Journal of Management Science Research Review
https://jmsrr.com/index.php/Journal/about
Volume. 5 Issue No. 2 (2026)
Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

# Board Diversity and Firm Value: Beyond Gender to Cognitive and Experiential Heterogeneity in Corporate Boards

**Dr. Asghar Kamal**
Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sarhad University, Peshawar. Asghar.ba@suit.edu.pk
**Dr. Aamir Ullah**
Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Qurtuba University of Science & IT. aamir.mgt1988@qurtuba.edu.pk.com
**Dr. Muhammad Israr***
Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Corresponding Auhtor Email: misrar04@gmail.com

## Abstract

Purpose – This article disputes the existing emphasis on demographic diversity (and especially gender) in corporate board studies by suggesting that cognitive and experiential heterogeneity- differences in the manner in which directors think, what they know, and in what ways they have encountered the business world- are more likely to affect firm value. Although gender and ethnic diversity are still a factor in the equity and legitimacy, the empirical findings to associate the demographic diversity with the financial performance is at best inconsistent. This paper summarizes current meta-analytic data indicating that cognitive diversity (expertise, experience, industry background) is a stronger predictor of innovation and governance performance as compared to more superficial demographic factors. Methodology and Approach- This theoretical paper is a synthesis of research findings of various meta-analyses (including more than 500 studies) and recent empirical studies in board diversity, cognitive heterogeneity and firm performance. It introduces a model that differentiates between the dimensions of demographic, cognitive, and experiential diversity. Findings - The synthesis has found three important insights: (1) demographic diversity is weak and inconsistent in direct impact on firm financial performance; (2) cognitive diversity, as measured through director dissent, expertise variety, and industry experience heterogeneity, is consistently predictive of board effectiveness and innovation; (3) demographic diversity could facilitate cognitive diversity, but only when board processes (psychological safety, constructive debate) are appropriately nurtured. Originality and Value – This article takes the discussion of diversity beyond check-the-box demographic measures of diversity to a more complex appreciation of what constitutes boards being intellectually resource-rich. It gives practical guidelines of nominating committees to construct cognitively heterogeneous boards.

**Keywords:** Board diversity, cognitive diversity, experiential heterogeneity, firm value, corporate governance, board effectiveness.

## 1. Introduction

During decades, the corporate boardroom has been described as a retreat of homogeneity, an old boys club, of white, male, Ivy-League-educated executives who are about to retire. The boardroom door has slowly been opened by social movements, regulatory reforms and pressure of institutional investors, with quantifiable increases in the gender and ethnic representation of listed firms around the world. A watershed was reached with the enactment of the 2003 gender quota law in Norway, and then in other European countries. In 2025, this discussion has changed radically: diversity will be no longer a peripheral issue but a governance expectation.

But a disturbing contradiction has come up. Although decades of research and millions of corporate funds have been spent on diversity initiatives, the empirical data connecting board diversity to firm financial performance is in impressive shambles. The so-called McKinsey statistic that diverse companies are 39% more likely to outperform, once quoted in the public by one governing scholar recently has been, according to that scholar, disproven multiple times. The Harvard Business Review, which has printed many articles promoting the business case of diversity, has been admonished as putting popularity, and consequently profit, above truth. Worst of all, a systematic review of 184 studies has found that the empirical evidence is only partial, mixed and inconclusive about the consequences of diversity.

This is not to say that diversity does not matter. The solution to the problem, however, could be found in the ways we have defined and quantified diversity. Most of the existing research on board diversity has concentrated on what Harrison and Klein (2007) term as surface-level diversity; the demographic characteristics readily identifiable by the eyes, including gender, race and age. Yet these qualities are at best proxies of underlying differences in the thinking of directors, the knowledge they have and the ways they solve problems. Not all forms of diversity are equally important, as one recent meta-analysis concluded, that they are. The same study concluded that the diversity in nationality which introduces genuinely different informational and cognitive views demonstrates greater impacts on the firm performance as compared to gender or ethnic diversity.

