# Effect of Corporate Directorship on Firm Performance: Cases of Companies Listed on the Uganda Securities Exchange (USE)

Louis Roy Byaruhanga<sup>1</sup>, Bulan Prabawani<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Andi Wijayanto<sup>3</sup> Uinversitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract:- The aim of this research study is to examine the influence of corporate directorship on firm's performance on listed firms of the Uganda Securities Exchange. For this purpose, this study performed fixed and random effect econometric estimation models and used the data for the time period from 2017 to 2021.

The study results indicate that between the two econometric estimation models, Hausman specification test recommended the estimation of the random effects model. According to the random effect model result corporate directorship significantly affects the listed firm's performance.

The study specifically focused on the influence of directors' payment, proportion of non-executive directors, board size, CEO age, and CEO tenure on firm performance with the controlling variables of firm size and age.

The study explored the influence of the corporate directorship on firms' performance on listed firms on the Uganda Securities Exchange and contributed to the existing literature on investments in the Ugandan setting.

Overall, corporate directorship variables included in the model, improved the performance of firms listed on USE by 11.2%. The study recommends that more corporate directorship variables should be studied to generate generalizable results.

*Keywords:* - Uganda Securities Exchange (USE), Corporate Directorship, Listed Companies, And Firm Performance.

# I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate directorship has been a major concern in the daily operations of a corporation because it ensures that everyone in the organization abides by a set of rules and regulations established by the Board of Directors. Corporate Directorship is concerned with how investors achieve a fair return on their investment. Corporate directorship issues have not, however, disappeared despite greater awareness of them in publicly traded firms. Investors in established and developing markets often reward companies with minimal risks related to corporate directorship while penalize companies with poor directorship.

Investors search for warning signs of unfavorable policies and principles, such as poor CEO compensation criteria, insufficient board credentials, limited shareowner rights, little to no disclosure, and other directorship issues. It is crucial to look into how current corporate directorship affects the performance of listed firms as modern securities exchanges sprout out around the globe, with an emphasis on the Uganda Securities Exchange sector, which is still growing and listing new companies.

Corporate directorship has been defined by various scholars. Li et al. (2019) referred to corporate directorship as a system of rules, processes, and principles applied to manage and direct a company. Becht and Jenkinson (2005) defined corporate directorship as a method through which a corporate company's set goals and objectives are pursued while complying with social, regulatory, and market standards are referred to as corporate directorship.

An institution that practices proper corporate directorship utilizes its resources well and performs according to the goals and objectives for which it was formed (International Federation of Accountants, 2009). Afrifa & Tauringana (2015) highlighted five crucial corporate directorship criteria, including CEO age, CEO tenure, board size, the proportion of non-executive directors, and directors' remuneration, as having a significant impact on a company's success in UK-listed firms. A study on how these factors impacted the performance of the companies listed on USE is needed in order to make recommendations.

The companies itemized on stock markets play a significant role in economic development (Zhan, 2017). Therefore, it is vital to study and recognize how these companies involved in the stock exchange are managed to enable policy actors to put enough effort into improving their corporate directorship. A well-governed and transparent corporation not only contributes to the country's growth and development, but it also decreases investment risk among investors, providing a favorable investment climate that can even attract overseas investors (Drabek & Payne, 2002).

As organizations enter international capital markets, investors expect companies to have a robust corporate directorship framework to protect their rights and interests. Failure to protect investors' interests leads to low investor turnover, negatively affecting the Company's performance.

In sub-Saharan Africa, listed companies have been reported to face many challenges due to incompetent corporate directorship structure tantamounting to poor corporate directorship principles. For instance, Waweru (2014) revealed that audit quality and company performance are the primary determinants behind the quality of corporate directorship in a study done to investigate the factors impacting the performance of listed firms in sub-Saharan Africa.

Also, Yartey and Komla (2007), who studied the importance of stock market companies in sub-Saharan Africa, found that though the companies have facilitated the financing of the growth of large corporations, they face a challenge of technical corporate directorship personnel. Due to the corporate directorship structure of the listed mining companies on the Johannesburg stock exchange, Dzingai & Fakoya (2017) discovered a weak negative correlation between return on equity and board size and a weak but positive correlation between return on equity and board independence in South Africa. This study indicated that corporate directorship enhances performance using secondary data from 2010 to 2015.

In their study, Okiro & Aduda (2015) identified the effect of corporate directorship on firm performance listed on the stock exchange of the East African Community. Between 2009 and 2013, census research was conducted on all 98 listed companies on the Nairobi, Uganda, Dar es Salaam, and Rwandan Securities Exchange. According to the study, there is a strong correlation between corporate directorship and firm performance. However, this research did not reveal which corporate directorship elements have a meaningful impact on the success of publicly traded companies, leaving a gap to be filled.

Researchers are analyzing the performance of listed small and medium sized enterprises in Great Britain based on corporate directorship parameters including board size, chief executive officer age and duration, percentage of nonexecutive directors, and directors' remuneration (Afrifa & Tauringana 2015), these factors are significantly related to performance. This study was conducted in the United Kingdom, which sets it apart from the current study in that it made performance distinctions between small and medium-sized businesses. As a result, a similar study in the Ugandan setting is required, with the goal of making recommendations.

The current study's main goal is to investigate the influence of corporate directorship features (board size, CEO age, CEO tenure, non-executive director proportion, and directors' remuneration) on the performance of companies listed on the Uganda Securities Exchange (USE). The rationale for considering these corporate directorship principles is due to their importance in firm performance (Afrifa & Tauringana, 2015; Boachie, 2020).

During the June 1998 conference, member states argued for drafting a framework and code of conduct/best practices to promote national corporate directorship. In 1999 Uganda established an Institute of Corporate Directorship (ICGU) and a national code of best principles. However, in Uganda, companies are majorly owned by related people such as family members, which makes companies neglect corporate directorship principles when directed and rely on family or individual interests.

The USE went through moments of rise and times of decrease between 2012 and 2017. The performance of individual companies listed on the exchange varied significantly depending on their specific economic sector, degree of financial stability, and market circumstances. The USE had a boost in market capitalization during this time, reflecting a general rise in the value of listed companies. Additionally, there was more trading activity on the market, with larger share volumes and trade values.

A number of industries, including banking, telecommunications, and manufacturing, had significant presences on the USE and influenced its success during this time. Some businesses in these industries saw tremendous growth and attracted the attention of investors. It's crucial to remember that a number of variables, such as macroeconomic circumstances, political stability, regulatory changes, and global market trends, can affect how well a market performs.

According to a report from USE (Ungar, 2022) study, trading activity fell drastically in 2020, with stocks market turnover falling 73.7% to Ugx 33.4 billion from Ugx 127 billion in 2019. The total number of deals closed in 2020 decreased by 40% to 3,174 compared to 5,317 in 2019, foreign investor participation decreased to 42% in 2020 compared to over 70% in previous years, and the Company's profitability decreased by 83% to Ugx 41.2 million in 2020 from Ugx 243.8 million in 2019. As a result, one questions whether the loss in performance is related to corporate directorship factors or to the listed firms themselves, hence the need for this study.

With a turnover of UGX 32.31 billion in 2021 compared to UGX 33.26 billion in 2020, trading experienced a modest dip. Nevertheless, there was a notable increase in trading volume, which was ascribed to increased interest in the SBU and UCL counters. The fourth quarter of 2021 accounted for roughly half of the total turnover, which can be primarily attributed to the economic recovery brought on by the reopening of important economic activities following the easing of several restrictions put in place to curb the spread of Covid 19 and the effects of the new listing on the stock market of MTN Uganda. The number of days traded in 2021 were 6 days less than the prior year, this was attributed to the previous year (USE, 2021).

Another famous example of a listed company on USE that collapsed was UCHUMI, where the financial situation worsened in 2015, and USE suspended its operations in 2016. As evidenced by the Board's recommendation for a forensic audit of the executive director and chief financial officer due to their flagrant misconduct and negligence that resulted in declining fortunes and a worsening revenue position, the collapse was attributed to abuse of the corporate directorship principles of responsibility, accountability, fairness, and transparency (Balaram, 2019).

Early in the 2000s, the Kenyan supermarket company Uchumi Supermarkets moved into Uganda. The business suffered a number of difficulties that ultimately to its demise, including: Mismanagement, including insufficient financial controls, inefficient inventory management, and weak corporate governance, were problems at Uchumi Supermarkets. High levels of debt were accrued by the company as a result of its quick growth and ineffective operations, which caused financial instability and an inability to pay off its debts. Intense local and foreign grocery chains competed fiercely with Uchumi in Uganda, putting pressure on its market share and profitability. Due to supply chain interruptions, Uchumi had trouble keeping constant product supplies, which had an impact on its capacity to meet consumer demand and on its reputation (Star, 2023).

