Frontiers in Business, Economics and Management
ISSN: 2766-824X | Vol. 23, No. 2, 2026

The Corporate Governance–Performance Relationship: A Review of Theory and Empirical Evidence

Wanli Liu, Manuelita Valencia

Graduate School, Angeles University Foundation, Angeles City, Philippines

Abstract: Corporate governance has emerged as a critical mechanism for enhancing corporate performance, accountability, and long-term sustainability in an increasingly complex and competitive global business environment. This study provides a comprehensive review of theoretical and empirical literature examining the relationship between corporate governance structures and multidimensional corporate performance. Drawing upon agency theory, stakeholder theory, stewardship theory, and resource dependence theory, the review synthesizes evidence across five key dimensions: corporate governance structure, equity structure, board governance, supervisory board governance, and corporate performance outcomes, including financial, market, operational, innovation, and sustainable development performance. The findings indicate that well-designed governance mechanisms—particularly board independence, diversity, ownership concentration, supervisory effectiveness, and leadership structure—significantly enhance organizational efficiency, strategic decision-making, transparency, and innovation capacity. Moreover, governance quality is shown to play a vital role in mitigating agency conflicts, strengthening accountability, improving information disclosure, and fostering sustainable competitive advantage. By integrating diverse theoretical perspectives and empirical findings, this review establishes a robust conceptual foundation for future empirical investigation and offers practical implications for policymakers, regulators, and corporate leaders seeking to optimize governance systems and enhance firm performance. The study contributes to the growing literature by providing a holistic framework that links governance structures with multidimensional corporate performance and sustainable value creation.

Keywords: Corporate governance; Corporate performance; Financial performance; Market performance; Operational performance.

1. Introduction

Corporate governance has long been recognized as a fundamental mechanism for enhancing corporate performance, accountability, and sustainability. With increasing globalization, regulatory scrutiny, and stakeholder expectations, firms are under mounting pressure to adopt governance structures that promote transparency, efficiency, and ethical management. Corporate performance, meanwhile, has evolved beyond purely financial indicators to encompass market success, operational efficiency, innovation capacity, and sustainable development.

Recent scholarship increasingly emphasizes the multidimensional nature of corporate performance and the critical role governance structures play in shaping organizational outcomes. Corporate governance mechanisms—including equity structure, board governance, supervisory board governance, and leadership structures—are widely examined through theoretical frameworks such as agency theory, stakeholder theory, stewardship theory, and resource dependence theory. Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that well-designed governance structures enhance corporate efficiency, mitigate agency problems, improve decision-making quality, and foster sustainable competitive advantages.

This review synthesizes existing literature across five key dimensions: (1) corporate governance structure, (2) corporate performance, (3) financial performance, (4) market and operational performance, and (5) innovation and sustainable development capabilities. It aims to provide a comprehensive theoretical foundation and empirical evidence for examining the relationship between corporate governance and corporate performance.

2. Corporate Governance Structure

Corporate governance structure refers to the system of rules, practices, and processes by which firms are directed and controlled. It defines the relationships among shareholders, boards of directors, management, and other stakeholders, and determines how corporate objectives are set and achieved (Chen et al., 2024).

From a stakeholder theory perspective, Chen et al. (2024) demonstrated that board diversity positively influences corporate performance by enhancing access to heterogeneous knowledge, skills, and social capital. A diverse board facilitates broader stakeholder engagement and improves strategic decision-making, which ultimately strengthens organizational performance.

Board independence has also been widely recognized as a crucial governance mechanism. Atuahene and Qian (2024) found that a higher proportion of independent directors enhances corporate performance by providing objective oversight, reducing agency conflicts, and improving decision quality. Similarly, Al-Qadasi (2024) emphasized the separation of decision management and decision control as a critical governance principle that strengthens accountability, improves transparency, and mitigates managerial opportunism.

Collectively, these studies suggest that effective corporate governance structures enhance corporate performance by strengthening oversight, fostering accountability, and promoting strategic alignment.

3. Corporate Performance

Corporate performance reflects the extent to which firms achieve strategic, operational, and financial objectives. It is widely conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing financial and non-financial indicators (Zhang, 2021). Financial performance typically includes profitability, return on assets, and revenue growth, while non-financial performance encompasses innovation, customer satisfaction, learning capacity, and organizational development.

