Accepted Manuscript

Not all clawbacks are the same: Consequences of strong versus weak clawback provisions

Michael H.R. Erkens, Ying Gan, B. Burcin Yurtoglu

PII: S0165-4101(18)30037-5

DOI: 10.1016/j.jacceco.2018.06.002

Reference: JAE 1193

To appear in: Journal of Accounting and Economics

Received date: 22 January 2018 Revised date: 30 May 2018 Accepted date: 6 June 2018



Please cite this article as: Michael H.R. Erkens, Ying Gan, B. Burcin Yurtoglu, Not all clawbacks are the same: Consequences of strong versus weak clawback provisions, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.jacceco.2018.06.002

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Not all clawbacks are the same: Consequences of strong vs. weak clawback provisions

Michael H.R. Erkens^{a,*}

Erasmus School of Economics - Erasmus University Rotterdam

Ying Gan^b

Erasmus School of Economics - Erasmus University Rotterdam

B. Burcin Yurtoglu^c

WHU - Otto-Beisheim-School of Management

Abstract

We develop a *Clawback Strength Index* and show that while some firms adopt unambiguous and strong clawback provisions, others adopt weak ones. We find that strong clawback adopters experience improvements in financial reporting quality, fewer CEO turnovers, and lower CEO pay. We advance two possible explanations: First, clawback strength may be primarily responsible for the improvements in reporting quality. Second, strong clawbacks may yield benefits because they are part of a broader reform package. While our findings on reporting quality and CEO turnover are consistent with both explanations, our results on CEO pay support only the broader reform explanation.

Keywords: Clawback provisions; corporate governance; linguistic analysis; reporting quality JEL codes: G30, G34, G35, K22, M21, M41

We owe special thanks to Jeroen Suijs for his insights, valuable comments, and suggestions. We are also grateful to comments and suggestions from John Core (editor) and an anonymous referee. We gratefully acknowledge comments by Axel Adam-Mueller, Walid Alissa, Raul Barroso, Bernard Black, Feng Chen, Hans B. Christensen, Ed de Haan, Thomas Keusch, Edith Leung, Christian Leuz, Garen Markarian, Gaizka Ormazabal, Buhui Qiu, Sander Renes, Eddie Riedl, Nemit Shroff, Hervé Stolowy, David Veenman, David Yermack, Teri L. Yohn, and seminar participants at Erasmus University, HEC Paris, UNSW, Universidad Carlos III, University of Sydney, and WHU Otto-Beisheim-School of Management. We also thank participants of the Academy of Management Annual Meeting (2014), the American Accounting Association Annual Meeting (2014), the European Accounting Association Annual Meeting (2015), the Berlin Accounting Conference (2018), the European Financial Management Annual Meeting (2015), the Global Finance Conference (2014), and the International Conference of the Journal of International Accounting Research (2014). We also thank Marije Minkman and Natalie Reid for their linguistic consulting. Part of this work was done while Michael H.R. Erkens was visiting the University of Chicago and Ying Gan was visiting HEC Paris.

^a ERASMUS School of Economics, ERASMUS University Rotterdam, 3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands, erkens@ese.eur.nl

^b ERASMUS School of Economics, ERASMUS University Rotterdam, 3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands, gan@ese.eur.nl

^cWHU Otto-Beisheim-School of Management, 56179 Vallendar, Germany, burcin.yurtoglu@whu.edu

^{*} Corresponding author

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8960855

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8960855

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>