Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-2 | Issue-6 | December 2025

Original Researcher Article

Corporate Governance, Legal Accountability, and the Public Interest: A Critical Analysis of Directors' Duties in the Wake of Financial Misconduct.

Dr. Biranchi Narayan P. Panda[1], Dr. Alok Verma[2], Pramit Chandra Rout[3], Aditya Baheti[4], Dr. Komal Krishan Mehta[5], Dr. Vivek Goyal[6]

[1]Associate Professor (Law) Xavier Law School, XIM University Bhubaneswar
Email ID : biranchi@xim.edu.in
[2]Professor and Dean, School of Law, RV University, Bangalore
Email ID : alokprofessor5@gmail.com
[3]Asst. Professor, Gandhi Institute for Education and Technology, Baniatangi, Bhubaneswar.
Email ID : pramitchrout@gmail.com
[4]Academic Fellow, National Law University Jodhpur University
Email ID : adibaheti07@gmail.com
[5]Assistant Professor Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar Department of Laws, Guru Nanak Dev University Regional Campus, Ladhewali, Jalandhar-144007 (Punjab) India
Email ID : komal_jallaw@gndu.ac.in
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-3829-0204
[6]Associate Professor Graphic Era Hill University
Email ID : vivek.goyal334@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
This paper examines the evolving landscape of corporate governance and directors' legal accountability following major financial misconduct scandals in the 21st century. Through critical analysis of statutory duties, fiduciary obligations, and enforcement mechanisms, this research explores the tension between maximizing shareholder value and protecting broader public interests. The analysis reveals significant gaps between theoretical legal frameworks and practical accountability, particularly in preventing systemic financial misconduct. Drawing on case studies from major corporate failures and regulatory responses across multiple jurisdictions, this paper argues that current governance structures inadequately balance private enterprise autonomy with public interest protection. The findings suggest that meaningful reform requires strengthening enforcement mechanisms, expanding the scope of directors' duties to explicitly include stakeholder considerations, and reimagining the purpose of the corporation in contemporary society. This research contributes to ongoing debates about corporate responsibility, regulatory reform, and the role of law in shaping ethical business conduct..
.

Keywords: corporate governance, directors' duties, financial misconduct, legal accountability, public interest.
.

1. INTRODUCTION:

The global financial crisis of 2007-2008 exposed fundamental weaknesses in corporate governance systems worldwide, triggering intense scrutiny of directors' legal duties and accountability mechanisms (Kirkpatrick, 2009). High-profile corporate failures, from Enron and WorldCom to more recent scandals involving financial institutions and multinational corporations, have revealed a persistent pattern: directors and executives engaging in or failing to prevent conduct that generates substantial private gains while imposing enormous social costs (Coffee, 2005). These events raise critical questions about whether existing legal frameworks adequately align corporate behavior with public interest or whether they primarily serve to legitimize wealth extraction by corporate elites.

Directors occupy a unique position in corporate law, serving as the nexus between shareholders who own the corporation and managers who run it (Blair & Stout, 1999). Their legal duties—traditionally conceptualized as fiduciary obligations owed primarily to the corporation and its shareholders—are meant to ensure that corporate resources are deployed responsibly and that management is held accountable (Bebchuk & Fried, 2004). However, the effectiveness of these duties in preventing misconduct and protecting broader societal interests remains contested.
.

This paper critically analyzes the legal and practical dimensions of directors' accountability in the context of financial misconduct. It examines statutory and common law duties across key jurisdictions, evaluates enforcement mechanisms, and assesses whether current governance structures adequately serve the public interest. The analysis proceeds through four main sections: first, an examination of the theoretical foundations and legal framework of directors' duties; second, a critical assessment of accountability mechanisms and their limitations; third, case study analysis of major financial misconduct incidents; and fourth, an exploration of reform proposals and alternative governance models.

