is capital employed efficiency and \( CE \) is book value of net assets.

SCE is obtained in equation (6):

\[ SCE_i = \frac{SC_i}{VA_i} \]  

Where SCE is structural capital efficiency and \( SC \) is structural capital.

In order to calculate \( SC \) in the above-mentioned formula, equation (7) is used:

\[ SC_i = VA_i - HC_i \]  

3.5. Research Variables

This study uses intellectual capital as an independent variable. The components of intellectual capital include human capital efficiency (HCE), Capital employed efficiency (CEE) and structural capital efficiency (SCE) and it is calculated on the basis of the VAIC model. The dependent variable of this study is the financial reporting quality and the quality index of accruals is used to measure the quality index of financial reporting.

4. Data Analysis

The data related to 184 firms, that have formed our statistical community, in the period between 2005 and 2010 has been analyzed in order to investigate the relationship between variables to test the hypotheses of the study. The collected data was calculated using the Excel software and was analyzed using SPSS 17 and E views 6.

The analysis of data in the descriptive statistics parts started with the calculation of main indexed such as mean, median, distribution indexes of standard deviation, skewness and Kurtosis. Then, test of normality of the independent variable, which was conducted using Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, was investigated. In order to analyze the models, Pearson correlation co-efficient and in order to analyze the merged data, combined data analysis or Panel without fixed effects, with fixed effects and with random effects was used. In order to determine the appropriateness of the model with fixed effect model and random effect model, Hasman Test was used.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

In the descriptive statistics part, analysis of the data has been done use the main indices of average, median, distribution factors, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. The skewness and kurtosis of FRQ, HCE, and SCE is to the right, skewness of CEE is to the left and skewness of LnFRQ is about 0 and is almost symmetrical. The kurtosis of all variables except LnFRQ is higher than normal distribution (table 2).

< Insert Table 2 Here >
5. Research Test

5.1. Normality Test

In order to investigate the normality of the dependent variable, the null hypothesis and the alternative hypotheses in the study are written as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
H_0 : & \quad \text{For the dependent variable, the data show normal distribution.} \\
H_1 : & \quad \text{For the dependent variable, the data show non-normal distribution.}
\end{align*}
\]

Table 3 depicts the normality state of the distribution of the values of the dependent variable.

The meaningful level for FRQ is lower than 5% in all years, thus FRQ does not have normal distribution. However, the level of meaningfulness for the logarithm variable of FRQ is higher than 0.05% in all years, thus logarithm of FRQ has normal distribution.

5.2. Process of Selecting the Best Model

In Panel analysis, one of the most fundamental issues is determining the intercept and determining if the fitting should be for the model without intercept (previous model) or for the model with intercept. When the model has intercept, the next question is whether a model with fixed effects is more proper or a model with random effects. Therefore, the process for selecting the model is as follows:

1. The model without fixed effects (merged data) has been fitted.
2. The model with fixed effects has been fitted and this model has been analyzed in comparison to the model without effects, using Chow Test.
3. The model with random effects has been fitted and it has been compared to the model without fixed effects using Hasman Test.

At the end, among the three models, the most proper will be selected and the significance of each of the dependent variables will be discussed.

5.3. Testing the Primary Hypothesis

With regard to the abovementioned issues and the investigation, the model with random effects was selected as the most proper model for fitting and the results gained from use of this model as follows:

Main Hypotheses: “There is a significant relationship between the components of intellectual capital and the financial reporting quality”.

The regression model used for the primary hypothesis of the research can be stated as equation (8):

\[
\ln(FRQ_{it}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CEE_{it} + \beta_2 HCE_{it} + \beta_3 SCE_{it} + \epsilon_{it}
\]  

(8)

Where FRQ is dependent variable of financial reporting quality, CEE is capital employed efficiency, HCE is human capital efficiency and SCE is structural capital efficiency.

Null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis for the meaningfulness of the model are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
H_0 : & \quad \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0 \\
H_1 : & \quad \beta_i \neq 0 \quad i = 1,2,3
\end{align*}
\]

Table 4 shows testing the main hypothesis of the research.

Probability value of F is 0.000 and is lower than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is rejected with 95% certainty and there is a significant model. Value of coefficient of determination is 0.079 which indicates that dependent variables have strong and significant effect on the dependent variable. Durbin-Watson test of this model shows that the observations are independent of one another since test statistic is 1.73 and is located between 1.5 – 2.5.

