

Corporate Governance: A Conceptual Analysis

Masiye Banda, (MA EPM)
Doctor of Business Administration Candidate (DBA)
ZCAS University, School of Business
PO Box 50497 RW, Lusaka Zambia
E-mail: masiyeb@yahoo.co.uk

Austin Mwange, PhD/DBA
Lecturer – Economics and Finance
The University of Zambia, Graduate School of Business
P.O. Box 32379, Lusaka, Zambia
E-mail: austin.mwange@unza.zm; austinmwange1@gmail.com

Abstract

According to the Chartered Institute of Corporate Governance, the term corporate governance is the system of rules, practices and processes by which a company is directed and controlled. Corporate Governance refers to the way in which companies are governed and to what purpose. It identifies who has power and accountability, and who makes decisions. It is, in essence, a toolkit that enables management and the board to deal more effectively with the challenges of running a company. Corporate governance ensures that businesses have appropriate decision-making processes and controls in place so that the interests of all stakeholders (shareholders, employees, suppliers, customers and the community) are balanced. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to provide a conceptual analysis of the term Corporate Governance. The paper further reviews the state of corporate governance in State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) in Zambia. The paper uses traditional or narrative literature review as the methodology. The paper concludes that Corporate Governance has been a central issue in developing countries long before the recent spate of corporate scandals in advanced countries. The paper concludes that Corporate Governance gained tremendous importance due to economic liberalization and deregulation of industry and business. It is against this background that it has gained so much prominence in the running of State-Owned Enterprises.

Keywords: Corporate Governance; Indicators of Corporate Governance; State-Owned Enterprises; SOEs, Zambia

DOI: 10.7176/RJFA/14-17-05
Publication date: September 30th 2023

1.0 Introduction

The concept of "corporate governance" is a moderately new one both in the public and scholarly debates, although the problems it reports have been around for much longer, at least since Berle and Means (1932) and the even earlier Smith (1776) cited in Farinha (2003). The appearance of the Corporate Governance term at global level took place in the context of recurring serious fraud and financial misuse in countries with developed capital economies (USA, UK, and Italy). According to particular literature (Ghita, Albu et al. 2013; Ionescu, 2010), the first time CG was stated was in the 70s, following the Watergate scandal, where American private organisations were revealed to have been tangled in politics, respectively through unlawful financing of political parties in the USA.

According to Bhagat, & Bolton, (2019) corporate governance is the set of laws, procedures, and processes that guide and manage a company. Corporate governance entails balancing the needs of a company's many stakeholders, who include owners, senior management officials, consumers, vendors, financiers, the government, and the society. Corporate governance covers virtually any aspect of management, from action plans and internal processes to performance evaluation and corporate transparency, because it also serves as a mechanism for achieving a company's goals.

Arcot(2010) adds that corporate governance in the business context refers to the systems of rules, practices, and processes by which companies are governed. In this way, the corporate governance model followed by a specific company is the distribution of rights and responsibilities by all participants in the organization. Governance ensures everyone in an organization follows appropriate and transparent decision-making processes and that the interests of all stakeholders (shareholders, managers, employees, suppliers, customers, among others) are protected.

Governance as per the study of Kovermann, &Velte, (2019) is said as the collection of rules, controls, laws, and decisions placed in place to govern organisational conduct. Proxy advisors and owners are significant stakeholders that have an indirect impact on governance, but they are not models of governance in and of themselves. The board of directors plays a crucial role in government, and its decisions may have a huge effect on stock values. The corporate governance of a corporation is important to investors because it reflects the company's path and corporate credibility. Strong corporate governance allows corporations to create trust in their investors and the environment. Corporate governance promotes financial viability by providing investor holders with a long-term investment incentive.

According to Paniagua, &Rivelles (2018), communicating a company's corporate governance is an essential aspect of society and investor relations. For example, on Apple Inc.'s investor relations website, the company describes its corporate leadership, the management team and board of directors as well as its corporate governance, which includes committee charters and governance documents such as bylaws, shareholder holding rules, and articles of incorporation. Many enterprises aim for a high degree of Corporate Governance. Many shareholders conclude that a company's sustainability is insufficient; it must therefore show strong corporate governance through environmental consciousness, ethical actions, and sound corporate governance practises. A good piece of corporate governance provides a clear set of rules and controls.

As a prevalent concept nowadays, GCG has not only one single meaning. GCG is a principal underlies a procedure and corporate device based on the PeraturanPerundang-undangan and business morals. To the Cadbury Committee on Cadbury Report (1992), GCG is an objective that directs and regulates a corporation to accomplish balancing between influence and authority in their accountability to the stockholders. A group of evolving countries, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also stated GCG as the way of organisation responsible to their shareholders by responsible decision and having the worth added. Last, Forum for Corporate Governance in Indonesia (FCGI) describes corporate governance as a set of rules which regulate relative among stockholders, management, employees, creditor, government, and external and internal relations. In other words, corporate governance is an arrangement that regulates and wheels a corporation.

Definitions above accomplish that the significant aspects of GCG are the balance of corporate components, fulfilled the errands to the stockholders, and fulfilled stakeholder's rights of information and decision, and reasonable treatment of the stakeholders. Gede Raka in the book of 'the Power of Corporate Governance' specified that a corporation is a human organisation including people with worth, dreams, individuality and social tasks.

Corporate governance problems are rising since the parting of the ownership and the management (Jil and Aris Salomon, 2004). Tricker (1994) contended, the managing power of the company comes from the ownership. The owner is predictable to run the company based on their asset value. And therefore, the owner will delegate the influence to the professional team known as the organisation team to administer the investment. The division power of the owner and the administration team creates a difficult named agency problem. This challenge occurred because there is a leading position of the organisation that operates and runs daily operation of the company. Sometimes they act beyond the bounds and forget the ultimate drive of maximizing stakeholder's value. This flaw needs to be solved by the existence of GCG practices.

One such example of corporate governance can be Volkswagen AG, Bad Corporate Governance may bring into question a company's dependability, credibility, or duty to customers, both of which may have consequences for the company's financial wellbeing according to Admati (2017). Tolerance or tolerance for criminal activity will lead to scandals such as the one that shocked Volkswagen AG in September 2015. The unfolding of "Dieselgate" details showed that the automaker had knowingly and routinely manipulated engine emission equipment in its vehicles for years in order to exploit emissions test results in America and Europe. Volkswagen's stock lost almost half its value in the days after the launch of the crisis, and its worldwide revenues plummeted 4.5 percent in the first full month after the report. VW's board configuration was a factor in how the pollution rigging occurred and went undetected for too long. In comparison to the traditional one-tier board structure in other businesses, Volkswagen has a two-tier board system comprising a management board and a supervisory board. The supervisory board was expected to oversee management and authorise organisational decisions, but it lacks the independence and power to do so.

An appropriate legislation of shareholders was included on the supervisory board. Members of the supervisory board managed 90% of shareholder voting rights. There was no true impartial supervisor; shareholders controlled the supervisory board, which nullified the supervisory board's function of overseeing management and staff and how they operated within the corporation, which of course included rigging emissions. GCG notions reflect the significance of, caring, sharing and conserving which are the genuine aspects of GCG. Basically, corporate governance is mainly concerned with discovering a solution to the principal-agent challenge. The objective is seeking ways to ensure the agent (management) handles their investment in such a way as to promise maximum returns for them as stakeholders and other investors (Agarwal and Knoeber, 1996, cited in Ncube, 2018).

Purpose of GCG is to generate and maximize the value added for all stakeholders. Theoretically, GCG practice intensifies firm value by accumulating firm performance and decreasing down the possibility of risk occurred from the self-benefit decision by the board members. In overall, GCG could increase stakeholders' trust (Tjager, et al., 2003).

1.1 Value of corporate governance

The problem of corporate governance is to find a way in which the benefits of shareholders, managements and other involved parties can all be adequately satisfied (Adegbie FF and Fofah, 2016). Thus, the popular of the guidelines in the codes of conduct for corporate governance and the codes of best practice are directed towards reducing the potential for conflict and reconciling the interests of the numerous stakeholder groups (Weil and Manges, 2002). In essence, effective corporate governance starts a system that guides the relationship between proprietors, boards, directors and various investors, clarifying the guidelines and procedures for making choices on corporate affairs, by whom the choices should be made and how they should be implemented (Crowther &Seifi, 2011). Corporate governance procedures, accordingly, insert transparency into the decision-making procedure, which is valuable to shareholders, possible investors, regulators, clienteles, suppliers, employees and any other stakeholders who may be affected by organizations actions (Hontz and Shkolnikov, 2009).

