

Determinants of Firm Market Value and Enhancement Strategies: An Integrated Theoretical Framework

Fengzhen Xu

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University International Business School Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract Firm market value reflects the collective assessment of investors regarding a firm's future prospects and serves as a critical indicator of corporate performance. Understanding the determinants of market value and identifying strategies for enhancement are central concerns in corporate finance and strategic management. Drawing upon resource-based view, signaling theory, stakeholder theory, and institutional theory, this study develops a theoretical framework to examine the multifaceted determinants of firm market value. The analysis identifies three categories of determinants: firm-specific factors (financial performance, intangible assets, corporate governance, human capital), strategic factors (innovation capability, market positioning, diversification strategy), and external factors (institutional environment, industry conditions, capital market development). The study further explores strategies for enhancing market value, including value creation strategies (innovation investment, human capital development, operational efficiency improvement), value communication strategies (information disclosure, investor relations management), and value protection strategies (corporate governance strengthening, risk management). The theoretical framework provides a foundation for understanding the complexity of market value determinants and offers implications for managerial practice and policy development.

Keywords firm market value; determinants; corporate strategy; intangible assets; corporate governance

Received: March 29, 2026

Revised: June 23, 2026

Accepted: June 25, 2026

Published: July 25, 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Licensee Axon Academic
Publishing Institute, Hong Kong,
China. This article is an open access
article distributed under the terms
and conditions of the Creative
Commons Attribution (CC BY)
license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).
DOI:10.67148/fahss-2026-234

1. Introduction

Firm market value represents the market's assessment of a firm's current performance and future prospects. As a key indicator of corporate success, market value influences firms' access to capital, ability to attract talent, and capacity for growth [1]. For managers, understanding the factors that shape market value is essential for strategic decision-making. For investors, identifying value determinants informs investment decisions. For policymakers, recognizing how institutional factors affect market value guides regulatory design.

The determinants of firm market value have been examined from multiple theoretical perspectives. Financial economics has emphasized the role of cash flows and discount rates in determining value [2, 3]. Strategic management research has highlighted the importance of competitive advantage and resource endowments [4, 5]. Corporate governance scholars have focused on how ownership structures and board characteristics affect firm performance [6, 7]. More recently, attention has turned to

intangible assets, including intellectual capital, human capital, and corporate reputation, as increasingly important value drivers [8, 9].

Despite extensive research, several gaps remain. First, the literature remains fragmented across disciplinary boundaries. Financial studies, strategic management studies, and corporate governance studies often proceed independently, limiting the development of integrated frameworks. Second, the relative importance of different determinants across contexts remains poorly understood. Factors that drive value in one setting may be less relevant in another. Third, the mechanisms through which determinants affect market value require further theoretical elaboration. Fourth, strategies for enhancing market value are often discussed in isolation from the theoretical literature on determinants.

This study addresses these gaps by developing a theoretical framework that integrates insights from multiple perspectives to explain the determinants of firm market value and identify strategies for enhancement. Drawing upon resource-based view [4, 10], signaling theory [11, 12], stakeholder theory [13, 14], and institutional theory [15, 16], the framework categorizes determinants into firm-specific factors, strategic factors, and external factors. It then examines strategies for enhancing market value across three domains: value creation, value communication, and value protection.

The study makes several contributions. First, it provides a comprehensive theoretical integration of diverse perspectives on firm market value determinants. Second, it develops a classification system that distinguishes among different categories of determinants, clarifying their distinct roles. Third, it identifies strategies for enhancing market value that correspond to the determinants identified. Fourth, it offers a foundation for future empirical research and provides implications for managerial practice.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Resource-Based View and Firm Value

The resource-based view provides a foundational perspective for understanding firm value creation. According to this view, firms achieve sustainable competitive advantage and superior performance through resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable [4]. These resources include tangible assets such as physical capital, intangible assets such as brand equity and intellectual property, and organizational capabilities such as managerial expertise and operational processes [10].

