

Corporate Governance Architecture, Ownership Structure, Institutional Context, and Financial Performance

Céline Mbarga¹ and Jean Ngoula ²

¹ University of Douala - Cameroon

² University of Douala - Cameroon

Citation: Mbarga, C., & Ngoula, J. (2026). Corporate governance architecture, ownership structure, institutional context, and financial performance.

Journal of Studies in Corporate & Market Finance, 1(1), 83–101.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23222392>

Copyright: © This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between corporate governance, ownership structure and financial performance by synthesizing recent empirical evidence on board architecture, ownership concentration, family control, institutional investors, foreign ownership and integrated governance configurations. The literature indicates that governance mechanisms rarely produce uniform financial consequences across firms and countries. Board independence, gender diversity, leadership structure, audit committees and board size can strengthen monitoring, advisory capacity and investor confidence, but their effectiveness depends on institutional conditions, ownership distribution and organizational characteristics. Ownership concentration can reduce managerial agency problems while simultaneously increasing the risk of controlling-shareholder entrenchment. Family, institutional, foreign and state ownership similarly generate heterogeneous effects according to shareholder incentives, governance quality and economic conditions. Cross-country and emerging-market evidence further demonstrates that formal governance reforms do not automatically translate into stronger corporate outcomes unless they modify actual monitoring capacity, managerial incentives and control structures. The overall literature therefore supports a contingent interpretation of governance-performance relationships in which financial outcomes emerge from interactions among board structures, ownership characteristics, institutional environments and firm-specific conditions rather than from isolated governance mechanisms.

Keywords: Corporate governance; Ownership structure; Board characteristics; Firm performance; Institutional environment

JEL classification: G30; G32; G34; L25; M14

Introduction

Corporate governance occupies a central position in the study of corporate financial performance because it determines how authority, monitoring responsibilities and control rights are distributed among managers, boards and shareholders. Governance arrangements influence the capacity of firms to supervise managerial decisions, limit opportunistic behavior, allocate resources and protect different categories of investors. Contemporary research has therefore moved beyond the simple assumption that adopting formally recognized governance mechanisms necessarily improves corporate outcomes. Board independence, leadership separation,



board size, gender diversity and specialized committees may strengthen monitoring and strategic advice, but their contribution varies according to the information available to directors, their effective authority and the institutional environment surrounding the firm. Similar complexity characterizes ownership structures. Concentrated ownership can facilitate monitoring by shareholders with sufficient incentives and resources to supervise managers, but excessive concentration may generate entrenchment and conflicts between controlling and minority shareholders. Consequently, governance should be understood as an interconnected system rather than a collection of independent structural indicators. Financial performance reflects the way individual mechanisms interact with one another and with the organizational and institutional circumstances in which firms operate.

The relationship between ownership and governance becomes particularly important in environments characterized by concentrated shareholdings, family control, state participation or significant institutional and foreign investment. Different shareholder categories possess different objectives, monitoring capacities, investment horizons and access to information, making ownership identity an important determinant of governance outcomes. Family shareholders may contribute long-term commitment and organizational continuity while simultaneously creating entrenchment concerns. Institutional investors can strengthen managerial discipline when they engage actively in monitoring, whereas passive or conflicted institutions may provide fewer governance benefits. Foreign investors may contribute capital, knowledge and managerial capabilities, although the performance consequences of their participation depend on domestic institutions, market conditions and their integration with existing ownership structures. These observations suggest that corporate financial performance cannot be explained through ownership concentration or board composition separately. Instead, the literature increasingly emphasizes combinations of governance mechanisms, shareholder characteristics and institutional arrangements. This paper reviews these relationships by examining board architecture, ownership structure and integrated empirical evidence across developed, emerging and developing markets in order to clarify why apparently similar governance mechanisms frequently generate different financial outcomes.

1. Board Architecture and Internal Corporate Governance

1.1. Board Independence, Leadership Structure and Board Size

Li et al. (2015) show that the performance contribution of independent directors becomes stronger when ownership concentration declines and firms are less dominated by state control. This implies that board independence cannot be evaluated separately from the distribution of control rights because the ability of outside directors to influence corporate decisions depends on the power retained by dominant shareholders. Liu et al. (2015) reinforce this interpretation by showing that greater board independence is positively associated with operating performance in Chinese firms, although the strength of the relationship varies according to ownership conditions. Their findings imply that independent directors can perform a monitoring role even in concentrated-ownership environments, but their effectiveness remains institutionally conditioned. Fuzi et al. (2016) add that merely increasing the proportion of formally independent directors does not guarantee improved performance when directors lack sufficient information, influence or monitoring capacity. Rashid (2018) provides a compatible qualification from Bangladesh by finding limited evidence that formal independence alone improves firm performance. Taken together, these contributions imply that the effectiveness of independent directors de-



depends less on numerical board-composition requirements than on whether governance arrangements provide them with sufficient authority and genuine independence to constrain insiders and contribute meaningfully to strategic decisions.

Li and Roberts (2018) show that mandatory independent-director requirements in New Zealand did not produce convincing systematic improvements in corporate performance. This implies that regulatory changes in board composition should not automatically be interpreted as economically effective simply because they increase formal compliance with governance standards. Mohapatra (2016) provides a more differentiated implication by showing that independent directors in India may contribute more clearly to market valuation than to some accounting-based performance measures. This suggests that governance reform can strengthen investor confidence or external perceptions of monitoring quality before producing comparable changes in operating profitability. Merendino and Melville (2019) reinforce this contingent interpretation by showing that board characteristics and firm performance do not follow a simple linear relationship because director roles, board composition and organizational circumstances interact. Fuzi et al. (2016) similarly emphasize that substantive independence matters more than the formal proportion of outside directors. Together, these contributions imply that the performance consequences of board independence depend on both how governance is measured and the institutional conditions surrounding implementation. Mandatory independence may alter board structures, but its economic value emerges only when independent directors possess the information, authority and organizational relevance necessary to affect corporate decisions and investor perceptions.

Chang et al. (2019) show that the performance consequences of CEO duality depend partly on economic policy uncertainty, implying that concentrated leadership can generate different outcomes as external conditions change. Their findings suggest that combining the chief executive and chair positions may create agency concerns under some circumstances while providing faster information processing and more centralized decision-making under others. Yeung (2018) similarly demonstrates that board size has a nonlinear relationship with corporate performance because additional directors can initially provide information and resources but eventually create coordination costs. The influence of directors' cultural backgrounds further implies that board resources are not converted into performance uniformly. Merendino and Melville (2019) reinforce this broader contingency perspective by showing that governance effects depend on interactions between board composition, director roles and organizational circumstances rather than universal numerical thresholds. Liu et al. (2015) add that even the contribution of board independence varies according to ownership conditions. Considered together, these contributions imply that board structure should not be evaluated through isolated governance indicators. Independence, leadership concentration and board size generate performance consequences through interactions with ownership, external uncertainty and internal coordination, making context-sensitive governance arrangements more appropriate than standardized prescriptions applied uniformly across firms.