T value for CEE is 1.67 and it is significant at the level of 90%. T value for HCE is 3.54 and it is -4.19 for SCE, thus HCE and CSE are significant at the level of 95%. The results gained from the study indicate that the two independent variables of capital employed efficiency and human capital efficiency have positive effect on the dependent variable of financial reporting quality, while the effect of the independent variable of structural capital efficiency on the dependent variable is negative.
5.4. Testing the Secondary hypotheses

First secondary hypothesis: \( H_i \) “There is a significant relationship between capital employed efficiency and the financial reporting quality”.

The regression model used for the first hypothesis is presented in the form of equation (10):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = \beta_{0i} + \beta_i \text{CEE}_i
\]  

Second secondary hypothesis: \( H_j \) “There is a significant relationship between human capital efficiency and the financial reporting quality”.

The regression model used for the second hypothesis is presented in the form of equation (11):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = \beta_{0i} + \beta_i \text{HCE}_i
\]  

Third secondary hypothesis: \( H_k \) “There is a significant relationship between structural capital efficiency and the financial reporting quality”.

The regression model used for the third hypothesis is presented in the form of equation (12):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = \beta_{0i} + \beta_i \text{SCE}_i
\]  

Table 5 depicts the test of the secondary hypotheses of the study.

As it can be seen in table 5, the probability values of Hasman test for the models of first and second secondary hypothesis are 1 and for the third model is 0.638 since this value is not lower that 0.05 , as for the primary hypothesis, use of a model with random effects has priority over other models. Therefore, the models presented with random effects are as follows:

5.4.1. First Model (first secondary hypothesis)

The probability value of F for capital employed efficiency is 0.057 and since this value is not lower than 0.05, therefore the variable is not significant at the level of 95%, but it is significant with 90% certainty. Coefficient of determination of the model is 0.01 and it indicates that the independent variable of CEE, on its own, does not have a strong and significant effect on the dependent variable. Durbin-Watson of this model indicates that the observations are independent of one another as its value is 1.73 and is located between 1.5 - 2.5.

The model of effectiveness of the independent variable of capital employed efficiency on the dependent variable is as stated in equation (13):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = 13/22 + 0/018\text{CEE}_i
\]  

5.4.2. Second Model (second supplementary variable)

The probability value of F for human capital efficiency is 0.000 and since this value is lower than 0.05, therefore the variable is significant at the level of 95%. Coefficient of determination of the model is 0.08 and it indicates that the independent variable of HCE, on its own, does not have a strong and significant effect on the dependent variable of the study. Durbin-Watson test of this model is 1.72 and this indicates that the observations are independent of one another.

The model of effectiveness of the independent variable of human capital efficiency on the dependent variable is as stated in equation (14):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = 13/19 + 0/01\text{HCE}_i
\]  

5.4.3. Third Model (third Secondary hypothesis)

The probability value of F for structural capital efficiency is 0.002 and since this value is lower than 0.05, therefore the variable is significant at the level of 95%. Coefficient of determination of the model is 0.01 and it indicates that as for the other two independent variables, the independent variable of SCE, on its own, does not have a strong and significant effect on the dependent variable of the study. Durbin-Watson test of this model is 1.72 and this indicates that the observations are independent of one another.

The model of effectiveness of the independent variable of structural capital efficiency on the dependent variable is as stated in equation (15):

\[
\text{Ln}(\text{FRQ}_i) = 13/26 – 0/027\text{SCE}_i
\]  

5.5. Investigating the co relational coefficient between variables

In order to prove the linear relationship between two variables, Pearson co relation coefficient is used. The correlation of the variables, in the form of null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis, is as follows:
\[ H_0 : \rho_{XY} = 0 \]
\[ H_1 : \rho_{XY} \neq 0 \]

Pearson Correlation matrix for investigating the relationship between variables is calculated in table 6 and the main results are:

As it can be seen in table 6, the correlation between the dependent variable of financial reporting quality (LnFRQ) and the capital employed efficiency (CEE) is 0.085 and the correlation between LnFRQ and human capital efficiency (HCE) is 0.363, that both are significant. However, the correlation between dependent variable and structural capital efficiency (SCE) is 0.044 which is not significant.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

First this study collect data required to calculated of the different components of intellectual capital (IC), that is Capital employed efficiency (CEE), human capital efficiency (HCE) and structural capital efficiency (SCE) as the independent variable, as well as the financial reporting quality (FRQ) as the dependent variable for 184 accepted companies in Tehran Stock Exchange and work in chemical and pharmaceutical industries, other non-metal minerals, cement, lime, plaster, tiles and ceramics, rubber and plastic, food and drink productions, sugar and sugar cubes, oil, products of oil refinery and nuclear fuels for a 6-year-period between 2005 and 2010 from audited financial statements of the companies and their accompanying notes.