In the context of market value, the resource-based view suggests that firms with superior resource endowments should command higher valuations. Investors recognize that such resources enable firms to generate above-normal returns over extended periods [17]. However, the value of resources is not directly observable, creating challenges for investors seeking to assess firm quality [18]. This observation highlights the importance of mechanisms through which firms communicate their resource endowments to capital markets.

Recent research has extended the resource-based view to consider how digital capabilities and artificial intelligence competencies affect firm value [19, 20]. Firms that develop advanced digital capabilities may achieve higher valuations due to their ability to innovate and adapt to changing market conditions [21]. Similarly, investments in

sustainability and environmental capabilities have been found to influence market value, particularly in contexts where such capabilities signal long-term orientation [22].

2.2 Signaling Theory and Market Perceptions

Signaling theory addresses how firms communicate their quality to external stakeholders [11]. In contexts of information asymmetry, firms with superior attributes may engage in costly signaling to distinguish themselves from firms with inferior attributes [12]. Signals must be observable, costly, and difficult to imitate to be credible.

In financial markets, firms use various signals to influence investor perceptions. Dividends signal firm profitability and management confidence [23]. Earnings announcements provide regular updates on performance [24]. Voluntary disclosure of non-financial information signals management quality and transparency [25]. More recently, firms have begun using social media and other digital platforms to communicate with investors, creating new signaling channels [26].

The effectiveness of signaling depends on the credibility of the signal and the sophistication of signal recipients [27]. In developed capital markets with sophisticated investors, signals may be processed efficiently. In less developed markets, signaling may be less effective due to limited information processing capacity or weak enforcement of disclosure requirements [28].

2.3 Stakeholder Theory and Multiple Value Drivers

Stakeholder theory suggests that firm value is shaped by relationships with multiple stakeholder groups, including shareholders, employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and regulators [13, 14]. Each stakeholder group contributes resources essential for firm operations, and the firm's ability to manage these relationships affects its performance and value.

From this perspective, market value reflects not only current financial performance but also the firm's capacity to maintain supportive stakeholder relationships over time [29]. Firms that treat employees well may benefit from higher productivity and lower turnover [1]. Firms that maintain strong customer relationships may enjoy revenue stability and pricing power [30]. Firms that manage supplier relationships effectively may achieve cost advantages and supply chain resilience [31].

Stakeholder management also affects risk perceptions. Firms with strong stakeholder relationships may be viewed as less risky because they have broader support and greater resilience in challenging times [32]. Conversely, firms that neglect stakeholder interests may face higher costs of capital due to perceived risk [33].

2.4 Institutional Theory and External Influences

Institutional theory emphasizes how external pressures shape organizational behavior and outcomes [15, 16]. Firms operate within institutional environments that include regulatory frameworks, industry norms, and cultural expectations. These institutions influence what strategies are considered legitimate and what practices are expected [34].

In the context of market value, institutional factors affect both how firms operate

and how they are evaluated. Regulatory requirements influence disclosure practices, which in turn affect information availability for investors [22]. Industry norms shape expectations about appropriate governance structures and performance targets [35]. Cultural factors influence investor preferences and valuation approaches [6].

Institutional differences across countries create variation in what drives market value. In economies with strong legal protections for investors, market value may more closely reflect underlying performance [7]. In economies with weaker institutions, political connections and relationship-based governance may play larger roles [36]. Understanding these contextual differences is essential for developing generalizable knowledge about value determinants.

3. Determinants of Firm Market Value

3.1 Firm-Specific Factors

Firm-specific factors represent the internal attributes that directly influence a firm's capacity to generate value. These factors can be categorized into financial performance, intangible assets, corporate governance, and human capital.

3.1.1 Financial Performance

Financial performance indicators, including profitability, growth, and cash flow stability, represent fundamental determinants of market value. The relationship between financial performance and market value has been extensively documented [37, 38]. Profitability measures such as return on assets and return on equity capture the efficiency with which firms convert resources into earnings. Growth measures such as revenue growth and earnings growth reflect future prospects. Cash flow measures indicate the firm's ability to fund operations and investments.