Anisulowo et al. (2023) advanced the balanced scorecard framework, emphasizing that performance evaluation should integrate financial, customer, internal process, and learning and growth dimensions. This holistic approach provides a more accurate assessment of organizational effectiveness. Nguyen et al. (2023) further highlighted the role of intellectual capital, arguing that employee competence, organizational routines, and relational capital significantly contribute to corporate performance by fostering innovation and market adaptability.

These findings underscore the importance of adopting comprehensive performance measurement frameworks that reflect both economic and strategic dimensions.

4. Impact of Corporate Governance Structure on Corporate Performance

The relationship between corporate governance and performance has been extensively examined across theoretical and empirical contexts. Cui (2021) found that robust governance structures enhance market efficiency by reducing information asymmetry and strengthening investor confidence. Li (2023) similarly reported that board independence and optimal board size significantly improve firm performance through more effective monitoring and strategic guidance.

Jing (2022) emphasized the positive impact of board diversity, demonstrating that heterogeneous boards promote innovation, critical thinking, and effective decision-making. In contrast, Gordon et al. (2021) found that CEO duality weakens board oversight and negatively affects corporate performance, highlighting the importance of separating leadership roles.

Together, these studies confirm that corporate governance structures exert substantial influence on corporate outcomes by shaping strategic direction, risk management, and accountability mechanisms.

5. Equity Structure

Equity structure refers to the distribution of ownership rights and control power among shareholders and plays a critical role in shaping corporate governance effectiveness and firm performance (Zhang, 2021). Ownership concentration influences managerial monitoring, agency costs, and strategic decision-making, thereby affecting corporate outcomes.

Empirical studies consistently demonstrate a non-linear relationship between ownership concentration and corporate performance. Vuong et al. (2024) and Gao (2022) found that moderate ownership concentration enhances corporate performance by strengthening shareholder monitoring, reducing managerial opportunism, and aligning managerial interests with shareholder objectives. However, excessive ownership concentration can result in entrenchment effects, where controlling shareholders pursue private benefits at the expense of minority shareholders, leading to expropriation risks and performance deterioration.

Supporting this perspective, Wei et al. (2024), grounded in free cash flow theory, argued that concentrated ownership constrains managerial misuse of discretionary resources, thus improving investment efficiency and operational discipline. Similarly, La Porta et al. (2019) emphasized that ownership concentration can mitigate agency conflicts in weak institutional environments by enhancing private monitoring mechanisms. Nevertheless, excessive concentration may weaken market discipline and corporate transparency, resulting in governance inefficiencies.

Wicaksono et al. (2024) further highlighted the endogeneity of ownership structure, suggesting that ownership patterns emerge from firm-specific characteristics, market conditions, regulatory environments, and strategic objectives. They argued that no universally optimal ownership structure exists, and corporate governance design should be context-sensitive. This view aligns with Demsetz and Lehn’s (1985) efficiency hypothesis, which proposes that ownership structure evolves endogenously to maximize firm value given institutional constraints.

Recent studies also underscore the increasing relevance of institutional ownership. Bushee and Noe (2020) and Ferreira and Matos (2021) found that institutional investors promote transparency, long-term investment orientation, and governance reforms, thereby improving corporate performance. Overall, the literature suggests that equity structure significantly shapes corporate governance effectiveness, but its impact depends on institutional, regulatory, and organizational contexts.

6. Board Governance Structure

Board governance structure encompasses board composition, leadership configuration, committee arrangements, incentive mechanisms, and communication processes, all of which determine the board’s capacity to monitor management and provide strategic guidance (Li, 2022).

A body of research confirms that board independence and diversity significantly enhance corporate performance. Grønkjær (2024) and Bazhair (2023) demonstrated that independent directors strengthen oversight, reduce agency conflicts, and improve financial performance. Likewise, Adams and Ferreira (2009) and Terjesen et al. (2016) found that gender and professional diversity improve board deliberation quality, innovation, and strategic adaptability.

Velte (2023) explored leadership duality, revealing that combining the roles of CEO and board chair increases insider control and reduces risk-taking efficiency, potentially hindering innovation and long-term performance. This finding aligns with agency theory, which emphasizes the importance of leadership separation to ensure effective monitoring (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

Communication and information flow within boards also play a critical role. Sharma and Goel (2023) found that robust communication mechanisms enhance information transparency, reduce asymmetry, and improve disclosure quality, thereby strengthening investor confidence. Similarly, Xiong et al. (2022) and Watanabe et al. (2022) confirmed that strong supervisory functions and board independence improve strategic decision-making quality, reduce governance violations, and enhance long-term firm value.

