THE STRATEGIC EVOLUTION OF THE CORPORATE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Subhajit Chakraborty *, Rajdip Bhadra Chaudhuri **,
Sarbani Bhowmik ***, Aditya Ghosh ***, Avik Banerjee **,
Shibayan Chattopadhyay ****

* *Corresponding author,* Xavier Law School, St. Xavier's University, Kolkata, India
Contact details: Xavier Law School, St. Xavier's University, Action Area III B, New Town, Kolkata 700160, India
** Xavier Law School, St. Xavier's University, Kolkata, India
*** Amity University, Kolkata, India
**** Seacom Skills University, West Bengal, India

How to cite this paper:
Chakraborty, S., Chaudhuri, R. B., Bhowmik, S., Ghosh, A., Banerjee, A., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2025). The strategic evolution of the corporate legal framework. *Corporate Law & Governance Review, 7*(1), 135–144.
https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv7i1p12

ISSN Online: 2664-1542
ISSN Print: 2707-1111

Received: 08.05.2024
Accepted: 25.02.2025

JEL Classification: J3, M3, M4
DOI: 10.22495/clgrv7i1p12

Abstract

The purpose of a company has elongated to be a central concern in corporate law, traditionally focused on identifying its primary beneficiaries. Modern views, however, redefine corporate purpose as a dynamic mission statement that unites stakeholders, fosters innovation, and enhances loyalty. This shift is reflected in regulatory frameworks like the UK's Corporate Governance Code, which mandates that boards articulate the company's purpose. The research aims to examine the importance of legal protections to preserve a company's purpose from shareholder pressures that could compromise its mission (Annesi et al., 2025). The paper addresses theoretical criticisms and stresses the role of corporate law in supporting objective-driven initiatives. The paper adopts a doctrinal approach to demonstrate the significance of companies' purposes (Roe & Vatiero, 2018). It emphasizes that in regions where legal structures and market practices avert the creation of such a protective space, the financial and social benefits of mission-driven corporations will be inaccessible, as their purpose liquefies into the ordinary or simply assists as a marketing strategy. The paper concludes that intricacies and dynamism of modern corporations demands a wider and more elastic understanding of companies' purpose, one that exceeds obstructive financial purposes to hold inclusive and justifiable entrepreneurship.

Keywords: Purpose, Corporate Governance, Marketing, Accounting, Financial Metrics

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — S.Chakr. and R.B.C.; Methodology — S.Chakr., S.B., and A.B.; Resources — S.Chakr., A.G., and S.Chatt.; Investigation — S.Chakr., R.B.C., and A.G.; Writing — Original Draft — S.Chakr., R.B.C., and A.B.; Writing — Review & Editing — S.B., A.B., and S.Chatt.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

The primary aim of a corporation is a central topic for corporate legal professionals, often revolving around who should ultimately benefit from corporate endeavors. While many prioritize profit generation and stockholder capital, others take a broader view, considering the well-being of employees, customers, suppliers, creditors, and the community. This ongoing discourse has deep historical roots within corporate law, marked by debates like the Berle–Dodd debate and Milton Friedman's work on the social responsibility of business (Berle, 1932). The US Business Roundtable's Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation (Armour et al., 2017), which emphasizes interests beyond shareholder value, adds to this long-standing discussion (Friedman, 1970).

However, while discussing the beneficiaries of corporate activities is important, it does not always provide practical guidance on how a company should operate or set its strategic direction. Just as life's purpose is not defined solely by the pursuit of maximum pleasure or utility, corporations, as complex entities, are influenced by more immediate factors like organizational culture and broader business missions (Klein & Eisenhardt, 2021). A company's purpose defines how its board and shareholders determine profitability and returns on investment, setting out how the company contributes to stakeholders' welfare — customers, employees, suppliers, and communities. This approach ensures that profits are earned ethically and legally without violating regulatory standards or harming a firm's reputation.

The concept of "purpose" as a driving force for corporate conduct and success has garnered increasing attention in business literature. Creating "purposeful companies" is seen as crucial in today's technology-driven economy. However, the notion of business objectives differs from the debate on who must benefit from corporate activities. Quinn and Thakor (2018), in their article, suggest that "higher purpose" offers a pathway for growth, providing meaning to employees and stakeholders and helping companies engage with staff beyond outdated economic incentives. This higher purpose, or objective purpose, bonds a corporation and its stakeholders around a transformative business mission, such as revolutionizing transportation or eliminating cash payments. Research shows that business leaders often view a common sense of purpose as a driver of value and positive change.

Chapman et al. (2017) reveals that executives consider purpose a key driver of important business metrics. Similarly, the Purposeful Company Project in the UK argues that purpose is central to both corporate and economic success, estimating substantial losses due to neglecting purpose. Purpose-driven corporations, which prioritize sustainable value creation over immediate profits, reshape corporate priorities and benefit a wide range of stakeholders. These companies also foster interconnectedness and resilience against systemic challenges and economic shocks like COVID-19 (Albuquerque et al., 2020). This emphasis on mission purpose is not just a theoretical idea but is gaining traction among investors, including figures like the chief executive officer (CEO) of BlackRock, who recognize its role in unlocking a company's potential.

The integration of behavioral economics, such as insights from Bukspan (2022), helps explain why corporate directors may prioritize immediate profits over purpose-driven goals due to psychological biases. By incorporating these ideas, laws can help nudge executives toward more socially responsible decisions. The growing acceptance of mission purpose is evident in corporate policies and investor priorities, with regulatory frameworks beginning to embrace purpose. For instance, the UK's Corporate Governance Code now encourages companies to establish their purpose, standards, and strategy aligned with culture. This regulatory shift serves as a platform for examining how purpose can balance stakeholder and shareholder interests, distinguishing modern discussions of corporate purpose from earlier debates.

