

Network effects and the appointment of female board members in Japan

Matthias Raddant^{a,b}, Hiroshi Takahashi^b

^a*Kiel University, Department of Economics, Olshausenstraße 40, 24118 Kiel, Germany*

^b*Graduate School of Business Administration, Keio University,
Yokohama Kanagawa, 223-8526, Japan*

Abstract

We investigate the dynamics in the networks of Japanese corporates and its interplay with the appointment of female board members. We find that firms with female board members show homophily with respect to gender and often have above average profitability. We also find that new appointments of women are more likely at boards which observe female board members at other firms to which they are tied by either ownership relations or corporate board interlocks.

Keywords: board member gender, corporate board interlock, firm performance, firm networks

JEL: G32, L14, M51, J16

1. Introduction

This paper is about the small group of women on the boards of 4,000 Japanese corporates. We analyze which companies appoint them, and we investigate what determines the slow but steady growth in the number of female board members from 2004 until 2013. In particular we argue that the number of female board member appointments depends to a significant extend on interaction effects in the practices of connected boards.

The share of female board members in Japan lies around 2 percent with a slight increase throughout the 10-year period covered by our data set. This is far below the numbers seen in other western economies. Even in 2017 the

share of female executives is far away from the goal of 10 percent (or one per board) as announced by the Japanese government in 2013 (Gender Equality Bureau Cabinet Office, 2017).

The composition of corporate boards in general has been a subject of research for quite some time. To much surprise, it seems that the composition of the board is often rather irrelevant for the success of a company, provided that basic governance practices are met (Dalton and Dalton, 2011). However, only very few studies actually investigate the gender ratio on corporate boards (Solimonte et al., 2017). The findings on the influence of gender on performance differ. For example, Kolev (2012) finds that female CEOs underperform with respect to shareholder's returns. Ahern and Dittmar (2012) find that the increase in female board members might have led to less experienced boards and thus decreased performance. Campbell and Minguez-Vera (2008) however find the opposite effect. With respect to earnings volatility and the long-run survival of firms Faccio et al. (2016) find positive effects from female CEOs. Also, while the under-representation of woman on boards might not be much of an issue in the short run, there is ample evidence that it influences the pace of innovation within the company (Torchia et al., 2011), as well as the setting of societal norms and practices within the corporation and outside of it (see also Page, 2007; Cimpian et al., 2020).

While the appointments of female board members therefore also serve as an indicator for gender equality and might influence the career paths of future generations of female executives, the currently appointed board members also live in a networked environment, where managerial practices, governance and appointment decisions are influenced by what is observed in other corporations (Borgatti and Foster, 2003; Uzzi, 1996; Branson, 2006).

The interorganizational networks within which managerial practices diffuse are manifold: they stem from ownership relationships, supply chains, contacts to customers and ties between the board rooms of corporations (Gulati and Gargiulo, 1999; Provan et al., 2007). Especially the case of corporate

board interlocks has been analyzed in great detail. While the relationship between such interlocks and firm performance is debated, there is ample evidence in the literature about the diffusion of practices through such interlocks (Horton et al., 2012; Zona et al., 2018; Devos et al., 2009; Lamb and Roundy, 2016; Mizruchi, 1996).

For the case of Japan, firm networks have been analyzed from different perspectives. Firm networks based on production processes have for example been analyzed by Krichene et al. (2019), firm conglomerates have been analyzed by Lincoln et al. (1992) and the interplay of board and ownership networks was analyzed by Raddant and Takahashi (2020). Corporate governance was for example investigated by Buchanan and Deakin (2009). However, to our knowledge this is, besides Kubo and Nguyen (2020), the first large-scale analysis of female board members in Japan.

In the following we will analyze the evolution of the group of female board members and their networks. Our network-approach is partly motivated by interdisciplinary studies that have shown that women often tend to connect to other women more than men to men, presumably due to in-group support. Additionally, the group of female executives of course forms a minority in an otherwise male-dominated network, which makes homophily one possible factor for the appointment of female board members (Karimi et al., 2018; Bramoull et al., 2012; McDowell and Smith, 1992; Jadidi et al., 2017).

We will give an overview about the data and the distribution of mandates and ties in the board network in section 2. In section 3 we discuss the extent of homophily in the different networks and the centrality of female board members compared to male ones. We then analyze the determinants of the number of female board members and the relationship with firm performance in sections 4 and 5. Finally, we analyze which firms appoint additional female board members and we show in how far network effects explain these appointments.

2. Board members and their networks

2.1. The data

For our analysis we have collected data of all publicly listed companies in Japan. Most of these are listed at the Tokyo Stock Exchange (TSE). This means that our sample includes all the roughly 1,700 firms of the so-called first section together with a similar amount of slightly smaller firms. We combine the data on the composition of corporate boards available from Toyo Keizai with financial data obtained from Nikkei Needs and Thompson Reuters Datastream. In particular we use the information on market value, income, total assets, the business sector, largest shareholders and share holder composition.

The information on the composition of the board is updated annually in the middle of the year. Besides the names of the board members we know their age, gender and whether they are outside board members or auditors. The naming and numerical identifiers of board members are unanimous within each year, but not necessarily throughout the years. Therefore we have developed an algorithm that traces the destinies of board members over time based on parts of their names, date of birth and affiliations.¹ The financial data of the firms is matched using the same yearly frequency.