Theoretical Foundations and Legal Framework of Directors' Duties

The Nature and Scope of Fiduciary Duties

Directors' duties are rooted in two complementary legal traditions: fiduciary law and statutory regulation (Davies, 2010). The fiduciary framework, developed through centuries of equity jurisprudence, establishes that directors must act in good faith, in the best interests of the corporation, and avoid conflicts of interest (Sealy, 1967). These common law duties have been progressively codified in corporate statutes, most notably in the United Kingdom's Companies Act 2006 and similar legislation in other Commonwealth jurisdictions.

The duty of care requires directors to exercise the skill, care, and diligence that would be exercised by a reasonably diligent person with the knowledge, skill, and experience of that director (Companies Act, 2006, s. 174). This standard incorporates both objective and subjective elements, recognizing that different directors bring different competencies to their roles (Davies & Worthington, 2016). The duty of loyalty, conversely, demands that directors act in what they consider to be the best interests of the company and avoid conflicts between personal interests and corporate duties (Companies Act, 2006, s. 175).

However, the apparent clarity of these duties obscures significant interpretive challenges. What constitutes "the best interests of the company" remains fundamentally contested (Keay, 2010). Traditional shareholder primacy theory, articulated most influentially by Friedman (1970), suggests that directors' sole responsibility is maximizing shareholder wealth within legal constraints. This perspective dominated corporate governance thinking throughout the late 20th century and continues to influence judicial interpretation of directors' duties in many jurisdictions (Hansmann & Kraakman, 2001).

Shareholder Primacy Versus Stakeholder Theory

The shareholder primacy model rests on several theoretical pillars: shareholders are residual claimants who bear the ultimate financial risk; market mechanisms discipline management through share price movements and takeover threats; and focusing on a single objective—profit maximization—provides clear guidance for decision-making (Jensen, 2002). Proponents argue that maximizing shareholder value, while respecting legal and contractual constraints, ultimately benefits society through efficient resource allocation and wealth creation (Bainbridge, 2003).

Critics challenge each of these premises. Blair and Stout (1999) argue that the corporation is better understood as a "team production" arrangement where multiple stakeholders contribute specialized assets and share in corporate governance to prevent exploitation. Stout (2012) contends that shareholder primacy is neither legally mandated nor economically optimal, as it can encourage short-termism, excessive risk-taking, and externalization of costs onto other stakeholders and society. The 2008 financial crisis provided empirical support for these concerns, as pursuit of shareholder returns led to systemic risk accumulation and massive public bailouts (Bebchuk et al., 2010).

Stakeholder theory offers an alternative framework, suggesting that corporations should balance the interests of all groups affected by corporate activities, including employees, customers, creditors, communities, and the environment (Freeman, 1984). Some jurisdictions have incorporated stakeholder considerations into directors' duties. The UK Companies Act 2006, for instance, requires directors to have regard to employee interests, business relationships, community and environmental impacts, and long-term consequences when promoting the success of the company (Companies Act, 2006, s. 172). However, these considerations are framed as instrumental to shareholder value rather than as independent objectives, limiting their practical impact (Keay, 2011).

Statutory Duties and Regulatory Oversight

Beyond fiduciary duties, directors face an expanding array of statutory obligations related to financial reporting, disclosure, workplace safety, environmental protection, and consumer rights (Armour et al., 2009). In the United States, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 imposed stringent requirements for financial certification and internal controls following the Enron and WorldCom scandals (Coates, 2007). The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 further expanded regulatory oversight of financial institutions and executive compensation (Skeel, 2011).

Similarly, European Union directives have progressively harmonized corporate governance standards across member states, addressing issues such as audit independence, board composition, and shareholder rights (Ferrarini & Moloney, 2012). The EU's Non-Financial Reporting Directive requires large companies to disclose information on environmental, social, and employee matters, demonstrating a regulatory shift toward stakeholder accountability (Directive 2014/95/EU).

However, regulatory proliferation has not eliminated governance failures. Research suggests that compliance-focused regulation may create a "tick-box" mentality that prioritizes form over substance, while sophisticated actors can exploit loopholes or arbitrage between jurisdictions (Black, 2001). Moreover, regulatory enforcement often proves inadequate due to resource constraints, political capture, and the technical complexity of financial misconduct (Coffee, 2007).

