

THE ROLE OF INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL IN MEDIATING THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND CORPORATE
PERFORMANCE

SOHAIL SAEED

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

International Business School
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

APRIL 2016

To my beloved parents, wife and lovely daughters

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise is to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds, and may His Blessings and Peace be upon our Prophet Muhammad. I thank Him for the blessings and for honouring me with His guidance in order to complete this thesis.

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my supervisors Dr. Siti Zaleha Abdul Rasid and Dr. Rohaida Basiruddin, for their guidance, knowledge, patience, time and support throughout every stage of my PhD and the development of this thesis.

I thank Mr. Imtiaz Haider Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission Pakistan, Dr. Abdul Majid Makki chairman, department of Commerce Islamia University Bahawalpur, and my friend Rehman Siddique for their support in completing this thesis.

Last, but not the least, I am thankful to my parents, my parents-in-law and my siblings for their continuous support and encouragement, especially my eldest sister Sumaira Zaka and her husband Zaka Ullah Zia for taking care of our parents in USA during my stay in Malaysia. Very special thanks to my wife Kiran, and my two daughters, Manahil and Hania, for their unconditional love, endless support and patience. Thank you very much for making my life so fulfilled.

ABSTRACT

Corporate performance can be enhanced if corporate governance contributes to the intellectual capabilities (IC) of the firms. Hence, this study examines four empirical analyses to develop a relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance through the mediation of intellectual capital. Firstly, the relationship between corporate governance measures and corporate performance is determined. Secondly, the relationship between corporate governance and intellectual capital (VAICTM) is examined. Thirdly, this study investigates the link between intellectual capital and corporate performance. Finally, the mediation effect of intellectual capital is tested in corporate governance and corporate performance relationship. Based on the data of Karachi stock exchange KSE-100 for eight years from 2005 to 2012 and use of the second-generation multivariate technique, i.e. PLS-SEM by using SmartPLS and SPSS, findings of the first analysis show a significant inverse relationship between corporate governance and the corporate performance. A possible reason is the over emphasis of the advising role of the board of directors, which results in lower corporate performance. Second and third analyses show a positive significant relationship between corporate governance and intellectual capital, and intellectual capital and corporate performance. The fourth analysis provides evidence that intellectual capital fully mediates the relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance. It can be interpreted as corporate governance influences the intellectual capital that in turn influences corporate performance. Overall, the results of this study are well aligned with the resource dependence-stewardship theories that focus on the value created in the firms through advising and coordination between directors and management. The study offers empirical evidence that an organization can use its corporate governance mechanism to enrich the intellectual capital that eventually creates more returns and productivity. The study would be valuable for corporate governors to capitalize intellectual capital resources in order to attain competitiveness, higher productivity and performance.

ABSTRAK

Prestasi korporat boleh dipertingkatkan sekiranya tadbir urus korporat menyumbang kepada keupayaan intelek (IC) firma. Oleh itu, kajian ini mengkaji empat analisis empirikal untuk membangunkan hubungan antara tadbir urus korporat dan prestasi korporat melalui pengantaraan modal intelektual. Pertama, hubungan antara langkah tadbir urus korporat dan prestasi korporat diselidiki. Kedua, hubungan antara tadbir urus korporat dan modal intelek (VAICTM) dikaji. Ketiga, kajian ini melihat hubungan antara modal intelektual dan prestasi korporat. Akhir sekali, kesan pengantaraan modal intelek dalam tadbir urus korporat dan hubungan prestasi korporat diuji. Berdasarkan data bursa saham Karachi KSE-100 untuk tempoh lapan tahun dari 2005 hingga 2012 dan penggunaan teknik multivariat generasi kedua, iaitu PLS-SEM dengan menggunakan SmartPLS dan SPSS, hasil analisis pertama menunjukkan hubungan signifikan yang negatif antara tadbir urus korporat dan prestasi korporat. Penekanan ke atas peranan penasihat lembaga pengarah merupakan sebab yang mungkin mengakibatkan prestasi korporat yang lebih rendah. Analisis kedua dan ketiga menunjukkan hubungan positif yang signifikan antara tadbir urus korporat dan modal intelek, dan modal intelektual dan prestasi korporat. Analisis keempat memberikan bukti bahawa modal intelek merupakan pengantara sepenuhnya antara hubungan tadbir urus korporat dan prestasi korporat. Ini menunjukkan bahawa tadbir urus korporat memberi kesan kepada modal intelektual yang seterusnya memberi kesan kepada prestasi korporat. Secara keseluruhan, hasil kajian ini juga selaras dengan teori *resource dependence-stewardship* yang memberi tumpuan kepada nilai yang diwujudkan di firma melalui penasihat dan penyelarasan antara pengarah dan pengurusan. Kajian ini menawarkan bukti empirikal bahawa sesebuah organisasi boleh menggunakan mekanisme tadbir urus korporat untuk memperkayakan modal intelek untuk mewujudkan lebih banyak pulangan dan akhirnya produktiviti. Kajian ini bermakna kepada gabenor korporat yang berusaha untuk memanfaatkan sumber modal intelektual bagi mencapai daya saing, produktiviti yang lebih tinggi dan prestasi.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xii
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xviii
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xix
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Background of Study	1
	1.2 Problem Statement	4
	1.3 Research Questions	7
	1.4 Objectives of the Study	15
	1.5 Scope of the Study	15
	1.6 Significance of the Study	17
	1.7 Definitions	24
2	LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS	
	DEVELOPMENT	26
	2.1 Introduction	26
	2.2 Definitions of Intellectual Capital	26

2.2.1	Human Capital	31
2.2.2	Structural Capital	32
2.2.3	Relational Capital	33
2.3	Measurement of Intellectual Capital	33
2.3.1	Direct IC Measurement Methods	34
2.3.2	Scorecard Methods	35
2.3.3	Market Capitalization Methods	37
2.3.4	Return on Asset Methods	38
2.3.5	Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC™)	39
2.4	Definitions of Corporate Governance	41
2.4.1	Corporate Governance in Pakistan	44
2.5	Measures of Corporate Governance	48
2.5.1	Board Size	49
2.5.2	Independent Non-Executive Directors	52
2.5.3	Board Meeting	54
2.5.4	Multiple Directorships	56
2.5.5	Female Directors On Board	58
2.5.6	Board of Directors' Expertise	61
2.5.7	Role Duality	63
2.6	Definitions of Corporate Performance	65
2.7	Measures of Corporate Performance	68
2.8	Previous Studies on CG, IC and Corporate Performance	69
2.8.1	Corporate Governance and Corporate Performance	69
2.8.2	Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital	78
2.8.3	Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance	84
2.8.4	Intellectual Capital as a Mediator	91
2.9	Theoretical Framework	96
2.10	Development of Hypotheses	102
2.10.1	CG and Corporate Performance Relationship	103
2.10.2	CG and IC Relationship	104
2.10.3	IC and Corporate Performance Relationship	106
2.10.4	IC Mediates the CG and Corporate Performance Relationship	107

2.11	Synthesis of Literature Review	108
2.12	Summary	110
3	METHODOLOGY	111
3.1	Introduction	111
3.2	Research Design	111
3.3	Population	112
3.3.1	Sample Firms	112
3.3.2	Sample Selection	113
3.3.3	Sources of Data	115
3.4	The Definition and Measurement of Hypothesized Variables	115
3.4.1	Corporate Governance Variables	115
3.4.2	Intellectual Capital Variables	117
3.4.3	Corporate Performance Variables	118
3.5	Model Specifications (PLS-SEM)	120
3.5.1	PLS Path Modeling	121
3.5.2	Reflective V's Formative Measurement Model	123
3.5.3	Mathematical Equations	124
3.5.3.1	Measurement Model Equations	124
3.5.3.2	Structural Model Equations	126
3.5.3.3	Mediating Model Equation	127
3.6	Data Analysis	127
3.6.1	Descriptive Statistics	127
3.6.2	Partial Least Square Analysis	128
3.6.2.1	Measurement Model Analysis	128
3.6.2.2	Reliability and Validity Assessment	128
3.6.2.3	Structural Model Analysis	130
3.6.3	Mediation Analysis	130
3.7	Summary	132
4	FINDINGS	132
4.1	Introduction	132
4.2	Sample Size	132

4.3	Descriptive Statistics Analysis	133
4.4	Partial Least Square Analysis	136
4.4.1	First Analysis: Corporate Governance and Corporate Performance	136
4.4.1.1	Measurement Model Analysis	136
4.4.1.2	Structural Model Analysis	141
4.4.2	Second Analysis: Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital	148
4.4.2.1	Measurement Model Analysis	148
4.4.2.2	Structural Model Analysis	153
4.4.3	Third Analysis: Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance	161
4.4.3.1	Measurement Model Analysis	161
4.4.3.2	Structural Model Analysis	164
4.4.4	Fourth Analysis: Corporate Governance, Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance	170
4.4.4.1	Measurement Model Analysis	170
4.4.4.2	Structural Model Analysis	175
4.5	Mediation Analysis	181
4.5.1	Measurement of Mediation	183
4.6	Testing of Hypotheses	187
4.7	Summary	188
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	189
5.1	Introduction	189
5.2	Recapitulation of the Study	189
5.3	Discussion of Findings	192
5.3.1	Relationship between Corporate Governance and Corporate Performance	192
5.3.2	Relationship between Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital	195
5.3.3	Relationship between Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance	198

5.3.4	Impact of IC (Mediator) on CG and Corporate Performance Relationship	200
5.4	Contribution and Implication of the Study	202
5.4.1	Theoretical Implication	202
5.4.2	Practical Implications	205
5.4.3	Methodological Implication	206
5.5	Limitations of the Study	207
5.6	Recommendations for the Future Research	208
5.7	Conclusion	208
	REFERENCES	210
	Appendices A-C	238-252

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Summary of the study	20
2.1	Intellectual capital definitions	28
2.2	Definitions of value creating IC	30
2.3:	Elements of IC	31
2.4	Direct measurement methods	35
2.5	Scorecard methods	36
2.6	Market capitalization method	37
2.7	Return on assets methods	38
2.8	Reasons in favour of VAIC TM methodology	39
2.9	Comparison of 2002 and 2012 codes	46
2.10	Summary of studies between CG and corporate performance	75
2.11	Summary of studies between CG and intellectual capital	82
2.12	Summary of studies between IC and corporate performance	89
2.13	Summary of IC studies related to mediation	94
2.14	Hypotheses of study	108
3.1	Sample selection process	114
3.2	Summary of variables in the study	119
3.3	Criteria for using PLS-SEM	122
3.4	Decision criteria for formative indicators	123
4.1	Required Sample Size	133
4.2	Indicators Validity Test	137
4.3	Indicators Validity Test	137
4.4	Indicators Validity Test	138
4.5	Collinearity Test	140
4.6	Significance of path coefficient	146

4.7	Indicators Validity Test	149
4.8	Indicators Validity Test	150
4.9	Indicators Validity Test	150
4.10	Collinearity Test	153
4.11	Significance of Path Coefficient	158
4.12	Indicators Validity Test	161
4.13	Indicators Validity Test	162
4.14	Indicators Validity Test	162
4.15	Collinearity Test	164
4.16	Significance of Path Coefficients	168
4.17	Indicators Validity Test	170
4.18	Indicators Validity Test	171
4.19	Indicators Validity Test	172
4.20	Collinearity Test	174
4.21	Significance of Path Coefficients	180
4.22	Sobel test results of measuring mediation	183
4.23	Measurement of mediation through bootstrapping	185
4.24	Variance Accounted For (before and after)	186
4.25	Results of Hypotheses	188

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Domains of business performance	66
2.2	Conceptual framework of the study.	101
2.3	Full mediation	102
3.1	Simple path model	122
4.1	Structural model for 2012	141
4.2	Structural model for 2011	142
4.3	Structural model for 2010	142
4.4	Structural model for 2009	143
4.5	Structural model for 2008	143
4.6	Structural model for 2007	144
4.7	Structural model for 2006	144
4.8	Structural model for 2005	145
4.9	Structural model for pooled data	145
4.10	CG and corporate performance relationship	148
4.11	Structural model for 2012	154
4.12	Structural model for 2011	154
4.13	Structural model for 2010	155
4.14	Structural model for 2009	155
4.15	Structural model for 2008	156
4.16	Structural model for 2007	156
4.17	Structural model for 2006	157
4.18	Structural model for 2005	157
4.19	Structural model for pooled data set	158
4.20	CG and intellectual capital relationship	160
4.21	Structural model for 2012	165

4.22	Structural model for 2011	165
4.23	Structural model for 2010	165
4.24	Structural model for 2009	166
4.25	Structural model for 2008	166
4.26	Structural model for 2007	166
4.27	Structural model for 2006	167
4.28	Structural model for 2005	167
4.29	Structural model for pooled data set	167
4.30	IC and corporate performance relationship	169
4.31	Structural model for 2012	175
4.32	Structural model for 2011	176
4.33	Structural model for 2010	176
4.34	Structural model for 2009	177
4.35	Structural model for 2008	177
4.36	Structural model for 2007	178
4.37	Structural model for 2006	178
4.38	Structural model for 2005	179
4.39	Structural model for pooled data set	179

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ATO	-	Assets Turnover
BOD	-	Board of Directors
BSC	-	Balanced Score Card
B-DUL	-	Role Duality of Board
B-EDU	-	Board of Directors' Education
B-EXP	-	Board of Directors' Experience
B-FEM	-	Female Directors on Board
B-IDOD	-	Executive Directors' Outside Directorships
B-NED	-	Independent Non-Executive Directors
B-SIZ	-	Board Size
CG	-	Corporate Governance
CE	-	Capital Employed
CEE	-	Capital Employed Efficiency
CP	-	Corporate Performance
DV	-	Dependent Variable
EU	-	European Union
EVA	-	Economic Value Added
HC	-	Human Capital
HCE	-	Human Capital Efficiency
HRA	-	Human Resource Accounting
IC	-	Intellectual Capital
IV	-	Independent Variable
KSE	-	Karachi Stock Exchange
OLS	-	Ordinary Least Squares
PLS-SEM	-	Partial Least Squares Based Structural Equation Modelling
P VALUE	-	P Value-Statistic

RC	-	Relational Capital
R&D	-	Research and Development
ROA	-	Return on Assets
ROE	-	Return on Equity
SC	-	Structural Capital
SCE	-	Structural Capital Efficiency
SEC	-	Securities Exchange Commission
SECP	-	Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan
S&P	-	Standard and Poor
SPSS	-	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
T-VALUE	-	T-Statistic
VA	-	Value Added
VAIC TM	-	Value Added Intellectual Coefficient

LIST OF SYMBOLS

%	-	Percentage
α	-	Level of significance
β	-	Path co-efficient between two latent variables
γ	-	Path co-efficient between indicator and latent variable
ζ	-	Random disturbance term
η	-	Latent endogenous variable
ξ	-	Latent exogenous variable
R^2	-	Coefficient of determination
f^2	-	Effect size
a	-	Path coefficient between independent variable and mediator
b	-	Path coefficient between dependent variable and mediator
c	-	Path coefficient between independent variable and dependent variable
c'	-	Path coefficient between independent variable and dependent variable after including mediator

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	IC Measurement Models and Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis	238
B	Descriptive statistics	242
C	Outerloading of CG, IC and CP Relationship	247

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Nowadays, businesses around the globe are facing new challenges due to the stiff competitive and rapidly changing environment. This century is the knowledge century and knowledge is deemed the most sustainable source of competitive advantage in the business. This shifting of paradigms from manufacturing to a knowledge economy demands organizations to maximize value from IC resources to succeed in the new world (Roos et al., 2005). The greatest challenge faced by the organizations is the recognition and cultivation of intellectual assets in the new 21st century. Nevertheless, now the significance of intellectual capital of firms to its performance and future viability is broadly recognized and ascertained (Khalique et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2011). In the words of Luthy (1998), intellectual capital is the outstanding source for generating economic wealth. Johnson and Kaplan (1987) argued that IC might be the most significant consideration regarding the performance of a company in the future. Intellectual capital measurement and management have become extremely important in a situation when service sectors are playing a vital role in the growth of economies around the globe and their share in overall GDP is rising rapidly than that of production sector (World Bank, 2006).