The degree to which nations attract foreign capital is reliant on their systems of corporate governance and the grade to which establishments are duty-bound to respect the legal rights of stakeholders and other investors (Horn, 2005). Arthur Levitt, the former United States' Securities and Exchange Commissioner confirmed that: "If a nation does not have a status for strong corporate governance follows, capital will flow elsewhere" (Demaki, 2013). Levitt's view is reinforced by Lipman who positions that decent corporate governance "improves the reputation of the company and makes it more attractive to clients, investors, contractors, and in the case of non-profit associations, contributors" (Lipman & Lipman, 2006). This means that "distinct and institutional stakeholders will refrain from providing capital or will demand an advanced risk premium for their capital from initiatives in nations without effective systems of corporate governance than from alike enterprises in nations having strong corporate governance standards" (Salacuse, 2012). Global investment thus not only delivers corporations with increasing sources of capital, but also inspires the continued integration of sound corporate governance roles, which may help the companies to gain the trust of stakeholders, reduce their capital prices and induce more steady financial foundations (Vaughn &Verstegen, 2006).

Corporate governance in community entities emphasis primarily on making the nation an influential owner, by creating "clear and simple lines of political and social accountability, improving board selection and quality, and contributing to the development of clear corporate strategies that reward efficiency and professionalism" (Hontz & Shkolnikov, 2009). Good corporate governance is significant for community entities in that it intensifies their productivity and attractiveness as well as helps to safeguard that public funds capitalised in these entities are not mishandled and are spent efficiently (Hontz & Shkolnikov, 2009). Improving the governance of public entities thus brings considerable benefits in the form of increased efficiency and profitability, enhanced financial position for the government, better protection and exploitation of public assets, decreased corruption (Sullivan, 2006), greater attractiveness to stakeholders resulting in enlarged state income and well-organized service delivery to the community (Hontz & Shkolnikov, 2009). In addition, good corporate domination helps to increase effectiveness and transparency as well as to avert public entity disappointments, thus minimising opposing social effects (Blume, 2006).

From the above, it can be decided that nations and business entities that sincerely observe and embrace the values of good corporate governance will derive vast welfare. Good corporate governance allows an organisation to draw investment, exploit the opportunities obtainable to it, increase transparency and answerability, manage its risks better, and improve its chances of succeeding in the market and to attain sustainable long term growth. Every nation or business entity should consequently strive to practice good business governance for sustainable long term development and success.

Despite the recognised vast benefits of corporate governance, it has been originating that, in some instances, corporate governance has not really added as much value due to the fact that in many examples directors just "box-tick" without considerably complying with the corporate governance values (King, 2006). This means that, whilst good corporate governance frameworks may be appreciated, they are not satisfactory on their own as managements may just comply with the form of corporate governance at the expense of substantive obedience. As an example, it has been found that the disappointment of Enron had little to do with insufficient corporate governance standards and measures, but entirely to do with the culture, location and conduct of the individuals at Enron (Cunningham and Harris, 2006). Unquestionably, Enron was reflected as having one of the best panels in America before its failure and was rated highly for its pledge to corporate governance practices (Cunningham and Harris, 2006). However, its failure may be a suggestion that directors just chose to box-tick without essentially complying with good corporate governance values.

1.2 International initiatives on corporate governance

Internationally, it has become well recognised that, to strengthen businesses, be they private or community entities, there must be non-stop investment of capital and human resources as well as customer gratification and public sureness in the entities (Cronin, 2012). To be able to achieve these objectives, businesses need to do more than just generate a track record of producing properties and services and having a sensible market share, but must have good and effective organisation and be perceived to be properly administered (Cronin, 2012). Proper corporate governance is internationally considered as a very significant tool to attain these aims.

The understanding of the importance of corporate governance for the socio-economic growth of countries has interested a number of initiatives, at state and at international levels, expected at responding to the corporate governance challenges globally. At national level, a number of nations have come up with reforms to avert the occurrence of further business collapses and improve corporate governance practices. Internationally, these initiatives are being led by multilateral associations including the World Bank, (Mason, cited in Moyo, 2016) CACG, UN ICGN and OECD, among others. The World Bank regards corporate governance as a vital tool in supporting international financial arrangements, creating a conducive investment environment for emerging countries to have admission to capital and removing corruption in both the secluded and public sectors. In furthering efforts to promote good corporate governance roles, the World Bank joined with the OECD to put together a far-reaching international co-operation framework (Nestor, 2001). The cooperation between the World Bank and the OECD is organised along two main initiatives: a Global Corporate Governance Forum (GCGF) (Iskander and Chamlou, 2000) and a series of Regional Policy Dialogue Round Tables (Nestor, 2001).

The principles articulated by the CACG, OECD, ICGN and UN have provided a broad framework for a large number of countries to progress their own specific principles of corporate governance (OECD, 2004). The broad association of the OECD, UN, ICGN and CACG propose that these principles reproduce the opinions of a large number of nations with respect to the correct method for addressing the encounter of corporate governance. The principles suggested by the CACG, OECD, ICGN and UN are minimum yardsticks against which member nations can compare their systems and carry out country-specific initiatives (OECD, 2004).

Corporate governance can mean different things to different people. According to the OECD Principles by Chancharat, N.& Vithessonthi, (2017), the definition is two-fold. Corporate Governance includes the interactions and resulting patterns of conduct between various agents in a limited liability corporation; the way management and owners communicate with each other, as well as staff, stakeholders, main clients, and societies, to shape the company's plan. This is the so-called "behavioural dimension" of corporate governance. Corporate governance, on the other hand, refers to the collection of laws that regulate certain partnerships and private behaviours, thus influencing corporate strategy development. This may include corporate law, securities legislation, and listing standards. They can, however, be private and self-regulating. This is referred to as the normative side of corporate governance.

The limited liability corporation could not have been formed without the clear support of public policy and legislative intervention. This is not breaking news. Governments have had to legislate limited liability since the 17th century. They had to protect company assets from private shareholders' creditors and vice versa. The impact of this largely nineteenth-century law has been enormous. Corporations now pay for a colossal portion of wealth production in OECD economies. The institutionalisation of today's consumer economies represents a strong contrast between our age and Adam Smith's. This could not have existed without the interference of public policy, and it would not continue to bear fruit until politicians constantly upgrade the fundamental principles of corporate governance to represent increasingly evolving conditions. It is worth noting that, as we speak, 17 OECD member countries are undergoing comprehensive corporate law reform efforts according to AktiSiregar, & Indra(2018).

It is also said by Wahyudin, &Solikhah(2017) that it is important to stress the value of organisation building for under developing countries. Poverty and a shortage of proper institutions go hand in hand. Mismanagement, inefficiency, expropriation, and theft result from this. The absence of well-functioning private institutions, for example, companies, has a significant effect on growth by limiting the supply of debt and equity investment. Unaccountable and secret companies are more likely to threaten the rule of law and government efficiency, establishing and perpetuating a vicious cycle of corruption, fraud, and mismanagement of the public sector.

Outside of the United States, the first few decades after World War II were marked by state-led development. But, over the past two decades, much of this has changed dramatically due to privatisation. As a result, in the last two decades, the position of the private sector company as an engine of economic growth and job creation has gained new urgency and significance. In the 1990s alone, global privatisation sales totalled more than USD 850 billion. This grossly understates the sum of assets directly passed to the private sector: many of these assets were not sold but instead transferred to private owners through numerous schemes that provided no revenue for the Treasury as per Mahrani, & Soewarno (2018).

When this undervaluation is taken into account, as well as the proceeds from privatisation in the 1980s, the figure is closer to USD1.3-1.4 trillion. This is an example of a massive transition suggesting new ownership and power systems, and probably even more. State investment structures are chaotic and far worse on business elites. It is also means new labour relationships and a radical change in prospective jobs creation in the private sector; and new ways of finance, mostly a shift away from debt in terms of equity corporate governance has a strong effect on both of these regions. It's no surprise. Governments are more concerned with how decisions are taken in the private sector these days.

Privatization has also played a significant role in the extraordinary development of financial markets according to Gerged (2021). Another significant factor driving demand growth has been an increasing trend of disintermediation of financial markets, which has moved funds from the banking sector to stock markets. Countries such as Italy and Spain have seen their market capitalisation increase from 14 and 23 per cent of GDP in 1990 to 49 and 73 per cent in 1997, respectively. When a larger proportion of the population becomes a residual claimant of the private sector, politicians are becoming more concerned with how these savings are used and distributed by companies. Corporate governance becomes a matter of systemic stability in capital markets, providing early warning measures that can be a contributing factor of crowd behaviour in challenging market conditions.

