

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN MANAGEMENT

**ESSAYS ON INTERNATIONALIZATION, CORPORATE
GOVERNANCE, OWNERSHIP NETWORKS, AND FIRM
PERFORMANCE**

By

ABU REHAN ABBASI



भारतीय प्रबंध संस्थान बेंगलूर
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
BANGALORE

2022

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN MANAGEMENT

**ESSAYS ON INTERNATIONALIZATION, CORPORATE
GOVERNANCE, OWNERSHIP NETWORKS, AND FIRM
PERFORMANCE**

By

Abu Rehan Abbasi

A Dissertation submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT BANGALORE

2022

Prof. Ananth Krishnamurthy

Chairperson
Doctoral Programme

Prof. Rejie George

Chairperson
Dissertation Advisory Committee

Members of the Dissertation Advisory Committee

1. **Prof. Rejie George** Chairperson
2. **Prof. Dalhia Mani** Member
3. **Prof. Sai Chittaranjan Kalubandi** Member

Copyright © 2022 by Abu Rehan Abbasi
All rights reserved.

To
My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

*Proclaim! (or read!) in the name of thy Lord and Cherisher, Who created-
Created man, out of a (mere) clot of congealed blood:
Proclaim! And thy Lord is Most Bountiful,-
He Who taught (the use of) the pen,-
Taught man that which he knew not.
[Quran, 96:1-5]*

I firmly believe that nothing happens without the Almighty's decree. Being thankful to Him begins with being grateful to His creation. This research output would not have been feasible without the support of several faculty, fellow students, staff, and family members.

At the outset, I express my deepest gratitude to members of my advisory committee starting with *Professor Rejie George*, the committee chairperson. His guidance, patience, empathy, motivation, and high expectations, starting with the independent studies during my course work, have been instrumental in conducting quality research within the stipulated time frame and ensuring my research journey during the program pans out as efficiently as possible. Assisting him in the MBA courses enriched me with nuanced insights, concept clarity, and an eye for detail, qualities that a prospective academic always strives to achieve. *Professor Dalhia Mani*, the external examiner for my comprehensive examination paper presentation who later graciously came on board my committee, has consistently been encouraging and available throughout my dissertation. Her guidance and feedback have been instrumental in enhancing the rigor of my research. I would also like to acknowledge her accommodating nature. *Professor Sai Chittaranjan Kalubandi*, the final member of my committee, has supported my endeavors to take up new methodologies and has always promptly provided his honest and detailed reviews of my research, which have been very useful.

In addition to my committee members, I am deeply indebted to several other faculty at IIMB for various reasons. *Professor Sai Yayavarm*, the area chairperson during my coursework, guided my decisions on selecting courses and deciding milestones. Later I had the opportunity to assist him in his MBA elective course that enhanced my understanding of

corporate strategy with real-world cases and kick-started a related research project. Working with him has fine-tuned my coding skills, which have also benefitted my dissertation. *Professor Pranav Garg*, former faculty at IIMB, went the extra mile to ensure that I equipped myself with the necessary econometric know-how to conduct quantitative research before he left. His advice on preparing for the comprehensive examination was invaluable, and I cleared the exams without any resubmits. Lastly, among the faculty, I express my profound appreciation to *Professors Malay Bhattacharya* (now superannuated), *Deepak Malghan*, and *Hema Swaminathan* for practically showing that being a concerned citizen and top-quality academician are not mutually exclusive.

This endeavor would not have been as enriching without conversations with my highly gifted fellow strategy area students *Priyatam Anurag*, *Shobha Tewari*, *Sachidananda Benegal*, *Ravi Shankar Pandey*, *Shooj Bhaskaran Raj*, *Bibek Bhattacharya*, *Vikas Prabhu*, *Himanshu Shekhar*, *Gaurav G.B.*, and *Veethica Smriti*. I am also indebted to my batch mates *Gopi Sankar*, *Soumya Pal*, *Anjana Karumathil*, *Jose Manu*, *Giriraj*, *Chhavi Shekhawat*, and *Soumya Kini* as well as to *Anupama Kondayya* for providing an excellent support group. I could not have survived the isolation of the extended lockdown during the pandemic without them and *Ankit Kumar* (then a Ph.D. candidate from IIM Raipur) - a gifted scholar with a maturity much beyond his age. My deepest gratitude to *Naveen Bharathi* for his brotherly affection, *Kshitij Awasthi* for his guidance, and *Shooj* for his unending support and mentoring throughout the program.

