ADVANCING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE GLOBALLY

Prof. Rahul Gupta

ADVANCING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE GLOBALLY

ADVANCING CORPORATE GOVERNANCE GLOBALLY

Prof. Rahul Gupta

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Advancing Corporate Governance Globally by *Prof. Rahul Gupta*

ISBN 979-8-89161-828-2

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

MULTIPLE NATIONAL SYSTEMS OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Prof Rahul Gupta, Adjunct Faculty
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- rahul_g@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Corporate governance is a critical aspect of modern economies, influencing the efficiency, stability, and sustainability of businesses. However, the landscape of corporate governance is diverse, reflecting the cultural, legal, and institutional differences across nations. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive overview and comparative analysis of multiple national systems of corporate governance. The comparative analysis encompasses various dimensions, including legal frameworks, ownership structures, board compositions, disclosure requirements, and regulatory mechanisms. By examining these aspects across different national contexts, this study seeks to uncover the underlying principles, practices, and challenges associated with diverse corporate governance systems. Key findings reveal that while there are commonalities in the objectives of corporate governance such as promoting transparency, accountability, and shareholder value the implementation varies significantly. For instance, countries with common law traditions tend to emphasize shareholder rights and market-based mechanisms, while civil law systems prioritize stakeholder interests and regulatory oversight.

KEYWORDS:

Comparative Analysis, Corporate Governance, Cultural Differences, Disclosure Requirements, Institutional Variances, Ownership Structures.

INTRODUCTION

Although there has been a recent surge in interest in corporate governance due to the high cost of corporate scandals, there is still a general lack of understanding about the topic, which is why governments around the world have been extremely hesitant to identify the best way to address CG challenges. Some individuals believe that this is a direct outcome of the concept's relative freshness, which is unavoidably anticipated to be accompanied with a lack of profound comprehension. For others, the issue stems primarily from a misunderstanding of the concepts of governance and control. They find it alarming that CG is often reduced at the organizational level to a straightforward issue of separating control from ownership some would even say, to a straightforward technical problem of supervision. But as time went on and the demands of everyday existence increased, we were compelled to give government a greater degree of legitimacy as well as a more expansive framework. A corporation is essentially a legal construct that results from the separation of its legal identity from its owners. As such, it has certain legal rights and, naturally, obligations. In fact, companies were granted some fundamental rights from the start [1], [2].

Unexpected financial effects arise from two rights: limited liability and perpetuity. The limited liability right is justified by its potential to facilitate anonymous trading in the company's shares by removing debtors from the corporation's shareholder list. By pooling shareholder funds, companies may generate even more money for their businesses thanks to limited liability. The amount that an investor may lose by making an investment in a corporation is further decreased by limited liability. Consequently, this significantly lowers the risk for potential investors and raises their likelihood of making an investment as well as their number, which gives the stock markets more volume and liquidity. The perpetuity concept, which states that a company's assets endure beyond the lives of any of its stakeholders or agents, promotes stability and capital accumulation, which frees up funds for longer-term and larger-scale initiatives [3], [4].

When we get right down to it, the corporate model is one of the cleverest organizational designs ever made by humans, and businesses today have a non-measurable influence on every aspect of our lives. They are making decisions on how we will die, how we will live, and eventually, how we could be born. However, recent history demonstrates that private organizations are also invading political space and having a direct impact on the direction, development, and implementation of politics. As such, it is only fair to demand from them a minimal level of good governance, as it is also a matter of social justice, democracy, and economic growth. Nevertheless, since the directors of such companies are the managers of other people's money rather than their own, it cannot be expected that they should watch over it with the same anxious vigilance that the partners in a private copartner frequently watch over their own. Adam Smith criticized the corporate form of business for this reason in his seminal book "Wealth of Nations." Consequently, carelessness and plenty must, more or less, constantly rule in the administration of such a company's operations.

Additionally, Adam Smith identified the following as the cornerstone of corporate governance: When used to protect each person's right as a stakeholder in the assets they rely on to provide a decent life for themselves and their families, property rights maintain their legitimate moral standing. But when they're employed by the affluent to deny others access to a minimal standard of living or to escape their moral accountability for fairly allocating and managing the resources that belong to everyone who was born into this world, they become morally dubious. The word "significance" in governance is subject to contextual modifications. From an organizational standpoint, the legal framework, the governing bodies, the transparency laws that influence how companies are run, and the financial market that sets corporate policies all serve as representations of the governance system. In the end, a business is nothing more than a collection of established customs that control the financial and material flows it produces. In this situation, governance would essentially boil down to the power dynamics between the ruling entities and the ruled. These governing organizations are used to establish policies and programs aimed at promoting economic growth and development. As of right now, governance is still a general term that encompasses both internal and external organizational methods and is associated with a specific goal [5], [6].

One goal of governance is to highlight the ownership of the firm and how corporate actions impact stakeholders' wealth. Increasingly, it surpasses that threshold by considering the generation of wealth by optimizing the organization's economic efficiency and guaranteeing that this money is distributed equitably among corporate stakeholders. In the field, like with Microsoft, CG is meant to fulfill many functions establishing and maintaining management accountability to owners through the appropriate division of powers and duties among shareholders, managers, and board members; offering a framework for management and the board to set and meet goals and track performance; fortifying and defending our culture of ethical business conduct; and promoting the responsible and efficient use of resources while holding us accountable for our stewardship of them.

DISCUSSION

The Board of Directors is the CG guarantee in its capacity as the representatives of the shareholders. The Board of Directors is chosen by the shareholders to supervise management and guarantee that the long-term interests of the stakeholders are met. The Board of Directors sets and advances organizational and corporate goals via supervision, evaluation, and advice. In addition to supervising the company's business operations and integrity, the Board collaborates with management to define the organization's mission and long-term goals. It also conducts the annual evaluation of the CEO, manages CEO succession planning, installs internal controls over financial reporting, and evaluates the company's risks and risk-reduction tactics. In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Board is divided into many committees, each of which is chaired by and made up entirely of independent directors:

1. Committee on Audits;

2. Committee on Compensation

3. Committee for Nominations; and

4. Committee on Finance.

To assist CG in carrying out its duties, the Board of Directors creates policies and procedures for the organization. In order to ensure that the Board has the power and procedures in place to examine and assess the company's business operations and to make decisions that are separate from management, these rules are often codified in the Corporate Governance Guidelines or Code. The Board regularly assesses new procedures to identify which would best meet the needs of the stakeholders. In relation to CG, particular emphasis is put on the Board of Directors' pivotal role. Naturally, the shareholders delegate such a function to him. As previously said, it's also intriguing to depict the organization as a tangle of explicit and implicit contracts, all of which work to balance the relationships between different interest groups. The alignment of interests seems to be increasingly important in determining an organization's success and, ultimately, in determining whether it will survive. However, contractual organization has its limitations. Contract agreements are inherently imperfect and do not always account for changes in time. They have been shown to be sensitive to changes in the environment and ultimately lose the majority of their efficacy. This is why early on, concerns were expressed about their failure [7], [8].

Theoretically, board members are meant to oversee the organization's operations in the best interests of shareholders and ensure that the conditions of contracts are upheld. However, it should be highlighted that the possibility of a conflict of interest is almost nonexistent when a person owns the whole firm; in contrast, the conflict of interest is always there when an organization is run by non-owners. As such, one of the primary duties of the Board of Directors is to ensure that managers carry out their duties in an efficient and responsible manner. In reality, a responsible board would make every effort to minimize conflicts of interest. To achieve this, however, members of the board must be properly nominated and carefully chosen. Unfortunately, even in the majority of wealthy nations, this is not the case. On November 20, 2003, the Chicago Tribune reported that the US Security Exchange Commission was looking into the board of the press behemoth Hollinger and that they had found that two of the board members were none other than Henry Kissinger and Richard Perle. Additionally, there have been other illegal payments and transactions connected to this investigation, namely to Conrad Black, a member of the English House of Lords and Chairman of Hollinger.

Undoubtedly, the Board's most concerning responsibility is deciding on management salaries and goals, which are often based on quantitative data rather than actual organizational success. It is thought that by simply adjusting compensation plans to reflect actual organizational performance, tensions inside the organizations may be greatly reduced. Some individuals firmly believe that adding just a few independent members will significantly increase the Board's ability to supervise.

Board members are often asked to boost an organization's profitability and reduce its volatility, so they are by no means immune to market pressure. A few managers have rapidly realized that the only way to meet those irrational demands was to manipulate the data. As a result, the Board must also prioritize learning about the operations and structure of the market. These so-called "external mechanisms for corporate governance" allow the Board to successfully carry out its stewardship responsibilities. Even though the Board is essential to the organization's sustainability, it is still undervalued or misunderstood. For example, four out of five CEOs still think that their company does a bad job of preparing for board meetings, and eighty-eight percent of them think that board members never seem to find the time or energy to do their jobs. Investors complain that the board does not give a better picture and that they do not seem to take their role seriously, particularly when it comes to selecting board members. An active, interdependent, and effective board of directors adds value to the company, first and foremost through selecting the best CEO. In general, there are many ways the Board may contribute value [9], [10].

From a strictly strategic perspective, the organization's development and growth strategy has to be updated to take CG factors into account. In actuality, CG has to take precedence over all business strategy choices. The Board should encourage strategic orientation conversations and support a strategy process. Additionally, Board members should be informed about the strategic plans that managers have created. The Board may focus on key performance metrics and take a number of other actions to lessen the managers' significant informational advantage. The Board should also ensure that it obtains accurate and detailed information on these indicators from unbiased sources. Lastly, the importance of an efficient pay and reward plan in motivating managers to value creation cannot be overstated. The Board must be able to interact with all types of stakeholders, seek a fair distribution of rewards between short- and long-term output, determine the desired total compensation amount in relation to relevant markets, implement safeguards against handling output measurements and indicators, and determine the proportion of internal measurements relative to external measurements of output. Organizational structures need to be modified at the structural level in order to facilitate the growth of CG within the company. It is true that certain organizational designs may support governance better than others.

In terms of organizational structure, the governance-friendly one should take precedence, and the Board in particular has to stay out of management's hands in order to accomplish CG objectives. An effective system should provide staff member’s unambiguous signals about the integration of the organization's multiple governance activities. In addition to the standard information required for conventional control and monitoring, the Board often requires access to strategic information that is especially pertinent to the kind of organization in question. As a result, it will have access to impartial assessments of the company's competitive standing as well as the level of satisfaction of its clients, staff, and employee retention on a regular basis. For these reasons, the Board need to have access to the services of a strong audit committee. But, if an audit committee is given the tools and resources it needs, it will be more successful in safeguarding confidential information within the company. Additionally, independence from management must be guaranteed. Previous discussions have shown that one of CG's main issues is the Board of Directors' inability to adequately represent the interests of shareholders and other stakeholders. Reforms in governance must take these aspects into account [11], [12].

CG measurements

Reliability for democratic governance and clean government are closely related, according to data from the Worldwide Governance Indicators for 2005. Democracies that are thriving tend to have extremely low levels of corruption, while nations that struggle with accountability and voice often have considerably higher levels of corruption. It is astonishing, however, to discover that boards of directors have only lately become aware of their fundamental and long-ignored corporate duty in the wake of the corporate catastrophe and its unparalleled moral savagery. In actuality, governance has shown to be essential for the business as well as for society at large. Even yet, there is ongoing discussion over the firm's presently agreed-upon goal, which is referred to as "shareholders' wealth maximization." In reality, it is becoming more and clearer that safeguarding the interests of other stakeholders must coexist with the goal of maximizing shareholder value.

Because sound corporate governance (CG) procedures enhance business management and lower associated risk, they are expected to attract investment. Globally speaking, developing nations, in particular, would be able to modernize their corporate sectors, draw in foreign investment and technology, and become globally competitive through adopting national institutions, rules, laws, and practices based on international norms and standards. Moreover, there would be a decrease in sovereign and political risks, and there would be a disassociation between economic performance and results and political regimes and resource reliance. A cordial working relationship between the management and the Board is hindering CG's progress. Respect for one another within a collaborative and self-responsibility framework is a skill that every member of the business must acquire. Any Board of Directors would struggle to carry out its duties in an efficient manner if it cannot compel the confidence and faith of its managers. But a management team that recognizes the Board's responsibility can only encourage it to be fully occupied. Similarly, managers who are able to carry out their duties with integrity command the respect of their staff and cultivate a sense of loyalty to the organization's goals. Because of this, the Board and management are able to work together purposefully and successfully, especially in areas like:

1. Clearly identifying the connections on which they are active and providing an explanation,

2. Employing people that are suitable in terms of their qualities and value as persons

3. Aligning their own objectives with those of the stockholders,

4. Establishing performance standards, rules, and goals for the company,

5. Assessing the strategies for achieving these goals, as well as the outcomes of those efforts, and

6. Responding to outcomes while keeping managerial accountability in mind.

Workers who really believe that their management is honest and values them will be much more committed, driven, and willing to help the company achieve its goals of expansion and success. It just requires demonstrating to staff members the right path to pursue, especially via the creation of well-organized action plans and ensuring that they possess the requisite skills, primarily through the implementation of suitable training programs.

Maintaining happy, competent staff can only increase consumer satisfaction and loyalty to the company, as well as that of suppliers, creditors, and other external relationships. They are now all associated with a reputable institution that is respected for its professionalism and seriousness. Under such circumstances, value will only rise, which should benefit all parties involved both inside and outside the company.

In this sense, the very repulsive actions of some corporate managers motivated only by their own gain rather than by creating value for stakeholders have shown to be highly detrimental to everyone involved and occasionally even pivotal for certain firms. Some managers learnt how to negotiate company goals to their personal advantage because they were self-serving. For example, they learn how to buy off workers' tranquility by offering them large, unaffordable collective bargaining agreements. They also acquired mathematical arithmetic skills in order to optimize their own choice strategies, etc. Suboptimality in decision-making has become the norm in these situations, and in 2000 alone, hundreds of billions of dollars were wasted in this manner. The magnitude of these losses has hindered social and economic development and poses a serious danger to the whole banking system of the model assumes that after being persuaded of the organization's sincerity, clients, vendors, and other outside parties are willing to relinquish their faith in it, may even start to worry for its future, and to some degree, they start to contribute to value creation.

Operationally, CG consists of a variety of operations, including auditing, control, evaluation, supervision, and strategic planning. The size of the Board's involvement in CG makes it essential for shareholders to have confidence in the effectiveness and reliability of the Board. Nonetheless, we should be sorry for the lack of concern at this point, particularly in relation to the availability of official and open processes for proposing candidates for the Board. We'll talk about a few simple steps that can really make a big difference.

The VCG model demonstrates the significance of corporate governance (CG) and suggests that shareholders, via their elected Board of Directors, should bear responsibility for it. Byrne, Steward and Walsh, and Millstein and MacAvoy all come to the same conclusion. On the other hand, the Board of Directors need to bear some of the blame for how the organization's value really increases as well as for the growth itself. To put it another way, care must be taken to make sure that the path used for this goal respects people and principles. In the end, ethical practices and sound governance will increase a company's wealth and establish its integrity, benefiting both the business and society at large. This is a predictable result given that the goal of effective governance is to raise the organizations' stability, viability, and competitiveness. Furthermore, competition is fierce in an economy that is becoming more international, and excellent governance may help by affecting how overseas investors see domestic enterprises.

The same goal and many different national CG systems

Global capital market rivalry is evolving into a kind of corporate governance (CG) competition, with international financing agencies even mandating the use of some CG standards. Currently, two schools of thought contest the universality of governance theory.

The first school, which has Anglo-Saxon roots, prioritizes the property right and shareholder supremacy.7 As a result, the organization's goal and the ultimate form of its governance are centered on maximizing shareholder wealth. Traditionally, this kind of perspective has been based on the justification that other stakeholders inside the business eventually have their own defense systems. For example, the long-term creditors may use certain contractual terms to protect themselves. Workers may also join unions that are only committed to protecting their rights, etc. According to this perspective, the only people who are left without any special protection are the shareholders. They must back the majority of the risk taken by the organization and offer cash in rather ambiguous circumstances. They are put in a situation where supervisors may take advantage of them. A second justification for a shareholder orientation is put out by the Anglo-Saxon method, particularly the American way, and it refers to the challenging undertaking of concurrently addressing the conflicting goals of several corporate stakeholders. Professor Yoshimori offers even another rationale. He claims that the Anglo-Saxon school's emphasis on the shareholder's superiority over other parties' rights originated in the nineteenth century, when contractors were often actively involved in running their own enterprises as well as being the major shareholders. It was quite reasonable and proper for them to be regarded as the main interested party since they held the lion's share of the shares, borne the lion's share of the risk, and had a tight financial relationship with their enterprises.

The second school of thinking takes a completely different tack; it views responsibility as a social duty because it believes that governance allows an organization to carry out its social purpose in a fair and transparent manner. For instance, in many European nations, the organization and its governance are seen according to this widely held belief that the organization's purpose is to balance the interests of its shareholders among other conflicting parties. According to David Brown, the so-called "homogeneity" across Anglo-Saxon models could simply be another mistake in judgment. According to him, there is a growing third style to governance, which is embodied in the contemporary Canadian model, which is mistakenly categorized as exclusively Anglo-Saxon. In contrast to the US method, which is focused on regulations and calls for additional laws, the Canadian approach is founded on values.

Turkish experience may be combined with Japanese experience to create still more alternative systems that, depending on political and economic forces, alternate between leaning toward the Anglo-Saxon and the European models. These role models never give up on finding their own path, which they believe will be sensitive to the requirements of their individual nations. Even while they are worried about the phenomena of CG, some nations have not yet made a decision, are still only thinking about governance from a constraint-free perspective, and consistently fail to put up the work required to go in the direction of real governance development.

Whichever approach is chosen, regardless of the nation, the recent American Sarbanes/Oxley Act will undoubtedly have an impact. It is widely believed that businesses and nations that use a CG model that emphasizes the market mechanisms of CG as the primary mechanism of CG have a distinct competitive advantage. As a result, CG is becoming more significant while making investing selections. Most laws across the world have found a suitable answer to the SOX8, which has resulted in the most significant overhaul of US securities markets regulation for the last ten years, in order to advance their own CG national system. In fact, the SOX's adoption has sparked a global "tsunami" of governance changes, and every new effort bears the spirit of the SOX's rules. The SOX had a major effect on national CG systems, whether they were Chinese, Japanese, Russian, French, Mexican, Canadian, European, etc.

However, SOX was never planned to be global; rather, it was created to solve a particular local American issue that only affected major American listed corporations. The SOX's unexpected influence can be explained by two factors: first, the significant international pressure that international agencies have placed on some nations to enhance their corporate governance (CG) systems in order to secure funding; and second, the majority of governance research originates in the United States, which inevitably reflects American concerns and proposes American solutions.

Aside from a shared starting point, the reasons for the governance operations in the many systems that are now in place vary typically. Environments where organizations, for example, heavily rely on the financial markets for funding tend to place more of a focus on governance action in order to safeguard shareholders and accomplish the goal of wealth maximization. The US governance system is an example of what is meant to be understood as "market based governance." It is also said under such a system that the goal of maximizing shareholder wealth automatically respects the interests of other stakeholders, including creditors, suppliers, workers, and so on. On the other hand, ownership is often concentrated in circumstances where firms must heavily rely on banks for funding. This leads to the emergence of an additional governance structure known as "banking governance" or internal auditing. In addition to ownership concentration, the financial market is unable to adequately monitor money and organization control is seldom successful. However, keep in mind that even under some financial governance regimes, ownership might occasionally be sufficiently dispersed, as in Japan, and occasionally very concentrated, as in Germany. In conclusion, many development environments include unique characteristics and methods. These settings are facing difficulties in identifying suitable solutions for their particular governance issues, and it is evident that CG models do not meet their requirements.

It goes without saying that CG concerns might differ across businesses as well as between nations. For instance, it might reveal that a key concern in the enforcement domain is the caliber and stature of the court. In some nations, mass privatization initiatives have also given rise to a class of shareholders who lack a clear understanding of their obligations to the firm, other owners, and both. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has its own guidelines to assist nations in developing their own CG systems. Originally adopted by OECD Ministers in 1999, the 2004 OECD Corporate Governance Principles have grown to become a global standard for decision-makers. Five key sectors have seen the advancement of these principles:

1. Ensuring the foundation for a framework of effective corporate governance;

2. The Principal Ownership Roles and Shareholder Rights;

3. The Equi Treatment of Disclosure to Shareholders

4. Of penness; and

5. The board's responsibilities.

National experiences with CG systems seem to indicate that the cornerstone of all currently recognized CG systems is management's Board oversight inside enterprises. A delegation from shareholders, banks, and other stakeholders, as well as the Board of Directors, are expected to guarantee this kind of oversight. However, because gathering information is an expensive procedure for outsiders, an efficient monitoring function can only take place in the presence of a trustworthy internal information system. Charreaux provides a summary of governance ideas in sections 2 and 3, mostly via an examination of current theories. Macro theories, also known as national system theories, are divided into two categories: those that attribute a dominating role to production and those that appropriate the organizational rent. Micro theories are provided by challenging the disciplinary perspective with the knowledge-based approach. According to the author, market-oriented governance is only one paradigm with several drawbacks. He comes to the conclusion that, over the long run, none of the national government systems in place now stand out in terms of effectiveness and utility.

CONCLUSION

Essentially, by providing a comprehensive understanding of the complex processes present in many national systems, this study advances our understanding of corporate governance and directs stakeholders toward more effective governance frameworks appropriate for a range of global situations. Moreover, corporate governance procedures are significantly shaped by ownership arrangements. Comparing countries with dispersed ownership, which are common in Anglo-American jurisdictions, with those with concentrated ownership, such family-owned enterprises, which are common in many developing economies, reveals distinct governance dynamics. Additionally, different national settings have different roles for boards of directors. While some nations place a strong emphasis on independent board structures to reduce agency issues, others place a higher priority on stakeholder participation and board diversity to guarantee more accountability and decision-making. Furthermore, corporate governance efficacy is greatly impacted by legal frameworks and enforcement procedures. Variations in legislative traditions, regulatory rigor, and enforcement capabilities lead to differences in governance outcomes and compliance rates across countries. The need of comprehending and adjusting to the subtleties of various national corporate governance systems is emphasized in the study's conclusion. Policymakers, regulators, and business executives may use comparative views to improve governance standards, encourage cross-border cooperation, and advance sustainable economic growth because they recognize that variety is a source of creativity and resilience.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. M. Bae, M. A. K. Masud, and J. D. Kim, "A cross-country investigation of corporate governance and corporate sustainability disclosure: A signaling theory perspective," *Sustain.*, 2018.

[2] M. Mahrani and N. Soewarno, "The effect of good corporate governance mechanism and corporate social responsibility on financial performance with earnings management as mediating variable," *Asian J. Account. Res.*, 2018.

[3] D. Anginer, A. Demirguc-Kunt, H. Huizinga, and K. Ma, "Corporate governance of banks and financial stability," *J. financ. econ.*, 2018.

[4] Z. Mahmood, R. Kouser, W. Ali, Z. Ahmad, and T. Salman, "Does corporate governance affect sustainability disclosure? A mixed methods study," *Sustain.*, 2018.

[5] R. K. Brahmana, R. K. Brahmana, and T. C. F. Ho, "Training and development policy, corporate governance, and firm performance," *Gadjah Mada Int. J. Bus.*, 2018.

[6] L. Liu, W. Qu, and J. Haman, "Product market competition, state-ownership, corporate governance and firm performance," *Asian Rev. Account.*, 2018.

[7] A. B. Báez, A. J. Báez-García, F. Flores-Muñoz, and J. Gutiérrez-Barroso, "Gender diversity, corporate governance and firm behavior: The challenge of emotional management," *Eur. Res. Manag. Bus. Econ.*, 2018.

[8] N. Lukviarman and A. P. Johan, "Meta-analysis of corporate governance in Asia," *Invest. Manag. Financ. Innov.*, 2018.

[9] S. Rughoobur, "An assessment of good corporate governance in state owned enterprises of Mauritius," *Stud. Bus. Econ.*, 2018.

[10] F. Nakpodia and E. Adegbite, "Corporate governance and elites," *Account. Forum*, 2018.

[11] M. Lassoued, "Corporate governance and financial stability in Islamic banking," *Manag. Financ.*, 2018.

[12] I. Muda, W. Maulana, H. S. Siregar, and N. Indra, "The analysis of effects of good corporate governance on earnings management in Indonesia with panel data approach," *Iran. Econ. Rev.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 2

MICRO THEORIES OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: A REVIEW STUDY

Dr. Chaya Bagrecha, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.chayabagrecha@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Corporate governance, as a multidimensional concept, is underpinned by various micro theories that offer insights into the internal mechanisms and dynamics governing firms' behavior and performance. This paper aims to dissect and analyze the micro theories of corporate governance, shedding light on their conceptual foundations, empirical evidence, and practical implications. The study delves into prominent micro theories, including agency theory, stewardship theory, resource dependence theory, transaction cost economics, and stakeholder theory. It examines how these theories elucidate the relationships between key actors within the corporate governance framework, such as shareholders, managers, boards of directors, and other stakeholders. Agency theory, for instance, focuses on the principal-agent relationship and the mechanisms to mitigate conflicts of interest between shareholders (principals) and managers (agents). Stewardship theory, in contrast, emphasizes managerial discretion and alignment of interests between managers and shareholders, fostering a collaborative approach to governance.

KEYWORDS:

Institutional Variances, Legal Frameworks, Ownership Structures, Regulatory Mechanisms, Shareholder Rights, Stakeholder Interests,

INTRODUCTION

Research on corporate governance has historically been primarily focused on Anglo-Saxon major public firms. As a result, the formal and informal regulations of a specific national institutional framework were studied in relation to CG systems. Therefore, it resulted in the development of mechanisms that were disassociated from their national specificities, such as the board of directors, managers' markets, and takeovers. Research comparing various national systems across time found that national institutional designs, such as those of the legal or political systems, have to be taken into consideration in order to fully comprehend the systems' variety as well as their underlying logic of operation. This will be dedicated to the ideas based on the management and the company as an extension of this development. After being presented, it will discuss methods that make up the paradigm of governance and evaluate how well current efforts to bring them together into a composite theory of governance are working. Lastly, it will wrap off with a summary of the many perspectives that make up the micro approach to governance [1], [2].

CG from a historical angle

The goal of governance theories is not to examine how managers govern—that would cause us to mistake the word governance with management but rather how they are governed. This is contrary to what the phrase "corporate governance," however imprecise, may signify, sometimes leading us to infer. We may compare the situation to that of a child's governess in order to make the concept clearer. This position's primary responsibilities include watching after kids and establishing the game's rules and latitude. As a result, the governess carries out two related tasks: a "constraining" disciplinary task and a "enabling" instructional one. The play area's design and the games' intrinsic qualities facilitate monitoring while simultaneously promoting learning [3], [4]. In an early analysis conducted after the 1929 crisis, Berle and Means found that the issue of managers' governance resulted from the division of ownership into two functions: a decision-making function that was assumed to be the prerogative of the managers and a disciplinary function that was supported by incentive and supervision systems, which were supposed to be carried out by the shareholders. This division of ownership occurred at the beginning of the century during the emergence of large public corporations with a broad shareholder base, known as "managerial" firms, where the managers do not hold a significant share of the capital. Due to the breakdown of the mechanisms in place to maintain the senior management' discipline, this split would have resulted in a fall in the firms' performance and spoliation of shareholders.

Because the responsibilities that are often united under the responsibility of a single entrepreneur are separated, Berle and Means came to the conclusion that the firm's goal should no longer be to maximize shareholder value.

The large public corporation's shareholders would no longer be able to legitimately claim to be the only residual claimants—that is, to have the exclusive right to appropriate the profit—because they had chosen to only perform the "passive" aspect of ownership rather than the "active" aspect. Only those who engage in active entrepreneurial functions should have been granted this status. As a result, they suggested using a stakeholder model, in which the big public corporation would have to take into consideration the interests of all of its stakeholders. Nonetheless, their idea would be the source of the United States' tightening of stock market laws, which led to the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which is in charge of safeguarding financial investors.

The issue of governance was first seen from the viewpoint of the manager's conduct from a "regulation" standpoint, which established the "rules of the game for managers." When stated thus way, this issue was only mentioned in the oldest books on the leadership of political parties.

The issue of governance persists, regardless of whether we are talking about the dynamic between management and shareholders or between public officials and the general public. In this sense, political scientists and constitutional lawyers have always been interested in governance, and the age-old issue of the separation of powers is usually one of governance. In the latter instance, however, the rules of the game aim to safeguard not just the members' financial resources and income but also other, more basic rights. Political sciences have recently gained more traction in explaining the emergence of various national corporate governance systems, legal analysis grids, and even specific sociological approaches, with explanatory factors like culture or religion. This is largely due to the work of Roe. Furthermore, the study of contrasted efficiency and the development of the NSCG has given rise to a resurgence of the old subject of economic system comparison, to the extent that some writers refer to it as "New Comparative Economics. It is hardly unexpected that these breakthroughs and multidisciplinary reconciliations have occurred. An institutionalism viewpoint is closely linked to the idea of governance as a set of administrative rules. This viewpoint is naturally present in sociology, law, and political science, and it has been heavily revived in economics during the last three decades with the rise of the neo-institutional approach.

When this viewpoint is applied to CG, it may be seen as a particular instance connected to North's methodology. According to the latter, institutions are "the rules of the game in a society," or, to put it more properly, "the humanly devised constraints that shape human interaction." As a result, the governance system is a collection of institutional processes that indicate the guidelines for managers, or an institutional "matrix." Accordingly, the term "governance" refers to the collection of institutional and organizational procedures that establish the authority and shape the choices made by managers; in other words, they "govern" their behavior and delineate their discretionary space [5], [6].

Micro-theories of governance: the management and governance of the company

The majority of micro theories place equal emphasis on efficiency and a specific interpretation of economic Darwinism, which results in a connection being made between the effectiveness of the governing structures and selection via inter-firm rivalry. Only effective systems that guarantee the control of businesses leading to the generation of sustainable value, as per the natural selection theory applied to the area of governance, are long-lasting.

As a result, the systems under observation would be regarded as efficient. Some contemporary biological studies question this relationship between efficiency and survival, which gives rise to a criticism called "Panglossianism."

This criticism of CG seeks to reach a conclusion that is often linked to the functionalist perspective: that is, that the governing systems that have been seen would be the most efficient feasible. Stated differently, first-degree efficiency would be ensured, and systems should automatically and methodically achieve peak performance. The disciplinary approach and the knowledge-based approach are the two methods that make up the efficiency paradigm.

All of the governance theories that are related to the efficiency paradigm are, more or less explicitly, predicated on a certain value generation and allocation model that is linked to an efficiency-based organizational theory. Every organization should aim to generate an excess, or organizational rent, based on the resources that are used; these resources should be allocated in a way that ensures the organization's sustainability by enlisting the support of various stakeholders. The idea of governance as a set of guidelines for managers may be applied to the organization and the model for creating and allocating value kept, which is linked to a certain understanding of efficiency. We shall make a distinction between the knowledge-based approach and the disciplinary approach.

The first strategy is based on the contractual perspective of the company, which is usually supported by disciplinary grounds. The company is portrayed as a "nexus of contracts," or a hub for decision-making in charge of centralized contract negotiations and administration for all contracts necessary for its operations. The spontaneous management of all contracts by the market, or the only price mechanism, does not create maximum value; that is, it does not make the best use of the investment opportunities that are thought to be given because of the asymmetry of information between the economic actors and the conflicts of interest. It was shown that an authoritarian management style guided by the hierarchy's directives was more effective for certain contracts [7], [8].

The "contractual theories" of the company have their roots in this debate. On the other hand, it presents a limited and unfavorable image of the fruitful endeavor. "Disciplinary" practices are the foundation of efficiency; incentives and oversight are required to prevent the gains from collaboration from being siphoned off.

The reason the company exists is because it can successfully reduce the loss of efficiency caused by stakeholder conflicts of interest, losses that ought to be quantifiable by the first rank Pareto optimum, sometimes known as "Nirvana economy," is the state in which market coordination is perfect and free from conflicts of interest. This perspective's underlying idea of efficiency may be explained as a modification of Pareto's allocative efficiency criterion. If there is another organization that generates superior average outcomes for all the stakeholders engaged in all potential environmental conditions, then Milgrom and Roberts contend that the other organization is inefficient. It should be open to the stakeholders to bargain, carry out, and uphold their choices.

Efficiency, by definition, depends on value created, but because of its Paretian origin, it also depends on how this value is allocated. Unless there are extremely specific circumstances, which are consistent with Coase's theorem and involve very small allocation costs, the creation and allocation of value are no longer independent and separable. Stated differently, the degree of value generated is influenced by the allocation mechanism. Because this technique is difficult to implement, it is often abandoned in favor of measuring productive efficiency alone, which is determined by reporting output in proportion to resources used.

DISCUSSION

Knowledge-based theories would have additional bases linked to knowledge acquisition and innovation if, from a contractual perspective, the creation of value results only from the resolution of conflicts of interest based on asymmetry of information: this allows the firm, a well-identified entity, to acquire the faculty of learning and to create knowledge. Value creation can follows a production route based on talents rather than the disciplinary path. The static definition of Pareto efficiency or basic productive efficiency is abandoned in favor of a dynamic or adaptive approach that draws heavily from Schumpeter, who values creativity, adaptability, and the capacity to create long-term value. Let us clarify that rather than the opposition between the "nexus of contracts" firm and the "productive entity" firm, which can be transcended by maintaining a constitutionalist view of the nexus of contracts, the two paradigms are primarily divided by an argument deemed crucial to the process of value creation: disciplinary vs. knowledge-based. In the latter case, the contracts network is seen as a constitution outlining the shared guidelines that let the company to function as a single unit [9], [10].

The CG discipline's perspective

There are several variations of the disciplinary viewpoint depending on how the value generation process is analyzed and how the nexus of contracts is represented. The financial or shareholder perspective is traditionally seen as predominating over the stakeholder view.

The shareholder-based governance model

Owing to the controversy surrounding huge public corporations that Berle and Means initiated, the agency theory is often linked to the financial model of governance. Ironically, this model's original analysis—which concerned the entrepreneurial firm's openness of capital—came from a study by Jensen and Meckling that had two primary goals. The first, and most ambitious, goal was to put out a contractual theory of the company as a group of productive inputs, with an emphasis on the agency relationship notion and drawing inspiration from the theory of property rights. The second, more constrained goal was to demonstrate the theory's capacity for explanation in relation to the firm's capital structure issue.

Initially, Jensen and Meckling viewed the firm as a hub of contracts that linked the firm to all resource contributors. However, their narrow goal of elucidating the capital structure prompted them to create a more basic model that only took into account two agency relationships. In the first, the management was associated with the shareholders, whereas in the second, the company was associated with the creditors. The shareholder model, however, is most often founded on the normative branch of agency theory, sometimes known as the "principal-agent" branch. This branch of theory asserts, via its dominant model, that managers are the only agents and shareholders are the only principals. Furthermore, an alternative justification for the shareholder purpose may be made in order to better align with the positive branch of the agency theory that emerged from Jensen and Meckling's investigation. All that is necessary to support the natural selection theory is the assertion that organizational practices have evolved naturally, increasing the likelihood that the businesses that embraced them would survive. Now, however, the challenge is to support this claim by seeking to pinpoint the origins of the advantage that was given.

The first justification, formulated by Williamson, is based on the assumption that, in the event that stakeholders, apart from the shareholders, are adequately safeguarded by their contracts, the unique features of the transaction, which involve the contribution of financial capital, expose the shareholders specifically to opportunistic risks, with them bearing the majority of the residual risk. In order to safeguard their interests and lower the expenses of this specific transaction, the shareholders would be given influence over the governance structure. Hansmann's decision to keep the manager's control expenses enabled him to conclude this first argument. An excessive expense may surpass the savings on processing expenses achieved by giving exclusive power to the owners. Because it is assumed that the interests of the shareholders are homogeneous, a low-cost, group decision would result, so the shareholder value is also necessary. Therefore, the two assumptions that underpin the shareholder aim are that there is homogeneity of interests across the various kinds of shareholders and that the shareholder investment is least protected against the opportunism of managers. Conflicts between dominant shareholders, holders of controlling interest, and minority investors render the latter theory erroneous [11], [12].

According to Jensen and Meckling's perspective, which is primarily completed by Fama's analysis focused on large public corporations, the system of governance is made up of "external" mechanisms that come from the markets' natural workings and "internal" mechanisms that are purposefully implemented by legislators or stakeholders. The ability of "external" mechanisms like takeovers and the market of managers to reduce agency costs resulting from conflicts between managers and shareholders is what led to the appearance and persistence of "internal" mechanisms like the voting rights assigned to shareholders, the board of directors, the remuneration systems, and the audits decided by the managers. The resolution of conflicts of interest between the company and its financial creditors justifies the use of additional mechanisms, including contractual guarantees, bankruptcy process laws, the financial information market, and even an unofficial mechanism like reputation.

The relevance of these several processes is not always the same. There is a hierarchy that differs based on the kind of business. Therefore, according to Fama, the market of managers, which is based on the financial market's assessment of performance, is the dominant mechanism for big public businesses. Managers aim to maximize shareholder value in order to enhance their reputation and market value. Internal processes include hierarchy, peer supervision among management team members, and most importantly, the board of directors, round out this initial mechanism. The latter serves a single disciplinary purpose and is either incentive-based it links managers' compensation to shareholder value sanction-based it involves evicting managers or monitoring executed, for instance, by the audit committee. In order to ensure efficiency, the board has to have both outside directors, whose independence should be ensured by the presence of a competitive market for directors, and internal directors for informative reasons. A harsh and expensive disciplinary mechanism, the takeover market steps in only as a last option.

Value loss may have a variety of causes, depending on the kind of dispute. Some models use management-implemented entrenchment tactics. The latter could choose to invest in "idiosyncratic" or low-profile initiatives in order to avoid being fired, which would save him from losing human capital and allow him to keep taking rent. This would increase the cost of replacing him for the shareholders. In the first scenario, the manager's leadership role is essential to the company's prosperity; if he were fired, the shareholders would forfeit a portion of their organizational rent. In the second scenario, there is less pressure from the managers' market and it would be more difficult for the shareholders to appraise the opportunity of a replacement. The efficiency paradigm is not at odds with this procedure of accounting for the managers' defensive actions as well as their methods of pursuing rent. Because entrenchment raises agency costs, the governance structures are meant to adjust to lessen the adverse consequences of this kind of approach from the start.