Therefore, in order to remain viable in the knowledge century, corporate governance (CG) is a mechanism which is needed to ensure value-added productivity, profitability, corporate success, economic growth, and investors' confidence (OECD, 2004). Corporate governance is a mechanism of rules and regulations, processes and procedures, and practices to direct and control the organizations (The Cadbury Report, 1992). As such, corporate governance is responsible for designing a framework to achieve organizational objectives so it

covers almost every sphere of organizational activities, from planning and controlling to performance measurement and corporate disclosure.

The recent discussion and research on corporate governance are based upon the principles and guidelines given in The Cadbury report 1992, UK; the Principles of Corporate Governance (OECD, 2004) and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (Sarbanes-Oxley Act, 2002) of USA. The Cadbury and OECD reports provide general principles of corporate governance around which the firms can assure to develop good governance structures to achieve their goals. Sarbanes-Oxley Act gives the US federal government, the authority to legislate some principles of corporate governance in the wake of corporate scandals (Enron and WorldCom) in 2001 and 2002, respectively. The financial crisis in 2008 also increased the interest of stakeholders in the corporate governance practices in the modern organizations. The key players involved in corporate governance are a board of directors, management and shareholders; though the external players like customers, creditors, government agencies and community as a whole also influence corporate governance mechanism (Solomon, 2007). There is a common notion that good corporate governance practices enhance the corporate performance in the organizations (Low *et al.*, 2015; Yang and Zhao, 2014; Liu *et al.*, 2015).

Similarly, higher corporate performance is treated as the function of good corporate governance. However, the exact definition of corporate performance demonstrates to be greatly abstract in spite of recurrent usage by many groups and researchers. It is because corporate performance is linked with a variety of aspects of the overall well-being of the organization, covering through revenue to financial returns to a market value of the firm. In the last century, the relationship between corporate governance and firm performance has been examined through conventional evaluation (accounting) systems when the world economy was transformed from the agriculture era to manufacturing and factors of production were mostly physical and financial like land and labour (Firer and Williams, 2003). Donaldson and Preston (1995) claimed that since Adam Smith, the central view of the firm conceives corporate performance to be the financial returns from the utilization of tangible assets. That is why financial measures, i.e. return on total assets, return on equity

and productivity are commonly used in empirical studies of CG and firm performance.

However, the recent theoretical views, particularly resource-based theory (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003) considers a firm as a collection of both tangible and intangible resources from the environment and provide another aspect of corporate performance. The proponents of this theory propose that corporate performance is a function of the efficient use of both physical and intangibles assets of the firm (Zahn *et al.*, 2004). Moreover, value addition (VA), described as the wealth created or added by the organization through the use of indispensable productive resources, is assumed as the suitable measure of theorizing corporate performance in the new knowledge economy (Sveiby, 1997). It is important to recall that the economic value of intangible assets of a company is called Intellectual Capital (OECD, 1999). It means that VA is the result of both, physical and financial resources, and intellectual capital resources. IC resources involve human, structural and relational capital, which are important to create value and competitive advantage for the organization and increase corporate performance that is measured through traditional accounting measures of financial returns and productivity.

This study is motivated on the future recommendations of several studies. Ho and Williams (2003) suggested that role of gender towards IC should be investigated in other developing country's environment. Yang and Lin (2009) and Wang *et al.* (2014) supported the idea to use objective measures of firm performance to test the mediating role of intellectual capital and examine firms in different industries and contexts. Ze'ghal and Maaloul (2010) and Wang *et al.* (2014) recommended that longitudinal study is required to prove the results to be consistent over time. Finally, Kiantu *et al.* (2014) theoretically supported the idea of using IC as a mediator and wanted it to be applied empirically. Moreover, the study of these variables in the context of Pakistan is more important to help the decision making authorities to understand the role of value addition in the products and services of Pakistani firms.

Pakistan is an emerging economy and the sixth largest populated country in the world. The role of CG and IC is important for Pakistan because labour is abundant and corporate culture is weak. Production is more labour intensive,

although labour force is unskilled and illiterate and it is no more the competitive advantage of the country. Despite having a population of two hundred million people, Pakistan exports reached at only 23.9 billion dollars in 2015 as stated by Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (PBS, 2015). Furthermore, Human Development Index report (HDI, 2015) of the United Nations Development Programme ranked Pakistan at 147th position, which is poor, and alarming sign of human development in Pakistan. In this desperate scenario, the optimal solution is to develop human resource with required knowledge, technical expertise and skill so they can meet the challenges of the knowledge economy. Pakistan can utilize its untapped potential in human resource and other physical resources if it adopts ways to shift its agro-based economy to more knowledge-driven economy. In this regard, Pakistan can learn from the experience of Malaysia where the Knowledge Economy Master Plan (KEMP) of Malaysia transformed Malaysia from an input driven economy to a knowledge-driven economy (Goh, 2005). Therefore, this study can help the government authorities, regulators and the corporate governors to understand the importance of IC resources in enhancing corporate performance after adopting good CG practices.

1.2 Problem Statement

It is usually argued that good corporate governance practices are crucial to enhancing the corporate performance of the organizations. Researches have been conducted in the past to show the relationship between CG practices and corporate performance, however, despite numerous studies, the result is still not conclusive. Some studies found significant relationship between CG and firm performance (for example, Low *et al.*, 2015; Yang and Zhao, 2014; Liu *et al.*, 2015; Coles *et al.*, 2012; Francis *et al.*, 2012; Khan and Awan 2012; Adams *et al.*, 2010; Reddy *et al.*, 2010; Renders *et al.*, 2010). On the other hand, some studies did not find any relationship between them (Terjesen *et al.*, 2015; Aebi *et al.*, 2012; Wang *et al.*, 2012; Shukeri *et al.*, 2012; Ahmed *et al.*, 2012; Topak, 2011; Lampion *et al.*, 2011; Yasser *et al.*, 2011; Bauer *et al.*, 2010; Aboagye and Otieku, 2010; Abdullah and Page, 2009). Such a dilemmatic situation, with many studies on each side, forces this study to

reconsider this link between CG and corporate performance again with longitudinal data for several years.

The change in the economy and nature of corporate sector from production to knowledge-intensive activities has triggered the importance of CG and IC. In the knowledge economy, the value added is not only derived from traditional factors of production, i.e. land, labor and capital but also from IC resources. There are a number of studies in recent years, which have theoretically and empirically shown an association between intellectual capital and corporate performance (see, for example, Berzkalne and Zelgalve 2014; Morariu 2014; Wang and Chen 2013; Rahman 2012; Ze'ghal and Maaloul 2010; Chan, 2009 and many more). All these studies show that IC resources are instrumental in increasing corporate performance. It also supports the idea that good CG practices and IC resources mutually may enhance the corporate performance. Ho and Williams (2003) argued that the influence of CG features on corporate performance might depend on the firm's mix of physical and intellectual capital. Directors cannot run the business alone rather their job is to get things done through management and employees. If human capital, structural capital and relational capital is not efficient and helpful in operations, it is impossible to succeed in the knowledge-intensive world market. Proficient CG also attracts human capital along with financial capital, in order to maximize value addition. Therefore, the effect of CG on corporate performance needs to be measured through IC.

It is suggested that corporate governors should focus their attention on the acquisition of IC resources along with physical and financial resources so that the proper mix of these resources may produce quality products and services. Corporate governance is responsible for developing a competitive advantage for the company in today's free market economy. This is achievable if the board of directors cultivates value creation efficiency from human brain's creativity (HC), organizational structure (SC) and customer relations. The most important element of CG, i.e. board of directors can establish effective strategies and policies on the acquisition and best utilization of human and structural resources, which then result in better production processes, operational procedures and development of patent and trademarks through research and development activities (Keenan and Aggestam, 2001). Relations with big corporate customers and quality raw material suppliers are also an important part

of directors' relational capital (Nicholson *et al.*, 2004). The empirical evidence of a link between corporate governance and IC can be seen in several research studies like Appuhami and Bhuyan (2015); Zamani *et al.* (2012); Abidin *et al.* (2009); Swartz and Firer (2005); Ho and Williams (2003) and Williams (2000).

Finally, this study has found a significant gap in the research field, i.e. the responsibility of the board of directors to contribute and acquire IC resources and then maximizing the value addition to improving corporate performance. It also depicts the mediation effect because CG affects IC, which in turn affects corporate performance, eventually. For this purpose, the impact of CG on corporate performance by considering IC as mediator is studied by using a sample of 100-index firms listed in Karachi stock exchange Pakistan. IC is measured through widely used IC efficiency model, namely Value Added Intellectual Coefficient VAICTM, i.e. human, structural and capital employed efficiencies. CG measures involve board size, independent non-executive directors, board meetings, multiple directorships, female directors, directors' education, directors' experience and role duality. Financial measures of profitability, i.e. return on assets and return on equity, and an operational measure of productivity, i.e. total asset turnover are measures of corporate performance. The role of IC as a mediator in CG and corporate performance relationship is also addressed.

This study argues that there is a possibility that corporate governance affects corporate performance directly or it may influence the corporate performance indirectly, through intellectual capital i.e. the value creating efficiency of IC resources. This study fills the void in literature in a way that no previous study has taken IC as a mediator in CG and corporate performance relationship. This is the pioneer study, which takes into consideration the IC as mediator. Therefore, on the basis of the above discussion, the problem statement of this study is to develop a relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance through intellectual capital. It can be further explained that this study would try to substantiate the possible relationship of CG, IC, and corporate performance so that organizations may improve its corporate performance through better use of IC resources after implementing good CG practices.

1.3 Research Questions

Corporate boards make important decisions, including those on investment policy, financial policy, and board governance. It is generally accepted that specific governance structures are allied with better corporate performance and greater firm value (Abdullah *et al.*, 2012; Liu *et al.*, 2015; Low *et al.*, 2015). For example, it is argued that if a number of independent non-executive directors on board increases, then, this would increase the firm performance (Liu *et al.*, 2015). Some studies claimed that presence of female directors on board increases the corporate performance (Abdullah *et al.*, 2012; Liu *et al.*, 2014; Low *et al.*, 2015).

Similarly, in prior research, other CG measures like board size, role duality, and expertise have shown positive relationships with corporate performance. Shukeri *et al.* (2012) found a positive link of the size of boards with firm performance after having analyzed 300 publicly listed firms in Malaysia. Yang and Zhao, (2014) reported that role duality is important due to speedy decisions and reducing cost and have a positive link with corporate performance. Knowledge, skills and expertise of individual director also contribute towards firm performance as shown in the studies of Dhaliwal *et al.* (2010) and Kim *et al.* (2011).

However, there are many studies, which could not find any relationship or found a negative relationship between CG measures and corporate performance. For example, Shukeri *et al.* (2012) found an insignificant relationship between female role, managerial ownership and role duality with firm performance. However, they were able to find a negative link of independent non-executive directors with firm performance. Aebi *et al.* (2012) examined the impact of corporate governance on 362 financial institutions during the financial crisis and reported that CG measures remained insignificant during the crisis. Wang *et al.* (2012) shared the same result when investigated the impact of CG variables on the performance of bank holding firms in the USA. They claimed that age of directors, outside directors, board size and role duality had a negative impact on firm performance. Abdullah and Page (2009) did not find any relationship between CG measures and corporate performance of the UK firms. While Sueyoshi *et al.* (2010) also could not establish a link between board composition and firm performance when they studied the impact

of CG reforms on Japanese firms. Yue *et al.* (2008) stated that there is no relationship between CG measures and firm performance. In the same way, Aboagye and Otieku (2010), did not find any link between CG and corporate performance.

In addition, in some indexed studies of CG and corporate performance, mixed results can be found. For example, Leal *et al.* (2015) studied the quality of corporate governance practices by using the corporate governance index (CGI) in Brazil and declared that overall CGI scores of firms are low. Braga-Alves and Morey (2012) studied the corporate governance system of 24 countries and concluded that firm growth predicts better governance. However, Black *et al.* (2006), used CG index in Korea, did not find that better governance resulted in the firm growth. Varshney *et al.* (2013) found a positive link of CG index to economic value added in Indian firms. Balasubramanian *et al.* (2010) found a positive relationship between CG index and firm market value in India. However, Bauer *et al.* (2010) came up with the opposite result that CG index is not linked to firm value. Gompers *et al.* (2003) revealed that well-governed firms showed better operating performance compared to poorly governed firms. However, Bebchuk *et al.* (2009) found a significant negative relationship of CG index and firm performance.