I am incredibly grateful to the library staff at IIMB and the doctoral program office. The high commitment and dedication of *Mihir Panda*, *Rajesh H.T.*, *Mansoor Khan*, *Mansoor Koormath*, *Reena Gupta*, and *Namrata Rai* ensured that I received timely support related to databases, books, and academic journals. The endeavors of *Ashoka Nag*, *Srinath*, *Shilpa*, *Shankarappa*, and *Kanka* in the doctoral program office made the journey very smooth.

Finally, words cannot express my gratitude to my family members. I start with my parents, who, from an early age, have instilled independence in decision-making and supported my leaving a well-settled career for the uncertainty of the Ph.D. program. Next, my kid sister, who, despite her love and affection, never once shies away from pointing out flaws and keeps me grounded. I must mention that, over the last year, their unwavering support and taking up additional responsibilities that otherwise were mine to take ensured that I could meet the various program milestones while working from home. Lastly, I am also grateful to the latest addition to my family – my wife, who quickly understood the challenges faced in pursuing a Ph.D. and adjusted seamlessly into my life.

Table of Contents

Abstract	xii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Outline of the Dissertation	6
2 What determines the Internationalization-Performance (I-P) Relationship? The moderating effect of Services, Manufacturing, and Product Diversification	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Theory and Hypothesis	21
2.2.1 Internationalization and Firm Performance	21
2.2.1.1 Benefits	21
2.2.1.2 Costs	23
2.2.1.3 Nature of relationship	25
2.2.1.4 Services versus manufacturing	27
2.2.2 Product Diversification as a Moderator	30
2.2.2.1 Services Sector and the effect of product diversification (unrelated) on the I-P relationship	32
2.2.2.2 Manufacturing sector and the effect of product diversification (related) on the I-P relationship.	34
2.3 Research Method	36
2.3.1 Sample	36
2.3.2 Description of Variables	37
2.3.3 Estimation Methods	39
2.3.3.1 Tests for the 'U,' 'S'/ three stages model	40
2.3.3.2 Endogeneity	41
2.4 Results	43
2.4.1 Descriptive Statistics	43
2.4.2 Regression Results	46
2.5 Post-hoc analysis	55
2.5.1 Is internationalization beneficial (performance-wise) for a services firm?	55
2.5.2 Is internationalization beneficial (performance-wise) for a manufacturing firm?	56
2.5.3 DOI as foreign assets to total assets (FATA) in place of FSTS	57
2.6 Discussion and Conclusion	58
3 Ownership Structure and the Internationalization-Firm Performance Relationship	77
3.1 Introduction	77

3.2	Theory and Hypothesis	82
3.2.1	Internationalization and Firm Performance	82
3.2.1.1	Benefits	82
3.2.1.2	Costs	84
3.2.2	Ownership structure	87
3.2.2.1	Family Ownership as a moderator	88
3.2.2.2	BG affiliation as a Moderator	92
3.2.2.3	Family Ownership and Business Group Affiliation	97
3.3	Research Methodology, Analysis, and Results	106
3.3.1	Research Setting	106
3.3.2	Data Sample	108
3.3.3	Measures	108
3.3.4	Estimation Methods	111
3.3.5	Endogeneity	113
3.4	Results	114
3.4.1	Descriptive Statistics	114
3.4.2	Regression Results	115
3.4.3	Post hoc tests	125
3.4.3.1	Subsample analysis of the I-P relationship	125
3.4.3.2	BG heterogeneity and the I-P relationship	125
3.5	Discussion and Conclusion	127
4	Interplay Between Liberalization and Ownership Networks - Small Worlds in India	148
4.1	Introduction	148
4.2	Context and Theory	152
4.2.1	Economic Liberalization	152
4.2.1.1	Liberalization and FDI reforms	154
4.2.1.2	Liberalization and Corporate Governance reforms	154
4.2.2	Ownership Network	156
4.3	Liberalization and the Ownership network	158
4.4	Setting	159
4.4.1	FDI reforms	160
4.4.2	Corporate Governance reforms	163
4.5	Indian Ownership Network and its Evolution	165
4.5.1	The role of Inward FDI reforms	170
4.5.2	The role of Outward FDI reforms	172
4.5.3	The role of Corporate Governance reforms	173
4.6	Methods	175
4.6.1	Sample and Data Source	175

