

**Enterprise Foundations:
Law, Taxation, Governance,
and Performance**

Other titles in Annals of Corporate Governance

The Social Purpose of the Modern Business Corporation

Peter J. Buckley

ISBN: 978-1-68083-874-9

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations: Internal Governance and External Legal Design

Wulf A. Kaal

ISBN: 978-1-68083-798-8

Decentralized Corporate Governance via Blockchain Technology

Wulf A. Kaal

ISBN: 978-1-68083-676-9

Corporate Governance in IPO Firms

Erik E. Lehmann and Silvio Vismara

ISBN: 978-1-68083-634-9

The Political and Governance Risks of Sovereign Wealth

Paul Rose

ISBN: 978-1-68083-624-0

Enterprise Foundations: Law, Taxation, Governance, and Performance

Steen Thomsen

Center for Corporate Governance
Copenhagen Business School and ECGI
Denmark
st.ccg@cbs.dk

Nikolaos Kavadis

Center for Corporate Governance
Copenhagen Business School
Denmark
nk.ccg@cbs.dk

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Annals of Corporate Governance

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
United States
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The preferred citation for this publication is

S. Thomsen and N. Kavadis. *Enterprise Foundations: Law, Taxation, Governance, and Performance*. Annals of Corporate Governance, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 227–333, 2022.

ISBN: 978-1-68083-943-2

© 2022 S. Thomsen and N. Kavadis

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

Annals of Corporate Governance
Volume 6, Issue 4, 2022
Editorial Board

Editors-in-Chief

Marc Goergen	Geoffrey Wood
IE Business School	Western University
Spain	Canada

Founding Editor

Douglas Cumming
Florida Atlantic University, USA

Associate Editors

Renee Adams
University of Oxford

Lucian Bebchuk
Harvard University

William Judge
Old Dominion University

Mark Roe
Harvard University

Rene Stulz
Ohio State University

James Westphal
University of Michigan

Editorial Scope

Topics

Annals of Corporate Governance publishes articles in the following topics:

- Boards of Directors
- Ownership
- National Corporate Governance Mechanisms
- Comparative Corporate Governance Systems
- Self Governance
- Teaching Corporate Governance

Information for Librarians

Annals of Corporate Governance, 2022, Volume 6, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 2381-6724. ISSN online version 2381-6732. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Why Denmark?	5
2	What is an Enterprise Foundation?	7
2.1	An Example: A. P. Møller Maersk	13
2.2	Types of Enterprise Foundations	15
3	Theory	19
3.1	Agency Theory	20
3.2	Non-Profit Theories	22
3.3	Foundation Ownership as a Commitment Mechanism	26
3.4	Commitment and Purpose	29
3.5	Why Are Enterprise Foundations So Rare?	30
3.6	Conclusion	31
4	Foundation Law	34
4.1	Supervision	45
4.2	Soft Law: Comply or Explain	47
5	Taxation	54
5.1	Taxation Principles	58
5.2	Economic Effects	65

6	Foundation Ownership and Firm Performance	72
7	Foundation Governance	82
8	Conclusion, Policy Implications, and Research Agenda	90
	Acknowledgments	96
	References	97

Enterprise Foundations: Law, Taxation, Governance, and Performance

Steen Thomsen¹ and Nikolaos Kavadis²

¹*Center for Corporate Governance, Copenhagen Business School and ECGI, Denmark; st.ccg@cbs.dk*

²*Center for Corporate Governance, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark; nk.ccg@cbs.dk*

ABSTRACT

Enterprise foundations are foundations, which own companies. While this structure is little known outside Northern Europe, a number of leading global companies such as Robert Bosch, Rolex, Carlsberg, Hershey, Ikea, the Wallenberg sphere or the Tata Group are ultimately owned by foundations. Aside from their economic significance, enterprise foundations have interesting governance characteristics including long-term ownership, the absence of a personal profit motive and the combination of business and philanthropy. Recently, they have attracted attention as a safeguard for a company purpose. In this monograph, we review the limited, but growing literature on the topic focusing on law, taxation, governance, and performance. We conclude by considering policy implications and avenues for research.