When corporate purpose conflicts with shareholder preferences, regulatory directives help maintain focus on mission-driven actions. In the absence of supportive conditions like controlling shareholders or committed leaders, corporate law plays a crucial role in shielding managers from conflicting pressures, enabling them to uphold a purpose-driven framework.

In furtherance, the significance of the paper underlines that purpose is a vivacious and detailed expression of a corporation's essential mission, contributing to a motivated visualization that can bring into line internal and external stakeholders (Mayer, 2022). This arrangement nurtures novelty, increases efficiency, and reinforces customer trustworthiness, further making corporate purpose support a shift toward a more comprehensive and unified form of modern capitalism. Additionally, the research paper is to examine the significance of "mission-purpose" in determining corporate governance, with specific reference to its implementation in the UK's Corporate Governance Code. The research shall analyze how mission-purpose corporations align and balance with the notion of prioritization of stakeholder interest, its role in creating value, and the way to redefine the ambit of the firm. Furthermore, the study will discourse the necessity for a focused ecology and the role of legally protected insulation while assessing the theoretic and experimental explanations for purposeful optionality and the case for supervisory detachment.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature, highlighting key theories and debates in company law. Furthermore, Section 3 contains the methodology adopted in this study, demarcating the research design adopted. Section 4 discusses the core mission of the corporations with special reference to the UK's Corporate Governance Code. Section 5 explores the purpose-driven dynamics of corporations along with the shift to empirical analysis of corporate law. Section 6 analyzes the corporate law ecosystem. Section 7 questions the presumed mandate. Section 8 studies adaptive legal ecologies. Section 9 provides the research results. Section 10 discusses the main findings. Section 11 concludes the paper.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the past 50 years, the credence among intellectuals and business elites has been that companies should work for the best use of shareholder affluence. Nevertheless, over the past era, this viewpoint has been confronted with challenges by those stakes favoring shareholder governance, who drive to bear in mind the benefits of other classes inside the corporation. In reply, defenders of the conventional view proclaim that this tendency of opposition is diplomatically thrilling, mistaken, and erratic (Lund, 2024). Contemporary debates in corporate law interchange around flexible and fluctuating issues, such as whether miscellaneous class shares should be approved and issued and how expansively staggered boards should be functional. Even when penetrating deeper queries about the meaning and purpose of a company, corporate specialists are inclined to simplify by classifying corporate law as contractual law, property law, or other branches of public law and bringing it into line with either shareholder-centric or stakeholder-centric approach (Raz, 2019).

Adanma and Ogunbiyi's (2024) paper discovers how global corporations are combining sustainability into their supply chains, stressing that robust governance mechanisms help to accomplish global risks like ecological harm and industrial exploitation. This investigation emphasizes the significance of governance models that encompass beyond the limitations of a company's immediate actions to include supply chain associates, strengthening the impression that corporate governance must be recognized in a wider global context.

A prominent progress in recent corporate governance literature is the growing concern about the legal and regulatory contexts that fortify sound governance practices. Recent studies, as done by Lee (2023) and Grove et al. (2020), have discovered how regulatory transformations are lashing companies to implement more stakeholder approach governance representations. Lee's (2023) study climaxed the role of administration policies in determining companies' performance, predominantly with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) compliance necessities and sustainability broadcasting. Harris (2021) contends that the increasing importance of ESG factors has revitalized corporations to implement a governance framework that not only brings economic returns to stockholders but also endorses enduring sustainability and confident social consequences. This change is also observable in the upsurge of purpose-obsessed businesses, where governance practices comprise a promise to social, ecological, and governance objectives that match with the welfare of a wider range of participants (Nakpodia et al., 2021).

In the last 30–40 years, corporate law and financial theory have, in different systems, dealt with the subject of principal agency costs (Armour et al., 2017). These costs arise when managers prioritize their interests at the cost of companies, but there is a lack of literature that supports the present research topic (Dodd, 1932). At the turn of the last era, researchers started turning to non-doctrinal and quantitative techniques to answer critical questions like: How the firm's performances are measured towards effective corporate governance practices? In furtherance, it is also observed that the meaning of optimal governance in the earlier shreds of evidence has been classically measured by the monetary value of the firm and shareholder wealth (Bebchuk et al., 2009). That is, the purpose of whether governance measures are optimal or suboptimal is contingent on their wealth-creating effects, as measured by equity returns over a long period, accounting revenues, or Tobin's Q ratios (Peters & Taylor, 2016). Nevertheless, these metrics do not cover the socio-welfare contributions that certain purpose-driven companies may offer. Consequently, in cases where a specific legal and regulatory construction endorses the expansion of a purposeful business, economic measures engrossed solely on shareholder interests, which might not fully reflect all the welfare consequences of the business laws in place (Leal et al., 2015).

The analysis of the available evidence on removal rights (Adams, 2017) and takeover defenses (Johnson et al., 2015), coupled with an exploration of significant methodological issues in the literature, shows that, from an empirical standpoint, the situation remains unclear. The current state of empirical research does not resolve the theoretical debate. Therefore, any claim that this literature provides conclusive support for either shareholder rights or board insulation is likely influenced by the prior beliefs and ideological stances of those making the assertion; these claims are speculative and based on theoretical and policy assumptions.

Moreover, general literature examines the wealth significance for the US corporations in both the short and long run based on whether they have a staggered board (Faleye, 2007). In many scholarly works, the staggered board is a separate factor in the non-doctrinal analysis. However, an index incorporating shareholder rights and governance requirements, including the staggered board as one of its components, is used to assess corporate governance (Gompers et al., 2003). The G-Index is one of the most important indices used for understanding the best corporate governance practices.