The basics of the treatment of the board composition data are simple. For each year we observe a set of board members and a set of firms. Board members serve on the boards of one or more firms. This creates relationships (incidences) between the set of board members and the set of firms which resemble a bi-partite graph. Incidences can be described by positive entries in the incidence matrix I , where the dimensions of I are given by the number of firms and the number of board members.

¹We have confirmed the validity of this algorithm by manual checks. The only known limitation of this method is that we may lose traces of board members who exit the data set and re-appear at a later year at a different company. Manual checks have confirmed that for the following analysis this effect is negligible.

From the incidence matrix I we can obtain two different un-directed networks by projection. $A_D = II'$ creates an adjacency matrix for the network of board members, where positive entries resemble cases where board members know each other from serving on at least one board together. By multiplying $I'I = A_B$ we obtain an adjacency matrix that describes the network of the firms based on board interlocks, our main focus of interest. A_B is a square matrix with as many rows and columns as we have firms in our sample. A positive entry A_{ij} describes a connection between the firms i and j that is given by at least one shared board members. In the following we will refer to this network as the board network.

We have also obtained data that reports the five largest shareholders (and their exact shareholding) for all of the firms in our sample. This might at first seem a little restrictive, yet in practice significant influence onto a company is unlikely to be performed by more than five owners. Also, since this data is reported from the point of the owned company this still results in a rather complete picture of the ownership network.

In the following we will refer to the firm networks based on ownership simply as the ownership networks. The ownership networks differs from the board networks by the fact that they are directed networks. The densities are however comparable, the ownership network in 2004 contains 2,574 directed links and we see a steady increase until 2013 when the network has 3,695 links (see Raddant and Takahashi, 2020, for a more general analysis of this data set).

Some statistics on these networks are given in table 1. While the overall share of female board members remains low throughout the sample period we observe some changes while their number almost doubles. Most noticeably, the average number of mandates for female board members is catching up and is finally exceeding the overall average. Female board members are over-represented in the group of auditors, this finding intensifies over time.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
no. firms	3,767	3,849	3,943	3,887	3,767	3,672	3,595	3,543	3,532	3,545
no. b. members	42,175	42,635	43,121	41,998	39,907	38,759	37,731	36,884	36,452	36,697
no. mandates	45,119	45,760	46,257	44,991	42,693	41,461	40,318	39,458	39,103	39,503
avg. board size	11.98	11.89	11.73	11.57	11.33	11.29	11.22	11.14	11.07	11.14
avg. mandates	1.070	1.073	1.073	1.071	1.070	1.070	1.069	1.070	1.073	1.076
avg. mand. women	1.046	1.053	1.053	1.062	1.069	1.072	1.084	1.095	1.103	1.136
max mandates	11	9	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7
max mandates f.	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
women	439	506	533	515	493	514	536	571	623	713
% women	1.04	1.19	1.24	1.23	1.24	1.33	1.42	1.55	1.71	1.94
avg. age	57.2	57.3	57.2	57.4	57.7	58.1	58.3	58.4	58.7	58.9
avg. age f.	51.3	50.9	51.6	52.0	52.3	52.8	52.9	53.3	53.8	54.1
% auditors (men)	17.18	18.00	18.42	18.89	19.27	19.64	19.74	19.86	19.84	19.63
% auditors (women)	19.82	21.74	25.33	28.16	29.82	29.57	30.60	31.35	31.14	30.01
edges board net.	3,221	3,498	3,415	3,266	3,045	2,956	2,883	2,869	2,984	3,240
edges owners. net.($> 2\%$)	1,920	2,047	2,162	2,138	2,167	2,417	2,451	2,528	2,604	2,667
edges personal net.	561,884	559,258	558,296	535,606	495,746	477,910	459,452	444,194	437,704	444,716

Table 1: Statistics on board members, firms, and networks connecting them

While the number of firms shows some churning over time, the size of the average board is rather stable. The number of female board members is increasing significantly, their share however remains low. The increase in the average number of mandates for female board members hints at an increase of their importance.

2.2. Distributions of mandates and degree

The change in the number of mandates of female board members deserves further attention. In the following we will explore how frequent multiple mandates occur among female board members and how the distributions compares to those of male board members. We will also investigate how this translates to the degree distributions in the board network and thus to the connectivity of female board members.

Figure 1 gives an overview about the development with respect to multiple mandates. We show the distributions for the number of mandates in 3-year intervals. Since female board members appear slightly more often in the role of the auditor than their male counterparts, we separately report the distributions that only consider auditors. In general auditors are slightly more likely to have multiple mandates than the entire population of board members. For female auditors this only hold in the later years of our data set. When we compare male and female board members we can clearly see a catching-up of the female board members in terms of the maximum of mandates and the relative frequency of mandates. In 2004 there is no woman with more than 3 mandates, while in 2013 we observe a maximum of 5 (compared to 7 for men). More importantly, in 2013 women are more likely to have multiple mandates than men (which of course mirrors our observation from table 1).

The increase in the number of mandates naturally leads to an increase in connectivity also in the personal network of board members. To illustrate we plot the degree distributions of male and female board members in figure 2. All these distributions are close to power-law behavior, however, one can also clearly see that the underlying networks are not prototypical scale-free graphs. For once, the maximum of connections is clearly limited, likely due to best practices and corporate governance guidelines about multiple mandates. Also, for board members with multiple mandates the number of connections increases step-wise with each board to which they are appointed. This leads




Figure 1: Distributions of mandates

We show the frequency of the number of mandates on a semi-log scale for male and female board members. Additionally we show these figure only taking auditors into account. We observe that the maximum of mandates for female board members increases over time and that their relative frequency surpasses those of men.

to a relatively high cut-off for the power-law and also some distortions at the intermediate range of connectivity.

