J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)

THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Financialization of Sustainability and Shadow Capitalism: ESG Signaling, Regulatory Arbitrage, and Corporate Legitimacy in the Post-BEPS Global Tax Era

Dr. Neha Prakash
Assistant Professor, Amity School of Management and Commerce, Amity University Jharkhand, Ranchi, nehaprakash6693@gmail.com

Priyadarsini Dip
Assistant Professor, Finance and Accounting, Regional college of Management, Bhubaneswar, Khurdha, Odisha, priyadarsini.d@rcm.ac / priyadarsinidip123@gmail.com

Siva Hemanth Kolla
Gen AI Research Scientist,Cloud Bridge Solutions Inc, USA, siva.kolla.hemanth@gmail.com,ORCID ID: 0009-0009-2644-5298

Dr. Chanchal Chawla
Professor, Department Of Management, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, chanchalchawla0@gmail.com

Akansh Garg
Director Array Research Pvt Ltd, 7505264391akg@gmail.com

Abstract

The increasing integration of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles into global financial markets has transformed sustainability from a primarily ethical and social concern into a strategic financial asset. While ESG frameworks were originally developed to encourage responsible corporate behavior and long-term value creation, the growing financialization of sustainability has generated new concerns regarding regulatory arbitrage, symbolic compliance, and corporate legitimacy management. Simultaneously, multinational corporations continue to employ sophisticated tax planning mechanisms, profit-shifting structures, and jurisdictional optimization strategies despite global regulatory reforms such as the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative. This convergence of sustainability finance and global tax governance has given rise to a complex phenomenon characterized by ESG signaling, shadow capitalism, and legitimacy-oriented corporate behavior. This study develops a comprehensive analytical framework for examining the relationship between sustainability financialization, ESG performance disclosures, regulatory arbitrage practices, and corporate legitimacy in the post-BEPS global economy. Drawing upon institutional theory, legitimacy theory, stakeholder theory, and financialization literature, the research investigates how firms utilize ESG narratives to manage reputational risks while simultaneously engaging in aggressive tax planning and financial engineering practices. The findings suggest that ESG signaling increasingly functions as a mechanism of strategic legitimacy construction rather than purely substantive sustainability transformation. Furthermore, post-BEPS regulatory reforms have altered but not eliminated opportunities for regulatory arbitrage, resulting in the emergence of more sophisticated forms of shadow capitalism. The study contributes to contemporary debates on sustainable finance, corporate governance, and global taxation by

highlighting tensions between symbolic sustainability commitments and underlying economic practices.

Key Words: ESG, Financialization, Sustainability, Regulatory Arbitrage, Corporate Legitimacy, BEPS, Shadow Capitalism, Tax Governance, Sustainable Finance, Corporate Accountability.

Introduction

The global economy has witnessed a profound transformation in the relationship between finance, sustainability, and corporate governance over the past two decades. Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) considerations have moved from the periphery of business strategy to the center of investment decision-making, regulatory discourse, and corporate reporting frameworks [1]. Financial institutions, multinational corporations, asset managers, and regulatory agencies increasingly promote ESG principles as mechanisms for achieving sustainable development, responsible investment, and long-term value creation. Consequently, sustainability has become deeply embedded within contemporary financial markets and corporate governance structures.

This transformation has been accompanied by the rapid expansion of sustainable finance. Global ESG-linked assets have grown substantially, with investors increasingly incorporating sustainability criteria into portfolio management decisions. ESG ratings, sustainability indices, green bonds, impact investing frameworks, and sustainability reporting standards have become influential components of modern financial systems [2]. These developments suggest an emerging consensus that financial markets can contribute to addressing environmental and social challenges while simultaneously generating economic returns.

However, the growing integration of sustainability into financial markets has generated important theoretical and practical concerns. Critics argue that the financialization of sustainability may transform environmental and social objectives into tradable financial assets, thereby prioritizing market logic over substantive sustainability outcomes [3]. Under such conditions, ESG frameworks risk becoming instruments of financial value creation rather than mechanisms for addressing structural environmental and social problems. This phenomenon raises important questions regarding the authenticity, effectiveness, and accountability of corporate sustainability initiatives.

One particularly significant concern involves ESG signaling. Signaling theory suggests that organizations communicate selected information to influence stakeholder perceptions and reduce information asymmetries [4]. Within sustainability contexts, corporations increasingly utilize ESG disclosures, sustainability reports, climate commitments, and responsible investment narratives to signal environmental and social responsibility. While such disclosures may reflect genuine sustainability efforts, they may also function as symbolic mechanisms designed to enhance reputation, attract investment, and strengthen corporate legitimacy without fundamentally altering business practices [5].

The concept of corporate legitimacy provides an important theoretical lens for understanding these dynamics. Legitimacy theory proposes that organizations seek alignment between their activities and prevailing societal norms, values, and expectations in order to secure continued access to resources and stakeholder support [6]. ESG disclosures can therefore be interpreted

as legitimacy-enhancing mechanisms through which corporations demonstrate conformity with emerging sustainability expectations. As sustainability becomes increasingly institutionalized within financial markets, ESG reporting may serve both informational and symbolic purposes.

Simultaneously, multinational corporations continue to operate within highly complex global tax environments characterized by regulatory diversity, jurisdictional competition, and evolving governance frameworks. Corporate tax strategies frequently involve sophisticated arrangements designed to minimize tax liabilities through transfer pricing, intellectual property migration, hybrid financial instruments, and offshore structures [7]. These practices are often described within broader discussions of shadow capitalism, which refers to economic activities that operate within legal boundaries while exploiting regulatory gaps and institutional asymmetries.

The OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative represents one of the most significant efforts to address aggressive tax planning and regulatory arbitrage in the global economy. Introduced in response to growing concerns regarding profit shifting and tax avoidance by multinational enterprises, BEPS seeks to enhance transparency, improve international tax coordination, and reduce opportunities for artificial profit allocation [8]. The initiative includes measures addressing transfer pricing, treaty abuse, hybrid mismatch arrangements, country-by-country reporting, and digital taxation.

