



DOI : 10.67397/ejgri.v2i4.55

ISSN : 3134-5441

TITLE: MANAGERIAL INCENTIVES AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Author by :

Dr. Cecil Mbofana

Doctorate of philosophy in Accounting Faculty of business and Economics
Sciences. Atlantic International University, Pioneer Plaza, 900 Fort Street Mall,
Suite 905, Honolulu, United States of America.

Sept 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
INCENTIVES	1
TYPES OF INCENTIVES	2
BENEFITS OF INCENTIVES	3
CORPORATE GOVERNANCE	3
IMPORTANCE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE	6
WHY CORPORATES EMPLOY MANAGERS	7
CONCLUSION	14
BIOGRAPHY	16

INTRODUCTION

Due to its promotion of effective contracting, the modern corporation is an effective tool for managing large-scale production. Combining the resources of numerous dispersed investors with the expertise of a seasoned management team is made easier by the corporate form of organisation.

Consequently, the capital providers do not even need to be familiar with or capable of managing the company. However, there might be an incentive mismatch and associated agency costs when one party gives another party the power to make decisions on its behalf. In other words, there is a chance that the management and ownership of a company have different objectives when they are separate entities. The term "agency problem" describes the discrepancy between the owners' and management's objectives (Thomas & Shughart II, 2013). Aligning managers' incentives to ensure they act in the best interests of owners rather than striving to achieve their objectives is the primary challenge of corporate governance. Examining the relationship between corporate governance and managerial incentives has been my goal.

INCENTIVES

Contextualising the concept of incentives

The majority of large corporations know how to maximize the potential of their workforce. Paying your staff isn't the best way to guarantee their loyalty or their creative output. The business's employees hold the key to their future prosperity and development. The board of a corporation can use incentives and rewards to increase employee satisfaction, grow the company at a steady pace, and save more money overall. This will ensure that the star employees stay with the company.

There are several incentives available, and each one has distinct objectives and results associated with its use (Raymond, 2023). Prior to selecting an incentive, managers and company owners must decide on the incentive's purpose and the desired result. The company will ultimately save money thanks to all of the incentives. This is true as long as it is combined with other corporate objectives and principles.

According to Raymond's (2023) theory, corporate governance comprises various mechanisms of checks and balances that can impact the motivation and oversight of a company's management. When a company's ownership and management are distinct, sound corporate governance is especially important. Randall (2009) stated that managers who are not part of a company's ownership may not be motivated to put in a lot of effort to meet shareholders' goal of maximising profits if proper corporate governance is not in place. Alternatively, non-owner managers may find themselves living luxurious lives and frivolously using funds and other resources in ways that directly benefit them, such as on perks. Remarkably, certain other managers might feel pressured to use company funds for fraud or theft in order to amass personal fortune (Randall, 2009). Within the realm of commerce, an incentive comprises a collection of driving forces intended to promote particular actions or behaviours. These incentives, which can range from monetary awards to public recognition and appreciation, are an essential instrument in managing both clients and staff.

Businesses employ incentives based on the idea that rewarding people for performing specific tasks increases their likelihood of doing so. Incentives can be used for a number of purposes, such as encouraging customers to purchase more goods or services or pushing employees to work harder. They can also be employed to sway the actions of investors,

suppliers, and other relevant parties. Although incentives can be a very useful tool for reaching organisational objectives, their application requires thought and planning in order to be successful (Welsh, 2023). Business rewards can take many different forms. Still, there is a clear foundation for every . A business incentive is when a motivating prize or perk is applied to staff members in order to achieve a specific goal. When an employee knows there will be a reward at the end, they are more likely to pursue the goal or work towards the deadline. A few variables may influence the incentives that businesses ultimately decide to use. The financial budget is the first factor that matters most. A budget establishes the upper limit on the amount of funds that can be allocated to a particular department within the company (Raymond, 2023).

TYPES OF INCENTIVES

Financial incentives and non-financial incentives are the two categories into which business incentives fall. Non-financial incentives use other types of reward, such as recognition or opportunities for personal growth to encourage behavior, whereas financial incentives use of monetary rewards. Stock options, commissions, profit-sharing plans, bonuses, and other financial incentives are examples of financial inducements. These incentives are frequently performance-based, awarding money to individuals or groups according to their capacity to reach or surpass predetermined goals (Welsh, 2023).

