

**FACTORS THAT DETERMINE INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR'S EXISTENCE ON THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS: EVIDENCE FROM MALAYSIAN LISTED COMPANIES**

BY:

MUBARIK MOHAMED ABDI

812371

Dissertation Submitted to

Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business

University Utara Malaysia

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Finance

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that:

- (1) This BPMZ69912 Research Paper is the end result of my own work and that due acknowledgement has been given in the references to all sources of information be they printed, electronic, or personal.
- (2) No portion of this research project has been submitted in support of any application for any other degree or qualification of this or any other university, or other institutes of learning.
- (3) The word count of this research report is 20177.

Name of Student: Mubarik Mohamed Abdi

Student ID: 812371

Signature:

Date:

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirement for a postgraduate degree from University Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library make a freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor or, in their absence by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this project paper or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be given to me and to University Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my project paper.

Request for permission to copy or make other use of material in this project paper, in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate of Business

University Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah Darul Ama

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to study the determinants of the presence of independent directors on boards of directors. Based on the agency theory, we study the different factors influencing the nomination of independent directors. The tests were applied to a sample of 71 companies belonging to Bursa Malaysia Main Market from 2007 to 2009. Using an OLS data regression framework, the findings show that the, coalition control, leverage and CEO tenure determine the independence of the board from the management. The result indicated that when the part of capital represented on the board and held by the coalition of control is low, the presence of independent directors is more important. The presence of the independent directors is significantly and positively determined by the level of debt and CEO tenure. However, we do not find evidence of the influence of the ownership structure, Company size and CEO Duality.

Keywords: Corporate governance, Independent directors, Ownership structure, board independence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.

Alhamdulillah, all praises to Allah for the strength and His blessing in completing this research paper. Special appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Norafifah Ahmad for her uncountable supervision and support. I am very indebted to her patience and invaluable advices that inspired me to think positively to finish my project paper. Without her suggestions and comments throughout this work, this project paper could not be completed on time.

I also want to thank to Dr. Ahmed Gunya for all his support and advices, Ifrah Abdilahi Jama, Ahmed Nur, and Ahmed Hadi, for all the valuable information and changing ideas and also to all my friends who always encouraged me in finishing my research paper.

Very special thanks to my family for their continuous support and encouragement, especially to my Mother, Habiba Said Yusuf, my sister and brother, Roda Mohamed Abdirahman and Abdilahi Mohamed Abdirahman, my Uncles, Saeed Abdirahman Nur, Ahmed Abdirahman Nur, Yasin Abdirahman Nur, Mohamud Abdirahman Nur, and my cousin Guelid Ahmed Abdirahman and lastly for the rest of my family who supports me directly or indirectly for their understanding and trust for me to finish this research paper. Without all of you, this research paper would not be the same as presented here.

Thank you.

CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	iii
PERMISSION TO USE	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.3 MALAYSIAN CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE.....	5
1.4 PROBLEM STATEMENT	6
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	7
1.6 REARCH QUESTIONS.....	8
1.7 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	9
1.8 SCOPE OF THE STUDY	10
1.9 CHAPTER ORGANIZATION	10
CHAPTER TWO.....	11
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	11
2.2 CORPORATE GOVERNANCE.....	11
2.3 INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS	14
2.4 BOARD INDEPENDENCE.....	14
2.5 DETERMINANTS OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS	18
2.6 THE EXISTENCE OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS.....	19
2.7 DEPENDENT VARIABLE	26
2.7.1 Percentage of independent directors.....	27
2.8 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	36
2.9 DETERMINANTS OF INDEPENDENT DIRECTORS AND HYPOTHESES	37
2.9.1 Institutional investors	37
2.9.2 Coalition control.....	39

2.9.3	Level of debt.....	41
2.9.4	CEO duality	42
2.9.5	CEO tenure	43
2.9.6	Company size	45
CHAPTER THREE	46
3.0	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	46
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	46
3.2	THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK.....	46
3.3	HYPOTHESES	47
3.4	RESEARCH DESIGN	48
3.5	DATA COLLECTION.....	48
3.6	SAMPLING FRAME.....	49
3.7	VARIABLES AND MEASUREMENT.....	50
3.7.1	DEPENDENT VARIABLE	50
3.7.2	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	51
3.8	DATA ANALYSIS AND USAGE	54
3.8.1	DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS	54
3.8.2	ORDINARY LEAST SQUARE (OLS) REGRESSION MODEL.....	54
3.8	CORRELATION ANALYSIS.....	55
3.9	CHAPTER SUMMARY	56
CHAPTER FOUR	57
4.0	RESUTLTS AND DISCUSSIONS	57
4.1	INTRODUTION	57
4.2	DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS	58
4.3	CORRELATION RESULTS	64
4.4	REGRESSION RESULTS	67
4.5	MULTICOLLINEARITY	77
4.6	ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION OF HYPOTHESES.....	77
4.7	CHAPTER SUMMARY	79