In the context of Pakistan, Ahmed *et al.* (2012) concluded no relationship between concentrated ownership and firm performance of 600 firms for the years 2005-2010 of Karachi Stock exchange. Gul *et al.* (2011) found a positive relationship between independent non-executive directors and negative relationship between role duality and size of the board with the performance of textile sector of KSE. Yasser *et al.* (2011) concluded with the same result with a distinction of no relationship of role duality to firm performance. Therefore, these mixed and inconclusive results stress the need to revisit this relationship and lead towards the first research question of this study.

RQ1 What is the relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance?

Nevertheless, it is important to understand that abilities, skills, experience, and knowledge of the board of directors also represent the part of the human capital of the firm, which is an integral part of intellectual capital (IC). Intellectual capital is not only the intellect or knowledge of individuals but it includes human, structural and relational capital of organization (Mention, 2012). Human capital involves knowledge, expertise, competencies, skills, talents and capabilities of employees in order to build and apply knowledge to perform their organizational tasks (OECD, 2008). It means that board directors with high formal education and experience prove to be a better human capital resource for the organization (Jermias and Gani, 2014). In the same way, it is also the duty of skilled directors to acquire knowledgeable, competent and skillful human capital from the labour market and utilize them to produce quality products and develop a competitive advantage.

On the other side, structural capital involves codified knowledge, innovations, organizational processes, culture, intellectual property, patents and information systems to enable human capital to function properly (Dzinkowski, 2000; Roos *et al.*, 2005). Acquiring good qualified, knowledgeable employees is not difficult and enough but to transform their skills and competencies to produce value, there is a need to develop effective structures to utilize and retain those employees (Safieddine *et al.*, 2009). Organizational culture is also an important part of structural capital and involves shared vision, values, traditions and symbols. Employees' performance is influenced by the culture through motivation and as a result, structural capital may increase or decrease human capital performance. The board meeting is considered as the intellectual exercise of directors (executive, non-executive, female) where they can share their visions, values, new ideas and propose policies and procedures to adopt them within the organization. Female directors on board also represent the value structure of female empowerment in the organization along with innovative, unique and strategic decision-making ability (Dezs and Ross, 2012).

Relational capital involves licenses, franchises, interactions and contracts with suppliers, creditors, investors, government and society, in order to enable the organization to produce and sell its products smoothly. It reflects the organizational capacity to develop and maintain communication links with all the stakeholders in

their business (Skyrme, 1998). It helps the organizations to develop databases with all the information about their customers, suppliers and competitors, to use that information to anticipate change and develop strategies for the future. Independent non-executive directors, female directors and directors with multiple directorships also show relational capital of board because their presence on other boards gives them the opportunity to bring valuable resources in the organization by combining their relational networks (Dalziel *et al.*, 2011). They also tend to perform better as they are prone to more experience, diversified working environment and broad exposure. Directors can earn external reputation, financial benefits and improvement in managerial skills by accepting outside directorships in other boards (Carcello *et al.*, 2002).

Similarly, in the prior literature, some studies have attempted to develop a positive relationship between corporate governance and IC. Zamani *et al.* (2012) examined the relationship between board characteristics of size, role duality, independent non-executive directors, and IC in Tehran Security Exchange for a 5-year time period (2005-2010) and found a positive relationship between some of them. Abidin *et al.* (2009) studied the relationship between different characteristics of the board of directors and intellectual capital performance through VAICTM model by taking a sample of 75 firms from Bursa Malaysia. They found that the large size of the board has a positive impact on the value added efficiency. They also concluded that by increasing independent non-executive directors on the board, the overall efficiency of the firms (VAICTM) increased. Williams (2000) also found a positive relationship of ethnicity and gender with IC performance when he examined 84 publicly listed firms in South Africa.

However, some studies could not find any relationship between different CG measures and IC performance. Swartz and Firer (2005) concluded that female directors did not have any impact on IC performance. Ho and Williams (2003) failed to identify any significant link between four board features, i.e. independent non-executive directors, board size, role duality, directors' ownership and IC performance across three countries. Williams (2000) also did not find any relationship between three board features (i.e. independent non-executive directors, stock ownership and

independent non-executive directors in committees) and IC performance. He did find a negative relationship between role duality and IC performance.

Therefore, this lack of consensus in the literature and shortage of studies in this area (no study in Pakistan, so far) triggers this study to focus on the assumption that CG measures also contribute significantly towards the IC efficiency of the firm. For this purpose, four new CG measures (multiple directorships, experience, education and board meetings) are added which have not been discussed in this relationship in prior studies. Thus, the second research question of this study becomes as follows.

RQ2 What is the relationship between corporate governance and intellectual capital?

However, intellectual capital also affects the corporate performance of the firms. This relationship is also a major turf for the current scholars and researchers as the importance and significance of intellectual capital is increasing in current literature and among different stakeholders in the corporate sector (Dumay *et al.*, 2015). Every organization is working hard to utilize its physical and financial resources with the help of its intellectual capital to produce goods and services that may create or add up value to the organization (Chiucchi and Dumay, 2015).

Similarly, there are a number of studies in recent years, which have empirically shown a positive association between intellectual capital and corporate performance. For example, using the sample of 4254 firm-year observations of Taiwanese stock exchange for the period 1992-2002, Chen *et al.* (2005) concluded that intellectual capital has a positive relationship with market-to-book value and financial performance in terms of return on assets and return on equity. Ze'ghal and Maaloul (2010) found a significant positive relationship between IC and corporate performance in terms of corporate measures when he examined 300 UK listed firms. Chan (2009) conducted a research on the relationship between IC efficiency and corporate performance measures of the sample from the Hong Kong stock exchange for the period 2001-2005 and revealed that structural capital had strong and positive relationship with financial measures of performance. The most recent research on IC

and corporate performance relationship is done by Berzkalne and Zelgalve (2014); Rahman (2012); Wang and Chen (2013), and these studies have found a positive relationship between IC and profitability.

However, there are studies, which could not find and/or found a negative link between IC and corporate performance. Morariu (2014) demonstrated a significant negative association between the IC and Market to book value and the insignificant link between IC and corporate performance. Firer and Williams (2003) and Shiu (2006) showed that IC is negatively associated with traditional measures of corporate performance. Kujansivu and Lonnqvist (2005) reported no connection between return on equity and IC performance of 60,304 Finnish firms in 2001 to 2003. Maditinos *et al.* (2011) researched in the association between IC and firm performance by using data from Greece and found no association between them.

In Pakistan, only some studies are conducted in the field of intellectual capital and firm performance, for example, Khaliq *et al.* (2012); Rehman *et al.* (2011); Kamath (2010) and Makki and Lodhi (2009) conducted researches on this relationship and all of them found a positive relationship of IC to firm performance. Therefore, these contrasting empirical findings at international level and limited work done in Pakistan encourages this study to focus on IC and corporate performance link again and on a longitudinal basis covering several years. Hence, the third research question of this study becomes:

RQ3 What is the relationship between intellectual capital and corporate performance?

However, as the empirical IC research has advanced, the models of IC and corporate performance relationship are also developed and the most popular is the mediation model (Kiantu *et al.*, 2014; Inkinen, 2015). Due to the organizational complexity and the assumed ambidexterity of the relationship between IC and corporate performance, the mediating variables are integrated into measurement models. Secondly, the higher corporate performance is likely to be a result of combining IC and other organizational variables, i.e. governance and managerial activities, hence, the phenomenon cannot be fully understood by just focusing on the

direct relationship between IC and corporate performance (Kiantu *et al.*, 2014; Yang and Lin, 2009).

Similarly, there are two sets of studies, which use IC in their mediation models. In the first set of studies, different organizational processes are used as mediator to influence IC and corporate performance relationship. For example, dynamic capabilities of firm mediate the relationship between IC and innovativeness (Hsu and Sabherwal, 2012) and also mediate the relational capital and innovative performance relationship (Wu *et al.*, 2007). Another process, innovation capability mediates the link between IC and competitive advantage of firms (Mathuramaytha, 2012). Firm learning capability mediates the relationship of human and relational capital to product innovation performance (Hsu and Fang, 2009). Competitive advantage also mediates the relationship between the IC components and corporate performance (Kamukama *et al.*, 2011). There is also a mediating effect of cross-functional integration and co-production on IC and new product sale performance (Chien and Chao, 2011). Additionally, entrepreneurial orientation mediates IC and corporate performance (Mehdivand *et al.*, 2012)

In the second set of studies, the IC is used as a mediator in different firm activities and corporate performance. For example, Wang *et al.*(2014) reported after studying 228 high technology firms in China that knowledge sharing is significantly contributing towards the human, structural and relational capital of IC which in turn enhance both operating and financial performance of the firms. Moreover, IC mediates the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and innovation (Wu *et al.*, 2008). Yang and Lin (2009) found that IC fully mediates the relationship between human resource practices and performance when they studied the healthcare industry in Taiwan. Wang and Chen (2013) also contributed by adding that human resource practices helped the organizational capital to increase performance. It is argued that human resource practices are helpful to generate IC, and investment in those HR practices increases the IC, which in turn improves the performance of firms (Youndt *et al.*, 2004). Overall, the growing knowledge of IC suggests that corporate performance accrues through the mediation of IC with other factors, and firm abilities, activities and processes help to understand how IC affect corporate performance (Inkinen, 2015).

Similarly, this study suggests, on the foundations of resource dependence theory that different characteristics of board of directors contribute to the intellectual capital of the organization through their expertise, knowledge, experience, broad exposure, relational capital and gender diversity and then intellectual capital leads to higher corporate performance, eventually (Kiantu *et al.*, 2014). Resource dependence theory of corporate governance states that it is the responsibility of the board of directors to acquire, retain and utilize competent and skilled human resources from the labour market. The board can also acquire the structural resources in terms of new and latest technology, production processes to produce quality and patent products and services. It can develop relations with the stakeholders of business like customers, suppliers, creditors and government agencies to get favour and develop a competitive advantage. It is argued that the board of directors is the part of human resources in the organization and independent non-executive directors contribute in terms of knowledge, vast experience and broad exposures due to working in different boards and represent the relational capital of the board (Coles *et al.*, 2012). Financial qualification and tenure of directors also bring a valuable understanding of business affairs due to their education and experience. Executive directors working on other boards, also represent the relational capital of the board, bring important information, and resolve diversified issues on their board as they handle in other boards (Masulis and Mobbs, 2011). The relational capital of directors helps them to maintain quality relations with the customers, raw material suppliers, investors, creditors and government agencies (Nicholson *et al.*, 2004). Moreover, female directors also contribute to their innovative, unique and strategic decision-making role to increase IC performance (Williams, 2000). Therefore, based on the discussion above, this study proposes IC as a mediator between the CG and corporate performance relationship and leads to the fourth and final research question.

RQ4 What is the impact of IC (mediator) on CG and corporate performance relationship?

In order to answer these questions, this study uses the data of 100-index firms from Karachi stock exchange Pakistan to determine the effect of CG measures on IC

and corporate performance, IC on corporate performance and the relationship between all three areas.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

Corporate governance is a broad area that covers corporate law, financial reporting, auditing and code of corporate governance, and intellectual capital deals with human resource management, financial management, strategic management and corporate reporting. The main objectives of the study are to find out and investigate the relationships among CG, IC and corporate performance and the role of IC as mediator between the relationship of CG and corporate performance and this is done through constructing, elaborating and understanding structural models of CG, IC and corporate performance of Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE-100 index) firms. IC is viewed as IC efficiency that consists of three types of efficiencies like human capital efficiency, structural capital efficiency and capital employed efficiency. CG is viewed as characteristics of the board of directors, which can bring higher returns to the firm after achieving higher IC efficiency. More precisely, the study would attempt,

- i) To determine the relationship between CG and corporate performance
- ii) To examine the effect of CG on intellectual capital
- iii) To investigate the impact of IC on corporate performance
- iv) To determine the role of IC as a mediator between CG and corporate performance relationship

1.5 Scope of the Study

In this study, corporate governance is supported by resource dependency and stewardship theories because they are more concerned with value creation processes in the organizations. Moreover, board of directors' characteristics has been selected as CG measures and, in this study; BOD is more concerned with the advice and cooperation role rather than monitoring role towards management. The entire board

members act as valued resources, e.g. the independent non-executive directors with diversifiable skills, broad practical knowledge and work experience to act as resources for the company to add value in the firm. Well-working boards can participate in value creation by collaborating with the managers (Finkelstein *et al.*, 2009).

Similarly, in this study, IC comprises of human capital, structural capital and relational capital, which combines with the physical or financial capital to result in value creation efficiency of the organization and Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAICTM) model, is used to measure IC. Likewise, in this study, corporate performance is measured through operational and financial measures to represent productivity and profitability, respectively.

Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE) is the largest stock exchange among three stock exchanges of Pakistan. There are more than 720 firms listed on the KSE (in year 2012). It was established in September 1947 and integrated as a company limited by guarantee in March 1949 with only five firms. It has three indexes namely KSE-all shares index, KSE-100 index and KSE-30 index. For this study, KSE-100 index has been selected because almost 95% daily trading of KSE takes place in the 100 firms of this index. Nowadays, this index has crossed 33000 index points and total market capitalization of this index is more than 55 billion US\$ (1-4-2016). Therefore, the data of these 100-index firms, for 8 years' period starting from 2005 to 2012, is used for the research.

The reasons for selecting public limited firms are that these firms follow the code of CG issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) and have IC resources. Corporate governance and IC performance data are generally published in the annual reports of these firms. The period of 8 years, ranging from 2005 to 2012, has been selected to study the impact of CG on corporate performance through IC because after the proclamation of the code of corporate governance by SECP in 2002, sufficient time has lapsed until 2005 to rationalize the CG code implementation by the firms. The year 2012 was the last year for this study because, in 2012, SECP introduced new CG codes, which were again amended in 2013 and

2014. Consequently, in order to use consistent data values for this study, it has been decided to use a period of 8 years i.e. 2005-2012.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this study is deviating from the leading agency theory of corporate governance, the main purpose of which is to monitor the activities of executive directors and safeguard the interests of shareholders. This study focuses on the advising role of directors, which deems important in this era of rapid change and technological advancement. In today's business environment, it is argued, that board of directors in either role of independent non-executive directors, executive directors, female directors, or experienced and highly qualified directors, must act as a leadership role, provide input for strategic decision making, support and guide the management to accomplish their goals (Finkelstein *et al.*, 2009). All CG measures have been identified due to the contribution of their advising role in the businesses. Moreover, this study theorizes it's first-ever relationship of CG and corporate performance through IC. The assumption of this study is that CG should contribute to the IC resources to be acquired and utilized which in turn generate or enhance corporate performance.