However, non-financial incentives can also take the form of positive reinforcement, flexible scheduling, opportunities for professional growth, training and recognition, as well as a supportive work atmosphere. These incentives have the potential to be even more potent than monetary compensation in certain circumstances (Welsh, 2023). For instance, studies have demonstrated that rewards such as money can frequently be less effective motivators than acknowledgment and praise. Similarly, for workers who are driven by the prospect of expanding their skill set and improving their careers, training and development opportunities can be a potent motivator.

BENEFITS OF INCENTIVES

There are many benefits to using incentives in business. When used wisely, incentives may boost output, enhance customer satisfaction, inspire staff, and help companies reach their objectives (Raymond, 2013). One of the main benefits of using incentives is that they can help to motivate employees. By offering rewards for certain behaviours or actions, businesses can encourage their employees to work harder and perform better. This can lead to increased productivity, which in turn can lead to increased profits.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Contextualising the concept of corporate governance In economics, the term “corporate governance” was initially used approximately forty years ago.

The amount of literature on the subject has increased dramatically since then. According to Faulkender et al. (2010), one of the main forces behind corporate governance is the recognition of managerial compensation plans. Analysing the effect of managerial remuneration on corporate governance has received relatively little attention, despite the corpus of research on corporate governance over the past forty years being quite extensive. More precisely, it is unclear to us at this time whether compensation plans improve corporations’ financial performance. Regarding this subject, Berle (1932) in Raymond (2013) established the notion that a thorough examination of the distinction between a company’s ownership and control was warranted. When management fails to maximise the owners’ utility, a well-known

agency conflict results from this separation.

The work of Jensen and Meckling (1979) in Raymond (2013) was the first to formalise agency theory, a theory of the contractual relationships between managers and shareholders. The field of corporate governance and executive compensation has changed as a result of the application of this theoretical approach to analysis from various perspectives (Edmans, 2014). Despite the fact that corporate governance has many different definitions, most of them agree that the idea is about how investors in corporations make sure they receive a return on their investment (Shleifer and Vishny, 1997). Ensuring that capital flows to firms (borrowing units) and is repaid to the suppliers of funds (lending units) is the efficient market hypothesis, which is supported by sound corporate control. Effective corporate governance mitigates the issue of ownership and control separation and advances the interests of stakeholders. The structure of management compensation packages is one corporate governance mechanism (Faulkender et al., 2010). Compensation and corporate governance are inextricably linked. Widely held businesses were urged to set up appropriate managerial remuneration schemes and strong governance structures by Jensen and Meckling (1979) and Edmans (2014), who skillfully examined various market-based restrictions on managerial discretion (Easterbrook, 1984). According to Ocasio and Joseph (2005), corporate governance became more shareholder-oriented as a result of increased focus on board composition, executive compensation plans, and institutional investors' involvement in takeover defences. As a result, the term "corporate governance" gained popularity among corporate managers. Corporate governance (CG) has become a rapidly expanding practice in organisations in recent years, and its significance has been emphasised globally. Even nations that do not currently have regulations governing the use of CG in organisations have embraced it. The fact that CG forms the foundation an organization's operational framework explains its widespread appeal. Since the owners are dedicated to utilising the mechanisms and principles, which in the broadest sense equates to an effective monitoring of a company's activities, especially when the principles of disclosure and transparency are adopted, it is anticipated that the adoption and implementation of the CG practice will benefit the owners. Following the 2008 financial crisis, scholars, decision-makers, and investors realised that the mishandling of remuneration packages led to serious issues with management responsibility, the effectiveness of boards of directors' oversight, and shareholder participation in publicly traded companies (Scott, 2010). There is no denying the relationship between executive compensation and corporate governance, and it merits careful examination. In order to find gaps in the literature and, consequently, potential directions for future research, we use a bibliometric analysis of the literature (Grantham, 2020). According to Hebble and (2005), adopting and implementing CG in a company can therefore positively influence decisions pertaining to both current and future investors respectively. Since there is guidance for investors to prefer to invest in companies that adopt best QA practices, investors have become more aware of organisations that are known for having good QA practices in order to achieve and maintain a good reputation. This is due to the bankruptcy and collapse of large US corporations like Worldcom, Enron, and Adolphia, as well as public awareness of these financial disasters. Furthermore, in addition to the analysts' evaluation, owners and shareholders can access and assess decisions on a daily basis because the information is readily available (Alabdullah, 2016). This highlights the CG's distinct and significant role in relation to how these mechanisms affect businesses' performance (Alabdullah, 2016). Corporate governance has many different definitions (Claessens, 2003). These definitions align with approximations that have been in place since 1992. These approximations centre around the establishment of guidelines for the management and

