International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, Vol (6), Issue (4), April (2025), Page – 15167-15171

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Analysis of Corporate Governance in U.S Vs. U.K

SHWETANK SINGH[1], Dr. Shova Devi[2]

[1] ENROLMENT NO.: - A8121520057
[2] Co Author
AMITY LAW SCHOOL
AMITY UNIVERSITY, LUCKNOW UTTAR PRADESH, SESSION: -

CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION

Corporate Governance seeks to cultivate an environment of trust, transparency, and accountability—essential elements for encouraging long-term investment, financial soundness, and ethical business conduct, thereby advancing broader societal growth and fairness.

In the modern era, marked by rapid globalization, the significance of Corporate Governance (commonly referred to as CG) has increased in cj.ontemporary market-driven economies. As nations and businesses become increasingly interconnected, governance serves as a critical tool to uphold fairness and safeguard the interests of multiple stakeholders ranging from shareholders and creditors to employees.

Corporate Governance primarily addresses the mechanisms through which investors can be assured of just and secure returns on their investments, whether through equity or debt instruments. It also plays a pivotal role in the strategic decision-making process, where notable differences often emerge between the governance preferences of a company's original founders and those of appointed managerial authorities.

Corporate Governance is conceptualized as a collaborative framework involving executives, directors, and equity financier individuals or entities that allocate and manage financial resources with the expectation of returns. This system ensures that the board of directors remains answerable for fulfilling organizational objectives while simultaneously adhering to legal and regulatory mandates.

Overview Of Corporate Governance

Corporate Governance refers to the framework through which corporations are directed, managed, and held accountable. It involves the structures and processes that ensure the company runs in the best interests of its stakeholders, with oversight provided by the Board of Directors and various specialized committees. At its core, Corporate Governance looks to balance the interests of individuals and the wider community, aligning economic goals with broader societal values.

An efficient governance system—one that empowers the Board with proper independence and oversight authority—can significantly enhance decision-making in both business and finance. In today's globalized and competitive economy, sound governance is not just desirable but essential. It helps companies generate greater value for their customers, enforces accountability, and contributes to sustainable economic progress.

Importantly, Corporate Governance also safeguards the rights of all investors, including both majority and minority shareholders. It ensures that their rights are acknowledged and protected, and that corporate conduct aligns with ethical standards and transparency. Covering a wide array of legal, social, and institutional concerns, Corporate Governance helps create an environment that is principled, responsible, and aligned with long-term stakeholder interests.

Main Attributes Of Corporate Governance

Corporate Governance embodies several essential features that contribute to the responsible and transparent management of an organization. Some of these key characteristics include:

- **Ethical Foundation**: Corporate governance serves as a code of ethical conduct that must be upheld by all stakeholders associated with the company, ensuring integrity in all corporate dealings.

- **Accountability and Transparency**: It promotes the effective and accountable administration of business operations. This includes ensuring that management acts transparently and adheres to ethical standards in all aspects of decision-making.

Core Principale Underpinning Corporate Governance

According to Mostovicz, Kakabadse, and Kakabadse (2011) the framework of corporate governance is structured around four core pillars that shape the conduct and integrity of corporate practices. These pillars help organizations maintain ethical standards and ensure alignment with stakeholder interests.

Pillar 1 – Accountability

Accountability implies that the individuals involved in decision-making within a company—especially the board of directors—must answer for their actions and outcomes. The board acts as the representative body for shareholders and is responsible for ensuring that the company remains aligned with its strategic goals while operating in a fair and responsible manner.

Pillar 2 – Transparency

Transparency requires companies to provide stakeholders with clear, accurate, and timely information. This openness fosters trust and reduces information asymmetry between management and stakeholders. It plays a critical role in investor confidence and regulatory compliance.

Pillar 3 – Fairness

Fairness relates to the equitable treatment of all stakeholders. This includes shareholders, employees, creditors, customers, and the wider community. Corporate governance mechanisms must ensure that no stakeholder group is given preferential treatment, and that all are provided fair opportunities and protections under corporate policies.

Pillar 4 – Responsibility

Responsibility pertains to the ethical obligations of the company's leadership. It requires directors and executives to act with integrity and in the long-term interest of the business. Responsible governance ensures that legal compliance, environmental stewardship, and social accountability are part of the organization's strategic decisions.

The Continental European Model of Corporate Governance

In several mainland European countries such as Germany, France, and Italy, ownership of corporate shares is more concentrated. A substantial portion of shares tends to be held by closely-knit shareholder groups, primarily private corporations and financial institutions, with individual investors typically holding a smaller stake.