Financial investors are the main focus of this initial governance strategy. The managers' discipline is necessary to create value for the shareholders. Discussions about the compensation of managers and directors, the function, makeup, and structure of the board of directors, the disciplining effect of takeovers, the performance standard guaranteed by the financial market, freedom of speech, and the safeguarding of small investors all stem primarily from the financial model. Although the Anglo-Saxon large public corporation served as the direct inspiration for this prevalent model, it has undergone significant changes due to the concentration of equity capital in non-Anglo-Saxon countries and the significant spoliation of small investors by dominant shareholders, particularly during privatizations in the former Eastern Bloc countries. The dominant stockholders, who would use their position to usurp the majority of the rent, came to the attention instead of the management, who was initially the center of attention. In a way, the conflict between managers and shareholders is less important in the financial model today than the dominant conflict between shareholders and small investors.

Because shareholders are the only remaining claimants, shareholder value is the sole metric used to evaluate the effectiveness of the various mechanisms. This has led to a number of empirical studies, which have been made possible by the availability of financial data banks. These often equivocal findings suggest that the shareholder model's capacity for explanation is restricted. This is most likely because of the effects of complementarity and substitution that arise between the different processes. This model needs to be extended to account for other stakeholders, such as employees, due to its shortcomings, particularly in explaining the structure and operation of non-Anglo-Saxon systems and its lack of realism given the small role shareholders play in company financing or the hazy relationship between disciplinary systems and shareholder performance.

The model of disciplinary stakeholders

The idea that the company is a collection of productive inputs, the synergies of which provide the foundation for organizational rent, is another source of inspiration for the disciplinary stakeholder model. Comparing the value creation model to the shareholder model, changes are made with regard to distribution, raising concerns about the shareholders' standing as exclusive residual claimants. The rejection of this theory raised concerns about rent distribution, which also affects value creation since the finance and investment are not independent. The only way to incentivize non-shareholder contributors of production elements to participate to value creation would be to provide them a portion of the rent in exchange for becoming residual claimants. Zingales clarifies that governance only affects the process of creating rent via distribution, saying that it is only a set of guidelines guiding the talks that take place after the fact over how the rent will be divided among the many stakeholders.

This perspective is the outcome of the revival of the incomplete contract theory's investigation of property rights. The distribution of residual profits and the residual control rights8 determine ownership equally. All parties involved in the nexus of contracts may be granted ownership status. A paid employee becomes a part owner when he is given the authority to make decisions so that he may use his expertise more effectively. When he receives a portion of the organizational rent in the form of overpayment, in whatever form, as opposed to his reservation compensation, he is consequently more motivated to put in more work. A particular focus of this analytical extension is human resources.

The focus on managers, which is crucial when it comes to the governance challenge, made Castanias and Helfat wonder about their contribution to the creation of the organizational rent that is, the significance of managerial rent because of their unique set of abilities. The model assumes that the more revenue the managers may appropriate, the more motivation they will have to generate the rent, even in cases where it does not explicitly address the idea of extended ownership. The issue of how to divide the rent among the owners then emerges, which is understandable given the managers' and shareholders' individual contributions as well as the lack of available talents. If the financial market is competitive and the shareholder function is restricted to the contribution of equity capital, or "passive" ownership, shareholders will have less clout. As a result, in order to retain them in the center of contracts, shareholders must be compensated at their opportunity cost, which is assumed to be equal to the market equilibrium rate. To prevent being fired, it is preferable for the management to split the rent with them; as a result, their interests somewhat align with those of the shareholders. This situation leads to a distinct understanding of the governance system, with some processes being interpreted differently and the severity of disputes being seen as less relevant than inside the financial model.

Therefore, in contrast to the conventional understanding, value is not always destroyed as a result of the managers' entrenchment strategies. By guaranteeing the return on the company's unique human capital investment, entrenchment promotes management investment in other areas, potentially increasing organizational rent. This reasoning may be applied to management freedom: too strict discipline that reduces latitude can lead to a decline in managers' efforts and initiatives, which in turn can lead to a decline in efficiency.

The question of where the rent came from focused attention not just on management capital but also on the unique abilities of the staff. It matters, as Rajan and Zingales have shown, especially in the context of the New Economy. If human capital is the foundation for the rent, then its distinctiveness makes it susceptible to expropriation efforts. Therefore, the governance system's justification is based on its capacity to safeguard this capital. The company turns into a hub for certain investments, bringing together people and co-specific assets. The process of accumulating certain assets connected to the crucial resources the management brings is what determines the organizational rent. If rent growth is strong enough to motivate various stakeholders to advance their respective investments particularly workers investing in their human capital the sustainability will be guaranteed. Furthermore, according to Rajan and Zingales, allocation rather than management shirking would emerge as the primary governance issue as a result of the vital assets' growing inalienability.

The expansion of the stakeholder approach to all parties involved in a contract is the obvious next step, and it helps to create an organizational rent. The latter also rely on the specific capabilities provided by certain suppliers, subcontractors, or consumers, particularly in long-term cooperative partnerships. Such an approach presupposes that the connections between the company and the many stakeholders are often co-constructed rather than reduced to straightforward market transactions guided by pricing. This method, which was put forth by

Charreaux and Charreaux and Desbrières, studies and assesses the governance system based on its capacity to generate stakeholder value for all stakeholders by minimizing the value loss brought on by disputes over the distribution of rent among the various stakeholders.

Even if certain components of the stakeholder model seem to be based on knowledge, the modeling of the production of value can be summed up as fundamentally resolving conflicts of interest by affecting distribution. The process of value creation itself is yet undiscovered, but according to Alchian and Demsetz, the manager then develops a specific skill related to the other production elements and stricto sensu plays a considerably bigger role in management than just monitoring or "metering." Furthermore, Jensen and Meckling, Jensen and Fama, and Jensen are content with their limited perspective that ownership, governance, and organizational architecture are structured to maximize the use of knowledge—knowledge not really being distinct from information. Not much more is offered by the models of Blair and Stout, Rajan, and Zingales. We might not really see this analysis of the value creation process in terms of comparative advantages tied to production if the first model holds that the organizational rent is the result of specific investments made by the various stakeholders and the second model emphasizes the significance of both vertical and horizontal cooperation to produce this rent. In particular, Rajan and Zingales' theory of the company maintains a conventional perspective on investment and value development. Although it offers a more comprehensive and comprehensive model, its theory of governance is in line with Hart and Moore's, and it is still purely disciplinary. The goal is to lessen the inefficiencies that arise from disputes over rent distribution and, in particular, those related to underinvestment brought on by the unique nature of assets and the hold-up phenomena in the Williamson tradition. This finding holds true for the broader studies as well, emphasizing the two different kinds of causation that exist between the ways in which ownership rights are structured and how skills are developed. If the attributes of the assets including human assets—determine the ownership structure in accordance with Grossman and Hart's theory of property rights, then the opposite may also be true.

Although it appears to be different, Berglöf and Von Thadden's definition of governance views it as a collection of mechanisms that translate signals from the goods market and production factors into the behavior of the firms. This definition is justified by two points: first, it emphasizes the significance of acknowledging the existence of actor categories other than financial investors and managers; and second, it is imperative to take into account a broader context that includes inter-firm connections and competition on the goods market. Nonetheless, the theory of the specialized business seems to place greater emphasis on organizational knowledge, leading to a shift in the theories of the firm that are disciplinary and knowledge-based—possibly even a main synthesis.

CONCLUSION

The theory of resource dependence emphasizes the external dependencies of the firm and its strategic interactions with external stakeholders. It also highlights the significance of network relationships and resource allocation choices in the dynamics of governance. The governance techniques used to reduce transaction costs resulting from opportunistic behavior and incomplete contracts are explained by transaction cost economics. Stakeholder theory further expands the purview of governance to include the interests of a variety of stakeholders, including as suppliers, consumers, workers, and the general public, in addition to shareholders. It highlights the interdependencies between stakeholders and promotes a fair governance model that takes into account their diverse interests. This research clarifies the benefits, drawbacks, and real-world applications of micro theories of corporate governance by synthesizing theoretical viewpoints with empirical data. It draws attention to how applicable these ideas are to solving problems with modern governance, such CEO pay, and diversity on boards, sustainability, and corporate social responsibility. The implications of micro theories for corporate governance practice, policy, and research are also covered in this work. It emphasizes the need of a sophisticated comprehension of governance mechanisms suited to particular organizational settings and industry dynamics and pushes for ongoing adjustment to changing market circumstances and stakeholder expectations.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. A. Lurie, A. L. Kalamkarov, Y. O. Solyaev, A. D. Ustenko, and A. V. Volkov, "Continuum micro-dilatation modeling of auxetic metamaterials," *Int. J. Solids Struct.*, 2018.

[2] S. Turner, C. Vasilakis, M. Utley, P. Foster, A. Kotecha, and N. J. Fulop, "Analysing barriers to service improvement using a multi-level theory of innovation: the case of glaucoma outpatient clinics," *Sociol. Heal. Illn.*, 2018.

[3] X. Li, L. Li, and Y. Hu, "Instability of functionally graded micro-beams via micro-structure-dependent beam theory," *Appl. Math. Mech. (English Ed.*, 2018.

[4] S. Yang, "Teaching mode of dance appreciation micro-course based on primary teaching theory," *Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn.*, 2018.

[5] H. Zhao, S. Guo, and H. Zhao, "Selecting the optimal micro-grid planning program using a novel multi-criteria decision making model based on grey cumulative prospect theory," *Energies*, 2018.

[6] A. A. Razak, F. Muhammad, M. Y. M. Hussin, M. R. Ramdan, and F. S. A. Hadi, "Applying Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour on the Participation of Micro-Entrepreneurs in Micro-Takaful," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[7] C. M. Barnes, C. T. Dang, K. Leavitt, C. L. Guarana, and E. L. Uhlmann, "Archival Data in Micro-Organizational Research: A Toolkit for Moving to a Broader Set of Topics," *J. Manage.*, 2018.

[8] A. Taloni, M. Vodret, G. Costantini, and S. Zapperi, "Size effects on the fracture of microscale and nanoscale materials," *Nature Reviews Materials*. 2018.

[9] D. Tosh, S. Sengupta, C. A. Kamhoua, and K. A. Kwiat, "Establishing evolutionary game models for CYBer security information EXchange (CYBEX)," *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 2018.

[10] K. A. Chatha, I. Butt, M. S. S. S. S. Jajja, and M. Arshad, "Theoretical developments in empirical quantitative manufacturing strategy literature," *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*. 2018.

[11] A. E. Douglas, "Good Daphnia parents do not control the offspring microbiome," *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 2018.

[12] M. A. Choudhury, "Micro-money, finance and real economy interrelationship in the framework of islamic ontology of unity of knowledge and the world-system of social economy," *Int. J. Soc. Econ.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 3

KNOWLEDGE-BASED APPROACH OF GOVERNANCE: A REVIEW STUDY

Dr. Batani Raghavendra Rao, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- brr@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
In the contemporary era of rapid technological advancement and information proliferation, the concept of governance is undergoing a paradigm shift towards a knowledge-based approach. This paper explores the principles, practices, and implications of embracing such an approach to governance. The knowledge-based approach to governance posits that effective decision-making, policy formulation, and organizational management are contingent upon harnessing and leveraging knowledge assets. Drawing upon principles from knowledge management, organizational learning, and information systems, this approach emphasizes the importance of knowledge creation, sharing, utilization, and preservation within governance processes. The study delineates key components of the knowledge-based governance framework, including knowledge identification, acquisition, validation, dissemination, and evaluation. It examines how these components intersect with traditional governance mechanisms to enhance transparency, accountability, and effectiveness in decision-making and policy implementation.

KEYWORDS:

Business Ethics, Chairman, Compliance, Corporate Culture, Corporate Governance Codes.

INTRODUCTION

The disciplinary approach of governance either overlooks the productive dynamic or provides a narrow perspective that is confined to the influence of incentive systems on production decisions. It is nevertheless constrained by the theories of the business upon which it is based. The perspective is nonetheless predicated on rigid and reactive concepts of efficiency even if the relationship between skills and organizational rent is acknowledged and if stakeholder value seems to have more explanatory power than shareholder value. At each given time, value is maximized, and because managers are theoretically aware of all investment options, they choose their investments using a "menu" analogy. According to the discipline viewpoint, the arrangement of rent distribution that provides enough incentive to maximize value continues to be the most important factor. In particular, there is currently a lack of attention paid to the process of value creation that occurs when the investment opportunity set emerges [1], [2].

We need to use the firm's knowledge-based theories in order to understand this process. These theories depart from the neo-classical economic model, in contrast to the discipline theories that might be read lato sensu as extensions of this model. In particular, they reject the theory of restricted or unlimited calculative rationality in favor of procedural rationality. Decision-making procedures are used to determine rationality rather than the outcomes of such choices. According to these ideas, the firm's identity and competencies when regarded as a cohesive whole are the primary determinants of value generation. It’s potential to generate information and, thus, long-term profitability is correlated with its specialization. Efficiency as a dynamic notion is maintained.

The knowledge-based theories' framework for value production and allocation is quite different from the contractual-disciplinary theories', which either downplay or disregard the productive side in favor of the incentive viewpoint. It leads to a distinct approach from the motivations for the company's founding, which defines its character and sets it apart from both the market and its rivals. For instance, companies exist because, in Foss's opinion, they are better able to organize the process of collective learning. The boundaries of the firm must be understood in terms of transaction costs as well as learning, path dependence, technological opportunities, selection, and asset complementarity, according to Dosi. Firms are made up of a set of core competencies and complementary assets that go along with these competencies [3], [4].

The primary component is the weight given to the producing side from both an innovation and coordinating perspective. Therefore, in Loasby's opinion, characterizing the company as a basic informational system in which coordination is achieved only via incentive techniques is insufficient to adequately explain the coordination challenge. It has to be reframed in terms of a development purpose that is centered on the application of knowledge, which includes not only gathering information but also processing and interpreting it. This reformulation also suggests rejecting the equilibrium notion in favor of the process concept and a more nuanced understanding of the company as an open system. From a similar angle, Hodgson characterizes production as a social activity that includes individuals with their own goals in life and limits their connections. Efficiency is dependent on a number of factors, including organization, management oversight, workforce motivation and skills, and institutional structures and routines as well as cultural norms carried over from previous generations. More significant than restructuring or reconfiguring the company's business portfolio in response to environmental changes is the perceptive component of the entrepreneurial function, which is associated with management's capacity for creativity, perception, and creation of new opportunities. Recall that the goal is to guarantee wealth generation that is sustainable, especially by creating growth prospects.

To summarize, the following uses of the knowledge-based argument support the firm's perception as a processor or reservoir of knowledge: activity oriented according to managers' perspective; knowledge creation as the foundation for innovation and all investment opportunities; this knowledge has a social and tacit character that makes it hard to copy; knowledge database protection; coordination of the productive activity that involves aspects like knowledge construction, exploitation, and transfer that go beyond the simple transfer of information; and conflict resolution that transcends conflicts of interest to take on a knowledge-based aspect [5], [6].

A particular mention should be made of this last point. While it is beneficial to minimize conflicts of interest, this goal seems less than ideal for cognitive conflicts. There is a substantial distinction between the nature of conflicts of interests and cognitive conflicts. Conflicting cognitive frameworks seem to encourage innovation, even basic adaptation. Put another way, the decrease in the possibility of innovation or adaptation may more than offset the gains in productivity brought about by the elimination of cognitive conflicts. This is where we find the classic dichotomy between "exploration" and "exploitation," or between "static efficiency" and "dynamic efficiency." A reevaluation of governance is prompted by the knowledge-based approach to the company. It must assist in identifying and putting into practice profi investments from a dynamic efficiency standpoint. Demsetz argues that in order to understand how the institutional framework and consequently, the governance system affects dynamic efficiency, we need to strike a balance between three goals: we should support a wide range of experimentation; we should direct investment toward promising experimentation and away from unpromising varieties; and we should make extensive use of newly acquired knowledge.

This strategy is supported by Prahalad's critique of the financial view of governance, which calls for this view to be broadened to take into account the nature of the manager-investor relationship and its potential to boost the firm's efficiency as well as to spot and seize growth opportunities. From a wider angle, the knowledge-based approach leads to an examination of governance systems in terms of their impact on the many cognitive facets involved in the process of creating value.

The knowledge-based approach also calls for a reevaluation of the traditional financial approach to governance, which views the firm's relationship with financial investors as limited to capital contributions and views the goal of management discipline as a means of safeguarding the investment. Thus, as a number of writers have proposed, finance also involves cognition. As a result, Aoki thinks that in the venture capital governance model, the most crucial element is not the venture capital investor's capacity to provide money, but rather his ability to quickly reject the financing of less intriguing projects and, using his knowledge and experience, choose the most promising ones. on a similar vein, Charreaux offers an analysis of the finance strategy grounded on cognitive arguments that specifically acknowledge the participation of the shareholders' competence, particularly that of industrial shareholders. These advancements argue in favor of reconstructing the financial perspective of governance to include cognitive elements [7], [8].

Of course, one can question whether knowledge-based theories and disciplinary theories are incompatible in light of the instances of Winter, Foss, and Foss & Foss.18 Their studies demonstrate that a certain number of inters are conceivable, as does the constitutionalist approach to the nexus of contracts. Gaining a better understanding of the firm's performance as a collection of skills may be facilitated by taking into account the basic principles of the discipline theories, particularly with regard to conflicts of interest. For instance, the idea of specificity may be applied to organizational skills, the sharing of similar cognitive frameworks can reduce conflicts of interest, and corporate acquisition strategies can be explained by the need to safeguard information and determine if rents are reasonable. Discipline considerations alone, however, are insufficient to fully understand the cognitive elements that are directly connected to the productive function and have a tacit and social character related to organizational learning. It is possible to easily apply Zingales' notion of access to a "network of specific investments," which he relates to organizational capital, to the idea of knowledge database access. This theory, which emphasizes the disciplinary characteristics, is unable to include the cognitive component of organizational capital formation, however. On the other hand, it is possible to view some of Aoki's more ambitious works and the works of Lazonick and O'Sullivan, who concentrate on the governance of innovative firms, as attempts to develop a theory of corporate governance that takes into account both disciplinary and cognitive factors.

The opportunity to demonstrate the organization of the connections between the micro and macro levels of governance would arise from the presentation of these works. This method does not imply that we start the second section, which is dedicated to presenting the NSCG theories. Rather, it requires that we accurately illustrate how the various levels of analysis in particular, organizational and institutional levels are included into the various corporate governance theories. When macro-level considerations are made, especially when the Aokian theory is offered, it is just to enhance comprehension of the structure of all the governance systems that oversee the company and its management; the particulars of the many NSCG are not discussed.

DISCUSSION

A theory of the innovative business was developed as a consequence of the research of Lazonik and O'Sullivan. Despite being primarily grounded on knowledge-based theories, they serve as one of the greatest examples of current efforts to integrate knowledge-based and discipline-based features in value creation models. The idea of innovation is still fairly wide; it encompasses administrative and commercial issues in addition to technical ones [9], [10].

These efforts have been successful in establishing synthetic governance and giving investment a major role. Three requirements must be met for this process to be effective: it must support development; it must have an organizational aspect because organizational learning can only be carried out through interactions within the company; it must have a strategic character because it arises from decisions that are not only based on the subjective interpretation of the environment but also that change over time in response to experience, which influences learning and changes the decision's very context. The allocation process has to be "developmental, organizational, and strategic," to put it briefly.

A corresponding conception and analysis of the governance system is brought about by the characteristics of the innovation process. These conditions are: financial commitment to support the development of expertise, while also ensuring that the innovation investments have enough time to pay off; organizational integration that provides incentives for insiders to use their knowledge and efforts in line with the firm's goals; and insider control over the distribution of corporate resources and returns, which guarantees that those in positions of control have the means and motivation to make creative investments.

Based on the idea of a "skill base," which is thought to be a deciding element in understanding why people commit to a collective and cumulative learning process, this micro analysis leads to a macro study of the NSCG. A durable competitive advantage can only be obtained by those with "broad and deep" skill bases, as shown by Japan's dominance in certain industries.

On the other hand, effective organizational learning would not occur in the American context, which is defined by organizational techniques built on the three kinds of segmentation: hierarchical, functional, and strategic. As a consequence, innovation would take the form of "narrow and concentrated" skill bases, which is unsuitable for long-term development.

This perspective led to the definition of three kinds of conditions: institutional, organizational, and industrial, which all contributed to the rise of the creative business. The analysis, on the other hand, focuses on the dynamic interactions between organizational and institutional conditions, highlighting four main types of institutions: "executive" institutions, which are responsible for outlining the roles and credentials of decision makers regarding resource and return allocation within the companies; "supervisory" institutions, whose job it is to decide which stakeholders the decision makers will be accountable to; "consultative" institutions, whose job it is to specify the stakeholders to be consulted as well as the procedures for consultation; and "regulatory" institutions, which specify the laws and regulations governing company decisions pertaining to resource and return allocation [11], [12].

Based on the innovation process, this governance theory suggests ways to redistribute rents that aren't often kept in stakeholder or shareholder models. One such way is to provide preference to entrepreneurs who start new ventures. Additionally, it helps analyze how well certain mechanisms, like the board of directors, can promote organizational learning and comes to the conclusion that, for example, this body should include representation from all entities that support this goal. Lastly, and more broadly, the State is credited with playing a significant role in organizing the institutions in a way that promotes organizational learning. Both the stakeholder approach and the financial perspective of governance are severely hampered by this unwaveringly prescriptive approach, which is accused of neglecting the dynamics of innovation. In addition to its normative component, it suggests analyzing governance structures according to how well they support innovation.

Comparative institutional analysis and Aoki

Aoki's research initially focused on the complementarity of mechanisms within the Japanese firm and the theory of the "cooperative" firm, which was based on the cooperation between shareholders and employees and gave equal weight to the horizontal and participative dimensions of coordination as the vertical dimensions. Aoki recently extended his research on the company and suggested a "comparative institutional analysis" that, at the moment, most certainly qualifies as the most ambitious and sophisticated study on governance systems, taking into account both the productive and disciplinary components of governance systems. The inclusion of the company in the first analysis is justified by its key position in the model, even if the later analysis is carried out at a macro level.

Within an analytical framework grounded in subjective evolutionary game theory, wherein each player is assumed to have unique and incomplete cognitive perspectives of the game, Aoki characterizes the institutions of governance as self-reinforcing mechanisms that regulate the players' strategic interactions.

The decisions made by the parties involved in the organizational sector are controlled by these systems. The examination of governance systems aligns with a broad problem that seeks to comprehend, from a static viewpoint, the variety and intricacy of the many NSCG as matching to the various Pareto equilibrium solutions for the same game. Second, while taking innovation into account, the goal is to examine the dynamic process of change within these systems in light of the theory that states that institutions are solutions to equilibria in an evolutionary game.

This study deviates from normative analyses of governance, such the ones that often guide the financial approach or serve as the foundation for discussions on the governance of creative firms. While acknowledging that, in accordance with the natural selection principle, the least effective systems and processes may eventually be removed as a result of firm rivalry, Aoki's goal is to comprehend the foundations of the variety of governance systems.

An "overall institutional arrangement," or system, is defined as a collection of domains linked by a group of institutions that play a certain role in an economy. A key component of the study is the evolution of organizational architecture, which is based on the cooperative firm theory. This architecture is described in terms of how the various organizational components divide up the cognitive work, or the information and knowledge processing tasks. Aoki's goal was to categorize the primary architectural forms in relation to building components using various informational linkage techniques, and to investigate how well these forms might adjust to environmental changes that affected both the commercial and technical spheres.

Aoki outlines a number of organizational styles based on the contrast between idiosyncratic and systematic information as well as the division between vertical and horizontal linkages. He demonstrates how the quality of human resources and abilities affects their effectiveness. More broadly, he argues that organizational structures and the kind of human capital articulated in terms of competence must coevolve in a coordinated manner. He also comes to some of the same findings as Zingales, but in a broader context, giving the cognitive aspects—especially mental models that can comprehend the surroundings—primary importance.

The State is seen in this approach as a complete player with goals of its own, but it also functions as a constraint because of how it interacts with the other players. Through the integration of public power, the political component of governance systems is introduced, and its impact on the system as a whole is examined. This broad framework adds to the structure-based method of analyzing government, which involves three different kinds of actors: the financial investors, the employees, who invest in human capital, and the managers, who make key decisions about how best to use the resources. Aoki places particular emphasis on the institutionalized links that exist between the organizational domain and the domains of financial transactions, work relations, and polity, specifically evaluating their interactions, in order to discuss the self-enforcing nature of governance mechanisms. This is done in relation to the various types of organizational structure.

Several institutional arrangement types were found and categorized into three categories by this investigation. The Walrasian model and the model of the business connected to Grossman, Hart, and Moore's theory are two referential and theoretical models in the first group. The second brings together several national models via stylized observations of the major industrialized nations, including Germany, Japan, and the United States, prior to the changes brought about by modern information technology. According to Aoki, more models that depict, say, France, Italy, or the Scandinavian nations may have been included, but further research has to be done. The globalization model and the venture capital model connected to Silicon Valley make up the third category, which is the last one.

The investigation goes on to look at how national models perform in contrast to emergent models. Will the latter subjugate them, or will they take their position entirely? Or will the national models change to effectively address the difficulties raised by these new models?

Though debatable in many ways, Aoki's study seems to best capture the micro and macro dimensions of governance. We may lament, among other things, that the game theory framework and the manner in which information is seen as knowledge can lead to an only cursory integration of the cognitive components, particularly the generation of knowledge via organizational learning. We can also lament the frequently arbitrary nature of the typologies employed and challenge them by reviewing the criticism made by Coriat and Weinstein of the advanced causality model, which is based on generic modes of information connectedness and may appear to be insufficiently tailored to account for organizational innovations in the Aokian theory of the firm.

The amount of thought put into the relationships between the various institutional systems and organizational architecture types, as well as the effects of complementarity between the various types of institutions, most likely led to the development of the most complex governance theory to date. An overview of the key elements of the various micro theories of the firm's CG is given in.A1.

Corporate governance macro theories

The conflict between the disciplinary and cognitive roles of governance, which underpin the many micro theories put forward, may eventually lead to the identification of national corporate governance systems via analysis. First, this dichotomy would lead to the presentation of disciplinary analyses of the NSCG that assume that the primary factor influencing efficiency—which is frequently determined by the growth of the national economy in accordance with the productive perspective—is based on safeguarding the interests of the various production factor contributors, with financial investors receiving priority due to the influence of the shareholder view. Second, the analysis giving the cognitive component priority would come after this presentation. Similar to businesses, countries are expected to possess comparative advantages based on their skills, which supports international specialization and is further supported by globalization.

However, this reasoning will not be followed in order to offer a more fair and understandable exposition of the many hypotheses of the NSCG. Rather than drawing a difference between knowledge-based and disciplinary theories, we would rather utilize the one that is, however very similar to, opposing both the theories that support and those that ignore the productive part of value production. Therefore, the productive aspect—regardless of whether it is founded on disciplinary or cognitive aspects—would be taken into account internationally.

The collected literature is from somewhat distinct domains. The first method mostly consists of neoclassical economics, political theories predicated on rent-seeking, and literature on law and finance. Research falls within a broader NSCG viewpoint in the second approach than the one that Aoki's comparative institutional analysis so eloquently demonstrates. They specifically address national innovation and production systems, as well as the explanation of the many kinds of capitalism and how they have developed.

The NSCG's rent-appropriation-based disciplinary theories

The financial origins of the analyses of the disciplinary viewpoint center on the appropriate use of organizational rents and the defense of the rights of financial investors. They start with the theory that economic development and prosperity are primarily explained by the financial system. Levine offers research that clarifies and evaluates this system's function with respect to information and transaction costs. The five functions of risk management—allocation of resources, monitoring of managers and corporate control, mobilization of savings, exchange of goods and services facilitation, hedging, diversification, and pooling of risk—are how its influence is wielded. Then, the financial system would encourage capital formation and innovation.

Numerous empirical research seem to corroborate this beneficial impact. Growth and productivity are positively correlated with various indicators of the financial system's liquidity, the central bank's role in relation to commercial banks, and the significance of credit given to businesses.1 After taking into account the effects of income, education, political stability, and monetary, trade, and fiscal policies, the initial stage of financial development is also a good predictor of future growth.

The relative importance of the many contributing elements for development is still up for debate, however. Highlight the fact that growth is maximized when the following factors are improved: life expectancy, education level, quality of the law, inflation control, and exchanges' efficiency; on the other hand, growth is inversely correlated with an out-of-control birth rate and taxation.) A high-performing financial system is expected to play a major role in either driving or facilitating growth. The next step is to determine whether institutional elements, from the standpoint of corporate governance, encourage the creation of such a system.

This method will be discussed first because to its considerable relevance. La Porta et al.'s primary explanation is based on corporate legal institutions, which some writers refer to as "the quality of corporate law argument." Next, we'll discuss the criticisms leveled against the methodology and go on to discuss the competing or complementary explanatory hypotheses (political, endowment-based, and socio-cultural).

The NSCG's perspective on law and finance: the strength of the corporate law argument against a financial standpoint, effectiveness relies on safeguarding the rights of financial investors against efforts by management or controlling shareholders to appropriate them. According to La Porta et al., the quality of the legislation and its ability to provide this protection have a significant role in explaining business ownership structures and financial policies. The various NSCG must thus be examined in light of the protective capacity, which seems to be primarily dependent on the legal tradition's place of origin as evidenced by the contrast between the Civil law tradition—which draws inspiration from Roman law and encompasses numerous branches—and the Anglo-Saxon Common law tradition. In summary, the two legal systems operate based on distinct concepts. In contrast, juries in the Common law system are not professionals, the laws are not codified, and the processes are oral. The civil systems are predicated on professional judges, legal codes, and written procedures.

The prevailing view is that the power dynamics between the monarchs and the landowners are the political basis for these variations in legal traditions. In order to guarantee the preservation of the owner's interests against the monarchy, British Common law originated and developed. In particular, this protection guarantees transaction secrecy, which promotes financial development. On the other hand, the establishment of the French and German civil codes throughout the 1800s resulted in the State gaining more control over the courts, which in turn led to the government overriding individual rights and increasing economic regulation. Following that, these many legal systems spread by conquests, colonization, or plain copying. Therefore, civil law would be linked to more government intrusion, weakened private interest protection, corrupt and ineffective governments, and even less political freedom.

On the other hand, Glaeser and Shleifer provide another theory that is equally political in character and emphasizes the state's protective function. In France, where feudal lords had especially great influence, it was important to designate judges who would report to the central government in order to prevent local courts from being completely subservient to them. The nations who initially had the least effective system of protecting rights chose the civil system, in accordance with this efficiency-driven reasoning, which states that regulation results in a higher degree of growth. We note that this second defense of the State does not necessarily refute the first assertion: the State's guarantee of protection may be seen as recompense for its own predatory authority.

We may also argue that Common law derives its superiority from its inherent advantages, which allows for a better adaptation to the demands of economic development. This argument goes beyond the political explanation, which holds that either civil law is imposed because it facilitates governmental intervention or the civil law structure itself requires governmental intervention. The ineffective, non-adapted rules would vanish from an evolutionary standpoint. Thus, Beck and colleagues juxtapose a "dynamic" legal and financial viewpoint with the political stance endorsed by La Porta and colleagues. Evidently, however, the two avenues of legal influence on finance political and adaptive are not mutually exclusive: the likelihood of jurisprudence evolving is equal to the degree that the legal system is autonomous from the government.

CONCLUSION

The understanding of knowledge as a strategic resource that cuts beyond organizational boundaries is fundamental to the knowledge-based governance paradigm. In order to promote cross-sectoral and cross-disciplinary information sharing and cooperation, the research examines the functions of knowledge networks, communities of practice, and collaborative platforms. Additionally, the study explores how a knowledge-based approach may affect governance methods in a number of different fields, such as international relations, corporate governance, and public administration. It draws attention to the ways in which knowledge-based governance may improve resilience, stimulate innovation, and deal with intricately linked problems like socioeconomic inequality, pandemics, and climate change. The research also looks at the difficulties and roadblocks that come with putting into practice a knowledge-based approach to governance, such as data privacy concerns, information overload, the digital divide, and cognitive biases. It emphasizes how crucial it is to create strong governance structures and technology infrastructure in order to lessen these difficulties and advance inclusive, moral, and ethical knowledge practices.

REFERENCES:

[1] Y. Keping, “Governance and Good Governance: A New Framework for Political Analysis,” *Fudan J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[2] N. J. Bennett and T. Satterfield, “Environmental governance: A practical framework to guide design, evaluation, and analysis,” *Conservation Letters*. 2018.

[3] I. Docherty, G. Marsden, and J. Anable, “The governance of smart mobility,” *Transp. Res. Part A Policy Pract.*, 2018.

[4] F. van der Molen, “How knowledge enables governance: The coproduction of environmental governance capacity,” *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2018.

[5] R. W. S. Ruhlandt, “The governance of smart cities: A systematic literature review,” *Cities*, 2018.

[6] A. F. T. Winfield and M. Jirotka, “Ethical governance is essential to building trust in robotics and artificial intelligence systems,” *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 2018.

[7] M. Al-Ruithe, E. Benkhelifa, and K. Hameed, “Data governance taxonomy: Cloud versus non-cloud,” *Sustain.*, 2018.

[8] R. W. Gregory, E. Kaganer, O. Henfridsson, and T. J. Ruch, “It consumerization and the transformation of it governance,” *MIS Q. Manag. Inf. Syst.*, 2018.

[9] G. Özerol *et al.*, “Comparative studies of water governance: A systematic review,” *Ecol. Soc.*, 2018.

[10] A. Joshi, L. Bollen, H. Hassink, S. De Haes, and W. Van Grembergen, “Explaining IT governance disclosure through the constructs of IT governance maturity and IT strategic role,” *Inf. Manag.*, 2018.

[11] F. Nunan, “Navigating multi-level natural resource governance: an analytical guide,” *Nat. Resour. Forum*, 2018.

[12] E. M. Coyne, J. G. Coyne, and K. B. Walker, “Big Data information governance by accountants,” *Int. J. Account. Inf. Manag.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 4

CRITIQUES OF THE LAW AND FINANCE THEORY

Dr. Geeti Sharma, Associate Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.geeti_sharma@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Law and finance theory, which posits a causal relationship between legal systems and financial development, has garnered significant attention in both academic and policy circles. This paper critically examines the foundational principles, empirical evidence, and critiques surrounding the law and finance theory, shedding light on its complexities and controversies. The law and finance theory suggests that the quality of a country's legal system influences its financial development and economic growth. Specifically, it argues that stronger legal protections for investors and creditors lead to better functioning financial markets, higher levels of investment, and overall economic prosperity. However, this paper identifies and analyzes several critiques and challenges to the law and finance theory. One primary critique is the heterogeneity of legal systems and financial outcomes across different countries, which complicates establishing clear causal relationships. Moreover, scholars have raised concerns about endogeneity issues, reverse causality, and omitted variable bias in empirical studies attempting to validate the theory.

KEYWORDS:

Crisis Management, Decision-Making, Director Compensation, Disclosure, Diversity, Environmental Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

The law and finance thesis rests on a straightforward justification. Due to its acknowledged greater flexibility, common law regimes would provide superior protection for financial investors—particularly minority shareholders and foster a more robust financial market. Numerous critiques were made of this argument, primarily challenging the following: the legal categories' homogeneity and relevance; the presumed connection to the growth of financial markets; the presumed benefits of Common law and the interest in distinguishing between them with regard to the significance of governmental regulations. The first criticism concerns the alleged superiority of Common law, arguing that Anglo-Saxon law would be more suited to adjusting to changes in the economic environment. Lamoreaux and Rosenthal came to a different conclusion after researching the many legal forms that may have been used by businesses in France and the United States in the nineteenth century. Firstly, there is more freedom under the French business law. Second, because of the difficulties in carrying out the contracts, French businesspeople were able to employ this flexibility more successfully than their American counterparts, who could only partially replicate it via contractual means. Thirdly, the two systems provided comparable protection for minority shareholder and creditor interests, with the French model seeming to provide a modest edge. It seems that the French form's rigidity was overestimated and was not as good as the American form on a global scale [1], [2].

Moreover, the way the legal system has changed since the 1800s seems to indicate that American corporation law adopted French law's model rather than the other way around. The reason for France's current disadvantage in protecting minorities is that, in contrast to the US, retirement benefits are not managed via the financial market. Because of the scandals that followed the 1929 crisis, this kind of protection did not initially exist in the United States and is consequently less significant there. The writers, unable to reconcile the Anglo-Saxon system's dominance with the features of the French legal system, proposed the theory that the latter, being more intricate, could function well only insofar as the higher legal competencies needed were present in sufficient numbers. Because there aren't enough skilled legal officials in developing nations, the French version is less effective even if it is of better quality. This finding has some resemblance to that of Beck et al., who believe that the French decision deviated from the spirit of the Civil law tradition. Had Napoleon I's original goal of codifying the law been to eradicate jurisprudence, then maintaining the significant role that jurisprudence played in guiding system adaptation would have been necessary in order to adapt the law to prior legal traditions and economic requirements. Nonetheless, nations that embraced the French legal system would not have experienced the ease brought about by French jurisprudence [3], [4].

A case for Common law's ultimate supremacy can only be made if conventional legal systems are crucial. However, Pistor and Xu assert that as regulatory involvement advanced significantly over the last century, their position would become more incidental. The rules would become more deficient due to the quick advancements in society and technology. Regardless of the nation's legal heritage, the incapacity of the legal system to change quickly enough would spur an increase in the regulatory involvement by public authorities. This more adaptable intervention was less susceptible to procedural restrictions, which improved adaptation but also made the regulator's control issue worse. The primary inquiry would now be on the composition of State governance rather than the genesis of the legal tradition.

Should we acknowledge the superiority of the Common law system, is it not necessary to prove that it is the source of the financial markets' superior development? Franks et al. vigorously dispute this connection in the British instance, where the need to safeguard minorities has just now come to light. The law and finance theory predicted that this would lead to a concentrated ownership structure. But because British law has changed over the course of the 20th century—from almost no protection to robust protection—a corresponding rise in ownership dispersion ought to have happened. Conversely, the examination of the ownership structures of English corporations as evaluated in 1900 and 1960 demonstrates that ownership was not concentrated at the start of the twentieth century and that the rates of dispersion did not differ significantly between these two dates, refuting the theories of law and finance. The authors make the assumption that, in the absence of legal protection, investors' security is guaranteed by implicit agreements based on unofficial trust relationships, which are made possible by the investors' physical location—often close to the enterprises in issue. These trusting connections would have ended with the external development via takeovers, and new systems guaranteeing formal legal protection would have been put in place [5], [6].