Keywords: enterprise foundations; economic performance; law; sustainability; corporate governance.

Steen Thomsen and Nikolaos Kavadis (2022), “Enterprise Foundations: Law, Taxation, Governance, and Performance”, *Annals of Corporate Governance: Vol. 6, No. 4*, pp 227–333. DOI: 10.1561/109.00000031.

©2022 S. Thomsen and N. Kavadis

1

Introduction

Enterprise foundations are foundations that own companies. The foundations are independent self-governing entities without owners. The companies may be active in any private business activity. Other terms used to describe the same phenomenon are “industrial foundations”, “corporate foundations”, “commercial foundations”, “business foundations”, “commercial non-profits”, “foundations with corporate interests”, “Unternehmensträgerstiftungen” (Germany), “Unternehmensstiftungen” (Lichtenstein), “fondations actionnaires” (France), “erhvervsfonde” (Denmark). We use here what we believe to be the most generic term: “enterprise foundations” (Hopt and von Hippel, 2010) with the same meaning as the term “industrial foundations” (Thomsen, 2017).

The owners are foundations or functionally equivalent entities – Stiftungen, trusts, fonde, Stichtingen, fondazioni, fundaciones etc. – whose names reflect their legal and national origins. The defining feature is that the foundation owns and controls the company and not vice versa. This means that the vast majority of corporate foundations around the world – who do philanthropy on behalf of a company – are not enterprise foundations. Moreover, the way we define them,

enterprise foundations are private entities and not governmental or quasi-governmental institutions. We provide more detail in Section 2.

Around the world, some very big companies are owned by foundations including the Indian Tata Group, the Swedish Wallenberg businesses, US Hershey, German Robert Bosch, or Swiss Rolex. However, nowhere are they as common as in Denmark, where they account for about half of domestic stock market capitalization. Foundations own three of the four largest Danish companies – A. P. Møller-Maersk, Novo-Nordisk, and Carlsberg. Below we provide a list of 20 foundation-owned companies around the world.

20 Foundation-Owned Companies around the World

A. P. Møller- Mærsk – Denmark
Anheuser Busch Inbev – Belgium
Bertelsmann – Germany
Robert Bosch – Germany
CaixaBank – Spain
Carl Zeiss – Germany
Carlsberg – Denmark
The Guardian – UK
Hershey – USA
Interogo Holding (IKEA) – Switzerland
Investor (Wallenberg) – Sweden
Kavli – Norway
Kuehne + Nagel – Switzerland
Lloyds Register – UK
Mahle – Germany
Norske Veritas (DNV GL) – Norway
Novo Nordisk – Denmark
Pierre Fabre – France
Rolex – Switzerland
Tata Sons – India

In addition to their economic and social significance as owners of large companies, enterprise foundations are interesting because their unique

corporate governance structure challenges conventional corporate governance principles. This gives rise to a number of interesting research questions, which we list below.

- (1) Enterprise foundations have no residual claimants and thus in a certain sense do away the profit motive, which features so prominently in neoclassical microeconomics and agency theory. On the other hand the foundations themselves are residual claimants in the companies that they own and from which they get their income. How does that effect the efficiency and economic performance of foundation-owned companies? Is it possible to have efficient firms without a conventional profit motive? Could it even be advantageous under some circumstances? The answer we give in this monograph is yes.
- (2) As perpetuities, enterprise foundations are very long-term owners whose companies are not for sale. Is it possible to have efficient firms without a market for corporate control? Perhaps there are competitive advantages to long-term ownership under some circumstances? Again the answer that we give to this question is yes.
- (3) Enterprise foundations often concentrate their investments in a single firm or a single business group. Can they compete efficiently without the risk diversification benefits of public listing? Here our answer is a bit more guarded “yes, maybe”. We observe that many of the best known foundation-owned companies are publicly listed while the foundation retains a controlling ownership position.
- (4) Enterprise foundation boards tend to be self-appointed. Doesn't this lack of checks and balances lead to passivity, self-dealing or other agency problems? If not, what are the mechanisms that keep it in check? Here we argue that passivity and self-dealing are a latent risk, which may be mitigated by regulation and foundation governance rules concerning nomination, independence, competencies and other structures.