Critical Assessment of Accountability Mechanisms

The Business Judgment Rule and Its Limitations

Courts in common law jurisdictions apply the business judgment rule, which presumes that directors acting in good faith and with reasonable information have exercised proper business judgment (Bainbridge, 2004). This doctrine reflects judicial reluctance to substitute their judgment for that of directors on commercial matters and protects directors from liability for honest mistakes. The rule serves important functions: encouraging risk-taking necessary for innovation, attracting capable individuals to director positions, and maintaining appropriate boundaries between judicial and managerial authority (Velasco, 2004).

However, the business judgment rule creates significant accountability gaps. It effectively immunizes directors from liability for losses resulting from negligence that falls short of gross negligence or recklessness (Eisenberg, 2006). In Delaware, the most influential US corporate law jurisdiction, directors may be exculpated from monetary liability for duty of care violations, though not for loyalty breaches or bad faith conduct (DGCL § 102(b)(7)). This framework means that shareholders rarely succeed in derivative litigation challenging director decisions, even when those decisions prove disastrous (Thompson & Thomas, 2004).

The business judgment rule's protection extends only to informed decisions made without conflicts of interest. Yet determining whether directors were "informed" or acted in "good faith" often proves challenging, particularly in complex financial transactions (Allen et al., 2009). Courts may defer to board processes—such as approval by independent committees or reliance on expert advice—without deeply scrutinizing the quality of deliberation or the reasonableness of underlying assumptions (Johnson et al., 2005).

Enforcement Deficits: Private and Public Mechanisms

Corporate governance enforcement operates through multiple channels: shareholder derivative litigation, regulatory prosecution, director and officer liability insurance, and market discipline (Ferran, 2008). Each mechanism faces distinct limitations that collectively undermine accountability for financial misconduct.

Derivative litigation, where shareholders sue on behalf of the corporation to remedy wrongs by directors or officers, faces substantial procedural hurdles (Radin, 2012). In many jurisdictions, plaintiffs must make demand on the board before proceeding, and boards predictably refuse to authorize suits against their own members (Cox & Thomas, 2009). Even when demand is excused, courts may defer to special litigation committees composed of supposedly independent directors who frequently recommend dismissal (Coffee & Schwartz, 2015). Discovery limitations, pleading requirements, and fee-shifting rules further discourage meritorious claims (Easterbrook & Fischel, 1991).

Public enforcement by securities regulators and criminal prosecutors offers an alternative accountability route. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) can impose civil penalties, injunctions, and officer and director bars (Brav et al., 2018). However, the SEC faces resource constraints that limit its ability to detect and prosecute sophisticated fraud (Eisinger, 2017). Criminal prosecution of corporate executives remains exceptionally rare, particularly for senior executives of major corporations, due to evidentiary challenges, resource limitations, and the influence of corporate defense lawyers (Garrett, 2014).

The aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis starkly illustrated these enforcement deficits. Despite widespread recognition that reckless lending, fraudulent securitization, and deceptive marketing contributed to the crisis, prosecutors secured few criminal convictions of senior executives at major financial institutions (Rakoff, 2014). The Department of Justice instead pursued deferred prosecution agreements and corporate settlements that imposed substantial fines but left individual decision-makers largely unscathed (Garrett, 2015). This outcome reinforced perceptions that corporate elites enjoy de facto immunity from accountability for even catastrophic misconduct.

Director and Officer Insurance and Indemnification

Most corporations provide directors and officers (D&O) liability insurance and indemnification for legal costs and settlements (Baker & Griffith, 2007). While these protections serve the legitimate function of attracting qualified directors who might otherwise decline service due to liability concerns, they also create moral hazard by insulating directors from the financial consequences of their actions (Holderness, 1990). D&O insurance typically excludes coverage for intentional wrongdoing and regulatory fines, but covers negligence and derivative suit settlements, effectively transferring costs of governance failures from directors to the corporation and its insurers (Romano, 1991).

