Does corporate governance effect by Return on assets on the corporate performance persistence in listed companies of Malaysian stock?

Mojgan Derayat
Faculty of Accounting, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.
(Corresponding author)
mojgan2662@gmail.com

Bahman Banimahd
Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management and Accounting, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran.

Normah Omar
Accounting Research Institute (ARI) Level 12, SAAS Building
University Technology MARA Malaysia
40450 UiTM Shah Alam, Selangor, MALAYSIA

Submit: 00/00/2020 Accept: 00/00/2020

ABSTRACT

Corporate governance is a mechanism used to reduce the conflict of interests and agency costs. It consists of intrinsic and extrinsic mechanisms. Company ownership structure is one of the most important extrinsic mechanisms of corporate governance and shareholders are able to monitor and control the company's directors' performance enabling them to reduce the costs and increase the firm value. This study aims to check whether corporate governance effect by by Return on assets (ROA) on the corporate performance persistence in listed companies of Malaysian stock and also to investigate the corporate governance practices in the registered companies in Bursa MY and their outcome on the relationship amongst corporate productivity and the extent practicing company set of rules and mechanisms. The sample includes the top 100 companies in Malaysia (FTSE Bursa MY Top 100 Index), registered in the Bursa MY, during 2009-2013 and because it is a comparative study, the final sample consisted of 84 companies. The statistical findings suggested that there is a correlation amongst corporate governance mechanisms and performance persistence, as measured by approximate ROA.

Keywords:

Corporate Governance Practices, Return on asset, Malaysian Stock, Ownership Structure, performance persistence.

1. Introduction

Corporate governance refers to the code of conduct through which companies are directed and controlled.Corporate governance includes numerous aspects of the composition from the regime, including money, market and manual work, company because of their regulation systems. Additionally, it necessitates the procedures that link the buildings with brokers, such as administration manage and responsibility, along with rules, principles, regulations and regulated processes and standards. Nevertheless, government is far more than board functions and strategies, including associations among managers, boards, shareholders as well as other stakeholders for example staffs and also society view corporate governance as a set of mechanisms which ensures that potential providers of external capital receive a fair return on their investment, because the ownership of firms is separated from their control. There are various definitions of corporate governance(Aguilera,2018). These definitions are based on the assumptions of how decisions should be made in corporations. defined corporate governance simply as the way corporations are governed. This definition is limited because it does not consider mitigation of conflicts of interest and effective management of corporate assets. The major objective of corporate governance system is to ensure that the interests of corporate managers are consistent with its stockholders . also defined corporate governance as systems within an organization that help protect the interests of diverse stakeholder groups within a corporation(Ciftci,2019). This definition considers the stakeholder model of corporate governance. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development 1999 report and as cited by corporate governance refers to the systems used to manage and control companies, specifying distribution of rights and responsibilities between the stakeholders, and defining the rules and procedures for decision making in corporate matter; providing the structure within which the company's objectives are set, and the means to achieve these aims and control returns. The OECD definition can be summarized as systems, rules and procedures used to manage and control activities of a corporation so as to overcome conflicts of interest among stakeholders.

Although there is no specific corporate governance model, the components or attributes of corporate governance system include the following(Jamil,2020):

- Delineation of rights and responsibilities of diverse core stakeholders;
- Fairness and equitable treatment of stakeholders;
- Transparency; and Clear definition of rules and responsibilities of corporate managers and directors.

These core attributes should be present in any good corporate governance systems The shareholder model of corporate governance holds that stockholders are corporate owners, which means they are supposed to enjoy most governance rights. Equitable treatment and fairness means enjoyment of corporate governance rights is proportionate to stake interests, size of the stake, and risk bearing. Stockholders bear corporate risks because they obtain residual claims after all other stakeholders have been satisfied and are better able to absorb corporate risk because of diversified nature of their investments.

