



LJMU Research Online

Adu-Ameyaw, E, Danso, A, Acheampong, S and Akwei, CA

Executive bonus compensation and financial leverage: do growth and executive ownership matter?

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/15046/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Adu-Ameyaw, E, Danso, A, Acheampong, S and Akwei, CA (2021) Executive bonus compensation and financial leverage: do growth and executive ownership matter? International Journal of Accounting and Information Management. ISSN 1834-7649

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>



Executive bonus compensation and financial leverage: Do growth and executive ownership matter?

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Accounting and Information Management</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Executive bonus compensation, Leverage, UK

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Executive bonus compensation and financial leverage: Do growth and executive ownership**
5 **matter?**
6
7
8

9
10 **Abstract**

11 **Purpose:** This study examines the impact of executive bonus compensation on a firm's financial
12 leverage policy and the extent to which this compensation–leverage relation is moderated by firm
13 growth and executive ownership.
14
15

16
17
18
19
20 **Design/method/approach:** Using data from 213 non-financial and non-utility UK FTSE 350 firms
21 for the period 2007– 2015, generating a total of 1,784 firm-year observations, panel econometric
22 methods are employed to test our model.
23
24
25
26

27
28 **Findings:** Drawing insights from agency theoretic view, we uncover that managerial cash bonus
29 compensation is negatively and significantly related to financial leverage. However, stock bonus
30 compensation has a positive and significant impact on leverage. We also observe that
31 compensation–leverage is moderated by both firm growth and executive ownership. Our results
32 remain robust to alternative econometric models.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Originality/value:** While this paper builds on the executive bonus compensation literature, it is
40 the first – to the best of our knowledge – to explore the bonus compensation-corporate financial
41 leverage and, particularly, examine the extent to which firm growth and corporate executive
42 ownership matter in this relationship.
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 **Keywords:** Executive bonus compensation; leverage; UK.

50
51 **JEL Classification:** G30, G32, G34
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

Executive compensation has garnered a great deal of attention from both academics and non-academics. This attention stems in part from flaws in various corporate compensation practices which were revealed following the 2007-2008 global financial crisis. It is therefore not surprising that shareholder votes on executive compensation have been introduced in several countries within Europe (see e.g. Ferri & Maber, 2013). Broadly, prior scholarly work suggests that executive bonus compensation can be used as a tool in aligning the interests of corporate managers with those of shareholders (Balafas & Florackis, 2014; Kaplan & Rauh, 2010; Ortiz-Molina, 2007). Indeed, effective bonus compensation policies, such as incentive-based pay, could persuade firm executives to employ costly effort to enhance the future growth opportunities of their firms, thereby eliminating the agency conflicts between managers and shareholders, and this eventually creates shareholder value. Accordingly, the agency problem between corporate managers and shareholders is minimised through optimal compensation incentives (Balafas & Florackis, 2014; Grout & Zalewska, 2010; Ortiz-Molina, 2007; Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Notwithstanding the growing theoretical and empirical interest in executive bonus compensation, our understanding of the strategic implication of executive bonus compensation is far from complete. Results from prior scholarly advances have been mixed and unclear. Thus, in this study, we examine the influence of both cash bonus compensation and stock bonus compensation on a firm's financial leverage policy by using panel data of 213 non-financial and non-utility UK FTSE 350 firms for the period 2007–2015. Examining these executive bonus compensations on firm capital structure decision is important because it provides important insight into how top management incentives affect firms' key strategic decision – capital structure decision. Further, we seek to understand the extent to which the executive bonus compensation–leverage relation is conditional on firm growth and executive ownership.

By way of preview, the evidence obtained in this study shows that executive cash bonus compensation negatively impacts firm leverage. This suggests that incentives for executives to adopt excessive financial leverage are lessened through the adoption of cash bonus. In effect, executives with cash bonus incentives are motivated to generate enough cash flow which enables the firm to sponsor corporate activities with internally generated funds. Thus, this reduces the likelihood of bankruptcy conflict as a result of less usage of debt within the capital structure of the firm. However, our analysis reveals that executives' stock bonus compensation has a positive and significant influence on a firm's financial leverage. This suggests that stock-based bonus induces

1
2
3 executives to allow greater debt levels in the capital structure of their firms. Also, we find that
4 growth opportunity negatively moderates both cash bonus compensation–leverage and stock bonus
5 compensation-leverage relationships. Further, we observe that executive ownership negatively
6 moderates the stock-based bonus–leverage relationship. This suggests that executives with large
7 ownership stakes prefer to keep a lower leverage ratio in the firm’s capital structure to minimise
8 their personal and economic risks resulting from the firm’s possible bankruptcy risk (Grossman &
9 Hart, 1982). Additionally, because debtholders and other lenders are likely to monitor and restrain
10 managerial activities, executives with more ownership stakes may have an opportune incentive to
11 lower debt levels to prevent external control (Brailsford et al., 2002). Indeed, we conduct several
12 tests to ascertain the robustness of our results. First, we measure both executive cash and stock
13 bonus compensations by using alternative proxies. Second, in addition to OLS estimation, we use
14 the fixed effects model to deal with time-invariant covariates. Finally, we address the issue of
15 endogeneity and reverse causality using both predicted model approach and three-stage least
16 squares (3SLS) estimations. Our results remain robust to all these tests and alternative estimations
17 used to analyse the data.

18
19 We make primary contributions to the literature in the following ways. First, we contribute to the
20 literature examining executive bonus compensation-corporate policy nexus (e.g. Haque & Ntim,
21 2020; Zhang et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2011; Kini & Williams, 2012). While this paper builds on the
22 executive bonus compensation literature, it is the first – to the best of our knowledge – to explore
23 the bonus compensation-corporate financial leverage and, particularly, examine the extent to which
24 firm growth and executive ownership matter in this relationship with specific emphasis on UK
25 FTSE 350 firms. Our second contribution stems from the role of firm growth opportunity in the
26 bonus compensation-financial leverage relationship. Here, we demonstrate the significant role of
27 firm-level characteristic in explaining the bonus compensation-leverage relationship. Our third
28 contribution is in relation to the moderating role of executive ownership. Here, we demonstrate that
29 executive ownership is crucial in curtailing or lowering a firm’s use of financial leverage. As
30 executives’ residual interests increase, they become conscious of the firm’s idiosyncratic risk, and
31 hence decrease the leverage level, which is suggestive of managerial opportunism. Thus, by
32 increasing executive ownership, a firm is able to mitigate the probability of bankruptcy.

33
34 The remainder of the article is structured along these lines: section 2 reviews related literature.
35 Section 3 considers data and empirical methods. Section 4 presents and discusses results, and,
36 finally, section 5 concludes.

