Journal Homepage: www.ijarpr.com ISSN: 3049-0103 (Online)

International Journal of Advance Research Publication and Reviews

Vol 03, Issue 10, pp 411-425, October, 2026

Founder CEO Leadership from Entrepreneurial Imprint to Financial Resilience

Ishaan Joshi*, Rudra Malhotra

School of Commerce & Management Studies, Dayananda Sagar University, Karnataka, India
**ishjoshi1999@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT :

Founder chief executive officers occupy an unusual position in corporate governance because they combine ownership, managerial authority, organizational memory, and personal identity. This narrative mini review examines how founder leadership research has developed across North America, Europe, and Asia, with particular attention to performance, investment, governance, succession, and financial resilience. North American evidence generally associates founder leadership with stronger valuation, investment, and long-run performance. European and Asian studies show more clearly that succession, concentrated ownership, board structure, family involvement, political connections, and investor protection can strengthen or weaken these benefits. Recent research also extends the founder question beyond performance to liquidity, leverage, solvency, and bankruptcy risk. The review concludes that founder leadership is best understood as a conditional governance advantage rather than a universal one. Founders may contribute long-term commitment, firm-specific knowledge, and strategic continuity, but these strengths create the most value when credible boards, transparent financial policies, and effective investor protections limit entrenchment. Future research should distinguish founder CEOs from descendants and other family executives and examine the channels through which founder leadership affects resilience under financial stress.

Keywords: founder CEO; family firms; corporate governance; firm performance; financial resilience; succession

Introduction

Founder CEOs are different from hired managers in one obvious way: the company is partly their creation. They often carry the original business idea, recruit the first employees, shape the early culture, and hold a meaningful ownership stake. That history can create unusually strong commitment and firm-specific knowledge. It can also create power that is difficult for boards or outside investors to challenge.

This tension explains why founder leadership has remained an important research question. Agency theory warns that concentrated control can allow managers or controlling owners to protect their own interests (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Stewardship theory points in the opposite direction, arguing that managers with strong identification with the organization may act as long-horizon stewards rather than short-term agents (Davis et al., 1997). Founder CEOs can fit both descriptions. Their ownership and emotional attachment may align them closely with the firm, but the same attachment may make succession, delegation, and outside monitoring harder.

This mini review examines how the founder-CEO literature has developed and where the current research frontier is moving. It compares evidence across North America, Europe, and Asia and pays particular attention to the recent shift from valuation and performance toward financial policy and resilience. The purpose is not to argue that founders are inherently better CEOs. It is to identify the conditions under which founder leadership appears to create value and the conditions under which concentrated founder influence becomes a governance problem.

Materials and Methods

This paper uses a narrative review approach. The literature was organized around five themes: founder leadership and firm performance, founder influence on investment and financial policy, governance and succession, emerging-market family ownership, and financial resilience. Foundational studies were retained because they established the main empirical questions. More recent studies were selected when they extended the founder literature to different institutional settings or to outcomes such as liquidity, leverage, solvency, and bankruptcy risk.

The studies were read comparatively rather than combined in a statistical meta-analysis. Particular care was taken to distinguish founder-CEO studies from the broader family-firm literature. The latter is included when it helps explain ownership concentration, succession, board structure, or institution-

al conditions surrounding founder control. A capital-structure study is used as complementary evidence on financial outcomes rather than treated as a direct test of founder leadership.

Results and Discussion

3.1 Why Founder CEOs May Be Different

The central founder-CEO question is a governance question about alignment and control. A founder usually owns more equity than a professional manager, has invested personal reputation in the company, and possesses knowledge that may be difficult to transfer. These features can reduce the classic separation between ownership and management described by agency theory (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). At the same time, a powerful founder may dominate the board, resist succession, or pursue private objectives that outside investors cannot easily discipline.

The stewardship perspective helps explain why founder leadership may nevertheless produce benefits (Davis et al., 1997). Founders often think in longer horizons because the company is tied to personal identity and legacy. They may tolerate short-run volatility in order to protect innovation, employees, or strategic control. The literature increasingly treats this long-term orientation as a possible source of value, while recognizing that the same commitment can become rigidity when the firm's needs change.

3.2 North American Evidence: Performance, Investment, and Financial Policy

North American evidence, drawn largely from U.S. public firms, has generally been favorable to founder and founding-family control. Anderson and Reeb (2003) found that founding-family firms in the S&P 500 performed better than nonfamily firms and that performance was stronger when a family member served as CEO. Villalonga and Amit (2006) refined that result by showing that family ownership created the most value when the founder remained CEO or chairman, whereas descendant CEOs were associated with weaker outcomes.

Research focused specifically on founders reached a similar conclusion. Palia et al. (2008) reported that founder-managed newly public firms had higher financial performance and survival rates than professionally managed firms. Adams et al. (2009) showed that founder-CEO status is endogenous: good performance can itself affect whether a founder remains in office. After addressing that issue, they found a positive causal effect of founder leadership on performance. Fahlenbrach (2009) documented that founder-CEO firms invested more in research and development and capital expenditures, made more focused acquisitions, and earned stronger stock-market performance.