However, the relationship between current financial performance and market value is not mechanical. Market value reflects expectations about future performance, which may diverge from current performance if investors anticipate changes [1]. This observation explains why some firms with strong current performance have modest valuations while firms with weak current performance command high valuations based on expected future performance.

3.1.2 Intangible Assets

Intangible assets have become increasingly important drivers of market value. Unlike tangible assets, which are readily valued through accounting methods, intangible assets are difficult to measure and often understated in financial statements [8]. This understatement creates gaps between book value and market value, particularly for firms in knowledge-intensive industries.

Intellectual property, including patents and trademarks, represents one category of intangible assets. Firms with strong patent portfolios may enjoy competitive advantages that support higher valuations [39]. Brand equity represents another category. Strong brands enable firms to command premium prices, maintain customer loyalty, and achieve cost advantages in marketing [40]. Customer relationships represent a third category. Firms with established customer bases may have more predictable revenue

streams and lower customer acquisition costs [41].

Research has documented the increasing importance of intangible assets for market value. Studies estimate that intangible assets account for a substantial and growing proportion of firm value in developed economies [42, 43]. This trend has implications for how investors evaluate firms and how managers allocate resources.

3.1.3 Corporate Governance

Corporate governance mechanisms influence firm value by affecting managerial behavior, risk taking, and resource allocation. Governance structures that align manager interests with shareholder interests may enhance value by reducing agency costs [44, 6].

Board characteristics represent one governance dimension. Independent boards, with directors who are not affiliated with management, may provide more effective oversight [45]. Board diversity, including gender and experience diversity, may enhance decision quality [46]. Board size and composition affect monitoring effectiveness [47].

Ownership structure represents another governance dimension. Concentrated ownership may align owner and manager interests but may also create expropriation risks for minority shareholders [7]. Institutional ownership may improve governance through active monitoring [48]. Executive compensation practices, including equity-based compensation, may align manager interests with shareholder interests but may also create incentives for excessive risk taking [49].

Research on governance and firm value has produced mixed findings, reflecting the complexity of governance effects. The relationship between governance and value likely depends on context, including the institutional environment and firm characteristics [50].

3.1.4 Human Capital

Human capital—the knowledge, skills, and capabilities of a firm’s workforce—represents a critical determinant of firm value. Firms with superior human capital may achieve higher productivity, greater innovation, and better adaptation to changing conditions [51].

The relationship between human capital and market value operates through multiple channels. First, human capital enhances operational efficiency, improving profitability. Second, human capital supports innovation, creating future growth opportunities. Third, human capital enables organizational adaptation, allowing firms to respond to environmental changes [52].

Research has documented the value relevance of human capital measures. Employee satisfaction has been associated with superior stock returns [1]. Workforce skill levels and educational attainment correlate with firm performance and valuation [53]. However, human capital is difficult for investors to observe directly, creating information asymmetry that may affect valuations [18].

3.2 Strategic Factors

Strategic factors represent the choices firms make about how to compete and allocate resources. These factors influence market value by shaping the firm’s

competitive position and growth trajectory.

3.2.1 Innovation Capability

Innovation capability reflects a firm's capacity to develop new products, processes, and business models. Firms with strong innovation capabilities may achieve competitive advantages that support higher valuations [54, 55].

Research has documented positive relationships between innovation investments and market value. Research and development expenditures, though often treated as expenses in accounting, are valued by investors as investments in future growth [56]. Patent portfolios, particularly those with high citation counts and broad claims, correlate with market value [57]. However, the relationship between innovation and value depends on the appropriability of innovation benefits—whether firms can capture returns from their investments [58].

Recent research has examined how digital innovation affects market value. Firms that successfully integrate digital technologies into their operations may achieve higher valuations due to improved efficiency and new revenue opportunities [21]. Artificial intelligence capabilities, though difficult to measure, may signal future competitive advantages [59].