Second the variables used in the study were calculated using Excel software. Eventually the significant relationship between intellectual capital and financial reporting quality for the companies under study was analyzed using SPSS and E views software.

Results of the study are shown as follows:

- Among the different components of intellectual capital as the independent variable, the effect of capital employed efficiency (CEE) on the dependent variable of financial reporting quality (FRQ) is positive and significant.
- Among the different components of intellectual capital as the independent variable, the effect of human capital efficiency (HCE) on the dependent variable of financial reporting quality (FRQ) is positive and significant.
- Among the different components of intellectual capital as the independent variable, the effect of structural capital efficiency (SCE) on the dependent variable of financial reporting quality (FRQ) is negative and significant.
- Among the three components of intellectual capital, the effect of human capital efficiency (HCE) on the financial reporting quality (FRQ) is by far stronger than the other two factors.

Based on the results of the present study and according to the significant effect of the components of intellectual capital as one intangible asset on the financial reporting quality and since based on the first statement of concept of the financial accounting standard board (FASB), financial reporting needs to "provide useful data so to help potential investors in their logical decision-makings", disclosure of intellectual capital in financial statements will lead to the usefulness of decision-makings of the users and thus the significance of proper disclosure of intellectual capital in financial reports of firms is more evident in order to contribute to their accomplishing of goals.
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Annexure

Table 1 List of under study industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Sub-industries</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-metal minerals</td>
<td>Other non-metallic mineral products, glass, cement, lime, plaster, tiles and ceramic</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>chemical and pharmaceutical</td>
<td>chemical and pharmaceutical products</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>Coke products, products from oil refinery and nuclear fuel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>food products except sugar and sugar cubes</td>
<td>food products</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sugar and sugar cubes</td>
<td>sugar and sugar cubes products</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rubber and plastic</td>
<td>rubber and plastic products</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of the research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>1/174</td>
<td>1/140</td>
<td>1/491</td>
<td>-2/278</td>
<td>28/468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCE</td>
<td>5/027</td>
<td>3/144</td>
<td>10/657</td>
<td>4/593</td>
<td>29/129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>0/700</td>
<td>0/726</td>
<td>0/824</td>
<td>3/272</td>
<td>41/179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRQ</td>
<td>645071</td>
<td>204011</td>
<td>1501400</td>
<td>5/891</td>
<td>42/116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln FRQ</td>
<td>13/247</td>
<td>13/010</td>
<td>0/792</td>
<td>1/028</td>
<td>1/273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Z value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test</th>
<th>Probability values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRQ</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3/946</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4/130</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4/105</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4/468</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4/219</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3/726</td>
<td>0/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnFRQ</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1/219</td>
<td>0/103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1/049</td>
<td>0/221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1/349</td>
<td>0/053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1/331</td>
<td>0/058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1/154</td>
<td>0/139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1/136</td>
<td>0/151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 Analysis of the panel data with random effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimated value</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Coefficient of determination</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson Test</th>
<th>Probability of Hasman Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed value</td>
<td>13/195</td>
<td>57/535</td>
<td>0/079</td>
<td>0/000</td>
<td>1/730</td>
<td>1/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>0/016</td>
<td>1/671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCE</td>
<td>0/010</td>
<td>3/542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>-0/028</td>
<td>-4/187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5 Assessment of the co-efficient for the simple linear models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>assessed value</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>coefficient of determination</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson value</th>
<th>probability of Hasman Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed value</td>
<td>13/222</td>
<td>51/764</td>
<td>0/010</td>
<td>0/057</td>
<td>1/73</td>
<td>1/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>0/018</td>
<td>1/908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed value</td>
<td>13/194</td>
<td>56/567</td>
<td>0/080</td>
<td>0/000</td>
<td>1/72</td>
<td>1/000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCE</td>
<td>0/010</td>
<td>3/565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed value</td>
<td>13/263</td>
<td>50/190</td>
<td>0/010</td>
<td>0/002</td>
<td>1/72</td>
<td>0/638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>-0/027</td>
<td>-3/190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 Pearson correlation coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LnFRQ</th>
<th>CEE</th>
<th>HCE</th>
<th>SCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0/085**</td>
<td>0/363**</td>
<td>0/044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of significance</td>
<td>0/005</td>
<td>0/000</td>
<td>0/143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>