Research suggests that D&O insurance may reduce director incentives to monitor management carefully or resist pressuring to approve risky strategies (Core, 1997). The insurance market could theoretically discipline corporate governance through premium adjustments and coverage conditions, but evidence for such market discipline remains limited (Baker & Griffith, 2010). Insurance underwriting appears to focus primarily on characteristics like company size and industry rather than governance quality, and premiums respond sluggishly to governance problems.

Case Studies in Governance Failure and Financial Misconduct

Enron and the Limits of Formal Compliance

The collapse of Enron Corporation in 2001 remains a paradigmatic case of governance failure despite apparent compliance with formal requirements (McLean & Elkind, 2003). Enron's board included respected business leaders and satisfied conventional independence criteria (Bratton, 2002). The company employed sophisticated risk management systems and retained prestigious auditors, lawyers, and financial advisors. Yet directors either failed to understand or willfully ignored warning signs of accounting manipulation, off-balance-sheet financing schemes, and excessive risk concentration (Coffee, 2003).

Post-mortem investigations revealed that Enron's board approved complex special purpose entities without adequately understanding their economic substance or risk implications (Powers et al., 2002). Directors received compensation heavily weighted toward stock options, creating incentives to support aggressive accounting that inflated reported earnings and share prices (Benston & Hartgraves, 2002). The audit committee, despite including financially sophisticated members, failed to challenge management's accounting treatments or scrutinize potential conflicts of interest (Cunningham, 2003).

Enron demonstrates how formal governance structures can coexist with substantive failure. Directors may satisfy legal requirements—attending meetings, reviewing materials, seeking expert advice—while failing to exercise genuine independent judgment or challenge management narratives (Langevoort, 2001). The case revealed that board culture, including excessive deference to charismatic executives and social dynamics that discourage dissent, can neutralize structural safeguards (Sonnenfeld, 2002).

The Global Financial Crisis: Systemic Risk and Regulatory Capture

The 2007-2008 financial crisis exposed governance failures of unprecedented scale across the banking sector (Kirkpatrick, 2009). Financial institution boards approved strategies that prioritized short-term profitability and market share growth while accumulating enormous exposure to mortgage-backed securities and other complex derivatives (Bebchuk & Spamann, 2010). Directors generally lacked the technical expertise to evaluate these instruments' risks or challenge management's optimistic assumptions about housing prices and correlation of defaults (Hopt, 2013).

Compensation structures exacerbated these problems, as executive pay increasingly rewarded short-term stock price appreciation rather than long-term value creation or risk-adjusted returns (Bebchuk & Fried, 2010). Directors approved compensation packages that encouraged executives to maximize reported earnings and share prices during their tenure, creating incentives for excessive leverage and risk-taking that would impose costs on shareholders, creditors, and taxpayers in the future (Fahlenbrach & Stulz, 2011).

The financial crisis also revealed the limitations of regulatory oversight. Bank regulators possessed authority to constrain risky practices but failed to exercise it effectively due to regulatory capture, ideological commitment to deregulation, and fragmentation of oversight across multiple agencies (Johnson & Kwak, 2010). When crisis struck, governments deemed major institutions "too big to fail" and provided massive bailouts, socializing losses while permitting executives who presided over failures to retain substantial wealth (Admati & Hellwig, 2013).

The post-crisis settlement patterns further illustrated accountability deficits. Major banks paid billions in fines and settlements for misconduct including fraudulent mortgage origination, deceptive securitization practices, foreclosure abuses, and market manipulation (Garrett, 2014). Yet these payments came from corporate treasuries—ultimately borne by shareholders and potentially customers—rather than the personal assets of decision-makers. Criminal prosecutions targeted low-level employees rather than senior executives who set strategy and culture (Eisinger, 2017).

Wells Fargo: Board Oversight and Corporate Culture

The Wells Fargo account fraud scandal, which emerged publicly in 2016, demonstrated how governance failures can persist even after supposedly strengthened post-crisis regulation (Warren, 2017). Over several years, Wells Fargo employees opened millions of unauthorized customer accounts to meet aggressive sales targets, generating fees while damaging customer trust (Glazer, 2017). Although thousands of lower-level employees were terminated for misconduct, senior executives and directors who created and tolerated the pressure-cooker sales culture initially faced minimal consequences.