1.2. Board Gender, Demographic and Cultural Diversity

Terjesen et al. (2016) show that female representation and board independence can operate jointly in shaping both accounting and market performance, implying that gender diversity should not be evaluated independently of the broader governance structure. Their findings suggest that women directors may strengthen monitoring and advisory functions when their presence is supported by effective board independence. Sanan (2016) reinforces this interpretation by showing that the proportion of independent women directors is positively associated with ROA and Tobin's Q among Indian listed firms. This implies that the governance contribution of



women may depend partly on whether they possess genuine independence rather than occupying board positions symbolically. Post and Byron (2015) provide broader meta-analytic support by finding a positive relationship between female board representation and accounting returns, while showing that the association with market performance depends more strongly on national institutional conditions. Kılıç and Kuzey (2016) add evidence from Turkey indicating favorable performance implications from greater gender diversity, although results vary according to the diversity and performance measures employed. Taken together, these contributions imply that gender-diverse boards can contribute to corporate performance when representation is accompanied by effective independence, appropriate governance roles and institutional conditions that allow directors to exercise monitoring and advisory functions meaningfully.

Owen and Temesvary (2018) show that the performance effects of board gender diversity can be nonlinear, with stronger benefits emerging only when female representation reaches a meaningful level and when banks possess adequate capitalization. This implies that isolated appointments may be insufficient to alter board processes and that organizational conditions influence whether diversity becomes economically consequential. Conyon and He (2017) reinforce this heterogeneous interpretation by showing that the relationship between boardroom gender diversity and performance varies across the performance distribution. Their findings imply that diversity can operate differently in weaker and stronger performing firms, making average effects potentially misleading. Gordini and Rancati (2017) similarly distinguish between the mere presence of women and broader gender diversity, showing that more meaningful diversity is associated with stronger financial and market outcomes. Marinova et al. (2016), however, do not identify a robust direct relationship between female representation and performance in Dutch and Danish firms. This result implies that numerical representation alone may not capture board influence when critical mass, responsibilities and selection processes differ across firms. Together, these contributions suggest that diversity effects depend on the level, structure and organizational context of female participation rather than on the simple presence of women directors.

Bennouri et al. (2018) show that the contribution of female directors to firm performance depends partly on director-specific characteristics such as education, expertise, independence and board position. This implies that gender alone cannot explain differences in governance outcomes because the resources and authority brought by individual directors shape their effectiveness. Post and Byron (2015) complement this perspective by showing that national shareholder protection and gender-related institutions condition the relationship between female board representation and market performance. Their findings imply that institutional environments determine how effectively firms and investors can translate board diversity into economic outcomes. Marinova et al. (2016) further demonstrate that female representation does not automatically generate measurable performance improvements, suggesting that selection processes and board responsibilities must be considered alongside demographic composition. Terjesen et al. (2016) add that gender diversity interacts with board independence, indicating that multiple governance characteristics can reinforce one another rather than operating separately. Considered together, these contributions imply that the performance implications of women on boards emerge from an interaction between individual qualifications, board structure and institutional context. Gender diversity is therefore more likely to influence corporate outcomes when women directors possess substantive authority, relevant expertise and governance conditions that enable their participation to affect monitoring and strategic decision-making.



1.3. Audit Committees, Monitoring and Internal Governance Mechanisms

Chang (2015) shows that corporate governance should be understood as a system composed of interacting internal and external mechanisms rather than as a collection of isolated board characteristics. This implies that performance effects can arise from substitution or complementarity among directors, ownership structures and external monitoring arrangements. Kallamu and Mohd Saat (2015) reinforce this perspective by showing that audit committee characteristics related to independence and monitoring capacity are associated with corporate performance among Malaysian finance companies. Their findings imply that specialized committees can reduce information asymmetry when their organization and quality permit effective supervision. Ali and Bin Nasir (2015) provide compatible evidence from Pakistan by showing that board characteristics and audit committee arrangements help explain differences in manufacturing-firm performance, which suggests that internal governance becomes particularly relevant where external investor protection is comparatively limited. Bansal and Sharma (2016), however, show that greater audit committee independence and meeting frequency do not automatically generate additional performance gains among Indian firms, even though other mechanisms such as board size and CEO–chair duality are positively associated with performance. Taken together, these contributions imply that formal committee structures are insufficient by themselves. Governance effectiveness depends on how audit committees, boards, ownership arrangements and other monitoring mechanisms interact within specific institutional and organizational contexts.

Wijethilake and Ekanayake (2020) show that the performance implications of CEO duality depend on CEO informal power and the extent of board involvement. This implies that combining the chief executive and chair positions cannot be classified as uniformly beneficial or detrimental because actual decision-making power extends beyond formal organizational titles. Kao et al. (2019) provide a contrasting governance configuration by showing that higher board independence, smaller boards, a two-tier board structure and separation of the CEO and chair positions are associated with stronger performance among Taiwanese listed companies. Their findings imply that governance structures emphasizing monitoring and reduced leadership concentration can improve firm outcomes under particular institutional conditions. Sheikh et al. (2018) broaden this relationship by demonstrating that executive compensation interacts with governance structures in shaping performance, suggesting that managerial incentives cannot be designed independently of board oversight. Singh et al. (2018) further show that governance arrangements have observable consequences for Tobin's Q, indicating that investors incorporate expectations about governance quality into firm valuation. Together, these contributions imply that leadership structure, board monitoring and incentive contracts operate jointly in determining corporate outcomes. Governance design should therefore consider the actual distribution of managerial power and board involvement rather than relying exclusively on formal structural indicators.

Pucheta-Martínez et al. (2018) show that board composition can influence financial reporting quality, corporate performance and CSR disclosure simultaneously, implying that governance mechanisms may first affect transparency and organizational practices before their consequences become fully visible in conventional profitability measures. Singh et al. (2018) complement this perspective by emphasizing market valuation, where governance arrangements can influence expectations about future corporate outcomes even when immediate accounting effects remain limited. Kao et al. (2019) extend this relationship by showing that board architecture operates alongside ownership structure, with blockholder, institutional, foreign and family ownership displaying positive associations with performance in their setting. Kallamu and



Mohd Saat (2015) add that the monitoring capacity of audit committees also matters for corporate outcomes, suggesting that specialized governance structures contribute to the wider information and control environment of the firm. Considered together, these contributions imply that governance performance should be evaluated multidimensionally rather than through a single accounting indicator. Board composition, ownership, specialized committees and transparency mechanisms can affect reporting behavior, investor perceptions and financial outcomes through different channels, meaning that improvements in governance may appear at different stages and through different measures of organizational performance.