Prior to its failure Crane Bank was one of Uganda's biggest commercial banks. Poor corporate governance, claims of mismanagement, insider lending, and regulatory non-compliance at Crane Bank were the main causes of its demise. The bank's management and board of directors were charged with engaging in questionable activities that damaged the bank's financial position. Non-performing loans posed serious problems for Crane Bank because a sizable chunk of its loan portfolio wasn't being repaid by borrowers. As a result, the bank's capital base and asset quality declined. Concerned about the financial viability of Crane Bank, the Bank of Uganda, the nation's central bank, intervened through regulatory means. The bank was placed under statutory management, and later on, it was sold to another bank after being declared insolvent (Eagle online, 2023).

On the basis of this assumption, I became interested in learning whether corporate directorship has an impact on firm performance because it would highlight the significance of sound corporate governance for companies listed on the Uganda Securities Exchange.

# II. RESEARCH SETTING

The main stock exchange, known as USE, was established in 1997, operates under the control of the Uganda Capital Markets Authority, and it is accountable to the Bank of Uganda (USE 2023). USE opened for trade in 1998, and by then, the exchange had a single listing, a bond issued by the East African Development Bank. There were scanty trades per week at the beginning but as of 2014, the exchange had listed up to 17 companies which were both Ugandan and East African, but during the year 2015, one of the listed companies, Uchumi, collapsed, and they remained 16 (USE 2023). USE operates closely with the other sister stock exchanges in Dar-es-salaam, Nairobi, and Rwanda (Mutisya 2008). The result presented in chapter four indicates data collected from 17 companies, as described in the next section. The vision of USE is to be Uganda's chosen institution for investments and capital sourcing while its mission is to empower its customers through service excellence and innovation to promote safe, convenient, sustainable investments (USE 2023).

As of 2021, the trading volume for December 2021 was 256,786,258 shares with a turnover of UGX 7,831,549,997. This month's turnover performance was a 107 % increase from 23,224,698 shares worth UGX 3,768,472,444 recorded in December 2020 (USE, 2021). Activity in December decreased by 1.6 % compared to the turnover registered in November, from 7.9 billion to 7.8 billion representing a daily average turnover of approximately UGX 340 million. Volume traded increased to 256 million shares compared to 69 million in November 2021. The number of deals increased to 435, up from 218 deals executed in November 2021, with 45 percent of the deals attributed to the MTN Uganda counter.

Stanbic counter dominated activity for the month, accounting for 81.74 percent of the total turnover, followed by MTN Uganda Limited with 9.15 percent. The Bank of Baroda Uganda was in third position, with a 7.05 percent contribution to the month's turnover. Uganda Clays Limited, New Vision Limited, UMEME, DFCU, CIPLA, and National Insurance Corporation (NIC) Uganda recorded 2.06 percent of the total turnover. Stanbic registered the highest volume of shares with 93.50 percent, followed by Uganda Clays Limited with 2.58 percent. Bank of Baroda Uganda came third with 2.26 percent of the volume, while MTN Uganda Limited was fourth with 1.39 percent. National Insurance Corporation Uganda accounted for 0.14 percent, UMEME, New Vision Limited, DFCU, and CIPLA had the least number of shares traded, amounting to 670,362 shares representing 0.26 percent of the total shares traded (USE, 2021).

#### III. RESEARCH PROBLEMS

In reference to the above background, six different research problems were identified as follows:

- Is there any significant influence of board size on the performance of companies listed on USE?
- Is there any significant influence of CEO age on the performance of listed companies on USE?
- Is there any significant influence of CEO tenure on the performance of listed companies on USE?
- Is there any significant influence of the proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs)on the performance of listed companies on USE?
- Is there any significant influence of directors' compensation on the performance of companies listed on USE?

• Do Directors' compensation, Proportion of nonexecutive directors, CEO age, CEO tenure and board size simultaneously significantly affect the performance of companies recorded on the USE?

#### A. General objective:

To understand the statistical effect of corporate directorship factors on the performance of companies listed on the USE.

#### B. Specific Objectives:

- To determine and explain the effect of board size on the performance of companies listed on the USE.
- To examine and explain the influence of CEO age on the performance of companies listed on the USE.
- To determine and explain the effect of CEO tenure on the performance of companies listed on the USE.
- To determine and explain the effect of non-executive directors (NEDs) on the performance of companies listed on the USE.
- To determine and explain the effect of directors' remuneration on the performance of companies listed on the USE.
- To determine and explain the effect of Directors' compensation, Proportion of non-executive directors, CEO age, CEO tenure and board size on the performance of companies recorded on USE.

## C. Hypothesis

The study was carried out with the following hypothesis;

- H1: Board size has a significant influence on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.
- H2: CEO age has a significant influence on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.

- H3: CEO tenure has a significant influence on the corporate performance of selected companies listed on the USE.
- H4: The proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs) has a significant influence on the corporate performance of selected companies listed on the USE.
- H5: Directors' remuneration has a significant influence on the corporate performance of selected companies listed on the USE.
- H6: Board size, CEO age, CEO tenure, proportion of non-executive directors, and directors' remuneration simultaneously affect the performance of companies listed on USE.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

The study followed an explanatory type using majorly quantitative methods with less application of qualitative methods except for document analysis. Since the study applied working hypotheses that require statistical answers, the quantitative method finds its use in this research. Quantitative research emphasizes measuring objectives and numerical data analysis collected through questionnaires and polls. Quantitative research allows data collection from a large sample size, which allows us to generalize a group of study subjects or a given phenomenon without bias in the results (DelIce, 2001).

## A. Population and sampling

All firms listed on the Uganda Securities Exchange were included in the analysis, as shown in table 1 below:

| S/N                   | Company Name                              | Year listed   | Sector            |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
|                       | Local Listings                            |               |                   |  |  |
| 1                     | Uganda Clays Ltd                          | January 2000  | Industrials       |  |  |
| 2                     | British American Tobacco (BAT) Uganda Ltd | October 2000  | Consumer goods    |  |  |
| 3                     | Bank of Baroda (U) Ltd listed             | November 2002 | Financial         |  |  |
| 4                     | DFCU Ltd                                  | October 2004  | Financial         |  |  |
| 5                     | New Vision Printing and Publishing Co Ltd | December 2004 | Consumer services |  |  |
| 6                     | Stanbic Bank Uganda Ltd                   | January 2007  | Financial         |  |  |
| 7                     | National Insurance Corporation            | January 2010  | Financial         |  |  |
| 8                     | UMEME Limited                             | February 2012 | Utility           |  |  |
| 9                     | Cipla Quality Chemical Industries Ltd     | October 2018  | Healthcare        |  |  |
| 10                    | MTN-Uganda                                | October 2019  | Telecom           |  |  |
| Cross border listings |   |               |                   |  |  |
| 11                    | East African Breweries Ltd                | March 2001    | Consumer goods    |  |  |
| 12                    | Kenya Airways                             | March 2002    | Consumer services |  |  |
| 13                    | Jubilee Holdings Ltd                      | February 2006 | Financial         |  |  |
| 14                    | Equity Bank Ltd                           | June 2009     | Financial         |  |  |
| 15                    | Kenya Commercial Bank Ltd                 | November 2008 | Financial         |  |  |
| 16                    | Nation Media Group                        | December 2010 | Consumer services |  |  |
| 17                    | Centum                                    | August 2011   | Financial         |  |  |
| 19                    | Uchumi                                    | 2013          | Consumer goods    |  |  |

Table 1: Companies listed on the Ugandan Stock Exchange

#### B. Sampling technique

The study applied census sampling to select all listed 18companies whose documents and annual reports were analyzed and quantitative data collected for the last five years (2017-2021). However, data for 17listed companies was collected due to the collapse of the 18th company operations in Uganda meaning that data was unavailable.

#### C. Data type and sources

Secondary data sources were used.

#### D. Documentation technique

Documentation Technique is a data collection technique that collects and analyses written documents, pictures, and electronic documents. Information was gathered through records from the Uganda Securities Exchange and fiscal and yearly reports of listed companies.

#### E. Data Analysis

Two analysis methods were used since the study has quantitative and qualitative data.

