International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 14s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

A Study On Exploring Fundamental Aspects Of Corporate Governance In Family Enterprises: Evidence From India.

Anuj Vaid[1], Dr Nitin Gupta[2]
[1]Research Scholar Lovely Professional University, anujvaid@devans.co.
[2]Professor at Lovely Professional University, Punjab.

Abstract
This study aims to explore and analyze the fundamental aspects of corporate governance in family-owned businesses by comparing them with non-family-owned firms listed on the National Stock Exchange (NSE) of India. Drawing on secondary data collected from 200 companies—comprising 100 family-owned and 100 non-family-owned firms—this research investigates key governance variables such as ownership concentration, board composition, independence, succession planning, gender diversity, and transparency, alongside financial performance indicators like Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), and market capitalization. The study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design, using statistical tools including t-tests, ANOVA, chi-square tests, and correlation analysis to assess the structural and performance-related governance disparities between the two firm types. Findings reveal that family-owned firms are characterized by higher promoter shareholding, limited board independence, lower gender diversity, informal succession processes, and weaker ESG disclosure practices compared to their non-family counterparts. However, governance maturity appears to improve across generations in family firms, with third-generation businesses displaying relatively stronger formalization and governance indicators. The study also identifies a positive correlation between governance quality and financial performance, reinforcing the strategic importance of adopting transparent and structured governance mechanisms. In contrast to stewardship theory's optimistic view of family leadership, the results suggest that without formal governance practices, family control may hinder accountability and performance. The paper contributes to the literature by offering empirical evidence from the Indian context and emphasizing the need for regulatory and institutional interventions to enhance governance in family enterprises. Limitations include the exclusive use of secondary data and a cross-sectional design, which future research could address through longitudinal and qualitative methods. Overall, this study highlights the duality of tradition and transformation in family business governance and offers actionable insights for practitioners, policymakers, and scholars alike.
Keywords: *Corporate Governance, Family Businesses, Board Composition, Succession Planning, ESG Disclosure, Ownership Structure.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance in family businesses represents a domain of considerable complexity, characterized by the confluence of familial norms, intergenerational dynamics, ownership control, and strategic stewardship. Unlike publicly listed corporations that operate under externally imposed regulatory frameworks and dispersed ownership, family-owned enterprises often blend formal institutional structures with deeply rooted informal family systems (Gersick et al., 1997; Corbetta & Salvato, 2004). This hybrid nature necessitates a distinct conceptual and analytical framework for understanding the mechanisms through which governance is enacted, contested, and transmitted across generations. In particular, family businesses are governed not only by codified laws and fiduciary duties, but also by kinship obligations, socioemotional attachments, and legacy-based motivations (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2006). Governance in such firms cannot be treated as a monolithic or static construct. Rather, it is an evolving, context-sensitive phenomenon shaped by ownership structures, succession strategies, board configurations, conflict management protocols, and ethical orientations (Le Breton-Miller et al., 2004; Zahra & Sharma, 2004). At the heart of this discourse lies the persistent tension between control and collaboration, where the founding family must balance their desire for strategic command with the imperatives of professionalization, accountability, and long-term sustainability (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Carney, 2005). Therefore, this research seeks to unravel the multifaceted and interdependent elements of corporate governance in family businesses by synthesizing perspectives from agency theory, stewardship theory, resource-based views, and socioemotional wealth theory.Agency theory, which posits that managers (agents) may not always act in the best interests of owners (principals), is often recontextualized in family firms, where ownership and management typically overlap (Fama & Jensen, 1983; Schulze et al., 2001). This overlap can mitigate traditional agency costs, as the alignment of ownership and control may lead to stronger goal congruence (Chrisman et al., 2004). However, it also introduces what has been termed "principal-principal conflicts"—particularly between majority and minority shareholders, or between family and non-family stakeholders (Morck & Yeung, 2003). The dual role of family members as both owners and executives can intensify issues related to nepotism, entrenchment, and resistance to change, potentially undermining the efficacy of governance structures (Anderson & Reeb, 2003; Villalonga & Amit, 2006). In contrast, stewardship theory offers a more optimistic view of family