Despite these reforms, opportunities for regulatory arbitrage remain prevalent. Regulatory arbitrage refers to the practice of exploiting differences among legal, regulatory, or tax systems to achieve economic advantages [9]. Multinational corporations often possess significant capabilities for identifying and utilizing such differences across jurisdictions. As traditional tax avoidance mechanisms become increasingly constrained by BEPS reforms, firms may develop more sophisticated strategies involving intangible assets, digital business models, and complex organizational structures.

The coexistence of ESG commitments and aggressive tax planning has generated increasing scholarly attention. While corporations frequently present themselves as socially responsible and sustainability-oriented entities, critics argue that extensive tax avoidance may undermine broader social responsibilities by reducing public revenues available for social and environmental programs [10]. This apparent contradiction raises important questions regarding the relationship between corporate sustainability narratives and underlying economic practices.

Recent research suggests that ESG performance and tax behavior may be interconnected through legitimacy management strategies. Firms facing reputational risks associated with tax controversies may increase sustainability disclosures to offset negative stakeholder perceptions. Conversely, strong ESG reputations may provide legitimacy buffers that reduce scrutiny of corporate tax practices [11]. Such dynamics highlight the need for integrated analyses examining sustainability reporting, corporate legitimacy, and tax governance within a common framework.

The concept of shadow capitalism is particularly relevant in this context. Shadow capitalism extends beyond traditional understandings of informal economic activity by emphasizing the

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

role of legal but opaque financial structures, regulatory complexity, and institutional fragmentation in facilitating economic value extraction [12]. Modern forms of shadow capitalism often involve sophisticated interactions among financial markets, legal systems, accounting practices, and global governance institutions. ESG financialization and post-BEPS tax planning may therefore represent interconnected manifestations of broader transformations within contemporary capitalism.

Furthermore, the post-BEPS environment has intensified debates regarding corporate accountability, transparency, and governance. Stakeholders increasingly expect corporations not only to demonstrate environmental responsibility but also to contribute fairly to public finances and social welfare. As a result, tax transparency has emerged as an important dimension of corporate sustainability and ESG evaluation [13]. Investors, regulators, and civil society organizations are increasingly scrutinizing relationships between sustainability commitments and corporate tax practices.

Given these developments, there is a growing need for comprehensive frameworks capable of examining the intersections among sustainability financialization, ESG signaling, regulatory arbitrage, corporate legitimacy, and global tax governance. Existing research often addresses these issues separately, limiting understanding of their interconnected nature within contemporary financial capitalism.
This study seeks to address this gap by developing an integrated analytical framework for examining financialization of sustainability and shadow capitalism in the post-BEPS global economy. Specifically, the research investigates the following questions:
1. How does ESG financialization influence corporate legitimacy strategies?
2. What role does ESG signaling play in managing stakeholder perceptions?
3. How have post-BEPS reforms affected regulatory arbitrage practices?
4. What relationships exist between sustainability disclosures and shadow capitalism mechanisms?
5. How can corporate legitimacy be understood within evolving global governance frameworks?

By addressing these questions, the study contributes to contemporary debates on sustainable finance, corporate governance, global taxation, and legitimacy management in the twenty-first-century economy.

Ii. Related Works

The growing convergence of sustainability, finance, and corporate governance has generated significant academic interest in understanding how corporations respond to increasing stakeholder expectations while simultaneously pursuing financial objectives. The emergence of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) frameworks, sustainable finance mechanisms, and international tax reforms has transformed the landscape within which multinational enterprises operate. Existing literature suggests that the financialization of sustainability, corporate legitimacy management, and regulatory arbitrage are increasingly interconnected phenomena that shape contemporary corporate behavior [14].

One of the foundational theoretical perspectives relevant to this study is Financialization Theory. Financialization refers to the increasing dominance of financial motives, financial actors, financial markets, and financial institutions within economic and social systems [15]. Scholars argue that financialization has fundamentally altered corporate governance by

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

prioritizing shareholder value maximization, financial performance metrics, and market-based evaluation mechanisms. Under financialized capitalism, corporations increasingly structure strategic decisions according to financial market expectations rather than broader societal objectives. Consequently, sustainability initiatives are often evaluated in terms of financial returns, risk management benefits, and investor perceptions rather than intrinsic environmental or social value.

The concept of sustainability financialization emerged from this broader theoretical tradition. Researchers have observed that sustainability issues previously considered ethical or environmental concerns are increasingly incorporated into financial instruments, investment strategies, and market valuation frameworks [16]. Green bonds, sustainability-linked loans, ESG investment funds, carbon markets, and climate-related financial disclosures exemplify this transformation. While proponents argue that financialization mobilizes capital toward sustainable development goals, critics contend that it may reduce complex environmental and social challenges to financial metrics and market opportunities.

A related stream of literature focuses on ESG signaling and corporate disclosure practices. Signaling Theory, originally developed by Spence, proposes that organizations communicate selected information to reduce information asymmetries and influence stakeholder perceptions [4]. Within sustainability contexts, ESG disclosures function as signals regarding corporate responsibility, ethical commitment, and governance quality. Investors frequently rely on such signals when evaluating corporate risk profiles and long-term performance potential.

However, several studies suggest that ESG disclosures do not always correspond to substantive sustainability performance. Lyon and Montgomery argue that corporations may engage in symbolic sustainability communication designed primarily to enhance reputation and stakeholder trust [17]. This phenomenon is commonly associated with concepts such as greenwashing, impression management, and symbolic compliance. Under these conditions, ESG reporting becomes a strategic communication tool rather than a direct reflection of organizational transformation.

The distinction between substantive and symbolic sustainability practices has become a major focus of contemporary ESG research. Substantive sustainability involves genuine organizational changes aimed at improving environmental and social outcomes, whereas symbolic sustainability emphasizes communication strategies intended to influence stakeholder perceptions without significant operational changes [18]. Researchers increasingly examine how firms balance these dimensions when responding to stakeholder demands and regulatory expectations.

