LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. S5(2025)

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS IN DECISION-MAKING

Dr.R.Thanigaiyarasu[1], Dr. Madhumathi Maduri[2], Dr Suman Roy Barman[3], Dr. Bhautik Alpeshkumar Patel[4], Ashok J[5], Rajesh Deb Barman[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Faculty of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science and Technology, Vadapalani Campus, Chennai.
[2]Assistant Professor, Law, KLEF, Guntur, Guntur, AP
[3]PGT, Commerce, Kirit Bikram Institution, Gomati, Udaipur, Tripura
[4] Assistant Professor, School of Commerce, Birsa Munda Tribal University, Rajpipla
[5]Professor, CHRIST University
[6]Assistant Professor, Commerce, Bodoland University, Kokrajhar, Kokrajhar, Assam

Thanigai110490@gmail.com[1]
Thanigar@srmist.edu.in[1]
madhumathimadhuri@kluniversity.in[2]
roybarmansuman2020@gmail.com[3]
bhautik29patel@gmail.com[4]
ashokmgmt@gmail.com[5]
rajesh.barman19@gmail.com[6]

Abstract: Corporate governance and strategic risk management have emerged as central pillars in ensuring resilience, accountability, and long-term sustainability of organizations in dynamic environments. This study explores the empirical relationship between board effectiveness and the quality of decision-making in contexts characterized by strategic risk. The research employs a mixed-method design integrating quantitative analysis of firm-level governance and performance data with qualitative insights from directors and executives across financial services, manufacturing, and technology industries. Data were drawn from 120 publicly listed companies operating in India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom during the period 2018 to 2023, complemented by survey responses and interviews with 45 board members and senior executives. The findings reveal that board independence, diversity in expertise, and the presence of formal risk committees have a significant positive effect on decision quality and timeliness when organizations are faced with complex risks. Firms with boards that actively engage in structured risk oversight and strategic monitoring achieved higher levels of resilience and reported stronger performance on risk-adjusted indicators compared to their peers. The results underscore the importance of moving beyond compliance-based governance toward a model in which boards function as active strategic partners. This study contributes to governance scholarship by offering evidence of how effective boards shape risk-related decision outcomes and provides actionable recommendations for policymakers, regulators, and corporate leaders.

Keywords: Corporate governance, Strategic risk management, Board effectiveness, Decision-making, Organizational resilience

I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance has become a critical mechanism for promoting transparency, accountability, and ethical practices within modern organizations. It provides the framework through which firms are directed and controlled while aligning managerial decision-making with the interests of stakeholders such as shareholders, employees, customers, and regulatory authorities. Over the last two decades, global corporate scandals and financial crises have emphasized the importance of effective governance systems that are capable of monitoring managerial actions and mitigating opportunistic behaviour. However, corporate governance is not limited to compliance or formal structures. It is increasingly seen as a strategic tool that enhances organizational resilience in uncertain environments. In parallel, strategic risk management has grown in significance as organizations face an unprecedented range of risks.

These risks include financial volatility, rapid technological advancement, climate change, regulatory changes, and geopolitical instability. Unlike operational risks that can be managed with internal controls, strategic risks are highly uncertain, external in origin, and capable of undermining an organization's long-term survival. Firms that successfully integrate risk management into their governance systems are better positioned to anticipate disruptions, respond effectively, and sustain competitive advantage. In this context, boards of directors play a decisive role because they occupy the highest decision-making position and are entrusted with safeguarding organizational continuity. Board effectiveness determines whether governance frameworks are translated into practical mechanisms for managing risks. An effective board does more than monitor management; it actively engages in shaping strategy and aligning decisions with the firm's risk appetite. Board independence, diversity, financial expertise, and the presence of specialized committees are widely acknowledged as drivers of effective oversight. Independent directors are expected to provide objective perspectives, while diversity in terms of gender, professional background, and international experience enriches the decision-making process. The establishment of audit and risk committees ensures focused attention on financial stability and risk exposure.

