

National institutional systems as antecedents of female board representation: an empirical study

Grosvold, Johanne; Brammer, Stephen

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Grosvold, J., & Brammer, S. (2010). National institutional systems as antecedents of female board representation: an empirical study. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 19(2), 116-135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2010.00830.x>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



National institutional systems as antecedents of female board representation: An empirical study

Journal:	<i>Corporate Governance: An International Review</i>
Manuscript ID:	CGIR-2009-0196.R5
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Board Composition < Board of Director Mechanisms, Institutional Theory < Corporate Governance Theories, Traditional analysis (e.g, regression, ANOVA) < Data Analysis

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Copy

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

National institutional systems as antecedents of female board representation: An empirical study

ABSTRACT

Manuscript Type: Empirical

Research Question/Issue: How are national institutional systems related to the proportion of women found on corporate boards of directors of companies listed in particular countries? Which particular types of national institutions play the most important role? We explore cross-country variation in the pattern of female representation on corporate boards and evaluate the extent to which it is associated with the nature of national institutional systems as captured in five frameworks each of which emphasises the importance of a distinct type of national institutions. Our analysis includes 38 countries and covers the years 2001-2007

Research Findings/Insights: Our findings show that as much as half of the variation in the presence of women on corporate boards across countries is attributable to national institutional systems and that culturally and legally-oriented institutional systems appear to play the most significant role in shaping board diversity.

Theoretical/Academic Implications: Our study suggests that country-level institutions, previously neglected in studies of board diversity, play an important role in shaping the prevalence of women on corporate boards and that these need to be more fully incorporated in future research on board diversity.

Practitioner/Policy Implications: The importance of national institutional systems for board diversity suggests that policy levers of a regulatory nature and national cultural characteristics are important elements in driving corporate board diversity and offer distinct opportunities for tailoring a mix of corporate governance interventions that suit the particular institutional nature of a given country.

Key words: Corporate Governance, Corporate Board diversity, Board Demography, Institutional Theory

National institutional systems as antecedents of female board representation: An empirical study

INTRODUCTION

The role played by national business environments for a range of corporate behaviours has long been of interest to Corporate Governance scholarship (Jackson & Deeg, 2008; Parboteeah, Hoegl & Cullen, 2008). National institutional factors have been identified as shaping a wide variety of business behaviours including entry strategies (Brouthers, 2002), diversification (Lee, Peng & Lee, 2008), innovation (Lundvall, Johnson, Anderson & Dalum, 2002), and corporate governance practices (Denis & McConnell, 2003). Although comparative, cross-national, research has addressed a wide range of phenomena, it has not, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Leksell & Lindgren, 1982; Terjesen & Singh, 2008), contributed significantly to research on corporate boards of directors. While a substantial and growing body of research has focused on corporate governance systems and their development internationally (Aguilera, 2005; Denis & McConnell, 2003; Khanna, Kogan & Palepu, 2006), such research has tended to focus on systemic issues such as evaluating the extent of convergence/divergence in practice internationally, rather than on questions concerned with boards of directors or their composition (Aguilera, 2005; Denis & McConnell, 2003; Fligstein & Freeland, 1995).

In recognition of their strategic importance, research concerned with boards of directors has proliferated in recent years. Within this, a considerable stream of research concerning the demographic aspects of boards of directors has emerged with a particular emphasis on the gender balance of boards of directors (Hillman, Cannella & Harris, 2002; Hillman, Shropshire & Cannella, 2007; Singh, 2007; Terjesen, Sealy & Singh, 2009). In this article, we explore cross-country variation in the pattern of female representation on corporate boards and examine the potential for it to be associated with national institutional

1
2
3 systems as captured in five distinct frameworks. Research on the institutional features of
4
5 countries has shown that particular institutional characteristics, such as the nature of welfare,
6
7 education and financial systems, and legal, regulatory, and political processes, tend to exhibit
8
9 complementarities such that countries typically exhibit a set, or “bundle”, of mutually
10
11 reinforcing institutional characteristics (Jackson & Deeg, 2008). Moreover, research has
12
13 suggested that groups of countries exist that each share a distinctive bundle of institutional
14
15 features (Aguilera & Jackson, 2003). Together, these distinctive bundles of institutional
16
17 features and those countries that are associated with them constitute “institutional systems”
18
19 and prior research has identified a variety of these systems that stem from the particular
20
21 disciplinary orientation of the institutional analysis. For example, economically-oriented
22
23 institutional analysis has identified distinct varieties of capitalism (Hall & Soskice, 2001)
24
25 and national business systems (Whitley, 1992; 1999), while political/legal institutional
26
27 research has identified distinct legal systems (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer & Vishny
28
29 1998) and systems of corporate governance (Weimer & Pape, 1999), and sociological
30
31 research has identified systems of national culture (Gupta, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002). Our
32
33 analysis examines both the overall predictive power of particular institutional systems in
34
35 respect of the variation across countries in the prevalence of women on corporate boards, and
36
37 whether support is provided for hypothesised differences between the clusters of countries
38
39 within each national institutional system and the proportion of women on corporate boards.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Through this analysis, we make two significant contributions. First, we extend and
50
51 complement earlier analyses of the factors associated with greater prevalence of women on
52
53 corporate boards of directors to encompass macro-level influences and processes. Given the
54
55 presence of a significant debate concerning the mix of policies and practices necessary to
56
57 promote women’s participation on corporate boards, our analysis is able to shed light on the
58
59 relevance of national institutional systems to this debate. Second, we apply the analysis of the
60

1
2
3 influences of national institutional systems to encompass the domain of board demography.
4
5 In so doing, we contribute to the development of the emerging literature that addresses a
6
7 comparative analysis of country institutions for business behaviours and outcomes and
8
9 contribute to the project of “gendering” comparative institutional analysis (Estevez-Abe,
10
11 2005, 2006; Mandel & Shalev, 2009).
12
13

14
15 The next section reviews existing literature relating to women on corporate boards
16
17 (WOCBs). We then outline alternative conceptions of national institutional systems and
18
19 develop hypotheses regarding how these influence the prevalence of WOCBs. We then
20
21 discuss our empirical methods and report our findings. Subsequently, we discuss the
22
23 importance of these, for both the literatures on board demography and comparative
24
25 institutional analysis. A final section concludes.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **PRIOR RESEARCH ON WOCBs**

33
34 A large body of research has focused on WOCBs. In the most recent comprehensive
35
36 review of this research, Terjesen et al. (2009) identify over 400 published references on the
37
38 topic, including 180 articles in academic journals and books. Terjesen et al. (2009) classify
39
40 extant research according to its level of analysis: micro (relating to individual directors),
41
42 meso (relating to boards or firms/organisations), and macro (relating to the industry/wider
43
44 environment within which boards and organisations are situated). Within this, the vast
45
46 majority of existing scholarship focuses on analysis at the micro or meso levels, with
47
48 relatively little research addressing macro-level issues.
49
50
51

52
53 At the micro level, a large amount of research has analysed the characteristics of
54
55 WOCBs and has attempted to explore their experiences of involvement in boards of directors
56
57 (Talmud & Izraeli, 1999; Terjesen et al., 2009). Much of this research has identified the
58
59 formal educational attainment and experiential characteristics that women need to obtain
60

1
2
3 board positions. Burke (1997), Sheridan (2002) and Singh and Vinnicombe (2004) surveyed
4
5 female board directors in Canada, Australia and the UK respectively and higher education
6
7 attainment in the form of university degrees were prevalent amongst the female directors in
8
9 all three countries as well as extensive business experience. In a similar vein, Bilimoria and
10
11 Piderit (1994) conclude that even though women possess sufficient educational qualifications
12
13 and relevant professional experience "...they continue to be blocked in their rise to the top"
14
15 (Bilimoria & Piderit, 1994: 1471) suggesting that even if women attain the formal and
16
17 professional prerequisites for board directorships, they face a number of organisational
18
19 barriers en route to board directorships, including opaque recruitment processes, insufficient
20
21 career development opportunities and lower remuneration (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2004).
22
23 Sheridan (2002) in her research on Australian female board directors' experiences concluded
24
25 that as well as relevant and professional experience, the women's contact network was crucial
26
27 in securing their board positions.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 At the meso level, a considerable amount of research has described the prevalence of
35
36 WOCBs, often by undertaking a "census" of the boards of companies listed on local stock
37
38 exchanges, and sought to understand these by reference to organisational characteristics
39
40 (Terjesen et al., 2009). Many studies have examined the prevalence of WOCBs within
41
42 particular country settings including the UK (Conyon & Mallin, 1997; Sealy, Singh
43
44 & Vinnicombe, 2007; Singh & Vinnicombe, 2004, 2006; Singh, Vinnicombe & Johnson,
45
46 2001), the US (Adams and Flynn, 2005; Arfken, Bellar & Helms, 2004; Farrell & Hersch,
47
48 2005; Peterson & Philpot, 2007; Soares, Carter & Combopiano, 2009), Canada (Burke, 1997,
49
50 1999), Switzerland (Ruigrok, Peck & Tacheva, 2007), Australia (Kang, Cheng & Gray, 2007;
51
52 Ross-Smith & Bridge, 2008; Sheridan, 2002), New Zealand (McGregor, 2003), Denmark
53
54 (Rose, 2007), Israel (Talmud & Izraeli, 1999), and Spain (Campbell & Miguez-Vera, 2008;
55
56 De Anca, 2008). Looking across the available evidence suggests that there is a striking degree
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of variation in the proportion of board directors who are women in a given country, ranging
4
5 from less than one percent in Switzerland (Ruigrok et al., 2007) to just over 15% in the US
6
7 (Soares et al., 2009), suggesting that a given number of companies could have more than 100
8
9 times more female directors in the United States than in Switzerland.
10
11

12 A second important strand of meso-level research has examined the organisation-level
13 antecedents of WOCBs. Singh and Vinnicombe (2004), mirroring earlier findings in the US,
14
15 UK and Canada, show that even among the largest 100 UK companies, the very largest
16
17 companies are twice as likely to have a female director as the smaller companies, suggesting
18
19 that firm size plays a significant role in influencing board diversity. There is also strong
20
21 evidence that where women and minorities are present on corporate boards they are far more
22
23 likely to be found in non-executive (outside) positions and may be less likely to be
24
25 represented on key board committees (Bilimoria & Piderit, 1994; Conyon & Mallin, 1997;
26
27 Daily, Certo & Dalton, 1999), indicating that the structure of corporate boards, and
28
29 particularly the balance between executive and non-executive directors, influences board
30
31 diversity. Other correlates of board diversity have attracted less clear support from earlier
32
33 evidence. For example, Singh and Vinnicombe (2004), in contrast to the findings of Burke
34
35 (1999), find no significant pattern in the link between board size and the presence of a female
36
37 director.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 At the macro-level, research has been more limited, but has examined the importance
46
47 of a firm's industry environment for the prevalence of WOCBs and, more recently, upon
48
49 some of the cross-country influences on WOCBs. A number of studies have highlighted the
50
51 importance of a firm's business activity or industry in shaping the presence of women at
52
53 board level (Hillman et al., 2007; Singh et al., 2001; Burke, 1999; Nelson & Levesque, 2007).
54
55 Pfeffer (1973) shows that the institutional environment significantly influenced the
56
57 composition of hospital boards, and Hillman, Cannella & Paetzolds' (2000) study of the
58
59
60

1
2
3 composition of boards in the US airline industry showed that as the institutional regulatory
4 environment changed, so too did the composition of the board "...to reflect the shift in
5
6 resource needs confronting the firm" (Hillman et al., 2000: 252). Similarly, Burke (1999)
7
8 demonstrates that there are significant differences across industries in the pattern of board
9
10 diversity with conglomerates having significantly more diverse boards than oil/gas and
11
12 mining/minerals companies.
13
14
15