A complete valuation and summary of the non-doctrinal literature on the connection between shareholder rights and shareholder value is outside the ambit of this present study (Demboski & McCrum, 2011). Here, we emphasize the key features of this research, predominantly the effects of the board of directors' tenure, elimination rights, and takeover defense strategies on value.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researchers have conducted the study based on a doctrinal approach by examining the core jurisprudence of corporate law in light of corporate governance practices in the UK. To systematically understand corporations' purpose-driven approach, the researchers have adopted qualitative research methodology to observe and understand the purpose-driven dynamics of corporate organizations through the lens of the UK's Corporate Governance Code. The research will rely on corporate law jurisprudence as its theoretical foundation. This will involve an in-depth examination of the doctrines of corporate responsibility, directors' fiduciary duties, shareholder primacy, and stakeholder theory. The study will explore how these concepts intersect with purpose-driven governance and the evolving expectations of corporate behavior in light of sustainability and social responsibility.

In addition to the doctrinal approach, the researchers may consider several alternative methods to enrich the study. A comparative legal analysis could provide insights by examining corporate governance practices in different jurisdictions, highlighting variations or commonalities in legal principles. Case study analysis might explore specific companies and their governance practices in-depth, offering a practical understanding of how corporate law is applied. The researchers could also incorporate empirical research through surveys or interviews with stakeholders, gaining direct insights into corporate governance from those involved. Furthermore, historical legal analysis could trace the evolution of corporate governance over time, providing a deeper understanding of its development and current state. Each of these methods could offer valuable perspectives, complementing the doctrinal approach and broadening the scope of the study.

Several analyses would be done to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings. First, legal precedents will be cross-referenced to verify the consistency of legal principles across case law and statutory regulations. Additionally, the findings will undergo peer review by legal scholars and practitioners in corporate governance to confirm that the conclusions are supported by established legal and theoretical frameworks.

4. INVESTIGATING THE CORE MISSION OF CORPORATIONS

The initial focus of our examination into purpose within corporate law shall cater to the current updates to the UK's Corporate Governance Code (the Code), which operates under a "comply or explain" framework concerning the roles, composition, and organization of boards within publicly listed companies. Following the 2018 revisions, section 1 of the Code now bears the title "Board Leadership and Company Purpose" (relatively than solely "Leadership"), underscoring the significance attributed by the Code's creators to the notion of purpose. The Code now mandates that "the board should establish the company's purpose, values and strategy, and satisfy itself that these and its culture are aligned" (Financial Reporting Council [FRC], 2018b, p. 4). The FRC, the independent body responsible for formulating and updating the Code, echoes this sentiment in its Guidance on Board Effectiveness, stating that a proficient board outlines the company's purpose and then devises a strategy to achieve it and that the board holds the responsibility for establishing and reaffirming the company's purpose (FRC, 2018a).

In the realm of Anglo-American corporate law, the term "company purpose" is utilized in various contexts (Quinn & Thakor, 2018). To grasp its application within the Code, it is imperative to delineate the correlation between the interpretations of terms in the Code and those in UK company law. One avenue of analysis is to liken this correlation to the perspective taken by the UK Takeover Panel and the Takeover Appeal Board regarding the relationship between the Takeover Code and company law. They perceive the Takeover Code as an independent framework of regulations not guaranteed by the definitions of undistinguishable terms in UK company law. Nevertheless, while these legal identifications do not definitively dictate the interpretation of the law, the Panel does not discount them; they may find them instructive. This indicates that although insights from company law may be informative, they do not establish the definitive interpretation of the Code, highlighting a lack of dynamic linkage between the meanings of concepts. Similarly, with regard to the UK's Corporate Governance Code and company law, the Code delineates governance recommendations that are self-contained and address aspects of board structure and function not explicitly covered by UK company law. This perspective posits that terms employed in the Code might possess unique Code precise meanings that diverge from their usage in company law and may change autonomously.

The demarcation between the Code and the law of the corporation presents more challenges compared to the Takeover Code. While the Takeover Code deals with areas clearly outside the scope of UK company law, like takeover offers and board membership distinctions, the Code overlaps with company law in areas of coverage. For instance, when the Code states that "the board should establish the company's purpose" (FRC, 2018b, p. 4), it directly enters the domain of company law. This instruction touches on corporate power exercise and associated duties, notably "section 172 of the Companies Act 2006" referenced in section 1 of the Code. Consequently, applying the idea of two-fold regulatory systems, as suggested by the Takeover Panel, to define the meaning of "purpose" is not feasible. Instead, the FRC uses the term carefully as contextualized within UK company law, ensuring consistency without creating conflicts. This does not mean the Code must mirror company law's interpretation exactly, but it must avoid direct contradictions. A more fitting regulatory analogy is seen in the European Union (EU) law's concept of minimum harmonization (Barnard, 2000). Here, higher-order rules (company law) set the borders for lower-order systems (the Code) to function, allowing terms to take on different meanings within these boundaries (Dougan, 2000).

To assess how UK corporate law brings into line with purpose-driven governance, a framework can be established by defining purpose-given governance and revising applicable laws, such as the Companies Act 2006. An organized assessment of models like stakeholder theory and corporate social responsibility (CSR) will afford a concrete foundation. The research procedure should comprise legal inspection and non-doctrinal methods, such as case studies or professional interviews. Metrics should evaluate how well UK law endorses general and eco-friendly goals. Finally, the framework should appraise the efficiency of existing legal frameworks and offer commendations for development, certifying the method is replicable for forthcoming research in other backgrounds.