If the rates of dispersion are comparable between 1900 and 1960, the ownership structures seem shakier in the latter part of the century. The expansion of market liquidity and investor rotation seem to be influenced by the fortification of investor formal protection. Lastly, unlike what has been seen in the United States, ownership and control were not separated in Great Britain as a consequence of ownership dispersion. Even when the founding family no longer had a significant portion of the wealth, they continued to exert strong influence on the boards of directors. For the US, coffee obtained a similar analysis. Minorities' interests were not adequately safeguarded over the most of the nineteenth century; this was similar to the current state of affairs in the former Eastern Bloc nations. Additionally, two safeguards for foreign investors funding infrastructure emerged: first, a seat on the board of directors was granted to investment bankers; and second, stock market regulations were put in place. Coffee rejected the law and finance theory because of the experiences he had in America and England. He believed that the growth of financial markets does not need the presence of laws. The reverse would be causality. These markets may first grow based on alternative private procedures, but ultimately the legislature was forced to step in to strengthen investor protection at their request.

DISCUSSION

The uniformity of the hotly debated legal categories is another need for the validity of the law and finance theory. Coffee does not prove that the English and American systems are in the same group. He demonstrates that minorities are significantly less protected in Great Britain than in the United States, and that this difference is most likely of the same kind as that which exists between the United States and France. He believes that the effectiveness of investor protection primarily depends on the ability to apply the law. Furthermore, judges play a very distinct function. Therefore, whereas American judges seem to be highly engaged in formulating new laws when there isn't a particular legislation in place, their British counterparts appear to be more passive. What therefore distinguishes nations with a civil law heritage from others? Coffee appears to be more concerned with the actual closeness between financial market regulations—which would account for the parallels in the evolution of the financial markets—than with the mere vicinity between American and British corporation laws [7], [8].

Beginning with an examination of the growth of the financial markets in Germany, England, America, and France, Coffee also offers an interpretation of the role of the State in contrast to LLSV, which holds that the financial markets cannot flourish in the absence of a legal framework safeguarding financial investors. An alternative paradigm is supported by the experiences of the United States and England, whose private mechanisms seemed to provide this protection. The legal system is crucial as a foundation for the decentralized creation of strategies for private regulation and for promoting the growth of financial markets, not as a means of defending the rights of investors. In contrast, the French situation supports this view. The government's monopolistic hold on the stock market served as an incentive for them to refrain from making improvements. Private efforts that guaranteed the protection of investors in Anglo-Saxon nations were discouraged due to government regulation.

This hypothesis has some resemblance to Pistor et al.'s very harsh criticism of the law and finance theory. The measures that LLSV uses to assess minority shareholder protection are often linked to legal procedures that, in common law nations, have either been abandoned long ago or have just lately been implemented in order to harmonize European regulations. Therefore, it does not appear well-founded to argue that these actions would follow from a more favorable attitude with respect to the preservation of ownership rights. As such, the presumed connection between legal customs and the evolution of financial markets has to be discovered in areas beyond the purview of these procedures. According to Pistor et al., the most crucial component is the legal system's flexibility in responding to the demands of social, political, and economic contexts. The flexibility of the legal system would be the primary criterion, not the protection of minority.

The political perspective

We resort to the previous political theory of the NSCG because of the law and finance theory's many shortcomings. Roe put out the first edition to describe how the American financial system was set up. Because of the role politics is said to have had in the establishment of financial institutions, it is frequently referred to as the politics and finance perspective. The Roe hypothesis has a similar position in the political viewpoint, while the LLSV theory is more prominent in the law and finance perspective. It will be pre-sent first because of this.

Roe's political ideology

The structure of the American financial system, namely the rise of big public companies and the distribution of stock ownership, is the main focus of Roe's research. This system's architecture cannot be fully explained by the pursuit of efficiency alone; rather, political limitations that have shaped its evolution in the past may have a greater impact. To bolster this thesis, Roe devolves into a historical examination of the American system, arguing that a lack of concentration prevents the system from being able to fund economic growth. Political factors that are either ideological in nature American populism would have prevented the formation of organizations strong enough to endanger the interests of the people or interest-based certain interest groups benefiting from the financial system's fragmentation are primarily to blame for this. These barriers to the establishment of a banking authority would have had an impact on insurance corporations and, to a lesser degree, investment funds, among other financial powerhouses. Thus, the argument rests on the overbearing laws and political constraints that make an NSCG inherently less than ideal.

The investors' discipline over the management would have been severely impacted if there hadn't been strong financial institutions. According to agency theory, even while concentrated ownership keeps its own costs, dispersion of ownership raises agency costs, which may result in increased capital costs. Nonetheless, the American system persisted because it was able to create new disciplinary procedures to keep managers under control and capitalize on the fragmented ownership structure that made funding and the development of managerial capital easier. However, the current shift toward institutional capital ownership and more active, direct management control may be seen as an acknowledgment of the benefits of concentrated control. Roe ultimately came to the conclusion that there has to be room for competition between the two primary systems, which pit concentrated ownership versus distributed ownership, and that neither system seems to be consistently better [9], [10].

Roe prioritized the study of the American system in his early research, but he also attempted to figure out why non-Anglo-Saxon countries did not have ownership dispersion, which would have prevented the formation of big public enterprises. Additionally, the rationale is political. Political constraints prevent shareholders' and managers' interests from aligning and lower agency costs in social democracies that uphold employee interests. As a result, managers are less motivated to carry out their management responsibilities in the shareholders' best interests. Codetermination is a major barrier to this decrease since it creates an extremely restrictive labor market. Hence, family-owned businesses or businesses with concentrated ownership would be the predominant ownership structures under social democracies. On the other hand, the US did not have a dominating social democracy, which is why the big public company did not emerge. The strong statistical association that exists between the significance of the financial market and income inequality, as well as between ownership dispersion and national political positions, lends credence to Roe's argument.

The last point, which supports the idea that political reasons impeded the development of a powerful financial force, brings the earlier arguments full circle. The theories disagree, however, when it comes to efficiency, with the former claiming that the presence of a financial power would lower agency costs between managers and shareholders and the latter claiming that the presence of a social democratic ideology would have the opposite impact. Because Roe chose not to assess the joint consequences of financial power and social democracy, the outcome is still unknown. By taking into account the competitive nature of markets, which is meant to establish the amount of appropriate rents, Roe expands his theory. Therefore, smaller countries with less of a competitive nature would be more likely to have social democracy. A higher rent would be the consequence of this vulnerability, which would provide management more flexibility while also giving other interest groups a stake in the property. In both scenarios, managers would be less constrained, agency costs would rise, and workers would be more motivated to look for rent. Owing to the workers' greater political significance than that of the stockholders, this circumstance would typically lead to the social democratic parties dominating at the federal level. In this case, the concentration of ownership would serve as a private means of protecting the interests of shareholders, which cannot be guaranteed by political or legislative means. This causation model is different from the previous one in that it bases corporate governance and political positions on the industrial structure. This concept is supported by the substantial association that has been seen in industrialized countries between market power and ownership concentration and worker protection [11], [12].

Critics of the law and finance theory also point to Roe's argument, which upholds the importance of political forces above powerful legal ones. Roe demonstrates that the law's capacity for explanation is finite, which serves to support its primacy. In order to achieve this, he divides the managerial agency costs into two categories: the first is related to "private benefits" that managers attempt to appropriate based on their opportunism, and the second is related to managerial errors, which are based on the managers' capacity to take advantage of investment opportunities in the best interests of the shareholders. These "errors," of course, could be viewed as pertinent decisions from the perspective of the managers or employees. The legislation is shown to be unable to completely eliminate the other expenses if it can effectively lower the first category of expenditures. This paradox would explain why most European countries preserve ownership concentration while providing financial investors with legal protection on par with that of the United States. Thus, the need to save expenses associated with management mistakes rather than a lack of legal protection would be the reason for this focus.

This highlights yet another limitation of the law and finance paradigm. Whether ownership concentration persists in a country, we are unsure whether this is due to financial investors' lack of protection from managers' appropriation strategies or to management mistakes that are thought to occur more often when strong shareholders are absent. Test findings validate the political theory's greater explanatory capacity in industrialized nations. Nonetheless, Roe does not come to the conclusion that the law and finance theory should be completely abandoned. The legal protection argument is still valid, especially in poor or transitional countries, but it is by no means the only one or even a significant influence in wealthy countries. It is worth noting that the law and finance theory acknowledges the significance of politics, however it confines it to elucidating the formation of the legal tradition.

According to Gourevitch, there are really three criticisms of the law and finance theory included in the political perspective of Roe. The first one has to do with how important it is for financial investors to have legal protection; nevertheless, this protection alone is insufficient to ensure dispersed ownership since control blocks exist for other reasons. The second assumes that the competitive nature of the markets, rather than the law, is what discourages requests for legal protection. Rents are constrained and disputes between the parties vying for rent appropriation are few in well-functioning markets. In conclusion, if competitiveness is the determining factor for CG, then political issues are the primary explanatory variable.

Critique of the political perspective and alternative models of politics

Roe's political theory was also the target of several criticisms and suggestions for improvement or extension. According to Gourevitch, different models may be just as persuasively put out since Roe allowed for political interpretations of administration. Specifically, Roe's theory seems to be lacking since it relies on the ideological rivalry between the left and right as well as the disagreement between workers and financial investors. It may be possible to create more scenarios with distinct interactions between the three primary interest groups—financial investors, managers, and workers. Some of these eventualities are shown by the models that Pagano and Volpin and Rajan and Zingales have suggested. Rajan and Zingales contend that the relative strength of the favorable political factors serves as the primary explanatory element for financial growth. According to their scenario, the dominant interest groups—financial or industrial—face a danger from this evolution. The established industrial interests are assumed not to be advantageous for the following reasons: they have few advantages and limited growth opportunities; they are easily financed, either by banks using their past reputation and existing project collateral as security for loans, or through their position and history on a relatively undeveloped financial market with little transparency;

Their assets are well safeguarded by their relative strength. Because of the linked nature of funding, growth jeopardizes the financial interests' competitive advantage. As a result, financial growth jeopardizes established interests by fostering more competition and impeding the advancement of current partnerships. Their relative strength and the strategy's profitability determine how strong the opposition is.

How have prevailing interest groups managed to stifle financial advancement in the past to safeguard their rental income? Due to its impact on the competitive nature of markets, the economy's global openness seems to have been the primary explanatory reason for development. Thus, the political interpretation is articulated in terms of resistance to this transparency. When there is a crisis, the public puts pressure on the government to provide more protection.

The ensuing restrictions not only hinder domestic competition but also hinder foreign competition, which helps to preserve the rents that the dominant interests have taken. Rajan and Zingales' analysis, which aims to explain the re-concentration of capital in European nations, is more dynamic and balanced than Roe's, which pits financial investors and workers against each other and argues that this is the reason for higher agency costs in social democracies and the preservation of capital concentration. The alliances formed by the interest groups will determine the outcome. Workers may sometimes be able to force the government to slow down the worldwide extension by striking a deal with business and financial interests.

Another model is put out by Pagano and Volpin. In addition to politics having an impact on how the legal framework is created in response to requests from different interest groups, political institutions' structures also have an impact on potential coalitions? Since it is assumed that businesses and managers have little sway, the political discourse mostly opposes labor and financial investors. The entrepreneurs may reach a deal with the employees that assures them of greater protection in matters pertaining to their jobs, allowing them to usurp private benefits at the cost of the financial investors. The makeup of the political institutions determines the likelihood of such an accord. The "majoritarian" systems are opposed by the "consensus" systems, which are coalition-based. Pagano and Volpin arrive to a solution in the first systems that is marked by a great protection of workers and a weak protection of financial investors. Majoritarian regimes have the opposite solution. The model's conclusions are sensitive to the dispersion of ownership; the more ownership that is dispersed, the more likely it is that capital protection will be necessary. As shown by test findings, the "corporatist" countries tend to have a "consensual" political system that favors coalitions and offers better protections for workers than for financial investors.

Gourevitch attempts to make the political theory more generic by seeing its earlier models as exceptional instances. First, in order to account for many sorts of conflicts, his theory is predicated on a portrayal of political preferences and interest groups that vary from the conventional opposition between the capital and labor or the left and right. According to Rajan and Zingales, under certain conditions, industry-based logics may win out over the capital/labor conflict; managers, owners, and employees might create coalitions to defend particular industry-based investments against the consequences of globalization. Gourevitch and Shinn carried out a methodical investigation of the alliances that these three groups may establish.

Second, as per Pagano and Volpin, political institutions including election rules, the extent of federalism, and the connections between the legislative, executive, and party systems are considered to have a significant effect in the accumulation of preferences. There is also a fundamental difference between the consensus and majoritarian systems. It does not represent the divide between the rights and left; a left-wing dictatorship might arise from both a majoritarian and a consensual logic.

In contrast to consensus systems that depend on compromise and discussion, majoritarian systems are contentious and encourage abrupt changes and drastic solutions. Only in a majority political environment can corporate governance be implemented in a way that benefits shareholders. Long-term promises that impact particular investments, especially those made by employees, only have credibility to the extent that the system is consensual. As a result, this kind of research is focused more on safeguarding the various stakeholder investments than it is on reducing opportunism only in relation to financial investors. This approach is similar to that of Blair and Zin- gales in that it does not include arguments of a cognitive type and instead concentrates on the preservation of particular investments made by workers.

There was also criticism of the political ideologies. Coffee specifically challenges Roe's argument on the political origins of the ownership dispersion in the US. If this idea is right, how can we explain the identical organizational structure of financial investors in Great Britain, where governmental constraints are far lower? Coffee is not persuaded by the political justification, which claims that the purpose of the ownership concentration and lack of transparency in Europe is to shield private investors from efforts to expropriate them by social democratic states.

He believes this theory is flawed because it suggests that these States would have a particular incentive to support transparency in order to weaken financial investors and enhance ownership dispersion, which would improve their control over the private sector. On the other hand, these States have previously resisted the growth of these financial markets. He believes that the argument put out by Rajan and Zingales—which holds that banks' comparative advantage as a tool for political intervention—is more likely to explain why the financial markets have not developed as well as they might. The banks had every right to fight the establishment of markets after they had secured their dominance.

However, Coffee does not downplay the significance of politics, which intervenes on two levels in the alternative theory he puts forth. This theory is based on the demand for liquidity from institutional investors, and it states that once ownership has been distributed, shareholders exert pressure on political leaders to obtain a legal regulation to safeguard their interests. Although the law is not absolute, it can be modified. Politics is also crucial to the theory's key variable, which is the State's intervention in economic life that influences the emergence of private mechanisms of governance.

Nonetheless, it is hard to dispute politics' significant impact on the NSCG constitution, even if it doesn't go in one way. According to Coffee's criticism, Roe believed that the dispersion of ownership could only occur as a result of the causation paradigm that underlies the American legal system. Because of this, Roe's method is not compatible with this kind of interpretation, which is predicated on naïve determinism and leaves open the possibility that alternative previous routes may have produced the same outcomes. Gourevitch, Gourevitch, and Shinn have highlighted the intricate nature of the routes that have resulted in politics influencing ownership structures.

The State is, of course, a crucial component of political theory. According to Beck et al., the political perspective leads to the conclusion that the dangers of interventionism, which might impair the effective operation of the financial markets, and the prospect of governmental predation make a centralized, powerful government incompatible with financial progress. In a similar vein, majoritarian voting systems and strong interest groups would be equally dangerous to the growth of the financial markets. This conclusion is far from universally acknowledged. Rajan and Zingales also demonstrate how certain arrangements of a balance between the interest groups might be advantageous to the growth of financial markets. A centralized state has attempted to develop the financial markets in the past, as shown by the socialist government in France two decades ago or even earlier during the French Second Empire.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at the drawbacks of attempting to convey the complexity of legal systems by quantitative indicators, including legal origin classifications. In addition, it examines how cultural elements, historical legacies, and unofficial institutions influence financial development aspects that the legal and financial framework sometimes ignores. The paper also explores critics of the theory that point out that it ignores institutional dynamics, enforcement mechanisms, and political economy issues in favor of legal formalism. It draws attention to the need of a more comprehensive understanding of how legal regulations, regulatory bodies, market participants, and sociopolitical settings interact to shape financial results. Notwithstanding these criticisms, the study highlights the insightful observations provided by the literature on law and finance and suggests directions for further investigation. To further our comprehension of the intricate link between law, finance, and development, it advocates for multidisciplinary methods that include viewpoints from the legal, economic, social, and political domains.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Lakshmi, “Gekko and black swans: Finance theory in UK undergraduate curricula,” *Crit. Perspect. Account.*, 2018.

[2] K. Budhiraja, T. V. Raman, and G. N. Bhardwaj, “Impact of behavioral finance in investment decision making,” *Int. J. Civ. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.

[3] Y. Chen, X. Gong, C. C. Chu, and Y. Cao, “Access to the internet and access to finance: Theory and evidence,” *Sustain.*, 2018.

[4] D. R. Escarraz and P. B. O’Neill, “The Theory of the Firm and Finance Theory,” *J. Financ. Educ.*, 2018.

[5] A. O. Boiar, T. O. Shmatkovska, and O. V. Stashchuk, “Towards the theory of supranational finance,” *Cogent Business and Management*. 2018.

[6] H. W. Huang, “Accounting and finance theory and practice: Future development,” *Asia Pacific Management Review*. 2018.

[7] M. Batu, N. Bower, E. Lun, and A. Sadanand, “Testing the effectiveness of online assignments in theory of finance,” *J. Educ. Bus.*, 2018.

[8] J. S. Ang, "Toward a Corporate Finance Theory for the Entrepreneurial Firm," *J. Entrep. Financ.*, 2018.

[9] B. Christophers, "Risking value theory in the political economy of finance and nature," *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, 2018.

[10] G. Myrdal, "The Theory of Public Finance," in *The Political Element in the Development of Economic Theory*, 2018.

[11] E. D. Baisden, J. J. Fox, and S. Bartholomae, "Financial management and marital quality: A phenomenological inquiry," *J. Financ. Ther.*, 2018.

[12] S. USLU DIVANOGLU and D. Hasim BAGCI, "Determining the Factors Affecting Individual Investors' Behaviours," *Int. J. Organ. Leadersh.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 5

ENDOWMENT THEORY AND THE SOCIO-CULTURAL THEORY: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Gopalakrishnan Chinnasamy, Associate Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.gopalakrishnan_c@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Endowment theory and socio-cultural perspectives offer valuable insights into human behavior, decision-making processes, and the dynamics of social interactions. This paper explores the foundational principles, empirical evidence, and practical implications of these theoretical frameworks, shedding light on their contributions to understanding individual and collective behaviors in diverse contexts. Endowment theory, rooted in behavioral economics, posits that individuals ascribe higher value to objects or resources they own, compared to identical objects they do not possess. Through a synthesis of psychological mechanisms such as loss aversion, reference dependence, and status quo bias, endowment theory elucidates the cognitive biases underlying decision-making related to ownership, exchange, and valuation. In contrast, socio-cultural perspectives emphasize the role of social norms, cultural values, and institutional structures in shaping human behavior and preferences. Drawing upon sociological theories, anthropology, and cultural psychology, socio-cultural perspectives elucidate the influence of societal contexts, group identities, and collective meanings on individual actions and societal dynamics.

KEYWORDS:

Financial Reporting, Governance Framework, Governance Structure, Governance Practices, Institutional Investors.

INTRODUCTION

Different or complementing interpretations of the legal-financial and political theories are put forward by two more ideas. The first, known as the "endowment" perspective or theory, examines how financial institutions came to be in historically colonized nations in relation to such nations' natural resource endowments and general state of health. This theory qualifies the legal and financial theories that assume the fundamental inferiority of the nations that adopted French law without taking the context into account, and it also helps us understand the success or failure of transplanted institutions. The second hypothesis includes all the works that continue to use socio-cultural variables as a means of explaining both the amount of agency costs and the risks that financial investors take [1], [2].

The theory of endowments

One significant body of evidence suggests that development has been influenced by variations in both geography and health. It should have been harder for the less wealthy nations to establish effective institutions, especially in the financial sector. Acemoglu and associates focused specifically on the state of health during colonization. The following is the reasoning behind this notion. Historians first assert that the kinds of institutions that are established are determined by the colonial strategies. In contrast to resource extraction techniques, implantation strategies resulted in the establishment of institutions to safeguard ownership rights and promote development. Secondly, there was a higher likelihood of the extraction tactics being formed if the health state was negative. Third, the institutions' original condition has been maintained up to this point. As a result, organizations that resorted to resource extraction—which were often authoritative and centralized were maintained by succeeding administrations to the extent that they proved advantageous. According to Acemoglu et al., the degree of development is mostly determined by the institutional variable, which stands for protection against expropriation and is based on the colonists' death rate. In actuality, the lower mortality in British colonies would account for the claimed superiority of the British legal system. Even after adjusting for death rates, the institutional structure that performs the worst is still linked to the French legal roots. Furthermore, the factors related to religion, climate, ethnolinguistics, endowment, and natural resources have less impact on the outcomes [3], [4].

The "geographic" determinism argument is largely refuted by Acemoglu et al.'s institutional theory, which upholds the importance of institutions in development. Acemoglu et al. provide evidence to support their argument by demonstrating a regression among the European powers' colonial nations: the wealthiest at the start of the sixteenth century have now become the lowest. If the Europeans had lived in historically less developed areas where implantation was simpler, they would have established institutions that protected private interests and encouraged investment. During the 1800s, countries that used the institutional framework saw more success with industrialization. The effect of the geographic component is still there in this scenario, but it was achieved via institutions. Easterly and Levine both support the institutional view. Among other things, they contrast the "geographic" and "institutional" theories with the "policy view" theory, which subtly guides the initiatives implemented by institutions for multilateral development. In the latter case, the historical legacy primarily serves to ensure the expansion of global commerce and the unrestricted movement of wealth. According to the findings, endowments have a major impact on development level, and mortality accounts for more than half of the variation. Nonetheless, endowments have an impact after going via the institutional channel. Nearly half of the institutional variance may be explained by mortality and geographic latitude, with control factors including law, ethnolinguistic, and religion often having a substantial impact.

Naturally, it's critical to understand whether endowments account for development in ways other than their impact on institutions. This is not the case, as shown by a process of simultaneous equations; rather, the institutional framework is the deciding element. Additionally, the notion of development policies is disproved, suggesting that political action without institutional transformation is ineffective. The variables linked to the legal origin become meaningless, so rendering the law and finance theory flawed as well. This also applies to the variables that do not indicate religious diversity, but rather the ethnolinguistic diversity. It is evident that the imbrication of the many factors makes it difficult to see the causal links clearly. However, endowments seem to be crucial only when accompanied by an institutional framework, supporting the institutional view [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Experiments on the endowments hypothesis often show that the ethnolinguistic and religious factors have a major impact. For example, Beck et al. conclude that the degree of financial intermediation is inversely connected with ethno-linguistic dispersion, or that religious practices have an impact on the financial growth of ancient colonies: the relationship seems to be less among people that are mostly Catholic or Muslim. In other research, the political, economic, and legal aspects become less important when these variables are included. These findings should come as no surprise. The disciplinary theories place opportunism at the center; we naturally anticipate that these factors which are connected to civic and social capital, trust, and religion will be significant.

La Porta et al. examine the importance of social capital and trust in line with Coleman, Putnam, and Fukuyama's theories, which hold that these factors indicate people's inclination to cooperate with others in order to boost productivity. The effectiveness of the legal system, the lack of corruption, the standard of bureaucracy, the acceptance of taxes, and civic participation all seem to be strongly and favorably connected with trust. We also examine the theory that the extremely hierarchical religious institutions, which maintain vertical linkages of power, would have hindered the development of trust. The hierarchical nature seems to be negatively correlated with trust and to have a negative impact on the standard of development and the caliber of institutions.

Stulz and Williamson make a distinction between the rights of creditors and shareholders in order to assess the impact of religion on financial progress. Only religion has a significant impact on creditors' rights; it seems to have a greater explanatory capacity than language, trade openness, personal affluence, and legal provenance. Catholic-majority nations tend to defend creditors' rights less and use medium- or long-term debt financing less often. The impact of religion is diminished by the openness of international commerce. Conversely, if the legal basis is considered, religion becomes less of an explanation for shareholder rights. The research validates the importance of language and religion on a global scale [7], [8].

Barro and McCleary separated church attendance from beliefs in an effort to better identify the impact of religion on economic growth beyond financial development. The significance of beliefs seems to be positively connected with economic progress, whereas attendance appears to be inversely correlated. Beliefs are the result of religious systems because they minimize opportunism by reinforcing values. Specifically, the dread of hell seems to have a stronger influence on development than the idea of paradise. Regarding attendance, it would be a measure of the resources used in the religious practice. More attendance would translate into poorer productive efficiency at a given belief level. By examining the supply and demand for religion, the writers also investigate the variables that impact religiosity. The presence of state religion has a positive correlation with religiosity, but the state's interference in the selection of religious leaders has a negative correlation. These findings pave the way for the political examination of religious values to be reintroduced. Finally, church attendance and beliefs are positively impacted by religious variety [9], [10].

The legal and theological factors are intended to be independent in each of these several investigations. However, some data suggest that they are interactive. Specifically, the theory positing that a higher moral standard replaces rigorous legal regulation seems tenable. Nonetheless, the corresponding hypothesis is also true: higher moral standards make the law easier to apply. Coffee challenges the relationship between moral principles and legal frameworks from this angle. His method is based on an apparent anomaly: the Scandinavian countries of the Civil law tradition have the lowest private advantages received by control, which is a conventional metric for assessing the level of legal protection. This outcome should have been attained in Common law countries. Coffee claims that the social norms that were used in place of laws to maintain effective discipline in the Scandinavian nations are what gave rise to this aberration. Even while Russia, Mexico, and Brazil seem to support this theory, many Common law nations, like the United States, do not.

Licht suggests using ideas and techniques from intercultural psychology to assess how country cultural variations affect the NSCG, given that national culture is the primary predictor of efficiency. He bases his description of the national cultures on the writings of Hofstede and Schwartz. Licht et al. evaluate the explanatory power of national cultural profiles in relation to the protection of minority shareholders and creditors using national scores derived from four Hofstede aspects (femininity/masculinity, group/autonomy, hierarchy/egalitarianism, and master/harmony) and three aspects identified by Schwartz. The principles of peace and avoiding uncertainty, which would cause financial investors to avoid conflicts and hence forgo the respect of their rights, are inversely connected with the protection of shareholders. Comparable harmony-related outcomes are attained for creditor protection. The presence of a legal-financial variable indicates that culture takes precedence over the law. Lastly, the legal typology of La Porta et al. is not reflected in the cultural categorization of the countries. The Far Eastern Common Law nations provide superior protection to both creditors and stockholders at the same time. While the Anglo-Saxon nations provide good protection for shareholders, they offer inadequate protection for creditors.

The disciplinary approach, which is driven by law and finance theory, sees financial growth backed by investor protection as the primary driver of prosperity. The law and finance hypothesis, which concludes that the NSCG should be rejected on the grounds of its legal foundation, is hotly debated since it gives legal factors alone a decisive role. According to other research, the explanatory value of political, social, and endowment factors is on par with or greater than that of legal variables. These findings, however, only challenge the causation relationships and the order of significant elements, not the disciplinary basis of performance. We need to take into consideration the producing side of wealth creation if we want to move beyond [11], [12].

Useful evaluations of NSCG

Both motivational and cognitive elements are included in productive evaluations at the same time. This prompts us to agree with Hodgson, Nelson, or Nelson and Sampat that institutions exhibit both a cognitive and an incentive matrix, both of which are crucial to the creation and transfer of information throughout the learning process. Charreaux even assumes that there are cognitive as well as motivational factors in the financial components.

In the event that institutions play both an incentive and a cognitive role, theoretical reflection will take on a systemic form that goes well beyond legal-financial aspects and is ultimately completed by political-cultural aspects. This includes integrating aspects related to education, technology, and work relationships into social systems of production, various forms of capitalism theory, comparative institutional analysis, and, ultimately, social systems of innovation and production, where interdependencies are crucial. The literature on economic systems thus incorporates the area of CG theories utilizing a considerably broader framework than the one Djankov et al. explored. Let us clarify that the fruitful analyses of NSCG are not confused with the technological theory, which maintains technology as the primary driving force behind development, whether it is in its neoclassical or evolutionary form. The imbrications of the incentive and cognitive components make a presentation based on the incentive/cognitive separation almost irrelevant. Another distinction makes it possible to divide fruitful assessments into two groups: one starts with an analysis of NSCG and is backed by a micro-study of corporate governance that is centered on the company, while the other starts directly at the macro level.

These many studies point to a variety of NSCG types that, apart from exceptions, do not correspond to the opposition based on legal categories as the law and finance theory emphasizes. If theories that place a strong emphasis on productive qualities sometimes lead to clear oppositions between two kinds of systems, they often produce more intricate typologies.

Useful NSCG analysis linked to the micro theory of governance

One goal of the prevalent VOC perspective, in line with ongoing research on the many kinds of capitalism, is to explain the persistence of various economic systems via the strategic actions of economic actors, particularly businesses. Hall and Soskice claim that the VOC illustrates a "relational" view of the company that combines the contractual and cognitive conceptions of the company and gives the productive side a significant role. However, Hall and Soskice mostly discuss the contractual viewpoint, even if businesses are first seen as players trying to develop and subsequently utilize skills inside the Resourced-Based View perspective.

Coordination encompasses both disciplinary and cognitive elements and is often thought of in relation to the development of competencies. There are five institutional areas that have been identified as important: systems of education and training; industrial relations institutions; CG" is construed narrowly in some contexts, such as the financial system; connections between firms, such as cooperative ventures and exchanges; and interactions inside the company with personnel to further the goals allocated to them.

"Liberal" and "coordinated" market economies are the two primary forms of NSCG that Hall and Soskice reject, depending on the prevailing coordination systems. We shall refer to these two forms of economies as "arm's length" and "relational" because of the ambiguity of this terminology. In the first type, coordination is mostly reliant on market processes. It is a spontaneous coordination that is "impersonal," price-driven, and places a strong emphasis on legal contracts. In the second category, game theory describes the strategic interactions between the actors and non-market relationships as the primary means of coordination. In particular, these interactions incorporate mechanisms inside the networks for information sharing and reputation. According to Hall and Gingerich, the institutional context determines which of the two coordinating strategies is best. The relational approach will prevail if markets are seen to be imperfect and there is significant institutional backing that permits the formation of credible promises. On the other hand, market coordination might make sense.

The integration of the cognitive component of value creation is implied by taking into account professional training and education as well as connections of inter-firm collaboration; yet, according to Hall and Soskice, institutions primarily play a disciplinary function. In order to ensure the enforcement of the agreements by lowering ambiguity, the main variables are the institutions' capacity to support information sharing, surveillance, and the penalizing of non-cooperative conduct. In order to build confidence, Hall and Soskice place special emphasis on the function of deliberative institutions, which allow information about the views and interests of the players to be exchanged. In the struggle against opportunism, the role of developing cognitive capacities seems secondary to that of strengthening the actor's capacity for strategic action in novel circumstances. The informal institutions, including cultural ones, are more responsible for this cognitive element. The shared mental models, or informal rules, are intended to guide cooperation toward certain focus points of equilibria. This feature also shows itself in common technical standards set by industry groups or in relationships between firms that transfer technology. The goal is to establish a shared foundation of abilities in both situations to make coordinating easier.

It is assumed that this institutional framework which plays a dual function of "enabling" and "constraining" is exogenous and that it shapes how businesses grow. Specifically, one of the core theories is that systematic variations in company strategy result from the unique characteristics of each NSCG. The national framework just establishes the parameters within which managers have considerable discretion while their decisions and abilities are seen as key factors, therefore this effect does not represent complete determinism. Relational economies provide a framework suitable for strategic relationships and particular investments by better shielding them from opportunistic risks. In contrast, arm's length economies feature structures that promote flexibility and resource redeployment.

The development of hybrids is not excluded by the conflict between the two kinds of economies, which are based on the predominant style of coordination. But only "coherent" systems in terms of institutional complementarities—that is, those that favor either market coordinating mechanisms or, conversely, non-market mechanisms—could prevail owing to higher productive efficiency. This is the central claim of the dominant version of the VOC. For instance, substantial growth in the financial markets would be accompanied with inadequate worker protection, flexible and loosely regulated labor markets, generic skill-based training programs, and impersonal, contract-based interfirm connections.

Some complementarities are considered essential. Financial governance and job relationships are connected in the first. Financial arrangements that allow managers to concentrate power via cross-shareholdings would discourage aggressive takeovers and encourage funding awarded based more on reputation than on performance. Through improved job security guarantees, incentives for long-term contracts, and facilitation of labor-employer union negotiations, these systems would boost the effectiveness of the organizations that oversee working relationships. The labor relationship and training systems are linked by the second complementarity. General skills-oriented training programs would be more effective than industry-specific human capital-based programs, which necessitate training backed by close company collaboration, in market coordination systems, which are defined by significant labor mobility and decentralized wage negotiations at the firm level. Lastly, there is a third complementarity between inter-firm interactions and financial governance. It would be simpler for managers to create believable commitments for inter-firm cooperation with regard to research, product development, or technology transfer if there was less pressure from the financial markets to ensure that they pursued an objective of maximization of shareholder value. There are many more types of complementarity than these three. Because of this, Estevez et al. stress the complementary nature of employee-beneficial social policies and production techniques based on particular assets. Regarding Casper and Teubner, they provide examples of the connections between legal systems and inter-firm collaboration. Lastly, Hall and Soskice state that the regulation of the goods market may be complementary to the negotiation-based wage systems, the relational-based financial disciplinary systems, and the systems of inter-firm relationships that foster cooperation in research and development by reducing the intensity of inter-firm competition.

This institutional complementarity study is similar to the Aoki perspective that is often used by writers. But when Hall and Soskice conclude that hybrid NSCG perform worse because their coordination is less coherent, they seem to depart from this point of view. If we restrict our analysis to the two primary forms of net social credit growth (NSCG), which are the most coherent, and the usually associated countries, we find that neither system is consistently superior to the other in terms of GDP growth rate, GDP per capita, and unemployment rate.

The institutional comparative advantage notion is highlighted by the VOC analysis: in specific kinds of activities, the firms within an NSCG have an advantage over other enterprises due to their institutional framework. Hall and Soskice demonstrate that arm's length economies support incremental innovation over radical innovation, which is typified by significant changes. This gives them an edge in fields where technology is advancing quickly. On the other hand, systems that support incremental innovation might do better in more established businesses where quality is the primary differentiator. There are several similarities between this study and the research done by Lazonick and O'Sullivan. It is different, however, in that the disciplinary components of the creative process seem to take precedence over the cognitive aspects, with the purpose of safeguarding certain assets being considered the most important.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, this study advances our comprehension of human behavior and decision-making by combining knowledge from socio-cultural and endowment theories. Intersections and complementarities between endowment theory and socio-cultural perspectives are highlighted, highlighting their combined explanatory power in understanding complex phenomena like consumer behavior, social norms, organizational culture, and economic development. This study offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the complexities of individual and collective actions by integrating psychological mechanisms with socio-cultural dynamics. This framework guides scholars, practitioners, and policymakers towards more nuanced and effective interventions in various spheres of human activity. The research also looks at actual data and real-world applications of these ideas in a number of fields, including as public policy, international relations, organizational behavior, and marketing. It clarifies how treatments meant to encourage behavior change, support innovation, and solve societal concerns are informed by insights from socio-cultural perspectives and endowment theory. Additionally, the study addresses how these ideas could affect corporate strategy, policy-making, and cross-cultural relationships. The statement emphasizes the significance of taking into account the cognitive biases of people, social situations, and cultural norms when creating policies, products, and interventions that are successful and suitable for a range of stakeholders.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Pathan, R. A. Memon, S. Memon, A. R. Khoso, and I. Bux, "A Critical Review of Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory in Second Language Acquisition," *Int. J. English Linguist.*, 2018.

[2] R. Elran-Barak and Y. Bar-Anan, "Implicit and explicit anti-fat bias: The role of weight-related attitudes and beliefs," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, 2018.

[3] M. Kirrane, M. Breen, and C. O'Connor, "A qualitative investigation of the origins of excessive work behaviour," *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.*, 2018.

[4] H. Zhao, "New insights into the process of peer review for EFL writing: A process-oriented socio-cultural perspective," *Learn. Instr.*, 2018.

[5] A. Ott, L. Broman, and K. Blum, "A pedagogical approach to solar energy education," *Sol. Energy*, 2018.

[6] T. Konst (e. Penttilä) and M. Scheinin, "The changing world has implications on the higher education and the teaching profession," *Horiz.*, 2018.

[7] C. T. Chen, M. Chang, K. H. Wu, and P. S. Yu, "Web-based conversation quest for enhancing English speaking skills," in *ICCE 2018 - 26th International Conference on Computers in Education, Workshop Proceedings*, 2018.

[8] A. C. Kornelaki and K. Plakitsi, "Thunderbolt hunt. Educational Program for Students from 5 to 9 Years Old in the Archaeological Museum of Ioannina," *World J. Educ.*, 2018.

[9] H. Buitrago, "Task-Based Language Teaching and Socio Cultural Theory Basis for Effective Scaffolding in a Communicative Approach Class: Context Matters," *Rev. Palabra*, 2018.

[10] A. T. Dede, "Examination of the collective argumentation studies in the mathematics education field," *Turkish J. Comput. Math. Educ.*, 2018.

[11] A. Bahari, "Developing listening and speaking via a psycho-socio-cultural learning model based on non-linear dynamic motivation," *Jordan J. Mod. Lang. Lit.*, 2018.

[12] I. Rodríguez and M. L. Inturias, "Conflict transformation in indigenous peoples' territories: doing environmental justice with a 'decolonial turn,'" *Dev. Stud. Res.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 6

POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE DUTCH EAST INDIA COMPANY (VOC)

Dr. Kiran Kumar M, Assistant Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- kiran_kumar.m@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The Dutch East India Company (VOC) stands as a quintessential example of early modern corporate power and its entanglement with political interests. This paper delves into the intricate political dimensions of the VOC, exploring how it wielded influence, navigated diplomatic landscapes, and shaped global governance structures during its heyday in the 17th and 18th centuries. Central to this analysis is an examination of the VOC's unique corporate structure, which granted it significant autonomy and quasi-sovereign powers in its overseas territories. Leveraging its military might, economic resources, and diplomatic prowess, the VOC established trade monopolies, negotiated treaties, and engaged in statecraft, effectively operating as a de facto extension of Dutch colonial ambitions. The study investigates the symbiotic relationship between the VOC and the Dutch Republic, wherein the company served both as a tool of state policy and as a source of private profit for its shareholders. It elucidates how the VOC's economic interests often intersected with broader geopolitical objectives, influencing colonial expansion, interstate rivalries, and the emergence of global trading networks.