16
17 Regarding country-level antecedents of WOCBs, a small number of studies have
18 begun to explore issues relating to the importance of institutional factors for the presence of
19
20 WOCBs. Public policy environments have attracted particular attention, especially in light of
21
22 the commitments of some governments to greater female representation on corporate boards
23
24 (De Anca, 2008; Hoel, 2008). In a related vein, Esping-Andersen (1990) evaluates the role of
25
26 institutional welfare provisions in promoting female work force participation across western
27
28 economies. He notes the distinctive role the state has played in Scandinavian countries, in
29
30 particular in Sweden and Norway, where maternity leave has ensured that women are able to
31
32 actively pursue professional career and skills development outside the home. This is an
33
34 essential first step for women wishing to acquire the necessary skills and competencies
35
36 required to pursue executive ambitions. More recently, Terjesen and Singh (2008) evaluated
37
38 women's share of the corporate board seats in an international perspective and detailed the
39
40 prevalence of women corporate board directors across a broad range of countries finding that
41
42 a greater presence of WOCBs was found in countries with greater prevalence of women in
43
44 senior official and management positions.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 To summarize, extant research has identified a wide range of explanations regarding
54
55 why such a small proportion of company directorships are occupied by women in many
56
57 countries. Most research has argued that women are discriminated against in the appointment
58
59 processes for board positions, or that women may lack the necessary competencies, networks
60

1
2
3 or desire to pursue board appointments. More recently, research has begun to address more
4
5 structural barriers to greater female participation on corporate boards, which operate in
6
7 particular industry or country environments. However, as yet, very little systematic research
8
9 has been undertaken that sheds light on the particular nature of these structural impediments
10
11 to higher proportions of women on corporate boards and it is to this deficit that we address
12
13 our analysis.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS AND WOCBs**

21
22 In this section, we develop the argument that national institutional systems play a
23
24 substantial role in shaping the demography, particularly in respect of gender, of the board of
25
26 directors of companies active in particular countries. Research in an international
27
28 comparative institutional tradition has proliferated in recent years and has drawn together
29
30 contributions from the political sciences, economics, sociology, and management studies
31
32 (Hall & Soskice, 2001; La Porta et al., 1998; Whitley, 1999). In recognition of the “bundled”,
33
34 or inter-dependent, nature of many institutional phenomena, the development of national
35
36 institutional systems in the form of typologies, taxonomies and classifications of countries
37
38 with shared institutional characteristics has been central to extant scholarship (La Porta et al.,
39
40 1998; Weimer and Pape, 1999; Whitley, 1999). In this study, we draw upon five of the most
41
42 widely cited systems of national institutions and examine both the strength of the association
43
44 between these frameworks and the cross-national pattern of WOCBs and hypothesised
45
46 relationships between clusters of countries within each framework and the prevalence of
47
48 WOCBs. The five national institutional systems we draw upon differ principally in respect of
49
50 the emphasis placed upon specific types of institutions. For example, economic institutions
51
52 are emphasised in both Hall and Soskice’s (2001) Varieties of Capitalism approach and
53
54 Whitley’s (1992, 1999) National Business Systems theory, legal/regulatory institutions are
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 central to La Porta et al.'s (1998) and Weimer and Pape's (1999) institutional systems, and
4
5 systems of national culture are core to Gupta et al.'s (2002) country clusters. In the
6
7 remainder of this section, we provide a brief overview of each system of national institutions
8
9 and develop testable hypotheses regarding the differences between clusters of countries
10
11 within each system that we expect to play an important role in shaping the prevalence of
12
13 WOCBs.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 National Economic Systems

21
22
23
24 **Varieties of Capitalism (VOC) & WOCBs.** Hall and Soskice (2001) are concerned
25
26 with economic institutions and conceptualise a framework of institutional comparison based
27
28 on an actor centred approach, which sees developed economies divided into two principal
29
30 categories depending on their national pattern of institutions: the coordinated market
31
32 economy (CME), and the liberal market economy (LME). They argue that firms as actors
33
34 must engage with a variety of institutions in their pursuit of corporate strategy and
35
36 profitability, including labour relations, industry collaboration and coordination and
37
38 education. The degree to which economic institutions are subjected to market coordination
39
40 (LMEs) versus non-market coordination (CMEs) and, by extension, how these two distinct
41
42 forms of economic systems create institutional complementarities within a given country
43
44 impacts on the country's competitive positioning (Jackson & Deeg, 2008). Hall and Soskice
45
46 (2001) highlight Germany, Switzerland and Belgium as examples of coordinated market
47
48 economies (CME). These countries are hallmarked by strong labour relations, extensive
49
50 vocational training programmes and strong business networks. The US, the UK and Australia
51
52 on the other hand, are seen as the archetypical liberal market economies (LME) where the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 market plays a determining role in balancing industrial relations, commerce is largely
4
5 contractually based and extensive industry collaborations are replaced by competition.
6
7

8 Recently, a strand of scholarship has begun the project of “gendering the VOC”
9
10 approach by exploring the implications of economic systems and their institutional
11
12 characteristics for gender inequality (Estevez-Abe, 2005, 2006; Mandel & Shalev, 2009;
13
14 Soskice, 2005). Of particular importance within this research are the characteristics of labour
15
16 market institutions, and specifically those that influence the patterns of skill investments
17
18 made by individuals (Estevez-Abe, 2005, 2006; Mandel and Shalev, 2009). Estevez-Abe
19
20 (2005, 2006) argues that the institutional characteristics of CMEs are not conducive to female
21
22 managerial ambitions because of the character of their “skill regimes”. In CMEs, skill
23
24 regimes are characterised by “institutions that make long-term mutual commitments between
25
26 employers and workers credible....much stronger employment protection legislation and
27
28 more generous unemployment benefits which make specific skill investments more viable,
29
30 [and] close cooperation between unions and employers [that] sustain a robust vocational
31
32 training in secondary schools” (Estevez-Abe, 2005:189). In contrast, in LMEs skill regimes
33
34 lack many of those strong institutions and are, thus, more strongly oriented to the
35
36 development of general skills, including most “certified general education—including high
37
38 school diploma, BA, MBA, and a license to practice medicine or law” (Estevez-Abe,
39
40 2005:190). The implication of this view at the aggregate, country, level is that, perhaps
41
42 paradoxically given their strong record on other aspects of gender equality (such as those
43
44 reflected in benefits systems), CMEs are less likely to develop women with the skills
45
46 necessary to compete for board positions because “the emphasis in coordinated economies on
47
48 specific skills is more appropriate to the male model of full-time continuous employment,
49
50 these economies are likely to exclude women from many sectors of employment” (Mandel &
51
52 Shalev, 2009:165). Moreover, women’s predicament is further exacerbated by maternity
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 leave, and other social, policies. Whilst maternity policies are designed to safeguard women's
4 jobs during child rearing and offer women the chance to continue work once the child is of a
5 certain age, employers incur significant costs in covering for maternity absences such as
6 hiring temporary staff. This reinforces the diminished return on investment to the firm, which
7 again results in firms preferring to hire and invest in male employees, thereby perpetuating
8 rather than addressing the disadvantageous position women may find themselves in.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 H1: There is a larger share of women on the corporate board of directors in liberal market
21 economies than in coordinated market economies.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **National Business Systems & WOCBs.** The National Business Systems perspective
28 (NBS henceforth) (Whitley, 1992, 1999) emphasises the economic aspects of institutions and,
29 like Hall and Soskice's (2001) varieties of capitalism (VOC), proposes that clusters of
30 countries exist that share a number of common economic institutional characteristics. The
31 common focus on economic institutions means that the VOC and NBS perspectives share a
32 number of features (Jackson & Deeg, 2006, 2008). At the same time, the NBS framework
33 proposes a greater number of clusters of countries that is based upon a focus on a greater
34 range of national institutions than that encompassed in the VOC approach and, in particular,
35 with a greater emphasis on diversity in the systems of ownership control and sectoral and
36 inter-sectoral coordination between companies (Jackson and Deeg, 2006). Hence, while the
37 VOC approach classifies Ireland and the UK as LMEs, in contrast to typical CMEs such as
38 Germany and Norway, because of their similar configuration of financial, skills and welfare
39 systems, the NBS approach sees Ireland as a collaborative system, along with Norway and
40 Germany, in light of similarities in the ownership of companies and in the patterns of sectoral
41 and inter-sectoral coordination. While the differences between the VOC and NBS approaches
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are to a substantial extent differences of degree, rather than differences of a fundamental
4 nature, given the prevalence of both frameworks in corporate governance research (Aguilera
5 & Jackson, 2003; Hall & Gingerich, 2009; Jackson & Deeg, 2006; Pedersen & Thomsen,
6 1999) we felt it important to assess whether the subtle distinctions inherent in the two
7 frameworks were significant in the context of corporate board demography. Whitley (1992,
8 1999) identifies six distinct national business systems, reflecting the degree to which various
9 elements of national economic systems are represented in particular countries: Fragmented,
10 Coordinated Industrial District, Compartmentalised, State Organised, Collaborative and
11 Highly Coordinated national business systems. Central to our discussion is the identification
12 and differentiation between distinct approaches to talent and leadership development,
13 employment and career progression and the impact these differences have on top
14 management recruitment. The collaborative business system relies on cooperative working
15 relationships between owners of the firm, providers of capital and other business partners,
16 such as industry associations and chambers of commerce. These industry alliances and
17 interest organisations are in the main male dominated and do therefore not represent a
18 relevant way in which women may derive the contacts and networks necessary for executive
19 leadership positions (Welter, 2006) . The systems which centre on coordination, such as the
20 coordinated industrial district and the highly coordinated economy seek to "establish long
21 term connections with their core workforce and develop distinctive patterns of skill and job
22 organisation" (Whitley, 1992:16). The general employment characteristics associated with
23 these countries are a long term commitment to the firm/employer on part of the employee,
24 segmentation of employees between a core and a peripheral work force, with the peripheral
25 workforce often consisting predominantly of women, an emphasis on firm specific skills and
26 the institutionalisation of organisational careers (Whitley, 1992; Houseman and Abraham,
27 1993). These factors result in promotions based on seniority within companies and a top

1
2
3 management team with a high degree of firm specific skills (Aguilera & Jackson, 2003;
4
5 Whitley, 1992). Such a system is likely to disadvantage women who are less likely to invest
6
7 in firm specific skills given that their employment trajectory is more likely to encompass
8
9 career breaks to raise children and the investment in firm specific skills takes longer to
10
11 recuperate and offers less flexibility in career advancement terms (Shire & Gottschall, 2007).
12
13
14

15 Career progression in compartmentalised countries, by comparison, relies on market
16
17 forces, lower levels of firm specific skills, considerable movement between firms and
18
19 industries. Countries classified as compartmentalised are, according to Whitley (1992) more
20
21 likely to recruit executive management from outside the firm and to place more emphasis on
22
23 university degrees and generic skills with an associated merit rather than seniority-based
24
25 remuneration and promotion structure. As women are more likely to invest in generic skills
26
27 and develop transferable managerial competencies which is compatible with a family life
28
29 (Shire & Gottschall, 2007; Webb, 2009) women are more likely to acquire senior executive
30
31 positions in compartmentalised economies. In state-organised business systems the founding
32
33 families and their allies are often able to retain considerable control as the state typically
34
35 provides subsidised credit to these firms (Whitley, 1992). Johannisson and Huse (2000) found
36
37 that where familial relations were central to firm management, women were more likely to
38
39 take on executive management roles. We therefore propose that:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 H2: There is a larger share of women on corporate boards of directors in countries
49
50 classified as Compartmentalised, and State-Organised than in countries classified as
51
52 Collaborative, Fragmented, Coordinated Industrial Districts or Highly Coordinated
53
54 economies.
55
56
57
58
59
60