Despite this recognition, the empirical evidence on the actual impact of board structures on strategic risk decision-making remains fragmented. The growing complexity of business environments further highlights the necessity for boards to shift from a compliance orientation to a strategic orientation. In volatile and uncertain contexts, decision-making requires a balance between prudence and innovation. Boards that fail to recognize emerging risks such as cybersecurity threats, environmental challenges, or reputational issues may expose their organizations to significant losses. Conversely, boards that actively integrate strategic risk management into their deliberations can create sustainable value and strengthen stakeholder confidence. This study seeks to empirically investigate the relationship between board effectiveness and decision-making in the context of strategic risk. The research adopts a mixed-method approach that combines quantitative analysis of governance data with qualitative insights from directors and executives. By examining listed firms in India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom, the study captures diverse institutional and cultural contexts. The focus is placed on how board composition, independence, and expertise shape the quality and timeliness of strategic decisions under risk conditions. The contribution of this study is twofold. First, it extends governance literature by empirically establishing the link between board effectiveness and strategic risk management, an area where limited research has been conducted. Second, it provides practical recommendations for policymakers, regulators, and corporate leaders on how to strengthen governance frameworks to ensure resilience in volatile environments. In doing so, the study highlights that effective governance is not only about compliance with codes but about the capacity of boards to act as strategic partners in navigating uncertainty.

II. RELEATED WORKS

The literature on corporate governance and strategic risk management has evolved significantly over the past two decades as scholars and practitioners have recognized the interdependence between governance structures and organizational resilience. Corporate governance was initially conceptualized primarily as a mechanism to reduce agency costs by ensuring that managers act in the best interests of shareholders. However, more recent research has emphasized its broader role in fostering transparency, accountability, and long-term value creation. Strategic risk management has similarly expanded from being viewed as a compliance requirement to a central component of corporate strategy. The intersection of these two domains has generated a rich body of literature that highlights the critical role of boards of directors in shaping organizational responses to complex and uncertain risk environments.

Early research focused on the link between board composition and firm performance. Jensen and Meckling [1] argued that effective monitoring by independent directors reduces agency conflicts and enhances decision quality. Subsequent empirical studies confirmed that higher board independence is associated with improved oversight of risk management practices. However, Dalton et al. [2] suggested that independence alone is insufficient and must be complemented by board expertise and diversity to enhance strategic decision-making. This insight laid the foundation for a more nuanced understanding of board effectiveness that considers both structural and behavioural dimensions. Scholars have increasingly emphasized the importance of risk committees as a specialized governance mechanism. Spira and Page [3] observed that the establishment of dedicated risk committees enhances board capacity to engage with complex risk issues beyond financial reporting. Similarly, Subramaniam et al. [4] found that firms with formal risk committees are better equipped to integrate enterprise risk management (ERM) into corporate strategy. These studies highlight that risk oversight requires focused attention rather than being subsumed within the responsibilities of audit committees. The literature on diversity in governance has also expanded. Carter et al. [5] demonstrated that gender and ethnic diversity contribute to more comprehensive deliberations and reduce groupthink in decision-making. Adams and Ferreira [6] provided evidence that female directors are more likely to demand accountability and raise critical questions related to risk exposure. This finding is reinforced by Nielsen and Huse [7], who concluded that diverse boards are more innovative and better prepared to manage strategic risks in dynamic environments. Such studies emphasize the importance of inclusivity not only for ethical reasons but also for strengthening organizational resilience.

Another important stream of research has examined the integration of governance and ERM frameworks. Kaplan and Mikes [8] proposed a typology of risks that distinguishes between preventable, strategy-related, and external risks, arguing that boards play a crucial role in differentiating between these categories and aligning responses accordingly. Beasley et al. [9] showed that firms with strong ERM practices experience lower volatility and improved risk-adjusted performance. Their findings indicate that governance structures are most effective when they encourage proactive engagement with risks rather than reactive compliance. The role of institutional context has also been explored extensively. Aguilera and Jackson [10] emphasized that governance practices are shaped by national legal systems, cultural norms, and market structures. Comparative studies across Europe and Asia have shown that differences in shareholder rights, regulatory regimes, and ownership concentration significantly influence how boards approach risk oversight. For example, Anderson and Reeb [11] observed that family-owned firms often rely on informal governance mechanisms, which may enhance agility but also increase exposure to unmonitored risks. This underscores the importance of considering contextual variables when assessing board effectiveness. Empirical research has also highlighted the limitations of formal governance mechanisms. Harmaline and Weisbach [12] argued that structural features such as board size and independence do not automatically guarantee effective oversight. Instead, board effectiveness depends on behavioural factors such as trust, communication, and power dynamics between directors and executives. These insights have led scholars to advocate for a more holistic approach to governance research that integrates structural, cultural, and behavioural dimensions.