KEYWORDS:

Investor Relations, Legal Framework, Leadership, Management Oversight, Managerial Accountability, Market Discipline, Minority Shareholders.

INTRODUCTION

The political component is given significant weight in the VOC perspective. Political organization must be in line with the predominant coordinating style, which might be relational or impersonal, as political activity must be characterized to promote collaboration. As a result, Hall and Soskice highlight how the political and other institutions complement one another and maintain the coherence of the two primary categories of NSCG. In order for the State to honor the promises made by employer and union groups, the relational economy should be founded on a political structure in which these organizations are sufficiently powerful. An effective relational coordination would be opposed by a strong executive authority founded on a majoritarian political system, which may even constitute a danger to these values. On the other hand, such coordination would be simpler under consensual regimes since they are more stable and prevent abrupt political reorientations. Investing in particular assets would be encouraged by an effective safeguard against the dangers posed by state interventionism. In relational economics, social policies benefit workers more as they provide stronger protection for particular investments, rather than just being advantageous for political or ideological reasons. However, Gourevitch and Hawes believe that this kind of analysis is lacking and might sometimes conflate the many tiers of politics. Formally speaking, institutions are intended to be the primary agents of political power [1], [2].

By adding a variable linked to the political representation of interest groups, Hall and Soskice also highlight a different angle beyond the conflict between majoritarian and consensual systems. This raises the question of whether "corporatism" should be taken into consideration when modeling political institutions. Iversen and Soskice, therefore, develop a hypothesis predicting that countries whose workers have a human capital that is very particular should be domin- ated by parties or governments that would safeguard this capital by social measures, so as to attract the votes of employees. Gourevitch and Hawes criticize this causality model because it confuses the independent and dependent variables in the test of the relationship between the type of NSCG and the political system's nature by making corporatism one of the system's determinants while it is more of a product of it.

Furthermore, such an approach assumes that the actors' preferences are the same regardless of the NSCG, according to Gourevitch and Hawes. However, the preferences and interests tend to change throughout kinds of economies, according to the protective purpose of distinct investments.

The composition of alliances in a relational economy is influenced by the interconnectedness of the actors' investments. For instance, there may be shared interests between financial investors and workers, which might motivate both parties to collaborate on the pursuit of protectionist policies. On the other hand, the conventional rivalry between capital and labor would emerge in an impersonal economy [3], [4].

Lastly, Gourevitch and Hawes also emphasize the significance of social networks in comprehending the variations among the NSCG. The alternatives for political action are determined by these networks. While the French State lacks comparable organizations, the German State may implement certain policies via a streamlined network. Generally speaking, the interactions between the various elements the nature of the institutions, the inclinations of interest groups, and the significance and structure of the social networks would determine how much politics impacted the NSCG.

Empirical VOC testing

Hall and Gingerich show that the results obtained by the main developed nations confirm the relevance of typology opposing arm's length and relational economies based on a synthetic indicator that takes into consideration the type of coordination present in the financial sectors, remunerations, and work relationships. As a result, it seems that the two categories of economies validate the various forms of complementarity that have been presented. At least, the hypothesis according to which greater systemic coherence results in a better economic performance is also corrob- orated. Gourevitch and Hawes examine the complementarity between this typology and the political traits.

The political variables that indicate the electoral system, political cohesiveness, and the number of "effective" political parties that would have a possibility of winning power have significantly positive connections with each other.

Nevertheless, a subset of tests yields findings that challenge Hall and Soskice's hypothesis by disproving some of their core assumptions about the two points of view. First, there is the movement of the production factors, which is thought to be less significant in relational economies; second, hybrid economies are thought to perform worse. Because of the imprecise nature of the measures of specialization of labor generally kept, Hiscox and Rickard challenge the least mobility theory. They show that, for the OECD's member nations between 1970 and 1992, labor mobility rates are greater in relational economies, arguing that it is more pertinent to investigate employee mobility using inter-sectoral mobility rates. Furthermore, it seems that the intra-type variation of these rates is just as significant as the difference across the various NSCG types. Nonetheless, certain outcomes match the VOC's expectations. Consequently, the distinctiveness of human capital is positively correlated with the variations between countries in terms of social protection. But other elements such as programs for retraining and reconversion of personnel, as well as the nature of the technology also interfere, adding to distend the perceived relationship between the distinctiveness of human capital and the structure of the business [5], [6].

Kenworthy questions Hall and Gin-gerich's empirical findings about the relationship between institutional coherence and economic success. The tests take into account just three of the five institutional domains that Hall and Soskice suggested; over half of the indicators that are kept are based only on the financial governance domain; the findings from several countries seem improbable. The findings obtained by a different measurement of coherence reject the hypothesis: performance is comparable for the three groups constructed according to the degree of coherency and the intra- group variance looks considerably superior to the inter-group variance. Kenworthy, however, does not refute the idea that institutions affect performance by influencing collaboration. Due primarily to the imprecise nature of the variable measurement, he solely questions the statistical studies' capacity to account for the presumed consequences of causation. The thesis, opposing two forms of coordination, seems to him to be over exaggerated likewise, owing to the recent American advances that seem to have stemmed, at least in part, from the relational processes borrowed from the Japanese model. An instance like this calls into question the relevance of the relationship between systemic coherence and performance as well as the growth of corporate governance systems via hybridization more broadly.

DISCUSSION

The method used by Hall and Soskice comes from a specific idea about how the company defines the NSCG. It makes an effort to illustrate how several NSCG coexist by comparing their capacity to achieve equal performance in line with the equifinality concept. The two most coherent polar forms would provide performances that are equal. Eventually, the less effective hybrid forms would be blamed for not having evolved. Nevertheless, given the two modalities of coordination that are still in place, this method represents only one specific variation of the VOC. According to Boyer, additional coordination modes may be defined in a way that produces a typology that opposes not two, but four sorts of systems that are also seen to be coherent. Furthermore, Aoki suggests a more intricate typology. There are moments when it's unclear where Hall and Soskice stand on the relative effectiveness of hybrid forms. Therefore, the distinctive feature of the VOC has less to do with the conflict between relational and arm's length economies and more to do with the relevance of the complementarity between the various institutional domains. It provides an explanation for the presence of several national systems while simultaneously taking into consideration the discipline-related and cognitive elements, with the latter playing a more significant role [7], [8].

An alternative perspective, known as "la théorie de la regulation," places significant emphasis on the interdependence of institutions and, hence, institutional coherence. There are some similarities between this theory and the VOC, most notably the rejection of the idea that there is a single best institutional design, but there are also many differences. When the regulatory theory first came into being in the middle of the 1970s, its goal was to examine the viability of the capitalist accumulation process with a particular emphasis on crises, rather than to explain the diversity of capitalisms. The wage-labor nexus; forms of competition; the monetary regime; the position and function of the State; and the interaction with the global economy are the five basic institutional elements that are considered to influence the method of regulation.

Nonetheless, this theory sparked interest in the diversity of capitalisms due to two phenomena: distinct institutional architectures can support various regimes, and various modes of regulation can serve as a foundation for the same kind of growth regime. To explain this variation and separate it from the technology theories, the regulation theory focuses emphasis on the political institutional aspect that mediates the social disputes and establishes the legal framework.

Because of the national distinctiveness of institutional compromises and governmental interventions, this causality model a priori results in as many types of NSCG and capitalism as States and political configurations. Regulating theory, on the other hand, finds fewer combinations, usually four, depending on a predominate form of control. The first system is market-based and is linked to market regulation and the Common Law system of law and finance theory. It is comparable to arm's length economies and guarantees the enforcement of agreements. The second, referred to as "social democratic," maintains the institutional structures based on the tripartite negotiations between business, labor unions, and the State. It is consistent with the relational economy paradigm, of which the Nordic nations serve as an exemplar. In the third structure, dubbed “meso-corporatist,” the adjustments are conducted mostly at the intermediate, or “meso-economic,” level of the huge conglomerate corporations regarded less vulnerable to variations in the broader economic environment. The economies of Korea and Japan serve as examples of this kind. Finally, the fourth configuration – the “public” system - accords a prominent role to action by the State and includes the continental European nations participating in European integration. Contrary to the interpretation supplied by the VOC perspective, the two later configurations do not comprise hybrids supposed to be less performing, between arm’s length and relational economies, but rather completely performing kinds because of the uniqueness of the techniques utilized to resolve crises [9], [10].

This lower number of configurations is justified for three reasons. First, the capacity of institutions to endure in an environment of economic rivalry determines whether or not they are considered to have a political foundation. Second, the number of configurations that might be made to comply with the various regulatory modes would be less if institutional and organizational forms were isomorphic. Lastly, the existence of a hierarchy or a particular complementarity between the various institutions would help to explain this reduction for each significant stage of capitalism. If the NSCG theory is built in the VOC perspective by flipping a micro to a macro dimension, then the micro elements were initially disregarded in the regulatory theory. However, there have been many efforts to ground regulation theory in a theory of the "regulationist" company, where causation is derived more from a macro than a micro level. These efforts notwithstanding, the perspective is still essentially macro.

Finally, in line with its basic purpose of explanation of the crises, the regulation theory treats time in a different approach. Conversely, the regulatory theory offers an explanation of endogenous nature, while the VOC supports a static analysis of complementarity and maintains an external explanation of crises brought on by significant shocks connected, for instance, to globalization. Although the regulation theory accentuates the political aspect, it does not disregard the importance of innovation, which tends to be impacted by the prevalent method of regulation. It is given more weight by the idea of social systems of invention and production, which is seen to have its roots in the regulatory theory. With six institutional sub-systems, it emphasizes interactions between them in terms of complementarity and hierarchy to assess coherence and the system's long-term survival, with the primary goal being to comprehend the phenomena of endogenous growth. The SSIP preserves the same typology of the NSCG as the regulatory theory with each of the four primary configurations classified in accordance to the six sub-systems. It results in some crucial predictions about industrial specialization, innovation, and evolution when examining the issue of convergence of the various NSCG.

The primary contributions of regulation theory are twofold: first, it expands on the analysis of institutional architectures by applying the notions of "institutional complementarity" and "institutional hierarchy," and second, it studies systems dynamically, such as the crises brought on by financial globalization. Additionally, it emphasizes production and innovation more than the VOC does by using cognitive aspects, whereas the VOC prioritizes disciplinary considerations for the protection of particular assets. The relationships between the various institutional domains are given the most weight in the macroanalyses of the NSCG that include the productive element; several empirical research support this conclusion. Both the regulatory view and the VOC believe that there is a connection between coherence and system performance, even if this connection takes different shapes depending on how many typical forms are kept or which complementarities are taken into account [11], [12].

The origin of the presumably endogenous crises and the dynamic coherence of institutional architectures are the two main topics covered by regulation theory. Hence, it aligns with the conventional discussions on the potential clash between static and dynamic efficiency, as well as between institutional coherence and ossification, as well as the NSCG's adaptability. Hodgson emphasizes how the various designs may help with knowledge generation and transmission, whereas Olson concentrates on the ossification issues connected to the appropriation of rents, which correlate to the disciplinary components of governance. He suggests analyzing the various systems' capacities for adaptation in light of the "impurity principle," which holds that for an economic system to be able to adapt, it needs to have at least one "foreign" structural element. This idea is primarily influenced by Polanyi and Schumpeter. A good adaptation may be hampered if the static coherence associated with strong institutional homogeneity is very high. From this perspective, the hybrid systems would seem to provide a better capacity for adaptability rather than being hindered by a lower level of coherence. Both the regulatory and the VOC perspectives emphasize the potential for interactions with the legal and financial domains while giving the productive and cognitive components a significant role. They also broaden the artificial efforts at research that already exist in relation to micro theories on a macro level. As a consequence of this integration, national ownership structures are analyzed as a substitute for the political and legal explanations of Roe and the legal and financial explanations of LLSV. In light of this, Charreaux suggests a model that incorporates cognitive elements in addition to disciplinary variables to explain ownership structures in terms of ownership concentration as well as the characteristics of shareholders and the skills they bring to the table.16 The intricacy of the institutional interactions begs the question of whether it is possible to comprehend how institutional structure affects NSCG performance when operating purely at the macro level. As a result, Aguilera and Jackson provide a model for NSCG that is centered on the actors and incorporates the three conventional stakeholder groups. This model demonstrates how institutions specifically impact the conflicts and strategic conduct of the players. Thomas and Waring and Kogut et al. also take this impact into account when explaining NSCG-related investment policies and diversification.

The national corporate governance system in the United States

In the United States, corporate governance has recently been the subject of intense discussion, heated debate, and varying definitions. The internal policies of a company that are meant to provide reasonable guarantees that corporate directors and officers make and carry out decisions in line with their obligations of care and loyalty to their companies are referred to as corporate governance (CG) for the purposes of this. In the US, CG is often linked to the latest actions implemented after corporate crises like Enron and MCI. The latest efforts are indeed significant, but it is essential to consider them in light of the corporate and securities legislation frameworks that are now in place. The present efforts in the United States and the terms of the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002 commonly dubbed "Sarbanes– Oxley") in key respects merely add to the governance measures already in place according to company law and securities legislation in the United States. The relevance and limits of Sarbanes-Oxley and the newly implemented NYSE listing criteria can only be understood after gaining a foundational grasp of corporation law and securities regulation in the United States.

The NYSE does not alter the performance standards currently applicable to directors under corporate law; rather, the recent NYSE initiatives aim to increase the level of independence among directors of corporations listed there, making them better able and more likely to meet those standards. Regretfully, the NYSE listing requirements are not legally binding. Conversely, Sarbanes–Oxley generally aims to strengthen the independence of company directors and external auditors, making it more probable that these individuals will be able to submit public reports in the manner and with the content that US securities rules demand. Additionally, there are clauses meant to improve the level of care with which corporate executives draft mandatory public announcements. Unfortunately, Sarbanes–Oxley relates limited to disclosure obligations under US securities rules. Sarbanes-Oxley is not intended to particularly apply to the standards that apply to directors' or officers' execution of their larger duties to their organizations, with a few exceptions.

American corporate law

At least in the US, company law is often discussed but seldom understood. This is partly because it is not federal law and partly because no government agency actively enforces it. Because securities legislation is a federal law that is actively implemented by a government agency, it is well understood. The three main areas of corporate law are corporate formation, corporate constitutions, and the possibility of personal liability for corporate officers and directors. First, the United States has provisions in its corporate law that deal with the establishment of companies. Generally speaking, companies are created when one or more investors move assets into a different account and get a divisible common interest in that account in return. The upshot of these two, simultaneous activities is the separation of share ownership from both corporate ownership of those assets and from corporate management of those assets.

Second, corporate law contains provisions concerning corporate constitutions. The arrangements that each company has for exercising control over its accounts that is, for proposing, deciding, and carrying out decisions on the sale of corporate assets are covered by these laws. Corporate law can be referred to as the "constitutional provisions" of corporate law because, within the bounds of these provisions, it is comparable to the constitutional provisions of national governments. Typically, corporate directors assign corporate officers the responsibility of managing corporate affairs in the regular course of business. As a result, corporate officers are required under corporate constitutional structures to report to corporate directors on how well they have fulfilled their management responsibilities.

Third, corporate law incorporates rules about directors’ and officers’ personal culpability for activities committed in their corporation’s name and for its account. The majority of these corporate law provisions are derived from agency law regulations. In general, failure to act on behalf of the corporation with appropriate care and loyalty may result in personal liability for corporate directors and officers.

Establishment of corporations

In the United States, investors must provide capital, or funds or assets, to the company in order to establish a fictional entity with the authority to own and dispose of assets. All of the assets that investors have provided are owned by corporations. As a condition to each shareholder’s contribution, the company promises to employ the donated assets in the conduct of a legitimate business. In addition, the corporation not its shareholders owe all of the liabilities incurred in the company's conduct of the business. The ownership of the investors in their businesses is often expressed in terms of "shares," which are frequently, though not always, represented by share certificates. If there are no classes of shares, then each share represents an equal and undivided right to take part in distributions to shareholders made by the company, either as dividends during regular business operations or as payouts upon a partial or complete liquidation of the company. Every share gets an equal vote in all decisions made by the shareholders regarding the company in the event that there are no classes of shares. Lastly, unless there is a mutual agreement between shareholders, shares are freely transferable, and the company survives any share transfers made via sales, testaments, or intestacies.

Corporate charters: distinguishing between corporate and share ownership

The ownership of shares by shareholders and the ownership of assets by the company are clearly distinct, as was previously mentioned.

Divided share ownership and corporate control in corporate constitutions

When it comes to disposing of partnership assets, each member in a partnership in the United States is generally able to act on behalf of the other partners and in the partnership's name. In the US, companies cannot exercise their private property rights by delegation to one or more individuals, unlike partnerships. of other words, unlike partners, shareholders of corporations cannot act in the name and for the account of their companies. Rather, one person is given complete power to act on behalf of and in the name of the company. Corporate statutes in the United States identify this individual as the "president," however they are often commonly referred to as the "chief executive officer.

In accordance with the corporation's constitutional papers, the CEO usually assigns part of his or her authority to one or more subordinates, each of whom is then permitted to act on behalf of the company within the parameters of that delegation. "Corporate officers" refer to the person or people who have been given the authority to exercise the private property rights over corporation assets. CEOs are required to make and carry out decisions about the disposal of company assets in the regular course of business in return for their salary. In accordance with corporate law, corporate officials are also required to report the outcomes of their operations to the directors of their companies, who act as the representatives of the shareholders. As previously mentioned, the division of corporate ownership and corporate control gives rise to this reporting need under corporate law.

Corporate charters: power over shareholders and directors

Under corporate law, shareholders may only choose the directors and auditors of a company; these positions are often filled by CEO nominations. Directors, for their part, usually restrict their authority to choosing CEOs and monitoring their performance based on the following corporate law provision: "The business and affairs of every corporation shall be managed by or under the direction of a board of directors." Making decisions on issues other than the corporation's regular course of business, such as dividend payments, business changes, mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, and the full or partial liquidation of the company, is the only additional component of shareholders' and directors' control under corporate law. When it comes to these issues, shareholders and directors usually base their choices on suggestions put forward by the CEO of the company.

In any case, in the US, directors and shareholders are never able to intervene on behalf of the company in its relationships with outside parties. The CEO and other executives are in charge of carrying out all such corporate actions, both in the regular course of business and in extraordinary circumstances. The CEO and other corporate executives are the only ones authorized to sign papers and take other actions on behalf of the company and in its name; in other words, only they are permitted to serve as the company's legal representative.

CONCLUSION

The ways in which the VOC interacted with competing European powers, Asian polities, and indigenous civilizations, illuminating the intricacies of intercultural communication, coercion, and cooperation in the early modern age. It looks at how the VOC shaped regional power structures, created reliance, and implemented new governmental and legal institutions in its trade colonies. The paper also explores the legacy and ongoing effects of VOCs on international relations, government, and global trade. It explores how changes in state formation, the creation of contemporary corporate governance principles, and global economic dynamics were influenced by the growth and subsequent collapse of the volatile organic compound (VOC). In conclusion, by exposing the complex relationships between the VOC and colonialism, state authority, and international commerce, this study advances our knowledge of the political dimension of the VOC. The study provides insightful understandings into the intricate relationship between trade, politics, and power in the early modern era, with lasting relevance for current discussions on globalization and corporate governance, by placing the VOC within larger historical narratives of empire and capitalism.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Bertrand, F. Kramarz, A. Schoar, and D. Thesmar, “The Cost of Political Connections,” *Review of Finance*. 2018.

[2] F. J. Z. Borgesius *et al.*, “Online political microtargeting: Promises and threats for democracy,” *Utr. Law Rev.*, 2018.

[3] C. A. Bail *et al.*, “Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2018.

[4] C. Vaccari and A. Valeriani, “Digital Political Talk and Political Participation: Comparing Established and Third Wave Democracies,” *SAGE Open*, 2018.

[5] J. Z. Yan and S. J. Chang, “The contingent effects of political strategies on firm performance: A political network perspective,” *Strateg. Manag. J.*, 2018.

[6] A. Salman, M. A. Mohamad Salleh, M. A. Yusoff, and M. Y. H. Abdullah, “Political engagement on social media as antecedent for political support among voters in Malaysia,” *J. Komun. Malaysian J. Commun.*, 2018.

[7] M. Bossetta, “The Digital Architectures of Social Media: Comparing Political Campaigning on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat in the 2016 U.S. Election,” *Journal. Mass Commun. Q.*, 2018.

[8] M. J. Burke and J. C. Stephens, “Political power and renewable energy futures: A critical review,” *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[9] A. Kidron and H. Vinarski Peretz, “Organizational political climate and employee engagement in political behavior in public sector organizations: A mixed methods study,” *Int. J. Organ. Anal.*, 2018.

[10] B. Chemouni, “The political path to universal health coverage: Power, ideas and community-based health insurance in Rwanda,” *World Dev.*, 2018.

[11] H. Pang, “Is mobile app a new political discussion platform? An empirical study of the effect of WeChat use on college students’ political discussion and political efficacy,” *PLoS One*, 2018.

[12] F. Farinosi *et al.*, “An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues,” *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 7

CORPORATE CONSTITUTIONS:
CEOS' AND OTHER OFFICERS CONTROL

Dr. Lourden Selvamani, Assistant Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.lourden_selvamani@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Corporate constitutions serve as the foundational documents that delineate the governance structure and decision-making processes within organizations. This paper delves into the intricate dynamics of corporate constitutions, focusing particularly on the control exerted by CEOs and other officers over corporate affairs. The study begins by examining the legal and regulatory frameworks that govern corporate constitutions, highlighting their significance in defining the rights, responsibilities, and powers of executive officers. It explores the evolution of corporate governance principles and the increasing emphasis on accountability, transparency, and shareholder rights in shaping modern corporate constitutions. Central to the analysis is an exploration of the concentration of control within corporate hierarchies, with CEOs often wielding substantial influence over strategic direction, resource allocation, and organizational culture. Drawing upon agency theory and behavioral economics, the study elucidates the mechanisms through which CEOs and officers exercise control, including executive compensation structures, board appointments, and strategic decision-making processes.

KEYWORDS:

Policy Implementation, Proxy Voting, Public Disclosure, Regulatory Compliance, Remuneration Committee, Reporting Requirements.

INTRODUCTION

With the few exclusions mentioned above, corporate officials alone make and carry out all corporate decisions in the majority of US firms. Actually, in the first place, all corporate decisions made in the regular course of business may only be proposed, made, and carried out by one corporate officer the CEO of the company. Nonetheless, CEOs have the power to assign some decisions, as well as often are mandated to do so by the charters of their companies, to other corporate executives. CEOs often have the exclusive ability to choose the people who will occupy such positions, with the exception of situations when they must assign authority to the chief legal officer or other specific officials. Officers are often the sole ones with the authority to offer the first suggestions and set up the decision-making process, even in situations where directors or shareholders have the ultimate say. For instance, CEOs alone frequently have the authority to choose the only candidate for directors and external auditors, even though shareholders normally elect directors and external auditors. CEOs or presidents also plan and oversee the election process. Lastly, as was already said, executives are required to report to the directors of their corporations, who are the representatives of the shareholders. The division of corporate ownership and corporate control gives rise to this reporting need under corporate law. Stated differently, the reason the officials are required to disclose is because they operate on behalf of a business and not in their own names or accounts [1], [2].

Officers' individual accountability to their companies

As the explanation above makes clear, there is a portion of US corporate law that deals with matters pertaining to how corporate decisions are proposed, made, carried out, and reported.

Another crucial area of corporate law is the personal responsibility of directors and officials to their companies. This will be a discussion of corporate officials' possible personal culpability. We'll talk about the possible personal culpability of company directors under the subject of "special topics under corporate law. CEOs and other corporate executives are not liable to third parties, or anyone other than the businesses they work for, while acting within the bounds of their power. CEOs typically do not incur any liability to other individuals or corporations on the basis of their acts, although corporations may be liable to individuals and other corporations under the laws of general obligation or contract law if their CEOs act in their names and on their accounts. Dealing with a corporation's CEO carries a certain amount of risk for both people and companies [3], [4].

However, under corporate law, CEOs and other corporate executives may be held accountable to their companies for the acts they do on their behalf. Corporate officers are comparable to bailees like warehousemen and common carriers in terms of potential personal responsibility to their businesses. Similar to bailees, managers only get possession of company assets as a required side effect of providing their own services. They do not acquire ownership to them. Similar to how bailees, warehousemen, or common carriers may be held accountable to the people who entrust them with assets if they don't fulfill their responsibilities, corporate officers may also be held accountable to their corporations for their inability to propose, make, carry out, and report on corporate decisions. Sarbanes-Oxley and the new NYSE listing standards do not raise the personal culpability of CEOs or other business officers under corporate law. Last but not least, if CEOs and other corporate executives break a law while carrying out their responsibilities on behalf of their companies, they may be held legally accountable by the US government and may even face criminal penalties. The standards for NYSE listing do not impact the possibility of criminal penalties; nonetheless, Sarbanes- Oxley heightens the penalties that might be imposed on CEOs and other business officials for breaking US securities laws. Officers' individual accountability to their companies: performance requirements known as "fiduciary duties.

Under corporate law, corporate officers must report to directors on the performance of their operations; but, they are not obligated to notify or confer with directors or shareholders prior to making and carrying out decisions in the regular course of business. Officers cannot be held accountable for disregarding the explicit desires of directors and officers in the absence of previous direction from these parties. However, corporate executives may be held accountable if they fall short of the standards that all organizations have a right to expect from them when it comes to decision-making, execution, and reporting. More specifically, corporate officials must adhere to two distinct performance requirements that are often referred to as "fiduciary duties." The "duty of care" and the "duty of loyalty" are the two obligations [5], [6].

Officers' individual accountability to their companies: obligation of allegiance

Corporate law requires all officers who accept appointment to uphold a "duty of loyalty" in whatever commitments they assume on behalf of their businesses. This means that officers must avoid putting their personal interests in conflict with those of their corporations. The obligation of loyalty owed by corporate leaders consists of three components. First, corporate executives commit to acting in the best interests of their company, not their personal interests. Second, company executives promise not to pursue goals that are contrary to the best interests of their company. Company officials are forbidden by this aspect of their duty of loyalty from continuing in their current competing endeavors or seizing company possibilities for themselves. Third, officials pledge to report conflicts of interest to disinterested directors and to defer to them when making decisions about the business in the event that their interests inherently clash with those of the corporation.

Officers' individual accountability to their companies: obligation of care

Corporate law requires all officers who accept appointments to uphold a "duty of care" in all actions they conduct on behalf of their companies. In other words, officials must behave responsibly and pursue their companies' objectives as if they were their own. There are three components to an officer's duty of care.

The officers must, first and foremost, be operating "within the scope of their authority." This component of the duty of care is related to the corporate resolutions, special authorizations, and bylaws of the company. Officers have violated their duty of care if they are not operating within the parameters set out in these charter papers and authorizations. The cops must not be behaving in a "negligent" manner, second. Officers' vigilance in gathering information relevant to their choices is reflected in this duty of care component. Corporate officers violate their duty of care while gathering information if they do not exercise the same level of diligence as a reasonably sensible corporate officer would in a comparable situation. The information that officers had access to and were aware of at the time they made their choices is the main emphasis of this duty of care component.

Third, they have to be operating "in good faith" as officials. This component of the duty of care concerns the attention with which officials proceed when drawing inferences from the information available to them at the moment of decision-making. Corporate executives violate their duty of care when they draw inferences and fail to use the same level of caution that a reasonable businessperson would use in a comparable situation. This duty of care component focuses on the process through which officers make choices.

The "business judgment rule" governs how officers' choices are affected when the duty of care is applied. According to this rule, courts apply the duty of care based on the information that corporate officials had access to reasonably at the time they were making and carrying out their decisions. They are not required to apply the duty of care based on information that the officers could not have known, even if they had been diligent. Furthermore, courts apply the duty of care based on outcomes corporate executives might reasonably anticipate to accomplish rather than achievements that were actually attained, according to the "business judgment rule." Government restrictions, including securities laws, and the duty of loyalty are exempt from the business judgment rule [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

Apart from the previously mentioned broad insights into US corporate law, it's critical to comprehend the unique concerns brought forward by Sarbanes-Oxley, the NYSE listing requirements, and general corporate governance measures. Special concerns pertaining to corporate law in the United States: the absence of a federal corporation law is the most significant special issue pertaining to corporate law in the country. The US Constitution reserves the authority for several states to adopt laws pertaining to corporations. Delawarean law is the most significant corporative legislation in the United States. Early in the 20th century, Delaware developed its present company legislation. Delaware has been by far the most popular state for business incorporations from that early period. Particular problems with US corporate law include trust responsibilities.

Corporate officers' connection with their corporations is built on trust, to the degree that they have the authority to make and carry out decisions without first seeking input from directors or shareholders. Corporate officials are trusted greatly since they make and carry out almost every decision made in the regular course of a company's operations without consulting or even alerting directors or shareholders in advance. In actuality, even after choices are taken and put into action, shareholders usually do not find out about the specific decisions made by their executives. Conversely, shareholders usually have little knowledge of the specific choices taken by the executives of their companies, nor the outcomes that stem from those specific actions.

The necessity under company law for executives to report to the corporate directors does not alter this condition. CEOs are not required by corporate law to report to directors on decisions they make and carry out in the regular course of business, unless the directors place a responsibility on the CEO to notify or confer with them prior to making and executing a decision. Likewise, US securities laws have no effect on this scenario. In accordance with US securities legislation, shareholders are only aware of the whole outcomes of all choices taken by the officers of their firms, and they become aware of these outcomes only after the decisions are put into action. As per US securities requirements, shareholders are only informed about these aggregate outcomes on a periodic basis, usually once every three, six, or one year period. Particular problems with US corporate law include directors' personal culpability to their companies. Directors must meet the same performance requirements as officers, as mentioned above. To put it another way, directors have the same responsibility to uphold the duty of care and loyalty to the extent that officials do.

But there's a significant distinction. Corporate executives are held to higher, "professional" standards, whilst directors are held to lesser, "unprofessional" ones. Stated differently, corporate executives are required to exhibit the same level of concern and allegiance as other corporate officials. Conversely, corporate directors are only required to exhibit the consideration and fidelity of a rational individual. There are also instances that imply the corporate directors' performance criteria are "personal," arbitrary benchmarks. Put another way, each corporate director is expected to act with the care and loyalty that is reasonable to be expected of him or her, taking into account all pertinent circumstances and facts, such as their background, their prior employment history with the company, and the length of time they have dedicated to the company. With one exception, neither Sarbanes-Oxley nor the NYSE attempted to use their CG initiatives to enforce a professional standard on directors' performance. The only exception is the Sarbanes-Oxley mandate that one audit committee member of a company be a "financial expert."

Delegations of power are special concerns under US corporation law. Authority delegation is essential to the establishment of business organizations. The first delegation required for corporate formation is the delegation of all corporate management by shareholders to directors. The directors' delegation of all corporate management in the regular course of business to the CEO is the next delegation of authority. The CEO then delegated to other company executives in the same way that was previously mentioned [9], [10].

If the delegating directors or officers have not complied with their obligations of care and loyalty in making and executing the delegations, they may be held personally accountable for the actions of the officers, employees, or agents to whom they have delegated power. Most crucially, if directors and officers who assign corporate responsibility breach their duty of care by neglecting to oversee the subordinate persons to whom they have delegated authority, they may face personal liability. The NYSE and the Security Exchange Commission have both addressed the crucial problem of director oversight of the CEO and other company officials via various CG programs. Both the NYSE and the SEC are attempting to reorganize company constitutions such that directors will, in reality, exert greater control over senior executives, without altering the performance criteria of directors under corporate law. In an effort to do this, they are putting more demands on the independence of directors serving on boards and key committees, such as the nominating, audit, and pay committees.

Shareholder derivative proceedings are special concerns under US corporate law. In general, the United States lacks government organizations that would uphold officials' individual accountability to their companies. Rather, in the US, corporations' legal actions against their officials are what impose such personal culpability. It goes without saying that this kind of movement poses a lot of challenges. First, companies only file for such legal action if they do so at all after their officials are fired. In the course of their termination agreements, corporate executives also usually negotiate releases from further personal liabilities. Secondly, the board of directors of the company must first approve any legal action taken. However, boards of directors often reluctant to file lawsuits against corporate officials, in part because doing so might negatively impact the standing of the officers in question. Third, shareholders have the right to sue corporate executives for personal liability to their companies in the event that the boards of directors do not take legal action. However, permitting a single or small group of shareholders to sue corporate officials might cause uncertainty and waste money for the company. "Shareholder derivative action" is the legal term for these cases.

To address this third challenge, shareholders wishing to file a lawsuit against their corporate executives are required to adhere to the protocols set down by the majority of corporate laws. Generally speaking, stockholders must file lawsuits using the corporation's name rather than their own. Furthermore, shareholders who possess a comparatively small percentage of outstanding shares are precluded from filing lawsuits; their legal actions are susceptible to termination by the corporation's independent directors; and they bear the risk of bearing full financial responsibility in the event that their claims against the corporate officers are unsuccessful.

The efficacy of the performance requirements is compromised by the challenges faced by shareholders when pursuing shareholder derivative actions. Too many times, they remain ineffectual in the absence of any government agency action enforcing those performance requirements. The NYSE and Sarbanes-Oxley efforts neither establish an institution tasked with upholding corporation law in the US nor remove any of the obstacles to shareholder derivative actions [11], [12].

Securities laws in the United States

Understanding American securities rules is just as crucial as understanding corporate law in the country when it comes to comprehending the latest CG efforts there. The lack of federal company law in the US actually makes securities rules even more important. To implement CG changes in this situation, "national" regulators must inevitably depend only on securities laws. It is common knowledge that corporate law and securities regulation are closely intertwined, and in some respects they are. Most significantly, both include standards for corporate reporting. However, there are some significant differences between the reporting requirements of company law and the public disclosure requirements under securities regulation. First, corporate law advances the status of companies as legal entities. Securities exchanges, another organization that would not be possible without legal assistance, are encouraged by securities regulation. Second, the main goal of corporation law is to protect shareholders—that is, corporate investors—during the times when they own their shares. The main goal of securities legislation is to assist share traders, or corporate investors, when they purchase or sell their shares. Third, corporate executives are required by law to report to company directors in private. Corporate executives are required by securities legislation to report to the public directly, since this is the only practical way to notify both prospective purchasers and sellers of shares.

Fourth, the public disclosure duties under securities regulation are distinct from and additional to the reporting requirements under company law. Corporate officers of publicly listed firms are required by securities legislation to prepare and make public disclosures. The public disclosures required by securities rules do not take the place of officers fulfilling their reporting obligations under corporation law. Stated differently, in the event that directors need further information beyond what is required by securities regulations, the CEO and other company officials are obligated by corporate law to provide such information.

Fifth, whereas securities law is founded on disclosures, corporate law is built on trust. Corporate law states that before directors or officers make decisions on behalf of their businesses, they are not obligated to disclose any important information to shareholders. Rather, shareholders have faith in the executives and directors of their businesses. In a similar vein, share sellers are not trusted by purchasers. Rather, before share purchasers make their selections, share sellers must disclose all relevant information in accordance with securities legislation.

Shareholders of publicly listed companies are not directly able to get the data needed to provide the important information that purchasers of shares seek. Because of this, publicly listed companies are obligated by securities laws to provide all pertinent information to the public, that is, to all prospective purchasers and sellers of shares. As a result, the confidence that prospective share purchasers and sellers have in the corporate officials who draft the public disclosures mandated by securities laws is the most crucial component of trust in securities transactions. Since 1976, the SEC has been allowed to pursue punishment for violating this aspect of trust via securities rules. Synopsis of US Securities Regulations: Consumer protection legislation and securities regulation are similar. Without "consumer protection" laws, vendors of goods are free to withhold information even crucial information about the products they put up for sale. Similar to this, sellers of corporate shares are free to withhold information about their shares and the companies that underpin them, even crucial information, in the absence of securities laws.

Current CG projects

The rest of this article focuses on newly implemented corporate governance (CG) efforts in the US that aim to provide reasonable guarantees that boards oversee company operations and affairs with loyalty and diligence. Recent authoritative steps regarding the supervision of a corporation's most senior management have been established by the US Congress via Sarbanes-Oxley and the NYSE through listing requirements.

Because of the coordinated but independent actions of these two entities a business group and a governmental body the current US measures maintain a crucial aspect of the US system for CG: its fragmented nature. There are three main reasons why two different organizations have taken action: first, there is no federal corporate law in the United States; second, there is no government agency actively enforcing corporate law in the United States; and third, there is no corporate law specifically designed for publicly-traded corporations in the United States. As you will see, the NYSE has made an effort to increase the level of independence among directors of companies listed there, making them more capable of meeting the performance requirements currently imposed on directors by corporate law. However, the NYSE does not alter these requirements. More specifically, the goals of the NYSE efforts are to enhance directors' independence without raising the bar for their skill or thoroughness. Regretfully, the NYSE listing criteria are not legally binding.

The US Congress generally aims to strengthen the independence of external auditors and the diligence of corporate officers and directors with the implementation of Sarbanes-Oxley. This is done in order to increase the likelihood that these parties will be better equipped and more likely to prepare public disclosures that meet the form and substance requirements of securities regulations. Except in some cases, Sarbanes–Oxley leaves the disclosure standards largely unchanged. Additionally, the performance criteria that apply to the production of such disclosures are not significantly altered by Sarbanes-Oxley. Corporate law provides broad discretion to those in charge of running a company, allowing them to make and carry out decisions in the names of their companies. The company may file a lawsuit to dispute the choices they make and carry out, often at the request of shareholders, but only to the degree that top corporate officials breach their duty of care and duty of loyalty in the process.

Senior corporate officials may typically negotiate directly with independent directors, or their designee, and fully disclose any conflicts of interest to them, satisfying their "duty of loyalty" in this way. Senior corporate officers are rarely found to have violated their "duty of care" in the absence of breaking any laws, including federal securities regulations. This is because courts' reviews of senior officers' decisions are governed by the "business judgment rule," which states that decisions made by senior corporate officers are not reviewed based on information that was not available to them at the time of the decision or based on the outcomes that were obtained. Their choices are evaluated only based on the information at their disposal or that, with reasonable effort, they might have had access to at the time of decision-making; the outcomes are not taken into account.

Generally, only three powers are set aside for directors within the extensive authority that directors provide to senior corporate officers in accordance with corporate constitutions: the right to choose senior corporate officers, the authority to set remuneration, and the authority to remove them. Directors usually have limited discretion when it comes to lowering the compensation of top company leaders for pragmatic and sometimes contractual reasons. As a result, directors' authority to oversee senior corporate officials is essentially restricted to their capacity to fire them after they are appointed.