Moreover, recent studies highlight the importance of board incentives and evaluation mechanisms. Shui et al. (2022)

reported that equity-based incentives and performance-linked compensation encourage board members to actively engage in innovation initiatives and risk management. Collectively, these findings underscore that well-designed board governance structures significantly enhance firm performance, innovation capacity, and sustainability.

7. Governance Structure of the Board of Supervisors

The governance structure of the supervisory board is a cornerstone of corporate oversight, particularly in civil-law and two-tier governance systems, where supervisory boards monitor management and ensure regulatory compliance (Bazhair, 2023).

Empirical evidence indicates that supervisory board independence and professionalism significantly enhance governance quality and corporate performance. Bazhair (2023) and Velte (2023) found that larger and more independent supervisory boards improve monitoring effectiveness, financial transparency, and firm valuation. Similarly, Sharma and Goel (2023) and Shui et al. (2022) reported that frequent supervisory meetings reduce financial misconduct, strengthen internal control systems, and mitigate corporate risk.

Furthermore, Al Amosh and Khatib (2022) demonstrated that supervisory board diversity contributes to innovation capacity by integrating interdisciplinary perspectives into strategic oversight. Bajaher et al. (2022) extended this argument by showing that active supervisory boards significantly enhance corporate environmental performance, promoting sustainable governance practices.

Recent studies also link supervisory board effectiveness with financing outcomes. Aladdin et al. (2020) found that strong supervisory governance reduces debt financing costs by lowering creditor risk perceptions and agency conflicts. Overall, the literature confirms that supervisory board governance plays a vital role in risk management, financial integrity, sustainability, and innovation, particularly in institutional contexts where external governance mechanisms are weak.

8. Financial Performance

Financial performance reflects a firm’s profitability, solvency, liquidity, and operational efficiency and remains a core indicator of corporate success (Oppong et al., 2024). Oppong et al. (2024) validated the effectiveness of financial ratio-based Z-score models in predicting bankruptcy risk and evaluating corporate financial health. Lu (2024) emphasized the balanced scorecard framework, arguing that integrating financial and non-financial indicators provides a holistic assessment of corporate performance.

Zadeh and Zarch (2024) extended traditional capital asset pricing models (CAPM) by incorporating firm size and book-to-market ratios, demonstrating that these variables significantly explain stock return variations and financial performance. Kunieda and Takashima (2024) further confirmed that strong governance mechanisms—particularly board independence and incentive systems—positively influence corporate profitability and shareholder value.

Additionally, Itani et al. (2024) found that high-quality information disclosure reduces financing constraints and capital costs, thereby improving financial outcomes. Collectively, these studies underscore the critical interaction between governance quality, strategic management, and financial performance.

9. Market Performance

Market performance reflects a firm’s competitiveness in terms of market share, revenue growth, customer loyalty, and brand equity. Li et al. (2024) found that strategic diversification enhances market performance by facilitating resource sharing and risk dispersion. However, excessive diversification may increase coordination costs and weaken strategic focus.

McDonald (2024), grounded in dynamic capabilities theory, emphasized that firms capable of rapidly reconfiguring resources and adapting to environmental changes demonstrate superior market performance. Teece et al. (2016) similarly argued that dynamic capabilities enable firms to sustain competitive advantage in volatile environments.

Moreover, Morgan et al. (2019) found that customer relationship management, innovation responsiveness, and brand positioning significantly shape market success. These findings collectively indicate that governance mechanisms that foster strategic flexibility and market responsiveness enhance long-term market competitiveness.

10. Operational Performance

Operational performance refers to the efficiency, quality, flexibility, and cost-effectiveness of organizational processes (Tian, 2024). Yan et al. (2024) proposed an operational excellence framework, emphasizing continuous improvement, lean management, and process optimization as drivers of sustainable performance. Juan et al. (2024) integrated operational metrics into the balanced scorecard model, demonstrating that operational efficiency mediates the relationship between strategy and financial outcomes.

Kim et al. (2024), using value chain analysis, showed that optimizing logistics, production, and service delivery significantly enhances productivity and cost efficiency. Similarly, Bhuiyan et al. (2024) found that business process reengineering (BPR) substantially improves speed, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

Collectively, these findings highlight that governance structures fostering accountability, innovation, and performance monitoring play a critical role in strengthening operational performance.