Legitimacy Theory provides another important perspective for understanding corporate sustainability behavior. According to Suchman, legitimacy represents a generalized perception that organizational activities are desirable, appropriate, or consistent with socially constructed norms and values [6]. Organizations depend upon legitimacy to secure stakeholder support, maintain access to resources, and ensure long-term survival. As sustainability expectations become institutionalized within global markets, corporations increasingly utilize ESG disclosures as mechanisms for demonstrating legitimacy and maintaining social acceptance.
The literature identifies several forms of legitimacy, including pragmatic legitimacy, moral

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

legitimacy, and cognitive legitimacy. Pragmatic legitimacy is based on stakeholder self-interest, moral legitimacy derives from ethical evaluations of organizational behavior, and cognitive legitimacy emerges when organizational practices become socially taken for granted [19]. ESG reporting can contribute to each of these forms by signaling responsibility, ethical commitment, and conformity with prevailing sustainability norms.

Institutional Theory further expands understanding of sustainability reporting and corporate governance practices. Institutional scholars argue that organizational behavior is shaped not only by economic incentives but also by institutional pressures arising from regulatory bodies, professional associations, industry norms, and societal expectations [20]. As ESG frameworks become increasingly institutionalized, corporations may adopt sustainability reporting practices in response to coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures rather than purely economic considerations.

Coercive pressures arise from regulations and legal requirements, normative pressures emerge from professional standards and industry expectations, and mimetic pressures occur when organizations imitate perceived successful practices adopted by competitors [21]. The rapid growth of ESG reporting standards and sustainability disclosure frameworks can be interpreted through this institutional lens. Corporations frequently adopt ESG practices to conform to evolving expectations within their institutional environments.

The literature on regulatory arbitrage provides another critical perspective relevant to this study. Regulatory arbitrage refers to the strategic exploitation of differences among regulatory regimes to achieve economic advantages [9]. Multinational corporations often operate across multiple jurisdictions characterized by varying tax rates, reporting requirements, governance standards, and legal frameworks. Such diversity creates opportunities for firms to structure operations in ways that minimize regulatory costs and maximize financial returns.
Prior research demonstrates that regulatory arbitrage has become increasingly sophisticated within globalized economic systems. Rather than relying solely on traditional tax havens, corporations utilize complex organizational structures involving intellectual property ownership, transfer pricing arrangements, financing subsidiaries, and hybrid entities [22]. These strategies enable firms to exploit legal inconsistencies and institutional fragmentation while remaining formally compliant with applicable regulations.

The OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative has generated a substantial body of literature examining international tax governance and corporate tax avoidance. BEPS was developed in response to concerns that multinational enterprises were artificially shifting profits to low-tax jurisdictions, thereby eroding national tax bases and undermining fiscal sovereignty [8]. The initiative introduced a comprehensive set of reforms addressing transfer pricing, treaty abuse, country-by-country reporting, hybrid mismatches, and digital taxation.
Several studies suggest that BEPS has improved transparency and reduced certain forms of aggressive tax planning [23]. However, researchers also argue that multinational corporations continue to adapt to evolving regulatory environments by developing new forms of tax optimization and organizational restructuring. Consequently, BEPS may have altered rather than eliminated opportunities for regulatory arbitrage.

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Table 1. Major Theoretical Perspectives on ESG, Legitimacy, and Regulatory Arbitrage

Theory	Core Concept	Relevance to Study
Financialization Theory	Expansion of financial logic into social domains	Explains ESG as financial asset
Signaling Theory	Information disclosure reduces asymmetry	Explains ESG communication strategies
Legitimacy Theory	Organizations seek societal acceptance	Explains ESG-based legitimacy construction
Institutional Theory	Organizations respond to institutional pressures	Explains ESG adoption and reporting
Stakeholder Theory	Firms must satisfy stakeholder expectations	Explains sustainability accountability
Regulatory Arbitrage Theory	Exploitation of regulatory differences	Explains tax optimization behavior

The relationship between ESG performance and corporate tax behavior has become an increasingly important area of investigation. Traditional sustainability research often treated environmental, social, and governance issues separately from tax governance. However, recent scholarship suggests that tax practices should be considered integral components of corporate social responsibility and sustainability performance [24]. Aggressive tax avoidance may undermine public finances and reduce resources available for social welfare, infrastructure, environmental protection, and sustainable development initiatives.

Several studies report conflicting evidence regarding the relationship between ESG performance and tax avoidance. Some researchers find that firms with strong ESG ratings exhibit lower levels of aggressive tax planning due to stronger governance structures and ethical commitments [25]. Others argue that ESG disclosures may function as reputational shields that reduce stakeholder scrutiny of corporate tax practices [26]. These contrasting findings suggest a complex relationship between sustainability narratives and underlying financial behavior.

The concept of shadow capitalism provides a broader framework for interpreting these developments. Shadow capitalism extends beyond traditional understandings of informal economic activity by focusing on legal yet opaque mechanisms of value extraction operating

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

within global financial systems [12]. Such mechanisms frequently involve complex financial structures, regulatory fragmentation, offshore jurisdictions, and institutional asymmetries. Modern shadow capitalism is therefore characterized not by illegality but by opacity, complexity, and strategic exploitation of governance gaps.

Recent scholarship suggests that ESG financialization and regulatory arbitrage may represent interconnected dimensions of contemporary capitalist systems. On one hand, corporations utilize sustainability frameworks to secure legitimacy, attract investment, and manage stakeholder expectations. On the other hand, they continue to pursue financial optimization strategies through sophisticated tax planning and regulatory navigation [27]. This coexistence creates tensions between corporate sustainability narratives and economic practices, raising important questions regarding accountability, transparency, and governance effectiveness.
The literature also highlights increasing investor interest in tax transparency as a component of ESG evaluation. Asset managers, institutional investors, and governance rating agencies increasingly incorporate tax governance indicators into sustainability assessments [28]. This trend reflects growing recognition that responsible corporate behavior extends beyond environmental performance to include fiscal responsibility and contribution to public goods.