2. Ownership Structure and Firm Financial Performance

2.1. Ownership Concentration, Blockholders and Managerial Control

Hamadi and Heinen (2015) show that the relationship between ownership concentration and firm performance is nonlinear, implying that additional control by dominant shareholders can initially strengthen monitoring but may become detrimental when excessive influence creates opportunities for entrenchment. Gaur et al. (2015) reinforce this contingency perspective by demonstrating that the performance consequences of concentrated ownership depend partly on board characteristics. Their findings imply that internal governance structures determine whether controlling shareholders primarily contribute monitoring benefits or create risks of private-benefit extraction. Nguyen et al. (2015) add an institutional dimension by showing that national governance quality modifies the concentration–performance relationship. Stronger external institutions can therefore influence both the effectiveness of blockholder monitoring and the extent to which minority shareholders are protected from dominant owners. Hanafi et al. (2018) further demonstrate that ownership effects can change under severe financial pressure, as concentrated shareholders may provide stronger commitment and monitoring during crisis periods while entrenchment risks remain present. Taken together, these contributions imply that ownership concentration cannot be classified as uniformly beneficial or detrimental. Its performance consequences depend on the level of concentration, board structure, national governance quality and prevailing macro-financial conditions, which jointly determine the balance between monitoring advantages and controlling-shareholder entrenchment.

Wang et al. (2019) show that ownership concentration produces different corporate outcomes according to the identity of the controlling shareholder, implying that identical ownership percentages can correspond to substantially different monitoring incentives and strategic objectives. Phung and Mishra (2016) reinforce this interpretation in Vietnam by identifying nonlinear and ownership-specific relationships among government, managerial and other concentrated shareholders. Their findings imply that ownership identity determines how controlling investors use their information advantages and intervention capacity within corporate decision-making. Rafique and Al-Mamun (2016) similarly demonstrate that the distribution and identity of ownership rights influence firm performance, suggesting that aggregate concentration ratios can conceal important differences among categories of shareholders. Alabdullah (2018) extends this reasoning to Jordanian firms, where concentrated shareholdings create a governance environment in which conflicts involving controlling and minority shareholders may become more important than the traditional separation between managers and dispersed owners. Together, these contributions imply that ownership structure should be treated as multidimensional. Concentration indicates the degree of control, but shareholder identity determines the objectives, incentives and governance behavior associated with that control. Performance effects therefore depend on who holds dominant positions as much as on how concentrated ownership itself becomes.



Gryko et al. (2024) show that ownership concentration and the identity of significant shareholders produce differentiated performance effects among Polish firms, implying that post-transition institutional settings continue to condition how controlling owners influence corporate outcomes. Nguyen et al. (2015) provide a complementary explanation by demonstrating that national governance quality alters the relationship between concentrated ownership and performance. Their findings suggest that stronger external institutions can constrain private-benefit extraction while preserving some monitoring advantages associated with large shareholders. Gaur et al. (2015) add that board structure also modifies these effects, indicating that internal governance mechanisms can either reinforce or restrain the influence of concentrated owners. Wang et al. (2019) further show that ownership identity matters because different controlling shareholders pursue different strategic objectives even when concentration levels are similar. Considered together, these contributions imply that ownership-performance relationships emerge from interactions among shareholder identity, internal board arrangements and external institutional protections. Concentrated ownership may improve monitoring in some settings while generating entrenchment in others, making universal prescriptions regarding optimal ownership concentration inappropriate. Effective governance therefore requires attention to both the distribution of voting rights and the institutional mechanisms that determine how dominant shareholders exercise their control.

2.2. Family Ownership, Family Governance and Performance

Maseda et al. (2019) show that the relationship between family board ownership and firm performance is nonlinear, with an S-shaped pattern that changes as the degree of family control increases. Their findings imply that family influence can produce different economic consequences at different ownership levels rather than generating a stable family premium or discount. Poutziouris et al. (2015) reinforce this interpretation by showing that performance depends on the extent and form of family involvement in listed companies. Their results suggest that stewardship, long-term commitment and concentrated monitoring can coexist with entrenchment when family control becomes particularly strong. Wang and Shailer (2017) extend this perspective to emerging markets by showing that family ownership can compensate for weak external monitoring, although institutional quality and governance arrangements condition whether this advantage is realized. Saleh et al. (2017) add that the performance effects of family and other concentrated ownership categories can change during periods of economic disruption. Taken together, these contributions imply that family ownership should not be interpreted as a uniform governance mechanism. Its performance consequences depend on the intensity of family control, institutional environment and macroeconomic conditions, which determine whether commitment and monitoring advantages dominate potential entrenchment and private-benefit extraction.

Memili and Misra (2015) show that governance provisions interact with the extent of family involvement, implying that formal agency-control mechanisms do not necessarily operate identically in family and non-family corporations. Their findings suggest that governance effectiveness depends on how formal controls are combined with family influence rather than on the simple adoption of conventional governance practices. Bhatt (2017) reinforces this interpretation by showing that board structures remain relevant in Indian family firms even when controlling families retain substantial influence. Independent and external directors can provide monitoring and strategic resources, but their contribution depends on the degree of authority available to them. Che and Langli (2015) extend this governance perspective to private family firms, where concentrated ownership reduces some traditional manager–shareholder conflicts while potentially intensifying tensions between controlling families and other stakeholders.



Binacci et al. (2016) add that professionalization through non-family managers generates differentiated performance effects because external managers vary in human capital, characteristics and governance positions. Together, these contributions imply that family-firm performance depends on the configuration of ownership, board structure and managerial professionalization. Effective governance therefore requires balancing the informational and commitment advantages of family control with formal monitoring and external managerial expertise rather than assuming that family influence alone provides sufficient organizational discipline.

Hansen et al. (2020) demonstrate that the relative performance of family firms changes across the business cycle, implying that family ownership advantages or disadvantages are contingent on economic conditions rather than structurally fixed. Their findings suggest that conservative financing, long-term orientation and family commitment may provide resilience during some phases while other governance constraints become more consequential in different circumstances. Saleh et al. (2017) provide compatible evidence by showing that the effects of different ownership categories changed around the global financial crisis, indicating that controlling shareholders differ in their capacity and willingness to support firms during external shocks. Maseda et al. (2019) add an internal family dimension by showing that generational involvement modifies the nonlinear relationship between family board ownership and performance. This implies that succession and changes in family participation can alter the governance consequences of ownership concentration over time. Poutziouris et al. (2015) further show that the form and degree of family involvement determine whether stewardship advantages or entrenchment costs become more prominent. Considered together, these contributions imply that family-firm performance is dynamic and context-dependent. Ownership intensity, generational structure and macroeconomic conditions jointly influence whether family control strengthens organizational resilience or creates governance costs that constrain corporate performance.