5. EXPLORING THE PURPOSE-DRIVEN DYNAMICS OF PURPOSEFUL ENTERPRISES

Considering an enterprise that emphasizes "customer-centricity" as its core mission, valuing employees and shareholders equally but after customers. On the flip side, envision a payment technology company dedicated to "phasing out cash transactions", placing the benefits of its employees above shareholders in choice-making, citing novelty as crucial to its long-term prosperity (Roe, 2013). Both companies diverge from the standard set by section 172(1) by crafting decision-making frameworks that prioritize their missions while downplaying shareholder importance. However, if these companies operate in an environment with 1) diverse shareholder bases, 2) robust equity rights, 3) a high likelihood of these rights being exercised formally or informally, and/or 4) market pressures favoring shareholder concerns, probably, shareholder interests will significantly influence board and senior management decisions, irrespective of the stated corporate mission or decision-making structure designed to achieve it. In a purpose-driven company operating within such an incentive framework, shareholders have various means to communicate their preferences to the board and senior management. This can occur when the board faces or anticipates activist shareholder interventions focused on initiatives that enhance shareholder value (Strine, 2017). These interventions can include strategies such as increased dividend payouts, corporate restructurings, and asset divestments. They may also involve appointing directors who are more likely to advocate for such actions, leading ultimately to the replacement of managers inclined to pursue these initiatives. A similar effect can arise when the managerial staff and board of directors are wary of a potential takeover bid — a fundamental aspect of the traditional corporate control market view. This concern over exposure to a takeover bid might lead to decision-making that is not aligned with the company's purpose. For instance, actions taken under this pressure may make the company less appealing to potential bidders or generate short- to moderate-term accounting profits that divert attention from potential bidders. Denis and Kruse (2000) indicate a strong correlation between management changes and some systems of corporate regulating activities in the year preceding the change, recommending that boards proactively take measures to discourage such activities. This highlights their sensitivity to accounting and value-related impacts that could either encourage or deter such activities. These communication effects are influenced by a corporation's legal and ownership structure, with operational incentives potentially amplifying or dampening these effects. If the incentives created by the legal and ownership framework enhance these effects, it could undermine the genuine engagement of directors and senior managers with a purpose that is not aligned with these dynamics.

Again, section 172 of the Companies Act 2006 in the UK outlines a crucial aspect of company law regarding the company's purpose and the directors' duty to act in the company's best interests. Unlike some other jurisdictions, such as certain US states and many continental European jurisdictions, the UK places a primary emphasis on shareholder interests. Section 172(1) mandates that directors must act in good faith to promote the company's success for the benefit of its members, with success and benefit generally interpreted as long-term value creation. The concept of "company's purpose" under section 172(1) is synonymous with furthering shareholder interests. While section 172(2) introduces the term "company purpose", it reaffirms that promoting shareholder interests is the default rule. This section clarifies that if the company's purposes extend beyond benefiting its members, the duty outlined in subsection 1 applies to achieving those purposes. Therefore, "purpose" in this context aligns with the notion of "company interest" as traditionally understood and must be interpreted consistently with common law principles. It is noteworthy that the company's purposes can be modified to include objectives other than benefiting its members, focusing on the interests of other groups as well.

6. THE CORPORATE LAW ECOSYSTEM

The pivotal aspect to consider regarding the purposeful ecosystem of company law within any jurisdiction is the allocation of authority between the board of directors and the stakeholders and whether this allocation is a default setting modifiable by the company or if it remains unalterable both legally and practically. The foundational aspects of the power distribution in the UK's corporate landscape include:

1) The initiation of corporate supremacy lies with the ultimate beneficiaries during general meetings, and this authority has to be subsequently delegated from shareholders to the board through the company's articles.

2) The appointment and empowerment of senior managers are vested in the board, with company law not inherently granting managerial authority or protection against removal for these managers.

3) Shareholders hold the ability to remove directors during an annual general meeting (AGM) at any time without necessitating a cause for elimination, requiring only a simple majority of votes cast (often translating to less than a simple majority of issued shares).

4) A five-percent segment of the stockholder base can call for a short-term meeting to exercise removal rights, and corporate law provides mechanisms for shareholders to communicate with each other regarding resolutions at general meetings. These aspects of power distribution within corporations are fundamental to the origin and framework of power in the UK.

Other facets of company law contribute to shareholder control over corporate development, particularly concerning share issuance and the relinquishment of preemption rights. These regulations grant substantial formal and informal authority to stockholders, confirming their welfares are prioritized in decisions related to raising funds for projects or expanding through acquisitions. These rights also impose constraints on senior management, shaping their strategic thinking within the boundaries of permissible share allotments and waiver approvals. Even in cases where shares are issued under ongoing authorizations and preemption right waivers, decisions are influenced by the need to validate these actions retrospectively to maintain such permissions in the future. Additionally, non-company law regulations further empower shareholders. Notably, business rules for "premium listed companies" mandate the owner's approval for transactions exceeding 25% of the company's value, amplifying shareholder influence in main acquisitions. The Takeover Code's non-frustration rule prohibits managerial actions that could thwart a bid without simultaneous shareholder consent once a bid is imminent (although similar safeguards exist in UK company law). Moreover, the pro-shareholder stability of power is evident in discretionary provisions within most companies' Articles of Association (AOA) and a few recommendations in the Code. These include rarely exercised stockholder instruction rights in articles of association of the company and the Code's suggestion of a one-year board term, reflecting a structural inclination towards shareholder interests (Armour et al., 2017). Looking at these regulations on the surface, UK corporate law creates a lawful environment that strongly favors shareholders and does not facilitate the creation of a purposefully insulated zone for companies. However, it is essential to compare the UK within a broader international context regarding its approach to shareholder primacy. Many advanced economy jurisdictions outside the Commonwealth have legal frameworks that vary significantly, offering options for companies to adopt less pro-shareholder structures or even construct zones of insulation.

