Received: 15 October 2025 | Revised: 10 December 2025 | Accepted: 8 January 2026 | Published online: 22 January 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

FinTech and Sustainable Innovation
2026, Vol. 00(00) 1–11
DOI: 10.47852/bonviewFSI62027903

Understanding Elon Musk's Acquisition of Twitter Through the Hubris Hypothesis: An Examination of Behavioral Finance, Governance, and Decision-Making

Jia-Ying Lyu[1,*]

[1] *School of Finance and Accounting, Fuzhou University of International Studies and Trade, China*

Abstract: This study analyzes Elon Musk's acquisition of Twitter through the lens of the hubris hypothesis and theories of managerial overconfidence. Using a qualitative case study design, the research triangulates news reports, press releases, and academic literature to meticulously reconstruct the deal's chronology and evaluate observable behavioral indicators. These indicators, including prior performance, media acclaim, leadership concentration, premium pricing, and the waiver of due diligence, are systematically coded against established measures in the behavioral corporate finance literature. The evidence strongly supports behavior consistent with the hubris hypothesis, helping to explain the controversial financing choices and the heightened post-deal governance risks. The analysis integrates agency theory and behavioral finance to demonstrate how typical institutional constraints can sometimes temper managerial overconfidence. Crucially, it also uncovers boundary conditions where both market discipline and effective board oversight fail to curb excessive risk-taking, particularly in high-profile, nontraditional mergers. By explicitly operationalizing hubris indicators in a replicable way, this research contributes to the expanding behavioral corporate finance literature by establishing a link between overconfidence and digital platform acquisitions, where both substantial financial leverage and potent ideological motives are salient factors. Policy implications advocate for stronger board independence, mandatory due-diligence disclosures, stricter leverage discipline, and robust governance safeguards for social media firms that operate as quasi-public spheres.

Keywords: hubris hypothesis, managerial overconfidence, corporate governance, social media platforms, Elon Musk

1. Introduction

1.1. Research background

In the first quarter of 2022, Elon Musk announced his intention to acquire Twitter, a leading social media platform. Twitter provides an online microblogging service enabling public conversations and is widely used by politicians, journalists, and companies. Musk built his fortune as chief executive of Tesla and SpaceX and became one of the world's wealthiest individuals. His agreement to purchase Twitter for $44 billion drew global attention because it involved taking a prominent listed firm private and because of the ideological reasoning he articulated. Musk described himself as a free speech absolutist and said he wanted to improve what he called the public town square by making Twitter's algorithms open source, defeating spam bots, and authenticating users. The announcement stirred debate about corporate governance, social responsibility, and the influence of billionaire entrepreneurs on public communication. In addition to its political significance, the deal is notable from a financial perspective. It represents one of the largest leveraged buyouts in the technology sector, it was negotiated during a volatile market, and it was completed after a contentious legal dispute. Scholars in corporate finance and organizational behavior view this case as a lens through which to examine whether managerial overconfidence and hubris affect major investment decisions.

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are pivotal activities in modern economies. They allow firms to gain access to new markets, acquire talent and technologies, and achieve economies of scale. Despite these potential benefits, empirical research shows that acquirers often fail to create value. Meta-analyses indicate that shareholders of the target firm typically gain while the shareholders of the acquiring firm experience neutral or negative returns. Early work by Roll introduced the hubris hypothesis of corporate takeovers, arguing that some managers overestimate their ability to create value and are willing to pay a premium that exceeds the intrinsic value of the target [1]. He proposed that managerial overconfidence can explain why acquirers persist in bidding wars despite diminishing returns. Later studies corroborated that acquiring firms' shareholders often suffer losses around merger announcements and that many transactions fail to achieve synergies. Against this backdrop, Musk's offer to pay $54.20 per

***Corresponding author:** Jia-Ying Lyu, School of Finance and Accounting, Fuzhou University of International Studies and Trade, China. Email: lvjiaying@fzfu.edu.cn

© The Author(s) 2026. Published by BON VIEW PUBLISHING PTE. LTD. This is an open access article under the CC BY License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

share for Twitter [2], embedding a numerical reference to cannabis culture, may exemplify a sense of invulnerability or a willingness to defy traditional valuation approaches [3]. The pricing not only exceeded analysts' valuations but also appeared to reflect personal humor. These factors render the case an instructive episode for examining behavioral motives in M&A.

In order to appreciate the significance of the transaction, it is important to examine Twitter's development and its role in society. The platform was launched in 2006 as a service for sending short messages to a network of followers. Over time, it evolved into a public square where politicians, journalists, and corporations broadcast announcements, engage in debates, and manage customer relations. During emergencies and social movements, Twitter has facilitated the rapid dissemination of information. Research in political communication and information systems shows that social media platforms can shape public opinion and mobilize collective action. The platform's open architecture allows anyone with an internet connection to participate, making it a vital component of digital democracies. Consequently, control over such an influential platform raises concerns about concentration of power, algorithmic transparency, and the potential for idiosyncratic moderation policies. These issues broaden the relevance of the acquisition beyond the financial sphere and tie it to questions of free speech and corporate responsibility.

The personal history of Elon Musk illustrates the intersection of entrepreneurship and public influence. He co-founded ventures that disrupted online payments, automotive manufacturing, and space exploration and built Tesla into a leader in electric vehicles. His management style is characterized by bold vision, aggressive timelines, and an emphasis on technology as a tool for human progress. Musk has long used Twitter as his primary communication channel to announce product launches, share company milestones, and engage directly with followers, sometimes in ways that move financial markets and attract regulatory scrutiny. His dual identity as both a prolific user and eventual owner of the platform blurs the line between private speech and corporate control, making his biography and communication practices directly relevant to the analysis of the deal.

1.2. Research questions and contributions

This study investigates whether the observable features of Musk's acquisition align with the hubris hypothesis and broader theories of managerial overconfidence. The analysis is structured around several questions. First, what behavioral and organizational indicators suggest that overconfidence or hubris may have influenced the decision to pursue the transaction? Second, how do governance mechanisms such as board oversight, due diligence, and financing constraints interact with managerial psychology? Third, what alternative strategic or ideological explanations could account for Musk's actions? By addressing these questions, the study contributes to the behavioral finance literature by providing a rich qualitative analysis of a high-profile case. It builds upon the hubris hypothesis and upper echelons theory by linking individual traits with organizational outcomes and examining the interplay between personal conviction, institutional structures, and market reactions.