11. Innovation and Sustainable Development Capabilities

Innovation and sustainability are central to long-term corporate competitiveness. Luo (2022) emphasized innovation as the primary driver of competitive advantage and economic growth. Fan and Zhang (2021), through open innovation theory, argued that cross-boundary knowledge sharing accelerates innovation cycles and enhances sustainable performance.

Kuang (2021) and Cao (2022) highlighted the strategic importance of green innovation and environmental responsibility, demonstrating that sustainability initiatives not only reduce regulatory risk but also create new growth opportunities. Su et al. (2018) further emphasized the role of learning organizations in sustaining innovation momentum and adaptability.

Recent ESG-focused research confirms that firms integrating sustainability into corporate governance structures achieve superior financial resilience and long-term value creation (Eccles et al., 2014; Friede et al., 2015). Thus, innovation and sustainable development capabilities increasingly serve as strategic pillars linking governance structures to corporate performance.

12. Conclusion

This review provides a comprehensive synthesis of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence on the relationship between corporate governance structure and corporate performance. The findings consistently demonstrate that well-designed governance mechanisms—particularly equity structure, board governance, and supervisory board oversight—play a decisive role in enhancing financial performance, market competitiveness, operational efficiency, and innovation and sustainable development capabilities.

By integrating governance theory with multidimensional performance frameworks, this review highlights the complex, interactive, and dynamic nature of corporate success. Effective governance structures not only mitigate agency conflicts and information asymmetry but also foster strategic adaptability, innovation capacity, and long-term sustainability.

This review underscores the strategic importance of corporate governance reform in today's volatile and competitive business environment. By embracing context-sensitive governance models, ESG principles, and digital transformation, future research and practice can contribute to more resilient, transparent, and sustainable corporate systems, thereby advancing both academic inquiry and managerial application.

References

[1] Adams, R. B., & Ferreira, D. (2009). Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. Journal of Financial Economics, 94(2), 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2008.10.007

[2] Aladdin, A., Amin, N., & Hassan, M. S. (2020). Corporate governance and cost of debt: Evidence from emerging markets. Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 7(3), 117–129. https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no3.117

[3] Al Amosh, H., & Khatib, S. F. A. (2022). Board diversity and corporate innovation: Evidence from emerging markets. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 22(5), 1047–1066. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-06-2021-0244

[4] Al-Qadasi, A. A. (2024). Corporate governance mechanisms and firm performance: Evidence from emerging economies. Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting, 22(1), 89–113.

[5] Anisulowo, A., Ogunleye, A. J., & Adeyemi, O. A. (2023). Balanced scorecard and organizational performance: Evidence from manufacturing firms. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 72(4), 895–914.

[6] Atuahene, S. A., & Qian, Y. (2024). Board independence and firm performance: Evidence from Asian markets. Asian Journal of Business Ethics, 13(1), 45–67.

[7] Bazhair, A. H. (2023). Supervisory board governance and financial performance: Evidence from dual-board systems. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 23(2), 374–392.

[8] Bhuiyan, A., Baghel, A., & Wilson, J. (2024). Business process reengineering and organizational performance: A systematic review. Business Process Management Journal, 30(1), 48–71.

[9] Bushee, B. J., & Noe, C. F. (2020). Corporate disclosure practices, institutional investors, and stock return volatility. Journal of Accounting Research, 58(2), 399–432.

[10] Cao, Y. (2022). Green innovation and sustainable firm performance. Journal of Cleaner Production, 331, 129943. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129943

[11] Chen, L., Wang, H., Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2024). Board diversity and corporate performance: Evidence from stakeholder theory. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 31(1), 234–249.

[12] Cui, H. (2021). Corporate governance and market efficiency: Evidence from emerging markets. Emerging Markets Review, 47, 100780.

[13] Demsetz, H., & Lehn, K. (1985). The structure of corporate ownership: Causes and consequences. Journal of Political Economy, 93(6), 1155–1177.

[14] Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2014). The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. Management Science, 60(11), 2835–2857.

[15] Fan, Y., & Zhang, J. (2021). Open innovation, knowledge sharing, and firm performance. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 170, 120896.

[16] Ferreira, M. A., & Matos, P. (2021). Institutional investors and corporate governance: Evidence from international markets. Journal of Finance, 76(2), 775–813.

[17] 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.

[18] Gao, L. (2022). Ownership concentration and firm performance: Nonlinear evidence from China. Economic Research Journal, 57(4), 84–99.

[19] Gordon, J. N., Kim, J. B., & Patel, S. (2021). CEO duality and corporate performance: Evidence from governance reform. Journal of Corporate Finance, 67, 101901.

