Corporate Governance, Executive Compensation, and Agency Problems

Li Na
Shandong University of Technology, China

ABSTRACT

The separation of ownership and control in the modern corporation creates agency problems: managers (agents) whose interests may not perfectly align with those of shareholders (principals) may pursue strategies that benefit themselves at shareholders' expense, including excessive perquisite consumption, empire-building acquisitions, earnings management, and risk-aversion that sacrifices expected returns for personal job security. Jensen and Meckling's (1976) foundational paper in the Journal of Financial Economics established the agency cost framework and motivated the design of compensation contracts that align managerial and shareholder incentives through stock-based pay. This paper reviews agency theory and its applications to executive compensation design, evaluates the evidence on whether stock-based compensation effectively reduces agency costs or creates new problems of incentive misalignment and excessive pay, and examines governance mechanisms—boards of directors, institutional investors, say-on-pay votes, and activism—that monitor and constrain executive behavior.

Keywords: Corporate Governance; Executive Compensation; Agency Theory; Jensen Meckling; Stock Options; Say-on-Pay; Board of Directors; CEO Pay

1. INTRODUCTION

The separation of ownership and control—identified by Berle and Means (1932) in 'The Modern Corporation and Private Property' (Macmillan) as the defining characteristic of the large American corporation—creates the fundamental corporate governance problem: managers who control corporate resources do not fully bear the financial consequences of their decisions, creating incentives to pursue self-interest at shareholders' expense. Jensen and Meckling (1976), in the Journal of Financial Economics (3(4): 305–360), formalized this as the 'agency problem' and established that agency costs—the costs of monitoring, bonding, and residual loss from suboptimal managerial behavior—are a fundamental feature of the corporate form. Their analysis motivated decades of research on compensation contract design, board structure, and governance mechanisms that reduce agency costs.

The rise of stock-based executive compensation—stock options and restricted stock units—in the 1980s and 1990s was directly motivated by agency theory: making CEO wealth sensitive to stock price was expected to align managerial incentives with shareholder value creation. Jensen and Murphy (1990) in the Journal of Political Economy documented that CEO compensation was surprisingly insensitive to firm performance, motivating stronger pay-performance linkage through option-based compensation. The subsequent explosion of CEO pay—from approximately 20 times average worker pay in 1965 to over 300 times in 2022 according to the Economic Policy Institute—has generated both academic debate about whether high pay reflects competitive market for executive talent or rent extraction by powerful managers, and public concern about income inequality.

2. AGENCY THEORY AND COMPENSATION DESIGN

2.1 Optimal Contract Theory

Holmstrom's (1979) landmark paper in the Bell Journal of Economics formalized the principal-agent model of compensation design, establishing conditions under which the optimal contract shares risk between principal and agent. When agent effort is unobservable but output depends on both effort and stochastic factors outside the agent's control, the optimal contract trades off incentive provision (making pay sensitive to output) against risk sharing (insulating the agent from noise in the output signal). This trade-off predicts that executive pay-performance sensitivity should be lower for firms with more volatile earnings (where performance is a noisier signal of effort) and higher when executives are more risk-tolerant—predictions that have received empirical support.

2.2 Managerial Power and Rent Extraction

Bebchuk and Fried (2004), in 'Pay Without Performance: The Unfulfilled Promise of Executive Compensation' (Harvard University Press), challenge the optimal contract interpretation of executive compensation, arguing instead that CEOs use their power over boards to extract rents beyond what competitive market forces would justify. Their 'managerial power' hypothesis predicts that pay will be set to maximize the CEO's welfare subject to the constraint of maintaining shareholder acquiescence—the 'outrage constraint'—rather than to maximize firm value. Evidence for this view includes the asymmetric responsiveness of CEO pay to positive versus negative firm performance (pay ratchets up with good performance but falls little with poor performance) and the use of compensation consultants who are hired by boards seeking rationale for high pay rather than independent advice.

3. EVIDENCE ON PAY-PERFORMANCE SENSITIVITY

Table 1. Executive compensation components and their agency alignment properties.

Compensation Component	Pay-Performance Sensitivity	Agency Alignment Effect
Base salary	Near zero: fixed, not contingent	None; pure fixed cost
Annual bonus	Positive: linked to accounting metrics; manipulable	Partial; gaming risk through earnings management
Stock options	High: convex payoff profile rewards risk-taking	Mixed; excessive risk-taking and near-term focus
Restricted stock units	High: symmetric performance exposure	Better alignment; reduces excessive risk incentive vs. options
Long-term incentive plans	Moderate: 3–5year horizon reduces short-termism	Better; targets sustained performance over multiple years

4. GOVERNANCE MECHANISMS

Board of directors oversight is the primary internal governance mechanism for monitoring and constraining executive behavior. Fama and Jensen (1983) in the Journal of Law and Economics identify board independence—the proportion of outside directors without ties to management—as a key governance quality indicator. Empirical evidence on board independence and firm performance is mixed: while independent boards are associated with better CEO turnover sensitivity to performance (Weisbach, 1988), the relationship between board structure and firm value is confounded by endogenous matching between governance and firm characteristics. Institutional investor activism—particularly by large index funds (BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street) and activist hedge funds—has grown as a governance mechanism, with shareholder voting and engagement providing additional monitoring pressure on boards and executives.

5. CONCLUSION

Corporate governance research has established that agency costs are real and economically significant, that compensation design significantly affects managerial behavior, and that governance mechanisms—board independence, institutional investor monitoring, say-on-pay—can partially mitigate agency problems. The debate between optimal contracting and managerial power interpretations of executive pay remains unresolved empirically, though both perspectives predict that pay-performance sensitivity is an important governance mechanism. Future research should examine how the growing dominance of index fund ownership—which creates universal shareholders with diversified interests rather than concentrated owners—changes the governance incentive structure, and whether new governance mechanisms (stakeholder representation, mandatory clawbacks, executive pay ratio disclosure) improve agency cost reduction.

REFERENCES

[1] Bebchuk, L. A., & Fried, J. M. (2004). Pay without performance: The unfulfilled promise of executive compensation. Harvard University Press.
[2] Berle, A. A., & Means, G. C. (1932). The modern corporation and private property. Macmillan.
[3] Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. Journal of Law and Economics, 26(2), 301–325.
[4] Holmstrom, B. (1979). Moral hazard and observability. Bell Journal of Economics, 10(1), 74–91.
[5] Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.
[6] Jensen, M. C., & Murphy, K. J. (1990). Performance pay and top-management incentives. Journal of Political Economy, 98(2), 225–264.