- (5) Enterprise Foundations generally have philanthropic as well as business purposes. How do these two goals coexist and interact? How does the philanthropy influence the operating companies?

The observation that many successful world-class companies are owned by enterprise foundations presents a paradox to conventional corporate governance models. Does the anecdotal evidence hold out in statistical testing? Do foundation-owned firms over- or underperform? If they perform well, does this mean that we have to rethink corporate governance and de-emphasize the profit motive aka shareholder value? Or perhaps their apparent success is attributable to other factors? In any case, it seems interesting to inquire how enterprise foundations are governed and whether governance makes a difference between more or less successful foundation ownership.

In this monograph, we review the emerging literature on enterprise foundations in an attempt to address these important questions. After this introduction (Section 1), we begin by defining an enterprise foundation and its essential characteristics (Section 2). We then discuss relevant theoretical perspectives on foundation ownership including agency theory, contract failure, and game theory (Section 3). Sections 4 and 5 examine enterprise foundation law and tax law respectively. Section 6 reviews the financial and social performance of foundation-owned companies. Section 7 addresses enterprise foundation governance. Section 8 concludes with a summary of findings and some ideas for future research.

1.1 Why Denmark?¹

Before proceeding, we briefly digress to address a frequently asked question. Why are there so relatively many enterprise foundations in Denmark and more generally in Northern Europe? Thomsen (2016a) tries to throw some light on this question.

One explanation is taxation. The Nordic countries are welfare states with high levels of taxation including high wealth taxes in international comparison (Thomsen, 1999). This creates a greater financial incentive

¹We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for raising this question head on.

to donate wealth to foundations which would (at least historically) avoid wealth taxes while retaining control of a business company. Secondly, the Nordic countries score very high on the World Bank's governance indicators including the rule of law and corruption control (Thomsen, 2016a,b). This means that foundation ownership in the Nordic countries may be less susceptible to expropriation of private benefits than elsewhere. Foundations in particular have to rely on the rule of law since they lack outside owners who can protect their property rights. Thirdly, as we will explain in Sections 4 and 5, Denmark in particular adopted a liberal enterprise foundation law, which allows foundations to own companies with very few exceptions, while other countries – including the US – opted to prohibit or restrain them from doing so.

Nordic culture may be another explanation. For example the Nordics routinely rank high on international comparisons of social trust (Brandl, 2020; Holmberg and Rothstein, 2017; Svendsen and Svendsen, 2016). It is conceivable that a high level of trust and trustworthiness facilitate the formation and governance of enterprise foundations with more limited self-dealing and private benefitting than in other countries. However, it is noteworthy that the frequency of enterprise foundation varies in the Nordic countries between Finland (low), Norway (medium), Sweden (high), and Denmark (very high). So there are other important determinants.

Schröder (2021) documents that enterprise foundations are found around the world in countries as different as India, Brazil, Taiwan, and US. In some countries they constitute a sizeable share of the domestic stock market – e.g., in Denmark (40%), Austria (30%), Sweden (20%), the Netherlands (15%), Norway (10%), India (5%), and Switzerland (5%). Typically, there are very few of them outside Europe (the Indian Tata trusts being an outlier), which is no doubt attributable to the large loss of personal wealth which founders must incur when they donate their shares in a company to an enterprise foundation (see Section 5). Thus, enterprise foundations are found around the world albeit most often in small numbers. That is, although they are particularly abundant in Denmark and the Nordics, they are not just a Danish or Nordic story.

