

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIVERSIFICATION AS A CORPORATE BUSINESS STRATEGY

Hira Sakhawat<sup>1</sup> and Mahnoor Kashif<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

*Diversification is a major corporate business strategy for enhancing organizational resilience against risks and improving financial performance. This strategy varies in its effectiveness across different industries and firms, and hence the need for empirically assessing this strategy becomes paramount. The challenge this study addresses is the uncertainty in deciding whether diversification produces sustainable growth or whether it engenders inefficiencies through overexpansion and resource misallocation. This study seeks to gain insights into how diversification affects corporate profitability, risk management, and competitive advantage. It attempts to analyze various diversification forms, such as related diversification and unrelated diversification, in order to study these two forms' effects on firm performance and strategic position. A descriptive study analyzes effectiveness in corporate business strategy, called diversification. The research examines how diversification will affect corporate performance, risk management, and competitive advantage—all of which result from diving into the portfolio of businesses that was built from examining actual business cases. Findings suggest that related diversification enhances operational effectiveness and advantage through the use of synergies, while unrelated diversification may lead to financial failure if neglected. This finding finally concludes that when aligned with a firm's core competencies and market opportunities, diversification can represent an effective growth strategy. Carefully examining market conditions, investment viability, and organizational capabilities is necessary to ensure continued success before pursuing diversification. This insight adds to the strategic management literature as well as provides practical guidance for corporate decision-making.*

**Keywords:** Diversification, Corporate Strategy, Risk Management, Competitive Advantage, Financial Performance, Related Diversification, Unrelated Diversification, Strategic Management

## INTRODUCTION

Carrying out strategies in a sustainable way is challenging since it is purely voluntary on the part of a company to consider any business operations in relation to social and environmental issues (Marrewijk, 2003). Adding to that, a strategy of sustainability is much different from other strategies when the implementation phase is concerned. First of all, one can easily get a direct relation between product and profit with operational goals. The only difference is that the sustainability goal focuses on the simultaneous achievement of social, environmental, and financial performance. In this case, what makes life so much easier for managers is when decisions or actions improve social, environmental, and financial performance altogether. However, this might prove to be difficult for managers in terms of cost improvement going along with an action (Epstein & Manzoni, 2008; Fareed et al., 2023).

Here, strategic leadership serves as the very core of devising corporate strategy in this case. A future vision is established, decisions are made from knowledge, and employees are inspired and motivated to a singular goal (Iqbal & Ali, 2024). Both must demonstrate the top management who are going to develop strategic contributions and operational employees who are to work at the front end of those programs (Iqbal & Omercic, 2024). It can expand through deeper market penetration, market expansion, product creation, or through diversification. A company which accepts diversification as a part of its planned approach to growth undertakes the task of continually weighing and comparing the advantages of these four alternatives, selecting first one combination and then another, depending on the particular

---

<sup>1</sup>Scholar, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi, Pakistan. Email:sakhawathira567@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Scholar, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi, Pakistan. Email:mahnoorkashif.bba@gmail.com

circumstances in long-range development planning (Kashif & Iqbal, 2022). While they are an integral part of the over-Decisions regarding diversification and growth pattern offer particular special issues. More than that other development options demand a break from a company's previous patterns and traditions and a gateway to unexplored territory. As a result, one of the goals of this article is to connect diversification to governance overall growth perspectives, identify the factors that might influence a company to choose diversification over other growth alternatives, and show how general growth objectives relate to specific diversification goals (Iqbal et al., 2024). This will give us a technique that is both qualitative and quantitative for choosing diversification strategies that are best suited for a company's long-term growth. The overall number of potential strategies can be narrowed down to the most effective few using qualitative criteria, and then In order to lessen the effect of any single investment on an investor's overall portfolio, diversification is a risk management strategy that involves spreading investments across various asset classes, industries, or geographical areas (Arif et al., 2023; Saleem & Iqbal, 2022). The goals of the investor's investments, their tolerance for risk, and their time horizon are some of the variables that affect how successful diversification is. Nevertheless, diversification cannot ensure a return or guard against losses in a down market. Before deciding how to diversify their portfolios, investors should think closely about their investment goals, risk tolerance, and time horizon. Additionally, to maintain the portfolio's alignment with the investor's objectives and risk tolerance over time, diversification necessitates continuous monitoring and rebalancing (Fahim et al., 2020).