It is however obvious that female board members also catch up to their male counterparts in terms of connectivity. While the maximum for the degree is still significantly lower the relative number of highly connected female board members in 2013 is even higher for women than for men. It is worth noting that this visible kink is in fact caused by a select few women who stand out from the still relatively small group of overall female board members.

In order to quantify the change in these distributions over time we have estimated the tail exponent for these distributions over time. The alpha for the fitted power-law distributions are reported in figure 3. For male board




Figure 2: Degree distributions for male and female board members

The figures show the degree distributions on a log-log scale. The distributions for men show some power-law behavior, yet the cut-off is rather high and the tail is somewhat dampened. Although the results for female board members are noisy, a catch-up process in terms of connectivity is visible.

members the already high α is slightly increasing over time, mirroring the trend of slightly smaller boards and slightly fewer multiple mandates in general. For female board members we see a trend into the opposite direction, their degree distribution become more heavy-tailed over time, surpassing those of their male colleagues.

It is worth noting that such differences in the distributions have also been analyzed theoretically by Lee et al. (2019) in extensions of the model of Barabási and Albert (1999). These models produce networks with a tail exponent of 3 in their baseline configuration. However, when different groups are introduced and when these groups are assigned different levels of homophily, tail exponents different from 3 will emerge as a result of homophilic behavior. In these models, a result like in the first years of our data set, with a higher α for the (minority) of women compared to men could be




Figure 3: Estimated alpha parameter for degree distribution of male and female board members over time.

The figure compares the estimated α assuming a power-law degree distribution. Dotted lines show the standard error. The results quantitatively confirm that connectivity for female board members as caught up and in fact overtaken that of men. The process seems to have temporarily reversed in 2009 and 2010.

obtained in settings where women have a preference to connect to women while the majority (of men) does not have any preference. It is therefore important to analyze if women behave in fact homophilic and if the change in their alpha is due to changes in this behavior or due to other effects.

3. Network effects

3.1. Homophily

As a next step we will investigate if male and female board members are connected to each other in an unbiased way or if the ego networks (the neighborhoods) of man and women differ. In other words, we analyze if homophily exists.

We will start by look at the personal networks of all board members.




Figure 4: Homophily in personal networks

The figure shown a comparison of the share of female board members in the ego networks of men and women compared with the overall share among all board members. It reveals that female board members connectivity is biased towards being connected to other female board members.

We know that the percentage of female board members is close to 1 percent in 2004 and rises to around 2 percent in 2013. This share serves as our benchmark. If ties between men and women were unbiased we expect that the average share of women in all the individual ego networks should be very close to the global share and that they should be identical for men and women. Figure 4 shows these averages and reveals that female board members are actually connected to more other female board members than what their overall share would suggest. The ratio between the expected and actual share is slightly narrowing over time. For men these shares are almost identical, the share of female board members is only very narrowly below the expected value, which is of course also related to the relative group sizes of men and women.




Figure 5: Homophily in the board network

The plot shows the average number of female board members in the ego networks of firms compared with the overall expected value. As networks we consider the board network, as well as the network towards owners and towards owned firms. We condition each case on whether at least one female board member is present on the board of the ego-firm. We find that homophily with respect to the presence of female board members is present also on the level of firms.

Personal ties in these networks are obviously mostly not made as an individual decision, they come as a result of membership on the board of a corporation. It therefore makes sense to search for homophily also on the level of firms. We can consider three types of network relationships and their firms' ego networks. First we look at the network between firms based on links in the board network. Here we look at the average number of female board members that serve on the boards of firms in the ego networks. We can compare this figure with the overall expected number of female board members (e.g., in 2004 one would expect 0.12 female board members). Further we can condition this on whether a firm actually has at least one women on its own board.

We can ask the same question for firms that are linked by shareholding

(of at least 2 percent). Here we can distinguish between ego networks that connect a firm to its owners and those connections that show the ownership over other firms.²

Figure 5 shows that homophily in fact exists on the level of firms. For all three ego networks the average number of female board members is higher among those alters where the ego has a female board member on its board. For the ownership network these effects seem to depend to some extent on the hierarchy. There are obviously cases where we see female board members on the boards of firms that are owned by somebody else. This does however not necessarily mean that the parent company would also have a female board member. On the other way around, if already the parent company has a female board member, chances are that firms in its ownership ego-network also have a female board members.³

3.2. *Centrality*

Our findings on the degree distributions and the number of mandates have hinted into the direction that – although in the minority – some female board members might have moved into rather central positions in the network in the last years of our sample period. Their actual centrality in the network of board members is of course also influenced by the actual firm they work for and whether the tendency to link to other women influences their relative position in the network.

We therefore calculate different measures for centrality for all the board members in our sample and we evaluate if female board members are adequately represented among the most central board members (conditional on

²Since there are firms that are not connected this limits the sample to around 2200 firms for the analysis of the board network and to around 1300 (750) in the owner (ownership) network (the exact numbers vary from year to year).

³Since the appearance of female board members is close to a binary event we chose in figure 5 to report the average number of female board members instead of average percentages (which would relate to varying board sizes). This implies that the plotted deviation from the expected number of female board members is not symmetric.