References

- Achleitner, A. K., D. Bazhutov, A. Betzer, J. Block, and F. Hosseini (2020). “Foundation ownership and shareholder value: An event study”. *Review of Managerial Science*. 14(3): 459–484.
- Agrawal, A. and C. R. Knoeber (1996). “Firm performance and mechanisms to control agency problems between managers and shareholders”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 31(3): 377–397.
- Akerlof, G. and R. Kranton (2000). “Economics and identity”. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 115(3): 715–753.
- Akerlof, G. and R. Kranton (2005). “Identity and the economics of organizations”. *Journal of Economics Perspectives*. 19(1): 9–32.
- Akerlof, G. and R. Kranton (2008). “Identity, supervision and work groups”. *American Economic Review*. 98(2): 212–217.
- Akerlof, G. and R. Kranton (2010). *Identity Economics: How Our Identities Shape Our Work, Wages, and Well-Being*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Andreoni, J. (1989). “Giving with impure altruism: Applications to charity and Ricardian equivalence”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 97: 1447–1458.
- Andreoni, J. (1990). “Impure altruism and donation to public goods: A theory of warm-glow giving”. *Economic Journal*. 100: 464–477.

- Auerbach, A. J. and J. Hines Jr. (2002). *Taxation and Economic Efficiency, Handbook of Public Economics*. Ed. by A. J. Auerbach and M. Feldstein. Edition 1. Vol. 3. Elsevier. Chap. 21. 1347–1421.
- Baker, G. P., M. C. Jensen, and K. J. Murphy (1988). “Compensation and incentives: Practice vs. theory”. *Journal of Finance*. 43: 593–616.
- Benabou, R. and J. Tirole (2011). “Law and norms”. *NBER Working Paper*, Cambridge, MA.
- Bennedsen, M., M. K. Nielsen, F. Pérez-González, and D. Wolfenzon (2007). “Inside the family firm: The role of families in succession decisions and performance”. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 122(2): 647–691.
- Bertrand, M. and Schoar (2006). “The role of the family in family firms”. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 20: 2–73.
- Block, J., S. Jarchow, N. Kammerlander, F. Hosseini, and A. K. Achleitner (2020). “Performance of foundation-owned firms in Germany: The role of foundation purpose, stock market listing, and family involvement”. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*. 11(4): 100356.
- Bøhren, Ø. and M. Josefsen (2013). “Stakeholder rights and economic performance: The profitability of non-profits”. *Journal of Banking and Finance*. 37: 4073–4086.
- Børsting, C., J. Kuhn, T. Poulsen, and S. Thomsen (2014a). “The performance of Danish foundation-owned companies”. *Working Paper*.
- Børsting, C., J. Kuhn, T. Poulsen, and S. Thomsen (2014b). “The governance of industrial foundations: Executive and director turnover”. *Working Paper*.
- Børsting, C. and S. Thomsen (2017). “Foundation ownership, reputation, and labour”. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. 33(2): 317–338.
- Brandl, B. (2020). “Variations and (a)symmetries in trust between employees and employers in Europe: Some (not so) well-known stylized facts”. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*. 26(3): 313–329.
- British Academy (2019). *Principles for Purposeful Business: How to Deliver the Framework for the Future of the Corporation*. London, UK: British Academy. Principles for purposeful business.

- Canada Revenue Agency (2018). Excess Corporate Holdings Regime for Private Foundations. URL: <https://www.canada.ca/en/revenue-agency/services/forms-publications/publications/t2082/excess-corporate-holdings-regime-private-foundations.html>.
- Carstensen, C. (2010). “Asset management in non-profit organizations”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cremers, M., A. A. Pareek, and Z. Sautner (2020). “Short-term investors, long-term investments, and firm value: Evidence from Russell 2000 index inclusions”. *Management Science*. 66(10): 4535–4551.
- Danish Tax Ministry (2018). “Beskatning ved overdragelse af erhvervsvirksomheder til erhvervsdrivende fonde”. Rapport fra Arbejdsgruppen om Succession til Erhvervsdrivende Fonde. København: Skatteministeriet (Taxation at Succession of Business Companies to Enterprise Foundations). Report from the Working Group on Succession to Enterprise Foundations. Copenhagen. p. 65.
- Debreu, G. (1959). *The Theory of Value: An Axiomatic Analysis of Economic Equilibrium*. New York: Wiley.
- Deckert, K. (2010). “Non-profit organizations in France”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Domhoff, G. W. (2009). “The power elite and their challengers. The role of nonprofits in american social conflict”. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 52(7): 955–973.
- Draheim, M. (2016). “Three essays on foundation owned firms in Germany”. Doctoral dissertation, U. Konstanz.
- Draheim, M. and G. Franke (2014). “Foundation owned firms in Germany: Governance and performance”. *Working Paper*.
- Draheim, M. and G. Franke (2018). “Employee orientation and financial performance of foundation owned firms”. *Schmalenbach Business Review*. 70(4): 375–410.
- Dzansi, J. (2011a). “Essays on financing and returns on investment”. Doctoral dissertation, Jönköping International Business School.