4.6.2	Network Construction	176
4.7	Results	177
4.7.1	Robustness checks	181
4.8	Discussion and Conclusion	184
5	Conclusions	188
5.1	Summary and Implications	188
5.2	Limitations	190
5.3	Future research directions	191
6	References	193

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Positioning the dissertation in management literature	7
Figure 1-2 Framework showing the scope of essays 1 and 2	11
Figure 1-3 Framework showing the scope of essay 3	14
Figure 2-1 Conceptualization of a U-shaped I-P relationship (Hypothesis 1a)	25
Figure 2-2 Conceptualization of a S-shaped I-P relationship (Hypothesis 1b)	25
Figure 2-3 Conceptualization of the effect of product diversification on I-P relationship for Services (Hypothesis 2a and 2b)	33
Figure 2-4 Conceptualization of the effect of product diversification on I-P relationship for Manufacturing (Hypothesis 3a and 3b)	35
Figure 2-5 U-shaped I-P relationship for sample of service sector firms	46
Figure 2-6 S-shaped I-P relationship for sample of manufacturing sector firms	47
Figure 2-7 Effect of unrelated product diversification (UR-PD) on the U-shaped I-P relationship for firms in the services sector	51
Figure 2-8 Effect of related product diversification (R-PD) on the S-shaped I-P relationship for firms in the manufacturing sector	52
Figure 3-1 Conceptualization of U-shaped I-P relationship (Hypothesis 1)	86
Figure 3-2 Conceptualization of the effect of family ownership on the I-P relationship (Hypothesis 2a & 2b)	92
Figure 3-3 Conceptualization of the effect of BG affiliation on the I-P relationship (Hypothesis 3a & 3b)	96
Figure 3-4 Conceptualization of the joint effect of family ownership & BG affiliation on the I-P relationship (Hypothesis 4a,4b,4c)	101
Figure 3-5 Expected relationship between DOI and Performance for different levels of family ownership among BG affiliates.	106
Figure 3-6 Value of foreign sales and foreign investments made by the firms in our sample	109
Figure 3-7 I-P relationship for our sample	115
Figure 3-8 Effect of family ownership and BG affiliation on the I-P relationship	123
Figure 3-9 Actual relationship between DOI and Performance for different levels of family ownership among BG affiliates.	123
Figure 4-1 Timeline of important outward FDI reforms in India	162
Figure 4-2 FDI trend in India	163
Figure 4-3 Timeline of important Corporate Governance reforms in India	165
Figure 4-4 Conceptual Framework	171
Figure 4-5 Whole Ownership Network for 2001	178
Figure 4-6 Whole Ownership Network for 2010	179
Figure 4-7 Whole Ownership Network for 2019	179

List of Tables

Table 2-1 Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations for sample of services firms	44
Table 2-2 Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations for sample of manufacturing firms	45
Table 2-3 Regression of firm performance (ROA%)	48
Table 2-4 Regression of firm performance (ROA%), includes interaction terms	50
Table 3-1 Summary of the latent mechanisms for the hypotheses	103
Table 3-2 Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations	117
Table 3-3 Regression of firm performance (ROA%)	118
Table 3-4 Wald test results for testing Hypothesis 1b	119
Table 3-5 Regression of firm performance (ROA%)	120
Table 4-1 Changes in inward FDI limits in certain key sectors	161
Table 4-2 Description of Ownership Networks for 2001, 2010 and 2019	178
Table 4-3 Percentage distribution of Ownership categories for firms in largest component	179
Table 4-4 Percentage distribution of Industry Classification for firms in largest component	179
Table 4-5 Dynamics of firms in the largest component	180
Table 4-6 Small World statistics for Ownership Networks in 2001, 2010, and 2019	180
Table 4-7 Inward FDI and Cross-group ties	182
Table 4-8 Outward FDI and Cross-group ties	182
Table 4-9 Inward FDI and Constraint	183
Table 4-10 Corporate Governance reform adoption and Constraint	184

