Incentives, Externalities, and Specific Cases: Differences in Private Enterprises, Public Institutions, and Nonprofits

Xishan Li
Minhang Crosspoint Academy, Shanghai Wenqi Private Middle School, Shanghai, China

Abstract: This article examines how corporations, public institutions, and nonprofit organizations differ in their incentive structures and ability to manage the externalities they encounter. From the case study on the 2010 BP oil spill, it is shown that corporations' profit-driven focus encourages efficiency and innovation but leads them to focus more on short-term gains, consider only a small group of stakeholders, and ignore the broader environmental and social costs. In contrast, although public institutions and nonprofits may still face inefficiencies, they are guided by broader missions that enable them to implement longer-term investments and a more comprehensive responsiveness to marginalized groups. This article highlights three key dimensions: the rigidity of corporate incentive structures that are shaped by the society, the differences in creation and management of externalities, and a variety of approaches to risk and marginalized groups. These comparisons demonstrate that while corporations are better in delivering rapid returns, public institutions and nonprofits are relatively more suited to address extensive development goals and protect long-term social welfare.

Keywords: Private Enterprises; Public Institutions; Non-profits; Incentives; Investment Horizon; Externalities; Risk; Edge Cases

1. Introduction

The April 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico stirred global controversy about the company's negligence, which had led to irrevocable damage of local environments and communities [1]. This classic case demonstrates how profit-driven enterprises prioritize shareholder returns, resulting in severe negative externalities, many of which are impossible to internalize. The question before us is twofold: what behaviors are engendered by the hope for profit, and whether these behaviors—characteristic of private enterprise—ultimately lead to better or worse outcomes than those of governments or nonprofits? This essay argues that corporations, as compared to nonprofits and governments, tend to have a more myopic focus on short-term gains incentivized by the market and regulatory structures, poor accounting of externalities, and inadequate risk assessment and management.

2. Incentives & Horizon

A private firm's rigid incentive structure, the result of a social-cultural construct, likely limits its ability to incorporate actors beyond the defined stakeholders, limiting its ability to commit to ultra-long-term investment projects.

Under the traditional framework, private enterprises are exclusively responsible to their shareholders, and only recently have expanded to include some form of social responsibility external to the financial stakeholders. However, these two goals can be at odds and often are. Recent initiatives in corporate social responsibility and the quantification of environment, social, and governance ratings are often good-willed but are subverted by the organization's profit motives [2].

Researchers have found that profit is a cultural narrative and regenerates itself in education. Business schools that teach profit maximization often ignore realistic firms' behavior and subtly "reinforce a pecuniary value" in their students that carries them into practice [3]. Further, maximizing profit overemphasizes the investors' interest in a capitalistic system, at the cost of moral duty and utility of its internal and external stakeholders: its employees, the community, and the environment. The aggregate economic growth and innovation through market competition are incidental to the motivation of the private firms.

Public-facing companies in developed markets need to periodically furnish financial statements to their investors, who can cast their vote through ultra-fast transaction systems. Therefore, to win the vote of capital, they need to prioritize what the public believes are profitable ventures, even if it conflicts with internal estimates. For example, facing the advent of general artificial intelligence agents, a private company will choose to cut staff instead of investing in retraining existing staff to satisfy the equity research analyst's projection of earnings.

Governments need not necessarily represent the public will, but they will eventually crumble without it. They are tasked with the gigantic task of balancing both intergenerational and cross-sectional distributive equity. Government and non-profit organizations often account for social costs and benefits in addition to profit. Due to the scale of governments, they can pool and lock up short-term capital contributions in the form of tax and invest in large capital expenditures like infrastructure, national defense, and health care that yield a greater collective benefit [4]. To tax, the government needs to either grant political representation or return to the public a portion of its tax investments in the form of public goods provisions. They are often the supreme authority of the land and are only accountable to themselves; any grievances will likely need to be addressed at the top, as they have no other entity upon which they rely or offload their duties.

Charities are principally concerned with fairness, social equity, and public welfare. They take on a variety of forms: entertainment clubs, educational institutions, research, crime watchdogs, quasi-public agencies, market exchanges, etc. Usually, they play the roles of a trustee and a mediator who are better positioned to address social issues precisely because it can signal credibility where consumers can't easily judge the quality and face no distribution constraint [5]. As the glue of a system that ties together the private with the public, they coordinate the activities and incentivize cooperation instead of conflict. They also plug the holes that both government and private firms choose to neglect. Their public-facing mandate is also incidentally beneficial in that it is less vulnerable to shifting external environments [6]. Nonprofits have multiple revenue sources: a mix of private and public funding ensures that the incentives are not limited to the richest people but also the broader citizens through tax revenue distribution. Non-profits also optimize for a variety of metrics and may end up providing a more well-rounded service, having considered all factors.