CHAPTER FIVE.....	80
5.0 CONCLUSION.....	80
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	80
5.2 SUMMARY OF GENERAL FINDINGS	80
5.3 CONCLUSION	82
5.4 CONTRIBUTIONS.....	83
5.5 RECOMMENDATION ON FUTURE RESEARCH.....	84
REFERENCES	84
APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	96
APPENDIX A1	96
APPENDIX A2	97
APPENDIX B: CORRELATIONS MATRIX	98
APPENDIX B1(2007).....	98
APPENDIXB2 (2008).....	99
APPENDIX B3 (2009).....	100
APPENDIX B4 (POOL DATA)	101
APPENDIX C: REGRESSION.....	102
APPENDIX C1	102
APPENDIX C2	104
APPENDIX C3	106
APPENDIX C4	108
APPENDIX D	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Dependent variable.....	51
Table 3.2	Independent variables.....	52
Table 3.3	Independent variables.....	53
Table 4.1	Descriptive Statistics for 2007 Data.....	58
Table 4.2.	Descriptive Statistics for 2008 Data.....	59
Table 4.3	Descriptive Statistics for 2009 Data.....	60
Table 4.4	Descriptive Statistics for the Pool Data.....	61
Table 4.5	Descriptive statistics of the variable PINDEP.....	62
Table 4.6:	Correlation matrix used in Model 1 (2007).....	64
Table 4.7:	Correlation matrix used in Model 1 (2008).....	65
Table 4.8:	Correlation matrix used in Model 1 (2009).....	66
Table 4.9	Regression Result.....	67
Table 4.10:	Regression result for for Pool Data.....	71
Table 4.11	Multicollinearity.....	77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1 Hypotheses	47
Figure 4.1 Independence on Malaysian Malaysian board from 2007 to 2009.	63

LIST OF APPROVIATION

ACE	Access, Certainty and Efficiency
BURSA MALAYSIA	Malaysian stock exchange
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
IPO	Initial Public Offering
KLSE	Kuala Lumpur Stock Exchange
MCCG	Malaysian Code on Corporate Governance
MESDAQ	Malaysia Exchange of Securities Dealing and Automated Quotation
PINDEP	Percentage of independent directors on the board
OLS	Ordinary Least Square
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
ROA	Return on Assets
ROE	Return on Equity
R&D	Research and Development
SC	Securities Commission
USA	United States of America
UK	United Kindom

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter one discusses the content of the research outline. It provides the bases of this current research. This chapter explains the fundamental of the research containing of the background, the development of Malaysian corporate governance, problem statement, research objectives and questions, significance, scope, definition of terms. The summary of the chapter is given at the end of the chapter.

1.2 BACKGROUND

Corporate governance has been a vital framework of rules and practices that determine corporate direction and performance. This issue of ensuring effective corporate governance has become a well-known discussion in the developed countries and as well as developing countries. Usually, the development of the corporate governance literature has highlighted a firm of having good corporate governance by considering an institution or management team that can affect the firm performance in the organization. This has been well agreed from previous studies carried out in both developed countries like the US and the UK, and also in developing countries like Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Taiwan.

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Abdul Rahman and Abdul Haniffa (2005). The effect of role of duality on corporate performance in Malaysia. *Corporate ownership and control*, 2 (2), 40-47.
- Abdullah, S. A. (2004). Accrual management and the independence of the board of directors and audit committees. *IIUM journal of Economics and Management*, 12 (1), 49-80.
- Agrawal, A. (1996). Firm performance and mechanisms to control agency problems between managers and shareholders. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 31 (3), 377-397.
- Bathala, C. R. (1995). The determinants of board composition: an agency theory perspective. *Managerial and decision economics*, 16, 59-69.
- Baxt, R. (2002). *Duties and responsibilities of directors and officers (17th Ed)*. Sydney, Australia, Australian Institute of Companies Directors.
- Baysinger, B. (1985). Corporate governance and the board of directors: performance effects of changes in board composition. *Journal of law, Economics and Organization*, 1, 101-124.
- Baysinger, B. D. (1985). Corporate Governance and the board of directors: Performance effects of changes in board composition. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organizations*, 1, 101–24.
- Beasley, M. (1996). An empirical analysis of the relation between the board of director composition and financial statement fraud. *The Accounting Review*, 71 (4), 443-465.
- Berle, A. M. (1932). *The modern corporation and private property*. New York, Macmillan.
- Bhagat, S. A. (2002). The non-correlation between board independence and long-term firm performance. *Journal of Corporate Law*, 27, 231–74.
- Bhagat, S. B. (1999). The uncertain relationship between board composition and firm performance. *Business Lawyer* 54, 921-963.