The spectacular rise of financial institutions as stock investors of private companies has also fuelled equity market growth. In 1998, insurance policy and pension fund funds accounted for 128 per cent of OECD countries'

GDP, up from 38 per cent in 1980. Furthermore, over the past decade, the percentage of equity spending by these institutions has almost doubled. According to recent study, fewer than 100 major non-bank financial institutions (mostly pension funds and insurance companies) manage roughly 20% of the world's top 20 most liquid stocks. These institutional owners serve as fiduciaries for millions of people around the world (Saidat, Silva, & Seaman, 2019). They have a long-term view of investing and leaving is not always an option: the bulk of their portfolios track stock market indices. As a result, improved corporate governance is becoming increasingly relevant in the well-being of ageing communities, in addition to being a vital component of financial stability.

Since 1980, foreign capital flows have risen by a factor of more than 20. Furthermore, the latest crises in emerging markets have amply shown a paradigm change in the essence of these flows, which are now predominantly private. Furthermore, they are being increasingly oriented toward equity, reinforcing the movement toward equity that was just mentioned. Empirical evidence shows that during the Asian crisis, countries with the lowest corporate governance norms, especially in terms of minority shareholder security, suffered the greatest exchange rate depreciation and stock market downturn. This has increased the importance of corporate governance. This has added corporate governance to the list of challenges that the developers of international financial stability must address. In addition to this was the impetus for the development of the OECD Principles, a multilateral initiative by 29 nations. Governments in a record one-year cycle that is the reason they are one of the 12 core in the Financial Stability Forum's taxonomy of financial stability concepts.

To complement the efforts of world-wide organisations like the CACG, OECD, ICGN, and UN African leaders and policy makers have also come up with initiatives to, among other things; indorse good corporate governance roles in the region. Examples of the initiatives are the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) (Mekelo and Resta, 2005), Africa Governance Forum (AGF), African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), Africa Governance Inventory (AGI) (Mekelo and Resta, 2005). In the same manner, a number of companies have spearheaded the elevation and facilitation of high standards of corporate governance, business ethics and social accountability for the economic development and social transformation of Africa. Examples are the Centre for Corporate Governance (CCG) and African Development Bank (AfDB). In addition, the Institutes of Directors from twelve African countries propelled the African Corporate Governance Network (ACGN) whose chief objective is to reinforce "national corporate governance values through shared education, experience interactions and distribution of best practices aimed at talking to on-going corporate governance problems in Africa".

1.3 Corporate governance in State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) in Zambia

According to Mulyadi (2012), there are two parts of corporate governance: conformance and performance. Conformance comprises two elements: monitoring and supervising executive presentation; and maintaining responsibility while performance consists of strategy construction and policy construction.

In the private sector, more importance is given to conformance features. But in the public sector, the performance aspect is as significant as the conformance aspect (Hodges et al., 1996, cited in Mulyadi 2012). Therefore, public sector corporate governance is basically concerned with constructions and processes for decision-making and with the controls and performance that support effective answerability for performance outcomes (Mulyadi 2012).

Challenges to the SOEs persist in spite of the corporate governance reforms of state owned initiatives in many nations. This is because the principal-agent relations exist in multi-layers in SOEs. According to Jedenastik (2013) the complex flora of corporate governance in SOEs is because of four types of principal-agent relations involved in SOEs fluctuating from government, departments, boards, senior administration and other major shareholders. The complications are strengthened with the interference of management. For instance, Muller (2002) shows how radical parties intervene in the chain of allocation in parliamentary equalities.

The involvement of the Zimbabwe state economy has dwindled over time as a result of the on-going bad results in providing products and services to consumers as a result of improper management. Since 1991, 240 companies have been privatised or liquidated as part of a major privatisation initiative. However, as in many other nations, government support for privatisation has shifted in recent years in many countries. This was largely the product of many trends, including several public privatisation concerns, especially in the mining sector, and a decline in the number of easily privatized companies.

The remaining portfolio consists of firms that are either "strategic" (such as not open to privatisation) or have a range of concerns or challenges that make them unappealing to private investors. Today, state-owned enterprises (SOEs) continue to play an important role in the Zambian economy. SOEs in Zambia operate in a variety of sectors and employ some of the country's highest formal-sector staff. They regulate core industries such as energy, communications, transportation, and media. SOEs are also significant in finance and mining.

The study of Meyer & Hinrik (2006) on the ministerial bureaucracy discloses that the passing of public administration improvements has not provided an operative constraint against politicization of the governmental bureaucracy which has enlarged over time in terms of extent, strength and scope in attractive their political control over the formulation and application of public policies.

Mwaura.K (2007), contends that the creativities undertaken to make parastatals (SOEs) more efficient are insufficient and will not realize the intended purposes unless the chief managers of parastatals are hired on an inexpensive basis, given more autonomy and the administration is committed not only to designing performance contracts that set realistic standards, but also enforcing them strictly. According to Osamu Koike (2013), the goal of achieving efficient and workable public administration is attained when political leaders builds the rational legal bureaucracy through reduced patronage influence, creates networking governance, allows engagement with civil society, and fosters high employee motivation for achieving efficient and accountable government.

Cadbury Report in the UK (1992) recognised three important values of corporate governance: integrity , openness, and accountability. This Cadbury Report is a report to Cadbury Committee, a formal group which was set up to address financial features of UK private sector corporate governance. This report was applied as the foundation for the first public sector corporate governance framework developed by British Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy in 1995 (Percy, 1994 cited in Mulyadi, 2012). One of the weaknesses of this framework is that they are based on broad principles (openness, integrity and accountability) instead of the detailed one.

In Australia, Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) focused on the corporate governance structures within Commonwealth Budget-funded agencies. They established five key working values which consist of: Management environment, leadership, risk management and accountability monitoring. The inclusion of leadership and risk management in the key operating principles grade performance aspect of corporate governance. This is in line with Hodges et al. (1996) cited in Mulyadi (2012) who contended that the performance aspect is as significant as conformance feature in the public sector. Previously, frameworks used in the UK only put highlight to conformance feature. Although this is a framework for the public sector, ANAO trusts that this framework is also valuable for management of the public sector who are close in drive and structure to the private sector (ANAO, 1997) cited in Mulyadi (2012).

The wonder of corporate governance although widely spread in the western nations, generally has a distant face in Africa and Zambia is not an exclusion to a large extent because of the historical political schemes. At an international level it was the going down of Enron, WorldCom and other main corporations such as Lehman Brothers in the United States which armoured the interests of corporate governance (Lemayan L.Melyoki, 2005).

According to the OECD (2005), corporate governance of State owned initiatives is a major encounter in many economies and until now there has not been any world-wide benchmark to help governments measure and improve the way they workout ownership of these enterprises, which often constitute an important share of the economy. In 2005, (OECD) sought to close the gap by coming up with strategies on State owned enterprises (S.O.Es) which involved interest from dissimilar investors.

1.4 Complexity of public sector corporate governance

Most corporate governance literature decided that corporate governance framework must be tailor-made to each organization, as there is alteration needed between one and another companies. The complexity elevated in public sector corporate governance as there will be a more complex relationship between those with primary accountability errands (parliament, ministers) as opposed with the private sector. Private sector corporate governance is often relatively more frank as the roles and errands are more clearly defined and generally involve a narrower range of vigorous investors (Barrett, 2002).

Corporate Governance as per Ho (2005) is a leadership and control system for public bodies entails a collection of basic standards and values (integrity, fairness / authenticity, accountability, and responsibility), as well as clear risk management and control processes, all of which are required to accomplish the aim of public institutions, which is to serve the public. The aim of good governance in the public sector is to ensure that institutions often behave in the public interest. Acting in the public interest necessitates a deep adherence to honesty, ethical principles, and the rule of law, as well as transparency and robust stakeholder involvement.

Corporate governance is usually synonymous with private-sector organisations. The failure and scandal of several large corporations prompted the creation of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, demonstrating the need to reform corporate governance practises. Though private sector corporate governance is a common discussion and research subject. People must also consider public sector corporate governance. There has been an uptick in global exposure to corporate governance in the public sector, for example, has released a framework of corporate governance in the public sector and recommendations for how to implement standards and procedures in corporate governance in the public sector.

1.5 Measures of corporate governance

Adeusi et al (2016) opinions out that the level of corporate governance working can be assessed through analysing the association among the variables of business governance which are Board size, Board's ownership, individuality of the board, CEO duality and independence of the audit committee. Boards can be prearranged in numerous ways so that the duties of the firm can be met. The change in these boards represents two distinct perspectives (Gay, 2015).

