PJMSS
PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

VOLUME : 3, ISSUE : 2, 2024

Pakistan Journal of Management & Social Science
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND FIRM PERFORMANCE

Darwaish Ali
MS Scholar, Department of Management Sciences, KUST.
Imam Nazir
MS Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Iqra National University, Peshawar.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between corporate governance and firm performance. Considering the growing significance of successful corporate governance to sustainable growth, and the importance of investor confidence, this relationship becomes extremely relevant in relation to stakeholders. This research is quantitative in nature that uses sample of stock exchange companies operating in different industries to analyze the data. The study uses regression analysis to investigate the influence of board structure, executive compensation and shareholder rights on measures of corporate performance (e.g. ROA, market value). It has been found that stronger corporate governance, conducted through independent boards and well-established compensation packages, has an positive impact on firm performance. On the other hand, the research also notices that governance practices may take different effects on industry and firm scale. These results have important implications for both regulators and firm managers interested in the significance of governance on firm value. The research highlights the demand for sector-specific governance that is targeted at varying needs of sectors.'

Keywords: Corporate Governance, Firm Performance, Board Structure, Executive Compensation, Shareholder Rights, Firm Value

INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance has become a pivotal subject matter in management studies based on its importance to firm performance and financial continuity. As world markets grow more complicated and public opinion becomes stricter, internal mechanisms of governance in organizations have come to play a crucial role serving the long-term interests of those institutions. Good corporate governance is not only for promoting clear decision-making, it also induces growth of the firm and instills trust in creditors (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). And in a competitive and more regulated market, the quality of governance is becoming more important in determining an organization's ability to weather storms, take risks and create value."

Corporate governance, at its very basic level, is formed by vital frameworks like board composition; executive compensation structures; shareholder rights and transparency in financial reporting (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). They also seek to develop a clear structure of what the function, duties and responsibilities of the governing bodies (e.g. board of directors) should be in providing that managers will act in shareholders and stakeholder’s best interest. For instance, the design of the board is an important factor in controlling executive performance and agency costs, and in aligning firms strategically with long-run goals (Fama & Jensen 1983). In addition, properly designed executive compensation plans that cause managers' and shareholders’ interests to coincide can help alleviate these conflicts of interest and motivate them to concentrate on creating long-term value (Bebchuk &Fried 2004).

Since then, studies in corporate governance have been updated and several scholars have worked on how these control structures affect the performance of firms in different types of industry and organized environments. A number of studies have also explored how board characteristics (e.g., independence and diversity of the board) are related to firm outcomes including profitability, growth, and market value (Adams & Ferreira, 2009). For example, board independence is frequently regarded as a means of driving down managerial entrenchment and improving the quality of decisions (Jensen, 1993). Conversely, it has been argued that executive pay tied to firm performance correlates positively with firm outcomes because they incite executives to act in the best interest of stockholders (Coles et al., 2008). Secondly, shareholder rights ensure that shareholders can hold the management accountable and safeguard their interests including influence on key decisions such as dividends (La Porta et al., 2000).

Although there is considerable research on corporate governance, limited insight has been gained about the specific channels through which governance mechanisms affect firm-level outcomes, especially in various institutional settings. For example, despite empirical evidence that effective governance is usually associated with superior financial performance, “the effectiveness of certain corporate governance mechanisms

PJMSS PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal
VOLUME : 3, ISSUE : 2, 2024
Pakistan Journal of Management & Social Science
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

will be contingent upon factors such as industry type culture and regulatory environment" (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003). The effect of governance mechanisms on firm performance may also vary in the light of interdependent factors such as firm size, ownership structure, and stage of development (Anderson & Reeb, 2004). Therefore, more fine studies are needed to consider the variety of governance mechanisms and their influences on firm performance under various contingencies.

The gap in the literature This study aims to provide empirical evidence concerning the effect of corporate governance on performance of the firm, especially that which influences a certain factor of corporate governance; namely board structure, executive compensation and shareholder rights on several key aspects measures such as profitability, growth and market value. Although previous research has identified a few general relationships, there has been an inadequate consideration of the context dependent differences across industries that may influence governance choices. By filling this gap, the present research adds to the relatively thin literature on corporate governance by offering a more nuanced explanation of how governance mechanisms impact firm performance within various sectors.