business governance. It suggests that family members, acting as stewards of the firm, are intrinsically motivated to safeguard the long-term interests of the organization, often valuing legacy, trust, and continuity over short-term profits (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson, 1997). This approach emphasizes intrinsic rewards, collectivist orientation, and a deep sense of psychological ownership—factors that may enhance organizational performance and resilience (Miller et al., 2008). The stewardship perspective is particularly relevant in family firms where founding values are perpetuated across generations, and where leadership is perceived as a familial duty rather than a mere occupational role (Le Breton-Miller & Miller, 2009). The resource-based view (RBV) further enriches this discussion by focusing on the unique and inimitable resources that family firms possess—collectively referred to as "familiness" (Habbershon & Williams, 1999). These resources may include reputation, trust-based relationships, long-term orientation, and social capital, all of which contribute to competitive advantage when properly governed (Sirmon & Hitt, 2003). However, these same resources can become liabilities if governance mechanisms fail to adapt to changing environmental or internal demands. For instance, excessive reliance on kinship networks can inhibit innovation and strategic renewal (De Massis et al., 2013), while rigid succession norms may constrain merit-based leadership transitions (Sharma et al., 2003). One of the most influential contemporary frameworks for understanding family business governance is socioemotional wealth (SEW) theory, which emphasizes non-financial goals such as family control, identity, emotional attachment, and intergenerational succession (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007). According to this view, family firms often prioritize the preservation of SEW even at the cost of economic performance—a phenomenon that fundamentally reshapes risk preferences, investment decisions, and governance structures (Berrone et al., 2012). The pursuit of SEW may lead to conservative decision-making, under-diversification, and resistance to external investors, thereby necessitating governance models that can mediate between emotional imperatives and strategic rationality (Zellweger et al., 2012). Succession planning represents another critical dimension of governance in family firms. Unlike non-family enterprises, where succession is typically determined by performance and market dynamics, family firms often view succession as a familial obligation or entitlement (Handler, 1994; Lansberg, 1999). The absence of transparent, meritocratic succession processes can jeopardize firm continuity and provoke intra-family conflict (Cabrera-Suárez et al., 2001). Moreover, empirical evidence suggests that the failure rate during generational transitions remains alarmingly high, underscoring the need for formal governance frameworks to manage succession risks (Morris et al., 1997; Sharma et al., 2001). These frameworks may include family constitutions, succession councils, mentoring systems, and advisory boards—each tailored to balance emotional sensitivities with organizational imperatives. Board structure and independence are also central to family business governance. While many family firms prefer tightly controlled, family-dominated boards, research indicates that board diversity and the inclusion of non-family directors can enhance decision-making quality, objectivity, and strategic foresight (Corbetta & Salvato, 2004; Minichilli et al., 2010). However, the appointment of independent directors often clashes with familial instincts for control and discretion, creating a governance paradox that must be addressed with sensitivity and foresight (Nordqvist et al., 2014). The extent to which boards are empowered to challenge executive decisions, monitor performance, and uphold stakeholder interests remains a vital area of inquiry in family business governance. Transparency, disclosure, and accountability are further complicated by the private nature of most family businesses. Unlike public corporations, which are mandated to disclose financial and operational data, family firms often resist transparency, viewing it as a threat to their privacy and autonomy (Chen et al., 2008). This opacity can hinder access to external capital, erode stakeholder trust, and exacerbate conflicts of interest. Thus, embedding governance practices that promote financial discipline, operational transparency, and ethical accountability is not only desirable but essential for long-term survival and legitimacy (IFC, 2008). In conclusion, the study of corporate governance in family businesses demands a multidimensional, theoretically robust, and context-sensitive approach. Governance in these entities cannot be adequately understood through conventional lenses alone; it must incorporate the idiosyncratic features of family involvement, socioemotional orientation, legacy preservation, and informal institutional logic. As family firms continue to dominate economic activity globally—particularly in emerging economies such as India, China, and Latin America—the relevance of this research becomes increasingly salient for academics, policymakers, practitioners, and family business stakeholders alike. By interrogating the fundamental aspects of governance—ownership, succession, board dynamics, transparency, and ethical stewardship—this study seeks to contribute meaningfully to the evolving discourse on sustainable and resilient governance models in family enterprises.

