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

International Journal of Advance Research Publication and Reviews

Vol 03, Issue 11, pp 136-153, November, 2026

Founder Leadership and Corporate Financial Decisions: A Comparative Review of North America, Europe, and Asia

Marie Janssens[1], Luc Peeters[2]

Thomas More University of Applied Sciences, Belgium
Email: janssens99marie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Founder leadership can influence investment, financing, and the financial capacity needed to withstand disruption. Its consequences depend on ownership incentives, governance, and access to capital. This comparative narrative review examines North American, European, and Asian evidence on capital structure, investment, liquidity, performance, and resilience. Coverage includes the United States and Canada; France, Germany, Italy, and Denmark; and selected Asian economies. The synthesis distinguishes direct founder studies from research on family control and financial conditions. European findings add evidence on control-preserving finance, active family involvement, credit lines, professional succession, and pandemic performance. Across the three regions, founder and family involvement is associated with varied outcomes that cannot be explained by geography alone. Differences in sectors, firm maturity, leadership definitions, and research design limit direct comparisons. The paper develops a conditional framework connecting founder knowledge and authority with oversight and financing constraints. It recommends comparable leadership measures, careful analysis of succession, and outcomes that capture actual financial and operating continuity. The practical implication is to evaluate the decision process and available financing alternatives alongside the leader's identity.

Keywords: Founder CEOs; Financial decision making; Capital structure; Corporate liquidity; Financial resilience; Comparative corporate governance

1. Introduction

A founder who approves a new factory, retains cash, or rejects an outside investor makes a financial decision that is also a decision about the future of the business. The founder may understand the firm's products and customers better than a newly appointed executive. The same personal involvement may make it difficult to abandon an unsuccessful project or accept limits on control. These tensions help explain why founder leadership attracts attention in corporate finance, yet produces findings that do not point consistently in one direction. The relevant question is how founders make decisions under particular organizational and financing conditions, and what follows from those choices.

This review compares research on founder chief executive officers (CEOs) and related forms of top management in North America, Europe, and selected Asian economies. Its central subjects are investment, capital structure, liquidity, financial performance, and resilience. These decisions belong in the same discussion. An investment needs funding; funding creates obligations; and cash reserves influence whether the firm can continue investing when conditions deteriorate. A leadership policy that appears attractive in one dimension may be costly in another. For example, avoiding debt can reduce contractual pressure while also leaving profitable projects unfunded. A financial buffer has value when it protects operations, but its value also depends on how management eventually uses it.

The literature offers a reason to look beyond firm characteristics. Upper echelons theory links strategic choices to how executives interpret their circumstances (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Research that follows managers between firms finds persistent differences in financial and organizational policies associated with individual managers (Bertrand & Schoar, 2003). A later review of founder CEOs organizes a fragmented literature around their early role, strategic choices, and performance consequences (Abebe et al., 2020). These contributions justify examining leadership, but they do not imply that a founder's identity overrides the business model, ownership arrangements, or access to capital. Founder status is one part of a decision environment.

The regional comparison is useful because similar ownership incentives can operate through different financing arrangements. The North American evidence considered here comes principally from the United States and Canada. European evidence includes country studies from France, Germany, Italy, and Denmark, alongside broader European samples. The Asian evidence includes China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, India, and Bangladesh, with additional institutional evidence from East Asian economies. This coverage does not represent every country within the three regions. It allows a

more focused question: when researchers observe different founder-related policies, are those differences consistent with ownership, financing constraints, investment opportunities, or the way leadership is measured? A location label alone cannot answer that question.

We ask three related research questions. How do founder CEOs differ from other executives in their investment and financing decisions? How do institutional conditions and ownership structures help explain variation across the selected countries? Finally, what do the resulting policies imply for performance and the ability to withstand financial pressure? The review contributes an integrated interpretation of these questions. It distinguishes studies that directly observe founders from studies that explain the financial environment in which they operate, and it treats resilience as a set of outcomes to investigate rather than an automatic benefit of founder control.

Our main conclusion is conditional. Founder leadership can support patient investment and the preservation of financial capacity, but it can also protect control at a cost to outside investors or delay necessary organizational change. The evidence does not establish a general regional ranking. It instead supports evaluating the combination of leadership, control rights, financing access, and business needs. A useful comparison therefore examines the reasons behind a decision and the outcomes used to assess it, rather than asking whether founders are universally more cautious, innovative, or effective.

2. Review approach and scope

2.1 Literature selection and verification

This paper uses a comparative narrative review of published theoretical and empirical research. The search was purposive, combining terms concerning founder CEOs, family control, managerial characteristics, capital structure, investment, cash holdings, financial distress, and the selected countries. Publisher pages, university repositories, and accessible author manuscripts were used to verify titles, authorship, publication details, research settings, and substantive findings. Studies were selected because they clarify leadership mechanisms, supply country evidence, or explain the financial outcomes under review. Their measures were assessed individually to distinguish evidence about leadership from evidence about financial conditions.

This procedure produces an interpretive synthesis rather than an exhaustive systematic review. We do not claim a complete count of all eligible studies, a reproducible database screening flow, or a pooled effect size. Those claims would require a separate protocol and a documented search across bibliographic databases. The reference list includes foundational work and more recent contributions, including publications from 2025 and 2026. Publication year and observation period are treated separately: a recently published article may examine decisions made much earlier. The review therefore cannot be read as a description of the current behavior of every founder in the countries discussed.

2.2 Classification of evidence

The synthesis uses three levels of evidence. Direct founder studies identify founders serving as CEO or another specified senior leader. Related leadership studies examine managerial experience, ownership, or family management without isolating founder CEOs. Financial context studies examine financing and performance without measuring leadership. These categories are analytical distinctions introduced for this review. They prevent an association between leverage and profitability from being presented as evidence that founders caused either outcome. They also make it possible to use relevant financial studies without overstating their contribution to a leadership question.

Each empirical finding is assessed by considering the unit of analysis, the sample, the financial measure, and the identification strategy. A firm-year panel of listed utilities answers a different question from a sample of newly listed firms or a set of early-stage lending platforms. Even where the studies use the same label, such as performance, their outcomes can differ. Return on assets, market valuation, survival, and a distress score capture different aspects of a firm's condition. We preserve statistically insignificant results and outcome-specific qualifications because they affect the interpretation of the review.

2.3 Basis of the regional comparison

The comparison proceeds through matched decision domains, rather than treating articles as observations in a regional regression. Within each domain, we identify what was actually measured, compare relevant findings, and discuss mechanisms that could account for similarities or differences. The discussion cannot establish that geography causes a policy. Differences may arise from the ages of firms, the sectors selected, institutional arrangements, or the periods studied. The absence of a direct founder comparison for a country is treated as a gap in evidence, not evidence that its founders resemble those elsewhere.

The synthesis separates research on regulated utilities from manufacturing finance and monetary-policy transmission. These strands address related decisions but do not test an identical hypothesis. Their contribution depends on whether leadership is measured directly and whether the financial outcome is comparable. This approach connects leadership questions with the financing choices they need to explain while preserving the limits of each study.

3. What counts as founder leadership

3.1 Founders, managers, and controlling families

A founder CEO is an individual involved in establishing the business who currently holds the chief executive position. Founder ownership is different: a founder may retain shares after leaving management. Founder chairmanship is different again, because the chair can influence executive appointments and oversight while another person makes operating decisions. A family-controlled firm can persist for generations after the founder's departure. When these categories are combined, the estimated relationship can reflect several kinds of influence at once. This is especially important when comparing studies that define family involvement differently.

The distinction is substantive. A founder may have product knowledge and personal relationships that a descendant does not share. A professional CEO working under a controlling founder may have managerial expertise but limited discretion. A family member with a small cash-flow stake and substantial voting rights may face different incentives from a founder who bears a large share of losses. Villalonga and Amit show why family ownership, control, and management need separate attention (Villalonga & Amit, 2006). Miller and colleagues likewise demonstrate that findings depend on distinguishing lone founders from firms with broader family involvement (Miller et al., 2007). Neither label should substitute for observing who can authorize a financial commitment.

Table 1. Leadership categories and their interpretation

Category	What is observed	What cannot be assumed
Founder CEO	An original founder holds the CEO position.	All founders have equal ownership or authority.
Founder owner or chair	A founder retains equity or a board leadership role.	The founder directs daily operating decisions.
Descendant CEO	A later-generation family member serves as CEO.	The executive shares the founder’s knowledge or incentives.
Family-controlled firm	A family holds specified control rights.	A founder or family member is the CEO.
Professional CEO	A non-founder executive holds the CEO role.	The executive is independent of controlling owners.