Overall, existing scholarship demonstrates that financialization, ESG signaling, legitimacy management, regulatory arbitrage, and tax governance are deeply interconnected phenomena shaping contemporary corporate behavior. Nevertheless, much of the existing literature examines these issues separately, limiting understanding of their combined effects within the post-BEPS global economy. There remains a need for integrated analytical frameworks capable of examining how sustainability narratives, financial incentives, and regulatory structures interact to influence corporate legitimacy and economic behavior. Addressing this gap provides the foundation for the present study.

Iii. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative analytical research design grounded in interdisciplinary perspectives from sustainable finance, corporate governance, institutional theory, legitimacy theory, and international taxation. The objective is to develop a conceptual framework explaining how multinational corporations employ ESG disclosures, sustainability narratives, and governance reporting mechanisms to construct legitimacy while simultaneously engaging in regulatory arbitrage and tax optimization strategies within the post-BEPS global economy. The research focuses on understanding the interaction between sustainability financialization and shadow capitalism rather than evaluating individual corporate cases.

A conceptual analytical approach is appropriate because the phenomenon under investigation involves complex institutional relationships among financial markets, regulatory frameworks, corporate governance systems, and stakeholder expectations. The study synthesizes theoretical insights from financialization literature, ESG governance research, tax policy studies, and corporate legitimacy scholarship to develop an integrated framework capable of explaining contemporary corporate behavior.

The analytical model assumes that corporate sustainability practices increasingly operate within financialized environments where ESG performance functions both as a governance mechanism and as a source of reputational capital. Simultaneously, firms continue to pursue

financial optimization strategies through legal but complex regulatory arrangements. The methodology therefore examines how these seemingly contradictory practices coexist within modern multinational enterprises.

3.2 Analytical Framework

The proposed framework evaluates interactions among five principal dimensions:

1. ESG Signaling Intensity
2. Corporate Legitimacy Construction
3. Regulatory Arbitrage Capability
4. Financialization of Sustainability
5. Post-BEPS Tax Governance

These dimensions collectively explain how organizations navigate increasing sustainability expectations while maintaining financial performance objectives.

The framework assumes that ESG reporting generates legitimacy benefits that influence stakeholder perceptions, investor confidence, and organizational reputation. At the same time, firms seek opportunities to optimize tax obligations and regulatory compliance costs through sophisticated governance structures. The interaction between these forces forms the basis of the analytical model.

Table 2. Core Analytical Dimensions

Dimension	Description	Strategic Objective
ESG Signaling	Sustainability disclosures and reporting practices	Reputation enhancement
Corporate Legitimacy	Stakeholder acceptance and trust	Social license to operate
Financialization	Conversion of sustainability into financial value	Investor attraction
Regulatory Arbitrage	Exploitation of regulatory differences	Cost optimization

Tax Governance	Management of tax obligations and transparency	Financial efficiency

The framework recognizes that these dimensions are not independent but interact dynamically within contemporary corporate governance systems.

3.3 Corporate Legitimacy Model

The study conceptualizes legitimacy as a strategic organizational resource that influences stakeholder support, investor confidence, and market valuation. Corporate legitimacy is assumed to be influenced by ESG disclosures, governance quality, transparency practices, and stakeholder engagement.

The legitimacy function can be represented as:

$$CL = f(ESG, TR, CG, SE)$$

where:

- **CL** = Corporate Legitimacy
- **ESG** = ESG Disclosure Intensity
- **TR** = Transparency Level
- **CG** = Corporate Governance Quality
- **SE** = Stakeholder Engagement

This model suggests that legitimacy is constructed through multiple mechanisms that collectively influence stakeholder perceptions of organizational responsibility and accountability.

Within financialized markets, ESG disclosures increasingly function as legitimacy signals capable of affecting investment decisions and corporate valuation. Consequently, sustainability reporting becomes both an accountability mechanism and a strategic communication tool.

3.4 Financialization and ESG Value Creation

The financialization dimension examines how sustainability performance is transformed into financial value through capital market mechanisms. Under financialized capitalism, ESG performance increasingly influences investment flows, cost of capital, access to financing, and market valuation.

The relationship between sustainability and financial value can be expressed as:

$$FV = \alpha ESG + \beta REP + \gamma INV + \varepsilon$$

where:

- **FV** = Financial Value Creation
- **ESG** = Sustainability Performance
- **REP** = Corporate Reputation
- **INV** = Investor Confidence
- **ε** = Error Term
- **α, β, γ** = Influence Coefficients

This formulation reflects the assumption that sustainability increasingly operates as a financial asset capable of generating measurable economic benefits.

The model further acknowledges that ESG ratings, sustainability indices, and responsible investment frameworks influence investor behavior and contribute to financial value generation.

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

3.5 Regulatory Arbitrage Assessment
A central objective of the study is examining how multinational enterprises exploit differences among regulatory systems despite increasing international tax coordination efforts.
Regulatory arbitrage capability is conceptualized as a function of jurisdictional diversity, organizational complexity, legal flexibility, and tax planning sophistication.

Table 3. Regulatory Arbitrage Mechanisms

Mechanism	Description	Strategic Outcome
Transfer Pricing	Pricing of intra-group transactions	Profit allocation
Intellectual Property Migration	Relocation of intangible assets	Tax reduction
Hybrid Financial Structures	Cross-border financing arrangements	Regulatory optimization
Treaty Shopping	Exploitation of tax treaties	Reduced tax liabilities
Offshore Structuring	Jurisdictional optimization	Financial efficiency

The framework assumes that post-BEPS reforms have reduced certain opportunities for aggressive tax planning but have simultaneously encouraged the development of more sophisticated organizational structures and compliance strategies.

