

Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance

Other titles in Foundations and Trends® in Finance

The Implications of Heterogeneity and Inequality for Asset Pricing

Stavros Panageas

ISBN: 978-1-68083-750-6

Risk Sharing Within the Firm: A Primer

Marco Pagano

ISBN: 978-1-68083-740-7

The Economics of Credit Rating Agencies

Francesco Sangiorgi and Chester Spatt

ISBN: 978-1-68083-380-5

Initial Public Offerings: A Synthesis of the Literature and Directions for Future Research

Michelle Lowry, Roni Michaely and Ekaterina Volkova

ISBN: 978-1-68083-340-9

Privatization, State Capitalism, and State Ownership of Business in the 21st Century

William L. Megginson

ISBN: 978-1-68083-338-6

Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance

Amil Dasgupta

London School of Economics and Political Science
UK
a.dasgupta@lse.ac.uk

Vyacheslav Fos

Boston College
USA
fos@bc.edu

Zacharias Sautner

Frankfurt School of Finance & Management
Germany
z.sautner@fs.de

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Finance

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

A. Dasgupta, V. Fos and Z. Sautner. *Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance*. Foundations and Trends[®] in Finance, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 276–394, 2021.

ISBN: 978-1-68083-879-4

© 2021 A. Dasgupta, V. Fos and Z. Sautner

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

Foundations and Trends[®] in Finance
Volume 12, Issue 4, 2021
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Sheridan Titman

University of Texas at Austin
United States

Associate Editors

Josef Zechner
*WU Vienna University of Economics
and Finance*

Chester Spatt
Carnegie Mellon University

Editorial Scope

Topics

Foundations and Trends® in Finance publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- Corporate Finance
 - Corporate Governance
 - Corporate Financing
 - Dividend Policy and Capital Structure
 - Corporate Control
 - Investment Policy
 - Agency Theory and Information
- Financial Markets
 - Market Microstructure
 - Portfolio Theory
 - Financial Intermediation
 - Investment Banking
 - Market Efficiency
 - Security Issuance
 - Anomalies and Behavioral Finance
- Asset Pricing
 - Asset-Pricing Theory
 - Asset-Pricing Models
 - Tax Effects
 - Liquidity
 - Equity Risk Premium
 - Pricing Models and Volatility
 - Fixed Income Securities
- Derivatives
 - Computational Finance
 - Futures Markets and Hedging
 - Financial Engineering
 - Interest Rate Derivatives
 - Credit Derivatives
 - Financial Econometrics
 - Estimating Volatilities and Correlations

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends® in Finance, 2021, Volume 12, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1567-2395. ISSN online version 1567-2409. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Stylized Facts on the Importance of Institutional Investors	7
2.1	Importance of Institutional Investors in the US	7
2.2	Importance of Institutional Investors Outside the US	13
3	Legal Environment: Obligations, Ability, and Incentives of Institutional Investors to Govern	18
3.1	Legal Obligations of Institutional Investors to Govern	20
3.2	Ability of Institutional Investors to Govern	28
3.3	Incentives of Institutional Investors to Govern	41
4	Theoretical Literature on Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance	46
4.1	Classical Theoretical Literature on Blockholder Governance	46
4.2	Theories Centered on Institution-Specific Ability	49
4.3	Theories of Blockholders as Agents	51
4.4	Theories on Institutional Investors and Proxy Voting Advisors	58

5 Empirical Literature on Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance	61
5.1 Institutional Investor Data	62
5.2 Empirical Methods to Identify Governance Effects of Institutional Investors	68
5.3 Institutional Investors as Blockholders: Classical Evidence on Voice and Exit	72
5.4 Institutional Investor Heterogeneity	77
5.5 Proxy Voting Advisors and Institutional Investors	89
6 Conclusions	96
Acknowledgements	100
References	101

Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance

Amil Dasgupta¹, Vyacheslav Fos² and Zacharias Sautner³

¹*London School of Economics and Political Science, UK;*
a.dasgupta@lse.ac.uk

²*Boston College, USA; fos@bc.edu*

³*Frankfurt School of Finance & Management, Germany;*
z.sautner@fs.de

ABSTRACT

We provide a comprehensive overview of the role of institutional investors in corporate governance with three main components. First, we establish new stylized facts documenting the evolution and importance of institutional ownership. Second, we provide a detailed characterization of key aspects of the legal and regulatory setting within which institutional investors govern portfolio firms. Third, we synthesize the evolving response of the recent theoretical and empirical academic literature in finance to the emergence of institutional investors in corporate governance. We highlight how the defining aspect of institutional investors – the fact that they are financial intermediaries – differentiates them in their governance role from standard principal blockholders. Further, not all institutional investors are identical, and we pay close attention to heterogeneity amongst institutional investors as blockholders.

Keywords: institutional investors; corporate governance; exit; voice; shareholder activism; proxy voting advisors.

Amil Dasgupta, Vyacheslav Fos and Zacharias Sautner (2021), “Institutional Investors and Corporate Governance”, *Foundations and Trends® in Finance*: Vol. 12, No. 4, pp 276–394. DOI: 10.1561/05000000056.

1

Introduction

Whenever the ownership of public corporations is dispersed amongst many shareholders, blockholders – owners of non-trivial percentages of a firm’s shares – become central to good corporate governance. In contrast to small shareholders, who have neither the incentive nor the capacity to effectively monitor management, blockholders are able to govern firms to the benefit of all. The governance role of blockholders today must be viewed in the backdrop of the explosive growth of the asset management industry in recent decades, which has led to the large-scale *intermediation* of equity ownership.