control of businesses, guiding their actions to ensure that investors are assured that the resources they invest in are managed to achieve profitability and efficiency. According to Iskander and Chamlou (2020), corporate governance can be defined as a collection of internal corporate arrangements that specify the dynamics between managers and shareholders. Shareholders can be concentrated or distributed, private or public. These agreements may be negotiated between the major stakeholders in the corporate charter, bylaws, and shareholder agreements, or they may be incorporated into company law, securities law, listing requirements, and similar regulations. The board of directors is the central authority in this system (Iskander and Chamlou, 2020). Its primary duties include supervising management and ensuring the company's long-term viability. In many nations, the board appoints, oversees, and replaces the management in addition to approving the company's major decisions and strategy. In certain nations, the board bears the fiduciary duty of guaranteeing adherence to legal statutes and regulations, encompassing the requirements related to accounting and financial reporting. The board of a going concern answers to the shareholders and, in certain cases, the creditors and employees. Its job is to safeguard the business's interests. The board's responsibility to the company's creditors changes when it faces financial difficulties; a director's main obligation is to the company, not the shareholders. The corporate sector's ownership structure determines which governance issues need to be addressed. The publicly traded company with widely distributed shareholdings is at one end of the spectrum. The difficulty there is getting outside shareholders to oversee managers' performance. Since managers predominate, the rules governing the appointment of directors—who must possess sufficient independence to guarantee that they will appropriately oversee managers' performance—are the primary means of governance (Iskander and Chamlou, 2020).

The closely held company with a controlling shareholder and a minority of outside shareholders is at the other end of the spectrum, where the manager follows the controlling shareholder's instructions. The main governance concern there is how external shareholders can stop the dominant shareholder from taking undue advantage of the minority's economic rights or engaging in self-dealing. Common safeguards include prohibitions on insider self-dealing, anti-dilution clauses, and minority shareholder rights to appraisal or withdrawal. Extra governance measures for publicly traded companies that are controlled by a controlling shareholder could be voting rights, allowing outsiders to serve on the board, and takeover restrictions that restrict the "control premium" that insiders can appropriate.

IMPORTANCE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

Why is corporate governance deemed necessary? In other words, the interests of individuals who effectively control a company may not align with those of those who provide external financing to the company. The issue, which is often called a principal-agent problem, arises from the division of corporate insiders and outsiders as well as ownership and control. Without the safeguards provided by good governance, information asymmetries and oversight challenges mean that capital providers without corporate control will find it costly and risky to defend themselves against managers' or controlling shareholders' opportunistic actions. Those in charge of the company may misuse their position to steal financial advantages if external capital providers are not adequately protected, frequently at the expense of the enterprise's long-term viability and worth. When bad corporate governance is the norm, the issues goes beyond corporate sector's poor performance and increases the financial system's susceptibility because it is challenging t for local capital providers (banks and institutional investors) to manage

governance risks. When capital providers are not adequately protected, it becomes more difficult for businesses to obtain financing on favorable terms. The precise definition of corporate governance is still up for discussion. There is a growing consensus among corporations that corporate governance pertains to optimizing value while fulfilling legal, contractual, and financial obligations. In order to achieve long-term sustained value for the company, this inclusive definition emphasises the necessity for boards of directors to strike a balance between the interests of shareholders and those of other stakeholders, including employees, customers, suppliers, investors, and communities. From the standpoint of public policy, corporate governance aims to support business while guaranteeing responsibility in the use of authority and favouritism by companies. Public policy's function is to safeguard stakeholders' interests by giving businesses the incentives and discipline they need to reduce the gap between private and social returns (Claessens, 2003).

WHY CORPORATES EMPLOY MANAGERS

Without a manager, a business, government, hospital, school, or other organisation is only made up of employees, resources, and budget. An effective manager breathes life into an organisation by directing employees, gathering resources, and developing budgets. He possesses the leadership abilities to foster a productive environment and achieve objectives. As organisations grow in size, complexity, and responsibilities, managers' leadership skills become increasingly important.