#### F. Quantitative data analysis

The data was analyzed at three levels. At the univariate analysis level. The data were described using the mean and standard deviation. Correlation statistics were used to identify the correlation between variables.

To further determine the effect of corporate directorship on the corporate performance of listed companies, a regression model specified below was used

 $y=b_0+b_1x_1+b_2x_2+b_3x_3+b_4x_4+b_5x_5...bnxn+e...$ ....(3)

- Where;
- y = ROA

 $b_0$  is the regression constant.

 $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ ,  $b_3$ ,  $b_4$ ,  $b_5...b_n$  are Corporate Directorship's parameter coefficients, and the e term is the error term.

- x1 board size
- x2 CEO age
- x3 CEO tenure
- x4 non-Executive director's proportion
- x5 Director remuneration

#### G. Qualitative data

A narrative technique was used. Collected data from reports was shown as information without requiring calculations. The practice of analyzing the tales individuals tell, reporting on them, and posing a specific question to the narrative "texts" for a specific goal is known as narrative analysis (Akinsanya & Bach 2014).

#### V. FINDINGS

Results of the research is a key factor in the completion of the thesis.

# A. The summary statistics are intimated below per variable;

Results indicate that British American Tobacco (BAT) Uganda Ltd had the smallest average board size for the five years of 6.4 members and this could be attributed to its reduced operations over the years but with an aggregation facility in the capital, Kampala. Nation Media Group has the biggest board size because it operates different subsidiaries in the fields of television, print media and some radio stations which all need different directors hence its big size in terms of the board.

Centum is the company is the company in Investments, private equity and real estate with youngest CEOs of average age of 41 years for the period analyzed of 5 years (2017-2021) and this is attributed to the company only recently entering the Ugandan market in 2011 with the purchase of 300 acres to develop the Pearl marina real estate development, thus hiring a young CEO who could adjust the company quickly and easily to the Ugandan setting. East African breweries has the oldest CEOs with average age at 57 years and this could be attributed lack of term limit for CEOs in the company and CEOs tend to age within that position.

British American Tobacco (BAT) Uganda Ltd is the company in the sector of manufacturing tobacco products with the lowest average CEO tenure period of 1.6 years while New Vision, a company in printing, publishing, broadcasting and the television sector with the highest average CEO tenure period of 12 years and this attributed to the long serving CEO Robert Kabushenga who served as the CEO from 2007-2021.

British American Tobacco (BAT) Uganda Ltd is the company with the lowest average Non-Executive Directors (NEDs) proportion of 3.6 of the board members and this could be attributed to smaller board size while Nation Media Group with largest average number of NEDs of 14 members and this could be associated to large board size and huge firm size.

Equity bank Uganda limited is the company listed on USE in the Banking and finance sector with the highest value of director remuneration of 23.596 Ugandan shillings and this could be associated with to big profits posted at the end of each financial year for the study period while DFCU Ltd is the company listed on USE in the banking and finance sector with the lowest remuneration value of 17.036 Ugandan shillings and this could be due to accumulated loss making of the company since 2015 when it acquired Crane Bank.

The youngest company listed on USE is Kenya Commercial Bank Ltd with only 12 years because it has of recent just commenced its operations in Uganda in 2007 while the oldest is East African Breweries limited with average age of 97 years.

The biggest company listed on USE is Equity Bank Ltd with a value of 30.58 worth of assets and this could be attributed to the fact that it's a multinational company operating in four East African countries and the smallest company on USE is British American Tobacco (BAT) Uganda Ltd with a value of 23.204 worth of assets which has scaled down its operations over the years with other parties entering the market it monopolized for years. DFCU Ltd is the company listed on USE with the least ROA of 0.012 which is in the banking sector and this could be due to losses made in previous years (DFCU, 2019) while Cipla Quality Chemical Industries Ltd is the listed company with the highest Return of Assets with a value of 0.304 and this is associated with market competition capacity the company gained as the company selling high quality human medicine and recently setting up a large factory thus expanding its asset base by leaps and bounds (Cipla, 2020).

The summary statistics for the dependent and independent variables utilized in the study are provided in the table 2 below;

| Descriptive statistics    | Ν  | Minimum | Maximum | Sum     | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------|----|---------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| ROA                       | 85 | .00     | 1.07    | 9.54    | .112  | .15091         |
| CEO tenure                | 85 | 1.00    | 21.00   | 503.00  | 5.92  | 4.81123        |
| NEDs                      | 85 | 3.00    | 15.00   | 693.00  | 8.15  | 2.68375        |
| Board size                | 85 | 5.00    | 17.00   | 882.00  | 10.38 | 2.61396        |
| CEO age                   | 85 | 39.00   | 59.00   | 4029.00 | 47.40 | 4.33205        |
| Remuneration of directors | 85 | 18.49   | 53.00   | 1902.99 | 22.39 | 3.65774        |
|                           |    |         |         |         |       |                |
| Control variables         |    |         |         |         |       |                |
| Firm size                 | 85 | 17.73   | 30.89   | 2296.10 | 27.01 | 2.34142        |
| Firm age                  | 85 | 10.00   | 99.00   | 3473.00 | 41.35 | 23.22363       |

The return on asset (ROA), which ranges from 0.00% to positive 107.00% with an average ratio of 11.20%, is employed as a performance measure. The variation in return on assets for the enterprises ranged from a profit of 107.00 percent (highest value) to a loss of 00.00 percent (lowest value). This examines a significant discrepancy in the profitability of the enterprises. Studies have found that a return on assets of 5% and above is considered a good performance (Supriyadi, 2021).

The average CEO tenure is approximately six years; the average None Executive Directors is eight. The average firm size is 27, in the same range as the UK-listed companies (Afrifa & Tauringana, 2015).

The average number of non-executive directors is more than 50% of the board size, meaning that the companies adhere to Uganda's corporate directorship principles. The average annual director's remuneration is Uganda shillings 22.39 million annually. The average firm age is 41 years, and the average CEO age is 47 years.

Additionally, this result reveals that among the factors analyzed, CEO tenure has the highest standard deviation (S.D.) at 4.81123, followed by CEO age at 14.33205. In contrast, ROA has the lowest S.D. at.15091, followed by board size at 2.61396.

#### B. Correlation findings

The Table 3 below provides the Pearson correlation coefficient for 17 companies listed on USE for 2017-2021.

| Corporate gov. | Board size | CEO age | CEO tenure | NEDs | REMD | Firm age | Firm size | ROA |
|----------------|------------|---------|------------|------|------|----------|-----------|-----|
| Board size     | 1          |         |            |      |      |          |           |     |
| CEO age        | 198        | 1       |            |      |      |          |           |     |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .069       |         |            |      |      |          |           |     |
| CEO tenure     | .197       | 107     | 1          |      |      |          |           |     |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .070       | .330    |            |      |      |          |           |     |
| NEDs           | .925**     | 150     | .235*      | 1    |      |          |           |     |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .000       | .171    | .030       |      |      |          |           |     |
| REMD           | .070       | 154     | .227*      | .083 | 1    |          |           |     |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .525       | .160    | .036       | .452 |      |          |           |     |
| Firm age       | 069        | .402**  | .175       | .016 | 191  | 1        |           |     |

ISSN No:-2456-2165

| Sig (2 tailed) | .530  | .000 | .110 | .888  | .081 |       |      |   |
|----------------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|---|
| Firm size      | .222* | 232* | .001 | .245* | .064 | 355** | 1    |   |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .041  | .033 | .993 | .024  | .562 | .001  |      |   |
| ROA            | 014   | .102 | 236* | 143   | 033  | 056   | 178  | 1 |
| Sig (2 tailed) | .897  | .352 | .029 | .192  | .762 | .612  | .103 |   |

The bold variables represent the control variables

Source: Results obtained from the data analysis using SPSS Version 23.

The percentage of NEDs was found to have a positive significant correlation with board size  $(r=0.925^{**})$  at 1% and CEO tenure  $(r=.235^{*})$  at 5%. The remuneration of directors (REMD) positively correlates with CEO tenure  $(r=.227^{*})$  at 5%. The firm age significantly correlated with the CEO age  $(r=.402^{**})$  at 1%. Firm size had a significant correlation with a board size  $(r=.222^{*})$  at 5%, a significant negative correlation with CEO age  $(r=.232^{*})$  at 5%, and a significant negative correlation with firm age  $(-.355^{**})$  at 1%. Finally, return on assets (firm performance) had a significant negative correlation with CEO tenure (r=.2010) and r=.2010.