- Bhagat, S. C. (1999). Directors ownership, corporate performance and management turnover. *Business lawyer*, 54, 885-899.
- Bohren, O. A. (2005). *Governance and performance revisited*. In *International Corporate Governance after Sarbanes-Oxley*. New York, Wiley.
- Borokhovich, K. P. (1996). Outside directors and CEO selection. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 31, 337-362.
- Bouton, R. (2002). *Pour un meilleur gouvernement des entreprises cotées*. MEDEF, AFEP/AGREF.
- Brickley, J. C. (1994). Outside directors and the adoption of poison pills. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 35, 371-390.
- Bushee, B. (1998). The Influence of institutional investors on myopic R&D investment behavior. *The Accounting Review*, 73, 305-333.
- Byrd, J. A. (1992). Do outsider directors monitor managers. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19, 589-606.
- Castro, C. B. (2009). Does the team leverage the board's decisions?. *Corporate Governance, An International Review*, 17 (6) 122-135.
- Charreaux, G. (1997). Conseil d'administration et pouvoirs dans l'entreprise. In Economica (Eds.), *Le gouvernement des entreprises. Théorie et Faits*, 4, 141-164.
- Charreaux, G. A. B. (1990). Le conseil d'administration . *Vuibert Gestion*, 6, 231-311.
- Cheah, F. S. (2009). *Corporate governance in Malaysia: Principles and practices*. Selangor, August Publishing.
- Chen, C. A. (2000). Association between independent directors, family control and financial disclosures in Hong Kong. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 19 (4/5).

- Chouchene, I. (2010). The determinants of the presence of independent directors in French board companies. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 5 (5), 222-243.
- Chung, R. M. (2002). Institutional monitoring and opportunistic earnings management. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 8, 29-48.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S. and Lang, L.H.P. (1999). *Who controls East Asian corporations?* World Bank Report, 2, 1-40.
- Co., M. a. (2000). Good governance pays off: institutions will pay a premium for an independent board. *Investor Relations Business*, 5 (14), 1-16.
- Conger, J. A. (2009). *Why your board needs a non-executive chair*. In J. A. Conger (Ed.), *boardroom realities*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Cotter, J. S. (2003). Board and monitoring committee independence. *ABACUS*, 39 (2), 211-232.
- Dalton, D. D. (1998). Meta-analytic reviews of board composition, leadership structure and financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 269-290.
- Dechow, P. S. (1996). Causes and consequences of earnings manipulation: An analysis of firms subject to enforcement actions by the SEC. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 13, 1-36.
- Deli, D. N. (2000). On the demand for independent and active audit committees. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 6, 427-445.
- Ezzamel, M. W. (1993). Organizational form, ownership structure, and corporate performance: A contextual empirical analysis of UK companies. *British Journal of Management*, 4, 161-176).
- Fama, E. (1980). Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88, 288-307.

- Fields, M. A. (2003). The emergence of corporate governance from Wall St. to main St: Outside directors, board diversity, earnings management, and managerial incentives to bear risk. *The Financial Review*, 38 (1), 1-24.
- Forbes, W. W. (1993). Managerial remuneration and corporate governance: A review of the issues, evidence and Cadbury committee proposals. *Accounting and Business Research*, 23, 331-338.
- Fosberg, R. (1989). Outside directors and managerial monitoring, Akron Business and Economic. *Akron Business and Economic Review*, 20 (2), 24-32.
- Garvey, G., and P. Swan, (1994). The economics of corporate governance: Beyond the Marshallian firm. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 1, 139-174
- Gillan, S.and Deli., (2003). Corporate governance, corporate ownership and the role of institutional investors: A global perspective. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 13 (2), 4-22.
- Gillan, S. S. (1998). A Survey of shareholder activism: Motivation and empirical evidence. *Contemporary Finance Digest*, 2, 10-34.
- Godard, L. (2002). La taille du conseil d'administration: déterminants et impact sur la performance. *Revue Sciences de Gestion*, 33, 125-148.
- Goo, S. H. (2003). *Corporate governance: The Hong Kong debate Causeway Bay*. Hong Kong, Sweet and Maxwell Asia.
- Governance, M. C. (2001). Finance committee on corporate governance: Malaysian Institute of corporate governance. *Malayan Law Journal Sdn. Bhd, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*, 2, 50-62.
- Harris, M. R. (1991). The theory of capital structure. *Journal of Finance*, 46, 297-356.

- Hellman, T. (1997). *A theory of corporate venture capital*. Stanford, Stanford University Graduate School of Business, Stanford.
- Hermalin, B. (1988). The determinants of board composition. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 19, 589-606.
- Hermalin, B. W. (1991). The effects of board composition and direct incentives on firm performance. *Financial Management*, 20, 101-112.
- Ho, S. S. (2002). *Corporate governance in the People's Republic of China*. In low, C.K. (Eds), *Corporate governance: An Asian Pacific Critique*. Hong Kong, Sweet and Maxwell Asia.
- J.G, R. S. (1990). Outside directors, board independence and shareholder. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 26, 175-191.
- Jensen, M. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance and takeovers. *American Economic Review*, 76, 323-329.
- Jensen, M. (1993). The modern industrial revolution exit and the failure of internal control systems. *Journal of Finance*, 48, 831-880.
- Jensen, M. (1993). Presidential Address: The modern industrial revolution, exit and the failure of internal control systems. *Journal of Finance*, 48, 831-880.
- Johnson, S., Boone, P., Breach, A., Friedman, E., (2000). Corporate governance in the Asian financial crisis, 1997–1998. *Journal of Financial Economics* 58, 141–186.
- John K., S. L. (1998). Corporate governance and board effectiveness. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 403 (22), 371-387.
- Khan, A. (2012). Effect of board composition on firm's performance: A case study of Pakistani listed companies. *Contemporary Research in Business*, 3 (10), 853-863.

