

# DEMYSTIFYING THE NEXUS BETWEEN OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND PERFORMANCE: A STUDY OF THE EMERGING MARKET

Pranesh Debnath<sup>\*</sup>, Biplab Kumar Dey<sup>\*\*</sup>, Nilanjan Mazumdar<sup>\*\*\*</sup>,  
Sukriti Das<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>, Happyson Gachuiwo<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author, Department of Commerce, Assam University, Assam, India

Contact details: Department of Commerce, Assam University, Silchar 788011, Assam, India

<sup>\*\*</sup> Department of Management, SRM University Sikkim, Gangtok, India

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Department of Business Administration, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya, Meghalaya, India

<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup> Department of Management, Assam Down Town University, Assam, India

<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup> Department of Business Administration, The Assam Royal Global University, Guwahati, India



## Abstract

**How to cite this paper:** Debnath, P., Dey, B. K., Mazumdar, N., Das, S., & Gachuiwo, H. (2022). Demystifying the nexus between ownership structure and performance: A study of the emerging market [Special issue]. *Corporate & Business Strategy Review*, 3(2), 306–320.

<https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv3i2siart12>

Copyright © 2022 The Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**ISSN Online:** 2708-4965

**ISSN Print:** 2708-9924

**Received:** 12.04.2022

**Accepted:** 19.12.2022

**JEL Classification:** G32, G34, M14

**DOI:** 10.22495/cbsrv3i2siart12

The main aim of this research is to study the effect of ownership structure (OS) on corporate performance after the application of the Companies Act, 2013 considering fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector firms listed on the Bombay Stock Exchange. This study applies the regression technique on panel data for five years, from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2019–2020. The study has used market-based performance (market capitalization) and accounting-based performance (return on capital employed) as dependent variables to investigate the impact of OS (ownership concentration (OC) and owners' identity (OI)) on firm performance. The findings demonstrate that OC measured by Hirschman–Herfindahl index (HHI) proposed by Demsetz and Lehn (1985) has a significant positive impact on accounting and market-based performance. The comparative analysis revealed that OI has a more significant impact on market-based performance than accounting performance. The result further reported that promoter ownership, institutional ownership, and body corporate holdings positively correlate with market-based performance. This study contributes to the existing corporate governance literature by evaluating the nexus between OS and corporate performance in the Indian context and enriches the existing literature, which will be important input for regulators, investors, and policymakers to take an informed decision. The study symbolizes the emerging market, one of the most attractive destinations for cross-country capital investment where corporate ownership structure differs from developed markets.

**Keywords:** Corporate Governance, Ownership Structure, Ownership Concentration, Owners' Identity, Corporate Performance

**Authors' individual contribution:** Conceptualization — P.D. and B.K.D.; Methodology — P.D. and B.K.D.; Validation — N.M., S.D., and H.G.; Formal Analysis — P.D. and B.K.D.; Investigation — P.D. and B.K.D.; Writing — Original Draft — P.D., B.K.D., and H.G.; Writing — Review & Editing — N.M., S.D., and H.G.; Visualization — P.D. and B.K.D.; Supervision — N.M., S.D., and H.G.

**Declaration of conflicting interests:** The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

**Acknowledgements:** Authors are thankful to the Central Library of Tripura Central University, Tripura, India for providing access to the premium database required for the collection of data for this study and also providing support for checking plagiarism through iThenticate anti-plagiarism software.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The corporate governance (CG) mechanism has received considerable attention in the free enterprise economy across the globe. Due to its economic crisis and the collapse of many reputed and well-performing corporate enterprises like Xerox, Enron, Satyam, and Kingfisher, many have questions about CG's role (Debnath, 2018). European countries and Asia, including India, have witnessed several corporate scams of large magnitude during the last two decades, which calls for robust corporate control. The CG describes a set of standards of practice for directing and controlling a company's and its stakeholders' activities (The Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance, 1992) and balancing the interest of all stakeholders. It is a statutory necessity in a company that imposes a fiduciary responsibility on management to perform for all shareholders and stakeholders (Gulzar et al., 2020). In the absence of a CG mechanism, investors (Principal) are unable to monitor the business on one hand and managers find it expedient to abuse organizational resources, which run in conflict with the interest of shareholders and the firm's performance on the other hand (Gulzar et al., 2020). Studies show that investors have better confidence and a positive perception of a firm maintaining higher governance standards (Arora & Bodhanwala, 2018). There are several cases of promoters have taken actions that are favourable to them but detrimental to the interests of minority shareholders, which have affected the confidence of minority shareholders in India (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]<sup>1</sup>, 2020). The agency cost arises from the separation of ownership from control of business matters, a prevalent problem in joint-stock companies (Berle & Means, 1932; Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Thus, the CG mechanism is a control mechanism that effectively protects, promotes, and promises the welfare of all stakeholders. Research studies (Fama, 1980; Fama & Jensen, 1983; Sarkar, Sarkar, & Sen, 2012; Arora & Bodhanwala, 2018; Meah & Chaudhory, 2019; Mishra, Jain, & Manogna, 2021) showed that an effective CG mechanism is crucial for the profitability of the firm. Giving impetus to the controversy, a few studies (Diriba & Basumatary, 2019; Bansal & Singh, 2021) documented a deleterious relationship between CG variables and corporate performance as essential criteria for achieving the overall objectives of the business (Subramanian, 2015; Arora & Bodhanwala, 2018). Although, some scholars in their studies (Mishra & Srivatsava, 2010; Arora & Sharma, 2016; Bhatt & Bhattacharya, 2017) argued that the firm's profitability is indifferent to CG practices and ownership structure.

Ownership structure (OS) is a crucial area of research and its upshot on corporate performance is a contentious issue in CG literature (Kumar & Zattoni, 2015). The OS refers to the distribution of equity shares among the shareholders. It comprises the ownership concentration, OC (the percentage of shares held by each shareholder), and owners' identity, OI (like individual promoters, public shareholders, foreign institutional owners, body

corporate, etc.). Different shareholders have distinct economic reasons for investing and engaging in strategic decision-making, which substantially impacts corporate performance (Manna, Sahu, & Gupta, 2016). As a result, previous studies have established that the OS affects the company's operational efficiency, performance, and management to a great extent (Arora & Bodhanwala, 2018; Nashier & Gupta, 2020). The debate on the impact of OS on corporate performance started a long time ago with the pioneer works of Smith (1776) and Berle and Means (1932). Previous scholars have proved that OC has a significant impact on CG mechanism and corporate performance as shareholders with intense shareholding influence the operations and management of a company (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Shleifer & Vishny, 1986; Manna et al., 2016; Yasser & Al Mamun, 2017; Panda & Bag, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020). Different studies have documented that OS in an emerging market like India is different from developed countries like the USA, the UK, Germany, and Japan (Sarkar & Sarkar, 2000). Family owners primarily conquer the OS in Indian corporate as promoters and promoter groups with high OC (Kavya & Shijin, 2017; Panda & Bag, 2019). The shareholdings of promoters in India have been relatively stable at around 50 percent from 2001 to 2018 (OECD, 2020). Therefore, determining the influence of OS on corporate performance in emerging economies such as India, which has become a popular destination for foreign institutional investors (FIIs), is crucial. FIIs are becoming more important players in the Indian capital market. Foreign institutional owners have a larger shareholding among institutional investors in Indian firms (Yadav, 2020). After the liberalization of the Indian economy in 1990, there has been a substantial transformation in investment by FIIs. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) allowed FIIs to invest in India on 14 September 1992. After that, the OS in India form experienced many changes with higher investment by FIIs (Gupta, 2019). The recent report on the OS of listed companies in India (OECD, 2020) disclosed that the proportion of the overall institutional investment and shareholdings by FIIs increased from 11.3 percent in 2001 to 46 percent in 2014. Because of this scenario, it is imperative to undertake this study on the Indian corporate sector after applying the Companies Act, 2013.

This study investigated the association between OS and corporate performance in the Indian context and contributed to the present literature in several ways. First, this study provides empirical evidence from the BSE-500 listed FMCG sector for the first time after the implementation of the Companies Act, of 2013. Second, it is crucial to analyze the Indian market since the corporate ownership pattern in India is quite different from that in the developed markets (Kavya & Shijin, 2017; OECD, 2020). Thus, research in an emerging market like the Indian economic setup can have important insinuations for regulators, investors, policymakers, and other stakeholders. Third, previous studies revealed that the corporate OS in developing countries is quite different from that in developed markets (Nashier & Gupta, 2020). This study considered the Indian market to symbolize the emerging economy. A sizable number of leading companies in India is typically controlled and managed by family ownership with few shareholders in promoters and

<sup>1</sup> The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), established in 1961, is an international organization that works to build better policies for better lives.

executive directors (Madhani, 2016; Kavya & Shijin, 2017). In Indian listed firms, promoters own around 50 percent of the total equity share capital (OECD, 2020), which is similar to other emerging Asian countries like Pakistan (Yassar & Al Mamun, 2017), Bangladesh (Khan, Muttakin, & Siddiqui, 2013) and Malaysia (Abdullah, Mohamad, & Mokhtar, 2011). The corporate scenario of the emerging economy is characterized by concentrated ownership in the hands of a few promoters, family control businesses, and the adoption of the western CG model where the economic environment is quite different. Therefore, the Indian market is the best representative of the growing economy for exploring the relationship between OS and corporate performance, which will contribute to the body of available literature.