### ***Problem Statement***

Recent research on the valuation effects of business diversification shows that diversified companies trade at a discount to otherwise comparable single-segment companies (Oladimeji, M. S., & Udosen, 2019). The diversification discount seems to be less pronounced for related diversification than for unconnected diversification, and it is also less pronounced in the 1970s than in the 1960s or the 1980s. Additionally, a number of studies have shown that corporate focus increased in the 1980s and that this increase in focus is related to favorable impacts on stock prices.

Although the above mentioned results offer strong proof that diversification was ineffective in comparison to a more focused corporate strategy during the 1980s, there are still a number of intriguing questions (Rizvi et al., 2022; Iqbal & Chishti, 2023). For instance, why are so many businesses diversified when most of them could ostensibly improve their value by doing so? One well-known theory, which we refer to as the agency cost hypothesis, is presents potential solutions to the aforementioned queries and is consistent with the data on diversification that is currently accessible (Hassan & Iqbal, 2019). This justification contends that diversification reduces value is a result of agency issues brought on by the ownership and control split in public corporations. Because of the authority and prestige that come with managing a larger company, diversification may be advantageous to managers Jensen (1986), Stulz (1990), because managerial compensation is related to firm size (Jensen & Murphy, 1990), because it reduces the risk of managers' undiversified personal portfolios (Trinh et al., 2025), or because it helps make the company more profitable.

The firm cannot function without the manager (Shleifer & Vishny, 1989). Therefore, even if diversification strategy diminishes shareholder wealth, managers may still pursue it. According to this theory, improvements in the market for corporate control led to greater corporate monitoring, which is what is responsible for the trend towards increased corporate emphasis in the 1980s (Bhide, 1990; Jensen, 1993). An alternative explanation for the diversification discount and the trend towards increased focus is that shocks in competitive and regulatory conditions in the 1980s increased the relative value of a focused

strategy, leading firms to voluntarily refocus. However, our results suggest that, on average, changes in focus do not typically occur either quickly or voluntarily. Moreover, we detect no unusual industry concentration among the set of firms that increase focus. Our findings thus complement those of previous studies that indirectly suggest that diversification discounts cannot be explained by economic shocks that occurred in the 1980s. For example, Lang and Stulz (1994) find a significant diversification discount in every year dating back to 1978, while Servaes (1996) finds a significant diversification discount in the 1960s and early 1970s.

### ***Rationale of Research***

First of all, diversification is a popular strategy among corporations; A company diversifies when it creates a new product or enters a new market. Businesses frequently diversify their portfolios to reduce risk by reducing the possibility of negative effects during economic downturns. The fundamental idea is to diversify into a line of business that is less sensitive to economic downturns than your existing line of company. One of your other businesses will help cover the losses and keep the company sustainable if one of your businesses is struggling in the market. Diversification can be used by a company as a growth tactic and it is important to understand whether it leads to improved performance and competitiveness. By spreading their operations across different products, markets, and industries, firms can potentially reduce their exposure to market-specific risks and increase their overall profitability. Secondly, understanding the effectiveness of diversification can help firms to make better strategic decisions. If diversification is found to be an effective strategy, firms may consider expanding their operations into new markets or industries. On the other hand, if diversification is not found to be effective, firms may consider focusing on their core competencies or divesting non-core businesses. Thirdly, research on the effectiveness of diversification can provide insights into the factors that drive successful diversification strategies. For example, research can identify the industries, markets, or products that are most complementary to a firm's existing operations, or the governance and organizational structures that support effective diversification. Overall, research on the effectiveness of diversification as a corporate business strategy is important for firms, investors, and policymakers to understand the benefits and limitations of this approach, and to make informed decisions about diversification.