3.2.2 Market Positioning

Market positioning refers to how a firm positions itself relative to competitors. Effective positioning can create competitive advantages that enhance market value [5]. Cost leadership strategies enable firms to achieve higher profitability through operational efficiency. Differentiation strategies enable firms to command premium prices through unique product attributes.

Market share represents one indicator of competitive position. Firms with larger market shares may achieve economies of scale, bargaining power with suppliers, and brand recognition that support higher valuations [60]. However, the relationship between market share and value is not linear, and high market share does not guarantee superior returns if achieved through price competition that erodes margins.

Industry structure also affects the value of market positioning. In concentrated industries, firms may have greater pricing power and higher profitability [61]. In fragmented industries, competitive pressures may limit returns. Understanding industry dynamics is essential for assessing the value implications of market positioning.

3.2.3 Diversification Strategy

Diversification strategy refers to the extent to which firms operate across multiple business segments, industries, or geographic regions. The relationship between diversification and market value has been extensively debated.

Related diversification, in which a firm expands into businesses that share resources or capabilities, may create value through economies of scope [62]. Unrelated diversification may create value through internal capital markets but may also create agency costs and coordination challenges [63]. Geographic diversification may provide growth opportunities and risk reduction but also introduces complexity and

coordination costs [64].

Research has produced mixed findings on the value effects of diversification. Some studies find that diversification reduces value due to agency costs and inefficiencies [65]. Other studies find that diversification can create value when implemented effectively [66]. These mixed findings suggest that the value effects of diversification depend on how it is implemented and the context in which it occurs.

3.3 External Factors

External factors represent conditions in the firm's environment that affect its capacity to create and sustain value. These factors are largely beyond managerial control but significantly influence market value.

3.3.1 Institutional Environment

The institutional environment includes the legal, regulatory, and political systems within which firms operate. Institutional quality affects both how firms operate and how they are evaluated by investors [67].

Legal protections for investors influence market value by affecting the security of property rights and the enforceability of contracts. Countries with strong legal protections tend to have larger capital markets and higher valuations [7]. Regulatory frameworks affect business operations and compliance costs. Changes in regulations can create value for some firms while destroying value for others [22].

Political stability and policy predictability also affect market value. Firms operating in stable political environments face less uncertainty about future conditions, potentially reducing risk premiums and enhancing valuations. Political connections may provide benefits in some contexts but may also create risks if political conditions change [36].

3.3.2 Industry Conditions

Industry conditions, including growth rates, competitive intensity, and technological change, affect the value potential of firms within the industry. Industries with favorable growth prospects may support higher valuations because investors anticipate future profit opportunities [68].

Competitive intensity affects profitability and value. In highly competitive industries, firms may struggle to achieve above-normal returns. In industries with barriers to entry, established firms may enjoy sustained profitability [61]. Technological change can disrupt existing industry structures, creating opportunities for some firms while threatening others [69].

Industry life cycle stage also influences value determinants. In emerging industries, expectations about future growth may dominate valuations. In mature industries, current profitability and cash flow stability may be more important. Understanding these industry dynamics is essential for interpreting firm valuations.

3.3.3 Capital Market Development

Capital market development affects how firms access financing and how they are valued. Developed capital markets with sophisticated investors may process information

efficiently, reducing information asymmetry and improving capital allocation [24]. These markets may also provide more accurate valuations because investors have better information and analytical capabilities.

Market liquidity affects the cost of capital and, indirectly, firm value. Firms in liquid markets may have lower costs of capital because investors can easily adjust their positions. The presence of sophisticated investors, including institutional investors and analysts, may enhance information production and improve valuation accuracy [48].

However, capital market development also creates pressures. Publicly traded firms face scrutiny from analysts and investors, which may focus managerial attention on short-term performance at the expense of long-term value creation [70].