.236\*). The correlation of the control variable suggests that multicollinearity does not interfere with multiple regressions. According to certain researchers, multicollinearity becomes troublesome if the correlation coefficient rises above 0.8, as stated by (Steve, 2018).

## C. Regression analysis

The fixed regression model was specified in the table 4 below to understand the effect of corporate directorship on the performance of companies listed on USE.

| Model  | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. An error in the Estimate |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1  | .432ª | .187     | .112              | .14288                        |  |  |  |  |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), firm size, CEO tenure, Remuneration of directors, CEO age, the board size, firm age, NEDs |       |          |                   |                               |  |  |  |  |

The regression model summary above indicates that the value of Adjusted R-square ( $R^2$ ) is 0.112 indicating that corporate directorship and the variables included in the model explain the performance of firms listed on USE by

11.2%. Implying that the model well explains that according to (Ozili, 2023), who indicated that a regression model with an R-Square value between 0.1-0.50 is considered good.

| Table 5: Fixed effects regression model on the effects of corporate directorship on firm performance (model f | Table 5: Fixed effects regression model or | on the effects of | corporate directorshi | p on firm | performance | (model 1) |
|---|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|---|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|

|  | Unstandardized Coefficients Standardized Coefficients |      |      |        |                             |  |  |  |
|--|---|------|------|--------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Variables  | Coefficient   | S. E | Beta | t      | <b>Prob.&gt;</b>   <b>t</b> |  |  |  |
| Constant   | .093  | .726 |      | .183   | .776                        |  |  |  |
| Board size   | .047  | .017 | .806 | 5.840  | .005                        |  |  |  |
| CEO age  | .004  | .067 | .111 | .845   | .346                        |  |  |  |
| CEO tenure   | 006   | .024 | 197  | -1.222 | .084                        |  |  |  |
| NEDs   | 044   | .036 | 789  | -3.669 | .007                        |  |  |  |
| Remuneration of directors (REMDs)  | .002  | .009 | .039 | .367   | .722                        |  |  |  |
| Control variables  |   |      |      |        |                             |  |  |  |
| Firm age   | .000  | .001 | 045  | 557    | .723                        |  |  |  |
| Firm size  | 010   | .017 | 156  | -1.451 | .181                        |  |  |  |
| Dependent Variable: ROA<br>Source: The outcomes of data analysis were done with SPSS Version 23. |   |      |      |        |                             |  |  |  |

D. Equation from statistical analysis

 $y = b_0 + b_1 x_1 + b_2 x_2 + b_3 x_3 + b_4 x_4 + \dots + b_n x_n + e$ 

Results in Table 5 indicate that board size 0.047 (0.005) significantly affects the performance of firms listed on USE at a 95% significance level or 5%. Implying that keeping other factors constant, board size affects the

performance of listed companies by 4.7%. It means that increasing the number of board members of the firm increases the performance of listed companies. The renumeration of directors was also found to positively affect the performance of listed firms. The proportion of non-executive directors was found to significantly negatively affect firm performance.

Table 6: Random effects regression model on the effects of corporate directorship on firm performance (model 1)

| Variables  | Coefficient | S. E | Beta | t      | <b>Prob.</b> > t |  |  |  |
|--|-------------|------|------|--------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Constant   | .073        | .326 |      | .285   | .776             |  |  |  |
| Board size   | .031        | .016 | .806 | 2.860  | .015             |  |  |  |
| CEO age  | .002        | .004 | .111 | .948   | .346             |  |  |  |
| CEO tenure   | 015         | .004 | 197  | -1.751 | .004             |  |  |  |
| NEDs   | 022         | .016 | 789  | -2.761 | .027             |  |  |  |
| Remuneration of directors  | .032        | .005 | .039 | .357   | .042             |  |  |  |
| Control variables  |             |      |      |        |                  |  |  |  |
| Firm age   | .007        | .001 | 045  | 356    | .723             |  |  |  |
| Firm size  | 021         | .007 | 156  | -1.350 | .181             |  |  |  |
| Dependent Variable: ROA; $R^2 = 0.5288$ ; Wald = 140.96; Prob = 0.0000 |             |      |      |        |                  |  |  |  |

Source: The outcomes of data analysis were done with SPSS Version 23.

**ROA** = 0.073+0.031 board size +0.002CEO age-0.015 CEO tenure-0.022NEDs+0.032REMDs-0.021Firm size + 0.007Firm Age

The random effects regression model Table 6 indicates that board size (p=0.015), CEO tenure (p=0.004), NEDs (p=0.027) and REMDs (p=0.042) are significantly associated with the performance of listed firms on USE.

The table 7 below specifies the Hausman test to help decide between the random and fixed models. The null hypothesis is that the model to take is random while the alternative hypothesis is that the preferred is fixed effects.

Table 7: Hausman specification test for fixed and random effect test comparison

| Variables                         | Fixed effects (FE) | Random effects (RE) | <b>Difference</b> (FE-RE) | SE     |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Board size                        | .093               | .073                | .02                       | .001   |
| CEO age                           | .047               | .031                | .016                      | .048   |
| CEO tenure                        | .004               | .002                | .002                      | -1.051 |
| NEDs                              | 006                | 015                 | .009                      | -2.360 |
| Remuneration of directors (REMDs) | 044                | 022                 | 002                       | .451   |
| Control variables                 | •                  | •                   |                           |        |
| firm age                          | .002               | .032                | 03                        | 551    |
| firm size                         | .000               | .007                | 007                       |        |

Prob>0.003

Source: The outcomes of data analysis were done with SPSS Version 23.

According to Spureconomics, (2023) The null and alternate hypothesis for this test can be stated as:

- H<sub>o</sub>: Both estimates are consistent but random effects estimates are efficient.
- H<sub>a</sub>: Fixed effects estimates are consistent but random effects estimates are not.

The coefficients of the fixed effects and random effects models are consistent under the null hypothesis. Only the random effects model's coefficients, though, are effective. The random-effects model ought to be adopted if the Wu-Hausman test cannot rule out the null hypothesis.

Contrarily, under the alternative hypothesis, only the fixed effects model's coefficients are consistent. The random effects model's coefficients are inconsistent. The fixed-effects model should be chosen over a random-effects model if the null hypothesis is rejected.

Based on the Hausman specification test in Table 7, we accept the null hypothesis and use the random effect model because its coefficients are more effective and have less variance and errors when compared with those of the fixed effects model.

### VI. DICUSSION

The researcher relied on the random effects model regression advised by the Hausman specification test to offer replies for acceptance or rejection of the stated hypotheses.

# A. The influence of Board size on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.

According to the random effects model regression, there is meaningful positive relationship between board size and company performance or Return on Assets, therefore, the alternative (H1) as per the research setting above which stated that board size has a significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the

USE is accepted, rejecting the null hypothesis that states that Board size has no significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE.

# *B. The influence of CEO age on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.*

The CEO's age has a marginally favorable impact on the success of corporate companies, according to the random effects model, however it is insignificant at the 5% level and as such we reject the alternative hypothesis (H2) stated in the research setting above.

This is further supported by the correlation results which indicated that no significant correlation between CEO age and Return on Assets and therefore the alternative, H2 as mentioned in the research setting above which stated that CEO age has a significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE is rejected taking the null hypothesis that states that CEO age has no significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE.

# *C. The influence of CEO tenure on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.*

Random effects regression model results indicated that there is a significant negative influence of CEO tenure on Return on Assets (ROA)/corporate performance and therefore the alternative in the research setting above (H3) which stated that CEO tenure has a significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE is accepted, rejecting the null hypothesis that states that CEO tenure has no significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE.

# D. The influence of the proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs) on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.

Random effects model results showed that there is a significant negative influence of non-executive directors (NEDs) on Return on Assets and therefore the alternative (H4) which stated that the proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs) has a significant influence on the corporate performance of selected companies listed on the USE is accepted, rejecting the null hypothesis that states that non-executive directors (NEDs) has no significant influence on the corporate performance performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE.

# *E. The influence of Directors' remuneration on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE.*

Random effects model results revealed that there is a significant positive influence of Directors' remuneration on corporate performance and therefore the alternative (H5) which stated that Directors' remuneration has a significant influence on the corporate performance of companies listed on the USE is accepted rejecting the null hypothesis that states that Directors' remuneration has no significant influence on the corporate performance (ROA) of companies listed on the USE.