List of Appendices

Appendix 2-1 Regression of firm performance (ROA%) with lag of ROA included as a control variable	64
Appendix 2-2 Dynamic panel system-GMM estimation	67
Appendix 2-3 Wald type test results for $\Delta > 0$	70
Appendix 2-4 Value of foreign sales and foreign investments	71
Appendix 2-5 Regression of firm performance (ROA%) when <i>DOI = FATA</i>	72
Appendix 2-6 I-P relationship when DOI is measured as FATA	73
Appendix 2-7 Regression of firm performance (ROA%) when <i>DOI = FATA</i> , includes interaction terms	74
Appendix 2-8 Effect of unrelated product diversification (UR-PD) on the U-shaped I-P relationship for firms in the services sector with DOI measured as FATA	76
Appendix 3-1 Confirming the occurrence of a flattening	132
Appendix 3-2 Tests for shift in turning point	134
Appendix 3-3 Regression of firm performance (ROA%) with lag of ROA included as a control variable	136
Appendix 3-4 Regression of firm performance (ROA%) with lag of ROA included as a control variable; includes interaction terms	137
Appendix 3-5 Effect of family ownership and BG affiliation on the I-P relationship (Model 4, appendix 3-4)	139
Appendix 3-6 Results of Granger test	140
Appendix 3-7 Dynamic panel system-GMM estimation	142
Appendix 3-8 Effect of family ownership on the I-P relationship for BG affiliates	144
Appendix 3-9 BG Heterogeneity: Regression of firm performance (ROA%) with different measures of BG heterogeneity included	145
Appendix 3-10 Effect of BG heterogeneity at different levels of family ownership	147

ABSTRACT

Understanding the determinants of the success or failure of a firm's internationalization strategy is one of the fundamental research motives in strategic management (e.g., Rumelt, Schendel, & Teece, 1994; Teece, 2020) and international business (e.g., Peng, 2004). Hence, investigating whether internationalization influences firm performance, and the extent of this influence is integral to this fundamental objective. The internationalization-firm performance (I-P) relationship has been studied extensively, and a few influential reviews have been published to enable us to navigate the research stream (e.g., Hitt, Tihanyi, Miller, & Connelly, 2006). However, it continues to generate renewed interest among scholars as past studies have differed in their conclusions about the I-P relationship (e.g., Abdi & Aulakh, 2018; Pisani, Garcia-Bernardo, & Heemskerk, 2020).

Primarily, two reasons account for this variance among studies examining the phenomenon. Firstly, the absence of adequate theoretical nuancing to contextualize the relationship at the firm, industry, and country levels leads to varying findings. Scholars have highlighted the influence of contextual factors in the I-P relationship and the need to move beyond grand theorizing focussed on why and how internationalization affects firm performance (Bowen, 2007; Contractor, 2007, 2012; Kirca, Roth, Hult, & Cavusgil, 2012). Secondly, a lack of appropriate data that is unrestricted based on firm size or level of internationalization and a lack of empirical sophistication and rigor have also contributed to ambiguity in the results (Bowen, 2007; Cardinal, Miller, & Palich, 2011; Contractor, 2012; Kirca et al., 2012).

The dissertation aims to re-examine the I-P relationship by incorporating these two aspects. The dissertation is organized into three essays. In the first two essays, we contextualize the analysis at the firm and industry level and undertake a mid-range contingency approach

more suited to the I-P research stream (e.g., Ruigrok, Amann, & Wagner, 2007; Singla & George, 2013). The first essay investigates the implications of industry heterogeneity and product diversification strategies on the nature of the I-P relationship. The second essay examines an important corporate governance mechanism – ownership structure – as a contingency investigating the individual and the simultaneous influence of two vital ownership structures – family ownership and business group affiliation – on the I-P relationship. The third essay takes a macro view and investigates a fifth contextual element that impacts firm-level behavior – the structure of the corporate ownership network. While this essay, does not undertake an analysis of the I-P relationship, we embark on the groundwork for future studies on the influence that network position may have on the relationship. We limit ourselves to investigating how changes in FDI and corporate governance reforms have impacted the ownership network.