1.1 Research Objectives

1. *To identify and analyze the fundamental aspects of corporate governance in family businesses, including ownership structure, board composition, succession planning, and transparency.*
2. *To examine the influence of familial involvement and intergenerational leadership on the effectiveness and sustainability of governance practices within family-owned enterprises.*

1.2 Research Questions

1) What are the key governance mechanisms adopted by family businesses, and how do these mechanisms differ from those in non-family firms?
2) How do family dynamics—such as succession planning, ownership structure, and emotional attachment—impact the effectiveness of corporate governance in family enterprises?

1.3 Research Gap

Despite the burgeoning interest in corporate governance, much of the existing scholarship remains predominantly focused on large, publicly traded corporations, thereby marginalizing the nuanced governance dynamics unique to family-owned businesses. While family firms constitute a significant share of global and national economies—particularly in emerging markets like India—governance models in these entities remain under-theorized and insufficiently explored in empirical literature. Most prior studies adopt conventional agency theory perspectives, often neglecting the intricate interplay of emotional, relational, and legacy-driven factors that shape decision-making in family businesses. Moreover, existing frameworks frequently overlook the idiosyncratic challenges these firms face, such as informal leadership transitions, non-meritocratic succession, resistance to external oversight, and limited transparency. Although some attention has been given to issues like succession and ownership concentration, there is a marked paucity of comprehensive studies that holistically examine governance structures, board independence, ethical accountability, and stakeholder inclusion in family firms. Additionally, the socio-cultural embeddedness of governance practices in family enterprises—especially within the context of patriarchal norms and collectivist values in South Asia—remains underrepresented in scholarly discourse. This research, therefore, seeks to fill a critical gap by systematically analyzing the fundamental aspects of corporate governance in family businesses, integrating both formal mechanisms and informal socioemotional dynamics, and contributing to a more inclusive and context-sensitive understanding of governance in entrepreneurial family settings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Ownership Structure and Control in Family Firms

Ownership structure is a central pillar of corporate governance in family businesses, deeply influencing both strategic decisions and governance practices. Unlike publicly held firms, family businesses often exhibit concentrated ownership, where a few family members control significant equity and managerial positions. This concentration can enhance alignment between ownership and control, reducing classic agency problems between shareholders and managers (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Fama & Jensen, 1983). However, it can also lead to principal-principal conflicts, especially when minority shareholders are excluded from governance decisions (Morck & Yeung, 2003; Claessens et al., 2002). Family ownership can yield advantages such as long-term orientation, stability, and resource commitment (Anderson & Reeb, 2003; Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2006). Yet, it may also foster nepotism, entrenchment, and an aversion to external scrutiny (Schulze et al., 2001). The degree of family involvement in management versus ownership presents a spectrum, ranging from passive investors to founder-led, family-managed entities. These variations produce differing governance challenges and necessitate tailored mechanisms (Villalonga & Amit, 2006). Further, ownership transitions across generations complicate governance, with successors often inheriting both control and responsibility without formal preparation or meritocratic assessment (Sharma et al., 2003). Literature has suggested that clear separation between ownership and management, alongside family charters or constitutions, can help mitigate conflict and improve governance quality (Gersick et al., 1997; Astrachan & Shanker, 2003). Thus, understanding the ownership structure in family businesses is foundational to addressing broader governance concerns and ensuring firm sustainability over time.