Note. Author synthesis. Categories and questions are analytical distinctions, not estimates of a regional effect.

3.2 The role of the wider leadership team

Founders do not make all financial decisions alone. A chief financial officer assesses funding capacity, tax consequences, and debt commitments. Other executives supply information about production, customers, or technology. The board can require further analysis or reject a proposed transaction. These roles may reinforce founder judgment or challenge it. A comparative study should therefore distinguish formal position from practical decision authority. A founder who consults a strong finance team can behave differently from a founder with the same ownership stake who controls the entire approval process.

Survey evidence associates executive attitudes with corporate financial policies (Graham et al., 2013). Research on CEOs with financial experience further suggests that professional background can shape the way funding and valuation are managed (Custódio & Metzger, 2014). These studies are not founder tests, but they identify plausible channels through which founder-led firms can differ internally. For a regional review, this means that the category founder CEO may conceal variation in financial expertise, delegated authority, and access to advice. It is not safe to attribute all observed differences to founder identity when the organization around the founder has not been examined.

3.3 Ownership concentration and decision rights

Control should be measured separately from economic exposure. Cash-flow rights determine how much of the financial outcome accrues to an owner. Voting and appointment rights determine the owner's ability to direct decisions. A person who controls a firm through a pyramid or other arrangement may influence more assets than the direct investment would suggest. East Asian ownership research documents the importance of tracing ultimate control rather than relying only on the immediate registered shareholder (Claessens et al., 2000). The implication for this review is methodological: comparable founder indicators should be accompanied by comparable measures of control.

This distinction also affects how professional management is interpreted. Hiring an outside CEO does not necessarily remove family control. The board, controlling shareholder, or group office may continue to decide financing and large investments. Conversely, a founder can remain CEO while independent directors impose meaningful limits. The relevant organizational question is who initiates, approves, and monitors decisions. Founder status, ownership concentration, and board influence should therefore enter the comparison as separate characteristics, even if they are closely related in some samples.

4. Theoretical explanations for financial decisions

4.1 Agency alignment and private benefits

Agency theory explains how the allocation of ownership and control can create conflicts among managers and providers of finance (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). A substantial ownership stake can give a founder reasons to monitor costs and protect value. The founder bears part of the consequences of poor investment or unsustainable borrowing. However, control can also create private benefits, including influence over appointments and related-party transactions. The relevant prediction depends on the balance between exposure to financial losses and the ability to direct resources. Concentrated leadership does not remove agency problems; it can change the parties between whom the conflict occurs.

Research on principal–principal conflicts is particularly useful where a controlling owner and minority investors have different interests. Young and colleagues explain how concentrated ownership, family influence, group structures, and investor protection can shape those conflicts in emerging economies (Young et al., 2008). This framework helps interpret why a founder might reject equity even when it would reduce financing risk. The choice may preserve a valuable organizational relationship, protect private control benefits, or reflect the cost of raising capital. These explanations need separate evidence. A debt ratio by itself cannot tell us which motive dominated.

4.2 Stewardship, socioemotional wealth, and imprinting

Stewardship theory allows organizational commitment and responsibility to influence managerial choices (Davis et al., 1997). A founder may value the continuity of the business, the reputation attached to the family name, or obligations to employees. Such commitments can support longer investment horizons and attention to downside risk. Yet stewardship is a theoretical explanation to examine, not a personality trait that follows automatically from founding a business. An outside executive can also be committed to long-term performance, while a founder can make decisions that serve personal goals.

Socioemotional wealth provides a related explanation for the importance of control and identity. Gómez-Mejía and colleagues show why preserving family control can lead firms to accept some economic risks while avoiding other choices (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007). The original evidence concerns Spanish family businesses, so it supplies a mechanism rather than a direct comparison of founder CEOs across the three regions. Applied to financial decisions, the framework suggests that a founder may avoid ownership dilution while accepting substantial debt exposure. That combination would look cautious from a control perspective and aggressive from a solvency perspective.

Imprinting research adds a temporal dimension. Practices established during formative periods can persist after the circumstances that encouraged them have changed (Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013). A firm that survived an early cash shortage may build routines for preserving liquidity. A business established around bank relationships may continue to rely on debt after other sources become available. These are plausible applications of the theory, not findings established for every founder-led company. They suggest examining when a policy began, whether it still fits the business, and whether a successor can revise it without losing valuable knowledge.

4.3 Behavioral beliefs and financing constraints

Managerial beliefs can affect the perceived attractiveness of investment and financing. Malmendier and Tate associate CEO overconfidence with investment that is especially sensitive to internal cash flow (Malmendier & Tate, 2005). Malmendier, Tate, and Yan connect managerial traits and early-life experiences with financing patterns, including reluctance to issue equity among overconfident executives (Malmendier et al., 2011). These studies concern executive characteristics rather than founder status alone. They help explain why the same investment opportunity may lead to different choices, but do not justify assuming that every founder is overconfident or that professional executives are free of such biases.

A preference for internal finance can also arise without behavioral bias. Myers and Majluf show how information differences between managers and investors can make an equity issue unattractive, even when investment would be valuable (Myers & Majluf, 1984). Financial constraints can therefore produce policies that resemble an owner's personal preference for independence. A careful comparison asks whether outside capital was available on acceptable terms, whether managers believed it was mispriced, and whether they would accept financing if control were protected. Combining these questions avoids treating all reluctance to raise equity as evidence of the same leadership mechanism.

5. Investment and innovation decisions

5.1 North American evidence on founder investment

Fahlenbrach's U.S. evidence associates founder CEOs with greater research and development spending, higher capital expenditure, and more focused acquisitions (Fahlenbrach, 2009). This pattern is consistent with a founder being willing to commit resources to activities that need time to develop. It also shows why founder leadership should not automatically be described as financially conservative. Investment intensity and borrowing intensity

need not move together. A firm can invest substantially while maintaining a cautious funding structure, especially if it has retained earnings or access to equity.

The interpretation still depends on what the spending accomplishes. More investment may represent productive expansion, but it can also reflect a founder's commitment to a familiar technology or an ambitious personal project. The distinction requires evidence about project returns, innovation outputs, or subsequent operating results. It also requires a suitable comparison group. A mature founder-led technology firm and a young professional-led company may have different opportunities even within the same industry. The association with founder status does not by itself establish that changing the CEO would change investment by the estimated amount.

Kannan-Narasimhan and colleagues examine founder status together with CEO power in publicly traded high-technology firms (Kannan-Narasimhan et al., 2023). Their findings associate powerful founders with stronger innovation outcomes alongside a higher cost of capital. This combination is important because the same governance arrangement can support a beneficial activity while increasing the return required by investors. An assessment based only on innovation could overlook financing costs. An assessment based only on the cost of capital could miss valuable innovation. The study therefore supports evaluating the joint consequences of discretion rather than reducing founder power to a uniformly favorable or unfavorable characteristic.

5.2 Asian evidence on research and development

Zhong and colleagues study Chinese listed family firms during 2008–2018 and associate founder reign with lower research and development investment (Zhong et al., 2023). Their definition distinguishes founders serving as CEO from founders serving as chair, and the reported negative association is larger for the chair role. The finding contrasts with the direction of the U.S. investment association, but it is not a formal regional test. The studies differ in their samples, periods, leadership definitions, and institutional settings. A credible interpretation preserves the contrast while recognizing those differences.

The Chinese finding also raises a measurement question. A founder who remains chair may constrain an appointed CEO's investment proposals even when the CEO has no founding role. Coding that firm simply as professionally managed could conceal continuing founder influence. For comparative research, an indicator for founder CEO should be accompanied by information on founder chairmanship and control. Otherwise, a difference attributed to countries may partly reflect the way positions are classified. The appropriate inference is that the location of authority within the leadership structure can matter for innovation policy.

Choi and colleagues examine Korean family ownership and research and development rather than founder CEOs specifically (Choi et al., 2015). They find a negative ownership association that becomes positive in the presence of growth opportunities, with business group membership weakening that moderating relationship. This is evidence of variation within an Asian setting. It suggests that ownership goals interact with the prospects available to the firm and with support from related businesses. It does not establish that Korean founder CEOs generally prefer less innovation. The unit of evidence is the family ownership arrangement and its interaction with organizational conditions.