Fourth, a novel contribution of this study is that it examined the role of OC by the Hirschman-Herfindahl index (HHI), which is mainly in a developed market economy. However, the HHI is rarely used in the emerging economy (except, Nashier and Gupta, 2020, in India, taking older data set before applying the Companies Act, 2013, and Yassar and Al Mamun, 2017, considered for Pakistani firms from much earlier time 2009 to 2013). Other emerging market studies have measured the OC by taking the percentage of shares held by the largest shareholders or promoter holding or institutional shareholding, foreign ownership, etc. Thus, this study considered this HHI to measure OC for this study as a different approach. Fifth, the present study considered the FMCG sector firm for the analysis. In the literature survey based on the Indian economy, it is found that no research has addressed this sector to assess the nexus between OS and corporate performance. Therefore, the analysis of the FMCG sector is vital in the Indian market for multiple reasons from the viewpoint of regulators, policymakers, global investors, and analysts. Firstly, the FMCG sector contributes to India's gross domestic product (GDP) growth (Patil, 2016). Presently, the FMCG industry is treated as the fourth largest sector in the Indian economy and employs around 3 million people. Moreover, the industry witnessed a healthy foreign direct investment (FDI) inflow of US\$16.28 billion from April 2000 to March 2020. Therefore, the Government of India has allowed 100 percent FDI opportunities in food processing and single-brand retail and 51 percent in multi-brand retail (India Brand Equity Foundation [IBEF]<sup>2</sup>, 2022), and studies reported the positive integration between FDI and economic development (Shahani & Aayushi, 2019). The findings of this study are important for international readers because many studies have been conducted to explore the relationship between OS and firm performance based on developed economic conditions but a very limited number of empirical evidence is available from emerging economies. This study provided evidence that the association between ownership structure and firm performance is almost similar to developed countries' corporate scenarios. Therefore, this study will bridge the existing gap in the literature producing empirical findings from the Indian

context which will be crucial input to international investors before taking an investment decision in the Indian corporate sector. Findings are also important for policymakers and regulators for framing the investors' friendly foreign investment policy to protect their interest ensuring a smooth flow of required foreign capital in the country and profitability.

A review of contemporary studies revealed no unanimity on the relationship between OS and corporate performance. While investigating the relationship between OS and corporate performance, some studies (Yassar & Al Mamun, 2017; Nashier & Gupta, 2020) advocated favouring the positive association. Others like Demsetz and Villalonga (2001) and Pandey and Sahu (2020) reported that OS negatively influences performance. Moreover, some studies documented no relationship (Al-Saidi & Al-Shammari, 2015; Bhatt & Bhattacharya, 2017; Panda & Bag, 2019). Therefore, further research is inevitable, given the absence of a unanimous conclusion on the relation between OS and corporate performance. Hence, this study attempts to estimate the impact of OS on the performance of BSE-listed FMCG sector firms in India from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2019–2020, i.e., post-application of the Companies Act, 2013. This primary objective is segregated into the following secondary objectives:

- To measure the effects of OC on the accounting performance of Indian FMCG companies.
- To determine the effect of OC on the market-based performance of Indian FMCG companies.
- To estimate the impact of OI on the accounting performance of FMCG sector firms in India.
- To examine the influence of OI on the market-based performance of Indian FMCG companies.

As per the literature survey, no studies on the nexus between OS and corporate performance in the Indian context after the Companies Act, 2013, have been conducted. Therefore, this study will enrich the body of contemporary studies on CG in emerging markets in general and India in particular.

The following is the order in which the article is organized. Section 1 provides an overview and background of the study. Section 2 presents empirical research investigating the relationship between ownership structure and corporate performance, whereas Section 3 addresses the data and methodology. Section 4 presents the data analysis and discussion. Finally, Section 5 provides concluding observations, limitations, and research scope for the future.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews the previous studies on the nexus between OS and corporate performance. Previous studies have established that OS has important implications on CG and performance (Thomsen & Pedersen, 2000). Many previous studies (e.g., Waheed & Malik, 2019) have provided evidence that OS as a part of the CG mechanism has important implications for corporate performance. The literature suggests that OC plays a vital role in CG because owners with a higher percentage of shareholding influence the operations and management of a company (Nashier & Gupta, 2020). Varghese and Sasidharan (2020) found mixed evidence that promoter ownership positively impacts corporate performance, but institutional investors' ownership exercises a negative influence.

<sup>2</sup> India Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF) is a trust established by the Department of Commerce, Ministry of Commerce and Industry. The government of India's primary objective is to promote and create international awareness of the Made in India label in the market overseas and facilitate discrimination of knowledge of Indian products and services.

However, few studies (Karpagam, Selvam, & Babu, 2013; Tran & Le, 2020) observed that corporate performance is indifferent to OS in India.

Promoters and non-promoters characterize the OS in Indian companies. In principle, promoters are groups of individuals or institutions responsible for establishing the company or controlling shareholders, while non-promoters refer to other shareholders, including minority shareholders. Like other emerging markets, promoters and promoter groups have steadily owned almost half of the shares in Indian listed firms for the last two decades (OECD, 2020). The OECD report further revealed that among the promoter category, individual promoters are the dominant group for all listed companies in India, whose shareholding proportion varied from 48 percent and 53 percent since 2006 (OECD, 2020). The OC is a prominent investor strategy for ensuring a fair yield on their investment (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997). Previous studies believe that OC also has significant repercussions on corporate performance (Altaf & Shah, 2018). Although this problem has acquired much attention in theories and empirical studies, there is no consensus on the direction of the effect. According to Jensen and Meckling (1976), OC can reduce the conflict of interest between owners and managers and strong corporate performance.

It could have been linked to agency conflicts, leading to minority shareholder deprivation and poor corporate performance. Katragadda and Sreeram (2018) reported that insider shareholding is positively and significantly related to corporate performance. The study of Haque and Shahid (2016) observed that foreign ownership negatively impacts corporate performance, but OC has no effect. Desoky and Mousa (2013) reported that OC and owner's identity are significant deterrents of the performance of Egyptian listed companies. At the same time, Alipour (2013) documented that the diffused OS promotes the profitability of Tehran Stock Exchange (TSE) listed firms. However, Al-Saidi and Al-Shammari (2015) encountered a negative association between OC and corporate performance in Kuwaiti firms. However, they have noted that individual ownership has significant implications on performance. Ben Slama Zouari and Boulila Taktak (2014) found that OC and performance are unresponsive to each other in banking companies.

While many previous studies have focused on agency relationships and the impact of CG on corporate performance, this study aims to estimate the effects of OS on corporate performance in an emerging economy like India, where it is yet to draw much attention in the academic literature. The identity of shareholders and OC reflects the power of a group of owners who can influence managerial decisions. Dwivedi and Jain (2005) and Haldar and Rao (2011) contributed to the inconclusive discussion by examining the association between OS and corporate performance based on BSE-listed firms. Panda and Leepsa (2019) and Din, Arshad Khan, Khan, and Khan (2021) observed that managerial and institutional ownership positively impact corporate performance in India. However, Panda and Bag (2019) found that OC harms market-based performance but does not impact financial performance. However, in another contemporary study based on the Indian economy, Nashier and Gupta (2020) reported that the OC has favourable implications on a company's market-based

performance and accounting performance. They suggest that concentrated ownership helps minimize agency costs as large shareholders actively monitor the company's management, resulting in better corporate performance.

Ganguli & Agrawal (2009) and Manna et al. (2016) have endeavored to assess the impact of OS on corporate performance in Indian companies and encountered the affirmative association between promoters' shareholding and corporate performance. Similarly, Roy (2016a, 2016b) and Sandhya and Parashar (2019) have also advocated in favour of constructive connotation between CG and corporate performance in India. Bhatia and Srivastava (2017) encountered the nonlinear relationship between promoters' shareholding and the performance of the firms in the Indian economic setup. They find evidence of the endogenous relationship between promoters' shareholding and corporate performance. The study of Nazir and Malhotra (2016) acknowledged that shareholding by non-promoters groups positively impacts firm profitability in India. Yasser and Al Mamun (2017) figured out a significant positive association between OS, market-based performance measures, and economic profit. They also observed that institutional shareholding and foreign shareholding are positively associated with corporate performance. The study of Kumar and Singh (2013) and Mishra and Kapil (2017) documented a significant positive association between promoter ownership and corporate performance. Rao, Parameshwar, Ajay, and Aradhyula (2018) revealed a meaningful positive relationship between promoter shareholding and firm value.