More recent North American work has moved from broad performance measures toward the financial choices through which founder leadership may matter. Alam et al. (2025) examine U.S. utility firms and report that founder CEO status is positively related to cash holdings, investment, equity financing, and interest coverage. Their later study of U.S. critical-infrastructure firms extends the question to resilience and reports stronger liquidity, lower leverage, and lower bankruptcy risk among founder-led firms (Alam et al., 2026). These findings are especially interesting because utilities operate in a regulated setting where managerial discretion might be expected to be relatively limited.

3.3 European Evidence: Founder Control, Succession, and Board Design

European evidence suggests that the founder effect cannot be separated from succession and board structure. Barontini and Caprio (2006), using firms from 11 Continental European countries, found higher valuation and operating performance in founder-controlled firms and in firms where descendants served as non-executive directors, but not when descendants became CEOs. García-Ramos and García-Olalla (2011) likewise showed that the relationship between board characteristics and performance differed between founder-led and later-generation family firms.

More recent European evidence continues to emphasize CEO identity rather than family ownership alone. Matias and Franco (2024), studying family businesses listed on Euronext, found that family membership of the CEO was positively associated with accounting performance, while CEO duality was negatively associated with performance and CEO ownership and tenure were positively related to return on assets. The broader lesson is that founder or family leadership is not one governance category. Founder CEOs, descendant CEOs, professional managers, and family board members can produce very different combinations of knowledge, incentives, and entrenchment.

3.4 Asian Evidence: Ownership Concentration, Family Control, and Institutional Conditions

Asian evidence is more heterogeneous because founder leadership often operates alongside concentrated family ownership and weaker protection for minority shareholders. Evidence from India provides one important example. Jameson et al. (2014) found that founders were present on the boards of a large share of listed firms and that controlling-shareholder board membership was negatively associated with Tobin's Q. This contrasts with much of the North American evidence and shows why founder control cannot be evaluated without considering minority-shareholder protection.

Other evidence from the same regional setting reaches a more conditional conclusion. Chahal and Sharma (2022) find that family ownership is positively related to accounting and market performance and that founder-managed firms outperform descendant- or professionally managed family firms in their sample. Chen et al. (2021) show another side of the same system: family CEOs in Indian family firms received higher compensation than profes-

sional CEOs, and weak governance could allow compensation to become a channel for tunneling resources from minority shareholders. Founder involvement can therefore create value and governance risk at the same time.

Evidence from South Asia further shows why institutional setting matters. Khan and Tariq (2022), using listed Pakistani firms, find that family firms outperform nonfamily firms and directly examine the role of family members in the CEO position. Arif et al. (2023) study several dimensions of CEO power, including family power, and show that CEO influence is related to firm performance. These studies suggest that leadership cannot be separated from ownership structure in markets where families often remain central to corporate control.

Related evidence from Bangladesh points in the same direction. Muttakin et al. (2015) find that family firms outperform nonfamily firms and that political connections further improve performance among family firms, although the benefit of those connections declines across generations. Hasan et al. (2014) report that family ownership is associated with lower board independence and smaller boards, showing how concentrated family control can weaken formal monitoring.

Islam and Maruf-Ul-Alam (2021) do not test founder CEOs directly, but their evidence from Bangladeshi manufacturing firms helps clarify the financial environment in which family-controlled firms operate. They link capital structure to firm performance. The relevance here is indirect but important: financing policy is one of the channels through which concentrated leadership can affect long-run survival.

3.5 The Current Frontier: From Founder Premium to Resilience

The newest founder-CEO research is moving beyond the question of whether founder firms have higher Tobin's Q or stock returns. Attention is shifting toward how founders manage liquidity, leverage, risk, and the capacity to withstand adverse conditions. This is a natural development. A founder may create value not by maximizing current profitability, but by preserving strategic options when financing conditions tighten.

Recent founder-specific evidence supports this broader resilience perspective. Alam et al. (2025) show that founder leadership is associated with differences in cash holdings, financing, investment, and interest coverage, while Alam et al. (2026) extend the analysis to liquidity, leverage, solvency, and bankruptcy risk. Read together, these studies suggest that founder leadership research is moving from a simple performance premium toward the financial policies that may make firms more or less robust.

This shift also raises harder empirical questions. Founder status is not randomly assigned, founders often leave after unusually good or bad performance, and founder firms differ systematically in age, industry, growth opportunities, ownership, and culture. The strongest future studies will therefore need better identification strategies and more precise distinctions among founder CEOs, founder chairs, descendants, professional managers, and other family executives.

3.6 Opinion: Founder Leadership Is a Conditional Advantage

The literature suggests that the founder advantage is real in some settings, but it is not a universal governance rule. The strongest founder-led firms appear to benefit from three things at once: deep firm-specific knowledge, meaningful ownership, and a willingness to invest with a longer horizon. Those qualities can support innovation and resilience when outside managers would face stronger short-term pressure.

The same qualities can become liabilities when the founder's authority is difficult to challenge. Concentrated ownership can weaken boards, succession can be delayed, and personal identification with the company can make strategic exit or restructuring harder. The Asian evidence is especially useful because it shows that founder or family control can coexist with minority-shareholder problems, concentrated ownership, and weaker board independence (Chen et al., 2021; Hasan et al., 2014; Jameson et al., 2014).