Qualifications for a NYSE listing

Recent corporate scandals raise the possibility that boards misused their authority to set pay guidelines and, when it was appropriate, disregarded their duty to fire top company executives. In recent years, the compensation of top corporate officials at some US corporations which were already very rich by worldwide standards has grown exponentially, even in the absence of a comparable improvement in corporate performance. Too often, it even seems as if directors have not fired top corporate officials, despite the possibility that some of them may have gravely violated their fiduciary and loyalty obligations over an extended period of time based on information later made public. Even in cases when top corporate executives have directly negotiated corporate contracts with directors and declared conflicts of interest, it seems that directors have far too often failed to get fair outcomes for their firms.

Due to the lack of US corporate law that applies to publicly listed firms, the US SEC has prompted the NYSE to take certain action in an effort to address apparent abuses and negligence on the part of directors in recent times. Particularly, the new "CG" guidelines mandate that firms listed on the NYSE establish committees of independent directors to decide on executive remuneration, propose senior corporate officers and directors, and audit the data that senior corporate officers submit to the boards of directors. The NYSE is working to ensure that directors exercise their rights regarding senior corporate officers and fulfill their supervisory obligations in a way that is consistent with their duties of loyalty and care by addressing the corporate constitutional issues of who should be corporate directors and how they should make decisions.

Senior executives need to be under the supervision of independent directors.

The most crucial need for the NYSE listing standards is that directors be independent, as shown by the following particular requirements. It appears that accepting "immaterial" fees from the listed company in addition to directors' fees won't compromise a director's "independence." Previously, independence was defined as having no "relationship with the company that may interfere with the exercise of the director's independence from management and the company." The board must affirmatively determine that a director has "no material relationship with the listed company" in order for a director to be considered independent.

For a period of five years following the conclusion of their engagement with the listed company, no former employees of a listed company, nor any employees or partners of its independent auditors, including the immediate families of any such employees or partners, may be classified as "independent" directors. The relevant time frame, sometimes known as the "cooling-off" period, used to be three years.

Senior officials should be overseen by independent directors; corporate boards must have a majority of independent directors, unless a listed business has a controlling shareholder. This is a novel prerequisite. Senior officials should be under the supervision of independent directors, who should also oversee the nomination and pay committees. Compensation and nomination committees are required for listed corporations, and they must be made up completely of independent directors. This is an entirely new prerequisite. Separate committees for nominations and pay were not necessary in the past.

Senior executives should be overseen by independent directors; the audit committee should be completely independent. A minimum of three independent directors had to make up the audit committee, which was a requirement for public businesses in the past.

As previously stated, audit committees must henceforth include only of independent directors. Members of the audit committee are required to limit their income from the firm to the fees they earn as directors, in addition to the "independence" guidelines that apply to other directors.

In the past, listed firms were not required to create nominating or pay committees, nor were audit committees required to have charters rules outlining processes and decisions for their committees. Instead, directors should oversee with defined policies and procedures. Board committees must also have and publish charters. These days, the audit, remuneration, and nominating committees of listed firms' boards must adopt charters, which then need to be publicized. Clear rules and processes should be followed by directors while supervising employees. Listed businesses are required to establish and publish governance principles and codes of business behavior that apply to top corporate officials, such as the CEO and CFO. This is a completely new requirement that comes directly after the SEC's new rule. Clear rules and procedures should be followed by directors, and non-management directors need to schedule separate meetings on a regular basis.

In order to examine corporate business and affairs, the independent directors of listed companies now sometimes referred to as the "executive committee" or "executive session" must convene on a regular basis without the presence of top management. This is an entirely new prerequisite. Clear rules and procedures should be followed by directors when supervising: most stock option schemes need shareholder approval; in the past, many stock option plans did not. All of these schemes now need shareholder approval, with the exception of tax-qualified plans like 401s, employment-induced options, and option plans obtained via mergers.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at how risk management, stakeholder interests, and organizational performance are affected by CEO and officer control. It looks at how, in certain situations, centralized control may improve flexibility and judgment but also run the danger of management entrenchment, conflicts of interest, and agency issues. The research also looks at supervision and accountability systems intended to prevent overbearing control and guarantee alignment with larger stakeholder interests. It talks about how company boards, institutional investors, authorities, and market forces watch on executive conduct, enforce rules, and support good corporate governance. In summary, by illuminating the dynamics of CEO and officer power, this study advances our knowledge of corporate constitutions. The study provides insightful information for policymakers, practitioners, and academics who aim to advance efficient governance frameworks that strike a balance between managerial autonomy, accountability, and stakeholder interests. It does this by clarifying the mechanisms, implications, and difficulties connected with centralized control within organizations.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Jebe, M. Meacham, and M. Williams, "Fostering Corporate Sustainability Through Directors' Duties: South Africa's Attempt to Align Corporate Governance with Its Constitution," *ILSA J. Int. Comp. Law*, 2018.

[2] J. A. Sempill, "What Rendered Ancient Tyrants Detestable: The Rule of Law and the Constitution of Corporate Power," *Hague J. Rule Law*, 2018.

[3] P. B. Santos, "In the genesis of the Political Constitution of 1933: The corporate ideology and the economic-social structure of Portuguese authoritarianism," *Estud. Hist.*, 2018.

[4] Y. Gendron, "Beyond conventional boundaries: Corporate governance as inspiration for critical accounting research," *Crit. Perspect. Account.*, 2018.

[5] L. M. Cacho, "Civil Rights, Commerce, and US Colonialism," *Soc. Text*, 2018.

[6] L. A. Wily, "Collective land ownership in the 21st century: Overview of global trends," *Land*, 2018.

[7] E. M. Azila-Gbettor, B. Q. Honyenuga, M. M. Berent-Braun, and A. Kil, "Structural aspects of corporate governance and family firm performance: a systematic review," *Journal of Family Business Management*. 2018.

[8] J. Lee, "Intra-Corporate Dispute Arbitration and Minority Shareholder Protection: A Corporate Governance Perspective," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[9] E. Z. Zinder, "Values-directed enterprise engineering," *Bus. Informatics*, 2018.

[10] A. Fraser, "Mexico's 'Sugar Tax': Space, Markets, Resistance," *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2018.

[11] Á. M. Ballesteros Barros, "Reflections on the modernization of European Company Law: Forum societatis and lex societatis," *Anu. Esp. Derecho Int. Priv.*, 2018.

[12] M. Greendorfer, "Discrimination as a Business Policy: The Misuse and Abuse of Corporate Social Responsibility Programs," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 8

AUDITOR INDEPENDENCE: LIMITATION OF AUDITORS AND NON-AUDIT SERVICES

Dr. Manita D Shah, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.manita_shah@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Auditor independence is a cornerstone of the auditing profession, ensuring impartiality, objectivity, and integrity in financial reporting. However, the provision of non-audit services (NAS) by auditors to their audit clients has raised concerns about potential conflicts of interest and compromised independence. This paper examines the limitations imposed by the provision of non-audit services on auditor independence, shedding light on the complexities, implications, and regulatory responses.

The study begins by delineating the concept of auditor independence and its critical importance in maintaining investor confidence and market integrity. It explores the theoretical underpinnings of independence, including agency theory, professional ethics, and regulatory frameworks, which emphasize the need for auditors to remain free from undue influence and financial dependencies on their clients. Central to the analysis is an investigation into the nature and scope of non-audit services offered by audit firms, including consulting, tax advisory, and other advisory services.

It elucidates how the provision of such services may create conflicts of interest, impair auditor objectivity, and compromise the perception of independence, particularly when auditors are tasked with evaluating their own work or advising clients on complex financial transactions.

KEYWORDS:

Stewardship, Strategic Direction, Sustainability Reporting, Transparency, Accountability Mechanisms, Anti-Corruption Measures.

INTRODUCTION

Previously, internal audit functions were not required for listed firms. Stated differently, audit committees were provided with all relevant data by external auditors or senior company managers. Internal audits are now required for all listed businesses, and the audit committee may access them for informational purposes and investigations.

The NYSE is permitted to, as in the past, remove listed businesses that violate standards off the list and to publicly admonish them under the new CG listing rules. Although the NYSE listing criteria for self-regulation provide certain benefits over government regulation, the only penalties that the NYSE may impose are essentially fines for corporations and their shareholders, not on corporate leaders and directors.

NYSE listing requirements: international corporations applying

The NYSE has decided that if a foreign company has securities listed on the NYSE and can provide written confirmation from legal counsel in its country of incorporation that the company complies with the CG rules of that country and any security exchange that lists the company's securities there, the NYSE will not apply any specific CG listing requirements to the foreign company [1], [2].

US securities laws

In the aftermath of the recent corporate scandals in the US, Sarbanes–Oxley has garnered significant attention as the most significant US CG initiative. Since the NYSE's CG requirements are meant to provide reasonable guarantees that directors actively and loyally monitor their delegations of power to CEOs and other company officials, they are likely more comprehensive than other requirements. On the other hand, Sarbanes-Oxley's scope and the power of the SEC are restricted to the adoption of reasonable procedures required for trustworthy corporate financial reporting and the avoidance of fraud in corporate securities trading. The three main topics covered by Sarbanes–Oxley are the content of public disclosures made by businesses in accordance with securities regulations, the independence of the auditors who prepare periodic financial reports, and the processes by which businesses prepare and present those reports. Sarbanes–Oxley also raises the possible criminal penalty for company officials who violate securities laws on a personal level.

Similar to the NYSE listing requirements, each overview enumerates the legal situation just before Sarbanes–Oxley was implemented. In the summary that follows, companies whose securities are listed for public trading on US exchanges are referred to as "issuers." The use of non-general accounting agreed-upon key financial measurements is the main component of securities reporting. This clause is fresh. It reacts to the current trend of issuers releasing pro-forma financial statements via press releases. Pro-forma financial statements are only allowed as an addition to required financial statements prepared and presented in compliance with generally accepted accounting principles, and only in specific situations (such as acquisitions during the reporting period) have they been allowed as part of the regular periodic disclosures. The content of securities disclosures: businesses are required to provide codes of ethics [3], [4].

Issuers are required to state whether they have enacted a code of ethics that governs the chief financial officer and executive officer of the business. If a business doesn't have one of these codes, it needs to admit this and provide an explanation for why. Additionally, any changes made to or exemptions from the code of ethics pertaining to any of those officers must be immediately disclosed by the corporation. Honest and moral behavior, trustworthy financial disclosures, adherence to relevant laws, and "the ethical handling of actual or apparent conflicts of interests between personal and professional relationships" are all requirements of a code of ethics. While there have been codes of ethics for at least some issuers, the SEC seems to be of the opinion that too many of them have not applied to the highest ranking officials of a company, either in theory or in actuality. According to the new regulations, top officers must disclose a code of ethics that is, at the very least, theoretically relevant to them. It's also crucial to disclose if any senior corporate officials have received exemptions from the code.

As said earlier, the only things that US securities laws address are accurate financial reporting and preventing fraud in the selling of securities on US markets. However, the SEC cannot ignore corporate due diligence issues to the extent that such efforts are necessary for corporations to prepare and present required financial statements and other public disclosures, as demonstrated by the SEC's pro-visions on internal accounting controls. Similar to this, the SEC mandated under Sarbanes–Oxley that publicly listed companies create and publish a code of conduct that applies only to their CEO and CFO.

Establish a "public accounting oversight board" to ensure auditor independence.

To regulate and set auditing standards for accountants who audit public businesses, the SEC will create an independent board. Of the five members of the board, only two will have certified public accounting certifications. Funding for the board will come from businesses whose stocks are listed on US stock markets. An independent board has been in place since 1933 with the aim of establishing auditing standards and regulating public company auditors. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants is the organization in question. Furthermore, the Financial Accounting Standards Board is an independent body that has existed since 1933 with the goal of creating widely accepted accounting principles [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

It is against the law for issuers to hire their auditors for non-audit services unless the audit committee gives prior clearance and the services rendered are disclosed to the public. If an audit partner's income depended on closing engagements for services other than audit, then an accountant wouldn't be considered “independent” from an audit client. A broad SEC regulation pertaining to auditor independence has been implemented. If the accountant or other covered person has a direct or significant indirect commercial connection with the audit client, other than providing professional services after February 5, 2001, then independence would be compromised in accordance with the regulations in place.

CG's special challenges include choosing and nominating directors.

In publicly listed US firms, top corporate officers propose candidates for their boards of directors. This structure has spurred an emphasis on the independence of directors, both in the NYSE listing requirements and in Sarbanes–Oxley. Senior corporate executives effectively choose their own supervisors and often pay them investment banking and consulting fees in addition to director compensation for their services. It is often believed that senior management's selection of directors and payment to them jeopardize the directors' position as senior management's supervisors.

Senior corporate officials are not required by law to propose candidates for their boards of directors. Conversely, company law only provides the latitude for senior executives to propose candidates on their own initiative. Corporate law mandates that shareholders elect candidates to serve as directors, regardless of whether they are nominated by top officials, other directors, or shareholders directly. Because top executives are in charge of creating the proxy solicitation materials used to elect directors, they are able to propose almost every candidate for the boards of directors of publicly listed US firms. However, there isn't a standard procedure in place to ask shareholders for nominations. In this particular setting, the only candidates on the ballot for election as directors are usually those recommended by top officials [7], [8].

Improved transparency to shareholders on the processes by which directors are nominated and enhanced shareholder access to the director nomination process were the recommendations of an SEC report dated July 15, 2003. The July 15 report, among other things, suggests that companies set up and make public particular channels through which investors can communicate with the directors of the companies in which they invest. It also mandates that large, long-term shareholders be given access to the company's proxy materials so they can propose directors, at least in cases where there are objective indicators suggesting that shareholders may not have had sufficient access to a functional proxy process.

The national corporate governance system in Canada

Executives in Canada

Appropriately balancing the power of a company's management and board has been a central theme of the Dey Report and all following talks. Corporate leaders in Canada have been at the forefront of innovation and supporting excellence in governance, even if this has not been publicly recognized. They exceeded those of the great majority of other countries even before the publication of the Dey Report. The CEOs of Canada are leading the charge in the CG discussion. The CEOs of Canada as a whole are represented by the Canadian Council of Chief Executives. A September 2002 report7 from CCCE called on Canada's CEOs to set an example in corporate behavior and ethics and to show, in action, that we do not need burdensome new regulations like SOX. This was CCCE's primary contribution to governance in the post-Enron period.

For executives and CCCE, resolving the conflict between management and boards is crucial. According to management theory, today's corporations are too complex for real direction and control to be left to volunteer or part-time directors; although owners may still "own," control has been transferred to a professional class of full-time managers who are the only ones who can effectively govern and manage the company due to their understanding of its complexities. The foundation of contemporary governance reform is agency theory, which clearly defines the function of boards of directors as the intermediaries between corporate leaders and agents. Boards have an economic responsibility to minimize agency expenses, or any funds that agents spend on behalf of the company that do not support the owners' objectives. The CEO is in charge of the management team, thus it is illogical to think that they can also serve as an adjudicator; responsibility becomes circular in the absence of a strong, independent board, according to agency theory, which challenges management theory's assertions. Even while 87 percent of Canadian board chairmen do not hold the position of CEO, 37 percent are "related" to the company, and 45 percent do not adhere to the more stringent "independence" requirements of today. Does the lack of independence indicate that management theory still has a lot of power in Canadian boardrooms, since the division between chair and CEO represents agency theory? Both Cadbury and Dey advocated a shift toward agency theory by clearly delegating governance responsibilities to the board, which implies that the CEO cannot supervise and hold oneself accountable. The board has to be in charge of governance [9], [10].

Directors' boards in Canada

The board members of Canada are represented by the Institute of Corporate Directors. In the recent past, the ICD has collaborated with the TSX to assess CG practices, with the CICA to explore the efficacy of Audit Committees, and with the Rotman School at the University of Toronto to launch a national director education program. The ICD aims to strike a balance between stewardship theory and agency theory while determining its course, much as the CCCE strives to strike the correct balance between management and agency theory to represent the opinions of its CEO members. According to stewardship theory, executives and directors are members of the same corporate team and are in charge of managing the company's resources. Therefore, the board's main responsibility is to assist and counsel management. The board's principal responsibility is to lead and oversee the corporation's administration, according to agency theory. When developing training for corporate directors in Canada, ICD takes into account these various board authority models.

A quarter of the publicly listed, widely held companies in Canada don't evaluate the performance of each individual director. Less than half of them provide directors a structured continuous program for education or development. What is stopping us from doing more thorough evaluations and providing more education, given the decline in terms and tenure and the increase in duties and pay?

Investors from Canada

Market discipline is the first line of defense against CG lapses. Two essential and illuminating principles for comprehending corporate governance (CG) and regulation in the modern era are spelled out in the Basel II Accord. First, an efficient risk management system run by the company's executives and board is the best approach to assess capital sufficiency. Compared to conventional functional hazards, a much wider spectrum of business risks must be reflected in this approach. The second idea put out by the Bank for International Settlement is that market discipline is the most effective means of guaranteeing that businesses really adhere to good business practices. This implies that by altering the availability and cost of money, capital markets will reward excellent practices and penalize unsound ones. According to BIS, this is much more quick and efficient in guaranteeing and upholding good standards than government-run regulatory supervisory entities like the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions and the Canadian Deposit Insurance Corporation. Although these findings pertain to capital adequacy, they may be easily applied to corporate governance (CG) as well: investors in the capital market should apply discipline as the first line of defense to assure and enforce strong governance standards, and boards and executives should adopt a risk-based approach to governance [11], [12].

Until the significant regulatory involvement of SOX, institutional investors in the US had long been at the forefront of establishing, assessing, and publicizing CG practices. Despite owning about 70% of Canada's outstanding stocks, big pension and mutual fund investors have been less outspoken and more passive in the country. According to US statistics, CEOs now own around 12% of all outstanding shares, a remarkable increase from just 2% fifteen years ago. In order to address the well-known issue of stock compensation, SOX mandates that Board Compensation Committees have direct communication with the firm's compensation consultant. Through the International Corporate Governance Network, the Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan has led the way in CG reform both domestically and globally. As an example of the new "active" investor, OTPP has publicly voted against management in executive pay and shareholder voting class motions. It also won't just sell its shares if it perceives a governance breakdown. Rather, it will interact with the board and management, vote its shares, and even take legal action to protect its interests.

In addition to publishing proxy voting procedures, the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System has also disclosed how it actually conducts ballots. In February 2003, the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board became the first institutional investor in Canada to openly declare its opposition to the majority of executive stock option schemes. Leading institutional investor in Quebec, La Caisse de Dépots et Placements, has also taken steps to assert itself as a leader in activist governance, especially when it comes to corporate disclosures and attempts to end the cycle of analyst calls and earnings projections. The Canadian Coalition for Good Governance is an alliance of Canada's top institutional investors. CCGG is committed to focusing on corporate governance procedures that enhance long-term shareholder value. To that end, the company will publish governance principles on matters such as CEO remuneration and impose them via proxy voting. Behind the scenes, CCGG achieved an early victory by opposing Canada's major banks to divide the CEO and board chair positions. This suggests that the CCGG accepts agency theory, and it will be fascinating to see whether or not its criteria in the future are in line with the board's authority. As defenders of "good governance," institutional investors have restrictions, just as any other investors do. They are motivated by accept market gains and want access to precise, real-time information from companies. The foundation of Canada's CG system, where "thou shalt disclose" is the only "rule," is the basic need for open disclosure that underpins market discipline.

According to Cadbury, shareholders have three main responsibilities or rights:

1. By designating the directors,

2. The auditors' appointment, and

3. To confirm for themselves that the company has a functional CGI system.

Therefore, in order to ensure effective shareholder governance, shareholders must carefully exercise their franchise by selecting directors and auditors who are knowledgeable, seasoned, and impartial. Shareholders should consider the conflict between agency theory and democratic governance theory when they make these crucial decisions. Democratic theory supports a "lay" board, in which the quality of a director's representation of the shareholder determines their qualification. In Canada, cooperatives, not-for-profit organizations, and even public sector businesses often embody democratic ideology in their operations by choosing board members according to how well they represent owner groups. According to agency theory, in order for directors to supervise and monitor management in an efficient manner, they need to possess a great deal of practical knowledge and expertise.

The agency theory function for Crown company boards was firmly supported by the Treasury Board Guidelines of 1996. However, after a few years, it was discovered that the procedure of choosing board members remained the same, often leading to a shortage of talents to carry out this duty. Another illustration of the ongoing trend toward agency theory and the transfer of authority to boards is SOX's requirement that members of the Audit Committee possess financial literacy.

Character, financial knowledge, skills, industry experience, and business experience rank first among the selection criteria for directors in widely held publicly traded companies; in Crown corporations, the top five criteria are skills, financial knowledge, geographic representation, industry experience, and gender representation. The impact of democratic philosophy, agency theory, and talent and experience are reflected in representation criteria. Given how hard it is to evaluate "character," how much of this is really just "who knows whom?"

The auditors in Canada

The third pillar of CG, after directors and executives, are auditors. Following Enron's demise, Canada's auditing companies were the first to implement governance measures. Actually, the heads of Canada's biggest accounting firms agreed to take two significant voluntary actions with regulators six months prior to SOX. They would establish an independent body to regulate their profession and divide their consulting and auditing divisions into separate businesses. Firms with names such as "Bearing Point" and "Cap Gemini" quickly made their way onto the business scene. On July 17, 2002, the Canadian Public Accountability Board was launched, and later that year, Gordon Thiessen was selected as its first chair. Every significant audit partner had discussed a plan of action to enhance the Committee's and the board's participation in audit supervision and internal control with the audit committees of their clients before the start of the new fiscal years.

For many years, the national organization for Chartered Accountants in Canada, the SRO, and the CICA have all taken the lead in board governance. It has collaborated with the TSX and ICD on evaluations, research, and seminars. It has also released the Criteria for Control and 20 Questions series, which serve as guidelines for Canadian boards of directors. The CICA has raised the standard for auditor independence, behavior, and disclosures recently.

Strong governance is also promoted both inside and outside of its membership by the Society of Management Accountants of Canada, the SRO and national society for Certified Management Accountants in Canada. Since winning Time Magazine's 2002 "Person of the Year" title over celebrities like George Bush, internal auditors have taken on a more prominent position at CG. The Institute of Internal Auditors is involved in internal auditor education and standards, which includes the newly revised and extended Treadway Commission standards committee of sponsoring organizations.

The stock exchanges and SROs in Canada

Beyond auditors, investors have other institutions to protect them: Canada's stock exchanges and the securities sector. Historically, English civil law nations such as the UK and Canada have relied heavily on stock markets to develop and enforce governance rules. The TSX benchmarked Canada's governance standards to SOX in September 2002, identifying areas in which the TSX or other authorities should be exerting greater influence and establishing the stance that more regulations would be detrimental to the Canadian principle-based system. The TSX then improved listing standards, mandating that boards and audit committees include a majority of independent directors. Tiered governance is now possible in Canada because to the publication of a different, more relaxed set of governance standards by TSX subsidiary Venture Exchange. According to the TSX, this is required to support Canada's junior capital market. Naturally, there are internal conflicts that need to be carefully handled on stock markets like the TSX. Strict governance guidelines are designed to guard against expensive mistakes and boost investor trust. Conversely, looser requirements increase market share and profitability of stock exchanges while opening up capital markets, particularly for small-cap companies.

The analysts in Canada

The Investment Dealers Association is in charge of formulating the rules controlling the criteria for analysts. When it comes to gathering, evaluating, and advising investors on their choices, financial analysts are essential. This effort may have a significant impact on governance behavior and greatly enhances capital market efficiency to the degree that it is robust and timely. Brokers and analysts, however, still have difficulties. Enron's ability to effectively manipulate the "buy" rating of its own shares by withholding "sell" business was a startling lesson in the US that may not have been applied here. The housing of "buy" and "sell" side brokers in Canada's financial intermediaries raises concerns about their independence. Furthermore, rather of looking at the industry through rose-colored glasses, boards and investors are encouraged to establish realistic expectations by the whole system of guiding, consensus calls, and rewarding analysts and brokerages. Enforcement has been one weakness in Canada's corporate governance self-regulation framework. In spite of widespread misconduct and significant market crashes, stock exchanges have been reluctant to delist or even penalize violators. Studies conducted on SROs in comparable sectors show that maintaining public confidence in a profession requires strict rules and enforcement.

A policy or strategy adopted by the board for informing and interacting with shareholders is lacking in 75% of listed businesses. Ninety-five percent of businesses only address CEO salary in very broad strokes, with no detailed explanation of how pay is decided upon or how it relates to overall business success. Why is it that these methods aren't more widely used in Canada?

Governments and regulators in Canada

The government team, which consists of executives, directors, investors, auditors, stock exchanges, SROs, and analysts, may entirely fail to perform due diligence, as 20–20 hindsight has shown with both Enron and WorldCom. In this case, supervisors and regulators will be our only line of defense. Once again, this is a balancing act between the proper role of market self-regulation and government regulation in governance. It is the responsibility of regulatory agencies to establish and implement fundamental norms of conduct and transparency when market discipline and self-regulation are deemed insufficient.

The provinces, who write their own Corporations Acts and run their own Securities Commissions, are in charge of most corporate and securities regulations. Within the national framework of the Canadian Securities Administrators, the Ontario Security Commission is recognized as Canada's primary securities regulator. Following SOX, the OSC demanded that market players including the TSX share their reactions and next steps within a few weeks. In keeping with the TSX and CCCE, the OSC chose to take a moderate stance and agreed that a "strong, made-in-Canada" solution is suitable, providing "equivalent but not identical" protection that takes into account the larger percentage of small size and controlled firms that trade on Canadian platforms. The boards or audit committees of more than 80% of publicly listed companies have already taken action to evaluate and guarantee the independence of their external auditor. ....Currently, less than 60% of directors of publicly listed companies satisfy the new, stricter independence requirements. Only 25% of publicly listed companies utilize director search services; in most cases, a very small group of individuals make these crucial decisions. Why have more independent norms prevailed for auditors but not for directors yet? The federal government still has at least three main means to affect CG nationwide in addition to the provinces:

The federal statute known as the Canada Business Corporations Act establishes the guidelines for corporation law among the provinces. It addresses fundamental issues of governance, such the responsibilities and credentials of directors, and is now undergoing further evaluation. Extending the required standards of corporate responsibility to include a corporation's obligation to stakeholders other than shareholders is one option being considered. This is the core idea of the last theory of governance, known as stakeholder theory, which implies that boards must represent the variety of stakeholder interests. The forefront of stakeholder and corporate social responsibility practices originated in continental Europe, where representatives from small shareholders, labor unions, lenders, workers, and other stakeholder groups are included on boards. According to a recent survey, the majority of Canadians support "public directors" who are chosen by the government or another impartial organization to represent the public interest in the boardrooms of the largest corporations in the country. One of these amendments to the CBCA would fundamentally alter Canadian CG, which is why there has been a great deal of lobbying for it.

Although the aim of this is not to go into the nuances of Canadian corporation law, 5.A1 provides a useful summary of the legal landscape of CG. The financial services sector is subject to federal regulation, which is based on both delegated and constitutional power. Here, the major participants are the CDIC, OSFI, and Finance Canada. Each has a strong reputation around the globe. Beyond Canada's financial sector, OSFI's CG guidelines—which call for committees and disclosure—as well as CDIC's good business practices—which prioritize control via risk management—have a significant impact.

Finance Canada looks for methods to standardize securities legislation throughout the nation as part of its national interest mission, and one such means is via its "wise-persons" group. There are two options available: one regulator, or a "passport" arrangement in which issuers would interact with only one regulator. The status quo, or third, option is, of course, always possible. Provinces' opinions on other recent attempts to change securities regulations, such as Ontario's Crawford Report, have been conflicting. The top four provinces vigorously contend with their positions. As some sardonic observers have pointed out, Canada will eventually establish a national securities commission even if it's the SEC! Only 47% of Canadian boards are in charge of guaranteeing their company's approach to corporate social responsibility, compared to 97% who are in charge of their corporation's approach to governance and 90% who are in charge of maintaining a code of conduct. Compared to North America, stakeholder theory has developed more in Europe. Leaders of the Group of Eight (G8) identified corporate social responsibility (CG), transparency and integrity, as the basis for stable macroeconomic development.

CONCLUSION

In order to address the constraints of non-audit services on auditor independence, the research looks at empirical data and regulatory actions. Research results on the relationship between NAS provision and audit quality are covered, along with legislative reactions such the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, which places limitations on the services auditors may provide to their audit customers. The research also looks at other approaches that may be used to improve auditor independence, such as collaborative audits, required audit firm rotation, and the creation of more precise rules for acceptable non-audit services. It addresses the trade-offs and real-world difficulties posed by these strategies, emphasizing the need of a well-balanced regulatory framework that protects auditor independence without placing an undue burden on audit firms or lowering the caliber of audits. In summary, by critically analyzing the constraints of non-audit services on auditor objectivity and integrity, this study advances our knowledge of auditor independence. The study provides useful guidance for policymakers, standard setters, audit firms, and investors seeking to promote strong governance mechanisms that protect the credibility and reliability of financial reporting in an increasingly complex business environment by combining theoretical insights with empirical evidence and regulatory perspectives.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Chu and Y. Hsu, "Non-audit services and audit quality — the effect of Sarbanes-Oxley Act," *Asia Pacific Manag. Rev.*, 2018.

[2] H. Khasharmeh and A. M. Desoky, "Does the provision of non-audit services affect auditor independence and audit quality? Evidence from bahrain," *Asian Acad. Manag. J. Account. Financ.*, 2018.

[3] L. S. Wiyantoro and F. Usman, "Audit tenure and quality to audit report lag in banking," *Eur. Res. Stud. J.*, 2018.

[4] P. Velte and T. Loy, "The impact of auditor rotation, audit firm rotation and non-audit services on earnings quality, audit quality and investor perceptions: A literature review," *J. Gov. Regul.*, 2018.

[5] E. Beardsley, A. Imdieke, and T. C. Omer, "Evidence of a Nonlinear Association between Auditor-Provided Non-Audit Services and Audit Quality," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[6] J. Fang, "Quasi-Indexer Institutions and Auditor Independence: Evidence from Non-Audit Service Fees," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[7] D. A. D. O. Al-Sraheen, "Does the provision of non□audit services impair auditor independence? The moderating role of audit committee financial expertise," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Business Information Management Association Conference, IBIMA 2018: Innovation Management and Education Excellence through Vision 2020*, 2018.

[8] M. Kend and Ii. Basioudis, "Reforms to the Market for Audit and Assurance Services in the Period after the Global Financial Crisis: Evidence from the UK," *Aust. Account. Rev.*, 2018.

[9] O. U. David, U. U. Boniface, and U. N. Christian, "Effect of audit quality on market price of firms listed on the Nigerian stock market," *J. Account. Tax.*, 2018.

[10] Z. T. Kowaleski, B. W. Mayhew, and A. C. Tegeler, “The Impact of Consulting Services on Audit Quality: An Experimental Approach,” *J. Account. Res.*, 2018.

[11] Y. Ganesan, H. Haron, A. Amran, and S. K. Ooi, “Corporate social responsibility in SMEs: The role of non-audit services,” in *Corporate Social Responsibility: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*, 2018.

[12] N. V. S. Ratzinger-Sakel and M. W. Schönberger, “The impact of auditor brand name on auditor remuneration in a large private client segment,” *Int. J. Audit.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 9

EXPLORING THE CORPORATE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. Mansi Kukreja, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.mansi_kukreja@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Corporate performance measurement is a fundamental aspect of strategic management, enabling organizations to assess their achievements, identify areas for improvement, and align activities with strategic objectives. This paper explores the multifaceted nature of corporate performance measurement, elucidating the strategies, metrics, and implications associated with evaluating organizational effectiveness.

The study begins by examining the theoretical underpinnings of performance measurement, drawing upon management theories such as the balanced scorecard, stakeholder theory, and agency theory. It explores how these theoretical frameworks inform the design and implementation of performance measurement systems, emphasizing the need for a balanced approach that considers financial, non-financial, and qualitative indicators. Central to the analysis is an exploration of performance measurement strategies, including the selection of key performance indicators (KPIs), benchmarking, target setting, and performance reporting. It discusses the importance of aligning performance metrics with organizational goals, industry benchmarks, and stakeholder expectations, while also fostering a culture of continuous improvement and accountability.

KEYWORDS:

Financial Transparency, Governance Principles, Governance Standards, Insider Dealing, Internal Controls, Investor Protection.

INTRODUCTION

We now go to a more thorough portrayal of CG practices and performance in Canada after outlining the major actors in the field and their impact on governance practice in recent times. Alongside each of the 14 TSX rules, governance practices and trends in Canada are shown, categorized by governance principle area, and benchmarked when data are available.

As was previously said, one of the main benefits of implementing a principle-based governance system is that it may be used by businesses of any size or in any sector, independent of the governance theory they adhere to.

Taking charge and being responsible

The foundations of CG are stewardship14 and leadership 13. Basic actions include establishing the strategic direction, managing risk and prioritizing goals, caring for shareholder and stakeholder resources, and appointing corporate leadership are among them. This is the first principle for two main reasons: it is the foundation of both the Cadbury and Dey Reports and it is where the board, executive, and shareholders first interact, incorporating expectations into plans, choosing what the corporation plans to do, and choosing the people who will steward the corporation on their behalf. Over half of the TSX Report addresses elements of leadership and stewardship, which is the subject of Dey's Guideline [1], [2].

Risk management and strategic planning

In order to take on responsibility for establishing the strategic direction and implementing a strategic planning process, boards of directors collaborate closely with management. At the end of the day, these executives are responsible for making sure that every action taken by the company advances the strategic vision and objective of the organization. There is disagreement even here, at the CG foundation, on how the board and management should be divided in terms of responsibilities. There are others who contend that creating a company purpose, vision, goals, and priorities is a task best left to the management team. Research by others, such as Dr. Chris Bart, the author of 20 Questions Directors Should Ask About Strategy, has shown that companies with boards of directors that participate early in determining the goal and strategy often have higher success rates [3], [4].

According to this theory, the earliest and greatest chance for directors to demonstrate their leadership abilities and control over the business is when they establish the company's strategic direction. It's crucial to set goals and objectives that complement the overarching aim. To make sure they don't cross the crucial but invisible boundary between board and management duties, boards need to be disciplined and restrained.

In Canada, more than 80% of boards actively participate in the creation and approval of the company's goals, strategies, tracking methods, and strategic plan. According to Spencer Stuart's study, 86% of Canadian boards participated in strategic planning: Only 7% of respondents met with management to construct the strategy, whereas 39% approved and 63% examined the final strategic plan. Even before a wider interest in CG arose, Canada's boards of directors started to become involved in this field in the 1970s and 1980s, and it is obvious that this participation has continued to increase during the 1990s. Additionally, Canadian boards of directors must clearly take on the responsibility of the corporation's stewardship as part of good governance. Effectively supervising the use of resources while maintaining a strategic focus and avoiding transactional tasks that should properly be performed by the CEO, employees, internal audit committees, or the external auditor is one of the biggest issues confronting boards.

The core theme of important governance reports is stewardship. Examples of these studies include the US SOX, which emphasizes including independent directors in oversight and control, and the Turnbull Report from the United Kingdom, which urges boards to adopt a risk-based approach to internal control. The rules and performance of the Canadian government predate these publications by a number of years.

The board is tasked with managing financial, human, environmental, and material resources as strategic leaders, and they should make every effort to protect and manage them with attention, care, and honesty. Generally speaking, boards are better at supervision than control, which often calls for access to timely and accurate information as well as financial expertise. The board should identify the primary risks facing the company and make sure that the necessary risk management processes are put in place as part of its overall stewardship. Once again, the board's responsibility for risk management has improved recently.

CEO and board appointment and succession

One of the key components of both the structural and cultural aspects of corporate governance (CG) is having the proper people at the top of the organization—people with the right kind of character, abilities, and involvement as well as the appropriate level of independence. "Where good governance begins" is in selecting the most qualified candidates to serve as the company's CEO, board chair, and director. The following are the main goals of the leadership renewal process. finding people with this combination of experience, skills, and character traits; making sure the board can operate without interference from management or specific shareholders; making sure succession planning and board renewal are executed well; and reaping the benefits of having a diverse group of leaders [5], [6].

Even though most governance statistics are difficult to compare across nations, it is reasonable to argue that Canada would rank among the top industrialized nations based on these director independence metrics. Nonetheless, some analysts have noted that Canada's tiny population and densely populated commercial districts lead to a similar but distinct issue: a high number of interlocking directorships, where a small number of individuals hold several significant company board positions. It is implied that the influence of their discussions across boards may weaken their independence. It's interesting to note that the 2003 Higgs Report in the UK was based on this accusation and came to the conclusion that, contrary to popular belief, there was no meaningful interlocking of directorships in the country. A candidate's core talents are essential to their selection for a board. This includes the knowledge, training, and experience they have gained that may instantly improve the efficacy of the business and board. Beyond them, directors' backgrounds and personalities are seen as crucial. Directors must have integrity since they are responsible for leading the company in its ethical practices. Compatibility is a prerequisite for collaboration.

Achievement and Quantification

The board must be thoroughly involved in comprehending the industry and business model as it bears ultimate responsibility for the organization's success in fulfilling its obligations to its principals, stakeholders, regulators, and others. Additionally, as the board "gets what it rewards" and "gets what it measures," the organization's performance management and incentive program must be in line with its goals. The corporate governance performance categories covered by accomplishment and measurement are as follows assessing the board, management, and company performance effectively. Attaining both financial performance and general success. Successfully completing tasks and strategic goals. Any amount of organizing, enabling, communicating, and serving the public has little value if the company doesn't make progress toward its goals and creates value. In this principal area, "success" for a firm is defined, and then this or these are measured, monitored, and ensured. "Every board of directors should establish a procedure for evaluating the performance of the board as a whole, the board's committees, and the individual directors' contributions. This procedure should be overseen by the nominating committee or another suitable bod [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

The adage "you get what you measure" has a lot of reality. Boards must guarantee efficient growth measurement systems that are in line with the company goal and span the whole firm. Boards often assess performance in the following crucial areas: finance, human resources, innovation, service/product, community, and environment. The majority of business boards track both non-financial and financial results. Over time, there has been a general rise in the use of non-financial performance indicators. The majority of boards of directors routinely utilize metrics related to employee, customer, and social performance; this suggests that CG systems are monitoring and assessing stakeholder relationships. Boards are depending more and more on performance dashboards, also known as scorecards, which summarize corporate performance information in important areas.