We use India as the empirical setting for the research. An advantage of choosing India is that firms here have internationalized relatively late, mostly post the 1991 liberalization of the Indian economy. The availability of a relatively large sample of data from the above period facilitates capturing the different stages of the phenomenon, in particular, the early stages, thereby avoiding range restrictions that may have biased the prior findings (e.g., Cardinal et al., 2011; Lu & Beamish, 2004). Moreover, past I-P research has primarily focused on developed markets, whereas emerging market firms internationalize while embedded in a different institutional context (e.g., Hitt et al., 2006); for example, differences in corporate governance norms (Young, Peng, Ahlstrom, Bruton, & Jiang, 2008). Therefore, by empirically situating the study in India, we can unravel the nuances associated with the single-country setting and focus on emerging markets.

A brief sketch of the content of the three essays at the core of the dissertation is provided below.

Essay 1: The essay investigates how industry context and product diversification strategies affect the relationship between internationalization and firm performance. The distinct characteristics of services, viz a viz manufacturing, and the simultaneous pursuit of product scope strategies are likely to disparately influence the underlying mechanisms of costs and benefits in the I-P relationship and consequently lead to differences in the nature of the I-P relationship. We investigate the impact of the simultaneous pursuit of internationalization and product diversification (including its types) on firm performance while accounting for the role of industry differences. Earlier studies in this domain have looked at these strategies in silos (Cuervo-Cazurra, Mudambi, Pedersen, & Piscitello, 2017), focussing on the manufacturing industry and seldom differentiating between the types of diversification: related and unrelated. In general, related product diversification due to resource sharing is said to provide superior benefits than unrelated product diversification; however, the same may not be the case in services due to a lack of fungibility of resources.

From a methodological viewpoint, we conduct a robust study offering valuable insights into the direct effects and contingencies. We overcome methodology and data-related concerns for non-linear relationships in past studies to a great extent. We take cognizance that the presence of a cubic relationship does not automatically confirm the presence of an S-shaped relationship and test for the existence of local minima and maxima necessary to substantiate the presence. Similarly, we confirm the presence of a ‘U’, by following the three-stage testing procedure of Lind & Mehlum (2010). We also ensure that our models follow a fuller specification and include all the lower-order direct and interaction terms to avoid potential biases in the estimation (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2002).

We study manufacturing and services firms from an emerging market (India) and trace a long twenty-four-year period (1996-2019) using an unrestricted sample of 189,844 firm-year observations. We find that for manufacturing firms, the I-P relationship is an ‘S.’ In contrast,

it is a ‘U’ for a sample of services firms, implying that, unlike manufacturing, services firms are yet to achieve their optimal internationalization level. We also find that increasing product diversification by services firms flattens the ‘U’ whereas increasing diversification by manufacturing firms strengthens the ‘S.’ These findings provide valuable new insights that services firms are better off pursuing the two strategies simultaneously unlike manufacturing firms. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first to document these contrarian influences on the I-P relationship. We check for our results’ robustness by conducting state-of-the-art statistical tests recommended in the literature for both the cubic model and the quadratic model.

Essay 2: In this essay, we attempt to address the lack of research on the effect of governance mechanisms on the outcomes of internationalization in emerging market contexts and focus on two unique ownership structures associated with emerging markets, namely, family ownership and business group affiliation (Aguilera, Crespi-Cladera, Infantes, & Pascual-Fuster, 2020; De Massis, Frattini, Majocchi, & Piscitello, 2018). We theorize how preservation of socio emotional wealth (Gomez-Mejia, Cruz, Berrone, & De Castro, 2011) by family owners leads to both principal-principal agency problems (Singla, Veliyath, & George, 2014) and principal-principal agency benefits (Sauerwald, Heugens, Turtorea, & Essen, 2019) which influences the underlying mechanisms of the I-P relationship leading to a change in shape and position of the relationship. For business group affiliation, we use the resource-based view (Penrose, 1959; Peteraf, 1993) and build on the salient features commonly associated with business groups including their reputation, interconnected organization structure, and internal capital markets. We theorize the influences business group affiliation has on the cost and benefits associated with internationalization and the resulting influence on the shape and position of the I-P relationship. Lastly, since treating all business groups with family ownership as homogenous in terms of the influence exerted by the family misses out on the variation in control that

different levels of family ownership may have, we, also theorize for a joint effect of family ownership and business group affiliation on the I-P relationship.