Additionally, this study has introduced some new variables, which are not discussed before in the literature of CG and IC. For example, the expertise of directors is split into the experience and educational qualification of directors. Experience is measured through a number of years; a director holds the seat on the board, while educational qualification is the degree or diploma in any field of management, accounting, finance or economics. Multiple directorships by inside directors (executive directors) are introduced to show abilities, skills and demand of inside directors by the other boards (Masulis and Mobbs, 2011). In the same way, the previous literature of the IC did not cover the link of experience, education, outside directorship of directors and board meeting to the intellectual capital efficiency.

Methodologically, this is the pioneer study to use second-generation multivariate analysis technique, i.e. Partial Least Square based Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) for secondary data analysis. Previously, this PLS approach was used only for primary data analysis; however, Hair *et al.* (2014) recommended its use for secondary data analysis. For this study, the CG is treated as a latent construct (hidden or invisible variable) which is measured by its eight indicators (measurable variables) of board size, independent non-executive directors, board meeting frequency, multiple directorships, female directors, board experience, board education and role duality. These all indicators, then collectively formulate the CG construct as the PLS performs iterative regressions dependent upon the specific model until weights are acquired to gauge the score of the latent construct (Hair *et al.*, 2014). Moreover, the impact of individual measures of CG construct on individual measures of other constructs has also been tested, for the first time, in this study. This method of measuring CG is different from the previously indexed studies of CG in which CG is calculated through scales of ten, twenty or more items, which are called index of CG. In previous studies, the weights of CG measures were assigned by the researchers manually and then the collective whole, i.e. CG and its relationship with firm performance is tested through first generation multiple regression approach (see, e.g. Balasubramanian *et al.*, 2010; Drobetz *et al.*, 2004; Ertugrul and Hegde 2009; Varshney, 2013). On the contrary, the PLS path modeling gives an opportunity to test the relationship among numerous variables simultaneously and it carries out a weighted PLS algorithm to calculate weights of standardized values of indicators to their respective constructs based upon their importance in the model.

Additionally, this study stresses upon the mediation of IC in the relationship of CG and corporate performance. For the purpose, eight years data sets and one pooled data set are used for this study. The main reason to use each year data set is to control for any impact on variables due to the international financial crisis in 2008 and makes sure the consistency of mediation over the number of years.

Contextually, most empirical studies observing the relationship between CG measures and corporate performance have used data from developed countries (see, for example, Adams *et al.*, 2010; Coles *et al.*, 2012; Coles *et al.*, 2008; Francis *et al.*,

2012; Guest 2009; Jermias and Gani, 2014; Reddy *et al.*, 2010; Renders *et al.*, 2010; and Yang and Zhao, 2014). It is questionable whether these results can be extended and applied to other regions of the world, particularly to emerging markets such as Pakistan, where the capital flow is limited, markets are less sophisticated, production is more labour intensive, and educational and professional resources are limited. The role of CG and IC is important for Pakistan because labour is abundant and corporate culture is weak. It is imperative for Pakistan's corporate sector to gain a competitive advantage by implementing good CG measures, which lead to higher IC efficiency and improve corporate performance. According to Knowledge Economy Index (KEI, 2012) of the World Bank, Pakistan is ranked at 117 out of total 145 countries, which shows its incompetence to use knowledge for economic development. No innovative system of firms, research centers, universities and think tanks is developed to tap into the sources of worldwide knowledge, acclimate it to local demands and create new solutions. It is important to understand that only an educated and properly trained population can create, share and use knowledge in the right direction (KEI, 2012). This study will help Pakistan to identify its core competencies in terms of knowledge, intellectual capital, and good governance practices and, at the end, better corporate performance.

Additionally, no considerable work, in these areas, has been done in Pakistan. Only some studies have contributed in this field, but the longitudinal gap is still to be filled. Therefore, this study will encourage the ongoing research in the areas of corporate governance, intellectual capital and corporate performance in Pakistan. Moreover, it tries to help the regulators (SECP) and other stakeholders to not only identify the intellectual capital in the firms but stresses upon its importance for the firms. Unfortunately, the SECP has not yet acknowledged the importance of the intellectual capital in its governance guidelines for corporate sectors in Pakistan. At the end of this section, it is worth mentioning to report the research gaps, research questions, findings, conclusion, contributions and implications of this study in table 1.1.

Table 0.1: Summary of the study

Research Gaps	RQ	Findings	Conclusions	Contribution	Implications
<p>Past studies found mixed results i.e. positive, negative or no link, in separate studies of indexed or individual measures of CG and CP relationship. This is the pioneer study to look into the impact of whole CG construct and separate measures of CG on whole CP construct and individual measures of CP, in the same study.</p> <p>Two new measures of CG are introduced. Those are outside directorship of executive directors (IDOD) and experience of directors based on their tenure on the board.</p>	<p>What is the relationship between CG and corporate performance?</p>	<p>There is a significant negative relationship between overall CG construct and CP construct.</p> <p>On the individual measures' basis, board size, board education and role duality have a positive impact on productivity but have a negative impact on profitability.</p> <p>Similarly, independent non-executive directors, board meetings, board IDODs and board female directors have a positive link to profitability, however, negative link to productivity.</p> <p>Board experience does not have any impact on productivity and profitability of the firms.</p>	<p>Overall, more corporate governance based on resource-stewardship theory results in lower corporate performance.</p> <p>Large board size with more formal business educated directors and the same role of CEO and chairperson of the board results in higher productivity, however, unable to control the operating expenses to result in higher profitability.</p> <p>In the same way, NEDs, board meetings, IDODs and female directors contributed positively towards profitability however negatively to productivity.</p>	<p>Theoretical Deviation from agency theory. Examining new variables like IDOD and board experience.</p> <p>Methodological Using PLS-SEM for secondary data analysis for the very first time. Construction of structural path models for analyzing data.</p> <p>Empirical Verifying and validating the link between CG and CP on individual measures as well as on overall construct level basis.</p> <p>Contextual No study of CG and CP as whole constructs has yet been done in Pakistan.</p>	<p>At an organizational level; to develop CG practices in a way to get the optimal level of performance both in terms of productivity and profitability.</p> <p>At regulatory and policy level; must understand that same CG measures may not result in higher performance both in terms of productivity and profitability.</p> <p>At research level; add more CG and CP measures and study them in a different context.</p>

Research Gaps	RQ	Findings	Conclusions	Contribution	Implications
<p>The limited past research found mixed results, i.e. positive, negative or no link, of individual measures of CG and IC relationship. This is the pioneer study to look into the impact of whole CG construct and individual measures of CG on whole IC construct and individual parts of IC like HCE, SCE and CEE, in the same study</p> <p>Four new measures of CG, ignored by the prior studies, are added to find a link between CG and IC. Those are board meetings, IDODs, board education and experience.</p>	<p>What is the relationship between CG and intellectual capital?</p>	<p>Overall, the corporate governance has a direct positive relationship with IC.</p> <p>On the individual measures' basis, board meetings, IDODs, board experience and independent non-executive directors have a positive contribution towards IC while board female directors and the board size are negatively related to the IC.</p> <p>In the yearly analysis, non-executive directors contributed positively to HCE and SCE while board experience contributed positively to only SCE and negatively to HCE. Moreover, the large board size is inversely related to SCE. Board education does not impact IC, Similarly, the dual role of CEO and chairperson of the board does not have any impact on IC.</p>	<p>Overall, the corporate governance based on resource-stewardship theory contributes positively towards the IC efficiency of the firms.</p> <p>Small board size with a number of independent non-executive directors and more experience of directors contributed positively to SCE of IC</p> <p>While large board size with more board meetings and having more IDODs contributed positively to the HCE of IC.</p> <p>IC efficiency in terms of HCE and SCE is not affected by the dual role of the same person as CEO and chairperson of the board and formal business education of the directors.</p>	<p>Theoretical Linking whole CG construct and IC construct.</p> <p>Developing and extending the relationship between new CG measures like board meetings, IDODs, board education, experience and IC</p> <p>Methodological Using PLS-SEM for secondary data analysis. Construction of structural path models for analyzing data.</p> <p>Empirical Verifying and validating results of CG and IC constructs, their individual measures and their relationship.</p> <p>Contextual No study has yet been conducted in Pakistan in this relationship.</p>	<p>For organizations. To establish CG practices that may cultivate human brain creativity (HCE) with the help of innovative techniques and processes (SCE) to result in better products and services.</p> <p>For regulators and policy makers. To introduce IC guidelines and measures, adaptation in the organizations and give training to the corporate governors and managers to use them properly.</p> <p>For researchers. To extend and generalize the findings of this study, they need to use other or more measures of CG and IC in other contexts.</p>

Research Gaps	RQ	Findings	Conclusions	Contribution	Implications
This study uses IC and CP constructs as a whole along with individual measures of them, which was ignored in the previous studies.	What is the relationship between IC and corporate performance?	<p>Overall, intellectual capital has a positive relationship to the corporate performance of the firms.</p> <p>At the individual level, the HCE, SCE and CEE have positive link to productivity and profitability of the firms</p> <p>At yearly level, CEE is the most important efficiency followed by structural capital efficiency and human capital efficiency, respectively, which affects the corporate performance.</p>	<p>It is ascertained that higher IC leads towards the higher corporate performance of the firms.</p> <p>A capital employed efficiency, which is the contribution of physical and financial assets contributes the most towards the CP.</p> <p>Structural capital efficiency is the second most important efficiency, which is contributing towards CP which is a good sign for the firms and shows their commitment to enhancing the structural capital capabilities.</p> <p>HCE is the least contributory efficiency towards CP which shows that human capital is not fully trained or skilled to contribute towards value addition of the firms.</p>	<p>Theoretical Linking IC and CP constructs, as a whole, for the first time.</p> <p>Methodological Using PLS-SEM for secondary data analysis. Construction of structural path models for analyzing data.</p> <p>Empirical Verifying and validating results of IC and CP constructs, their individual measures and their relationship.</p> <p>Contextual No study Linking IC and CP constructs, as a whole, has yet been done in Pakistan.</p>	<p>For organizations. More focus on the IC efficiency through proper acquisition and utilization of IC resources from the environment.</p> <p>For regulators and policy makers. To help organizations in gathering and utilizing IC resources through proper guidelines and rules and regulations so that every organization may have access to those resources without any conflict.</p> <p>For researchers. To extend and generalize the findings of this study, they need to use other measures of IC and CP in other contexts.</p>

Research Gaps	RQ	Findings	Conclusions	Contribution	Implications
<p>No prior study, which takes into account the IC as a mediator between corporate governance and corporate performance relationship.</p>	<p>What is the impact of IC (mediator) on CG and corporate performance relationship?</p>	<p>Overall, IC fully mediates the relationship between CG and CP.</p> <p>Overall, board duality and board education have positive and board female directors have a negative impact on IC and CP.</p> <p>At yearly analysis, IC also fully mediates the link between CG and CP.</p>	<p>Overall, it shows that corporate governance based on resources-stewardship theory positively contributes towards IC efficiency, which in turn leads towards the higher corporate performance of the firms.</p>	<p>Theoretical Confirms that resource-stewardship theory is more suitable and appropriate for value creation rather than for value protection.</p> <p>Methodological Using PLS-SEM for secondary data analysis. Construction of structural path models for analyzing data.</p> <p>Empirical Verifying and validating a mediation model of CG, IC and CP constructs, their individual measures and their relationship.</p> <p>Contextual No study has yet been conducted in Pakistan so far.</p>	<p>For organizations. Concentrate on value creation or addition processes in the organization which in turn generate financial returns eventually.</p> <p>For regulators and policy makers. To give proper attention to the IC resources that result in the higher corporate performance of the organizations.</p> <p>For researchers. To extend the mediation model of this study, they need to use other measures of CG, IC and CP in other contexts. Also, they can use IC as a moderator between CG and CP.</p>

1.7 Definitions

In this section, definitions of key terms used in the study are given. As this study concern with corporate governance, intellectual capital, corporate performance and their measurements, so the respective terms are defined with particular reference to this study.

Corporate Governance (CG): This study follows the definition of corporate governance as supported by resource dependency theory because it is more concerned with value creation processes. Well-working boards can participate in value creation by collaborating with managers (Finkelstein *et al.*, 2009). In this theory, the perception shifts from a conflictual relationship between the board and management to more cooperative work between the two parties so the firm can add more value (Adam and Ferreira, 2007).

Board of Directors (BOD): Board of directors is viewed as the apex of decision control systems (Fama and Jensen, 1983). However, according to this study, BOD is more concerned with the advice and cooperation role rather than monitoring and conflicting role towards management. All the board members act as valued resources, e.g. the independent non-executive directors with diversifiable skills, broad practical knowledge and work experience to act as resources for the company to add value to the firm (Mueller *et al.*, 2008). Boards with women are energetic in boosting non-monetary performance measures such as customer and employee satisfaction (Williams, 2000).

Intellectual Capital (IC): The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 1999) describes intellectual capital as the economic value of two categories of intangible assets of a company: organizational (structural) capital and human capital. This study uses the definition of OECD (1999) and Shih *et al.*, (2010) according to which, IC comprises of human capital, structural capital and relational capital, which combines with the physical or financial capital to result in value creation efficiency of the organization.

Human Capital (HC): Human capital means individual competence which refers to the skills, knowledge and expertise of employees that adds value to the organization (OECD, 2008).

Structural Capital (SC): It includes procedures, system, culture, databases and software systems and processes (OECD, 2008).

Relational Capital (RC): It is the set of all relations that a firm establishes with other firms, institutions and research centers, suppliers and customers (OECD, 2008).

The Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAICTM): It is a commonly used model for measuring intellectual capital. It is an index to measure the efficiency of human, physical and financial resources in value creation for the business (Pulic, 2004). VAICTM model can measure all components of IC namely human capital, structural capital (including relational capital) to create the value added by the company (Rahman, 2012; Ze'ghal and Maaloul, 2010).

Corporate Performance: It means the overall well-being of the firm and its traditional measures are sale, assets, profits, book value and market value (Goh, 2005). In this study, corporate performance is measured through productivity and profitability measures namely, total assets turnover, return on total assets and return on equity.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A. and Page, M. (2009). Corporate Governance and Corporate Performance: UK FTSE-350 Companies. Paper presented at Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland, Edinburgh, UK.
- Abdullah, S.N., Ismail, K.N.I., and Nachum, L. (2012). Women on Boards of Malaysian Firms: Impact on Market and Accounting Performance. *Electronic copy available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2145007>*.
- Abidin, Z.Z., Kamal, N.M., and Jusoff, K. (2009). Board Structure and Corporate Performance in Malaysia. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE*. 1 (1), 150-164.
- Aboagye, A.Q. and Otieku, J. (2010). Are Ghanaian MFIs' Performance Associated with Corporate Governance? *Corporate Governance*. 10 (3), 307-320.
- Adam, R. and Ferreria, D. (2007). A Theory of Friendly Boards. *Journal of Finance*, 217-250.
- Adams, R. (2009). Asking Directors About Their Dual Roles. . Working paper, University of Queensland.
- Adams, R.B. (2005). What Do Boards Do? Evidence from Board Committee and Director Compensation Data. *Evidence from Board Committee and Director Compensation Data (March 13, 2003)*. EFA.
- Adams, R.B. and Ferreira, D. (2009). Women in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Governance and Performance. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 94 (2), 291-309.
- Adams, R.B., Hermalin, B.E., and Weisbach, M.S. (2010). The Role of Boards of Directors in Corporate Governance: A Conceptual Framework and Survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 48 (1), 58-107.
- Adams, R.B. and Mehran, H. (2005). Corporate Governance, Board Structure and Its Determinants in the Banking Industry. Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York, USA.

- Aebi, V., Sabato, G., and Schmid, M. (2012). Risk Management, Corporate Governance, and Bank Performance in the Financial Crisis. *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 36, 3213-3226.
- Aggarwal, R., Erel, I., Stulz, R., and Williamson, R. (2009). Differences in Governance Practices between U.S. And Foreign Firms: Measurement, Causes, and Consequences. *Review of Financial Studies*. 22 (8), 3131-3169.
- Aguilera, R. (2005). Corporate Governance and Director Accountability: An Institutional Comparative Perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 39-53.
- Ahmed, K., Sehrish, S., Saleem, F., Yasir, M., and Shehzad, F. (2012). Impact of Concentrated Ownership on Firm Performance (Evidence from Karachi Stock Exchange. *INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH IN BUSINESS*. 4 (5), 201-210.
- Aldas-Manzano, J., Lasalla-Navarre, C., Ruiz-Mafe, C., and Sanz-Blas, S. (2009). Key Drivers in Internet Banking Service Use. *Online Information Review*. 33 (4), 672-695.
- Al-Musali, M.A.K. and Ismail, K.N.I.K. (2014). Intellectual Capital and Its Effect on Financial Performance of Banks: Evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 164, 201-207.
- Andreev, P., Heart, T., Maoz, H., and Pliskin, N. (2009). Validating Formative Partial Least Squares (PLS) Models: Methodological Review and Empirical Illustration. Paper presented at 30th International Conference on Information Systems at Phoenix, Arizona.
- Appuhami, B.A.R. (2007). The Impact of Intellectual Capital on Investors' Capital Gain on Shares: An Empirical Investigation in Thai Banking, Finance & Insurance Sector. Paper presented at ASAC 2007, at Ottawa, Ontario.
- Appuhami, R. and Bhuyan, M. (2015). Examining the Influence of Corporate Governance on Intellectual Capital Efficiency: Evidence from Top Service Firms in Australia. *Managerial Auditing Journal*. 30 (4/5), 347-372.
- Ararat, M., Aksu, M., and Tansel Cetin, A. (2015). How Board Diversity Affects Firm Performance in Emerging Markets: Evidence on Channels in Controlled Firms. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 23 (2), 83-103.

- Ali, A. and Nasir, S.B. (2014). Impact of Board Characteristics and Audit Committee on Financial Performance: A Study of Manufacturing Sector of Pakistan. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*. 5 (7), 144-151.
- Baber, W.R., Kang, S.-H., Liang, L., and Zhu, Z. (2015). External Corporate Governance and Misreporting. *Contemporary Accounting Research*. 32 (4), 1413-1442.
- Balasubramanian, B.N., Barua, S.K., Bhagavatula, S., and George, R. (2011). Coping with Corporate Cholesterol: Board Interlocks and Their Impact on Corporate Governance: The Indian Experience.
- Balasubramanian, N., Black, B.S., and Khanna, V. (2010). The Relation between Firm-Level Corporate Governance and Market Value: A Case Study of India. *Emerging Markets Review*. 11 (4), 319-340.
- Bank, W. (2006). World Development Report. Available at: www.worldbank.org.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*. 17 (1), 99-120.
- Baron, R.M. and Kenny, D.A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51 (6), 1173-1182.
- Bauer, R., Eichholtz, P., and Kok, N. (2010). Corporate Governance and Performance: The REIT Effect. *Real Estate Economics*. 38 (1), 1-29.
- Bebchuk, L., Cohen, A., and Ferrell, A. (2009). What Matters in Corporate Governance? *Review of Financial Studies*. 22 (2), 783-827.
- Beiner, S., Drobetz, W., Schmid, M.M., and Zimmermann, H. (2006). An Integrated Framework of Corporate Governance and Firm Valuation. *European Financial Management*. 12 (2), 249-283.
- Belkhir, M. (2009). Board of Directors' Size and Performance in the Banking Industry. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*. 5 (2), 201-221.
- Bellman, S. (2003). How to Use Pls. *Graduate School of Management, University of Western Australia, Crawley, July, 2003*.
- Berzkalne, I. and Zelgalve, E. (2014). Intellectual Capital and Company Value. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 110, 887-896.
- Bhagat, S. and Bolton, B. (2008). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 14 (3), 257-273.

- Bilimoria, D. (2006). The Relationship between Women Corporate Directors and Women Corporate Officers. *Journal of Managerial Issues*. 18 (1), 47-61.
- Black, B. and Kim, W. (2012). The Effect of Board Structure on Firm Value: A Multiple Identification Strategies Approach Using Korean Data. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 104 (1), 203-226.
- Black, B.S., Jang, H., and Kim, W. (2006). Predicting Firms' Corporate Governance Choices: Evidence from Korea. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 12 (3), 660-691.
- Bøhren, Ø. and Staubo, S. (2014). Does Mandatory Gender Balance Work? Changing Organizational Form to Avoid Board Upheaval. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 28, 152-168.
- Bollen, K.A. (1989). *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bollen, K.A. and Bauldry, S. (2011). Three Cs in Measurement Models: Causal Indicators, Composite Indicators, and Covariates. *Psychological Methods*. 16 (3), 265-284.
- Bollen, K.A. and Lennox, R. (1991). Conventional Wisdom on Measurement: A Structural Equation Perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*. 110, 305-314.
- Bontis, N. (1998). Intellectual Capital: An Exploratory Study That Develops Measures and Models. *Management Decision*. 36 (2), 63-76.
- Bontis, N. (1999). Managing Organisational Knowledge by Diagnosing Intellectual Capital: Framing and Advancing the State of the Field. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 18 (5-8), 433-462.
- Bontis, N. (2001). Assessing Knowledge Assets: A Review of the Models Used to Measure Intellectual Capital. *International journal of management reviews*. 3 (1), 41-60.
- Bontis, N., Crossan, M., and Hulland, J. (2002). Managing an Organizational Learning System by Aligning Stocks and Flows. *Journal of Management Studies*. 39 (4), 369-437.
- Bontis, N., Dragonetti, N.C., Jacobsen, K., and Roos, G. (1999). The Knowledge Toolbox: A Review of the Tools Available to Measure and Manage Intangible Resources. *European Management Journal*. 17 (4), 391-402.

- Bontis, N., Keow, W.C.C., and Richardson, S. (2000). Intellectual Capital and Business Performance in Malaysian Industries. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 1 (1), 85-100.
- Braga-Alves, M.V. and Morey, M. (2012). Predicting Corporate Governance in Emerging Markets. *Journal of International Money and Finance*. 31 (6), 1414-1439.
- Brick, I.E. and Chidambaran, N.K. (2010). Board Meetings, Committee Structure, and Firm Value. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 16 (4), 533-553.
- Brickley, J.A. and Zimmerman, J.L. (2010). Corporate Governance Myths: Comments on Armstrong, Guay, and Weber. Working paper, University of Rochester.
- Brooking, A. (1997). The Management of Intellectual Capital. *Long Range Planning*. 30 (3), 364-365.
- Cabrita, M.D.R. and Bontis, N. (2008). Intellectual Capital and Business Performance in the Portuguese Banking Industry. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 43(1-3), 212.
- Cadbury, A. (1992). Cadbury Report: The Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance. *Tech report, HMG, London*.
- Carcello, J.V., Hermanson, D.R., Neal, T.L., and Jr, R.A.R. (2002). Board Characteristics and Audit Fees. *Contemporary Accounting Research*. 19 (3), 365-384.
- Carter, D.A., D'Souza, F., Simkins, B.J., and Simpson, W.G. (2010). The Gender and Ethnic Diversity of Us Boards and Board Committees and Firm Financial Performance. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 18 (5), 396-414.
- Catalyst (2011). Catalyst Census of Women Board Directors of the Fortune 500. New York: Catalyst.
- CCG (2012). Code of Corporate Governance, Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan. Available At: [Http://Www.Secp.Gov.Pk/Cg.Asp](http://www.secp.gov.pk/Cg.Asp)
- Cerbioni, F. and Parbonetti, A. (2007). Exploring the Effects of Corporate Governance on Intellectual Capital Disclosure: An Analysis of European Biotechnology Companies. *European Accounting Review*. 16 (4), 791-826.

- Certo, S.T., Daily, C.M., and Dalton, D.R. (2001). Signaling Firm Value through Board Structure: An Investigation of Initial Public Offerings. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 26 (2), 33-50.
- Chan, K.H. (2009). Impact of Intellectual Capital on Organisational Performance: An Empirical Study of Companies in the Hang Seng Index. *The Learning Organization*. 16 (1), 4-21.
- Chen, D. (2008). The Monitoring and Advisory Functions of Corporate Boards: Theory and Evidence. Working paper, University of Baltimore.
- Chen, M., Cheng, S., and Hwang, Y. (2005). An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship between Intellectual Capital & Firm's Market Value and Financial Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 6 (2), 159-176.
- Chien, S.-H. and Chao, M.-C. (2011). Intellectual Capital and New Product Sale Performance of the Financial Services Industry in Taiwan. *Service Industries Journal*. 31 (16), 2641-2659.
- Chin, W.W. (2010). How to Write up and Report PLS Analyses. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications in Marketing and Related Fields*, edited by V. Esposito Vinzi, Chin, W.W., Henseler, J., Wang, Huiwen. Berlin: Springer.
- Chiucchi, M.S. and Dumay, J. (2015). Unlocking Intellectual Capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 16 (2), 305-330.
- Christensen, J., Kent, P., and Stewart, J. (2010). Corporate Governance and Company Performance in Australia. *Australian Accounting Review*. 20 (4), 372-386.
- Chu, S.K.W., Chan, K.H., and Wu, W.W.Y. (2011). Charting Intellectual Capital Performance of the Gateway to China. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 12 (2), 249-276.
- Cicero, D., Wintoki, M.B., and Yang, T. (2013). How Do Firms Adjust Their Board Structures? *Corporate Finance*. 23, 108-127.
- Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*: Academic press.
- Coles, J.L., Daniel, N.D., and Naveen, L. (2008). Boards: Does One Size Fit All? *Journal of Financial Economics*. 87, 329-356.
- Coles, J.L., Daniel, N.D., and Naveen, L. (2012). Board Advising Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2002250> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2002250>.

- Combs, J., Crook, T., and Shook, C. (2005). The Dimensionality of Organizational Performance and Its Implications for Strategic Management Research. In *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management* edited by B. D. Ketchen DJ. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Core, J.E., Guay, W.R., and Rusticus, T.O. (2006). Does Weak Governance Cause Weak Stock Returns? An Examination of Firm Operating Performance and Investors' Expectations. *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE*. 61 (2), 655-687.
- Cremers, K.J.M. and Nair, V.B. (2005). Governance Mechanisms and Equity Prices. *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE*. 60 (5), Vol. 60, No. 5, pp. 2859-2894.
- Dadashinasab, M. and Sofian, S. (2014). The Impact of Intellectual Capital on Firm Financial Performance by Moderating of Dynamic Capability. *Asian Social Science*. 10 (17).
- Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T., and Dalton, D.R. (1999). A Decade of Corporate Women: Some Progress in the Boardroom, None in the Executive Suite. *Strategic Management Journal*. 20, 93-99.
- Daily, C.M. and Dalton, D.R. (1994). Corporate Governance and the Bankrupt Firm: An Empirical Assessment. *Strategic Management Journal*. 15 (8), 643-654.
- Daily, C.M., Dalton, D.R., and Cannella, A.A. (2003). Corporate Governance: Decades of Dialogue and Data. *Academy of Management Review*. 28 (3), 371-382.
- Dalton, D.R. and Dalton, C.M. (2011). Integration of Micro and Macro Studies in Governance Research: CEO Duality, Board Composition, and Financial Performance. *Journal of Management*. 37 (2), 404-411.
- Dalziel, T., Gentry, R.J., and Bowerman, M. (2011). An Integrated Agency-Resource Dependence View of the Influence of Directors' Human and Relational Capital on Firms' R&D Spending. *Journal of Management Studies*. 48 (6), 1217-1242.
- Darmadi, S. (2011). Board Diversity and Firm Performance: The Indonesian Evidence. *Corporate ownership and control Journal*. 8 (2), 450-466.
- Devos, E., Prevost, A., and Puthenpurackal, J. (2009). Are Interlocked Directors Effective Monitors? *Financial management*. 38 (4), 861-887.
- Dey, A., Engel, E., and Liu, X. (2011). CEO and Board Chair Roles: To Split or Not to Split? *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 17 (5), 1595-1618.