This paper makes three main contributions. It synthesizes insights from established research on hubris and overconfidence and applies them to a contemporary case. First, by examining a founder-led, highly leveraged acquisition of a digital platform that functions as a quasi-public sphere, the study extends classic evidence from landmark deals such as AOL-Time Warner and HP-Autonomy to a new organizational and technological context. It proposes replicable operational definitions and measurement proxies that other researchers can use to evaluate hubris in acquisitions. These indicators are presented in tables that can serve as a coding template for small-N comparative studies of major transactions. Finally, the paper offers policy implications for boards, regulators, and investors by highlighting governance mechanisms that can temper managerial exuberance and by spelling out boundary conditions under which market discipline and board oversight are likely to fail.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Hubris, overconfidence, and personality in acquisitions

The hubris hypothesis originates from Roll's pioneering study of corporate takeovers. Roll argued that managers may be overly optimistic about their ability to manage acquired assets and thus pay too much. He contended that bidding firms are more likely to overpay when competition is intense and uncertainty about value is high. The hypothesis implies that market mechanisms alone may not discipline executives because overconfident managers believe they are better at generating value than rivals. More recent work extends Roll's thesis. A risk and compliance overview summarizes that acquirer hubris arises when executives ignore evidence suggesting that the target is overpriced and proceed based on inflated self-belief [1, 4]. Studies show that hubris is part of behavioral corporate finance, a field examining how psychological biases affect financial decisions. In M&A, this perspective helps explain why deals often destroy value.

Later empirical research added nuance to the hubris hypothesis. Hayward and Hambrick examined large US acquisitions and introduced four measurable indicators of CEO hubris: prior firm performance relative to peers, recent media praise for the CEO, the CEO's self-importance (operationalized as holding multiple titles such as board chair), and a composite factor summarizing these variables. They found that higher hubris scores were associated with larger takeover premiums and that this relationship was stronger when the board's vigilance was low [5]. Their study integrated behavioral factors with governance by showing that attentive boards can curb excessive premiums. Subsequent research documented that hubris is more common when firms have abundant free cash flow and limited disciplinary mechanisms [6]. The winner's curse, a related concept from auction theory, describes the tendency for the winning bidder to overpay when valuations are uncertain. Fergusson et al. highlighted that the winner's curse arises from managerial optimism and overconfidence and emphasized the need for boards to set reservation prices and maintain discipline [7]. These behavioral explanations complement economic theories of synergies by highlighting the human element in deal-making [8, 9].

A large body of work links CEO overconfidence to corporate investment and acquisition activity. Malmendier and Tate, in a series of influential studies, developed a proxy for CEO overconfidence based on personal portfolio choices [10]. They classified a CEO as overconfident if he held vested in-the-money stock options beyond the optimal exercise point, revealing a belief in higher future share prices. In their study of corporate investment, they showed that overconfident CEOs invest more when internal funds are available but cut investment when they need external capital [11]. An NBER digest summarizing their findings notes that overconfident managers overestimate project returns and regard outside financing as excessively costly [11]. In a subsequent paper on acquisitions, Malmendier and Tate combined the portfolio measure with media characterizations of CEOs to study the market's response to mergers. They found that overconfident CEOs were more likely to make acquisitions and particularly diversifying acquisitions [12]. Overconfident acquirers conducted more mergers even after controlling for firm characteristics, and the market reacted more negatively to their bids [12]. The authors concluded that overconfidence does not necessarily increase the frequency of mergers but increases the propensity to engage in value-destroying deals when firms have abundant cash [12].

Related research reinforces these insights. Billett and Qian examined frequent acquirers and attributed their behavior to self-attribution bias [13], where managers attribute past success to their own skill and discount external factors. Their findings support the view that overconfident executives pursue multiple acquisitions without sufficient reflection. Ferris, Jayaraman, and Sabherwal analyzed international merger activity and reported that overconfident CEOs were significantly more likely to undertake both diversifying and non-diversifying deals [14]. Yang, Bai, and Yang employed a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis on Chinese listed firms and found that proactive and overconfident CEOs favored cross-industry mergers, while non-proactive and low-educated CEOs preferred intra-industry deals [15]. They argued that proactive personality amplifies the influence of overconfidence in strategic decisions. These studies collectively show that overconfidence is not a uniform trait; it interacts with personality, experience, and institutional context.

More recent research explores situational factors that moderate overconfidence. Jory et al. [16] propose that CEO overconfidence can be deflated by social shocks, such as the unexpected firing of a peer in the CEO's network. They find that after a network turnover shock, CEOs are less likely to hold deep in-the-money options, make fewer acquisitions, and abandon pending deals, and the deals they do pursue are of higher quality [16]. Their evidence suggests that overconfidence varies over time and can be influenced by salient events [16]. Board overconfidence also matters. Brahma, Boateng, and Ahmad study 754 UK deals and measure board overconfidence using the fraction of male directors and multiple acquisitions. They report that a higher male fraction and repeated acquisitions lead to poor performance and that using cash or engaging in diversifying deals exacerbates the negative effects [17]. Their results underline that overconfidence is not only a personal trait but can be a collective board characteristic. Table 1 positions the case against core empirical regularities on overconfidence and M&A outcomes. The alignment with Table 1 suggests that the Twitter transaction's risk profile is consistent with settings where managerial overconfidence is salient [17].

Upper echelons theory posits that organizational outcomes reflect the values, cognitive biases, and personalities of top executives. Hambrick and Mason argued that the strategic choices of firms could be predicted by examining executive demographics and traits [18]. Subsequent work has incorporated psychological constructs into this framework. Research on proactive personality suggests that individuals who proactively shape their environment are more likely to pursue transformative strategies. Yang and colleagues found that proactive CEOs were more inclined toward cross-industry mergers, especially when coupled with overconfidence [15]. This interaction effect supports the idea that personality traits can magnify behavioral biases.

Another personality trait of interest is narcissism. Wang, Li, and Mu studied Chinese A-share firms and measured CEO narcissism using signature size. They found that narcissistic CEOs reduced R&D investment and that financing constraints moderated this effect [19]. Although their study focused on innovation rather than acquisitions, it illustrates how personality can shape investment decisions. Combined with evidence that women tend to be less overconfident than men and that female directors are associated with lower risk and fewer aggressive acquisitions, the literature suggests that gender diversity and personality diversity on boards can mitigate hubris [20].

2.2. Governance mechanisms and the winner's curse

Effective governance can constrain overconfident managers and reduce the likelihood of overpayment. Hayward and Hambrick showed that high board vigilance dampened the association between hubris and premiums [5]. Fergusson emphasized that boards should set reservation prices, avoid escalating commitment, and insist on thorough due diligence [21]. They also cautioned that firms with weak governance and forceful CEOs are particularly prone to the winner's curse [7]. Jory et al.'s [16] study indicates that financing constraints and exogenous shocks can deflate hubris. These findings suggest that corporate boards, lenders, and regulators have tools to curb overconfidence, such as requiring independent board members, tying compensation to long-term performance, and imposing capital structure discipline [22].