3.6 Evaluation Dimensions
The effectiveness of ESG signaling and legitimacy construction is evaluated through four major analytical dimensions:
1. Sustainability Disclosure Effectiveness
2. Investor Confidence Generation
3. Tax Transparency Alignment
4. Corporate Accountability Outcomes

These dimensions provide a basis for assessing whether sustainability reporting corresponds with broader governance and accountability objectives.

Table 4. Evaluation Framework

Evaluation Area	Assessment Focus
ESG Effectiveness	Quality and credibility of sustainability disclosures
Legitimacy Outcomes	Stakeholder trust and acceptance
Governance Quality	Transparency and accountability
Tax Responsibility	Alignment between ESG and tax behavior
Investor Response	Market confidence and valuation effects
Regulatory Compliance	Conformity with international standards

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)

The framework recognizes that strong ESG performance does not necessarily imply responsible tax behavior, making integrated evaluation essential.

3.7 Analytical Procedure

The analytical process begins with a review of contemporary literature concerning ESG reporting, sustainable finance, financialization, legitimacy theory, tax governance, and regulatory arbitrage. Theoretical constructs are subsequently integrated into a unified conceptual framework linking sustainability disclosures with financial and governance outcomes.

The framework then evaluates relationships among ESG signaling practices, legitimacy construction mechanisms, and tax governance strategies. Particular attention is given to identifying areas where symbolic sustainability commitments may diverge from underlying economic behavior. The analysis further examines how post-BEPS reforms have altered opportunities for regulatory arbitrage and influenced corporate governance strategies.

Finally, the study synthesizes findings from multiple theoretical perspectives to develop an integrated explanation of sustainability financialization and shadow capitalism within contemporary global markets. This approach provides a comprehensive basis for evaluating tensions between corporate sustainability narratives and financial optimization strategies.

Iv. Results And Analysis

4.1 ESG Signaling and Corporate Legitimacy

The analysis indicates that ESG disclosures have become one of the most influential mechanisms through which corporations construct legitimacy in contemporary financial markets. Over the past decade, sustainability reporting has evolved from a voluntary communication practice into a strategic governance instrument closely linked to investor expectations, stakeholder engagement, and market valuation. Organizations increasingly utilize ESG disclosures not only to communicate environmental and social performance but also to demonstrate conformity with prevailing institutional norms and governance standards.

The findings suggest that ESG reporting performs dual functions. First, it provides information regarding corporate sustainability practices. Second, it serves as a legitimacy-enhancing mechanism that strengthens stakeholder trust and reduces reputational risks. As sustainability becomes increasingly institutionalized within financial markets, firms that fail to demonstrate ESG commitment may face legitimacy deficits affecting investor confidence and market perception.

However, the analysis also indicates that ESG signaling frequently extends beyond substantive sustainability performance. Many organizations adopt highly visible sustainability initiatives while maintaining business models and financial structures that remain largely unchanged. Under such circumstances, ESG disclosures function primarily as symbolic legitimacy tools rather than indicators of transformational sustainability practices.

Table 5. ESG Signaling and Legitimacy Outcomes

ESG Activity	Primary Stakeholder Impact	Legitimacy Effect
Sustainability Reporting	Investors	High
Climate Commitments	Regulators and Society	High
ESG Ratings Participation	Financial Markets	Moderate to High
Sustainability Certifications	Consumers	Moderate

Governance Disclosures	Shareholders	High

The results suggest that legitimacy benefits often constitute a major motivation underlying ESG disclosure strategies, particularly in highly visible multinational corporations.

4.2 Financialization of Sustainability

The analysis reveals that sustainability has increasingly become embedded within financial market structures, transforming environmental and social performance into measurable financial assets. This process, commonly described as the financialization of sustainability, reflects the growing tendency of investors, asset managers, rating agencies, and financial institutions to evaluate sustainability through market-oriented indicators and valuation mechanisms [15], [16].

Historically, sustainability initiatives were largely associated with corporate citizenship, environmental stewardship, and ethical responsibility. However, the expansion of ESG investing, sustainability-linked finance, green bonds, and climate-related disclosures has altered the strategic role of sustainability within corporate governance systems. Sustainability performance now directly influences investment decisions, access to capital, risk assessments, and corporate valuation models. Consequently, ESG performance has become an important determinant of financial competitiveness.

The findings indicate that organizations increasingly view sustainability as a source of economic value creation rather than solely a social obligation. Strong ESG ratings may reduce financing costs, improve investor confidence, enhance brand reputation, and strengthen market positioning. These benefits create incentives for firms to invest heavily in sustainability communication and ESG disclosure practices.

However, the financialization process also generates important concerns. As sustainability becomes increasingly quantified through ratings, rankings, and disclosure metrics, organizations may prioritize performance indicators that influence investors while neglecting broader sustainability objectives. Such dynamics can encourage symbolic compliance, where firms focus on improving ESG scores rather than addressing underlying environmental and social challenges.

Table 6. Financialization Mechanisms within ESG Governance

Mechanism	**Financial Outcome**	**Strategic Effect**
ESG Ratings	Increased investor confidence	Capital attraction
Sustainability Indices	Market visibility	Reputation enhancement
Green Bonds	Access to sustainable finance	Funding diversification
ESG Investment	Higher institutional	Valuation improvement

Funds	ownership	
Sustainability Reporting	Risk reduction perceptions	Legitimacy building

The analysis suggests that financialization has transformed sustainability into a strategic financial resource capable of generating economic returns while simultaneously influencing stakeholder perceptions.

4.3 Regulatory Arbitrage in the Post-BEPS Era

The findings indicate that the OECD Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative has significantly altered the international tax environment but has not eliminated opportunities for regulatory arbitrage. Prior to BEPS implementation, multinational corporations frequently utilized transfer pricing arrangements, intellectual property migration, hybrid entities, and offshore structures to shift profits toward low-tax jurisdictions [8].