- Dezs, C.L. and Ross, D.G. (2012). Does Female Representation in Top Management Improve Firm Performance? A Panel Data Investigation. *Strategic Management Journal*. 33, 1072–1089.
- Dhaliwal, D., Naiker, V., and Navissi, F. (2010). The Association between Accruals Quality and the Characteristics of Accounting Experts and Mix of Expertise on Audit Committees. *Contemporary Accounting Research*. 27 (3), 782-827.
- Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P., and Roth, K.P. (2008). Advancing Formative Measurement Models. *Journal of Business Research*. 61 (12), 1203-1218.
- Diamantopoulos, A. and Sigauw, J. (2006). Formative Versus Reflective Indicators in Organizational Measure Development: A Comparison and Empirical Illustration. *British Journal of Management*. 17 (4), 263-82.
- Diamantopoulos, A. and Winklhofer, H. (2001). Index Construction with Formative Indicators: An Alternative to Scale Development. *Journal of Marketing Research*. (37), 269-77.
- Donaldson, L. (1990). The Ethereal Hand: Organizational Economics and Management Theory. *Academy of Management Review*. 15 (3), 369-381.
- Donaldson, T. and Preston, L.E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence and Implication. *Academy of Management Review*. 20 (1), 65-91.
- Drees, J.M. and Heugens, P.P. (2013). Synthesizing and Extending Resource Dependence Theory a Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*, 0149206312471391.
- Drobetz, W., Schillhofer, A., and Zimmerman, H. (2004). Corporate Governance and Expected Stock Returns: Evidence from Germany. *European Financial Management*, 267-295.
- Dumay, J., Guthrie, J., and Puntillo, P. (2015). IC and Public Sector: A Structured Literature Review. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 16 (2), 267-284.
- Dzinkowski, R. (2000). The Measurement and Management of Intellectual Capital: An Introduction. *Management Accounting*. 78 (2), 32-36.
- Edvinsson, L. (2013). IC 21: Reflections from 21 Years of IC Practice and Theory. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 14 (1), 163-172.
- Edvinsson, L. and Malone, M.S. (1997). Intellectual Capital: Realizing Your Company's True Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower.

- Ertugrul, M. and Hegde, S. (2009). Corporate Governance Ratings and Firm Performance. *Financial management*. 38 (1), 139-160.
- Fama, E.F. and Jensen, M.C. (1983). Separation of Ownership and Control. . *Journal of Law and Economics*. 26, 301-325.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., and Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical Power Analyses Using G*Power 3.1: Tests for Correlation and Regression Analyses. *Behav Res Methods*. 41 (4), 1149-60.
- Fayez, A., Hameed, A.-Q., and Ridha, A.-K. (2011). The Intellectual Capital Performance of Kuwaiti Banks: An Application of VAICTM Model. *iBusiness*. 03 (01), 88-96.
- Feldman, E.R. and Montgomery, C.A. (2015). Are Incentives without Expertise Sufficient? Evidence from Fortune 500 Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*. 36 (1), 113-122.
- Fich, E.M. and Shivdasani, A. (2006). Are Busy Boards Effective Monitors? *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE*. 61 (2), 689-724.
- Finkelstein, S. and Ann, C.M. (2003). Not the Usual Suspects: How to Use Board Process to Make Boards Better. *The Academy of Management Executive (1993-2005)*. 17 (2), 101-113.
- Finkelstein, S., Hambrick, D.C., and Cannella, A.A. (2009). Strategic Leadership; Theory and Research on Executives, Top Management Teams and Boards. oxford: Oxford university Press.
- Firer, S. and Williams, S.M. (2003). Intellectual Capital and Traditional Measures of Corporate Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 4 (3), 348-360.
- Forbes, D.P. and Milliken, F.J. (1999). Cognition and Corporate Governance: Understanding Boards of Directors as Strategic Decision-Making Groups. *The Academy of Management Review*. 24 (3), 489-505.
- Fornell, C. and Bookstein, F.L. (1982). Two Structural Equation Models: LISREL and PLS Applied to Consumer Exit-Voice Theory. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 19 (4), 440-452.
- Francis, B., Hasan, I., and Wu, Q. (2012). Do Corporate Boards Affect Firm Performance? New Evidence from the Financial Crisis. Bank of Finland Research Discussion Papers.

- Francis, B., Hasan, I., and Wu, Q. (2015). Professors in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Corporate Governance and Firm Performance. *Financial management*. 44 (3), 547-581.
- Freeze, R.D. and Raschke, R.L. (2007). An Assessment of Formative and Reflective Constructs in Is Research. Paper presented at ECIS.
- Fritz, M.S., Taylor, A.B., and Mackinnon, D.P. (2012). Explanation of Two Anomalous Results in Statistical Mediation Analysis. *Multivariate Behav Res*. 47 (1), 61-87.
- Gambi, L.D.N., Boer, H., Gerolamo, M.C., Jørgensen, F., and Carpinetti, L.C.R. (2015). The Relationship between Organizational Culture and Quality Techniques, and Its Impact on Operational Performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*. 35 (10), 1460-1484.
- Gan, K. and Saleh, Z. (2008). Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance of Technology-Intensive Companies: Malaysia Evidence. *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting*. 1 (1), 113-130.
- Gaur, S.S., Bathula, H., Singh, D., Adcroft, A., and Matthews, C. (2015). Ownership Concentration, Board Characteristics and Firm Performance: A Contingency Framework. *Management Decision*. 53 (5).
- Geletkanycz, M.A. and Boyd, B.K. (2011). CEO Outside Directorships and Firm Performance: A Reconciliation of Agency and Embeddedness Views. *Academy of Management Journal*. 54 (2), 335-352.
- Ghazal, V.A. (2015). CEO Duality and Corporate Stewardship: Evidence from Takeovers. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2616464> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2616464>, 1-18.
- Given, L.M. (2008). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Goerzen, A. and Beamish, P.W. (2005). The Effect of Alliance Network Diversity on Multinational Enterprise Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. 26 (4), 333-354.
- Goh, P.C. (2005). Intellectual Capital Performance of Commercial Banks in Malaysia. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 6 (3), 386-395.
- Gompers, P.A., Ishii, J.L., and Metrick, A. (2003). Corporate Governance and Equity Prices. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107-155.

- Gruszczynski, M. (2006). Corporate Governance and Financial Performance of Companies in Poland. *International Advances in Economic Research*. 12 (2), 251-259.
- Gudergan, S.P., Ringle, C.M., Wende, S., and Will, A. (2008). Confirmatory Tetrad Analysis in PLS Path Modeling. *Journal of Business Research*. 61 (12), 1238-1249.
- Guest, P. (2009). The Impact of Board Size on Firm Performance: Evidence from the UK. *The European Journal of Finance*. 15 (4), 385-404.
- Gul, S., Sajid, M., Khan, M.B., Bukhari, S.A., and Iqbal, J. (2011). The Relationship between Corporate Governance and Firm Performance (Evidence from Textile Sector of Pakistan). *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*. 1 (12), 45-53.
- Guo, L., Lach, P., and Mobbs, S. (2015). Tradeoffs between Internal and External Governance: Evidence from Exogenous Regulatory Shocks. *Financial management*. 44 (1), 81-114.
- Gupta, K., Krishnamurti, C., and Tourani-Rad, A. (2013). Is Corporate Governance Relevant During the Financial Crisis? *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*. 23, 85-110.
- Haider, N., Khan, N., and Iqbal, N. (2015). Impact of Corporate Governance on Firm Financial Performance in Islamic Financial Institution. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*. 51, 106-110.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., and Anderson, R.E. (2010). *2010. Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective: (7th ed.)*, Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., and Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M., and Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*. 18 (2), 139-152.
- Haslam, S.A. and Ryan, M.K. (2008). The Road to the Glass Cliff: Differences in the Perceived Suitability of Men and Women for Leadership Positions in Succeeding and Failing Organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 19, 530-546.

- Haveman, H.A. and Baresford, L.S. (2012). If You're So Smart, Why Aren't You the Boss? Explaining the Persistent Vertical Gender Gap in Management. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 639 (1), 114-130.
- HDI (2015). Human Development Reports. United Nations Development Programme. Available at <http://hdr.undp.org/en/2015-report>
- Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T.K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C.M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D.W., Ketchen, D.J., Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., and Calantone, R.J. (2014). Common Beliefs and Reality About PLS Comments on Rönkkö and Evermann (2013). *Organizational Research Methods*. 17 (2), 182-209.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M., and Sinkovics, R.R. (2009). The Use of Partial Least Squares Path Modeling in International Marketing. In *Advances in International Marketing*, edited by R. R. Sinkovics and P. N. Ghauri. Bingley: Emerald
- Hillman, A.J. and Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of Directors and Firm Performance: Integrating Agency and Resource Dependence Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*. 28 (3), 383-396.
- Hillman, A.J., Shropshire, C., and Cannella, A.A. (2007). Organizational Predictors of Women on Corporate Boards. *Academy of Management Journal*. 50 (4), 941-952.
- Hillman, A.J., Withers, M.C., and Collins, B.J. (2009). Resource Dependence Theory: A Review. *Journal of Management*. 35 (6), 1404-1427.
- Ho, C.A. and Williams, S.M. (2003). International Comparative Analysis of the Association between Board Structure and the Efficiency of Value Added by a Firm from Its Physical Capital and Intellectual Capital Resources. *International Journal of Accounting*. 38, 465-491.
- Ho, L.-A. (2008). What Affects Organizational Performance? The Linking of Learning and Knowledge Management. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. 108 (9), 1234-1254.
- Holienka, M. and Pilková, A. (2014). Impact of Intellectual Capital and Its Components on Firm Performance before and after Crisis. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*. 12 (4).

- Holienka, M., Pilková, A., and Kubišová, M. (2016). The Influence of Intellectual Capital Performance on Value Creation in Slovak SMEs. In *The Essence and Measurement of Organizational Efficiency*: Springer.
- Horton, J., Millo, Y., and Serafeim, G. (2012). Resources or Power? Implications of Social Networks on Compensation and Firm Performance. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*. 39 (3-4), 399-426.
- Hsu, I.-C. and Sabherwal, R. (2012). Relationship between Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Management: An Empirical Investigation. *Decision Sciences*. 43 (3), 489-524.
- Hsu, L.-C. and Wang, C.-H. (2012). Clarifying the Effect of Intellectual Capital on Performance: The Mediating Role of Dynamic Capability. *British Journal of Management*. 23 (2), 179-205.
- Hsu, Y.-H. and Fang, W. (2009). Intellectual Capital and New Product Development Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Learning Capability. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 76 (5), 664-677.
- Huang, S.-Y. (2014). Intellectual Capital Measures: Literature Review. Paper presented at Portland International Center for Management of Engineering and Technology: Infrastructure and Service Integration, at Portland, USA.
- Iazzolino, G. and Laise, D. (2013). Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC). *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 14 (4), 547-563.
- Ingle, C.B. and McCaffrey, K. (2007). Effective Governance for Start-up Companies: Regarding the Board as a Strategic Resource. *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics*. 3 (3), 308-329.
- Inkinen, H. (2015). Review of Empirical Research on Intellectual Capital and Firm Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 16 (3), 518-565.
- Jarvis, C.B., MacKenzie, S.B., and Podsakoff, P.M.A. (2003). Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 30, 199-218.
- Jensen, M.C. (1993). The Modern Industrial Revolution, Exit, and the Failure of Internal Control Systems. *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE*. 48 (3), 831-880.
- Jermias, J. and Gani, L. (2014). The Impact of Board Capital and Board Characteristics on Firm Performance. *The British Accounting Review*. 46 (2), 135-153.

- Johnson, H.T. and Kaplan, R.S. (1987). *Relevance Lost: The Rise and Fall of Management Accounting*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Jose, P.E. (2013). *Doing Statistical Mediation and Moderation*: Guilford Press.
- Julizaerma, M.K. and Sori, Z.M. (2012). Gender Diversity in the Boardroom and Firm Performance of Malaysian Public Listed Companies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 65, 1077-1085.
- Jurkus, A.F., Park, J.C., and Woodard, L.S. (2011). Women in Top Management and Agency Costs. *Journal of Business Research*. 64 (2), 180-186.
- Kaczmarek, S., Kimino, S., and Pye, A. (2014). Interlocking Directorships and Firm Performance in Highly Regulated Sectors: The Moderating Impact of Board Diversity. *Journal of Management & Governance*. 18 (2), 347-372.
- Kamath, B.G. (2010). The Intellectual Capital Performance of Banking Sector in Pakistan. *Pak. J. Commer. Soc. Sci.* 4 (1), 84-99.
- Kamath, G.B. (2007). The Intellectual Capital Performance of the Indian Banking Sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 8 (1), 96-123.
- Kamath, G.B. (2008). Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance in Indian Pharmaceutical Industry. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 9 (4), 684-704.
- Kamukama, N., Ahiauzu, A., and Ntayi, J.M. (2011). Competitive Advantage: Mediator of Intellectual Capital and Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 12 (1), 152-164.
- Kanellos, T. and George, T. (2007). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: Results from Greek Firms. *Munich Personal Respect Archive*. 6414.
- Kaplan, R.S. and Norton, D.P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy into Action*: Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Keenan, J. and Aggestam, M. (2001). Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital: Some Conceptualizations, Corporate Governance. *An International Review*. 9 (4), 259-275.
- KEI (2012). Knowledge Economy Index. In *World Bank*. Available at <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/KEI>.
- Kenyon, G.N., Meixell, M.J., and Westfall, P.H. (2016). Production Outsourcing and Operational Performance: An Empirical Study Using Secondary Data. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 171, 336-349.