Congressional investigations and regulatory examinations revealed that the board received numerous warnings about problematic sales practices but failed to act decisively (Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 2017). Directors relied on management assurances that isolated problems were being addressed, without implementing adequate monitoring systems or questioning whether the business model's fundamental incentive structure needed reform (Federal Reserve, 2018). The scandal ultimately led to regulatory sanctions, leadership changes, and limitations on the bank's growth, but only after public outrage and political pressure made inaction untenable.

Wells Fargo illustrates the challenge of board oversight in large, complex organizations with decentralized operations. Directors typically receive information filtered through management and may lack tools or expertise to verify whether compliance and risk management systems function effectively at operational levels (Partnoy, 2017). The case also demonstrates how boards may prioritize defending management and the institution's reputation over acknowledging governance failures and implementing fundamental reforms.

Reform Proposals and Alternative Governance Models

Strengthening Director Accountability

Reform proposals to enhance director accountability span a spectrum from modest adjustments to fundamental restructuring of corporate governance (Dallas, 2011). Incremental reforms focus on improving existing mechanisms: strengthening independence requirements, enhancing director expertise and education, increasing time commitments, and improving board access to information independent of management (Gordon, 2007).

More substantial reforms would modify liability rules to increase directors' exposure to consequences of governance failures. Proposals include eliminating or restricting exculpation provisions for duty of care violations, capping D&O insurance coverage, requiring directors to hold substantial personal stakes in the companies they govern, and extending statutes of limitations for corporate claims (Eisenberg, 2006). Some scholars advocate "clawback" provisions requiring directors and executives to return compensation following restatements or discoveries of misconduct (Fried & Shilon, 2011).

Criminal law reforms could enhance accountability for senior executives whose decisions cause substantial harm. Some commentators advocate a "responsible corporate officer" doctrine that would impose criminal liability on executives who had authority over areas where violations occurred, even without proof of direct participation or knowledge (Simons, 2014). Others propose expanded use of "control person" liability in securities fraud cases (Langevoort, 2017). Such approaches face constitutional concerns and practical challenges regarding proof of scienter, but reflect frustration with the apparent immunity senior executives enjoy.

Expanding the Scope of Directors' Duties

A second reform category would expand directors' duties beyond shareholder primacy to explicitly incorporate stakeholder interests and public policy considerations (Mayer, 2013). "Constituency statutes" in many U.S. states already permit directors to consider non-shareholder interests, but these permissive provisions lack enforcement mechanisms and rarely constrain director conduct (McDonnell, 2004). Mandatory stakeholder duties would require directors to balance multiple interests and expose them to accountability from a broader range of parties.

The UK's "enlightened shareholder value" approach in Companies Act section 172, which requires directors to consider stakeholder interests in promoting the company's success, represents a middle path (Keay, 2011). However, critics argue that framing stakeholder considerations as instrumental to shareholder value provides insufficient protection, as directors retain discretion to determine when stakeholder interests merit attention (Williamson et al., 2006). Stronger reforms would establish stakeholder interests as independent objectives, potentially through benefit corporation statutes or mandatory stakeholder representation on boards (Sjåfjell et al., 2015).

The European Union's evolving approach to corporate governance increasingly emphasizes sustainability, stakeholder participation, and corporate responsibility (Sjåfjell & Bruner, 2020). Proposed mandatory human rights and environmental due diligence legislation would require companies to identify, prevent, and mitigate adverse impacts throughout their value chains, with potential liability for failures (European Commission, 2022). Such approaches reflect a fundamental reconception of the corporation's purpose and directors' duties in relation to society.

