## **EDITORIAL**

## Dear readers!

The recent issue of the journal Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review is devoted to the issues of corporate governance and value of family-owned businesses, cooperative banks' M&A, CG and sustainability for businesses and for social development etc.

In particular, Sabeen Sikandar and Waqas Mahmood investigate the relationship between practices of corporate governance in family-owned firms operating in cement sector, listed in Pakistan Stock Exchange (PSX) with their value (firm value). *Kimie Harada* examines the performances of Japanese cooperative banks (Shinkin) during the merger waves from 1994 to 2003. *Shirley Mo-Ching* Yeung, Chloe Ko and Heidi Leung review visually re-design service processes for quality sustainable development. Hugh Grove and *Mac Clouse* provide a summary of current sustainability issues and trends of ESG reporting companies which register higher financial returns than their non-ESG reporting competitors. *Mireille Chidiac El Hajj* determines the importance of a corporate governance system for a sustainable social and political development in Lebanese experience.

Some of the aspects of the topics studied in mentioned papers were explored in the academic literature previously. For example Gifferent studies have considered the effects of family ownership on performance of listed companies in specific countries (Filatotchev et al.; 2005; Klein et al. 2005; Brenes et al., 2011; Basco, 2013; Cannella et al., 2015; Calabrò et al., 2017; Fahed-Sreih, 2008; Memili et al., 2016; Pounder, 2015). However, the paper is referred to a specific sector with a positive relationship between firm value and corporate governance metrics in Pakistan and it is new. Japanese banking system has main peculiarities as shown in Kawai (2005) and the case of Shrinkin banks is really a less investigated theme and the paper presented in the issue is surely an indepth analysis of the problem after Hosono et al. (2007), as it considers the evolution of Japanese banking system from 1994 to 2003 giving the results of these changes. Technology and quality sustainable development are a real novelty, as it is shown by existing literature (Dale, 2010), and the paper of this issue is relevant enough just to cover this new approach. The relationship between corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance has been subject to extensive empirical enquiry. The results show that the business case for ESG investing is empirically very well founded (Friede et al., 2015; Galant & Cadez, 2017; Di results show that the business case for ESG investing is empirically very well founded (Friede et al., 2015; Galant & Cadez, 2017; Di Giacomo & Cenci, 2018). The previous review study analyzes just a fraction of existing primary studies, making findings difficult to generalize. Thus, knowledge on the financial effects of ESG criteria remains fragmented. To overcome this shortcoming, the study presented in the issue extracts the relevance of ESG reporting as basis for higher financial returns. Sustainable development and governance have been investigated both form theory and from practice (Kemp et al., 2005; Boeva et al., 2017; Okaro et al., 2018; Castellini & Agyemang, 2012; Huse, 2005; Grove & Clouse, 2017; Jones & Thompson, 2012), but it is relevant for the paper of the issue that is argued that sustainability is best viewed as a socially instituted process of adaptive change built on a general collaboration of all social components, as a way to improve social growth in emerging countries. Overall, this issue of the journal is composed of papers which consider many fundamental issues of corporate governance which have been described in a whole by other scholars (Kostvuk et al., 2006; Kostvuk et al., 2008; Meier & Mei other scholars (Kostyuk et al., 2006; López-Iturriaga & Hoffmann, 2005; Kostyuk et al., 2011; Maingot & Zeghal, 2008; Meier & Meier, 2013; Nerantzidis et al., 2012; Ponssard et al., 2005; Kissin & Herrera, 1990).