This study also has implications for the limitations of prior literature by providing evidence on how corporate governance regimes are adapted to industries and firm-specific attributes. Given that considerations on multiple governance dimensions may have influenced firm performance, a more comprehensive analysis will enable us to make better recommendations for academia and practice. Learning how some governance features, including board structures and executive compensation systems contribute to improved firm performance could assist policy makers, managers and investors in formulating more effective governance practices. Finally, the research intends to underscore the significance of governance as a theme in value creation and pursuance of sustainability over time, especially in an era where economies are increasingly integrated and competitive.

Research Objectives

To examine the association between board structure and firm performance.

To examine the effect of executive compensation on firm performance.

To explore the impact of shareholder rights on firm performance.

Research Questions

What are the impacts of board structure on firm performance?

What is the association between executive remuneration and firm performance?

What is the effect of shareholder rights on firm performance?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate governance contributes in the determination of strategic direction and performance. Coordination and Control of Firm Governance structures and practices are a means by which to enable and constrain firm behavior, protect shareholders' interests, clearly define organizational objectives, monitor management progress toward those goals. Good corporate governance encourages accountability, transparency and ethical decision-making as necessary for long-term sustainability and growth. A number of theoretical concepts have been formulated to understand the nature through which governance mechanisms influence internal firm decisions, providing different views that address the involvement of managers and board members in maintaining organizational goals with shareholder interests.

According to introduction agency theory by Jensen and Meckling (1976), there is a divergence of interest between the managers (agents) and shareholders (principals) due to personal goals that mangers may be biased to which, for example, is career advancement, financial compensation, over the interests of firm long-term prosperity. This conflict, formally termed the "agency problem," can result in suboptimal decisions and lower firm performance. According to agency theory, we should expect corporate governance practices to be strong enough that conflicts will be attenuated and managers' interests will come into line with shareholders. Such methods include outside directors, pay-for-performance schemes for senior management and the exercise of shareholder franchise (Fama & Jensen, 1983).

Unlike agency theory, stewardship theory presents a positive perspective on management. As stewardship theory suggests, given enough discretion and responsibility, mangers can be expected to act in the best interest of the firm and its stakeholders. These managers subscribe to what Davis, Schoorman and Donaldson (1997) call the stewardship theory and believe that they are stewards of the organization with a natural bent towards safeguarding corporate interests over personal ones. Stewardship theory endorses structures of governance on the basis that it provides managers with discretion in making decisions and builds on trust between board and executive.

Except it does, and views such as this put a strong emphasis on the need for a partnership approach, or working together in an environment which is less adversarial in nature between directors and management with decisions being based upon what can be achieved – not over seeing/lording over communication. For example, in firms where stewardship theory is more relevant, boards are likely to employ less formal governance mechanisms which rather emphasize mutual respect, trust and interest alignment. However, while stewardship theory provides a less pessimistic view of the intentions of management, its applicability is contingent upon organizational settings and the quality of relations that exist between managers and shareholders.

Empirical Evidence on the Relationship between Board Nature and Firm Performance

The literature on how board nature affects firm performance provides mixed results. The importance of board independence in enhancing firm performance stems from its ability to mitigate managerial entrenchment as well as expose the behaviour of executives at their posts (Fama and Jensen 1983)." Independent board members can also improve strategic decision-making by offering unbiased perspectives and expertise that can lead to superior corporate performance as a whole.

Conversely, some studies have indicated that board diversity—beyond independence—is a factor that helps to improve strategic decisions. Carter, Simkins and Simpson (2003) conversely posit that a heterogeneous board consisting of directors with diverse knowledge, background and viewpoints can impose positive effects on the decision-making process of organisation which in turn might have repercussions on firm's performance. Being diverse also gives rise to the thought that they will spend more time thinking about – and so managing risks in areas from innovation, to stakeholder engagement - all important for long term success particularly in competitive global environments.

The relationship between executive pay and firm performance also has been the subject of much study. Agency theory would argue that by tying executive compensation to firm performance, the agency problem can be reduced due to managers being motivated to act in the best interest of shareholders (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Performance based pay such as stock options or bonuses can provide an incentive for executives to look long term for profitability and growth rather than short term from personal tactics.

But there are also questions about the potential pitfalls of incentive — or performance-based — pay. Bebchuk, Fried, 2004 claim that high or inappropriately structured executive compensation can cause adverse outcomes such as increased risk taking and short-term exploitation at the expense of long term sustainability. In addition, leaders may do whatever they can to boost short-term stock prices — even if doing so turns out to be harmful for the company down the road. So, though exec comp can serve as a valuable device for linking incentives, it does have to be crafted with care lest we forego unintended consequences.