Performance assessments

A corporation's overall responsibility to its owners and stakeholders includes making sure the board and CEO are accountable. In Canada, director accountability is still lacking despite recent improvements. Nonetheless, Spencer Stuart's study indicates that Canadian boards are far more committed to formal board and director reviews than US boards, which is consistent with our performance being equivalent to that of our main trade partners.

The performance of the organization and the fulfillment of its vision, mandate, and objectives are ultimately the responsibility and accountability of the board of directors, which serves as the body corporate's guiding mind and legal authority. As we've seen, the majority of Canadian boards take a very active role in financial oversight, strategic planning, and even holding management accountable for outcomes by means of official yearly CEO performance reviews. Arguing that board responsibility can only be attained at the top of the company, at the board level, via a comparable process of review and evaluation makes sense. Just one-third of the businesses that conduct individual director evaluations do so using peer or external assessments of performance; the other two-thirds rely on self-evaluations. Corporations run the danger of dividing participants and misusing the findings if they don't really comprehend why they should and are conducting an examination of the board and its directors. Although the majority of directors support both, this fear may be the main reason why so many do not use peer evaluations. There are many advantages to board and director evaluations, outweighing the concerns, which can be allayed with sound methodology and implementation. All governance procedures should support the achievement of the organization's goal or mandate; in reality, a thorough review encourages positive change and creates a roadmap for success for the whole enterprise. There are several ways to conduct board evaluations, and the best approach will depend on the desired results. Board evaluations may be a beneficial compliance exercise or a potent instrument to add value to a firm. "The value you will get out of board evaluation is directly correlated to the investment you put into it," as is the case with so many things in life [9], [10].

The national corporate governance system in France

In response to numerous financial frauds, the entry of foreign investors into the capital of significant listed companies, pension funds, and the organization of minority shareholders in defense associations, corporate governance did not truly take off in France until the early 1990s. To this end, several listed company general meetings have been highly turbulent. When combined, these three factors have prompted lawmakers, industry professionals, scholars, and politicians to doubt the validity of ongoing criticisms about the management and financial openness of listed French corporations. This is an analysis of how CG has influenced the development of French law and customs.

Contextual history

It is necessary to revisit the idea's contextual background and the specific linguistic translations it has into French legislation in order to comprehend the development of the French CG system. A distinction can be made between the period before and after the mid-1990s in terms of legal analysis, whether it be in the number of texts and reports published on the subject of CG since then or the acceleration of the legal and regulatory changes that took place. This is true even though the context in which CG first appeared in French law was first and foremost an international issue before it became a domestic French issue [11], [12].

Prior to the 1980s

It is essential to understand the present discussion around CG in French law to realize that attempts have been made to import and impose Anglo-Saxon methods and concepts, either in their original form or by adaptation. The debate's words arise from the distinctions between France and the Anglo-Saxon nations, most notably the United States, in terms of their legal systems and cultures. The Anglo-Saxon countries are thought to have "Common Law," while France is thought to have "Civil Law." This means that statutory freedoms in "Common Law" countries are far broader than in "Civil Law" countries, which poses a barrier to the "uniformization" of company law regulations. Although the Sarbanes–Oxley Act, passed by the US Congress in July 2002, is a perfect counter-example, CG legal provisions in the US make more sense as part of stock market regulations or the adoption of codes of ethics or good conduct than they do in the adoption of laws or regulations as in France. In the US, concerns about CG first centered on the directors' meagre time commitment to the firm and the body's lack of efficacy in uniting them behind the crucial objective of mitigating risks associated with carrying out their responsibilities. The American Law Institute adopted the "Principles of Corporate Governance Analysis and Recommendations" in 1993, with updates made in 1999. The recommendations were based on research conducted in the United States and highlighted the issue of directors' inactivity. This has also been verified in the UK, where the Bank of England and other publications have raised similar concerns. It's noteworthy to note that the German and French systems were cited in studies conducted in the 1970s that were published in the US with the goal of resolving discontent with the performance of US enterprises and eliminating doubts about the management skills of such companies.

It wasn't until much later that the discussion turned to the function of directors rather than first concentrating on the connection between shareholders and directors, which helped to highlight the conflicting interests at play. It was previously determined in 1931 that directors and stockholders had accountability for organizational events. Although the CG problem is much older, the discussion first reached France in the 1970s. For example, censors with extensive control powers were in place in nineteenth-century practice. According to Daigre, nothing pleases us more in France than to cast doubt on the matter and hide both private and business lives. Anybody who does not fit into the concentric rings that make up the board of directors is distrusted in the way that businesses function, whether they be the State, consumers, workers, or shareholders. Due to networks of influence, which can occasionally be brought about by internal checks, certain socio-professional groups have been able to seize control of large corporations' boards of directors, replacing the expected vigilance among shareholder representatives with complacency, complaisance, or compromise.

Four primary factors contributed to the deepening and acceleration of the acceptance of the CG mechanisms in the mid-1990s: the financial markets' rapid globalization, the internationalization of investors in the Paris stock market, privatizations, and political-financial scandals involving both public and private corporations. Here, we focus on four particular problems. The first is the introduction of an economic structure predicated on the unquestioning faith in financial markets and their hegemony. The second is that, as financial scandals demonstrate, the crisis is upending the system itself. Due to a lack of local investment, French privatizations particularly those that began in 1993 have fostered an unparalleled flood of international investors into French markets, indicating a weakness in the capitalization of the French market. Ultimately, the need for pension funds and similar initiatives has arisen from the aging of the French population.

Additionally, the 1990s saw a rise in corporate concentrations via takeover offers and other means. For instance, a flurry of fresh financial scandals involving big publicly traded companies and record-high debt levels characterized the years 2002–2003. However, there were even more references to CG in France, particularly as a result of pressure from organizations on the other side of the Atlantic, such the American Law Institute. Some public firms had a corporate governance problem in 2004 and early 2005. The Shell Group, for instance, was fined £17 million for overestimating its oil reserves. Additionally, the growing activity of minority shareholders and groups of minority shareholders whose most recent examples in France include the following has led to an expansion of the application of CG ideas.

However, financial scandals and activity by minority shareholders do not fully account for the rise in significance of CG in French legislation. It's also important to bring up discussions about CEO remuneration, particularly when stock options are given to executives in spite of their flaws or even incapacity. Beyond all of these many variables, it is primarily evident that the latest scandals are the outcome of internal or external audit mechanisms failing. The introduction, transposition, and arguments surrounding the application of CG are evident in the many legal sources and research devoted to the topic, as well as in the external legal borrowings and advancements in French law.

Sources of law pertaining to CG

The aforementioned reports and research have had an impact on the development of French business law since the mid-1990s. Essentially, French company law is a "law in perpetual movement" that is becoming more and more difficult for practitioners and scholars to understand and interpret, either due to ideological or pragmatic reasons. Its many modifications have only resulted in a series of stratifications without any kind of shared goal-setting or process for introspection. On this point, it might be argued that in order to analyze French business law, one must first grasp "the discourse on method!" by investigating the method of dis-course."

Although there are a number of reasons for the board of directors' revisions, the spirit of the July 24, 1966, statute is the primary one. The challenges arising from the question of powers inside companies and the strong relationship between the market and power structure that has developed over time were not anticipated by this statute at the time, as is now essential. In addition to this overarching reason, there are a number of other criticisms that are all linked to the issue of the board of directors' ineffectiveness, which has been criticized since the turn of the 20th century. The first of these criticisms centers on the fact that boards are composed primarily of the same individuals, a practice that some refer to as "colonization" or "consanguinity." This concentration was made possible by the reciprocal shareholding and cooptation procedures, which resulted in a lack of managerial action critiques.

The second complaint leveled at the board of directors is that, due to the board's secretive nature and the previously stated reasons, it functions as a rubber stamp body for the chairman's choices. And one may question whether the board of directors hasn't evolved into a group that just rubber stamps the desires of the majority of shareholders. The lack of any control over the policies or strategies put in place by the managers in charge of the day-to-day operations of the company is the most significant consequence of the board's inactivity. Information for board members is the subject of the third complaint against the board of directors. In fact, despite the fact that the board of directors is primarily a collegial organization, the legislature has not set up a system for updating board members. The board of directors is often criticized for its tendency to prioritize the interests of its members and majority shareholders above those of the business, a corporate entity with its own interests, or minority shareholders. This is the fourth of these criticisms. The customs of "golden hellos" and "golden parachutes" are pertinent to this critique in this regard.

A number of modification suggestions have been made in response to these complaints. It is possible to group together the changes made in several themes: the composition of the board, its operations, the appointment of multiple directors, and the formation of committees to help the board carry out its responsibilities. Some changes are the result of the intervention of "hard law" legislators; others are the result of recommendations for practices or organizations that have taken up the subject of CG, to the point of creating what is called "soft law." Due to reciprocal shareholdings between groups of companies, the board of directors is accused of being a simple rubber stamp body and of consisting primarily of directors who know each other and support one another. This is linked to the question of the board's composition because it can lead to consanguinity, which can impede critical thinking and judgment. The demands in this domain have mostly included expanding the board of directors, particularly by strengthening the prohibition against holding multiple directorships, but also by adding independent directors and incorporating staff members into the organization.

However, by lowering the maximum number of directors from 24 to 18, the legislator has also taken action in another area to give the board of directors' actions some context. The Minister of Justice at the time justified this clause in order to prevent numerous boards of directors in the future, to enhance the board of directors' supervisory function, and to take the restriction on multiple directorships into consideration. The concept of director that is being discussed in the French discussion on CG today is not at all what was originally intended. Actually, minority shareholders made the first requests for independent directors' presence because they wanted them to speak for a certain group of shareholders. However, this claim was turned down since it was deemed too risky for the business to operate. In fact, there is a known risk that representing category interests could prevent the business from functioning as intended. For example, conflicts of interest between majority and minority shareholders may prevent or make it more difficult for the general shareholders' meeting to adopt decisions.

Furthermore, it is a common misconception that the concept of an independent director is a means of incorporating the Anglo-Saxon legal difference between "executive directors" and "non-executive directors" into French law. In the Anglo-Saxon global paradigm, the difference between EDs and NEDs is based on identifying board members who have executive responsibilities against those who do not. However, this rationale presents a challenge under French law. For the simple reason that French law distinguishes, in theory, between the roles of director and general manager, these ideas cannot be understood in the same manner there. Furthermore, the reference to this criteria of executive responsibilities is not the most pertinent since a general manager is not always a director and directors are not always general managers.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at how decision-making procedures, organizational behavior, and strategic results are affected by performance assessment. It looks at how management behavior, choices about how to allocate resources, and the pursuit of long-term value creation are influenced by performance measures, emphasizing the function that incentives, feedback systems, and performance transparency have in promoting organizational success. In addition, the research delves into new developments and obstacles in the assessment of corporate performance. These include the incorporation of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) metrics, the utilization of digital technologies for instantaneous monitoring, and the requirement for increased uniformity and comparability in reporting procedures. To sum up, this study advances our knowledge of corporate performance assessment by combining theoretical understanding with real-world applications. In order to improve performance management practices and promote sustainable value creation in the fast-paced business environment of today, practitioners, policymakers, and academics can benefit greatly from the study's clear explanation of the approaches, metrics, and implications involved in assessing organizational effectiveness.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. N. Morioka, D. R. Iritani, A. R. Ometto, and M. M. De Carvalho, "Systematic review of the literature on corporate sustainability performance measurement: A discussion of contributions and gaps," *Gest. e Prod.*, 2018.

[2] C. S. Chen, C. C. Yu, and J. S. Hu, "Constructing performance measurement indicators to suggested corporate environmental responsibility framework," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 2018.

[3] A. Alshehhi, H. Nobanee, and N. Khare, "The impact of sustainability practices on corporate financial performance: Literature trends and future research potential," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2018.

[4] H. Ajili and A. Bouri, "Corporate governance quality of Islamic banks: measurement and effect on financial performance," *Int. J. Islam. Middle East. Financ. Manag.*, 2018.

[5] V. D. Dragomir, "How do we measure corporate environmental performance? A critical review," *Journal of Cleaner Production*. 2018.

[6] N. S. Fauzi, A. Zainuddin, A. H. Nawawi, and N. Johari, "A Pilot Framework of Corporate Real Estate Sustainable Performance Measurement (CRESPM)," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[7] E. G. Hansen and S. Schaltegger, "Sustainability Balanced Scorecards and their Architectures: Irrelevant or Misunderstood?," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2018.

[8] P. Ahi, C. Searcy, and M. Y. Jaber, "A Quantitative Approach for Assessing Sustainability Performance of Corporations," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2018.

[9] K. Kim, "Proactive versus reactive corporate environmental practices and environmental performance," *Sustain.*, 2018.

[10] C. Dincel and N. Gungor, "Does corporate sustainability practices have an impact on financial performance: A study based on BIST manufacturing firms," *Pressacademia*, 2018.

[11] D. Krasniqi, "Corporate Sustainability Indexes: Dow-Jones Index," *J. Account. Financ. Audit. Stud.*, 2018.

[12] R. Jaffar, R. RaziAziendeh, Z. A. Shukor, and M. R. C. A. Rahman, "Environmental performance: Does corporate governance matter?," *J. Pengur.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 10

AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMPANY MANAGEMENT

Dr. Premalatha K P, Assistant Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.premalatha_kp@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Company management plays a pivotal role in shaping the success, resilience, and sustainability of organizations in today's dynamic business landscape. This paper provides a comprehensive exploration of company management, examining the strategies, challenges, and best practices associated with effectively leading and governing modern enterprises. The study begins by delineating the multifaceted responsibilities of company management, encompassing strategic planning, organizational development, resource allocation, risk management, and stakeholder engagement. It explores the evolving role of management in responding to internal and external pressures, including technological disruptions, regulatory changes, and shifting market dynamics. Central to the analysis is an examination of management strategies aimed at driving organizational performance and fostering innovation. It discusses the importance of fostering a culture of collaboration, adaptability, and continuous learning within companies, while also emphasizing the need for strategic alignment, goal clarity, and effective communication throughout the organization.

KEYWORDS:

Shareholder Rights, Social Responsibility, Stakeholder Theory, Transparency Mechanisms, Voting Rights, Whistleblower Protection.

INTRODUCTION

The majority of listed businesses have nominated independent directors to their boards of directors, according to the most recent data on this topic accessible in France3. Despite this, the appointments are still seen as mostly insufficient since it seems that the proportion of independent directors does not surpass one-third of all directors. Those advocating for the reinforcement of independent directors' representation on boards of directors overlook another issue, which is the process of their appointment. In reality, nobody is aware of the number of applicants for a job or the process used to choose the official candidates. We are led to believe that directors are not entirely independent due to this lack of openness, and this is still the case. The appointment of independent directors at the general shareholders' meeting after the candidate's selection by a selection committee would be one approach to address this lack of openness. In actuality, this is often composed of the board chairman, other members, and one or more independent directors [1], [2].

In a follow-up to the action plan it released in May 2003, the European Commission concluded on October 6, 2004, that a fair distribution of executive and non-executive directors should be on the board of directors to prevent a single individual or small group of individuals from controlling the board's decision-making process. From the perspective of French law, adding independent members to the board of directors presents several additional challenges for businesses. There are currently two ways that firms have employee representation:

First, employee representation is optional. The articles of association, and thus the general shareholders' meeting, determine which directors elected by all employees will serve on the board of directors and have voting rights. The number of employees elected by employees cannot exceed four or five, nor can it exceed one-third of the total number of directors.

Employee presence was also required in firms that had undergone privatization. The second demands the convocation and attendance of two members of the works committee, selected by the works committee, at all meetings of the board of directors or supervisory board. However, these two works committee members are merely present as advisors at the sessions. There are three further suggestions for changes to the makeup of the board of directors that have also been made: the inclusion of creditors, minority shareholders, and a more feminine representation on the board [3], [4].

Given the financial and managerial prowess of the banks, seating creditors on the board of directors might seem like an intriguing solution, but we shouldn't undervalue the issues of potential conflicts of interest between the role of creditor and the duty of loyalty associated with the position of board member. Therefore, it would seem preferable contrary to Institut Montaigne, which chose not to take a position on the matter that the creditor bank be prohibited from holding a directorship because of the considerable risk that it would prioritize its own interests as a creditor over those of the business and its shareholders. The creditor bank may, at most, own stock in the business. In the second scenario, the other shareholders would provide a choice to the creditor bank: they could support it or obstruct it by rejecting its wishes. The lawmaker has not codified in law the customary demands of minority shareholders and shareholder defense groups. In actuality, however, some chairmen of publicly traded corporations like Madame Colette Neuville, chairperson of the Minority Shareholder Defense Association have asked members of these shareholder defense groups to serve on the board of directors. Insofar as the board of directors collectively represents all shareholders, this claim does take into account minority shareholders' interests, which are frequently at odds with those of the majority. However, it is problematic because there is a chance that the opposing interests from general shareholders' meetings will be transferred to the board of directors, potentially judicializing board operations [5], [6].

If the incorporation of the CG principles into French legislation has enhanced the standing of directors, it has also fundamentally altered and updated the boards' operations. The ideas behind CG served as the basis for all of these modifications. The tight division of powers between the board of directors, the chairman of the board, and the general manager, as well as the enhancement of the board's activities, have been the focus of the legislator's efforts in this area. Prior to the law of May 15, 2001, the law of July 24, 1966, stipulated that the general manager, the chairman of the board, and the board of directors should have the most authority to act in the company's name in all situations. This led to a lack of clarity about authority and, as a consequence, legal uncertainty for outside parties looking to enter into agreements with the corporation. The changes attempted to transform the board of directors into an entity to supervise the actions of those who act in the company's name and to establish a better balance of power within the traditional corporation. In actuality, the changes clarified the missions of the board of directors while assigning it a function of discussion and supervision.

Enhancing the board of directors' operations has resulted in the addition of new responsibilities to the board through the incorporation of information and communication technologies into company law and a change in the legal standing of contracts the company signs with one of its managers. In terms of legal analysis, however, some find all of these developments to be rather problematic due to the too frequent modifications and ambiguous ideas that legislators are adopting more and more. In light of these many legislative modifications, the board of directors now has additional general and specific authority. The general powers pertain to the management of the firm. They deal with figuring out how the business will conduct its operations, resolving issues that might interfere with its smooth running, and doing any checks and verifications that are deemed required. Regarding influencing the company's activity orientations, the legislature most definitely did not put the board of directors in competition with general management. Thus, this should be seen as just having the authority to establish the broad objectives that general management is then responsible for implementing [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

Deliberating on matters that impact the seamless operations of the firm does not provide authority to act on behalf of the organization. It is only the obvious and reasonable result of being able to determine the company's strategic orientations. Setting strategic orientations would be meaningless if the board of directors had no control over general management. The dismissal of a general manager who fails to meet his set goals is one instance of what the board of directors could discuss on this issue. The choice to raise funds in order to finance a certain plan might serve as another example. Therefore, rather than being the authority of external firm representation with third parties, this is the initial phase of a supervisory role. Regarding the beneficial inspections and verifications it performs, this new role is an obvious extension of its current supervisory mandate. It has to do with the "veri counterweight" that has been established, which will undoubtedly increase the corporation's operational efficacy and rebalance the corporation's power structure. Consequently, the main benefit of this supervisory authority is that it makes the responsibilities and rights of the board's directors very obvious.

Contracts made with the business often address the presence of conflicts of interest that might be detrimental to the business. Regarding this, it is sufficient to bring up the practice whereby many managers who reach "retirement age" have their pensions or supplement paid for by the firm. There is a genuine possibility of cooperation in this case between the departing director and the other directors, with the intention of giving the retiring director an unjustified pension supplement at the expense of the firm. In order to avert situations such as these and, more broadly, to prevent the company from being used for personal gain, legislators established a distinction in the law of July 24, 1966, between common agreements signed under ordinary circumstances, forbidden agreements, and regulated agreements covered by special procedures.

The legislation dated May 15, 2001

As a result, the system that had been in place before was given a wider range of applications by the legislation passed on May 15, 2001. The modifications specifically address common agreements executed under ordinary circumstances and regulated agreements. The regulations that apply to regulated agreements and common agreements signed under normal circumstances have been expanded to include agreements between the company and its manager of another company, as well as shareholders who hold a majority of the voting rights. The legislator put a requirement on the interested party to notify the board of directors and shareholders of any joint agreements formed under normal circumstances. Despite being a limitation, the structure in place avoided conflicts of interest, which is a basic tenet of conflict resolution. Professional associations like MEDEF were able to influence the statute of August 1, 2003, also known as the Financial Security statute, to include additional flexibility in this agreement structure [9], [10].

If specified in the company's articles of organization, the board of directors may convene by videoconference during its meetings, according to legislation enacted on May 15, 2001. Therefore, directors may participate in and cast their votes at board meetings even when they are not physically present at the location. However, this option is only available for the least significant choices. As a result, discussions on shutting the corporate and consolidated accounts, as well as the nomination and removal of the general manager and chairman, are not included. It is feasible to incorporate in the articles of association that the directors may be convoked by email, which will facilitate convocation itself, in line with what is presently available for shareholders if they so agree. Once again, using ICT techniques is in no way at odds with CG ideals. Significant changes have also been made to the legal position of directors by the legislature. The three areas of the interventions, which take CG into consideration, are directors' responsibilities, rights, and duties, as well as the internal board rules that are supplemented by the directors' charter.

Rights of Directors

After the missions of the board of directors were modified, the rights of directors were altered, most notably their access to knowledge. Directors now have an inalienable legal right to knowledge. The right to information for directors was established by case law prior to the legislation enacted on May 15, 2001. The judges devised a procedure that guaranteed each person's right to knowledge, the nullity of which would render all decisions and actions taken at the board meeting void. Prior to the board of directors' meeting, each person had the right to information, which meant that the board chairman had to provide it to them by either sending it or making it accessible. Article L of the statute of May 15, 2001, codified this procedure. The right can arise from a request made by the director to the chairman of the board of directors, who is free to determine whether transmitting documents is necessary if doing so would be abusive or have no other purpose than to harm the company's interests. However, the legislation of May 15, 2001, did not specify who was required to disclose the information, even though it made sense that the chairman of the board of directors should not be in this role. It also did not specify the consequences for failing to comply with this responsibility. However, there was a danger associated with this approach since the general manager, the auditors, or the organizations that represent the employees may potentially possess the information. In reality, the statute of August 1, 2003, which was intended to address the inadequacies of the 2001 text, limited each director's personal access to information. Although this obligation's owner is now known, the directors' ability to seek papers they deemed helpful was removed. Moreover, it still doesn't address the issue of information stored by others except those mentioned in the law language [11], [12].

Directors' responsibilities

According to the corporate governance doctrine, directors are accountable for four requirements: "requirement of diligence, competence, loyalty, and good faith."5 Therefore, these requirements shouldn't be applied uniformly to all companies; on the contrary, consideration should be given to the company's listing status. Theoretically, at least, the directors' duties get more exigent as their obligations are strengthened. Depending on whether the idea originates with French lawmakers or the European Union, director accountability involves many adjustments of various kinds, as per the notions of CG. The proposals, which originate from the European Commission Action Plan integrating the recommendations of the High-Level Group of Company Law Experts, are based on three key ideas: the creation of a rule on punishable negligence for "wrongful trading," which would hold directors personally accountable for the consequences of the company's fault if they knew the company would not be able to pay its debts and yet chose not to take action to wind it up or bring it back to viability; the imposition of a ban on using the position of director in the EU as a way to address the situation.

The European Commission Action Plan's various demands are not unprecedented in French law; these include actions for liability coverage, a right to an investigation akin to management consulting, actions for punishable negligence, a ban on holding a directorship in the event of personal bankruptcy, and a management ban. Although not new to French company law, the new legal element contained in the report of the High-Level Group of Company Law Experts is more expansive than what was included in the European Commission Action Plan. The group's work mandates that directors bear joint accountability for all matters pertaining to the consolidated and annual accounts, as well as for non-financial information, most notably the CG annual statement, and all statements related to the company's financial status, such as quarterly income statements. The financial statements are the new facet of this common accountability, not the yearly accounts.

Board of Directors internal regulations

The Commercial Code does not mandate internal rules, but this issue was raised in the discussions leading up to the passage of the law on May 15, 2001, which established new economic regulations. The draft bill had mandated the creation and dissemination of internal board of director’s regulations. The legislation enacted on May 15, 2001, made reference to it in many articles. However, the COB, which is now known as the Autorité des Marchés Financiers, or Financial Markets Authority, partially addressed this legal gap in 2001 when it mandated that listed firms' reference documents include "particular provisions concerning directors." The regulation only applies to listed firms, which further blurs the distinction between listed and non-listed businesses. This should be made clear right away. All organizations agree that formalizing rules for the board of directors is a good idea. It is conceivable that managers would face a civil culpability lawsuit in the event of an accident. Agencies that consider this criterion's "ethical" grade to be especially significant when deciding whether to invest in a certain firm may face further penalties. It is also possible to incur a market penalty, although this should not be overstated.

The board of directors is responsible for creating its own internal policies. However, if the articles of association mandate the creation of such laws, they may more or less explicitly specify their substance by enumerating the primary topics they address. This has legal implications, notwithstanding what some directors have sometimes believed. In actuality, it binds the members of the board of directors.

The Commercial Code has nothing to do with disclosing internal rules. However, the COB directive from December 2001 mandates that the reference document created by listed businesses include the operating guidelines for the organization's management, supervisory, and administrative bodies. Undoubtedly, an evaluation of article 145 of the New Code of Civil Procedure will allow the shareholder to discover the contents of the internal rules if they are concealed, and if required, to get a restraining order. Legal analysis of the directors' charter presents a challenge because it may be interpreted as either a simple unilateral commitment by each director, who may be penalized in the event of a breach owing to tort liability or quasi-contractual liability, or as a contract that each director individually signs with the company and/or shareholders. Beyond these uncertainties, it is a given that it is enforceable only by the directors and that any violation would result in civil penalties, much like internal rules. In addition to restructuring the board of directors' activities, the legislator changed the regulations governing multiple directorships in order to account for the consanguinity of boards of directors.

Several directorships

This change was implemented in three phases, eliminating all sense and clarity from the existing laws. First, the statute enacted on May 15, 2001, was changed to severely limit the number of directorships that might exist and to impose severe penalties for noncompliance. A legislation enacted on October 29, 2002, relaxed the regulations pertaining to multiple directorships with the express purpose of addressing the urgent requests of professional associations like AFEP, MEDEF, and others. If that wasn't enough, the Financial Security Law enacted on August 1, 2003, introduced the ability to hold numerous directorships indefinitely. The back-and-forth method used by legislators for purely political reasons should be sharply condemned due to the legal insecurity it causes and the complexity it adds in the application and analysis of legal provisions. It is undeniable that restricting the number of directorships is necessary for the smooth operation of boards of directors and opening up the boards.

The lack of a social status for directors and the desire to dominate power lead to several directorships. Therefore, shouldn't we establish a social status for directors in order to decrease the opportunities for numerous directorships? This would increase the appeal of the director role. In a similar vein, shouldn't businesses arrange for directors to get ongoing training so they can function in an ever-more complicated legal environment? The majority of the CG proposals include that committees tasked with offering specialized insight should support the boards of directors in reaching specific decisions.

Committees on boards

One of the main goals of the CG principles is the formation of specialized committees. Because the committees would be preparing the judgments ahead of time, this formation may increase the effectiveness of the boards.

The presence of these expert committees would reassure investors that choices are made with the management and profitability of the firm in mind. The establishment of an audit, compensation, and appointment committees is recommended in every report. Managers of the corporation seem to have realized again how beneficial an advisory censor may be in more recent times.

The formation of a minimum of three committees an audit committee, a compensation committee, and an appointment committee is mandated by the CG principles. The strategy committee is a fourth committee that some businesses have chosen to include. Therefore, before looking at each committee's specific authority and trying to figure out what duties apply to them, it is important to look at the legislative framework of these specialist committees. Since article 90, paragraph 2 of the decree of March 23, 1967, stipulates that the board of directors may choose to establish committees for the purpose of studying questions submitted by the board or by its chairperson for recommendations following their examination, the formation of specialized committees does not present any unique legal challenges. It establishes the makeup and characteristics of the committees that carry out their duties. According to French law, the legal structure may look something like this:

Specialized committees are not required; the board of directors is in charge of their establishment and composition; they just serve as advisors; article 90 paragraph 2 of the decree, which uses the word opinion, states that the board of directors is accountable for their actions. There is agreement on certain areas and disagreement on others about the make-up of specialized committees. There is consensus that they ought to consist of both directors and non-directors. Thus, shareholders may get involved. Once again, the consensus on this alternative is that it is preferable to exclude non-director shareholders since doing so would disrupt the equality that exists between member shareholders and non-member shareholders on these committees. The chairman of the board of directors' attendance is another matter that has to be considered. Professor Y. Guyon says it is hard for the chairman to believe that the majority of significant specialized committees are not within his jurisdiction. However, Professor Guyon also states that the chairperson's presence lessens these committees' independence and, as a result, their use. We will just look at the audit, compensation, and appointment committees for the purpose of concision.

Committees for audits

Often referred to as accounting committees, its two main responsibilities are management control and confirming the accuracy and dependability of the data that will be provided to the markets and shareholders. Accounts committees should also investigate significant activities from which conflicts of interest may arise, although its goal is "less to go into the details of the accounts than to appreciate the reliability of the devices used to draw them up." The accounting committees must be able to meet with statutory auditors, financial managers, and other individuals who contribute to the preparation of the accounts in order to properly fulfill their mandate. Finally, it has to provide a report to the board of directors after completing its mandate. The rules governing CG include that although a majority of its members must be independent, it must consist primarily of directors.

Committees for compensation

They are responsible for recommending compensation for company executives. A broad understanding of compensation is necessary for the system to function well. This understanding should be applied to include director fees, cost reimbursements, extraordinary compensation, and share purchase or subscription schemes. Once again, in order to bolster their validity, the CG guidelines advise that reciprocal directors be shunned and that the pay committees include mostly of independent directors. Regarding the function of compensation committees, the Proxinvest 2004 study on manager salary in public firms is pessimistic. Since 2003, their rate of existence has not increased, their level of independence has not significantly improved despite growth, and the oversight functions of compensation committees have not, quite, improved in recent years.

Committees for Appointments

Often known as selection committees, their job is to recommend to the board of directors the names of candidates they have chosen based on a variety of factors, including the composition of the board, potential representation of interests within a category, the process of seeking out and evaluating potential candidates, and chances for mandate renewal.

As a result, they have to put in place a hiring process so that they can advise the board of directors with knowledge. These committees may even employ "headhunters," who will make a preliminary selection of applicants; it will be up to them to pick viable applicants after reviewing the applications they have chosen. It is recommended by the CG principles that appointment committees include of a minimum of thirty percent independent directors. Applying a judgment from the commercial chamber of the Cour de Cassation on July 4, 1995, analogously, these panels are solely advisory in nature. They are unable to act as the board of directors' proxy for any decisions. The chairman of the board of directors was given a pension supplement in the aforementioned affair by an ad hoc commission, which was not within its authority as compensation, including pension supplements, falls under the purview of the board of directors' exclusive powers or is subject to regulated agreement procedures. The committees' obligation to adhere to the legislative guidelines for the devolution of functions within the organization and, therefore, the hierarchical structure established by the Cour de Cassation in a decision on June 4, 1946, is the second effect of this advising authority. According to the most current CG standards, these specialist committees should have a charter that outlines their functions and authority and is part of the board of directors' internal policies.

One issue with the specialized committees' responsibilities is that, according to CG standards, they must include of both independent directors and board directors. Do they possess criminal and civil liability? Since independent directors are not directors themselves, they cannot be held accountable under the same laws that apply to directors. Furthermore, the general legal obligation of directors cannot be applied to directors serving on specialized committees, since they have a different mandate from the board of directors. Since there hasn't been any litigation in this field, the jurist's only option is to speculate on the answers to all of these problems.

Business administration

The need for the separation of the roles of chairman of the board of directors and general manager is one of the key tenets of corporate governance ideology. The situation in English-speaking companies, which seeks to separate the roles of "directors" and "officers," is not comparable to this division of labor. "Directors," working under the direction of the "Chairman of the Board," have a supervisory function over the "officers," who carry out the day-to-day operations of the company under the direction of the "Chief Executive Officer." In France, the association's goal is to keep the roles of general manager and chairman of the board of directors as distinct as feasible. Furthermore, according to some writers, the French separation of roles is more in line with the goal of corporate independence than it is with transparency and explication. Nonetheless, this separation has helped to clarify roles and, more specifically, the goals of the chairman of the board of directors and general manager. Manager pay is the second advancement in the use of CG ideas.

Pay slips for managers, long a secretive and taboo topic, have long been the subject of contentious discussion. How can salary hikes for management in struggling firms be justified when workers are being laid off and dividends to minority shareholders are being reduced? Finally, lawmakers have increased the transparency of management compensation in response to pressure from shareholder organizations and trade unions.

Redefining the roles in management

It is evident that the redefining of functions is the outcome of French legislation accounting for CG concepts. Without differentiating between listed and non-listed enterprises, this is applicable to all businesses. These days, the chairman of the board of directors oversees the smooth operation of the company's management bodies, directs and plans the board's work, and prepares a report that is included in the annual report outlining the circumstances surrounding the preparation and planning of the board's work and the internal audit procedures implemented by the company. The general manager is the one with the broadest authority to act on behalf of the firm in all situations; nevertheless, this authority is constrained by the company's goals, the authority provided at shareholder meetings, and the authority expressly reserved for the board of directors.

Disclosure of the salary of the management

Prior to the legislation enacted on May 15, 2001, shareholders' sole notification rights related to management compensation were restricted. In actuality, they were unable to get the whole amount of compensation given to the top five or 10 earners. Due to the lack of clarity on the parties involved and the modalities of compensation, this information was incomplete and problematic. Furthermore, the total sum was meaningless. Since the middle of the 1990s, this opaqueness in compensation has been criticized, particularly in English-speaking nations and by the Greenbury study, "Director's Remuneration."

In France, the disclosure of compensation focuses more on the company's compensation policy than it does on the specific amount of compensation. The legislation of May 15, 2001, mandated the publication of manager compensation in the annual firm management reports in response to demand from shareholder organizations and international investors. These reports are intended to provide information on the total compensation and benefits provided to each corporate officer during the accounting period. They are often delivered at the general meeting by the executive board or the board of directors. It should also include the total compensation and benefits that each of these executives earned from controlled firms during the accounting period.

The New Economic Regulations bill has been accused of targeting both listed and non-listed enterprises, despite the fact that there is a practical difference in compensation. While this critique is valid, it shouldn't be used as an excuse for the fact that managers in a certain percentage of family-owned businesses pay themselves what they want and often take advantage of advantages that are on par with those received by management of publicly traded firms. The NRE law's processes, which did not apply to the compensation provided by the parent business to a representative in one of its subsidiaries, are the subject of the second critique. Given that the disclosure was incomplete, the objections were valid in this regard.

The NRE legislation's mechanism was modified in two ways by the law of August 1, 2003. Currently, this disclosure obligation is exclusive to listed firms; non-listed companies are not included in this system. However, listed firms' non-listed subsidiaries are taken into account. The second modification is that the annual report on business management should now include the compensation that the parent company pays to a representative in one of its subsidiaries. However, the lawmaker did not stipulate that failure to include this information in the yearly management report would result in fines. Since it is, in theory, a matter of management operations, it is conceivable that the supervisory board or the board of director's members may be held accountable. Additionally, shareholders may be able to write the managers with inquiries.

Even if the compensation's legality is debatable, it nonetheless adds to the management's holdings; the manager gains advantages from the arrangement. Judges have outlined the requirements for these agreements' validity, even in the event that they are genuinely unlawful. Revocations typically occur without payment; if a text stipulates compensation, it only applies to situations where the revocation is carried out without a good reason. In actuality, even if the court finds that the contract that was made with the business or majority shareholder is void, this recompense can come at the cost of the latter, the firm, or a subsidiary. In actuality, this pay is the outcome of a deal arranged between the company's legal counsel and the manager who was fired. This transaction is strictly confidential and isn't meant to be shared or publicized.

Consequently, these pay agreements must to be included in the annual report because of their significance and to combat a certain lack of transparency. This would prevent some managers from choosing to give them up just in response to pressure from the media or because the minority shareholders want to investigate this matter. French company law provides for a corporation with an executive board and a supervisory board in addition to the corporation with a board of directors. From the perspective of the need to separate functions, this configuration fits the requirements of CG. Although specific linguistic arrangements are required, as Professor Le Cannu has shown, a business with an executive board and a supervisory board clearly differentiates between functions. It is important to note, nevertheless, that "dual" firms do not, by any means, constitute the majority in France. A few structures that have stopped using this kind of organization since 2004 serve as examples of this observation. Unilever and Royal Dutch Shell, two significant international corporations, have chosen to replace their "dual" structure which consisted of two chairmen with a general manager and a non-operational chairman. Legal study predicts that in the near future, the number of organizations with executive boards and supervisory boards will not expand greatly as a result of this circumstance. In reality, it is essential to establish internal or external audit procedures and to protect shareholder rights in organizations with a basic board of directors and no true counterbalancing authority, as shown by several recent events.

CONCLUSION

The difficulties and complications that come with managing a business, such as managing crises, keeping talent, and navigating moral conundrums. It looks at how managers handle these difficulties while juggling conflicting demands, maintaining stakeholder confidence, and balancing opposing interests. In addition, the study investigates optimal approaches in business administration, using knowledge from empirical investigations, management theory, and real-life case studies. It covers the usefulness of data-driven decision making, the significance of diversity and inclusion in decision-making, and the function of corporate governance procedures in fostering accountability and openness. In summary, this study advances our knowledge of business management by fusing theoretical knowledge with real-world applications. The study provides insightful guidance for managers, executives, policymakers, and scholars aiming to navigate the complexities of contemporary business environments and foster sustainable success in an increasingly interconnected world by clarifying the tactics, obstacles, and best practices related to leading and governing organizations.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. G. Nikolaev, "Strategic company management in the digital business environment," *Eur. J. Manag. Issues*, 2018.

[2] A. M. Dima and M. A. Maassen, "From waterfall to agile software: Development models in the IT sector, 2006 to 2018. impacts on company management," *J. Int. Stud.*, 2018.

[3] L. A. Jordaan, M. de Klerk, and C. J. de Villiers, "Corporate social responsibility and earnings management of South African companies," *South African J. Econ. Manag. Sci.*, 2018.

[4] T. Castillo, L. F. Alarcón, and E. Pellicer, "Finding Differences among Construction Companies' Management Practices and Their Relation to Project Performance," *J. Manag. Eng.*, 2018.

[5] K. Fedorková, "Importance of Financial Aspects of a Company Crisis Management in Slovakia," *Mark. Brand. Res.*, 2018.