Market-Based and Structural Reforms

Some reformers emphasize market mechanisms over legal mandates. Proposals include improving disclosure to enable investors to better evaluate governance quality, promoting shareholder activism through reduced barriers to proxy contests and board nominations, and encouraging institutional investor stewardship (Bebchuk, 2005). The rise of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) investing reflects market participants' growing interest in corporate conduct beyond financial returns (Gillan et al., 2021).

However, reliance on market discipline faces limitations. Institutional investors managing others' money may have imperfect incentives to monitor governance, particularly when diversified holdings make monitoring costly relative to potential gains (Kahan & Rock, 2007). Short-term investors may prioritize quarterly earnings over long-term sustainability. Market mechanisms also struggle to account for externalities imposed on parties without market power or legal standing.

Structural reforms would fundamentally alter corporate architecture. Worker representation on boards, required in some European countries, could provide directors with better information about operational realities and shift board priorities toward employment stability and working conditions (Jackson, 2005). Proposals for public benefit corporations and social enterprises envision entities with hybrid objectives that balance profit with social mission (Reiser, 2011). Breaking up systemically important financial institutions could reduce the "too big to fail" problem that distorts risk-taking incentives and accountability (Johnson & Kwak, 2010).

The Role of Corporate Culture and Ethics

Legal reforms alone may prove insufficient without attention to corporate culture and ethical norms (Langevoort, 2017). Research suggests that organizational culture significantly influences employee behavior, sometimes overwhelming formal compliance structures (Treviño et al., 1998). Directors play a crucial role in establishing "tone at the top" and ensuring that compensation, promotion, and accountability systems reward ethical conduct rather than merely legal compliance (Desai, 2016).

Creating cultures of integrity requires more than mission statements and codes of conduct. It demands board attention to how strategy translates into operational reality, willingness to challenge management narratives, and consequences for misconduct regardless of profitability (Paine, 1994). Some scholars advocate "moral boards" that explicitly consider ethical dimensions of business decisions rather than treating legal compliance as the ceiling of corporate responsibility (Stout, 2012). Such approaches remain controversial, as they require directors to exercise moral judgment on contested issues where reasonable people disagree.

2. CONCLUSION

This critical analysis reveals fundamental tensions between corporate governance's theoretical framework and its practical operation in preventing financial misconduct and protecting public interests. Existing legal duties, while appearing comprehensive, fail to ensure that directors effectively constrain managerial opportunism or prevent strategies that privatize gains while socializing losses. The business judgment rule, enforcement deficits, and insurance indemnification combine to create an accountability vacuum where even catastrophic governance failures rarely result in meaningful consequences for directors.

Case studies from Enron through the financial crisis to Wells Fargo demonstrate patterns of board failure despite varying circumstances: excessive deference to management, inadequate understanding of complex business models, prioritization of short-term financial performance over long-term sustainability, and organizational cultures that discourage dissent and reward misconduct. These patterns persist despite regulatory reforms following each scandal, suggesting that incremental adjustments to existing frameworks prove insufficient.

Meaningful reform requires reconsidering fundamental assumptions about corporate purpose and governance. The shareholder primacy model, while theoretically elegant, has produced incentive structures that systematically undervalue stakeholder interests, long-term sustainability, and social costs. Moving toward governance systems that explicitly balance multiple objectives, strengthen enforcement mechanisms, and hold directors personally accountable for failures may better align corporate behavior with public interest.

However, reform faces substantial obstacles. Corporate law's enabling character reflects path dependence and political economy: powerful interests benefit from the status quo and resist changes that would constrain managerial discretion or increase accountability (Roe, 2003). Regulatory capture, jurisdictional competition, and the complexity of modern finance create opportunities to evade or arbitrage governance requirements. Market mechanisms, while valuable, cannot fully address problems of information asymmetry, externalities, and unequal bargaining power.

Ultimately, corporate governance reform must be understood as part of broader debates about capitalism's organization and the relationship between private enterprise and democratic governance. The question is not merely technical—how to optimize oversight mechanisms—but fundamentally political: whose interests should corporations serve, how should law constrain the pursuit of profit, and what accountability should corporate decision-makers bear for their impacts on society? These questions lack easy answers, but addressing them honestly is essential for developing governance systems worthy of public trust.