2.3. Institutional, Foreign and State Ownership

Lin and Fu (2017) show that institutional investors can contribute positively to firm performance when their incentives support active monitoring rather than passive or conflicted ownership. Their findings imply that institutional shareholders should not be treated as a homogeneous category because monitoring intensity depends on investment horizons, business relationships and the degree of independence from corporate insiders. He et al. (2019) reinforce this interpretation by showing that institutional participation in Chinese private-equity placements can strengthen monitoring and improve subsequent corporate outcomes. Their evidence suggests that sophisticated outside investors can influence capital allocation and managerial discipline when they possess both incentives and mechanisms to intervene. Abedin et al. (2022) extend this perspective by distinguishing domestic and foreign institutional shareholders and showing that board structure interacts with ownership effects. This implies that institutional monitoring is partly conditioned by internal board arrangements rather than operating independently. Zhang and Kyaw (2017) further demonstrate that institutional, state, legal-person and other ownership categories generate different performance consequences because shareholders possess distinct objectives and capabilities. Taken together, these contributions imply that ownership identity matters as much as ownership concentration. Institutional investors can improve governance, but their effectiveness depends on their incentives, origin, monitoring capacity and interaction with the board structure surrounding corporate decision-making.

Carney et al. (2019) show that the performance implications of foreign ownership depend strongly on national institutional systems. Their findings imply that the capital, technology and managerial capabilities introduced by foreign investors do not automatically generate superior



outcomes when ownership restrictions, weak institutions or limited local embeddedness constrain their effective deployment. Wang et al. (2018) provide a complementary explanation from China by showing that global capital interacts with domestic ownership structures and local institutional arrangements. This suggests that the value of foreign ownership is produced through institutional complementarities rather than through an unconditional foreign-investor advantage. Ali et al. (2018) add a regional dimension by demonstrating that the performance effects of different ownership categories vary across Chinese regions with different levels of institutional development. Gu et al. (2019) further show that foreign shareholders influence performance partly through international diversification, while competitive conditions modify the magnitude of this relationship. Together, these contributions imply that foreign ownership should be interpreted as an institutionally and organizationally contingent governance mechanism. Its performance benefits depend on whether foreign investors can combine their resources with supportive local institutions, appropriate domestic ownership structures and market conditions that permit international capabilities to be translated into firm-level value.

Al-Gamrh et al. (2020) show that foreign ownership and board independence generate differentiated effects across financial and social performance in UAE firms, implying that governance mechanisms cannot be evaluated adequately through a single outcome measure. Their findings suggest that ownership and board structures may influence economic and non-financial objectives through distinct channels. Abedin et al. (2022) reinforce this joint-governance perspective by showing that institutional ownership interacts with board structure in shaping firm performance. This implies that the effectiveness of outside shareholders depends partly on whether internal governance arrangements support or constrain their monitoring role. Gu et al. (2019) similarly demonstrate that the effects of foreign ownership are mediated by international diversification and moderated by competitive conditions, indicating that ownership influence operates through identifiable organizational and market mechanisms rather than directly. Lin and Fu (2017) add that institutional investors themselves differ in monitoring incentives and investment horizons, which affects their contribution to corporate outcomes. Considered together, these contributions imply that institutional and foreign shareholders generate performance effects through interaction with boards, organizational strategies and market conditions. Governance outcomes therefore depend not simply on the presence of sophisticated outside owners but on whether their incentives and resources are compatible with the internal and external structures through which corporate control is exercised.

3. Integrated Corporate Governance–Performance Evidence

3.1. Cross-Country and Developed-Market Evidence

Paniagua et al. (2018) show that ownership, board structure and financial performance are connected through nonlinear and interdependent relationships, implying that no single governance mechanism can be treated as universally optimal. Their findings suggest that performance emerges from combinations of ownership concentration, board characteristics and other control arrangements rather than isolated governance prescriptions. Kyere and Ausloos (2021) reinforce this interpretation by showing that different corporate governance mechanisms produce positive, negative or insignificant effects depending on the specific practice and performance measure considered. Malik and Makhdoom (2016) add that governance remains associated with performance even among very large multinational corporations, although organizational scale, complex ownership structures and international operations alter how monitoring mechanisms function. Bhagat and Bolton (2019) further emphasize the importance of incen-



tives by showing that director stock ownership remains informative for subsequent performance, while broad governance indices provide less consistent explanatory power. Taken together, these contributions imply that corporate governance should be interpreted as a configuration of interdependent mechanisms rather than a checklist of formal practices. Effective governance depends on how ownership, board structures and director incentives complement one another within the particular organizational environment in which corporate decisions are made.

Zattoni et al. (2017) demonstrate substantial cross-country heterogeneity in the consequences of board independence, implying that formally similar board structures can produce different performance outcomes across institutional systems. Their findings suggest that legal protections, governance traditions and national arrangements influence whether independent directors can exercise meaningful monitoring and advisory functions. Uribe-Bohorquez et al. (2018) reinforce this conclusion by explicitly showing that national institutional quality moderates the relationship between board independence and firm performance. This indicates that outside directors are neither automatic value creators nor inherently ineffective, since their contribution depends on external institutions supporting their authority and independence. Akbar et al. (2016) add an econometric qualification by showing that accounting for endogeneity changes the apparent importance of several conventional governance variables. Their results imply that observed governance–performance relationships may partly reflect reverse causality or unobserved firm characteristics. Kyere and Ausloos (2021) further show that governance mechanisms generate heterogeneous effects across performance indicators. Together, these contributions imply that credible assessment of governance requires attention to both institutional context and empirical methodology. Formal board characteristics should therefore be evaluated alongside the national environment that determines their effectiveness and the econometric procedures needed to distinguish genuine governance effects from endogenous relationships. García-Meca et al. (2015) show that different forms of board diversity generate distinct performance effects, with gender diversity associated with stronger bank performance while greater nationality diversity can introduce communication and coordination costs. Their findings imply that diversity simultaneously provides additional resources and creates integration challenges. Frijns et al. (2016) reinforce this trade-off by documenting negative relationships between national cultural diversity and both Tobin's Q and ROA, although these adverse effects weaken among complex firms and companies with extensive foreign operations. This suggests that organizational experience with international complexity can improve firms' capacity to manage culturally diverse boards. Zattoni et al. (2017) provide a broader institutional interpretation by showing that board effectiveness varies across national governance systems, meaning that the contribution of diverse directors can also depend on the legal and institutional environment in which they operate. Malik and Makhdoom (2016) add that multinational scale and organizational complexity alter how governance mechanisms contribute to corporate outcomes. Considered together, these contributions imply that board diversity should not be regarded as uniformly beneficial or detrimental. Its performance consequences depend on the type of diversity involved, firms' ability to manage coordination demands, their degree of international complexity and the institutional context surrounding board activity.