Figure 6: Centrality of female board members

The plots show a comparison of the number of female board members who are present in the five top 2% slices of the distributions of degree, eigenvector centrality and betweenness centrality. For each years we have also plotted their expected number and the standard error. Although the data is noisy we observe significantly more highly central female board members after 2011, both with respect to their absolute number as well as with respect to their relative frequency.

their overall share). To achieve this we order the board members by centrality score and count how many female board members are present in the first five 2 percent intervals of these distributions.⁴ We can then compare the actual number of top female board members with their expected numbers assuming their centrality should be distributed like that of the entire population. The results are shown in figure 6. Due to the low overall number of female board members the results are admittedly noisy, nevertheless, by comparing the results for all the years some trend is visible. When we judge according to degree centrality or eigencentrality female board members are mostly underrepresented from 2004–2006. When we compare this with the years 2011–2013 we observe that the overall level has increased and that in fact even a peak forms for female board members in the top 2 percent. The results from betweenness centrality look slightly different. While the general trend is the same, a small peak is already visible very early. This might hint at a few female board members that connect groups of board members which are not well connected otherwise, a finding that is likely related to the homophilic tendencies that we discussed earlier.

4. Determinants of the number of female board members

We have already mentioned that female board members are more frequently found at firms that provide services or are into trade than say, more traditional sectors, like mining and construction. While such a classification is likely to explain the distribution of female board members to some degree our analysis of the network structure between firms and their boards has also revealed some regularities that could itself help to understand why certain firms do have female board members and some others do not. To test the influence of these network effects on board composition we can estimate the

⁴Due to the heavy tails of these distributions all board members that are outside the top 10 percent are basically equally unimportant.

year	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
N	3767	3849	3943	3887	3767	3672	3595	3543	3532	3545
R^2	0.8941	0.8828	0.8717	0.8747	0.8755	0.8668	0.8573	0.8442	0.8304	0.8011
$R^2_{f=1}$	0.0230	0.0338	0.0274	0.0340	0.0417	0.0379	0.0486	0.0593	0.0869	0.1322
disp	1.0601	1.0708	1.0563	1.0487	1.0421	1.0176	1.0274	1.0463	1.0532	1.0375
const	-2.3855	-2.2845	-2.2153	-2.2699	-2.2150	-2.1334	-2.1197	-2.0321	-2.0054	-1.8839
	(-21.2843)	(-21.8646)	(-21.7579)	(-22.0459)	(-21.1004)	(-20.6194)	(-20.7458)	(-20.7789)	(-21.3662)	(-21.6469)
b. size	-0.0097	0.0013	0.0116	0.0088	0.0057	0.0036	0.0121	0.0224	0.0257	0.0344
	(-0.7049)	(0.1005)	(0.9690)	(0.7144)	(0.4299)	(0.2648)	(0.9239)	(1.7534)	(2.2049)	(3.3320)
degree	-0.1015	-0.0438	-0.1104	-0.1102	-0.1409	-0.0598	-0.0539	-0.0578	0.0223	0.0847
board	(-1.4903)	(-0.7134)	(-1.7919)	(-1.7110)	(-2.0554)	(-0.9086)	(-0.8438)	(-0.9320)	(0.3820)	(1.5870)
degree	-0.0918	-0.0165	0.0376	0.1788	0.1953	0.1254	0.1288	0.1056	0.1256	0.0831
owner	(-0.6214)	(-0.1379)	(0.3449)	(1.8574)	(1.9982)	(1.3461)	(1.4675)	(1.2951)	(1.6845)	(1.2486)
degree	-0.8420	-0.8791	-0.7308	-0.6985	-0.7797	-0.7986	-0.7455	-0.7273	-0.7752	-0.7734
ownsh.	(-5.3768)	(-5.9183)	(-5.5117)	(-5.1929)	(-5.7086)	(-6.3669)	(-6.2143)	(-6.3197)	(-6.9469)	(-7.3946)
< n > fem	1.1678	1.0570	1.2839	1.1439	1.3094	1.0265	1.0376	1.1667	1.0755	0.9887
board net	(5.6676)	(6.1437)	(8.0031)	(7.0344)	(8.0742)	(6.9430)	(7.1847)	(8.5191)	(8.3224)	(8.9032)
< n > fem	1.6201	1.2621	1.0485	1.1264	0.9493	0.9378	0.7827	0.6668	0.7146	0.7119
owner net	(4.4267)	(3.7377)	(3.2129)	(4.0486)	(3.4977)	(3.8465)	(3.7464)	(3.6636)	(4.0270)	(4.7518)
< n > fem	1.2501	1.3837	0.4971	0.7906	0.9325	1.1873	1.3334	1.1551	0.9645	1.0685
owsh net	(3.2547)	(3.9221)	(1.1788)	(2.4181)	(2.5928)	(4.5360)	(5.9166)	(5.5440)	(4.9935)	(6.6107)
sector	0.7011	0.7458	0.7953	0.8791	0.6437	0.7237	0.7294	0.7878	0.6910	0.5473
Foods	(3.1538)	(3.7191)	(4.0907)	(4.5886)	(3.0453)	(3.6395)	(3.7678)	(4.3644)	(3.9522)	(3.4288)
sector	0.2063	-0.0009	-0.0233	0.1376	0.1716	0.2888	0.2921	0.3257	0.3865	0.2920
Chem.	(0.8293)	(-0.0037)	(-0.0972)	(0.6221)	(0.7874)	(1.4337)	(1.5255)	(1.8168)	(2.3325)	(1.8991)
sector	-0.0388	-0.1111	-0.1600	-0.1440	-0.0521	-0.1024	-0.1534	-0.3901	-0.3995	-0.5925
Machinery	(-0.1525)	(-0.4517)	(-0.6678)	(-0.6013)	(-0.2261)	(-0.4546)	(-0.6698)	(-1.6422)	(-1.7686)	(-2.6542)
sector	-0.1618	-0.3243	-0.3977	-0.3602	-0.3158	-0.2635	-0.2360	-0.2920	-0.2038	-0.3219
El. Appl.	(-0.6646)	(-1.3491)	(-1.6613)	(-1.5046)	(-1.3444)	(-1.1929)	(-1.0895)	(-1.3817)	(-1.0486)	(-1.7752)
sector	0.7807	0.6893	0.6187	0.5942	0.4906	0.4538	0.5022	0.5035	0.4880	0.3056
IT	(4.7911)	(4.6183)	(4.1897)	(3.9465)	(3.0894)	(2.9366)	(3.3786)	(3.6147)	(3.6376)	(2.4205)
sector	-0.0410	0.1289	0.1157	-0.0125	-0.0154	-0.1265	-0.1117	-0.2226	-0.1878	-0.0490
WS Trade	(-0.1981)	(0.7099)	(0.6488)	(-0.0660)	(-0.0820)	(-0.6609)	(-0.5989)	(-1.1940)	(-1.0634)	(-0.3241)
sector	0.8778	0.8489	0.8269	0.8407	0.7335	0.6245	0.6961	0.6787	0.6931	0.6049
R Trade	(5.9324)	(6.1659)	(6.1412)	(6.1531)	(5.2021)	(4.3927)	(5.0443)	(5.1158)	(5.5334)	(5.2330)
sector	1.0638	1.0080	0.9580	0.9379	0.9424	0.9070	0.9683	0.8985	0.8635	0.7593
Services	(7.2536)	(7.3918)	(7.2551)	(7.0310)	(7.0048)	(6.9315)	(7.5791)	(7.2908)	(7.3024)	(6.9961)