Compared to the Anglo-American model, fewer companies are listed publicly in these regions. Individuals are more likely to save privately rather than invest through capital markets. Consequently, a limited number of major shareholders often control substantial portions of corporate capital, having contributed significantly while also bearing considerable risk.

This model often aligns closely with stakeholder theory, as it emphasizes the importance of mechanisms that allow for stakeholder involvement in governance. Such participation is believed to enhance the legitimacy and operational capacity of corporations within this framework.

Corporate Governance Philosophies.

While the structure and implementation of Corporate Governance (CG) can differ across organizations, certain fundamental principles are widely acknowledged. According to Lazonick and O'Sullivan (2000) the core ideologies of CG include:

- **Equitable treatment of investors** is essential. This involves not only treating all shareholders justly but also ensuring they are well-informed about their rights and the means to exercise them effectively.
- **Stakeholders' rights**, whether legal, contractual, or social, must be honored. This necessitates maintaining regular and transparent communication with employees, investors, suppliers, and members of the broader community.
- **Corporate directors** are expected to uphold values such as accountability, fairness, inclusivity, and openness within the governance framework.
- **Board members** should possess the necessary expertise to critically evaluate the actions and strategies of the management.
- **A clearly defined ethical code** should be established for both management and board members, and future appointments should align with these standards.
- **Corporate governance mechanisms and activities** should remain accessible to relevant stakeholders or be formally disclosed to them as part of organizational transparency.

Extent And Relevance Of The Research

In today's highly competitive market, transparency has become a priority, making corporate governance vital across all sectors, including public institutions. Corporate governance plays a crucial role in building and sustaining the trust of various stakeholders—ranging from customers and suppliers to employees, shareholders, banks, and the broader community. At its core, CG is a system comprising rules, practices, and procedures that guide and supervise organizations. It stands on four foundational principles: transparency, thorough disclosure, independent monitoring, and fairness.

As discussed in Chapter I, multiple internal and external elements influence CG practices at both company and national levels. Therefore, studying the corporate governance frameworks of nations—especially advanced economies like the USA and UK, and a developing one like India—becomes imperative. This study aims to explore and compare selected dimensions of CG across these three countries and identify key takeaways for India from globally recognized practices.

Corporate Governance Practices in the United Kingdom (UK):

Globally, there are three major legal traditions: common law (originating from the UK), civil law (with French roots), and the German legal system. Common law jurisdictions are more numerous, which is why most comparative studies on CG focus on the British or Anglo-American systems.

In a comparative study across 49 countries, La Porta et al. (1997) analyzed legal factors influencing external finance, followed by further investigations in 2000. Their findings emphasized that where both investor and creditor rights are strong and actively enforced by regulatory institutions and the judiciary, investment tends to flourish. However, criticisms of the Anglo-American model have surfaced, especially concerning concentrated ownership structures and the vulnerability of minority shareholders to exploitation (La Porta et al., 1997, 1998, 1999).

Scholars have contrasted this with systems in Japan and Germany, where stakeholder consensus is emphasized, leading to more balanced internal governance (Porter, 1992; Lazonick & O'Sullivan, 1996; Roe, 1998).

Approach And Technique For Research

With the advancement of technology, the availability of large datasets has significantly increased, enabling researchers to conduct studies based on extensive pre-compiled information. As a result, there is a growing trend to rely on such readily available data and engage in secondary data analysis. This approach, while highly adaptable across various contexts, involves not just numerical analysis but also interpretative and legal-qualitative considerations. When a structured and formal research design is adopted, secondary data analysis often serves as a suitable and effective tool for investigation.

This study employs secondary data analysis to explore corporate governance frameworks and sustainability reporting across India, the UK, and the USA. The research followed a systematic process, as outlined below:

Step 1: Formulating Research Questions

The process begins with defining clear research questions, which form the core of the investigation. These questions are addressed using both theoretical foundations and conceptual understanding. The focus is on issues related to corporate governance practices, board structures, and sustainability initiatives across different legal jurisdictions.

Step 2: Data Identification and Sample Selection

An initial literature review was conducted to assess existing studies and identify gaps in current knowledge. Upon finalizing the research questions, relevant data sources were identified to help answer those questions effectively. To determine the required sample size, the Central Limit Theorem was applied, taking into account the confidence level and margin of error.

Although the total population of companies across the three countries may be approximately 15,000 or more, for a confidence level of 90% and a 10% margin of error, the appropriate sample size is around 68 companies. Even if the population increases to 20,000, 40,000, or 50,000, this number remains statistically valid. In cases where the study focuses on leading companies indexed on major stock exchanges—such as the Nifty 500 (India), S&P 500 (USA), and FTSE 100/250 (UK)—the total pool becomes 1350 companies. For this population, with a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error, the sample size increases to 90.