The growing complexity of global risks as further shaped governance literature. Kolbjørnsrud et al. [13] emphasized that boards must address emerging risks such as cybersecurity, environmental sustainability, and geopolitical instability. Studies show that many boards lack sufficient expertise in these areas, which creates significant vulnerabilities. For example, Ernst and Young's global governance survey reported that less than half of directors feel confident in their ability to oversee technological risks effectively. This gap highlights the urgent need for continuous training and recruitment strategies to equip boards with the necessary skills. More recently, scholars have examined the relationship between board effectiveness and organizational resilience. Hillman and Dalziel [14] argued that boards provide not only monitoring functions but also critical resources such as legitimacy, expertise, and networks that enable firms to adapt to uncertainty. Their resource dependence perspective suggests that effective boards contribute directly to resilience by mobilizing external resources and stakeholder support. This perspective has been echoed by Zahra and Pearce [15], who emphasized that boards play a strategic role in shaping vision, guiding innovation, and ensuring long-term competitiveness. Taken together, the literature demonstrates that corporate governance and strategic risk management are deeply interconnected. Effective boards enhance resilience by integrating risk oversight into strategic decision-making, leveraging diversity, and establishing specialized committees. However, significant gaps remain in understanding how these mechanisms operate in practice across different institutional contexts. The present study contributes to this gap by empirically assessing how variations in board independence, diversity, and committee structures influence decision-making outcomes in firms across India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-method research design that integrates quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of board effectiveness in strategic risk management. The quantitative part involves statistical analysis of governance and financial performance data from listed firms, while the qualitative part involves structured surveys and interviews with directors and executives. This dual approach enables both measurable outcomes and experiential insights to be considered, ensuring methodological rigor and triangulation of evidence [16].

3.2 Study Sample and Scope

The study focuses on 120 publicly listed firms across three countries: India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom. These firms were selected based on their continuous listing for at least five years, the availability of annual reports and governance disclosures, and their engagement in sectors exposed to high levels of strategic risk. The three countries were chosen to capture variations in institutional settings, legal frameworks, and cultural contexts [17].

Table 1: Characteristics of Study Firms

Region	Number of Firms	Dominant Sectors	Average Board Size	Governance Disclosure Level	Average Market Cap (USD)
India	40	Financial Services, IT	9	High	2.1B
Singapore	35	Manufacturing, Technology	10	Medium	1.8B
UK	45	Diversified Industries	11	High	3.5B

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection involved two main components.

1. **Quantitative Data**
   Governance-related variables were obtained from annual reports and corporate governance disclosures. These included board size, independence ratio, gender

diversity, director expertise, and the existence of audit and risk committees. Performance indicators such as return on assets (ROA), Tobin's Q, and risk-adjusted returns were collected from financial databases [18].

2. **Qualitative Data**
   Surveys and semi-structured interviews were conducted with 45 directors and executives from the sampled firms. The survey included Likert-scale items evaluating perceptions of board effectiveness, timeliness of decisions, and integration of risk management with strategy. Interviews provided deeper insights into boardroom dynamics, challenges, and practices related to strategic risk oversight [19].

3.4 Analytical Approach

Quantitative analysis was conducted using regression models to test relationships between governance characteristics and decision-making outcomes. Dependent variables included decision timeliness, decision comprehensiveness, and resilience scores measured by risk-adjusted performance indicators. Independent variables included board independence, diversity, expertise, and the presence of risk committees. Control variables included firm size, industry type, and ownership concentration [20].

Qualitative data were analysed using thematic coding. Responses were categorized into themes such as communication quality, expertise gaps, and boardroom culture. The integration of findings was achieved through triangulation, ensuring that statistical results were supported or challenged by insights from directors and executives [21].

3.5 Data Validation and Reliability

To ensure reliability and validity, several measures were undertaken:

- Cross-verification of quantitative data with multiple databases and company reports.
- Triangulation of survey responses with interview narratives.
- Pilot testing of the survey instrument with five directors before full administration.
- Use of inter-coder reliability in qualitative coding to minimize bias [22].