The article suggests that there should be a fundamental reframing. Rather than posing the question as to whether board diversity creates value, we ought to pose the question as to what type of diversity creates value, under what conditions, and how? The data is increasingly indicating that cognitive and experiential heterogeneity, or differences in functional expertise, industry background, approach to problem solving and knowledge structure, are the drivers of board effectiveness. Cognitive diversity can be enabled by demographic diversity yet this relationship is not automatic or inevitable. In the absence of suitable board practices, which foster dissent and incorporate a wider range of views, the demographic minorities may remain tokens with their voices being pushed to the fringes instead of being heard and appreciated.

This article follows in the following way. Section 2 presents three narrow research questions. Section 3 provides a review of theoretical and empirical literature on board diversity, differentiating between demographic, cognitive, and experiential aspects. Section 4 shows tabular synthesized findings. Section 5 addresses implications to theory, practice and policy. Recommendations on future research are given at section 6.

## 2. Research Questions

This article will answer three research questions that are interrelated and based on the gaps identified in the literature:

RQ1: How do demographic diversity (gender, ethnicity, age) and cognitive diversity (expertise, functional background, problem-solving style) contribute to board effectiveness and firm value, relative to each other?

RQ2: How does cognitive heterogeneity become translated into better outcomes in board decision-making and governance?

RQ3: In what circumstances does demographic diversity facilitate cognitive diversity and in what circumstances does it not (i.e. what moderates the diversityperformance relationship)?

## 3. Literature Review

### 3.1 Theoretical Background: Why Diversity May Be Important.

Board diversity is based on theoretical grounds founded on a number of proven pillars in the field of organizational psychology and strategic management. The resource dependence school of thought implies that boards supply the firm with vital resources such as information, legitimacy, links. Directors with a wide background presumably have access to a variety of resources. The upper echelons theory is based on the argument that the results of organizations are indicative of the values and cognitive frames of the top decision-makers. By this reasoning, homogeneous teams have blind spots and groupthink, they lack opportunities and risks that would be noticed by a more diverse team.

The most interesting mechanism, though, is a result of studies in group decision-making. When operating well, diverse teams seek a broader set of alternatives, have more intense discussion, and do not rush to a consensus. According to one practitioner article, not all the riskiest decisions within the

Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

boardroom are made in haste, but rather made in harmony, not in the productive sense, but in the sense of homogeneous thought, deference to a strong CEO and unquestioned beliefs.

Diversity is not, however, a unitary concept. Harrison and Klein (2007) identify three different types: separation (differences in position or opinion along a continuum), variety (differences in kind or category) and disparity (differences in concentration of valued assets). They have varying implications on group functioning. The research on board diversity has generally mixed up these definitions; a female director is regarded as the same as a director with a different functional background; an assumption that cannot be substantiated by theory.

### 3.2 The Demographic Diversity Puzzle: Weak and Inconsistent Effects

Empirical studies on demographic diversity and financial performance of a firm are numerous. Hundreds of studies have been synthesized using meta-analyses, but the inferences have been astonishingly similar in their ambiguity. Post and Byron (2015) conducted a meta-analysis of gender diversity and discovered a small significant positive correlation in the countries where shareholder protections were strong, and no correlation in other countries. A more recent meta-analysis of 398 effect sizes in 35 studies published between 1995 and 2023 found that all types of board diversity could add to the diversity of thinking styles, although not all could do so with unique and private information.

The most prominent fact about this meta-analysis is that access of information is of more importance than the thinking style itself. Gender diversity introduces a variety of viewpoints, and these viewpoints may not be encoded into distinctively valuable information in the privacy. Nationality diversity on the other hand introduces directors who do not work in the same informational set up, have access to different networks and market intelligence. The meta-analysis established that nationality diversity provides more access to private information as compared to gender or ethnicity diversity. This observation is important: it indicates that the value of diversity is conditioned by whether it actually increases the information set of the board, rather than by whether it alters the demographic make-up.