Table 1.1 shows that 50 years ago households *directly* owned almost 80% of US corporate equity. Such direct ownership has declined dramatically over the years, reducing by more than a half, so that today only 38.3% of US corporate equity is directly owned by households. The remainder is *indirectly* held via different asset managers – commonly referred to as *institutional investors*. The table shows that such institutional ownership is dominated by four major types of domestic investors: Mutual funds (20.8%), exchange traded funds (ETFs) (6.6%), public pension funds (5.3%), and private pension funds (5.4%). The remaining institutional investors include insurance companies (1.9%), which

Table 1.1: Ownership shares of the US stock market in percent

Sector	1950	1970	1990	2000	2010	2020
Private Pension Funds	0.0	8.1	16.2	11.2	7.8	5.4
Federal, State and Government Pension Funds	0.0	1.2	8.1	7.7	8.5	5.3
Insurance Companies	2.6	3.3	4.1	6.2	6.7	1.9
Mutual Funds	1.6	4.8	7.1	18.3	20.2	20.8
Closed-End Funds	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.2
Exchange-Traded Funds	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.6	6.6
Foreign Sector	1.6	3.3	6.9	9.3	13.7	16.4
Household Sector	92.8	78.2	56.5	45.6	37.2	38.3
Other	0.4	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.8	5.1

Source: Federal reserve statistical release data: Flow of funds data United States. Exchange-traded funds are first listed in December 7, 2001. The household sector includes bank personal trusts.

have become progressively smaller over time, and “other” unclassified domestic investors (5.1%), a catch-all category including hedge funds or the proprietary holdings of financial institutions. Finally, 16.4% is held by foreign institutional investors.¹ Thus, a majority of equity holders in public US firms are institutional investors. This phenomenon is not limited to the US: below we provide evidence of a similarly significant growth of institutional ownership in other major economies around the world.

Institutional investors are different from the standard blockholders of the classical corporate governance literature in a number of ways. They are larger than most private investors, often subject to extensive regulations, and – perhaps most fundamentally – they differ from private blockholders because they invest other people’s money. Given the preponderance of institutional investors in corporate equity ownership, it is important to understand the role they play in corporate governance.

In this review, we provide a comprehensive overview of the role of institutional investors in corporate governance. Our contribution has

¹The measure of foreign ownership does not allow the separation between direct investments by households and institutional investors. However, the vast majority of this category likely originates from foreign hedge funds, pension funds, mutual funds, and sovereign wealth funds.

three main components. First, we trace the emergence of institutional investors as the modal concentrated owners of public firms in modern economies, using a wide variety of data sources to establish new stylized facts. Second, we provide a detailed characterization of key aspects of the legal and regulatory setting within which institutional investors operate with respect to the governance of their portfolio firms. Third, we synthesize the evolving response of the academic literature in finance to the emergence of institutional investors in corporate governance, attempting to link theoretical predictions to empirical findings.

Because of our focus on institutional investors as the holders of equity blocks we highlight the role that characteristics specific to this type of equity blockholder play in corporate governance. For example, we document how the defining aspect of institutional investors – the fact that they are financial intermediaries – differentiates them in their governance role from standard principal blockholders (e.g., individuals, families, and firms). As a result, we discuss how differences with respect to explicit and implicit incentives, organizational structures, and regulatory requirements shape their obligations, incentives and ability to govern. This focus leads us to highlight aspects of governance that are unique to institutional investors, for example, the institutions' voting processes, the role of proxy voting advisors, and conflicts of interests arising from business ties with portfolio firms.² Further, not all institutional investors are identical, and we pay close attention to *heterogeneity* amongst institutional investors as blockholders, arising because of differences in their incentives, size, investment horizons, preferred governance mechanisms, or regulatory constraints. We shine a light on heterogeneity across institution types by establishing stylized facts on ownership heterogeneity, and by synthesizing the emerging lessons from the theoretical and empirical literatures on the impact of such heterogeneity.

²Given our specific focus, we do not review the literature on the role of non-institutional blockholders, such as families or other corporations, which also play an important role in the governance of firms. While some aspects in our discussions also apply to these blockholders, notably the broader theories and the evidence on monitoring by institutional blockholders, most aspects in our review are specific to institutional blockholders.

Hence, our monograph differs in two important ways from recent surveys that look at the role of blockholders *per se* in corporate governance (e.g., Edmans, 2014; Edmans and Holderness, 2017). First, we highlight governance issues specific to institutional investors, which can lead to substantial differences between the objectives of canonical blockholders who maximize the value of their blocks and the objectives of institutional investors. For instance, a labor union pension fund that manages pension accounts of a firm's employees might consider negative effects of a value increasing action on the employees and thus resist the action. Second, the main objective of a rising class of passive institutional investors is to not maximize the value of their investment but to rather track an index. For instance, with trillions of dollars in assets, the objective of most ETFs is to track the performance of a basket of securities. Investment companies managing ETFs are, however, required to vote in the best interest of their investors. Thus, there is an important gap between the fiduciary duties of ETF managers and their investment objectives.³

Though we do not focus on the role of non-institutional blockholders, such as families, wealthy individuals, or other corporations, we should note that these equity blockholders also play an important role in the governance of firms, both by themselves and in their interactions with institutional investors. Notably, in publicly traded firms in Germany or even the US (outside of the largest firms), family ownership remains a significant governance factor. Villalonga *et al.* (2015) review the literature on corporate governance in family-owned firms.

A few other recent surveys cover related issues. Yermack (2010) surveys the literature on shareholder voting, while we in contrast delve in detail on institution-specific aspects of proxy voting. Brav *et al.* (2010 and 2015a) provide surveys of activist hedge funds specifically. While activist hedge funds feature prominently in our review, they are only one part of the much wider landscape of the role of institutional investors in corporate governance that is of interest to us. Schmalz (2018) surveys the emerging literature on common ownership, a specific topic tied to

³Despite our different focus, we pick up on key themes highlighted in Edmans and Holderness (2017), namely the role of blockholder heterogeneity and evidence from institutional settings beyond the US.

the existence of large institutional investors, which we only touch on briefly below. Institutional investors are sometimes under scrutiny for their role in environmental and social issues tied to corporate actions. In a recent review, Matos (2020) focuses specifically at this aspect of the role of institutional investors. Finally, Franks (2020) provides a contemporaneous review of institutional ownership around the world and discusses topics within their governance role.