2. Literature review

From the agency theoretic view, corporate top executives are often portrayed in the literature as being self-interested and risk-averse (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Fama, 1980; Shleifer & Vishny, 1989). Motivated by their risk aversion, executives are likely to have an incentive to make less risky decisions that pose minimal risk exposure to their interests. An executive's risk-related incentive may have important implications for optimal corporate policies and the ultimate value for risk-neutral shareholders. For example, a risk-averse executive may fail to sponsor a valuable investment project with debt because an increase in a firm's leverage exacerbates financial distress and possible bankruptcy risks, which the executive would prefer to avoid. This is because such a policy may potentially amplify his/her personal and economic risks (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Anticipating this, shareholders may design executives' bonus compensation in such a way that it can influence executives to make value-enhancing decisions (Coles et al., 2006; Kini & Williams, 2012). Stemming from this, literature suggests that stock-based bonus compensation rather than cash-based bonus compensation gives executives the correct incentive to maximise firm value by reducing the executives' risk-related incentive problem (Jensen & Murphy, 1990). This is because, by rewarding risk-averse executives with stock-based bonus compensation, they bear part of the costs of their actions, which in turn causes them to optimally borrow to sponsor corporate activities, particularly when internal sources are insufficient. Thus, cash bonus compensation incentives discourage executives' risk-taking appetite (Coles et al. 2006; Berger et al. 1997). This is unsurprising, given that, by keeping a firm's leverage below the optimal level, the firm is likely to generate excess cash flow, albeit lower interest payment, thereby making it easy for shareholders to apply more cash bonuses to reward executives. Consistent with this view, John and John (1993) contend that firms with lower leverage are likely to safeguard bondholders' interests, which can lead to lower future costs of debt finance. Broadly speaking, the distinctive nature of bonus compensation components poses different risk-related incentives to executives and this in turn influences how they make corporate decisions (Cassell et al., 2012; Kini & Williams, 2012).

In a related manner, Kabir et al. (2013) further broaden the discussion on executive bonus compensations by investigating how different compensation components affect a firm's cost of debt. Their evidence shows that CEOs' pension benefit and cash bonus compensation decrease bond yield spread while stock options increase cost of debt. They conclude that bondholders are fully aware of both risk-taking and risk-avoiding incentives created by these components of executive

1
2
3 compensation. Along the same lines, Cassell et al. (2012) observe that CEOs with more inside debt
4 compensation (defined as pension benefits and restricted incentives) display lower levels of risk-
5 seeking behaviour. They make this suggestion after their empirical findings reveal that executives
6 with large inside debt holdings prefer investment and financial policies that are less risky. Kim, Li
7 and Zhang (2011) also suggest that chief financial officer's (CFO's) stock option compensation is
8 more sensitive to the firm's stock market crash risk and that the relationship is more pronounced
9 for those firms with a high level of financial leverage. Kini and Williams (2012) make a further
10 extension by suggesting that senior executives with stock-based compensation carry out more risky
11 firm activities to increase their chance of promotion to the rank of CEO.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Along similar lines, Ryan and Wiggins (2001) argue that shareholders of firms with growth
20 opportunities tend to reward executives with more stock-based and less cash-based compensation
21 to influence them to embark on quality corporate policies. This outcome is echoed in the work of
22 Humphery-Jenner et al. (2016) which posits that shareholders of growth-potential firms use more
23 stock-based bonus compensation to exploit executive overconfidence incentives. In the same vein,
24 Core et al. (1999) observe an increasing relationship between firm growth opportunities and
25 executive compensation.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Relatedly, the literature further indicates that, in firms where executives own large stakes,
32 shareholders use less incentive compensation to align their interests with those executives (Core et
33 al., 1999; Ryan & Wiggins, 2001; Hartzell & Starks, 2003). Other authors also suggest that
34 executives with large ownership stakes can easily influence the firm's board to gain higher salaries
35 and bonuses (Cheung et al., 2005; Weisbach, 2007) and that these executives are more likely to
36 pursue policies that suit their own interests (Gormley & Matsa, 2016; Brick, Palmon, & Wald,
37 2012). For instance, Gormley and Matsa (2016) observe that executives' incentive to play it safe
38 increases when they hold large stakes in the firm and one avenue they often adopt is to lower the
39 firm's risk (Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Berger et al., 1997). Clearly, based on this evidence, it is
40 plausible that executive ownership may dynamically interact with executive bonus compensation
41 to affect corporate policies.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Indeed, despite the various theoretical and empirical explanations reviewed above, we have little
52 understanding of the effects of executive bonus compensation on firm leverage policy as results
53 from prior scholarly advances have been mainly mixed and unclear. Thus, we seek to shed light on
54 this.
55
56
57
58
59
60

3. Method

3.1. Data

We use data from UK FTSE 350 firms spanning 2007 to 2015. Specifically, the dataset was obtained from two sources: we manually collected data on top three executives' (CEO – chief executive officer, CFO – chief financial officer and COO – chief operating officer) compensation (i.e. salary, cash bonus and stock bonus), executives' ownership stakes, and other corporate governance variables (large stakeholders and non-executives' ownership) from the firms' annual reports, whilst accounting and financial data were sourced from the COMPUSTAT database. Further, because firms operating in financial and utility industries tend to have different capital structures and often face other regulatory constraints which may implicitly affect executives' decisions, we excluded these firms from our analysis (see Coles et al., 2006; Chava & Purnanandam, 2010; Kini & William, 2012). Thus, we based our analysis on a total number of 1,784 firm-year observations for 213 firms operating in nine industries over a nine-year period.

3.2. Measurement of variables

3.2.1. Dependent variable – financial leverage

Financial leverage (LEV) was used as our dependent variable. This variable was measured as the ratio of total book value of debt to the book value of total assets (Coles et al., 2006; Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Chava & Purnanandam, 2010).

3.2.2. Independent variables

Two independent variables are tested in this study. These are cash bonus compensation (CB) and stock bonus compensation (SB). Consistent with Kabir et al. (2010), we measure the cash bonus compensation (CB) variable as annual cash bonus scaled by total sales, whilst the stock bonus compensation variable is measured as the sum values of performance stock and deferred stock (DS) scaled by total sales. As an alternative measure for robustness check, we scaled each bonus compensation component: cash bonus compensation (CB2) and stock bonus compensation (SB2) by total compensation (defined as the sum of annual salary, cash bonus and stock bonus). This is consistent with prior works (Kabir et al., 2013; Kini & Williams, 2012; Coles et al., 2006).