- Dzansi, J. (2011b). “Foundations and investment performance: The role of non-financial motives”. *Global Economy and Finance Journal*. 5(2): 58–78.
- Dzansi, J. (2012). “Foundation control and investment performance: Do intrinsic aspects of ownership and control matter?” *Global Economy and Finance Journal*. 5(2): 58–78.
- Edie, J. A. (2010). “Good or not so good governance of non-profit organizations: Factual observations from the USA”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. 2010. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edmans, A. (2020). *Grow the Pie*. Cambridge Books.
- Elster, J. (2000). “Rational choice history: A case of excessive ambition”. *American Political Science Review*. 94(3): 685–695.
- Erhvervsfondsudvalget (2012). 55. LU – Landeundersøgelse til brug for Erhvervsfondudvalget Notat. Bilag.
- EU (2020). *Social Enterprises and Their Ecosystems in Europe*. Comparative synthesis report.
- Faíña-Medín, A., I. García-Jurado, J. Méndez-Naya, and L. Méndez-Naya (1998). “Unilateral commitment in the finitely repeated prisoners’ dilemma”. *Annals of Operations Research*. 84(1–4): 187–194.
- Fama, E. F. and M. C. Jensen (1983). “Agency problems and residual claims”. *Journal of Law and Economics*. June. 26: 327–349.
- Fama, E. and M. Jensen (1985). “Organizational forms and investment decisions”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 14(1): 101–119.
- Feldthusen, R. and K. S. Nørgaard (2016). “Hvordan beskatter andre lande erhvervsfonde?” (How Do Other Countries Tax Enterprise Foundations?) Skattepolitisk Oversigt (SPO). 2016.69.
- Feldthusen, R. K. and M. Poulsen (2015). “Reformen af erhvervsfond-sloven”. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Selskabsret*. 1: 46–60.
- Ferri, G., P. Kalmi, and E. Kerola (2015). “Organizational structure and performance in European banks: A reassessment”. *Advances in the Economic Analysis of Participatory and Labor-Managed Firms*. 16: 109–141.