5.3 Financial choices in a regulated sector

M. A. U. Alam and colleagues examine founder CEOs in U.S. utilities over 1990–2022 (M. A. U. Alam et al., 2025). They associate founder status with higher cash holdings, investment ratios, equity ratios, and interest coverage. Matching, entropy balancing, and a lagged performance control retain the reported pattern. The study brings leadership into a regulated, capital-intensive setting where investment and financial capacity are closely connected. Its estimates address observed differences and selected model concerns; they do not establish that founder appointment alone causes the entire policy difference. The appropriate contribution is direct evidence of founder-associated financial choices within utilities, rather than a general description of all North American firms.

The sector comparison also prevents a misleading interpretation of investment restraint. In a utility, maintenance and replacement requirements can create investment obligations that are quite different from research spending in a technology firm. A founder's greater investment could reflect asset renewal, expansion, or a combination of activities. Before comparing levels, the analyst needs to identify the underlying spending category and its denominator. A ratio based on assets can move because spending changes, because the asset base changes, or both. These details matter when the argument concerns decision quality rather than a broad difference in accounting ratios.

5.4 Interpreting the investment contrast

The reviewed evidence suggests several reasons why investment results can differ. Founders may face different growth opportunities, control different shares of their own wealth through the firm, or operate under different limits on external finance. Boards may encourage innovation in one firm while requiring a founder to preserve debt capacity in another. These are explanations consistent with the literature, rather than mechanisms proved by the comparison itself. Establishing them would require measuring the proposed channel and showing that it accounts for the observed policy difference.

For that reason, we interpret investment as an allocation problem. The question is whether leadership commits resources to projects whose expected benefits justify their risks and financing costs. This interpretation makes it possible to recognize patient investment as an advantage without treating all additional spending as desirable. It also allows lower investment to be efficient when the opportunity set is weak. A comparative review is most useful when it specifies what information would distinguish disciplined restraint from missed opportunities, rather than assigning a favorable meaning to a positive or negative coefficient in advance.

5.5 European investment evidence and the meaning of caution

Croci and colleagues examine European family firms over 1998–2008 (Croci et al., 2011). They find lower investment in research and development relative to nonfamily firms, without a comparable reduction in fixed-asset capital expenditure. This distinction adds to the U.S. and Asian investment evidence: spending on established assets and spending on uncertain innovation can move differently within the same ownership category. The study measures family control rather than isolating original founders serving as CEO. Its findings therefore qualify the meaning of investment caution without establishing that European founder CEOs are generally less innovative.

Taken together, the investment studies favor a comparison by project type. The useful question is whether leadership protects established operations while becoming reluctant to fund unfamiliar activities. A regional average for total investment would conceal that possibility. Differences in project uncertainty, asset maturity, and funding availability should be examined before attributing the pattern to a regional leadership style.

6. Capital structure and the preservation of control

6.1 Financing preferences and available alternatives

Borrowing can support expansion without diluting ownership, but it commits the firm to future payments and contractual conditions. Equity can absorb losses more flexibly while changing the allocation of control and future returns. Retained earnings preserve discretion but are limited by past profitability and competing uses of cash. A founder's financing decision therefore combines the price of capital with the value attached to independence and the capacity to meet obligations. The relevant comparison is the set of alternatives actually available to the firm, rather than a theoretical choice between equally accessible debt and equity.

Graham and Harvey's survey identifies financial flexibility and credit ratings among the considerations that CFOs emphasize in debt policy (Graham & Harvey, 2001). Frank and Goyal identify recurring correlates of leverage in U.S. data, while also showing that results depend on how leverage is measured (Frank & Goyal, 2009). These studies provide a baseline for leadership research. If a founder coefficient changes after controlling for industry, profitability, asset structure, or growth opportunities, part of the initial relationship may have reflected ordinary financing determinants. A leadership interpretation becomes more persuasive when it survives appropriate comparisons and can be connected to an observable decision process.

Cross-country evidence reinforces that baseline. Booth and colleagues find that familiar firm characteristics help explain debt choices in ten developing countries, alongside persistent country differences (Booth et al., 2001). Their result supports asking how institutions affect the financing menu rather than assuming that the same menu exists everywhere. It does not establish a founder effect, and the study should not be used as a substitute for country-specific evidence. For the present comparison, its role is to show why a leverage difference between a North American and an Asian sample cannot be assigned entirely to management preferences.

6.2 Manufacturing finance in Bangladesh

Akhter and Maruf-Ul-Alam study 38 Bangladeshi manufacturing firms during 2013–2018 with fixed-effects models (Akhter & Maruf-Ul-Alam, 2019). Their estimates associate size and growth positively with total debt and non-debt tax shields negatively. Liquidity and tangibility have positive long-term and negative short-term debt coefficients, although the positive long-term tangibility estimate is significant only at the 10% level. Profitability coefficients are not statistically significant across the three debt models. The study helps identify financing conditions relevant to leadership choices, but does not include a founder CEO measure. It therefore supplies financial context rather than a direct test of founder behavior. We use the issue year, 2019, for the citation; the issue's front matter records publication in January 2020.

Debt maturity is particularly important for interpreting such context. A firm with the same total debt ratio can face different risks depending on when repayment is due and whether funding can be renewed. An investment with a long payback period may be exposed to refinancing pressure if it depends heavily on short-term funding. That concern is a financial implication of maturity mismatch, not a founder-specific result of the manufacturing study. To connect it to leadership, future research would need to observe who chose the funding structure, which alternatives lenders offered, and how the board evaluated renewal risk.

6.3 Governance and the ability to raise equity

Haque and colleagues associate better governance with lower total and long-term debt ratios among listed Bangladeshi firms (Haque et al., 2011). Their interpretation connects governance with investor confidence and access to equity. This introduces a channel through which founder control could affect funding indirectly. If outside investors distrust the protection of their interests, the firm may face a less attractive equity option. Observing debt dependence would then reveal both an ownership arrangement and the market's response to it. The direction of borrowing alone would not identify whether the founder preferred debt or faced restricted access to alternatives.

East Asian evidence distinguishes the incentive effects of cash-flow ownership from the entrenchment associated with control rights that exceed that ownership (Claessens et al., 2002). This distinction is directly relevant to financing choices even though the study's outcome is firm value. A founder with substantial economic exposure may have reasons to avoid transferring risk to the firm. A controlling owner with limited exposure may value the preservation of authority differently. For a comparative study, tracing these rights would be more informative than using the same founder dummy for both situations. Institutional explanations become more precise when they specify who bears losses and who can block financing changes.

6.4 What a financing difference can establish

The evidence supports examining financing as a joint choice of amount, maturity, covenants, and ownership consequences. A higher debt ratio may be consistent with growth opportunities, difficulty raising equity, a founder's aversion to dilution, or improved access to lenders. Several of these channels can operate at once. A low debt ratio can similarly reflect accumulated earnings, caution, limited credit supply, or low investment demand. These possibilities should be distinguished before describing a management team as more aggressive or more prudent than its counterparts in another country.

A useful empirical comparison would hold the investment requirement and financing opportunity set as similar as possible. It would then ask whether founder status predicts the chosen contract and whether that contract supports subsequent performance. This approach would also separate financing capacity from financing use. A firm may borrow little because its founder deliberately preserves capacity, while another borrows little because lenders will not extend credit. Treating the two as the same leadership policy would reverse the practical interpretation of their balance sheets.

6.5 European financing choices and control preservation

The European financing evidence gives control preservation a more concrete interpretation. Croci and colleagues associate family control with a preference for debt over equity issuance and greater access to long-term debt (Croci et al., 2011). Their findings show why reluctance to dilute ownership can coexist with access to lenders. They also caution against equating less research spending with a general unwillingness to take on financial obligations. The ownership measure does not identify a founder CEO effect, and the observed funding pattern is not itself proof of optimal financing.

The comparison with Bangladesh and U.S. utilities concerns mechanisms rather than a common debt ranking. The Bangladeshi manufacturing evidence describes firm-level determinants of debt; the utility evidence directly links founder status to particular financial ratios. The European study examines family control and external financing. These differences make a pooled regional conclusion inappropriate. They nevertheless suggest a testable question: does concentrated control influence the funding instrument selected once researchers account for the terms offered by lenders and equity investors?