In order to investigate these phenomena, we utilize a twelve-year longitudinal data set of 2,168 manufacturing firms from an emerging market (India) with a combined total of 18,489 firm-year observations. We use a subset of the dataset used in the previous essay as the ownership data required to operationalize family ownership is available in an appropriate format from a later date. Further, we narrow down to the manufacturing industry as it is the more widely studied of the two. We use new tools and techniques to theorize for non-linear relationships and their associated moderating effects as suggested by Haans, Pieters, & He, (2016), and in the process furnish a robust understanding of the influence that family ownership and business groups have on the I-P relationship. Specifically, our key finding indicates that a firm that has high levels of family ownership and is affiliated with a business group can change the nature of the underlying U-shaped relationship between internationalization and performance (I-P) to an inverted 'U' relationship. As such we provide new insights that there can exist both a 'U' and an inverted 'U' relationship over the same stages of internationalization. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first documentation of such a phenomenon in the I-P domain and our study represents the first that simultaneously investigates the twin effect of key governance mechanisms (family ownership and business group affiliation) on the I-P relationship.

Essay 3: The essay investigates how institutional changes – FDI and corporate governance reforms, associated with liberalization, govern the evolution of ownership networks. Domestic interfirm networks where firms have a long history of operation are a primary source of information, resources, and capabilities. Therefore, understanding their evolution is essential for management scholars; however, they continue to be understudied. Increasing globalization due to economic liberalization should lead to fragmentation and erosion of a country's

ownership network. Yet, these networks remain highly persistent due to the presence of properties consistent with small worlds. The lack of efficient institutions and the prevalence of institutional voids in emerging markets encourage businesses to organize as business groups (Guillén, 2000; Khanna & Palepu, 1997), and these groups occupy prominent positions in the economy (e.g., Manikandan & Ramachandran, 2015).

We use shareholding data of listed firms in India to construct and investigate the ownership networks at three points in time – 2001, 2010, and 2019. India started liberalizing its economy in the early 1990s, and FDI and corporate governance reforms commenced in the latter half of that decade. We find evidence that post-liberalization, at the time of the inception of FDI and corporate governance reforms, the corporate ownership network in India exhibited small-world characteristics. Specifically, we find that in 2001 at the onset of the reforms the ownership network in India reflects small-world properties, which, however, weaken in 2010 but are relatively stronger in 2019. Our unpacking of the influence of institutional transition on ownership networks due to FDI and corporate governance reforms and the use of the institution-based view from the strategy field marks our contribution to strategy, international business, and corporate governance.

To conclude, the dissertation, which lies at the intersection of strategy, international business, and corporate governance, strives to make several contributions. *First*, by focusing on contextual considerations at the firm and industry level, it answers the call for more context-based studies to understand better the underlying basis for the I-P relationship (e.g., Bowen, 2007; Kirca et al., 2012) and it highlights the need to develop mid-range theories for the I-P research stream (e.g., Singla & George, 2013). *Second*, the findings from essay-1 indicate that outcomes of firm internationalization are contingent on the industry and within the industry on the levels and types of product diversification. The study, therefore, provides a sense of industry-specific optimal product scope for profitable internationalization by firms. *Third*, by

investigating the effect of corporate governance-related contingencies of family ownership and business group affiliation on the I-P relationship, we respond to the call by De Massis et al. (2018) to explore the influence that different corporate governance configurations have on internationalization outcomes. *Fourth*, by incorporating the various methodological advancements in the assessment of quadratic and cubic models and the suggestions on data sample, our investigation of the I-P relationship provides relatively more robust answers than earlier studies to the fundamental question on determinants of internationalization outcomes in strategy and international business domains. *Fifth*, by investigating the evolution of the ownership network in India, its small-world characteristics, and the role of CG and FDI reforms, we contribute to the literature on small worlds of corporate governance. *Finally*, at a broader level, it attempts to answer two fundamental questions in strategic management, i.e., what determines the success or failure of firms' internationalization strategies? and why are firms different? (Rumelt et al., 1994; Teece, 2020).

Key Words: Internationalization, Firm Performance, Family Ownership, Business Groups, Ownership Networks