F. Board size, CEO age, CEO tenure, Proportion of nonexecutive directors (NEDs), and Directors' remuneration simultaneously influence the performance of companies listed on USE.

Random effects regression results indicated that only board size, CEO tenure, the proportion of NEDs, and REMDs significantly influence performance of companies listed on USE. CEO age has a positive but insignificant influence on the performance of companies listed on the stock exchange thus it can be surmised that Board size, CEO age, CEO tenure, Proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs), and Directors' remuneration simultaneously influence the performance of companies listed on USE and thus we accept the alternative hypothesis (H6)

# G. Control variables

Two control variables were adopted in the study that is firm age and firm size.

# H. Firm age

Based on the random fixed model, we found that firm age had no significant influence on the performance of the firms (p=.723), however keeping other factors constant firm age was found to increase the performance of firms listed on USE by 0.7%.

# I. Firm size

Although the results of the random effects regression model show that firm size had no discernible impact on listed companies' performance (p=.181), when all other parameters are held constant, firm size was found to have a 2.1 percent negative impact on performance.

It was noted in summary that all the control variables never had a significant influence on firm performance and therefore the whole influence in firm performance is attributed to the corporate directorship variables excluding the control variables.

## VII. CONCLUSION

There is significant positive influence of board size on the financial performance of companies listed on USE. This is because a company with a larger board size has more expertise available to it in terms of decision making and deciding its strategic direction leading to more profitability.

There is no significant influence of CEO age on the performance of listed companies on USE. This is attributed to age having no effect on someone's ability, one company with a young CEO can perform just as well as a company with a much older CEO.

There is a significant negative influence of CEO tenure on the performance of listed companies on USE. This is attributed to CEOs losing their effectiveness over the strategic direction of the company with the passage of time.

There is a significant negative influence of the proportion of non-executive directors (NEDs) on the performance of listed companies on USE. This is because as a company takes on more and more non-executive directors, it comes as a huge agency expense in the day to day running of the company hence reducing the financial performance of the company.

There is a significant positive influence of directors' remuneration on the performance of companies listed on USE. This is attributed to higher renumeration motivating the directors to come up with better and more profitable ideas for the company as is the case with the listed financial institutions such as KCB and Equity Bank.

Board size, CEO tenure, the proportion of NEDs, and REMDs simultaneously significantly affect the performance of companies listed on USE.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was supported by the Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdel, M., Ibrahim, L., & Nawaiseh, A. (2020). The Effect of Firm 's Age, Size and Growth on Its Profitability: Evidence from Jordan. European Journal of Business and Management, 12(5), 88–93. https://doi.org/10.7176/EJBM/12-5-10
- [2]. Abdullah, H., & Valentine, B. (2009). Fundamental and Ethics Theories of Corporate Directorship. Middle Eastern Finance and Economics, 4(4), 1–6.
- [3]. Aca, A. I., Garba, M., & Musa, F. (2020). Assessment of Corporate Directorship Practice among Listed Conglomerate Companies in Nigeria Background of the Study. International Journal of Scientific Research, 1(12), 1–18.
- [4]. ACCA Global. (2018). Tenets of good corporate directorship About ACCA. The Association of Chartered Certified Accountants.
- [5]. Achi, M., Borlea, S., & Gold, W. V. (2014). The assessment of corporate directorship system quality in the is of the companies listed on the Romanian sectors . Analysi Bucharest Stock. Procedia Economics and Finance, 15(14), 617–625. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00530-9
- [6]. Adamade. (2015). Relationship between firm age and financial performance using a pooled and disaggregated dataset for manufacturing industries in Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Volume, 17(3), 128–141.
- [7]. Addae-boateng, S., Wen, X., & Brew, Y. (2015). Contractual Directorship, Relational Directorship, and Firm Performance: The Case of Chinese and Ghanaian and Family Firms. American Journal of Industrial and Business Management,5(4), 288–310.
- [8]. Afrifa, G. A., & Tauringana, V. (2015). Corporate directorship and performance of UK listed small and medium enterprises. Emerald Group Publishing

Limited, 15(5), 719–733. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-03-2015-0029

- [9]. African Markets (2023) Nation Media Group Limited. Available at https://www.africanmarkets.com/en/stock-markets/rse/listedcompanies/company?code=NMG (Accessed: 23 April 2023)
- [10]. African2trust (2023) SBU ABOUT NATIONAL INSURANCE CORPORATION LIMITED(NIC). Available at https://www.africa2trust.com/Member/?l=1&c=1&si d=620&glx=0&CatID=3 (Accessed: 23 April 2023)
- [11]. African' Xchanges (2023) SBU Stanbic Bank Uganda. Available at https://afx.kwayisi.org/use/sbu.html#:~:text=The%2 0current%20share%20price%20of,Uganda%20Secu rities%20Exchange%20(USE). (Accessed: 23 April 2023)
- [12]. Ahmed, S. P. (2021). "Corporate directorship practices in the banking sector of Bangladesh: do they Corporate directorship practices in the banking sector of Bangladesh: do they really matter? Banks and Bank Systems, 12(1), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.21511/bbs.12(1).2017.03
- [13]. Akinsanya, A., & Bach, P. C. (2014). Narrative Analysis: The Personal Experience Narrative Approach. ASEE 2014 Zone I Conference, April 3-5, 2014, University of Bridgeport, Bridgpeort, CT, USA., 95–112.
- [14]. Akinyi, G. L., & Moturi, C. A. (2015). Application of IS-Balanced Scorecard in Performance Measurement of e-Government Services in Kenya. American Journal of Information Systems, 3(1), 1– 14. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajis-3-1-1
- [15]. Alchetron (2023) Selestino Babungi. Available at https://alchetron.com/Selestino-Babungi (Accessed: 23 April 2023)
- [16]. Alfonso, M., & Castrillón, G. (2021). The concept of corporate directorship. Revista Científica "Visión de Futuro, 25(2), 44–56.
- [17]. Allgood, S., Farrell, K. A., Allgood, S., & Farrell, K. A. (2000). The Effect of CEO Tenure on the Relation between Firm Performance and Turnover The Effect of CEO Tenure on the Relation between Firm Performance and Turnover. Finance Department Faculty, 1(2), 1–9.
- [18]. ALLIANZ SE (2023) Allianz : completes acquisition of majority stake in Jubilee General Insurance, Kenya. Available at https://www.marketscreener.com/quote/stock/ALLI ANZ-SE-436843/news/Allianz-completesacquisition-of-majority-stake-in-Jubilee-General-Insurance-Kenya-33155013/ (Accessed: 23 April 2023)
- [19]. Alqatan, A., Chbib, I., & Hussainey, K. (2019). How does board structure impact on firm performance in the UK? Corporate Board Role Duties and Composition, 15(2), 18–27. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbv15i2art2
- [20]. Arshida, M. M. (2012). Critical Success Factors (CSFs) for TQM Implementation: Current Status

and Challenges in Libyan Manufacturing Companies. GSTF Journal on Business Review, 2(1), 71–79. https://doi.org/10.5176/2010-4804

- [21]. Aslam, E., Haron, R., & Naveed, M. (2019). Borsa \_ Istanbul Review How director remuneration impacts firm performance: An empirical analysis of executive director remuneration in Pakistan. Borsa Istanbul Review, 19(2), 186–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2019.01.003
- [22]. Ayoor, I. (2021). Effect Of Audit Quality On Firm Performance : A Review Of Effect Of Audit Quality On Firm Performance : International Journal of Advanced Academic Research, 2(4), 1–10.
- [23]. BAT (2023) British American Tobacco Uganda (BATU.ug). Available at https://africanfinancials.com/company/ug-batu/ (Accessed: 17 April 2023)
- [24]. Balaram. (2019). The validity of altman's failure prediction model in predicting corporate financial distress in uchumi supermarket in kenya. J Conserv Dent. 2013, 16(4), 2013. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23956527/
- [25]. Ballard, P. J. (2013). ScholarWorks at WMU Measuring Performance Excellence: Key Performance Indicators for Institutions Accepted into the Academic Quality Improvement Program ( AQIP). Western Michigan University, 1(2), 1–9.
- [26]. Bank of Baroda Uganda. (2018). Annual Report. Available at https://www.bankofbaroda.ug/-/media/project/bob/countrywebsites/uganda/financia l-reports/annual-report-2018.pdf
- [27]. Bank of Baroda Uganda. (2021). Annual Report. Available at https://www.bankofbaroda.ug/-/media/project/bob/countrywebsites/uganda/financia l-reports/annual-report-2021.pdf
- [28]. Becht, M., & Jenkinson, T. I. M. (2005). Corporate Directorship: An Assessment. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 21(2), 155–163. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gri009
- [29]. Belenzon, S., Shamshur, A., & Zarutskie, R. (2019). CEO's Age and the Performance of Closely Held Firms. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3003
- [30]. Boachie, C. (2020). Corporate directorship and financial performance of banks in Ghana: the moderating role of ownership structure. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-09-2020-1146
- [31]. Boyacioglu, M. A. (2014). The effect of corporate directorship on firm performance : a case of Turkey The effect of corporate directorship on firm performance : a case of Turkey Yunus Emre Akdogan \* Melek Acar Boyacioglu. International Journal of Critical Accounting, 2(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJCA.2014.063365
- [32]. Breepoel, W. (2019). The impact of CEO compensation on firm performance. 1(2), 9–17.
- [33]. Breheny, M., & Stephens, C. (2015). Approaches to Narrative Analysis: Using Personal, Dialogical and Social Stories to Promote Peace. Approaches to Narrative Analysis, 4(9), 275–291. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18395-4\_14