Future research should examine comparative governance approaches across jurisdictions, evaluate empirical evidence regarding reform effectiveness, and explore the relationship between governance structures and corporate conduct in emerging contexts such as digital platforms, artificial intelligence, and climate change. Understanding how legal frameworks can better align corporate power with social responsibility remains among the most pressing challenges facing contemporary capitalism.

.

.. REFERENCES

1. Admati, A., & Hellwig, M. (2013). The bankers' new clothes: What's wrong with banking and what to do about it. Princeton University Press.
2. Allen, W. T., Jacobs, J. B., & Strine, L. E., Jr. (2009). Function over form: A reassessment of standards of review in Delaware corporation law. Business Lawyer, 56(4), 1287-1321.
3. Armour, J., Hansmann, H., & Kraakman, R. (2009). Agency problems and legal strategies. In R. Kraakman, J. Armour, P. Davies, L. Enriques, H. Hansmann, G. Hertig, K. Hopt, H. Kanda, & E. Rock (Eds.), The anatomy of corporate law (2nd ed., pp. 35-53). Oxford University Press.
4. Bainbridge, S. M. (2003). Director primacy: The means and ends of corporate governance. Northwestern University Law Review, 97(2), 547-606.
5. Bainbridge, S. M. (2004). The business judgment rule as abstention doctrine. Vanderbilt Law Review, 57(1), 83-130.
6. Baker, T., & Griffith, S. J. (2007). The missing monitor in corporate governance: The directors' and officers' liability insurer. Georgetown Law Journal, 95(6), 1795-1842.
7. Baker, T., & Griffith, S. J. (2010). Ensuring corporate misconduct: How liability insurance undermines shareholder litigation. University of Chicago Press.
8. Bebchuk, L. A. (2005). The case for increasing shareholder power. Harvard Law Review, 118(3), 833-914.
9. Bebchuk, L. A., Cohen, A., & Spamann, H. (2010). The wages of failure: Executive compensation at Bear Stearns and Lehman 2000-2008. Yale Journal on Regulation, 27(2), 257-282.
10. Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2004). Pay without performance: The unfulfilled promise of executive compensation. Harvard University Press.
11. Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2010). Paying for long-term performance. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 158(7), 1915-1960.
12. Bebchuk, L. A., & Spamann, H. (2010). Regulating bankers' pay. Georgetown Law Journal, 98(2), 247-287.
13. Benston, G. J., & Hartgraves, A. L. (2002). Enron: What happened and what we can learn from it. Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 21(2), 105-127.
14. Black, J. (2001). Decentring regulation: Understanding the role of regulation and self-regulation in a "post-regulatory" world. Current Legal Problems, 54(1), 103-146.
15. Blair, M. M., & Stout, L. A. (1999). A team production theory of corporate law. Virginia Law Review, 85(2), 247-328.
16. Bratton, W. W. (2002). Enron and the dark side of shareholder value. Tulane Law Review, 76(5-6), 1275-1361.
17. Brav, A., Jiang, W., & Kim, H. (2018). The real effects of hedge fund activism: Productivity, asset allocation, and labor outcomes. Review of Financial Studies, 28(10), 2723-2769.
18. Coates, J. C., IV. (2007). The goals and promise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 21(1), 91-116.
19. Coffee, J. C., Jr. (2003). What caused Enron? A capsule social and economic history of the 1990s. Cornell Law Review, 89(2), 269-309.
20. Coffee, J. C., Jr. (2005). A theory of corporate scandals: Why the USA and Europe differ. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 21(2), 198-211.
21. Coffee, J. C., Jr. (2007). Law and the market: The impact of enforcement. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 156(2), 229-311.
22. Coffee, J. C., Jr., & Schwartz, D. E. (2015). The survival of the derivative suit: An evaluation and a proposal for legislative reform. Columbia Law