Chatterjee and Bhattacharjee (2020) observed that OC has a favourable implication on the performance of Indian technology small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The nexus between ownership structure and corporate performance has engrossed considerable attention, particularly in developing markets, yet empirical results remain diverse and inconclusive. Some studies (Yasser & Al Mamun, 2017; Iwasaki & Mizobata, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020) claim that OC can increase performance and makes owners increasingly inclined or capable of managing agents. While Demsetz and Lehn (1985) and Demsetz and Villalonga (2001) have documented that corporate performance is not dependent on OC and OS, respectively. However, others have argued that market oversight will control the managers in the presence of efficient markets (Kuznetsov & Muravyev, 2000).

The central contradiction between diffused and focused ownership systems has been a critical issue in CG literature worldwide. Ganguli and Guha Deb (2021) witnessed that OC between 25 and 75 percent enhances corporate performance, but low concentration adversely impacts performance. Similarly, Saha and Kabra (2019), and Prince (2021) identified an affirmative link between OS and market-based corporate performance. Yadav (2020) documented different results where the study found that mutual fund ownership positively influences corporate social performance and foreign institutional ownership ignores the social responsibility of corporations. Mazumder (2016), on the other hand, identified a destructive relationship between corporate shareholding and corporate performance in Japan. Along the same line, Pandey

and Sahu (2020) observed the negative impact of OC on India's manufacturing industry's performance. Altaf and Shah (2018) concluded that OC and corporate performance had an inverse U-shaped connection. Meah and Chaudhory (2019) found that shareholding by family directors adversely influences firm profitability. Rajverma, Misra, Mohapatra, and Chandra (2019) and Singla (2020) noted that family ownership positively influences profitability, and Sahasranamam, Arya, and Sud (2020) viewed that business group ownership and family ownership make the firm more socially responsible than others in the Indian context. Earlier studies (Desoky & Mousa, 2013) have revealed that ownership identity (OI) significantly influences the firms' decision-making process and performance. Studies have also reported that promoters' shareholding can positively impact corporate performance (Bhatia & Srivastava, 2017). Institutional ownership has a favourable association with corporate performance, according to Thomsen and Pedersen (2000), because it promotes external supervision of the firms. In addition, institutional ownership lowers the chance of bankruptcy (Carrillo & Bathala, 2010).

The dividend policy is a significant financial decision of a firm directly linked to the interest of shareholders. A recent study by Kiran and Ramesh (2021) noted that the holding of shares by institutional investors and promoter groups negatively influences dividend distribution. Madhani (2016) also found that promoters' shareholding has a negative effect on corporate performance in India. Aluchna and Kaminski (2017) observed a negative linkage between OC and performance. However, Laporsek, Dolenc, Grum, and Stubelj (2021) found that OC and corporate performance are indifferent to each other. Similarly, Machek and Kubicek (2018) found no relationship between OC and corporate performance using the HHI.

Kalsie and Shrivastav (2016), Mishra and Kapil (2017), and Pareek, Pandey, and Sahu (2019) concluded that board size has a positive and significant impact on corporate performance in India. Ocak (2021) observed that the presence of women directors enhances corporate performance in Turkey. Vishwakarma (2017) exhibited a significant positive relationship between gender diversity on the board and corporate performance in microfinance institutions (MFIs) in India and suggested that MFIs should think about femininity on board to improve the firm's financial viability. Meah and Chaudhory (2019), and Khidmat, Khan, and Ullah (2020) found that gender diversity and educational diversity positively impact performance for accounting and market measures in listed firms. However, Kumar, Nigam, and Singh (2020) documented that women directors do not significantly differ in corporate performance. They observed that the proportion of women directors in most Indian boards is too small to make much impact. Studies across different countries reported different associations between OS and corporate performance, such as in India (Manna et al., 2016; Saha & Kabra, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020), Slovenia (Laporsek et al., 2021), and Pakistan (Din et al., 2021) reported positive associations. However, Meah and Chaudhory (2019) and Alipour (2013) reported a negative connection in India and Iran, respectively. At the same time, Mishra and Srivatsava (2010) in India, Tran and Le (2020) in Vietnam, Machek and

Kubicek (2018) in the Czech Republic, Varghese and Sasidharan (2020) in inter-country comparison between India and China reported no significant relations.

Jensen and Meckling (1976) and Fama (1980) envisaged the agency problem and argued that OS improves corporate performance by alleviating the conflict between managers and owners. Therefore, it is presumed that OS has significant implications on the performance of firms working in the Indian emerging market. Following the previous studies of the emerging economy, this study considered OC (Yasser & Al Mamun, 2017; Panda & Bag, 2019) and OI (Manna et al., 2016; Nashier & Gupta, 2020) as two separate dimensions of OS. Contemporary studies revealed no consensus on the relationship between OS and corporate performance across developed and developing countries, which calls for further investigation. Therefore, the following hypotheses are articulated to realize the set objective of this study:

*H1: Ownership concentration has had a significant impact on FMCG sector firms' accounting performance in India after applying the Companies Act, 2013.*

*H2: Ownership concentration has had a significant impact on the market-based performance of FMCG sector firms in India after the Companies Act, 2013.*

*H3: Owners' identity has had a significant impact on the market-based performance of FMCG sector firms in India after the Companies Act, 2013.*

*H4: Owners' identity has had a significant impact on the accounting performance of FMCG sector firms in India after the application of the Companies Act, 2013.*

### 3. DATA AND METHODS

#### 3.1. Sample design and sample companies

Keeping the objectives of the present study in consideration, the researchers have selected 57 firms under the FMCG sector listed in the Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE) for a period of five years from FY 2015-2016 to FY 2019-2020 which yields 285 firm-year observations.

#### 3.2. Data source

The present study is empirical research based on secondary data. Related data have been collected manually through a content analysis approach from the annual reports published by the respective companies to accomplish the set objectives. In addition, for the extraction of accounting and other company-specific data, the researchers have explored the CapitalinePlus Database, which is administered and offered by Capital Market Publishers Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai.

#### 3.3. Corporate performance variables

The primary objective of this research is to quantify the influence of OC and OI on corporate performance in FMCG-listed companies in India, an emerging market. Therefore, keeping the objective into consideration, two different variables such as *ROCE* (Desoky & Mousa, 2013; Debnath & Chinmoy, 2018; Singh & Bagga, 2019) and *MCap* (Panda & Bag, 2019; Gulzar et al., 2020) have

been taken as a proxy of accounting-based performance and market-based performance, respectively. In addition, following prior studies, both accounting-based and market-based yardsticks have been used to reflect corporate performance to confirm the robustness of the results revealed by the analysis (Manna et al., 2016; Yasser & Al Mamun, 2017; Gulzar et al., 2020; Din et al., 2021).

### 3.4. Explanatory variables

Twelve predictor variables are grouped into two categories apart from the dependent variables. The first category comprises six variables related to OC as follows: 1) the largest shareholder, 2) the two largest shareholders, 3) the three largest shareholders, 4) the four largest shareholders; 5) the five largest shareholders (the measurement of these five variables follows Yasser and Al Mamun, 2017), and 6) the Hirschman-Herfindahl index, HHI (Demsetz & Lehn, 1985; Nashier & Gupta, 2020). The second category consists of six variables related to OI such as 1) promoter ownership, 2) institutional ownership, 3) individual promoter ownership, 4) body corporate ownership, 5) foreign promoter ownership, and 6) public shareholding. The present study has estimated the OI-related variables following some previous contemporary studies investigating the association between OS and corporate performance related to emerging markets (Thomsen & Pedersen, 2000; Carrillo & Bathala, 2010; Mishra & Srivatsava, 2010; Manna et al., 2016; Bhatia & Srivastava, 2017; Yasser & Al Mamun, 2017; Kohli, 2018; Panda & Bag, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020).

### 3.5. Control variables

To adjust to economic and firm-specific effects having significant implications on the firm's performance in the empirical analysis, the researchers

have used some firm-specific variables to control corporate performance. Following some contemporary studies (Manna et al., 2016; Debnath & Chinmoy, 2017; Panda & Bag, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020), following variables such as 1) firm age, 2) firm size, 3) leverage, and 4) liquidity are applied in the regression model to estimate the implication of OS on corporate performance. Firm age is a crucial firm-specific characteristic that significantly impacts corporate performance (Coad, Segarra, & Teruel, 2013; Debnath & Chinmoy, 2017). The present study considered the natural logarithm of the total number of years from the year of incorporation to represent firm age (Meah & Chaudhory, 2019). Size is another significant firm-specific factor that has an insinuation on the overall performance of any organization using the benefits of economies of scale. Therefore, the natural logarithm of total assets is taken as a proxy for firm size (Panda & Bag, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020). Leverage, represented by the debt-equity ratio (DER), is included as the control variable because it indicates the debt-capital ratio compared to equity to finance the total assets (Singh & Bagga, 2019; Gulzar et al., 2020). As debt capital is cheaper than equity, higher leverage produces higher profit at higher risk. Assets turnover (ATO) indicates how effectively the firm is using its total assets to generate revenues. Thus, as per accounting literature, a higher turnover ratio leads to better performance (Welch, 2003). This study measured the liquidity by the current ratio, i.e., current assets to current liabilities, which symbolizes the short-term solvency of the firm. Thus, a solvent firm has higher liquidity, resulting in profitability (Alipour, 2013; Singh & Bagga, 2019; Nashier & Gupta, 2020).

