Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(4):1269-1273

Received: 21-06-2026
Accepted: 01-08-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Corporate Governance Decisions from Shareholder Control to Strategic Resilience

Trisha Biswas
School of Management, Techno India University, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

Corresponding Author: **Trisha Biswas**

Abstract
Corporate governance began as a problem of divided power. Shareholders supplied capital, but managers controlled the firm and usually knew far more about its operations. Early research therefore concentrated on monitoring executives and protecting investors. Over time, the agenda widened. Scholars examined legal protection, board design, executive pay, shareholder rights, diversity, institutional ownership, sustainability, founder leadership, and, more recently, artificial intelligence. This mini review traces that development through influential theoretical and empirical papers from developed and emerging markets. The evidence does not point to one governance structure that works everywhere. Formal independence can help, but only when directors have the information, expertise, and authority to use it. Concentrated ownership may strengthen monitoring while exposing minority investors to new risks. Diversity can improve board judgment, but its value depends on whether different voices influence discussion. The modern board is therefore expected to do more than restrain managers. It must also contribute to strategy, oversee financial and technological risks, and preserve the firm's capacity to respond to shocks. The review concludes that corporate governance has moved from a mainly defensive system of control toward a broader model of informed stewardship. That wider role is useful only when it remains tied to clear responsibility and measurable outcomes.

Keywords: Corporate Governance, Board of Directors, Agency Theory, Shareholder Rights, Stakeholder Governance, Financial Resilience

1. Introduction

Corporate governance began as a question about power inside the corporation. Shareholders owned the residual claim, but professional managers-controlled information, resources, and day-to-day decisions. The resulting concern was easy to state: what prevents managers from using the firm for their own security, status, or private benefit? Much of the early literature treated governance as the answer to that problem.

That concern has not disappeared, but the board's job is now harder to describe in a single sentence. Directors still monitor executives and protect investors. They are also expected to understand strategy, succession, capital allocation, cyber risk, sustainability, human capital, and the use of artificial intelligence. A board can satisfy formal independence rules and still be ineffective if its members lack time, information, or the confidence to challenge management. Conversely, close knowledge of business can improve advice while making genuine independence more difficult. Governance therefore depends not only on structure, but also on how directors work together.

This mini review follows the main changes in governance research from the separation of ownership and control to the modern emphasis on stewardship and resilience. It is selective rather than exhaustive. The purpose is to identify the papers that changed the question being asked: first, how managers could be controlled; later, how boards, shareholders, institutions, and leaders could improve the quality of major corporate decisions. The central argument is that modern governance has broadened, but it should not become vague. Wider responsibility must still be matched by clear accountability.

2. Materials and Methods

This paper uses a narrative review approach. The literature was organized around major stages in the development of corporate governance: ownership and control, agency theory, board monitoring, investor protection, governance indices, executive compensation, board design, diversity, institutional ownership, stakeholder governance, sustainability, leadership, financial oversight, and technology. Foundational papers were retained because the review is historical. More recent studies were included when they extended the board's role beyond traditional monitoring or reconsidered how governance affects strategic and financial resilience.

The studies were read comparatively. For each paper, the review considered the governance problem being addressed, the mechanism proposed, the evidence presented, and the practical implication for boards or investors. Evidence from emerging markets and regulated industries was included to avoid treating the governance arrangements of large United States corporations as universal. The review is interpretive rather than a statistical meta-analysis, and it does not claim to identify every relevant study. Findings are paraphrased and attributed to their original sources. Additional studies from India, Malaysia, China, Japan, and Singapore were used to examine how similar governance mechanisms operate under different ownership structures and institutional settings.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Ownership, control, and the agency problem

Berle and Means placed the separation of ownership and control at the center of the modern corporation [1]. In a company with dispersed shareholders, each investor bears the cost of monitoring but receives only a small part of the benefit. Managers may consequently gain considerable freedom over investment, compensation, and corporate growth. The early governance problem was not simply whether managers were capable. It was whether anyone had both the incentive and the authority to hold them accountable.

Jensen and Meckling later formalized this conflict through agency theory [2]. Owners delegate decision-making to managers but cannot observe every action or verify every claim. Monitoring, managerial ownership, incentive pay, debt, and external control can reduce the conflict, although each remedy creates costs of its own. Fama emphasized discipline from managerial labor markets and boards [3]. Fama and Jensen then distinguished the initiation and implementation of decisions from their ratification and monitoring, giving the board a central role in decision control [4].