Board Composition and Governance Effectiveness

Board composition plays a pivotal role in shaping corporate governance outcomes in family businesses, particularly in balancing familial control with professional oversight. In many family-owned firms, boards tend to be small, informal, and dominated by family members, limiting diversity of thought and independent scrutiny (Corbetta & Salvato, 2004). Such boards often serve as instruments of continuity and trust, but their insularity can hinder strategic objectivity and risk management (Minichilli et al., 2010). Empirical studies suggest that inclusion of non-family, independent directors enhances governance by bringing in external expertise, promoting transparency, and holding management accountable (Anderson & Reeb, 2004; Zahra & Pearce, 1989). Independent directors can act as neutral arbiters in intra-family conflicts and succession issues, and foster strategic innovation by offering a non-emotional perspective (Nordqvist et al., 2014). However, their effectiveness often depends on how empowered they are within the firm's governance framework (Mustakallio et al., 2002).Family firms that formalize their board structures with defined roles, audit committees, and regular performance reviews are more likely to experience positive governance outcomes (IFC, 2008). Nonetheless, resistance to such formalization remains high due to fears of losing control and exposing internal dynamics (Chen et al., 2008). The dual identity of board members as both kin and fiduciaries creates a governance paradox that requires carefully designed structures, such as advisory boards, family councils, and hybrid models (Gersick et al., 1997). Overall, board composition in family businesses must strike a balance between preserving family values and ensuring objective decision-making. This duality is at the heart of effective governance and underscores the importance of contextual, culturally informed approaches to board design.

Succession Planning and Intergenerational Governance

Succession planning remains one of the most studied and critical areas of corporate governance in family firms. Unlike public corporations where succession is typically driven by merit and market mechanisms, family businesses often prioritize kinship and emotional bonds in leadership transition (Handler, 1994; Lansberg, 1999). This can result in unprepared successors, ambiguous authority structures, and conflict among family members (Sharma et al., 2003; Cabrera-Suárez et al., 2001). The literature emphasizes that the absence of clear, structured succession planning increases the risk of organizational instability and can severely impact firm performance (Morris et al., 1997; Sharma et al., 2001). Moreover, intergenerational governance challenges often include generational value clashes, differing visions for the firm, and varying degrees of risk tolerance (Le Breton-Miller et al., 2004). These issues become more pronounced in founder-led businesses transitioning to second or third generations. Effective governance in succession includes early identification of potential leaders, formal mentoring, clear communication of expectations, and institutionalized transition processes (Dyck et al., 2002). Family constitutions, succession councils, and legally binding agreements have been proposed as tools to ensure a smooth and fair process (Aronoff & Ward, 1995; Poza & Daugherty, 2013). However, cultural norms and patriarchal traditions may limit the implementation of these mechanisms, especially in Asian and Middle Eastern family firms (Zahra et al., 2007). Research also highlights the importance of balancing tradition and innovation during succession. Successors must honor legacy while driving transformation—a task that requires both strategic acumen and emotional intelligence (Miller et al., 2003). Succession, therefore, is not merely a leadership change but a deeply embedded governance process with enduring implications for family harmony and business continuity.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive and comparative research design, utilizing secondary data collected from a sample of 200 NSE-listed companies, comprising 100 family-owned businesses and 100 non-family-owned businesses, to examine the fundamental aspects of corporate governance across different ownership structures. The selection of companies was based on purposive sampling, ensuring representation across diverse sectors while maintaining balance between family and non-family enterprises. Data were extracted from publicly available sources, including annual reports, corporate governance disclosures, board committee reports, proxy statements, and filings on the NSE and SEBI databases, covering a recent five-year period to ensure reliability and relevance. Key governance indicators such as board composition, promoter shareholding, frequency of board meetings, presence of independent directors, audit committee structure, succession disclosures, and compliance with corporate governance norms were systematically coded and analyzed. Comparative analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics and cross-tabulations to identify patterns and variations in governance practices between family and non-family firms. The reliance on verified secondary data not only enhances the objectivity and transparency of the research process but also allows for a comprehensive assessment of real-world governance practices as reported by companies themselves, thereby strengthening the validity and generalizability of the study's findings within the Indian corporate context.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The data for this study were exclusively derived from secondary sources, focusing on a balanced sample of 200 companies listed on the National Stock Exchange (NSE), comprising 100 family-owned and 100 non-family-owned firms across diverse sectors. Data were meticulously extracted from publicly available documents including annual reports, corporate governance disclosures, SEBI filings, ESG reports, and directors' reports spanning the most recent five-year period. Key governance variables analyzed included promoter shareholding, board composition, presence of independent and female directors, audit committee structure, frequency of board meetings, succession planning disclosures, and ESG compliance scores. The analysis adopted a comparative quantitative approach, utilizing descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, percentage distributions) to identify structural differences between family and non-family firms, while inferential statistical tests such as independent t-tests, ANOVA, chi-square tests, and correlation analyses were applied to assess the significance and strength of these differences. The data were further segmented based on generational status for family firms, allowing the study to trace governance evolution across first, second, and third generations. A governance quality index was constructed by assigning weighted scores to key parameters, which was then correlated with financial performance indicators like ROA, ROE, and market capitalization to evaluate the relationship between governance strength and firm success. The comprehensive analysis revealed systemic governance gaps in family firms, particularly in areas such as board independence, transparency, and formal succession planning, and established a strong empirical link between higher governance quality and better financial outcomes, especially among non-family firms and later-generation family businesses.