3.2. Integrated Evidence from Emerging and Developing Markets

Puni and Anlesinya (2020) show that board composition, board activities, committees, leadership arrangements and ownership concentration can generate differentiated effects across profitability and market-based outcomes. Their findings imply that governance effectiveness depends on the interaction among several internal mechanisms rather than on a single formal



characteristic. Darko et al. (2016) reinforce this interpretation in Ghana by jointly considering director characteristics, board structure, ownership and corporate control. Their results suggest that ownership concentration and board arrangements represent interconnected responses to agency problems rather than independent governance devices. Pillai and Al-Malkawi (2018) extend this multidimensional perspective across GCC countries, demonstrating that ownership, board characteristics and external controls explain differences in firm performance, although the effects vary according to the performance measure and empirical specification employed. Buallay et al. (2017) provide similar evidence from Saudi Arabia by showing that governance indicators do not affect ROA, ROE and market valuation uniformly. Taken together, these contributions imply that corporate governance in emerging markets should be understood as a system of complementary and potentially substitutable mechanisms. The economic contribution of governance depends on how boards, ownership structures, committees and control arrangements operate jointly and on which dimension of corporate performance is being considered.

Detthamrong et al. (2017) show that the governance–performance relationship in Thailand is intertwined with capital-structure decisions, implying that governance mechanisms may influence corporate outcomes indirectly through leverage, financial discipline and access to funding. This suggests that governance structures cannot be evaluated independently of firms’ financing policies. Bhatt and Bhatt (2017) add that governance mechanisms in Malaysia operate within an evolving national governance framework and produce different effects across firms. Their findings imply that formal codes acquire economic significance only when they are effectively transmitted through boards, ownership structures and institutional enforcement. Arora and Sharma (2016) provide related evidence from India by showing that several governance characteristics have economically meaningful but non-uniform effects on performance. Their results indicate that governance prescriptions developed for dispersed-ownership systems cannot necessarily be transferred mechanically to environments characterized by concentrated ownership and weaker external discipline. Wang et al. (2020) reinforce this argument by showing that revised governance-code provisions do not automatically generate stronger financial performance, while ownership variables can remain influential. Together, these contributions imply that governance reform is effective only when formal rules modify underlying incentives, financing behavior and monitoring capacity rather than merely changing observable board structures.

Shao (2019) demonstrates that governance mechanisms in China produce differentiated performance effects, with CEO duality generating adverse consequences in some specifications while ownership and supervisory mechanisms contribute differently and board size or independence are not consistently significant. This implies that governance structures must be interpreted within China’s concentrated-ownership and dual-board institutional environment. Wang et al. (2020) provide a compatible implication by showing that formal board characteristics introduced through governance-code reform do not necessarily translate into superior financial outcomes when ownership incentives remain influential. Puni and Anlesinya (2020) similarly demonstrate that leadership arrangements, committees and ownership concentration have different effects across accounting and market-oriented performance measures. Darko et al. (2016) add evidence from Ghana showing that board control and ownership concentration operate jointly in addressing agency problems. Considered together, these contributions imply that emerging-market governance cannot be reduced to universal board prescriptions such as greater independence or standardized leadership structures. Its effectiveness depends on the institutional architecture within which boards and controlling shareholders operate, the



strength of complementary governance mechanisms and the extent to which formal arrangements alter actual monitoring, incentives and corporate decision-making.

3.3. Meta-Evidence, Contextual Contingencies

Prashar and Gupta (2021) show through meta-analytic evidence that board independence, diversity, size and leadership structure can influence firm performance, but that their effects vary according to legal origin, industry and firm context. This implies that board mechanisms cannot be assessed through universal prescriptions detached from the environment in which firms operate. Zubeltzu-Jaka et al. (2019) reinforce this interpretation by showing that independent directors have different implications for accounting and market performance and that institutional and social conditions explain part of the variation across studies. Siddiqui (2015) similarly demonstrates substantial heterogeneity in the governance–performance relationship, with research design, governance mechanism and performance measure helping to explain conflicting empirical findings. Maranhão and Leal (2018) extend this evidence to Latin America, where stronger governance is generally associated with better outcomes but where concentrated ownership, family control and weaker investor protection produce substantial cross-country and firm-level variation. Taken together, these contributions imply that contradictory governance findings should not be interpreted as evidence that governance lacks economic relevance. Rather, they indicate that board effectiveness depends on institutional setting, ownership configuration, methodological design and the particular performance dimension examined.

Bhakar et al. (2024) show that ownership concentration remains an important determinant of firm performance, while managerial, government, institutional, foreign and family ownership generate positive, negative or insignificant outcomes across studies. Their synthesis implies that shareholder identity and ownership concentration must be considered jointly rather than represented through a single aggregate ownership variable. Nguyen and Dao (2022) reinforce this broader interpretation by showing that governance indices, board characteristics and ownership variables are meaningfully related to liquidity and firm performance, although substantial heterogeneity persists across empirical settings. Their findings suggest that governance influences how financial resources and market perceptions are translated into corporate value. Maranhão and Leal (2018) provide a regional illustration by showing that governance effects in Latin America are shaped by concentrated control and comparatively weaker investor protection. Prashar and Gupta (2021) add that legal origin and firm context systematically modify board-performance effects. Together, these contributions imply that governance and ownership operate within an institutional architecture that determines the incentives and constraints facing controlling shareholders and boards. Performance consequences therefore depend on who exercises control, how concentrated that control becomes and whether external legal and market institutions are capable of constraining opportunistic behavior.

Choukar et al. (2021) show that transparency and effective contractual relations can reduce transaction costs and support financial performance among Moroccan SMEs, implying that governance extends beyond formal boards toward the mechanisms regulating stakeholder relationships and information flows. Touil et al. (2024) reinforce this broader governance perspective by showing that sustainable supply-chain quality-management practices can improve financial outcomes through lower sourcing and contracting costs and reduced non-compliance risks. Their findings suggest that interorganizational monitoring and contractual coordination can operate as economically relevant governance mechanisms. Siddiqui (2015) complements this interpretation by demonstrating that external governance mechanisms help explain part of the heterogeneity in the relationship between governance and performance. Nguyen and Dao



(2022) further show that governance affects how financial resources and market perceptions contribute to firm value, indicating that organizational control influences performance through several financial and relational channels. Considered together, these contributions imply that the governance–performance relationship should not be confined to board structure or ownership alone. Transparency, contractual discipline, stakeholder coordination and interorganizational monitoring can also reduce information asymmetry and transaction costs, thereby creating channels through which governance arrangements influence financial outcomes.