Table 2: Determinants of the number of female board members in a firm. Results of the Poisson-regression, t -statistics in parenthesis. As the main influences we test for connectivity in the board and ownership network (degree), as well as the average number of female board members in the ego-networks, < n > fem. Further, 8 sector fixed effects are included to account for industry-specific differences.

number of female board members in each firm by coding the connectivity and the exposure to other female board members in the network of firms and by controlling for known fixed effects by sectoral differences.

Table 2 reports the results of a Poisson regression that tests for the network effects in the following way. First we should take account of the size of the board in each firm, since the chance of having a female board member should increase with the number of seats. The variable *b. size* therefore represents the difference in the size of a firm’s board from the mean. Further we test for the influence of connectivity in the board and ownership network by including three variables for the degree. For the ownership network we consider the in- and out-degree separately (as a logged variable, i.e., $\log(1 + k_i)$). We test for the influence of homophily in the networks by accounting for the average number of female board members that is observed at connected firms in either the board or ownership network. Further we use 8 dummies, covering the most populated sectors.⁵

When we look at the results the first point to take notice of is that the board size variable starts out with a negative sign and turns to be significantly positive in the later years. The reason is that many female board members have initially been hired at smaller firms with smaller boards, it is only towards the end of our sample period that also large corporations have hired some female board members (see also Kubo and Nguyen, 2020, for similar findings). The variable for the degree in the board network (which is mostly not significant) shows a similar behavior. Since large corporations (with very few female board members) are the most networked this finding can be expected. For the ownership network we again find evidence of some hierarchical influences. Firms that have ownership in many other firms have

⁵Since in many sectors only very few woman are employed we are limited to the use of about 8 sector dummies for technical reasons. These 8 dummies however cover 61 percent of all firms and we have verified that the exact selection of dummy variables does not influence our findings.

significantly fewer female board members. The influence of the in-degree (connected owners) is tendentially reversed, although in this analysis it is mostly insignificant.

The most important part are of course the variables that describe the average number of female board members in the three respective ego networks. They are all positive and highly significant (with one exception for the ownership network in 2006). This means that the homophily in the network has a measurable impact on the board composition: the number of female board members of a firm is connected to the fact whether female board members are observed at connected peers. Hence, we find network effects for the presence of female board members that speak in favor of influences of the network on the composition of the board with respect to gender.⁶

5. Performance

From an economic point of view it is of course necessary to investigate if we can say anything about differences in the performance of firms with and without female board members. Since we deal with firms from very different sectors we should analyze this by looking at the return on assets (ROA) as the most general criterion of performance. Also, since firms from different sectors will typically have different balance sheet structures, we normalize this ROA be the sector averages in each year. We can then compare the firms that have boards with only men to those where at least one women serves on the board.

For this analysis we use a sub-sample of 1,357 firms for which data is available for all 10 years. 1,187 of these firms never had a female board

⁶To investigate the seemingly good fit of the model we have calculated an additional measure labeled $R_{f=1}^2$ which give the ratio of correct predictions of firms that have exactly one female board member. It shows that these cases are more difficult to predict than having no female board members at all. In particular our model predicts on average 0.1996 female board members for firm with no female board members and 0.3199 (0.4519) for firms with 1(2) female board members.




Figure 7: Firm profitability

The figure compares the ROA of firms with at least 1 female board member with that of firms without any female board members. The ROAs have been normalized by the annual sector averages. Firms with female board members tend to have a higher ROA than those without. The dotted lines show the 99% confidence interval for the ROA of a group with the size like that of the firms with female board members.

member. We will focus on the 32 firms that have at least one female board member on average over this time period and compare their performance to the sample average (we obtain qualitatively very similar results as long as the average number of female board members is > 0.7).