Table 1 presents the summary of variables under consideration in the current study.

Table 1. Summary of variables and estimation

Variables	Definition
<b>Dependent variables (performance of firm)</b>	
Return on capital employed (ROCE)	EBIT/Total assets
Market capitalisation (MCap)	Natural logarithm of market capitalization
<b>Independent variables (ownership concentration, OC)</b>	
Largest shareholder (OC1)	% of shares owned by the largest shareholder
Two largest shareholders (OC2)	% of shares owned by the two largest shareholders
Three largest shareholders (OC3)	% of shares owned by the three largest shareholders
Four largest shareholders (OC4)	% of shares owned by the four largest shareholders
Five largest shareholders (OC5)	% of shares owned by the five largest shareholders
Hirschman-Herfindahl index (HHI)	% of shares owned by a different type of shareholders*
<b>Independent variables (owners' identity, OI)</b>	
Promoter ownership (PO)	% of shares owned by promoters
Institutional ownership (IO)	% of shares owned by institutions
Individual promoter ownership (IPO)	% of shares owned by individual promoters
Body corporate ownership (BCO)	% of shares owned by body corporate
Foreign promoter ownership (FPO)	% of shares owned by foreign promoters
Public shareholding (PSH)	% of shares owned by other than promoters
<b>Control variables (firm-specific characteristics)</b>	
Firm size (FS)	Natural logarithm of total sales
Leverage (DER)	Debt-equity ratio
Liquidity (LIQ)	Current assets/Current liabilities
Assets turnover (ATO)	Net sales/Total assets
Firm age (FA)	Natural logarithm of the number of the year from the incorporation

Note: \* As recommended by Demsetz and Lehn (1985) and following the study of Nashier and Gupta (2020), the present study has calculated the HHI as the natural logarithm of square of % of shareholding by Indian individuals promoter + square of % shareholding by corporate body promoters + square of % shareholding by Indian promoter + square of % shareholding by foreign promoters + square of % of public institutional shareholding + square of % non-institutional public shareholding.

Source: Authors' elaboration.

### 3.6. Econometric model specification

The regression model has been separated into two dimensions in light of the set objectives. In the first part, this study estimates the impact of OC on corporate performance (both accounting and

market-based performance) by framing the following panel regression model. In Model 1, it is assumed that corporate performance (both market and accounting-based measures) is a function of OC (see Table 1).

#### Model 1

$$M\text{Cap}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 OC1_{it} + \beta_2 OC2_{it} + \beta_3 OC3_{it} + \beta_4 OC4_{it} + \beta_5 OC5_{it} + \gamma_1 FS_{it} + \gamma_2 DER_{it} + \gamma_3 LIQ_{it} + \gamma_4 ATO_{it} + \gamma_5 FA_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$ROCE_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 OC1_{it} + \beta_2 OC2_{it} + \beta_3 OC3_{it} + \beta_4 OC4_{it} + \beta_5 OC5_{it} + \gamma_1 FS_{it} + \gamma_2 DER_{it} + \gamma_3 LIQ_{it} + \gamma_4 ATO_{it} + \gamma_5 FA_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where,  $i$  denotes individual sample firm,  $t$  represents the time period from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2019–2020. The  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  parameters capture the potential impacts of independent and control variables, respectively;  $\varepsilon$  is the error term.

In the second part, the present study estimates the effect of OI or ownership types on corporate

performance (accounting and market-based performance) by assessing the following panel data regression model. In Model 2, it is assumed that corporate performance (both market and accounting-based measures) is a function of OI (see Table 1).

#### Model 2

$$M\text{Cap}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PO_{it} + \beta_2 IO_{it} + \beta_3 IPO_{it} + \beta_4 BCO_{it} + \beta_5 FPO_{it} + \beta_6 PSH_{it} + \gamma_1 FS_{it} + \gamma_2 DER_{it} + \gamma_3 LIQ_{it} + \gamma_4 ATO_{it} + \gamma_5 FA_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)$$

$$ROCE_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 PO_{it} + \beta_2 IO_{it} + \beta_3 IPO_{it} + \beta_4 BCO_{it} + \beta_5 FPO_{it} + \beta_6 PSH_{it} + \gamma_1 FS_{it} + \gamma_2 DER_{it} + \gamma_3 LIQ_{it} + \gamma_4 ATO_{it} + \gamma_5 FA_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

where,  $i$  denotes individual sample firm,  $t$  represents the time period from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2019–2020. The  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  parameters capture the potential impacts of independent and control variables respectively;  $\varepsilon$  is the error term.

Panel data is better than time-series and cross-section data to analyze historical data in CG and financial literature because it allows for studying cross-sectional variations and time-series variations in the dataset. It helps to assess the sample's time and individual or group effects. The panel model also controls the dataset's undetected diverse characteristics (heterogeneity) (Wooldridge, 2005). Hence, the study considered a panel dataset comprised of 57 selected companies for five years (2016–2020), making 285 firm-year observations to estimate the impact of OC and OI on a firm's accounting and market-based performance. Further, to check the appropriateness of the regression model, we administered F-test (Baltagi, 1995) to compare the fitness between pooled ordinary least squares (OLS) and fixed effect (FE) model and the Lagrange multiplier (LM) test (Breusch & Pagan, 1980) to choose between pooled OLS and random effect (RE) models. At last, the study applied the Hausman test (Hausman, 1978) to check the aptness between RE and FE models.

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS

The present section reports the analysis of data and findings of the study. Findings are reported according to objectives and research questions.

### 4.1. Descriptive statistics

This subsection presented summary statistics of all dependent, independent, and control variables used to estimate the effect of OC and OI on corporate performance.

Table 2 summarized the descriptive statistics of all the variables under consideration in the present study. Concerning the dependent variables, it is found that the average  $M\text{Cap}$  is 15606.53 crore and the average  $ROCE$  is 23.46 percent. With regards to OC variables, it is visible that the largest shareholder ( $OC1$ ), the two largest shareholders ( $OC2$ ), the three largest shareholders ( $OC3$ ), the four largest shareholders ( $OC4$ ), and the five largest shareholders ( $OC5$ ) hold about 7.48 percent, 10.92 percent, 13.28 percent, 14.96 percent, and 16.25 percent, respectively in the total equity capital of the firms under consideration. In the summary statistics, it is observed that the average value of the  $HHI$  is 0.49 in Table 2. Concerning OI variables, it is found that the promoter group and public shareholdings are about 57.83 percent and 42.17 percent, respectively in the firm's total equity capital.

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of performance and ownership variables

Variables	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Sleekness	Kurtosis	Std. Dev.	Variance
MCap (₹ in crore)	15606.53	21.73	497513.67	6.66	54.11	47122.13	3.02
ROCE (%)	23.46	-11.38	143.27	1.98	5.71	20.23	0.86
OC1 (%)	7.48	0.00	74.22	4.76	31.52	8.93	1.19
OC2 (%)	10.92	0.19	77.13	3.20	16.26	10.22	0.94
OC3 (%)	13.28	0.38	78.89	2.48	9.66	11.44	0.86
OC4 (%)	14.96	0.57	80.57	2.24	7.37	12.40	0.83
OC5 (%)	16.25	0.76	81.86	2.13	6.22	13.17	0.81
HHI (Index)	0.49	0.14	0.66	-0.97	1.78	0.08	0.17
PO (%)	57.83	15.43	100.00	-0.19	0.30	14.27	0.25
IPO (%)	17.95	0.00	99.90	1.13	0.18	23.07	1.28
IO (%)	14.40	0.00	51.33	0.61	-0.39	12.14	0.84
BCO (%)	27.97	0.00	74.45	0.29	-1.44	26.03	0.93
FPO (%)	10.87	0.00	74.44	1.81	1.82	21.43	1.97
PSH (%)	42.17	0.00	84.57	0.19	0.30	14.27	0.34
FS (N-logarithm)	3.16	1.39	4.59	-0.28	0.24	0.56	0.18
DER	0.99	0.00	73.27	14.16	220.13	4.58	4.63
LIQ	1.44	0.20	8.48	3.95	23.25	0.96	0.67
ATO	1.79	0.03	7.42	1.78	4.12	1.20	0.67
FA (Year)	47	7	232	3	7	41	0.65

Source: Authors' calculation.

From Table 2, it is visible that the holding proportion of institutional ownership (IO), individual promoter ownership (IPO), body corporate ownership (BCO), and foreign promoter ownership (FPO) is 14.4 percent, 17.95 percent, 27.97 percent, and 10.87 percent, respectively. So far, control

variables are concerned. Table 2 depicted that the average firm age is 47 years with the average firm size being 3.16 (natural logarithm of total sales). Leverage (DER), liquidity and assets turnover ratio (ATO) is 0.99, 1.44, and 1.79 times, respectively.