- Kiel, G. N. (2003). Board composition and corporate performance: How the Australian experience informs contrasting theories of corporate governance. *Corporate Governance, 11* (3), 189-205.
- Klein, A. (1998). Firm performance and board committee structure. *Journal of Law and Economics, 2* (3), 275-303.
- Kim, B., Burns, M. L., & Prescott, J. E. (2009). The strategic role of the board: The impact of board structure on top management team strategic action capability. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 17*(6), 728-743.
- Kumar, N. (2012). Outside directors, corporate governance and firm performance: Empirical evidence from India. *Asian Journal of Finance & Accounting, 4* (2), 213-226.
- La Porta, R. L.D. S. (1999). Corporate ownership around the world. *Journal of Finance, 54* (2), 471-517.
- Le Maux, J. (2004). Les déterminants de l'ampleur des bénéfices privés : Un test sur les données françaises. *Finance Contrôle Stratégie, 7* (2), 195-231.
- Leong, P. L. (2013). *A study on the implication of independent directors in Malaysia*. UTAR, Doctoral dissertation.
- Lessing, J. (2009). The checks and balances of good corporate governance. *Corporate Governance ejournal, Bond University Faculty of Law, 2*,1-9.
- Liew, P. K. (2006). *The perceived roles of corporate governance reforms in Malaysia: The view of corporate practitioners*. University of Essex, 25, 06-02.
- Li, J. (1994). Ownership structure and board composition: A multi-country test of agency theory prediction. *Managerial and Decision Economics, 15* (4), 359-368.

Ma, S. a. (2009). Board composition, board activity and ownership concentration, the impact on firm performance. Problems and perspectives in management. *Business perspectives*, 7 (3), 42-61.

MacAvoy P., C. S. (1983). *ALI Proposals for increased control of the corporation by the board of directors: An Economic analysis, in statement of the business roundtable on the American Law Institute's proposed principles of corporate governance and structure: Restatement*. New York, Business Roundtable.

Mace, M. (1971). *Directors: Myth and reality*. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School.

Mak, Y. T. (2001). Determinants of corporate ownership and board structure: Evidence from Singapore. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 17, 235-256.

Malaysia Bourse Security Limited (2004), *Best Practice in Corporate Disclosure*. Viewed 03. March2014.<http://www.klse.com.my/website/bm/rulesandregulations/listingrequirements /downloads/CDBP-final2004. Pdf>.

Malaysia Code on Corporate Governance (Revised), 2007, *Malaysia Securities Commission*. Viewed 13 March 2014, <http://www.sc.com.my/eng/html/cg/cg2007>.

Malaysia Bourse Securities Limited 2001, Practice Note No 9/2001, *Disclosure in relation to the Malaysian code on corporate governance and the state of internal control (Issued in relation to paragraphs 15.26 and 15.27 of the listing requirements and pursuant to paragraph 2.08 of the listing requirements)*.viewed 13 March 2014.

Malaysia Securities Commission & MICG 2003, *Independent Director: Perceptions, roles and responsibilities*, Malaysia securities commission. Publication, Kuala Lumpur: Malaysia.

Mary, A. C. (2005). *The relationship between chief executive officer duality and subsequent corporate financial performance*. Working Paper, Capella University.

Mashayekhi, B. (2008). Corporate governance and firm performance in Iran. *Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics*, 4 (2), 156-172.

McKinsey, (2002). *Global investor opinion survey on corporate governance*. In 2003 McKinsey/KIOD survey on corporate governance. Retrieved April 27, 2014 from http://www.eiodqa.eiod.org/percent5CUploadedPdfFilespercent5C survey_mckinsey.pdf

Mohd Saat, N. A. (2011). Effective oversight roles of board of directors: The case of listed firms in Bursa Malaysia. *World Review of Business Research*, 1 (1), 231-245.

Muhiudeen, S. (2010). *A case of form over substance*. The Star, SBW9.

Nikomborirak, D. (2001). *An assessment of the role of board of directors in building good governance*: The case of Thailand. The role of boards and stakeholders in corporate governance (Presented at the third Asian round table on corporate governance). Singapore: Shangri-La.

Nikomborirak, D. T. (1999). *Corporate governance: the challenge facing the Thai economy*. Paper presented at the OEDC Conference on corporate governance in Asia: a comparative perspective. OEDC Conference on Corporate Governance in Asia (pp. 11-19). Bankook: OEDC.

O'Sullivan, N. (2000). The impact of board composition and ownership on audit quality: Evidence from large UK companies. *British Accounting Review*, 32, 397-414.

Ow-Yong, K. (2000). Corporate governance codes: A comparison between Malaysia and the UK. Corporate Governance. *An International Review*, 8 (2), 125-132.

Panasian, Christine, Prevost, Andrew K. and Bhabra, Harjeet S., (2008). Voluntary listing requirements and corporate performance: The Case of the Dey Report and Canadian firms. *Financial Review*, 43 (1), 129-157.

Paul, A., Friday, O. and Godwin, O. (2011). Board composition and corporate performance: An analysis of evidence from Nigeria. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 29 (5), 731-760.