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained before data collection. Participation was voluntary and respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. Firms were anonymized in reporting results to protect sensitive information. Data were stored securely and used exclusively for academic purposes [23].

3.7 Limitations

The study acknowledges certain limitations. The sample is limited to three countries and may not fully represent global governance practices. Self-reported survey data may involve response bias. Furthermore, while quantitative measures capture structural characteristics, behavioural aspects of board effectiveness may not be fully observable. These limitations are addressed by integrating multiple data sources and emphasizing triangulation.

IV. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Board Independence and Decision-Making Quality

The analysis shows that board independence is strongly associated with improved decision quality. Firms with more than 50 percent independent directors exhibited higher resilience scores and faster decision-making in response to external shocks. Regression analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between independence ratio and timeliness of decisions ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$). This indicates that independent boards are better positioned to provide objective oversight and challenge managerial assumptions, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of strategic risk management.

Figure 1: Deloitte Governance Framework [24]

Table 2: Relationship between Board Independence and Decision Outcomes

Independence Ratio	Average Timeliness Score	Risk-Adjusted Return (%)
< 30%	2.8	6.3
30–50%	3.4	8.1
> 50%	4.1	10.7

4.2 Diversity and Board Expertise

Board diversity was found to significantly influence the comprehensiveness of strategic decisions. Firms with higher gender and skill diversity reported broader perspectives during risk deliberations and stronger adaptability to dynamic market conditions. Boards with at least 30 percent female representation and a mix of expertise in finance, law, and technology scored higher on adaptability indices compared to less diverse boards.

4.3 Risk Committees and Formalized Frameworks

The presence of specialized risk committees had a measurable effect on the integration of risk considerations into strategic planning. Firms with risk committees outperformed those without by an average of 12 percent in risk-adjusted returns. Moreover, directors in these firms reported greater confidence in their ability to anticipate and mitigate risks. This finding supports prior literature emphasizing the importance of formal governance structures dedicated to risk oversight.

Figure 2: Governance Health Check [25]

Table 3: Performance Comparison of Firms with and without Risk Committees

Category	Firms with Risk Committees	Firms without Risk Committees
Avg. Risk-Adjusted Return (%)	11.2	9.1
Decision Timeliness Score	4.0	3.2
Integration with Strategy	High	Moderate

4.4 Regional Comparison of Governance Practices

Regional differences were observed in the effectiveness of governance practices. UK firms demonstrated the highest levels of strategic integration of risk management, while Indian firms displayed strong compliance with governance codes but weaker board proactivity. Singaporean firms struck a balance between governance flexibility and adaptability.

4.5 Perceptions of Directors and Executives

Survey and interview responses revealed that directors value open communication, continuous training, and balanced power dynamics as key enablers of board effectiveness. A recurring concern was the lack of expertise in emerging risks such as cybersecurity, ESG compliance, and geopolitical challenges. Directors emphasized that effective governance requires not only structural independence but also a culture of active engagement and professional development.

Table 4: Survey Highlights on Perceived Board Effectiveness

Dimension	High Importance (%)	Moderate Importance (%)	Low Importance (%)
Independence	82	14	4
Diversity	76	18	6
Open Communication	89	9	2
Continuous Training	84	13	3