4. 4. Strategies for Enhancing Firm Market Value

4.1 Value Creation Strategies

Value creation strategies focus on improving the underlying performance and capabilities that generate firm value. These strategies address the firm-specific and strategic determinants identified above.

4.1.1 Innovation Investment

Investment in innovation represents a fundamental value creation strategy. Firms can enhance market value by developing new products, processes, and business models that create competitive advantages [54]. However, innovation investments involve uncertainty and require sustained commitment.

Effective innovation management requires balancing exploration of new opportunities with exploitation of existing capabilities [71]. Firms that invest too heavily in exploration may sacrifice current profitability. Firms that invest too little may become obsolete. Managing this balance is essential for value creation.

Research suggests that firms with systematic innovation processes achieve better outcomes than those relying on occasional breakthroughs [72]. Establishing innovation routines, building innovation capabilities, and developing mechanisms for capturing value from innovation represent important managerial priorities.

4.1.2 Human Capital Development

Developing human capital represents another value creation strategy. Firms can enhance market value by investing in employee skills, capabilities, and motivation [51]. Such investments may improve productivity, support innovation, and enhance organizational adaptability.

Effective human capital development requires both attracting talent and developing existing employees. Recruitment practices that identify high-potential candidates, training programs that build capabilities, and career development systems that retain talent represent important investments [73]. However, human capital investments may not be fully valued by markets if investors cannot observe their benefits. Firms may need to complement investments with communication strategies that make human capital visible.

4.1.3 Operational Efficiency Improvement

Improving operational efficiency represents a direct path to value creation. Firms can enhance market value by reducing costs, improving quality, and increasing productivity [5]. Operational improvements increase current profitability and may also enhance future growth capacity.

Operational efficiency improvements require systematic attention to processes, technologies, and organizational systems. Lean management practices, quality improvement programs, and process automation represent common approaches. Digital technologies provide new opportunities for operational improvement, including data analytics, artificial intelligence, and automation [21].

However, operational improvements may not create lasting value if easily imitated by competitors. Sustainable value requires developing operational capabilities that are difficult for competitors to replicate [4].

4.2 Value Communication Strategies

Value communication strategies focus on ensuring that capital markets accurately perceive firm value. These strategies address information asymmetry between firms and investors.

4.2.1 Information Disclosure

Information disclosure represents a primary mechanism for communicating with investors. Firms can enhance market value by providing information that reduces uncertainty and signals firm quality [24]. Disclosure of financial performance, strategic plans, and non-financial indicators may all affect investor perceptions.

Effective disclosure requires balancing informativeness with manageability. Firms that provide too little information may be undervalued due to information asymmetry. Firms that provide too much information may overwhelm investors or reveal sensitive information to competitors. Finding the appropriate level and content of disclosure is essential [74].

Recent research has examined the value relevance of non-financial disclosure. Environmental, social, and governance disclosure has been associated with lower cost of capital and higher valuations [25]. However, the effects of such disclosure depend on credibility and context [22].

4.2.2 Investor Relations Management

Investor relations management involves the systematic management of communication with current and potential investors. Effective investor relations can enhance market value by building trust, reducing information asymmetry, and managing expectations [75].

Investor relations activities include analyst meetings, investor presentations, earnings calls, and direct communications. These activities provide opportunities for management to explain firm strategy, respond to investor concerns, and build relationships with the investment community. Firms that invest in professional investor relations functions may benefit from more accurate valuations and lower cost of capital.

However, investor relations management also involves risks. Over-promising and

failing to deliver can damage credibility. Focusing too heavily on short-term expectations may distract from long-term value creation. Effective investor relations require balancing responsiveness to investors with commitment to long-term strategy.

4.3 Value Protection Strategies

Value protection strategies focus on preserving existing value and managing risks that could erode market value. These strategies address governance and risk management.

4.3.1 Corporate Governance Strengthening

Strengthening corporate governance can protect market value by reducing agency costs and ensuring that management acts in shareholder interests [6]. Effective governance mechanisms include independent boards, appropriate executive compensation, and strong internal controls.