For example, in Germany, the Stock Corporation Act establishes a two-level board system comprising a managerial board. Unlike in the UK, where shareholders delegate corporate power, in Germany, power directly rests with the management board. Moreover, the law of Germany allows for diverse forms of member board participation in corporations with two-tier boards, with a specific representation ratio mandated based on company size and employee count. Interestingly, while codetermination is often seen as mandatory, there is some flexibility in its application, especially if employees do not establish a works council or if the company has fewer German resident employees than a specified threshold (Grant & Kirchmaier, 2004). In terms of shareholder representation, German corporate law permits the elimination of superintendent board members by a 75% shareholder majority and outlines conditions for the removal of management board members, albeit with enforcement challenges. Unlike the UK, German companies have preemption rights but are not subject to extensive transaction approval regulations. Additionally, while German takeover laws lack a non-frustration rule for target boards, they impose barriers to common US-style takeover barriers like "poison pills" and restrict "pre-bid defenses" (Davies et al., 2010). This nuanced legal landscape in Germany provides companies with options for structuring governance and defense mechanisms beyond the strict pro-shareholder stance seen in the UK.

In the US, corporate law has typically focused on shareholder primacy, but growing attention to ESG issues has led to broader stakeholder consideration. Delaware courts have affirmed that directors can consider social and environmental factors when aligned with long-term financial goals (Bainbridge, 2002). Laws such as the California Transparency in Supply Chains Act and New York's climate risk disclosure regulations push companies toward greater sustainability and social responsibility. Germany's governance model involves employee participation in decisions, which ensures that the interests of shareholders and other stakeholders are balanced. The German Act on Corporate Due Diligence Obligations in Supply Chains of 2023 requires companies to meet human rights and environmental standards in their global supply chains (Harrison & Freeman, 1999). The UK could benefit from adopting these practices, promoting stakeholder involvement and responsible governance while preserving flexibility and innovation. By analyzing both the US and German systems, the UK can tailor purpose-driven governance reforms that align with its unique legal and business culture.

7. QUESTIONING THE PRESUMED MANDATE

The fundamental rules governing power distribution, such as board elimination and shareholder meetings in the UK, are compulsory. Similarly, listed companies must adhere to preemption rights rules (unless waived by shareholders), the Takeover Code's Non-Frustration Rule, and significant transaction rules for premium-listed companies. Treating these instructions as non-negotiable implies that creating a legal barrier in widely held UK companies is impractical. Without unique elements like purposeful rights, a corporation's stated mission, requiring a rebalancing of stakeholder interests, may lack substance. This leads to a significant question: Is it feasible, in practice, to devise mechanisms within UK company regulations that support a purpose-driven approach while complying with these mandatory rules? In other words, can innovative legal strategies foster a purpose-oriented environment despite the rigid landscape of these rules? The formal response is "yes", but practically speaking, it is challenging. Although UK corporate law offers flexibility, it remains largely untapped and underutilized.

Creating a conducive legal framework for purpose-driven companies would likely require intervention from the state to educate market participants about available legal avenues and legitimize their adoption. Exploring this hidden flexibility necessitates considering theoretical approaches to tempering the mandatory pro-shareholder stance of UK corporate law. The flexibility within UK corporate law offers substantial opportunities, yet these opportunities are frequently overlooked and underutilized in real-world scenarios. Facilitating companies in creating a legal structure that aligns with their distinct objectives would necessitate government intervention to raise awareness among market participants about this existing flexibility and to validate its implementation. To delve into this concealed potential for adaptability, let us examine two theoretical strategies for balancing the obligatory shareholder-centric stance of UK corporate law.

Removal of the Board: Consider a scenario where the bye-laws of a listed company stipulate that 1) directors are selected for a term of five years, and 2) if a shareholder resolution is proposed to eliminate any director, the shares held by the directors will be granted voting rights determined by a majority of the directors, without a cap on the number of votes. If this provision is legally binding, it would grant directors a level of protection from shareholder pressure comparable to that seen in many US companies. However, is this provision compellable? In *Bushell v. Faith* (1970), the House of Lords endorsed a similar provision where, in a company with three equal shareholders, a director received three votes per share during a removal resolution against them. The Lords ruled that this procedure was not nullified by the compulsory removal right. The majority of the bench, particularly Lords Upjohn and Donovan, reasoned that the compulsory removal provision simply required a relative majority of votes to eliminate a director, and the Companies Act explicitly deputized the power to regulate voting rights to the company's articles. Lord Donovan highlighted that during the conscripting of the provision, Parliament was well aware of heavy voting rights practices but chose not to discourse them in the Act, indicating a deliberate decision to leave voting rights allocation to the discretion of companies and their shareholders. However, this judgment has faced significant criticism. Lord Morris of Borth-y-Gest dissented, echoing the first example judge's view that such arrangements made a "mockery" of the mandatory removal right. Gower's Principles of Modern Company Law also criticized the judgment as "apparently indefensible" unless narrowly construed for small partnership-like companies (Hare et al., 2021).

Lord Donovan did note that such provisions are often necessary in small companies to prevent internal disputes, but this observation does not alter the legal principle outlined by Lords Donovan and Upjohn regarding the company's power to determine share rights despite the elimination provision. Nevertheless, even if contingent heavy voting rights comply with the laws of corporations, the rules of listing pose hindrances to their acceptance. For "premium-listed companies", principle 7 of listing rules since 2014 forbids unequal voting arrangements. Yet, this ban does not apply to Standard Listings, making weighted voting provisions officially accessible to all firms under such listings.

The "Non-Frustration Rule" (NFR): Considering NFR (Kershaw, 2007), let us start with the assumption of shareholder approval for a poison pill. A distinctive poison pill comprises an alternative to purchasing shares in the target corporation (a "flip-in" plan), with terms drawn in a "shareholder rights plan". When triggered, the defense pill causes value reduction for the purchaser by allowing all shareholders except the offeror to buy newly issued shares at a substantial rebate (usually around 50%). A normal poison pill that grants the board the option to accept a bidder crossing a verge is not submissive with the NFR because any decision to disapprove the bidder's crossing of the threshold could be seen as interfering with shareholders' ability to evaluate the bid independently. Nevertheless, if the pill's "triggering or non-triggering" was tied to the board's separate and mandatory reference to shareholders regarding whether to admit or discard the bid (as per rule 25 of the UK Takeover Code), then this would not involve the board directly interfering with the bid. Instead, any interference would arise from a distinct and formally unrelated board action.