National Legal Systems

Legal Origin & WOCBs. Having discussed the possible relevance of national economic systems for the prevalence of WOCBs, we now turn to the likely impacts of legal and regulatory national systems that have been central to political science research on country institutions. La Porta et al. (1998) ground their framework of national institutions within country legal heritages. Constructing a data set of 27 countries, the authors determine legal heritage for each country based on established legal distinctions developed by Reynolds and Flores (1989). Reynolds and Flores (1989) consider differences across countries with regards to national judicial heritage, with particular foci on the distinction between common law and civil law. The legal families identified are: English, German, French and Scandinavian-origin. Countries classified as having a legal structure based on the English common law are put in the English-Origin Countries, whilst countries based on the civil law heritage are allocated to the French, German and Scandinavian-origin clusters, depending on the particular institutional features of the country. Regulative institutions at the national level have been found to play a role in the managerial employment opportunities women are afforded (Parboteeah et al., 2008). Botero, Djankov, La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes and Shleifer (2004) investigated the role played by labour regulation across 85 countries, including the role regulative heritage played in encouraging female labour force participation. The authors concluded that where extensive employment protection laws were in place women's work force participation rates were higher compared to men, and the authors observed that "In broad terms, common and civil law traditions utilize different strategies for dealing with market failure: the former relying on contract and private litigation and the latter on direct supervision of markets by government. Under this theory, the historical origin of a country's law shapes its regulation of labour and other markets" (Botero et al., 2004:1340). Civil law

1
2
3 countries traditionally have more extensive employment protection laws and better legislation
4
5 covering social and welfare policies that are designed to safeguard and promote women's
6
7 pursuit of professional careers outside the home (Botero et al., 2004). In Common Law
8
9 countries, market forces are more dominant; employment contracts tend to be more flexible
10
11 and welfare legislation concerned with engendering a work-life balance that allows women to
12
13 pursue professional careers and have family commitments is less extensive (Botero et al.,
14
15 2004). In contrast to the argument put forth in support of hypothesis one, the argument we
16
17 extend here suggests that civil law countries, many of whom are also CMEs, tend to have a
18
19 higher rate of female labour force participation which enables women to build the necessary
20
21 professional experience and professional ties which affords them the opportunity to ascend
22
23 the corporate ladder (ibid). This argument is justified on the basis that the legal framework
24
25 we evaluate here is focused on legislative heritage rather than broader institutional facets, and
26
27 *ceteris paribus*, civil-law legislation is designed to be beneficial to women. Therefore we
28
29 suggest that:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 H3: There is a smaller share of women on the corporate board of directors in countries
40
41 classified as English-Origin legal systems than in countries with French, German and
42
43 Scandinavian-origin legal systems.
44
45
46
47

48 **Corporate Governance & WOCBs.** Patterns of corporate board demography have
49
50 been shown to be substantially influenced by the prevailing national corporate governance
51
52 practices (Aguilera & Jackson, 2003; Ruigrok et al., 2007). Weimer and Pape (1999)
53
54 synthesise a framework that revolves around eight corporate governance characteristics as
55
56 follows: the prevailing concept of the firm; the board system; the stakeholders that have the
57
58 ability to influence managerial decision making; the equity market's importance in the
59
60

1
2
3 national economy; the prevalence for a market for corporate control, corporate ownership
4
5 concentration, the strength of a link between managerial performance and pay and time scale
6
7 involved in economic relationships. Weimer and Pape (1999) argue that distinct geographic
8
9 regions will exhibit similar bundles of these eight features, and they identify four clusters of
10
11 national corporate governance, a Japanese, a Germanic, a Latin and Anglo-Saxon system of
12
13 corporate governance. The literature that investigates the salience of corporate governance
14
15 practices for corporate board demography, shows that that where more concentrated forms of
16
17 share ownership prevail, companies tend to have more female corporate board directors
18
19 (Ruigrok et al., 2007). Concentrated share ownership is a central feature of the Germanic and
20
21 Latin systems of corporate governance. From a stakeholder perspective, where family
22
23 connections and patriarchal ownership structures dominate, women are more frequently
24
25 accorded board directorships (Branson, 2007; Johannisson & Huse, 2000; Sheridan &
26
27 Milgate, 2005). Broad stakeholder engagement and concentrated forms of ownership are
28
29 hallmarks of the Latin origin and the Germanic origin corporate governance framework
30
31 (Weimer & Pape, 1999). The notable exception to these research findings is Japan. Japan is
32
33 known for highly concentrated ownership (Yafeh, 2000). Historically, Japanese boards are
34
35 heavily insider dominated. Board directors are in the main drawn from a select group of
36
37 highly committed managers forming part of the core workforce where women are broadly
38
39 absent, as women are in the main assigned to the peripheral workforce (Aguilera, 2005;
40
41 Houseman & Abraham, 1993; Miyajima, 2009; Whitley, 1992)

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Broader stakeholder engagement and better governance are also arguments used in
52
53 favour of the dual tiered board structure which is common in Germanic origin countries and
54
55 permissible in Latin origin countries (Huse, Nielsen & Hagen, 2009; Levinson, 2001;
56
57 Weimer & Pape, 1999). Employee representatives are likely to be more diverse, and in
58
59 particular women have often been found to be more prevalent among employee board
60

1
2
3 directorships. Although an employee wields different powers to the executive and non-
4
5 executive directors, they are considered full board members (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt,
6
7 Lengnick-Hall & Jennings, 1988). We therefore suggest:
8
9

10
11
12 H4: There is a larger share of women corporate board directors in countries classified as
13
14 Germanic and Latin than in countries classified as Japanese or Anglo-Saxon.
15
16
17
18
19

20 National Cultural Systems

21
22 **Cultural clusters & WOCBs.** Research has established that national culture is an
23
24 important factor defining women's role in society more broadly, but also that country cultures
25
26 help shape corporate board demography (Adams & Flynn, 2005; Burke & Mattis, 2000;
27
28 Hofstede, 1983). Research concerned with national culture has established that such cultures
29
30 are multifaceted with Hofstede's pioneering research identifying five dimensions to national
31
32 culture and the more recent, and more comprehensive, Global Leadership and Organizational
33
34 Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) project identifying nine dimensions of national culture,
35
36 some of which map closely onto Hofstede's original dimensions. While both Hofstede's work
37
38 and the GLOBE project are concerned with exploring the dimensionality of national culture,
39
40 they stop short of providing a typology of countries that have similar patterns of cultural
41
42 institutions. Gupta et al. (2002) analyse national cultures using data from the GLOBE project
43
44 and construct a framework which shows that national cultures, though consisting of a set of
45
46 distinct dimensions, also share significant similarities across particular geographic regions.
47
48 Gupta et al. (2002) show that clusters of countries have common cultural characteristics, and
49
50 in total they identify 10 such geographic cultural clusters. Of particular interest to our study is
51
52 the degree to which culturally held attitudes to gender may impact on women's executive
53
54 career opportunities and ambitions. In particular, following Parboteeah et al. (2008) we focus
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on how different patterns within four of the nine aspects of national culture identified in the
4 GLOBE research (gender differentiation, assertiveness, uncertainty avoidance and power
5 distance) that are present in particular groups of countries play a role in shaping corporate
6 board demography. Gender differentiation is the degree to which men and women are viewed
7 differently in a given society. Where gender differentiation is lower, women are more likely
8 to assume senior positions of authority (Javidan & House, 2001). The Nordic European and
9 Eastern European cultural clusters have lower levels of gender differentiation (Bakacsi,
10 Takács, Karácsonyi & Imrek, 2002; Szabo, Brodbeck, Den Hartog, Reber, Weibler &
11 Wurder, 2002), whilst the Anglo cultural cluster score higher (Ashkanasy, Trevor-Roberts &
12 Earnshaw, 2002), as do the Latin and Asian cultural clusters (Gupta et al., 2002). The
13 assertiveness category in the GLOBE framework is not dissimilar to the Masculinity element
14 articulated by Hofstede (1983). Assertiveness refers to elements of aggression and
15 confrontation in social relationships. Assertive societies are deemed to be characterised by
16 more masculine values and norms with an emphasis on toughness and material possessions
17 (Parboteeah et al., 2008), suggesting societal attitudes linked to more traditional gender
18 stereotype roles. The Germanic cultural cluster scores high on assertiveness (Szabo et al.,
19 2002). Uncertainty avoidance refers to a nation's reliance on well established social norms to
20 cope with unpredictability. Bilimoria and Piderit (1994) stated that companies were
21 occasionally reluctant to take on women directors as there was perceived risk and uncertainty
22 in appointing them, hence countries that score high on uncertainty avoidance are expected to
23 have fewer female board directors. The Eastern European cultural cluster is particularly
24 associated with low uncertainty avoidance (Bakacsi et al., 2002). Finally, the concept of
25 power distance captures the degree to which a country accepts and recognises that power is
26 unequally distributed in society. Hierarchies, patriarchal control and gender inequalities are
27 often associated with countries that are considered to have high power distance. Women are
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 often accorded positions at the bottom of the career ladder and are expected to adhere to more
4
5 traditional female gender roles (Parboteeah et al., 2008), suggesting women are less likely to
6
7 hold positions of power in such societies. The Germanic and Latin European cultural clusters
8
9 are associated with high levels of power distance.
10
11

12
13
14
15 H5: There is a smaller share of women on the corporate board of directors in countries
16
17 classified as Anglo, Germanic, Latin European, Latin American, Sub-Saharan,
18
19 Confucian Asian and Southern Asian cultures than in countries classified as Nordic
20
21 European or Eastern European cultures.
22
23
24
25
26

27 METHODS

28 Sample

29
30 Our analysis focuses on exploring the extent to which variation between countries in
31
32 the prevalence of women on corporate boards of directors can be explained by corresponding
33
34 variations in their institutional environments. It follows from these objectives that our
35
36 analysis requires that there are corporations, i.e. companies that adopt the corporate form, and
37
38 that these companies have boards or a comparable highest corporate decision making body.
39
40 Notwithstanding these constraints, our sample encompasses all the major continents
41
42 including Europe (including almost all of Western Europe, many countries of the former
43
44 Eastern Bloc, and Southern Europe including Greece and Turkey), Australasia, Africa, Asia
45
46 (including key economies such as Japan, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, India and Malaysia),
47
48 Latin America (including Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and Chile), and the United States and
49
50 Canada. Notwithstanding this, the constraints described above did limit the number of
51
52 countries included from Africa, the Middle East, and parts of Asia. In total 38 countries were
53
54 included in our analysis, and the sample covers the years 2001-2007.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Dependent Variable

Following earlier WOCB research, our dependent variable is the percentage of women on corporate boards in a given country/year and is calculated according to methods similar to those followed by Arfken et al. (2004) and Terjesen and Singh (2008) in that we draw upon a range of primary and secondary sources and focus on the largest listed companies in a given country. Given our approach of examining the composition of the boards of the largest listed companies for as many companies for which reliable estimates could be identified, a primary issue relates to the variation in stock market depth across countries and, hence in the number of firm-level observations available upon which to base an estimate of the overall prevalence of WOCBs in a given country. For example, while there are thousands of listed companies in the United States, and hundreds in many European countries, many countries have fewer (<30) large listed companies. Our approach to dealing with this issue was fourfold. First, we sought to use as much information as possible in deriving our estimates of the proportion of WOCBs – i.e. to use the full range of listed companies for countries where that was available. Second, we imposed a lower bound of 10 on the number of companies per country that we required to provide an estimate for that country in order to eliminate possibly spurious estimates based on very small numbers of companies. Third, we attempted wherever possible to triangulate our estimate with estimates available in a range of secondary sources described below. Fourth, we undertook a range of robustness tests that imposed different thresholds for the number of company observations used in the analysis to ensure that our findings were robust to this decision.