Our results for this analysis are shown in figure 7. We can see that the ROA for the majority of firms with entirely male boards is very close to the overall average. For the firms with at least one female board member we have numerically determined the 99-percent interval (i.e., the expected range for the average ROA of a randomly select sub-sample of firms). Interestingly we find that firms with female board members do perform noticeably better most of the time. This result is however only significant in the last three years.

Given that the majority of studies on board composition struggle to establish any relationship to performance this finding is in fact surprising. It

should however also not be overstated, there is no reason to draw conclusions on causality here. It is likely that this finding is related to good governance in general. Firms that have good governance are more profitable and those firms might also be better in facilitating the hiring of female board members. In this respect our results are similar to those of Farrell and Hersch (2005) who also found women to serve for better performing firms.. The results also support Campbell and Minguez-Vera (2008) who found that increasing the number of female board members is not an issue for firm performance. Given that the overall number of female board members is still low, it seems plausible that effects related to inexperienced board members, as described by Ahern and Dittmar (2012), should not be an issue in the Japanese case.

6. Appointment of female board members

After looking at the networks of existing female board members and firm performance we have to look at the dynamics of the appointment process. The aim is to find out if network effects also explain this process and could therefore be useful for policy advice on gender diversity (a visualization of appointments in the network is provided in figure A.8 in the appendix).

In order to look at the determinants of female hirings we limit the analysis to the 1,357 corporations which are present throughout the entire time period and for which data on earnings and shareholder-ship is available. In the time period from 2004–2013 218 new female board members have been hired by 179 corporations. We compare the firms which have hired female board members with those that did not hire any and we analyze in how far network effects and firm characteristic can explain this behavior.

Table 3 shows the results of a logistic regression where the dependent variable signals the hiring of a female board member (based on the changes observed in the annual reports). The two firm characteristics that, as we have seen before, might relate to hiring is the *board size* and the profitability, the *ROA* of the company. We then estimate three versions of this model.

model	only year dummies		incl. sectors		incl. foreign sh.	
MF R^2	0.1293		0.1455		0.1470	
LR ratio	275.9		310.5		313.6	
log L	-929.0		-911.8		-910.2	
obs. / ones	10820	218	10820	218	10820	218
vars	18		25		26	
9 year const	•		•		•	
board size	0.0428	(2.72)	0.0488	(3.03)	0.0466	(2.89)
ROA	4.2788	(2.62)	2.9835	(1.76)	2.0992	(1.20)
foreign sh.					1.2164	(1.80)
degree board	0.1931	(1.86)	0.2258	(2.15)	0.2107	(2.00)
degree owner	0.4056	(3.87)	0.4474	(4.19)	0.3979	(3.62)
degree ownsh.	-0.7653	(-4.95)	-0.8250	(-5.23)	-0.7603	(-4.69)
fem. board net	0.6445	(1.88)	0.6222	(1.80)	0.5767	(1.66)
fem. owner net	1.1913	(4.10)	1.2761	(4.35)	1.2806	(4.37)
fem. ownsh. net	1.2522	(3.26)	0.9763	(2.50)	0.9909	(2.53)
existing fem.	1.4977	(7.56)	1.3068	(6.42)	1.3232	(6.50)
Foods			1.2219	(4.36)	1.2649	(4.49)
Chemicals			0.7689	(3.24)	0.7521	(3.17)
Pharmac.			1.0618	(2.61)	1.0625	(2.63)
IT			0.6379	(2.19)	0.6738	(2.30)
WHS Trade			0.7148	(3.15)	0.7443	(3.27)
RT Trade			0.6232	(1.83)	0.6715	(1.97)
Services			0.9886	(3.39)	1.0547	(3.60)

Table 3: Determinants of new female board members.

The table shows results of the logistic regression, t -statistics in parentheses. We compare the characteristics of firms with respect to whether they hire an additional female board member in the period from 2004–2013. We estimate three models that differ by the inclusion of sector-fixed effects and a variable that represents foreign share holdings. We find that, besides sector-specific differences, the relative position in the ownership network as well as the presence of other female board members at the boards of connected firms significantly influence the appointment of female board members.

The left columns show the results with fixed effects for the different years only. The middle columns adds fixed effects for sectors.⁷ The two rightmost columns also include the effects of foreign shareholder-ship.

All three versions contain data on the number of connections in the board network, the in- and out-degree in the ownership network and the average number of observed female board members in the respective ego-networks,⁸ formatted in the same way as described in section 4. Additionally we account for the case that some firms might already have a female board member and hire another one. This is accounted for by the *existing fem* variable.

At a first glance it looks that our model explains some variation in the data but certainly not all of it. We can therefore have a look at the conditional in-sample prediction accuracy. On the basis of events we can check if the 218 events that our model classifies as the most likely to lead to an appointment actually do so. While the probability for all events is 2.01 percent, the top 218 predictions turn out to be correct in 24.31 percent of the cases. We can also ask the same question on the level of firms and take as given that the appointments have taken place at 179 firms and check if the 179 firms that our model predicts to be the most likely ones associated with an appointment do hire at least one female board member. What we find is that while the unconditional probability to hire a female board members among all firms is 13.19 percent, the 179 firm predicted by the model are correct 18.99 percent of the time. (Since firms that do not hire appear in the sample each year

⁷Also here, the low number of female board members limits the possible number of sector dummy variables. We have included the most populated sectors with the most hirings. We have verified that the results do not depend on the exact choice of sectors, in particular we have also estimated the model with the exact same set of sector dummies as in table 2 and found no significant difference in the results. Our choice of sectors differs partly from the model presented in section 4 since here we look at differences in the change of female board membership whilst we looked at differences in levels before.