2.3. Social media platforms and corporate responsibility

The acquisition of Twitter brings to the fore debates about digital platforms as public infrastructures and the responsibilities

Table 1
Empirical studies on overconfidence and M&A outcomes

Study	Sample/period	Overconfidence measure	Main finding
Hayward and Hambrick [5]	Large US acquisitions	Hubris index (performance, media, titles)	Higher hubris → higher premiums; vigilant boards moderate
Malmendier and Tate [11]	US firms	Late option exercise	Invest more with internal funds; cut with external finance
Malmendier and Tate [12]	US acquisitions	Portfolio + media portrayal	More diversifying M&A; more negative market reactions
Jory et al. [16]	US CEOs	Network-shock deflation	Shocks reduce hubris and M&A count; improve quality
Brahma et al. [17]	UK deals	Board overconfidence proxies	Male-heavy, frequent acquirers underperform

of private owners. Social media firms operate two-sided markets: they provide free services to users and sell targeted advertising to businesses. Their value derives from network effects: the more users participate, the more attractive the platform becomes, creating high barriers to entry. Because of these network effects, ownership of a leading platform confers not only financial benefits but also influence over public discourse and access to user data. Scholars have argued that major platforms perform quasi-public functions, such as enabling political mobilization, facilitating information exchange, and shaping collective memory. When a single individual acquires such an entity, concerns emerge about whether governance structures can balance shareholder interests with democratic norms.

Research on free speech and platform governance suggests that content moderation policies and algorithmic design have significant implications for diversity of viewpoints, misinformation propagation, and user safety. Unlike traditional publishers, social media firms rely on algorithms to curate user feeds and remove inappropriate content. Transparency in these processes is limited, which can erode trust. Musk justified his bid by appealing to free speech principles and by pledging to open-source Twitter's algorithms and authenticate users. These commitments align with calls from digital rights advocates for greater transparency. However, critics note that algorithmic openness alone does not guarantee fairness, because machine learning systems can perpetuate biases. Moreover, authenticating users may deter anonymous participation that is vital for whistle-blowing and dissent in authoritarian contexts. Literature on corporate social responsibility emphasizes that firms must balance profit motives with societal obligations. Platform owners have unique duties to protect user privacy, combat harassment, and prevent the spread of harmful content.

Another aspect concerns intangible assets and reputation. Unlike tangible industries, the primary assets of social media firms are user relationships, software code, and brand capital. These intangible assets are vulnerable to user backlash and reputational damage. During the acquisition process, some advertisers paused spending on Twitter due to uncertainty about future content policies. The Bracken Group recorded that a parody account impersonating a pharmaceutical company caused a stock price drop when the impersonated firm had to respond to a tweet offering free insulin [3, 23]. Such episodes illustrate how platform governance decisions can have spillover effects on other businesses. Overconfident acquirers may underestimate the complexity of maintaining trust among users, advertisers, and regulators. As the literature on corporate reputation shows, regaining credibility after missteps can be costly.

In sum, the literature on social media platforms underscores that ownership confers both opportunities and obligations. Incorporating this perspective into the hubris analysis highlights that the risks of overconfidence extend beyond financial metrics to encompass societal impacts. Understanding how platform governance interacts with entrepreneurial vision and behavioral biases is therefore essential for evaluating the long-term consequences of the Twitter acquisition.

2.4. Agency theory and behavioral finance

Traditional corporate finance models explain M&A using agency theory and the free cash flow hypothesis. Agency theory posits that managers (agents) may pursue personal goals that diverge from those of shareholders (principals) when monitoring is imperfect. Jensen and Meckling conceptualized the firm as a nexus of contracts and argued that divergent interests create agency costs. In the context of mergers, agency problems arise when executives seek empire building, prestige, or job security rather than shareholder value. Jensen's free cash flow hypothesis suggests that when firms generate cash in excess of profitable investment opportunities, managers are tempted to squander resources on value-destroying projects, including acquisitions. Empirical research shows that acquirers with large cash holdings are more likely to overpay and that shareholders of these firms earn lower returns post-merger. By contrast, firms facing capital constraints or high debt levels tend to be more disciplined. These theories provide a rational explanation for why acquisitions often fail even without invoking psychological biases.

Behavioral finance complements agency models by focusing on cognitive biases and social influences. Overconfidence is one such bias: managers overestimate their ability to generate returns and underestimate risks, leading them to pursue ambitious projects and ignore contrary information. Hubris, a related but distinct concept, emphasizes pride and self-aggrandizement. Whereas agency theory assumes that managers are rational but opportunistic, behavioral finance recognizes that even well-meaning executives can make mistakes due to flawed judgment. These frameworks are not mutually exclusive. For example, a CEO may rationally pursue growth to increase compensation (agency motive) while simultaneously believing that he or she can manage the target better than others (overconfidence). Combining agency and behavioral perspectives yields a more complete understanding of acquisition decisions.

Integrating the free cash flow hypothesis with behavioral insights can explain why financing structures matter. Firms with excess cash or access to cheap capital are more prone to overconfidence because they feel insulated from financing constraints. Jory et al.'s [16] findings that network shocks reduce overconfidence support the view that constraints can discipline behavior. When external financing is costly or when lenders impose covenants, managers must justify acquisitions more rigorously, which may reduce the influence of bias. Conversely, large cash reserves enable discretionary spending, increasing the risk of empire building and hubris. This dynamic resonates with Jensen's prediction that managers with surplus cash may pursue negative net present value projects to avoid distributing cash to shareholders.

Agency considerations also underscore the importance of incentive alignment. Executive compensation structures that tie rewards to long-term performance, such as restricted stock or performance-vesting equity, can deter short-term value destruction. Boards can design contracts to penalize failed acquisitions, although measuring success is complex. In addition, monitoring by institutional investors and active engagement by shareholders can reduce agency slack. When combined with behavioral awareness, such as board training on cognitive biases, agency-aligned incentives may mitigate the propensity for overconfident or hubristic decisions.

International differences illustrate how legal and institutional environments influence the balance between agency conflicts and behavioral biases. In countries with concentrated ownership and strong family control, such as parts of Asia and continental Europe, principals may have greater ability to discipline managers, but the entrenchment of controlling shareholders can create its own challenges. In dispersed ownership systems, typical of Anglo-American markets, professional managers wield significant power, increasing the relevance of both agency and behavioral considerations. Cross-country studies find variation in merger outcomes, suggesting that culture, legal protection, and market development shape the expression of hubris and overconfidence. These insights encourage a nuanced approach that takes institutional context into account.