- Pearce, J. a. (1992). Board composition from a strategic contingency perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29 (4), 411-438.
- Peasnell, P. P. (2000). Detecting earnings management using cross-sectional abnormal accruals. *Accounting and Business Research*, 30, 313-326.
- Peasnell, P. P. (2000b). *Board monitoring and earnings management: Do outside directors influence abnormal accruals?*. Working paper. Lancaster, Lancaster University.
- Prevost, A. R. (2002). Board composition in New Zealand: An agency perspective. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 29 (5), 731-760.
- Rashid, A. D. (2010). Board composition and firm performance: evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Australasian Accounting Business and Finance*, 4 (1), 76-95.
- S.N., A. (2004). Board composition, CEO duality and performance among Malaysian listed companies. *Corporate Governance*, 4 (4), 47-61.
- Saito, T. (2009). *Why outside directors in Japan are not prevalent?* Tokayo: REITI.
- Sakawa, H. W. Z. (2009). Management in firms and organizations. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 7 (3), 38-41.
- Schellenger, M. W. (1989). Board of directors composition, shareholder wealth, and dividend policy. *Journal of Management*, 67 (15), 457-4.
- Shakir, R. (2008). Board size, board composition and property firm performance. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal*, 14, (1), 1-16.
- Shamsul Nahar Abdullah, (1999). *The Role of Corporate Governance and Ownership Structure on Accounting Earnings Quality*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Shleifer, A., and R. Vishny, (1997). A Survey of Corporate Governance. *Journal of Finance*, 5 (2), 737-783.

Smith, M. (1996). Shareholder activism by institutional investors: Evidence from CalPERS. *Journal of Finance*, 51, 227–252.

Solomon, J. (2007). *Corporate Governance and Accountability, Second Ed.* Chichester, John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Stein, G. and Plaza, S. (2011). *The role of the independent director in CEO supervision and turnover.* IESE Business School Working Paper, 2, 133-148.

Tee, L. S. (2010). *Famous past scandals.* The Star, Starbizweek. p. SBW23.

The World Bank Report (2005). *Report on the Observance of Standards and Codes (ROSC) – Corporate Governance Country Assessment Malaysia.* 1-38. Retrieved April 15, 2014, from http://www.worldbank.org/ifa/rosc_cg.html.

The Economist. (2006). *Turning boomers into boomerangs.* Economist 378, 65-67.

The Edge Malaysia. (2014b, August 24). Need for effective independent directors. Retrieved March 16, 2014 from <http://www.theedgemalaysia.com/component/content/article/149628.html>.

Thillainathan, R (1999). *Corporate governance and restructuring in Malaysia:* a review of markets, mechanisms, agents and the legal infrastructure, joint World Bank/OECD.

Tricker, R. (1978). *The independent director: a study of the non-executive director and of the audit committee.* Croydon, United Kingdom, Tolley.

Weisbach, M. (1988). Outside directors and CEO turnover. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20, 431-460.

Weisbach, M. S. (1988). Outside Directors and CEO Turnover. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20, 431–60.

Whidbee, D. (1997). Board composition and control of shareholder voting rights in the banking industry. *Financial Management*, 26, 27-41.

- Yeap, C. (2009). *Putting quality into our boardrooms*. The Edge Malaysia, 3, 59-60.
- Yermarck, D. (1996). Higher market valuation of companies with small board of directors. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 40, 185-211.
- Young, C. S. (2008). Voluntary appointment of independent directors in Taiwan: Motives and consequences. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 35 (9-10), 1103-1137.
- Zahra, S. (1989). Board of directors and corporate financial performance: A review on integrative model. *Journal of Management*, 15 (2), 291-335.

APPENDIX A
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

APPENDIX A1
Descriptive Statistics (2007)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PINDEP	.399585	.1154041	71
INSTIT	.607214	.2111561	71
COALITION	.250024794694	.2921970830739	71
LEV	.827143370155	.7687297139793	71
TENURE	7.83	7.089	71
LOGSIZE	7.192359939	1.2835947992	71
DUALITY	.14	.350	71

Descriptive Statistics (2008)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PINDEP	.423789	.1306421	71
INSTIT	.610908	.2170536	71
COALITION	.284907887882	.3997297402354	71
LEV	.793497577872	.6447837627104	71
TENURE	8.82	7.102	71
LOGSIZE	7.061131606	1.4912123689	71
DUALITY	.15	.364	71

Descriptive Statistics (2009)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PINDEP	.425444	.1157116	71
INSTIT	.610976	.2240534	71
COALITION	.259795420589	.3159927985146	71
LEV	.779234794939	.7105991178918	71
TENURE	9.77	7.148	71
LOGSIZE	7.163345914	1.3069519321	71
DUALITY	.17	.377	71

APPENDIX A2

Descriptive Statistics (Pool Data)

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PINDEP	.416273	.1208067	213
INSTIT	.609699	.2164638	213
COALITION	.264909367721	.3378413309553	213
LEV	.799958580989	.7067761886142	213
TENURE	8.81	7.124	213
LOGSIZE	7.138945820	1.3584752790	213
DUALITY	.15	.363	213

APPENDIX B
CORRELATIONS MATRIX

APPENDIX B1(2007)