This line of reasoning shaped governance practice for decades. It supported independent directors, audit committees, performance-based compensation, and an active market for corporate control. Shleifer and Vishny captured the underlying concern by asking how those who provide finance can be confident of receiving a return [5]. The agency framework remains valuable because it identifies a real conflict. Its weakness is not that the conflict is imaginary, but that corporations contain more relationships than the shareholder-manager model can comfortably explain.

3.2 Formal governance and investor protection

Governance became more formal and more international during the 1990s. The Cadbury Report promoted clearer board responsibility, a stronger role for non-executive directors, and separation between the chair and chief executive positions [6]. At roughly the same time, La Porta and coauthors showed that countries differ greatly in their protection of investors and that these legal differences are related to ownership concentration and financial-market development [7]. Governance could no longer be understood only by looking inside the firm. The surrounding legal system determined which rights could be enforced and how costly outside finance would be.

Researchers also began converting governance into observable measures. Yermack found that firms with smaller boards tended to have higher market values [8]. Later reviews, however, stressed that board structure is endogenous: firms choose directors in response to their own complexity, risks, and bargaining relationships, while performance can also change the board [9, 10]. Governance indices became influential after Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick linked stronger shareholder rights with firm value and returns [11]. Bebchuk, Cohen, and Ferrell later argued that a smaller group of entrenchment provisions explained much of this association [12].

These measures made large-sample research possible, but they also made governance look easier to judge than it really is. A company may have annual elections, independent committees, and the recommended policies, yet still have a board that rarely challenges management. Formal rules matter. They do not reveal whether directors receive useful information, understand the business, or speak candidly when a decision becomes uncomfortable.

3.3 Boards, executive pay, and effective monitoring

Executive compensation was expected to align managers with shareholders, particularly when pay was tied to equity value. The evidence soon showed that compensation can also reflect the chief executive's influence over the board. Core, Holthausen, and Larcker associated weaker governance arrangements with higher chief executive pay and poorer later performance [13]. Bebchuk and Fried went further, arguing that managerial power can shape compensation contracts themselves [14]. Incentive pay may reduce one agency problem while becoming evidence of another.

Research on board design reached a similarly cautious conclusion. Coles, Daniel, and Naveen found that large or complex firms may benefit from boards with more members and greater advisory capacity [15]. In later work, they showed that directors appointed after the chief executive assumed office may be less effective monitors, even when they satisfy formal definitions of independence [16]. The practical lesson is that independence cannot be read from a biography or committee list alone.

The board must perform two roles that do not always fit neatly together. It must know enough about the company to give useful advice, but remain sufficiently detached to question management's assumptions. Excessive distance can produce weak advice; excessive closeness can produce weak oversight. Governance research gradually moved from counting independent directors toward asking whether the board has the expertise, information, incentives, and internal culture needed to use its authority well.

3.4 Diversity, ownership, and board judgment

Board diversity became a major research topic in the 2000s and 2010s. Adams and Ferreira found that female directors were associated with stronger monitoring, although the performance effect depended on the firm's existing governance environment [17]. Ahern and Dittmar's study of Norway's board quota highlighted the adjustment costs that can arise when mandated change is rapid and the pool of experienced candidates is initially limited [18]. Post and

Byron's meta-analysis later reported a positive association between female board representation and accounting performance, with stronger effects in some institutional settings than in others [19].

The most useful reading of this literature is not that demographic diversity automatically improves performance. Different backgrounds can widen the board's information set and reduce habitual thinking, but those benefits appear only when directors are heard and disagreement is treated as useful. A board can become more diverse without changing how decisions are made. The relevant question is whether differences in knowledge and experience alter the discussion.

Ownership also changed the source of governance pressure. Large shareholders can devote resources to monitoring that small investors cannot justify individually [20]. The rise of passive funds initially raised fears that index investors would remain disengaged. Appel, Gormley, and Keim found instead that passive ownership influenced board independence, takeover defenses, and voting outcomes [21]. Governance increasingly became a conversation among boards, managers, and long-horizon investors rather than an activity confined to the boardroom.