Shareholder rights protections is also a second important CSR component of corporate governance that was demonstrated to affect firm performance. When shareholder rights are strong, the outlook for shareholder wealth is also promising since shareholders have the ability to monitor management behaviors, mitigate managerial abuse, and maximize profits in their long-term interests (La Porta et al. 2000). It is believed that shareholder participation in voting, specifically when coupled with the right to submit governance changes, increases transparency and corporate responsibility. It has been documented in previous studies that firms which are more shareholder friendly have better financial performance and higher market valuations, since shareholder activism can lead to improvements being made to the corporate governance standards (Gompers et al., 2003).

Although there exists an expanding literature on corporate governance, much remains to be learned regarding how these governance mechanisms interact as a set to impact performance across industries. The majority of the studies examine individual governance dimensions in isolation, without taking into account the potential interactive effects between all different governance mechanisms, including board structure (i.e., composition), executive compensation, and shareholders rights. Subsequently, how these factors affect firm performance could be contingent on institutional environments and industry or market conditions other than business

PJMSS PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal
VOLUME : 3, ISSUE : 2, 2024
Pakistan Journal of Management & Social Science
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

strategies' approval. The purpose of this study is to bridge these gaps by offering a wide-ranging investigation into the association between corporate governance and firm performance, including industry factors and firm characteristics. In doing so, it adds to the continuing debate about the role of good governance in increasing firm value and long-term sustainability.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research method used in this study is of quantitative nature analyzing corporate governance practice and firm performance. The main aim is to empirically determine the impact of different governance mechanisms on performance measures in different sectors. The adoption of a quantitative design ensures that statistical procedures can be used to determine patterns, relationships and make an impersonal judgment with regards numerical data (Creswell, 2014). Utilising the data of listed companies, this paper intends to measure the impact of governance mechanisms on financial performance.

It comprises 100 publicly listed companies drawn from various sectors such as technology, manufacturing, healthcare and finance, to cover the diversity of certain governance arrangements. The sample size was determined with a view to optimising the trade-off between statistical power and availability of data, as in line with standard cross-sectional study best practice (Hair et al., 2019). Publicly-listed firms were selected as they are mandated to provide the detailed financial and governance data that made them a convenient choice for this analysis. The sample of firms is drawn on the basis of those whose data are available in reputable secondary sources, for example, company annual reports and filings and financial databases (e.g., Bloomberg, Thomson Reuters).

The analysis covers five years (2018-2023), thus making it suitable to assess short and long-term trends within corporate governance and performance developments. Use of data over multiple years drives out the noise in firm performance in any single year and gives a more robust picture of the governance-firm performance linkage. Secondary sources of data are useful in this context, enabling massive and comprehensive datasets that are easy to access.

PJMSS
PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

VOLUME : 3, ISSUE : 2, 2024

Pakistan Journal of Management & Social Science
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

Board structure: The aspect is proxied by a sum of three factors: board independence, board size, and diversity. Independence of the board is the extent of independent directors on board, which ensures impartial supervision and decision-making (Fama & Jensen, 1983). And so board size is examined because it is possible that larger boards can bring together a broader scope of expertise and views, which has the potential to improve governance (Jensen, 1993). It has been found that diverse boards (on dimensions such as gender and expertise) positively affect firm decision-making and perform ance (Carter et al.

S -Executive Compensation: This attribute represents the format of executive payment structure consisting of Salaries, Bonuses and Stock Options. Pay-for-performance ties the interest of executives to that of shareholders, this way encouraging decisions that promote sustained firm performance (Bebchuk & Fried, 2004). The structure of executive compensation is relevant given its potential impact on the managers' decision process, including risk taking and intervention in strategy generation.

Shareholder rights: This is about voting power and what elements of shareholder engagement there are. It is assumed that good shareholder rights may have a positive impact on firm performance through monitoring and transparency, which in turn leads to better corporate governance (La Porta et al., 2000). The voting power of shareholders on significant corporate matters — mergers, buying other companies or changes in governance structures — can quite literally steer the company.

In this study, the financial performance of firms is gauged by three popular financial indicators:

Return on assets (ROA) A measure of a company's profitability in relation to its assets, this ratio is an all-encompassing indication of operational efficiency.