Why then have the results of gender diversity research been so inconsistent? Various reasons have been put forward. First, the connection can be non-linear: one female director can be a token whose voice is suppressed, and three or more can be a critical mass and can shape the dynamics of the board. Second, context is everything. The positive effects are stronger in countries with a high shareholder protection and genderegalitarian cultural norms. Third, most importantly to this article, gender diversity can be a poor proxy of cognitive diversity. Women and men who have pursued similar career paths (e.g. both were former CEOs of large corporations) might believe more alike than they are different.

**3.3 Cognitive Diversity: The Lost Connector**

In case the demographic diversity exhibits weak and inconsistent impacts, the cognitive diversity will provide a brighter picture. Cognitive diversity is the differences in the knowledge structures, areas of expertise, problem-solving styles and information-processing styles of the board members. Cognitive diversity cannot be visually observed, as opposed to demographic features; it has to be based on behavioral cues or background features.

Recently, a meta-analysis that specifically focused on the connection between board diversity and firm innovation compared cognitive and demographic diversity. The findings are quite shocking: there does exist a strong and statistically significant relationship between board diversity and firms innovation, which is contributed by cognitive diversity of board members more than by demographic diversity. The authors suggest that rather than concentrating on choosing board members on the basis of demographic (surface-level) diversity, selections be made on the basis of interplay of the experience, expertise and background demographic traits of the prospective candidates.

Director level analysis evidence gives a more accurate mechanism. A study on director dissent as a behavioral indicator of cognitive diversity discovered that dissimilar individual directors compared to other board members in terms of tenure and experience are more likely to dissent. At the board level, boards that are made up of heterogeneous directors in terms of tenure, experience and gender are more likely to disagree. Most importantly, companies that receive dissent-based proposal rejections, gain value and internal management and reduce risk. This implies that cognitive diversity, which is operationalized as actual disagreement in the boardroom, is a strong predictor of governance quality.

Experience heterogeneity - disparities in industry experience, functional expertise, and career experience - is one dimension of cognitive diversity that is of special importance. Experienced directors have analogical reasoning skills, solving problems in one context and applying them to a new context. Directors that have varied functional backgrounds (finance, operations, marketing, technology) offer different perspective lenses on the strategic decisions. An industry-experience diversity study reported positive impacts on firm value by means of corporate innovation.

### 3.4 The Demographic-to-Cognitive Pipeline: Successful translation Conditions

Demographic diversity and cognitive diversity do not necessarily have a relationship. A board can be homogeneous in terms of cognition but heterogeneous in terms of demographics, i.e. when all of them had followed the same career paths and have similar mental models. On the other hand, a homogeneous board based on demographics can be cognitively varied whereby the members belong to various functional backgrounds and industry settings.

Board process research has found out essential moderators. Psychological safety (the aspect of believing that he/she can raise his/her voice without the fear of being punished) is critical. In its absence, the minority directors can go unheard and their possible valuable opinions will never be heard. The issue of board leadership is critical: when the chair can actively seek opposing opinions and set an example of how to disagree constructively, then diversity will have an opportunity to thrive. The inquiry of the UK Parliament on corporate governance was also provided with evidence that has highlighted that demographic variables of board members are directly related to the way boards are doing their job and they are only indirectly influencing the performance of firms. The quality of debate, the spectrum of alternatives discussed, the strength of assumptions put to test, are cognitive outputs of board processes, which mediate the diversityperformance relationship.

This means that demographic diversity can be regarded as a possible resource, rather than an automatic performance driver. Understanding that potential needs purposeful board process design. The usefulness of a diverse board, as one practitioner commentary says, is only achieved when boards provide a space in which such divergent views are stimulated and incorporated constructively into the decision-making process.

### 3.5 Outside the Business Case: Ethical and Legitimacy Arguments

A significant caveat is justified before going on. The fact that cognitive diversity is more important than demographic diversity in terms of financial performance, should not be misunderstood to mean that demographic diversity lacks significance. Ethical, legitimacy, and stakeholder arguments in support of diverse board representation have strong grounds that can be independent of the financial business case.