However, as statistical conventions suggest that a sample of 30 observations is sufficiently large for reliable inference, the researcher decided to select an equal sample size of 30 companies from each country. This approach supports both within-country generalization and cross-country comparison. Moreover, selection bias is minimized, as all companies were chosen from leading stock indices, representing top-performing corporations.

Major Research Finding

This section summarizes the key insights derived from the comparative analysis conducted across India, the UK, and the USA. The major findings are outlined below:

1. The framework, practices, and legal structures governing Corporate Governance differ substantially across the three countries.
2. In India and the United Kingdom, the board plays an integral role in corporate governance, overseeing everything from strategy development to execution and monitoring. In contrast, the focus in the United States has shifted towards the importance of independent directors, particularly after the introduction of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX), which emphasizes the need for robust internal control mechanisms.
3. Board composition in each country is largely shaped by the specific corporate governance laws prevailing in that jurisdiction.
4. In India, the Chairperson typically plays a central role in governance. The UK, on the other hand, prefers a collective executive leadership approach. Meanwhile, the U.S. places stronger emphasis on independent directors, and its legal frameworks vary significantly across different states.
5. The Indian board's accountability appears comparatively limited, mainly due to the differential liability of directors depending on their level of participation in board decisions. However, recent legal reforms are working toward bridging this gap.
6. Indian corporate governance norms promote the inclusion of at least one woman and a minimum number of independent directors. However, the law specifies minimum requirements rather than encouraging broader inclusion. In the United States, although governance frameworks are robust, they are highly rule-based and intricate, often making compliance challenging. This has led to some foreign firms withdrawing from U.S. stock markets due to stringent regulatory demands. In contrast, the UK employs a more adaptable "comply or explain" model, as exemplified by the Cadbury Report, offering more flexibility than the rigid SOX-driven U.S. system.
7. In terms of accounting frameworks, the UK adopts the principle-based IFRS, while the U.S. adheres to the more rigid, rule-based US GAAP.

India has moved toward convergence with IFRS through its InDAS standards, making its approach more aligned with the UK.

8. The Companies Act serves as the primary statutory document for companies in both the UK and India, while the Articles of Association act as their internal constitution. Among the three countries, the UK's governance framework is considered the most progressive due to regular updates typically every two years to adapt to emerging global standards. India also makes updates, albeit less frequently.
9. A notable rise in ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) reporting is observed among major Indian corporations. Compared to past studies, assurance engagements have increased significantly. The data also suggest that current sustainability frameworks adequately meet the needs of stakeholders across sectors. Most Indian companies rely on frameworks such as the GRI, NVGs, and UNSDGs to shape their sustainability strategies and prepare their ESG reports.
10. Similar trends are seen in the UK, where ESG reporting and assurance practices have grown among large enterprises. Firms frequently align their sustainability efforts with frameworks like the GRI, UNSDGs, the Paris Agreement, and other ESG-oriented standards.
11. In the United States, ESG reporting is also gaining momentum. However, the current sustainability reporting frameworks may not fully meet the diverse needs of stakeholders. Many U.S. companies have developed customized sustainability disclosure models, resulting in inconsistent formats and reporting styles.
12. Regarding third-party (external) assurance in sustainability reporting, only 21 out of 90 companies (23.33%) provided such assurance. These include 12 companies from India, 5 from the UK, and 4 from the USA. This figure falls short of global benchmarks cited by KPMG (2020) [Footnote 264], where approximately 50% of G250 and N100 firms included an assurance statement in their 2020 CSR reports. While India shows significant improvement, it still lags behind. Statistical analysis confirms that the differences between India and both the UK and USA are significant at the 5% level.
13. When it comes to internal assurance mechanisms for sustainability reporting, 69 out of the 90 companies (76.64%) reported having such systems in place. This includes 18 companies from India, 25 from the UK, and 26 from the USA. These firms often appoint dedicated committees or directors to oversee report reliability. Internal assurance is most prevalent in the U.S. (88%), followed by the UK (83.34%), and India (60%). Again, statistical tests show significant differences between India and the other two countries at the 5% significance level, but not between the UK and USA.
14. Concerning the use of Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, 39 out of 90 firms (43.33%) across the three countries adhered to these in shaping their sustainability reporting. This figure is significantly lower than the global statistics cited by KPMG (2020)…87 which found that 73% of G250 and 67% of N100 firms followed GRI standards in their 2019–2020 reports.