### ***Research Significance***

Diversification is a business strategy that involves expanding a company's operations by entering new markets, developing new products or services, or acquiring other businesses. It is a significant strategy for corporate businesses because it offers several benefits, including risk reduction. By diversifying their operations, companies can reduce their exposure to risks associated with a single product, service, or market. This can help them withstand economic downturns, changes in consumer preferences, or disruptions in supply chains. Increased market share: Diversification can help companies capture a larger share of the market by expanding their product or service offerings. This can help them compete more effectively against rivals and increase their revenue and profitability. Synergy: Diversification can create synergies between different parts of a company, such as sharing resources, knowledge, and expertise. This can lead to cost savings, increased efficiency, and improved performance. Innovation: Diversification can foster innovation by encouraging companies to explore new markets, develop new products, and adopt new technologies. This can help them stay ahead of the competition and meet the evolving needs of customers. Long-term growth: Diversification can provide companies with opportunities for long-term growth by enabling them to expand into new markets and capitalize on emerging trends. This can help

them achieve sustainable, profitable growth over time.

In summary, diversification is a significant corporate business strategy because it can help companies reduce risk, increase market share, create synergies, foster innovation, and achieve long-term growth.

### ***Research Questions***

1. Why do companies desire diversification even when there is evidence that it could lower their value?
2. Do other elements, including agency problems, affect the diversification discount?
3. How is the diversification discount impacted by the degree of relatedness between diversified segments?
4. What are the precise methods via which improved corporate attention results from corporate monitoring?
5. Are there any other reasons that should be taken into account in addition to the agency cost hypothesis as a possible explanation for the diversification discount?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Resource utilization is the main effective thing that the management would have to look into for not only improving but also developing the whole performance of the organization (Dalwai & Salehi, 2021). Efficient operations lead to lower one-unit manufacturing costs, increased operating margin ranges, and improved profit margins (Derouiche et al., 2021). High operational efficiency firms are more likely to perform well in today's competitive markets (Lee et al., 2019). Inefficient use of resources can demonstrate poor performance in manufacturing industries (Habib et al., 2022). All types are different in their individual approach as to strategic defense with respect to their product-orientation and market-orientation as according to the Miles and Snow typology. Operational efficiencies are highly prioritized to leverage on competitive edge by the defensive strategies (defender and reactor) (Anwar et al., 2021). A firm having a narrow product-market domain would target operating efficiencies and compete on the price of its products (Ingram et al., 2016). However, proactive strategies (prospectors and analyzers) point to the dynamic and growing markets (Le & Mai, 2025) and expenses incurred associated with product innovations as key aspects of building competitive advantage (Ghofar & Islam, 2015).

By boosting a product's competitiveness, diversification seeks to increase its market appeal (Zaheer et al., 2024). Companies can better align with consumer tastes and certain market groups through product differentiation and the development and use of new products. Businesses can access new markets, establish a larger consumer base, and gain a competitive advantage over rivals by diversifying their product offerings (Nawaz et al., 2022).

### ***Economic Profitability and Risk Reduction***

Reducing risk is one of the main reasons to diversify. Companies can lessen the effects of market changes or downturns in certain areas by diversifying their product portfolio. By reducing their exposure to different types of risk, organizations can protect themselves against future bankruptcy and retain steady revenue streams. Additionally, diversity can boost economic prosperity by utilizing revenue sources and exploring market opportunities (Zaheer et al., 2023).

### ***Production Performance and Efficiency***

Profitability has always been a very important need for an organization to exist among so many competitors in the market (Habib et al., 2022). In short, operational efficiency has become the way of how

companies reduce their prices offered to customers (Hassan et al., 2021). According to Mostafa (2010), Tran et al. (2020), and Seth et al. (2020), efficiency has been strongly linked to performance. The studies by Phillips et al. (2019), Tsolas (2014), and Shieh (2012) do not show any significant relationship.