4. Discussion

The evidence concerning board architecture indicates that formal board characteristics are economically meaningful only when they translate into effective monitoring and participation in corporate decision-making. Liu et al. (2015) associate greater board independence with stronger operating performance, while Li et al. (2015) show that its contribution becomes more significant when concentrated ownership and state control are weaker. However, Fuzi et al. (2016) and Rashid (2018) caution that formal independence alone does not guarantee stronger performance when outside directors lack information, authority or practical influence. Comparable heterogeneity appears in research on gender diversity. Post and Byron (2015) identify favorable accounting-performance consequences from female representation but emphasize the moderating importance of national institutions, while Terjesen et al. (2016) show that female participation interacts with board independence. Bennouri et al. (2018) further demonstrate that education, expertise and board position influence the contribution made by female directors. Similar qualifications apply to CEO duality and board size. Chang et al. (2019) show that leadership concentration interacts with economic uncertainty, whereas Yeung (2018) identifies nonlinear consequences of board size. These findings suggest that board effectiveness is determined by substantive authority, complementary governance mechanisms and organizational context rather than compliance with isolated structural criteria.

Ownership research leads to a comparable conclusion because concentration can generate both monitoring advantages and governance costs. Hamadi and Heinen (2015) identify a nonlinear relationship between ownership concentration and performance, suggesting that greater shareholder control may initially reduce managerial discretion but eventually create entrenchment problems. Nguyen et al. (2015) demonstrate that national governance quality modifies this relationship, while Wang et al. (2019) show that shareholder identity changes the consequences associated with apparently similar concentration levels. Family ownership presents another illustration of this conditional relationship. Maseda et al. (2019) document nonlinear performance consequences associated with family board ownership, while Poutziouris et al. (2015) show that the degree and form of family involvement influence whether stewardship advantages or entrenchment costs dominate. Hansen et al. (2020) add that the performance of family firms varies across the business cycle, demonstrating that ownership effects also change with macroeconomic conditions. Institutional and foreign investors are equally heterogeneous. Lin and Fu (2017) emphasize that institutional shareholders contribute more effectively when they possess incentives for active monitoring, whereas Carney et al. (2019) show that foreign ownership benefits depend substantially on national institutional systems. Ownership therefore affects performance through both concentration and shareholder-specific objectives, resources and governance capabilities.

The integrated literature provides particularly strong support for a contingent conception of corporate governance. Paniagua et al. (2018) demonstrate that ownership, boards and financial performance are connected through nonlinear relationships, indicating that effective governance depends on combinations of mechanisms rather than a universally preferred arrangement.



Zattoni et al. (2017) similarly identify considerable cross-country variation in the effectiveness of board independence, while Uribe-Bohorquez et al. (2018) demonstrate that institutional quality moderates its relationship with performance. Emerging-market studies reach comparable conclusions. Puni and Anlesinya (2020) show that board structures, committees, leadership arrangements and ownership concentration affect accounting and market performance differently, and Pillai and Al-Malkawi (2018) demonstrate substantial variation across GCC firms. Arora and Sharma (2016) likewise suggest that governance prescriptions developed in dispersed-ownership environments cannot automatically be transferred to concentrated-ownership systems. Meta-analytic evidence strengthens this interpretation. Siddiqui (2015) identifies considerable heterogeneity across governance mechanisms, performance measures and research designs, while Prashar and Gupta (2021) show that legal origin, industry characteristics and firm context influence board-performance relationships. The wider evidence therefore indicates that corporate governance affects performance through configurations of control, incentives and institutional constraints rather than through standardized structures applicable equally across firms and countries.

Conclusion

The reviewed literature demonstrates that corporate governance and ownership structure remain important determinants of financial performance, but their effects are neither linear nor universal. Board independence, gender diversity, leadership structure, board size and audit committees can enhance monitoring and strategic decision-making when directors possess sufficient authority, information and organizational relevance. Their effectiveness nevertheless varies across firms because governance mechanisms interact with ownership concentration, managerial power and external institutional conditions. Ownership produces similarly differentiated consequences. Concentrated shareholders can improve oversight and limit managerial opportunism, but excessive control can increase entrenchment and reduce minority-shareholder protection. Family ownership combines potential stewardship and long-term commitment with risks arising from concentrated control, while institutional and foreign shareholders contribute more effectively when their incentives and resources support active monitoring. These findings indicate that evaluating individual governance mechanisms in isolation provides an incomplete representation of the governance-performance relationship. The relevant unit of interpretation is instead the broader governance configuration through which board characteristics, shareholder identity, ownership concentration, managerial incentives and external institutions jointly influence corporate decisions and financial outcomes.

The principal implication is that corporate governance should be approached as a context-dependent organizational system rather than a standardized set of formal practices. Regulations requiring greater independence, leadership separation or specific board structures may improve observable compliance without necessarily producing stronger financial results when directors lack practical influence or when controlling shareholders continue to dominate decision-making. Similarly, the introduction of institutional or foreign investors does not automatically improve performance unless these shareholders possess incentives to monitor management and operate within an institutional environment capable of protecting investors and enforcing governance standards. Future research should consequently place greater emphasis on interactions among governance mechanisms, nonlinear relationships, shareholder identity and institutional heterogeneity. Greater attention should also be devoted to changes occurring across economic cycles and periods of financial stress because the effectiveness of ownership and governance mechanisms may vary considerably under different macroeconomic conditions. Such an approach offers a more coherent interpretation of the mixed empirical evidence



and explains why similar governance structures may produce substantially different financial consequences across developed, emerging and developing economies.

References

1. Abedin, S. H., Haque, H., Shahjahan, T., & Kabir, M. N. (2022). Institutional ownership and firm performance: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(12), Article 567. doi: 10.3390/jrfm15120567.
2. Akbar, S., Poletti-Hughes, J., El-Faitouri, R., & Shah, S. Z. A. (2016). More on the relationship between corporate governance and firm performance in the UK: Evidence from the application of generalized method of moments estimation. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 38, 417–429. doi: 10.1016/j.ribaf.2016.03.009.
3. Alabdullah, T. T. Y. (2018). The relationship between ownership structure and firm financial performance: Evidence from Jordan. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 25(1), 319–333. doi: 10.1108/BIJ-04-2016-0051.
4. Carney, M., Estrin, S., Liang, Z., & Shapiro, D. (2019). National institutional systems, foreign ownership and firm performance: The case of understudied countries. *Journal of World Business*, 54(4), 244–257. doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2018.03.003.
5. Chang, A. (2015). The role of internal and external corporate governance mechanisms on firm's financial performance in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Accounting and Governance*, 6, 55–65. doi: 10.17576/ajag-2015-6-8278.
6. Chang, K., Lee, J., & Shim, H. (2019). CEO duality and firm performance: Does economic policy uncertainty mediate the relation? *International Review of Finance*, 19(4), 877–891. doi: 10.1111/irfi.12193.
7. Che, L., & Langli, J. C. (2015). Governance structure and firm performance in private family firms. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 42(9–10), 1216–1250. doi: 10.1111/jbfa.12170.
8. Choukar, E., El Hamidi, N., Ait Hbib, A., & Makhrouf, S. (2021). CSR and financial performance: Are CSR practices a factor in reducing transaction costs? *International Journal of Economic Studies and Management*, 1(2), 307–320. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.11473043.
9. Conyon, M. J., & He, L. (2017). Firm performance and boardroom gender diversity: A quantile regression approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 79, 198–211. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.02.006.
10. Darko, J., Aribi, Z. A., & Uzonwanne, G. C. (2016). Corporate governance: The impact of director and board structure, ownership structure and corporate control on the performance of listed companies on the Ghana stock exchange. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 16(2), 259–277. doi: 10.1108/CG-11-2014-0133.
11. Detthamrong, U., Chancharat, N., & Vithessonthi, C. (2017). Corporate governance, capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from Thailand. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 42, 689–709. doi: 10.1016/j.ribaf.2017.07.011.
12. Frijns, B., Dodd, O., & Cimerova, H. (2016). The impact of cultural diversity in corporate boards on firm performance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 41, 521–541. doi: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2016.07.014.
13. Fuzi, S. F. S. M., Halim, S. A. A., & Khudzari, J. M. (2016). Board independence and firm performance. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37, 460–465. doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30152-6.
14. García-Meca, E., García-Sánchez, I.-M., & Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2015). Board diversity and its effects on bank performance: An international analysis. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 53, 202–214. doi: 10.1016/j.jbankfin.2014.12.002.