3.5 Stakeholders, sustainability, leadership, and resilience

The shareholder-centered model was gradually joined by a broader account of corporate purpose. Freeman argued that firms depend on continuing relationships with employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and investors [22]. Blair and Stout described the corporation as a team-production arrangement in which the board mediates among contributors rather than acting only as a direct agent for shareholders [23]. These ideas gained practical force as environmental, social, and human-capital risks began to affect operations, reputation, and access to finance.

Empirical studies connected sustainability with governance processes and longer-term outcomes. Eccles, Ioannou, and Serafeim found that firms with established sustainability policies developed different measurement and oversight systems and performed better over long horizons [24]. Flammer reported that narrowly approved corporate social responsibility proposals improved subsequent performance, suggesting that at least some stakeholder investments can create value [25]. Broader reviews by Gillan, Koch, and Starks and by Ludwig and Sassen reach a more qualified conclusion: the relationship depends on ownership, board characteristics, regulation, and the way environmental and social performance is measured [26, 27].

Leadership still matters to governance, but it is better treated as one part of a wider system rather than as a stand-alone explanation. Fahlenbrach found that founder-led firms differed in investment behavior and market performance [28]. More broadly, the governance literature suggests that leadership effects depend on the checks around the chief executive, including board independence, ownership structure, disclosure, and the ability of outside investors to intervene. This makes institutional context especially important when comparing governance across countries.

Boards also govern through the financial policies they approve and monitor. Evidence from Bangladeshi manufacturing firms indicates that distress, size, growth, taxation, liquidity, and asset characteristics influence capital-structure choices [29]. A related study associates both short-term and long-term debt with lower returns on assets and equity, while size, age, and operating efficiency are positively related to performance [30]. These are financing studies rather than direct tests of board composition, so their contribution should be stated carefully. They matter here because capital structure, liquidity, and financial performance are among the outcomes for which boards and senior managers are accountable.

3.6 Artificial intelligence and the modern board

Technology is changing both what boards oversee and how governance decisions can be made. Erel and coauthors used machine learning to study director selection and found that algorithmically identified candidates differed meaningfully from those companies had appointed [31]. The study does not show that nomination committees should hand appointments to a model. It shows that data can reveal recurring preferences and blind spots that traditional searches may leave unexamined.

Artificial intelligence also creates a new oversight problem. Boards need to know where automated systems are being used, which data shape their outputs, how the systems are tested, and who remains responsible when a decision causes harm. Ahern argues that artificial intelligence is likely to affect directors, shareholders, regulators, and corporate-law institutions [32]. Better information may reduce some monitoring costs, but opaque models can also create a fresh information gap between technical specialists and the directors who bear legal and reputational responsibility.

Directors do not need to become software engineers. They do need enough technological literacy to recognize when an explanation is incomplete and enough independence to pause a project when the risks are unclear. In this setting, governance is not simply approval of a technology budget. It is a judgment about which uses of technology fit the firm's strategy, risk tolerance, and obligations to those affected by its decisions.

3.7 Governance evidence from Asian markets

Evidence from Asian markets reinforces a point made throughout this review: a governance mechanism cannot be judged apart from the ownership and legal setting in which it operates. India provides especially useful evidence. Mishra and Mohanty developed a governance measure that combined legal, board, and proactive indicators and found that the board and proactive dimensions were significantly related to firm performance, while legal compliance alone was not [33]. Arora and Sharma, using a large sample of Indian firms, also reported that governance characteristics influence performance, but the effects differed across individual board mechanisms [34]. Chauhan, Lakshmi, and Dey focused on the agency problem created by controlling shareholders and found that stronger firm-level governance was associated with less self-dealing and better subsequent performance [35]. Together, these studies make a useful point for this review: formal compliance is important, but governance becomes more meaningful when board practices and investor protections affect actual managerial behavior.

Evidence from other Asian markets is more mixed. Haniffa and Hudaib reported that board size and the shareholdings of the five largest owners were associated with accounting and market performance in Malaysia, while several other governance variables produced less consistent results [36]. In China, Bai and coauthors found that differences in firm-level governance were reflected in the market valuation of listed companies [37].