Return on equity (ROE): A measure of a company's ability to produce net income from the shareholders' equity in the company, indicating financial health and management effectiveness.

Market value (market capitalization): This refers to the total market value of a company's outstanding shares, and is therefore an indicator of investor sentiment or how well the markets are performing.

These measures provide a complete measure of corporate performance, capturing aspects of operations efficiency (ROA) and profitability (ROE), as well as sentiment in the market (market value).

The data were analyzed using regression methods, namely multiple linear regres- sion, to assess how strong and in what direction are the governance variables negatively or positively related to firm performance measures. Regression analysis is suitable in this study since it allows the examination of the effect of several independent variables (governance dimensions) on dependent variables (performance measures) controlling for other factors (Hair et al., 2019).

Furthermore, industry dummy and the size of firm were also adjusted in the regression models. These control variables should give protect for variation in outcome that stem from industry factors, which could restrict or enhance performance if larger organization have more resources or different governance routines than smaller firm do (Hillman & Dalziel, 2003). This addition enhances the generalizability of the findings and ensures that corporate governance is not contaminated by external factors through firm performance.

RESULTS

The regression analysis conducted for this paper provided a number of interesting findings which underline the importance of corporate governance mechanisms in determining firm performance. Our results add to the literature on how governance mechanisms, such as board structure, executive remuneration, and shareholder protections are related to financial performance in terms of ROA (ROE), market value, and profitability.

Positive and significant relation was also found between board independence and firm performance. Higher ratios of independence in boards of directors were associated with better financial performance, particularly ROA and market value. This result confirms earlier research that indicate independent boards improve decision-making and limit managerial self-interests by relieving the tension of separating ownership and control reduce, and providing exposure to corporate strategy consistent with shareholder preferences (Fama & Jensen, 1983). Independent directors, with their lack of material relationship with the company's management, are more likely to provide

PJMSS PAKISTAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT & SOCIAL SCIENCE
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

VOLUME : 3, ISSUE : 2, 2024

Pakistan Journal of Management & Social Science
https://pakistanjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/Journal

independent monitoring and fresh ideas that would promote good governance and better decisions. The agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976) also validates this finding by stressing the need for devices that alleviate the conflicts of interest between management and shareholders. Therefore firms with higher board independence might achieve more accountability and enhanced strategic direction resulting in better performance measures.

The second main result of the regression analysis related to executive pay. If executive compensation was consistent with long term performance objectives, the finding was that it had a significant positive effect on firm profitability. Companies with performance-based pay plans-stock options and performance bonuses-experienced better ROE (Return on Equity) and improved profitability overall. This reflects the agency theory (Jensen & Meck?ling 1976), which suggests that makes executive pay directly related to firm performance are more likely to align manager and shareholder interests by motivating managers to focus on long-term value growth as opposed to short-term profits.

The study did find, however, that excessive executive compensation — particularly when not linked to performance incentive — was associated with worse financial results. This finding is consistent with the arguments made by Bebchuk and Fried (2004) that excessiver executive compensation which not tied to performance may lead managers to engage in inappropriate risk-taking activities or self-serving behavior, rather than maxim monetization of net cash resources for long-term shareholders. Executive compensation packages of this nature may prompt the executive team to become more concerned with stock prices in the short term, quelling long-term growth and profits and generally resulting in poorer financial performance. As such, the research signals that the adoption of compensation packages closely tied to long-term objectives is crucial in addressing these risks.

A third key observation made by the study was that enhanced rights of shareholders is affirmatively related to the performance of a firm and in particular, market value. Companies with higher shareholder rights, such as voting power and engagement ought to perform better in the stock market. This result is consistent with that of the stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) for enhancing shareholders' involvement and influence in making decision. Shareholders with stronger rights are more likely to scrutinize and monitor managers' decisions, push for better governance quality and hold executives responsible of their choices, resulting in firms possessing higher market values. This is also consistent with La Porta et al. (2000), who showed that such features help to improve the financial performance of entities as they lessen managerial overconsumption and bring more transparency.

The relationships were also analysed through a regression analysis, the intensity if the links being different between industries. For instance, for the tech industry, the relationship between board diversity and firm performance was much higher than in other sectors. This result is also consistent with the work of Carter et al. (2003), which discovered that varied boards offer different perspectives and ideas, leading to more innovative decision-making — crucial in fast-moving fields like technology. By contrast, in the manufacturing industry, executive pay was a much better indicator of firm performance. It is possible that the manufacturing industry in capital-intensive itself such that agency-based executives receive incentives to improve operational efficiency, control costs, and enhance profitability.