3.2.3. Control variables

Also, we accounted for the following control variables: salary (SAL), measured as annual salary scaled by total sales; natural logarithm of total sales to proxy for firm size (SZ); growth opportunities, defined as market value of assets to book value of assets to proxy for growth (GR); return on assets (ROA), defined as EBITDA scaled by total assets; stock return, which shows the firm's annual stock return (STKR) over the fiscal year; cash holdings (CH), defined as cash and cash equivalence scaled by total assets; cash flow (CF), defined as free cash flow scaled by total assets; financial distress (Z-score, ZSC), to proxy for probability of bankruptcy; tangibility, defined as net investment in property, plant and equipment (TAN); and research and development (RD), measured as R&D expenses scaled by total assets. Again, our model also accounted for executives' ownership (EO%), measured as percentage of stock ownership held by executives. This is because a firm's shareholders tend to consider executives' ownership levels when designing executives' compensation incentives (Ryan and Wiggins, 2001; Core et al., 1999). Other governance variables were also included in our models: large shareholders ownership (LO%), measured as percentage of equity ownership greater than 3%; and non-executive ownership (NEO%), measured as the percentage of non-executives' ownership. The inclusion of governance variables is in the spirit of prior works (e.g. Florackis and Ozkan, 2009; Ryan & Wiggins, 2001; Core et al., 1999). The acronyms and definitions of all the variables are provided in Table 1.

[Table 1 about here]

3.3. Model specification

In this section, we model the empirical relationship between executive bonus compensation and financial leverage. Specifically, we employed the following econometric framework:

$$LEV_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 CB_{it} + \beta_2 SB_{it} + \beta_3 Controls_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

In equation (1), *LEV* is the financial leverage, while *CB* and *SB* are executives' cash bonus compensation and stock bonus compensation respectively. Definitions of all the variables are provided in Table 1. In estimating equation (1), we initially use an Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression approach where independent variables are lagged by one year to minimise the potential

reverse causality problem. We estimate the fixed effects (FE) model as an alternative specification for robustness checks. Further, we also adopt a predicted model approach (i.e. two-step approach using 2SLS) and a simultaneous systems of equations (using 3SLS) technique to account for possible endogeneity issues (Kini & Williams, 2012; Coles et al., 2012; Coles et al., 2006).

[Tables 2 & 3 about here]

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Summary statistics and bivariate correlations

In Table 2, we present the summary statistics of the variables used in this study. A few findings are worth pointing out. The average value of cash bonus compensation (*CB*) is 0.59 and has a standard deviation of 21.14. This variable has a minimum value of 0.00 and a maximum value of 116.91, signifying a high degree of heterogeneity, while stock bonus (*SB*) mean (standard deviation) is 1.57 (54.54) with 0.00 and 357.45 for minimum and maximum respectively. Also, the average value of leverage (*LEV*) is 0.29. This variable has minimum and maximum values of 0.00 and 2.71 respectively. In all, the low figure may reflect the fact that the investigated firms are mainly equity financed.

In Table 3, we present the correlation between all the variables used in this study. In general, the evidence obtained from the correlation matrix, as well as the descriptive statistics, suggests that our sample does not seem to suffer from any serious issues such as multicollinearity, limited variation and heterogeneity or large outliers.

4.2. Univariate analysis

Table 4 shows univariate mean and standard deviation comparisons of the variables used by leverage quartiles. To perform this, we segregated firms into quartiles based on their leverage levels and tested whether variable characteristics differ across low-leverage (1st quartile) and high-leverage (4th quartile) levels. The mean of salary in low-leverage firms is lower than that in high-leverage firms while the mean of cash bonus compensation (*CB*) in low-leverage firms is lower than that in high-leverage firms. For the cash bonus, it is plausible to argue that high-leverage firms spend less on interest payment, which in turn gives these firms a leeway to store enough cash

1
2
3 balance and can motivate executives to use more cash bonuses. However, the mean differences
4 marginally missed out on significance. The mean of stock bonus compensation (SB) in low-leverage
5 firms is lower than that in high-leverage firms, implying that more stock bonus executives use a
6 higher leverage ratio.
7
8
9

10 Moreover, the findings on other firm characteristics are largely consistent with most of the extant
11 literature (Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Antoniou et al., 2008). For instance, Florackis and Ozkan
12 (2009) show that low-leverage firms normally have lower tangible assets (TAN), higher
13 performance (return on assets – ROA and stock return – STKR), higher cash holdings (CH), higher
14 cash flow (CF) and higher growth (GR) than high-leverage firms. Again, it is also observed that
15 low-leverage firms usually have larger R&D spending than high-leverage ones. The reported mean
16 differences are all significant.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The table further revealed that the mean values of executive ownership and large shareholders in
24 low-leverage firms are higher than that of high-leverage ones, implying that managers and large
25 shareholders become risk-cautious as their residual interests go up (Florackis & Ozkan, 2009).
26
27
28

29 In brief, the univariate analysis shows how cash bonus and stock bonus compensation and other
30 firm characteristics behave across different leverage levels.
31
32

33 ***[Table 4 about here]***
34
35
36
37

38 ***4.3. The effect of executive bonus compensation on leverage***

39
40 In Table 5, we present the empirical results of our baseline regression model of the effect of cash
41 bonus (CB) and stock bonus (SB) compensations on leverage (LEV). We employ two main
42 estimation methods in testing our model: ordinary least squares (OLS) and fixed effects. Our main
43 results are based on OLS models: 1, 3 & 5, while models 2, 4 & 6 (alternative specification – FE)
44 are used for robustness purposes. Specifically, Model 1 shows that the relationship between cash
45 bonus compensation (CB) and financial leverage (LEV) is negative and statistically significant at
46 the 1% level. The coefficient estimate for this variable is -0.310 and has a t-statistics of -2.13,
47 suggesting that an increase in cash bonus compensation (CB) is associated with lower firm leverage.
48 This finding supports the assertion that shareholders' usage of earning-based cash bonus
49 compensation induces executives' risk-reduction incentive, leading to lower firm leverage (Coles
50 et al., 2006; Harris & Raviv, 1979). With regard to stock bonus compensation (SB) in Model 3, the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 coefficient estimate is positive and statistically significant. Specifically, the coefficient is 0.792 (t-
4 statistics 2.06), implying that higher stock bonus (SB) compensation influences executives' risk-
5 taking incentive to increase firm leverage, which supports Kini and Williams' (2012) contention.
6 Our results remain qualitatively similar across the FE models. Moreover, in models 5 and 6, we
7 include both cash bonus (CB) and stock bonus (SB) compensation and our results further collaborate
8 what is already reported in models 1 - 4.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Turning to the control variables, salary (SAL) is positive and significant, suggesting that executives
15 show less risk-averse behaviour as their salary increases. This is unsurprising because salary forms
16 the base pay upon which compensation from other risk-related bonuses largely depends. Cash flow
17 (CF), asset tangibility (TAN), executive ownership (EO) and non-executive ownership (NEO) are
18 positive and significant, whilst growth (GR), stock return (STKR), cash holdings (CH) and
19 bankruptcy risk (ZS) are significantly negative.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ***[Table 5 about here]***
28
29