		PINDEP	INSTIT	COALITI ON	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
PINDEP	Pearson Correlation	1	-.023	-.012	.143	.027	.015	-.036
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.425	.469	.117	.411	.452	.382
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
INSTIT	Pearson Correlation	-.023	1	-.011	.012	.064	-.332**	.058
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.425	.000	.460	.297	.002	.315
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
COALITI ON	Pearson Correlation	-.012	-.011	1	-.163	.214*	.208*	-.028
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.469	.000	.087	.037	.041	.409
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LEV	Pearson Correlation	.143	.012	-.163	1	-.030	-.077	-.059
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.117	.460	.087	.401	.261	.311
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
TENURE	Pearson Correlation	.027	.064	.214*	-.030	1	.151	.188
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.411	.297	.037	.401	.105	.058
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LOGSIZE	Pearson Correlation	.015	-.332**	.208*	-.077	.151	1	.154
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.452	.002	.041	.261	.105	.099
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
DUALITY	Pearson Correlation	-.036	.058	-.028	-.059	.188	.154	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.382	.315	.409	.311	.058	.099
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

CORRELATION

APPENDIXB2 (2008)

		PINDEP	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
PINDEP	Pearson Correlation	1	0.089	-0.011	0.094	0.138	0.039	.309**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		0.23	0.239	0.219	0.125	0.372	0.004
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
INSTIT	Pearson Correlation	0.089	1	-.012**	-0.015	0.058	-.311**	0.019
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.23		0.003	0.45	0.316	0.004	0.438
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
COALITION	Pearson Correlation	-0.011	-.012	1	-0.194	0.094	0.073	-0.081
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.239	0.003		0.053	0.217	0.271	0.25
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LEV	Pearson Correlation	0.094	-0.015	-0.194	1	-0.136	-0.036	-0.038
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.219	0.45	0.053		0.129	0.382	0.376
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
TENURE	Pearson Correlation	0.138	0.058	0.094	-0.136	1	0.165	0.144
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.125	0.316	0.217	0.129		0.084	0.116
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LOGSIZE	Pearson Correlation	0.039	-.311**	0.073	-0.036	0.165	1	0.013
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.372	0.004	0.271	0.382	0.084		0.456
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
DUALITY	Pearson Correlation	.309**	0.019	-0.081	-0.038	0.144	0.013	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.004	0.438	0.25	0.376	0.116	0.456	
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

CORRELATION

APPENDIX B3 (2009)

		PINDEP	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
	Pearson Correlation	1	-.060	-.012	.258*	.126	.166	.145
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.311	.319	.015	.148	.083	.113
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
INSTIT	Pearson Correlation	-.060	1	-.011	.007	.076	-.298**	.013
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.311		.007	.477	.263	.006	.456
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
COALITIO N	Pearson Correlation	-.012	-.011	1	-.126	.298**	.060	.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.319	.007		.148	.006	.310	.499
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LEV	Pearson Correlation	.258*	.007	-.126	1	-.181	-.094	.018
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.015	.477	.148		.066	.218	.442
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
TENURE	Pearson Correlation	.126	.076	.298**	-.181	1	.151	.099
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.148	.263	.006	.066		.104	.206
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
LOGSIZE	Pearson Correlation	.166	-.298**	.060	-.094	.151	1	.194
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.083	.006	.310	.218	.104		.052
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
DUALITY	Pearson Correlation	.145	.013	.000	.018	.099	.194	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.113	.456	.499	.442	.206	.052	
	N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

CORRELATION

APPENDIX B4 (POOL DATA)

		PINDEP	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
PINDEP	Pearson Correlation	1	0.006	-.010	.159*	0.107	0.068	.150*
	Sig. (1-tailed)		0.464	0.245	0.01	0.059	0.163	0.014
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
INS	Pearson Correlation	0.006	1	-.011	0.002	0.067	-.312**	0.029
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.464		0	0.49	0.166	0	0.335
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
COALITION	Pearson Correlation	-.010	-.011	1	-.159*	.191**	0.104	-0.039
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.245	0	213	0.01	0.003	0.066	0.284
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
LEV	Pearson Correlation	.159*	0.002	-.159*	1	-.115*	-0.068	-0.027
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.01	0.49	0.01		0.047	0.162	0.348
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
TENURE	Pearson Correlation	0.107	0.067	.191**	-.115*	1	.154*	.145*
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.059	0.166	0.003	0.047		0.012	0.017
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
LOGSIZE	Pearson Correlation	0.068	-.312**	0.104	-	.154*	1	.115*
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.163	0	0.066	0.068	0.012		0.047
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213
DUALITY	Pearson Correlation	.150*	0.029	-0.039	-	.145*	.115*	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	0.014	0.335	0.284	0.027	0.017	0.047	
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213	213

APPENDIX C
REGRESSION (2007)

APPENDIX C1

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY,		. Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.285 ^a	.434	-.375	.1166117

a. Predictors: (Constant), Institutional, Coalition, Leverage, LogSize, Tenure, Duality