In philosophy, this could create an operative poison pill. However, this method has not been verified, and the Takeover Panel would likely view it unfavorably. It raises concerns about boards intentionally interfering with bid evaluations under the guise of their recommendation. This could be perceived as undermining the spirit of the NFR and the fundamental principles of the Code, including non-interference with shareholder choice. Therefore, while technically possible, there is uncertainty about its practical reliability due to potential conflicts with regulatory principles.

8. CRITIQUING ADAPTIVE LEGAL ECOLOGIES

8.1. Examining notions: Accountability and authority frameworks

The impression that company law should sometimes simplify the creation of customized legal environments to shield the board and managers from shareholder pressure contradicts prevailing political narratives and much academic thought. These narratives and theories stress the increasing need to hold the board and managers responsible to shareholders, advocating for robust shareholder rights and active shareholder involvement. Looking critically at this "zone of insulation", one could label it as the "realm of unaccountability" or the "territory of managerial abuse". Scholars like Bebchuk and Tallarita (2020) argue that existing managerial incentives make it improbable for shareholder interests to take a back seat, regardless of a company's stated goals. They point out the difficulties in altering these incentives and the dangers of decreased managerial accountability. The notion of purposive governance in corporate law and governance faces substantial academic challenges. Over the past few decades, the focus has been on addressing managerial agency costs — instances where managers prioritize their interests over the company's. This has led to a strong emphasis on accountability and exploring legal strategies to mitigate such costs. However, discussions on board accountability and discipline have been enriched by diverse opposing theories, particularly from scholars in the US and continental Europe.

These alternative theories highlight the benefits of corporate legal frameworks that empower boards while restricting certain shareholder rights. They emphasize the crucial role of board authority in shaping long-term investment strategies and enabling effective balancing of various interests by boards and management. This approach encourages investments in specialized skills tailored to the company's needs, ultimately boosting productivity. These theories resonate closely with the principles of purposive governance discussed here and manifest in various forms, supporting both shareholder and stakeholder perspectives.

8.2. The shift to empirical analysis in corporate law

The shift towards empirical methods in corporate governance scholarship at the turn of the millennium aimed to deliver a clearer understanding of the optimal form of corporate governance. However, it is important to retain that the notion of optimal governance preparations in this pragmatic literature is primarily measured by fiscal metrics such as the economic value of the corporation and the value of shareholders' wealth. These measures, which include share price returns over time, accounting returns, or Tobin's Q, focus on wealth generation effects and may not fully capture the societal effects that purposeful companies can create. As a result, legal and regulatory frameworks that support the development of purposeful companies might not be fully reflected in traditional financial measures that primarily focus on shareholder welfare. This distinction underscores the broader impact of corporate legal rules beyond just financial outcomes. In the realm of corporate governance, the nonfinancial welfare effects for employees are significant. These effects can include an improved wisdom of one's own purpose and direction stemming from being part of a corporate mission or purpose. Such benefits, which contribute to psychological well-being and a sense of a meaningful life, often extend beyond mere financial considerations and may not be fully captured in labor costs.

Psychological research supports the idea that companies focused on employee well-being and CSR can positively impact employee perceptions and overall psychological capital (Leal et al., 2015). This positive impact can manifest in various ways, from increased self-efficacy and sanguinity to suppleness and hope among employees. It also contributes to happier and less indignant individuals, enhances the validity of corporate life, and can even bolster the perception of capitalism as a whole (Gompers et al., 2003). Legal environments that support purposeful companies with a focus on employee well-being can indeed have significant positive psychological effects that extend beyond the workplace. These effects may spill over into employees' personal, corporate, and even political lives, influencing their overall fulfillment, happiness, confidence, and level of resentment (Rangan et al., 2015). While the specific firm-level value effects can be captured through various measures like value metrics, productivity, and innovation proxies, quantifying the broader societal welfare effect of happier and more fulfilled citizens is more complex. This includes considering the impact of purposeful psychological spillovers on political voting decisions and the subsequent effects on the lives of purposeful corporate citizens (Bebchuk & Cohen, 2005).

Although measuring such effects with confidence may be challenging for empirical social science, it is essential to recognize and consider these potential impacts when evaluating the optimal nature and form of laws and governance structures that support purposeful companies (Roe & Vatiero, 2018). Making evidence-based judgments should take into account not only financial metrics but also the broader societal and psychological implications of corporate governance frameworks.

9. RESULTS

The concept of a business's purpose has remained a longstanding topic in academic discourse. Throughout the history of corporate law, the idea of company purpose has evolved. In the 19th century, it primarily mentioned the matters and dimensions of the company from the perspective of Anglo-American or Anglo-Commonwealth corporate lawyers. In the 20th century and continuing today for many, company purpose has been understood in terms of the last awardees of corporate activities, focusing on whose welfare would be measured and ranked when corporate power is exercised. This traditional understanding is reflected in recent controversial statements, such as the US Business Roundtable's Statement on the Purpose of a Companies (Armour et al., 2017). However, in the present executive and commercial environment, backed by research institutes and growing regulatory acceptance, the company's purpose is taking on a new dimension. It is increasingly seen as not just what the corporation does but also how its actions contribute to and potentially transform the ecosphere in which we live.