3. Externalities

Although governments and nonprofit organizations are also creators of externalities, the ways in which they are created and managed are different.

Governments are not immune to massive externalities through their state-led activities, but they paradoxically also serve as the clean-up crew of the last resort. Nonprofit organizations are harder to generalize, as each institution's internal structure, incentives, and priorities together will determine its willingness and ability to manage externalities.

Short-term profit pressures often lead to private enterprises having to disclose their performance quarterly or annually, subsequently optimizing for tangible metrics. As a result, the decision makers are constrained to make investment decisions that cater to the expectations of the investors, who are often short-term focused themselves. Long-term capital expenditure or research that is reflected in its market price and market capitalization is forgone. Among investors, customers, and employees, the company owes first and foremost a legal fiduciary duty to its equity and debt investors, who channel their power through the board, as granted by the legal system.

Moreover, immense pressure to win market share might stimulate the company to conflate information in its advertisement and marketing instead of improve product quality and suitability for its customers. Studies shows that some firms use false advertising to overstate the value of their products [7]. Ironically, many such instances exist when what is good for the customers might not be good for business. In certain cases, the pressure is so great that firms will choose to circumvent existing regulations to benefit from short-term gains. These practices can generate negative externalities to not only consumers, but also to the market of those products. To be specific, when consumer cannot buy the product which met their expectations, their welfare will be undermined. Similarly, when more and more companies believe that using these methods to cheat their consumers can help them earn more profit, they will continue to do so, which reduces the credibility of the market.

The 2008 Financial Crisis serves as an example of how private enterprises generate large-scale negative externalities when were driven only by profit motives. In the early 2000s, banks and other financial institutions loosened their lending standards and issued a huge number of subprime loans [8]. These loans were risky and then be used into complex financial products such as collateralized debt obligations (CDOs). They received artificially high ratings from private credit agencies that were motivated by profit rather than accuracy in spite of their fragility. Thus, when the housing market collapsed, the financial system unraveled immediately. This caused massive unemployment, inflation, and economic dislocation [9]. The costs of this crisis were not afford by the firms that created it. Instead, they were shifted to households and governments, who were forced to cover the losses through these stimulus and hazardous programs [10]. Nevertheless, these bailouts reinforced moral hazard: encouraging financial institutions to continue their risky behaviors, focusing on short-term profits, knowing they would be rescued by someone if they failed [11]. Even today, the consequences remain visible. The rising national debt, continuing recession, droping confidence in consumers and businesses, and broader social instability [12]. This demonstrates how private profit-seeking behaviors produces severe negative externalities for the public that extend beyond the financial collapse.

Furthermore, price discrimination will likely exacerbate the social inequalities by effectively allowing producers to capture the marginal benefit accrued to each consumer, compared to that obtained with a uniform price [13]. Consumers, especially those who are at the margins, may end up paying a much higher proportion of their income towards necessities. Economic efficiency at the macro level still will lead to tangible pain and disastrous outcomes for the poor. Inequality also increases as a result of the different degrees of reliance on necessities between the poor and the rich.

Governments often use a combination of policy and taxation to correct and address externalities created in the private sector. Taxation enables states to fund essential services and achieve public needs. For example, the U.S. federal government's investment in the interstate highway system in the 1950s reshaped the national economy and mobility infrastructure, although this program seemed costly in the short run. Also, when people realize that the substantial benefits in their daily lives are funded by their money paid for the tax, they will be more willing to pay the tax rather than doing so only under their governments' coercion [14]. Thus, it can eliminate negative externalities such as conflicts between citizens and governments.

The nonprofit's role as a risk mitigator allows the market to digest the externalities often left by governments and private enterprises. Some industries have such skewed cost or reward structures that nonprofits may be required to investigate and report on these at-risk activities [15]. Awareness is requisite for scrutiny and problem-solving. Some also function as risk poolers to reduce the risk of disasters, such as public healthcare insurance in advanced economies. A meta-study of for-profit and not-for-profit nursing homes found that elders' homes run by non-profits are much better in terms of services than for-profit facilities, as the latter may cut corners and reduce necessary costs that endanger the health and safety of residents [16,17].

4. Risk & Edge Cases

The three groups also differ in the way they view risks and manage edge cases, such as the marginalized groups in society.