4.6 Discussion of Key Findings

The findings highlight the strong connection between board structures and the effectiveness of strategic risk management. Independent and diverse boards demonstrated superior decision-making outcomes, particularly under volatile market conditions. The presence of risk committees provided focused oversight, ensuring that risk considerations were systematically integrated into strategic deliberations. However, the study also revealed that structural features alone do not guarantee effectiveness. Boardroom culture, expertise in emerging risks, and continuous training were repeatedly emphasized as critical factors by directors and executives. Regional comparisons further underline the importance of contextual factors, as institutional frameworks influence how governance practices are implemented. Taken together, these results demonstrate that effective boards are not merely compliant with governance codes but act as strategic partners that anticipate, evaluate, and respond to risks. This supports the argument that governance must evolve from a compliance-driven model to a strategic enabler of resilience.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study sought to explore the empirical relationship between corporate governance and strategic risk management, with particular emphasis on how board effectiveness shapes the quality of decision-making. Drawing on data from listed firms in India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom, and combining quantitative performance indicators with qualitative insights from directors and executives, the findings provide strong evidence that effective boards are critical determinants of resilience and sustainability in uncertain environments. The analysis revealed that board independence contributes significantly to decision timeliness and quality. Independent directors bring impartiality and objective oversight that allows organizations to respond quickly to external shocks. This finding reinforces agency theory by showing that independence helps mitigate managerial opportunism while enhancing strategic oversight. However, independence alone was not sufficient. Boards that lacked diversity or specialized knowledge often struggled to recognize and manage emerging risks. This indicates that independence must be complemented by expertise and inclusivity to achieve comprehensive governance outcomes. Diversity emerged as another key factor influencing decision adaptability. Boards with gender diversity and varied professional backgrounds demonstrated broader perspectives and a greater ability to evaluate risks holistically. This aligns with stewardship theory, which suggests that diverse boards do not merely monitor management but actively contribute knowledge, creativity, and innovation to the decision-making process. Diversity was not only beneficial for ethical and representational reasons but also had tangible performance benefits by reducing groupthink and enhancing resilience in the face of complexity. The findings also underscored the importance of specialized governance mechanisms such as risk committees. Firms with formalized risk committees consistently outperformed those without in terms of risk-adjusted returns and integration of risk scenarios into strategic planning. Risk committees provided a structured platform for deliberating on risk issues, ensuring that such considerations were not overshadowed by financial or operational concerns. This confirms the need for boards to institutionalize risk oversight through dedicated structures rather than relying on dispersed or informal mechanisms.

Regional comparisons added another layer of insight by showing that institutional context influences how governance practices are implemented. UK firms demonstrated the most integrated approach to strategic risk management, Indian firms displayed stronger compliance orientation but weaker proactivity, while Singaporean firms balanced governance flexibility with adaptability. These differences highlight that board effectiveness is not only shaped by structural features but also by regulatory environments, cultural norms, and market practices. Future reforms in governance should therefore account for contextual variation rather than adopting a one-size-fits-all model. Another critical theme emerging from the study was the role of boardroom culture and continuous development. Directors consistently emphasized that effective governance depends on open communication, balanced power dynamics, and ongoing training in emerging risk areas such as cybersecurity, environmental sustainability, and geopolitical volatility. Structural reforms, such as increasing independence or diversity, may be ineffective unless they are supported by a culture of constructive dialogue and professional development. Boards must therefore invest in training programs, scenario planning exercises, and external advisory inputs to build risk awareness and strategic foresight.

The broader implication of this study that corporate governance should not be narrowly understood as compliance with codes or regulations. While compliance is essential, governance must be viewed as a strategic enabler that allows organizations to anticipate and respond to risks. Effective boards act not only as monitors but also as strategic partners who guide firms through uncertainty and position them for long-term success. This shift from compliance to strategy is crucial in a business landscape characterized by volatility, technological disruption, and global interdependence. The study contributes to governance scholarship by providing empirical evidence of how board characteristics such as independence, diversity, and the presence of risk committees directly affect decision-making outcomes. It also highlights the importance of contextual factors and behavioural dimensions that extend beyond formal structures. Policymakers and regulators can draw from these insights to design governance codes that encourage substance rather than form, emphasizing effectiveness over box-ticking.

For practitioners, the findings underscore the need to strengthen board capacity through diversity, training, and specialized risk oversight structures. In conclusion, the evidence demonstrates that effective boards play a decisive role in ensuring that corporate governance and strategic risk management operate in tandem. By combining structural independence, diverse expertise, formalized risk mechanisms, and a culture of engagement, boards can significantly enhance organizational resilience. As risks become more complex and interconnected, the role of boards will only become more pivotal. Organizations that recognize and invest in board effectiveness are more likely to thrive in uncertain environments and deliver sustainable value to stakeholders.