**Table 3.** Year-wise mean value of dependent, independent, and control variables

Year	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
MCap (₹ in crore)	10650.70	12654.11	16258.30	18407.22	20062.34
ROCE (%)	23.89	24.58	26.31	22.41	20.10
OC1 (%)	7.15	6.71	7.48	7.72	8.34
OC2 (%)	10.62	9.92	10.89	11.17	11.99
OC3 (%)	12.96	12.22	13.29	13.56	14.38
OC4 (%)	14.66	13.80	14.97	15.35	16.01
OC5 (%)	15.90	15.00	16.27	16.68	17.38
HHI (Index)	9.08	9.07	9.04	9.04	9.04
PO (%)	60.07	59.17	57.21	56.80	55.89
IPO (%)	19.21	19.07	17.28	17.26	16.95
IO (%)	12.79	13.69	14.74	15.42	15.36
BCO (%)	29.10	28.75	28.58	27.31	26.13
FPO (%)	10.68	10.46	10.49	11.30	11.40
PSH (%)	39.93	40.83	42.79	43.20	44.11
FS (N-logarithm)	7.14	7.23	7.24	7.32	7.41
DER	2.33	0.78	0.60	0.77	0.46
LIQ	1.40	1.47	1.47	1.44	1.42
ATO	2.03	1.87	1.74	1.68	1.63
FA (Year)	3.56	3.59	3.62	3.65	3.68

Source: Authors' calculation.

Apart from Table 2, the mean value of variables of interest is arranged on yearly basis for five years under consideration in Table 3 to present the companies' profitability and OS after the application of the Companies Act, 2013.

In Table 3, it can be seen that the mean value of MCap of the company shows a sharp rise after the Companies Act, 2013, but ROCE shows a mixed growth trend. Thus it can be concluded that the market-based performance of the company is more influenced by the Companies Act, 2013 than accounting performance. Concerning OC in the hands of the five largest shareholders (other than directors, promoters, and holders of Global Depository

Receipts, GDRs and American Depositary Receipts, ADRs), it shows balanced and upward movements after 2016. However, the concentration level measured by standard proxy of the HHI (the comprehensive measure of the OC index applied across the globe) witnessed a sharp decline after 2016. As far as IO is concerned, the proportion of shares held by PO, IPO, and BCO has steadily decreased in total equity since the Companies Act was enacted in 2013. PSH and IO, on the other hand, have seen a considerable increase in total proportion, whereas FPO has shown mixed growth since 2016.



Table 4. Correlation matrix and variance inflation factor (VIF) of variables

	MCap	ROCE	OC1	OC2	OC3	OC4	OC5	HHI	PO	IPO	IO	BCO	FPO	PSH	FS	DER	LIQ	ATO	FA	VIF	
MCap	1																				1.456
ROCE	0.41	1																			3.269
OC1	-0.07	0.05	1																		1.259
OC2	0.02	-0.04	0.35	1																	4.025
OC3	-0.03	0.02	0.12	0.13	1																1.079
OC4	0.21	-0.04	0.25	0.70	0.09	1															2.098
OC5	0.02	0.01	0.15	0.14	0.08	0.18	1														3.124
HHI	0.27	0.21	-0.11	-0.21	-0.17	-0.04	-0.15	1													2.359
PO	0.16	0.12	-0.14	-0.24	-0.16	-0.26	-0.28	0.18	1												4.587
IPO	-0.10	-0.05	-0.10	-0.05	-0.11	-0.12	-0.12	0.03	0.08	1											1.098
IO	0.49	0.06	-0.01	0.17	0.14	0.43	0.22	0.01	-0.12	-0.09	1										1.037
BCO	-0.03	-0.07	0.08	-0.04	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.34	0.32	-0.28	-0.13	1									2.053
FPO	0.36	0.36	-0.11	-0.13	-0.15	-0.15	-0.16	0.27	0.19	-0.34	0.04	-0.25	1								3.076
PSH	-0.16	-0.12	0.14	0.34	0.26	0.26	0.28	-0.19	-1.00	-0.08	0.42	-0.32	-0.19	1							3.004
FS	0.66	0.25	-0.17	-0.03	-0.13	0.18	-0.07	0.01	-0.08	-0.08	0.44	-0.16	0.23	0.07	1						5.022
DER	-0.21	-0.09	-0.05	-0.04	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	0.04	0.09	-0.05	-0.11	0.11	-0.05	-0.08	-0.04	1					2.782
LIQ	-0.07	0.00	-0.03	-0.07	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07	0.12	0.05	-0.02	-0.09	0.09	-0.02	-0.05	-0.34	-0.12	1				2.034
ATO	0.10	0.53	0.07	-0.06	0.03	-0.12	-0.01	0.14	0.11	0.07	-0.09	-0.15	0.26	-0.11	0.24	-0.05	-0.18	1			2.073
FA	0.20	0.00	-0.04	-0.12	-0.08	0.01	-0.07	-0.05	-0.19	-0.21	0.12	0.00	0.28	0.18	0.21	-0.06	-0.10	-0.07	1		2.221

Source: Authors' calculation.

Table 4 shows the correlation coefficient of the variables under consideration. The maximum value of the correlation coefficient is 0.66 between *MCap* and *FS*, which is acceptable as they are dependent and control variables, respectively and the value is far less than the maximum threshold limit of 0.80. Therefore, it is evident that the independent variables under consideration are not strongly correlated. Hence, the collinearity issue does not arise in the regression models (Gujarati, 2009). In addition to a low correlation coefficient of variables, lower VIF values (less than 10) corresponding to independent and control variables ensure the absence of multicollinearity in the present dataset.

#### 4.2. Panel regression model

The findings of panel regression analysis are presented in this subsection. To analyze the impact of OC and OI on corporate performance, two distinct models are presented.

In two distinct equations, Table 5 shows the regression outcomes used to assess the relationship between OC and the profitability of the company in terms of market capitalization and return on capital employed, respectively. The study has used Breusch-Pagan LM test to determine the feasibility of the RE model and the pooled OLS model in the regression. The test shows that the t-statistic value is significant at 1 percent (t-statistic = 24.78,

p-value = 0.0000). As a result, the pooled OLS model outperformed the RE (pooled OLS) model. According to the Hausman test result reported in Table 5, the FE model appears to be more appropriate than the RE model for both panels.

Table 5 shows that the OC in the hands first five largest shareholders (*OC1*, *OC2*, *OC3*, *OC4*, and *OC5*) seemed to have no statistically significant impact on the accounting and market-based performance of the selected companies during the study period. Thus holding by large shareholders does not have any impact on corporate performance. Therefore, the current finding validates the findings of Panda and Bag (2019) when it relates to the linkage between OC and accounting performance. However, using the HHI, it is observed that OC has a strongly favourable effect on a firm's accounting and market-based performance, which is consistent with the findings of Yasser and Al Mamun (2017) in Pakistan, Nashier and Gupta (2020) in India, and Nguyen, Locke, and Reddy (2015) in Vietnam. Table 5 further highlighted that *FS*, *FA*, and *LIQ* have a favourable effect on the firm's market-based performance among the control variables. Similarly, *DER* and *ATO* had an adverse influence on market-based performance. However, on the contrary, *ATO* shows positive implications on accounting performance, similar to Manna et al. (2016). Nonetheless, *DER* and *FA* have no impact on accounting performance during the study period.

Table 5. Panel data regression result for OC and corporate performance

Variables	Dependent variables	
	MCap	ROCE
(Constant)	-21.225 (3.143)***	-135.096 (45.434)***
OC1	-0.071 (0.068)	-0.339 (0.979)
OC2	-0.051 (0.097)	-0.304 (1.398)
OC3	0.035 (0.168)	-2.163 (2.421)
OC4	-0.143 (0.265)	-5.599 (3.826)
OC5	0.048 (0.149)	2.657 (2.163)
HHI	2.346 (0.336)***	12.477 (4.859)**
FS	0.950 (0.064)***	3.028 (0.932)***
DER	-0.064 (0.015)***	-0.174 (0.221)
LIQ	0.204 (0.079)**	2.878 (1.147)
ATO	-0.136 (0.062)**	8.238 (0.929)
FA	0.217 (0.115)*	0.941 (1.671)
No. of obs.	285	285
R-squared	0.572	0.341
Adj. R-squared	0.555	0.314
F-statistic	33.215***	12.832***
Breusch-Pagan LM test	324.781***	232.542***
Hausman test	13.791***	17.235***

Note: Standard errors appear in parentheses; \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* represent 1%, 5%, and 10% significance levels, respectively.

Source: Authors' calculation.