For many countries we aggregated from the firm to the country level using board data from company annual reports as compiled by BoardEx, a commercially available database of the largest listed companies in a wide range of countries, which has been used in earlier academic research (Singh, 2007). For other countries, we collected data directly from

1
2
3 corporate annual reports. For example, using Latin Trade's list of Top 500 companies in
4
5 Latin America by Net Sales, we identified companies for Argentina, Brazil, Chile and
6
7 Mexico, the largest Latin American trading economies. Given the difference in the size and
8
9 scale of the Latin American trading economies this meant that for some countries we
10
11 included all the companies on the Latin Trade 500 list e.g. Argentina, whilst for other
12
13 countries like Mexico, we included the 65 companies that had a corporate board based in
14
15 Mexico, however we did not include large companies that were incorporated in Mexico but
16
17 which were under the auspice of the parent company board which was based overseas. In
18
19 addition to this firm level data, we used data from a variety of other sources including the
20
21 European Commission, Spencer Stuart Board Indices, Catalyst, the Australian Equal
22
23 Opportunities for Women in the Workplace Agency (EOWA), Business Women's
24
25 Association South Africa and Globe Women. Where this process provided us with multiple
26
27 estimates of the prevalence of women on boards within a particular country, we elected to
28
29 adopt the estimate that was generated using the largest sample of firm observations since we
30
31 viewed this as providing the most robust and reliable estimate. From these sources we
32
33 identified how many board seats each corporation had and how many of these seats were
34
35 occupied by women. We then aggregated this to the national level by calculating how many
36
37 board seats the largest publicly listed companies had between them in total, and then we
38
39 calculated how many of these seats were held by women. We then divided the total number
40
41 of board positions held by women by the total number of board seats available and arrived at
42
43 a percentage share of board seats held by women for a given country.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Independent variables**

56
57 Our approach involves generating a set of independent variables that encapsulate the
58
59 distribution of countries across each of the five national institutional systems discussed
60

1
2
3 above. This was done on the basis of an extensive review of the literature concerned with
4 comparative institutional analysis. For four of the five systems of national institutions we
5
6 draw upon, the authors attribute countries to clusters in such a way as to make construction of
7
8 our independent variables straightforward (Gupta et al., 2002; Hall & Soskice, 2001; La Porta
9
10 et al., 1998; Weimer & Pape, 1999). Only in the case of NBS was additional research
11
12 required in order to attribute particular countries to the classifications described in the
13
14 conceptualisation of country institutional systems. Where possible, we supplemented this
15
16 with an examination of key indicator variables highlighted in the frameworks that we drew
17
18 from databases constructed by the OECD and World Bank. Drawing upon multiple sources
19
20 enables us to triangulate our attribution of particular countries to categories described in the
21
22 NBS approach and so give us greater confidence in the robustness of this process of
23
24 attribution. Table 1, below, describes the attribution of countries to particular clusters within
25
26 each national institutional system.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35
36
37 -----
38 Insert table 1 about here
39 -----
40
41

42 Having attributed as far as possible countries to clusters within the national
43
44 institutional systems, we constructed a family of dummy variables for each system that
45
46 encapsulated the grouping of countries within particular clusters. For example, in the case of
47
48 Hall and Soskice's (2001) economic framework varieties of capitalism, we created three
49
50 variables labelled "Liberal Market Economy", "Coordinated Market Economy", and "Other
51
52 Economies". Each variable takes a value of one if a given country is attributed to that cluster,
53
54 and zero otherwise. In a similar manner, we created a family of dummy variables that capture
55
56 the clusters of national economic systems encompassed in the NBS approach (Whitley,
57
58 1999), the national legal systems identified in La Porta et al. (1998), the clusters of national
59
60

1
2
3 systems of corporate governance proposed in Weimer and Pape (1999) and the cultural
4 clusters identified in Gupta et al. (2002). In each case, we also created an additional variable
5
6 “Other” to which any country not included in the authors’ data set was ascribed. In the case
7
8 of the cultural clusters, identified in Gupta et al. (2002), the Arab culture was excluded from
9
10 our analysis due to the lack of sufficient data for Arab countries.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Control variables**

18
19 In order to reflect the possibility that the composition of boards of directors has changed over
20 time independent of the nature of the prevailing national institutional systems, we created a
21
22 set of dummy variables, one for each year encompassed by our dataset, which take a value of
23
24 one if a given observation is attributable to that year, and zero otherwise.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **FINDINGS**

33
34 In this section, we discuss the findings of our empirical analysis. We begin by
35 providing a descriptive overview of the prevalence of women on corporate boards. This
36
37 descriptive overview is presented in table 2, below. Consistent with the observations of
38
39 earlier research, the prevalence of women on corporate boards (as reflected in the percentage
40
41 of directorships held by female directors) varies very substantially across countries (Burke,
42
43 1999; Burke & Mattis, 2000; Conyon & Mallin, 1997; Singh et al., 2001, 2004; Terjesen &
44
45 Singh, 2008). At one end of the spectrum, 30% or more of directorships are occupied by
46
47 female directors in Norway, Bulgaria, Finland and Latvia, while, at the other, female
48
49 directors are almost entirely absent from boardrooms in Japan, Singapore, Egypt and Chile.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 -----
57 Insert table 2 about here
58 -----
59
60

1
2
3
4 Before reporting our regression results, we present the descriptive statistics, and
5
6 correlation coefficients for our data. Given the mutual exclusivity of the classification of
7
8 countries to particular clusters within each national institutional system, our analysis is very
9
10 unlikely to encounter multicollinearity. As expected given this mutual exclusivity, there are
11
12 negative correlations between the clusters within a given system of national institutions.
13
14 Perhaps most interesting is the pattern of correlation between particular clusters of different
15
16 national institutional systems. Very high positive correlations were found between
17
18 membership of the Liberal Market Economy cluster, the Anglo-Saxon corporate governance
19
20 cluster and the Anglo cultural cluster. A similarly high correlation was found between
21
22 involvement in the coordinated market economy and in the Germanic system of governance
23
24 cluster. Since Japan is the only country in these categories, correlations of 1 were found
25
26 between Confucian Asian cultures, the Japanese system of governance and the highly
27
28 coordinated economy cluster. Other high correlations were seen where they would be
29
30 expected such as the correlation between Germanic cultural cluster and the Germanic law
31
32 cluster, and between the Anglo-Saxon cultural cluster and the Anglo-Saxon legal system
33
34 cluster. Given the variety present in the fundamental precepts of these alternative conceptions
35
36 of national institutions, the pattern of correlations identified is strongly suggestive of
37
38 significant interdependencies between elements of national institutional systems. However, in
39
40 other areas, the correlations are quite low, indicating that there is also a significant degree of
41
42 heterogeneity across different conceptions of the prevailing national institutional systems.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Insert table 3 about here

54
55
56
57
58 Turning to our regression analysis, our initial results are reported in table 4. In order
59
60 to avoid the dummy variable trap, it is necessary to omit one cluster from each of our national

1
2
3 institutional systems (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). The “Other economies”
4
5 cluster was omitted from the Varieties of Capitalism framework, in order to retain both the
6
7 LME and CME clusters. In the analysis of systems of legal/regulatory, corporate governance
8
9 and cultural institutions, we omitted the Germanic cluster as this was closest to the mean for
10
11 the dependent variable. The compartmentalised cluster was omitted from the NBS model as
12
13 this included the US and the UK the two largest developed trading economies in the sample,
14
15 where the largest share of board seats available to women would be found. In considering our
16
17 results, the interest lies principally in two aspects. First, the explanatory power of each model
18
19 provides an insight into the overall importance of a particular national institutional system for
20
21 the prevalence of women on a country’s boards. Given that the number of clusters identified
22
23 within the each institutional framework varies, the focus is appropriately with the adjusted R-
24
25 squared statistic. Second, the statistical significance of particular clusters of countries within
26
27 each framework provides an insight into the particular institutional characteristics that are
28
29 conducive, or otherwise, to greater female representation on corporate boards.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 We report two sets of regression results that differ according to the sample analysed.
37
38 The first set of results, models 1-6 reported in table 4, outline the findings of explaining the
39
40 variance across countries and time in the prevalence of women on corporate boards where the
41
42 sample is the maximum permitted given the breadth of our database and the range of
43
44 countries identified in the conceptual discussions of national institutional systems (described
45
46 in table 1). Model 1 provides a baseline by exploring the relationship between the prevalence
47
48 of women on corporate boards and time alone. Overall, this model explains approximately
49
50 13% of the variance between countries and time in the level of female representation on
51
52 corporate boards. Furthermore, and consistent with recent evidence, our results show that the
53
54 proportion of directorships held by female directors has grown quite substantially in recent
55
56 years. Specifically, we estimate that the percentage of women on boards has grown by nearly
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 6% in the period 2000-2007. Relative to the average initial level of board diversity in our
4
5 sample of approximately 6%, this is a substantial change. Models 2-6 examine the
6
7 explanatory power and pattern of significance of each of the five systems of national
8
9 institutions discussed above in turn. Respectively, models 2-6 explore the relevance for
10
11 female board representation of economic institutions (models 2 and 5), legal/regulatory
12
13 institutions (models 3 and 4) and cultural institutions (model 6).
14
15
16

17
18 Model two explores the relevance for WOCBs of national economic systems as
19
20 reflected in the VOC approach (Hall & Soskice, 2001), and the model finds that the share of
21
22 female corporate board directors is higher in both coordinated market economies (Model 2:
23
24 $t=1.05$, $p<0.01$) and in liberal market economies (Model 2: $t=1.10$, $p<0.01$) than in other
25
26 economies, but that there is no statistically significant difference between LMEs and CMEs
27
28 in respect of the prevalence of WOCBs. The adjusted R^2 for this model is 15.9%, suggesting
29
30 that national economic institutions, thus conceptualised, add about 8% to the overall
31
32 explanatory power of the base model. Model 3 examines the importance of national legal
33
34 institutions for WOCBs. The analysis shows that countries with legal frameworks that are
35
36 characterised as being English Origin (Model 3: $t=0.80$, $p<0.01$) and Scandinavian Origin
37
38 (Model 3: $t=0.93$, $p<0.01$) have a significantly greater percentage of WOCBs than countries
39
40 with either French or Germanic legal heritages. Regarding the addition to the overall
41
42 explanatory power of the base model provided by including national legal systems, we find
43
44 that the adjusted R^2 for model 3 is 51.9%, a very substantial increase relative to the base
45
46 model, suggesting that national legal institutions are, overall, very important for WOCBs.
47
48
49
50
51
52 Model 4 evaluates the role of corporate governance systems in shaping the extent of WOCBs.
53
54 Countries classified to the Latin (Model 4: $t=0.96$, $p<0.01$) and Japanese (Model 4: $t=3.14$,
55
56 $p<0.05$) corporate governance systems were found to have a significantly lower percentage of
57
58 women on their boards compared with both the Anglo-Saxon and German systems of
59
60

1
2
3 corporate governance. Regarding the overall contribution of national systems of corporate
4
5 governance to the explanatory power of the model, model 4's adjusted R-Squared is 32.5%,
6
7 suggesting that systems of corporate governance play a modest role in shaping WOCBs.
8
9
10 Model 5 evaluates the significance of national economic systems as seen in the NBS
11
12 framework and reveals that countries in both the Co-ordinated Industrial Districts (Model 5:
13
14 $t=1.24$, $p<0.01$) and Highly Co-ordinated (Model 5: $t=3.12$, $p<0.05$) clusters have
15
16 significantly lower proportions of women on their boards than countries classified to the
17
18 other clusters. Finally, model 6 explores the relevance of national cultural institutions for
19
20 WOCBs. The coefficients for the Anglo cluster (Model 6: $t=0.79$, $p<0.01$) of countries along
21
22 with the Nordic European (Model 6: $t=0.96$, $p<0.01$), Eastern European (Model 6: $t=0.96$,
23
24 $p<0.01$) and Sub-Saharan (Model 6: $t=1.34$, $p<0.01$) were positive and statistically significant
25
26 suggesting that these clusters have significantly greater percentages of women on their boards
27
28 than the Germanic European cluster of countries. The South Asian, Latin Europe and
29
30 Confucian Asian clusters had a lower proportion of WOCBs than the Germanic European
31
32 cluster, however only the Confucian Asia result was marginally significant at the 10% level.
33
34 The overall contribution of introducing cultural clusters to the base model led to an increase
35
36 in the adjusted R-Squared to 47.4%, suggesting that cultural institutions are also a very
37
38 important influences on WOCBs. Comparing the additions to the explanatory power, models
39
40 2-6 range from an R-squared of 21% to 54%. The largest increments to explanatory power
41
42 were related to the inclusion of national legal systems and national cultures, suggesting that
43
44 the relatively legally and culturally-oriented institutional systems have more to offer in
45
46 explaining board diversity than the economically-oriented national institutional systems or
47
48 systems of corporate governance.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert table 4 about here