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.076	7	.011	.024	.595 ^a
Residual	.857	63	.014		
Total	.932	70			

a. Predictors: (Constant), INSTIT ,COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.496	0.129		3.837	0	
	INSTIT	-0.002	0.077	-0.003	-0.02	0.984	0.738
	COALITION	-0.011	0.055	0.018	-1.73	0.011	0.759
	LEV	0.02	0.019	0.134	1.089	0.28	0.96
	TENURE	0	0.002	0.016	0.126	0.9	0.873
	LOGSIZE	0.001	0.012	0.006	0.049	0.961	0.832
	DUALITY	-0.036	0.043	-0.108	-0.829	0.41	0.859

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions							
				(Constant)	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY	
1	1	5.647	1	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0	
	2	0.868	2.55	0	0	0	0.02	0.01	0	0	0.77
	3	0.654	2.939	0	0.01	0.42	0.17	0.04	0	0	0.01
	4	0.362	3.948	0	0.02	0.27	0.53	0.2	0	0	0.07
	5	0.341	4.069	0	0.01	0.01	0.22	0.7	0	0	0.03
	6	0.076	8.614	0	0.65	0.26	0.01	0.02	0.06	0	
	7	0.008	26.204	0.98	0.3	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.72	0	

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.317228	.464801	.399585	.0328582	71
Residual	-.2472435	.3641930	.0000000	.1106275	71
Std. Predicted Value	-2.506	1.985	.000	1.000	71
Std. Residual	-2.120	3.123	.000	.949	71

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

APPENDIX C2
REGRESSION (2008)

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY,	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.430 ^a	.393	.349	.1242983

a. Predictors: (Constant), INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.221	7	.032	2.047	.063 ^a
Residual	.973	63	.015		
Total	1.195	70			

a. Predictors: (Constant), INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error			Beta	Tolerance
1	(Constant)	0.496	0.129		3.837	0
	INSTIT	-0.002	0.077	-0.003	-0.02	0.984
	COALITION	-0.011	0.055	0.018	-1.73	0.011
	LEV	0.02	0.019	0.134	1.089	0.28
	TENURE	0	0.002	0.016	0.126	0.9
	LOGSIZE	0.001	0.012	0.006	0.049	0.961
	DUALITY	-0.036	0.043	-0.108	-0.829	0.41

a. Dependent Variable: PINDE

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions						
				(Constant)	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
1	1	5.653	1	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0
	2	0.862	2.561	0	0	0.08	0	0	0	0
	3	0.693	2.855	0	0	0.52	0.1	0.01	0	0.075
	4	0.392	3.799	0	0	0.16	0.32	0.44	0	0.07
	5	0.256	4.703	0	0.04	0.01	0.5	0.5	0	0.08
	6	0.093	7.782	0	0.57	0.12	0.03	0	0.1	0
	7	0.01	23.819	0.99	0.33	0.1	0.03	0	0.55	0.05

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.317228	.464801	.399585	.0328582	71
Residual	-.2472435	.3641930	.0000000	.1106275	71
Std. Predicted Value	-2.506	1.985	.000	1.000	71
Std. Residual	-2.120	3.123	.000	.949	71

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

APPENDIX C3

REGRESSION (2009)

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, LOGSIZE, TENURE, DUALITY,		. Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.511 ^a	.431	.370	.1048757

a. Predictors: (Constant), Duality, Coalition, Leverage, LogSize, Tenure, Institutional

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.244	7	.035	.025	.006 ^a
	Residual	.693	63	.011		
	Total	.937	70			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Duality, Coalition, Leverage, LogSize, Tenure, Institutional

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta				Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	0.51	0.118		-0.053	4.32	0		
	INSTIT	-0.027	0.063		-0.1	-0.434	0.665	0.788	1.269
	COALITION	-0.016	0.044		-0.1	-1.93	0.01	0.801	1.249
	LEV	0.042	0.018		0.258	2.32	0.024	0.946	1.057
	TENURE	0.003	0.002		0.175	1.471	0.146	0.827	1.21
	LOGSIZE	0.008	0.011		0.092	0.771	0.443	0.825	1.213
	DUALITY	0	0.035		0.001	0.01	0.992	0.884	1.131

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions						
				(Constant)	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY
1	1	5.758	1	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0.01
	2	0.813	2.662	0	0	0.01	0	0	0	0.85
	3	0.662	2.95	0	0.01	0.41	0.18	0.04	0	0
	4	0.399	3.798	0	0.02	0.3	0.53	0.08	0	0.01
	5	0.228	5.022	0	0.01	0.07	0.22	0.82	0	0.01
	6	0.091	7.948	0	0.67	0.15	0	0.01	0.07	0
	7	0.008	26.785	0.99	0.25	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.72	0

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	0.273565	0.592229	0.425444	0.059077	71
Residual Std.	-0.26287	0.311711	0	0.099494	71
Predicted Value	-2.571	2.823	0	1	71
Std. Residual	-2.506	2.972	0	0.949	71

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

APPENDIX C4
REGRESSION (POOL DATA)

Variables Entered/Removed^b

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Duality, Leverage, Institutional, Tenure, LogSize, Coalition		. Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.368 ^a	.41	.37	.1142136

a. Predictors: (Constant), INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, TENURE, LOGSIZE, DUALITY