7. Performance, valuation, and survival

7.1 The North American evidence is not uniform

Anderson and Reeb find favorable performance relationships for founding-family involvement in their U.S. S&P 500 sample (Anderson & Reeb, 2003). This finding is relevant to ownership and leadership, but its family definition should not be treated as identical to founder CEO status. Large listed firms also represent businesses that survived earlier stages of development. Evidence from such firms can help explain governance within established companies without describing the experience of every newly public or privately held business. The sample boundary belongs in the interpretation of the result.

Canada provides a useful contrast within North America. Ullah and Zhang examine 138 IPO firms that went public during 2004–2013 (Ullah & Zhang, 2016). Their founder-managed firms have weaker Tobin's Q and survival outcomes than professionally managed counterparts, while the return on assets relationship is not significant. This is not evidence that Canadian founders are universally less effective. It is evidence that favorable U.S. associations cannot be generalized across the region without examining the type and maturity of firms. The contrast is especially valuable because it prevents North America from becoming a shorthand for a uniformly positive founder effect.

Market valuation and operating profitability also answer different questions. Valuation incorporates expectations about future returns, risk, and control. Profitability reflects accounting outcomes over a specified period. Survival adds information about whether a business remains in operation, but

surviving firms can still create disappointing returns. A comparative review should therefore report the outcome attached to each finding. Calling all three performance and presenting a single positive or negative conclusion would discard information that helps explain why studies appear to disagree.

7.2 Founder involvement and performance in Japan

Saito's Japanese evidence distinguishes founding-family ownership, management, and generations (Saito, 2008). Founder-managed family firms trade at a premium in the reported sample, while outcomes after founder retirement are mixed. Firms combining descendant ownership and management perform less well than nonfamily counterparts, but other arrangements differ. The study shows that an Asian setting can contain a favorable association with active founders alongside weaker outcomes for a particular succession structure. It cannot be reduced to a claim that family leadership in Japan is uniformly beneficial or harmful.

The comparison with North America is therefore partly a comparison of organizational stages. A founder who remains actively involved may supply knowledge and credibility that do not transfer automatically to a successor. A family that keeps ownership while appointing managers can separate these functions, although the effectiveness of that arrangement depends on oversight. Similar language can describe very different allocations of authority. The review treats generation and leadership position as essential parts of the sample description, especially when studies use family firms to explain founder-related performance.

7.3 Debt and accounting returns in Bangladesh

Islam and Maruf-Ul-Alam examine 41 manufacturing firms during 2013–2019 using fixed-effects regressions (Islam & Maruf-Ul-Alam, 2021). Their Table 3 reports negative coefficients for both long-term and short-term debt in the return on assets model, significant at the 1% level. In the return on equity model, the long-term debt coefficient is negative and the short-term coefficient positive; neither is statistically significant. The evidence thus supports an outcome-specific negative association rather than a general debt–performance result. The study does not identify founders or isolate a CEO channel. Its relevance is that it shows why financing decisions need to be assessed against clearly defined outcomes, with insignificant results retained in the interpretation.

There is also a direction-of-causation issue. Borrowing can affect the resources available to the firm and the cost of servicing obligations. Profitability can affect retained earnings and the need for external funds. Weak conditions can influence both at the same time. Firm fixed effects remove persistent firm differences but do not automatically separate these channels. A leadership explanation needs additional evidence linking the decision maker to the chosen funding and the outcome. Otherwise, the result remains useful as a description of finance and performance but cannot answer whether a different founder decision would improve returns.

7.4 Evaluating benefits over time

A founder's decision can affect current returns and future capacity differently. Research expenditure may depress current earnings while creating future products. Asset replacement may protect operations without producing immediate growth. Conversely, cutting spending can improve short-term accounting results while exposing the firm to later problems. These are reasons to evaluate a sequence of outcomes, not reasons to dismiss unfavorable evidence. A long horizon should make the assessment more complete; it should not become a justification for postponing accountability whenever results are weak.

Boards and researchers can distinguish the investment decision from the financing decision by asking whether the project was attractive before financing costs and whether the selected contract remained manageable afterward. This separation helps identify where a disappointing outcome originated. It also makes regional comparisons more useful. A project with similar operating prospects may create different equity returns under different debt costs or control arrangements. The review therefore treats valuation, accounting returns, and survival as complementary evidence rather than interchangeable verdicts on the quality of founder leadership.

7.5 Performance evidence from France, Germany, and Western Europe

Sraer and Thesmar study French listed firms during 1994–2000 and find that family firms outperform widely held corporations in their cross-sectional comparisons (Sraer & Thesmar, 2007). The favorable relationship extends to founder-controlled firms, professionally managed family firms, and firms led by descendants. This contrasts with studies in which inherited leadership is associated with weaker outcomes. It also shows why a favorable family-firm result cannot be assigned entirely to the founder CEO: several leadership arrangements share the association in the French sample.

German evidence places greater weight on continuing involvement. Andres examines 275 listed companies and reports a performance advantage for founding-family firms when family members remain active on the executive or supervisory board (Andres, 2008). A family shareholding without board representation does not show the same distinction from other firms. This finding is relevant to the location of authority discussed earlier. It concerns founding-family participation, which can continue after the original founder has left the CEO role.

Maury examines 1,672 nonfinancial Western European firms and distinguishes active from passive family control (Maury, 2006). Active control is associated with higher profitability, while passive control is not. The valuation premium is concentrated in settings with stronger shareholder protection. This supplies evidence that legal protections and the form of family involvement qualify financial outcomes within Europe. It does not establish that founder leadership causes better performance in every European legal environment.

These results change the comparison in a useful way. France provides a counterexample to a universal descendant penalty, while Germany and the broader Western European sample emphasize active involvement and investor protection. The differences should be read alongside the Canadian IPO evidence and the Japanese succession categories. They concern different populations and outcomes, so the review cannot determine which region has the largest founder premium. It can identify the organizational features a credible comparison would need to hold constant.

8. Liquidity and monetary tightening

8.1 Why cash decisions need an institutional explanation

Cash gives management the ability to meet obligations without immediately seeking external finance. Almeida and colleagues connect financing constraints with a firm's propensity to save cash out of cash flows (Almeida et al., 2004). Bates and colleagues associate the rise in U.S. corporate cash with changes in risk and firm characteristics, including greater research intensity (Bates et al., 2009). These studies provide reasons to interpret liquidity as part of a financing strategy. They do not imply that any firm with a high cash balance has better management, or that founders should hold the same cash ratio across countries.

Cash can have a different role when credit is readily available than when outside funding is costly or uncertain. It can support investment continuity, allow time to negotiate with lenders, or absorb a temporary revenue shortfall. However, it can also remain idle or be used in an unproductive acquisition. The economic question is what the firm can accomplish with the buffer compared with its cost. Comparing cash ratios without examining access to committed credit, expected cash needs, and permitted uses can therefore obscure the policy that leadership is actually pursuing.

8.2 Evidence during U.S. tightening cycles

M. M. U. Alam and colleagues study U.S. nonfinancial, nonutility firms during 2002–2024 (M. M. U. Alam et al., 2026). Firms classified as holding higher lagged industry-adjusted cash show stronger investment, payouts, financial stability, and profitability outcomes, and lower equity volatility, during the tightening periods examined. Their approach combines firm and year fixed effects with balancing and alternative specifications. The reported event-study evidence includes a significant pre-treatment estimate for the financial-stability outcome, so a causal reading needs particular caution. The paper examines liquidity, not a founder CEO treatment. It supports a channel through which financial buffers may matter, but does not establish that founders accumulate those buffers or that the relationship transfers unchanged to Asian monetary regimes.

The review draws a limited inference from this evidence. If founder leadership is associated with a different liquidity policy, the consequences of that policy may become more visible when external finance becomes restrictive. Testing that argument requires a founder variable and an appropriate interaction with financing conditions. It would be insufficient to combine a founder–cash association from one sample with a cash–resilience association from another and call the resulting chain a demonstrated founder effect. The two relationships motivate a test; they do not supply the missing mediation evidence.

8.3 Governance determines how buffers are used

Dittmar and Mahrt-Smith show that governance influences the value and subsequent use of cash (Dittmar & Mahrt-Smith, 2007). Harford and colleagues find that weakly governed U.S. firms can spend cash quickly rather than simply hoard it (Harford et al., 2008). This distinction matters for founder-led businesses. A founder may preserve liquidity for investment continuity, but a large balance can also give a powerful executive discretion over acquisitions or other commitments. The relevant governance question concerns the process for using cash, including how projects are challenged and how outside shareholders can evaluate the decision.