Board is a high position of power and influence. According to evidence provided to a UK Parliament, it is significant that the directorships should mirror the labour force since directorships are, in any case, the sources of power and influence. In the UK 47 percent of the labor force is female and large percentages are of ethnic minority backgrounds, but, 62 percent of FTSE 100 boards are homogeneous Caucasian only boards. That kind of underrepresentation is an issue of concern as far as legitimacy is concerned whether the bottom line is impacted or not.

In addition, the lack of demographic diversity can negatively affect the firm value indirectly through reputation damage, stakeholder drive away, or regulatory penalties. The business case in its narrow sense, short-term financial performance, is just a single prism in which to assess diversity. This paper defends cognitive diversity as an addition to demographic diversity, as opposed to its elimination.

## 4. Results

**Table 1: *Comparative Effects of Demographic vs. Cognitive Diversity on Firm Outcomes***

| Outcome Variable | Demographic Diversity (Gender/Ethnicity) | Cognitive/Experiential Diversity | Key Meta-Analysis Source |
|---|---|---|---|
| Financial Performance (ROA, Tobin's Q) | Weak, inconsistent; context-dependent | Moderate positive; mediated by innovation | Post & Byron (2015); Torchia & Solarino (2025) |
| Firm Innovation (patents, R&D intensity) | Small positive | Strong positive; primary driver | Makkonen (2022) |
| Board Monitoring Effectiveness | Mixed; requires critical mass | Positive; via director dissent | Kang, Kim & Oh (2022) |
| Strategic Decision Quality | Indirect; process-mediated | Direct; via range of alternatives | Milliken & Martins (1996) |
| Risk Oversight | Weak evidence | Positive; dissent reduces groupthink | Bernile et al. (2018) |
| Internationalization/ FDI | Moderate (nationality diversity) | Strong (international experience) | Gattai et al. (2022) |

*Source: Author synthesis of meta-analytic findings*

**Table 2: Mechanisms Linking Cognitive Heterogeneity to Board Effectiveness**

| Mechanism | Definition | Evidence | Conditions for Effectiveness |
|---|---|---|---|
| Constructive Dissent | Active disagreement with proposals; alternative solution generation | Dissenting directors show 2-3x higher likelihood of value improvement post-rejection | Psychological safety; chair facilitation |
| Information Elaboration | Deep processing and integration of unique information held by different members | Nationality diversity provides unique private information not available to homogeneous boards | Sufficient time for discussion; absence of status hierarchies |
| Analogical Reasoning | Transferring solutions from one domain/industry to another | Industry-experience diversity positively associated with innovation | Cognitive flexibility; shared vocabulary across domains |
| Blind Spot Detection | Identifying risks and opportunities that homogeneous groups miss | Homogeneous boards show systematic overconfidence and strategic persistence | Explicit assumption-testing routines |
| Stakeholder Perspective-Taking | Considering decisions from multiple stakeholder viewpoints | Particularly salient for ESG and reputational decisions | Empathy; stakeholder engagement mechanisms |

*Source: Author synthesis*

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Theoretical Implications

These results summarized in this paper have a number of significant implications to governance theory. To start with, they imply that upper echelons theory has to be refined. Although the original formulation by Hambrick and Mason focused on demographic traits as a proxy to cognitive frames, we have evidence that indicates that cognitive diversity can be directly measured using behavioral (such as dissent) or background (such as functional experience and industry experience) indicators, and that this is theoretically preferable. Further studies need to go beyond demographic proxies to a more straightforward measure of cognitive heterogeneity.

Second, resource dependence perspective is more specific. Not every resource is equally valuable; a non-redundant piece of private information that is not already known by the current board members seems to have especially severe consequences. This is an indication that boards must not only be assessed in terms of whether they are diverse but also the non-redundancy of their information network. A director with knowledge similar to that of the other directors is not adding any value despite his or her demographic features.

Third, it is important that the literature on group decision-making in the context of corporate governance should pay more attention to contingencies that involve boards. The boards are not similar to any other decision making groups: they seldom meet, they have big status disparities, they are highly exposed to liability and they must work under time pressure. Such circumstances can either enhance or diminish the impacts of diversity. Indicatively the stakes associated with board decisions can be very high, which might result in social loafing or deference to authority and hence that the advantage of diversity might be stifled unless there are specific safeguards over the process involved.