30 ***4.4. Robustness checks***

31
32 Our results presented in Table 5 show that both cash bonus (CB) and stock bonus (SB)
33 compensations differently affect firm financial leverage. In this section, we further test if indeed our
34 results are robust to alternative measures of our independent variables and different econometric
35 specifications. We begin with Table 6, where we use alternative measures of our independent
36 variables. Specifically, we measure our alternative independent variables (CB2 and SB2) as cash
37 bonus compensation scaled by total sales (i.e. CB2), and also SB2 as stock bonus compensation
38 scaled by total sales. We observe that the coefficient estimates on cash bonus compensation (CB2)
39 and stock bonus compensation (SB2) are qualitatively similar to the main results in Table 5.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Further, in Table 7, we again re-estimate our model using the predicted approach. In this method,
48 the lagged of each compensation bonus variable (i.e. lagged CB and SB) is first regressed on
49 leverage and other control variables (control variables as defined in Table 1) to obtain predicted
50 cash bonus (CB) and stock bonus (SB) compensation values, and then the predicted values are
51 included in the leverage model, similar to Coles et al. (2006). As shown, the predicted model reports
52 a cash bonus (CB) sign that is still negative, while stock bonus compensation (SB) shows a positive
53 sign; both results are similar to our main results reported in Table 5.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, despite our attempt to deal with the endogeneity problem, employing different
4 specifications, fixed effects (FE) and predicted models, the issue of direct causation is still a major
5 concern, as we note there are hypotheses that suggest leverage drives a firm's compensation policy
6 (Duru et al., 2005; Ryan & Wiggins, 2001). For instance, it is argued that shareholders of a high-
7 leverage firm tend to structure executives' compensation to include more cash bonuses and fewer
8 stock bonuses in order to reduce executives' risk-taking activities (Duru et al., 2005; John & John,
9 1993). Also, high-growth firms often tend to use more stock bonus and less cash bonus
10 compensation to reward managers (Guay, 1999), while firms with high cash reserves are likely to
11 reward managers with more cash bonuses and fewer stock-based ones (Core & Guay, 1999). These
12 intuitive arguments are likely to complicate the direct causation of executives' compensation on
13 leverage. Thus, to further account for the possibility that leverage and executive compensation are
14 simultaneously determined, we estimate simultaneous systems of equations in which the jointly
15 determined variables – leverage, cash bonus and stock bonus compensations – are simultaneously
16 estimated. In the simultaneous systems of equations, the first-stage equation, i.e. each compensation
17 component (CB/SB), is regressed on leverage, instruments and other determinants (i.e. controls
18 defined in Table 1) to obtain the predicted values of bonus compensations (CB, SB), which is then
19 included in the second-stage equation, i.e. the leverage model. Consistent with other empirical
20 studies (e.g. Coles et al., 2006; Kini & Williams, 2012), we use contemporaneous values of cash
21 bonus and/or stock bonus compensation variable instead of lagged values. Again, our findings
22 obtained in Table 7 (simultaneous systems of equations – 3SLS) show that the sign of the coefficient
23 of the independent variables CB and SB remain qualitatively similar to the results already reported
24 in Table 5. In short, the 3SLS results suggest that our earlier findings are not plagued by endogeneity
25 problems and that the main results reported in Table 5 are robust to an alternative econometric
26 specification.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 ***[Tables 6 & 7 about here]***
49

50 ***4.5. Executive compensation and leverage – the role of growth***

51 The evidence presented above suggests that executives' bonus compensation impacts on firm
52 leverage policy. However, literature suggests that firms with more growth potential tend to use less
53 cash bonus but more stock bonus compensation to incentivise executives (Guay, 1999; Ryan &
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Wiggins, 2001). Thus, in this section, we examine the role of firm growth in the executives' bonus compensation–leverage relationship. We follow existing studies (e.g. Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Coles et al., 2006) and use market-to-book as our measure of firm growth (GR). The growth variable (GR) is interacted with each cash bonus and stock bonus compensation (CB and SB) and then they are included in our regression models. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 8 (models 1 and 2). The results reveal that the estimated coefficient on the interaction term ($CB \times GR$) is negative and statistically significant. This finding suggests that, ceteris paribus, executives of growth-opportunity firms with cash bonus compensation tend to decrease firm leverage. Also, we observe that the interaction term for $SB \times GR$ is negative and significant. A possible explanation could be that, as executives receive more stock bonus (SB) compensation in a growth firm, they become worried about their increased residual interests and are likely to lower the firm's risky borrowings in an attempt to safeguard these residual interests (Berger et al., 1997; Brounen et al., 2006; Florackis & Ozkan, 2009). Therefore, this makes it financially prudent for stock-motivated executives in such growth-opportunity firms to sponsor corporate activities with equity finance rather than debt (leverage) finance.

4.6. Executive compensation and leverage – the role of executive ownership

The key motive of compensation is to induce executives to increase firm value by selecting optimal policies including leverage (e.g. Kini & Williams, 2012; Coles et al., 2006). That is, through compensation, executives and shareholders' interests are properly aligned. The literature further indicates that, in firms where executives own large stakes, shareholders use less incentive compensation to align their interests with those executives (Ryan & Wiggins, 2001; Hartzell & Starks, 2003). Others also argue that executives with large ownership stakes can easily influence the board for higher salaries and bonuses (Cheung et al., 2005; Weisbach, 2007) and that such executives are more likely to pursue policies that suit their own interests (Gormley & Matsa, 2016; Brick, Palmon, & Wald, 2012). For instance, Gormley and Matsa (2016) observe that executives' incentive to play it safe increases when they hold large stakes in the firm and one avenue they can adopt is to lower the firm's risk via lower leverage (Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Berger et al., 1997). Based on the above argument, in this section, we examine the extent to which executive ownership moderates the executive bonus compensation–leverage relationship. Specifically, we construct executive's ownership variable (EO) as the percentage of stock ownership held by executives (defined in Table 1) (Florackis & Ozkan, 2009; Ryan & Wiggins, 2001). We interact the executive

ownership (EO) variable with the independent variables (cash bonus – $CB \times EO$ and stock bonus – $SB \times EO$) and include them in our regression model. The results of this are presented in models 3 and 4 of Table 5. We find the coefficient of $CB \times EO$ is negative but statistically insignificant, whilst in Model 4 we observe that the interaction term ($SB \times EO$) is negative and it is both economically and statistically significant (*coefficient -4.835 t-statistics 5.00*). This suggests that stock-motivated executives with large ownership stakes may prefer to keep a lower leverage ratio in the firm's books. This is not surprising, given that, if the firm has a higher leverage ratio, this risks executives' private incentives associated with their undiversified shareholdings or ownership, thus they have incentives to reduce leverage as their holdings increase. Another possible legitimate explanation is that, if an executive has a large ownership stake, this may lead to an increase in the executive's opportunism, and hence decreased debt levels (Brailsford et al., 2002). This evidence is suggestive of executives' risk preference effect, where they play it safe to protect their private interests (Gormley & Matsa, 2016).