International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 14s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Table 1: Ownership & Control Structure by Firm Type

Firm Type	Avg. Promoter Shareholding (%)	% with Dual-Class Shares	% with Voting Rights >60%	% with Professional CEO (non-family)	% with Family CEO
Family-Owned (n=100)	63.8	12	78	34	66
Non-Family-Owned (n=100)	21.5	3	8	92	8

Insight: Family firms retain significant control and are more likely to install a family CEO, whereas non-family firms demonstrate stronger separation of ownership and management.Family-owned businesses exhibit significantly higher promoter shareholding (avg. 63.8%), with 78% having voting rights exceeding 60%, indicating concentrated control. 66% of these firms are led by family CEOs, while only 34% use professional CEOs, showing resistance to external leadership. In contrast, non-family firms have more dispersed ownership, rarely use dual-class shares, and overwhelmingly employ professional CEOs (92%), suggesting stronger managerial independence and shareholder protections.

Table 2: Board Composition, Diversity, and Independence

Variable	Family Firms (Mean)	Non-Family Firms (Mean)	Stat. Significance (p-value)
Board Size	7.6	9.1	0.002
% Independent Directors	37.2%	68.4%	<0.001
% Female Directors	11.1%	25.3%	<0.001
% External Industry Experts	19.4%	42.6%	<0.001
Avg. Director Tenure (Years)	6.3	4.9	0.017

Insight: Family businesses have smaller, less independent boards with longer tenures and limited diversity, impacting governance objectivity and innovation. Boards in family firms are smaller, less diverse, and more entrenched. The percentage of independent directors (37.2%) is significantly lower than in non-family firms (68.4%), and female representation is also lagging (11.1% vs. 25.3%). Director tenure in family firms is longer (6.3 years), potentially indicating loyalty but also raising concerns about stagnation and lack of board refreshment. All differences are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), highlighting systematic governance gaps.

Table 3: Succession Planning Practices and Generational Status

Generation	No. of Firms	Formal Succession Plan (%)	Next-Gen Involved in Board (%)	External Mentorship Program (%)
1st Generation	32	12	28	9

Generation	No. of Firms	Formal Succession Plan (%)	Next-Gen Involved in Board (%)	External Mentorship Program (%)
2nd Generation	41	36	64	19
3rd+ Generation	27	71	85	44

Insight: Formalization of succession and inclusion of next-generation leaders increase across generations, suggesting governance maturity over time. There is clear progression in governance practices across generations in family firms. Only 12% of 1st generation firms have a formal succession plan, compared to 71% in 3rd generation firms, showing professionalization increases with longevity. The involvement of the next generation in boards and external mentorship programs also increases over time, indicating governance maturity through intergenerational transition.

Table 4: Corporate Governance Performance Indicators

Indicator	Family Firms (Mean)	Non-Family Firms (Mean)	Stat. Sig. (p-value)
Avg. Board Meetings per Year	5.1	7.2	<0.001
Avg. Audit Committee Meetings/Year	3.3	5.6	<0.001
CEO-Chairperson Separation (%)	14	79	<0.001
Code of Ethics/Publicly Disclosed (%)	39	87	<0.001
CSR Reporting Transparency (0–100)	48.2	82.3	<0.001

Insight: Non-family firms significantly outperform family firms on governance transparency, accountability, and separation of powers. Non-family firms are stronger in governance compliance. They conduct more board and audit meetings annually, maintain CEO-chairperson separation (79%), and score higher in ethical code disclosure and CSR transparency. The low meeting frequency and combined leadership roles in family firms weaken internal checks and balances, making them more susceptible to conflicts of interest and governance inefficiencies.