The first one is that it is unspoken that boards are created to improve to the uttermost the supervision of the governance of an organization by accepting preparations that grant jurisdiction of the board by managers, developing in a remarkable performance because of the internal knowledge and an improved understanding of the obligations of the group which is unattainable to external liberated directors (Berle& Means, 2014). The other angle is that boards are prearranged in a bid to lessen agency expenses by the embracing of formations that necessitate for the go-ahead and supervision of manager's conduct through the assistance of external directors thereby lessening the difference amidst investors and managers attention (Coleman, 2018).

The OECD opinions out that the board of state initiatives duty is to oversee organisation and equip them with adequate crucial direction in correspondence with the areas established under the aegis of the stockholders Pfeiffer (2015). The function of SEP boards is vague in comparison with that of secluded firms for a number of explanations. The first exposition is that these boards have not yet succeeded while absolutely authorised and in addition they are also incapable of sufficiently and autonomously performing their errands which is probably owing to the statutory status these firms own, a deprivation of clarified goals and incompetent managerial and jurisdictive frameworks (Mwaura, 2017).

The answerability of state enterprises board can maybe be portrayed or hugely maneuverer by the government as it is the sole stockholder. In this way, the board is consequently not commissioned to assume issues which maybe of supreme importance will be subject to the control of the administration (Fredrick, 2016).

1.6 Good Corporate Governance (GCG) General Principles or tenets

OECD (2014) clarifies that OECD principles exhibit the first step taken by an inter-governmental group to create the foundation of good corporate governance values. These principles can also be applied by governments as a benchmark for appraisal and amending their national codes of corporate domination. There are six values vital to a sound corporate governance framework and these are:

Effecting the foundation for an efficient corporate governance framework

The corporate governance outline should inspire translucent and actual markets, homogeneous with the edict of law and normally express the parting of errands amid disparate regulatory enforcement, and guiding authorities (OECD 2014).

The rights of shareholders and essential proprietorship duties

The corporate governance outline must safeguard and comfort the exercise of stakeholders" rights (OECD, 2014).

The impartial treatment of shareholders

The corporate governance outline needs to make sure that an unbiased treatment of all investors is affected comprehensively by minority and foreign stockholders. Every shareholder must be given the chance to restore efficiently any encroachment of their privileges.

The responsibility of stakeholders in corporate governance

The corporate governance framework ought to identify the rights of stakeholders incorporated by either law or by means of mutual concurrence and boost cooperation among corporations and stakeholders whilst making, creating jobs, wealth and maintaining monetarily sound firms. The importance of corporate governance is made apparent by the positive impacts that occur when risks are controlled, and organizational procedures are streamlined and consistent. Organizations can see many direct benefits with good corporate governance including enhancing integrity. A company's corporate governance is important to investors since it shows a company's direction and business integrity. Good corporate governance helps companies build trust with investors and the community. As a result, corporate governance helps promote financial viability by creating a long-term investment opportunity for market participants.

Disclosure and Transparency

A corporate governance agenda must make sure that well-timed and detailed disclosures are contrived on all significant issues regarding the firm along with the monetary position, accomplishments, firm governance and ownership.

Van Berghe (2012) says "the better you know the more certain you are". This is the mantra that the stakeholders adhere to wholeheartedly. Transparency yields dividends in the corporate community. Companies who are transparent about their activities and financials gain the public's confidence, which is immeasurable. Transparency is important at all levels of activity in a corporate organisation, especially at the top management level, where significant decisions are taken and major strategies are developed. Holding investors and other stakeholder's awareness leads to the creation of a bond of confidence and solidarity, and these results in the gains of higher value and better access to capital.

The Responsibilities of the Board

The corporate governance outline ought to make sure that there is a crucial organisation of the firm, well-organized control of management by the board, and the board's accountability to the firm and the entire stockholders.

Good Corporate Governance (GCG) general values consist of five basic values as specified by the National Committee on Governance Indonesia. It comprises Accountability, Transparency Responsibility, Fairness and Independency (TARIF).

Transparency

Transparency forces open information that is obtainable in time, clear, comparable and complete. It captures financial, ownership information, operational performance, and organisation. To preserve and uphold the impartiality in practicing commercials, a company must provide material and applicable information that are effortlessly accessible and comprehensible by stakeholders. According to the guideline of Indonesia capital market, material and relevant means evidence which affect the variation of corporate share price then will affect the risk and prospect of the company. A business must take the initiative to reveal not only the issues instructed by laws and regulations, but also other evidence deemed necessary by stockholders, creditors and other investors to form a decision.

Benefits of the application of transparency are stakeholders could know the possibility of risk occurred in doing communications to the corporation. Hence, there will be the likelihood of market efficiency and circumvent the conflict of interest among parties in the organisation team.

Accountability

Accountability is a set of strong function system, structure, and errands of corporate organs so that the corporate organisation could work efficiently. It includes the clear arrangement of rights, duties, and responsibilities among stakeholders, commissioners and management. This comprehensive function will evade any problem related to the separation of authority and agency difficulties occurring.

A company must be answerable for its performance transparently and fairly. Thus, a business must be managed in a proper and quantifiable manner, in such that it is allied with the interest of a company by also seeing the interest of shareholders and other investors. Accountability is a prerequisite to achieve maintainable performance.

Accountability, in the simplest sense is said by Lenssen, & Louche (2005), signifies a desire or duty to take responsibility for one's actions. In fact, transparency offers answers to more questions than just who is accountable. It must also be seen in a favourable light because it recognises contributions. Accountability allows shareholders trust in the corporation because, whenever an adverse circumstance happens in the organisation, the persons liable would be dealt with accordingly. Accountability creates a mechanism in which everyone is kept responsible for their respective work and responsibilities.

In countries with relatively strong shareholder rights, such as in the US, directors are expected to be accountable to shareholders. However, excessive promotion of the interests of shareholders can lead to conflicts with other stakeholders. Due to different contractual arrangements, the interests of stakeholders are often in conflict. Board members are required to always use ethical and appropriate judgment to make seemingly correct choices when conflicts arise. In many other countries, directors have a duty to the company, not to shareholders. In Germany, for example, the company is considered distinct from the collective shareholders, which prevents shareholders from claiming that the directors have a duty toward them first and foremost(Shahwan,2016).

Responsibility

A business shall abide by laws and rules and fulfil its accountability to the communities and environment for the determination of maintaining long term sustainability of the company to be recognized as a good company citizen. Corporate managers' responsibilities, of course, are not limited to producing truthful financial reporting, carrying out the core functions of conducting business and obeying the various applicable laws. Businesses also have to respond to the expectations of the democratic societies in which they operate – expectations that often are not written down as formal law. The term "corporate responsibility" refers to the actions taken by businesses in response to such expectations in order to enhance the mutually dependent relationship between business and societies. Shareholders, in fact, expect their corporations to meet society's demands, consistent with maximising the value of the firm. Indeed, experience has shown that companies that do so are generally the best performers in the long run.

The challenge of meeting these expectations has become more complex in today's global economy, with firms typically operating in a number of legal, regulatory, cultural and business environments. Globalisation's benefits are well documented, but it has raised legitimate public concerns, several of which have been directed at multinational enterprises as agents of the globalisation process. Multinational enterprises sometimes are perceived as taking the money and running, not doing enough to build up local economies, and so on. They are accused of being party in many cases, inadvertently to serious problems such as corruption of public officials, human rights and labour rights abuses and environmental damage. Companies have to address such concerns when they arise. In fact, apart from ethical considerations and the law, their host country market valuations would suffer if they ignored them. In recent years, businesses have engaged in voluntary initiatives to improve their performance in various areas of business ethics as well as legal compliance. They have developed codes of conduct and management systems designed to help them comply with these commitments. They have developed them with the help of labour unions, nongovernmental organisations and governments (Sinan, 2008).

Independence

To accelerate the application of the GCG values, a company must be achieved independently with an appropriate steadiness of power, in such a manner that no single business's organ shall dominate the other and that no interference from other parties shall exist.

Independence is defined by Maier (2005) as the ability to make decisions while being free of any constraints or influence. And this has proven to be critical to the smooth operation of businesses as well. Independence is the capacity to retain one's position in the face of adverse factors. The capacity to make clear, unequivocal decisions on any particular topic with the desire to maintain professionalism and do the right thing for the organisation. It enables the person to behave with dignity and make decisions and form conclusions while keeping the best interests of the stakeholders in mind. This is why businesses select impartial directors: to ensure that no bullying is used and that the director does not have any vested agendas in the company that hinder his freedom to make free decisions.

Independency is crucial in decision making procedure. Loss of independence in decision making means the loss of fairness, and will be terrible if corporate reputation has to be seconded. To increase independence in business choice, corporations should progress some rules, leadership, and roles in the corporate board especially in the level of Board of Officials and Directors.