Generating revenue without a sales manager can result in unpredictable sales, which can strain an organization's budget. Hiring an experienced sales manager provides the organisation with a sales plan that includes objectives. According to the Bureau of Labour Statistics, a sales manager analyses sales statistics to determine the potential profitability of the organization's products and services, as well as identifying ways to increase sales revenue. The sales manager leads the sales team, setting sales goals, developing training programmes, and motivating the team to meet the organization's revenue targets. Recruiting and retaining top talent accounts for a significant portion of management's importance in modern business. Employees in an organisation represent a talent pool. Employees who do not have a manager may not be able to perform to the best of their abilities in their daily duties. A manager can transform each employee's strengths into valuable performances by analyzing and identifying their knowledge and experience. He discusses the organization's expectations and encourage employees to take initiatives in areas where they excel to help the organization gain competitive advantage. Organizations must establish a moral and ethical code for both employers and employees to follow. Hiring a human resources manager ensures that the organization follows the code and avoids unethical behaviour like discrimination and harassment. A human resources manager is responsible for ensuring that employers incorporate diversity into their hiring processes, which includes different age groups, genders and ethnic and racial backgrounds. Managers play an important role in an organization by training all employees on what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate workplace behaviour.

According to the Project Management Institute, without project managers, an organization may be unable to compete in the marketplace. . For example, an organization may need to create the most recent social media strategy or overhaul its information technology infrastructure. Project managers thrive on new challenges and are results-driven. Hiring a certified project manager brings expertise in goal setting and time management to critical projects. They understand how to collaborate with a team to achieve goals with minimal disruption, on time and within budget. This information emphasises the importance of managers in corporations.

However, previous research has concluded that separating a firm's management and ownership is detrimental to the economic protocol that has been in place for the past three decades. Such separation is rapidly increasing, and it appears to be a predictable trend in modern corporate work (Dixon, Guariglia & Vijayakumaran, 2013). Several contemporary scholars have taken the same stance. However, some argue that the root of the problem is capitalism. As a result, the dilemma maintained that regulations, antitrust policies, tax incentives, and political pressure to implement anti-takeover statutes have resulted in the development of focused managers (Randall, 2009). In Contrast, recent research has shown that there has been no significant increase in the separation of management and ownership since 1930. In fact, firms by management's ownership of publicly traded companies has increased rather than decreased. In contrast to the past, directors and officers have scooped a larger percentage of the company's ownership, resulting in managers owning significant stakes in the firms (Dixon et al., 2013). Nonetheless, managerial ownership is just one of many tools available to help ensure that managers' and owners' incentives are aligned. Firms use a variety of internal control and incentive strategies to eliminate the agency problem. Incentives such as bonuses, ownership stakes, and stock options appear to be a binding factor between managers' rewards and the firm's performance (Tirole, 2010). With the authority to hire and fire top executives, the independent board of directors can constantly monitor and punish managers. Incentive-alignment is especially beneficial for firms that are difficult to monitor from the outside.

Furthermore, agency costs may be restrained by outside market forces. For instance, in a market where there is competition, well-managed businesses have the power to drive out poorly managed ones. Although market competition for the company's products is advisable, it might not keep up with efforts to ensure incentive design and safeguard the interests of shareholders. Another well-known market force that allows outsiders to take over poorly run businesses and replace both the managers and the company's internal corporate governance system is the market for corporate control. The management must closely monitor potential takeover threats, but this is not a guarantee that agency costs will be kept to a minimum given the many laws and regulations that currently discourage takeovers in industries. Due to internal incentive alignment and market forces strategies, the legal environment consequently actively influences the disciplinary impact. It seems that the risks that shareholders face are increased by the pitiful alignment of management's incentives with those of the company owners.

More specifically, Dixon et al. (2013) noted that managers have a propensity to be risk-averse if their wealth is linked to an undiversified investment of human capital within the company. As a result of their ability to diversify their investments across several capital markets in an effort to spread risks, shareholders, on the other hand, are mostly risk-neutral. The agency theory, on the other hand, contends that managers would typically increase their short-term consumption and leverage company resources to increase their own utility, which would disadvantage shareholders. It has been said by Dixon et al. (2013) that managers are hesitant to take on risky investments. As a result, their motivation to take chances will primarily rely on how closely their goals coincide with those of the shareholders in order to maximise share value.