- Fleischmann, J. (2001). “Public policy and philanthropic purpose – foundation ownership and control of corporations in Germany and the United States”. In: *Foundations in Europe: Society, Management and Law*. Ed. by A. Schlüter, V. Then (Bertelsmann Foundation), and P. Walkenhorst. London: Directory for Social Change. 372–408.
- Formby, J. P., W. J. Smith, and P. D. Thistle (1992). “On the definition of tax neutrality: Distributional and welfare implications of policy alternatives”. *Public Finance Quarterly*. 20: 3–23.
- Franke, G. and M. Draheim (2015). “Foundation owned firms in Germany—A field experiment for agency theory”. In: *Annual Conference 2015 (Muenster): Economic Development - Theory and Policy 113217*, Verein für Socialpolitik/German Economic Association.
- Frick, B. (2004). “Does ownership matter? Empirical evidence from the German wine industry”. *Kyklos*. 57(3): 357–386.
- Fudenberg, D. and J. Tirole (1985). “Predation without reputation”. *Working Paper*.
- Ghemawat, P. (1991). *Commitment*. Simon and Schuster.
- Glaeser, E. L. (2002). “The political economy of hatred”. *NBER Working Paper*, Cambridge, MA.
- Glaeser, E. L. and A. Shleifer (2001). “Not-for-profit entrepreneurs”. *Journal of Public Economics*. 81(1): 99–115.
- Hansen, C. and J. Block (2020). “Exploring the relation between family involvement and firms’ financial performance: A replication and extension meta-analysis”. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*. 13: e00158.
- Hansmann, H. (1980). “The role of non-profit enterprise”. *The Yale Law Review*. April. 89(5): 835–901.
- Hansmann, H. (1987). “Economic theories of non-profit organization”. In: *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Ed. by W. W. Powell. Yale University Press.
- Hansmann, H. (2010). “The economics of non-profit organizations”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hansmann, H. and S. Thomsen (2013a). “Managerial distance and virtual ownership: The governance of enterprise foundations”. In: *Prepared for the Conference on Corporate Governance After the Crisis*. Oxford, and January 13–14, 2002.
- Hansmann, H. and S. Thomsen (2013b). “The performance of foundation-owned companies”. Paper presented to the RICF Conference on ‘*Frontiers in Corporate Finance and Corporate Governance*’ Development Bank of Japan, 18 November 2011, and to the Department of Banking and Finance, University of Chulalongkorn, 21–3–2013, Workshop on Accountability and Responsibility of Corporate Ownership. 9–10 May 2013.
- Hansmann, H. and S. Thomsen (2013c). “Managerial distance and virtual ownership: The governance of industrial foundations”. *ECGI—Finance Working Paper 372*.
- Hansmann, H. and S. Thomsen (2021). “The governance of foundation-owned firms”. *Journal of Legal Analysis*. 13(1): 172–230.
- Henderson, R. and E. Van den Steen (2015). “Why do firms have ‘purpose’? The firm’s role as a carrier of identity and reputation”. *American Economic Review*. 105(5): 326–330.
- Herrmann, M. and G. Franke (2002). “Performance and policy of foundation-owned firms in Germany”. *European Financial Management*. 8: 261–279.
- Holmberg, S. and B. Rothstein (2017). “Trusting other people”. *Journal of Public Affairs*. 17(1/2): e1645.
- Hopt, K. J. (2010). “The board of non-profit organizations: Some corporate governance thoughts from Europe”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopt, K. J. and T. von Hippel (2010). *International Corporate Law and Financial Market Regulation, Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hopt, K. J., T. von Hippel, H. Anheier, V. Then, W. Ebke, E. Reimer, and T. Vahlpahl (2008). “Feasibility study on a European foundation statute: Final report”. URL: <http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/archiv/18688>.

- Hosseini, H. G. (2018). “Foundation-owned firms in Germany: The impact of foundation-ownership on firm performance and corporate governance challenges”. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Universität Trier.
- House of Representatives (1969). The Tax Reform Act of (H.R. 13270). URL: <https://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Prttax2.pdf>.
- Hulgaard, N. and S. Thomsen (2020). “Foundation ownership and firm performance: Difference-in-differences estimation”. *Working Paper*.
- Jensen, M. C. (2002). “Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function”. In: *Unfolding Stakeholder Thinking*. Ed. by R. Edward Freeman, J. Andriof, S. Waddock, B. Husted, and S. Sutherland Rahman. Greenleaf Publishing.
- Jensen, M. C. and K. J. Murphy (1990). “Performance pay and top-management incentives”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 98(2): 225–264.
- Kreps, D. M. (1990a). *Game Theory and Economic Modelling*. Oxford University Press.
- Kreps, D. M. (1990b). “Corporate culture and economic theory”. In: *Rational Perspectives on Political Economy*. Ed. by J. Alt and L. Shepsle. Cambridge University Press. 90–142.
- Kreps, D. M., P. Milgrom, J. Roberts, and R. Wilson (1982). “Rational cooperation in the finitely repeated prisoners’ dilemma”. *Journal of Economic Theory*. 27(2): 245.
- Kronke, H. (1988). *Stiftungstypus und Unternehmensträgerstiftung*. Tübingen. J.C.B. Mohr.
- Kuhn, J. (2015). “Note: Industrial foundations in the Danish register databases”. *Working Paper*. The Research Project on Industrial Foundations.
- Kuhn, J. and S. Thomsen (2015a). “Performance drivers in foundation-owned companies”. *Working Paper*.
- Kuhn, J. and S. Thomsen (2015b). “Changes in foundation ownership and firm performance”. *Working Paper*.
- Kuhn, J. and S. Thomsen (2014). “The demography of Danish foundation-owned companies”. *Working Paper*.