**5.2 Implications on Board Composition**

In the case of nominating committees and board search firms, the implications are quite clear yet difficult. The existing trend of focusing on demographic measures, although useful in equity terms, is inadequate to construct cognitively heterogeneous boards. Search processes need to explicitly evaluate:

1. Functional diversity: Does the candidate possess expertise in an area that is not represented (e.g., technology, supply chain, cybersecurity, human capital)?
2. Industry diversity: Has the candidate been employed in industries that have varying competitive forces, regulation, or business models?
3. Cognitive style: Does the candidate solve problems in a different way-more analytically vs. intuitively, more cautiously vs. opportunistically?
4. Network non-redundancy: Does the candidate possess access to information, talent or relationships that are not already present among the current directors?

Nonetheless, the assessment of cognitive diversity is not as easy as counting demographics. It involves thorough interviewing, reference checking and occasionally psychometric evaluation. Executive search agencies that have traditionally had a limited pool of candidates attracted through the ranks of

Online ISSN: 3006-2047
Print ISSN: 3006-2039

CEO and CFOs might have to dramatically increase their networks. According to one commentator on governance, directors must broaden their talent pool beyond the conventional executive pools to find candidates with alternative sectoral, international, cultural and functional experiences.

**5.3 Practical Implication of Board Processes**

A cognitively diverse board will not achieve its potential because board processes will hush dissent and impose conformity. There are a number of evidence-based process interventions:

Development of psychological safety: The chairs must clearly welcome dissent opinions, appreciate directors who express worries, and demonstrate constructive conflict. Students indicate that diversity is not a better predictor of team learning as compared to psychological safety.

Pre-meeting preparation: Directors need to get materials well before the meeting so that they can form independent points of view. The JIT delivery of information is more about consensus than deliberation.

Devil advocate procedures: Alternating the appointment of a director to make a formal objection to proposals, whether you agree with the proposal or not, has been found to enhance the quality of decisions in other governance settings.

Reflection after the decision: Boards ought to occasionally review previous decisions, and examine whether the dissenting opinions were rightly taken into account and whether the results would have been different had other processes been used.

**5.4 Policy Implications**

To regulators and stock exchanges contemplating the use of diversity requirements, the data indicates that there should be caution with regards to quotas that are tightly focused. Gender quotas will not lead to a proper improvement in governance, but instead, tokenism, unless cognitive diversity and processes in boards are considered. More encouraging are those policies that:

- Make board skills matrices and experience inventories disclosed, not demographic counts.
- Require board effectiveness reviews annually, which should measure the quality of processes, such as psychological safety and dissent norms.
- Promote compliant or clarify reporting of incorporating diverse views in the decision-making of boards.

Support voluntary goals on various aspects of diversity (gender, ethnicity, age, functional background, international experience)

The voluntary scheme in the UK led by Lord Davies and the 30% Club had produced substantial gender diversity gains without the side effects of hard quotas that may often ensue. An analogous voluntary strategy, redesigned to include cognitive and experiential diversity, could be more productive than police decrees.

### 5.5 Limitations and Future Research Directions

There are a number of limitations in this article that can open up research opportunities in the future. Firstly, the evidence base is largely correlational. It is not easy to find causality in the relationship between cognitive diversity and firm value since boards are endogenously with members chosen by boards. Quasi-experimental designs like natural experiments made by the death of directors or regulatory shocks provide promising solutions.

Second, the majority of the studies have only analyzed the dimensions of diversity separately, whereas boards consist of people who are different on several attributes at the same time. What are the interactions among the different dimensions of diversity? Does gender diversity increase or reduce the impact of cognitive diversity? The effects of interaction are not well studied.

Third, the expenses of diversity, such as coordination challenges, interpersonal conflict, and slower decisions have not gotten the same attention as benefits. In which circumstances do the costs exceed the benefits? This probably is determined by dynamism in the industry, complexity of tasks, and the quality of the board leadership.

Fourth, there is limited comparative international research. The impact of diversity is probably mitigated significantly by cultural norms of hierarchy, dissent and gender role. The fact that nationality diversity is important in culturally tight societies implies that there are good cross-national research prospects..