According to Dixon et al. (2013), there will be insufficient contracting against managerial policy decisions in cases where managers' actions are difficult to monitor. Offering managers incentives in the form of company equity shares is their recommended solution to this issue. This is regarded as one approach to resolving the management's moral hazard issues. Similarly, other academics contended that managers who own common stock in a company help to mitigate issues related to management's incentives by encouraging them to make investments that result

in higher variance. According to evidence presented by other researchers, managers who own equity in a company are incentivized to take on riskier policies and make significant investments in research and development (R&D), which is a major driver of organisational growth and business expansion. A study by Dixon et al. (2013) found a positive correlation between managers' ownership of the company and the level of efficiency of the company.

Conversely, according to Dixon et al. (2013), managers who have a stake in a company that makes them wealthy may exhibit risk aversion and forgo making investments that could spur organisational growth. According to Tirole (2010), managers might choose low-risk investment opportunities over high-risk ones that could foster organisational growth. Riskier projects are typically avoided by management to the greater extent that personal gains are involved.

According to Tirole (2010), capital market oversight, particularly when conducted by a sizable institutional investor, serves as a check on management behaviour and will limit managerial power. When management is aware that their activities are being observed, they are more likely to engage in business ventures that foster organisational growth as opposed to those that maximise their own profits. But managerial incentives to support organisational development go beyond resolving the agency issue. According to Tirole (2010), experts in fields like psychology, consulting, and personnel management would undoubtedly view the economist's analysis of managerial incentives as clumsy. He believes that in addition to intrinsic motivation, corporate culture, trust, social responsibility, the core of self-esteem, and a passion for their work, these other elements are crucial in inspiring managers to put in extra effort to enhance their role in the expansion of their organisations. According to Tirole (2010), bonuses, stock options, and salaries are the forms of compensation that managers and top executives receive. The salary of a manager is a set sum that is paid either monthly or annually at the conclusion of a predetermined time period. The incentive part of monetary compensation that is thought to be effective in persuading managers to internalize the interests of shareholders consists of bonuses and stock option reimbursements. Businesses all over the world are using stock options extensively as management incentives to increase their level of organisational growth. Williams (2015) states that up to 30,000 different stock options were made available to managers in the US in 2011. Williams (2015) stated in his remarks that in order to encourage employees to maximise shareholder value, companies now provide stock options to lower-level executives as well as top executives. The fundamental premise is that managers would exert a great deal of effort to raise a company's share price in order to profit from the transaction.

The high value of the shares helps shareholders as well during the process. It has been discovered that stock options are a powerful motivator for management to deliver above-average performance and, as a result, enhance their role in the expansion of the company.

Incentives for managers in the United States have traditionally focused on stock-based rewards, which make up the majority of the incentive package. Germany and Japan have reported a sharp rise in equity-based compensation, primarily in the form of stock options (Tirole, 2010). It is thought that stock-based incentives can encourage managers to focus on increasing share value (Tirole, 2010). Although there is growing consensus regarding the relationship between performance and compensation, it is also widely acknowledged that imperfect performance measurement exists. The primary foundation for bonus plans for managers is manipulable accounting data. According to Randall (2009), bonuses have been linked to significant accounting frauds, with the Enron scandal serving as an excellent example. It has been suggested that since stock options and bonuses have different goals of encouraging