15. Gaur, S. S., Bathula, H., & Singh, D. (2015). Ownership concentration, board characteristics and firm performance: A contingency framework. *Management Decision*, 53(5), 911–931. doi: 10.1108/MD-08-2014-0519.
16. Gordini, N., & Rancati, E. (2017). Gender diversity in the Italian boardroom and firm financial performance. *Management Research Review*, 40(1), 75–94. doi: 10.1108/MRR-02-2016-0039.
17. Gryko, A., Cierocki, J., & Celer, K. (2024). Ownership structure and firm performance: A panel regression study from Poland. *Central European Journal of Economic Modelling and Econometrics*, 16(1), 25–60. doi: 10.24425/cejeme.2024.151364.
18. Gu, V. C., Cao, R. Q., & Wang, J. (2019). Foreign ownership and performance: Mediating and moderating effects. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 29(2), 86–102. doi: 10.1108/RIBS-08-2018-0068.
19. Hamadi, M., & Heinen, A. (2015). Firm performance when ownership is very concentrated: Evidence from a semiparametric panel. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 34, 172–194. doi: 10.1016/j.jempfin.2015.07.004.
20. Hanafi, M. M., Setiyono, B., & Sanjaya, I. P. S. (2018). Ownership structure and firm performance: Evidence from the subprime crisis period. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 18(2), 206–219. doi: 10.1108/CG-10-2016-0203.
21. Hansen, C., Block, J., & Neuenkirch, M. (2020). Family firm performance over the business cycle: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 34(3), 476–511. doi: 10.1111/joes.12364.
22. He, Q., Li, D., Lu, L., & Chong, T. T. L. (2019). Institutional ownership and private equity placements: Evidence from Chinese listed firms. *International Review of Finance*, 19(2), 315–346. doi: 10.1111/irfi.12182.
23. Kallamu, B. S., & Mohd Saat, N. A. (2015). Audit committee attributes and firm performance: Evidence from Malaysian finance companies. *Asian Review of Accounting*, 23(3), 206–231. doi: 10.1108/ARA-11-2013-0076.
24. Kao, M.-F., Hodgkinson, L., & Jaafar, A. (2019). Ownership structure, board of directors and firm performance: Evidence from Taiwan. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 19(1), 189–216. doi: 10.1108/CG-04-2018-0144.
25. Kılıç, M., & Kuzey, C. (2016). The effect of board gender diversity on firm performance: Evidence from Turkey. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 31(7), 434–455. doi: 10.1108/GM-10-2015-0088.
26. Kyere, M., & Ausloos, M. (2021). Corporate governance and firms financial performance in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 26(2), 1871–1885. doi: 10.1002/ijfe.1883.
27. Li, K., Lu, L., Mittoo, U. R., & Zhang, Z. (2015). Board independence, ownership concentration and corporate performance—Chinese evidence. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 41, 162–175. doi: 10.1016/j.irfa.2015.05.024.
28. Li, M., & Roberts, H. (2018). Does mandated independence improve firm performance? Evidence from New Zealand. *Pacific Accounting Review*, 30(1), 92–109. doi: 10.1108/PAR-01-2017-0004.
29. Lin, Y. R., & Fu, X. M. (2017). Does institutional ownership influence firm performance? Evidence from China. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 49, 17–57. doi: 10.1016/j.iref.2017.01.021.
30. Liu, Y., Miletkov, M. K., Wei, Z., & Yang, T. (2015). Board independence and firm performance in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 30, 223–244. doi: 10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2014.12.004.
31. Malik, M. S., & Makhdoom, D. D. (2016). Does corporate governance beget firm performance in Fortune Global 500 companies? *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 16(4), 747–764. doi: 10.1108/CG-12-2015-0156.



32. Maranhão, F. S., & Leal, R. P. C. (2018). Corporate governance and firm performance in Latin America: A meta-analysis. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 31(1), 195–211. doi: 10.1108/ARLA-04-2017-0126.
33. Marinova, J., Plantenga, J., & Remery, C. (2016). Gender diversity and firm performance: Evidence from Dutch and Danish boardrooms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(15), 1777–1790. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2015.1079229.
34. Maseda, A., Iturralde, T., Aparicio, G., Boulkeroua, L., & Cooper, S. (2019). Family board ownership, generational involvement and performance in family SMEs: A test of the S-shaped hypothesis. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 28(3), 285–300. doi: 10.1108/EJMBE-07-2018-0071.
35. Memili, E., & Misra, K. (2015). Corporate governance provisions, family involvement, and firm performance in publicly traded family firms. *International Journal of Financial Studies*, 3(3), 194–229. doi: 10.3390/ijfs3030194.
36. Merendino, A., & Melville, R. (2019). The board of directors and firm performance: Empirical evidence from listed companies. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 19(3), 508–551. doi: 10.1108/CG-06-2018-0211.
37. Mohapatra, P. (2016). Board independence and firm performance in India. *International Journal of Management Practice*, 9(3), 317–332. doi: 10.1504/IJMP.2016.077834.
38. Nguyen, N. P. A., & Dao, T. T. B. (2022). Liquidity, corporate governance and firm performance: A meta-analysis. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), Article 2137960. doi: 10.1080/23311975.2022.2137960.
39. Nguyen, T., Locke, S., & Reddy, K. (2015). Ownership concentration and corporate performance from a dynamic perspective: Does national governance quality matter? *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 41, 148–161. doi: 10.1016/j.irfa.2015.06.005.
40. Owen, A. L., & Temesvary, J. (2018). The performance effects of gender diversity on bank boards. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 90, 50–63. doi: 10.1016/j.jbankfin.2018.02.015.
41. Paniagua, J., Rivelles, R., & Sapena, J. (2018). Corporate governance and financial performance: The role of ownership and board structure. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 229–234. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.01.060.
42. Phung, D. N., & Mishra, A. V. (2016). Ownership structure and firm performance: Evidence from Vietnamese listed firms. *Australian Economic Papers*, 55(1), 63–98. doi: 10.1111/1467-8454.12056.
43. Pillai, R., & Al-Malkawi, H.-A. N. (2018). On the relationship between corporate governance and firm performance: Evidence from GCC countries. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 44, 394–410. doi: 10.1016/j.ribaf.2017.07.110.
44. Post, C., & Byron, K. (2015). Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5), 1546–1571. doi: 10.5465/amj.2013.0319.
45. Poutziouris, P. Z., Savva, C. S., & Hadjielias, E. (2015). Family involvement and firm performance: Evidence from UK listed firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 6(1), 14–32. doi: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.12.001.
46. Prashar, A., & Gupta, P. (2021). Corporate boards and firm performance: A meta-analytic approach to examine the impact of contextual factors. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 16(7), 1454–1478. doi: 10.1108/IJOEM-10-2019-0860.
47. Pucheta-Martínez, M. C., Bel-Oms, I., & Olcina-Sempere, G. (2018). The association between board gender diversity and financial reporting quality, corporate performance and corporate social responsibility disclosure. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 31(1), 177–194. doi: 10.1108/ARLA-04-2017-0110.