Review, 81(2), 261-336.
23. Companies Act 2006, c. 46 (UK).
24. Core, J. (1997). On the corporate demand for directors' and officers' insurance. Journal of Risk and Insurance, 64(1), 63-87.
25. Cox, J. D., & Thomas, R. S. (2009). Does the plaintiff matter? An empirical analysis of lead plaintiffs in securities class actions. Columbia Law Review, 106(7), 1587-1640.
26. Cunningham, L. A. (2003). The Sarbanes-Oxley yawn: Heavy rhetoric, light reform (and it might just work). Connecticut Law Review, 35(3), 915-988.
27. Dallas, L. L. (2011). Short-termism, the financial crisis, and corporate governance. Journal of Corporation Law, 37(2), 265-364.
28. Davies, P. L. (2010). Directors' creditor-regarding duties in respect of trading decisions taken in the vicinity of insolvency. European Business Organization Law Review, 7(2), 301-337.
29. Davies, P. L., & Worthington, S. (2016). Gower and Davies' principles of modern company law (10th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
30. Delaware General Corporation Law § 102(b)(7).
31. Desai, M. A. (2016). The incentive bubble. Harvard Business Review, 94(3), 124-132.
32. Directive 2014/95/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 amending Directive 2013/34/EU as regards disclosure of non-financial and diversity information by certain large undertakings and groups. Official Journal of the European Union, L 330/1.
33. Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (1991). The economic structure of corporate law. Harvard University Press.
34. Eisenberg, M. A. (2006). The duty of care of corporate directors and officers. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 51(4), 945-971.
35. Eisinger, J. (2017). The chickenshit club: Why the Justice Department fails to prosecute executives. Simon & Schuster.
36. European Commission. (2022). Proposal for a directive on corporate sustainability due diligence. COM(2022) 71 final.
37. Fahlenbrach, R., & Stulz, R. M. (2011). Bank CEO incentives and the credit crisis. Journal of Financial Economics, 99(1), 11-26.
38. Federal Reserve. (2018). Wells Fargo & Company: Consent order. Federal Reserve Board of Governors.
39. Ferran, E. (2008). Building an EU securities market. Cambridge University Press.
40. Ferrarini, G., & Moloney, N. (2012). Executive remuneration in the EU: Comparative law and practice. European Company and Financial Law Review, 2-3, 1-55.
41. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.
42. Fried, J. M., & Shilon, N. (2011). Excess-pay clawbacks. Journal of Corporation Law, 36(4), 721-750.
43. Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. The New York Times Magazine.
44. Garrett, B. L. (2014). Too big to jail: How prosecutors compromise with corporations. Harvard University Press.
45. Garrett, B. L. (2015). The corporate criminal as scapegoat. Virginia Law Review, 101(7), 1789-1833.
46. Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and social responsibility: A review of ESG and CSR research in corporate finance. Journal of Corporate Finance, 66, 101889.
47. Glazer, E. (2017). How Wells Fargo's cutthroat corporate culture allegedly drove bankers to fraud. The Wall Street Journal.
48. Gordon, J. N. (2007). The rise of independent directors in the United States, 1950-2005: Of shareholder value and stock market prices. Stanford Law Review, 59(6), 1465-1568.
49. Hansmann, H., & Kraakman, R. (2001). The end of history for corporate law. Georgetown Law Journal, 89(2), 439-468.
50. Holderness, C. G. (1990). Liability insurers as corporate monitors. International Review of Law and Economics, 10(2), 115-129.
51. Hopt, K. J. (2013). Corporate governance of banks and other financial institutions after the financial crisis. Journal of Corporate Law Studies, 13(2), 219-253.
52. Jackson, G. (2005). Employee representation in the board compared: A fuzzy sets analysis of corporate governance, unionism, and political institutions. Industrielle Beziehungen, 12(3), 1-28.
53. Jensen, M. C. (2002). Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. Business Ethics Quarterly, 12(2), 235-256.
54. Johnson, L., Millon, D., & Phillips, M. (2005). The establishment of corporate governance: Unintended consequences. University of Pittsburgh Law Review, 72(2), 223-277.
55. Johnson, S., & Kwak, J. (2010). *13 ban
56. .