Lastly, research that may be conducted in the future should go beyond firm financial performance as an outcome variable. Board diversity can have an impact on stakeholder outcomes (employee satisfaction, customer loyalty, community relations), innovation portfolios, risk exposure, and long-term sustainability that is not reflective of quarterly financial data.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper has presented the need to reframe the diversity discussion in the board. Following the decades of studies that have yielded inconsistent results of demographic diversity on financial performance, it is time to move beyond superficial features and examine cognitive and experiential heterogeneity that actually leads to effective boards. It has been demonstrated consistently through meta-analysis that cognitive diversity, i.e., differences in expertise, functional background, industry experience, and problem-solving styles, have stronger, more consistent impacts on innovation, monitoring quality, and strategic decision-making than either gender or ethnic diversity does.

It is not an argument on the lack of demographic diversity. The ethical, legitimacy and stakeholder considerations present the strong arguments to have boards representing the populations to which they belong. Instead, this article states that demographic diversity should be viewed as a possible facilitator of cognitive diversity and not a goal per se. In the absence of board procedures that create a sense of psychological security, promote healthy dissent, and incorporate varied views, demographic minorities are at risk of becoming tokens whose voices are overlooked.

There are important practical implications. The nominating committees need to evaluate the candidates based not only on their demographics but also on the knowledge that cannot be duplicated and the truly diverse perspectives that they can offer. Board chairs are advised to devise mechanisms that expose disagreement and avoid early consensus. Regulators ought to promote the reporting of skills matrices and process assessments, rather than demographic numbers.

The future boards will be those that are most effective and not those that merely tick demographic boxes. They will be those that gather together, in fact, heterogeneous sets of thinkers-directors who perceive the world in different ways, who have had different experience and have different knowledge structures, and they then contrive to make the differences work to their advantage, not to volve into conflict. Going beyond gender into cognitive and experiential heterogeneity is not merely an intellectual game; it is a governance must-have to establish value that is more enduring.

**References**

Adams, R. B. (2016). Women on boards: The superheroes of tomorrow? The Leadership Quarterly, 27(3), 371-386.

Bernile, G., Bhagwat, V., & Yonker, S. (2018). Board diversity, firm risk, and corporate policies. Journal of Financial Economics, 127(3), 588-612.

Briner, R. (2025, May 2). Case study: Should we drop our board diversity goals? [LinkedIn post].

Choudhury, B. (2023). Written evidence on corporate governance (CGV0160). UK Parliament, House of Commons.

Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 32(4), 1199-1228.

Huang, P., Lu, Y., & Wu, J. (2023). Does board diversity in industry-experience boost firm value? The role of corporate innovation. Economic Modelling, 120, 106504.

Kang, J. K., Kim, S., & Oh, S. (2022). Does board demographic diversity enhance cognitive diversity and monitoring? The Accounting Review, 97(4), 123-148.

Makkonen, T. (2022). Board diversity and firm innovation: A meta-analysis. European Journal of Innovation Management, 25(6), 941-960.

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. Academy of Management Review, 21(2), 402-433.

Nielsen, S., & Huse, M. (2010). The contribution of women on boards of directors: Going beyond the surface. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 18(2), 136-148.

Post, C., & Byron, K. (2015). Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. Academy of Management Journal, 58(5), 1546-1571.

Raymond, D., & Brett, A. (2025). Stepping outside the echo chamber: Why a diversity of perspectives matters in the boardroom. Directors & Boards.

Tasheva, S., & Hillman, A. J. (2019). Integrating diversity at different levels: Multi-level human capital, social capital, and demographic diversity and their implications for team effectiveness. Academy of Management Review, 44(4), 746-765.

Torchia, M., & Solarino, A. (2025). Gender, ethnic and nationality board diversity and firm performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Management & Governance, 26(1), 233-252.

Zattoni, A., & Cuomo, F. (2022). Board diversity's antecedents and consequences: A review and research agenda. The Leadership Quarterly, 33(6), 101-125.