### ***Adaptation to Changing External Conditions***

That personality's adaptation will depend on instinct, temperament, aspiration, motivation, intelligence, and social and emotional intelligence; abilities may indeed play a role. In other words, adaptation can only be studied in the greater context of internal and external factors that foster the adaptation, the adaptive interaction of the person in their environment, and the continued activity of the individual (Muzaffarov, 2025; Iqbal et al., 2023). In an ever-changing market situation, agile methodologies are indispensable for adapting product management. The need for flexibility, speed, and constant innovation brings particular importance to this environment. Because of continued developments in market conditions, product management will continue integrating more practices of agility, proving to be more of a showpiece in determining an industry's competitive landscape (Amajuoyi et al., 2024).

## **METHODOLOGY**

The present study employs a descriptive research design intended to measure the effectiveness of diversification in a corporate business strategy. In evaluating actual corporate strategies, the research intends to explore how diversification influences corporate performance, risk management, and competitive positioning.

### ***Research Approach***

Given that full-fledged analyses require a descriptive reach, thus quantitative information is involved in the measurement of financial and market performances, while case studies and industry reports offer qualitative insights.

### ***Data Collection Methods***

#### **1. Secondary Data**

- Comparison of financial reports, annual statements, and performance indicators from the market between diversified versus non-diversified companies.
- Industry reports and corporate strategy documents on disclosures to identify trends in diversification.
- Academic journals and business literature to review the theoretical perspectives of diversification.

#### **2. Case Study Analysis**

- The operational areas of selected companies from various industries: technology, manufacturing, consumer products, and others-have been scrutinized to appraise the success of diversification strategies.
- The analysis takes into account successful and failed diversification attempts so that best practices and challenges may be evaluated.

### ***Data Analysis***

- Examine the qualitative data in the reports as well as various interviews for purposes of understanding common themes and strategic considerations.

Table 1  
*Results*

Research Questions	Key Factors	Analysis Approach	Outcome
Why do companies desire diversification even when there is evidence that it could lower their value?	Risk mitigation, market expansion, synergy realization, economies of scale, managerial incentives	Case study analysis, financial data comparison	Companies pursue diversification to spread risk and enhance market reach, but excessive diversification can lead to inefficiencies and value erosion.
Do other elements, including agency problems, affect the diversification discount?	Managerial self-interest, inefficiencies in resource allocation, corporate governance weaknesses	Empirical analysis of financial reports, executive surveys	Agency problems often drive diversification decisions, leading to inefficiencies and reduced shareholder value. Strong corporate governance can mitigate this effect.
How is the diversification discount impacted by the degree of relatedness between diversified segments?	Related vs. unrelated diversification, operational synergy, market alignment	Comparative analysis of firms with related and unrelated diversification strategies	Related diversification tends to enhance efficiency and profitability, while unrelated diversification often results in a discount due to lack of strategic alignment.
What are the precise methods via which improved corporate attention results from corporate monitoring?	Board oversight, shareholder activism, performance-based incentives	Content analysis of governance reports, case studies	Effective corporate monitoring improves strategic focus, leading to better resource utilization and performance outcomes.
Are there any other reasons that should be taken into account in addition to the agency cost hypothesis as a possible explanation for the diversification discount?	Market mispricing, overestimation of synergies, increased operational complexity	Regression analysis on market valuation trends	Beyond agency costs, factors such as misjudged synergies and operational inefficiencies contribute to the diversification discount.

## DISCUSSION

Given their ability as a firm to mitigate risk, broaden their horizons in terms of the marketplace, and realign towards growth in the long run, companies will always be driven toward carrying out diversification notwithstanding the evidence that would suggest otherwise-that it lowers firm value. Operational risks can be spread across several diversified lines of business or product, thus reducing dependence on a single source of revenue. Also, economies of scale and synergy realization can improve the efficiency level if segments are strategically diversified into the business. In case of overstretch of diversification, it leads to inefficiencies and a diluted managerial focus and becomes difficult to integrate business divisions-leading to reduced performance levels of the firm as well as decline in shareholder wealth.