Board effectiveness requires attention to composition, structure, and processes. Independent directors with relevant expertise, diverse perspectives, and commitment to oversight can enhance governance quality [46]. Board evaluation processes that assess performance and identify areas for improvement represent important governance practices.

Executive compensation practices that align manager interests with shareholder interests can reduce agency costs. However, compensation design must balance incentives for performance with avoidance of excessive risk taking. Equity-based compensation can align interests but may also encourage short-term focus [49].

4.3.2 Risk Management

Effective risk management protects market value by reducing the likelihood and impact of adverse events. Risk management involves identifying risks, assessing their potential impact, and implementing controls to mitigate them [76].

Operational risks, including supply chain disruptions, quality failures, and cybersecurity breaches, can affect value by impairing performance or damaging reputation. Financial risks, including interest rate, currency, and credit risks, affect cash flow stability. Strategic risks, including competitive threats and technological disruption, affect long-term viability.

Risk management systems that identify emerging risks and enable rapid response can protect value. However, risk management must balance protection against excessive caution that constrains value creation. Effective risk management enables informed risk taking rather than risk avoidance.

5. Conclusion and Future Directions

5.1 Summary of Theoretical Contributions

This study has developed a theoretical framework for understanding the determinants of firm market value and identifying strategies for enhancement. The framework integrates insights from resource-based view, signaling theory, stakeholder theory, and institutional theory to categorize determinants into firm-specific factors,

strategic factors, and external factors. It then examines strategies for enhancing value across three domains: value creation, value communication, and value protection.

The theoretical contributions are threefold. First, the study provides a comprehensive integration of diverse theoretical perspectives on firm value determinants. Second, it develops a classification system that clarifies the distinct roles of different categories of determinants. Third, it identifies strategies for enhancing market value that correspond to the determinants identified, providing a bridge between analysis and action.

5.2 Implications for Practice

The theoretical framework has implications for managerial practice. For managers seeking to enhance firm market value, the framework suggests the need for a multifaceted approach that addresses value creation, value communication, and value protection simultaneously. Focusing exclusively on financial performance may be insufficient if markets do not perceive underlying strengths. Focusing exclusively on communication may be ineffective if underlying performance is weak.

The framework also highlights the importance of context. Strategies that enhance value in one setting may be less effective in another. Managers should consider firm characteristics, industry conditions, and institutional environment when developing value enhancement strategies.

For investors, the framework suggests the importance of looking beyond financial performance to consider intangible assets, governance quality, human capital, and strategic positioning. These factors may provide insights into firm prospects that are not captured in financial statements.

For policymakers, the framework suggests the importance of institutional conditions that support accurate market valuation. Strong legal protections for investors, effective regulatory frameworks, and developed capital markets facilitate the efficient allocation of capital and the accurate valuation of firms.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study has several limitations. As a theoretical study, it does not provide empirical evidence for the relationships identified. The framework requires empirical testing using appropriate data and methods. Future research should undertake such testing, examining the relative importance of different determinants across contexts and the effectiveness of different enhancement strategies.

Several specific research directions emerge. First, research should examine how the importance of different determinants varies across industries, countries, and time periods. Understanding contextual variation is essential for developing practical guidance.

Second, research should examine the interactions among determinants. Determinants may not operate independently; their effects may depend on the presence or absence of other factors. Understanding these interactions could provide insights into how firms can combine multiple value drivers.

Third, research should examine the mechanisms through which strategies affect market value. Understanding the intermediate processes linking managerial actions to

market outcomes could inform more effective strategy implementation.

Fourth, research should examine the costs of value enhancement strategies. The framework assumes that benefits exceed costs, but strategies impose real costs. Understanding these costs and how they vary across contexts is important for managerial decision-making.

Fifth, research should examine how digital transformation affects the determinants of market value. As digital technologies reshape industries, the factors that drive value may change. Understanding these changes is essential for both research and practice.