15. With regard to internal assurance in sustainability reporting, it was found that 69 of the 90 analyzed companies (76.64%) implemented such mechanisms. Country-wise, 18 firms in India, 25 in the UK, and 26 in the USA reported using internal assurance practices. These companies often establish dedicated committees or assign specific directors to ensure the reliability and quality of their sustainability disclosures. The highest rate was observed in the United States (88%), followed by the UK (83.34%) and India (60%). Statistical evaluation shows that the difference between India and both the UK and the USA is significant at the 5% level, while there is no statistically significant difference between the UK and the USA.
16. Regarding the adoption of Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, only 39 companies (43.33%) out of the 90 studied used GRI for structuring their sustainability disclosures. This figure is notably lower compared to global averages reported by KPMG (2020)…87 where 73% of G250 and 67% of N100 companies globally adopted GRI standards in 2019–2020. In terms of country-wise adherence: 15 companies in India (50%), 14 in the USA (47%), and 10 in the UK (33.33%) reported following GRI standards. Although adoption rates vary, statistical analysis indicates that the differences across the three countries are not significant.
17. When examining the use of United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) in sustainability reporting, the study identified 32 companies adhering to them. This includes 11 companies from India, 16 from the UK, and 5 from the USA. The UK leads with 53.33% of companies aligning with UN SDGs, followed by India at 36.66%, and the USA at 16.66%. Statistical significance testing revealed a meaningful difference between the UK and the USA at the 2% level, and between India and the USA at the 10% level.
18. The study also identified that 22 of the 90 companies developed their own unique sustainability goals or activities. By region: only 1 company in India (3.33%), 5 in the UK (16.66%), and 16 in the USA (53.33%) engaged in such customized initiatives. The difference between India and the USA, as well as between the UK and the USA, was statistically significant at the 1% level. The difference between the UK and the USA was also significant at the 10% level. This finding underscores that India, while progressing, can still benefit from the practices of countries like the USA, though the implementation of personalized frameworks is often resource-intensive.
19. A notable case is ITC Limited in India, which utilizes external assurance for its sustainability reporting through DNV (Det Norske Veritas AS), a Europe-based
20. assurance provider, adhering to the AA1000 Assurance Standard (AA1000AS). Interestingly, its parent company, British American Tobacco (BAT), headquartered in the UK, employs an internal assurance mechanism—highlighting how differing regulatory environments influence assurance choices.
21. The research highlights a rapid surge in interest among companies in all three countries regarding ESG reporting, demonstrating a global shift towards transparency and accountability in corporate sustainability.
22. Finally, the study confirms the continuous evolution and refinement of ESG reporting processes and assurance mechanisms—whether internal or external—across India, the UK, and the USA.

Proposed Recommendations

This section outlines the researcher's proposed recommendations for both corporations and the regulatory authorities of India, the UK, and the USA. While these are framed in the context of the three selected nations, they have broader global relevance and can be considered by other countries as well.

Recommendations for Companies

1. Indian companies may consider aligning the tenure of directors with the standards set in the UK and USA. Extended tenures can sometimes create opportunities for malpractice, and in the absence of regulation, companies could voluntarily adopt shorter terms.
2. Both Indian and UK-based companies could benefit from increasing the representation of Independent Directors, especially when compared to US firms. Indian corporations, in particular, are encouraged to voluntarily ensure that Independent Directors make up at least 50% of the board, which can strengthen fraud prevention and enhance stakeholder protection.
3. Gender diversity on corporate boards in all three countries requires attention. An ideal target would be to aim for 50% female representation, reflecting demographic parity.
4. External assurance in sustainability disclosures should be enhanced across companies in India, the UK, and the USA. This step would improve transparency and build greater trust among stakeholders.
5. Companies across the three countries are encouraged to incorporate the UN Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs) into their sustainability initiatives, acknowledging their importance in fostering long-term value.
6. In India particularly, there is a need for heightened focus on board independence, following the high benchmarks established in the USA. This fosters transparency and accountability, and enhances shareholder trust.
7. Executive remuneration should be more transparently linked to performance benchmarks. Clearly articulating performance indicators and their relation to executive pay would improve accountability and stakeholder confidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aguilera, R. V., & Jackson, G. (2003). The cross-national diversity of corporate governance: Dimensions and determinants. Academy of Management Review, 28(3), 447–465. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2003.10196772
2. Bebchuk, L. A., & Roe, M. J. (1999). A theory of path dependence in corporate ownership and governance. Stanford Law Review, 52(1), 127–170. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229522
3. Cadbury, A. (1992). Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance. Gee Publishing.
4. Clarke, T. (2007). International corporate governance: A comparative approach. Routledge.
5. 5. Mallin, C. A. (2019). Corporate governance (6th ed.). Oxford University Press