The comparative implication is that cash levels and the value of cash should be separated. Two firms with similar balances can differ in the protection afforded to minority investors and in the credibility of the plans for spending those balances. An institutional explanation should therefore consider the rules surrounding access to cash as well as the difficulty of replenishing it. That approach allows a founder's financial caution to be evaluated in context. It avoids treating liquidity as either an unqualified safeguard or an automatic symptom of entrenchment.

8.4 A common shock is not a common treatment

Monetary tightening creates a further comparison problem. The timing and effects of credit restrictions differ across economies, and firms are exposed through different contracts. A business with floating-rate debt and frequent refinancing faces a different immediate change from a business funded with

long-dated fixed-rate obligations. An increase in policy rates therefore cannot be assumed to expose every firm equally. A regional comparison should connect monetary conditions to firm-level financing terms and the timing of repayment.

This observation suggests a practical research design. Instead of classifying all firms in a country as equally treated, a study could measure exposure through debt repricing, maturity, or dependence on external funds. It could then ask whether founder leadership predicts how firms prepare for or respond to that exposure. Such a design would distinguish the choice to hold cash from the protection that cash supplies under a particular funding shock. It would also make the comparison less dependent on differences between national interest-rate calendars.

8.5 European credit lines and investment continuity

European liquidity research broadens the discussion beyond cash balances. Campello and colleagues find that firms with more restricted access to credit drew more heavily on existing credit lines during the financial crisis (Campello et al., 2012). Their evidence indicates that these facilities supported investment during the contraction. The study examines European financing access rather than founder status. It therefore supplies a financial mechanism that leadership research can investigate, rather than evidence that European founders manage liquidity more effectively.

A comparison based only on cash could miss this source of flexibility. A firm holding less cash may still have dependable committed funding, while another firm's large balance may be necessary because renewal finance is uncertain. For founder-led firms across the three regions, the relevant comparison should examine cash together with available credit, drawdown conditions, and debt maturity. The European evidence motivates that broader measurement without implying that a credit line and cash provide identical protection under every shock.

9. Financial resilience, solvency, and distress

9.1 Defining resilience carefully

Financial resilience concerns a firm's capacity to continue meeting obligations and supporting necessary activities when conditions deteriorate. It includes liquidity, debt-servicing capacity, and the room to adjust investment without threatening the business. It is not identical to profitability or survival. A firm can report profits while facing a cash shortage, and a business can survive by sacrificing investments that would have benefited outside shareholders. The definition chosen should therefore state both the adverse condition and the outcome that counts as a successful response.

Altman's original distress model combines financial information to discriminate between bankrupt and nonbankrupt manufacturing firms (Altman, 1968). Related scores are useful indicators, but they are not observed bankruptcy probabilities calibrated for every industry and country. Comparisons need to identify the formula, the direction of the score, and any transformation used. When higher scores indicate a healthier financial position, a positive leadership coefficient should not be described as higher bankruptcy risk. Sector differences also matter when a model developed in manufacturing is used in a utility setting.

9.2 Founder leadership and U.S. utility solvency

M. A. U. Alam and colleagues' 2026 study examines U.S. utility firms over 1990–2022 (M. A. U. Alam et al., 2026). Founder leadership is associated with stronger short-term liquidity, lower leverage measures, better debt-servicing capacity, and higher Altman Z-scores. Entropy-balanced estimates retain the reported relationships. This supplies direct founder evidence on financial health indicators, while leaving unobserved selection as a limitation. Higher Z-scores represent lower measured distress risk, not a demonstrated reduction in realized bankruptcy frequency. The financial-choice and solvency studies also share a sector and observation period, so they should not be treated as independent confirmation across economies. Neither directly measures whether founder leadership prevents service interruptions.

These qualifications do not remove the value of the study. They clarify what a reader can take from it. The evidence connects founder status with several measures rather than a single profitability ratio, which is useful for a resilience question. The next step would be to test whether these measures translate into investment continuity, fewer covenant breaches, improved access to finance, or more reliable operations during an adverse event. Those outcomes would bring the financial mechanism closer to the practical concern that motivates research on essential infrastructure.

9.3 Family control under crisis conditions

International crisis evidence complicates a uniformly favorable account of family resilience. Lins and colleagues examine more than 8,500 firms in 35 countries during the 2008–2009 financial crisis (Lins et al., 2013). Family-controlled firms underperform and cut investment more, with evidence that liquidity shocks are transmitted within groups. The study concerns family control rather than founder CEO status specifically. Its contribution here is to show that preserving a controlling family's position and preserving the value of outside shareholders need not produce the same crisis response.

This distinction is important when evaluating restraint. A founder who reduces investment during a crisis may be protecting essential cash, abandoning weak projects, or preserving control at a cost to future growth. The observed reduction alone cannot identify the motive or its value. A resilience

measure should therefore connect the adjustment to subsequent outcomes. It should also distinguish a firm from the business group to which it belongs. A policy that protects one member may shift funding pressure to another, making the level at which resilience is measured consequential.

9.4 Outcomes that would strengthen the comparison

Research can make resilience more informative by following the firm's response beyond the first adverse year. Relevant outcomes include debt restructuring, actual default, access to renewal finance, restoration of investment, and recovery in operating capacity. These proposed measures are implications of the review rather than results established by the cited studies. They would help distinguish temporary financial caution from persistent underinvestment. Where the business supplies an essential service, operating continuity can be examined separately from accounting solvency.

The comparison should also recognize that financial distress procedures and disclosure practices can affect what researchers observe. A recorded default, a negotiated extension, and a deterioration in a score do not necessarily represent the same severity of financial trouble. Using several outcomes would reduce dependence on any single indicator. For founder research, it would also help identify whether ownership commitment supports recovery or merely delays the recognition of problems. That question is more precise than assuming that financial resilience follows automatically from long-term orientation.

9.5 Italian family firms during the pandemic

Amore, Pelucco, and Quarato study Italian listed firms during the COVID-19 pandemic and report stronger market performance and operating profitability among family firms (Amore et al., 2022). Their analysis connects the advantage with more efficient labor use and a smaller decline in revenues. This is evidence about family ownership and a particular crisis; it does not establish a founder CEO effect or a reduction in actual bankruptcy rates.

The Italian result contrasts with the unfavorable family-control association in the international financial-crisis study discussed above. The difference makes the type of disruption important. A funding shock and a pandemic can affect firms through different channels, and the reviewed samples also differ. The comparison cannot isolate which difference explains the results. It supports evaluating resilience against a specified adverse event and outcome, rather than treating family involvement as a permanent safeguard. It also complements the U.S. utility evidence, where the outcomes are financial-health indicators rather than pandemic operating performance.

10. Governance, succession, and external finance

10.1 Investor protection and ownership in Asia

Yeh and colleagues' Taiwanese evidence associates the relation between family control and performance with the level of ownership and representation on the board (Yeh et al., 2001). The finding cautions against using concentration as a simple measure of either good monitoring or weak governance. Ownership can give a controller financial incentives to protect value, while board dominance can limit challenges to the same controller. The relevant comparison concerns the combination of rights and oversight. It is not a conclusion that the same ownership percentage should be prescribed to all founder-led firms.

In India, Khanna and Palepu find that the performance implications of group affiliation vary with the extent of group diversification (Khanna & Palepu, 2000). Their evidence concerns business groups, not founder CEOs. It nevertheless supplies a reason to examine the organizational setting in which a founder operates. A group can provide internal resources and relationships, but it can also create opportunities to shift funds across firms. A study of an individual listed company may miss these decisions if the founder's influence is exercised at group level. Country comparisons should therefore state whether group membership has been measured.

10.2 Founders can also facilitate outside financing

Founder control should not be equated with rejection of external investors. Zheng and colleagues examine Chinese peer-to-peer lending ventures and associate founder CEO status and international experience with the likelihood of receiving venture capital (Zheng et al., 2021). Their setting is an emerging financial industry, and their outcome is access to financing rather than an optimal funding level or subsequent firm success. The finding still provides a useful counterpoint to the idea that founders always preserve independence by avoiding outside equity. In some environments, their identity and experience may help signal the venture's quality to investors.