The remainder of this monograph is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a series of new stylized facts on the evolution of institutional ownership and its heterogeneity in the US and outside of the US. Section 3 describes the legal and regulatory environment within which institutional investors operate, with a focus on the obligations, ability, and incentives of such investors to engage in the corporate governance of firms. Section 4 reviews the theoretical literature on institutional investors and corporate governance while Section 5 discusses the empirical literature. Section 6 concludes.

References

- Achleitner, A.-K., A. Betzer, and J. Gider (2010). “Do corporate governance motives drive hedge fund and private equity fund activities?” *European Financial Management*. 16(5): 805–828.
- Adams, R. B., B. E. Hermalin, and M. S. Weisbach (2010). “The role of boards of directors in corporate governance: A conceptual framework and survey”. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 48(1): 58–107.
- Admati, A. R. and P. Pfleiderer (2009). “The ‘wall street walk’ and shareholder activism: Exit as a form of voice”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 22(7): 2645–2685.
- Agarwal, V., N. D. Daniel, and N. Y. Naik (2009). “Role of managerial incentives and discretion in hedge fund performance”. *Journal of Finance*. 64(5): 2221–2256.
- Agarwal, V., V. Fos, and W. Jiang (2013a). “Inferring reporting-related biases in hedge fund databases from hedge fund equity holdings”. *Management Science*. 59(6): 1271–1289.
- Agarwal, V., W. Jiang, Y. Tang, and B. Yang (2013b). “Uncovering hedge fund skill from the portfolio holdings they hide”. *Journal of Finance*. 68(2): 739–783.
- Aggarwal, R., I. Erel, M. Ferreira, and P. Matos (2011). “Does governance travel around the world? Evidence from institutional investors”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 100(1): 154–181.

- Aggarwal, R., I. Erel, and L. T. Starks (2014). “Influence of public opinion on investor voting and proxy advisors”. *Working Paper*.
- Aghion, P., J. Van Reenen, and L. Zingales (2013). “Innovation and institutional ownership”. *American Economic Review*. 103(1): 277–304.
- Agrawal, A. K. (2012). “Corporate governance objectives of labor union shareholders: Evidence from proxy voting”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 25(1): 187–226.
- Albuquerque, A. M., M. E. Carter, and S. Gallani (2020). “Are ISS recommendations informative? Evidence from assessments of compensation practices”. *Working Paper*.
- Albuquerque, R. A., V. Fos, and E. J. Schroth (2021). “Value creation in shareholder activism”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. Forthcoming.
- Alexander, C. R., M. A. Chen, D. J. Seppi, and C. S. Spatt (2010). “Interim news and the role of proxy voting advice”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 23(12): 4419–4454.
- Amel-Zadeh, A. and G. Serafeim (2018). “Why and how investors use ESG information: Evidence from a global survey”. *Financial Analysts Journal*. 74(3): 87–103.
- Andonov, A., Y. V. Hochberg, and J. D. Rauh (2018). “Political representation and governance: Evidence from the investment decisions of public pension funds”. *Journal of Finance*. 73(5): 2041–2086.
- Anton, M., F. Ederer, M. Giné, and M. C. Schmalz (2020). “Common ownership, competition, and top management incentives”. *Working Paper*.
- Appel, I. R., T. Gormley, and D. Keim (2016). “Passive investors, not passive owners”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 121(1): 111–141.
- Appel, I., T. Gormley, and D. Keim (2019). “Standing on the shoulders of giants: The effect of passive investors on activism”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 32(7): 2720–2774.
- Artiga Gonzalez, T. and P. Calluzzo (2019). “Clustered shareholder activism”. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. 27(3): 210–225.

- Ashraf, R., N. Jayaraman, and H. E. Ryan (2012). “Do pension-related business ties influence mutual fund proxy voting? Evidence from shareholder proposals on executive compensation”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 47(3): 567–588.
- Azar, J., M. C. Schmalz, and I. Tecu (2018). “Anticompetitive effects of common ownership”. *Journal of Finance*. 73(4): 1513–1565.
- Bach, L. and D. Metzger (2019). “How close are close shareholder votes?” *Review of Financial Studies*. 32(8): 3183–3214.
- Back, K., P. Collin-Dufresne, V. Fos, and T. Li (2018). “Activism, strategic trading, and liquidity”. *Econometrica*. 86(4): 1431–1463.
- Backus, M., C. Conlon, and M. Sinkinson (2021). “Common ownership in America: 1980–2017”. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*. 13(3): 273–308.
- Barko, T., M. Cremers, and L. Renneboog (2018). “Shareholder engagement on environmental, social, and governance performance”. *Working Paper*.
- Bebchuk, L. A., A. Brav, W. Jiang, and T. Keusch (2020). “Dancing with activists”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 137(1): 1–41.
- Bebchuk, L. A., A. Cohen, and S. Hirst (2017). “The agency problems of institutional investors”. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 31(3): 89–102.
- Bebchuk, L. A. and S. Hirst (2019). “Index funds and the future of corporate governance: Theory, evidence, and policy”. *Columbia Law Review*. 119(8): 2029–2146.
- Becht, M., J. Franks, C. Mayer, and S. Rossi (2009). “Returns to shareholder activism: Evidence from a clinical study of the Hermes UK focus fund”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 22(8): 3093–3129.
- Becht, M., J. Franks, J. Grant, and H. F. Wagner (2017). “Returns to hedge fund activism: An international study”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 30(9): 2933–2971.
- Becht, M., J. R. Franks, and H. F. Wagner (2019). “Corporate governance through exit and voice”. *Working Paper*.
- Bena, J., M. A. Ferreira, P. Matos, and P. Pires (2017). “Are foreign investors locusts? The long-term effects of foreign institutional ownership”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 126(1): 122–146.