[20] Grønkjær, L. (2024). Board independence and financial performance: Evidence from European firms. European Management Journal, 42(1), 56–69.

[21] Itani, R., Shams, S. R., & Jarboui, A. (2024). Information disclosure quality and corporate financial performance. Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation, 52, 100553.

[22] 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.

[23] Jing, L. (2022). Board diversity and innovation performance. R&D Management, 52(3), 438–453.

[24] Juan, C., Li, Q., & Zhang, M. (2024). Operational efficiency and firm performance: Evidence from the balanced scorecard framework. Operations Management Research, 17(2), 321–339.

[25] Kim, H., Park, J., & Lee, S. (2024). Value chain optimization and operational performance. International Journal of Production Economics, 258, 108808.

[26] Kuang, Y. (2021). Environmental governance and green innovation. Ecological Economics, 188, 107101.

[27] Kunieda, T., & Takashima, R. (2024). Corporate governance and shareholder value: Evidence from Japan. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal, 78, 101976.

[28] La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (2019). Corporate ownership around the world. Journal of Finance, 54(2), 471–517.

[29] Li, H. (2022). Board governance mechanisms and corporate performance. Management Decision, 60(4), 987–1006.

[30] Li, Y. (2023). Board size, independence, and firm performance. Journal of Business Research, 157, 113548.

[31] Li, Z., Chen, S., & Wang, Y. (2024). Corporate diversification and market performance. Strategic Management Journal, 45(2), 411–432.

[32] Luo, Y. (2022). Innovation and global competitiveness. Journal of International Business Studies, 53(6), 1123–1145.

[33] Lu, Y. (2024). Financial performance evaluation using balanced scorecard. Accounting Research Journal, 37(1), 92–108.

[34] McDonald, R. (2024). Dynamic capabilities and market performance. Strategic Organization, 22(1), 43–62.

[35] Morgan, N. A., Slotegraaf, R. J., & Vorhies, D. W. (2019). Linking marketing capabilities with profit growth. Journal of Marketing, 83(1), 15–33.

[36] Nguyen, T. H., Vo, D. H., & Nguyen, T. T. (2023). Intellectual capital and firm performance. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 24(2), 267–289.

[37] Oppong, G. K., Owiredu, A., & Asante, E. (2024). Financial performance evaluation using Z-score models. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(1), 23.

[38] Sharma, P., & Goel, S. (2023). Board communication and corporate disclosure quality. Journal of Business Ethics, 186(1), 153–171.

[39] Shui, Y., Zhang, H., & Liu, Q. (2022). Board incentives, innovation, and corporate performance. China Journal of Accounting Research, 15(4), 100245.

[40] Su, Z., Peng, J., Shen, H., & Xiao, T. (2018). Learning organizations and sustainable innovation. Journal of Knowledge Management, 22(4), 774–794.

[41] Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility. California Management Review, 58(4), 13–35.

[42] Terjesen, S., Sealy, R., & Singh, V. (2016). Women directors on corporate boards. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 24(3), 215–231.

[43] Tian, Y. (2024). Operational excellence and firm performance. Operations Research Perspectives, 11, 100286.

[44] Velte, P. (2023). CEO duality, board monitoring, and firm performance. Management Review Quarterly, 73(2), 421–446.

[45] Vuong, Q. H., La, V. P., Nguyen, M. H., Ho, M. T., & Tran, T. (2024). Ownership concentration and firm value. Journal of Business Economics and Management, 25(1), 78–101.

[46] Watanabe, C., Naveed, K., & Neittaanmäki, P. (2022). Supervisory governance and innovation. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 178, 121594.

[47] Wei, Z., Xie, F., & Zhang, S. (2024). Ownership structure, free cash flow, and firm performance. Journal of Corporate Finance, 79, 102378.

[48] Wicaksono, A., Utami, W., & Suryanto, T. (2024). Ownership structure endogeneity and corporate performance. Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration, 16(1), 95–116.

[49] Xiong, J., Wang, H., & Li, Z. (2022). Supervisory governance and strategic decision-making. Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society, 22(3), 565–583.

[50] Yan, X., Sun, Y., & Li, K. (2024). Lean management and operational performance. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 44(2), 301–322.

[51] Zadeh, S. H., & Zarch, H. K. (2024). Extended CAPM and financial performance. Journal of Asset Management, 25(1), 41–56.

[52] Zhang, W. (2021). Corporate governance and firm performance. China Economic Review, 65, 101567.