management to enhance an organization's growth, they cannot be substituted for one another. A bonus-based compensation plan, on the one hand, encourages management to prioritise short-term over long-term goals. As a result, when conducting business, a manager would typically trade off short-term and long-term profits. According to reports, managers are incentivized to boost an organization's current profit when bonuses are raised. On the other hand, a plan that increases stock options for managers will incentivize them to concentrate on accomplishing the organization's long-term goals. (2010) Tirole. Gain sharing and incentive schemes that encourage increased corporate culture participation and collaboration are two possible forms of stock options as a kind of managerial remuneration. As per Williams (2015), there is evidence that gainsharing is an extremely effective way of assisting managers in attaining better operational performance and fostering a positive work environment. To encourage management's performance, financial incentives can be applied in addition to sanctions. Governments can use performance results to boost organisational performance, according to an Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development review report. by giving incentives to and disciplining those in charge of running government organisations. It is reported that when agency heads fall short of their organization's performance goals, they receive negative compensation in more than 20% of OECD countries. According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2009), for instance, an agency's COE in nations like the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Korea is influenced in part by how well the agency meets its performance targets. Linking management performance to compensation is a complicated topic, though. When taking into account the Irish situation, the current system promotes performance enhancement by attaching penalties to underperformance instead of awards for culinary achievement. Organisational performance is used as part of an appraisal strategy that has the potential to affect performance within an organisation, even though it may not be directly related to management pay (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2009). According to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, linking management's output to the goals of the company can support the development of a high-performing culture and provide incentives for it. Financial compensation is just one aspect of managers' performance incentives. Improving flexibility can directly encourage managers to enhance their role in the expansion of the company. Numerous financial crises in recent years, including the US financial crisis of 2008, Enron, and Worldcom, have highlighted the significance of a company's management. As a result, researchers and professionals have looked into how to control agitation while also promoting and putting corporate governance procedures into place. In the field of accounting, corporate governance has always been a significant research area. Since ownership and management are distinct in an enterprise, the management team must use their own initiative and stay on the course that will best serve the company's growth. Management's ability will undoubtedly have an impact on an enterprise's business performance as the decision-making leader (Yujie, 2021). Strong managerial abilities enable the collection, interpretation, and application of information, thereby mitigating information asymmetry and the principal-agent dilemma that businesses encounter during mergers and acquisitions. According to "Upper Echelons Theory," management is unable to fully comprehend every facet of the business because of the complexity of the internal and external environments. The managerial team's cognitive aptitude and values dictate their capacity to gather pertinent data, which in turn influences their strategic decisions and overall company performance (Hambrick and Mason, 1984). The performance of the company will ultimately show how well management performs in relation to the company's ability to select an enterprise innovation strategy (Li et al.,

2022), invest efficiently (Lijie et al., 2020), and enter new markets. The quality of the company's earnings is also influenced by management's ability (Choi et al., 2015). Numerous research works have investigated the connection between corporate governance practices and organisational performance. These studies have also looked at the role that stakeholders, information transparency, board of directors' function, shareholders' method of company governance, and independent directors' role. The majority of these studies have discovered that a company with strong corporate governance practices performs much better operationally than a company with weaker corporate governance practices (Huiqin, 2018). Better corporate governance results from more capable management. Ability is a reflection of human capital. Building excellent internal control systems and raising the bar for corporate governance is made easier by stronger managerial aptitude (Xiaonan and Panpan, 2021). Strong managerial skills enable the timely correction of internal control flaws and the assurance of the controls' overall quality. The most crucial aspect of an organization's internal management is internal control, which allows managers to positively influence corporate governance through internal controls (Su, 2015). Therefore, a company's operating performance increases with stronger managerial ability. The principal-agent theory states that the agent's and the principal's objectives are frequently at odds. In a principal-agent relationship, each side anticipates maximising their own gains. The client wants to increase the enterprise's value and amass more wealth for themselves as the true owner of the residual value of the business. However, when managing the business, the agents (management) may make decisions that are against the wishes of the principal in order to further their own interests, such as a higher salary and more in-service benefits (Graham, 2020). Consequently, the principal-agent problem that arises from the information asymmetry between owners and management will make it impossible for management to operate efficiently. In this situation, management incentives such as equity incentives or compensation plans can encourage management to make strategic choices that are better for the long-term growth of businesses, lessen the principal agent issue, and keep management from adopting risk-averse short-term actions that are detrimental to enterprise innovation (Xiaonan and Panpan, 2021). A strong guarantee for fostering the enhancement of enterprise performance, the efficient use of enterprise resources, and the long-term growth of enterprises can be found in the close alignment of managers' personal interests and those of the enterprises.

CONCLUSION

Business integrity is safeguarded, accountability to stakeholders is guaranteed, and profitability is maximized through the use of corporate governance, which is essentially a guide for managing businesses. Corporate governance comprises a range of elements, depending on the particular business, including principles, financial disclosures, action plans, decision-making procedures, policies, and responsibilities. The board of directors' members are the primary individuals in an organisation who bear the responsibility of attaining sound corporate governance. The law mandates that every publicly traded company have a board of directors, chosen by the shareholders to provide direction to the organisation. The main responsibilities of the board of directors are risk mitigation, strategic guidance, and high-level decision-making—all of which are related to corporate governance. The board of directors does not, however, always carry out its decisions. This justifies the requirement for managerial staff employment. Performance is the ultimate measure of how well management performs, as it has a substantial impact on the company's earnings quality, enterprise investment efficiency, innovation strategy selection, and new market entry strategy. Numerous research works