BEPS reforms introduced greater transparency requirements, country-by-country reporting obligations, anti-abuse provisions, and strengthened transfer pricing regulations. These measures increased regulatory scrutiny and reduced some of the most visible forms of aggressive tax planning. Nevertheless, multinational enterprises continue to demonstrate substantial adaptability in response to evolving regulatory environments.

The analysis reveals that regulatory arbitrage has shifted from straightforward tax minimization strategies toward more sophisticated forms of organizational and financial structuring. Rather than relying solely on traditional tax havens, corporations increasingly utilize complex combinations of intellectual property management, digital business models, financing arrangements, and treaty networks to optimize tax outcomes.

Furthermore, differences in national implementation of BEPS measures create new opportunities for regulatory navigation. While international coordination has improved, inconsistencies among domestic legal systems continue to provide avenues for strategic tax planning.

Table 7. Regulatory Arbitrage before and after BEPS

Dimension	Pre-BEPS Environment	Post-BEPS Environment
Transfer Pricing Flexibility	High	Moderate
Offshore Profit Shifting	Extensive	Reduced
Transparency Requirements	Limited	High
Country-by-Country Reporting	Absent	Mandatory
Regulatory Complexity	Moderate	Very High

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Strategic Adaptation Opportunities	High	Moderate to High

The findings suggest that BEPS reforms have increased compliance obligations and transparency but have not fundamentally eliminated the incentives driving regulatory arbitrage behavior.

4.4 Shadow Capitalism and Corporate Governance

The concept of shadow capitalism provides a broader framework for understanding how corporations operate within increasingly complex global governance systems. Unlike traditional conceptions of illegal economic activity, shadow capitalism refers to legal yet opaque practices that exploit institutional fragmentation, regulatory asymmetries, and governance gaps to generate economic advantages [12].

The analysis demonstrates that shadow capitalism frequently operates through sophisticated financial structures that remain formally compliant with applicable regulations while reducing transparency and accountability. Such practices include complex ownership arrangements, offshore financing structures, intellectual property migration, tax-efficient organizational designs, and multilayered corporate entities.

Corporate governance mechanisms play a crucial role in legitimizing these arrangements. Firms frequently justify complex structures on the basis of shareholder value creation, operational efficiency, global competitiveness, and fiduciary responsibility. At the same time, sustainability disclosures and ESG commitments may strengthen corporate legitimacy by shifting stakeholder attention toward socially desirable initiatives.

The coexistence of sustainability narratives and aggressive financial optimization strategies creates a paradox within contemporary corporate governance. Organizations simultaneously seek recognition as responsible corporate citizens while engaging in practices that may reduce public revenues and complicate regulatory oversight.

Table 8. Characteristics of Contemporary Shadow Capitalism

Characteristic	Description	Governance Implication
Regulatory Complexity	Utilization of multi-jurisdictional structures	Reduced transparency
Financial Engineering	Optimization through financial instruments	Enhanced profitability
Legal Compliance	Formal adherence to regulations	Legitimacy preservation
Information Asymmetry	Limited stakeholder visibility	Accountability challenges

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Institutional Fragmentation	Exploitation of governance differences	Regulatory arbitrage opportunities

The findings suggest that shadow capitalism is increasingly embedded within mainstream corporate governance systems rather than existing outside formal economic structures.

4.5 Integrated Analysis: ESG, Legitimacy, and Tax Governance

The most significant finding emerging from this study is the interconnected nature of ESG signaling, legitimacy management, sustainability financialization, and regulatory arbitrage. These phenomena should not be viewed as separate dimensions of corporate behavior but rather as components of an integrated governance strategy operating within contemporary global capitalism.

The analysis indicates that ESG disclosures frequently generate legitimacy benefits that may indirectly reduce stakeholder scrutiny of corporate financial practices. Strong sustainability reputations can function as reputational assets that enhance organizational credibility and stakeholder trust. In some cases, these legitimacy benefits may offset concerns regarding aggressive tax planning or complex financial structures.

At the same time, investors increasingly incorporate tax transparency and governance indicators into ESG evaluations. This development suggests a gradual convergence between sustainability accountability and fiscal responsibility. Stakeholders are beginning to recognize that corporate sustainability extends beyond environmental performance and includes broader obligations related to taxation, governance, transparency, and social contribution.

Table 9. Interaction among ESG, Legitimacy, and Regulatory Arbitrage

Variable	ESG Signaling	Legitimacy	Regulatory Arbitrage
ESG Disclosure	High Positive Effect	Strong Positive Effect	Indirect Influence
Sustainability Reputation	Positive	Strong Positive	Potential Shielding Effect
Tax Transparency	Positive	Positive	Reduces Arbitrage Risk
Governance Quality	Positive	Positive	Reduces Opportunistic Behavior
Stakeholder Scrutiny	Moderate	Variable	Constrains Arbitrage

V. Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that the financialization of sustainability has fundamentally altered the relationship between corporate governance, capital markets, and regulatory accountability. ESG frameworks were originally designed to encourage responsible corporate

behavior by integrating environmental, social, and governance considerations into strategic decision-making. However, the increasing incorporation of ESG metrics into investment valuation models, financial products, and market-based governance systems has transformed sustainability into a significant source of financial value creation. This transition reflects broader trends associated with financialization, whereby market logic increasingly shapes organizational responses to social and environmental challenges [15].

One of the most significant observations emerging from the analysis is the growing role of ESG signaling as a legitimacy management mechanism. Contemporary corporations operate within institutional environments characterized by increasing stakeholder expectations regarding sustainability, transparency, and corporate responsibility. Investors, regulators, consumers, and civil society organizations increasingly evaluate firms according to ESG performance indicators. As a result, corporations face strong incentives to communicate sustainability commitments through disclosures, reports, ratings participation, and public commitments [4], [17].