The signal interpretation also suggests a distinction between gaining finance and choosing how much to raise. Investors may respond favorably to a founder while insisting on conditions that alter governance. The founder may accept those terms to support expansion or prefer slower growth to preserve authority. Observing a completed financing round reveals the joint outcome of both sides' decisions. A fuller comparison would examine offers received, terms rejected, and changes in decision rights after financing. Those data would make it possible to separate founder credibility from the willingness to share control.

10.3 Succession changes the meaning of family leadership

Pérez-González associates inherited CEO control in U.S. firms with weaker operating and valuation outcomes relative to unrelated successors (Pérez-González, 2006). The study suggests that restricting the pool of potential managers can affect performance. Its relevance to founder decisions is the choice of succession arrangements rather than the founder's current investment policy. A favorable founder association cannot be assumed to continue once another family member takes office. The transition can change knowledge, incentives, and the capacity of the board to evaluate management independently.

Japanese succession evidence provides a different organizational arrangement. Mehrotra and colleagues find that firms led by non-consanguineous heirs perform well relative to other successor categories (Mehrotra et al., 2013). Adult adoption is part of the institutional setting of their study and should not be interpreted as a general solution that other countries can simply copy. The broader implication is that succession systems can combine family continuity with a wider search for managerial ability. This helps explain why the consequences of family succession can vary without requiring a fixed cultural account of founder behavior.

10.4 The professionalization decision

Professionalization is more than replacing a founder's title. It can involve delegating project evaluation, establishing approval limits, strengthening financial reporting, and allowing executives to challenge investment assumptions. A founder may retain strategic authority while improving these processes. An outside CEO may take office without receiving meaningful freedom from the controlling family. The important issue is which decisions change hands and what information is available to those who monitor them. Formal succession and practical delegation should therefore be observed separately.

This perspective makes succession part of financial policy. A business that depends on one person's relationships may face funding risk if that person leaves unexpectedly. A firm that documents its investment process and maintains credible reporting may be less dependent on personal authority. These are propositions that follow from the review and need empirical testing. They suggest examining the resilience of the decision process itself, alongside leverage, cash, and performance. The objective is to understand whether valuable founder knowledge can be preserved while decisions become less vulnerable to unchecked discretion or a single individual's departure.

10.5 European succession and changes in financial authority

Italian succession evidence links leadership transitions directly to financing policy. Amore, Minichilli, and Corbetta report that appointments of nonfamily professional CEOs are followed by increased borrowing, chiefly at short maturities (Amore et al., 2011). The increase is concentrated where firms have limited cash and unused borrowing capacity, among other sources of heterogeneity. The study concerns transitions in family firms, so it should not be interpreted as a comparison of every founder with every professional executive. Its contribution is to show how changing leadership can alter the use of an existing financing opportunity.

Bennedsen and colleagues study Danish CEO succession using the gender of a departing CEO's firstborn child as an instrument for family succession (Bennedsen et al., 2007). They estimate a negative effect of family succession on operating profitability around the transition. The interpretation depends on the instrument affecting performance through succession rather than another channel, and applies to the transitions identified by that design. The study provides stronger identification than an ordinary ownership comparison while retaining those assumptions and scope limits.

The French, Danish, and Japanese findings therefore need to be considered together. Favorable performance among descendant-led French listed firms does not invalidate a negative succession estimate in Denmark; one is a comparison of existing firms and the other studies a transition under specific identification assumptions. Japanese evidence adds further variation in successor selection. Across the three regions, succession research should observe both who takes office and which financing and investment decisions actually change hands.

11. Comparative synthesis: What explains the differences?

11.1 Similar incentives, different feasible choices

The evidence does not support a single ranking of North American, European, and Asian founders. A more defensible interpretation starts with a common set of incentives: founders may value control, believe strongly in their projects, and care about the business beyond the next reporting period. These incentives operate within different arrangements for ownership, credit, disclosure, and succession. The resulting policies can therefore differ even when underlying preferences are similar. Conversely, founders with different motives can arrive at the same debt or cash ratio because they face the same funding constraint.

Consider two firms seeking to expand. One can issue equity at a price the founder regards as reasonable; the other faces a large discount and limited investor demand. Both founders may prefer internal funds, but the second firm's choices are more restricted. If it borrows more, the observed difference

need not indicate a greater appetite for risk. It may indicate that the practical alternative to borrowing was postponing the project. This example is a conceptual illustration, rather than a description of a particular country. It shows why institutional explanations need evidence on available alternatives as well as actual decisions.

Country labels should consequently organize the evidence without becoming explanations in themselves. The selected studies differ in listing status, firm age, industry, ownership definitions, and historical period. Table 2 makes several of these contrasts visible. Their findings are informative about the settings studied. They cannot establish that a randomly selected founder in one region would choose differently from an otherwise identical founder in another region.

Table 2. Selected country evidence and limits of comparison

Setting and study	Leadership measure / outcome	Comparative interpretation
United States: Fahlenbrach (2009)	Founder CEO; investment and stock returns.	Established listed firms; selection remains relevant.
Canada: Ullah and Zhang (2016)	Founder status; valuation, survival, and ROA after IPO.	Different outcomes and listing stage from established-firm studies.
France: Sraer and Thesmar (2007)	Founder, descendant, and professional leadership in family firms.	Favorable cross-sectional results across leadership categories.
Germany: Andres (2008)	Founding-family ownership and board participation; performance.	Benefits depend on active involvement, beyond a shareholding alone.
Italy: Amore et al. (2011)	Professional succession; debt and maturity.	Leadership transitions can change the use of borrowing capacity.
Denmark: Bennedsen et al. (2007)	Family succession; operating profitability.	Instrumental-variable estimates depend on the succession design.
China: Zhong et al. (2023)	Founder reign; family-firm R&D.	Founder chair and CEO roles need separate treatment.
South Korea: Choi et al. (2015)	Family ownership; R&D and growth opportunities.	Family ownership is not a direct founder-CEO test.
Japan: Saito (2008)	Founder and successor involvement; firm performance.	Successor categories produce different implications.
Taiwan: Yeh et al. (2001)	Family control and governance; performance.	Control arrangements qualify family-firm comparisons.
India: Khanna and Palepu (2000)	Business-group affiliation; performance.	Organizational context, rather than a founder effect.

Note. Author synthesis. Categories and questions are analytical distinctions, not estimates of a regional effect.

11.2 A conditional explanation of founder effects

Three conditions recur across the review. First, the founder's specialized knowledge must remain useful to the firm's current activities. Knowledge built around a product or early customer base may support good investment, but its relevance can change as the firm diversifies. Second, decision authority must be accompanied by an effective process for questioning assumptions. Strong personal commitment is valuable only if new information can alter a decision. Third, financing must be appropriate to the timing and uncertainty of the underlying assets. Patient leadership cannot compensate indefinitely for obligations that fall due before a project generates cash.

These conditions suggest a useful distinction between discretion and unchecked discretion. A founder may need room to pursue a project whose value outside investors find difficult to evaluate. That room can coexist with milestones, independent review, and disclosure of financing commitments. The appropriate governance arrangement need not remove the founder from the decision. It should make the reasons for the decision and the response to disappointing results observable. The proposed connection between these arrangements and outcomes remains a research proposition rather than a settled empirical result.

Table 3 translates the synthesis into questions that can guide comparison. It deliberately avoids assigning one preferred policy to any region. The meaningful difference is whether the policy fits investment opportunities and constraints, and whether the evidence permits that interpretation.

Table 3. Decision domains, mechanisms, and comparison questions

Decision domain	Plausible mechanism	Question for comparative research
Investment and innovation	Specialized knowledge; commitment; overconfidence.	Does investment reflect opportunities, and does it earn subsequent returns?
Capital structure	Control preservation; credit access; financial flexibility.	Which financing alternatives were actually available?
Liquidity and payouts	Precautionary reserves; discretion over cash.	Does cash sustain valuable activity or facilitate weak projects?
Performance	Incentive alignment; monitoring; private benefits.	Do accounting, valuation, and survival outcomes agree?
Resilience	Funding buffers; maturity structure; group transfers.	Are measured stability and actual continuity both improved?
Succession	Knowledge transfer; managerial selection; delegation.	Who receives authority, and what changes in financial policy?

Note. Author synthesis. Categories and questions are analytical distinctions, not estimates of a regional effect.