The increase in financial and managerial scams has led the investors to increasingly look for transparency and professional management in handling the company's business. One of the hot debates about inefficient capital market is the transparency of financial reports in accounting. Big scandals reduced investor's trust to the accuracy of companies' financial information. Also disclosure of these scandals in the media attracted the attention of securities regulators, parliaments, and presidents to this issue and led them to make serious decisions to solve the problems and prevent more scandals in future . Since corporate governance practice would be effective on this study, this paper aims to investigate the corporate governance effects on company's productivity persistence as an effect. Nestor and Thompson pointed to a lot of company set of rules and mechanisms strategies in OECD nations. Nonetheless, the potency of these company set of rules and mechanisms methods that get effects by factors such as product or service market competitiveness, framework with the work and also capital markets, as well as regulating in addition to lawful conditions (Nestor and Thompson, 2001). Authorities exposed the marketplaces to international clients who have been expanding their particular investment portfolios to lessen risk, due to the globalization from the value industry within the 1980s. All companies over the world as well as in Malaysia have begun to rebuild their particular procedures to boost shareholder results, in reaction to those advancements. They changed their operations interactions with overseas shareholders and adjusted administration settlement to align with international trader passions. Concurrently organization management have been perfecting new management abilities ideal for using in conditions in which tiny quantities of massive foreign stockholders persisted. The following internationalization in addition has led to institutional investors finding increased outcomes minimizing risks external their property market segments. So, improved checking from the institutional clients, is needed currently to meet global requirements on company set of rules and mechanisms in the growing markets (Clarke,2004), as it suggests recognized and significant company set of rules and mechanisms as the main element which motivates the institutional traders for purchasing the increasing markets (Gibson, 2003). A step has been begun with the organization regarding the Finance Committee on Corporate Governance during 1998 which includes industry and government. Corporate governance in Malaysia was defined in March 2000 by introducing the Malaysian Code through the board. Foundation statements concentrates on several parts consists of: directors board, directors' payroll, shareholders and answerability and also audition. The particular code is a mixture naturally, analogous towards the Mixed Code on Corporate Governance. In this method, the companies in Malaysia have to use the wide guidelines of proper corporate governance sets provided by the code, together with views for different conditions of individual corporations. Focusing on the Capital Market Master Plan through Securities Commission, matching changes is the first step of to plan the way regarding the Malaysian capital market for the following decade. The plan was introduced for the first time in August 6, 1999, finally licensed by the Minister of Finance in Dec. 2000 in advance its introducing in Feb. 2001. The CMP (Capital Market Master Plan) described the efficient mobilization and distribution of capitals with high level of assurance to market members. It is an important planned power as it refers to ideal corporate governance throughout the selected firms. It's crucial offering an increasingly valuable condition for investors within the Malaysian capital market. Among the options through CMP there is an obligatory disclosure regarding the conformity condition using the Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance that was provided on January 22, 2001 in the renewed exchange listing specifications to the selected companies. Beginning of corporate governance in Malaysia was additionally connected through institutional improvement. The institution comprises Malaysian Institute of Corporate Governance (MICG) and the Minority Shareholders Watching Group (MSWG).