Table 5: ESG and Disclosure Scores (Weighted Index: 0–100)

ESG Dimension	Family Firms (Mean)	Non-Family Firms (Mean)	Top Quartile (%)	Bottom Quartile (%)
Environmental	41.2	73.4	18	52
Social	45.7	68.9	22	47
Governance	53.3	83.1	19	33
Overall ESG Score	46.7	75.1	21	48

Insight: Family firms score considerably lower in ESG compliance, particularly on environment and social metrics, though some show strong governance values. Family firms underperform significantly across ESG dimensions, particularly in environmental and social disclosures. Only 18% of family firms are in the top ESG quartile, compared to 52% in the bottom quartile, highlighting weak sustainability commitments. While some family firms maintain relatively good governance scores, the lack of formal ESG frameworks and stakeholder transparency limits their competitiveness in global investment environments.

International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 14s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Table 6: Financial Performance vs. Governance Quality Score

Governance Quality Score Range	No. of Companies	Avg. ROA (%)	Avg. ROE (%)	Avg. Market Cap (₹ Cr.)	Firm Type Dominance
80–100	34	11.5	18.6	58,000	Non-Family
60–79	61	9.3	14.4	32,400	Mixed
40–59	72	6.1	10.1	17,200	Mostly Family
Below 40	33	3.9	7.6	9,100	Predominantly Family

Insight: Higher governance quality is positively associated with stronger financial performance, with non-family firms dominating the top governance-performance tier. This table clearly establishes a positive correlation between governance quality and financial performance (ROA, ROE, market cap). Firms with governance scores above 80 have the highest profitability and valuation metrics and are predominantly non-family firms. Conversely, firms scoring below 40 are mostly family-owned and financially underperforming, reinforcing the critical link between good governance and firm success.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study offer important insights into the fundamental aspects of corporate governance in family-owned businesses and reveal a consistent pattern of divergence when compared to non-family firms, aligning with and extending existing literature. The data demonstrated that family businesses are characterized by high ownership concentration, limited board independence, low gender diversity, and informal succession mechanisms, confirming earlier assertions by Anderson and Reeb (2003), and Schulze et al. (2001), who highlighted the governance challenges inherent in concentrated ownership structures. The dominance of family CEOs and limited presence of external professionals on boards supports the arguments made by Villalonga and Amit (2006), suggesting that family firms often prioritize familial control over meritocratic governance practices. Furthermore, the lower levels of transparency, particularly in ESG disclosures and code of ethics publication, reinforce the concerns raised by Zahra and Sharma (2004) regarding the opacity and limited stakeholder accountability in family-controlled enterprises. The study also supports the generational governance evolution theory posited by Le Breton-Miller et al. (2004), as governance quality was found to improve in later-generation firms, evidenced by increased succession formalization, greater board diversity, and stronger performance metrics. In contrast, non-family firms displayed consistently stronger governance attributes, including higher proportions of independent directors, frequent board and audit committee meetings, and greater compliance with ESG standards, which are in line with the findings of Minichilli et al. (2010) and IFC (2008), affirming the importance of formal structures and transparency in enhancing governance effectiveness. Notably, the strong positive correlation identified between governance quality scores and financial performance indicators such as ROA and ROE mirrors the conclusions of Chen et al. (2008) and Carney (2005), suggesting that robust governance is not only a structural necessity but also a strategic advantage. This study also contributes to the socioemotional wealth (SEW) literature by showing that emotional ties and legacy concerns in family firms, while promoting long-term orientation, often come at the cost of professionalization and transparency (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007). While the stewardship theory (Davis et al., 1997) posits that family leaders act in the best interest of the firm, the empirical data here indicate that without formalized governance, these good intentions do not always translate into sustainable outcomes. The discussion also touches upon succession challenges, with first-generation firms exhibiting high succession risk due to the lack of structured plans, echoing the concerns of Handler (1994) and Sharma et al. (2003). The generational shift toward better governance suggests an internal learning curve within family firms, indicating potential for convergence with best practices if institutional support and regulatory nudges are provided. From a policy perspective, the study underscores the need for regulatory frameworks that promote independent directorship, gender diversity, and mandatory succession disclosures for family-dominated companies. Moreover, investor scrutiny, especially from ESG-conscious funds, may play a catalytic role in pushing family firms toward more transparent and accountable governance models. In conclusion, while family firms offer unique strengths such as long-term vision and stakeholder loyalty, their governance frameworks often lag behind due to familial dominance, lack of formalization, and resistance to external oversight. The comparative findings not only reinforce existing scholarly debates but also provide empirical evidence from the Indian context, highlighting the urgent need for governance reforms in family businesses. Future research could explore longitudinal case studies and incorporate qualitative data from family executives to better understand the psychological and cultural underpinnings of governance resistance, thereby enriching the global discourse on sustainable family enterprise governance.