- La Porta, R., F. Lopez-de-Silanes, A. Shleifer, and R. Vishny (2000). "Investor protection and corporate governance". *Journal of Financial Economics*. 58(1–2): 3–27.
- Laux, F. (1998). *Die Lehre vom Unternehmen and sich: Walther Rathenau und die aktienrechtliche Diskussion in der Weimarer Republik (Schriften zur Rechtsgeschichte; 74)*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Leardini, C., G. Rossi, and S. Moggi (2014). *Board Governance in Bank Foundations*. Berlin: Springer.
- List, J. A. (2011). "The market for charitable giving". *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 25(2): 157–180.
- Malani, A., T. Philipson, and G. David (2003). "Theories of firm behavior in the nonprofit sector. A synthesis and empirical evaluation". In: *The Governance of Not-For-Profit Organizations*. University of Chicago Press. 181–216.
- Mayer, C. (2013). *Firm Commitment: Why the Corporation is Failing us and How to Restore Trust in it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, C. (2018). *Prosperity: Better Business Makes the Greater Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, C. (2021). "The future of the corporation and the economics of purpose". *Journal of Management Studies*. 58(3): 887–901.
- McAdams, R. H. (2010). "Economic costs of inequality". *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. 2010: Article 3.
- Meggison, W. L. and L. M. Salamon (2018). *How to Apply PtP to State-Owned Enterprises*. Philanthropication thru Privatization. Building Permanent Endowments for the Common Good. PtP How-To Booklet no. 2. East-West Management Institute.
- Mehrotra, V., R. Morck, J. Shim, and Y. Wiwattanakantang (2011). "Must love kill the family firm? Some exploratory evidence". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 35(6): 1121–1148.
- Moore, G., S. Sobieraj, J. Whitt, O. Mayorova, and D. Beaulieu (2002). "Elite interlocks in three U.S. sectors: Non-profit, corporate, and government". *Social Science Quarterly*. 83: 726–744.
- Newhouse, J. P. (1970). "Toward a theory of non-profit institutions: An economic model of a hospital". *American Economic Review, American Economic Association*. 60(1): 64–74.