[6] N. Tasić, Ž. Đurić, D. Malešević, R. Maksimović, and N. Radaković, "Automation of process performance management in a company," *Teh. Vjesn.*, 2018.

[7] I. Masri, "The role of corporate governance in the relationships of family company with real earnings management," *J. Akunt.*, 2018.

[8] E. Boštjančič and Z. Slana, "The role of talent management comparing medium-sized and large companies - major challenges in attracting and retaining talented employees," *Front. Psychol.*, 2018.

[9] Z. V. Gornostaeva, V. A. Povalyaeva, Y. V. Tepina, N. G. Tregulova, and I. V. Kushnaryova, "Marketing model of modern company HR management for provision of its global competitiveness," *Espacios*, 2018.

[10] S. Benyettou and M. Abdellatif, "Empirical study on the integrated management system in algerian companies," *J. Ind. Eng. Manag.*, 2018.

[11] G. Čelesnik, M. Radujković, and I. Vrečko, "Resolving Companies in Crisis: Agile Crisis Project Management," *Organizacija*, 2018.

[12] T. S. Demchenko, P. Karácsony, M. V. Vinichenko, M. V. Demchenko, and A. V. Melnichuk, "Youth involvement in social control of the implementation of the youth personnel policy in the company management system," *Espacios*, 2018.

CHAPTER 11

ANALYZING THE NEW AUDITOR GENERAL MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Dr. Pujari Sudharshana Reddy, Assistant Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- pujarisudharsana_reddy@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
The relationship between auditors general and management teams is undergoing significant evolution, driven by shifting regulatory landscapes, technological advancements, and changing expectations of stakeholders. This paper examines the dynamics of the new auditor-general-management relations, shedding light on the challenges, opportunities, and implications for both auditors general and management. The study begins by contextualizing the traditional roles of auditors general as independent watchdogs tasked with ensuring accountability, transparency, and compliance within public sector organizations. It explores how these roles are being redefined in light of emerging demands for performance auditing, risk management, and strategic oversight. Central to the analysis is an examination of the evolving nature of the auditor-general's interactions with management teams, including increased collaboration, communication, and knowledge sharing. It discusses how auditors general are increasingly viewed as strategic partners, providing valuable insights, recommendations, and assurance to management on governance, risk, and control processes.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Agency Theory, Annual Reports, Audit Committee, Auditing, Board Diversity.

INTRODUCTION

The absence of supervision over the acts of the board of directors and corporate management has been a frequent point of contention. In actuality, there are many controls over these organizations because, in addition to the shareholders' conventional control over the company's management, the works committee and auditors also have influence over it. Furthermore, the shift in the authority dynamics between the general management and the board of directors has made the board of directors an oversight body for the management. Legislators have been involved in the management and administration's monitoring procedures. In practical terms, the auditors now have almost equal authority as the management bodies and legal supervision has been modified. All of these adjustments were made with the intention of improving business operations' openness, or more specifically, "ensuring the truthfulness of information [1], [2].

Restructuring the legal supervision of the accounts

The statute of May 15, 2001, which unified the position of auditors without making a distinction between corporations and other types of businesses, marked the beginning of the reform of legal supervision. The financial security legislation enacted on August 1, 2003, fundamentally altered the legal supervision of accounting to account for the fallout from the Enron incident and advancements in corporate governance. The inseparability of audit and advising roles as well as the lack of independence among auditors were well shown by these two cases. The lawmaker made the decision to establish a High Council of Statutory Auditors in order to strengthen the auditors' actions and change the profession's organizational structure [3], [4].

Statutory auditors

The High Council of Statutory Auditors functions as a kind of appeal court for judgments made at the regional level pertaining to registration and disciplinary matters. It is also expected to supervise the profession by defining the framework and orientations for professional audits, as well as recognizing and promoting good professional practices and providing opinions on the professional standards developed by the Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes. In addition to reorganizing the audit profession, the Financial Security Law on August 1, 2003, created opportunities for collaboration between these two CG parties. As part of this cooperation, auditors will be required to notify the AMF of any information or decision that results in a refusal of certification. They will also be required to send the written document to the company heads in the event that the warning procedure is triggered and the report detailing any misstatements and irregularities that they plan to present. Conversely, the auditors have the authority to ask the AMF for information on any matter that comes up while performing their duties and that can have an impact on the entity's financial reporting. The following guidelines are associated with reinforced independence and are outlined in the Financial Security Law on August 1, 2003: separation of audit and consulting missions by prohibiting the statutory auditor from offering any advice or services unrelated to the audit's mission to the entity that appointed him to certify its accounts; an auditor is not permitted to take, receive, or hold, directly or indirectly, a stake in the entity for which he is responsible for certifying the accounts, or an entity that controls or is controlled by said entity; an auditor is not permitted to be appointed manager of a company that he audits for less than five years after the conclusion of his functions, with the opposite rule applying to managers or employees of a corporate entity who wish to be named auditor; an auditor is not permitted to certify the accounts of a corporate entity making public offerings for more than six consecutive financial. Although the French regulations are much tighter than the American regulations and are intended to prevent this sort of thing from happening, all of these additional requirements are effectively targeted at preventing any Enron-type phenomena from occurring in France. However, going forward, with the implementation of the new International Financial Reporting Standards—some of which are very similar to American accounting procedures—a certain level of caution should be used [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

These novel relationships are evident in two domains. The certification of accounts is the first topic. Prior to the August 1, 2003, legislation, auditors were required to attest to the audited company's financial statements, decline to attest, or attest with reservations. The requirement that the auditors provide justification for their appreciations prior to the general shareholders' meeting is what makes the financial security legislation innovative.

Rights of Shareholders

One of the foundational elements of "Corporate Governance" is the shareholders, who comprise the general shareholders' meeting. The CG theory advocates for both an expansion of the general meeting's authority and an expansion of each shareholder's individual rights. Given that the company is set up as a democracy where power is shared by the shareholders at general meetings, it makes sense for the shareholder to be one of CG's focal points of attention. In actuality, this portrayal is inaccurate since, in tiny structures, a single shareholder is often present, and in listed groupings, the vast majority of owners have little involvement in the company's operations. The usage of blank proxies and general meeting absenteeism are two straightforward realities that result from this lack of interest.

Nonetheless, it seems that a revival of general shareholders' meetings has occurred since the late 1990s, fueled by two movements: the judicialization of the defense of shareholders' rights and the strengthening of such rights. This dual trend demonstrates the growing influence of shareholders. Either individually or collectively, the once-passive shareholders have now assumed an active role. According to this perspective, one of the main factors that has contributed to rebalancing the power struggle inside corporations is the establishment of shareholder organizations. The minority shareholder defense organization was instrumental in the Vivendi issue, and it was the shareholder defense association that overthrew the management and installed a new team in the Eurotunnel incident. However, an equally important factor for the renewal of the general shareholders' meeting is the significant influx of foreign investors, particularly those well-known pension funds, which have changed the management's perspective on shareholders [7], [8].

The statutes of May 15, 2001, and August 1, 2003, as well as the decree of June 24, 2004, which reformed the securities system, are the primary legislation that have strengthened the rights of shareholders. The rationale for strengthening shareholder rights is to promote openness in business operations. As shareholders own the annual authority to scrutinize, sanction, or reject the company's management, they need to be the principal recipients of this information. Therefore, the initial controllers of the company's management are its shareholders. It is now feasible to doubt the existence of shareholder oversight in businesses, particularly in light of Vivendi Universal and France Télécom, which attained unprecedented debt levels without receiving a response from the majority of shareholders. Exists unreported collaboration between the management's and the majority shareholders' interests? The rights of shareholders have been strengthened in a number of areas, including the right to vote, the right to information, the modernization of general shareholder meetings, and the ability of shareholders and shareholder groups to take legal action.

Informational rights of investors

A classic shareholder right codified in the statute of July 24, 1966, is the right to knowledge. The criticism of shareholder information has been well-established for a long time. Despite the fact that there is a lot of it, it is insufficient, and the papers that are provided are either sent slowly or not at all. Nevertheless, in order to make well-informed choices at general meetings about the management's performance or capital increases that are critical to the company's existence, shareholders must have access to information. In a case involving a capital reduction, the Cour de Cassation was able to determine that shareholders who decline to vote in favor of a capital increase are not engaging in minority abuse if they were not provided with the information required to provide informed consent, due to the fundamental nature of shareholder information. The innovation really resides in the expansion of shareholder information into new domains, such as information on the company's internal operations and the environment and society [9], [10].

Critical evaluation of the duty

Without going into every detail that has been produced on the topic, this informational need does seem commendable, but it can cause issues with how the organization performs. Furthermore, despite the widespread criticism that the information provided to shareholders is overly detailed and extensive, this additional need for information may serve to legitimize the unnecessarily broad nature of shareholder disclosures. Finally, it would be too easy to assume that this information is just utilized as a marketing or communication tool, which would eliminate any importance. In order to achieve this, certain acts were decriminalized and replaced with a civil procedure for transmitting information and increasing the information due from the managers, particularly for questions of internal audit procedures. The legislator also modified shareholder information on company operations by reinforcing it, this information often being assimilated with "one of the methods of organizing a possible counterweight within companies." The process for management consultancy was examined concurrently.

The legislation enacted on July 24, 1966, established several punitive punishments that favored shareholders, but it did not provide them the option to demand the compelled handover of certain papers. It was observed that these punitive measures were completely ineffective in reality and were seldom ever used. As a result, shareholder defense groups and minority shareholders asked that the management provide them access to the papers they believed to be necessary. A new procedure for the benefit of shareholders was introduced into French law by the law of May 15, 2001. It stated that in situations where individuals are unable to obtain the production, communication, or transmission of documents, they may request that the President of the Court issue an injunction requiring the liquidator, board members, managers, and directors to either transmit the documents themselves or designate an agent to do so. These procedures include, among other things, sending certain documents to shareholders upon request, such as the annual accounts, the management report, draft resolutions to be brought before the general assembly, minutes of the general assembly, and attendance records from the previous three fiscal years' general meetings. By adding two new grounds for injunctions to execute—the calling of specific general or special meetings and the transcription of the minutes of the meetings of the administrative and managerial bodies on a special register maintained at the head offices—the order dated June 24, 2004, expanded the scope of applications for the "injunction to execute" procedure. In other words, the creation of these injunction procedures with penalties is intended to enforce and reinforce shareholders' right to information by placing restrictions on company managers who disobey this fundamental shareholder right. This information is intended to be made available to shareholders as per legal provisions.

The Financial Security Law of August 1, 2003, established a new report on “the conditions for preparing and organizing the board's work and the procedures for internal auditing implemented by the company in addition to the annual management report. The text of the report indicates that the chairman of the board of directors “reports,” and it is intended for all corporations, public or private, to improve information for shareholders and transparency in company operations. Furthermore, the legislation excluded simplified joint stock corporations by singling out the businesses that engage in this activity. Therefore, the information required by the financial security law represents an intriguing innovation for transparency in the board of directors' operations. This is especially true given that the AMF is required to compile an annual report based on the data provided by companies that are conducting initial public offerings. As a result, it stands to reason that the report will include information on the requirements for planning and arranging the board's activities for businesses who want to go public. Thus, the goal of transparency will be achieved [11], [12].

Content of the board operations report

In specifics, the information in this report must include the number of board of directors meetings, their duration, convocation periods, information provided to the directors, the subjects covered, the directors in attendance, absent, or represented, the distribution of directors' fees, and any conflicts of interest resulting from one or more directors. Thus, the issue is how to provide the shareholders with specific, useful information that will allow them to assess the effectiveness and sincerity of the board of directors and, most importantly, ensure that the key issues pertaining to the company's future are thoughtfully considered and prepared. Conversely, practical implementation of the law may provide issues since the lawmaker did not stipulate consequences for noncompliance with this particular clause.

Details on internal auditing processes: which processes

The law language only stipulates that the chairman of the board of directors must provide a report on these processes; the legislature has never specified the exact procedures to be followed. Actually, the company's risk management is covered in part by the internal audit processes. As a result, every company must analyze potential risks and put in place internal controls to either prevent them from happening or handle them if they do. This examination should and may include the company's size, industry it operates in, and if it has an international reach. These protocols might be in the form of internal procedure manuals, like those seen in the banking sector, or they could be as simple as giving a firm credit if it follows a set of guidelines intended to reduce litigation. They are essentially codes of behavior that the business enforces upon all individuals who work there or are employed by it.

There is universal agreement that the executive board or general manager should be in charge of creating the processes and allocating resources to ensure their implementation or verification, given the procedures' value in supplying information to shareholders. The supervisory board or the board of directors is simply in charge of confirming the procedures. Only the report that is annexed to the general report on the management of the firm falls within the purview of the chairman of the board of directors. The fact that the chairman of the board of directors is solely responsible for the report and the board of directors is deemed responsible for verifying the procedures, despite the division of responsibilities, aligns with the CG principles regarding the board of directors' transformation into an oversight body overseeing general management and the board's accountability for accurately identifying responsible parties. The fact that it will be simpler to challenge the directors' accountability if the processes are not followed or if there is no internal audit serves as an example of this heightened accountability.

The 2004 report on CG and internal audit processes was made available to the public by the Financial Markets Authority. Overall, it seemed that listed corporations had complied with this requirement. As a result, half of the chosen organizations had identified or characterized their primary risks, and 92% of companies included in their reports the goals allocated to internal audit processes. However, there is room for improvement in a few areas, including the way the risks are linked to the processes followed and the way the diligence "underlying" the chairman's report preparation is mentioned. Last but not least, the AMF suggests forming a working group whose goal would be to come to a consensus on a shared reference system at the national and European levels.

The statute of July 24, 1966, gave rise to management consulting, sometimes known as "expertise de minorité." By requiring management to be more transparent, it was developed in reaction to the advancement in shareholder information. The report that the court-appointed expert provides to the shareholder plaintiff does, in fact, enhance shareholder information. Nonetheless, minority consulting has evolved into management consulting, and shareholder groups now support its usage. However, a practical tendency toward the instrumentalization of management consulting has emerged, as with other legal requirements. That's why the legislation of May 15, 2001, was passed to address this. In order to accomplish this, the legislator separated the process for management consulting into two stages: first, the shareholders or shareholder associations ask the managers written questions about a management operation in the company or in a company under its control; second, if the manager does not answer or if the information provided is insufficient, they can request that a judge appoint a management consultant.

That being said, management consulting is not a panacea. Due to the "Cour de Cassation's jurispru- dence" on this issue, the appointment requirements are stringent. Actually, only management operations that is, those coming from management bodies—are being targeted. This means that actions requiring the simultaneous participation of a management body and a general shareholders' meeting are not included in the scope of management consulting. However, there seems to be a tendency in the Courts of Appeal on this matter, excluding activities that fall within the exclusive purview of the general shareholders' meeting. For this reason, in some Courts of Appeal, the hiring of a management consultant is permissible in the framework of regulated agreements, which call for previous board of directors approval and general shareholders' meeting debates. Furthermore, the courts want the petitioner to demonstrate the operation's suspicious nature, which is sometimes difficult to do in reality when the shareholders lack enough knowledge.

Using common law advisory services

As a result, shareholders resort to the common law consultants included in article 145 of the recently adopted Code of Civil Procedure, who are directly rivals to management consultants. Once again, this common law consulting is used as a workaround for the management consulting's limiting applicability. Success has varied based on the circumstances. As a result, in the Vivendi Universal case, a shareholder asked the Commercial Court President for an evaluation. This request was related to the functioning of the board of directors. The shareholder requested information on the number of meetings the board of directors had, the duration of the meetings, the kind of papers given to the directors, the directors present and absent, and the protocols the board used for its deliberations. The motion was denied by the Commercial Court against all expectations, since the evidence did not support the claim that the board of directors had acted improperly. Given that the shareholder was requesting information on the board's operations, such a purpose is unavoidably surprising. Fortunately, the Financial Security Law stepped in and mandated that the chairman of the board of directors produce a report outlining the procedures used to plan and prepare the board's work.

Voting rights of shareholders

One of the most fundamental rights of every associate is the ability to vote, which is closely related to the ability to attend general meetings. Even though the general meeting participation principle is uncontested and clearly applied, it has been called into question by statutory or legal provisions that limit associates' ability to participate in general meetings by requiring a specific number of shares to be held in order to attend. The recent ruling by the Cour de Cassation noted that, "all associates have the right to participate in collective decisions and to vote, and the articles of association may not provide any exceptions to these provisions" demonstrates the extent to which this has gotten. French law was not waiting for the development of CG principles. However, there are a number of valid reasons why the value of shareholder voting rights is disputed, including the fact that shareholders frequently miss general meetings, that they rarely exercise their right to vote because they behave more like spectators than investors, the existence of legal structures that are used to concentrate power at general meetings, etc. However, the growing vibrancy of general shareholders' meetings and the activity of foreign investment funds and shareholder protection groups are casting doubt on this statement. In response to these critiques, the legislature has taken action on many occasions to guarantee that the right to vote remains valuable. Examples of these actions include the removal of limitations on access to shareholder meetings and the need to vote for mutual funds. However, as seen by the issue of blank proxies and the issuance of preferential shares, which represent a particular restriction on the revived vitality of voting rights, this intervention has really been vague and insufficient.

Modernization of meetings for general shareholders

This study will solely examine the modernization of shareholders' meetings in the context of the contributions made by ICTs. Many players in the CG space, including shareholders, shareholder associations, organizations, and institutions that have published papers on the subject, have called for the use of ICTs to increase the effectiveness of shareholders' rights and the function of shareholders' meetings.

Workers' thoughtfulness

There has long been discussion over the role that employee engagement should play in business management. In reality, employee engagement in management was first brought up near the close of World War II, and the Sudreau report suggested that workers do basic joint supervision. The original goal of incorporating the German co-management system into French legislation was so far from fulfilled. It is imperative that we acknowledge that, until to recently, workers were mostly excluded from business law, particularly when it comes to enterprises that are facing problems. The question of workers' role in corporate management before the introduction of CG principles. And yet, the issue of where workers belong has been brought up again, at least partially, because of CG. This resurgence stems from the notion of corporate governance (CG), which emphasizes the need of addressing all stakeholders, including workers, in addition to the business entity's interests. It is also indicative that only the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Principles of Corporate Governance, which were released in January 2004, include workers as a key component of their proposals. However, the European Commission Action Plan of May 21, 2003, has no mention of staff. It should be emphasized once again that the primary focus of the European Commission Action Plan is the issue of corporate mobility inside the EU. In actuality and legally, we need to refer to the two European regulations that established the European cooperative society and the European company, each of which has a directive pertaining to employee engagement in the business, in order to locate a trace of workers in company law.

The laws of May 15, 2001, which enhanced shareholder disclosure, February 19, 2001, on save-as-you-earn plans, and January 17, 2002, on social modernization, are what led to employee engagement in management. Three primary concepts are grouped together in these three texts: financial involvement by employees, information about employees, and employee representation on the board of directors or supervisory board.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at the difficulties and conflicts that come with the new auditor-general-management relationships, including how to handle conflicts of interest, strike a balance between independence and cooperation, and deal with political pressure. It looks at ways to maintain the objectivity and integrity of auditors in general while enhancing the efficacy of the audit process via the promotion of respectful communication, openness, and mutual understanding. The research also looks at how technology and data analytics may be used to improve the efficacy, relevance, and efficiency of audits. It talks about how developments in machine learning, artificial intelligence, and data visualization are changing audit techniques and empowering auditors in general to provide management more insightful analysis and value-added services. In summary, by clarifying the dynamics, difficulties, and possibilities present in this changing connection, this study advances our knowledge of the new auditor-general-management linkages. In the end, public sector organizations may serve the interests of people and stakeholders by strengthening governance practices, improving decision-making processes, and enhancing accountability via the promotion of cooperation, transparency, and innovation by auditors general and management teams.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Shariman, A. Nawawi, A. Saiful, and A. P. Salin, “Issues and concerns on statutory bodies and federal government - Evidence from Malaysian Auditor General’s report,” *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*. 2018.

[2] W. Newman, M. Charity, and S. Faith, “Effectiveness of risk management systems on financial performance in a public setting,” *Acad. Account. Financ. Stud. J.*, 2018.

[3] Government of Canada, *Perspectives on Climate Change Action in Canada - A Collaborative Report from Auditors General - March 2018*. 2018.

[4] K. Reichborn-Kjennerud and Å. Johnsen, “Performance Audits and Supreme Audit Institutions’ Impact on Public Administration: The Case of the Office of the Auditor General in Norway,” *Adm. Soc.*, 2018.

[5] S. Adi and P. Dutil, “Searching for strategy: Value for Money (VFM) audit choice in the new public management era,” *Can. Public Adm.*, 2018.

[6] M. Bunn, R. Pilcher, and D. Gilchrist, “Public sector audit history in Britain and Australia,” *Financ. Account. Manag.*, 2018.

[7] M. Mentz, K. Barac, and E. Odendaal, “An audit evidence planning model for the public sector,” *J. Econ. Financ. Sci.*, 2018.

[8] D. M. Mello, “Monitoring and evaluation: The missing link in South African municipalities,” *J. Transdiscipl. Res. South. Africa*, 2018.

[9] M. K. Cho, “The effects of human resources in internal audit on external audit pricing decision,” *Corp. Ownersh. Control*, 2018.

[10] A. M. Ismail, M. Hasan, and C. Clark, “Public Sector Procurement: the Effectiveness of Monitoring Mechanism,” *Asia-Pacific Manag. Account. J.*, 2018.

[11] O. Nzewi, M. Sibanda, N. Sikhosana, and M. Sentiwe, “Creating compliance value through informal work procedures,” *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[12] I. K. Norziaton, M. D.Mohamad Ridhuan, and A. N. Nur Adura, “Assets Misappropriation in the Malaysian Public and Private Sectors,” *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 12

JAPANESE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Dr. Selvi S, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.selvi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The Japanese national system of corporate governance stands as a unique and influential model that has evolved through historical, cultural, and economic factors. This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the Japanese corporate governance system, exploring its principles, practices, and evolution in response to domestic and global challenges. The study begins by contextualizing the Japanese corporate governance system within the broader socio-economic context, tracing its historical roots to the post-war period of rapid industrialization and economic growth. It examines how traditional cultural values such as consensus-building, long-term relationships, and stakeholder collaboration have shaped the governance landscape, fostering a distinctive approach characterized by close ties between corporations, banks, and government agencies. Central to the analysis is an exploration of the key features of the Japanese corporate governance model, including the prevalence of cross-shareholdings, the role of keiretsu networks, and the emphasis on stakeholder interests beyond shareholders. It examines how these features have influenced decision-making processes, board structures, and management practices within Japanese corporations.

KEYWORDS:

Crisis Management, Decision-Making, Director Compensation, Diversity, Dual-Class Shares, Environmental Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

The works committee was given particular attributions via the statute of May 15, 2001, which brought it within the purview of companies and commercial company law. According to the first, the works committee may convene a general shareholders' meeting by requesting that the courts choose a representative to handle the call. This option was used in the Gemplus incident. It is the judge's responsibility to confirm if an emergency exists and whether the business interest is upheld. The second one says that draft resolutions may be requested to be added to the meeting agenda by the works committee. Two works committee members are permitted to attend general meetings by virtue of the third. It is important to consider that the significance of this new right is limited to non-listed corporations, thus it is important to weigh this third one carefully.

The works committee's ability to intervene in matters pertaining to terminations throughout the company's existence was reinforced by the social modernization legislation enacted on January 17, 2002. However, it also reinforced the authority of the works committee to make public declarations about economic policy by differentiating between actions that may have a major impact on work or employment circumstances.

The works committee may meet within 48 hours of the announcement if the employer does not notify it in advance provided it does not impact employment conditions. However, before to making a public declaration, the company's CEO must notify the works committee. Profit-sharing for employees is an outdated system. Just take a look at how the firm gives its workers a year-end bonus. Save-as-you-earn programs have long had difficulty taking off, despite the passage of legislative measures on 7 January 1959 establishing voluntary profit sharing and 17 August 1967 creating a required profit-sharing system. The legislation enacted in February 2001, May 2001, and January 2002 were necessary to establish the employee profit mechanisms [1], [2].

Since the economic bubble burst and Japan entered a decade of economic decline at the beginning of the 1990s, corporate governance has grown to be one of the most well-liked management topics in that country. A never-ending string of corporate scandals, unethical actions by high-ranking executives, and bankruptcy of once-reputable companies have abruptly awakened the Japanese to the serious shortcomings in their CG system. CG is becoming a social as well as an economic problem. The fact that the phrase "corporate governance" is often employed as a phonetic transliteration of the English term illustrates how late Japan is to this issue area. Unless otherwise noted, this analyzes the biggest publicly traded companies' present CG system [3], [4].

The historical context

Japan began her modernization process in 1868 in response to the pressing necessity to preserve her independence from Western powers as they were colonizing her surrounding nations. Almost all of Japan's contemporary institutions, including political, social, economic, military, and educational ones, were fashioned after those of Western Europe in her hurried endeavors to realize the country's dream of becoming a "rich country with strong soldiers." Thus, the German scholar Hermann Roesler's draft of the first Japanese Commercial Code was adopted in 1899. Up to the conclusion of World War II, the evident German legacy was evident, and it may still be seen today. For example, Article 261–3 of the current Commercial Code states that the Representative Director has the ability to handle all business matters both within and outside of court. This is an exact translation of Aktiengesetz Article 78.1's German language. The first significant update to the Code was issued in 1950, after World War II, while Japan was still ruled by American-led Allied Occupation troops. The five members of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, which is in charge of the Allied Occupation troops, were the main architects. Because three of the five officials were trial attorneys from Illinois, the new code was thus a copy of the US model, notably the Illinois Code. As a result, the Japanese Code is described as a hybrid of the US and German models.

Japan's democracy and CG

Democracy, which demands that the people have sovereign authority and that the political governance system include checks and balances, is one of the fundamental tenets of a contemporary state. After World War II, the Occupation troops imposed democracy on Japan from above, in contrast to most Western countries where democracy was achieved by the grassroots via a grueling process of centuries-long fights, sometimes violent, to free themselves from the feudal yokes. But what the Japanese have established is essentially a paper democracy, not a democracy in heart and substance. The outcome is a massive discrepancy between the actual execution of the law and its text. The Statutory Auditors are one example, which will be covered later. They have the overwhelming authority required by law to halt Board actions that violate company policies or the law. However, they are helpless against the CEO and the Board, which is led by him, since they were essentially chosen by the CEO, whom they are legally required to oversee. For many decades, the legal community, politicians, attorneys, and law professors have all maintained this obvious contradiction, with the business community being the main supporter. The most well-known article of the Japanese Constitution, which was imposed on the country by the Americans during the Occupation, is Article 9, which states that "land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained" and that the country "forever renounces war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force." Nonetheless, the truth is that Japan has the greatest military "potential" in Asia, which is ostensibly supported by the US nuclear umbrella. Fortunately, this capability has never been used up to this point. In spite of this contradiction, since its proclamation in 1947, the Constitution has never been changed. So, the main cause of Japan's CG's egregious shortcomings is its immature democracy. Although significant, the most recent amendment to the Commercial Code, which took effect in April 2003, is just one step in the right direction toward fixing the problems [5], [6].

The theoretical structure

Blair's description of CG is perhaps the most concise and fitting term available. According to her, CG is about distributing incentive and control among stakeholders. There are three reasons why any debate on CG must begin with the definition of the key stakeholder that forms the basis of the first question above: this is too abstract for the purposes of this. First, the primary aspect that establishes the CG system is defining the main stakeholder. Second, for CG, the main stakeholder's legitimacy is essential. It is difficult to establish cohesiveness and collaboration among stakeholders in a firm if there isn't a wide agreement on this matter. Third, traditional conversations on CG focus too much on the CEO and not enough on the policing structure. Even though this is a crucial element, CG need to be more proactive in attempting to provide the CEO with financial and psychological incentives to perform better. According to Freeman, a stakeholder in an organization is any group or person that has the potential to influence and be impacted by the accomplishment of the organization's goals. This definition is among the most often used. This term is excessively sweeping and is difficult to operationalize. This examines the viewpoints of upper management, whose primary responsibility it is to identify the principal player in every significant decision. Given that they are a shareholder in the company, they are unique stakeholders. According to their viewpoints, stakeholders are specifically defined as a group or individuals who are intimately associated with the survival and prosperity of the company, such as management, long-term or block shareholders, banks, suppliers, and customers with whom the company conducts the majority of its long-term business dealings. These stakeholders are distinguished by their long-term, quantitatively significant dependency with the company. For this reason, banks, suppliers, and customers who do not rely on the company for their survival and prosperity, as well as short-term shareholders like day traders, investors, and speculators, are all considered stakeholders; however, it is important to remember that they have interests in the company as well. This term is comparable to the definition of main stakeholders provided by Frederic and associates; secondary and tertiary stakeholders are the other two groups [7], [8].

In contrast to the United States and the United Kingdom, where the prevailing philosophy is shareholder primacy, the employee-centered notion of the business still holds sway in Japan. The bold statement made by Toyota CEO Okuda demonstrates this belief. As stated in the article "Managers! He criticizes the mindset of some of Japan's top executives who are willing to fire staff members in the sake of increasing shareholder value as "a short-sighted view dominated by the stock market logic" and supports the traditionalist Japanese emphasis on job security. "If you dismiss Your Employees, Do Hara-kiri." Long-term employment, according to the CEO of Japan's biggest automaker, is a good match for the country's culture, which values teamwork and job security. Given that he is the head of the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations, or Nippon Keidanren, the most powerful national group that advocates on behalf of the interests of the biggest businesses when drafting public policy, his people-oriented view of the company is all the more important. In an essay headlined "Job Security at All Cost is the Road to the Titanic," Miyauchi, the CEO of Orix, a significant leasing service provider and a well-known advocate for shareholder interests, challenged Okuda's viewpoint in the same edition of the monthly magazine. Miyauchi underscores that "a company will sink like the Titanic if it does nothing with its employees." How advanced might it be? However, his remarks should be interpreted cautiously because he hires primarily young women for his company, sparing him the trouble of redundant work; these women leave the company at comparatively younger ages due to factors like marriage, childbirth, husbands' relocation, etc., far earlier than male employees. Additionally, he proposes that Japanese CEOs hold their positions for 10 years, as opposed to the traditional four, in order to have the long-term perspective necessary to let their staff to make no more than two errors. According to him, managing involves taking risks, but one cannot distinguish between good and poor risks until they have really implemented an idea. According to Miyauchi, "one should not punish the person who has taken the risk and discontinue a new business too soon" because of this. It is unclear how his long-term perspective and his stance on staff reorganization are compatible. Therefore, in essence, Miyauchi's argument is unpersuasive and is the same as Okuda's in that both emphasize the necessity of long-term perspective, which is only achievable under long-term employment. Similar to France and Germany, there has been a great deal of discussion in Japan over the problem of the major stakeholder. The craze for shareholder value swiftly faded after the Enron and other corporate crises of 2001 [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

The Commercial Code is the primary piece of law that directly affects CG. The most recent Code modifications, which went into effect on April 1, 2003, represent a significant and long-overdue move in the right path toward a more open and efficient CG system. As will be seen later, the Code moves it even closer to the US model. There are around 10,000 big enterprises that are covered by the updated Code. At his request, this organization was combined into the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations, of which he now serves as chairman as of September 2003. A number of voluntary rules of corporate governance preceded the changes; the most well-known of them is the Corporate Governance Principles, which were released by the Japan Corporate Governance Forum, an organization made up of academics, attorneys, consultants, and senior executives. None of them, however, have achieved the same degree of acceptance and compliance as the French Viénot Reports I and II, the UK's Combined Codes, which incorporate the previous Cadbury, Greenbury, Hampel, and Mainers reports, or the most recent Codes of Best Practices from the German government-sponsored Cromme Committee. The Code's modifications essentially serve as a formal validation of Sony's 1997 Board reform. Sony divided its 38-member board into Executive Officers and Directors. There are 34 Officers, including nine recently appointed Executive Officers, and 10 Directors, three of which are Outside Directors. Concurrently, seven directors took on the role of officer. Hundreds of listed companies swiftly adopted the change, making it a de facto law. Two years prior to the implementation of the new Code, in 2001, Sony made yet another move in the same manner by establishing the Nominating Committee and Compensation Committee. The CEO Idei's greatest contribution to the Board changes is without a doubt his strong dedication, which has contributed to the reform's success. Sony has shown its ability to innovate in both CG and technological goods. This is most likely the first instance when a private company's reform proposal has been included in the Code. This demonstrates that corporate leaders are more advanced than conservative legislators. The average size of major Japanese corporations shrank to a more manageable size as a result of the division of Inside Directors into Officers from the Board of Directors. A typical public company had an enormous board with between 30 and 60 directors prior to the Sony changes. There were not many companies that had outside directors, and those that did had management from the company's past or companies with whom the company had commercial relationships, so they weren't really independent. A majority, or

54%, of the 2,103 listed businesses surveyed by the Tokyo Stock Exchange—of which 1,363 or 65 percent responded—have a board with fewer than ten members. Even Toyota has softened its formerly cautious attitude on the size and composition of boards. As of July 2002, Toyota had 58 board members in total, over five times more than GM's 12 and three times more than DaimlerChrysler's 20. Toyota, like many other Japanese companies, assigned its directors seven distinct titles, each denoting a different level of supposed hierarchical power, responsibility, and seniority. According to the company's list, these are: one Honorary Chairman, one Chairman, two Vice Chairmen, one President and CEO, eight Executive Vice Presidents, five Senmu Senior Directors, fourteen Jomu Directors, and lastly, twenty-six ordinary Directors.

The list is intended to show the descending order of authority of the titles. The Board is meant to be overseen by six statu- tory auditors. Given the trend toward smaller boards among public businesses in Japan, Toyota's board was unquestionably one of the biggest. Toyota cut the number of Directors on the Board by more than half, to 27, in June 2003, with those directors being above Senmu level. Thirty-nine Executive Officers were named, with three non-Japanese executives of Toyota's US and UK companies among them for the first time in the company's history. There aren't any outside directors. Joint stock enterprises having declared capital of at least ¥500 million or liabilities exceeding ¥20 billion are classified as large corporations [11], [12].

Under the updated Commercial Code, there are three alternative structures.

The most notable feature is the freedom major companies have to choose between the two sorts of board structures: the traditional and the creative ones. The second unique feature of the former is that it is essentially based on the US system, which is often acknowledged as the de facto norm in developed countries. On the other hand, the conventional type and the classic model are almost similar, with a few minor but noticeable enhancements. The initial US-style model was the only one on the lawmakers' minds. The business sector, led by Japan Keidanren, vigorously protested, ultimately forcing them to accept the optional system.

Inventive Board: "companies with committees"

The novel structure, which the revised Code refers to as "firms with committees," is characterized by the Board of Directors' significantly increased oversight power and the more distinct separation of Officers' and Directors' management and monitoring responsibilities. The second point is that the Board now has more power than the General Meeting of Shareholders, which has further reduced its influence. Officers may take on the role of Director, with the exception of the Audit Committee; the term of office for a Director is reduced from two to one year; the establishment of three major Board Committees is required; the reporting responsibilities of the Officers to the Board are strengthened. Senmu and Jomu are informal, commonly used names for senior director positions in Japanese businesses of various sizes. In terms of power and responsibility, the former is ranked second only to the Executive Vice President or, in the absence of such a title, to the President and CEO. As such, they are both strong contenders to succeed the President. In some instances, these titles are more or less honorific designations to convey rather than ones that are associated with any particular role or power.

Officers and directors being kept apart

Inside directors made up the majority of boards in Japanese corporations before to Sony's 1997 changes. As a result, there wasn't much of a difference between Directors and Officers, even though this is standard practice in the UK and the US and is required by law in Germany. For the first time in Japanese history, the new Code clearly identifies Officers as being in control of daily management operations and Directors as having supervision authority over Officers and fundamental decision making. This amendment only acknowledges the Sony changes legally. The Board does not meddle in the officers' operations; instead, it appoints and oversees them. But the division is not rigid since Directors may also hold the role of Officers at the same time. That being said, as Sony has shown, the CEO may combine the role of Chairman of the Board. However, only the highest ranking officials, including the CEO and its closest allies, are anticipated to serve on the board concurrently. It follows that the Board size is likely to be smaller and more in line with the roughly 12-member US norm.

The three Board committees must be constituted

The main feature of the updated Code is this. In fact, Japan is the only nation where big businesses that choose this kind of board are required by law to form the Audit, Nomination, and Compensation committees, the three main Board committees. Only the Audit Committee is required to be listed on the New York Stock Exchange in the United States. Board committees are not required by law in the UK, Germany, or France, but they are promoted by voluntary standards of best practices. Another important requirement is that each of these committees have three members minimum, with the majority of those members having to be outside directors who are permitted to serve on all three committees at the same time. This demonstrates the lawmakers' goal to guarantee the committees' neutrality toward the CEO and to add more outside directors to the board. There must be at least two Outside Directors on the Board in order for there to be a majority of Outside Directors on any Committee having at least three members. In order to preemptively guard against an incident or health issue, companies will often appoint three Outside Directors.

The need for Outside Directors was the component that incited vehement opposition from large company leaders. For example, when Mitarai, the CEO of Canon, said he would have outside directors on his board "over his dead body," his critics would usually use the outside directors' purported lack of knowledge and experience in the company's business and industry as justification for their objections.

The challenge of recruiting enough "qualified" Outside Directors is another factor. They also emphasize how well-suited the traditional Statutory Auditors would be for the supervision role due to their extensive working experience and familiarity with the company's operations. Another factor given for Japanese companies' opposition was their general lack of experience with Board Committees.

The majority of CEOs may be resistant because they do not want their formerly almost limitless power to be curtailed when it comes to selecting their successor and making important decisions. Another reason might be that the CEO's title was altered from "Representative Director and President" to "Representative Officer," which may not have appealed to most prospective CEOs since the President is more well-known and seen as more prestigious by the general public. In order to address the concerns raised by managers, the Ministry of Justice had to provide companies the option to choose between the two kinds of Boards.

The roles that the board committees perform

The Board of Directors nominates the Committee members, although they are not bound by its directives or commands to carry out their responsibilities. Officers are eligible to join all three Committees and take on the role of director simultaneously. The three Board Committees' responsibilities are outlined in the modified Code.

Committee of Audits

The audit committee's responsibilities include supervising directors and officers, auditing financial statements and reporting findings in the audit report for board approval, and recommending chartered public accountant candidates for the position of auditor to the general meeting of shareholders in order to represent the business in derivative lawsuits filed against directors and officers in an effort to reduce their liabilities.