⁸Effectively, we are looking at 9 transition from year t to $t + 1$. When we observe the appointment of a female board in the annual report published in $t + 1$ we relate this to the characteristics of the firm in year t since this is the year in which the appointment was most likely decided upon.

and those that do only appear when they hire, these two figures differ.)

The results show that network effects are significantly related to the appointment of female board members. The results are robust to the use of sector dummies. The seven network variables are all significant, four of them even at the $\alpha < 1\%$ level. The influences are weaker in the board network than in the ownership network. In the latter we observe a similar hierarchical pattern as before, companies which have some control over others (*degree ownsh.*) tend to have fewer female board members. This effect can however be weakened if those controlled companies do have female board members (*fem. ownsh. net*). Companies with an existing female board members are always more likely to appoint additional ones.

We can follow up on our previous observations about profitability by looking at the *ROA*. While its coefficient is positive in all three models, we also observe that by including the share of foreign shareholding the effect is no longer significant. One can argue that *foreign sh.* can serve as a proxy for a corporations' openness to modern ('western') corporate governance practices although it is also slightly correlated to the size of firms in general. However, the results for *ROA* and *foreign sh.* hint into the expected direction that besides network effects governance is of course related to both performance and the composition of the board.

7. Conclusions

Our analysis has shown that even if the number of female board members in Japan is still low, they have started to change their position in the networks of executives. Relatively many female board members have multiple mandates, which made them become more central.

Network effects play an important role in explaining the gender ratio of corporate boards and they are also an important aspect of new appointments. New female board members are often appointed when connected firms also have at least one female board member. In ownership networks this effect

is hierarchical. The effect of female hirings on performance is tendentially positive.

What remains to be investigated is if the network effects among (minimally) diversified boards will continue to work in favor of a further increase in gender equality. From a theoretical point of view one should probably avoid too homophilic structures, since these could shield conservative sectors from change and would thus limit the relative centrality and thus influence of female executives.

Acknowledgments

We thank Chieko Takahashi for help in compiling the board network data. We thank Fariba Karimi for discussing a first draft. MR is grateful for partial funding of this work by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI, 16K01256).

References

References

- Ahern, K. R., Dittmar, A. K., 2012. The changing of the boards: the impact on firm valuation of mandated female board representation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127 (1), 137–197.
- Barabási, A.-L., Albert, R., 1999. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286, 509–512.
- Borgatti, S. P., Foster, P. C., 2003. The network paradigm in organizational research: A review and typology. *Journal of Management* 29 (6), 991–1013.
- Bramoull, Y., Currarini, S., Jackson, M. O., Pin, P., Rogers, B. W., 2012. Homophily and long-run integration in social networks. *Journal of Economic Theory* 147 (5), 1754–1786.

- Branson, D., 2006. *No Seat at the Table: How Corporate Governance keeps Women out of Americas boardrooms*. New York University Press, New York.
- Buchanan, J., Deakin, S., 2009. In the shadow of corporate governance reform: Change and continuity in managerial practice at listed companies in Japan. In: Whittaker, D. H., Deakin, S. (Eds.), *Corporate Governance and managerial Reform in Japan*. Oxford UP, pp. 28–69.
- Campbell, K., Minguez-Vera, A., 2008. Gender diversity in the boardroom and firm financial performance. *J Bus Ethics* 83, 435–451.
- Cimpian, J. R., Kim, T. H., McDermott, Z. T., 2020. Understanding persistent gender gaps in STEM. *Science* 268 (6497), 1317–1319.
- Dalton, D. R., Dalton, C. M., 2011. Integration of micro and macro studies in governance research: CEO duality, board composition, and financial performance. *Journal of Management* 37 (2), 404–411.
- Devos, E., Prevost, A., Puthenpurackal, J., 2009. Are interlocked directors effective monitors? *Financial Management* 38, 861–887.
- Faccio, M., Marchica, M., Mura, R., 2016. CEO gender, corporate risk-taking, and the efficiency of capital allocation. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 39, 193–209.
- Farrell, K., Hersch, P., 2005. Additions to corporate boards: the effect of gender. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 11, 85–106.
- Gender Equality Bureau Cabinet Office, 2017. Status of female officers in listed companies (in Japanese). [Http://www.gender.go.jp/policy/mieruka/company/yakuin.html](http://www.gender.go.jp/policy/mieruka/company/yakuin.html), retrieved 04/2018.
- Gulati, R., Gargiulo, M., 1999. Where do interorganizational networks come from? *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (5), 1439–1493.