Understanding the interplay between agency motives, free cash flow, and behavioral biases enriches the analysis of the Twitter transaction. Musk financed the deal largely through personal wealth and leveraged loans rather than corporate cash, which distinguishes it from typical cases studied in the free cash flow literature. Nevertheless, his capacity to mobilize vast resources without board oversight reveals how agency problems can manifest when ownership and control are concentrated. Recognizing these theoretical frameworks helps situate the case within broader debates about corporate decision-making and informs the policy recommendations proposed later.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

This research adopts a qualitative case study design. Case studies are appropriate for examining complex phenomena in real-world contexts, especially when boundaries between the phenomenon and its context are not clearly defined. The acquisition of Twitter by Elon Musk provides an extreme case that illustrates the interplay between managerial psychology, governance structures, and market dynamics. By triangulating information from multiple sources, such as news reports, court filings, press releases, and academic literature, the study reconstructs the sequence of events and analyzes decision points. The focus is on constructing a narrative that connects actions with underlying motivations and external constraints. Consistent with best practice in qualitative case study work, the empirical "findings" and their interpretation are presented in an integrated section (Section 4), with subheadings that distinguish between the descriptive evidence and the comparative, theory-driven discussion.

3.2. Data collection and operational definitions

Data were collected from reputable news agencies, official documents, academic publications, and public filings. Reuters reports provided detailed accounts of the financing structure, premium offered, and closing events of the transaction [3]. Press releases from both Musk and Twitter contained statements about the strategic rationale. The Bracken Group's analysis documented the waiver of due diligence and legal disputes. Academic sources supplied theoretical frameworks and empirical findings. To enhance transparency, the corpus was restricted to sources published between 2019 and 2024 in English, with priority given to Reuters and official filings when numeric or legal details were involved; opinion pieces and unverifiable blog posts were excluded. These diverse materials allow for cross-validation. When possible, the study references primary sources to avoid misinterpretation. For replication in other settings, Table 2 catalogs standard proxies and data sources to operationalize overconfidence. In this study, rather than imposing arbitrary numerical cut-offs, each indicator is coded on a three-point scale (low/medium/high) using established benchmarks in the literature (e.g., relative stock-price performance, the magnitude of the takeover premium, and the presence or absence of due-diligence waivers); these coding rules are documented in a structured spreadsheet that can be shared on request and tightened into pre-registered thresholds in future multi-case studies.

To systematically evaluate hubris in this case, several constructs are operationalized. Following Hayward and Hambrick, hubris is measured through four indicators: (1) prior performance, proxied by Tesla's extraordinary stock returns relative to market indices in the years preceding the deal; (2) media praise, approximated by widespread accolades describing Musk as a visionary innovator; (3) CEO self-importance, defined as holding multiple leadership roles and substantial ownership stakes; and (4) a composite score combining these factors [5]. CEO overconfidence is proxied by personal portfolio behavior and financial decisions. Although direct data on Musk's stock option exercises are unavailable, his reluctance to sell Tesla shares and his willingness to pledge them as collateral for loans suggest high confidence in future value. Overconfidence is also inferred from the inclusion of the number 420 in the offer price [3]. Due diligence is defined as the systematic assessment of a target's financial and operational condition before concluding a purchase. Twitter's board offered Musk access to due diligence information, but he waived this right, an unusual choice for a deal of this size [3, 23]. Governance strength is proxied by the independence and expertise of the acquirer's board, which, in Musk's case, is peculiar because the acquisition was executed personally rather than through Tesla. Financing constraint is measured by the ratio of debt to equity and the availability of cash. Reuters noted that Musk secured \$13 billion in debt financing and pledged approximately \$33.5 billion in equity, including contributions from co-investors [3]. His net worth was largely tied to Tesla stock; he reportedly had roughly \$20 billion in cash and needed additional funds to close the gap [23]. This reliance on leverage and personal wealth factors into the analysis.

3.3. Analytical approach, validity, and reliability

The analysis proceeds through a five-step analytical pipeline. First, it constructs a chronological table of events to anchor subsequent interpretation; the timeline captures key announcements, financing milestones, legal developments, and closing actions. Second, it evaluates each operational indicator against the evidence to assess whether the case fits the hubris hypothesis, including mapping Musk's prior performance and public image to the hubris framework, examining his decision to waive due diligence, and analyzing the premium offered. Third, coded events and statements are grouped into broader categories – prior

Table 2
Proxies for measuring overconfidence

Proxy	Measurement idea	Source/type
Late option exercise	Hold ITM options beyond rational threshold	Malmendier and Tate [11]
Media portrayal	Share of "confident/optimistic" labels	Malmendier and Tate [12]
Frequent acquirer	Rolling 3-year deal count	Billett and Qian [13]
Board composition	Male fraction; tenure concentration	Brahma et al. [17]
Due-diligence stance	Presence/absence; scope limits	Merger agreements/legal filings

performance, media praise, self-importance, financing, governance, and alternative motives – and scored on the low/medium/high hubris scale described in Section 3.2 and Table 2. Fourth, the pattern of scores is compared with empirical regularities reported in prior studies on overconfidence and M&A outcomes to assess similarity and divergence. Fifth, observations are compared with alternative explanations, considering strategic motives such as platform vision and free speech. The study also draws on negative evidence tests. For instance, it assesses whether external shocks tempered overconfidence, as suggested by Jory et al. [16], or whether financing constraints imposed discipline. By triangulating these perspectives, the analysis aims to provide a balanced interpretation.

Qualitative case studies are susceptible to confirmation bias. To mitigate this risk, the research includes negative evidence tests and considers competing hypotheses. For example, the decision to temporarily suspend the deal and litigate may indicate caution rather than hubris. Musk attempted to terminate the agreement, citing concerns about spam bots, and he eventually closed the transaction only after legal pressure. These events may suggest responsiveness to new information rather than blind overconfidence. Furthermore, the financing structure, which involved significant debt and equity commitments, indicates that lenders were willing to underwrite the purchase. If lenders believed the deal was reckless, they might have imposed prohibitive terms. Finally, the study acknowledges that ideological motives such as promoting free speech cannot be entirely reduced to financial calculations. The validity of the findings thus depends on careful cross-examination of multiple sources.

The qualitative analysis relied on systematic coding of textual sources. First, the data set comprising news articles, press releases, court filings, and academic papers was assembled chronologically. Each document was read carefully to identify salient events, statements, motivations, and reactions. Using open coding, segments of text were labeled with descriptive codes such as “offer price,” “due diligence waiver,” “financing arrangement,” and “legal dispute.” These codes were then grouped into broader categories corresponding to the operational indicators outlined in Section 3.3, such as prior performance, media praise, and governance mechanisms. To enhance reliability, coding was performed iteratively. After initial coding, the labels were reviewed and refined to ensure consistency. Ambiguous cases were discussed and reconciled by comparing them with theoretical definitions. This approach mirrors established methods in case study research, which emphasize transparency and reproducibility. Although the study was conducted by a single researcher, documenting coding rules and decisions helps others understand and critique the interpretation.