References

- [1] Edmans, A. (2011). Does the stock market fully value intangibles? Employee satisfaction and equity prices. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 101(3), 621-640.
- [2] Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383-417.
- [3] Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *American Economic Review*, 48(3), 261-297.
- [4] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- [5] Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage*. Free Press.
- [6] Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(2), 737-783.
- [7] La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. (2000). Investor protection and corporate governance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 58(1-2), 3-27.
- [8] Lev, B., & Gu, F. (2016). *The end of accounting and the path forward for investors and managers*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [9] Gamerschlag, R., & Moeller, K. (2021). The value relevance of intangible assets: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Economics*, 91(5), 673-711.
- [10] Barney, J. B., & Hesterly, W. S. (2019). *Strategic management and competitive advantage: Concepts and cases* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- [11] Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355-374.
- [12] Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- [13] Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- [14] Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.
- [15] DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- [16] Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [17] Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource-based view of the firm. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 701-721.
- [18] Coff, R. W. (1997). Human assets and management dilemmas: Coping with hazards on the road to resource-based theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 374-402.
- [19] Nambisan, S., Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., & Song, M. (2017). Digital innovation management: Reinventing innovation management research in a digital world. *MIS Quarterly*, 41(1), 223-238.
- [20] Warner, K. S., & Wäger, M. (2019). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 52(3), 326-349.
- [21] Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021).

Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889-901.

- [22] Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2021). Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: Economic analysis and literature review. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 26(3), 1176-1248.
- [23] Miller, M. H., & Rock, K. (1985). Dividend policy under asymmetric information. *The Journal of Finance*, 40(4), 1031-1051.
- [24] Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 31(1-3), 405-440.
- [25] Dhaliwal, D. S., Li, O. Z., Tsang, A., & Yang, Y. G. (2011). Voluntary nonfinancial disclosure and the cost of equity capital: The initiation of corporate social responsibility reporting. *The Accounting Review*, 86(1), 59-100.
- [26] Lee, L. F., Hutton, A. P., & Shu, S. (2015). The role of social media in the capital market: Evidence from consumer product recalls. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 53(2), 367-404.
- [27] Bergh, D. D., Connelly, B. L., Ketchen, D. J., & Shannon, L. M. (2014). Signalling theory and equilibrium in strategic management research: An assessment and a research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(8), 1334-1360.
- [28] Leuz, C., & Wysocki, P. D. (2016). The economics of disclosure and financial reporting regulation: Evidence and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 54(2), 525-622.
- [29] Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L., & de Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge University Press.
- [30] Grewal, R., Chandrashekar, M., & Citrin, A. V. (2010). Customer satisfaction heterogeneity and shareholder value. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(4), 612-626.
- [31] Wong, C. Y., Wong, C. W., & Boon-itt, S. (2020). The combined effects of internal and external supply chain integration on product innovation. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 226, 107618.
- [32] Lins, K. V., Servaes, H., & Tamayo, A. (2017). Social capital, trust, and firm performance: The value of corporate social responsibility during the financial crisis. *The Journal of Finance*, 72(4), 1785-1824.
- [33] El Ghouli, S., Guedhami, O., Kwok, C. C., & Mishra, D. R. (2011). Does corporate social responsibility affect the cost of capital? *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35(9), 2388-2406.
- [34] Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- [35] Khan, M., Serafeim, G., & Yoon, A. (2016). Corporate sustainability: First evidence on materiality. *The Accounting Review*, 91(6), 1697-1724.
- [36] Faccio, M. (2006). Politically connected firms. *American Economic Review*, 96(1), 369-386.
- [37] Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (1998). Value versus growth: The international evidence. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(6), 1975-1999.
- [38] Penman, S. H. (2010). *Financial statement analysis and security valuation* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [39] Hsu, D. H. (2009). Technology-based entrepreneurship. In Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship research* (pp. 367-387). Springer.
- [40] Keller, K. L., & Lehmann, D. R. (2006). Brands and branding: Research findings and future priorities. *Marketing Science*, 25(6), 740-759.
- [41] Gupta, S., Lehmann, D. R., & Stuart, J. A. (2004). Valuing customers. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 41(1), 7-18.
- [42] Corrado, C., Hulten, C., & Sichel, D. (2009). Intangible capital and US economic growth. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 55(3), 661-685.
- [43] Ewens, M., Peters, R. H., & Wang, S. (2022). Measuring intangible capital with market prices. *Management Science*, 68(3), 1875-1903.