The Audit Committee has a great deal of authority. The Committee may now authorize the financial statements, including the allocation of profits, and notify the shareholders' general meeting of the decision. Previously, the consent of the General Meeting of Shareholders was required for these agendas. In this way, the Board's authority is increased to the same degree as that of its US counterpart. One little distinction from the US is that, as the final item above indicates, the Audit Committee takes over the responsibilities of the US Litigation Committee. No Director or Officer of the business's subsidiary companies, nor any Officer of the company having committees, may serve on the Audit Committee.

Committee for Nominations

These rights were borne by the Board of Directors, which was presided over by the CEO, under the previous Code. In two surveys conducted in 1991 and 1996, 75–90% of participants said that the CEO's influence played a crucial role in choosing potential directors and his successor.2 This clearly gave the CEO the greatest amount of authority and influence. CEO influence is reduced, at least in theory, in the process of choosing director candidates since the Nominating Committee is now able to recommend candidates directly to the General Meeting of Shareholders under the new Code.

Committee on Compensation

The remuneration Committee's primary duties include recommending stock option plans for approval by the General Meeting and determining the remuneration of each Director and Officer on a per-modality basis. Japan is at the other end of the spectrum when it comes to the disclosure of director and officer salary, either legally required or voluntary, as compared to the United States, the United Kingdom, and France.

The amended legislation does not address this scenario in any way not even with a single word. At the 2002 General Meeting of Shareholders, a shareholder requested an individual disbursement of compensation. The CEO of Sony, an international corporation, refused to comply, stating that the shareholders should get a suitable amount of compensation overall. The majority of top executives in Japan claim that they are "ashamed" to reveal their compensation since it is so low. It is well acknowledged and supported by evidence that Japanese directors and managers get relatively modest remuneration when compared to other countries. Many observers speculate that, if their perks, costs, and benefits are taken into consideration, their remuneration may not be as modest as they prefer to highlight, given their stance toward honest transparency. Only one company has made the announcement to reveal specific pay packages so far.

Denial of Statutory Auditors' Rights

For the apparent reason that the aforementioned Committees, and the Audit Committee in particular, may easily replace them, firms that choose the innovative Board are not required to have Statutory Auditors. The claim that the creative type has been legally prohibited from existing is not hyperbole. As will be shown later, no other Japanese CG institution has ever been as problematic and divisive as Statutory Auditors.

Reduced duration as a director

The Office of Directors will have a one-year term instead of a two-year one, with the option to run again. On the basis of an annual review and the Nominating Committee's suggestion, this theoretically allows the Board to swiftly dismiss undesirable or underperforming Directors, including the CEO. Some commentators believe that this provision may result in a short-term perspective.

The committees' and outside directors' independence

The efficacy of the Committee's operations depends on the independence of the Outside Directors. According to the updated Code, outside directors are those who do not presently and have never had management positions with the firm or any of its subsidiaries. Five years of such contacts with the firm were required per the preceding criteria. Nonetheless, a parent firm may still designate officers or managers to serve on committees at its subsidiaries in accordance with the new Code. One potential issue is that conflicts of interest between the parent company and the subsidiary might arise from the subsidiary's obligation to act in its best interests. Under such situations, shareholders of the subsidiary may be unhappy, even if the subsidiary is a public company, which is not rare.

Enhanced officers' reporting responsibilities

The promptness and quality of the information supplied by the CEO determines how well the Board is able to monitor. Because of this, the updated Code now mandates that the CEO and Officers report to the Board on the company's performance every three months. In addition, they have a duty to notify the Audit Committee and the Board or Committee of any incident that might cause significant harm to the business upon request.

Officers' shorter tenure

Officers' terms have been reduced from two years to one year, just as directors' terms have. With this adjustment, the performance officers especially the CEO will be evaluated annually, and if needed, underperforming officers will be removed more quickly to keep them on their toes.

Response to the Innovative Board

As of March 1, 2003, Sony, Hitachi and its eighteen related businesses, Toshiba, Orix, Ion, Nomura Holdings, Palco, and Konica-Minolta are among the corporations that have declared their intention to join the Innovative Board. These still represent a tiny minority since the vast majority 60 percent remains opposed to it. According to a study conducted in January 2003 on 100 significant organizations, out of the 90 firms that responded, 58 percent said they would keep the Conventional Board with Statutory Auditors in place, while just 2 percent said they were planned to introduce the Innovative Board. 38 percent of respondents think the new Board structure is worthwhile to consider as they decide whether or not to implement it. A poll with 1,363 respondents that included 2,103 businesses listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange revealed similar results. Sixty-six percent responded negatively, five percent positively, and two percent made choices in favor of the new system. As shown by Toyota and Canon, it seems that most businesses are against the Innovative Board, while others are choosing to wait and see policies in order to make up their minds.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at how the corporate governance framework in Japan has changed in response to national and international calls for more responsibility, transparency, and shareholder rights.

It talks about steps to improve governance effectiveness and win back investor trust, such introducing the Corporate Governance Code and changing the makeup of boards, paying executives, and engaging shareholders. The report also examines the potential and problems that the Japanese corporate governance structure is confronting in the face of globalization, technological advancements, and demographic changes. It talks about current initiatives inside Japanese firms to advance sustainability, diversity, and innovation while maintaining the advantages of the conventional governance paradigm. In summary, this study advances our knowledge of the Japanese national corporate governance system by clarifying its tenets, procedures, and historical development. The research provides insightful information for academics, practitioners, and policymakers attempting to manage the challenges of governance in many international settings by placing the Japanese model within larger theoretical frameworks and empirical data.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. R. Karim Miajee, "The American National System of Corporate Governance," *Int. J. Shari'ah Corp. Gov. Res.*, 2018.

[2] D. Feils, M. Rahman, and F. Şabac, "Corporate Governance Systems Diversity: A Coasian Perspective on Stakeholder Rights," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2018.

[3] R. Barkemeyer, L. Preuss, and M. Ohana, "Developing country firms and the challenge of corruption: Do company commitments mirror the quality of national-level institutions?," *J. Bus. Res.*, 2018.

[4] D. Jamali and C. Karam, "Corporate Social Responsibility in Developing Countries as an Emerging Field of Study," *Int. J. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 32–61, 2018.

[5] S. Fainshmidt, W. Q. Judge, R. V. Aguilera, and A. Smith, "Varieties of institutional systems: A contextual taxonomy of understudied countries," *J. World Bus.*, 2018.

[6] A. Dementieva, Y. Kalyuzhnova, and M. Sokolova, "Convergence of corporate governance models in the context of globalization," *Mezhdunarodnye Protsessy*, 2018.

[7] L. A. Nwanyanwu, "Accountants' Ethics and Fraud Control in Nigeria: The Emergence of a Fraud Control Model," *J. Accounting, Financ. Audit. Stud.*, 2018.

[8] I. S. Mezhov and O. B. Dronova, "National corporate governance model: The imperatives of funding the growth of the russian economy," *Financ. Theory Pract.*, 2018.

[9] L. A. Stout *et al.*, "The Modern Corporation Statement on Company Law," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018.

[10] D. S. Chang, W. S. Wang, and R. Wang, "Identifying Critical Factors of Sustainable Healthcare Institutions' Indicators Under Taiwan's National Health Insurance System," *Soc. Indic. Res.*, 2018.

[11] D. F. Khasanah, "Analisis Kepatuhan Syari'Ah Terhadap Sistem Operasional Pada Bank BNI Syari'Ah Kcp Mikro Lumajang," *Prog. Conf.*, 2018.

[12] I. Schiffauer, "EU rules on corporate governance as means to promote sustainability?," *Cent. Eur. Rev. Econ. Manag.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 13

CONVENTIONAL BOARD: FIRMS WITH THE STATUTORY AUDITORS

Dr. Shaji Thomas, Professor
Department of Finance, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- shaji.t@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Conventional board structures, often characterized by the presence of statutory auditors, represent a significant aspect of corporate governance in many jurisdictions. This paper delves into the dynamics, functions, and implications of such boards, shedding light on their unique features and roles within organizational governance frameworks. The study begins by contextualizing conventional board structures within the broader landscape of corporate governance, highlighting the historical and regulatory contexts that have shaped their development. It examines the rationale behind the appointment of statutory auditors and their role in providing oversight, assurance, and accountability within firms. Central to the analysis is an exploration of the functions and responsibilities of statutory auditors, including financial reporting oversight, risk assessment, and compliance monitoring. It examines how statutory auditors interact with other board members, management teams, external auditors, and regulatory bodies to fulfill their duties effectively.

KEYWORDS:

Director Independence, Director Responsibilities, Environmental Disclosures, Executive Remuneration, External Auditors, Financial Transparency, Governance Principles.

INTRODUCTION

This kind of board is the outcome of a compromise to appease the CEOs who were against the innovative form of board that had three committees and required outside directors. The retention of the Statutory Auditors, whose monitoring efficacy has been hotly contested, is the distinguishing feature of this Board. As a result, there is little difference between the classic model and the conventional kind.

The corporation retains the freedom to choose between the two varieties: the classic type and the upgraded type. There aren't many differences between these. There is no equivalent of the Statutory Auditors institution in the US, UK, Germany, or France; it is unique to Japan. On the recommendation of the Board of Directors, they are chosen at the General Meeting of Shareholders. They are responsible for overseeing the Board to ensure that its choices are both economically prudent and compliant with applicable laws and bylaws. This is how they represent the interests of shareholders.

As a result, their roles resemble those of the US Audit Committee. They had the ability to halt unlawful Board actions, which was a strong and comprehensive authority, but their actual oversight over the CEO and the Board was and remains almost nonexistent. This main problem is mostly caused by the fact that their candidates are chosen by the CEO and approved automatically at the General Meeting. In an attempt to lessen their reliance on the CEO in both an economic and psychological sense, the lawmakers permitted businesses to maintain their current Board structure as long as the Statutory Auditors underwent the following changes:

Enhanced autonomy of the Statutory Auditors

More than three Statutory Auditors are required, with the majority being independent. They had to have never worked for the firm or served as a director. This clause fortifies the impartiality of auditors who were essentially chosen by the CEO, severely undermining their independence from the CEO [1], [2].

The tenure of the position

The Statutory Auditors' term of office has been extended from three to four years, which is twice as long as that of Directors. The purpose of this modification is to provide Statutory Auditors more job security, which should strengthen their independence.

Participation at the Board meeting

They have to go up to the board meeting and voice their concerns. Their responsibilities and power have been expanded since, prior to the modification, the Commercial Code allowed them to attend Board meetings. At the annual shareholder meeting, they may provide an explanation for their resignation. This is an additional possible way to strengthen the impartiality of State Auditors, as the change would make it more difficult for the CEO to fire them for personal gain. Given that they are still, at the very least, psychologically reliant on the CEO for having nominated them for the role, it is unlikely that many Statutory Auditors would use their power to do so [3], [4].

The consent and proposal rights

The nomination of a new Statutory Auditor may be proposed by auditors and approved by them. This provision strengthens their position of power over the CEO, who has hitherto had the last word in choosing candidates.

The Committee on Major Assets in conjunction with the Conventional Board

Large corporations with 10 or more directors are eligible to propose the Committee in terms of Outside Directors. The Committee has the authority to determine and carry out the purchase and sale of significant assets, as well as take on considerable debt. Prior to the Code's modification, the Board of Directors had exclusive authority to make these choices. This clause allows the Committee to make decisions quickly since it does not need Board approval or lengthy consideration. This benefit is thought to encourage businesses to add outside directors. Of the three alternative board kinds, this one is the least significant since it differs very little from the Conventional Board with Statutory Auditors. Only one company, Honda Motors, has chosen it as of October 2003.

The CEO and Chairman of the Board

The Code has no clause that forbids CEO duality, or the assumption of both the CEO role and the Board Chairmanship by the same individual. Separating the two roles, however, is practically a standard practice in the majority of publicly traded companies. Of the CEO duality, Sony, Sanyo, and a few others make up a small minority. This in no way indicates that the CEO is effectively under the board chairman's supervision. Conversely, the situation is the opposite. In a study of 761 CEOs, 235 Board Chairmen, and 1,537 Managers, over 70% of participants said that the Chairman serves as the CEO's advisor. This was followed by 55% who said that the Chairman's true function is to represent the company in trade and economic groups. According to 48% of respondents, the Chairman is active in choosing directors and executive candidates, and 26% says the Chairman is involved in choosing executives for linked and subsidiary businesses. Thus, the Chairman has no authority to supervise the CEO. In fact, it is standard practice for the Board Chairman to not obstruct the CEO in carrying out their duties. Being chairman is the last or second-to-last post before to a final retirement from active life and is often seen as an honorific one. In any event, a typical chairman is too old—more than 70 years old—to be active in day-to-day management [5], [6].

All-Shareholder Meeting With the approval of the Board of Directors, shareholders may use electronic channels, such as email, to exercise their voting rights as of April 1, 2002. Firms may now provide information on the general meeting of shareholders to individual shareholders via the Internet or other electronic methods with their permission. Balance sheets and profit and loss statements may now be made available on the corporate website as required disclosures. The general meeting of shareholders must to happen no later than sixty days after the fiscal period's conclusion. The final week of June is the busiest month for the General Meeting of Shareholders, followed by March, as most listed corporations have their fiscal term from April 1 to March 31 of the following year. The General Meeting of Shareholders' ritualism is not unique to Japan. Still, the trend is as strong in Japan as it is in any other nation. Granted, there are meetings that go on for many hours and include serious discussion of agenda items, but these are the exception rather than the norm. The primary reason is that "friendly" hands or "s shareholders" hold or "stabilize" the majority of the outstanding shares. These include the primary bank, institutional investors like pension funds, and non-financial companies in the manufacturing and service sectors. In theory, they wouldn't sell them without the portfolio company's prior consent.

The main point is that almost all choices are decided with in accordance with significant shareholders' management prior to the General Meeting. The Japan Association of Statutory Auditors conducted a mail survey of 1,106 public corporations in June 1993 and found that nearly 80 percent of them were involved in litigation. However, the alarmed business community's demand to limit director liability was sparked by the astronomical amount of damages that the court imposed on the Daiwa Bank directors. In the well-known Daiwa Bank case, the Osaka District Court mandated that the 11 directors of the Bank pay a total of ¥82.9 billion, or $775,000, as compensation for their losses. Later, in an out-of-court settlement, the sum was lowered. The maximum responsibility is now limited by the amended Commercial Code to six years' compensation, which is divided into two years for Outside Directors and Statutory Auditors and four years for other Directors. The most effective deterrent against management wrongdoing at the time is the shareholders' derivative action as it has the potential to negatively impact management's material well-being [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

As previously mentioned, the Statutory Auditor is an internal auditing body that is in charge of ex ante and interim control, which means that they prevent directors' decisions from being made or carried out if they believe that they would violate laws, ordinances, the company's articles of incorporation, or have other negative effects. Therefore, in order to safeguard the interests of the business and its stakeholders by averting unfavorable choices and actions before it's too late, statutory auditors conduct both accounting and operational audits. As the Introduction has previously made clear, they are useless as monitoring agents. The main reasons are discussed.

Statutory Auditors' Dysfunctions

This is just another instance of the wide disparity that exists between the letter and the spirit of the law in Japan. A seemingly never-ending string of corporate misconduct and the State Auditors' dismal performance record. Of course, there are auditors who will stop at nothing to fulfill their obligations, even if it means losing their jobs. There are CEOs who appreciate and assist their auditing work and who understand the significance of their roles. However, the typical perception of a Statutory Auditor is that of a person with a lot of experience and little authority who did not make it into the mainstream for advancement to a higher executive position or board membership. Since the early 20th century, when a well-known legal scholar said that an auditor in Germany would be comparable in stature and authority to a board member in Japan or someone in an even higher position overseeing board members, this unfavorable perception has remained largely unchanged. In Japan, on the other hand, an auditor is considered a lowly employee, a person of inferior status, or an elderly person who is still employed but not given much authority [9], [10].

Just 6.8% of the 2,427 auditors of listed companies that participated in the 1993 study by the Japan Association of Auditors are former chairman, vice chairman, president, or executive vice presidents, who would have significant influence as auditors over the current CEO. The majority of the Statutory Auditors, at 55.6 percent, are ordinary directors or former Senior Executives with less influence. Prior to being promoted to auditor, 24.5 percent work as division or department supervisors. Nonetheless, the Commercial Code grants the Statutory Auditors a strong and extensive range of managerial oversight powers. The Statutory Auditors, chosen by the General Meeting of Shareholders, are legally distinct from the CEO-dominated Board of Directors. So, in theory, they are able to keep an eye on the CEO and the Board. While the Code does not provide a clear definition of their monitoring power, the general consensus is that monitoring serves as a means of ensuring that management choices are both economically prudent and comply with the law. Stated differently, the role of the Statutory Auditors is to verify that the actions taken by the management are lawful and represent wise and prudent business choices. The Statutory Auditors have the following authority in order to carry out their responsibility. participate in Board meetings to express their opinions; report to the Board any actual or potential deviations from the company's activities, laws, and bylaws; demand a meeting of the Board, and if it is not accepted, call one anyway under their own authority; demand that the Board members, management, and employees provide reports on the business at all times; inspect the company's assets and operations, as well as those of its subsidiary companies; present the audit report to the General Meeting of Shareholders; and suspend any illegal or bylaws-related actions.

The majority of the well-known business crises in recent years might have been avoided if the Statutory Auditors had carried out their duties as required. In actuality, they are unable to do any of these tasks in an efficient manner. For instance, according to Shin'ichi Suzuki, Executive Director of the Japan Association of Statutory Auditors, it is unprecedented for Directors to really exercise their most potent authority to halt unlawful activity.

Reasons behind malfunctions

The primary reason for the Statutory Auditors' lack of oversight is because, as it stands, they are essentially chosen by the President or CEO, whom they are tasked with overseeing. Because the Inside Directors are chosen by the CEO, this circumstance is the same as the Inside Directors' lack of independence. Whether they have remained silent and submissive to the CEO will determine whether their employment is extended for a further period. People in positions of authority naturally do not like to see them questioned, much less diminished. Therefore, if they take their responsibilities seriously, they should constantly be ready to step down from their position [11], [12].

The fact that senior management has unquestionably greater access to knowledge about the firm's actions and circumstances than the Statutory Auditors does presents a more significant barrier to their ability to conduct an effective audit, even in the case that they were fully independent. There are two reasons for this informational imbalance. Usually, Statutory Auditors were not involved in high-level decision-making. Real decisions are already made at a small Executive Committee meeting called Jomukai, which is attended by the CEO and his executive staff, rather than at a formal meeting of the Board of Directors. Statutory Auditors are seldom asked to attend meetings. As a result, they are unable to access the same degree of firm knowledge, although senior management has access to crucial data. In the window-dressing instance of Aipec, a publisher of educational materials whose shares were exchanged on the over-the-counter market, this is precisely what happened. A retired public prosecutor general and a former senior National Tax Agency official were the company's two outside auditors. Despite their origin, which makes them almost perfect for auditors, they have used as a kind of cover for window decoration that was supposedly so intricate as to be undetectable. The Commercial Code was modified and went into effect on October 1, 1993, with the goal of strengthening the authority of the Statutory Auditors.

The number of Statutory Auditors had to be increased for every significant firm from the previous minimum of two to a minimum of three, with one being an Outside Auditor. A person who had not worked for the corporation or any of its subsidiaries for at least five years prior to appointment as an outside auditor was classified as such. As long as the CEO continues to choose them, this adjustment was a minor step in the right direction, but it fell short of the solution. According to a survey conducted on 1,314 listed companies, 45 percent of them hired outside auditors from among former executives or auditors who worked for their parent company or any associated or subsidiary businesses. US institutional investors swiftly protested this lack of independence. The creation of the Innovative Board with Committees and the elimination of the Statutory Auditors was one of the main goals of the most recent reform to the Commercial Code.

External CPA auditor audits

Efforts to salvage damaged credibility

Professional accountants certified to conduct audits after completing one of the government's most rigorous exams are known as CPAs, and they conduct independent audits. In an average year, less than 10 percent of candidates pass the three-level exams. These qualified accountants may operate on their own or with an auditing business. Audit companies handle the majority of the audits for big listed businesses. It is mandatory for corporations listed on a stock exchange, with total liabilities exceeding ¥120 billion and capitalization above ¥1,500 million, to have their financial statements audited by CPAs or an audit company. Independent External Auditors are the final line of defense if Statutory Auditors are unreliable in their ability to act as effective management checkers. However, they seldom ever act like that. Sanyo Special Steel Company, which registered in 1965, is the traditional example. The business has been inflating profits and understating managerial compensation for the previous seven years. Knowing that the financial statements were falsified, the company's external auditor submitted them with a "unqualified opinion," meaning that they "present fairly financial conditions and results of operations in conformity with accounting principles."

Several of the biggest securities firms, like as Nomura, Nikko, Yamaichi, and others, were found guilty in 1991 of paying back a portion of the losses that their institutional customers suffered on investments made via them. The CPAs in charge of auditing these securities businesses were likely aware of this unlawful spending, according to one of the board members of the Japanese Institute of Certified Public Accountants, who is also a long-time CPA. The auditors in a bankruptcy involving the real estate business Maruko the same year said that there was no irregularity in the financial accounts that had been released only six months earlier. One of the biggest manufacturers of home décor items, LEC, which was listed on the Tokyo Stock Exchange's Second, went bankrupt less than a year after the tragedy. Even though the firm had questionable loans that were much larger than its capitalization, the auditing report on its financial accounts, which was released only four and a half months earlier, certified them with a "unqualified opinion." Another example is Yamaichi Securities, which had over a century of history before failing. One of the most notable bankruptcies in Japanese corporate history after World War II resulted from the CPA auditors' inability to uncover extensive illicit company operations. The ubiquitous issue of knowledge asymmetry is one of the main reasons for insufficient CPA audits. Top executives may always choose to conceal or even alter facts in order to prevent the CPA from doing their audit in an efficient manner. As US instances like Enron or WorldCom demonstrate, they are often helpless against motivated crooks in upper management. There are two other factors that are probably unique to Japan.

Reasons behind dysfunction

First off, there is a striking similarity between the relationships between External Auditors and the companies they represent and the President/CEO of the Statutory Auditors. If CPAs remain faithful to their professional ethics, they must be prepared to lose their client and a substantial salary, which is an unreasonable expectation. Clients do not want to work with auditors who they perceive to be "too rigorous." For the majority of Japanese auditing companies, which are tiny in contrast to other countries and lack sufficient resources, this potential danger is too great. In addition to having a poor negotiating position, CPAs must deal with intense psychological pressure when they have to qualify or contradict their view since doing so would undoubtedly damage the client's reputation with banks, suppliers, and consumers and may even result in delisting. This leads to the fact that auditors often avoid expressing such grave objections. One example is the listed hotel company Gajoen Kanko, which terminated its agreement with its auditing firm. It is generally accepted that the company's delisting may have resulted from the management's dislike of the auditor's negative assessment. The business quickly brought on a second CPA, who completed an audit on his own and submitted a report with a "unqualified opinion" in an exceptionally short amount of time—about one week. Remarkably, neither the Ministry of Finance (then the supervising ministry of CPAs) nor the JICSA called into question the veracity of the questionable audit nor mandated that the corporation restore the CPA who had been fired. It was said that this infamous incident exposed some serious weaknesses in the independent audit system in Japan.

Second, most auditors have been in business with their customers for 20, 30, or even 40 years at this point. Many of them have developed too strong of a personal bond with their customers throughout this time as a result of their casual interactions with the Finance Director and other senior executives at restaurants or golf courses. The JICPA's rule on its members holding shares of the firms they represent raised questions about possible widespread insider trading by CPAs. Auditing firms have sometimes allowed CPA-qualified staff members from their client companies to audit the latter's business. The majority of CPAs no longer have an impartial, arm's-length relationship with their client corporations; instead, they are now considered to be quasi-insiders. Rather of defending shareholders and other stakeholders, they ultimately defend the directors and management of the client firm. As previously said, the outcome is a lackadaisical evaluation and management, as well as sporadic cooperation with the customer in unlawful activities such as window dressing.

Wide-ranging adjustments have been made to the audit procedures in an attempt to rebuild public trust in CPAs and accounting firms. The auditing of going companies, the adoption of a risk strategy, the improvement of fraud detection, the evaluation of quality control practices, and the CPA Investigation Examination Board were among the many auditing standards that underwent a comprehensive review and revision in fiscal 2001. The need that auditors assess a business's viability is the most significant modification to auditing standards. They are now accountable for more than just verifying that their client companies are following the accounting regulations. Their level of independence and professional ethics-based standards must be significantly greater for this. On May 30, 2003, the measure amending the CPA Law was passed, marking the biggest reform since the 1970s. The US Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002 had a significant impact on the change, as shown.

However, as of April 2004, the updated CPA Law forbids audit companies from offering the following non-audit services. The JICPA's "Oversight and Independence of CPA Auditing in Japan, 2002," which is available at www.jicpa.or.jp/n–eng services to any clients that are required to be audited in accordance with the Securities and Exchange Law and certain large corporations subject to statutory audits under the Commercial Code, is heavily referenced in the following descriptions of the CPA reforms. The current CPA Law prohibits tax consulting services, but it also forbids the following non-audit services: bookkeeping, financial document preparation, accounting bookkeeping; design of financial or accounting information systems; appraisal of contribution-in-kind reports; actuarial services; internal audit outsourcing; any service involving the sale or promotion of shares or other audit clients' interests; and any service that is comparable to the aforementioned services and could involve management decisions or result in a self-audit of the financial documents the auditor examines.

Keep in mind that there is now a seven-year need for auditor partner rotation, along with a two-year time-out period. This will be changed to rotate within seven years at predetermined intervals, with a time-out period to be determined subsequently. Put otherwise, a higher degree of audit task independence will be achieved by a more regular rotation of audit partners. Nonetheless, a client business may choose to appoint a retired audit firm partner as management under current CPA law. The retired auditor must wait a full year to assume a managerial role in the firm they audited before they may do so.

Currently, the Financial Services Agency is in charge of JICPA and auditor oversight. A new CPA and Auditing Oversight Board must be formed in accordance with the modified CPA Law in order to strengthen CPA oversight. Ten members of the Board will be chosen by the Prime Minister and approved by the Diet. The US Security Exchange Commission commissioners, who are directly chosen by the US President, are reminiscent of this nomination process. The amended law mandates that JICPA conduct quality control reviews of auditors.

The existing three-stage CPA test procedure will be simplified to a single step with the effective date of January 2006 according to the modified CPA Law. This will be followed by two years of practical training and other forms of instruction. The purpose of this clause is to significantly expand the number of CPAs, since the current number is insufficient to handle the increasingly complex accounting activities of major enterprises. Comparably, there were around 330,000 CPAs in the United States as of March 31, 2003, compared to 13,721 in the United Kingdom. At the moment, each partner in an audit company has joint and unlimited responsibility for all obligations. According to the amended CPA Law, additional partners are only accountable to the extent of their equity stake in the audit company in the event of misconduct or carelessness; only the auditors who actually conducted audits would be held jointly responsible. This is a clear defensive strategy against the growing number of investor lawsuits against CPAs.

System of accounting and disclosure

Like other economic institutions, a nation's accounting system is a creation of its past. Up until recently, the German model served as the foundation for the Japanese accounting system, which prioritized creditor protection and conservative value rules based on past expenses. This is an inevitable result of Japan's and Continental Europe's comparatively undeveloped equities market and, on the other hand, highly sophisticated banking systems. Due to the fact that almost all financial transactions were done between partners who were already acquainted via long-term personal, equity, and commercial relationships, this arrangement did not need a high degree of accounting information disclosure. The Anglo-Saxon approach, on the other hand, is a reflection of a long history of stock market capitalism. As such, it prioritizes protecting the interests of numerous anonymous investors by giving them access to accurate and trustworthy information on company performance and forecasts in order to help them make decisions. In order to determine the actual worth of the firm, this model uses market value and consolidated financial statements as the valuation standards. It is evident that there is more transparency.

The triangle system's disclosure mechanism

Three separate laws govern the Japanese accounting system: the Income Tax Law, the Corporate Securities and Exchange Law, and the Commercial Code. One of the primary reasons consolidated accounting was not the norm in Japan until recently was the need placed on joint stock businesses by the Commercial Code to make an annual report on an individual basis. The balance sheet, income statement, business report, and request for profit appropriation or loss disposal must all be included in the annual report, which must be approved at the general meeting of shareholders in accordance with the Commercial Code. Consolidated financial statements, or the balance sheet and income statement, are required to be included in the annual report for major firms as defined by the Commercial Code for accounting years ending in or after April 2004.

According to the Securities and Exchange Law, companies that issue securities are required to submit reports to the Prime Minister on a yearly and semi-annual basis, as well as to the Stock Exchange, where the securities are listed. The aforementioned Commercial Code financial statements, along with any supporting schedules, must be included in the aforementioned reports together with a consolidated balance sheet, income statement, statement of retained profits, cash flows, and any supporting schedules. For the most part, there is compatibility between the financial statements made under the Securities and Exchange Law and the Commercial Code. The Corporate Tax Law establishes the formulas for determining taxable income and mandates that all receipts and outlays be documented in the books of account in order for them to be legally justified.

The most recent accounting "Big Bang" improvements

Accounting standards were created over fifty years by the Ministry of Finance using the Business Accounting Deliberation Council, an outside organization. Ten prominent private sector groups, including JICPA, joined together to launch the Financial Accounting Standards Foundation in 2001 in response to the pressing need for a private, independent entity to create standards. The Accounting Standards Board of Japan was established as a body specifically in charge of establishing accounting standards within the FASF. To be enforceable, they must be examined and authorized by the Financial Services Agency's Business Accounting Council. JICPA further publishes Practical Guidelines. In 1996, Prime Minister Hashimoto announced the Accounting "Big Bang" in an effort to bring the Japanese financial market up to par with the New York and London markets. The 1980s UK experience served as the impetus for this endeavor. Three guiding concepts guided the Japanese reforms: Global: Align legal, accounting, and tax regulations with worldwide norms. Since that time, a number of accounting reforms have been put into place, including the introduction of consolidated financial statements in 1997, the implementation of tax-effect and retirement-benefit accounting in 1998, and the introduction of accounting for financial instruments and market-value accounting for securities in 1999. As a consequence, the International Accounting Standards and the US General Accounting Agreed on Principle are now more closely aligned with Japanese accounting standards. The main changes are listed in detail.

Combined bookkeeping

They became closer to the US Tax Code when the Consolidated Accounting Standards for Tax Purposes went into force in April 2002. Businesses may now deduct losses at their subsidiaries from parent profits, therefore lowering their overall tax obligations. A parent business may no longer utilize its subsidiaries as a means of engaging in widespread accounting fraud under the new structure. By making bogus sales of goods and assets to subsidiaries, the parent company's profits were artificially inflated. The definition of subsidiaries or connected entities that need to be consolidated is a critical component of consolidated accounting. The lone criteria that was previously prescribed equity holdings has been replaced with a new one that calls for the degree of control or influence that a corporation has over others. Companies are unable to conceal losses, non-performing assets, and indebted subsidiaries by removing them from the consolidated assets statement due to this accounting rule. It became necessary to have consolidated cash flow statements.

Accounting for market value

The replacement of acquisition cost accounting with a market value system in April 2000 marked one of the biggest changes to the Anglo-Saxon accounting paradigm. Instead of recording their holdings of securities and marketable assets at cost, firms are now compelled to register them at actual market value. As a result, unrealized gains and losses must now be shown on the balance sheet under shareholders' equity for market securities and on the income statement for trading securities. Due to their exposure to the negative share price volatility, one of the major effects is the increasing unwinding of cross-shareholdings. Due to the weak stock market performance over the majority of the 1990s and early 2000s, a considerable number of businesses, both financial and non-financial, had their profits reduced to a loss when the current price of the shareholdings dropped below the purchase cost.

Accounting for impairment

Beginning with the 2005 fiscal year, businesses will have to report losses on their balance sheets when the market value of fixed assets like land holdings, factories, office buildings, golf courses, etc. falls by 50% below their book value. This is known as impairment accounting. Businesses whose operational earnings or cash flows are predicted to be negative for three straight fiscal years, including the present year, may also use this accounting approach. Given the dropping values of land bought during the bubble era, impairment accounting is projected to have a significant effect on profitability. Businesses have the option to use this accounting technique voluntarily in order to eliminate unrealized losses. Figuring out the true market value of certain assets whose markets aren't well established is one of the biggest challenges facing impairment accounting adoption.

Accounting for retirement benefits

Since its implementation in 2001, this accounting method has required businesses to disclose in their financial statements the future obligations for employee retirement benefits, which include pension payments and retirement allowances. Any remaining amount has to be deducted as operational costs. Market value accounting for the securities and present-value actuarial procedures for the liabilities are to be used in the computation of the net liabilities. Due to the weak stock market, the majority of businesses have not been able to achieve the anticipated return on investment for their pension plans, resulting in significant liabilities. The fact that many otherwise profitable firms had to finance underfunded pension systems caused their performance to decline.

The legal structure and implementation

The FSA's primary responsibilities are to protect investors in securities, depositors, and policyholders of insurance by maintaining the stability of the financial system. The FSA is the primary body in charge of overseeing and regulating banks, insurance providers, and other private sector financial organizations in addition to securities firms. It also has the power to execute laws pertaining to financial institution bankruptcies, including as the Deposit Insurance Law, Securities Exchange Law, and Banking Law. The FSA develops company accounting standards, oversees CPAs and audit firms, and uses surveillance and inspection to make sure that the regulations regulating the securities markets are followed. It also sets up rules for trading in the securities markets. The MOF, Japan's most powerful regulatory and supervisory authority, has a history of soft-pedaling regulations and leniently enforcing them, as shown by the FSA. The Banking Bureau and Securities Bureau of the Ministry once handled the duties of the current FSA. By the end of the 1990s, the public's trust in the MOF had been damaged by careless oversight practices and even collusive relationships with financial scandal-ridden enterprises. The Hokkaido Takushoku Bank became the first bank to fail since World War II as a result of bad debts held by the banks growing to an unmanageable level. Yamaichi Securities was then liquidated following the discovery of its losses in off-book accounts, which were reportedly discovered with at least one MOF official's knowledge. When MOF personnel were involved in yet another spectacular incident in 1998, the Tokyo Prosecutor's Office organized a large raid on MOF facilities, involving 100 detectives, to gather evidence of receiving bribes in the form of extravagant and questionable entertainment provided to MOF officials in charge of bank inspection. A third official committed suicide, and two were detained. Even though the FSA performed many different tasks, as of March 2003, there were only 1,100 employees working for it. As a result, the two bureaus in question were divided. The descriptions on the FSA mostly refer to the MOF data that was transferred to the FSA and is accessible at www.fsa.go.jp/info.

Commission on Securities and Exchange Surveillance

The SESC is an entity formed inside the FSA and is responsible for ensuring compliance with the laws of financial future markets and securities markets. It is the market watchdog that performs tasks most similar to those of the US SEC. The Prime Minister appoints two Commissioners and a Chairperson directly. If laws and regulations are not upheld in letter and spirit, they have little or no significance. Since there are often consequences for breaking the law, such fines or jail time, legal duties are typically more successful than voluntary guidelines or standards of conduct. Even though the Tokyo Stock Exchange is the second biggest stock exchange in the world in terms of market value, only the New York Stock Exchange is larger, its enforcement function pales in contrast to that of the US SEC, which employs 3,000 professionals and administrative personnel. The Tokyo Stock Exchange employs 217 people in total. Calls to strengthen it at the SEC level are becoming more and more prevalent.

CONCLUSION

The study looks at how traditional board forms affect stakeholder interests, organizational performance, and the efficacy of governance. Empirical data on the effects of statutory auditors on investor confidence, financial transparency, and audit quality are covered, along with the difficulties posed by possible conflicts of interest and a lack of independence. The research also looks at new developments and best practices in the governance of companies that have statutory auditors, such as initiatives to improve board accountability, diversity, and openness. It talks about how regulations are being changed to enhance governance frameworks and bring them into compliance with global norms. Examples of these reforms include the adoption of corporate governance rules and guidelines. In summary, by clarifying the roles, dynamics, and consequences of traditional board structures within corporate governance systems, this study advances our knowledge of these structures. The research provides useful information for policymakers, practitioners, and academics attempting to manage the complexity of governance in enterprises with statutory auditors by combining theoretical ideas with empirical data and practical issues.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Priya and S. Hait, "Extraction of metals from high grade waste printed circuit board by conventional and hybrid bioleaching using Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans," *Hydrometallurgy*, 2018.

[2] N. Ngadiman *et al.*, "Panel Board from Coconut Fibre and Pet Bottle," in *E3S Web of Conferences*, 2018.

[3] D. Sibbritt, M. Kaye, J. Millbank, A. Stuhmcke, J. Wardle, and I. Karpin, "How are complementary health professions regulated in Australia? An examination of complementary health professions in the national registration and accreditation scheme," *Complement. Ther. Med.*, 2018.

[4] K. U. Schmitt, M. H. Muser, H. Thueler, and O. Bruegger, "Crash-test dummy and pendulum impact tests of ice hockey boards: Greater displacement does not reduce impact," *Br. J. Sports Med.*, 2018.

[5] M. Y. Mat Zain, M. T. Ali, A. A. Azlan, and A. N. H. Hussin, "Electrical characterization of bambusa vulgaris as a new microwave substrate," *J. Telecommun. Electron. Comput. Eng.*, 2018.

[6] F. M. Bayat, M. Prezioso, B. Chakrabarti, H. Nili, I. Kataeva, and D. Strukov, "Implementation of multilayer perceptron network with highly uniform passive memristive crossbar circuits," *Nat. Commun.*, 2018.

[7] T. Uktveris and V. Jusas, "Development of a modular board for eeg signal acquisition," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 2018.

[8] W. C. Hsu, T. Sugiarto, J. W. Chen, and Y. J. Lin, "The design and application of simplified insole-based prototypes with plantar pressure measurement for fast screening of flat-foot," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 2018.

[9] M. S. Zuraimi *et al.*, "Performance of sorption- and photocatalytic oxidation-based indoor passive panel technologies," *Build. Environ.*, 2018.

[10] A. Xavereyno, "Comparative Analysis of VoIP Server Performance on Single Board Computers and Conventional CPUs," *J. Jartel J. Jar. Telekomun.*, 2018.

[11] M. K. Hassan, F. Miglietta, A. Paltrinieri, and J. Floreani, "The effects of Shariah board composition on Islamic equity indices' performance," *Bus. Ethics*, 2018.

[12] F. S. Cuesta, I. A. Faniayeu, V. S. Asadchy, and S. A. Tretyakov, "Planar Broadband Huygens' Metasurfaces for Wave Manipulations," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, 2018.