Table 6 presents the panel data regression analysis deployed to estimate the impact of OI on corporate performance. As per the appropriateness test viz; Breusch-Pagan LM test and Hausman test systematically, it is decided to use the RE model for the analysis. From the analysis, it is observed that OI (*IPO*, *IO*, *BCO*, and *FPO*) has a statistically significant (at a 1 percent level) positive impact on the market-based performance of the firms under consideration. Nevertheless, at the same time, the present findings challenged the findings of Varghese and Sasidharan (2020), who found that institutional ownership discourages the firm's financial performance. However, *PO* and *PSH* negatively impact market-based performance. This finding is similar to Dwivedi and Jain (2005), who observed a significant negative association between corporate performance and public shareholding. Therefore, this finding contradicts the findings of Ganguli and Agrawal (2009), Kumar and Singh (2013), and Chatterjee and Bhattacharjee (2020). This result implies that promoter shareholders may be unfavourable for the corporate performance as their objectives clash with small shareholders (Desoky & Mousa, 2013).

When the accounting performance as a variable of interest is considered, it is observed that the coefficient of *FPO* proportion and *BCO* has a significant affirmative impact on corporate performance at a 1 percent and 10 percent significant levels, respectively. However, other ownership identity variables (*PO*, *IPO*, *IO*, and *PSH*) do not significantly impact profitability.

So far, the regression model has identified control variables to estimate the control of OI on corporate performance; it is evident that *FS*, *LIQ*, *DER*, and *ATO* have a statistically significant effect on corporate performance. On the other hand, *FS* and *LIQ* positively affect the firm's market-based and accounting performance. The leverage encourages market-based performance but does not affect accounting performance. The study also finds that *ATO* has a positive impact on accounting performance but a negative on market-based performance. Finally, it is observed that corporate performance is indifferent from *FA*.

The effect of OI on corporate performance (market and accounting measure) is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Panel data regression result for ownership identity and corporate performance

Variables	Dependent variables	
	MCap	ROCE
(Constant)	0.854 (3284.314)	0.194(53616.570)
<i>PO</i>	-0.853 (32.843)	-0.195(0.923)
<i>IO</i>	8.561 (0.006)***	1.189(0.102)
<i>IPO</i>	2.847 (0.005)**	6.247(0.041)**
<i>BCO</i>	2.925 (0.005)**	1.682(0.084)*
<i>FPO</i>	4.690 (0.005)***	3.548(0.083)**
<i>PSH</i>	-0.854 (32.843)	-0.195(0.834)
<i>FS</i>	11.760 (0.059)***	1.906(0.972)*
<i>DER</i>	-4.443 (0.013)***	-0.709(0.217)
<i>LIQ</i>	2.522 (0.068)**	2.197(1.110)**
<i>ATO</i>	-1.716 (0.055)*	8.591(0.910)***
<i>FA</i>	1.871 (0.107)*	-0.676(1.755)
No. of obs.	285	285
R-squared	0.679	0.370
Adj. R-squared	0.667	0.344
F-statistic	52.663***	14.584***
Breusch-Pagan LM test	231.770**	325.194***
Hausman test	41.239***	35.572**

Note: Standard errors appear in parentheses; \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* represent 1%, 5%, and 10% significance levels, respectively.

Source: Authors' calculation.

## 5. DISCUSSION

This section discusses the implication of the findings reported in the previous data analysis section.

From the descriptive analysis, it is observed that the ownership structure in the selected firms under consideration in the present study has more concentrated ownership compared to the findings of the OECD (2020). That means a small number of shareholders are controlling the higher proportion of the shareholding portfolio in the organization. Table 2 also reported that institutional ownership (*IO*), individual promoter ownership (*IPO*), body corporate ownership (*BCO*), and foreign promoter ownership (*FPO*) are also considerably less in the Indian corporate shareholding pattern.

From the trend analysis, it is observed that there has been a mismatch in the growth pattern for the last couple of years between market capitalisation and profitability among the firms under consideration. So far ownership structure (*OS*) is concerned it has been observed that some variables of ownership have declined sharply while others have shown ups and down. Therefore, the analysis failed to reveal any particular trend of growth during the period under consideration.

In view of a positive significant relationship between the HHI and profitability measures in terms of return on capital employed and market capitalisation the present findings supported the alternative hypotheses *H1* and *H2* where it is presumed that ownership concentration (*OC*) has a significant relationship with accounting-based performance and market-based performance, respectively. Considering the positive relationship between the owners' identity (*OI*) variables with market-based performance this study backed the finding of many worth noting previous findings across different country (Sharma & Singh, 2018; Panda & Leepsa, 2019). Therefore, findings supported the alternative hypothesis *H3* which assumed that market-based corporate performance is linked with *OI* in the *OS*. Similarly, in view of a positive association between accounting-based performance and owners' identity variables under consideration, this study also upholds the fourth alternative hypothesis *H4*.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The previous empirical research on the impact of *OS* on corporate performance has produced mixed results in developed market setups and limited numbers in emerging markets, particularly in India. Given the limited and inconclusive findings, this study examines the impact of *OS* (*OC* and *OI*) on FMCG sector firms' performance following the Companies Act, 2013 in India's CG framework.

The study observes the *OC* to a large extent and the five largest shareholders control roughly 16.24 percent of total equity capital, and a consistent increase in the holding proportion over the years after implementing the Companies Act, 2013, whilst the HHI is on the decline. Other recent research in emerging markets such as Pakistan (Yassar & Al Mamun, 2017), Bangladesh (Khan et al., 2013), Malaysia (Abdullah et al., 2011), and Turkey (Ararat & Ugur, 2003) have reported similar findings.

In the FMCG sector, it is also observed that 58 percent of total equity capital and 42 percent of shareholding go to non-promoters shareholders. As a result, compared to the average shareholding of all Indian listed companies, the *OS* in the FMCG sector is more concentrated in the hands of promoters. However, year-wise, statistics exposed that promoters' ownership proportion has declined while public ownership has gone up after the application of the Companies Act, 2013. From the regression analysis, the study finds that, in line with other contemporary studies, *OC* (measured by the HHI) has a significant positive impact on the accounting and market-based performance of the selected firms, which is similar to the contemporary studies (Nashier & Gupta, 2020). However, the present study finds no association between *OC* in the hands of the five largest shareholders and performance. In the second model, the study finds that some *OI* variables such as *IPO*, *IO*, *BCO*, and *FPO* positively impact performance. However, promoter ownership and public shareholding have a negative impact. This finding challenges Mishra and Kapil (2017) and Varghese and Sasidharan (2020), who reported a positive affiliation concerning promoter ownership and corporate performance. The analysis revealed that *OS* had a more significant effect on market-based performance than accounting-based performance during the study period.

As this is the only study in India after the Companies Act, 2013, the result would undoubtedly enrich the present body of CG studies in the emergent markets. The present study results draw the attention of shareholders, policymakers, creditors, and other investors to know the prominence of *OS* to influence the accounting and market-based performance of the corporate organization in an emerging market like India. This study will benefit the market regulators, policymakers, investors, and researchers by giving better insight into the *OS* of Indian FMCG sector companies in the post-application of the Companies Act, 2013. The outcome of this study presents a better amplification of the impact of *OC* and *OI* on corporate performance in FMCG companies working in the Indian market in the Companies Act, 2013 era.

Nevertheless, there are some drawbacks to this study. In this study, the BSE-listed FMCG sector firms are included for five years, from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2019–2020, i.e., after adopting the Companies Act, 2013. Therefore, the current findings may not generalize to diverse trade and economic contexts. This constraint may serve as a source of inspiration for future scholars.