Fairness

Fairness simply defines as are a reasonable way of all shareholder rights as printed in the agreement and the PeraturanPerundang-undangan. Fairness involves indistinct rights of entrepreneurs, the law system, and the founding of regulation to protect stakeholder rights and avoid any fraudulence events.

There will be assistance in the execution of this principal, corporate assets are achieved in prudent which hence will deliver protection to shareholder privileges. Fairness is expected to evade any form of corporate harm doings. Shortly, it could assure fairness among welfare corporations.

1.7 Corporate governance practices

In 2005, the OECD was required to close the gap by pending up with rules on State owned enterprises (S.O.Es) which involved interest from different investors.

Hence, OECD crafted the following direction on the corporate governance practices of S.O.Es;

- **Ensuring an Effective Legal and Regulatory Framework on S.O.Es**

  The legal and controlling framework of S.O.Es should safeguard a level playing field in markets where S.O.Es and isolated sector businesses compete in order to avoid marketplace misrepresentations.

- **The State Acting as an Owner**

  The state should act as an informed owner and find a clear and reliable ownership policy, ensuring that the governance of S.O.Es is approved out in a transparent and accountable way with the necessary degree of competence and efficiency.

- **Equitable Treatment of Shareholders**

  The state and S.O.Es should know the rights of other stockholders and in accordance with OECD principles of corporate governance which safeguard their equitable conduct and equal access to corporate evidence.

- **Transparency and Disclosure**

  State-owned enterprises should detect high standards of photography in accordance with the OECD principles of corporate supremacy.

- **Responsibilities of the Board of State Owned Enterprises**

  The board of S.O.Es should have the essential authority, capabilities and objectivity to carry out their task of strategic guidance and monitoring of administration. They should act with honesty and be answerable for their actions.

- **Relations with Stakeholders**

The State owned enterprises should fully recognise the State owned initiatives responsibilities towards stakeholders and appeal that they report on their relatives with stakeholders. In other developments, on corporate governance Sinan Duztas (2008) in Turkey evaluated the effects of board features, information technology and photography in relation to company presentation.

1.8 Indicators of Good Corporate Governance (GCG)

There are four key points in measuring GCG practices based on the study of Black, Jang, Kim (2003). Some factors affecting GCG are stockholder rights, outside commissioners, board of commissioners and, disclosure, audit committee, and ownership party.

Corporate governance is embodied by Shank, & Stang (2013) in a variety of processes that enable management to administer a business for the good of one or more stakeholders. There are various frameworks in place to ensure the efficacy of corporate governance, including major shareholders, creditors, management control and oversight structures, external and independent auditors, and the regulatory structure under which a company functions. Corporate governance structures are categorised into two categories: internal and external. External frameworks include the regulatory system, the market's control and competitiveness, and the defence of minority ownership interests. Internal pathways are often implicated. Internal structures most often include: boards of directors, management motivation policies, equity concentration, stakeholder relationships, and accountability of actual financial activities and reporting. Each of these frameworks is important in its own way for regulating management's work and ensuring proper execution and enforcement of corporate governance standards. Internal and external processes serve as the basis for assessing the index for calculating corporate governance efficiency.

Shareholder Rights

Sylvia Veronica Siregar (2017) in the book of Corporate Governance in Developing and Emerging Markets had clarified basic shareholder rights such as protected ownership registration, having satisfactory information on appropriate and regular foundation, and transferring shares, contributing and voting in general assembly, removing board associate, and sharing profit of the company (OECD, 2015). Balance of ownership structure and rights and providing stakeholder rights correctly will increase their affluences and wealth. This will also intensify their demand of purchasing shares which affect the increasing share values in the market. Each stakeholder has to know their rights and check each other to form respectable corporate governance.

Efendi (2015) specified, share prices showed firm value, if one upsurges, others will intensify too. In other words, share price upsurges caused by one of the factors of the stakeholder's prosperity and it will be achieved by satisfying their rights. Therefore, fulfilling shareholder rights, advancing their prosperity, will raise corporate share values and the firm value.

Board of Commissioners and Outside Commissioners

Board of commissioners is the essential of corporate governance who has responsibility to ensure corporate strategy, organisation supervise, and controlling answerability (Egon, Zehnder International in FCGI 2006). It is the centre of fortitude and success of the company. Another argument from Young (1998) contended that the role of the board of commissioners matters in refining company performance by pressing the operation of earnings and providing pledge on the proper evidence about the company's processes. GCG should be reinforced from the higher level that is the board of commissioners to intensify the affectivity hence will increase firm value.

Besides, outside officials have functions to solve agency conflicts inside the company. They could communicate the drive of every shareholder to the management team. Dechow et al. (1996) stated, the independence of the corporate board will reduce the deceitful activities in the financial report. The existence of outside officials is expected to increase the affectivity of supervising and the quality of monetary report. Better the quality of financial reports upsurge investor trust and let them capitalise more to the company. More shares are exploited will intensify share price and thus intensifies firm value.

Audit Committee

As written in the Crisan et al. (2014) examination, a group of investigators suggests that the audit committee play a big role in merging of financial control within a business (Collier, 1993; Vinten& Lee, 1993). A sum of studies have found that inside of corporations with an audit committee, mainly when the committee is independent and active , there is less accidental for the occurrence of fraud (Beasley et al., 2000; Abbott et al., 2000, McMullen, 1996) and other irregularities commentary (McMullen, 1996). The audit committee has responsibilities, monitoring the financial reporting procedure, monitoring the efficiency of internal control or internal audit, as suitable, and risk management of the firm, monitoring the statutory audit of yearly financial reports and the consolidated yearly financial statements, and monitoring the independence of the statutory auditor of the business. The existence of an audit committee plays the vital element in supporting the personification of GCG. Naturally, it could lower down the possibility of the errors in financial commentary, the earnings management approaches to smooth income, the compliance with GAAP, the reliability of the accounting statistics, and the confidence of the balances. Hence, it is all for the harmony between the interest of organisation, shareholders, stakeholders, public and regulator.

Disclosure

Glosten and Milgrom (1985) in Sugito (2012) specified that disclosure is applied to reduce the information asymmetry which then could lessen the possibility of earnings management in the corporation. Investors could price a corporation by the items that the corporation unveils. More disclosure will intensify their trust to capitalise more to the corporation. Through information disclosure, corporations could lower down the doubt of the corporate's upcoming prospect. This activity will intensify trading volume and add share price in the market which mirror firm value.

1.9 Factors Defining the Success of Good Corporate Governance (GCG)

Claessens (2006) has explained Good corporate governance needs proper policies and procedures. The problem is also to sustain a community in which healthy ties between partners lead positively to the organisation's long-term objectives. Many studies have highlighted the many components of governance, including transparency, automation, and clarification of the position, continuity of policies (especially in relation to objectives), involvement and engagement of stakeholders, competence (capability) and openness.

As subjected to misgovernment measures said by Andayani, Mwangi, Sadewo, &Atmini (2008), economic growth in a nation is greatly affected, but differences affect the extent of its effects. Inefficiency of governments and loss of regulation over corruption is related to low economic performance due to lack of regulatory qualities. A lean, easy and transparent governance system must be efficient. This begins with the establishment of an Executive Committee dedicated at any level to help achieve established strategic priorities. In good governance, recurrent checks play a crucial role. By applying the rules of GCG, namely, openness, integrity, accountability, independence and terror, the company's intellectual resources can be incorporated well into the operations of businesses providing optimum financial performance. A system for good governance is an optimal arrangement and a collection of guidelines that outline the managing and control of an organisation. Good governance structures in the public sector are based on six fundamental principles which are: responsibility, openness, honesty, fairness, stewardship, productivity and leadership. There are factors defining the success of GCG practices which are internal and external factors.

1. **Internal factor**

Internal factor is the achievement of factors from the inside of company, includes corporate culture, which support GCG practices in mechanism and management work system in the corporation, regulation and rules related to the GCG, corporate risk management practices ,effective audit system to reduce the possibility of fraudulent movement, and information disclosure to community.

2. **External factor**

External factors are every aspect from outside of the corporation which influence the success of GCG roles. It includes a law scheme to guarantee the effective and consistent sovereignty of law. Besides, other provisions from the public sector or government organisation also affect GCG success. Best practices are required as the standard to build social value in the social order. Moreover, the routine of anti-corruption in Indonesia is also significant followed by the building of education which hence will broaden the job field.

Despite two aspects above, the other features to support GCG practices efficiently are skill, quality, integrity and credibility from all parties in the company.