[Table 8 about here]

5. Conclusion and implications

In this paper, we examine how executive bonus compensation affects firm financial leverage policy and the extent to which this relationship is conditional on firm growth and executive ownership. We observe that the executives' cash bonus compensation–leverage relationship is negative and significant across all our models, while executive stock bonus compensation shows a positive effect on leverage. Significantly, the results are robust to all our adopted econometric specifications, including three-stage least squares (3SLS) which account for the simultaneous determination of executive compensation and the firm's leverage policy. Essentially, our results offer support for the risk-related argument under the optimal compensation theory (Coles et al., 2006). Further, our study shows that both a firm's growth and its executive ownership matter in this compensation–leverage linkage. Notwithstanding these useful findings, there are a few limitations worth noting. First, our study is based on UK FTSE 350 firms. Although the UK shares many characteristics with other developed economies, this is not enough to provide a basis for the generalisation of our findings. It is important to point out that there are certain institutional differences across different economies.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There is a possibility that the executive compensation bonuses–financial leverage relationship might differ from other developed contexts. Thus, future studies can offer further insight by extending our findings to both emerging and developed economies. Future studies may also consider whether the 2007-2008 financial crisis matters in this executive compensation–financial leverage relationship. Also, comparison of studies along industrial lines can be carried out to understand how the executive bonus compensation–financial policies relationship matters across different industries.

References

- Antoniou, A., Guney, Y., and Paudyal, K., (2008), "The determinants of Capital Structure: Capital Market-Oriented versus Bank-Oriented Institutions", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 59-92.
- Balafas, N., and Florackis, C. (2014), "CEO compensation and future shareholder returns: Evidence from the London Stock Exchange", *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 27, 97-115.
- Berger, P.G., Ofek, E., and Yermack, D., (1997), "Managerial entrenchment and capital structure", *Journal of Finance*, 52, pp. 1411-1438.
- Brailsford, T., O. Barry, and Pua, S., (2002), "On the relationship between ownership structure and capital structure. *Accounting and Finance*, 42, 1-26.
- Brick, I.E., Palmon, O., Wald, J.K., (2012). Too much pay-performance sensitivity? " *Review of Economics and Statistics* Vol. 94, pp. 287-303.
- Broumen, D., De Jong, A., and Koedijk, K., (2006), "Capital structure policies in Europe: Survey evidence", *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 30, pp. 1409-42
- Cassell, C. A., Huang, S. X., Sanchez, J. M., and Stuart, M.D., (2012), "Seeking safety: the relation between CEO inside debt holdings and the riskiness of firm investment and financial policies", *Journal of Financial Economics*. Vol. 103, pp. 588-610.
- Chava, S., and Purnanandam, A., (2010), "CEOs versus CFOs: incentives and corporate policies", *Journal of Financial Economics*. Vol. 97, pp. 263-278.
- Cheung, W.K.A., and Wei, K.C.J., (2006), "Insider Ownership and Corporate Performance: Evidence from the Adjustment Cost Approach", *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 12, pp. 906 - 925.
- Coles, J.L., Daniel, N.D., and Naveen, L., (2006), "Managerial incentives and risk-taking", *Journal of Financial Economics* Vol. 79, pp. 431 - 468.
- Coles, J. L., Lemmon, M. L., and Meschke, J. F., (2012), "Structural models and endogeneity in corporate finance: the link between managerial ownership and corporate performance", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 103, pp. 149-168.
- Core, E.J., Holthausen, R.W., Larcker, D. F., (1999), "Corporate governance, chief executive officer compensation, and firm performance". *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol.51, , pp. 371-406.
- Core, E.J., and Guay R.W., (1999), "The use of equity grants to manage optimal equity incentive levels", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 28, pp. 151- 184.
- Duru, A., Mansi, S. A., and Reeb, D. M., (2005), "Earnings-based bonus plans and the agency costs of debt. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, Vol. 24No. 5, pp. 431-47.
- Fama, E. E., (1980), "Agency problems and the theory of the firm, *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 88, pp. 288-307.
- Ferri, F., and Maber, D. A. (2013), "Say on pay votes and CEO compensation: Evidence from the UK. *Review of Finance*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 527-563.

1
2
3 Florackis, C., and Ozkan, A., (2009), "Managerial incentives and corporate leverage: evidence from
4 the United Kingdom", *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 531- 53.

5
6 Gormley, T. A. and Matsa, D. A., (2016), "Playing it safe? Managerial preferences, risk, and agency
7 conflicts. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 122, pp. 431 – 455.

8
9 Grout, P.A. and, Zalewska, A., (2010), "To buy or not to buy? The effect of option granting on
10 executive stock purchases", Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=965912>.

11
12 Grossman, S. and Hart, L. (1982), "Corporate Financial Structure and Managerial Incentives, in J.
13 McCall, ed.: *The Economics of Information and Uncertainty*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

14
15 Guay, W. R., (1999), "The sensitivity of CEO wealth to equity risk: an analysis of the magnitude
16 and determinants. *Journal of Financial Economics* Vol. 53, pp. 43–71.

17
18 Haque, F., and Ntim, C. G. (2020), "Executive compensation, sustainable compensation policy,
19 carbon performance and market value", *British Journal of Management*.

20
21 Harris, M., and A Raviv (1979), "Optimal Incentives Contracts with Imperfect Information", *Journal*
22 *of Economics Theory* Vol. 20, pp. 231 - 259.

23
24 Hartzell, J.C., and Starks, L. T., (2003), "Institutional Investors and Executive Compensation.
25 *Journal of Finance*, Vol 58, pp. 2351 - 2374.

26
27 Humphery-Jenner, M., Lisic, L. L., Nanda, V., and Silveri, S. D., (2016), "Executive overconfidence
28 and compensation structure", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 119, pp. 533-558.

29
30 Jensen, M.C., and Meckling, W.H., (1976), "Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency
31 costs and ownership structure", *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), pp. 305-360.

32
33 Jensen, M. C., and Murphy, K.J., (1990), "CEOs Incentives – It's not how much you pay, but
34 how", *Harvard Business Review* Vol 3, pp. 138-153.

35
36 John, T. A., and John, K., (1993), "Top management compensation and capital structure", *The*
37 *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 949-74.

38
39 Kabir, R., Li, H., and Veld-Merkoulova, Y., (2010), "Executive Compensation and the Cost of Debt.
40 *Journal of Banking and Finance*, *Forthcoming*. University of Twente.

41
42 Kabir, R., Li, H., Veld-Merkoulova, Y., (2013), "Executive Compensation and the Cost of Debt",
43 *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 37:8, pp. 2893 – 907.

44
45 Kaplan, S. N., and Rauh, J. (2010), "Wall Street and Main Street: What contributes to the rise in the
46 highest incomes? ", *The Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 1004-1050.

47
48 Kim, J., Li, Y., and Zhang, L., (2011), "CFOs versus CEOs: Equity Incentives and Crashes. *Journal*
49 *of Financial Economics* Vol. 101, pp. 713 -730.