- Bennet, B., R. M. Stulz, and Z. Wang (2020). “Does joining the S&P 500 index hurt firms?” *Working Paper*.
- Berger, E. (2019). “Selection bias in mutual fund flow-induced fire sales: Causes and consequences”. *Working Paper*.
- Bethel, J. E., G. Hu, and Q. Wang (2009). “The market for shareholder voting rights around mergers and acquisitions: Evidence from institutional daily trading and voting”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 15(1): 129–145.
- Bharath, S. T., S. Jayaraman, and V. Nagar (2013). “Exit as governance: An empirical analysis”. *Journal of Finance*. 68(6): 2515–2547.
- Black, B. S. (1990). “Shareholder passivity reexamined”. *Michigan Law Review*. 89(3): 520–608.
- Black, B. S. (1992). “Agents watching agents: The promise of institutional investor voice”. *UCLA Law Review*. 39(4): 811–893.
- Bolton, P., T. Li, E. Ravina, and H. Rosenthal (2020). “Investor ideology”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 137(2): 320–352.
- Boone, A. L., S. Gillan, and M. Towner (2020). “The role of proxy advisors and large passive funds in shareholder voting: Lions or lambs?” *Working Paper*.
- Boone, A. L. and J. T. White (2015). “The effect of institutional ownership on firm transparency and information production”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 117(3): 508–533.
- Borochin, P. and J. Yang (2017). “The effects of institutional investor objectives on firm valuation and governance”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 126(1): 171–199.
- Bradley, M., A. Brav, I. Goldstein, and W. Jiang (2010). “Activist arbitrage: A study of open-ending attempts of closed-end funds”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 95(1): 1–19.
- Brav, A., A. Dasgupta, and R. D. Mathews (2021). “Wolf pack activism”. *Management Science*. Forthcoming.
- Brav, A., W. Jiang, and H. Kim (2010). “Hedge fund activism: A review”. *Foundations and Trends in Finance*. 4: 185–246.
- Brav, A., W. Jiang, and H. Kim (2015a). “Recent advances in research on hedge fund activism: Value creation and identification”. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 7: 579–595.

- Brav, A., W. Jiang, and H. Kim (2015b). “The real effects of hedge fund activism: Productivity, asset allocation, and labor outcomes”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 28(10): 2723–2769.
- Brav, A., W. Jiang, F. Partnoy, and R. Thomas (2008). “Hedge fund activism, corporate governance, and firm performance”. *Journal of Finance*. 63(4): 1729–1775.
- Brav, A. and R. D. Mathews (2011). “Empty voting and the efficiency of corporate governance”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 99(2): 289–307.
- Brav, A., W. Jiang, T. Li, and J. Pinnington (2020). “Picking friends before picking (Proxy) fights: How mutual fund voting shapes proxy contests”. *Working Paper*.
- Brown, K. C., W. V. Harlow, and L. T. Starks (1996). “Of tournaments and temptations: An analysis of managerial incentives in the mutual fund industry”. *Journal of Finance*. 51(1): 85–110.
- Bubb, R. and E. Catan (2021). “The party structure of mutual funds”. *Review of Financial Studies*. Forthcoming.
- Buchanan, B., J. Netter, A. Poulsen, and Y. Tina (2012). “Shareholder proposal rules and practice: Evidence from a comparison of the United States and United Kingdom”. *American Business Law Journal*. 49(4): 739–803.
- Burkart, M. and A. Dasgupta (2021). “Competition for flow and short-termism in activism”. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*. 10(1): 44–81.
- Burkart, M., D. Gromb, and F. Panunzi (1997). “Large shareholders, monitoring and the value of the firm”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 16(4): 443–455.
- Burkart, M. and S. Lee (2021). “Activism and takeovers”. *Review of Financial Studies*. Forthcoming.
- Bushee, B. J. (1998). “The influence of institutional investors on myopic R&d investment behavior”. *The Accounting Review*. 73(3): 305–333.
- Calio, J. E. and R. X. Zahraiddin (1994). “The securities and exchange commission’s 1992 proxy amendments: Questions of accountability”. *Pace Law Review*. 14(2): 459.
- Calluzzo, P. and E. Dudley (2019). “The real effects of proxy advisors on the firm”. *Financial Management*. 48(3): 917–943.

- Campbell, J. Y., T. Ramadorai, and A. Schwartz (2009). “Caught on tape: Institutional trading, stock returns, and earnings announcements”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 92(1): 66–91.
- Carleton, W. T., J. M. Nelson, and M. S. Weisbach (1998). “The influence of institutions on corporate governance through private negotiations: Evidence from TIAA-CREF”. *Journal of Finance*. 53(4): 1335–1362.
- Champ, N. (2012). *Speech by SEC Staff: What SEC Registration Means for Hedge Fund Advisers*. New York City. Available at URL: <https://www.sec.gov/news/speech/2012-spch051112nchtm>.
- Chan, K., V. Covrig, and L. Ng (2009). “Does home bias affect firm value? Evidence from holdings of mutual funds worldwide”. *Journal of International Economics*. 78(2): 230–241.
- Chang, Y.-C., H. Hong, and I. Liskovich (2015). “Regression discontinuity and the price effects of stock market indexing”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 28(1): 212–246.
- Chen, X., J. Harford, and K. Li (2007). “Monitoring: Which institutions matter?” *Journal of Financial Economics*. 86(2): 279–305.
- Chevalier, J. and G. Ellison (1997). “Risk taking by mutual funds as a response to incentives”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 105(6): 1167–1200.
- Chhaochharia, V., A. Kumar, and A. Niessen-Ruenzi (2012). “Local investors and corporate governance”. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*. 54(1): 42–67.
- Choi, S. (2000). “Proxy issue proposals: Impact of the 1992 SEC proxy reforms”. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 16(1): 233–268.
- Choi, S. J., J. E. Fisch, and M. Kahan (2008). “Director elections and the influence of proxy advisors”. *Working Paper*.
- Choi, S. J., J. E. Fisch, and M. Kahan (2010). “The power of proxy advisors: Myth or reality?” *Emory Law Journal*. 59(4): 869–918.
- Clay, D. G. (2000). “The effects of institutional investment on CEO compensation”. *Working Paper*.
- Clay, D. G. (2002). “Institutional ownership and firm value”. *Working Paper*.