-
- [44] 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.
- [45] Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26(2), 301-325.
- [46] 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.
- [47] Yermack, D. (1996). Higher market valuation of companies with a small board of directors. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 40(2), 185-211.
- [48] Bushee, B. J. (1998). The influence of institutional investors on myopic R&D investment behavior. *The Accounting Review*, 73(3), 305-333.
- [49] Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2003). Executive compensation as an agency problem. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(3), 71-92.
- [50] Aguilera, R. V., Desender, K., Kabbach de Castro, L. R., & Lee, J. H. (2012). The governance of firm value: A comparative perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1), 281-340.
- [51] Ployhart, R. E., Nyberg, A. J., Reilly, G., & Maltarich, M. A. (2014). Human capital is dead; long live human capital resources! *Journal of Management*, 40(2), 371-398.
- [52] Campbell, B. A., Coff, R., & Kryscynski, D. (2012). Rethinking sustained competitive advantage from human capital. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 376-395.
- [53] Crook, T. R., Todd, S. Y., Combs, J. G., Woehr, D. J., & Ketchen, D. J. (2011). Does human capital matter? A meta-analysis of the relationship between human capital and firm performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(3), 443-456.
- [54] Dosi, G. (1988). Sources, procedures, and microeconomic effects of innovation. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 26(3), 1120-1171.
- [55] Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350.
- [56] Chan, L. K., Lakonishok, J., & Sougiannis, T. (2001). The stock market valuation of research and development expenditures. *The Journal of Finance*, 56(6), 2431-2456.
- [57] Hall, B. H., Jaffe, A., & Trajtenberg, M. (2005). Market value and patent citations. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 36(1), 16-38.
- [58] Teece, D. J. (1986). Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *Research Policy*, 15(6), 285-305.
- [59] Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton.
- [60] Szymanski, D. M., Bharadwaj, S. G., & Varadarajan, P. R. (1993). Standardization versus adaptation of international marketing strategy: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(4), 1-17.
- [61] Bain, J. S. (1956). *Barriers to new competition*. Harvard University Press.
- [62] Rumelt, R. P. (1974). *Strategy, structure, and economic performance*. Harvard University Press.
- [63] Montgomery, C. A. (1994). Corporate diversification. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8(3), 163-178.
- [64] Hitt, M. A., Hoskisson, R. E., & Kim, H. (1997). International diversification: Effects on innovation and firm performance in product-diversified firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(4), 767-798.
- [65] Lang, L. H., & Stulz, R. M. (1994). Tobin's q, corporate diversification, and firm performance. *Journal of Political Economy*, 102(6), 1248-1280.
- [66] Villalonga, B. (2004). Diversification discount or premium? New evidence from the business information tracking series. *The Journal of Finance*, 59(2), 479-506.
- [67] North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University

Press.

[68] Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. Free Press.

[69] Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma*. Harvard Business School Press.

[70] Graham, J. R., Harvey, C. R., & Rajgopal, S. (2005). The economic implications of corporate financial reporting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 40(1-3), 3-73.

[71] March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.

[72] Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 9-30.

[73] Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635-672.

[74] Verrecchia, R. E. (2001). Essays on disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 32(1-3), 97-180.

[75] Bushee, B. J., & Miller, G. S. (2012). Investor relations, firm visibility, and investor following. *The Accounting Review*, 87(3), 867-897.

[76] Kaplan, R. S., & Mikes, A. (2012). Managing risks: A new framework. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(6), 48-60.