- Horton, J., Millo, Y., Serafeim, G., 2012. Resources or power? Implications of social networks on compensation and firm performance. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* 39, 399–426.
- Jadidi, M., Karimi, F., Lietz, H., Wagner, C., 2017. Gender disparities in science? Dropout, productivity, collaborations and success of male and female computer scientists. *Advances in Complex Systems* 1750011.
- Karimi, F., Génois, M., Wagner, C., Singer, P., Strohmaier, M., 2018. Homophily influences ranking of minorities in social networks. *Scientific Reports* 8 (11077).
- Kolev, G. I., 2012. Underperformance by female CEOs: A more powerful test. *Economics Letters* 117 (2), 436–440.
- Krichene, H., Fujiwara, Y., Chakraborty, A., Arata, Y., Hiroyasu, I., Terai, M., 2019. The emergence of properties of the Japanese production network: How do listed firms choose their partners? *Social Networks* 59, 1–9.
- Kubo, K., Nguyen, T. P. T., 2020. Female CEO on Japanese corporate boards and firm performance. mimeo, School of Commerce, Waseda University.
- Lamb, N. H., Roundy, P., 2016. The “ties that bind” board interlocks research: a systematic review. *Management Research Review* 39 (11), 1516–1542.
- Lee, E., Karimi, F., Wagner, C., Jo, H.-H., Strohmaier, M., Galesic, M., 2019. Homophily and minority-group size explain perception biases in social networks. *Nature Human Behavior* 3, 1078–1087.
- Lincoln, J. R., Gerlach, M. L., Takahashi, P., 1992. A dyad analysis of intercorporate ties. *American Sociological Review* 57 (5), 561–585.

- Mcdowell, J., Smith, J., 1992. The effect of genderting on propensity to coauthor: Implications for academic promotion. *Economic Inquiry* 30 (1), 68–82.
- Mizruchi, S., 1996. What do interlocks do? An analysis, critique, and assessment of research on interlocking directorates. *Annual review of Sociology*, 271–298.
- Page, S. E., 2007. *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Provan, K. G., Fish, A., Sydow, J., 2007. Interorganizational networks at the network level: A review of the empirical literature on whole networks. *Journal of Management* 33 (3), 479–516.
- Raddant, M., Takahashi, H., 2020. Corporate boards, interorganizational ties and profitability: The case of Japan. University of Kiel, Economics Working Papers No. 2.
- Solimonte, S., Coluccia, D., Fontana, S., 2017. Gender diversity on corporate boards: an empirical investigation of Italian listed companies. *Palgrave Communications* 3 (1), 16109.
- Torchia, M., Calbro, A., Huse, M., 2011. Women directors on corporate boards: From tokenism to critical mass. *Journal of Business Ethics* 102 (2), 299–317.
- Uzzi, B., 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review* 61 (4), 674–698.
- Zona, F., Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Withers, M. C., 2018. Board interlocks and firm performance: towards a combined agency-resource dependence perspective. *Journal of Management* 44 (2), 586–618.

Appendix A. Female board members over time

sector	2004				2013			
	firms	b. m.	female b.m.	share	firms	b. m.	female b.m.	share
Insurance	11	179	6	0.0335	12	147	12	0.0816
Services	325	3463	88	0.0254	359	3612	148	0.0410
Air Transportation	6	82	0	0	6	74	3	0.0405
Electric Power and Gas	25	470	7	0.0149	23	366	14	0.0382
Oil and Coal Prod.	13	172	1	0.0058	13	163	6	0.0368
Retail Trade	375	4163	85	0.0204	342	3617	121	0.0335
Rubber Products	21	260	2	0.0077	19	221	7	0.0317
Foods	157	1988	25	0.0126	131	1563	48	0.0307
Fishery, Agric. For.	11	146	3	0.0205	11	135	4	0.0296
Real Estate	110	1172	24	0.0205	111	1084	30	0.0277
Pharmaceutical	54	651	7	0.0108	61	698	18	0.0258
Information and Comm.	306	3301	63	0.0191	349	3517	89	0.0253
Other Financing B.	55	648	7	0.0108	32	381	8	0.0210
Chemicals	216	2707	19	0.0070	215	2496	52	0.0208
Banks	96	1382	2	0.0014	93	1408	29	0.0206
<i>2013 average</i>								<i>0.0194</i>
Textiles App.	87	987	7	0.0071	56	625	11	0.0176
Securities and Com. F.	42	506	2	0.0040	40	414	7	0.0170
Precision Instruments	51	575	3	0.0052	50	560	9	0.0161
Other Products	111	1345	13	0.0100	109	1202	19	0.0158
Glass and Cer.	72	809	4	0.0049	62	661	10	0.0151
Wholesale Trade	375	4319	31	0.0072	343	3656	54	0.0148
Pulp and Paper	29	366	1	0.0027	26	303	4	0.0132
Electric Appl.	305	3676	20	0.0054	273	3066	35	0.0114
Land Transportation	70	1038	4	0.0039	65	930	9	0.0097
Warehousing and H. T.	43	573	1	0.0017	41	519	5	0.0096
Machinery	249	2951	18	0.0061	230	2563	22	0.0086
Metal Products	100	1143	3	0.0026	91	976	8	0.0082
Nonferrous Metals	39	458	0	0	36	394	3	0.0076
Transportation Eq.	106	1545	4	0.0026	100	1225	9	0.0073
Construction	223	2945	5	0.0017	174	2075	12	0.0058
Marine Transportation	19	249	1	0.0040	16	188	1	0.0053
Iron and Steel	56	732	2	0.0027	49	568	3	0.0053
Mining	9	118	1	0.0085	7	96	0	0

Table A.4: Female board members by sector

We compare the number of female board members in 2004 and 2013. The rows are sorted by the sector-average in 2013.




Figure A.8: Female board members in the corporate network
 Links resemble connectivity on the board and ownership network within the period 2004–2013. Nodes (firms) that appear white do not have any female board member. Nodes in shades of grey have appointant at least one female board member, the node is the darker the earlier the appointment took place.