- Nguyen, V. D. and R. M. Moursli (2014). “Foundation-controlled firms and CEO compensation”. *Working Paper*.
- Nielsen, S. B. (2014). “Industrial foundations in the tax system”. *Working Paper*. The Research Project on Industrial Foundations. *Paper Presented at the 70th Annual Conference of The International Institute of Public Finance (IIPF)*. URL: <http://www.tifp.dk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/if-tax-sbn.pdf>.
- Norwegian Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries (2013). *Diverse and Value-Creating Ownership*. Meld. St. 27 (2013–2014) Report to the Storting (white paper).
- OECD/G20 (2015). “Fundamental principles of taxation”. In: *Addressing the Tax Challenges of the Digital Economy*. OECD. Chap. 2.
- Pauly, M. and M. Redisch (1973). “The not-for-profit hospital as a physicians’ cooperative”. *The American Economic Review*. 63(1): 87–99.
- Pigou, A. C. (1932). *The Economics of Welfare*. 4th edition. London: Macmillan.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Poulsen, T., C. Børsting, and S. Thomsen (2021). “Purpose and prosperity. Foundation ownership and parental leave”. *Unpublished Working Paper*. Center for Corporate Governance. Copenhagen Business School.
- Radner, R. (1998). *Economic Survival*. Nancy Schwartz Memorial Lecture, Northwestern University, 1996; reprinted in D. P. Jacobs *et al.* *Frontiers of Research in Economic Theory*. Cambridge: Northwestern University. 183–209.
- Reich, B. (2018). *Just Giving. Why Philanthropy is Failing Democracy and How it Can Do Better*. Princeton University Press.
- Reiser, D. (2020). “Foundation regulation in our age of impact”. *Pittsburg Tax Review*. 17(2). URL: <https://doi.org/10.5195/taxreview.2020.111>.
- Roe, M. J. (1994). *Strong Managers, Weak Owners: The Political Roots of American Corporate Finance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Romer, P. M. (1990). “Endogenous technological change”. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 98(5): S71–S10.
- Salamon, L. M. (2014). *Philanthropicization Through Privatization: Building Permanent Endowments for the Common Good*. Center for Civil Society Studies at Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies.
- Schelling, T. C. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard University Press.
- Schelling, T. C. (1985). “Enforcing rules on oneself”. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 1(2): 357–374.
- Schröder, D. J. (2021). “Publicly listed foundation-owned firms around the world: An overview”. *Unpublished Working paper*. URL: <https://www.enterprisefoundations.dk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Publicly-listed-FoFs-Descriptive-Paper-02112021.pdf>.
- Schröder, D. J. and S. Thomsen (2021a). “Foundation ownership and financial performance—A global analysis”. In: *Presentation at the International Corporate Governance Society Annual Conference*. October 8–10. Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Schröder, D. J. and S. Thomsen (2021b). “Foundation ownership and sustainability”. In: *Presentation at the International Corporate Governance Society Annual Conference*. October 8–10. Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Shurtz, N. E. (1986). “A critical view of traditional tax policy theory: A pragmatic alternative”. *Villanova Law Review*. 31(6): 1665–1701.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). “A comment on ‘the science of public administration’”. *Public Administration Review*. 7(3): 200–203.
- Simon, J. G. (1995). “The regulation of American foundations: Looking backward at the tax reform act of 1969”. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 6(3): 243–254.
- Steinberg, R. (2010). “Principal-agent theory and non-profit accountability”. In: *Comparative Corporate Governance of Non-Profit Organizations*. Ed. by K. J. Hopt and T. von Hippel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. (1987). “Pareto efficient and optimal taxation and the new welfare economics”. In: *Handbook of Public Economics*. Ed. by A. J. Auerbach and M. Feldstein. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North-Holland). 991–1042.

- Svendsen, G. L. H. and G. T. Svendsen (2016). “How did trade norms evolve in Scandinavia? Long-distance trade and social trust in the Viking age”. *Economic Systems*. 40(2): 198–205.
- Thomsen, S. (1996). “Foundation ownership and economic performance”. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 4(4): 212–221.
- Thomsen, S. (1999). “Corporate ownership by industrial foundations”. *European Journal of Law and Economics*. 7(2): 117–137.
- Thomsen, S. (2014). “The comparative governance of non-profits”. *European Company and Financial Law Review*. 11(1).
- Thomsen, S. (2016a). “The Nordic corporate governance model”. *Management and Organization Review*. 12(1): 189–204.
- Thomsen, S. (2016b). *Industrial Foundations: The Danish Model*. Ed. by A. Simonyi and D. Cagan. Nordic Ways: Brookings Institution Press. 3–33. October 25, 2016.
- Thomsen, S. (2017). *The Danish Industrial Foundations*. Djøf Forlag.
- Thomsen, S. (2018). “Foundation ownership and firm performance”. In: *Corporate Governance in Contention*. Oxford University Press. 66–85.
- Thomsen, S., T. Poulsen, C. Børsting, and J. Kuhn (2018). “Industrial foundations as long-term owners”. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 26(3): 180–196.
- Thomsen, S. and C. Rose (2004). “Foundation ownership and financial performance: Do companies need owners?” *European Journal of Law and Economics*. 18(3): 343–364.
- Uhlaner, L., M. Wright, and M. Huse (2007). “Private firms and corporate governance: An integrated economic and management perspective”. *Small Business Economics*. 29(3): 225–241.
- Wilson, D. S. (2015). *Does Altruism Exist? Culture, Genes, and the Welfare of Others (Foundational Questions in Science)*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.