These industry-level results imply that there might be no overall effect of corporate governance on firm value, and the effectiveness of some elements in good corporate governance is sector-specific. So the ideal board-room model and compensation package for various sectors may vary in terms of its composition and dynamism.

DISCUSSION

This study highlights the importance of corporate governance in influencing the performance of firms and calls for good governance systems that can align management with shareholders. This alignment is necessary to secure the long-term value generation, financial stability, and confidence of investors in a competitive business world. The findings support the belief that corporate governance, in the sense of mechanisms such as independent boards, pay-for performance, and strong shareholder rights help lead to better firm performance along several dimensions of value – profitability, market value, operational efficiency.

One of the key results of this paper is the favorable effect of board independence on firm performance. Source: Institute for Governance and Policy Studies Research shows independent boards lead to better decision-making, improved financial performance and accountability. This finding is consistent with the literature on agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976), which maintains that managerial entrenchment (i.e., where managers have significant discretion over firm decisions) may be inefficient and result in lower firm value. Outside directors, who are not employees working under management team, have greater capacity to monitor the activities of executives, since they do not share their own personal interests or relations. Their independent scrutiny ensures that strategic decisions are for the benefit of shareholders and not the convenience of executives. Resource dependence theory) with independent directors supposedly acting as a barrier to fend off conflict between the owners and managers in other authorities convincing them that this enhances decisional and firm performance.

This result also suggests the benefit of board diversity for improving governance. Gender diverse, experience and skill diverse boards can provide a greater diversity of perspectives for firms to tackle difficult problems, respond to changes in markets and promote innovation (Carter et al., 2003). Independence combined with diversity fosters governance mechanisms that are more likely to lead to robust decisions, which is especially critical in fast-paced industries such as technology, where companies need to be nimble and quick when the market changes.

The evidence also shows that the executive compensation based on performance is essential to bridging the gap between shareholders and managers. Principals remunerated for long-run measures, such as ROE and growth in the stock price) will be motivated to focus on sustainable rent-seeking. This finding is consistent with those postulated by agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976), which contends that linking executive pay to firm performance will reduce the agency issue by aligning the personal incentives of managers and shareholders.

The results, though, also highlight the downside to high levels of executive compensation that are not related to performance. If executive wage packages are too large, or dependent on short-term metrics, they might encourage executives to chase short-term profits rather than sustainable profitability. Such compensation schemes are likely to stimulate short-term risky behavior or decision making that will artificially boost the firm's stock price in the short run, but at the expense of long-term value creation (Bebchuk & Fried, 2004). For instance, management in pursuit of short-term financial goals may incur too much debt or implement drastic cost cutting measures that could damage the company in the long run. This result emphasizes the role of compensation packages that are built with pay for long-term performance in mind, motivating executives to simply maximize long-term shareholder value rather than engage in a short-termist behavior.

The positive effect of shareholder rights on firm performance is another important result of our research. The findings indicate that market value and profit performance are enhanced by the power to vote and actively engage shareholders in firms. Owners who are able to make their voices heard on the firm's policy decisions, by perhaps being in a position to vote favorably or unfavorably in mergers as well as control transfers of shares -corporate governance and garner more influence (La Porta et al., 2000). In addition, shareholder activism - which involves shareholders communicating directly with management and making efforts to influence corporate conduct and governance behavior - can enhance corporate governance, transparency, and accountability, resulting in the achievement of superior financial performance (Gompers et al., 2003).

The result highlights that robust shareholder safeguards are imperative in a transparent and accountable environment. Firms can reduce the risks of managerial overreach and improve long-run performance by providing shareholders with the resources and rights to discipline managers. This result is particularly important in say regions or markets with emerging structures of governance and where the protections for shareholders might be lower that the Nigerian experience. Legislators and regulators may want to refer to this knowledge in fostering governance mechanisms and shareholder rights that can ultimately be beneficial for the overall good of the capital market.

In a policy context, the results of this study imply several important implications for managers in firms as well as policymakers. I.: 1) Corporate officers shall concentrate in empowering their boards with an independent and diverse membership so that decision-making becomes more neutral, equitable and productive. Promoting diversity, including diversity in terms of experience and skill sets, at the board can result in stronger decision-making strategies that drive innovation and create a competitive edge.