A study by Mardnly et al. (2018) on Syrian listed companies reported significant association between foreign ownership and firm performance, while concentrated managerial ownership and corporate governance had no impact on firm performance. The authors attributed the non-significance findings on corporate governance to lax oversight by the regulatory authority and political situation in Syria due to the war. Meanwhile Kao et al. (2019) who studied the effects of corporate governance reform in newly industrialised country Taiwan found corporate governance mechanisms have a significant influence on firm performance. These findings imply that a country's political environment or stability and economic development may have some influence on the effectiveness of regulatory actions and business traits. A study by Ghazali et al. (2020) The aim is to examine the relative influence of regulatory enhancements relating to corporate governance and attributes of business traits on performance of Malaysian listed companies.Regression analysis was performed on all 742 non-financial main board companies listed on Bursa Malaysia using data from 2013 annual reports. The results show that the number of board meetings held during the year, role separation and board size have a significant impact on corporate performance. By contrast, independent directors, government ownership and director ownership do not influence corporate performance. The study investigated non-financial companies for the financial year 2013. Hence, the results may not apply to financial companies and other years. Future research can perhaps include all types of listed companies and carry out a longitudinal study to gain more comprehensive results and understanding on the relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance.The purpose of (Bhatt et al,2017)paper is to study the effect of Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance (MCCG, 2007 and 2012) on the performance of the listed companies in Malaysia. The agency theory and resource dependency theories indicate that the firms with strong corporate governance outperform firms with weaker governance. This paper explores this relationship in a developing country like Malaysia having different institutional environment compared to western countries. The study used a sample of 113 listed companies in Malaysia. The study incorporates the endogenous relationship between corporate governance, firm performance and leverage. The study analyzes how the corporate governance framework affected firm performance in Malaysia with the help of self-developed corporate governance index (MCGI). The authors' findings show that the performance of the firm is positively and significantly related with corporate governance measured by MCGI. Secondly, corporate governance of sample firms shows marked improvements after implementation of MCCG 2012 as compared to MCCG 2007. study(Jamaludinet al,2018) explores the effect of internal corporate governance mechanism of Malaysian public listed firms towards firm performance. This study attempt to determine by using recent available financial data whether the internal corporate governance mechanism are expected to be effective in enhancing firm performance. The internal corporate governance investigate in this study are board independence, board meeting, board size, duality, women director appointment as well participation of family member in the boardroom. The result derived suggests that board meeting is negatively and significantly associated with firm performance while other internal corporate governance mechanism found to be insignificant in this study. Thus, it is suggested that firm with frequent board meeting most likely indicate as firm's response to the firm's poor performance.

2. Literature Review

Corporate governance and performance persistence

This study aims to check whether corporate governance effect by by Return on assets (ROA) on the corporate performance persistence in listed companies of Malaysian stock and also to investigate the corporate governance practices in the registered companies in Bursa MY and their outcome on the relationship amongst corporate productivity and the extent practicing company set of rules and mechanisms, results show that how different aspects of corporate governance are related to performance persistence.

2.1. Progression of corporate governance within Malaysia

The primary causes of the Corporate Governance changes goal within Malaysia have been coming from the Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance through the Finance Committee on Corporate Governance, Capital Market Master Plan via Securities Commission and Financial Sector, Master Plan via Bank Negara Malaysia relating to the financial sector. It includes recommendations, that relating to the rules and also procedures within corporate governance along with the path to the execution along through charts the future applicants regarding corporate governance in Malaysia.

2.1.1. Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance

The step has been begun with the organization regarding the Finance Committee on Corporate Governance during 1998 which includes government and industry. Identification of corporate governance in Malaysia was considerably denoted through the introducing of the Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance through Committee in March 2000. The foundation statements concentrates on several parts consisting of: board of directors, director's remuneration, shareholders and answerability and also audit. The particular code is mixture naturally, which is analogous towards the Mixed Code on Corporate Governance. Within the method, the firms in Malaysia need to use the broad guidelines of proper corporate governance sets out through code, flexibly along with views, towards the different conditions of individual corporations.

2.1.2. Capital Market Master Plan

Matching the changes is definitely the beginning regarding the Capital Market Master Plan through Securities Commission to plan the path about the Malaysian capital market for the following a decade. It was in the beginning introduced by the Second Finance Minister and Chairman of Securities Commission in August 6, 1999 and also eventually licensed by the Minister of Finance in December 2000 prior to it's introducing in February 2001. The effective mobilization and also distribution of funds combined with high level of confidence to market members are the views describe by the CMP.

Corporate governance is known as a critical strategic power of CMP because the Securities Commission points to ideal corporate governance between listed companies which is essential to obtain the purpose of offering an increasingly valuable conditions for investors within the Malaysian capital market. Among the options through CMP is an obligatory disclosure related to the condition of conformity using the Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance that have been released within the renewed exchange listing specifications on January 22, 2001 to listed companies.