Triangulation further bolstered reliability. By cross-checking information from multiple sources, such as comparing details of the financing structure reported by different news outlets and verifying them against regulatory filings, the analysis sought to minimize inaccuracies. When discrepancies arose, the study favored primary documents or sources closest to the events. For instance, statements attributed to Musk were drawn directly from his public communications rather than secondary commentary. This meticulous approach mitigates the risk of accepting unverified claims and supports the credibility of the conclusions.

3.4. Limitations of the methodology

Despite efforts to ensure rigor, the study has limitations. First, the analysis is based on publicly available information, which may omit confidential details about negotiations, internal deliberations, and motivations. Without access to internal documents or interviews with the principals, the assessment of psychological factors such as overconfidence relies on behavioral indicators and cannot capture private intentions. Second, the single case design limits the generalizability of the findings. While the Twitter acquisition provides a rich example, other acquisitions by different entrepreneurs might exhibit different dynamics. Third, the coding process, though systematic, is inherently interpretive. Different researchers might assign different meanings to the same statements or emphasize alternative aspects of the data. Future research could address these limitations by employing mixed methods, incorporating interviews with participants, or conducting comparative case studies across multiple transactions.

All data used in this study are drawn from publicly available news reports, press releases, court filings, and academic publications cited in the references; the underlying event chronology and coding spreadsheet are available from the author upon reasonable request.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1. Chronology of the Twitter acquisition

Table 3 summarizes the chronology of Musk’s acquisition of Twitter. The sequence of events illustrates how the deal evolved over several months. On April 14, 2022, Musk offered to buy all outstanding shares for $54.20 per share, valuing the company at approximately $44 billion. The offer was accepted by Twitter’s

Table 3
Timeline of Musk’s Twitter acquisition

Date	Event	Key actions	Sources
April 14, 2022	Offer announced	Musk offers to buy Twitter for $54.20 per share, citing free speech goals	Reuters, PR Newswire
April 25, 2022	Board acceptance	Twitter accepts the $44 billion offer and signs a merger agreement	Reuters
July 4, 2022	Attempted termination	Musk seeks to terminate the agreement, citing bot concerns; Twitter sues to enforce	Reuters
October 13, 2022	Financing progress	Banks finalize $13 billion debt financing; Musk secures equity commitments	Reuters
October 27, 2022	Deal closing	Musk closes the acquisition, fires top executives, and declares the bird freed	Reuters

board on April 25 after they weighed the premium against alternatives [3, 23]. Musk announced that the platform should be a public town square and emphasized his commitment to free speech. In July, he attempted to terminate the agreement, citing concerns about bots and misrepresentation of active users. Twitter sued to enforce the deal, and a Delaware judge scheduled a trial. After months of legal maneuvering, Musk closed the purchase on October 27, 2022. He immediately fired top executives and tweeted “the bird is freed [3]. These events anchor the analysis of hubris and governance.

See Table 3 for an overview of the key milestones in the transaction. The timeline highlights several features of the deal. First, the interval between the offer and the board’s acceptance was short, suggesting that the premium was attractive. Second, Musk’s attempt to withdraw indicates that he may have had second thoughts or concerns about due diligence. Third, the closing occurred only after legal proceedings made termination costly. These observations inform the assessment of hubris versus strategic calculation.

4.2. Evidence of hubris and overconfidence

The first indicator of hubris is prior performance. Before the Twitter offer, Tesla’s market capitalization exceeded that of most automobile manufacturers. The company’s share price increased dramatically from 2019 through 2021, and Musk’s personal wealth reached more than \$200 billion [23]. Such extraordinary performance may foster a belief in personal invincibility. Studies show that managers who experience success are more prone to overconfidence, believing that their skill rather than favorable conditions drives outcomes. The second indicator is media praise. Musk was widely celebrated as a visionary entrepreneur, and his ventures were often portrayed as transformational. Hayward and Hambrick noted that positive press coverage increases hubris scores [5]. Musk’s large social media following and public admiration likely reinforced his self-image.

The third indicator is CEO self-importance. Musk held multiple leadership roles: he was chief executive of Tesla, chief engineer at SpaceX, and founder of The Boring Company and Neuralink. He also served as chair at various times and owned substantial equity stakes. Such concentration of authority aligns with the self-importance dimension. The fourth indicator is the premium offered. To make the hubris construct replicable, Table 4 lists observable indicators and how they manifest in this case. Together, the indicators in Table 4 triangulate a hubris-consistent pattern: elevated self-regard, discipline bypass, and premium-bearing pricing. Musk’s bid valued Twitter at a significant premium over the pre-offer trading price. While some premium is customary in M&A, the inclusion of the number 420 in the offer price suggests a degree of personal whimsy. Reuters reported that the digits referenced cannabis culture and were intended as a joke [3]. Offering a price with symbolic digits rather than a round figure may signal a disregard for conventional valuation methods.

Another piece of evidence is the waiver of due diligence. The Bracken Group noted that Musk waived his right to perform extensive due diligence before signing the merger agreement [3, 23]. This is unusual for a transaction of such magnitude, as due diligence helps verify financial statements, user statistics, and compliance issues. Waiving this step may reflect a belief that one’s intuition supersedes formal verification. When Musk attempted to terminate the agreement, he cited concerns about spam bots, yet the waiver limited his ability to claim misrepresentation. This sequence aligns with behavioral explanations: overconfident managers may ignore information that contradicts their beliefs and later regret the oversight. To contextualize financing and governance discipline, Table 5 contrasts the Twitter deal with typical leveraged buyouts (LBOs) and strategic acquisitions. As Table 5 indicates, leverage scale and due-diligence posture depart from prudent norms, sharpening ex post governance risk.