The most useful modern question is therefore not whether founders are better CEOs. It is when founder-specific strengths are supported by governance that preserves accountability. Founder leadership seems most valuable when boards can challenge without destroying the founder's strategic advantage, when financial policies preserve flexibility, and when succession is treated as a governance process rather than a personal decision.

Conclusion

Founder CEO research has developed from a narrow comparison of founder and professional managers into a broader literature on ownership, governance, investment, succession, and resilience. North American studies generally document higher valuation, stronger investment, or better performance under founder leadership. European research shows that the benefit often depends on generation and board role. Asian evidence highlights the importance of concentrated ownership, family management, political connections, board independence, minority-shareholder protection, and financing constraints.

Recent work adds another dimension by examining liquidity, leverage, solvency, and bankruptcy risk. This makes the founder question more practical. Long-term orientation is valuable only if it helps the firm survive difficult conditions without sacrificing accountability. The current literature therefore points toward a conditional view: founders can be unusually effective stewards, but their advantages are strongest when ownership, boards, financial policy, and institutions limit entrenchment while preserving the founder's knowledge and commitment.

Recommendations

Future founder-CEO research should separate founder status from family ownership more carefully and should distinguish founder CEOs from founder chairs, descendants, and other family executives. Cross-country work is especially valuable because legal protection, ownership concentration, and access to capital can change the same leadership structure from a strength into a governance risk.

Researchers should also study the channels through which founders affect resilience, including cash holdings, debt maturity, investment cuts, refinancing behavior, and recovery after shocks. For boards and investors, the practical implication is not to prefer founders automatically, but to preserve the founder's long-term knowledge while maintaining credible independent oversight and a clear succession process.

Acknowledgements

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

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. B., Almeida, H., & Ferreira, D. (2009). Understanding the relationship between founder-CEOs and firm performance. Journal of Empirical Finance, 16(1), 136-150.
- Alam, M. A. U., Alam, M. M. U., & Nazrul, T. (2025). Founder CEOs and utility firms' financial choices. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 18(10), 531.
- Alam, M. A. U., Alam, M. M. U., & Nazrul, T. (2026). Founder CEO leadership and financial resilience in U.S. critical infrastructure firms: Evidence on solvency, stability and bankruptcy risk. Journal of Finance and Accountancy, 36, 1-26.
- Anderson, R. C., & Reeb, D. M. (2003). Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500. Journal of Finance, 58(3), 1301-1328.
- Arif, K., Isa, C. R., & Mustapha, M. Z. (2023). Do powerful CEOs benefit firm performance in Pakistan? Asian Journal of Business and Accounting, 16(2), 53-82.
- Barontini, R., & Caprio, L. (2006). The effect of family control on firm value and performance: Evidence from Continental Europe. European Financial Management, 12(5), 689-723.
- Chahal, H., & Sharma, A. K. (2022). Family involvement in ownership, management and firm performance: Evidence from Indian listed companies. Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies, 15(1), 1-24.
- Chen, G., Chittoor, R., & Vissa, B. (2021). Does nepotism run in the family? CEO pay and pay-performance sensitivity in Indian family firms. Strategic Management Journal, 42(7), 1326-1343.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. Academy of Management Review, 22(1), 20-47.
- Fahlenbrach, R. (2009). Founder-CEOs, investment decisions, and stock market performance. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 44(2), 439-466.
- García-Ramos, R., & García-Olalla, M. (2011). Board characteristics and firm performance in public founder- and nonfounder-led family businesses. Journal of Family Business Strategy, 2(4), 220-231.
- Hasan, M. S., Abdul Rahman, R., & Hossain, S. Z. (2014). Monitoring family performance: Family ownership and corporate governance structure in Bangladesh. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 145, 103-109.
- Islam, R., & Maruf-Ul-Alam, M. (2021). Capital structure and firms' performance: Evidence from manufacturing sector of Bangladesh. Journal of Business Studies, 9, 61-90.
- Jameson, M., Prevost, A., & Puthenpurackal, J. (2014). Controlling shareholders, board structure, and firm performance: Evidence from India. Journal of Corporate Finance, 27, 1-20.
- 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.
- Khan, M. R., & Tariq, Y. B. (2022). An investigation of family entrepreneurship in ownership and firm performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 9(5), 63-73.
- Matias, C., & Franco, M. (2024). The impact of CEO characteristics on the financial performance of family businesses listed in the Euronext Exchange. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 17(3), 129.

- Muttakin, M. B., Monem, R. M., Khan, A., & Subramaniam, N. (2015). Family firms, firm performance and political connections: Evidence from Bangladesh. Journal of Contemporary Accounting & Economics, 11(3), 215-230.
- Palia, D., Ravid, S. A., & Wang, C. C. (2008). Do founders matter? A study of executive compensation, governance structure and firm performance. Journal of Business Venturing, 23(3), 257-279.
- Villalonga, B., & Amit, R. (2006). How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value? Journal of Financial Economics, 80(2), 385-417.