- Khalique, M., Md. Isa, A.H.B., and Shaari, J.A.N. (2012). Challenges Faced by Pakistani Pharmaceutical Industry: An Intellectual Capital Perspective. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*. 1 (1), 39-45.
- Khan, A. and Awan, D.S.H. (2012). Effect of Board Composition on Firm's Performance: A Case of Pakistani Listed Companies. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 3 (10), 853-863.
- Kianto, A., Ritala, P., Spender, J.-C., and Vanhala, M. (2014). The Interaction of Intellectual Capital Assets and Knowledge Management Practices in Organizational Value Creation. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 15 (3), 362-375.
- Kim, K., Mauldin, E., and Patro, S. (2011). Directors' Firm-Specific Knowledge Versus Individual Expertise and Board Performance. Paper presented at corporate governance, at Missouri.
- Kim, K., Mauldin, E., and Patro, S. (2014). Outside Directors and Board Advising and Monitoring Performance. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*. 57 (2-3), 110-131.
- Kirkpatrick, G. (2009). The Corporate Governance Lessons from the Financial Crisis. *OECD Journal: Financial Market Trends*. 2009 (1), 61-87.
- Klein, D.A. and Prusak, L. (1994). Characterizing Intellectual Capital. In *working paper*: Center for Business Innovation, Ernst & Young.
- Kock, N. (2011). Using WarpPLS in e-collaboration studies: Mediating effects, control and second order variables, and algorithm choices. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 7(3), 1-13.
- Komnencic, B. and Pokrajčić, D. (2012). Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance of MNCs in Serbia. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 13 (1), 106-119.
- Kraemer, H.C., Kiernan, M., and Essex, M. (2008). How and Why Criteria Defining Moderators and Mediators Differ between the Baron & Kenny and Macarthur Approaches. *Health Psychology*, 101-108.
- Kraft, J. and Ravix, J.L. (2008). Corporate Governance and the Governance of Knowledge: Rethinking the Relationship in Terms of Corporate Coherence. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*. 17 (1-2), 79-95.
- Krause, R., Semadeni, M., and Cannella, A.A. (2013). CEO Duality: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*. 40 (1), 256-286.

- Krause, R., Semadeni, M., and Cannella, A.A. (2014). CEO Duality a Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*. 40 (1), 256-286.
- Kujansivu, P. and Lonnqvist, A. (2005). The Value and Efficiency of Intellectual Capital in Finnish Companies. Institute of Industrial Management, Tampere University of Technology, Tampere. Finland.
- Kujansivu, P. and Lönnqvist, A. (2007). Investigating the Value and Efficiency of Intellectual Capital. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 8 (2), 272-287.
- Lamport, M.J., Latona, M.N., Seetanah, B., and Sannasse, V. (2011). Relationship between Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: Evidence from a Sample of Top 100 Mauritian Companies. Paper presented at Cambridge Business and Economics Conference, at Cambridge.
- Larcker, D. and Tayan, B. (2011). *Corporate Governance Matters: A Closer Look at Organizational Choices and Their Consequences*: FT Press.
- Leal, R.P.C., Carvalhal, A.L., and Iervolino, A.P. (2015). One Decade of Evolution of Corporate Governance Practices in Brazil. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2611372> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2611372>
- Li, J., Pike, R., and Haniffa, R. (2008). Intellectual Capital Disclosure and Corporate Governance Structure in UK Firms. *Accounting and Business Research*. 38 (2), 137-159.
- Lin, Y.-f., Yeh, Y.M.C., and Yang, F.-m. (2014). Supervisory Quality of Board and Firm Performance: A Perspective of Board Meeting Attendance. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*. 25 (3-4), 264-279.
- Liu, Y., Miletkov, M.K., Wei, Z., and Yang, T. (2015). Board Independence and Firm Performance in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 30, 223-244.
- Liu, Y., Wei, Z., and Xie, F. (2014). Do Women Directors Improve Firm Performance in China? *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 28, 169-184.
- Low, D.C.M., Roberts, H., and Whiting, R.H. (2015). Board Gender Diversity and Firm Performance: Empirical Evidence from Hong Kong, South Korea, Malaysia and Singapore. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*. 35 (Part A), 381-401.
- Lückerath-Rovers, M. (2013). Women on Boards and Firm Performance. *Journal of Management & Governance*. 17 (2), 491-509.

- Luthy, D.H. (1998). Intellectual Capital and Its Measurement. Paper presented at Proceedings of the Asian Pacific Interdisciplinary Research in Accounting Conference (APIRA), Osaka, Japan.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M., and Jarvis, C.B. (2005). The Problem of Measurement Model Misspecification in Behavioral and Organizational Research and Some Recommended Solutions. *J Appl Psychol.* 90 (4), 710-30.
- MacKinnon, D.P., Lockwood, C.M., Hoffman, J.M., West, S.G., and Sheets, V. (2002). A Comparison of Methods to Test Mediation and Other Intervening Variable Effects. *Psychol Methods.* 7 (1), 83.
- Maditinos, D., Chatzoudes, D., Tsairidis, C., and Theriou, G. (2011). The Impact of Intellectual Capital on Firms' Market Value and Financial Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital.* 12 (1), 132-151.
- Maharaj, R. (2008). Critiquing and Contrasting "Moral" Stakeholder Theory and "Strategic" Stakeholder: Implications for the Board of Directors. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society.* 8 (2), 115-127.
- Majid, D. and Saudah, S. (2014). The Impact of Intellectual Capital on Firm Financial Performance by Moderating of Dynamic Capability. *Asian Social Science.* 10 (17), 93-100.
- Mak, Y.T. and Kusnadi, Y. (2005). Size Really Matters: Further Evidence on the Negative Relationship between Board Size and Firm Value. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal.* 13 (3), 301-318.
- Makki, M.A.M. and Lodhi, S.A. (2008). Impact of Intellectual Capital Efficiency on Profitability (a Case Study of LSE-25 Companies). *The Lahore Journal of Economics.* 13 (2), 81-98.
- Makki, M.A.M. and Lodhi, S.A. (2009). Impact of Intellectual Capital on Return on Investment in Pakistani Corporate Sector. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences.* 3 (3), 2995-3007.
- Malik, S.U. (2012). Relationship between Corporate Governance Score and Stock Prices: Evidence from KSE-30 Index Companies. *International Journal of Business and Social Science.* 3 (4), 239-249.
- Masulis, R.W. and Mobbs, S. (2011). Are All inside Directors the Same? Evidence from the External Directorship Market. *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE.* LXIV (3), 823-872.

- Masulisa, R.W., Ruzzierb, C., Xiaoc, S., and Zhaod, S. (2012). Do Independent Expert Directors Matter? Paper presented at Weinberg Center for Corporate Governance, University of Delaware USA
- Mathuramaytha, C. (2012). The Impacts of Intellectual Capital on Innovative Capability: Building the Sustain Competitive Advantage on a Resource-Based Perspective of Thailand Industrials. *International Business Management*. 6 (4), 451-457.
- Mavridis, D.G. (2004). The Intellectual Capital Performance of the Japanese Banking Sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 92-115. 1, 92-115.
- McCahery, J., Starks, L., and Sautner, Z. (2010). Behind the Scenes: The Corporate Governance Preferences of Institutional Investors. Paper presented at Working paper, at University of Amsterdam.
- Medcof, J.W. (2001). Resource-Based Strategy and Managerial Power in Networks of Internationally Dispersed Technology Units. *Strategic Management Journal*. 22 (11), 999-1012.
- Mehdivand, M., Zali, M.R., Madhoshi, M., and Kordnaeij, A. (2012). Intellectual Capital and Nano-Businesses Performance: The Moderating Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*. (52), 147-162.
- Mehralian, G., Rajabzadeh, A., Reza Sadeh, M., and Reza Rasekh, H. (2012). Intellectual Capital and Corporate Performance in Iranian Pharmaceutical Industry. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 13 (1), 138-158.
- Menor, L.J., Kristal, M.M., and Rosenzweig, E.D. (2007). Examining the Influence of Operational Intellectual Capital on Capabilities and Performance. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 9 (4), 559-578.
- Mention, A.-L. (2012). Intellectual Capital, Innovation and Performance: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Business and Economic Research*. 2 (1), 1-37.
- Miller, C.C., Washburn, N.T., and Glick, W.H. (2013). Perspective—the Myth of Firm Performance. *Organization Science*. 24 (3), 948-964.
- Minichilli, A., Zattoni, A., Nielsen, S., and Huse, M. (2012). Board Task Performance: An Exploration of Micro- and Macro-Level Determinants of Board Effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 33 (2), 193-215.

- Minton, B.A., Taillard, J.P., and Williamson, R. (2014). Financial Expertise of the Board, Risk Taking, and Performance: Evidence from Bank Holding Companies. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 49 (02), 351-380.
- Mohammadi, A., Basir, N.O., and Lööf, H. (2015). CEO Duality and Firm Performance Revisited. Royal Institute of Technology, CESIS-Centre of Excellence for Science and Innovation Studies.
- Mohanty, P. (2004). Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance in India. *National Stock Exchange of India Research Initiative Paper* (15).
- Mondal, A. and Ghosh, S.K. (2012). Intellectual Capital and Financial Performance of Indian Banks. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 13 (4), 257-288.
- Morariu, C.M. (2014). Intellectual Capital Performance in the Case of Romanian Public Companies. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 15 (3), 392-410.
- Mueller, J., Ingley, C., and Cocks, G. (2008). The Blender Approach to Governance Leadership: Do Diverse Director Attributes Contribute to Board Capital. Paper presented at managing in the Pacific Century, at 22nd Australia and New Zealand Academy of Management Annual Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Mulili, B. and Wong, P. (2011). Continuous Organizational Development (Cod). *Industrial and Commercial Training*. 43 (6), 377-384.
- Mura, M., Lettieri, E., Spiller, N., and Radaelli, G. (2012). Intellectual Capital and Innovative Work Behaviour: Opening the Black Box. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, 1.
- Nakamura, L.I. (2001). What Is the US Gross Investment in Intangibles? (at Least) One Trillion a Year. working paper, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA.
- Nakano, M. and Nguyen, P. (2013). Why Do Firms with Larger Boards Have Lower Market Values? Evidence from the Investment Behavior of Japanese Firms. Working Paper, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo.
- Namvar, M., Fathian, M., Akhavan, P., and Reza Gholamian, M. (2010). Exploring the Impacts of Intellectual Property on Intellectual Capital and Company Performance. *Management Decision*. 48 (5), 676-697.
- Nguyen, P., Rahman, N., Tong, A., and Zhao, R. (2015). Board Size and Firm Value: Evidence from Australia. *Journal of Management & Governance*.

- Nguyen, T., Locke, S., and Reddy, K. (2015). Does Boardroom Gender Diversity Matter? Evidence from a Transitional Economy. *International Review of Economics & Finance*. 37, 184-202.
- Nicholson, G.J., Alexander, M., and Kiel, G.C. (2004). Defining the Social Capital of the Board of Directors: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Australian New Zealand Academy of Management*. 10 (1), 54-72.
- Nienhüser, W. (2008). Resource Dependence Theory-How Well Does It Explain Behavior of Organizations? *management revue*. 19 (1-2), 9-32.
- Ntim, C.G., Opong, K.K., and Danbolt, J. (2012). The Relative Value Relevance of Shareholder Versus Stakeholder Corporate Governance Disclosure Policy Reforms in South Africa. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 20 (1), 84-105.
- Ntim, C.G., Opong, K.K., and Danbolt, J. (2014). Board Size, Corporate Regulations and Firm Valuation in an Emerging Market: A Simultaneous Equation Approach. *International Review of Applied Economics*. 29 (2), 194-220.
- Nunnally, J. and Bernstein, I.H. (1994). Psychometric Theory. New York, McGraw-Hill Publishers.
- OECD (1999). OECD Symposium on Measuring and Reporting Intellectual Capital: June, Amsterdam
- OECD (2004). OECD Principles of Corporate Governance. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2008). Intellectual Assets and Value Creation: Synthesis Report. *Meeting of the OECD Council at Ministerial level, OECD, Paris*.
- Ozturk, M.B. and Demirgunes, K. (2007). Determination of Effect of Intellectual Capital on Firm Value Via Value Added Intellectual Coefficient Methodology: An Empirical Study on ISE-Listed Manufacturing Firms. *ISE Review*. 10 (37), 59-77.
- Pal, K. and Soriya, S. (2012). IC Performance of Indian Pharmaceutical and Textile Industry. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 13 (1), 120-137.
- Pathan, S. (2009). Strong Boards, CEO Power and Bank Risk-Taking. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 1340-1350.
- PBS (2015). External Trade Statistics, Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad, Pakistan. Available at: www.pbs.gov.pk/trade-tables.
- Peng, M.W. (2004). Outside Directors and Firm Performance During Institutional Transitions. *Strategic Management Journal*. 25 (5), 453-471.

- Peppard, J. and Rylander, A. (2001). Using an Intellectual Capital Perspective to Design and Implement a Growth Strategy. *European Management Journal*. 19 (5), 510-525.
- Petty, R. and Guthrie, J. (2000). Intellectual Capital Review—Measurement, Reporting and Management. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 1 (2), 155-176.
- Petty, R., Ricceri, F., and Guthrie, J. (2008). Intellectual Capital: A User's Perspective. *Management Research News*. 31 (6), 434-447.
- Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. (2003). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*: Stanford University Press.
- Phusavat, K. and Kanchana, R. (2007). Competitive Priorities of Manufacturing Firms in Thailand. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. 107 (7), 979-996.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Shen, W., and Podsakoff, P.M. (2006). The Role of Formative Measurement Models in Strategic Management Research: Review, Critique, and Implications for Future Research. In *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, edited by D. J. Ketchen and D. D. Bergh: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Preacher, K.J. and Hayes, A.F. (2004). SPSS and SAS Procedures for Estimating Indirect Effects in Simple Mediation Models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*. 36, 717-731.
- Pucci, T., Simoni, C., and Zanni, L. (2013). Measuring the Relationship between Marketing Assets, Intellectual Capital and Firm Performance. *Journal of Management & Governance*. 19 (3), 589-616.
- Pulic, A. (2000). VAIC™—an Accounting Tool for IC Management. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 20 (5-8), 702-714.
- Pulic, A. (2004). Intellectual Capital- Does It Create Value or Destroy It? *Measuring Business Excellence*. 8 (1), 62-68.
- Rahman, S. (2012). The Role of Intellectual Capital in Determining Differences between Stock Market and Financial Performance. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*. (89), 46-77.
- Rehman, W.u., Rehman, P.D.C.A., Rehman, P.D.H.u., and Zahid, A. (2011). Intellectual Capital Performance and Its Impact on Corporate Performance: An Empirical Evidence from Modaraba Sector of Pakistan. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*. 1 (5), 8-16.