This modern opinion, which we term mission purpose in this paper, highlights the goal of a company's realism and its general significance. In a meaningful company, the old-fashioned notion of firm determination regarding ultimate beneficiaries becomes secondary to the identified mission purpose. The configuration and prioritization of welfare are structured to aid and stimulate this objective purpose. This modification in focus underlines a deeper promise for generating value not just for shareholders but for a wider array of stakeholders, including staff, groups, and the environment. Companies that hold this viewpoint vigorously align their policies with societal requirements and encounters, representing a commitment to sustainable growth and long-term impact. By implanting this mission purpose into their core actions, businesses can steer a rapidly shifting world where success is well-adjusted with moral considerations and the quest for a higher communal good. Eventually, this method redefines accomplishment, placing establishments as fundamental players in the global struggle to address intricated social and ecological issues while nurturing invention and forming collective value across manifold magnitudes.

10. DISCUSSION

This study reveals a clear shift toward mission-driven corporate purpose, where companies are increasingly focused on societal and environmental impact alongside profit. However, the implementation of this shift remains inconsistent, as many companies still struggle to align their stated purposes with actual practices. The UK's "comply or explain" model, while beneficial in fostering mission-purpose companies, may not offer the necessary flexibility to accommodate diverse corporate needs, especially in jurisdictions with different governance structures. The findings suggest that corporate law should allow greater flexibility, enabling businesses to create governance models that align with their unique missions without being constrained by rigid regulations. This approach would support long-term, purpose-driven growth. Future research could explore the real-world impacts of such flexible governance models and their effectiveness in achieving sustainable outcomes.

11. CONCLUSION

Administrative decentralization is a complicated process that entails moving authority and duties from more powerful levels of government to lower levels of governance, such as regional or local authorities. It is connected to organizational restructuring and ownership. It seeks to advance neighborhood decision-making, increase responsiveness, and better service provision. The primary criterion for organizational restructuring of decentralization activity is ownership of duty in local government. As government units and agencies are rebuilt to conform to the new decentralized governance framework, organizational restructuring frequently follows administrative decentralization efforts. To facilitate the successful implementation of decentralized policies and programs, this reorganization may require modifications to organizational structures, responsibilities, and functions.

Ownership usually refers to the possession of assets and resources by decentralized entities in the context of administrative decentralization. The public could transfer ownership to local governments or other pertinent parties. This might give local organizations more sway over resources and decision-making. Administrative decentralization, organizational restructuring, and ownership are interrelated elements of governance reform, according to the particular conclusion on administrative decentralization in connection to ownership and ownership. They strive to improve local decision-making, service delivery, and responsibility distribution.

Administrative decentralization is a process that transfers authority from higher government levels to lower authorities, aiming to improve local decision-making, responsiveness, and service delivery. This process is closely linked to organizational restructuring and ownership, which involves the possession of assets and resources by decentralized entities. However, the study's scope is limited to specific case studies or regions, and its reliance on qualitative data may be subject to interpretation bias. Future research should consider quantitative analysis and a broader range of cases to enhance the robustness of the conclusions. Future research should also focus on comparative studies, long-term impacts, technology's role in decentralization, and the perspectives of stakeholders. This highlights the importance of expanding the research scope and acknowledging the limitations of the current study.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. B. (2017). *The ABCs of empirical corporate (governance) research*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3020479

Adanma, U. M., & Ogunbiyi, E. O. (2024). Evaluating the effectiveness of global governance mechanisms in promoting environmental sustainability and international relations. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal, 6*(5), 763–791. https://doi.org/10.51594/farj.v6i5.1151

Albuquerque, R., Koskinen, Y., Yang, S., & Zhang, C. (2020). Resilience of environmental and social stocks: An analysis of the exogenous Covid-19 market crash. *The Review of Corporate Finance Studies, 9*(3), 593–621. https://doi.org/10.1093/rcfs/cfaa011

Annesi, N., Battaglia, M., Ceglia, I., & Mercuri, F. (2025). Navigating paradoxes: Building a sustainable strategy for an integrated ESG corporate governance. *Management Decision, 63*(2), 531–559. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2023-2006

Armour, J., Enriques, L., Hansmann, H., & Kraakman, R. (2017). *The basic governance structure: The interests of shareholders as a class* (Law Working Paper No. 337/2017). European Corporate Governance Institute. https://www.ecgi.global/sites/default/files/working_papers/documents/SSRN-id2901416.pdf

Bainbridge, S. M. (2002). *Director primacy: The means and ends of corporate governance*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.300860

Barnard, C. (2016). *The substantive law of the EU: The four freedoms* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Bebchuk, L. A., & Cohen, A. (2005). The costs of entrenched boards. *Journal of Financial Economics, 78*(2), 409–433. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.12.006

Bebchuk, L. A., & Tallarita, R. (2020). The illusory promise of stakeholder governance. *Cornell Law Review, 106*(1), 91–178. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3544978

Bebchuk, L. A., Cohen, A., & Ferrell, A. (2009). What matters in corporate governance? *Review of Financial Studies, 22*(2), 783–827. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.593423

Berle, A. A., Jr. (1932). For whom are corporate managers trustees? A note. *Harvard Law Review, 45*(7), 1365–1372. https://doi.org/10.2307/1331920

Bukspan, E. (2022, January 13). *Corporate purpose and stakeholder fairness through the lens of behavioral economics: Legal implications*. Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance. https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2022/01/13/corporate-purpose-and-stakeholder-fairness-through-the-lens-of-behavioral-economics-legal-implications/

Bushell v Faith [1970] 1 All ER 53. Oxbridge notes. https://www.oxbridgenotes.co.uk/law_cases/bushell-v-faith

Chapman, C., Edmans, A., Gosling, T., Hutton, W., & Mayer, C. (2017). *The purposeful company* (Policy report). Big Innovation Centre. https://thepurposefulcompany.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/feb-24_tpc_policy-report_final_printed-2.pdf

Companies Act 2006. (2006). Legislation.gov.uk. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/contents

Davies, P. L., Schuster, E., & van de Walle de Ghelcke, E. (2010). *The takeover directive as a protectionist tool?* (ECGI Law Working Paper No. 141/2010). European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1554616