have investigated the connection between corporate governance practices and organisational performance. These studies have also looked at the role that stakeholders, information transparency, board of directors' function, shareholders' method of company governance, and independent directors' role. The main conclusion drawn from these studies is that a company with strong corporate governance practices performs much better operationally than one with weaker controls. Corporate governance improves with more capable management. Capacity is a manifestation of human capital. Building excellent internal control systems and raising the bar for corporate governance is made easier by stronger managerial aptitude. Strong management skills are necessary to spot internal control flaws, provide prompt fixes, and ensure the integrity of the controls. Managerial ability and corporate performance are closely related. Corporate financial performance can be defined as the managers' past performance in implementing policies to earn compensation for the company. The likelihood that management will disclose high-quality accounting information to the public and share management outcomes and operations is positively correlated with its level of competence. Increasing managerial skill can help the business overcome its financial obstacles, bring in enough money, better support its investment plan, and boost business performance over time. Managerial skill can enhance business performance in a variety of ways. Managerial aptitude has a signaling function, on the one hand. Enterprise total factor productivity improves when companies with superior managerial ability have lower information asymmetry and more efficient resource allocation and asset utilisation.

BIOGRAPHY

- Abdallah, A. A. (2016). Corporate Governance Practices, Ownership Structure, and Corporate Performance in the GCC Countries. Sharjah, UAE: American University of Sharjah.
- Choi, W., Han, S., Jung, S. H., & Kang, T. (2015). .CEO's operating ability and the association between accruals and future cash flows. *J. Bus. Finance Account.* 42 (5-6),619-634. doi:10.1111/jbfa.12118.
- Claessens, S. (2003). Corporate governance and development. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.642721>.
- Dixon, A., Jizi, M. I., Salama, R., & Stratling, R. (2014). Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: Evidence from the US Banking Sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125(4), 601-615. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1929-2>.
- Easterbrook, F. H. (1984). Two agency-cost explanations of dividends. *The American Economic Review (American Economic Association)*, 74(4):650-659.
- Edmans, A. (2014). Blockholders and corporate governance. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 6 (40: 23-50.
- Faukunder, M. W., Kadyizhanova, D. & Sewnket, L.W. (2010). Executive compensation: An overview of research on corporate practices and proposed reforms., url={<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:153813818>}.
- Goldfarb, A. & Xiao, M. (2011). Who thinks about the competition? Managerial ability and strategic entry in US local telephone markets. *American Economic Review*, 101(7):3130-3161.
- Grantham, R. B. (2020). Law and practice of corporate governance. Sydney: University of Queensland.
- Hambrick, D. C. & Mason, M. A. (1984). Echelons: The organisation as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(5): 193-206.

Hebble, A. & Ramaswamy, V. (2011). Corporate governance and firm characteristics. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 3, url=(<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:166390576>).

Huaijian, L., & Xiaohan, G. (2021). Research and Development investment, executive incentive and corporate performance: An empirical study based on Chinese listed companies. *J. Harbin Univ. Commer. Soc. Sci. Ed.* 6, 36–48.

Huiqin, H. (2018). Corporate governance, ma (14) (PDF) Managerial ability, compensation incentives, and corporate performance. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373752818_Managerial_ability_compensation_incentives_and_corporate_performance [accessed Jan 20 2024].

Iskander, M. R. & Chamlou, N. (2000). Corporate governance: A framework for implementation-overview. url=<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:167139921>).

Jensen, M. and Meckling, W.H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behaviour, agency costs and ownership structure. *Financial Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4);305–360.

Ocasio, W. and Joseph, J. (2005). Cultural adaptation and institutional change: The evolution of vocabularies of corporate governance, 1972–2003. *Journal of Poetics*, 33(3–4): 163–178.

Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1787/annrep-2009-en>

Raymond, P. (2023). The importance of business incentives and how they can save you money. *Business News*, June 24, 2023.

Scott, K. F. (2010). *Perspectives on corporate governance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shleifer, A. & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. *Journal of Finance*, 52(2): 737–783.

Su, K. (2015). Managerial equity incentive, risk taking and capital allocation efficiency. *Manag. Sci.* 3, 14.