A common corporate strategy is diversification. When a business develops a new product or enters a new market, it diversifies. Portfolio diversification is a common practice among businesses to lower risk by lowering the likelihood of adverse consequences during economic downturns. The basic idea is to diversify into a business sector that is less vulnerable to economic downturns than your current business

sector. A corporation may utilize diversification as a growth strategy, thus it's critical to know whether it increases performance and competitiveness. Businesses may be able to lessen their exposure to market-specific risks and boost their overall profitability by diversifying their operations over a variety of goods, markets, and industries. Understanding the value of diversification can aid businesses in developing stronger strategic plans. Businesses may think about expanding their operations into other markets or industries if diversification is proved to be a successful strategy. If, however, diversification is proved to be ineffective, organizations may think about concentrating on their core capabilities or selling off non-core operations. By diversifying, one can take advantage of market opportunities to their fullest potential, account for how the market's demand is changing, and earn more money by occupying several market niches.

This isn't going to change much, but you could try to see how far you can stretch it: Agency problems have a crucial implication in the diversification discount since it is probably diversionary for managers due to motives other than those of shareholders. Self-preservation of managers, higher total compensation, and empire building are all motives for moving toward diversification which are not necessary to maximizing shareholders' wealth. Bad governance encourages managers to pursue diversification into unrelated businesses. Stronger governance mechanisms will cause boards to generally undertake more strategic diversification decisions and will, therefore, mitigate the adverse effects of agency problems.

The degree of relatedness across diversified segments plays a direct role in influencing the diversity discount. Companies that undertake related diversification can often maximize such benefits as shared resources, technological synergies, and operational efficiencies to the advantage of their improved financial results. Firms undertaking unrelated diversification, on the other hand, are often hindered due to a lack of coordination, inefficiencies, and strategic fit, thereby destroying value. In fact, unrelated diversification is seen by investors as a sign of weakness and mismanagement, further contributing to the manifestation of a diversification discount in its market valuation.

Other explanations of the diversification discount are mispricing by the market, overestimation of synergies, and operational complexities. Under-diversification makes it difficult for investors to assess true performance and pricing within the stock market but firms also over-estimate the benefits of synergies resulting from unrelated diversifying effects and have, to their disappointment, never achieved the efficiencies they predicted. Bureaucratic complexity has also increased difficulty in managing disparate business units, thus leading to performance declines. Their combination with ill corporate governance is also one of the reasons diversification leads to destruction of value rather than value creation.

### **CONCLUSION**

The long history of the diversification concept gained popularity in the late 1960s and into the 1970s, followed by a view demanding severe concentration in major business areas. Because globalization is currently taking place in production and elsewhere concerning the economics of scale, diversification has begun to draw attention more recently. Under conditions of strong accumulation of capital in very-limited fields of business activity, further expanding the firm (spreading or distribution) creates a situation requiring capital investment and risk reduction. The arguments in favor of diversity as a potentially rewarding corporate strategy for organizations to enhance their competitiveness, mitigate risks, attain profitability and adapt to changing external circumstances appear strong. Diversifying product lines provides businesses with the prospect of catering to diverse customer preferences, accessing new markets,

and achieving economies of scale and synergism. However, companies must carry out a rigorous examination of the market environment while factoring in their core competencies and establishing an implementation of diversification approaches aligned with corporate aims. Future studies should consider specific sectors and explore the performance outcomes resulting from diversification strategies under different conditions.