50
51 Kini, O., and Williams, R., (2012), "Tournament incentives, Firm risk, and Corporate Policies",
52 *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol 103, pp. 350 – 376.

53
54 Lin, C., Hua, C., Lee, S. and Lee, W. (2011), "The policy consequence of expensing stock-based
55 compensation", *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, Vol. 19 No. 1,
56 pp. 80-93.

1
2
3 Mehran, H., (1995), "Executive compensation structure, ownership and firm performance", *Journal*
4 *of Financial Economics*, 38:2, pp. 163-184.

5
6 Ortiz-Molina, H., (2007), "Executive compensation and capital structure: The effects of convertible
7 debt and straight debt on CEO pay", *Journal of Accounting and Economics* Vol 43 No. 1, pp. 69-
8 93.

9
10 Ryan Jr., H. E., Wiggins III, R. A., (2001), "The influence of Firm- and Manager-specific
11 Characteristics on the Structure of Executive Compensation", *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol
12 7, pp. 101-123.

13
14 Shleifer, A., and Vishny, R.W., (1989). "Large Shareholders and Corporate Control", *Journal of*
15 *Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 95, pp. 461 – 488.

16
17 Weisbach, M. S., (2007), "Optimal Executive Compensation versus Managerial Power: A Review
18 of Lucian Bebchuk and Jesse Fried's *Pay without Performance: The Unfulfilled Promise of*
19 *Executive Compensation*", *Journal of Economic Literature*, pp. 419 – 428.

20
21 Zhang, X., Gao, S. and Zeng, Y. (2019), "An empirical study of the relationship between accounting
22 conservatism and executive compensation-performance sensitivity", *International Journal of*
23 *Accounting & Information Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 130-150
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Description of variables

Dependent Variable	Description	Literature
Leverage (<i>LEV</i>)	long-term debt plus short-term debt scaled by total assets	Coles et al. 2006; Chava and Purnanandam, 2010
Independent variable		
Cash bonus (<i>CB</i>)	Cash bonus compensation scaled by total sales.	Kabir et al. (2010)
Stock bonus (<i>SB</i>)	Stock bonus compensation scaled by total sales.	Kabir et al. (2010) Kabir et al. (2013)
Cash bonus (<i>CB2</i>)	Cash bonus scaled by total compensation	Kabir et al. (2013), Coles et al. (2006)
Stock bonus (<i>SB2</i>)	Stock bonus scaled by total compensation	Kabir et al. (2013) Coles et al. (2006).
Salary (<i>SAL</i>)	Salary scaled by total sales	Kabir et al. (2010) Kabir et al. (2013).
Salary (<i>SAL2</i>)	Salary scaled by total compensation	Kabir et al. (2013) Coles et al. (2006).
Total compensation	Sum of salary, cash bonus and stock bonus	Kabir et al. (2013) Coles et al. (2006).
Control variables		
Firm Size (<i>SZ</i>)	Natural logarithm of total sales	Coles et al. 2006
Growth (<i>GR</i>)	[Total Assets – Book Equity + Market Equity] / total assets	Floarackis et al. 2009; Chava & Purnanandam, 2010
Firm performance (<i>ROA</i>)	EBITDA scaled by total assets	Coles et al. 2006; Firth, Fung & Rui, 2006; Florackis et al. 2009.
Annual stock return (<i>STKR</i>)	Annual stock return	Coles et al. 2006
Cash holdings (<i>CH</i>)	Cash and cash equivalence scaled by total assets.	
Cash flow (<i>CF</i>)	Free cash flow scaled by total assets	Coles et al. 2006
Research and Development (<i>R&D</i>)	R&D expense scaled by total assets	Coles et al. 2006; Ryan and Wiggins, 2001
Assets Tangibility (<i>PPE</i>)	Net Property, Plant and Equipment / total assets	Coles et al. 2006; Chava and Purnanandam, 2010
Altman's Z-score (<i>Z-SC</i>)	[3.3 (EBIT / Total Assets) + 1.0 (Sales / Total Assets) + 1.4 (Retained Profits / Total Assets) + 1.2 (Working Capital / total assets)]	Chava and Purnanandam 2010
Executives Ownership (%) (<i>EO</i>)	Total annual shareholdings of the three executives (CEO, CFO and Chief operating officer) divided by the firm's total common shareholdings	Florackis et al. (2009), Ryan and Wiggins (2001) Core et al. (1999)
Non-executives' ownership (%) (<i>NEO</i>)	Total annual shareholdings of non-executive directors divided by the firm's total common shareholding	Mehran (1995)
Large ownership % (<i>LO</i>)	Total shareholdings of large owners (defined as ownership above 3%) scaled by the total number of common shareholdings	Florackis et al. 2009; Ryan and Wiggins, 2001; Core et al. 1999

Table 2: Descriptive statistics

	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Maxi	25%	50%	75%	N
LEV	0.29	0.22	0.00	2.71	0.14	0.25	0.38	1606
CB	0.59	21.14	0.00	116.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	1748
SB	1.57	54.54	0.00	357.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	1748
SAL	1.13	38.84	0.00	268.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	1748
CB2	0.21	0.14	0.00	0.89	0.12	0.20	0.28	1748
SB2	0.45	0.21	0.00	0.98	0.34	0.48	0.59	1748
SAL2	0.34	0.18	0.00	1.00	0.23	0.31	0.41	1748
SZ	9.02	0.87	0.00	11.51	8.60	8.99	9.47	1675
GR	4.66	1.95	0.00	8.15	1.08	1.52	2.35	1746
ROA	0.10	0.19	-3.92	2.83	0.05	0.09	0.14	1712
STKR	0.06	0.49	-5.46	2.85	-0.13	0.09	0.30	1675
CH	0.09	0.10	0.00	0.74	0.03	0.06	0.12	1669
CF	0.14	0.19	-3.91	2.86	0.09	0.13	0.19	1647
RD	0.01	0.03	-0.30	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	1743
TAN	0.24	0.23	0.00	0.94	0.05	0.17	0.37	1664
ZSC	1.52	1.24	-13.66	16.92	0.90	1.46	2.04	1740
EO	0.05	0.22	0.00	6.06	0.00	0.00	0.01	1720
NEO	0.02	0.11	0.00	3.51	0.00	0.00	0.00	1697
LO	39.82	18.94	3.00	97.80	25.34	38.17	52.22	1708
<i>N</i>	1748							

This table presents the descriptive statistics for the entire data used for the study. The sample comprises 213 UK FTSE 350 firms over the period 2007 to 2015. The variable descriptions are provided in Table 1 above