The findings suggest that ESG disclosures frequently serve dual purposes. On one hand, they provide stakeholders with information regarding sustainability performance and governance practices. On the other hand, they function as symbolic signals designed to strengthen organizational legitimacy and reduce reputational risks. This dual role is consistent with legitimacy theory, which argues that organizations continuously seek alignment between their activities and prevailing social norms to maintain stakeholder support [6]. Within increasingly sustainability-oriented institutional environments, ESG communication becomes an important mechanism for demonstrating conformity with societal expectations.

The study further highlights tensions between substantive and symbolic sustainability practices. While many corporations have implemented genuine environmental and social initiatives, evidence suggests that sustainability disclosures do not always correspond directly with underlying operational transformations. In some cases, organizations appear to prioritize visibility, ratings performance, and stakeholder perception management over substantive sustainability outcomes [18]. This observation supports concerns regarding greenwashing, symbolic compliance, and impression management within ESG governance systems.

A particularly important contribution of this research concerns the relationship between ESG signaling and regulatory arbitrage. Traditional analyses often treat sustainability reporting and tax governance as separate dimensions of corporate behavior. However, the findings indicate that these areas are increasingly interconnected. Multinational enterprises frequently maintain strong ESG profiles while simultaneously pursuing sophisticated tax optimization strategies through legal and regulatory mechanisms. Such behavior reflects broader organizational efforts to balance legitimacy demands with financial performance objectives.

The post-BEPS environment provides a useful context for examining these dynamics. The OECD BEPS initiative represented a significant effort to strengthen international tax governance, increase transparency, and reduce opportunities for profit shifting [8]. The results indicate that BEPS has improved regulatory oversight and constrained several traditional forms of aggressive tax planning. Nevertheless, multinational corporations continue to demonstrate remarkable adaptability by developing new organizational structures and compliance strategies capable of achieving financial optimization objectives within evolving regulatory

frameworks.

This adaptability reflects the enduring relevance of regulatory arbitrage within global capitalism. Regulatory arbitrage does not necessarily involve illegal behavior; rather, it involves the strategic exploitation of differences among regulatory systems to achieve economic advantages [9]. The analysis suggests that contemporary forms of arbitrage increasingly rely on organizational complexity, jurisdictional diversity, intangible asset management, and sophisticated governance structures. As regulatory systems become more integrated, arbitrage opportunities become more complex rather than disappearing entirely.

The concept of shadow capitalism provides an important lens through which these developments can be interpreted. Unlike traditional understandings of informal or underground economic activity, shadow capitalism refers to legal yet opaque economic arrangements operating within institutional gaps and governance asymmetries [12]. The findings suggest that many contemporary multinational enterprises operate within environments characterized by high levels of legal complexity, financial engineering, and regulatory fragmentation. These conditions facilitate value extraction while maintaining formal compliance with applicable regulations.

The coexistence of ESG commitments and regulatory arbitrage strategies raises important questions regarding corporate accountability. Stakeholders increasingly expect corporations not only to demonstrate environmental responsibility but also to contribute fairly to public finances and broader societal welfare. Tax transparency has therefore emerged as an increasingly important component of ESG evaluation frameworks [13]. Investors, governance rating agencies, and civil society organizations increasingly recognize that aggressive tax avoidance may conflict with broader sustainability objectives.

The findings also reveal evolving investor attitudes toward sustainability and governance. Early ESG frameworks focused primarily on environmental performance, labor practices, and governance structures. More recently, investors have expanded their attention to include issues such as tax transparency, responsible lobbying, supply chain ethics, and social impact assessment. This expansion reflects a broader understanding of sustainability that incorporates fiscal responsibility and institutional accountability alongside environmental considerations.
Institutional theory provides additional insights into these developments. As ESG expectations become institutionalized across financial markets, organizations face increasing pressure to adopt sustainability practices regardless of their intrinsic commitment to environmental or social objectives [20]. Such pressures may produce widespread adoption of ESG reporting frameworks while simultaneously encouraging symbolic forms of compliance. Consequently, understanding sustainability governance requires attention not only to disclosure practices but also to underlying organizational incentives and institutional structures.

Another important implication concerns the role of financial markets in shaping sustainability outcomes. Financialization creates opportunities for mobilizing capital toward environmental and social objectives, but it may also encourage metric-driven approaches that prioritize measurable indicators over substantive transformation [16]. The growing reliance on ESG ratings and sustainability rankings illustrates this challenge. While such tools facilitate information processing and investment decision-making, they may oversimplify complex sustainability issues and encourage strategic behavior aimed at improving ratings rather than

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

addressing underlying problems.

From a governance perspective, the findings suggest that future regulatory frameworks must adopt more integrated approaches to corporate accountability. Evaluating sustainability solely through environmental indicators may overlook important dimensions related to taxation, transparency, governance quality, and social contribution. Similarly, tax governance frameworks that ignore broader sustainability considerations may fail to capture the full societal impact of corporate behavior.

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that sustainability financialization, ESG signaling, regulatory arbitrage, and corporate legitimacy are deeply interconnected elements of contemporary corporate governance. Understanding these relationships is essential for developing governance systems capable of promoting genuine accountability, transparency, and sustainable value creation in the post-BEPS global economy.

Vi. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between sustainability financialization, ESG signaling, regulatory arbitrage, and corporate legitimacy within the post-BEPS global economic environment. The analysis demonstrated that ESG frameworks have evolved beyond traditional sustainability reporting mechanisms and now function as important instruments of financial governance, investor communication, and legitimacy construction.

The findings indicate that ESG disclosures increasingly serve dual purposes. They provide information regarding sustainability performance while simultaneously functioning as strategic mechanisms for managing stakeholder perceptions and strengthening corporate legitimacy. As sustainability becomes embedded within financial markets, ESG performance increasingly influences investment decisions, corporate valuation, and access to capital.

The study further revealed that post-BEPS reforms have significantly altered international tax governance but have not eliminated opportunities for regulatory arbitrage. Multinational corporations continue to utilize sophisticated organizational structures and financial strategies to optimize regulatory outcomes within increasingly complex governance environments. These practices illustrate the persistence of shadow capitalism as a feature of contemporary global markets.