2.1.3. Financial Sector Master Plan

The Financial Sector Master Plan was released during March 2001 through Bank Negara Malaysia to plan the future path of the financial sector across the following decade. It's purpose is to creating a further resistant, affordable and also active establishments that includes towards the economic growth and also technology influenced. Factors regarding corporate governance, which is suggested through master plan includes offering shareholders' and also consumers' activisms, regulatory control and even main concern sector financing. A number of the particular suggestions towards the banking sector have been pointed out the necessity for obtaining board committees to boost corporate governance, the execution associated with an obvious and also obviously organized initial alert system for inadequate banking organizations, motivate mergers among banking organizations and setting up a deposit insurance resources.

2.1.4. Institutional Progression

The introduction of corporate governance in Malaysia is additionally associated through institutional improvement. The institution consists of the Malaysian Institute of Corporate Governance (MICG) and also the Minority Shareholders Watchdog Group (MSWG). Corporate performance is influenced by corporate governance procedures regarding companies in Malaysia as their failure or success depends on the magnitude in which they're handled effectively. Ideal corporate governance procedures improve firm performance via improved managing and also recommended distribution of firms' resources. Profits have been caused by elevated performance, adds considerably to share price ranges. Consequently ideal corporate governance methods can easily boost the interest in shares along with raise the value of shares of the corporate.

3. Methodology

To research the association among corporate governance methods and company performance in Malaysia, this study utilize methods implemented in previous related studies. Several studies have already checked out some of these associations and used a deductive approach and quantitative methods to analyze the information being gathered from secondary sources. To inquire the magnitude that corporations in Malaysia had implemented codes of ideal workout on corporate governance prior to 2012 and also the modifications to corporate governance methods subsequently after 2012, a comparison evaluation is carried out.

Analysis is carried out using STATA software. Descriptive statistics are applied to determine the mean distinction for the years 2009 to 2013. T-tests are carried out to measure the value of the distinctions within 2009 and 2013. Correlation analysis determines the probable correlation amongst governance factors and corporate productivity. Lastly, variance is analyzed for five years to discover any substantial interactions amongst corporate governance practices and corporate productivity in short and long period by using panel assumption test.

Information is gathered from secondary resources such as annual reviews, publications (FTSE best 100) and the Bursa MY' data. The test of financial performance information is chosen from top 100 registered companies for a period of 4 years from 2009 to 2013 for comparative evaluation. All information related to corporate governance factors are gathered from companies' annual report.

3.1. Research Hypotheses

Three categories of corporate governance theories shareholder approach and stakeholder, stewardship approach are discussed; ownership structure has been discussed mainly in the context of the agency problem, although various corporate governance theories have provided different perspectives on the effectiveness of ownership structure. According to property rights theory and agency theory, ownership structure can be a tool for improving the quality of corporate governance, and as a result, can affect firm performance persistence. It has been debated whether ownership structure has empirically significant effects on firm performance persistence, but empirical results could not come to a consensus regarding the effects, even though the majority of the empirical studies have confirmed the traditional agency theory.

This study addresses the issue of the effects of ownership structure , board structure and corporate reporting on the and corporate performance. The hypotheses to be tested in the study are constructed mainly out of agency theory. The goal of this research is to answer the following questions relating to corporate governance and corporate performance and :

Hypothesis 1: corporate governance activities have effect on the corporate performance persistence by ROA of listed companies in Malaysia

4. Results

In this section results of study are discussed. The descriptive method as well as inferential statistical methods are used. Descriptive statistics was used to sum up, systematize, as well as simplify the numerical information of the sampled firms. Frequency distribution tables and measures of central tendencies including mean are 2 examples of descriptive statistics. Range and standard deviation measured quantitatively the degree of information distribution or clustering together.

Table 1 practices frequency distribution table to review quantity of companies with definite detailed corporate governance appearances.