> Dr. Rosaria Cerrone University of Salerno, Italy

## REFERENCES

- 1.
- 2.
- 3. 4.
- 5.
- Basco, R. (2013). The family's effect on family firm performance: A model testing the demographic and essence approaches. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 4(1),* 42-66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2012.12.003
  Boeva, B., Zhivkova, S., & Stoychev, I. (2017). Corporate governance and the sustainable development. *European Journal of Economics and Business Studies, 3(1),* 1-17. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejes.v7i1.p17-24
  Brenes, E. R., Madrigal, K., & Requena, B. (2011). Corporate governance and family business performance. *Journal of Business Research, 64(3),* 280-285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.11.013
  Calabrò, A., Campopiano, G., & Basco, R. (2017). Principal-principal conflicts and family firm growth: The moderating role of business family identity. *Journal of Family Business Management, 7(3),* 291-308. https://doi.org/10.108/JFBM-02-2017-0005
  Cannella, A. A., Jones, C. D., & Withers, M. C. (2015). Family-versus lone-founder-controlled public corporations: Social identity theory and boards of directors. *Academy of Management Journal, 98(2),* 436-459. https://doi.org/10.21465/ami\_2012.0045
  Castellini, M., & Agyemang, O. S. (2012). Ownership and board structures to ensuring effective corporate governance through ownership and board control systems. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 9(2-3),* 343-354. https://doi.org/10.21495/cocv9i2c3art4
  Dale, A., Newman, L., & Ling, C. (2010). Facilitating transdisciplinary sustainable development research teams through online collaboration. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 11(1),* 36-48. https://doi.org/10.1108/14676371011010039
  Di Giacomo, M., & Cenci, M. (2018). Corporate control and ownership networks. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 15(4),* 86-95. https://doi.org/10.21495/cocv9i2495/cocv15i4art8
  Fahed-Sreih, J. (2008). An exploratory study on a new corporate governance mechanism: Evidence from small family firms. 6.
- 7.
- 8. 9.
- 10
- Di Glacomo, M., & Cenci, M. (2018). Corporate control and ownership networks. Corporate ownership & Control, 15(47), 60-53.
  https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv15i4art8
  Fahed-Sreih, J. (2008). An exploratory study on a new corporate governance mechanism: Evidence from small family firms. *Management Research News*, 32(1), 50-61. https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170910920023
  Filatothev, I., Lien, Y. C., & Piesse, J. (2005). Corporate governance and performance in publicly listed, family-controlled firms: Evidence from Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22(3), 257-283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-005-3569-2
  Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 5(4), 210-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917
  Galant, A, & Cadez, S. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance relationship: a review of measurement approaches. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrativanja*, 30(1), 676-693. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2017.1313122
  Grove, H., & Clouse, M. (2017). Corporate governance principles and sustainability. *Corporate Governance and Sustainability Review*, 1(2), 13-19. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgsrv1i2p2
  Hosono, K., Sakai, K., & Tsuru, K. (2007). *Consolidation of banks in Japan: Causes and consequences (NBER Working Paper No. 13399)*. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: https://dieas.repec.org/p.nbr/nberwo/13399.html
  Hutss://doi.org/10.22495/cocv24493
  Jones, A. L., & Thompson, C. H. (2012). The sustainability of corporate governance Considerations for a model. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of Business in Society*, 12(3), 306-318. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701211234573
  Kawai, M. (2005). Reform of the Japanese banking system. *International Economic Policy*, 2(4), 307-335. https://doi.org 11.
- 12
- 13. 14.
- 15.
- 16
- 17. 18
- 19
- 20.
- 21.
- 22. 23.
- 24.
- 25.
- 26.
- 27 28
- international journal of Business in Society, 12(3), 306-318. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701211234573 Kawai, M. (2005). Reform of the Japanese banking system. International Economics and Economic Policy, 2(4), 307-335. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-005-0039-8 Kemp, R., Parto, S., & Gibson, R. B. (2005). Governance for sustainable development: Moving from theory to practice. International Journal of Sustainable Development, 8(1/2), 12-30. https://doi.org/10.1504/JISD.2005.007372 Kissin, W. D., & Herrera, J. (1990). International mergers and acquisitions. Journal of Business Strategy, 11(4), 51-54. https://doi.org/10.111/j.1467-8683.2005.00469.x Kostyuk, A. N., Koverga, V., & Kostyuk, H. V. (2006). Board size and composition: The main tradeoffs. Corporate Board: Role, Duties and Composition, 2(1), 48-54. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbv211art5 Kostyuk, A., Govorun, D., Neselevska, O., lefymenko, V., & Gyrba, O. (2011). Corporate governance and performance: Stakes on ownership? Empirical research of the Ukrainian banks. Corporate Querenship & Control, 8(4-5), 532-550. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocc8i4c5art7 López-Iturriaga, F. J., & Hoffmann, P. S. (2005). Earnings management and internal mechanisms of corporate governance: Empirical evidence from Chilean firms. Corporate Ownership & Control, 3(1), 17-29. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocc3i1p2 Maingot, M., & Zeghal, D. (2008). An analysis of corporate governance information disclosure by Canadian banks. Corporate Ownership & Control, 5(2-1), 225-236. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocc5i2c1p7 Meier, H. H., & Meier, N. C. (2013). Corporate governance: An examination of U.S. and European models. Corporate Board: Role, Duties and composition, 9(2), 6-11. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocc5i2c1p7 Meier, H. H., & Meier, N. C. (2013). Corporate governance and family firm outcomes. Journal of Family Business Management, 6(2). https://doi.org/10.108/JFBM-52-016-0010 Nerantzids, M., Filos, J., & Lazarides, T. (2012). The puzzle of corporate governance definition(s): A content analysis. Cor 29.
- 30.

<u>VIRTUS</u>