- Renders, A., Gaeremynck, A., and Sercu, P. (2010). Corporate-Governance Ratings and Company Performance: A Cross-European Study. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 18 (2), 87-106.
- Riahi-Belkaoui, A. (2003). Intellectual Capital and Firm Performance of US Multinational Firms. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 4 (2), 215-226.
- Richard, P.J., Devinney, T.M., Yip, G.S., and Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. *Journal of Management*. 35 (3), 718-804.
- Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M., and Mooi, E.A. (2010). Response-Based Segmentation Using Finite Mixture Partial Least Squares: Theoretical Foundations and an Application to American Customer Satisfaction Index Data. *Annals of Information Systems*. 8, 19-49.
- Ringle, C.M., Wende, S., and Becker, J.M. (2015). Smartpls3. Boenningstedt: Smart PLS GmbH
- Roos, G., Pike, S., and Fernstrom, L. (2005). *Managing Intellectual Capital in Practice*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier/Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Rossiter, J.R. (2002). The C-Oar-Se Procedure for Scale Development in Marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. 19, 305-335.
- Safieddine, A., Jamali, D., and Nouredine, S. (2009). Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital: Evidence from an Academic Institution. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*. 9 (2), 146-157.
- Sánchez, L.P.-C. and Barroso-Castro, C. (2015). It Is Useful to Consider the Interlocks According to the Type of Board Member (Executive or Non-Executive) Who Posseses Them? Their Effect on Firm Performance. *Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa*. 24 (3), 130-137.
- Sanda, A.U., Garba, T., and Mikailu, A.S. (2008). Board Independence and Firm Financial Performance: Evidence from Nigeria. Working Paper. Usmano Danfodiyo University.
- Santos, J.B. and Brito, L.A.L. (2012). Toward a Subjective Measurement Model for Firm Performance. *BAR - Brazilian Administration Review*. 9, 95-117.
- Sarbanes-Oxley Act*. 107th Congress Public Law 107-204. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. 107.
- Schiama, G. and Lerro, A. (2008). Intellectual Capital and Company's Performance. *Measuring Business Excellence*. 12 (2), 3-14.

- SECP (2005). Forensic Investigation for the SECP into the KSE Events of March 2005. Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Shaikh, J.M. (2004). Measuring and Reporting of Intellectual Capital Performance Analysis. *Journal of American Academy of Business*. 4 (1/2), 439-448.
- Sheikh, S. and Chatterjee, S. (1995). Perspectives on Corporate Governance. In *Corporate Governance and Corporate Control*, edited by S. Sheikh and W. Rees. UK: Cavendish Publishing.
- Shih, K., Chang, C., and Lin, B. (2010). Assessing Knowledge Creation and Intellectual Capital in Banking Industry. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 11 (1), 74-89.
- Shiu, H.-J. (2006). The Application of the Value Added Intellectual Coefficient to Measure Corporate Performance: Evidence from Technological Firms. *International Journal of Management*. 23 (2), 356-365.
- Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W. (1997). A Survey of Corporate Governance. *THE JOURNAL OF FINANCE*. 52 (2), 737-783.
- Shropshire, C. (2010). The Role of the Interlocking Director and Board Receptivity in the Diffusion of Practices. *Academy of Management Review*. 35 (2), 246-264.
- Shrout, P.E. and Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in Experimental and Nonexperimental Studies: New Procedures and Recommendations. *Psychological Methods*. 7 (4), 422-445.
- Shukeri, S.N., Shin, O.W., and Shaari, M.S. (2012). Does Board of Director's Characteristics Affect Firm Performance? Evidence from Malaysian Public Listed Companies. *International Business Research*. 5 (9), 120-127.
- Singh, D.A. and Gaur, A.S. (2009). Business Group Affiliation, Firm Governance, and Firm Performance: Evidence from China and India. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 17 (4), 411-425.
- Singh, P.J., Power, D., and Chuong, S.C. (2011). A Resource Dependence Theory Perspective of ISO 9000 in Managing Organizational Environment. *Journal of Operations Management*. 29 (1-2), 49-64.
- Skyrme, D.J. (1998). Valuing Knowledge: Is It Worth It? *Managing Information*. 5 (2), 24-26.
- Sobel, M.E. (1982). Asymptotic Confidence Intervals for Indirect Effects in Structural Equation Models. *Sociological Methodology*. 13, 290-312.

- Solomon, J.F. (2007). *Corporate Governance and Accountability, (2nd Ed.)*. New York: Wiley.
- Steigenberger, N. (2014). Only a Matter of Chance? How Firm Performance Measurement Impacts Study Results. *European Management Journal*. 32 (1), 46-65.
- Sternberg, E. (2004). *Corporate Governance: Accountability in the Marketplace*. UK: the Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Stewart, T.A. (1997). *Intellectual Capital: The New Wealth of Organizations*. London: Nicholas Brealey
- Straub, D., Boudreau, M.C., and Gefen, D. (2004). Validation Guidelines for Is Positivist Research. *Communication of the Association for Information Systems*. 13, 380-427.
- Sueyoshi, T., Goto, M., and Omi, Y. (2010). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: Evidence from Japanese Manufacturing Industries after the Lost Decade. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 203 (3), 724-736.
- Sullivan, P.H. (2000). *Value Driven Intellectual Capital: How to Convert Intangible Corporate Assets into Market Value*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Survey, P.E. (2008-2009). Pakistan Economic Survey. Ministry of Finance, Islamabad, Pakistan. Available at: www.finance.gov.pk/survey_0809.html.
- Sveiby, K. (1997). *The New Organizational Wealth: Managing and Measuring Knowledge- Based Assets*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Sveiby, K.-E. (2010). Methods for Measuring Intangible Assets. Available at [Http://Www.Sveiby.Com](http://www.sveiby.com)
- Swartz, N.-P. and Firer, S. (2005). Board Structure and Intellectual Capital Performance in South Africa. *Meditari Accountancy Research*. 13 (2), 145-166.
- Taliyang, S.M. and Jusop, M. (2011). Intellectual Capital Disclosure and Corporate Governance Structure: Evidence in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 6 (12), 109-117.
- Tan, H.P., Plowman, D., and Hancock, P. (2007). Intellectual Capital and Financial Returns of Companies. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 8 (1), 76-95.
- Tan, L.P. and Wong, K.Y. (2015). Linkage between Knowledge Management and Manufacturing Performance: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 19 (4), 814-835.

- Terjesen, S., Couto, E.B., and Francisco, P.M. (2015). Does the Presence of Independent and Female Directors Impact Firm Performance? A Multi-Country Study of Board Diversity. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 1-37.
- Thongrattana, P.T. (2010). Assessing Reliability and Validity of a Measurement Instrument for Studying Uncertain Factors in Thai Rice Supply Chain. Paper presented at Higher Degree Research Student Conference at the University of Wollongong, at Australia.
- Topak, M.S. (2011). The Effect of Board Size on Firm Performance: Evidence from Turkey. *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics*. (14), 119-127.
- Tovestiga, G. and Tulugurova, E. (2007). Intellectual Capital Practice and Performance in Russian Enterprise. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 4, 695-707.
- Vafeas, N. (1999). Board Meeting Frequency and Firm Performance. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 53 (1), 113-142.
- Vafeas, N. and Theodorou, E. (1998). The Association between Board Structure and Firm Performance in the UK. *British accounting Review*. 30, 383-407.
- Vandenbroucke, E., Knockaert, M., and Ucbasaran, D. (2014). Outside Board Human Capital and Early Stage High-Tech Firm Performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, n/a-n/a.
- Varshney, P., Kaul, V.K., and Vasal, V. (2013). Corporate Governance Mechanisms and Firm Performance: A Study of Select Indian Firms. *Afro-Asian Journal of Finance and Accounting*. 3 (4), 341-395.
- Varshney, P., Kaul, V.K., and Vasal, V.K. (2012). Corporate Governance Index and Firm Performance: Empirical Evidence from India. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2103462> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2103462>.
- Velnampy, T. (2013). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: A Study of Sri Lankan Manufacturing Companies. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. 4 (3), 228-235.
- Venkatraman, N. and Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measurement of Business Performance in Strategy Research: A Comparison of Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*. 11 (4), 801-814.

- Voordeckers, W., Van Gils, A., and Van den Heuvel, J. (2007). Board Composition in Small and Medium-Sized Family Firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 45 (1), 137-156.
- Walsh, K., Enz, C.A., and Canina, L. (2008). The Impact of Strategic Orientation on Intellectual Capital Investments in Customer Service Firms. *Journal of Service Research*. 10 (4), 300-317.
- Wang, C.N., Chang, Y.L., Huang, Q.H., and Wang, C.H. (2011). Assessment on Intellectual Capital Management for Taiwanese Pharmaceutical Industry: Using GRA and MPI. *African Journal of Business*. 5 (7), 2950-2958.
- Wang, D. and Chen, S. (2013). Does Intellectual Capital Matter? High-Performance Work Systems and Bilateral Innovative Capabilities. *International Journal of Manpower*. 34 (8), 861-879.
- Wang, W. (2014). Independent Directors and Corporate Performance in China: A Meta-Empirical Study. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 2 (3), 145-171.
- Wang, W.-K., Lu, W.-M., and Lin, Y.-L. (2012). Does Corporate Governance Play an Important Role in BHC Performance? Evidence from the U.S. *Economic Modelling*. 29, 751-760.
- Wang, Z., Wang, N., and Liang, H. (2014). Knowledge Sharing, Intellectual Capital and Firm Performance. *Management Decision*. 52 (2), 230-258.
- Wanyama, S., Burton, B., and Helliard, C. (2013). Stakeholders, Accountability and the Theory-Practice Gap in Developing Nations' Corporate Governance Systems: Evidence from Uganda. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*. 13 (1), 18-38.
- William, S. (2001). Is Intellectual Capital Performance and Disclosure Related. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 2 (3), 192-203.
- Williams, R.J. (2003). Women on Corporate Boards of Directors and Their Influence on Corporate Philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 42 (1), 1-10.
- Williams, S.M. (2000). Relationship between Board Structure and a Firm's Intellectual Capital Performance in an Emerging Economy. Working Paper, University of Calgary, Canada.
- Wintoki, M.B., Linck, J.S., and Netter, J.M. (2012). Endogeneity and the Dynamics of Internal Corporate Governance. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 105 (3), 581-606.

- Wu, S.-H., Lin, L.-Y., and Hsu, M.-Y. (2007). Intellectual Capital, Dynamic Capabilities and Innovative Performance of Organisations. *International Journal of Technology Management*. 39 (3-4), 279-296.
- Wu, W.Y., Chang, M.L., and Chen, C.W. (2008). Promoting Innovation through the Accumulation of Intellectual Capital, Social Capital, and Entrepreneurial Orientation. *R&D Management*. 38 (30), 265-277.
- Yalama, A. and Coskun, M. (2007). Intellectual Capital Performance of Quoted Banks on the Istanbul Stock Exchange Market. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 8 (2), 256-271.
- Yang, C.-C. and Lin, C.Y.-Y. (2009). Does Intellectual Capital Mediate the Relationship between HRM and Organizational Performance? Perspective of a Healthcare Industry in Taiwan. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 20 (9), 1965-1984.
- Yang, T. and Zhao, S. (2014). CEO Duality and Firm Performance: Evidence from an Exogenous Shock to the Competitive Environment. *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 49, 534-552.
- Yasser, Q.R., Entebang, H., and Mansor, S.A. (2011). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance in Pakistan: The Case of Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE)-30. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*. 3 (8), 482-491.
- Yermack, D. (1996). Higher Market Valuation of Companies with a Small Board of Directors. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 40 (2), 185-211.
- Yoo, T. and Sung, T. (2015). How Outside Directors Facilitate Corporate R&D Investment? Evidence from Large Korean Firms. *Journal of Business Research*. 68 (6), 1251-1260.
- Youndt, M.A., Subramaniam, M., and Snell, S.A. (2004). Intellectual Capital Profiles: An Examination of Investments and Returns. *Journal of Management Studies*. 41 (2), 335-361.
- Yue, Q., Lan, H.-I., and Jiang, L. (2008). Data Mining in Corporate Governance: Ownership Structure, Structure of Board of Directors and Firm Performance. Paper presented at Computational Intelligence and Design, 2008. ISCID'08.
- Zahn, J.-L.W.M.V.d., Neilson, J., and Tower, G. (2004). *Intellectual Capital and the Efficiency of Value Added: Trends in the Singapore Capital Market 2000–2002*. Australia: Burleigh M.D.C., Qld Poseidon Books.

- Zahra, S.A. and Pearce, J.A. (1989). Boards of Directors and Corporate Financial Performance: A Review and Integrative Model. *Journal of Management*. 15 (2), 291-334.
- Zamani, F.G., Nahandi, Y.B., Lalepour, M., and Rezagholibeyghi, A. (2012). The Relation between Corporate Governance and Intellectual Capital Stressing Human Capital Characteristics. *International Journal of Business and Management Tomorrow*. 2 (7), 1-7.
- Zattoni, A., Gnan, L., and Huse, M. (2015). Does Family Involvement Influence Firm Performance? Exploring the Mediating Effects of Board Processes and Tasks. *Journal of Management*. 41 (4), 1214-1243.
- Zéghal, D. and Maaloul, A. (2010). Analysing Value Added as an Indicator of Intellectual Capital and Its Consequences on Company Performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. 11 (1), 39-60.
- Zhang, Q., Chen, L., and Feng, T. (2014). Mediation or Moderation? The Role of R&D Investment in the Relationship between Corporate Governance and Firm Performance: Empirical Evidence from the Chinese It Industry. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 22 (6), 501-517.
- Zhao, Y. and Chen, K.H. (2008). Staggered Boards and Earnings Management. *The Accounting Review*. 83 (5), 1347-1381.
- Zheka, V. (2006). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance in Ukraine. *Heriot-Watt University Centre for Economic Reform and Transformation Discussion Paper*. 5, 1-68.
- Zona, F., Gomez-Mejia, L.R., and Withers, M.C. (2015). Board Interlocks and Firm Performance: Toward a Combined Agency-Resource Dependence Perspective. *Journal of Management*. 1-30