Private firms' goal is to always maximize their profits and make decisions regardless of risks or feelings from others, which is not always feasible. Governments act as the safety net that guarantees a minimum level of public health and education because many such projects may not be profitable but are essential to the functioning of the economy. Markets depend on the price mechanism for determining the optimal level of production and consumption. However, if every good and service market is purely determined by willingness to pay, those who are most poised to benefit from education and healthcare, for example, may be the least prepared to pay for these services. Hence, in an ideal market, the exclusion of these consumers will be perfectly efficient. However, the outcome is suboptimal ethically and, by extension, politically. And as every market is intricately linked, uneducated and poor-health individuals are massive externalities to the welfare and stability of a society and can have severe negative spillover effects into adjacent markets. Studies have shown poverty can act like a trap, leading those who are less educated and with poorer health to have poorer employability and social status, which are themselves important factors for civil participation and community belonging [18]. Therefore, the negative reinforcement cycle continues of poorer outcomes leading to diminished agency and bad decisions.

Governments, out of political necessity, understood its mandate as the ultimate risk mitigator in society, providing social security safety nets such as disability insurance, farm subsidies, and protection of women, children, and elders to ensure those who are least protected from risk can have some basic form of mitigation [19]. Mitigation is crucial to provide the psychological safety required for vulnerable groups to be productive members of society. Also, through policies such as education and skills training, governments enable marginalized groups with the abilities required to enter the labor market. This enhanced their employment opportunities and social participation [20]. Providing access to training programs not only improves individual employment rate but also helps to close the skills gap in the economy. These practices create a more competitive and resilient workforce, address short-term unemployment, and interrupt cycles of disadvantage by reducing poverty and long-term social inequality. At the same time, if governments establish participatory governance practices that allow marginalized groups to have a voice in policymaking, policies will become more targeted and fair because they directly reflect the demands of these groups of people [21]. Such methods will strengthen social cohesion, reduce feelings of alienation, and enhance public trust in the legitimacy of government action.

Charities are different from governments. For instance, they improve works such as investments in training, planning, evaluation, and internal systems [22]. There is a study that shows the way that profit-driven pricing strategies can threaten fairness and restrict access to certain majors for lower-income students. These behaviors reflect the negative effect of differential pricing in education, which is often worse than charity models in preserving equal opportunity. "On the other hand, if a university hedges this possibility by keeping its general undergraduate prices within a range acceptable to most students and parents, it runs a different type of risk. It may become progressively unable to foster growth and maintain quality in selected curricula that are inherently expensive to operate" [23]. To avoid people being priced out of an education, public scrutiny, either from an agency or a regulatory organization, is important to guarantee a basic level of education. With charities' supervision and funds, more people that are trapped in poverty can still have the right to be educated.

Nevertheless, government can be corrupt, and the risk might be over-regulation. In many countries, governments and nonprofits are expected to solve such problems and protect public interests. However, these institutions are sometimes neither more ethical than enterprises nor effective in addressing social costs. Also, it's commonly accepted that competition begets innovation, and that's what maximizes social utility. As Aghion & Howitt pointed out in 1992, creative destruction improves the productivity and aggregate utility of the society, as innovation renders existing factors of protection obsolete, leading to destruction but also creation [24].

5. Conclusion

Although the pursuit of profit by private enterprises acts as propulsion for efficiency and innovation, it also gives rise to a rigid incentive structure. This structure limits the ability of firms to develop inclusively and reduces their willingness to invest in long-term projects. These rigidities are generated by social and cultural constructs, which often lead to the ignoring of groups beyond defined stakeholders and make it difficult to address social values that cannot be monetized. In contrast, while governments and nonprofit organizations also face issues of inefficiency, their creation and management of externalities are typically guided by broader missions and different perceptions of risk. As a result, they are more inclined to prioritize long-term social welfare and the needs of marginalized groups. These differences in incentive structures and risk orientation are important because they shape how people from different groups respond to the complex societal challenges and finally determine who benefits from the outcomes.

References

[1] US Department of Commerce. 2024. "Coastal Pollution Tutorial: NOAA's National Ocean Service Education." Oceanservice.noaa.gov. July 8, 2024. https://oceanservice.noaa.gov/education/tutorial-coastal/oil-spills/os04-sub-01.html.

[2] Brav, Alon, Wei J, Song M, Xuan T. "The Short-Termism Trap: Catering to Informed Investors with Limited Horizons." Harvard Law School Forum on Corporate Governance, August 13, 2024. https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2024/08/13/the-short-termism-trap-catering-to-informe d-investors-with-limited-horizons/.

[3] Northrop, Emily. "The Accuracy, Market Ethic, and Individual Morality Surrounding the Profit Maximization Assumption." The American Economist 58, no. 2 (2013): 111–23. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43664747.