- [34]. Bubbico. (2012). " The impact of corporate directorship on the market value of financial institutions : empirical evidences from Italy " The impact of corporate directorship on the market value of financial institutions : empirical evidence from Italy. Banks and Bank Systems, 7(2), 1–18.
- [35]. Centre for Financial Markets Integrity. (2004). The Corporate Directorship of Listed Companies : A Manual for Investors of Listed Companies : CFA Institute, 1(2), 0–54.
- [36]. Chimtengo, S., Mkandawire, K., & Hanif, R. (2017). An evaluation of performance using the balanced scorecard model for the university of Malawi 's polytechnic. African Journal of Business Management, 1(1–9), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM2016.8201
- [37]. Chu, C. A. O., Zhi, Y., & Xin, L. (2021). The relationship between board size and firm performance. E3S Web of Conferences, 02079(57), 1–6.
- [38]. Cipla. (2020). Annual report. 1(3), 1–89.
- [39]. Cornforth, C., & Chambers, N. (2010). The role of corporate directorship and boards in organisational performance Naomi Chambers and Chris Cornforth. 1(1–9), 1–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511762000.007
- [40]. Dang, C. D., & Li, F. (2015). Measuring Firm Size in Empirical Corporate Finance Measuring Firm Size in Empirical Corporate Finance Abstract. 519.
- [41]. Davies, P. L. (2000). The Board of Directors: Composition, Structure, Duties and Powers by Paul L Davies Cassel Professor of Commercial Law London School of Economics and Political Science Company Law Reform in OECD Countries A Comparative Outlook of Current Trends. December.
- [42]. Dellce, A. (2001). The Sampling Issues in Quantitative. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 10(4), 2001–2018.
- [43]. DFCU. (2019). Annual report and financial statements 2019. 1(2), 1–98.
- [44]. Dissanaike, G., & Szilagyi, P. G. (2010). Corporate Directorship and Control: Introduction. European Financial Management, 16(5), 710–711. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-036X.2010.00575.x
- [45]. Drabek, Z., & Payne, W. (2002). The Impact of Transparency on Foreign Direct Investment. Journal of Economic Integration, 17(4), 777–810.
- [46]. Dzingai, I., & Fakoya, M. B. (2017). Effect of Corporate Directorship Structure on the Financial Performance of Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE ) -Listed Mining Firms. Sustainability, 9(867), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9060867
- [47]. Eagle Online (2023) Did Sudhir Ruparelia collapse his own Crane Bank as claimed by BOU?. Available at https://eagle.co.ug/2019/01/10/did-sudhirruparelia-collapse-his-own-crane-bank-as-claimedby-bou.html (Accessed: 24 June 2023)
- [48]. Eduardo, M., Poole, B., Eduardo, M., & Poole, B.
   (2016). CEO age and gender: Subsequent market performance CEO age and gender: Subsequent market performance. Cogent Business &

Management, 94(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2016.1146389

- [49]. Equity UG (2023) Transforming banking in Uganda. Available at https://equitygroupholdings.com/ug/about-equity. (Accessed: 24 April 2023)
- [50]. Ewart, B. H. D., & Ewart, B. D. (2015). The Effect of CEO Gender, Age, and Salary On Firm Value. Claremont Colleges, 1(8), 1–9.
- [51]. Faatihah, S., Fuzi, S., Abdul, A., & Julizaerma, M. K. (2016). Board Independence and Firm Performance. Procedia Economics and Finance, 37(16), 460–465. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30152-6
- [52]. Fauziah, W., Yusoff, W., Tun, U., Onn, H., & Alhaji, I. A. (2012). Insight of Corporate Directorship Theories. Journal of Business & Management, 1(1), 52–63. https://doi.org/10.12735/jbm.v1i1p52
- [53]. Friedl, G., & Deuschinger, L. (2008). A Note on Economic Value Added (EVA). November.
- [54]. Garbarino, S., & Holland, J. (2009). Quantitative and qualitative methods in impact evaluation and measuring results. In Directorship and Social Development Resource Center (Vol. 1, Issue 1). https://doi.org/9780704427563
- [55]. Ghardallou, W., Borgi, H., & Alkhalifah, H. (2020). CEO Characteristics and Firm Performance: A Study of Saudi Arabia Listed Firms \*. 7(11), 291– 301.

https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no11.291

- [56]. Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2023). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales. Midwest Research to Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, 1(1992), 82–88.
- [57]. Goel, A. (2020a). Effect of Board Size on Firm 's Performance: Evidences from India Effect of Board Size on Firm 's Performance: Evidences from India. International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research, 1(11).
- [58]. Goel, A. (2020b). Effect of Board Size on Firm 's Performance : Evidences from India Effect of Board Size on Firm 's Performance : Evidences from India. November.
- [59]. Guide2Uganda (2023) top-10-biggest-companies-inuganda. Available at https://guide2uganda.ug/top-10-biggest-companies-in-uganda/. (Accessed: 24 April 2023)
- [60]. Gunarsih, T. (2021). The influence of dividend policy, profitability, and corporate directorship (cg) on company value (empirical study on go public companies listed in cgpi index improvements 201 .... Directorship (cg) on company value (empirical study on go public. March 2019.
- [61]. Guo, Z., & Kumara, U. (2012). Corporate Directorship and Firm Performance of Listed Firms in Sri Lanka. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 40(1), 664–667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.246

- [62]. Guping, C., Sial, M. S., Wan, P., Badulescu, A., Badulescu, D., & Brugni, T. V. (2020). Do Board Gender Diversity and Non-Executive Directors A ff ect CSR Reporting? Insight from Agency Theory Perspective. Sustainability, 1(1), 1–8.
- [63]. Harrison, J. S., & Freeman, R. E. (2015). Stakeholder Theory As an Ethical Approach to Effective Management: applying the theory to multiple contexts. Revista Brasileira de Gestao de Negocios , 1(11), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.7819/rbgn.v17i55.2647
- [64]. Ifeoluwapo. (2004). Effect of Board Size on Financial Performance of Listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. Bingham International Journal of Accounting and Finance, 2(1), 1–13.
- [65]. Independent (2023) Cipla to raise Shs168bn in IPO. Available at https://www.independent.co.ug/ciplato-raise-shs168bn-in-ipo/. (Accessed: 24 April 2023)
- [66]. International Federation of Accountants. (2009). Evaluating and Improving Directorship in Organizations. International Good Practice Guidance, 1(2), 12–22.
- [67]. Jubilee Insurance (2023) Live Free with Jubilee Insurance. Available at https://jubileeinsurance.com/ug/. (Accessed: 24 April 2023)
- [68]. Jubilee Annual and Financial Report. (2017). Jubilee-Annual-Financial; Annual report. 1(18)
- [69]. Kalsie, A., & Shrivastav, S. M. (2016). Analysis of Board Size and Firm Performance : Evidence from NSE Companies Analysis of Board Size and Firm Performance : Evidence from NSE Companies Using Panel Data Approach. Indian Journal of Corporate Directorship, 1(12), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686216666456
- [70]. KCB (2023) Our History as KCB. Available at https://kcbgroup.com/our-history/ (Accessed: 20 April 2023)
- [71]. Khan, T. M., Bai, G., Fareed, Z., Quresh, S., & Khalid, Z. (2021). CEO Tenure , CEO Compensation , Corporate Social and Environmental Performance in China: The Moderating Role of Coastal and Non-coastal Areas. 11(January). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.574062
- [72]. Khanchel, I. (2007). Corporate directorship: Measurement and determinant analysis. Managerial Auditing Journal, 22(8), 740–760. https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900710819625
- [73]. Kime, K. J. (2015). The balanced scorecard: From customer perspective to stakeholder perspectives. Humboldt State University, 1(2), 1–267.
- [74]. Kuala, U. S. (2021). Board size and firm performance of listed companies in Indonesia. 13(2), 292–296.
- [75]. Kyaw. (2016). The Effect of Corporate Directorship on Firm Performance, Evidence from Egypt. Asian Economic and Financial Review , 1(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.aefr/2014.4.12/102. 12.1865.1877