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Reflecting the variation in the breadth of countries encompassed by the national
9 institutional systems, the number of observations varies very significantly across the models
10 presented in table 4. Consequently, both the relative predictive ability of the frameworks and
11 the substantive conclusions concerning the clusters of countries most associated with higher
12 proportions of WOCBs may simply be an artefact of the variation in the sample across the
13 models. Therefore, in order to test the findings reported above for robustness, we undertook a
14 second phase of analysis that focused on a common sample of countries/years that were
15 available for all of the national institutional systems. These results are presented in models 7-
16 11 in table 5. Given the need for commonality across all five frameworks, this reduces the
17 number of observations considerably and reduces the range of categories of some institutional
18 systems present in our analysis. Specifically, focusing on the set of countries which are
19 present in each institutional system eliminates the Eastern European, Latin American, South
20 Asian, and Sub-Saharan cultural clusters from our analysis.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Substantively, the results are very similar to those discussed above. For example,
39 concerning the explanatory power of the models, the overall contributions made by adding
40 national cultural clusters and national legal systems remain higher than the additional
41 explanatory power obtained by adding national economic institutions or systems of corporate
42 governance. Hence, we find further evidence that among the breadth of national institutional
43 systems, cultural and legal systems play the most significant role in shaping the prevalence of
44 women on boards. Concerning the particular clusters of countries captured in the specific
45 national institutional systems, the findings regarding models 7-11 are strongly resonant with
46 those discussed above. Specifically, Scandinavian and English legal systems, Anglo-Saxon
47 and Germanic systems of corporate governance, and Nordic European and Anglo-Saxon
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cultures are most conducive to high levels of female representation on corporate boards. In
4
5 contrast, women are substantially less prevalent on corporate boards in Latin and Japanese
6
7 governance systems, and in Latin and Confucian cultures.
8
9

10
11
12
13 -----
14 Insert table 5 about here
15 -----
16
17

18
19 The final robustness test to be completed concerned ensuring the inclusion of Norway
20
21 had not unduly skewed the results, given the legislative requirement for female corporate
22
23 board representation in Norway. Consequently, the regressions presented in Model 1-6 were
24
25 re-run absent the Norwegian data. The results conformed to those presented in table 4 and are
26
27 therefore not reported here. This test confirmed that the inclusion of Norway in the analysis
28
29 did not impact our analysis. Regarding the findings with respect to particular institutional
30
31 configurations, Scandinavian legal systems, Anglo-Saxon and Germanic modes of corporate
32
33 governance, and Nordic cultures are found to be most conducive to the presence of higher
34
35 percentages of women on corporate boards.
36
37
38
39

40 Reflecting upon the results presented in tables 4 and 5 in light of our hypotheses
41
42 suggests that we find some support for many of the hypothesised relationships. Specifically,
43
44 we find some support for hypothesis 1 in that, controlling for variation across models in
45
46 sample size, liberal market economies have a ratio of women on corporate boards
47
48 approximately two percentage points greater than that seen in coordinated market economies.
49
50 The evidence also supports hypothesis 2 to a substantial degree with highly coordinated and
51
52 coordinated industrial district economies exhibiting significantly fewer women on their
53
54 boards than other types of economy. In respect of hypothesis 3, results are mixed. While,
55
56 consistent with hypothesis 3, we find that countries with Scandinavian legal systems to have
57
58 significantly higher percentages of women on their boards, we, in contrast to hypothesis 3,
59
60

1
2
3 find that countries with English-origin legal systems have a higher prevalence of WOCBs
4
5 than countries with French and German origin legal systems. Results in respect of hypothesis
6
7 4 are also mixed with support for a higher proportion of WOCBs in countries with Germanic
8
9 systems of corporate governance relative to other systems and a significantly lower rate of
10
11 WOCBs among countries with Japanese corporate governance. At the same time, countries
12
13 with Latin systems of corporate governance had a lower percentage of WOCBs than those
14
15 with Anglo-Saxon corporate governance, contrary to hypothesis 4. Finally, hypothesis 5
16
17 attracted strong support with greater proportions of WOCBs being found in Nordic and
18
19 Eastern-European cultural clusters than elsewhere.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **DISCUSSION**

28
29 In this study, we have examined the role played by national institutional systems in
30
31 explaining cross-country variation in the prevalence of WOCBs. In order to address this
32
33 question, we have compared the predictive power and substantive implications of five
34
35 existing frameworks of national institutional systems that emphasise the importance of
36
37 economic, legal/regulatory, corporate governance and cultural institutions. These frameworks
38
39 encapsulate a variety of national institutional characteristics and provide a means to
40
41 distinguish between the salience of different aspects of country institutional systems in
42
43 shaping board demography. Our findings show that as much as half of the variation across
44
45 countries in the presence of women on corporate boards is attributable to institutional factors
46
47 and that, overall, legal and cultural institutions appear to play the most significant role in
48
49 shaping the prevalence of women on corporate boards. Our analysis makes an important
50
51 contribution to the Corporate Governance literature, which has called for further analysis of
52
53 how country level institutional systems influence and explain a variety of interest-group level
54
55 phenomenon (Redding, 2005), and to research concerned with WOCBs, where it has been
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 observed that “the field would benefit from further international studies” (Terjesen et al.,
4
5 2009: 333). This study is among the first to systematically assess the explanatory power of
6
7 institutional influences on WOCBs and, through this, we significantly extend the literature on
8
9 board demography. Our analysis complements existing research on WOCBs by showing that
10
11 not only do processes that shape board demography work at the firm and industry level, but
12
13 there are also a set of processes related to a country’s institutional environment that play an
14
15 important role in shaping the prevalence of women on boards and that contribute significant
16
17 structural barriers to, or facilitators of, the presence of WOCBs. This suggests that research
18
19 concerning board demography should now pay greater attention to macro-level influences
20
21 and the relationship between these and meso- and micro-level influences associated with
22
23 industry pressures, firm characteristics and internal firm processes of director selection and
24
25 retention.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Beyond exploring the broad macro-level relevance of national institutional systems
33
34 for WOCBs, our analysis of the variation within each system, and between clusters of
35
36 countries with similar underlying institutional characteristics, also found support for a
37
38 number of hypothesised relationships. We identified some weak support for hypothesis one in
39
40 that, having controlled for variations across models in sampling, Liberal Market Economies
41
42 have a higher proportion of women on their boards than do Coordinated Market Economies
43
44 by around two percentage points. However, our evidence in respect of hypothesis three was
45
46 contrary to our expectations. Specifically, we found that countries in the Germanic and
47
48 French clusters as classified by La Porta et al. (1998) had a lower proportion of women on
49
50 their boards in spite of greater legislative safeguards designed to assure women’s
51
52 employment rights and professional career opportunities. One possible explanation may lie in
53
54 the competing contentions presented in hypothesis one and hypothesis three; although
55
56 legislation may be designed to protect women’s employment rights, it is possible that the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effectiveness of employment protection law may also rely on putting in place appropriate
4 incentives for companies to engage female employees. If firms operating in CMEs and civil-
5 law countries are not adequately compensated for the loss of human capital investment and
6 skills associated with women taking career breaks, the firms will be more inclined to hire and
7 invest in male employees who are more likely to have a sustained and uninterrupted career
8 trajectory in the knowledge that the law would force them to invest in similar ways for male
9 and female employees. A substantive finding from this analysis, irrespective of the particular
10 contention of the hypothesis posed is the finding that legal/regulatory institutional systems
11 add considerable explanatory power to our model. Whilst our starting premise rested on the
12 assumption that legislation designed to safeguard women's employment opportunities and
13 rights would increase the share of women board directors, in fact what may be the case is that
14 women prevail to a larger degree on corporate boards in countries where the legal
15 institutional system is based on market forces. In fact, it has been suggested that the
16 regulative incentives provided for by strong equal opportunities legislation might require
17 affirmative action initiatives such as that introduced in Norway. Although the introduction of
18 a mandate that all corporate boards have a minimum of 40% of the seats occupied by women
19 was highly controversial, it was successful in increasing the prevalence of women on
20 corporate boards dramatically.

21
22 Country culture was found to play an important role in shaping WOCBs, with
23 countries classified as belonging either to the Scandinavian or Eastern European cultural
24 cluster having more corporate board seats occupied by women than the countries classified in
25 the Latin European, Confucian Asia or South Asia cluster. National culture is therefore an
26 important factor in shaping corporate board demography. The GLOBE framework
27 highlighted the cultural advantages afforded women in, amongst others, Scandinavian
28 countries. This finding perhaps further serves to underline the importance of national

1
2
3 legislation in changing the gender composition of corporate boards. Since national cultures
4 are slow to change, consequently nations with a cultural heritage might have to consider more
5 radical options like affirmative action to redress the gender imbalance in the corporate board
6 room. Spain, a Latin European country, with low female board participation has done just so
7 (Toomey, 2008), and introduced a clause in their national corporate governance code which
8 stipulates a “balanced presence of women and men” by 2015 (De Anca, 2007).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 Regarding the implications of our research for research in comparative capitalisms,
18 our findings suggest that this strand of research has the capacity to contribute significantly to
19 our understanding of gender-related phenomena and also to issues concerned with board
20 composition. As in the case of the economic performance of nations, our findings suggest that
21 no one form of capitalism is most conducive to a greater presence of WOCB but that both
22 LMEs and CMEs have a higher prevalence of women on boards than other countries.
23 Equally, the findings for the NBS approach demonstrate that co-ordinated economic systems
24 tend to have significantly fewer WOCBs. At the same time, the project of creating more
25 nuanced and descriptively valid frameworks that reflect the particular configurations of
26 institutional features present in particular groups of countries appears to contribute relatively
27 little to our understanding relative to the primary distinction between LMEs and CMEs made
28 in the VOC approach.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Our analysis indicates that future research concerned with the relevance of
46 institutional environments for both aspects of boards of directors in general, and the
47 participation of women in boards in particular, might provide further valuable insights. Our
48 analysis has confined itself to a focus on board gender diversity, but future work could extend
49 this to other aspects of boards and their activities. Since, as our research shows, multiple
50 levels of analysis are necessary in order to fully appreciate the drivers of female participation
51 on corporate boards, future research should also attempt to assess the relative importance of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 these multiple levels of analysis. We have identified important country-level phenomena, but
4
5 it is also important to recognise that institutional and other effects operate at the level of the
6
7 industry, firm and within intra-firm processes. Future research could profitably explore these
8
9 influences.
10
11

12 Finally, some limitations of this study suggest valuable future research opportunities.
13
14 Some of these relate to the sample of countries we were able to analyse and some with the
15
16 level of analysis. Our analysis was constrained by the availability of publicly accessible data
17
18 concerning the make up of boards in many countries, future work could attempt to overcome
19
20 this limitation as better data become available for more African, Middle Eastern, and Asian
21
22 countries. This would add considerable variety to the pattern of institutional environments
23
24 present in future work and help to establish the robustness of our findings. Work that sampled
25
26 companies other than the largest listed companies would also provide for distinctive insights.
27
28 Future research could also go beyond the national institutional systems encompassed in our
29
30 study, and explore the underlying components of the broad clusters of institutions explored
31
32 here. This would help to address Allen's (2004) observation that one shortcoming of the
33
34 Varieties of Capitalism approach to analysing institutional context is the assumption that firm
35
36 behaviour is identical across institutionally different countries. Whitley (1998) also notes that
37
38 Hall and Soskice's (2001) framework could benefit from deeper firm level probing to better
39
40 evaluate how the particulars of internationalisation and economic activity impact on firm
41
42 behaviour.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Lastly, because our analysis occurs at the country level, it is unable to evaluate the
51
52 extent to which the role of country institutions for WOCBs might vary with some firm and/or
53
54 industry characteristics. One particularly interesting potential avenue for future research
55
56 concerns the difference between MNCs and their domestic counterparts. MNCs are distinct in
57
58 that they establish a physical presence in at least one other country. Recent debates on the
59
60