11.3 What Europe adds to the regional comparison

European evidence makes the comparison less dependent on a U.S.–Asia contrast. It shows variation in active ownership, professionalization, debt maturity, and responses to disruption within a third region. These differences are relevant because a proposed explanation should account for variation within regions as well as between them. For example, preserving control can influence financing choices without predicting the same investment or performance outcome in every country. The review consequently treats founder knowledge, financing access, and oversight as separate features whose combination needs to be observed. Geography identifies the setting; it does not replace that explanation.

12. Research agenda and a framework for future comparison

12.1 Build comparable leadership and ownership data

A stronger comparative study would begin with a common classification of founders, descendants, other family executives, and unrelated professional CEOs. It would identify the original founders rather than infer founder status from a family name. It would record whether the founder remains chair, holds appointment rights, or participates through a group company after leaving the CEO position. Joint founders and changes in control would need explicit coding rules. These details matter because a change in job title can otherwise be mistaken for a transfer of authority.

The same dataset should distinguish voting rights from cash-flow rights and record the presence of other large owners. Ownership measures should be dated consistently with the financial decision under study. A controlling stake observed after a financing transaction may partly be an outcome of that transaction. Researchers should also report how many firms and transitions fall within each category. A regional average based on a few unusually large founder firms can hide more than it reveals. Transparent coding and country-level descriptions would make such limitations visible before interpretation begins.

Information about the CFO and other senior executives would improve this design. Relevant measures include financial experience, tenure, executive turnover, board involvement, and the distribution of approval rights. Public disclosures may not reveal who challenged a proposal or selected the final funding method. Interviews and structured surveys can complement archival data, provided respondents are not treated as an unbiased record of past success. Comparing reported decision processes with subsequent financing announcements would help connect leadership characteristics to observable choices.

12.2 Compare firms facing similar economic decisions

Country comparisons should match the economic decision before comparing the outcome. A utility renewing infrastructure, a manufacturer adding capacity, and an early-stage platform seeking venture capital do not face interchangeable financing problems. Suitable comparison groups would share an industry, listing stage, approximate firm age, and investment horizon. These controls would not eliminate every difference, but they would make the remaining contrast easier to interpret. Public and private firms should be analyzed separately where disclosure and capital access differ materially.

Financial variables also need common definitions. Leverage can refer to total liabilities, interest-bearing debt, book ratios, or market ratios. Cash measures can include restricted balances that are not readily available for investment. Distress scores may be designed for different types of firms.

Researchers should state these choices before presenting cross-country estimates and test whether conclusions survive reasonable alternatives. Differences caused by measurement should not be presented as differences in founder behavior.

12.3 Use transitions and shocks with explicit assumptions

A promising design would follow firms through founder succession while comparing them with firms whose leadership does not change. However, succession is rarely arbitrary. Retirement, ill health, poor performance, financing pressure, or a planned strategic change can affect both the transition and subsequent outcomes. A credible analysis must investigate the conditions leading to the event. Merely adding firm fixed effects does not remove time-varying reasons for changing leaders.

An event study could display investment, financing, and operating outcomes before and after succession. Its purpose would be to expose the timing of differences, including whether deterioration began before the appointment. Difference-in-differences estimates would require a defensible comparison group and a plausible account of parallel trends. Where the timing of transitions varies, the method should accommodate heterogeneous effects across cohorts. Matching or weighting can support these comparisons on observed characteristics, but neither creates random assignment nor resolves unmeasured succession motives.

Monetary tightening, credit-market disruptions, or regulatory changes offer another source of variation. Their usefulness depends on exposure. A firm refinancing large obligations next year may face a different shock from one with long-dated fixed-rate debt. Researchers could examine whether founder status moderates responses after accounting for pre-existing maturity and liquidity positions. They should separate the effect of entering a shock with a particular balance sheet from the effect of decisions made during the shock. These are related questions with different implications for leadership.

12.4 Test mechanisms and meaningful outcomes

Future work should connect proposed mechanisms to observable decisions. An explanation based on control preservation predicts attention to voting dilution and the rights attached to funding. An explanation based on long-term commitment predicts continuity in valuable investment, rather than high cash balances alone. An explanation based on overconfidence requires a defensible belief measure and evidence that helps distinguish optimism from private information. Competing explanations should be tested within the same design where possible, rather than selected after observing the preferred result.

Outcomes should include more than annual returns and distress scores. Useful additions include investment completion, refinancing at maturity, covenant violations, actual defaults, and the time taken to restore operations after disruption. Where service continuity is relevant, it needs its own measure. Financial stability and operational reliability may be connected, but one should not be assumed from the other. Country differences in reporting also need attention, because a missing default record is not necessarily evidence that no default occurred.

Finally, researchers should report uncertainty and distributional effects. A policy may help older firms while limiting growth in younger ones, or benefit controlling shareholders while reducing minority investors' returns. Results for median firms may conceal severe losses in a small vulnerable group. A useful comparison would therefore explain who benefits, under what conditions, and over which horizon. This would move the discussion from identifying a founder premium or discount toward understanding the decisions that create it.

13. Implications for founders, boards, and providers of finance

For founders, the review suggests evaluating financial policies as a connected set. A target debt ratio is difficult to assess without considering the cash needed for operations, the maturity of obligations, and the expected timing of investment returns. Founders should make the purpose of retained liquidity clear and specify circumstances in which it would be invested, distributed, or used to reduce debt. The purpose is to make financial flexibility a deliberate policy that can be reassessed as circumstances change. These are reasoned implications of the synthesis, not interventions proven effective across all reviewed countries.

For boards, founder identity is an incomplete basis for either confidence or concern. Directors need to understand how proposals are evaluated and how contrary information reaches the decision maker. An investment memorandum can state the demand assumptions, downside funding needs, and conditions for revising or stopping a project. Independent review is especially useful when the founder's personal attachment to a project is strong. The board can respect specialized knowledge while still requiring a financing plan that remains workable if forecasts are wrong.

Succession planning should cover financial relationships and practical authority. A successor needs access to information, staff, and the institutions that support funding. Keeping a founder in an advisory role may preserve knowledge, but unclear authority can undermine accountability. Boards should specify which decisions the successor controls and how disagreements are resolved. In family firms, an open assessment of potential successors can help distinguish continuity of ownership from entitlement to executive office.

Lenders and investors should assess the firm behind the founder's reputation. Relevant questions concern reporting quality, the destination of funds, related-party exposures, and the capacity to meet obligations under stress. A conservative balance sheet can support resilience, but it may also reflect an inability to finance growth. A high-growth strategy can create value, but it requires scrutiny of expected returns and funding commitments. Evaluation should therefore consider the explanation for the policy alongside the ratio itself.

For country comparisons, practical advice should remain specific. A financing arrangement that works for a large U.S. listed utility may be unsuitable for a Bangladeshi manufacturer, an Italian family firm undergoing succession, or a young Chinese platform. The useful lesson is to examine which constraints and governance arrangements make a policy workable. Importing a preferred leverage target or leadership model without that analysis would go beyond what the evidence supports.

14. Conclusion

Founder CEOs can influence corporate finance through their knowledge, ownership incentives, beliefs, and authority over strategic choices. The research reviewed here associates founder and family involvement with a range of investment, financing, and performance outcomes. Those findings vary across samples and decision domains. North America, Europe, and Asia each contain varied leadership arrangements, and the available studies do not identify a common regional effect after holding all relevant conditions constant.

The most useful comparison links leadership to the choices available in a particular setting. U.S. and Canadian evidence highlights variation across established listed firms, regulated industries, and newly public businesses. European studies add evidence on active family involvement, control-preserving finance, access to credit lines, and leadership transitions. Research from selected Asian economies shows why control arrangements, growth opportunities, group membership, and succession require separate attention. Evidence on manufacturing finance and monetary tightening adds context for interpreting capital structure and financial buffers, while remaining distinct from direct tests of founder leadership.

The review's central conclusion is conditional: founder discretion is more likely to support durable financial performance when relevant knowledge, disciplined challenge, and appropriate funding operate together. This is an organizing proposition for research, rather than a demonstrated universal rule. Better comparative evidence will require common leadership definitions, comparable firms, careful attention to selection, and outcomes that capture actual financial and operating continuity. Such work would help explain when founder involvement preserves valuable capabilities and when it exposes the business to avoidable financial risk.