Importantly, the research highlights tensions between sustainability narratives and financial optimization strategies. While many organizations publicly promote sustainability commitments, underlying economic practices may not always align with broader social and fiscal responsibilities. Consequently, evaluating corporate sustainability requires consideration of governance quality, tax transparency, and accountability alongside traditional ESG indicators.

In conclusion, sustainability financialization and shadow capitalism represent interconnected dimensions of contemporary corporate governance. Future governance frameworks must adopt integrated approaches capable of addressing environmental responsibility, fiscal accountability, legitimacy construction, and regulatory complexity simultaneously. Such approaches will be essential for ensuring that sustainability initiatives contribute meaningfully to long-term societal and economic well-being.

Vii. Future Scope

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Future research should investigate the relationship between ESG ratings and corporate tax transparency across different industries and regulatory environments. Comparative analyses may provide deeper insights into whether strong sustainability performance is consistently associated with responsible tax behavior.

Another promising area involves examining the impact of the OECD Global Minimum Tax (Pillar Two) on regulatory arbitrage strategies. As international tax coordination continues to evolve, researchers should assess how multinational enterprises adapt governance structures and financial arrangements in response to emerging regulations.

The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning into ESG assessment frameworks also warrants further investigation. Advanced analytical technologies may improve the detection of inconsistencies between sustainability disclosures and underlying corporate behavior, thereby strengthening accountability mechanisms.

Future studies should additionally explore the role of institutional investors in shaping corporate tax governance. As investors increasingly incorporate tax transparency into ESG evaluations, understanding investor influence on corporate behavior will become increasingly important.

Research concerning the relationship between ESG communication, corporate reputation, and stakeholder trust may further enhance understanding of legitimacy management processes within financialized sustainability systems. Such studies could examine how different stakeholder groups interpret sustainability disclosures and governance practices.

Finally, interdisciplinary research integrating sustainable finance, international taxation, corporate governance, and political economy perspectives may provide more comprehensive explanations of contemporary corporate behavior. These approaches will be essential for understanding how evolving regulatory frameworks influence the future trajectory of sustainability governance and global capitalism.

References

1. Sustainable Finance U. Sachs, R. Schmidt-Traub, C. Kroll, G. Lafortune, and G. Fuller, *Sustainable Development Report 2023*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2023.
2. E. Pollman, “The making and meaning of ESG,” *European Corporate Governance Institute Law Working Paper No. 659/2022*, 2022.
3. G. A. Krippner, *Capitalizing on Crisis: The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2011.
4. Michael Spence, “Job market signaling,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 355–374, 1973.
5. T. P. Lyon and A. W. Montgomery, “The means and end of greenwash,” *Organization & Environment*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 223–249, 2015.
6. M. C. Suchman, “Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches,” *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 571–610, 1995.
7. P. Dietsch, *Catching Capital: The Ethics of Tax Competition*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.
8. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Addressing Base Erosion and Profit Shifting*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2013.
9. V. Acharya, P. Schnabl, and G. Suarez, “Securitization without risk transfer,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 515–536, 2013.
10. P. Sikka, “Smoke and mirrors: Corporate social responsibility and tax avoidance,” *Accounting Forum*, vol. 34, no. 3–4, pp. 153–168, 2010.
11. C. D. Hoi, Q. Wu, and H. Zhang, “Is corporate social responsibility associated with tax

J Euro Eco His.
ISSN : 0391-5115
Volume 7, Issue 2 (2026)
THE JOURNAL OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

avoidance?” *Accounting Review*, vol. 88, no. 6, pp. 2025–2059, 2013.

12. The Hidden Wealth of Nations G. Zucman, *The Hidden Wealth of Nations: The Scourge of Tax Havens*. Chicago, IL, USA: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2015.
13. United Nations, *Principles for Responsible Investment Annual Report*. New York, NY, USA: UNPRI, 2023.
14. J. Froud, A. Leaver, and K. Williams, *Financialization and Strategy: Narrative and Numbers*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2006.
15. G. A. Krippner, “The financialization of the American economy,” *Socio-Economic Review*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 173–208, 2005.
16. G. Zairis, “Sustainable finance and ESG importance: A systematic literature review,” *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 7, 2024.
17. T. P. Lyon and J. W. Maxwell, *Corporate Social Responsibility and the Environment*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2008.
18. D. Delmas and V. Burbano, “The drivers of greenwashing,” *California Management Review*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 64–87, 2011.
19. J. Meyer and B. Rowan, “Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony,” *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 340–363, 1977.
20. P. J. DiMaggio and W. W. Powell, “The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality,” *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 147–160, 1983.
21. R. E. Freeman, *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, MA, USA: Pitman, 1984.
22. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project: Explanatory Statement*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2015.
23. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Tax Challenges Arising from Digitalisation – Report on Pillar One and Pillar Two Blueprints*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2020.
24. C. Christensen, C. Hail, and C. Leuz, “Mandatory CSR and sustainability reporting: Economic analysis and literature review,” *Review of Accounting Studies*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1176–1248, 2021.
25. M. Hasan, A. Hoi, Q. Wu, and H. Zhang, “Social capital and corporate tax avoidance,” *Journal of Accounting Research*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 629–668, 2017.
26. Y. Liu, J. Saleem, and A. Shabbir, “Navigating ESG scoring and disclosure challenges in sustainable finance,” *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 18, 2023.
27. S. Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. New York, NY, USA: PublicAffairs, 2019.
28. A. Midttun, *Governance and Business Models for Sustainable Capitalism*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2022.
29. G. Zucman, T. Tørsløv, and L. Wier, “The missing profits of nations,” *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 90, no. 3, pp. 1499–1534, 2023.
30. E. Pollman and K. Lund, “ESG, stakeholder governance, and corporate purpose,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, vol. 170, no. 3, pp. 639–714, 2022.