1
2
3 relevance of institutional context for MNCs have taken a very interesting turn, suggesting that
4
5 MNCs make up a meta-institutional field (Kostova, Roth & Dacin, 2008) which transgresses
6
7 industry and country borders. Instead, MNCs “are becoming, it is argued, increasingly
8
9 disconnected from national institutional systems” (Kostova et al., 2008: 998). In other words,
10
11 the national institutional context of the MNCs’ country-of-origin would be a less significant
12
13 factor in shaping the gender-profile of MNCs’ corporate boards. Further research into the
14
15 international character of corporate board composition has shown that a number of women
16
17 board directors are foreign nationals, suggesting that cross-fertilisation of the institutional
18
19 environment may be taking place (Singh & Vinnicombe, 2004). Given the complex nature of
20
21 institutional environment and the debate on women corporate board directors, the firm level
22
23 behaviour of companies in different institutional settings with regards to this question may
24
25 offer interesting areas of future research.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 CONCLUSION

35
36 In this study, we examine the role played by national institutional systems in
37
38 explaining cross-country variation in the prevalence of women on corporate boards of
39
40 directors. We do so with reference to five frameworks of national institutional systems. We
41
42 include two economically-oriented institutional frameworks as captured by Hall and Soskice
43
44 (2001) varieties of capitalism and Whitley’s (1992; 1999) national business systems, we
45
46 further include two frameworks that encompass corporate governance and legislative
47
48 institutional systems as reflected in Weimer and Pape (1999) and La Porta et al.’s (1998)
49
50 frameworks respectively and finally one framework which centres on institutional systems
51
52 related to national cultural characteristics (Gupta et al., 2002). Our findings show that as
53
54 much as half of the variation across countries in the presence of women on corporate boards
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is attributable to institutional factors and that legal institutions appear to play the most
4
5 significant role in shaping board diversity.
6
7

8 Our study has some notable practical implications. We found that legislative heritage
9
10 was a particularly important driver in shaping corporate board demography. However, at the
11
12 same time where countries had introduced welfare provisions to encourage women to balance
13
14 a professional career with care responsibilities these countries had fewer women board
15
16 directors. This suggests that affirmative action initiatives like those adopted by Norway, and
17
18 subsequently Spain may have an important role to play in creating more gender balanced
19
20 boards. Although Norway's decision to introduce affirmative action in this area was
21
22 controversial at the time, it has radically altered the face of Norway's corporate boards and set
23
24 an example to other countries. A second, but related finding was the view that national
25
26 culture plays an important role in female board ascension. The Scandinavian and Eastern
27
28 European cluster of countries had the largest share of female board directors, yet Norway was
29
30 still forced to implement drastic measures to redress the gender balance in Norwegian
31
32 boardrooms. Where a given national culture is less open to high-profile commercial roles for
33
34 women, legislative initiatives may be a particularly effective lever in ensuring the best talent
35
36 is represented on the corporate board of directors, irrespective of gender.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Adams, S.M. & Flynn, P.M. 2005. Local knowledge advances women's access to corporate
7 boards. *Corporate Governance*, 13(6): 836-46
8
9 Aguilera, R.V. 2005. Corporate governance and director accountability: an institutional
10 comparative perspective. *British Journal of Management* 16(s1)39-53
11
12 Aguilera, R. V. 2006. Corporate Governance. In J. Beckert, & Zafiroski, M. (Ed.),
13 *International Encyclopaedia of Economic Sociology*: 120-124. London: Routledge.
14
15 Aguilera, R. V. & Jackson, G. 2003. The Cross-National Diversity of Corporate Governance:
16 Dimensions and Determinants. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28(3): 447-465.
17
18 Allen, M. 2004 The VOC paradigm: not enough variety? *Socio-economic Review*, 2: 87-108
19
20 Arfken, D.E., Bellar, S.I. and Helms, M.M. 2004. The ultimate glass ceiling revisited: the
21 presence of women on corporate boards. *Journal of Business Ethics* 50(2):177-86
22
23 Ashkanasy, N. M., Trevor-Roberts, E., & Earnshaw, L. 2002. The Anglo Cluster: legacy of
24 the British Empire. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1): 28-39.
25
26 Bakacsi, G., Takács, S., Karácsonyi, A., Imrek, V. 2002. Eastern European cluster: tradition
27 and transition. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1): 69-80.
28
29 Bilimoria, D.& Piderit, S.K. 1994. Board Committee membership: effects of sex-based bias.
30 *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6):1453-1477
31
32 Botero, J. C., Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-De-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. 2004. The
33 Regulation of Labor, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119: 1339-1382
34
35 Branson, Douglas M. 2007. No Seat at the Table: How Corporate Governance and Law Keep
36 Women Out of the Boardroom. *The Road to the Top: The Evidence*, Chapter 7, NYU Press
37
38 Brouthers, K.D. 2002. Institutional, cultural and transaction cost influences on entry mode
39 choice and performance. *Journal of International Business Studies* 33(2): 203-221
40
41 Burke, R.J.1997. Women on corporate boards of directors: a needed resource. *Journal of*
42 *Business Ethics* 16(9):909-915
43
44 Burke, R.J. 1999. Women on Canadian Boards of Directors: getting the numbers right!
45 *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 7(4), 374-78
46
47 Burke, R. J., & Mattis, M.C. 2000. Women on Corporate Boards of Directors *International*
48 *Challenges and Opportunities*: Kluwer Academic Publishers
49
50 Campbell, K. & Mínguez-Vera, A. 2008. Gender Diversity in the Boardroom and Firm
51 Financial Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics* 83(3):435-451
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Conyon, M.J. and Mallin, C. 1997. Women in the boardroom: evidence from large UK
4 companies. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 5(3), 112-117.
5
6 Cotton, J. L., Vollrath, D. A., Froggatt, K. L., Lengnick-Hall, M. L., & Jennings, K. R. 1988.
7 Employee Participation: Diverse Forms and Different Outcomes. *Academy of Management*
8 *Review*, 13(1): 8-22.
9
10 Daily, C.M., Certo, S.T. & Dalton, D.R. 1999. A decade of corporate women: Some progress
11 in the boardroom, none in the executive suite. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(1):93-100
12
13 De Anca, C. 2007 Women on corporate boards: Powering the future. AIWF Conference,
14 Dubai
15
16 De Anca, C. 2008. Women on corporate boards of directors in Spanish listed companies, in
17 Vinnicombe, S., Singh, V., Burke, R., Bilimoria, D., and Huse, M. (eds) *Women on*
18 *Corporate Boards of Directors: International Research and Practice*, Cheltenham, Edward
19 Elgar, pp. 96-107
20
21 Deeg, Richard and Jackson, Gregory (2006). "How Many Varieties of Capitalism?
22 Comparing the Comparative Institutional Analyses of Capitalist Diversity." MPIfG
23 Discussion Paper 06/2. Cologne: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies.
24
25 Denis, D.K. & McConnell, J.J. 2003. International Corporate Governance. *Journal of*
26 *Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 38(1): 1-36
27
28 Esping-Andersen, G. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Polity Press
29
30 Estevez-Abe, M. 2005. Gender Bias in Skills and Social Policies: The Varieties of Capitalism
31 Perspective on Sex Segregation. *Social Politics*, 12: 180-215
32
33 Estevez-Abe, M. 2006. Gendering the varieties of capitalism: a study of occupational
34 segregation by sex in advanced industrial societies. *World Politics*, 59(1): 142.
35
36 Farrell, K.A. & Hersch, P.L. 2005. Additions to corporate boards: the effect of gender. *Journal*
37 *of Corporate Finance* 11(1-2): 85-106
38
39 Fligstein, N. & Freeland, R. 1995. Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives on Corporate
40 Organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21(1): 21
41
42 Gupta, V. Hanges, P. J. & Dorfman, P. 2002. Cultural clusters: methodology and findings.
43 *Journal of International Business* 37(1):11-15
44
45 Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis*
46 (5e), New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.
47
48 Hall, P. A., & Gingerich, D.W. 2009. Varieties of Capitalism and Institutional
49 Complementarities in the Political Economy: An Empirical Analysis. *British Journal of*
50 *Political Science*, 39(03): 449-482.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hall, P.A. & Soskice, D. 2001 *Varieties of Capitalism The Institutional Foundations of*
4 *Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press
5
6 Hillman, A. J., Shropshire, C. & Cannella, AA. 2007. Organizational predictors of women on
7 corporate boards. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(4): 941-952.
8
9 Hillman, A.J., Cannella, A.A and Paetzold, R.L. 2000. The Resource Dependence Role of
10 Corporate Directors: Strategic Adaptation of Board Composition in Response to
11 Environmental Change. *Journal of Management Studies* 37(2):235 - 256
12
13 Hillman, A.J., Cannella, A.A. and Harris, I.C. 2002. Women and Racial Minorities in the
14 Boardroom: How Do Directors Differ? *Journal of Management* 28(6): 747-763.
15
16 Hofstede, G. 1983. National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory on cultural
17 differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organizations* 13(1-
18 2):46-74
19
20 Hoel, M. 2008. The quota story: Five years of change in Norway, in Vinnicombe, S., Singh,
21 V., Burke, R., Bilimoria, D., and Huse, M. (eds) *Women on Corporate Boards of Directors:*
22 *International Research and Practice*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, pp. 79-87
23
24 Houseman, S. N. & Abraham, K. G. 1993. Female Workers as a Buffer in the Japanese
25 Economy. *The American Economic Review*, 83(2): 45-5
26
27 Huse, M., Nielsen, S., & Hagen, I. 2009. Women and Employee-Elected Board Members,
28 and Their Contributions to Board Control Tasks, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89: 581-597.
29
30 Jackson, G. and R. Deeg. 2008. Comparing capitalisms: understanding institutional diversity
31 and its implications for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*
32 39(4): 540-561.
33
34 Javidan, M., & House, R. J. 2001. Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from
35 project GLOBE. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29, 289-305.
36
37 Johannisson, B. & Huse, M. 2000. Recruiting outside board members in the small family
38 business: an ideological challenge. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 12(4):353-
39 378.
40
41 Kang, H., M. Cheng, S.J. Gray. 2007. Corporate Governance and Board Composition:
42 diversity and independence of Australian boards. *Corporate Governance: An International*
43 *Review* 15(2): 194-207
44
45 Khanna, T., Kogan, J.& Palepu, K. 2006. Globalization and similarities in corporate
46 governance: a cross-country analysis. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(1):69-90
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kostova, T., Roth, K., & Dacin, M.T. 2008. Institutional Theory in the Study of Multinational
4 Corporations: A Critique and new Directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4),
5 994 – 1006.
6
7
8 La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R., 1998. Law and Finance. *Journal*
9 *of Political Economy* 106, 1113-1155.
10
11 Lee, K., Peng, M.W & Lee, K. 2008. From diversification premium to diversification
12 discount during institutional transitions . *Journal of World Business* 43(1):47-65
13
14 Leksell, L & Lindgren, L. 1982. The Board of Directors in Foreign Subsidiaries. *Journal of*
15 *International Business Studies*. 13(1): 27-38
16
17 Levinson, K. 2001. Employee Representatives on Company Boards in Sweden. *Industrial*
18 *Relations Journal*, 32(3): 264-274.
19
20 Lundvall, A., Johnson, B., Anderson, E., Dalum, B. 2002. National systems of production,
21 innovation and competence building. *Research Policy*, 31(2): 213-231
22
23 Mandel, H. & Shalev, M 2009. Gender, Class, and Varieties of Capitalism. *Social Politics:*
24 *International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 16(2):161-181.
25
26
27 McGregor, J. 2003. Girl Power: double jeopardy or diversity in action behind boardroom
28 doors in New Zealand? *Women in Management Review* 18(7):369-375
29
30 Miyajima, H. 2009. Increasing overseas investors & corporate governance in Japan. *Japan*
31 *Spotlight* (May/June).
32
33 Nelson, T. and Levesque, L. L. 2007. The Status of Women in Corporate Governance in
34 High-Growth, High-Potential Firms. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, Blackwell
35 Publishing Limited. 31(2):209-232.
36
37 Parboteeah, K.P., Hoegl, M & Cullen, JB. 2008. Managers' gender role attitude: a country
38 institutional approach. *Journal of International Business Studies* 39(5):795-813
39
40 Pedersen, T., & Thomsen, S. 1999. Business Systems and Corporate Governance.
41 *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 29(2): 43.
42
43 Peterson, C. & J. Philpot. 2007. Women's Roles on U.S. Fortune 500 Boards: Director
44 Expertise and Committee Memberships. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72: 177-196
45
46 Pfeffer, J. 1973. Size, Composition, and Function of Hospital Boards of Directors: A Study of
47 Organization- Environment Linkage. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 18(3):349-364.
48
49 Redding, G. 2005. The thick description and comparison of societal systems of capitalism.
50 *Journal of International Business Studies*. 36(2): 123-155
51
52 Reynolds, T.H. and Flores, A.A. 1989. Foreign Law: Current Sources of Codes and Basic
53 Legislation in Jurisdictions of the World. FB Rothman
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rose, C. 2007. Does female board representation influence firm performance? The Danish
4 evidence. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 15(2): 404-413
5
6
7 Ross-Smith, A. and Bridge, J. 2008. Glacial at best: Women's progress on corporate boards in
8 Australia, in Vinnicombe, S., Singh, V., Burke, R., Bilimoria, D., and Huse, M. (eds)
9 Women on Corporate Boards of Directors: International Research and Practice,
10 Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, pp.101-119
11
12
13 Ruigrok, W., Peck, S., and Tacheva, S. 2007. Nationality and Gender Diversity on Swiss
14 Corporate Boards. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 15(4), 546-557.
15
16
17 Sealy, V., Singh, V., and Vinnicombe, S. 2007. The Female FTSE Report 2007. Cranfield.
18
19 Sheridan, A. 2002. What you know and who you know; "successful" women's experiences of
20 accessing board positions. *Career Development International*, 7(4): 203-10
21
22
23 Sheridan, A. & Milgate, G. 2005. Accessing Board Positions: a comparison of female and
24 male board members' views. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 13(6):847-
25 855
26
27
28 Shire, K., & Gottschall, K. 2007. Understanding Employment Systems from a Gender
29 Perspective - Pitfalls and Potentials of New Comparative Analytical Frameworks, ZeE-
30 Arbeitpapier: 1-39. Bremen: Zentrum für Sozialpolitik.
31
32
33 Singh, V. 2007. Ethnic diversity on top corporate boards: a resource dependency perspective.
34 *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 18(12): 2128-2146
35
36
37 Singh, V. & Vinnicombe, S. 2004. Why so few women in top UK boardrooms? Evidence and
38 theoretical explanations. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 12(4):479-488
39
40
41 Singh, V., & Vinnicombe, S. 2006. Identifying the new generation of women directors. The
42 female FTSE report 2006. Cranfield
43
44
45 Singh, V., Vinnicombe, S. & Johnson P. 2001. Women directors on top UK boards.
46 *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 9(3), 206-216.
47
48
49 Soares, R., Carter, N.M & Combopiano, J. 2009. 2009 Catalyst Census: Fortune 500 Women
50 Board Directors. [http://www.catalyst.org/publication/357/2009-catalyst-census-fortune-](http://www.catalyst.org/publication/357/2009-catalyst-census-fortune-500-women-board-directors)
51 [500-women-board-directors](http://www.catalyst.org/publication/357/2009-catalyst-census-fortune-500-women-board-directors) April 20 2010
52
53
54 Soskice, D. 2005. Varieties of capitalism and cross-national gender differences. *International*
55 *studies in gender state and society*, 12(2): 170-179.
56
57
58 Szabo, E, Brodbeck, C, Den Hartog, N, Reber, G, Weibler, J, Wunderer, R. 2002. The
59 Germanic Europe: where employees have a voice. *Journal of World Business* 37(1): 55-68.
60
Terjesen, S. & Singh, V. 2008. Female Presence on Corporate Boards: A Multi-Country
Study of Environmental Context, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(1): 55-63.