Demboski, A., & McCrum, D. (2011, February 23). Calpers wins Apple shareholder vote. *Financial Times*. https://on.ft.com/33Gc2cn

Denis, D. J., & Kruse, T. A. (2000). Managerial discipline and corporate restructuring following performance declines. *Journal of Financial Economics, 55*(3), 391–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(99)00055-0

Dodd, E. M., Jr. (1932). For whom are corporate managers trustees? *Harvard Law Review, 45*(7), 1145–1163. https://doi.org/10.2307/1331697

Dougan, M. (2000). Minimum harmonization and the internal market. *Common Market Law Review, 37*(4), 853–885. https://doi.org/10.54648/272669

Faleye, O. (2007). Classified boards, firm value, and managerial entrenchment. *Journal of Financial Economics, 83*(2), 501–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2006.01.005

Financial Reporting Council (FRC). (2018a). *Guidance on Board Effectiveness*. https://media.frc.org.uk/documents/Guidance_on_Board_Effectiveness_MmfcOrz.pdf

Financial Reporting Council (FRC). (2018b). *UK Corporate Governance Code*. https://media.frc.org.uk/documents/UK_Corporate_Governance_Code_2018.pdf

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman Publishing.

Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). A Friedman doctrine — The social responsibility of a business to increase its profits. *The New York Times Magazine*. https://www.nytimes.com/1970/09/13/archives/a-friedman-doctrine-the-social-responsibility-of-business-is-to.html

Gesetz über die Drittelbeteiligung der Arbeitnehmer im Aufsichtsrat (DrittelbG) [Law on the One-Third Participation of Employees in the Supervisory Board (DrittelbG)]. (2004). Bundesministerium der Justiz. https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/drittelbg/BJNR097410004.html

Gesetz über die Mitbestimmung der Arbeitnehmer (MitbestG) [Law on Employee Co-Determination (MitbestG)]. (1976). Bundesministerium der Justiz. https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/mitbestg/BJNR011530976.html

Gompers, P. A., Ishii, J., & Metrick, A. (2003). Corporate governance and equity prices. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118*(1), 107–156. https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360535162

Grant, J., & Kirchmaier, T. (2004). Corporate control in Europe. *Corporate Ownership & Control, 2*(2), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv2i2p6

Grove, H., Clouse, M., & Xu, T. (2020). Stakeholder capitalism strategies and opportunities for corporate governance. *Journal of Governance & Regulation, 9*(4), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv9i4art5

Hare, C., Davies, P. L., & Worthington, S. (2021). *Gower: Principles of modern company law* (11th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.

Harris. (2021). The role of ESG factors in corporate governance. *ESG Governance Reports, 5*(1), 33–50.

Harrison, J. S., & Freeman, R. E. (1999). Stakeholders, social responsibility, and performance: Empirical evidence and theoretical perspectives. *The Academy of Management Journal, 42*(5), 479–485. https://doi.org/10.2307/256971

Johnson, W. C., Karpoff, J. M., & Yi, S. (2015). The bonding hypothesis of takeover defenses: Evidence from IPO firms. *Journal of Financial Economics (JFE), 117*(2), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1923667

Kershaw, D. (2007). The illusion of importance: Reconsidering the UK's takeover prohibition. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly, 56*(2), 267–307. https://doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei165

Klein, J., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2021). Reshaping corporate governance: The role of purpose in innovation and competition. *Strategic Management Journal, 42*(3), 545–571.

Leal, S., Rego, A., & Pina Cunha, M. (2015). How employees' perceptions of corporate social responsibility make them happier and psychologically stronger. *International Journal of Sustainable Development, 8*(9), 113–114. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/70620308.pdf

Lee, J. M. (2023). Regulatory transformations in governance and ESG compliance. *Journal of Corporate Governance Studies, 18*(2), 123–145.

Lund, D. S. (2024). Public primacy in corporate law. *Seattle University Law Review, 47*(1). https://ssrn.com/abstract=4677040

Mayer, C. (2022). What is wrong with corporate law? The purpose of law and the law's purpose. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 18*(1), 283–296. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-050520-102251

Nakpodia, F., Adegbite, E., & Ashiru, F. (2021). Corporate governance regulation: A practice theory perspective. *Accounting Forum, 47*(1), 73–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/01559982.2021.1995934

Peters, R. H., & Taylor, L. A. (2016). Intangible capital and the investment-q relation. *Journal of Financial Economics*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2405231

Quinn, R. E., & Thakor, A. V. (2018). Creating a purpose-driven organization. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(5), 78–79. https://hbr.org/2018/07/creating-a-purpose-driven-organization

Rangan, K., Chase, L., & Karim, S. (2015). The truth about CSR. *Harvard Business Review, 93*(1), 40–49. https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=48438

Raz, A. (2019). A purpose-based theory of corporate law. *Villanova Law Review, 65*(3), Article 523. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3406942

Ringe, W.-G. (2015). Changing law and ownership patterns in Germany: Corporate governance and the erosion of Deutschland AG. *The American Journal of Comparative Law, 63*(2), 493–538. https://doi.org/10.5131/AJCL.2015.0014

Roe, M. J. (2013). Corporate short-termism — In the boardroom and in the courtroom. *Business Lawyer, 68*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2239132

Roe, M. J., & Vatiero, M. (2018). Corporate governance and its political economy. In J. N. Gordon & W.-G. Ringe (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of corporate law and governance* (pp. 283–296). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198743682.013.50

Strine, L. E., Jr. (2017). Corporate power is corporate purpose I: Evidence from my home town. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 33*(2), 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grx027

The German Act on Corporate Due Diligence Obligations in Supply Chains. (2023). Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) Division Sustainable transformation of global supply chains. https://www.bmz.de/resource/blob/154774/lieferkettengesetz-faktenpapier-partnerlaender-eng-bf.pdf