1.10 Corporate Governance in Zambia

Anxiety concerning corporate conduct and working in the wake of various scandals in the developed world has motivated considerable interest in supremacy systems, but this discussion has not been limited to the states where the difficulties have been most protruding (Wu, 2005). The emphasis of discussions has extended from (initially) being constrained to developed nations dominated by large firms to the developing world where, in many cases, management ministries, charities (including faith-based societies) ,trade unions, and local establishments play a more important role in economic movement (Arun and Turner,2009; Wanyama et al., 2013).

While companies in the, Europe ,USA and somewhere else in the developed world responded to a series of high-profile reputes with targeted improvements (Berglöf and Claessens, 2004), in many African states corporate governance fluctuates, like political reforms, have been encompassed only reluctantly, often highlighting form over substance (Chulu, 2006; Josiah et al., 2010). In most African countries, the principles adopted by theoretically robust corporate governance practices often run counter to the privileges of power-driven, imposing politics that characterise the region (Gruzd, 2008). This inappropriateness can foster and rouse opaqueness, allowing main institutions to operationalize strategies that, at worst, suggest disapproval for (and intolerance of) conventional ideas of transparency and responsibility (Shkolnikov, 2002). The lack of payments and balances on community accountability lead in turn to the rise of corruption, self-entrenchment and self-enrichment among the governing elite, at the expenditure of national wealth (Shkolnikov, 2002; Gruzd, 2008).

In relatively current history, Zambia can believe that the buoyant economy which is a legacy of the pre-independence era in which copper consisted for over 70 % of export earnings (Andersson et al., 2000; Lungu and Kapena, 2010). This achievement allowed Zambia to operate with a composed external trading account and supported important investment in sectors (such as education and health) that were measured to be a key to growth. However, overreliance on a sector where governance values were as low as anywhere in the nation became an issue when a sharp reduction in copper values in the early 1970s dramatically transformed the economic landscape, instigating severe financial adversity for most Zambians (Haglund, 2008). This was seen by numerous as the starting point for what became a long slump in the financial fortunes of a once-prosperous nation (Ihonvbere, 1996); copper incomes which between 1965 and1973 accounted for over 35 per cent of Zambia's GDP, over 70 per cent of all spread earnings and 45 per cent of total Zambian Government incomes halved in value on the world market in less than two ages (Zacher, 1993, cited in Chanda et al., 2017).

Zambia has practiced three main economic governance stages since independence: the open market economy that sustained after British rule until 1969, followed by two periods of state control and preparation and a subsequent return to free marketplace principles in 1991; each of these involved specific governance challenges for the business sector (Lungu, 2005; Chulu, 2006). In the first phase, corporate governance principles were based on a well-established (colonial) market system driven by the private sector while the state provided a supportive environment for business (Mulwila, 1980; Chulu, 2006). Throughout this period, the Zambian Government recognised the important role that the private sector played in economic development, as established in the world's richest countries, including the UK from where main elements of Zambian corporation law could trace their source (Mulwila, 1980).

In this phase, foreign corporations with ownership structures and governance replicas reflecting Anglo-American norms conquered the domestic economic movement (Turok, 1980). The 1970s and 1980s witnessed large-scale nationalisation of main industries. Economic performance worsened, leading to IMF participation and, ultimately, the end of Kenneth Kaunda's high-level reign in 1991; a programme of economic changeover based on privatisation and liberalisation that relates to this day was then set in train by incoming President Frederick Chiluba (Chulu, 2006) cited in Chanda et al. (2017).

One of the key drivers of corporate governance transformation in Africa is its supposed character in fostering economic development (Charkham and Ploix, 2005; Tsamenyi and Uddin, 2008; Arun and Turner, 2009). In the development setting, North et al. (2008) contend that governance should be viewed as part of the broad institutional measures that underpin economic presentation, with robust systems necessitating the underpinning that only strong institutional capacity can deliver (La Porta et al., 1997; Rossouw, 2005). Several educationon the African landmass attribute deficiencies in corporate governance to disappointments in this regard (Haglund, 2009; Wanyama et al., 2009), but the World Bank (2004) struggles that Zambia is particularly feeble in these terms.

An increasing figure of literature by Dabor and Adeyemi(2009) proposes that corporate governance reform goes hand-in-hand with public sector governance improvement. The economic improvements that followed radical political alteration in 1991 saw the role of the Zambian state which at one stage organised more than 80 per cent of all financial activity (Kalinda and Floro, 1992) reduce, paving the way for private ownership with the stated aim of improving the organisation of state-owned initiatives (SOEs). The consequent fluctuations in ownership structures had major insinuations for corporate governance in Zambia, leading to sensitive debate regarding the way in which businesses should be measured (Mwanawina and Mulungushi, 2002).

As a main foreign aid destination country, accountability and governance pressures were also mounting in Zambia by way of the thorough conditionality's imposed by main donors (Silwamba, 2009). However, the first direct thought of corporate governance in the nation began with the founding of the Institute of Directors of Zambia (IODZ) in 2000. Although progress was slow, this growth led in 2005 to the appearance of the state's first corporate governance code, the Lusaka Stock Exchange (LuSE) Code, affecting all listed companies. The creation of the Lusaka exchange in 1994 had itself reflected a governmental economic reform programme intended to develop the nation's monetary and capital market, supporting and enhancing private sector creativities and facilitating the divestiture of state possession by creating a broad shareholding base (Lusaka Stock Exchange, 2005).This initiative was followed by the publication of the Bank of Zambia (BoZ) corporate governance strategies in 2006, developed in the wake of several universal scandals in the financial segment (Bank of Zambia, 2006). Similarly, the 2008 report of the Parliamentary Committee on Legal Affairs, Governance, Human Rights and Gender Matters cited the non-appearance of "good" governance as the cause of extant business misconduct (Zambia National Meeting, 2008).

The BOZ promise was augmented by the book of IODZ guidelines in 2009 and the founding of a governance secretariat in the Ministry of Justice as well as the state's accession to Africa's Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) in 2006. These creativities suggest a shift in arrogances amongst Zambian establishments towards refining governance standards, but the extent to which this has been felt in repetition remains untested; this oversight is one of the main motivations of the current study.

Notwithstanding these improvements, the push for greater accountability and vigorous corporate governance practices in emerging countries has been shown to be fraught with encounters that continue to impinge on the reform procedure; cultural barriers, a lack of appropriate legislation, weak official and regulatory frameworks and rampant dishonesty are some of the most usually reported impediments (for example, Dabor and Adeyemi, 2009; Wanyama et al., 2009, 2013). In Zambia, the aspiration for better corporate behaviour itself is often based on the assumption that strong governance has the tendency to infuse the values of responsibility, fairness, accountability, and transparency into institutional organisations at all levels (Obong'o, 2009).

2.0 Conclusion and Implication of the Study

The paper concludes that corporate governance includes the processes by which corporate objectives are established and pursued in the context of the social, legal and market environment. It deals with practices and procedures that ensure that the company is managed in a way that achieves its objectives, while at the same time ensuring that stakeholders can be assured that their trust in the company This is well-founded. The article argues that good governance is important because it provides the necessary infrastructure to improve the quality of decisions made by those running the business. Good-quality, ethical decision-making builds sustainable businesses and enables them to more effectively create long-term value.

3.0 References

Abang'a, A. O. G., Tauringana, V., Wang'ombe, D., &Achiro, L. O. (2022). Corporate governance and financial performance of state-owned enterprises in Kenya. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, *22*(4), 798-820.

Abdullah, S. N., Ismail, K. N. I. K., & Nachum, L. (2016). Does having women on boards create value? The impact of societal perceptions and corporate governance in emerging markets. *Strategic Management Journal*, *37*(3), 466-476.

Adegbie FF and Fofah ET. (2016). *Ethics, Corporate Governance and Financial Reporting in the Nigerian Banking Industry*: Global Role of International Financial Reporting Standards. 5(1) Accounting and Finance Research 50-63.

Akben-Selcuk, E. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: The moderating role of ownership concentration in Turkey. *Sustainability*, *11*(13), 3643.

Alabdullah, T. T. Y., Ahmed, E. R., & Muneerali, M. (2019). Effect of board size and duality on corporate social responsibility: what has improved in corporate governance in Asia?. *Journal of Accounting Science*, *3*(2), 121-135.

Alchian, A. A., &Damtez, H.(2012). *Production, Information Costs, and, and Economic Organization.* The American Economic Review, 62, 777-795.

Al Farooque, O., Buachoom, W., & Sun, L. (2020). Board, audit committee, ownership and financial performance–emerging trends from Thailand. *Pacific Accounting Review*.

Alshehhi, A., Nobanee, H., & Khare, N. (2018). The impact of sustainability practices on corporate financial performance: Literature trends and future research potential. *Sustainability*, *10*(2), 494.