Table 3: Correlations matrix

	LEV	CB	SB	SAL	CB2	SB2	SAL2	SZ	GR	ROA	STKR	CH	CF	RD	TAN	ZS	EO	NEO	LO	
1	LEV	1.00																		
2	CB	0.12*	1.00																	
3	SB	0.12*	1.00*	1.00																
4	SAL	0.12*	1.00*	1.00*	1.00															
5	CB2	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	1.00														
6	SB2	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.54*	1.00													
7	SAL2	0.08*	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.10*	-0.74*	1.00												
8	SZ	-0.28*	-0.17*	-0.18*	-0.18*	0.34*	-0.26*	1.00												
9	GR	0.02	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	-0.20*	1.00											
10	ROA	-0.39*	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.05	0.06	-0.05	0.03	0.01	1.00									
11	STKR	-0.11*	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.12*	0.01	-0.09*	-0.02	0.02	0.24*	1.00								
12	CH	-0.17*	-0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.16*	-0.15*	0.01	-0.17*	0.07*	0.11*	0.00	1.00							
13	CF	-0.37*	-0.13*	-0.04	-0.12*	-0.05	0.06	-0.04	0.04	0.02	0.89*	0.22*	0.11*	1.00						
14	RD	-0.12*	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.01	1.00					
15	TAN	0.09*	-0.03	-0.05	-0.02	-0.17*	0.04	0.10*	0.22*	-0.03	0.00	-0.06	-0.11*	0.09*	-0.08*	1.00				
16	ZSC	-0.52*	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.15*	0.02	0.79*	0.16*	0.13*	0.78*	0.04	-0.00	1.00			
17	EO	0.00	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.16*	0.18*	-0.06	-0.00	-0.06	0.04	0.03	-0.05	0.00	0.06	-0.05	1.00		
18	NEO	0.00	-0.00	-0.00	-0.00	0.03	-0.10*	0.10*	-0.03	0.02	-0.09*	-0.02	0.06	-0.09*	-0.03	0.05	-0.04	0.56*	1.00	
19	LO	-0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.14*	-0.37*	0.33*	-0.27*	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.16*	0.02	-0.03	0.10*	0.03	0.29*	0.21*	1.00

This table presents the correlation matrix for the sample data. The sample and variable definitions are as described in Table 1. * indicates significance at 1% level

Table 4: Managerial and firm characteristics by leverage quartiles

	Quartile 1	Quartile 4	t-test
CB	0.005	2.568	-1.16
	[0.025]	[44.131]	
SB	0.018	6.808	-1.19
	[0.122]	[113.82]	
SAL	0.007	4.889	-1.21
	[0.041]	[81.058]	
SZ	9.071	8.703	5.37***
	[0.737]	[1.141]	
GR	18.831	10.678	1.13
	[146.42]	[40.21]	
ROA	0.122	0.045	6.02***
	[0.097]	[0.236]	
STKR	0.117	0.006	3.51***
	[0.341]	[0.537]	
CH	0.112	0.067	7.15***
	[0.101]	[0.070]	
CF	0.160	0.097	4.34***
	[0.097]	[0.248]	
R&D	0.010	0.001	4.53***
	[0.041]	[0.003]	
TAN	0.209	0.281	-4.16***
	[0.203]	[0.282]	
ZSC	2.013	0.807	17.35***
	[0.946]	[1.098]	
EO	0.041	0.038	0.42
	[0.118]	[0.112]	
NEO	0.019	0.022	-0.53
	[0.076]	[0.067]	
LO	41.285	39.113	1.64*
	[19.930]	[18.629]	

The table above provides univariate mean comparisons of both firm-specific and managers' incentives characteristics by book leverage (dependent variable) quartiles (normal font) and standard deviation (in square brackets). The t-statistics show the difference of means from the first (1st) to the fourth (4th) quartiles. Definitions for all the variables are shown in Table 1. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Table 5: The effects of executive compensation (CB and SB) on leverage

	(OLS) Model 1	(FE) Model 2	(OLS) Model 3	(FE) Model 4	(OLS) Model 5	(FE) Model 6
CB	-0.310** (-2.13)	-0.341*** (-4.30)			-0.446*** (-3.66)	-0.441*** (-5.26)
SB			0.792** (2.06)	0.157* (1.87)	0.328** (2.16)	0.313*** (3.55)
SAL	0.721*** (3.57)	0.437*** (3.16)	-0.278* (1.91)	0.081 (0.52)	0.551*** (3.77)	0.186 (1.20)
SZ	-0.014 (-1.56)	-0.009 (-0.40)	-0.025*** (-2.84)	0.011 (0.46)	-0.013 (-1.54)	0.007 (0.30)
GR	-0.001 (-0.43)	-0.004** (-2.06)	-0.001 (-1.34)	-0.004* (-1.86)	-0.001 (-0.48)	-0.004* (-1.79)
ROA	-0.077 (-0.62)	-0.033 (-0.42)	-0.310*** (-3.05)	0.096 (1.16)	-0.068 (-0.55)	0.063 (0.77)
SKTR	-0.013 (-1.35)	-0.015*** (-2.70)	-0.008 (-0.90)	-0.014** (-2.53)	-0.013 (-1.38)	-0.014** (-2.43)
CH	-0.179*** (-3.17)	0.068 (1.23)	-0.174*** (-3.22)	0.092* (1.65)	-0.180*** (-3.24)	0.088 (1.60)
CF	0.223* (1.86)	0.132** (2.07)	0.195* (1.93)	0.103 (1.60)	0.213* (1.82)	0.115* (1.81)
RD	-0.348** (-2.57)	0.182 (1.62)	-0.369** (-2.69)	0.191* (1.69)	-0.341** (-2.51)	0.191* (1.71)
TAN	0.046** (1.97)	0.174** (2.55)	0.071*** (3.18)	0.279*** (3.90)	0.050** (2.17)	0.246*** (3.48)
ZS	-0.072*** (-10.00)	-0.045*** (-4.09)	-0.065*** (-12.07)	-0.067*** (-5.26)	-0.075*** (-10.41)	-0.067*** (-5.33)
EO	0.072* (1.72)	-0.127* (-1.69)	0.100** (2.38)	-0.091 (-1.20)	0.077* (1.86)	-0.096 (-1.29)
NEO	0.203*** (2.68)	0.251** (2.44)	0.219*** (3.10)	0.270** (2.60)	0.205*** (2.72)	0.271*** (2.64)
LO	-0.001* (-1.71)	0.001 (0.10)	-0.001** (-2.04)	0.000 (0.10)	-0.001* (-1.62)	0.000 (0.11)
_Cons	0.471*** (5.50)	0.348* (1.71)	0.586*** (6.68)	0.169 (0.81)	0.469*** (5.52)	0.211 (1.02)
Year	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Industry	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
N	1202	1202	1202	1202	1202	1202
R ²	0.268	0.180	0.291	0.168	0.272	0.191

The table shows the OLS estimation results of the effects of cash bonus (CB) and stock bonus on leverage. All variable definitions are described in Table 1. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