Financing decisions further illuminate overconfidence. Musk secured \$13 billion in debt from banks and committed about \$33.5 billion in equity [3]. Reuters reported that his net worth was largely tied to Tesla shares and that he had about \$20 billion in cash, leaving a funding gap of several billion dollars [23]. To cover the gap, he sold Tesla shares and solicited investments from co-investors, including venture capital firms. The willingness to

Table 4
Indicators of hubris

Indicator	Operational definition	Evidence in this case
Prior performance	Exceptional recent performance vs peers	Tesla market-cap surge 2019–2021
Media praise	Sustained “visionary” accolades	Widespread positive coverage/followers
Self-importance	Multiple titles/concentrated authority	CEO of Tesla; chief engineer at SpaceX; founder roles
Premium/price symbolism	High premium + numerology	\$54.20 offer; symbolic digits noted by Reuters
Due-diligence waiver	Foregoing standard verification	Waiver recorded by Reuters

Table 5
Pearson correlation analysis between teachers’ beliefs, concerns, and practices toward solid waste management and recycling

Structure element	Twitter deal	Typical LBO	Diversifying M&A (typical)
Equity contribution	~\$33.5bn (Musk + co-investors)	20–35% fund equity	Varies
Debt package	~\$13bn senior bank debt	Senior + mezzanine stack	Often lower leverage
Cash vs stock	All-cash at \$54.20	Cash or mix	Cash/stock mix
Diligence	Waived pre-signing	Extensive diligence	Standard diligence
Control	Sole owner via X Holdings	Sponsor control	Integrated with acquirer

leverage personal stock and take on significant debt may reflect confidence in his ability to generate returns. Overconfident CEOs often overestimate future cash flows and underestimate downside risks. The financing structure thus complements the behavioral interpretation.

4.3. Comparative and contextual analysis

A comparison between Musk's actions and empirical findings reveals both consistencies and deviations. Malmendier and Tate found that overconfident CEOs conduct more mergers when their firms have ample internal funds [12]. Musk used personal wealth and debt financing rather than Tesla's corporate funds, yet he had significant liquidity through his stock. The portfolio measure used by Malmendier and Tate is not directly observable in this case; however, Musk's late exercise of stock options and reluctance to diversify his holdings suggest similar behavior. The negative market reaction predicted by their study lowered cumulative abnormal returns for overconfident bids manifested as investors expressed concern over Tesla's stock after the announcement [24].

Hayward and Hambrick observed that hubris leads to larger premiums and that board vigilance mitigates this effect [5]. In Musk's case, there was no formal acquirer board; he acted as an individual. This lack of an independent board removed a key governance mechanism. Brahma, Boateng, and Ahmad showed that boards with high male representation and multiple acquisitions tend to underperform [17]. Since Musk was the sole decision-maker, the gender composition of a board is irrelevant, but the study illustrates how unchecked confidence can harm outcomes. Yang, Bai, and Yang emphasized that proactive and overconfident CEOs pursue cross-industry deals [15]. Musk's acquisition of a social media platform does not create direct synergies with his automobile or aerospace businesses, fitting the pattern of diversifying mergers.

Jory et al.'s [16] network shock framework implies that external events can attenuate overconfidence. No evidence suggests that Musk experienced such a shock before the Twitter deal. On the contrary, his successes may have reinforced his confidence. Nevertheless, the threat of legal action and the potential cost of a trial may have constrained his behavior during the dispute phase, illustrating that institutional constraints can influence overconfident actors. Overall, the evidence supports the hubris hypothesis but also highlights the importance of governance and contextual factors.

The comparative cases referenced in this section were selected purposively from the existing literature on "classic" overconfidence-colored deals: they involve large, high-visibility transactions in technology or media sectors, were widely discussed as examples of value-destroying mergers, and have been analyzed in depth in prior academic work.

4.4. Strategic, social, and ethical considerations and policy implications

Behavioral explanations do not preclude strategic or ideological motives. Musk articulated that he wanted to enhance free speech and create an inclusive digital town square. He criticized Twitter's moderation policies and suggested that making algorithms transparent would build trust. From this perspective, the acquisition can be interpreted as a mission-driven investment. Taking the company private would allow longer-term decisions without quarterly earnings pressure. Musk also hinted at leveraging the platform to accelerate the development of "X," an everything app integrating payments, messaging, and social media. These strategic visions could justify paying a premium and waiving due diligence if the acquirer believed that intangible benefits outweighed risks.

Another explanation is that the high premium served as a deterrent to competing bidders and signaled commitment. When a buyer offers a substantial premium, the target board is more likely to accept quickly, reducing uncertainty. The 420 digits may have been chosen to attract attention and shape narratives rather than out of carelessness. In addition, the waiver of due diligence could have been a strategic gamble to expedite the process and prevent the leaking of sensitive user data. Such behavior aligns with the concept of bargaining power: by waiving due diligence, Musk accelerated the timeline and limited the target's ability to delay.

Financing decisions might also reflect strategic calculus. Musk's reliance on debt shifted risk to lenders and required Twitter to service interest payments, which can incentivize cost-cutting and operational efficiencies. Private equity investments often employ leverage to discipline managers. Although the high debt load drew criticism, it may have been viewed as a mechanism to concentrate future cash flows. Furthermore, bringing in co-investors such as venture funds diversified risk and signaled confidence from sophisticated partners.

A final alternative explanation is that Musk sought to protect his personal brand and intellectual freedom. Twitter was his primary communication platform and a tool for shaping public discourse. Ownership ensures control over content moderation rules and reduces the risk of platform bans. From this perspective, the acquisition yields private benefits that are not captured by conventional valuation models. However, such motivations are consistent with behavioral theories because they emphasize nonfinancial goals and personal utility.

The analysis offers lessons for policymakers, investors, and boards. First, cases of extreme founder wealth highlight the limitations of traditional governance mechanisms. When individuals have sufficient resources to personally finance major acquisitions, external monitoring becomes harder. Regulators might consider disclosure requirements or leverage caps to ensure that due diligence is performed and that risks are transparent to creditors. Second, boards should cultivate diversity in gender and personality to counteract groupthink. Evidence suggests that male-dominated boards and frequent acquirers are prone to overconfidence [17]. Including directors with different perspectives can introduce healthy skepticism. Third, lenders and investors can impose covenants and capital structure discipline. Financing constraints have been shown to moderate overconfidence [16]. Fourth, the presence of independent media and public scrutiny may temper hubris by highlighting potential risks. In Musk's case, widespread debate about the merits of his plan may have influenced the legal outcome and pressured him to honor the contract.

Examining other high-profile mergers provides perspective on whether Musk's behavior is unique or part of a broader pattern. Corporate finance research documents numerous cases where acquirers paid substantial premiums based on optimistic projections and subsequently struggled to realize expected synergies. The merger of AOL and Time Warner in 2000 was initially hailed as a convergence of new and old media, yet within a few years, the combined entity wrote down tens of billions of dollars of goodwill. Analysts attributed much of the failure to cultural clashes, technological misalignment, and unrealistic expectations. Similarly, Hewlett-Packard's 2011 acquisition of Autonomy involved allegations of accounting improprieties and resulted in significant impairment charges, leading to litigation and reputational damage. These episodes illustrate how enthusiasm for disruptive technologies can lead managers to overlook fundamental risks. Scholars such as Doukas and Petmezas [25] have linked overvalued equity to the winner's curse [6], showing that acquirers using overvalued stock tend to overpay and underperform in the long run. Studies by Agrawal et al. [26] and by Loughran and Vijh [27] have documented that many mergers fail to produce positive abnormal returns for acquiring shareholders over long horizons.