[4] Musgrave, Richard A, Peggy B. Musgrave. Public Finance in Theory and Practice. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1989.https://desmarais-tremblay.com/Resources/Musgrave%20Richard%20A.%20and%20Musgrave%20Peggy%20B.%201989%20%281973%29%20Public%20Finance%20in%20Theory%20and%20Practice_5th%20ed.pdf

[5] Hansmann, Henry B. "The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise." The Yale Law Journal 89, no. 5 (1980): 835–901. https://www.jstor.org/stable/796089

[6] Carroll, Deborah A, Keely Jones Stater. "Revenue Diversification in Nonprofit Organizations: Does It Lead to Financial Stability?" Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART 19, no. 4 (2009): 947–66. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20627883.

[7] Rhodes, Andrew, Chris M. Wilson. "False Advertising." The RAND Journal of Economics 49, no. 2 (2018): 348–69. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45147707

[8] Mishkin, Frederic S. "Over the Cliff: From the Subprime to the Global Financial Crisis." The Journal of Economic Perspectives 25, no. 1 (2011): 49–70. https://www.jstor. org/stable/23049438

[9] Riley, Rebecca, Garry Y. "FINANCIAL CRISIS AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE: INTRODUCTION." National Institute Economic Review, no. 228 (2014): R1–2. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44396461

[10] Bianchi, Javier. "Efficient Bailouts?" The American Economic Review 106, no. 12 (2016): 3607–59. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24911356

[11] Marshall, John M. "Moral Hazard." The American Economic Review 66, no. 5 (1976): 880–90. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1827499

[12] Loo, Andrew. "2008-2009 Global Financial Crisis." Corporate Finance Institute, 2015, https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/economics/2008-2009-global-financial-crisis/#:~:text=It%20led%20to%20the%20dismal,CFI%20resources%20will%20be%20helpful:

[13] Cowan, Simon. "Third-Degree Price Discrimination and Consumer Surplus." The Journal of Industrial Economics 60, no. 2 (2012): 333–45. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23324510.

[14] Helmig, B, Veronika I, Christine P. "Success Factors of Nonprofit Organizations: A Literature Review." Journal of Business Ethics 137, no. 3 (2016): 557–77. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-015-2868-x.

[15] Goldberg, Robyn. 2023. "Exploring Risk Mitigation Methods among Today's Nonprofits." Altrata, August 8, 2023. https://altrata.com/articles/exploring-risk-mitigation-methods-among-todays-nonprofits.

[16] Comondore, Vikram R, Devereaux P J, Qi Z, Samuel B, Stone, Jason W, Busse, Nikila C. Ravindran, Karen E. Burns, et al. "Quality of Care in For-Profit and Not-for-Profit Nursing Homes: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." BMJ: British Medical Journal 339, no. 7717 (2009): 381–84. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25672384.

[17] America's Charities. "What Percentage of

Donations Go to Charity.” 2025. https://www.charities.org/what-percentage-donations-go-charity/#:~:text=Overhead%20costs%20include%20important%20investments,overhead%2C%20they%20need%20high%20performance.
[18] Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. 2024. “Poverty.” Health.gov. 2024. https://odphp.health.gov/ healthypeople/priority-areas/social-determinants-health/literature-summaries/poverty.
[19] Corrente, Makaela. 2024. “Safeguarding Your Mission: Essential Risk Management Strategies for Nonprofits - Grassi.” Grassi, June 25, 2024. https://www.grassiadvisors.com/blog/safeguarding-your-mission-essential-risk-management-strategies-for-nonprofits/.
[20] Friedlander, Daniel, David H. Greenberg, Philip K. Robins. “Evaluating Government Training Programs for the Economically Disadvantaged.” Journal of Economic Literature 35, no. 4 (1997): 1809–55. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2729880
[21] Bingham, Lisa Blomgren, Tina Nabatchi, Rosemary O’Leary. “The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government.” Public Administration Review 65, no. 5 (2005): 547–58. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3542521
[22] Chikoto-Schultz, Grace L, Yu X, Paul Manson, Maryam Amiri. “Non-Profit Sector Organizational Actions on Risk Reduction Practices, Policymaking Participation, Community and Social Contributions, and Recovery.” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science. August 28, 2019. Accessed July 20, 2025. https://oxfordre.com/ naturalhazard science/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.001.0001/acrefore-9780199389407-e-203.
[23] Yanikoski, Richard A, Richard F. Wilson. “Differential Pricing of Undergraduate Education.” The Journal of Higher Education 55, no. 6 (1984): 735–50. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1981511.
[24] Aghion, Philippe, Antonin Bergeaud, Timo Boppart, Peter J, Klenow, Li H Y. “Missing Growth from Creative Destruction.” The American Economic Review 109, no. 8 (2019): 2795–2822. https://www.jstor.org /stable/26747408.