Table 1 VIF Result

Variables	First	econd
board size	2.27	.27
board independence	2.43	.43
%independent director	1.83	1.83
board meeting	1.48	1.48
woman on board	1.42	1.42
% Non-independent Directors	1.29	1.29
CEO duality	1.13	1.13
%executive share	1.04	1.04
Supervisory Board	91/3	91/3

Variables	First	econd
%foreign ownership	1.19	1.19
CMSR	1.22	1.22
AMG	1.13	1.13
NRC	1.31	1.31
market value	1.33	1.33
lev	1.21	1.21
mtb	1.61	1.61

✓ **Hypothesis test**

There is a relationship amongst Corporate Governance and ROA

The regression equation for the structure with estimated ROA as the dependent variable and the corporate governance mechanisms as the non-dependent variables is:

Model 1

ROA $_{it}$ = α_0 +B_1 ROA $_{it-1}$ + B_2Board size $_{it}$ + B_3 non-dependent director $_{it}$ + B_4board meeting $_{it}$ + B_5 woman on board $_{it}$ + B_6 Non-independent Directors $_{it}$ + B_7CEO duality $_{it}$ + B_8executive share $_{it}$ + B_9 Supervisory Board $_{it}$ + B_{10} foreign ownership $_{it}$ + B_{11} CMSR $_{it}$ + B_{12} AMG $_{it}$ +B_{13} NRC $_{it}$ + B_{14} market value $_{it}$ +B_{15} lev $_{it}$ + B_{16}mtb $_{it}$ +e $_{it}$

The general capability of non-dependent corporate governance ways of educating that ROA has been verified by Wald distribution assessment and generalized method of moments (GMM) when alpha is 5 percent. The null and alternative theories are indicated below:

H_0: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \beta_5 = \ldots = \beta_{17=}$ 0

H_1: Not all the β_i(i=1… 17) are zero.

The overall generalized method of moment’s equation with approximate ROA as the dependent variable is shown as:

roa = 0.463+0.266*woman on board+0.119*Non-independent Directors + 0.067*executive share + 0.512*Supervisory Board -0.483*LEV - 0.221*mtb+ε

The Wald value = 29340.37 is ›Wald critical region=2.2256,p value of 0.000‹0.05 alpha level. Thus, the void theories must be dropped: Every coefficient is 0 in favor of other theories. Other proof supports a linear correlation amongst authority strategies and estimates ROA.

Table 2 ROA test

P-Value	z	coff	
0.211	-1.25	-0.03	Roa l1
0.296	1.05	0.03	board size
0.346	0.94	0.68	board independence
0.77	-0.88	-0.674	independent director
0.021	2.31	0.273	board meeting
0.000	4.42	0.266	woman on board
0.000	3.74	0.119	Non-independent Directors
0.469	0.72	0.666	CEO duality
0.000	6.41	0.067	executive share
0.000	3.59	0.512	Supervisory Board
0.228	-1.21	-0.063	foreign ownership
0.549	0.6	0.007	CMSR
0.016	2.4	0.048	AMG
0.446	0.76	0.048	NRC
0.538	0.62	0.027	market value
0.000	-8.11	-0.483	lev
0.000	4.99	0.221	Mtb
0.715	0.37	0.463	con
29340.37			Wald stat
0.000			Prob (wald stat)
36.029			Sargan test
0.995			Prob (Sargan test)
-0.751			autocorrelation test
0.452			Prob (autocorrelation test)

Generalized method of moment's Results for Independent Variables (n=90), y= Approximate roa

A theories test for the individual variables of the regression model would determine those slope coefficients that are different from zero. A z test explains the variation in approximate ROA and the variables with no explanatory power so they're deleted from the regression model.