Comparisons also highlight the role of governance. In the AOL-Time Warner and HP-Autonomy deals, boards approved acquisitions championed by charismatic CEOs, and subsequent investigations questioned whether directors exercised sufficient oversight. The pattern resonates with the indicators outlined in this study: high prior performance of the acquirer, media accolades for executives, and a focus on visionary narratives. Although each case differs in industry and context, the recurring themes underscore that overconfidence and hubris are pervasive risks in strategic decision-making. They also reinforce the value of independent due diligence, skeptical board members, and realistic integration planning. By situating the Twitter acquisition within this broader landscape, the analysis shows that the underlying behavioral dynamics are not isolated but part of a continuum of managerial exuberance.

Beyond financial outcomes, the Twitter acquisition raises ethical and societal questions about the governance of digital platforms. Social media firms mediate public discourse, shape political mobilization, and influence market sentiment. When ownership shifts from dispersed shareholders to a single individual, the balance between corporate autonomy and democratic accountability becomes salient. Musk's pledge to champion free speech by relaxing content moderation rules has been praised by some as a corrective to perceived censorship and criticized by others as a potential catalyst for misinformation and harassment. Legal scholars note that the First Amendment of the United States Constitution constrains government but not private companies; hence, the internal policies of platforms define the boundaries of permissible speech. Changes in these policies can affect vulnerable communities and have geopolitical repercussions.

Algorithmic transparency is another ethical issue. Musk promised to open-source Twitter's ranking algorithms and to authenticate users. Providing insight into how posts are prioritized could enhance accountability, but full transparency may expose proprietary code and enable manipulation. Mandating user authentication might reduce spam and bot activity but could discourage anonymous speech, which is sometimes necessary for whistle-blowing and activism. The tension between identity verification and privacy rights exemplifies the complex trade-offs facing platform owners.

Data privacy also merits attention. Twitter collects vast amounts of user data, including metadata about interactions. Ownership by an individual who controls multiple technology companies raises concerns about cross-platform data sharing and potential conflicts of interest. Regulators around the world have enacted data protection laws, such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation, which impose stringent requirements on data controllers. Compliance with such regulations becomes more challenging when business models depend on personalizing content and advertising. Overconfidence in one's ability to navigate regulatory landscapes may lead to legal exposure.

Finally, the transaction underscores the broader debate about democratic oversight of essential communication infrastructures. Some scholars propose treating large social media platforms as public utilities subject to regulatory oversight, while others argue that competition and market forces suffice. The hubris hypothesis suggests that without external checks, visionary founders may make unilateral decisions that have far-reaching societal implications. Recognizing these ethical dimensions broadens the evaluative framework beyond financial metrics and underscores the importance of multi-stakeholder governance in the digital age.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Summary of findings

This paper analyzed Elon Musk's acquisition of Twitter through the lens of the hubris hypothesis and related theories of managerial overconfidence. Drawing on a rich body of behavioral finance research, the study operationalized hubris using indicators such as prior performance, media praise, self-importance, and the premium offered. It reconstructed the timeline of events and examined the decision to waive due diligence, the financing structure, and the strategic justifications. The findings indicate that many aspects of the transaction align with the predictions of the hubris hypothesis. Musk's exceptional wealth and success likely fostered overconfidence; his public image as a visionary and his multiple leadership roles amplified self-importance; the premium and symbolic pricing suggest nontraditional valuation; and the waiver of due diligence reflects a reliance on personal judgment.

Comparisons with empirical studies reinforce the behavioral interpretation. Overconfident CEOs are documented to pursue diversifying mergers and to overpay when cash is abundant [12]. The absence of an independent acquirer board in Musk's case removed a potential constraint. The financing arrangement, while complex, resembled patterns seen in other cases of overconfidence: heavy leverage and reliance on personal equity. Yet the analysis also acknowledges competing explanations. Strategic visions related to free speech and long-term platform value may have played a role. The attempt to terminate the deal illustrates that Musk was responsive to legal and market pressures.

5.2. Implications and future research

The study's implications extend beyond the specific case. First, it underscores the importance of integrating behavioral factors with corporate finance models. Traditional valuation analyses may underestimate the role of psychological biases. Second, it highlights the need for robust governance, particularly in transactions involving charismatic founders. Boards and regulators should ensure that due diligence is not waived without compelling justification. Third, the case raises questions about the social responsibilities of platform ownership. When private individuals control public communication infrastructure, their personal beliefs can shape discourse. Future research could compare this case with other founder-led acquisitions, conduct quantitative event studies to measure abnormal returns, and explore the interplay between personality traits and ideological motives. Researchers might also examine cross-cultural differences in hubris manifestations and investigate whether regulatory regimes constrain or amplify overconfidence.

5.3. Policy recommendations

Taken together, the findings point to three clusters of policy interventions: reforms to corporate governance at the firm level, safeguards in deal financing and capital structure, and oversight mechanisms tailored to digital platforms that function as quasi-public spheres. At the level of corporate governance, boards should prioritize independence and diversity when overseeing founder-led acquisitions. From a financing perspective, leverage caps and covenant design can mitigate the downside of overconfident deal-making. For digital platforms that serve as de facto public infrastructures, additional oversight arrangements are required.

Drawing on the evidence and comparative analysis, several policy recommendations emerge. First, governance reforms should prioritize board independence and diversity. Boards that include directors with varied backgrounds and less personal connection to the founder are more likely to challenge assumptions and insist on rigorous due diligence. Gender diversity in particular has been linked to more cautious risk assessments and can counteract overconfidence biases. Regulators could mandate minimum proportions of independent directors for companies above a certain size or for transactions exceeding specified thresholds.

Second, acquirers should be required to conduct and disclose comprehensive due diligence, especially when deals involve sensitive industries such as social media. Waiving due diligence should trigger heightened scrutiny from regulators and lenders. Disclosure requirements could include summarized findings of technical audits, assessments of data integrity, and analysis of user metrics. Such transparency would enable stakeholders to evaluate whether the purchase price and financing structure are justified.

Third, capital structure oversight can mitigate the consequences of managerial overconfidence. Leverage magnifies both returns and losses; therefore, imposing debt caps relative to cash flows for acquisitions could prevent overextension [28]. Lenders play a critical role by demanding covenants tied to performance metrics. Regulators may consider stress testing highly leveraged deals to assess resilience under adverse scenarios.