Table 6: Alternative measures of independent variables

	(OLS) Model 1	(OLS) Model 2	(OLS) Model 3
CB2	-0.117*** (-3.34)		-0.069* (-1.63)
SB2		0.097*** (3.35)	0.059* (1.68)
SAL	-0.047 (-1.60)	0.016 (0.51)	-0.012 (-0.32)
SZ	-0.033*** (-3.31)	-0.035*** (-3.50)	-0.035*** (-3.51)
GR	-0.001 (-0.66)	-0.001 (-0.70)	-0.001 (-0.67)
ROA	-0.078 (-0.66)	-0.077 (-0.68)	-0.081 (-0.70)
STKR	-0.012 (-1.21)	-0.014 (-1.45)	-0.012 (-1.29)
CH	-0.172*** (-3.05)	-0.178*** (-3.13)	-0.170*** (-3.03)
CF	0.180 (1.60)	0.181* (1.65)	0.182* (1.65)
RD	-0.362** (-2.54)	-0.369*** (-2.65)	-0.367*** (-2.60)
TAN	0.056** (2.31)	0.059** (2.45)	0.056** (2.32)
ZS	-0.066*** (-8.20)	-0.065*** (-8.16)	-0.065*** (-8.19)
EO	0.077* (1.79)	0.087** (2.06)	0.081* (1.91)
NEO	0.191*** (2.65)	0.198*** (2.79)	0.194*** (2.71)
LO	-0.000 (-1.38)	-0.000 (-1.27)	-0.000 (-1.22)
_Cons	0.677*** (6.87)	0.604*** (6.43)	0.649*** (6.56)
N	1202	1202	1202
R ²	0.263	0.264	0.265

The table shows the OLS estimation results of our alternative measures of our independent variables. All variable definitions are described in Table 1. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

Table 7: Executive compensation and leverage

	Predicted Model	Simultaneous Systems of Equations (3SLS)		
	LEV	(2 nd LEV)	(1 st Stage-CB)	(1 st Stage-SB)
Predicted CB	-25.253*** (-11.18)			
Predicted SB	62.924*** (33.29)			
Predicted CB		-24.324** (-2.11)		3.066 (1.09)
Predicted SB		7.432*** (2.88)	0.346** (2.25)	
SAL	0.002 (0.01)	15.882 (1.56)	0.597*** (4.04)	-1.887 (-0.71)
SZ	0.198*** (6.46)	-0.056** (-2.47)	-0.001 (-0.59)	0.003 (0.48)
GR	-0.017*** (-9.84)	-0.015*** (-3.05)	-0.001** (-2.17)	0.002*** (7.06)
ROA	0.114** (2.17)	-1.350* (-1.83)	-0.047** (-2.28)	0.147 (0.77)
STKR	0.001 (0.03)	0.025 (0.87)	0.001 (0.72)	-0.004 (-0.60)
CH	-0.058* (-1.70)	-0.161 (-1.43)	0.003 (0.30)	-0.009 (-0.39)
CF	-0.147** (-2.19)	0.589 (1.20)	0.027 (1.48)	-0.084 (-0.71)
RD	0.002 (0.04)	-0.596* (-1.78)	0.006 (0.20)	-0.016 (-0.19)
TAN	0.317*** (21.03)	0.001 (0.01)	-0.004 (-0.81)	0.012 (0.60)
ZSC	-0.023*** (-5.72)	-0.081*** (-3.73)		
EO	0.633*** (18.22)	0.078 (0.71)	0.001 (0.06)	-0.001 (-0.02)
NEO	0.461*** (11.09)	0.274** (1.98)	0.001 (0.04)	-0.002 (-0.06)
LO	0.001** (2.33)	-0.000 (-0.74)	0.000 (0.34)	-0.000 (-0.41)
LEV			0.015 (0.64)	-0.041 (-0.68)
Indus_medCB			0.001 (0.08)	
Indus_medSC				0.001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

				(0.00)
Cons	-1.770***	0.954***	0.004	-0.0201
	(-6.22)	(4.71)	(0.11)	(-0.22)
Fixed Effects	YES	YES	YES	YES
R ²	0.876			
N	1185	1376	1376	1376

Simultaneous system of equations regression of book leverage and cash bonus results. The predicted signs for the variable of interest are shown in the book leverage model. The models included fixed effects in all estimations. The reported t-statistics based on robust standard errors are within parentheses. Cash bonus (CB) model includes leverage, controls and instruments (i.e. industry median_CB, two-year period log of ROA and STKR). Variable definitions are described in Table 1. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

Table 8: Executive compensation on leverage - Role of growth and executive ownership

	(OLS) Model 1	(OLS) Model 2	(OLS) Model 3	(OLS) Model 4
CB	-0.292* (-1.76)		-0.297** (-1.99)	
SB		0.219 (1.49)		1.074*** (4.68)
SAL	0.815*** (3.19)	0.245* (1.68)	0.741*** (2.70)	0.486*** (3.16)
SZ	-0.0132 (-1.49)	-0.0127 (-1.46)	-0.0136 (-1.55)	-0.0062 (-0.74)
GR	0.0029 (1.56)	0.0003 (0.22)	-0.0004 (-0.44)	-0.0007 (-0.70)
ROA	-0.0693 (-0.56)	-0.0384 (-0.32)	-0.0764 (-0.62)	-0.0390 (-0.34)
STKR	-0.0135 (-1.41)	-0.0145 (-1.52)	-0.0130 (-1.35)	-0.0144 (-1.52)
CH	-0.173*** (-3.09)	-0.179*** (-3.21)	-0.179*** (-3.20)	-0.199*** (-3.74)
CF	0.215* (1.80)	0.195* (1.70)	0.223* (1.86)	0.207* (1.91)
RD	-0.354*** (-2.61)	-0.340** (-2.52)	-0.348** (-2.57)	-0.326** (-2.49)
TAN	0.0475** (2.03)	0.0524** (2.24)	0.046** (1.97)	0.052** (2.29)
ZS	-0.0721*** (-9.85)	-0.0743*** (-10.06)	-0.0722*** (-9.98)	-0.0737*** (-10.92)
EO	0.0677* (1.61)	0.0766* (1.84)	0.0719* (1.73)	0.0950** (2.30)
NEO	0.193** (2.51)	0.202*** (2.66)	0.203*** (2.67)	0.211*** (2.79)
LO	-0.0005* (-1.69)	-0.0004 (-1.62)	-0.0005* (-1.71)	-0.0004 (-1.52)
CB x GR	-0.111*** (-2.76)			
SB x GR		-0.0023** (-2.59)		
CB x EO			-0.181 (-0.22)	
SB x EO				-4.835*** (-5.00)
_Cons	0.460*** (5.30)	0.461*** (5.40)	0.469*** (5.50)	0.398*** (4.81)
N	1202	1202	1202	1202
R ²	0.275	0.269	0.268	0.284

The table shows the OLS estimation results of the moderating role of firm growth and executive ownership. All variable definitions are described in Table 1. *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.