- [76]. Lawson, B. R., Hatch, T., & Desroches, D. (2020). CORPORATE CULTURE AFFECTS PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT. January 2013.
- [77]. Leong, M., Chen, X., & Yao, X. (2021). CEO Tenure and Stock Returns Performance \*. Working Paper, 1(8), 1–8.
- [78]. Li, Y., Miao, X., Zheng, D., & Tang, Y. (2019). Corporate Public Transparency on Financial Performance: The Moderating Role of Political Embeddedness. Sustainability, 11(2), 77–86.
- [79]. Liu, C., & Jiang, H. (2020). Impact of CEO characteristics on firm performance : evidence from China listed firms. Applied Economics Letters, 00(00), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2019.1607965
- [80]. Loderer, C., & Waelchli, U. (2010). Munich Personal RePEc Archive Firm age and performance Firm age and performance. Munich Personal RePEc Archive, 26450.
- [81]. Maher, M., & Andersson, T. (2019). Corporate Directorship: Effects On Firm Performance And By. OECD, 1(6), 1–66.
- [82]. Mallinguh, E., & Wasike, C. (2020). The Business Sector, Firm Age, and Performance: The Mediating Role of Foreign Ownership and Financial Leverage. International Journal of Financial Studies, 1(1), 90–101.
- [83]. Martello, M., County, C., & York, N. (2008). Implementing A Balanced Scorecard In A Not-For-Profit Organization. 6(9), 67–80.
- [84]. McCahery, J. A., & Vermeulen, E. P. M. (2014). Six Components of Corporate Directorship that Cannot Be Ignored. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2(08), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2406565
- [85]. Meier, H. H., & Meier, N. C. (2013). Corporate directorship : an examination of u . S . And european models. Corporate Board: Role, Duties & Composition, 9(2), 6–11.
- [86]. Meiryani. (2020). The Effect of Firm 's Size on Corporate Performance. International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 11(5), 272–277.
- [87]. Meyer, E., & de Wet, J. H. V. H. (2013). The impact of board structure on the financial performance of listed South African companies. Corporate Board: Role, Duties and Composition, 9(3), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbv9i3art2
- [88]. Mihail, B. A., & Micu, C. D. (2021). The Influence of the Independent Non-Executive Board Members on the Financial Performance of the Companies Listed in the Bucharest Stock Exchange. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 14(10), 462. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14100462
- [89]. Mihok, J. (2006). Corporate performance management as a new way in directing companies. 11, 278–282.
- [90]. Mildred, A. M. (2012). The Relationship Between Director Remuneration And. November.
- [91]. Momoh, A., & Emmanuel, K. (2020). Effect of Audit Quality on Organizational Performance in

Nigeria. Bingham University Journal of Accounting and Business, 2(2), 53–63.

- [92]. MTN (2023) MTN Uganda Limited announces that it will proceed today with the listing of its 22.4 billion ordinary shares on the Uganda Securities Exchange (USE), with trading commencing immediately. Available at https://www.mtn.com/tag/listing/. (Accessed: 20 April 2023)
- [93]. Mutisya Peter Mumo. (2008). A survey of the cchallenges and benefits of regional crosslisting: The case of eligible companies quoted at the Nairobi Stock Exchange. University of Nairobi Library
- [94]. Mukherjee, T., & Sen, S. S. (2022). Impact of CEO attributes on corporate reputation, financial performance, and corporate sustainable growth: evidence from India. Financial Innovation, 2(7), 7– 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-022-00344-7
- [95]. Naimah, Z. (2017). The Role of Corporate Directorship in Firm Performance. SHS Web of Conferences, 13003(34), 20–26.
- [96]. Napakol, A., & Mugunga, A. (2019). Do not bank on us! Taking stock of transparency and accountability during crises in Uganda: the case of Crane Bank collapse. Proceedings Of The International Crisis And Risk Communications Conference March 11-13, 2019, Orlando Fl, USA, 23–26.
- [97]. Narayanamma, P. L., & Lalitha, K. (2016). Balanced Scorecard - The Learning & Growth Perspective. XXI(2), 3.
- [98]. Natalia, T. L. (2012). Corporate Directorship Perception Index (CGPI) and Cost of Debt. 3(18), 223–232.
- [99]. Ndubuisi, N., Chinyere, O. J., & State, A. (2020). Effect of audit quality on financial performance of quoted conglomerates in nigeria. International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection, 1(2), 87–98.
- [100]. NIC. (2021). Annual reports and Accounts. 1(1), 1– 8.
- [101]. NIC (2023) NIC Holdings Ltd. Available at https://www.nic.co.ug/about-nic/. (Accessed: 20 April 2023)
- [102]. NMG. (2019). Media of Africa, for Africa Annual report& Financial Statements. Pg 60-64.
- [103]. Nyberg, A., Fulmer, I., Gerhart, B., & Carpenter, M. (2010). Agency theory revisited: CEO return and shareholder interest alignment. Academy of Management Journal, 53(5), 1029–1049. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.54533188
- [104]. OECD. (2011). Chapter 6 . Corporate Directorship Legal , regulatory and institutional framework Equitable treatment Protecting shareholder rights Shareholder influence Disclosure The role of the board and the rights of stakeholders Voluntary private initiatives National.
- [105]. Okiro, K., & Aduda, P. J. (2015). The Effect Of Corporate Directorship And Capital Structure On Performance Of Firms Listed At The East African

Community Securities Exchange. European Scientific Journal, 11(7), 517–546.

- [106]. Oluseye, O. O., & Tairat, B. T. (2014). Customer Relationship Management Approach and Student Satisfaction in Higher Education Marketing. Custos e Agronegocio, 6(3), 49–62. https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2014.03.04
- [107]. Ombayo, J. O. (2011). A M a n a g e m e n t Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the R e q u i r e m e n t of the Degree of M a s t e r of Business A d m i n i s t r a t i o n, School of Business, University Of Nairobi. S e p t e m b e r, 2011. Unpublished Masters Thesis, 1(2), 1–9.
- [108]. Samuel O. Onyuma, Robert K. Mugo & John K. Karuiya. (DOES CROSS-BORDER LISTING (STILL) IMPROVE FIRM FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE IN EASTERN AFRICA Journal of Business Econmics & Finance, Volume 1, Issue 1 2012. 92-107
- [109]. Star (2023) The rise and fall of Uchumi Supermarket. Available at https://www.thestar.co.ke/business/kenya/2019-11-04-the-rise-andfall-of-uchumi-supermarket/ (Accessed: 20 June 2023)
- [110]. Orozco, L. A., Vargas, J., & Galindo-dorado, R. (2018). Trends on the relationship between board size and financial and reputational corporate performance The Colombian case. 27(2), 183–197. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-02-2018-0029
- [111]. Owusu, A., & Holmes, M. (2022). The Performance Consequences of Board Structure Changes: Evidence from Ghana. School of Economics, Finance and Accounting, 3(1), 1–33.
- [112]. Ozili, P. K. (2023). The Acceptable R-Square in Empirical Modelling for Social Science Research. MPRA Paper, 1(115769), 134–143. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-6859-3.ch009
- [113]. Paladino, B. (2020). Five Key Principles of Corporate Performance Management.
- [114]. Parmar, B., Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., & Colle, S. De. (2010). Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art. The Academy of Management Annals -, 3(1), 45–53.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2010.495581

- [115]. Poll, H. M. Van Der, Booyse, N. J., & Pienaar, A. J. (2011). An overview of the implementation of Economic Value Added (EVA TM) performance measures in South Africa. Measure Evaluations, 15(3), 122–141.
- [116]. Pratheepkanth, P. (2014). Corporate Directorship and Firm Performance : A Study of Selected Listed Corporate Directorship and Firm Performance : A Study of Selected Listed Companies in Sri Lanka Abstract. Corporate Ownership & Control, 1(6), 1– 22.
- [117]. Private sector initiative for corporate Directorship.
   (2017). Principles for Corporate Directorship in Kenya. Private Sector Corporate Directorship Trus, 1(2), 1–7.
- [118]. Putri, I. S., Hayati, S., Friantin, E., & Aryanto, D. (2021). The Influence of Corporate Directorship

Perception Index , Profitability , and Company Size on Stock Value on Go Public Companies at CGPI Listed On the Indonesia Stock Exchange. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation, 1(2).