- 1
2
3 Terjesen, S, Sealy, R, and Singh, V. 2009. Women Directors on Corporate Boards: A Review
4 and Research Agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 17(3):320-33
5
6
7 Talmud, I. & Izraeli, D. N. 1999. The Relationship between Gender and Performance Issues
8 of Concern to Directors: Correlates or Institution? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
9 20(4): 459-474.
10
11
12 Toomey, C. 2008. Quotas for women on the board: do they work? *Times* June 8 2008
13
14 Webb, J. 2009. Gender and Occupation in Market Economies: Change and restructuring since
15 the 1980s. *Social politics : international studies in gender state and society*, 16(1): 82-110.
16
17
18 Weimer, J. & Pape, J.C. 1999. A taxonomy of systems of corporate governance. *Corporate*
19 *Governance* 7(2): 152-166
20
21
22 Welter, F. 2006. Women's entrepreneurship in Germany: progress in a still traditional
23 environment. In Brush, C., and Carter, N., Gatewood., and Hart, M. (Eds), *Growth-oriented*
24 *Women Entrepreneurs and Their Businesses: A global research perspective*, Edward Elgar
25 Publishing, Boston MA
26
27
28 Whitley, R. 1992. *European Business Systems: Firms and markets in their national contexts.*
29 Sage Publications
30
31
32 Whitley, R. 1998. Internationalization and varieties of capitalism: the limited effects of cross-
33 national coordination of economic activities on the nature of business systems. *Review of*
34 *International Political Economy*, 5: 445-481.
35
36
37 Whitley, R. 1999. *Divergent Capitalisms The Social Structuring and Change of Business*
38 *Systems.* Oxford University Press
39
40
41 Yafeh, Y. 2000. *Corporate Governance in Japan.* *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 16(2):
42 74-84.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 1

: The classification of countries to institutional systems

Table 1: Typologies of National Business Environments

Hall and Soskice (2001)		Whitley (1991, 1999)		La Porta et al., (1998)		Weimar & Pape (1999)		Gupta et al., (2002)			
Grouping	Countries	Grouping	Countries	Grouping	Countries	Grouping	Countries	Grouping	Countries		
Liberal Market Economies	United States	Fragmented Business System	Argentina	English-Origin Countries	Australia	Anglo-Saxon Countries	United States	Anglo Cultures	United Kingdom		
	United Kingdom		Brazil		Canada		United Kingdom		United States		
	Ireland		Chile		Hong Kong		Canada		Australia		
	Canada		Denmark		India	Australia	South Africa				
	Australia		Mexico		Ireland	Germany	Canada				
	New Zealand		Poland		Israel	Netherlands	New Zealand				
Coordinated Market Economies	Japan		Coordinated Industrial District		South Africa	Latin Countries	Kenya	Germanic Countries	Switzerland	Latin European Cultures	Ireland
	Netherlands				Hong Kong		Malaysia		Sweden		Israel
	Belgium				Turkey		New Zealand		Austria		Italy
	Denmark				Portugal		Nigeria	Denmark	Portugal		
	Sweden	Italy		Pakistan	Norway		Spain				
	Finland	Belgium		Singapore	Finland		France				
	Germany	Australia		South Africa	France		Nordic European Cultures	Finland			
	Switzerland	Canada		Sri Lanka	Italy		Sweden				
	Norway	Cyprus		Thailand	Spain		Denmark				
	Austria	Netherlands		United Kingdom	Belgium		Germany				
Other countries	Israel	Compartmentalised Business Systems	New Zealand	French-Origin Countries	United States	Japan	Japan	Germanic European Cultures	Austria		
	Singapore		UK		Zimbabwe		Argentina		Switzerland		
	Taiwan		US		Belgium		Belgium		Netherlands		
	SKorea		Spain		Brazil	Brazil	Hungary				
	France		Bulgaria		Chile	Chile	Russia				
	Italy		China		Columbia	Columbia	Kazakhstan				
	Spain		Egypt		Ecuador	Ecuador	Albania				
	State Organised Business Systems		State Organised Business Systems		France	Egypt	Egypt	Poland			
					Greece	France	France	Greece			
					Hungary	Greece	Greece	Slovenia			
Malaysia		Indonesia		Indonesia	Georgia						
Russia		Italy		Italy	Costa Rica						
Czech Republic		Jordan		Italy	Venezuela						
Collaborative Business Systems		Collaborative Business Systems		Austria	Mexico	Jordan	Ecuador				
				Finland	Netherlands	Mexico	Mexico				
				Germany	Peru	Netherlands	B Salvador				
				Ireland	Philippines	Peru	Columbia				
	Israel		Portugal	Philippines	Guatemala						
	Norway		Spain	Portugal	Bolivia						
	Switzerland		Turkey	Spain	Brazil						
	Sweden		Uruguay	Turkey	Argentina						
	Highly Coordinated Business Systems		Highly Coordinated Business Systems	Japan	Venezuela	Uruguay	Namibia				
				German-Origin Countries	Austria	Austria	Zambia				
Germany		Germany			Zimbabwe						
Japan		Japan			Nigeria						
South Korea		South Korea			Qatar						
Switzerland		Switzerland			Morocco						
Taiwan		Taiwan			Turkey						
Scandinavian Origin Countries		Scandinavian Origin Countries			Denmark	Denmark	Egypt				
					Finland	Finland	Kuwait				
					Norway	Norway	Southern Asian Cultures	India			
	Sweden		Sweden		Indonesia						
	Confucian Cultures		Confucian Cultures	Taiwan	Taiwan	Philippines					
				China	China	Malaysia					
				Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Thailand					
				Japan	Japan	Iran					
				South Korea	South Korea	Liberal Market Economies	Taiwan				
				Singapore	Singapore		United States				
Anglo-Saxon Countries	Anglo-Saxon Countries	United States	United States	United Kingdom							
		United Kingdom	United Kingdom	United States							
		Canada	Canada	Australia							
		Australia	Australia	South Africa							
		South Africa	South Africa	Canada							
		New Zealand	New Zealand	New Zealand							

TABLE 2

Cross-country variation in the percentage of board seats held by female directors

<i>Percentage number of female board directors 2006</i>			
Country	Female board directors %	Country	Female board directors %
Argentina	6.52%*	Latvia	21.00%
Australia	10.90%	Lichtenstein	8.33%
Austria	6.00%	Lithuania	17.00%
Belgium	5.78%	Luxembourg	1.00%
Brazil	8.73%*	Malaysia	4.00%
Bulgaria	21.00%	Malta	4.00%
Canada	8.70%	Mexico	3.35%*
Chile	1.01%*	Netherlands	4.88%
China	12.50%	New Zealand	7.13%
Cyprus	7.00%	Norway	32.00%
Czech Republic	8.00%	Poland	10.00%
Denmark	12.71%	Portugal	7.00%
Egypt	1.00%	Romania	13.00%
Estonia	15.00%	Russia	3.13%
Finland	19.00%	Singapore	0.00%
France	6.98%	Slovak Republic	10.00%
Germany	6.46%	Slovenia	21.00%
Greece	6.31%	South Africa	11.50%
Hong Kong	5.88%	Spain	4.38%
Hungary	14.00%	Sweden	17.37%
Iceland	6.00%	Switzerland	6.37%
India	3.86%	Turkey	7.00%
Ireland	4.04%	UK	8.10%
Israel	13.36%	Ukraine	16.67
Italy	2.63%	US	15.12%
Japan	0.00%		

*BoardEx provided the data for the following countries: Australia, Belgium, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lichtenstein, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Russia, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and Ukraine. The following countries rely on numbers from the European Commission: Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Turkey. Numbers for India, Norway, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico come from our own self-extracted dataset. Spencer Stuart provided data for the following countries: Canada and South Africa. Catalyst provided numbers for the US. * Latest number is from 2005*