48. Puni, A., & Anlesinya, A. (2020). Corporate governance mechanisms and firm performance in a developing country. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 62(2), 147–169. doi: 10.1108/IJLMA-03-2019-0076.
49. Rafique, Q., & Al-Mamun, A. (2016). The impact of ownership structure on firm performance. *International Journal of Corporate Finance and Accounting*, 3(1), 36–54. doi: 10.4018/IJCFA.2016010103.
50. Rashid, A. (2018). Board independence and firm performance: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Future Business Journal*, 4(1), 34–49. doi: 10.1016/j.fbj.2017.11.003.
51. Saleh, A. S., Halili, E., Zeitun, R., & Salim, R. (2017). Global financial crisis, ownership structure and firm financial performance. *Studies in Economics and Finance*, 34(4), 447–465. doi: 10.1108/SEF-09-2016-0223.
52. Sanan, N. K. (2016). Board gender diversity and firm performance: Evidence from India. *Asian Journal of Business Ethics*, 5(1–2), 1–18. doi: 10.1007/s13520-016-0050-x.
53. Shao, L. (2019). Dynamic study of corporate governance structure and firm performance in China. *Chinese Management Studies*, 13(2), 299–317. doi: 10.1108/CMS-08-2017-0217.
54. Sheikh, M. F., Shah, S. Z. A., & Akbar, S. (2018). Firm performance, corporate governance and executive compensation in Pakistan. *Applied Economics*, 50(18), 2012–2027. doi: 10.1080/00036846.2017.1386277.
55. Siddiqui, S. S. (2015). The association between corporate governance and firm performance—A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, 23(3), 218–237. doi: 10.1108/IJAIM-04-2014-0023.
56. Singh, S., Tabassum, N., Darwish, T. K., & Batsakis, G. (2018). Corporate governance and Tobin's Q as a measure of organizational performance. *British Journal of Management*, 29(1), 171–190. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12237.
57. Terjesen, S., Couto, E. B., & Francisco, P. M. (2016). Does the presence of independent and female directors impact firm performance? A multi-country study of board diversity. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 20(3), 447–483. doi: 10.1007/s10997-014-9307-8.
58. Touil, A., Babounia, A., & El Hamidi, N. (2024). How does adopting sustainable supply chain quality management improve corporate financial performance? A transaction cost perspective. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 21(3), 170–186. doi: 10.21511/imfi.21(3).2024.15.
59. Uribe-Bohorquez, M.-V., Martínez-Ferrero, J., & García-Sánchez, I.-M. (2018). Board independence and firm performance: The moderating effect of institutional context. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 28–43. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.03.005.
60. Wang, H., Wu, J., Yang, Y., Li, R., & Liu, Y. (2019). Ownership concentration, identity and firm performance: Evidence from China's listed firms. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 55(15), 3653–3666. doi: 10.1080/1540496X.2019.1672042.
61. Wang, J., Zhang, Y., & Guthrie, D. (2018). Economic openness and institutional embeddedness: Global capital and firm performance in China's stock market. *Social Science Quarterly*, 99(2), 807–828. doi: 10.1111/ssqu.12413.
62. Wang, K. T., & Shailer, G. (2017). Family ownership and financial performance relations in emerging markets. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 51, 82–98. doi: 10.1016/j.iref.2017.05.014.
63. Wang, Y., Abbasi, K., Babajide, B., & Yekini, K. C. (2020). Corporate governance mechanisms and firm performance: Evidence from the emerging market following the revised CG code. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 20(1), 158–174. doi: 10.1108/CG-07-2018-0244.



64. Wijethilake, C., & Ekanayake, A. (2020). CEO duality and firm performance: The moderating roles of CEO informal power and board involvements. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 16(8), 1453–1474. doi: 10.1108/SRJ-12-2018-0321.
65. Yeung, J. C. K. (2018). Nonlinear effect of board size on corporate performance: Impact of the cultural backgrounds of directors in Hong Kong. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Financial Studies*, 47(1), 107–131. doi: 10.1111/ajfs.12205.
66. Zattoni, A., Witt, M. A., Judge, W. Q., Talaulicar, T., Chen, J. J., Lewellyn, K., Hu, H. W., Gabrielsson, J., Rivas, J. L., Puffer, S., Shukla, D., Lopez, F., Adegbite, E., Fassin, Y., Yamak, S., Fainshmidt, S., & van Ees, H. (2017). Does board independence influence financial performance in IPO firms? The moderating role of the national business system. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 628–639. doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2017.04.002.
67. Zhang, H., & Kyaw, K. (2017). Ownership structure and firm performance: An empirical analysis of Chinese companies. *Applied Economics and Finance*, 4(2), 57–64. doi: 10.11114/aef.v4i2.2109.
68. Zubeltzu-Jaka, E., Ortas, E., & Álvarez-Etxeberria, I. (2019). Independent directors and organizational performance: New evidence from a meta-analytic regression analysis. *Sustainability*, 11(24), Article 7121. doi: 10.3390/su11247121.

Note: All statements, opinions, and data presented in the publications are the sole responsibility of the respective author(s) and contributor(s) and do not reflect the views of *Journal of Studies in Corporate & Market Finance*.