Arora, A., & Sharma, C. (2016). Corporate governance and firm performance in developing countries: evidence from India. *Corporate governance*.

Becher. D. A., and Campbell. T.L (2004), "*Corporate governance of bank mergers".* Core, J. E., Holthausen, R. W. and Larcker, D. F. (1999), "Corporate governance, chief executive officer compensation, and firm performance", Journal of Financial Economics, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 371-406.

Behn, R. D. (2003) *Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures,* Public Governance Review, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 586-606.

Bett, B.K. &Kihara, A., 2022. Corporate Governance Attributes and Performance of State-Owned Enterprises. A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Business and Strategic Management*, *7*(4), pp.43-67.

Bhat, K. U., Chen, Y., Jebran, K., & Bhutto, N. A. (2018). Corporate governance and firm value: a comparative analysis of state and non-state owned companies in the context of Pakistan. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, *18*(6), 1196-1206.

Blume, D. (2006). *Policy Framework for Investment*: A Review of Good Practices (OECD Publishing 2006) 137-140 available at www.oecd.org/investment/investment-policy/40287385.pdf (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Chamba, L.T. &Chazireni, B., 2023. Intrapreneurship as a means of achieving the efficacy of state-owned enterprises. *Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review*, *11*(1), p.10.

Chen, C. (2016). Solving the puzzle of corporate governance of state-owned enterprises: The path of the Temasek model in Singapore and lessons for China. *Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus.*, *36*, 303.

Chijoke-Mgbame, A. M., Mgbame, C. O., Akintoye, S., &Ohalehi, P. (2020). The role of corporate governance on CSR disclosure and firm performance in a voluntary environment. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*.

Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2012). *Business research; a practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cooper, D. & Schindler, S. (2014). *Business Research Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications.

Cronin, P. (2012). *Corporate Governance for Main Market and AIM Companies* (Paper prepared by White Page Ltd in association with London Stock Exchange Plc) 3 available at http://www.londonstockexchange.com/companies-andadvisors/aim/publications/documents/corpgov.pdf (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Crowther D and Seifi S. (2011). *Corporate Governance and International Business*. 13-14.

Cunningham, G. M and Harris, J. E. (2006). *Enron and Arthur Andersen*: The Case of the Crooked E and the Fallen A, 3(1) Global Perspectives on Accounting Education 27-48.

Dat, P. M., Mau, N. D., Loan, B. T. T., & Huy, D. T. N. (2020). COMPARATIVE CHINA CORPORATE GOVERNANCE STANDARDS AFTER FINANCIAL CRISIS, CORPORATE SCANDALS AND MANIPULATION. *Journal of security & sustainability issues*, *9*(3).

Danoshana, S., & Ravivathani, T. (2019). The impact of the corporate governance on firm performance: A study on financial institutions in Sri Lanka. *SAARJ Journal on Banking & Insurance Research*, *8*(1), 62-67.

Demaki, G O. (2013). "*Proliferation of Codes of Corporate Governance in Nigeria and Economic Development"* 3(3) Business and Management Review 37–42.

Deng, P., & Yang, M. (2015). Cross-border mergers and acquisitions by emerging market firms: A comparative investigation. *International Business Review*, *24*(1), 157-172.

Esfahbodi, A., Zhang, Y., & Watson, G. (2016). Sustainable supply chain management in emerging economies: Trade-offs between environmental and cost performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *181*, 350-366.

Fahad, P., & Rahman, P. M. (2020). Impact of corporate governance on CSR disclosure. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, *17*(2-3), 155-167.

Farinha. J (2003), *"Corporate Governance: A Survey of The Literature*", JEL Classification: G300. Gompers P., J. L. Ishii, and A. Metrick (2003), "Corporate governance and equity prices",Quarterly Journal of Economics 118: 107-155.

Farinha. J (2003), "*Corporate Governance: A Survey of The Literature*", JEL Classification: G300. Gompers P., J. L. Ishii, and A. Metrick (2003), "Corporate governance and equity prices",Quarterly Journal of Economics 118: 107-155.

Frynas, J. G., &Yamahaki, C. (2016). *Corporate social responsibility*: Review and roadmap of theoretical perspectives. Business Ethics: A European Review, 25(3), 258-285.

Ghauri, P.N. &Gronhaug, K. (2010). *Research Methods in Business Studies: A PracticalGuide.* Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Ghita, M., (2008). *Corporate Governance,*Bucuresti, Economic Publishing.

Glass, C., Cook, A., & Ingersoll, A. R. (2016). Do women leaders promote sustainability? Analyzing the effect of corporate governance composition on environmental performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *25*(7), 495-511.

Glinkowska, B., & Kaczmarek, B. (2015). Classical and modern concepts of corporate governance (Stewardship Theory and Agency Theory). *Management*, *19*(2), 84.

Grossi, G., Papenfuß, U., & Tremblay, M. S. (2015). Corporate governance and accountability of state-owned enterprises: Relevance for science and society and interdisciplinary research perspectives. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *28*(4/5), 274-285.

Hakimah, Y., Pratama, I., Fitri, H., Ganatri, M., &Sulbahrie, R. A. (2019). Impact of Intrinsic Corporate Governance on Financial Performance of Indonesian SMEs. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change Vol*, *7*(1), 32-51.

Hontz E and Shkolnikov A. (2009). *Corporate Governance*: The Intersection of Public and Private Reform (Center for International Private Enterprise 2009) 29 available at www.cipe.org/sites/default/files/publication-docs/CG_USAID.pdf (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Hontz E and Shkolnikov A. (2009). *Corporate Governance*: The Intersection of Public and Private Reform. 27-29.

Horn, R. C. (2005). *The Legal Regulation of Corporate Governance with Reference to International Trends*. Unpublished Thesis (University of Stellenbosch 2005) 15-16. See also Cornelius P "Corporate Practices and National Governance Systems: What do Country Rankings Tell Us?" 6(3) German Law Journal 583-604 available at https://www.germanlawjournal.com/pdfs/Vol06No03/PDF_583-604_Articles_Cornelius.pdf (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Hussain, N., Rigoni, U., &Orij, R. P. (2018). Corporate governance and sustainability performance: Analysis of triple bottom line performance. *Journal of business ethics*, *149*, 411-432.

Ilham, R. N., Arliansyah, A., Juanda, R., Sinta, I., Multazam, M., &Syahputri, L. (2022). Application Of Good Corporate Governance Principles In Improving Benefits Of State-Owned Enterprises (An Emperical Evidence From Indonesian Stock Exchange At Moment Of Covid-19). *International Journal of Economic, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS)*, *2*(5), 761-772.

Ionescu, A., (2010). *Corporate governance in developed economies*, on-line at http://mastermrufeaa.ucoz.com/s4/Alin_Ionescu.pdf.

Iskander MR and Chamlou N. (2000). *Corporate Governance:* A Framework for Implementation (World Bank Publication 2000) 70-71 available at http://www.persianholdings.com/UsersFiles/admin/files/BookFile/CorporateGovernance (accessed on 18 November 2014.

Iqbal, S., Nawaz, A., & Ehsan, S. (2019). Financial performance and corporate governance in microfinance: Evidence from Asia. *Journal of Asian Economics*, *60*, 1-13.

Jebran, K., & Chen, S. (2023). Can we learn lessons from the past? COVID-19 crisis and corporate governance responses. International Journal of Finance & Economics, 28(1), 421-429.

Jia, N., Huang, K. G., & Man Zhang, C. (2019). Public governance, corporate governance, and firm innovation: An examination of state-owned enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, *62*(1), 220-247.

Johnson, C.C., Beiman, I. & Thompson, J., 2007. *Balanced Scorecard: for State-owned Enterprises: Driving Performance and Corporate Governance*. Asian Development Bank.

Kakwezi, P., &Nyeko, S. (2019). Procurement processes and performance: Efficiency and effectiveness of the procurement function. *International Journal of Social Sciences Management and Entrepreneurship (IJSSME)*, *3*(1).

Keay, A. (2017). Stewardship theory: is board accountability necessary?. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *59*(6), 1292-1314.

Khongmalai, O., &Distanont, A. (2017). Corporate governance model in Thai state-owned enterprises: structural equation modelling approach. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*.

King, M. (2006). *Governance for All Entities*, The Corporate Citizen, Johannesburg.

Kiranmai, J., & Mishra, R. K. (2019). Corporate governance practices in listed state-owned enterprises in India: An empirical research. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, *12*(1), 94-121.

Kistóth, K. (2021). Measuring and analysing the financial performance of state-owned economic entities. *PÉNZÜGYI SZEMLE/PUBLIC FINANCE QUARTERLY*, *66*(SE/2), 31-51.