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	.420	7	.060	.024	.000 ^a
Residual	2.674	205	.013		
Total	3.094	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), INSTIT, COALITION, LEV, TENURE, LOGSIZE, DUALITY

b. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
¹	(Constant)	0.5	0.071		7.056	0	
	INSTIT	0.001	0.041	0.002	0.021	0.984	0.782
	COALITION	-0.04	0.026	-0.059	-2.89	0.012	0.821
	LEV	0.027	0.011	0.159	2.404	0.017	0.96
	TENURE	0.002	0.001	0.101	1.461	0.146	0.89
	LOGSIZE	0.003	0.006	0.036	0.52	0.604	0.856
	DUALITY	0.018	0.023	0.053	0.774	0.44	0.889

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions							
				(Constant)	INSTIT	COALITION	LEV	TENURE	LOGSIZE	DUALITY	
¹	1	5.673	1	0	0	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	0	
	2	0.843	2.595	0	0	0.02	0.01	0	0	0	0.82
	3	0.676	2.897	0	0.01	0.49	0.14	0.03	0	0	0.01
	4	0.389	3.82	0	0.01	0.26	0.46	0.25	0	0	0.05
	5	0.279	4.506	0	0.02	0	0.33	0.68	0	0	0.02
	6	0.088	8.008	0	0.63	0.16	0.01	0	0.08	0	0
	7	0.009	25.185	0.99	0.3	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.66	0.66	0.01

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	.300066	.553122	.416273	.0444997	213
Residual	-.3120472	.3567866	.0000000	.1123122	213
Std. Predicted Value	-2.611	3.075	.000	1.000	213
Std. Residual	-2.732	3.124	.000	.983	213

a. Dependent Variable: PINDEP

APPENDIX D
LIST OF COMPANIES

No:	Name
1	AMTEK HOLDINGS BERHAD
2	APEX HEALTHCARE BERHAD
3	APOLLO FOOD HOLDINGS BERHAD
4	APP INDUSTRIES BERHAD
5	ASIA FILE CORPORATION BHD
6	BOSIS GROUP BERHAD
7	BONIA CORPORATION BERHAD
8	CAB CAKARAN CORPORATION BERHAD
9	HING YIAP KNITTING INDUSTRIES BERHAD
10	JOHN MASTER INDUSTRIES BERHAD
11	ORIENTAL FOOD INDUSTRIES
12	PADIBERAS NASIONAL BERHAD
13	PAN MALAYSIA CORPORATION BERHAD
14	PANASONIC MANUFACTURING MALAYSIA BHD
15	PARAGON UNION BERHAD
16	PELIKAN INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION BERHAD
17	POH HUAT RESOURCES HOLDINGS BERHAD
18	POH KONG HOLDINGS BERHAD
19	PROLEXUS BERHAD
20	REX INDUSTRY BERHAD
21	SERN KOU RESOURCES BERHAD
22	SHH RESOURCES HOLDINGS BERHAD
23	SIN HENG CHAN (MALAYA) BERHAD
24	SPRITZER BERHAD
25	SYF RESOURCES BERHAD
26	TAFI INDUSTRIES BERHAD
27	TAKASO RESOURCES BERHAD
28	TAN CHONG MOTOR HOLDINGS BERHAD
29	TEO GUAN LEE CORPORATION BERHAD
30	TPC PLUS BERHAD
31	UPA CORPORATION BHD
32	XIAN LENG HOLDINGS BERHAD
33	YEE LEE CORPORATION BHD
34	YEN GLOBAL BERHAD
35	BRITISH AMERICAN TUBACO
36	CARLSBERG COMPANY
37	DUTCH LADY BERHAD
38	AMWAY (MALAYSIA)
39	NESTLE MALAYSIA BERHAD
40	QL RESOURCE BERHAD

41	UMW HOLDINGS BERHAD
42	ZHULIAN BERHAD
43	JT INTERNATIONAL BERHAD
44	CHOO BEE METALINDUSTRIES BERHAD
45	FRASER & NEAVE HOLDINGS BHD
46	ECO WORLD DEVELOPMENT GROUP BHD (ECW)
47	HUNZA PROPERTIES BERHA
48	IGB BERHAD
49	IJM LAND BERHAD (IJMLD)
50	IOI PROPERTY BERHAD
51	KUMPULAN EUROPLUS BHD (KEUR)
52	LIEN HOE CORP BERHAD (LHC)
53	KAWAN FOOD BERHAD
54	KBB RESOURCES BERHAD
56	KHEE SAN BERHAD
57	LEE SWEE KIAT GROUP BERHAD
58	FORMOSA PROSONIC INDUSTRIES
59	ENG KAH CORPORATIONS BERHAD
60	LATITUDE TREE HOLDING BERHAD
61	NAIM HOLDINGS BERHAD (NHB)
62	MALAYSIA PACIFIC CORPORATION BERHAD
63	IREKA CORPORATION BERHAD
64	PASDEC HOLDING BERHAD (PSD)
65	MAH SING GROUP BERHAD
66	PARAMOUNT CORPORATION BERHAD'S
67	MITHRIL BERHAD
68	PLENITUDE
69	SYMPHONY IIFE BERHAD (SYML)
70	TAHBS
71	YNH PROPERTY BHD