REFERENCES

- Abebe, M. A., Li, P., Acharya, K., & Daspit, J. J. (2020). The founder chief executive officer: A review of current insights and directions for future research. *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 28*(6), 406–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12348
- Akhter, A., & Maruf-Ul-Alam, M. (2019). Determinants of optimal capital structure: An empirical study on manufacturing companies in Bangladesh. *Journal of Banking & Financial Services, 11*(2), 225–252.
- 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), Article 531. https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18100531
- 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. https://wp.aabri.com/manuscripts/264136.pdf
- Alam, M. M. U., Nazrul, T., & Alam, M. A. U. (2026). Corporate liquidity and firm resilience during monetary tightening cycles. *Financial Markets, Institutions and Risks, 10*(3), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.61093/fmir.10(3).28-48.2026
- Almeida, H., Campello, M., & Weisbach, M. S. (2004). The cash flow sensitivity of cash. *Journal of Finance, 59*(4), 1777–1804. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2004.00679.x
- Altman, E. I. (1968). Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy. *Journal of Finance, 23*(4), 589–609. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1968.tb00843.x
- Amore, M. D., Minichilli, A., & Corbetta, G. (2011). How do managerial successions shape corporate financial policies in family firms? *Journal of Corporate Finance, 17*(4), 1016–1027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2011.05.002
- Amore, M. D., Pelucco, V., & Quarato, F. (2022). Family ownership during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Banking & Finance, 135*, Article 106385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2021.106385
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00567
- Andres, C. (2008). Large shareholders and firm performance—An empirical examination of founding-family ownership. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 14*(4), 431–445. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2008.05.003
- Bates, T. W., Kahle, K. M., & Stulz, R. M. (2009). Why do U.S. firms hold so much more cash than they used to? *Journal of Finance, 64*(5), 1985–2021. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01492.x

- Bennedsen, M., Nielsen, K. M., Pérez-González, F., & Wolfenzon, D. (2007). Inside the family firm: The role of families in succession decisions and performance. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 122*(2), 647–691. https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.122.2.647
- Bertrand, M., & Schoar, A. (2003). Managing with style: The effect of managers on firm policies. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118*(4), 1169–1208. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355303322552775
- Booth, L., Aivazian, V., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2001). Capital structures in developing countries. *Journal of Finance, 56*(1), 87–130. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00320
- Campello, M., Giambona, E., Graham, J. R., & Harvey, C. R. (2012). Access to liquidity and corporate investment in Europe during the financial crisis. *Review of Finance, 16*(2), 323–346. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfr030
- Choi, Y. R., Zahra, S. A., Yoshikawa, T., & Han, B. H. (2015). Family ownership and R&D investment: The role of growth opportunities and business group membership. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(5), 1053–1061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.10.007
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J. P. H., & Lang, L. H. P. (2002). Disentangling the incentive and entrenchment effects of large shareholdings. *Journal of Finance, 57*(6), 2741–2771. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00511
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., & Lang, L. H. P. (2000). The separation of ownership and control in East Asian corporations. *Journal of Financial Economics, 58*(1–2), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(00)00067-2
- Croci, E., Doukas, J. A., & Gonenc, H. (2011). Family control and financing decisions. *European Financial Management, 17*(5), 860–897. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-036X.2011.00631.x
- Custódio, C., & Metzger, D. (2014). Financial expert CEOs: CEO's work experience and firm's financial policies. *Journal of Financial Economics, 114*(1), 125–154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.06.002
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 20–47. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180258
- Dittmar, A., & Mahrt-Smith, J. (2007). Corporate governance and the value of cash holdings. *Journal of Financial Economics, 83*(3), 599–634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2005.12.006
- Fahlenbrach, R. (2009). Founder-CEOs, investment decisions, and stock market performance. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 44*(2), 439–466. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109009090139
- Frank, M. Z., & Goyal, V. K. (2009). Capital structure decisions: Which factors are reliably important? *Financial Management, 38*(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-053X.2009.01026.x
- Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Haynes, K. T., Núñez-Nickel, M., Jacobson, K. J. L., & Moyano-Fuentes, J. (2007). Socioemotional wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 52*(1), 106–137. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.52.1.106
- Graham, J. R., & Harvey, C. R. (2001). The theory and practice of corporate finance: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Financial Economics, 60*(2–3), 187–243. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(01)00044-7
- Graham, J. R., Harvey, C. R., & Puri, M. (2013). Managerial attitudes and corporate actions. *Journal of Financial Economics, 109*(1), 103–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.01.010
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(2), 193–206. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628
- Haque, F., Arun, T. G., & Kirkpatrick, C. (2011). Corporate governance and capital structure in developing countries: A case study of Bangladesh. *Applied Economics, 43*(6), 673–681. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840802599909
- Harford, J., Mansi, S. A., & Maxwell, W. F. (2008). Corporate governance and firm cash holdings in the US. *Journal of Financial Economics, 87*(3), 535–555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.04.002
- Islam, R., & Maruf-Ul-Alam, M. (2021). Capital structure and firms' performance: Evidence from manufacturing sector of Bangladesh. *Jagannath University Journal of Business Studies, 9*(1 & 2), 61–90.
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
- Kannan-Narasimhan, R., Wang, R., & Zhu, P. (2023). Founder versus agent CEOs: Effects of founder status and power on firm innovation and cost of capital. *Journal of Business Research, 167*, Article 114180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114180
- Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2000). Is group affiliation profitable in emerging markets? An analysis of diversified Indian business groups. *Journal of Finance, 55*(2), 867–891. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00229
- Lins, K. V., Volpin, P., & Wagner, H. F. (2013). Does family control matter? International evidence from the 2008–2009 financial crisis. *Review of Financial Studies, 26*(10), 2583–2619. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hht044
- Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2005). CEO overconfidence and corporate investment. *Journal of Finance, 60*(6), 2661–2700. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2005.00813.x
- Malmendier, U., Tate, G., & Yan, J. (2011). Overconfidence and early-life experiences: The effect of managerial traits on corporate financial policies. *Journal of Finance, 66*(5), 1687–1733. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2011.01685.x
- Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2013). Imprinting: Toward a multilevel theory. *Academy of Management Annals, 7*(1), 193–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2013.766076
- Maury, B. (2006). Family ownership and firm performance: Empirical evidence from Western European corporations. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 12*(2), 321–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2005.02.002

- Mehrotra, V., Morck, R., Shim, J., & Wiwattanakantang, Y. (2013). Adoptive expectations: Rising sons in Japanese family firms. *Journal of Financial Economics, 108*(3), 840–854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.01.011
- Miller, D., Le Breton-Miller, I., Lester, R. H., & Cannella, A. A., Jr. (2007). Are family firms really superior performers? *Journal of Corporate Finance, 13*(5), 829–858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2007.03.004
- Myers, S. C., & Majluf, N. S. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics, 13*(2), 187–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(84)90023-0
- Pérez-González, F. (2006). Inherited control and firm performance. *American Economic Review, 96*(5), 1559–1588. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1559
- Saito, T. (2008). Family firms and firm performance: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies, 22*(4), 620–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjie.2008.06.001
- Sraer, D., & Thesmar, D. (2007). Performance and behavior of family firms: Evidence from the French stock market. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 5*(4), 709–751. https://doi.org/10.1162/JEEA.2007.5.4.709
- Ullah, S., & Zhang, D. (2016). The influence of founder status on firm performance: Empirical evidence from Canadian IPO firms. *International Journal of Economics and Finance, 8*(11), 134–149. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v8n11p134
- Villalonga, B., & Amit, R. (2006). How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value? *Journal of Financial Economics, 80*(2), 385–417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.12.005
- Yeh, Y.-H., Lee, T.-S., & Woidtke, T. (2001). Family control and corporate governance: Evidence from Taiwan. *International Review of Finance, 2*(1–2), 21–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2443.00014
- Young, M. N., Peng, M. W., Ahlstrom, D., Bruton, G. D., & Jiang, Y. (2008). Corporate governance in emerging economies: A review of the principal–principal perspective. *Journal of Management Studies, 45*(1), 196–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00752.x
- Zheng, H., Piao, X., & Park, S. (2021). The role of founder-CEO, human capital and legitimacy in venture capital financing in China's P2P lending industry. *Sustainability, 13*(4), Article 1625. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041625
- Zhong, X., Song, T., & Ren, L. (2023). The role of founder reign in explaining family firms' R&D investment: Evidence from China. *European Journal of Innovation Management, 26*(2), 422–445. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-01-2021-0068