However, despite several novel contributions of the present study, it would also be interesting for the researchers to conduct studies in other countries with similar economic development levels to cross-check the findings. Researchers can also consider multicounty corporate datasets to compare the impact of *OS* on firm performance across different countries. The researcher can look at multiple industries over a more extended period before the Companies Act, 2013, allowing for inter-sector comparisons and the impact of the Companies Act, 2013 on *OS* and corporate performance. Thus, future studies can use qualitative data such as directors' financial knowledge as CG variables.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdullah, S. N., Mohamad, N. R., & Mokhtar, M. Z. (2011). Board independence, ownership and CSR of Malaysian large firms. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 8(2-4), 467-483. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv8i2c4p5>
2. Alipour, M. (2013). An investigation of the association between ownership structure and corporate performance: Empirical evidence from Tehran Stock Exchange (TSE). *Management Research Review*, 36(11), 1137-1166. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2012-0188>
3. Al-Saidi, M., & Al-Shammari, B. (2015). Ownership concentration, ownership composition and the performance of the Kuwaiti listed non-financial firms. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 25(1), 108-132. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCOMA-07-2013-0065>
4. Altaf, N., & Shah, F. A. (2018). Ownership concentration and firm performance in Indian firms: Does investor protection quality matter? *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 10(1), 33-52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIBR-01-2017-0009>
5. Aluchna, M., & Kaminski, B. (2017). Ownership structure and company performance: A panel study from Poland. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 12(4), 485-502. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-01-2017-0025>
6. Ararat, M., & Ugur, M. (2003). Corporate governance in Turkey: An overview and some policy recommendations. *Corporate Governance*, 3(1), 58-75. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700310459863>
7. Arora, A., & Bodhanwala, S. (2018). Relationship between corporate governance index and firm performance: Indian evidence. *Global Business Review*, 19(3), 675-689. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917713812>
8. Arora, A., & Sharma, C. (2016). Corporate governance and firm performance in developing countries: Evidence from India. *Corporate Governance*, 16(2), 420-436. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-01-2016-0018>
9. Baltagi, B. H. (1995). *Econometric analysis of panel data*. Springer Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53953-5>
10. Bansal, D., & Singh, S. (2021). Does board structure impact a firm's financial performance? Evidence from the Indian software sector. *American Journal of Business*, 37(1), 34-49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJB-08-2020-0125>
11. Ben Slama Zouari, S., & Boulila Taktak, N. (2014). Ownership structure and financial performance in Islamic banks: Does bank ownership matter? *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 7(2), 146-160. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMEFM-01-2013-0002>
12. Berle, A. A., & Means, G. C. (1932). *The modern corporations and the private property*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.
13. Bhatia, S., & Srivastava, A. (2017). Do promoter holding and firm performance exhibit endogenous relationship? An analysis from emerging market of India. *Management and Labour Studies*, 42(2), 107-119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X17714073>
14. Bhatt, R. R., & Bhattacharya, S. (2017). Family firms, board structure and firm performance: Evidence from top Indian firms. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 59(5), 699-717. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-02-2016-0013>
15. Breusch, T. S., & Pagan, A. R. (1980). The Lagrange Multiplier test and its applications to model specification in econometrics. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 47(1), 239-253. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2297111>
16. Carrillo, G., & Bathala, C. (2010). Corporate governance in banks: Do ownership and board structure matter for banks' risk profile and valuation? *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 3(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220100101>
17. Chatterjee, M., & Bhattacharjee, T. (2020). Ownership concentration, innovation and firm performance: Empirical study in Indian technology SME context. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 10(2), 149-170. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-10-2019-0185>
18. Coad, A., Segarra, A., & Teruel, M. (2013). Like milk or wine: Does firm performance improve with age? *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 24(3), 173-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2012.07.002>
19. Debnath, P. (2018). Further evidence on association between corporate governance and firm performance in Indian scenario. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, 7(10), 255-266. Retrieved from <https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:ajmr&volume=7&issue=10&article=026>
20. Debnath, P., & Chinmoy, R. (2017). Do firm specific characteristics influence earnings management? Contemporary evidence from Indian economy. *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management*, 7(6), 318-336. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7307.2017.00091.3>
21. Demsetz, H., & Lehn, K. (1985). The structure of corporate ownership: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(6), 1155-1177. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261354>
22. Demsetz, H., & Villalonga, B. (2001). Ownership structure and corporate performance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 7(3), 209-233. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-1199\(01\)00020-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0929-1199(01)00020-7)
23. Desoky, A. M., & Mousa, G. A. (2013). An empirical investigation of the influence of ownership concentration and identity on firm performance of Egyptian listed companies. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 3(2), 164-188. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20421161311320698>
24. Din, S. U., Arshad Khan, M., Khan, M. J., & Khan, M. Y. (2021). Ownership structure and corporate financial performance in an emerging market: A dynamic panel data analysis. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 17(8), 1973-1997. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-03-2019-0220>
25. Diriba, M., & Basumatary, D. (2019). Impact of corporate governance on firm performance: Evidence from Indian leading companies. *Parikalpana: KIIT Journal of Management*, 15(1-2), 127-140. <https://doi.org/10.23862/kiit-parikalpana/2019/v15/i1-2/190178>
26. Dwivedi, N., & Jain, A. K. (2005). Corporate governance and performance of Indian firms: The effect of board size and ownership. *Employ Response Rights Journal*, 17, 161-172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-005-6939-5>
27. Fama, E. F. (1980). Agency problem and the theory of the business. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88(2), 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1086/260866>
28. Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(2), 301-325. <https://doi.org/10.1086/467037>
29. Ganguli, S. K., & Guha Deb, S. (2021). Board composition, ownership structure and firm performance: New Indian evidence. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 18, 256-268. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41310-021-00113-5>

30. Ganguli, S., & Agrawal, S. (2009). Ownership structure and firm performance: An empirical study on listed Mid-Cap Indian companies. *The IUP Journal of Applied Finance*, 15(12), 37-52. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1523669>
31. Gujarati, D. N. (2009). *Basic econometrics*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
32. Gulzar, I., Haque, S. M. I., & Khan, T. (2020). Corporate Governance and firm performance in Indian textile companies: Evidence from NSE 500. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 13(2), 210-222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220966809>
33. Gupta, A. (2019). Capital structure, ownership structure and R&D investments: Evidence from Indian firms. *IUP Journal of Applied Finance*, 25(1), 25. Retrieved from [https://iupindia.in/1901/Applied%20Finance/Capital\\_Structure\\_Ownership\\_Structure.asp](https://iupindia.in/1901/Applied%20Finance/Capital_Structure_Ownership_Structure.asp)
34. Haldar, A., & Rao, N. S. (2011). Empirical study on ownership structure and firm performance. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 4(2), 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220110203>
35. Haque, F., & Shahid, R. (2016). Ownership, risk-taking and performance of banks in emerging economies: Evidence from India. *Journal of Financial Economic Policy*, 8(3), 282-297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFEP-09-2015-0054>
36. Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica*, 46(6), 1251-1271. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1913827>
37. India Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF). (2022). *FMCG industry in India industry report*. Retrieved from <https://www.ibef.org/industry/fmcg.aspx>
38. Iwasaki, I., & Mizobata, S. (2019). Ownership concentration and firm performance in European emerging economies: A meta-analysis. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 56(1), 32-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X.2018.1530107>
39. Jensen, M. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance and takeovers. *The American Economic Review*, 76(2), 323-329. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1818789>
40. 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(76\)90026-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X)
41. Kalsie, A., & Shrivastav, S. (2016). Analysis of board size and firm performance: Evidence from NSE Companies using panel data approach. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 9(2), 148-172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686216666456>
42. Karpagam, V., Selvam, M., & Babu, M. (2013). Impact of ownership structure on corporate performance with special reference to BSE listed companies. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Management Research (IJAFMR)*, 3(1), 133-140. Retrieved from <https://pdfcoffee.com/10-impact-of-ownership-full-pdf-free.html>
43. Katragadda, R., & Sreeram, A. (2018). Shareholding patterns and its impact on firm performance: A contemporary study of Indian NIFTY 50 companies. *Asian Journal of Managerial Science*, 7(1), 31-41. <https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2018.7.1.1291>
44. Kavya, B., & Shijin, S. (2017). Ownership and control of widely and closely held firms in India. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 21(4), 449-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262917738895>
45. Khan, A., Muttakin, M. B., & Siddiqui, J. (2013). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility disclosures: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114(2), 207-223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1336-0>
46. Khidmat, W., Khan, M. A., & Ullah, H. (2020). The effect of board diversity on firm performance: Evidence from Chinese listed companies. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 13(1) 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220923793>
47. Kiran, A., & Ramesh, K. (2021). Impact of ownership structure on dividend policies of Indian non-financial firms. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.17010/ijf/2021/v15i2/157639>
48. Kohli, M. (2018). Impact of ownership type and board characteristics on the pay-performance relationship: Evidence from India. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 11(1), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686218763853>
49. Kumar, A., Nigam, N. K., & Singh, K. (2020). Do women directors impact financial outcomes? The Indian evidence. *Journal of Corporate Governance*, 13(2) 119-139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220966813>
50. Kumar, N., & Singh, J. P. (2013). Effect of board size and promoter ownership on firm value: Some empirical findings from India. *Corporate Governance*, 13(1), 88-98. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701311302431>
51. Kumar, P., & Zattoni, A. (2015). Ownership structure, corporate governance and firm performance. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 23(6), 469-471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12146>
52. Kuznetsov, P., & Muravyev, A. (2000). Ownership concentration and firm performance in Russia: The case of blue chips of the stock market. *ActaOeconomica*, 51(4), 469-488. <https://doi.org/10.1556/aoecon.51.2000-2001.4.2>
53. Laporsek, S., Dolenc, P., Grum, A., & Stubelj, I. (2021). Ownership structure and firm performance — The case of Slovenia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 34(1), 2975-2996. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1865827>
54. Machek, O., & Kubicek, A. (2018). The relationship between ownership concentration and performance in Czech Republic. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(1), 177-186. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2018/11-1/13>
55. Madhani, P. M. (2016). Ownership concentration, corporate governance and disclosure practices: A study of firms listed in Bombay Stock Exchange. *The IUP Journal of Corporate Governance*, 15(4), 7-32. Retrieved from [https://www.iupindia.in/1610/Corporate%20Governance/Ownership\\_Concentration.html](https://www.iupindia.in/1610/Corporate%20Governance/Ownership_Concentration.html)
56. Manna, A., Sahu, T. N., & Gupta, A. (2016). Impact of ownership structure and board composition on corporate performance in Indian companies. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 9(1) 44-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686216635787>
57. Mazumder, M. M. (2016). Exploring the impact of ownership structure on earnings predictability: Insights from Japan. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 9(2), 97-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686216666453>
58. Meah, M. R., & Chaudhory, N. U. (2019). Corporate governance and firm's profitability: An emerging economy-based investigation. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 12(1), 71-93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686219836544>
59. Mishra, A. K., Jain, S., & Manogna, R. L. (2021). Does corporate governance characteristics influence firm performance in India? Empirical evidence using dynamic panel data analysis. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 18, 71-82. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41310-020-00098-7>