Japan and Singapore provide further evidence that governance develops with the financial system around it. Ullah's study of Japanese firms associates the unwinding of traditional cross-shareholdings and greater private and foreign ownership with improved performance [38]. Using companies from Singapore and Malaysia, Mak and Kusnadi found a fairly robust negative relation between board size and firm value, but little consistent evidence for many of the other governance measures they examined [39]. These studies do not produce one Asian governance model. They instead show why imported governance codes should be evaluated against local ownership concentration, capital-market development, and the actual authority of boards and outside investors.

3.8 Opinion: From managerial control to informed stewardship

No single stage of the literature made the previous one irrelevant. Agency theory still explains why monitoring and incentives matter. Investor protection remains essential where controlling owners or managers can disadvantage minority shareholders. Board composition affects both advice and oversight. What has changed is the range of questions assigned to governance and the recognition that formal arrangements do not operate the same way in every firm.

In my view, the most important change is the movement from governance as restraint toward governance as informed stewardship. The earlier literature asked how shareholders could stop managers from wasting or diverting corporate resources. That question remains necessary. A modern board must also judge long-term risks, oversee capital allocation, understand new technology, and preserve the firm’s ability to withstand shocks. Preventing misconduct is not the same as preparing a company to make good decisions under pressure.

The wider role of the board should not become an excuse for unclear responsibility. A board instructed to serve every interest without priorities or evidence can become difficult to evaluate. Good stewardship therefore needs discipline: directors should explain the reasoning behind major decisions, identify the risks they accepted, and review whether the promised outcomes occurred. The strongest board is not the one with the longest governance checklist. It is the one that understands the business, challenges management when necessary, and remains answerable for the consequences.

4. Conclusion

Corporate governance research has moved from the problem of separated ownership and control to a much broader account of how companies are directed. Agency theory explained the need for monitoring and incentives. Later work added investor protection, board structure, executive compensation, shareholder rights, diversity, institutional ownership, stakeholder interests, sustainability, leadership, financial oversight, and artificial intelligence.

The earlier ideas remain useful, but they now describe only part of the board’s task. Modern directors are expected to monitor management and contribute to strategy, protect investors and consider material stakeholder interests, support innovation and control its risks, and pursue performance without weakening resilience. Governance has therefore become less a fixed collection of formal rules and more a continuing process of judgment and accountability. Its quality depends on whether the firm has the right people, information, incentives, and willingness to confront difficult decisions.

5. Recommendations

Boards should judge governance quality by conduct and outcomes, not by formal independence alone. Director selection should consider industry knowledge, financial literacy, technological competence, time commitment, and a demonstrated willingness to question management. Analytical tools can widen the candidate pool and reveal selection patterns, but responsibility for appointments and oversight should remain with people who can explain their decisions.

Future research should examine how governance mechanisms work together rather than treating each one in isolation. More evidence is needed from emerging markets, regulated industries, ownership-intensive companies, and firms with substantial exposure to artificial intelligence or climate risk. Researchers should also distinguish governance arrangements that satisfy a code from those that improve decision quality, financial resilience, and accountability over time.

6. Acknowledgement

The author received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. No additional acknowledgements are reported.

7. References

1. Berle AA, Means GC. The modern corporation and private property. New York, Macmillan, 1932.
2. Jensen MC, Meckling WH. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics. 1976; 3(4):305-360.
3. Fama EF. Agency problems and the theory of the firm. Journal of Political Economy. 1980; 88(2):288-307.
4. Fama EF, Jensen MC. Separation of ownership and control. Journal of Law and Economics. 1983; 26(2):301-325.
5. Shleifer A, Vishny RW. A survey of corporate governance. Journal of Finance. 1997; 52(2):737-783.
6. Cadbury A. Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporate governance. London, Gee and Co., 1992.
7. La Porta R, Lopez-de-Silanes F, Shleifer A, Vishny RW. Law and finance. Journal of Political Economy. 1998; 106(6):1113-1155.
8. Yermack D. Higher market valuation of companies with a small board of directors. Journal of Financial Economics. 1996; 40(2):185-211.
9. Hermalin BE, Weisbach MS. Boards of directors as an endogenously determined institution: A survey of the economic literature. Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review. 2003; 9(1):7-26.
10. Adams RB, Hermalin BE, Weisbach MS. The role of boards of directors in corporate governance: A conceptual framework and survey. Journal of Economic Literature. 2010; 48(1):58-107.
11. Gompers P, Ishii J, Metrick A. Corporate governance