Klausen, J. E., &Winsvold, M. (2021). Corporate governance and democratic accountability: local state-owned enterprises in Norway. *Journal of Public Policy*, *41*(1), 161-184.

Kowalewski . O, Stetsyuk. I. and Talavera,O (2007), "*Corporate Governance and Dividend Policy in Poland*".

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (2012). *Determining sample size for research activities*. Educational and psychological measurement*, 3,* 7-10.

Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology*: A step-by-step guide for beginners. London: Sage.

Kyere, M., & Ausloos, M. (2021). Corporate governance and firms financial performance in the United Kingdom. International Journal of Finance & Economics, 26(2), 1871-1885.

Leedy, P. & Ormrod, J. (2014). *Practical research: Planning and design.* New Jersey: Sage Publications.

Lin, K. J., Lu, X., Zhang, J., & Zheng, Y. (2020). State-owned enterprises in China: A review of 40 years of research and practice. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, *13*(1), 31-55.

Lipman FD and Lipman LK. (2006). *Corporate Governance Best Practices*: Strategies for Public, Private, and Not-for-Profit Organizations. John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey. 3.

Lu, Z., & Zhu, J. (2020). Tracing back to the source: Understanding the corporate governance of boards of directors in Chinese SOEs. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, *13*(2), 129-145.

Luputa, S. & Mwanza, J., 2022. The Ideal Corporate Governance Model for State Owned Enterprises in Zambia. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *10*(11), pp.419-440.

Marimuthu, F., & Kwenda, F. (2019). The relationship between executive remuneration and financial performance in South African State-owned entities. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal; Vol. 23, Issue 4*.

Marimuthu, F., 2020. Government assistance to state-owned enterprises: a hindrance to financial performance. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations, Vol. 17, Issue 2*.

Mason ES and Asher,(1999).*The World Bank Since Bretton Woods*, Brookings Institution Press 3).

Matuszak, Ł., Różańska, E., &Macuda, M. (2019). The impact of corporate governance characteristics on banks' corporate social responsibility disclosure: Evidence from Poland. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*.

Mekelo A and Resta V. (2005). *Governance Progress in Africa*: Challenges and Trends (Discussion paper prepared by United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs) 9 available at unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan021509.pdf (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Mekelo A and Resta V. (2005). *Governance Progress in Africa*: Challenges and Trends. 11-12.

Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research Methods:* Quantitative and qualitative approach,Laba-Graphics Services, Nairobi.

Mukhtaruddin, M., Ubaidillah, U., Dewi, K., Hakiki, A., &Nopriyanto, N. (2019). Good corporate governance, corporate social responsibility, firm value, and financial performance as moderating variable. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, *3*(1), 55â-64.

Mutize, M. & Tefera, E., 2020. The Governance of State-Owned Enterprises in Africa: an analysis of selected cases. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, *12*(2 (J)), pp.9-16.

Nestor S. (2001). *International Efforts to Improve Corporate Governance*: New York Times.

Nikhashemi, S. R., Paim, L., Haque, A., Khatibi, A., &Tarofder, A. K. (2013). *Internet technology, CRM and customer loyalty*: Customer retention and satisfaction perspective. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, *14*(1), 79-92.

Novikova (2004), "*The Impact of Internal Corporate Governance System on Firms Innovative Activities*", Research design to be presented at the DRUID Academy's Winter Conference on Innovation, Growth and Industrial Dynamics Aalborg, Denmark.

OECD. (2004). *Principles of Corporate Governance.* 11-12 and CACG Guidelines (1999) 1-2.

Okafor, A., Adeleye, B. N., & Adusei, M. (2021). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Evidence from US tech firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *292*, 126078.

Okeahalam C., and Akinboade. O. A., (2003), "*A Review of Corporate Governance in Africa*: Literature, Issues and Challenges", Global Corporate Governance Forum.

Opstrup, N., &Villadsen, A. R. (2015). The right mix? Gender diversity in top management teams and financial performance. *Public Administration Review*, *75*(2), 291-301.

Orazalin, N. (2019). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in an emerging economy: evidence from commercial banks of Kazakhstan. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*.

Papenfub, U. (2020). Corporate governance of state-owned enterprises: conceptualization, challenges and perspectives for the public corporate governance field. *The Routledge handbook of state-owned enterprises*, 433-444.

Pekovic, S., & Vogt, S. (2021). The fit between corporate social responsibility and corporate governance: the impact on a firm's financial performance. *Review of Managerial Science*, *15*, 1095-1125.

Piesse. J, Lien. Y, and Filatotchev. I (2004),"*Corporate Governance and Performance in Publicly Listed,* Family controlled Firms: Evidence from Taiwan" , Department of Management , King's college of London.

Platonova, E., Asutay, M., Dixon, R., & Mohammad, S. (2018). The impact of corporate social responsibility disclosure on financial performance: Evidence from the GCC Islamic banking sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *151*, 451-471.

Reguera-Alvarado, N., de Fuentes, P., &Laffarga, J. (2017). Does board gender diversity influence financial performance? Evidence from Spain. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *141*, 337-350.

Rodriguez-Fernandez, M. (2016). Social responsibility and financial performance: The role of good corporate governance. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, *19*(2), 137-151.

Safitri, V. A. D., & Nani, D. A. (2021). Does Good Corporate Governance and Eco–Efficiency Really Contribute To Firm Value? an Empirical Study in Indonesian State-Owned Enterprises (Soes). *Akuntabilitas*, *15*(1), 73-88.

Safitri, V. A. D., & Nani, D. A. (2021). Does Good Corporate Governance and Eco–Efficiency Really Contribute To Firm Value? an Empirical Study in Indonesian State-Owned Enterprises (Soes). *Akuntabilitas*, *15*(1), 73-88.

Salacuse JW. (2012). "*Corporate Governance in the New Century*" (2004) 25(3) The Company Lawyer 69-83. See also Tura HA "Overview of Corporate Governance in Ethiopia: The Role, Composition and Remuneration of Boards of Directors in Share Companies" 6(1) Mizan Law Review - African Journals Online (AJOL) 45-76 available at http://www.ajol.info/index.php/mlr (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Sari, M., Lubis, A. F., Maksum, A., Lumbanraja, P., & Muda, I. (2018). The Influence of Organization's Culture and Internal Control to Corporate Governance and Its Impact on State-Owned Enterprises Corporate. *Journal of Applied Economic Sciences*, *13*(3).

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2016). *Research methods for business students*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Schillemans, T., &Bjurstrøm, K. H. (2020). Trust and verification: Balancing agency and stewardship theory in the governance of agencies. *International Public Management Journal*, *23*(5), 650-676.

Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research for Business–A Skill Building Approach*. 5th ed. New York: John-

Wiley and Sons.

Shu, P. G., & Chiang, S. J. (2020). The impact of corporate governance on corporate social performance: Cases from listed firms in Taiwan. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, *61*, 101332.

Stuebs, M., & Sun, L. (2015). Corporate governance and social responsibility. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *57*(1), 38-52.

Sullivan, J. D. (2006). *Corruption, Economic Development, and Governance*: Private Sector Perspectives from Developing Countries (Global Corporate Governance Forum Issue 2 of 2006) 3-5 available at www.unglobalcompact.org (accessed on 30 July 2020).

Syofyan, R., & Putra, D. G. (2020, March). The role of Good Corporate Governance (GCG) implementation in Indonesian company. In *4th Padang International Conference on Education, Economics, Business and Accounting (PICEEBA-2 2019)* (pp. 819-825). Atlantis Press.

Tien, N. H., Anh, D. B. H., & Ngoc, N. M. (2020). Corporate financial performance due to sustainable development in Vietnam. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *27*(2), 694-705.

US Department of State (2020).*2020 Investment Climate Statements: Zambia*. [Online]. Accessed at: https://www.state.gov/reports/2020-investment-climate-statements/zambia/ (Retrieved 20 January 2021).

Vaughn M &Verstegen Ryan L. (2006). "*Corporate Governance in South Africa: a Bellwether for the Continent*?" (2006) 14(5) Corporate Governance: An International Review 504-512.

Weil G and Manges LP. (2002). *Comparative Study of Corporate Governance Codes Relevant to the European Union and Its Member States*.OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, CAGG Guidelines and the UK Corporate Governance Code.

Yang IH, Yan LI, Li Y, & Yang H (2012). *Disclosure and the expense of value capital*: an examination at the market level.

Zabri, S. M., Ahmad, K., & Wah, K. K. (2016). Corporate governance practices and firm performance: Evidence from top 100 public listed companies in Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *35*, 287-296.