VI. FUTURE WORK

Future research on corporate governance and strategic risk management should build upon the findings of this study by expanding the scope across different regions and industries, incorporating longitudinal data, and exploring emerging dimensions of board effectiveness. While this study provided valuable insights from firms in India, Singapore, and the United Kingdom, future work should examine governance practices in regions such as North America, Africa, and Latin America to capture the influence of diverse institutional frameworks and socio-economic environments. Comparative cross-country analysis could also shed light on how cultural norms and legal systems shape board responses to strategic risk. Longitudinal studies that track governance practices and risk outcomes over extended time periods would offer a deeper understanding of causality and reveal how boards evolve in response to crises such as pandemics, technological disruptions, and climate-related challenges. Another promising direction is to investigate the role of digital transformation in governance, particularly how technologies such as artificial intelligence, blockchain, and big data analytics can support boards in risk detection, scenario analysis, and decision-making. Similarly, environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations are becoming central to board agendas, and future work should examine how ESG-focused governance frameworks enhance resilience and stakeholder trust. The behavioural dimensions of board effectiveness, including group dynamics, trust, and leadership styles, also warrant more attention as structural features alone cannot fully explain decision outcomes. Integrating psychological and sociological perspectives into governance research may provide a richer understanding of how boardroom culture influences risk oversight. Finally, experimental and simulation-based studies that test board responses to hypothetical risk scenarios could complement empirical analyses and provide actionable insights for practice. Collectively, these avenues of inquiry can advance both theory and practice by positioning governance as a proactive and strategic driver of organizational resilience.

REFERENCES

[1] M. C. Jensen and W. H. Meckling, “Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs and ownership structure,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 305–360, 1976.
[2] D. R. Dalton, C. M. Daily, A. E. Ellstrand, and J. L. Johnson, “Meta-analytic reviews of board composition, leadership structure, and financial performance,” *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 269–290, 1998.
[3] L. F. Spira and M. Page, “Risk management: The reinvention of internal control and the changing role of internal audit,” *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 640–661, 2003.
[4] N. Subramaniam, J. McManus, and J. Zhang, “Corporate governance, firm characteristics and risk management committee formation in Australian companies,” *Managerial Auditing Journal*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 316–339, 2009.

[5] D. A. Carter, B. J. Simkins, and W. G. Simpson, "Corporate governance, board diversity, and firm value," *Financial Review*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 33–53, 2003.
[6] R. B. Adams and D. Ferreira, "Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance," *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 94, no. 2, pp. 291–309, 2009.
[7] S. Nielsen and M. Huse, "Women directors' contribution to board decision-making and strategic involvement: The role of equality perception," *European Management Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 16–29, 2010.
[8] R. S. Kaplan and A. Mikes, "Managing risks: A new framework," *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 48–60, 2012.
[9] M. S. Beasley, B. C. Branson, and B. V. Hancock, *Developing Key Risk Indicators to Strengthen Enterprise Risk Management*. Durham, NC: COSO, 2010.
[10] R. Aguilera and G. Jackson, "Comparative and international corporate governance," *Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 485–556, 2010.
[11] R. C. Anderson and D. M. Reeb, "Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500," *Journal of Finance*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 1301–1328, 2003.
[12] B. E. Harmaline and M. S. Weisbach, "Boards of directors as an endogenously determined institution: A survey of the economic literature," *Economic Policy Review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 7–26, 2003.
[13] V. Kolbjørnsrud, R. Amico, and R. Thomas, *Boards of the Future*. Oslo: Accenture Institute for High Performance, 2016.
[14] A. J. Hillman and T. Dalziel, "Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 383–396, 2003.
[15] S. A. Zahra and J. A. Pearce, "Boards of directors and corporate financial performance: A review and integrative model," *Journal of Management*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 291–334, 1989.
[16] D. Northcott and R. Doolin, "Reviewing the literature on governance and risk management," *Financial Accountability & Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 3–26, 2010.
[17] OECD, *G20/OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*, Paris: OECD Publishing, 2015.
[18] IFC, *Corporate Governance Progression Matrix for State-Owned Enterprises*, Washington DC: International Finance Corporation, 2021.
[19] A. Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles, Policies, and Practices*, 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2019.
[20] K. A. Eisenhardt, "Agency theory: An assessment and review," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 57–74, 1989.
[21] M. Useem, *The Inner Circle: Large Corporations and the Rise of Business Political Activity in the U.S. and U.K.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1984.
[22] S. Claessens and B. Yurtoglu, "Corporate governance in emerging markets: A survey," *Emerging Markets Review*, vol. 15, pp. 1–33, 2013.
[23] D. C. Hambrick, M. A. Werder, and E. Zajac, "New directions in corporate governance research," *Organization Science*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 381–385, 2005.
[24] B. Tricker, *Corporate Governance: Principles and Practices*. London: Routledge, 2012.
[25] World Economic Forum, *Global Risk Report 2023*, Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2023.