Fourth, platform governance must address ethical concerns. Owners of digital platforms should establish independent oversight bodies responsible for content moderation policies, algorithmic transparency, and data protection. These bodies could include representatives from civil society, academia, and industry to ensure a balance between free expression and harm prevention. Regulators might set guidelines for algorithmic accountability, requiring platforms to document how ranking and recommendation systems impact information exposure. User authentication policies should be designed to reduce abuse while preserving anonymity where necessary for safety and whistle-blowing.

Fifth, policymakers should explore the feasibility of treating large social media platforms as essential infrastructure subject to bespoke regulatory regimes. Just as utilities are regulated to ensure fair access and prevent monopolistic abuses, platforms with significant market power could be required to adhere to standards of openness and nondiscrimination. Creating a regulatory framework tailored to digital public squares would help reconcile the tension between private ownership and public interest.

Finally, education and training for executives and directors on behavioral biases can reduce the likelihood of hubris in strategic decisions. Incorporating behavioral finance modules into executive education and board training programs would raise awareness of overconfidence, escalation of commitment, and other psychological pitfalls. Encouraging a culture of constructive dissent and critical analysis within organizations can create internal checks that complement external regulation. By implementing these recommendations, stakeholders can better align entrepreneurial ambition with sustainable value creation and social responsibility.

Ethical Statement

This study does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects performed by the author.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that she has no conflicts of interest to this work.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Author Contribution Statement

Jia-Ying Lyu: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Supervision.

References

[1] Roll, R. (1986). The hubris hypothesis of corporate takeovers. *The Journal of Business*, *59*(2), 197–216. https://doi.org/10.1086/296325

[2] Twitter, Inc. (2022). *Elon Musk to acquire Twitter*. *PR Newswire*, Retrieved from: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/elon-musk-to-acquire-twitter-301532245.html

[3] Jin, H., & Oguh, C. (2022). *Explainer: How Elon Musk funded the $44 billion Twitter deal*. *Reuters*.

[4] Farooq, M., Khan, I., Kainat, M., & Mumtaz, A. (2025). Corporate social responsibility and firm value: The role of enterprise risk management and corporate governance. *Corporate Governance*, *25*(3), 631–663. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-08-2023-0341

[5] Hayward, M. L. A., & Hambrick, D. C. (1997). Explaining the premiums paid for large acquisitions: Evidence of CEO hubris. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42*(1), 103–127. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393810

[6] Twardawski, T., & Kind, A. (2023). Board overconfidence in mergers and acquisitions. *Journal of Business Research*, *165*, 114026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114026

[7] Fergusson, L., Querubin, P., Ruiz, N. A., & Vargas, J. F. (2021). The real winner's curse. *American Journal of Political Science*, *65*(1), 52–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12508

[8] Feldman, E. R., & Hernandez, E. (2022). Synergy in mergers and acquisitions: Typology, life cycles, and value. *Academy of Management Review*, *47*(4), 549–578. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0345

[9] Raithatha, M., & Ladkani, R. (2023). Do board characteristics play a moderating role in M&A decisions of family firms? *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, *18*(11), 5257–5279. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-07-2021-1068

[10] Kraft, P. S., Dickler, T. A., & Withers, M. C. (2025). When do firms benefit from overconfident CEOs? The role of board

expertise and power for technological breakthrough innovation. *Strategic Management Journal*, *46*(2), 381–410. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3657
[11] Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2005). CEO overconfidence and corporate investment. *The Journal of Finance*, *60*(6), 2661–2700. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2005.00813.x
[12] Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2008). Who makes acquisitions? CEO overconfidence and the market's reaction. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *89*(1), 20–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.07.002
[13] Billett, M. T., & Qian, Y. (2008). Are overconfident CEOs born or made? Evidence of self-attribution bias from frequent acquirers. *Management Science*, *54*(6), 1037–1051. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1070.0830
[14] Ferris, S. P., Jayaraman, N., & Sabherwal, S. (2013). CEO overconfidence and international merger and acquisition activity. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, *48*(1), 137–164. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109013000069
[15] Yang, X., Bai, T., & Yang, L. (2021). Chief executive officer's proactive personality and firm mergers and acquisitions: A fuzzy-set QCA approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 703678. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.703678
[16] Jory, S., Ngo, T., & Susnjara, J. (2025). The effect of CEO overconfidence on corporate disclosures amid a pervasive shock: Evidence from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, *52*(3), 1431–1462. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbfa.12849
[17] Brahma, S., Boateng, A., & Ahmad, S. (2023). Board overconfidence and M&A performance: Evidence from the UK. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting*, *60*(4), 1363–1391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11156-023-01133-8
[18] Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*(2), 193–206. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628
[19] Wang, L., Li, H., & Mu, Y. (2022). Study of CEO narcissism and corporate R&D investment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 888618. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.888618
[20] Burbano, V., Padilla, N., & Meier, S. (2024). Gender differences in preferences for meaning at work. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *16*(3), 61–94. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20220121
[21] Even-Tov, O., Ryans, J., & Davidoff Solomon, S. (2024). Representations and warranties insurance in mergers and acquisitions. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *29*(1), 423–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-022-09709-w
[22] Chen, S.-S., Ho, K.-Y., Ho, P.-H., & Nie, W.-Y. (2022). CEO overconfidence and bondholder wealth effects: Evidence from mergers and acquisitions. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *77*, 102278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2022.102278
[23] Wiessner, D. (2022). *Explainer: Will Twitter layoffs violate U.S. law? Reuters*. https://www.reuters.com/legal/will-twitter-layoffs-violate-us-law-2022-11-04/
[24] Nie, W.-Y., & Yen, K.-C. (2024). CEO overconfidence and investor sentiment in M&A decisions. *Finance Research Letters*, *64*, 105390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105390
[25] Brander, J. A., & Egan, E. J. (2017). The winner's curse in acquisitions of privately-held firms. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, *65*, 249–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2017.01.010
[26] Agrawal, A., Jaffe, J. F., & Mandelker, G. N. (1992). The post-merger performance of acquiring firms: A re-examination of an anomaly. *The Journal of Finance*, *47*(4), 1605–1621. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1992.tb04674.x
[27] Loughran, T., & Vijh, A. M. (1997). Do long-term shareholders benefit from corporate acquisitions? *The Journal of Finance*, *52*(5), 1765–1790. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb02741.x
[28] Wang, M., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Excess goodwill and enterprise litigation risk. *Finance Research Letters*, *67*, 105819. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2024.105819

How to Cite: Lyu, J. -Y. (2026). Understanding Elon Musk's Acquisition of Twitter Through the Hubris Hypothesis: An Examination of Behavioral Finance, Governance, and Decision-Making. *FinTech and Sustainable Innovation*. https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewFSI62027903