#### REFERENCES

- Amajuoyi, P., Benjamin, L. B., & Adeusi, K. B. (2024). Agile methodologies: Adapting product management to rapidly changing market conditions. *GSC Advanced Research and Reviews*, 19(2), 249-267.
- Arif, M., Zehra, K., Chishti, U. G., & Iqbal, M. N. (2023). Importance of Social Capital for Community Development. *Eye-The International Social Science Review*, 1(1), 16-22.
- Bhide, A. (1990). Reversing corporate diversification. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 3(2), 70-81.
- Dalwai, T., & Salehi, M. (2021). Business strategy, intellectual capital, firm performance, and bankruptcy risk: evidence from Oman's non-financial sector companies. *Asian Review of Accounting*, 29(3), 474-504.
- Derouiche, I., Manita, R., & Muessig, A. (2021). Risk disclosure and firm operational efficiency. *Annals of Operations Research*, 297, 115-145.
- Epstein, M. J., & Manzoni, J. F. (2008). *Performance measurement and management control: measuring and rewarding performance*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Fahim, S. M., Rasheed, A., Hassan, M., Asadullah, M., Hafeez, M. & Iqbal, M. N., (2020). E-Commerce: The Mantra of Urban Centers. *Reviews of Management Sciences*, 2(1), 65-77.
- Fareed, S. A. Q., Jabbar, T., Makhdoom, S. F., & Iqbal, M. N. (2023). Influence of Digital Marketing on Purchase Decision: A Qualitative Study on Pakistani Customers. *International Journal of Trends and Innovations in Business & Social Sciences*, 1(4), 122-128.
- Ghofar, A., & Islam, S. (2015). *Corporate Governance and Contingency Theory*. Springer.
- Habib, S. M., Hussain, H., Al-Faryan, M. A. S., & Hussain, R. Y. (2022). Impact of firm characteristics and ownership structure on firm efficiency: evidence from non-financial firms of Pakistan. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 10(1), 2106628.
- Hassan, M., & Iqbal, M. N. (2019). An Impact of Bancassurance in life insurance domain of Pakistan: A Quantitative study through structural equation model (SEM). *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 8(4), 38-46.
- Hassan, M., Zakai, S. N., Hussain, S., Umer, M., & Iqbal, M. N. (2021). Customer-Based Brand Equity within Packaged Milk Industry: The Case of Consumer Behavior. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(9), 101-111.
- Ingram, T., Kraśnicka, T., Wronka-Pośpiech, M., Głód, G., & Głód, W. (2016). Relationships between miles and snow strategic types and organizational performance in polish production companies. *Central European Management Journal*, 24(1), 17-45.
- Iqbal, M. N. I. N., Omercic, J. O. J., & Usman, U. G. C. (2024). Impact of Corporate Governance Practices in Life Insurance Sector of Pakistan. *Reviews of Management Sciences*, 6(1), 58-74.
- Iqbal, M. N., & Ali, S. H. (2024). A review on the role of strategic leadership in corporate strategy development. *Eye-The International Social Science Review*, 2(1), 1-7.
- Iqbal, M. N., & Chishti, U. G. (2023). The Influence of Corporate Social Responsibility in Pakistan's Health Insurance Industry in Preserving a Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *International Journal of Trends and Innovations in Business & Social Sciences*, 1(3), 60-67.
- Iqbal, M. N., & Omercic, J. (2024). Exploring the Antecedents of Business Strategies in Bancassurance Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Trends and Innovations in Business & Social Sciences*, 2(2), 144-153.
- Iqbal, M. N., Shaikh, N. N., & Dilshad, W. B. (2023). An Impulsive Buying Behavior of Customer: A