TABLE 3

Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients

	Mean	Standard Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
1. % Women on the board	7.74	5.54	-																										
2. Liberal Market Economy	.16	.37	.52	-																									
3. Coordinated Market Economy	.22	.42	.08	-.23	-																								
4. English La Porta	.28	.45	-.05	.70	-.33	-																							
5. French La Porta	.27	.44	-.37	-.27	-.09	-.38	-																						
6. German La Porta	.09	.29	-.13	-.14	.60	-.20	-.19	-																					
7. Scandinavian La Porta	.09	.28	.32	-.14	.58	-.19	-.19	-.10	-																				
8. Anglo-Saxon Weimar and Pape	.11	.31	.13	.80	-.19	.57	-.21	-.11	-.11	-																			
9. Germanic Weimar and Pape	.17	.38	-.16	-.20	.86	-.29	-.15	-.45	-.67	-.16	-																		
10. Latin Weimar and Pape	.09	.28	-.19	-.14	.02	-.19	.51	-.10	-.09	-.11	-.14	-																	
11. Japanese Weimar and Pape	.03	.16	-.15	-.07	.31	-.10	-.10	-.52	-.05	-.06	-.08	-.05	-																
12. Collaborative	.17	.38	.15	-.05	-.58	-.03	-.28	-.45	.47	-.16	.70	-.14	-.08	-															
13. Compartmentalized	.20	.40	.00	.74	-.13	.48	-.05	-.16	-.15	.71	-.08	.04	-.08	-.22	-														
14. Co-ordinated Industrial District	.04	.20	-.16	-.09	.14	-.13	.35	-.07	-.07	-.07	-.10	.69	-.04	-.10	-.10	-													
15. Fragmented	.22	.41	-.16	-.23	-.16	-.08	.40	-.17	.02	-.19	-.10	-.16	-.09	-.24	-.26	-.11	-												
16. State Organized	.15	.36	-.01	-.18	-.22	-.16	.07	-.13	-.13	-.15	-.19	.09	-.07	-.19	-.21	-.09	-.22	-											
17. Highly Coordinated	.03	.16	-.15	-.07	.31	-.10	-.10	.52	-.05	-.06	-.08	-.05	1.00	-.08	-.08	-.04	-.09	-.07	-										
18. Anglo Cultures (GLOBE)	.16	.37	.05	1.000	-.23	.70	-.27	-.14	-.14	.80	-.20	-.14	-.07	-.05	.74	-.09	-.23	-.18	-.07	-									
19. Latin Europe (GLOBE)	.11	.31	-.15	-.15	-.19	-.06	.40	-.11	-.11	-.12	-.16	.64	-.06	.03	.00	.27	-.02	.05	-.06	-.15	-								
20. Nordic Europe (GLOBE)	.06	.25	.25	-.12	.50	-.16	-.16	-.08	.86	-.09	.58	-.08	-.04	.34	-.13	-.06	.07	-.11	-.04	-.12	-.09	-							
21. German Europe (GLOBE)	.09	.28	-.11	-.14	-.58	-.19	-.01	.70	-.09	-.11	.67	-.09	-.05	.47	.04	-.07	-.16	-.13	-.05	-.14	-.11	-.08	-						
22. Eastern Europe (GLOBE)	.09	.29	.09	-.14	-.17	-.20	-.02	-.10	-.10	-.11	-.15	-.10	-.05	-.15	-.16	-.07	.01	.42	-.05	-.14	-.11	-.08	-.10	-					
23. Latin American (GLOBE)	.06	.25	-.16	-.12	-.14	-.16	.44	-.08	-.08	-.09	-.12	-.08	-.04	-.12	-.13	-.06	.50	-.11	-.04	-.12	-.09	-.07	-.08	-.08	-				
24. South Asia (GLOBE)	.03	.18	-.15	-.08	-.10	.29	-.11	-.06	-.06	-.06	-.08	-.06	-.03	-.08	-.09	-.04	-.10	.18	-.03	-.08	-.06	-.05	-.06	-.06	-.05	-			
25. Confucian Asia (GLOBE)	.09	.28	-.21	-.14	.07	.11	-.19	.24	-.09	-.11	-.14	-.09	.54	-.14	-.15	-.07	.00	.09	.54	-.14	-.11	-.08	-.09	-.10	-.08	-.06	-		
26. Arab (GLOBE)	.01	.09	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.06	.15	-.03	-.03	-.03	-.04	-.03	-.02	-.04	-.04	-.02	-.05	.22	-.02	-.04	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.03	-	
27. Sub-Saharan Africa (GLOBE)	.03	.16	.05	-.07	-.09	.27	-.10	-.05	-.05	-.06	-.08	-.05	-.03	-.08	-.08	-.04	.32	-.07	-.03	-.07	-.06	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.04	-.03	-.05	-.02	

N = 257

Correlation > |.111| are significant at p = .05

TABLE 4
Regression results (Dependent variable: Percentage women on the corporate board of directors)

Independent variables	Dependent Variable = Percentage women on corporate boards					
	Model (1)	Model (2)	Model (3)	Model (4)	Model (5)	Model (6)
CONSTANT	5.28 (0.86)	2.62 (1.26)	3.19 (0.88)	7.02 (1.10)	5.75 (0.82)	3.50 (0.89)
2001	0.49 (1.42)	0.50 (1.51)	0.58 (0.92)	0.74 (1.53)	0.22 (1.22)	-0.07 (1.02)
2002	1.37 (1.38)	1.86 (1.48)	1.34 (0.89)	1.25 (1.49)	1.13 (1.21)	1.39 (1.00)
2003	3.51 (1.21)**	2.43 (1.44)	1.74 (0.86)*	2.05 (1.44)	1.87 (1.13)	2.29 (0.94)*
2004	3.25 (1.17)**	2.51 (1.39)	2.10 (0.84)*	2.78 (1.41)	2.45 (1.08)*	2.32 (0.91)*
2005	4.11 (1.18)**	3.82 (1.46)**	3.07 (0.86)**	3.83 (1.44)**	3.48 (1.11)**	3.01 (0.95)**
2006	5.13 (1.19)**	4.62 (1.41)**	3.85 (0.087)**	4.54 (1.44)**	4.23 (1.12)**	3.44 (0.95)**
2007	5.88 (1.27)**	6.00 (1.54)**	5.02 (0.95)**	6.14 (1.57)**	4.72 (1.21)**	4.65 (0.99)**
Liberal Market Economy		3.58 (1.10)**				
Coordinated Market Economy		3.64 (1.05)**				
Other Economies						
English Origin Law La Porta et al.			3.23 (0.80)**			
French Origin Law La Porta et al.			-0.49 (0.79)			
Germanic Origin Law La Porta et al.						
Scandinavian Origin Law La Porta et al.			8.36 (0.93)**			
Germanic Law Weimar and Pape						
Latin Law Weimar and Pape				-5.21 (0.96)**		
Anglo-Saxon Law Weimar and Pape				0.82 (0.93)		
Japanese Law Weimar and Pape				-7.96 (3.14)*		
Fragmented					-1.09 (0.82)	
Coordinated Industrial District					-4.25 (1.24)**	
Compartmentalized						
State Organised					1.28 (0.99)	
Collaborative					1.49 (0.81)	
Highly coordinated					-6.52 (3.12)*	
Anglo Globe						3.18 (0.79)**
Latin Europe Globe						-0.48 (0.86)
Germanic Europe Globe						
Nordic Europe Globe						7.59 (0.96)**
Eastern Europe Globe						4.99 (0.97)**
Latin America Globe						0.09 (1.08)
South Asia Globe						-2.13 (1.50)
Confucian Asia Globe						-4.21 (2.47)
Sub-Saharan Globe						3.78 (1.34)**
R-Squared	13.1%	21.1%	54.4%	38.0%	25.7%	51.7%
R-Squared Adjusted	10.7%	15.9%	51.9%	32.5%	21.2%	47.4%
Δ in R-Squared relative to model (1)		8.0%	41.3%	24.9%	12.6%	38.6%
No. of Observations	257	144	194	124	210	185

Notes: t-values are provided in parenthesis, significance levels: †p<0.10; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; ***p<.001. Variable definitions: Liberal Market Economy, Coordinated Market Economy and Other use dummy variables 1 or 0 to indicate which category Hall and Soskice (2001) assigned to each country. English origin law, French origin law, Germanic origin law and Scandinavian origin law apply a dummy variable of 1 or 0 to indicate country classification as applied by La Porta et al. (1999). Latin law, Anglo-Saxon law, Germanic law and Japanese law use the same dummy variable for ascribing categories as defined by Weimar and Pape (1999). Reflecting Whitley (1999) Fragmented, Coordinated Industrial District, Compartmentalised, State Organised, Collaborative and Highly coordinated business systems were applied to the country set by the authors of this article based on research as outlined in the methods section. Dummy variables of 1 and 0 were used.

Regression results (Dependent variable: Percentage women on the corporate board of directors)

	Dependent Variable = Percentage women on corporate boards				
	Model (7)	Model (8)	Model (9)	Model (10)	Model (11)
Independent variables					
CONSTANT	1.80 (1.17)	3.22 (0.85)	6.82 (1.02)	7.02 (0.98)	3.65 (0.80)
2001	0.73 (1.47)	0.57 (1.05)	0.28 (1.44)	-0.52 (1.55)	0.32 (1.03)
2002	1.20 (1.43)	1.04 (1.02)	0.77 (1.40)	0.14 (1.50)	0.79 (1.00)
2003	1.97 (1.37)	1.70 (-0.98)	1.51 (1.34)	0.81 (1.44)	1.45 (0.96)
2004	2.14 (1.35)	2.08 (0.96)*	2.16 (1.31)	1.49 (1.41)	2.10 (0.94)*
2005	3.41 (1.37)*	3.14 (0.98)**	2.95 (1.34)*	2.25 (1.44)	2.89 (0.93)**
2006	3.47 (1.37)*	3.20 (0.98)**	3.01 (1.34)*	2.31 (1.44)	2.95 (0.96)**
2007	6.50 (1.44)**	5.95 (1.03)**	6.04 (1.45)**	5.21 (1.51)**	5.71 (1.01)**
Liberal Market Economy	6.26 (1.03)**				
Coordinated Market Economy	4.40 (0.96)**				
Other Economies					
English Origin Law La Porta et al.		5.02 (0.75)**			
French Origin Law La Porta et al.		-0.92 (0.76)			
Germanic Origin Law La Porta et al.					
Scandinavian Origin Law La Porta et al.		7.79 (0.84)**			
Germanic Law Weimar and Pape					
Latin Law Weimar and Pape			-4.68 (0.93)**		
Anglo-Saxon Law Weimar and Pape			1.52 (0.84)		
Japanese Law Weimar and Pape			-7.45 (2.76)**		
Fragmented				2.08 (1.54)	
Coordinated Industrial District				-5.98 (1.54)**	
Compartmentalized					
State Organised				-1.69 (1.54)	
Collaborative				0.91 (0.91)	
Highly coordinated				-7.32 (2.97)*	
Anglo Globe					4.73 (0.69)**
Latin Europe Globe					-1.45 (0.75)
Germanic Europe Globe					
Nordic Europe Globe					7.55 (0.78)**
Eastern Europe Globe					
Latin America Globe					
South Asia Globe					
Confucian Asia Globe					-4.25 (2.01)*
Sub-Saharan Globe					
R-Squared	37.5%	68.5%	41.7%	33.3%	70.2%
R-Squared Adjusted	31.9%	65.4%	35.9%	25.1%	66.9%
Δ in R-Squared relative to model (1)		31.1%	4.2%	-4.2%	32.8%
No. of Observations	110	110	110	110	110

Notes: t-values are provided in parenthesis, significance levels: †p<0.10; * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; ***p<.001. Variable definitions: Liberal Market Economy, Coordinated Market Economy and Other use dummy variables 1 or 0 to indicate which category Hall and Soskice (2001) assigned to each country. English origin law, French origin law, Germanic origin law and Scandinavian origin law apply a dummy variable of 1 or 0 to indicate country classification as applied by La Porta et al. (1999). Latin law, Anglo-Saxon law, Germanic law and Japanese law use the same dummy variable for ascribing categories as defined by Weimar and Pape (1999). Reflecting Whitley (1999) Fragmented, Coordinated Industrial District, Compartmentalised, State Organised, Collaborative and Highly coordinated business systems were applied to the country set by the authors of this article based on research as outlined in the methods section. Dummy variables of 1 and 0 were used