Second, pay packages for executives should be tied to the performance of the company over the long-term so that execs are rewarded for focusing on the well-being of a business in 30 years rather than this quarter. Companies should consider optimizing compensation models when linking executive pay to corporate KPIs such as long-term stock price growth, return on equity and sustainable profitability rather than Shor- term compensation plans.

Last but not least, policymakers and regulators might need to enhance shareholders' rights and protection, especially in upgrading markets where corporate governance is still immature. Enabling shareholders to meaningfully engage in governance decisions can lead to increased transparency, accountability and long term firm value. Powers that enable shareholders to engage better, such as enhanced voting rights and greater ability for shareholder activism may also help in ensuring that companies are well governed and responsive to investor interests.

CONCLUSION

There is sufficient empirical evidence to support the beneficial influence of corporate governance on performance, which underscores the strategic importance of governance mechanisms for value generation. The main results emphasize that board independence, performance-based executive compensation and shareholder rights play a significant role in improving firm value. These governance systems enable effective and efficient decision-making, align management interests with those of shareholders and promote internal accountability for the organization. For example, outside boards also reduce the potential for manager entrenchment and allow for independent monitoring essential to long-term corporate performance (Fama & Jensen, 1983). Likewise, the performance-based compensation aspect also links executive incentives to shareholder values and promotes decision making focused on long-term growth (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Another reason that shareholder rights are important is that they give the investors a voice on calls made by management and drive transparent, better performance decisions (La Porta et al., 2000).

The study has several limitations, despite its strong findings. One important limitation is the reliance on secondary data, which while reliable could potentially miss the subtleties of private governance practices or overlook an entire spectrum of governance mechanisms in use. Moreover, the study does not control for all factors that may affect firm's performance, including variables related to macroeconomic conditions or industry shocks. These constraints point to several future directions of research. For example, further research may investigate how corporate governance could shape risk-taking in distinct cultural or regulatory environments and different legal and culture backgrounds on account of the fact that governance mechanisms might significantly differ across such countries (La Porta et al., 1998). Furthermore, it can be examined how particular governance mechanisms are affected at different points in a firm's lifecycle (e.g., growth phase, financial distress or corporate restructuring) and what consequences the evolution has for performance.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. B., & Ferreira, D. (2009). Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. *Journal of Financial Economics, 94*(2), 291-309.

Anderson, R. C., & Reeb, D. M. (2004). Board composition: Balancing family influence in S&P 500 firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 49*(2), 209-237.

Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2004). *Pay without performance: The unfulfilled promise of executive compensation.* Harvard University Press.

Bhagat, S., & Black, B. (2002). The non-correlation between board independence and long-term firm performance. *Journal of Corporation Law, 27*(2), 231-273.

Brown, L. D., & Caylor, M. L. (2006). Corporate governance and firm performance. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 25*(4), 409-434.

Carter, D. A., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2003). Corporate governance, board diversity, and firm value. *Financial Review, 38*(1), 33-53.

Coles, J. L., Daniel, N. D., & Naveen, L. (2008). Boards: Does one size fit all?. *Journal of Financial Economics, 87*(2), 329-356.

Daily, C. M., & Dalton, D. R. (2003). Governance and the bankrupt firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(12), 1097-1114.

Dube, L., & Giroux, M. (2015). The corporate governance structure and the performance of firms: Evidence from Canada. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 23*(3), 190-203.

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics, 26*(2), 301-325.

Finkelstein, S., & D'Aveni, R. A. (1994). CEO duality as a double-edged sword: How boards of directors balance entrenchment avoidance and unity of command. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(5), 1079-1108.

Gupta, P., & Sharma, R. (2015). Corporate governance and its impact on financial performance of firms. *Journal of Financial Economics, 116*(1), 48-65.

Hillman, A. J., & Dalziel, T. (2003). Board of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(3), 383-396.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305-360.

La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2000). Investor protection and corporate governance. *Journal of Financial Economics, 58*(1-2), 3-27.

Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *Journal of Finance, 52*(2), 737-783.

Tirole, J. (2006). *The theory of corporate finance.* Princeton University Press.

Wang, Y., & Zhang, W. (2014). Corporate governance and firm performance: The role of institutional investors. *International Journal of Business and Economics, 13*(3), 241-256.