- Clifford, C. P. (2008). “Value creation or destruction? Hedge funds as shareholder activists”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 14(4): 323–336.
- Cohen, L. and B. Schmidt (2009). “Attracting flows by attracting big clients”. *The Journal of Finance*. 64(5): 2125–2151.
- Collin-Dufresne, P. and V. Fos (2015). “Do prices reveal the presence of informed trading?” *The Journal of Finance*. 70(4): 1555–1582.
- Collin-Dufresne, P., V. Fos, and D. Muravyev (2021). “Informed trading and option prices: Theory and evidence from activist trading”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. Forthcoming.
- Corum, A. A. and D. Levit (2019). “Corporate control activism”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 133(1): 1–17.
- Corum, A. A., A. Malenko, and N. Malenko (2020). “Corporate governance in the presence of active and passive delegated investment”. *Working Paper*.
- Cotter, J., A. Palmiter, and R. Thomas (2010). “ISS recommendations and mutual fund voting on proxy proposals”. *Villanova Law Review*. 55(1): 1–56.
- Coval, J. and E. Stafford (2007). “Asset fire sales (and purchases) in equity markets”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 86(2): 479–512.
- Crane, A. D., A. Koch, and S. Michenaud (2019). “Institutional investor cliques and governance”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 133(1): 175–197.
- Crane, A. D., S. Michenaud, and J. P. Weston (2016). “The effect of institutional ownership on payout policy: Evidence from index thresholds”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 29(6): 1377–1408.
- Cremers, M., A. Pareek, and Z. Sautner (2020). “Short-term institutions, analyst recommendations, and mispricing”. *Management Science*. 66(10): 4535–4551.
- Cuñat, V., M. Gine, and M. Guadalupe (2012). “The vote is cast: The effect of corporate governance on shareholder value”. *Journal of Finance*. 67(5): 1943–1977.
- Cvijanović, D., A. Dasgupta, and K. E. Zachariadis (2016). “Ties that bind: How business connections affect mutual fund activism”. *Journal of Finance*. 71(6): 2933–2966.

- Cvijanovic, D., A. Dasgupta, and K. E. Zachariadis (2019). “The wall street stampede: Exit as governance with interacting blockholders”. *Working Paper*.
- Dasgupta, A. and G. Piacentino (2015). “The wall street walk when blockholders compete for flows”. *Journal of Finance*. 70(6): 2853–2896.
- Davis, G. F. and E. H. Kim (2007). “Business ties and proxy voting by mutual funds”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 85(2): 552–570.
- Del Guercio, D., L. Seery, and T. Woidtke (2008). “Do boards pay attention when institutional investor activists ‘just vote no?’” *Journal of Financial Economics*. 90(1): 84–103.
- Denes, M. R., J. M. Karpoff, and V. B. McWilliams (2017). “Thirty years of shareholder activism: A survey of empirical research”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 44: 405–424.
- Dennis, P. J., K. Gerardi, and C. Schenone (2019). “Common ownership does not have anti-competitive effects in the airline industry”. *Working Paper*.
- Derrien, F., A. Kecskés, and D. Thesmar (2013). “Investor horizons and corporate policies”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 48(6): 1755–1780.
- Dimmock, S. G., W. C. Gerken, Z. Ivković, and S. J. Weisbenner (2018). “Capital gains lock-in and governance choices”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 127(1): 113–135.
- Dimson, E., O. Karakaş, and X. Li (2015). “Active ownership”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 28(12): 3225–3268.
- Dimson, E., O. Karakaş, and X. Li (2020). “Coordinated engagements”. *Working Paper*.
- Doidge, C., A. Dyck, H. Mahmudi, and A. Virani (2019). “Collective action and governance activism”. *Review of Finance*. 23(5): 893–933.
- DoL (1988). *Letter from the Department of Labor to Helmut Fandl, Chairman of the Retirement Board of Avon Products, Inc.*
- DoL (1990). *Letter from the Department of Labor to Robert A.G. Monks, Institutional Shareholder Services, Inc.*
- DoL (1994). *Interpretive Bulletins Relating to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.*

- DoL (2007). *US Department of Labor Opinion: Response to Thomas J. Donohue*.
- Dressler, E. (2020). “Voice and power: Do institutional shareholders make use of their voting power?” *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 65(1): 101716.
- Duan, Y. and Y. Jiao (2016). “The role of mutual funds in corporate governance: Evidence from mutual funds’ proxy voting and trading behavior”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 51(2): 489–513.
- Dyck, A., K. V. Lins, L. Roth, and H. F. Wagner (2019). “Do institutional investors drive corporate social responsibility? International evidence”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 131(3): 693–714.
- Edmans, A. (2009). “Blockholder trading, market efficiency, and managerial myopia”. *Journal of Finance*. 64(6): 2481–2513.
- Edmans, A. (2014). “Blockholders and corporate governance”. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 6(1): 23–50.
- Edmans, A., V. W. Fang, and E. Zur (2013). “The effect of liquidity on governance”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 26(6): 1443–1482.
- Edmans, A., X. Gabaix, and D. Jenter (2017). “Executive compensation: A survey of theory and evidence”. *Handbook of the Economics of Corporate Governance*. 1: 383–539.
- Edmans, A., I. Goldstein, and W. Jiang (2012). “The real effects of financial markets: The impact of prices on takeovers”. *Journal of Finance*. 67(3): 933–971.
- Edmans, A. and C. G. Holderness (2017). “Blockholders: A survey of theory and evidence”. *Handbook of the Economics of Corporate Governance*. 1: 541–636.
- Edmans, A., D. Levit, and D. Reilly (2019). “Governance under common ownership”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 32(7): 2673–2719.
- Edmans, A. and G. Manso (2011). “Governance through trading and intervention: A theory of multiple blockholders”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 24(7): 2395–2428.
- Elton, E. J., M. J. Gruber, and C. R. Blake (2003). “Incentive fees and mutual funds”. *Journal of Finance*. 58(2): 779–804.