and equity prices. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2003; 118(1):107-155.
12. Bebchuk LA, Cohen A, Ferrell A. What matters in corporate governance? Review of Financial Studies. 2009; 22(2):783-827.
13. Core JE, Holthausen RW, Larcker DF. Corporate governance, chief executive officer compensation, and firm performance. Journal of Financial Economics. 1999; 51(3):371-406.
14. Bebchuk LA, Fried JM. Pay without performance: The unfulfilled promise of executive compensation. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2004.
15. Coles JL, Daniel ND, Naveen L. Boards: Does one size fit all? Journal of Financial Economics. 2008; 87(2):329-356.
16. Coles JL, Daniel ND, Naveen L. Co-opted boards. Review of Financial Studies. 2014; 27(6):1751-1796.
17. Adams RB, Ferreira D. Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. Journal of Financial Economics. 2009; 94(2):291-309.
18. Ahern KR, Dittmar AK. The changing of the boards: The impact on firm valuation of mandated female board representation. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2012; 127(1):137-197.
19. Post C, Byron K. Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. Academy of Management Journal. 2015; 58(5):1546-1571.
20. Edmans A. Blockholders and corporate governance. Annual Review of Financial Economics. 2014; 6:23-50.
21. Appel IR, Gormley TA, Keim DB. Passive investors, not passive owners. Journal of Financial Economics. 2016; 121(1):111-141.
22. Freeman RE. Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston, Pitman, 1984.
23. Blair MM, Stout LA. A team production theory of corporate law. Virginia Law Review. 1999; 85(2):247-328.
24. Eccles RG, Ioannou I, Serafeim G. The impact of corporate sustainability on organizational processes and performance. Management Science. 2014; 60(11):2835-2857.
25. Flammer C. Does corporate social responsibility lead to superior financial performance? A regression discontinuity approach. Management Science. 2015; 61(11):2549-2568.
26. Gillan SL, Koch A, Starks LT. Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. Journal of Corporate Finance. 2021; 66:101889.
27. Ludwig P, Sassen R. Which internal corporate governance mechanisms drive corporate sustainability? Journal of Environmental Management. 2022; 301:113780.
28. Fahlenbrach R. Founder-chief executive officers, investment decisions, and stock market performance. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis. 2009; 44(2):439-466.
29. Akhter A, Maruf-Ul-Alam M. Determinants of optimal capital structure: An empirical study on manufacturing companies in Bangladesh. Journal of Banking and Financial Services. 2019; 11(2):225-252.
30. Islam R, Maruf-Ul-Alam M. Capital structure and firms' performance: Evidence from manufacturing sector of Bangladesh. Jagannath University Journal of Business Studies. 2021; 9(1-2):61-90.
31. Erel I, Stern LH, Tan C, Weisbach MS. Selecting directors using machine learning. Review of Financial Studies. 2021; 34(7):3226-3264.
32. Ahern D. Corporate law, corporate governance and artificial intelligence: Are we ready for robots in the boardroom? In: Lim E, Morgan P, editors. The Cambridge handbook of private law and artificial intelligence. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2024, 409-430.
33. Mishra S, Mohanty P. Corporate governance as a value driver for firm performance: Evidence from India. Corporate Governance. 2014; 14(2):265-280.
34. Arora A, Sharma C. Corporate governance and firm performance in developing countries: Evidence from India. Corporate Governance. 2016; 16(2):420-436.
35. Chauhan Y, Lakshmi KR, Dey DK. Corporate governance practices, self-dealings, and firm performance: Evidence from India. Journal of Contemporary Accounting & Economics. 2016; 12(3):274-289.
36. Haniffa R, Hudaib M. Corporate governance structure and performance of Malaysian listed companies. Journal of Business Finance & Accounting. 2006; 33(7-8):1034-1062.
37. Bai CE, Liu Q, Lu J, Song FM, Zhang J. Corporate governance and market valuation in China. Journal of Comparative Economics. 2004; 32(4):599-616.
38. Ullah W. Evolving corporate governance and firms performance: Evidence from Japanese firms. Economics of Governance. 2017; 18(1):1-33.
39. Mak YT, Kusnadi Y. Size really matters: Further evidence on the negative relationship between board size and firm value. Pacific-Basin Finance Journal. 2005; 13(3):301-318.