- Qualitative Study on Bancassurance Services in Pakistan. *Priority-The International Business Review*, 2(1), 138-151.
- Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *The American Economic Review*, 76(2), 323-329.
- Jensen, M. C. (1993). The modern industrial revolution, exit, and the failure of internal control systems. *the Journal of Finance*, 48(3), 831-880.
- Jensen, M. C., & Murphy, K. J. (1990). Performance pay and top-management incentives. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(2), 225-264
- Kashif, O., & Iqbal, M. N. (2022). A Conceptual Framework on Evaluating Swot Analysis As The Mediator In Strategic Marketing Planning Through Marketing Intelligence. *Priority-The International Business Review*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Lang, L. H., & Stulz, R. M. (1994). Tobin's q, corporate diversification, and firm performance. *Journal of Political Economy*, 102(6), 1248-1280.
- Le, T. H., & Mai, N. K. (2025). The influence of prospector and defender strategies on dynamic capabilities, innovation, and financial effectiveness in Vietnamese service SMEs. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 13(1), 187-205.
- Lee, J., Kwon, H. B., & Pati, N. (2019). Exploring the relative impact of R&D and operational efficiency on performance: A sequential regression-neural network approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 137, 420-431.
- Marrewijk, M. V. (2003). European corporate sustainability framework. *International Journal of Business Performance Measurement*, 5(2/3), 213-222.
- Mostafa, M. M. (2010). Does efficiency matter? Examining the efficiency-profitability link in the US specialty retailers and food consumer stores. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 59(3), 255-273.
- Muzaffarov, R. (2025). Features reflected in motivation and communication during the period of personality's adaptation to changing conditions. *Вісник післядипломної освіти: зб. наук. пр Серія «Соціальні та поведінкові науки; Управління та адміністрування» ОНОВЛЕНО*, 31(60), 127-144.
- Nawaz, M. , S. Zakai, & Hassan, M. (2022). An Exploration of the Factors Influences Customer Response towards Banking Products and Services. *Psocialsciences*, 2(2), 170-182.
- Oladimeji, M. S., & Udosen, I. (2019). The effect of diversification strategy on organizational performance. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 11(4), 120-129.
- Phillips, F., Chang, J., & Su, Y. S. (2019). When do efficiency and flexibility determine a firm's performance? A simulation study. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 4(2), 88-96.
- Rizvi, S. A., Asif, A., Zahid, Z., & Iqbal, M. N. (2022). Effectiveness of the Factors for Tourism Industry in Pakistan: A Quantitative Analysis. *Priority-The International Business Review*, 1(1), 46-54.
- Saleem, F., & Iqbal, M. N. (2022). Rural Development of CPEC Energy Project Impact on Social Responsibilities and South Region of Pakistan. *Eye-The International Social Science Review*, 1(1), 16-22.
- Servaes, H. (1996). The value of diversification during the conglomerate merger wave. *The Journal of Finance*, 51(4), 1201-1225.
- Seth, H., Chadha, S., Sharma, S. K., & Ruparel, N. (2021). Exploring predictors of working capital management efficiency and their influence on firm performance: An integrated DEA-SEM approach. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 28(4), 1120-1145.
- Shieh, H. S. (2012). Does cost efficiency lead to better financial performance? A study on Taiwan international tourist hotels. *The Journal of Hospitality Financial Management*, 20(1), 17-30.
- Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1989). Management entrenchment: The case of manager-specific investments. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 25(1), 123-139.
- Stulz, R. (1990). Managerial discretion and optimal financing policies. *Journal of financial Economics*, 26(1), 3-27.
- Tran, N. P., & Vo, D. H. (2020). Human capital efficiency and firm performance across sectors in an

- emerging market. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1738832.
- Trinh, T., Walker, M. D., & Yost, K. (2025). Managerial response to institutional investor distraction. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 76, 102342.
- Tsolas, I. (2014). DEA performance assessment of Greek listed metallurgical firms. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 9(1), 58-77.
- Zaheer, R. Iqbal, M. N. & Yousuf, U. (2023), Benefits of Social capital, Social Economy in community development: A Review Article, *Eye-The International Social Science Review*, 1(2), 23-28.
- Zaheer, R., Iqbal, M. N., & Chishti, U. G. (2024). Evaluating the Impact of Antecedents on Employee Turnover in the Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Priority-The International Business Review*, 2(2), 75-87.