- Erkens, D. H., M. Hung, and P. Matos (2012). “Corporate governance in the 2007–2008 financial crisis: Evidence from financial institutions worldwide”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 18(2): 389–411.
- Ertimur, Y., F. Ferri, and V. Muslu (2011). “Shareholder activism and CEO pay”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 24(2): 535–592.
- Ertimur, Y., F. Ferri, and D. Oesch (2013). “Shareholder votes and proxy advisors: Evidence from say on pay”. *Journal of Accounting Research*. 51(5): 951–996.
- Faure-Grimaud, A. and D. Gromb (2004). “Public trading and private incentives”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 17(4): 985–1014.
- Fernandes, N., M. A. Ferreira, P. Matos, and K. J. Murphy (2013). “Are US CEOs paid more? New international evidence”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 26(2): 323–367.
- Ferreira, M. A., M. Massa, and P. Matos (2010). “Shareholders at the gate? Institutional investors and cross-border mergers and acquisitions”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 23(2): 601–644.
- Ferreira, M. A. and P. Matos (2008). “The colors of investors’ money: The role of institutional investors around the world”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 88(3): 499–533.
- Fich, E. M., J. Harford, and A. L. Tran (2015). “Motivated monitors: The importance of institutional investors’ portfolio weights”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 118(1): 21–48.
- Filali Adib, F. Z. (2020). “Passive aggressive: How index funds vote on corporate governance proposals”. *Working Paper*.
- Flammer, C. (2015). “Does corporate social responsibility lead to superior financial performance? A regression discontinuity approach”. *Management Science*. 61(11): 2549–2568.
- Fos, V. (2017). “The disciplinary effects of proxy contests”. *Management Science*. 63(3): 655–671.
- Franks, J. (2020). “Institutional ownership and governance”. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. 36(2): 258–274.
- Fung, W. and D. A. Hsieh (1999). “A primer on hedge funds”. *Journal of Empirical Finance*. 6(3): 309–331.

- Gallagher, D. R., P. A. Gardner, and P. L. Swan (2013). “Governance through trading: Institutional swing trades and subsequent firm performance”. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 48(2): 427–458.
- Gantchev, N. (2013). “The costs of shareholder activism: Evidence from a sequential decision model”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 107(3): 610–631.
- Gantchev, N., O. Gredil, and P. Jotikasthira (2019). “Governance under the Gun: Spillover effects of hedge fund activism”. *Review of Finance*. 23(6): 1031–1068.
- Gantchev, N. and C. Jotikasthira (2018). “Institutional trading and hedge fund activism”. *Management Science*. 64(6): 2930–2950.
- Gaspar, J.-M., M. Massa, and P. Matos (2005). “Shareholder investment horizons and the market for corporate control”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 76(1): 135–165.
- Gaspar, J.-M., M. Massa, P. Matos, R. Patgiri, and Z. Rehman (2013). “Payout policy choices and shareholder investment horizons”. *Review of Finance*. 17(1): 261–320.
- Geng, H., H. Hau, and S. Lai (2021). “Does shareholder overlap alleviate patent holdup?” *Working Paper*.
- Giannetti, M. and X. Yu (2021). “Adapting to radical change: The benefits of short-horizon investors”. *Management Science*. 67(7): 4032–4055.
- Gibson, R., S. Glossner, P. Krueger, P. Matos, and T. Steffen (2020). “Responsible institutional investing around the world”. *Working Paper*.
- Gilje, E. P., T. A. Gormley, and D. Levit (2020). “Who’s paying attention? Measuring common ownership and its impact on managerial incentives”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 137(1): 152–178.
- Gillan, S. L. and L. T. Starks (2000). “Corporate governance proposals and shareholder activism: The role of institutional investors”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 57(2): 275–305.
- Gillan, S. L. and L. T. Starks (2007). “The evolution of shareholder activism in the United States”. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*. 19(1): 55–73.

- Ginglinger, E., C. Hebert, and L. Renneboog (2017). “Connected firms and investor myopia”. *Working Paper*.
- Goldman, E. and G. Strobl (2013). “Large shareholder trading and the complexity of corporate investments”. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*. 22(1): 106–122.
- Graham, J. R. and C. R. Harvey (2001). “The theory and practice of corporate finance: Evidence from the field”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 60(2–3): 187–243.
- Graham, J. R., C. R. Harvey, and M. Puri (2015). “Capital allocation and delegation of decision-making authority within firms”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 115(3): 449–470.
- Greenwood, R. and M. Schor (2009). “Investor activism and takeovers”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 92(3): 362–375.
- Grinstein, Y. and R. Michaely (2005). “Institutional holdings and payout policy”. *Journal of Finance*. 60(3): 1389–1426.
- Grossman, S. J. and O. D. Hart (1980). “Takeover bids, the free-rider problem, and the theory of the corporation”. *Bell Journal of Economics*. 11(1): 42–64.
- Grossman, S. J. and O. D. Hart (1988). “One share-one vote and the market for corporate control”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 20(1–2): 175–202.
- Guest, P. M. and M. Nerino (2020). “Do corporate governance ratings change investor expectations? Evidence from announcements by institutional shareholder services”. *Review of Finance*. 24(4): 891–928.
- Gupta, A. and K. Sachdeva (2019). “Skin or skim? Inside investment and hedge fund performance”. *Working Paper*.
- Gutiérrez, G. and T. Philippon (2018). “Ownership, concentration, and investment”. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*. 108: 432–437.
- Hamdani, A. and Y. Yafeh (2013). “Institutional investors as minority shareholders”. *Review of Finance*. 17(2): 691–725.
- Harford, J., A. Kecskés, and S. Mansi (2018). “Do long-term investors improve corporate decision making?” *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 50: 424–452.