6. FUTURE SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

While this study offers critical insights into the comparative governance structures of family and non-family firms in India, it is not without limitations, which also present avenues for future research. First, the study relies entirely on secondary data from publicly available corporate disclosures, which may not fully capture the informal and nuanced governance dynamics typical of family enterprises, such as internal conflicts, unreported succession decisions, or influence of non-board family members. Secondly, the sample is restricted to 200 NSE-listed firms, which, although balanced, may not be representative of the vast number of unlisted or SME-level family businesses where governance challenges may be even more pronounced. Thirdly, the study adopts a cross-sectional design, limiting its ability to account for temporal changes in governance practices, particularly across economic cycles or generational transitions. Additionally, while the research employs robust quantitative techniques, it does not incorporate qualitative insights such as interviews or case narratives, which could reveal the socio-cultural motivations behind governance choices. These limitations open up several promising directions for future research. Longitudinal studies could track governance evolution over time, especially through generational handovers or leadership changes. Mixed-method approaches combining financial analysis with in-depth interviews of family firm stakeholders could yield richer, context-sensitive understandings. Moreover, comparative international studies may explore how cultural, legal, and economic environments influence governance in family firms across countries. Finally, future research could examine the role of regulatory interventions, institutional investors, and ESG frameworks in reshaping governance behavior in family enterprises. By expanding the methodological and geographical scope, subsequent studies can contribute to a more comprehensive and globally relevant understanding of corporate governance in family businesses.

REFERENCES

1) Anderson, R. C., & Reeb, D. M. (2003). *Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500*. Journal of Finance, 58(3), 1301–1328. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00567
2) Aronoff, C. E., & Ward, J. L. (1995). *Family-owned businesses: A thing of the past or a model for the future?* Family Business Review, 8(2), 121–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1995.00121.x
3) Astrachan, J. H., & Shanker, M. C. (2003). *Family businesses' contribution to the U.S. economy: A closer look*. Family Business Review, 16(3), 211–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/08944865030160030601
4) Block, J., & Wagner, M. (2014). *Ownership versus management effects on corporate social responsibility concerns in large family and founder firms*. Journal of Family Business Strategy, 5(3), 339–346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.12.003
5) Cabrera-Suárez, K., De Saá-Pérez, P., & García-Almeida, D. (2001). *The succession process from a resource- and knowledge-based view of the family firm*. Family Business Review, 14(1), 37–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2001.00037.x
6) Carney, M. (2005). *Corporate governance and competitive advantage in family-controlled firms*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 29(3), 249–265. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00081.x
7) Chen, C. X., Chen, X., & Cheng, Q. (2008). *Do family firms provide more or less voluntary disclosure?* Journal of Accounting Research, 46(3), 499–536. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2008.00288.x
8) Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J. P. H., & Lang, L. H. P. (2002). *Disentangling the incentive and entrenchment effects of large shareholdings*. Journal of Finance, 57(6), 2741–2771. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00511
9) Corbetta, G., & Salvato, C. (2004). *The board of directors in family firms: One size fits all?* Family Business Review, 17(2), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2004.00008.x

10) Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). *Toward a stewardship theory of management*. Academy of Management Review, 22(1), 20–47. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258
11) Dyck, B., Mauws, M., Starke, F. A., & Mischke, G. A. (2002). *Passing the baton: The importance of sequence, timing, technique and communication in executive succession*. Journal of Business Venturing, 17(2), 143–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00056-2
12) Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). *Separation of ownership and control*. Journal of Law and Economics, 26(2), 301–325. https://doi.org/10.1086/467037
13) Gersick, K. E., Davis, J. A., Hampton, M. M., & Lansberg, I. (1997). *Generation to generation: Life cycles of the family business*. Harvard Business Press.
14) Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Haynes, K. T., Núñez-Nickel, M., Jacobson, K. J., & Moyano-Fuentes, J. (2007). *Socioemotional wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 52(1), 106–137. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.1.106
15) Handler, W. C. (1994). *Succession in family business: A review of the research*. Family Business Review, 7(2), 133–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1994.00133.x
16) IFC (International Finance Corporation). (2008). *Family Business Governance Handbook*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. [Available online from IFC publications]
17) 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
18) Kapopoulos, P., & Lazaretou, S. (2007). *Corporate ownership structure and firm performance: Evidence from Greek firms*. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 15(2), 144–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8683.2007.00551.x
19) Lambrecht, J., & Lievens, J. (2008). *Pruning the family tree: An unexplored path to family business continuity and family harmony*. Family Business Review, 21(4), 295–313. https://doi.org/10.1177/08944865080210040104
20) Lansberg, I. (1999). *Succeeding generations: Realizing the dream of families in business*. Harvard Business Review Press.
21) Le Breton-Miller, I., Miller, D., & Steier, L. P. (2004). *Toward an integrative model of effective FOB succession*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 28(4), 305–328. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2004.00047.x
22) Miller, D., Le Breton-Miller, I., & Scholnick, B. (2008). *Stewardship vs. stagnation: An empirical comparison of small family and non-family businesses*. Journal of Management Studies, 45(1), 51–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00718.x
23) Minichilli, A., Corbetta, G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2010). *Top management teams in family-controlled companies: 'Familiness', 'faultlines', and their impact on financial performance*. Journal of Management Studies, 47(2), 205–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00888.x
24) Morck, R., & Yeung, B. (2003). *Agency problems in large family business groups*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 27(4), 367–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-8520.t01-1-00015
25) Morris, M. H., Williams, R. O., Allen, J. A., & Avila, R. A. (1997). *Correlates of success in family business transitions*. Journal of Business Venturing, 12(5), 385–401. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00010-4
26) Mustakallio, M., Autio, E., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). *Relational and contractual governance in family firms: Effects on strategic decision making*. Family Business Review, 15(3), 205–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2002.00205.x
27) Nordqvist, M., Sharma, P., & Chirico, F. (2014). *Family firm heterogeneity and governance: A configuration approach*. Journal of Small Business Management, 52(2), 192–209. https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12096
28) Poza, E. J., & Daugherty, M. S. (2013). *Family business (4th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
29) Schulze, W. S., Lubatkin, M. H., & Dino, R. N. (2001). *Agency relationships in family firms: Theory and evidence*. Organization Science, 12(2), 99–116. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.2.99.10114
30) Sharma, P., Chrisman, J. J., & Chua, J. H. (2003). *Predictors of satisfaction with the succession process in family firms*. Journal of Business Venturing, 18(5), 667–687. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00015-6
31) Sharma, P., Chrisman, J. J., Pablo, A. L., & Chua, J. H. (2001). *Determinants of initial satisfaction with the succession process in family firms: A conceptual model*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 25(3), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225870102500302
32) Tagiuri, R., & Davis, J. A. (1996). *Bivalent attributes of the family firm*. Family Business Review, 9(2), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.1996.00199.x
33) Villalonga, B., & Amit, R. (2006). *How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value?* Journal of Financial Economics, 80(2), 385–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.12.005
34) Zahra, S. A., & Sharma, P. (2004). *Family business research: A strategic reflection*. Family Business Review, 17(4), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2004.00022.x
35) Zahra, S. A., Hayton, J. C., & Salvato, C. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in family vs. non-family firms: A resource-based analysis of the effect of organizational culture*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 31(6), 879–886. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00206.x