60. Mishra, R., & Kapil, S. (2017). Effect of ownership structure and board structure on firm value: Evidence from India. *Corporate Governance*, 17(4), 700–726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-03-2016-0059>
61. Mishra, S. P., & Srivatsava, H. V. (2010). Corporate governance: An empirical analysis of ownership and performance in Indian banks. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 3(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220100102>
62. Nashier, T., & Gupta, A. (2020). Ownership concentration and firm performance in India. *Global Business Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919894395>
63. Nazir, N., & Malhotra, A. K. (2016). The effect of ownership structure on firm profitability in India: A panel data approach. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 8(6), 237–249. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v8n6p237>
64. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2015.06.005>
65. Ocak, M. (2021). Do females in audit firm governance affect firm performance? Findings from Turkey. *Gender in Management*, 36(3), 386–409. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-05-2019-0075>
66. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Ownership structure of listed companies in India*. Retrieved from [www.oecd.org/corporate/ownership-structure-listed-companies-india.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/corporate/ownership-structure-listed-companies-india.pdf)
67. Panda, B., & Bag, D. (2019). Does ownership structure affect firm performance in an emerging market? The case of India. *Asian Journal of Business and Accounting*, 12(1), 189–227. <https://doi.org/10.22452/ajba.vol12no1.7>
68. Panda, B., & Leepsa, N. M. (2019). Does institutional ownership engagement matter for greater financial performance? Evidence from a developing market. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 61(2), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-09-2017-0228>
69. Pandey, K. D., & Sahu, T. N. (2020). Ownership concentration and agency crises in Indian manufacturing firms. *Business Perspective Research*, 9(1), 128–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533720910842>
70. Pareek, R. P., Pandey, K. D., & Sahu, T. N. (2019). Corporate governance, firms' characteristics and environmental performance disclosure practices of Indian companies. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 12(2), 142–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686219881091>
71. Patil, P. H. (2016). An overview of Indian FMCG sector. *Indian Journal of Research*, 5(2), 171–173. Retrieved from [https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/recent\\_issues\\_pdf/2016/February/an-overview-of-indian-fm-cg-sector\\_February\\_2016\\_9050651554\\_8505908.pdf](https://www.worldwidejournals.com/paripex/recent_issues_pdf/2016/February/an-overview-of-indian-fm-cg-sector_February_2016_9050651554_8505908.pdf)
72. Prince, J. B. (2021). Ownership characteristics, corporate social responsibility, resource productivity and firm performance: An empirical study. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 14(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09746862211007035>
73. Rajverma, A. K., Misra, A. K., Mohapatra, S., & Chandra, A. (2019). Impact of ownership structure and dividend on firm performance and firm risk. *Managerial Finance*, 45(8), 1041–1061. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MF-09-2018-0443>
74. Rao, K. T. V., Parameshwar, H. S., Ajay, K., & Aradhyula, A. Y. (2018). The impact of promoter shareholding on firm value and financial performance: Empirical evidence from listed firms in India. *Pacific Business Review International*, 11(5), 103–110. [http://www.pbr.co.in/2018/2018\\_month/Nov/9.pdf](http://www.pbr.co.in/2018/2018_month/Nov/9.pdf)
75. Roy, A. (2016a). Corporate governance and firm performance: An exploratory analysis of Indian listed companies. *Indian Journal of Business Research*, 3(1–2), 93–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278682116629537>
76. Roy, A. (2016b). Corporate governance and firm performance: A study of Indian listed firms. *Metamorphosis: A Journal of Management Research*, 15(1), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972622516629032>
77. Saha, R., & Kabra, K. C. (2019). Does corporate governance influence firm performance? Evidence from India. *Economics and Business Review*, 5(19), 70–89. <https://doi.org/10.18559/ebv.2019.4.4>
78. Sahasranamam, S., Arya, B., & Sud, M. (2020). Ownership structure and corporate social responsibility in an emerging market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37, 1165–1192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-019-09649-1>
79. Sandhya, S., & Parashar, N. (2019). A study on corporate governance practices of selected banks in India. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 13(2). <http://doi.org/10.17010/ijf%2F2019%2Fv13i2%2F141686>
80. Sarkar, J., & Sarkar, S. (2000). Large shareholder activism in corporate governance in developing countries: Evidence from India. *International Review of Finance*, 1(3), 161–194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2443.00010>
81. Sarkar, J., Sarkar, S., & Sen, K. (2012). *A corporate governance index for large listed companies in India* (Pace University Accounting Research Paper No. 2012/08). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2055091>
82. Shahani, R., & Aayushi. (2019). Exploring dynamic linkages between inward FDI and India's economic growth. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 8(2), 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278682119833194>
83. Sharma, S., & Singh, M. (2018). Corporate governance and firm's performance during subprime crisis: Evidence from Indian firms. *Gurukul Business Review*, 14, 12–25. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339365298\\_CORPORATE\\_GOVERNANCE\\_AND\\_FIRM'S\\_PERFORMANC\\_E\\_DURING\\_SUBPRIME\\_CRISIS\\_EVIDENCE\\_FROM\\_INDIAN\\_FIRMS](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339365298_CORPORATE_GOVERNANCE_AND_FIRM'S_PERFORMANC_E_DURING_SUBPRIME_CRISIS_EVIDENCE_FROM_INDIAN_FIRMS)
84. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(2), 737–783. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb04820.x>
85. Singh, N. P., & Bagga, M. (2019). The effect of capital structure on profitability: An empirical panel data study. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 8(1), 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278682118823312>
86. Singla, H. K. (2020). Does family ownership affect the profitability of construction and real estate firms? Evidence from India. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 25(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMPC-08-2019-0067>
87. Smith, A. (1776). *The wealth of nation, modern library education*. New York, NY: Random House.
88. Subramanian, S. (2015). Corporate governance, institutional ownership and firm performance in Indian state-owned enterprises. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, 11(2), 117–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X15576273>
89. The Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance. (1992). *Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance*. Retrieved from [https://www.frc.org.uk/getattachment/9c19ea6f-bcc7-434c-b481-f2e29c1c271a/The-Financial-Aspects-of-Corporate-Governance-\(the-Cadbury-Code\).pdf](https://www.frc.org.uk/getattachment/9c19ea6f-bcc7-434c-b481-f2e29c1c271a/The-Financial-Aspects-of-Corporate-Governance-(the-Cadbury-Code).pdf)

90. Thomsen, S., & Pedersen, T. (2000). Ownership structure and economic performance in the largest European companies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(6), 689–705. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(200006\)21:6%3C689::AID-SMJ115%3E3.0.CO;2-Y](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200006)21:6%3C689::AID-SMJ115%3E3.0.CO;2-Y)
91. Tran, N. H., & Le, C. D. (2020). Ownership concentration, corporate risk-taking and performance: Evidence from Vietnamese listed firms. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 8(1), 1732640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2020.1732640>
92. Varghese, G., & Sasidharan, A. (2020). Impact of ownership structure and board characteristics on firm value: Evidence From China and India. In R. Biswas & M. Michaelides (Eds.), *Financial issues in emerging economies: Special issue including selected papers from II International Conference on Economics and Finance, 2019* (Research in Finance, Vol. 36, pp. 217–234). <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0196-382120200000036012>
93. Vishwakarma, R. (2017). Women on board and its impact on performance: Evidence from microfinance sector. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 10(1), 58–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686217701465>
94. Waheed, A., & Malik, Q. A. (2019). Board characteristics, ownership concentration and firms' performance: A contingent theoretical based approach. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 8(2), 146–165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-03-2018-0031>
95. Welch, E. (2003). The relationship between ownership structure and performance in listed Australian companies. *Australian Journal of Management*, 28(3), 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/031289620302800304>
96. Wooldridge, J. M. (2005). Simple solutions to the initial conditions problem in dynamic, nonlinear panel data models with unobserved heterogeneity. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 20(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.770>
97. Yadav, S. (2020). Institutional ownership and corporate social performance in emerging economies multinationals: Evidence from India. *Indian Journal of Corporate Governance*, 13(2), 227–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974686220966812>
98. Yasser, Q. R., & Al Mamun, A. (2017). The impact of ownership concentration on firm performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *Emerging Economy Studies*, 3(1), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394901517696647>