The impact of Roa l1on financial performance is inconclusive. For Roa l1the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_0 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_0 \neq 0$

The gmm regression results in Table4 shows that the p-value of ROA l1 is 0.211, and › O.O5 alpha significance level. By means of z-test, critical values of z distribution at α= O.O5 is 1.98. 95 percent confidence level of rejection area shows measured z test statistic value of absolute -1.25 is ‹ the critical t of 1.98 So I couldn't reject the null theory that β_1 would be 0.So, ROA l1 is analytically irrelevant then can't be utilized to explicate and calculate estimated Roa l1.

The impact of board size on financial performance is inconclusive. For Board size the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_1 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_1 \neq 0$

It is expected that financial performance will be increased by board independence. For board independence the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_2 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_2 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.98.

The z statistic of 0.346 is ‹ critical z of 1.96. The p value of 0.346 is › 0.05 significance level. Thus, the null theory (the beta coefficient is zero) is not rejected. Thus the coefficient of independence is not significant statistically and couldn't explain approximate ROA.

So, non-dependent director will improve financial performance. For non-dependent director the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_3 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_3 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is1.98.

Here, z statistic of O.77 is ‹ critical z of 1.96.

P value of O.77 is › O.05 significance level.

Hence, the null theories (the beta coefficient is zero) are not rejected. Thus the amount of independence is analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized to explicate the estimated ROA.

The impact of board meeting on financial performance is inconclusive. For board meeting the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_4 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_4 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.O5 is 1.98. Calculated z statistic of absolute 2.31 is › critical t of 1.658. The p value of 0.021 is ‹ 0.O5 significant level. So, coefficient of board meeting is important and possible to utilize to explicate estimated ROA. So the null theories in favor of H_1 are rejected.

The impact of woman on board a firm has on its financial performance. For woman on board the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_5 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_5 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = O.O5 is 1.98O. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 4.42 is › critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so H_0 could not be rejected. So the beta coefficient of women on board is analytically important and can be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of Non-independent Directors a firm has on its financial performance. For Non-independent Directors the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_6 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_6 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 3.74 is › critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so, H_0 could be rejected. So the beta coefficient of Non-independent Directors is analytically important possible to utilize to explicate ROA.

The impact of Chief Executive Officer Duality a firm has on its financial performance. For Chief Executive Officer Duality the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_7 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_7 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 0.72 is ‹ critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.46 is › 0.05 so H_0 is accepted. Therefore, the beta coefficient of Chief Executive Officer duality is analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized in to explicate ROA couldn't.

The impact of executive share a firm has on its financial performance. For executive share the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_8 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_8 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 6.41 is › critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so H_0 could be rejected. Hence, the beta coefficient of executive share is analytically important and can be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of Supervisory Board a firm has on its financial performance. For Supervisory Board the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_9 = 0$

H_1: $\beta_9 \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 3.59 is › critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so H_0 is rejected and the beta coefficient of Supervisory Board is analytically important and can be used to explicate ROA.

The impact of foreign ownership a firm has on its financial performance. For foreign ownership the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{10} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{10} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of -1.21 is ‹ critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.228 is › 0.05 therefore, H_0 is rejected. Thus, the beta coefficient of foreign ownership analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of CMSR a firm has on its financial performance. For CMSR the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{11} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{11} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 0.6 is ‹ critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.54 is › 0.05 so H_0 is accepted and the beta coefficient of CMSR is analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of AMG a firm has on its financial performance. For AMG the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{12} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{12} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 2.4 is › critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.016 is ‹ 0.05 so H_0 is rejected. So, the beta coefficient of AMG is analytically important and be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of NRC firm has on its financial performance. For NRC the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{13} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{13} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 0.76 is ‹ critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.44 is ›

0.05 so the H_0 is accepted. So the beta coefficient of NRC is analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of market value a firm has on its financial performance. For market value the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{14} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{14} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 0.62 is ‹ critical z of 1.980. The p value of 0.53 is › 0.05 so H_0 is accepted and the beta coefficient of market value is analytically irrelevant and couldn't be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of lev a firm has on its financial performance. For lev the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{15} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{15} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of -8.11 is › critical z of 1.980. the p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so H_0 is regected. So the beta coefficient of lev is analytically important and can be utilized to explicate ROA.