- Hartzell, J. C. and L. T. Starks (2003). “Institutional investors and executive compensation”. *Journal of Finance*. 58(6): 2351–2374.
- He, Y., B. Kahraman, and M. Lowry (2020). “ES risks and shareholder voice”. *Working Paper*.
- He, Z. and A. Krishnamurthy (2013). “Intermediary asset pricing”. *American Economic Review*. 103(2): 732–770.
- Heath, D., D. Macciocchi, R. Michaely, and M. Ringgenberg (2021). “Do index funds monitor?” *Review of Financial Studies*. Forthcoming.
- Heinen, V., C. Koch, and M. Scharfbillig (2018). “Exporting corporate governance: Do foreign and local proxy advisors differ?” *Working Paper*.
- Helwege, J., V. J. Intintoli, and A. Zhang (2012). “Voting with their feet or activism? Institutional investors’ impact on CEO turnover”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 18(1): 22–37.
- Hitz, J.-M. and N. Lehmann (2018). “Empirical evidence on the role of proxy advisors in European capital markets”. *European Accounting Review*. 27(4): 713–745.
- Hoepner, A. G. F., I. Oikonomou, Z. Sautner, L. T. Starks, and X. Zhou (2021). “ESG shareholder engagement and downside risk”. *Working Paper*.
- Holderness, C. G. and D. P. Sheehan (1985). “Raiders or saviors? The evidence on six controversial investors”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 14(4): 555–579.
- Hornstein, J. A. (1993). “Proxy solicitation redefined: The SEC takes an incremental step toward effective corporate governance”. *Washington University Law Quarterly*. 71(4): 1129–1163.
- Hu, G., K. M. Jo, Y. A. Wang, and J. Xie (2018). “Institutional trading and Abel Noser Data”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 52: 143–167.
- Hu, H. T. C. and B. Black (2007). “Hedge funds, insiders, and the decoupling of economic and voting ownership: Empty voting and hidden (morphable) ownership”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 13(2–3): 343–367.
- Ilhan, E., P. Krueger, Z. Sautner, and L. T. Starks (2021). “Climate risk disclosure and institutional investors”. *Working Paper*.
- Iliev, P., J. Kalodimos, and M. Lowry (2021). “Investors’ attention to corporate governance”. *Review of Financial Studies*. Forthcoming.

- Iliev, P. and M. Lowry (2015). “Are mutual funds active voters?” *Review of Financial Studies*. 28(2): 446–485.
- Ishida, S. and T. Kochiyama (2020). “ISS’s proxy voting guidelines and ROE management”. *Working Paper*.
- Israelsen, R. D., M. Schwartz-Ziv, and J. Watson (2019). “Ownership and governance style: New evidence from nonfinancial blockholders”. *Working Paper*.
- Jensen, M. C. (1986). “Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers”. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*. 76(2): 323–329.
- Jiang, W., K. L. Li, and W. Wang (2012). “Hedge funds and Chapter 11”. *Journal of Finance*. 67(2): 513–560.
- Kahn, C. and A. Winton (1998). “Ownership structure, speculation, and shareholder intervention?” *Journal of Finance*. 53(1): 99–129.
- Kang, J.-K., J. Luo, and H. S. Na (2018). “Are institutional investors with multiple blockholdings effective monitors?” *Journal of Financial Economics*. 128(3): 576–602.
- Karolyi, G. A., D. Kim, and R. Liao (2020). “The theory and practice of investor relations: A global perspective”. *Management Science*. 66(10): 4359–4919.
- Karpoff, J. M., P. H. Malatesta, and R. A. Walkling (1996). “Corporate governance and shareholder initiatives: Empirical evidence”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 42(3): 365–395.
- Katelouzou, D. and M. Siems (2020). “The global diffusion of stewardship codes”. *Working Paper*.
- Kedia, S., L. T. Starks, and X. Wang (2021). “Institutional investors and hedge fund activism”. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*. 10(1): 1–43.
- Kempf, E., A. Manconi, and O. Spalt (2017). “Distracted shareholders and corporate actions”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 30(5): 1660–1695.
- Khorona, A., H. Servaes, and L. Wedge (2007). “Portfolio manager ownership and fund performance”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 85(1): 179–204.

- Kim, I., S. Miller, H. Wan, and B. Wang (2016). “Drivers behind the monitoring effectiveness of global institutional investors: Evidence from earnings management”. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 40: 24–46.
- Klein, A. and E. Zur (2009). “Entrepreneurial shareholder activism: Hedge funds and other private investors”. *Journal of Finance*. 64(1): 187–229.
- Krueger, P., Z. Sautner, and L. T. Starks (2020). “The importance of climate risks for institutional investors”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 33(3): 1067–1111.
- Kyle, A. S. and J. L. Vila (1991). “Noise trading and takeovers”. *RAND Journal of Economics*. 22(1): 54–71.
- Larcker, D. F., A. L. McCall, and G. Ormazabal (2015). “Outsourcing shareholder voting to proxy advisory firms”. *Journal of Law and Economics*. 58(1): 173–204.
- Leuz, C., K. V. Lins, and F. E. Warnock (2008). “Do foreigners invest less in poorly governed firms?” *Review of Financial Studies*. 22(8): 3245–3285.
- Levit, D. (2019). “Soft shareholder activism”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 32(7): 2775–2808.
- Levit, D., N. Malenko, and E. Maug (2021). “Trading and shareholder democracy”. *Working Paper*.
- Levit, D. and A. Tsoy (2021). “A theory of one-size-fits-all recommendations”. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*. Forthcoming.
- Lewellen, J. and K. Lewellen (2021). “Institutional investors and corporate governance: The incentive to be engaged”. *Journal of Finance*. Forthcoming.
- Lewellen, K. and M. Lowry (2021). “Does common ownership really increase firm coordination?”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 141(1): 322–344.
- Li, T. (2018). “Outsourcing corporate governance: Conflicts of interest within the proxy advisory industry”. *Management Science*. 64(6): 2951–2971.
- Lim, J., B. A. Sensoy, and M. S. Weisbach (2016). “Indirect incentives of hedge fund managers”. *Journal of Finance*. 71(2): 871–918.