- [119]. Rahman. (2017). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Language "Testing and Assessment " Research : A Literature Review. Journal of Education and Learning, 6(1), 102–112. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n1p102
- [120]. Rahman, R. A. (2005). Is There A Relationship Between Directors Remuneration And Firm Performance? Corporate Board: Role, Duties & Composition, 1(2), 39–48.
- [121]. Retail Banker International (2023) Largest banks in Uganda: an emerging digital market. Available at https://www.retailbankerinternational.com/features/l argest-banks-inuganda/#:~:text=Stanbic%20Bank%20is%20one%2 0of,the%20largest%20bank%20by%20assets. (Accessed: 20 April 2023)
- [122]. Richard, P. (2009). Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practice. August 2014. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308330560
- [123]. Rong, L. B., Kowang, T. O., Hee, O. C., Fei, G. C., & Kim, L. (2019). Corporate Performance: An Indicator for Corporate Future Direction from the Eyes or Top Management Corporate Performance: An Indicator for Corporate Future Direction from the Eyes or Top Management. International Business, 9(9), 1000–1016. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v9-i9/6387
- [124]. Salehi, M., Dashtbayaz, M. L., & Gouji, A. S. (2020). The Effect Of Intellectual Capital On Corporate Performance. ABAC Journal, 40(4), 149– 173.
- [125]. Sayyar, H. (2016). Akademia Baru The Impact of Audit Quality on Firm Performance : Evidence from Malaysia. Journal of Advanced Review on Scientific Research, 1(1–9), 1–89.
- [126]. Schnyder, G. (2013). Measuring Corporate Directorship: Lessons from the "Bundles Approach." SSRN Electronic Journal, December 2012. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2220616
- [127]. Serrat, B. O. (2011). A Primer on Corporate Directorship. Knowledge Management, 2(1), 1–9.
- [128]. Setyawan, M. B., & Anggraita, V. (2018). The Effects of CEO Tenure on Earnings Management: The Role of CEO Career Origin and Affiliated Relationships. 55(Iac 2017), 104–111.
- [129]. Sharaf-addin, H. H. (2022). Balanced Scorecard Development as a Performance Management System in Saudi Public Universities : A Case Study Approach. Sia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation ·, 2(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X211048591
- [130]. Sharaf-addin, H. H., & Fazel, H. (2021). Balanced Scorecard Development as a Performance Management System in Saudi Public Universities: A Case Study Approach. Asia-Pacific Journal of

Management Research and Innovation, 17(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X211048591

- [131]. Soft Power (2023) New appointments. Available at https://softpower.ug/coca-cola-appoints-kirundamagoola-public-affairs-and-communicationsdirector/ (Accessed: 15 April 2023)
- [132]. Soni, T. K., & Singh, A. (2020). Directors ' Remuneration, Corporate Directorship And Firm Performance Linkages: Evidence From The Emerging CountrY. 18(1), 382–392. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv18i1siart12
- [133]. Sritharan, V. (2015). Does firm size influence on firm's Profitability? Evidence from listed firms of Sri Lankan Hotels and Travels sector. Research Journal of Finance and Accounting Www.Iiste.Org ISSN, 6(6), 201–208. www.iiste.org
- [134]. Stanbic (2023) Who we are. Available athttps://www.stanbicbank.co.ug/uganda/personal/ab out-us/who-we-are (Accessed: 21 April 2023)
- [135]. Spurecomics (2023) Wu-Hausman Test: Choosing between Fixed and Random Effects. Available at https://spureconomics.com/wu-hausman-testchoosing-between-fixed-and-random-effects/ (Accessed: 27 June 2023)
- [136]. Steve. (2018). Discovering statistics using SPSS ( 2nd edition). Andy Field, London: Sage Copyright
  © The British Psychological Society. https://doi.org/10.1348/000709906X100611
- [137]. Supriyadi, T. (2021). Effect of Return on Assets (Roa), Return on Equity (Roe), and Net Profit Margin (Npm) on the Company'S Value in Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Exchange Indonesia Securities Year 2016-2019. International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research, 5(04), 2021. www.ijebmr.com
- [138]. Topal, Y. mesut dogan. (2014). Impact of Board Size on Financial Performance: The Case of BIST Manufacturing Industry \*. International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research (IJBMER), 5(4), 74–79.
- [139]. UCL. (2018). Uganda clays limited; Annual report. 1(21), 1–90.
- [140]. UCL. (2021). Uganda Clays Ltd.1(8), 1-6.
- [141]. UCL (2023) Board of Directors Message. Available at https://ugandaclays.co.ug/who-we-are/board-ofdirectors/ (Accessed: 16 April 2023)
- [142]. UMEME (2023) History of Umeme. Available at https://www.umeme.co.ug/about (Accessed: 16 April 2023)
- [143]. Ungar, M. (2022). Uganda securities exchange. Resilience Growth and Hope, 1(2), 1–8.
- [144]. USE. (2021). Monthly Bulletin; Market performance report. 1(12), 1–7.
- [145]. USE (2023) Milestones of the USE. Available at https://www.use.or.ug/content/milestones-use (Accessed: 15 April 2023)
- [146]. USE (2023) Uganda Clays Limited. Available at https://www.use.or.ug/listed/UCL (Accessed: 16 April 2023)

- [147]. Viewer mag (2023)DFCU appoints Charles Mudiwa sa new CEO. Available at https://viewer.joomag.com/issue-763/0947371001680896346?page=24 (Accessed: 18 April 2023)
- [148]. Vision Group (2023)DFCU Vision Group, The Best Multimedia Service Company. Available at https://www.visiongroup.co.ug/about/ (Accessed: 19 April 2023)
- [149]. Vision Group (2023) Annual Reports. Available at https://www.visiongroup.co.ug/annual-reports/ (Accessed: 20 April 2023)
- [150]. Wagana, D., & Karanja, K. (2015). The influence of Corporate Directorship on Corporate Performance Among Manufacturing Firms in Kenya: A Theoretical Model. 5(4), 258–272. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i4/1571
- [151]. Waliuddin, M., Razali, M., Yee, N. S., Yau, J., Hwang, T., Hisham, A., & Tak, B. (2018). Direct ors 'Remuneration and Firm 's Performance: A Study on Malaysian Listed Firm under Consumer Product Industry. International Business Research, 11(5), 102–109. https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v11n5p102
- [152]. Wang, X. (2010). Performance measurement in universities. 1(3), 1–9.
- [153]. Waweru, N. M. (2014). Determinants of quality corporate directorship in Sub-Saharan Africa Evidence from Kenya and South Africa. 29(5), 455– 485. https://doi.org/10.1108/MAJ-07-2013-0897
- [154]. Yilun, L. (2020). Firm Size, Firm Age and Firm Profitability: Evidence from China. Unpublished Masters Thesis, 1(1), 1–89.J. Clerk Maxwell, A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism, 3rd ed., vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1892, pp.68-73.
- [155]. I.S. Jacobs and C.P. Bean, "Fine particles, thin films and exchange anisotropy," in Magnetism, vol. III, G.T. Rado and H. Suhl, Eds. New York: Academic, 1963, pp. 271-350.
- [156]. K. Elissa, "Title of paper if known," unpublished.
- [157]. R. Nicole, "Title of paper with only first word capitalized," J. Name Stand. Abbrev., in press.
- [158]. Y. Yorozu, M. Hirano, K. Oka, and Y. Tagawa, "Electron spectroscopy studies on magneto-optical media and plastic substrate interface," IEEE Transl. J. Magn. Japan, vol. 2, pp. 740-741, August 1987 [Digests 9th Annual Conf. Magnetics Japan, p. 301, 1982].
- [159]. Youssef, T. ., & Thornton, G. (1986). Corporate Directorship: An Overview around the Globe. Atomic Energy, 1(1), 1–21.
- [160]. Zhan. (2017). The Role of Stock Exchanges in Fostering Economic Growth and Sustainable Development. World Federation of Exchanges, 1(2), 1–23.