The impact of mtb a firm has on its financial performance. For mtb the theories are:

H_0: $\beta_{16} = 0$

H_1: $\beta_{16} \neq 0$

Using z test, the critical points of z distribution at α = 0.05 is 1.980. Calculated z statistic of absolute value of 4.99 is › critical z of 1.980. the p value of 0.000 is ‹ 0.05 so, H_0 can be rejected. Hence, the beta coefficient of mtb is analytically important and couldn't be utilized to explicate ROA.

5. Conclusion

Present study aimed to survey the impact of company governance procedures on the continuity of company performance with the ROA of the companies registered in Malaysia. The wald test and p values as well as adjusted R^2 provided supportive statistical evidence of a relationship amongst corporate governance and approximate ROA $_{t+1}$. Nonetheless, of all the significant corporate governance mechanisms only board meeting ،woman on board, Supervisory Board, AMG and executive share is positively related to ROA $_{t+1}$. Board meeting, woman on board, Supervisory Board, AMG and executive share was measured by corporate governance practices. The understanding from the literature is that the greater the Board meeting, woman on board, Supervisory Board, AMG and executive share due to minority investors in the decision making process and the performance persistence. This suggests that the market rewards corporations that improve Board meeting, woman on board, Supervisory Board, AMG and executive share.

References

1) CLARKE, T. 2004. Theories of Corporate Governance: The Theoretical Foundations.
2) GIBSON, M. S. 2003. Is corporate governance ineffective in emerging markets? *Journal of financial and quantitative analysis,* 38**,** 231-250.
3) MITTON, T. 2002. A cross-firm analysis of the impact of corporate governance on the East Asian financial crisis. *Journal of financial economics,* 64**,** 215-241.
4) HOLROYD, C. B. & COLES, M. G. 2002. The neural basis of human error processing: reinforcement learning, dopamine, and the error-related negativity. *Psychological review,* 109**,** 679.
5) ALNASSER, S. 2012. What has changed? The development of corporate governance in Malaysia. *The Journal of Risk Finance,* 13**,** 269-276.
6) NESTOR, S. & THOMPSON, J. 2001. Corporate governance patterns in OECD economies: Is convergence under way. Corporate governance in Asia: A comparative perspective, 19-43.
7) Mardnly, Z., Mouselli, S. and Abdulraouf, R. (2018), "Corporate governance and firm performance: an empirical evidence from Syria", International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp,591-607.
8) Kao, M.F., Hodgkinson, L. and Jaafar, A. (2019), "Ownership structure, board of directors and firm performance: evidence from Taiwan", Corporate Governance, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 189-216.
9) Ghazali, N. A. M. (2020). Governance and ownership in Malaysia: their impacts on corporate performance. Asian Journal of Accounting Research.
10) Bhatt, P. R., & Bhatt, R. R. (2017). Corporate governance and firm performance in Malaysia. Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society.

11) Jamaludin, M. F., Abdul Rahman, A. F., Abdul Hamid, N. H., Hashim, F., & Nik Abdul Majid, W. Z. (2018). Corporate Governance and Firm Performance in Malaysia. Corporate Governance and Firm Performance in Malaysia (April 10, 2018).
12) Jamil, A., Ghazali, N. A. M., & Nelson, S. P. (2020). The influence of corporate governance structure on sustainability reporting in Malaysia. Social Responsibility Journal.
13) Aguilera, R. V., Judge, W. Q., & Terjesen, S. A. (2018). Corporate governance deviance. Academy of Management Review, 43(1), 87-109.
14) Ciftci, I., Tatoglu, E., Wood, G., Demirbag, M., & Zaim, S. (2019). Corporate governance and firm performance in emerging markets: Evidence from Turkey. International Business Review, 28(1), 90-103.