- Liu, C., A. Low, R. Masulis, and L. Zhang (2020). “Monitoring the monitor: Distracted institutional investors and board governance”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 33(10): 4489–4531.
- Luong, H., F. Moshirian, L. Nguyen, X. Tian, and B. Zhang (2017). “How do foreign institutional investors enhance firm innovation?” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 52(4): 1449–1490.
- Macey, J. R. and J. M. Netter (1987). “Regulation 13D and the regulatory process”. *Washington University Law Quarterly*. 65(1): 131–161.
- Malenko, A. and N. Malenko (2019). “Proxy advisory firms: The economics of selling information to voters”. *Journal of Finance*. 74(5): 2441–2490.
- Malenko, N. and Y. Shen (2016). “The role of proxy advisory firms: Evidence from a regression-discontinuity design”. *Review of Financial Studies*. 29(12): 3394–3427.
- Matos, P. (2020). “ESG and responsible institutional investing around the world: A critical review”. *Working Paper*.
- Matvos, G. and M. Ostrovsky (2010). “Heterogeneity and peer effects in mutual fund proxy voting”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 98(1): 90–112.
- Maug, E. (1998). “Large shareholders as monitors: Is there a trade-off between liquidity and control?” *Journal of Finance*. 53(1): 65–98.
- McCahery, J. A., Z. Sautner, and L. T. Starks (2016). “Behind the scenes: The corporate governance preferences of institutional investors”. *Journal of Finance*. 71(6): 2905–2932.
- McRitchie, J. (2014). “Fiduciary duty to announce votes (Part 2): Historical background”. Retrieved from URL <https://www.corpgov.net/2014/05/fiduciary-duty-announce-votes-part-2-historical-background/>.
- Michaely, R. and C. Vincent (2013). “Do institutional investors influence capital structure decisions?” *Working Paper*.
- Miyajima, H. and T. Hoda (2015). “Ownership structure and corporate governance: Has an increase in institutional investors’ ownership improved business performance?” *Policy Research Institute, Ministry of Finance, Japan, Public Policy Review*. 11(3): 361–393.

- Morley, J. (2019). “Too big to be activist”. *Southern California Law Review*. 92(6): 1407–1454.
- Mullins, W. (2014). “The governance impact of index funds: Evidence from regression discontinuity”. *Working Paper*.
- Ng, L., F. Wu, J. Yu, and B. Zhang (2016). “Foreign investor heterogeneity and stock liquidity around the world”. *Review of Finance*. 20(5): 1867–1910.
- Parrino, R., R. W. Sias, and L. T. Starks (2003). “Voting with their feet: Institutional ownership changes around forced CEO turnover”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 68(1): 3–46.
- Pezier, E. (2020). “Estimating the long-term effects of activism using a natural experiment in UK small-cap stocks”. *Working Paper*.
- Piacentino, G. (2019). “Venture capital and capital allocation”. *Journal of Finance*. 74(3): 1261–1314.
- Ringe, W. G. (2021). “Stewardship and shareholder engagement in Germany”. *European Business Organization Law Review*. 22: 87–124.
- Rock, E. (2018). “Institutional investors in corporate governance”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Law and Governance*. Ed. by J. N. Gordon and W. G. Ringe. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Roe, M. J. (1991). “A political theory of American corporate finance”. *Columbia Law Review*. 91(1): 10–67.
- Schiffman, H. (1976). “The relationship between the investment advisor and the mutual fund: Too close for comfort”. *Fordham Law Review*. 45: 183–202.
- Schmalz, M. C. (2018). “Common-ownership concentration and corporate conduct”. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 10(1): 413–448.
- Schmidt, C. and R. Fahlenbrach (2017). “Do exogenous changes in passive institutional ownership affect corporate governance and firm value?” *Journal of Financial Economics*. 124(2): 285–306.
- Schwartz-Ziv, M. and E. Volkova (2020). “Is blockholder diversity detrimental?” *Working Paper*.

- SEC (2003a). “Disclosure of proxy voting policies and proxy voting records by registered management investment companies”. In: *17 CFR Parts 239, 249, 270, and 274*. URL: <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8188.htm>.
- SEC (2003b). “Proxy voting by investment advisers”. In: *17 CFR Part 275*. URL: <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/ia-2106.htm>.
- SEC (2019a). “Commission interpretation and guidance regarding the applicability of the proxy rules to proxy voting advice (a)”. In: *17 CFR Part 241*. URL: <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-2019-09-10/2019-18355>.
- SEC (2019b). “Commission guidance regarding proxy voting responsibilities of investment advisers (b)”. In: *17 CFR Parts 271 and 276*. URL: <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-2019-09-10/2019-18342>.
- Shadab, H. B. (2009). “The law and economics of hedge funds: Financial innovation and investor protection”. *Berkeley Business Law Journal*. 6(2): 240–297.
- Shleifer, A. and R. W. Vishny (1986). “Large shareholders and corporate control”. *Journal of Political Economy*. 94(3): 461–488.
- Shu, C. (2020). “Proxy advice industry and its growing influence”. *Working Paper*.
- Smith, M. P. (1996). “Shareholder activism by institutional investors: Evidence from CalPERS”. *Journal of Finance*. 51(1): 227–252.
- Song, F. (2017). “Blockholder short-term incentives, structures, and governance”. *Working Paper*.
- Starks, L. T., P. Venkat, and Q. Zhu (2021). “Corporate ESG profiles and investor horizons”. *Working Paper*.
- Tett, G. (2019). “Proxy advisers must embrace calls for reform”. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from URL <https://www.ft.com/content/d6c79acc-3039-11e9-ba00-0251022932c8>.
- Villalonga, B., R. Amit, M. A. Trujillo, and A. Guzmán (2015). “Governance of family firms”. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 7(1): 635–654.
- Wardlaw, M. (2020). “Measuring mutual fund flow pressure as shock to stock returns”. *Journal of Finance*. 75(6): 3221–3243.

- Webber, D. (2014). “The use and abuse of labor’s capital”. *New York University Law Review*. 89(6): 2106–2189.
- Wei, W. and A. Young (2019). “Selection bias or treatment effect? A re-examination of Russell 1000/2000 index reconstitution”. *Working Paper*.
- Winton, A. (1993). “Limitation of liability and the ownership structure of the firm”. *Journal of Finance*. 48(2): 487–512.
- Woidtke, T. (2002). “Agents watching agents?: Evidence from pension fund ownership and firm value”. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 63(1): 99–131.
- Yermack, D. (2010). “Shareholder voting and corporate governance”. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. 2(1): 103–125.
- Zachariadis, K. E. and I. F. Olaru (2017). “The impact of security trading on corporate restructuring”. *Review of Finance*. 21(2): 667–718.