
Corporate governance mechanisms and the performance of small-cap firms in Canada

Lorne N. Switzer*

Finance Department
John Molson School of Business
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, H3G 1M8, Canada
Fax: 514-481-4561
E-mail: switz@jmsb.concordia.ca
*Corresponding author

Catherine Kelly

Finance Department
John Molson School of Business
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, H3G 1M8, Canada
Fax: 514-848-4500
E-mail: katie80@hotmail.com

Abstract: Identifying corporate governance mechanisms to improve firm performance has been at the forefront of policy discussion and research in recent years. Existing research in this area focuses on large-capitalisation firms, and has not provided much insight on smaller firms. This paper tests for the optimality of deployment of governance mechanisms for Canadian small-cap firms by estimating a simultaneous equation system that links four control mechanisms to firm performance, using recent data. The results confirm simultaneity between several governance mechanisms and Canadian small-cap firm performance. CEO ownership and shareholder rights are shown to determine board independence. CEO ownership in turn is shown to depend on the extent of shareholder rights and whether the CEO is also Chairperson of the board. Canadian small-cap firms appear to overutilise debt as a control mechanism. There is somewhat weaker evidence that board independence and CEO ownership are beyond the optimum. The latter, given the relatively high degree of CEO ownership in Canadian small-cap firms, is consistent with management entrenchment. We also do not find any significant discount to performance for Quebec-based firms, or for firms with dual or multiple voting class shares structures.

Keywords: corporate governance mechanisms; small-cap firms; company performance.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Switzer, L.N. and Kelly, C. (2006) 'Corporate governance mechanisms and the performance of small-cap firms in Canada', *Int. J. Business Governance and Ethics*, Vol. 2, Nos. 3/4, pp.294-328.

Biographical notes: Lorne N. Switzer is Professor of Finance and the Van Berkow Endowed Chair in Small Cap Equities in the Finance Department, John Molson School of Business at Concordia University. He also serves as the Associate Director, of the Concordia-HEC Montreal Institute for Governance of Private and Public Organizations. He has published numerous academic articles and books and has served since 1994 as an Associate Editor for *European Financial Management* and is on the Scientific Committee of *La Revue Financier*. He has served as a consultant for many business firms and organisations, including the Caisse de Dépôt et Placement du Québec, Schlesinger Newman Goldman, Inc., AMI Partners, Inc., Bank Credit Analysts Research Group, Institute for Canadian Bankers, and the Bourse de Montréal. He obtained his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1982.

Catherine Kelly is currently the Executive Assistant in the Department of Public Affairs and Communications at the Jewish General Hospital in Montreal, Quebec. A native of England, she holds a Bachelor of Science (Honours) degree in Management from the University of East Anglia in Norwich, UK, and a Master of Science in Administration (Finance) degree from the John Molson School of Business at Concordia University in Montreal, Quebec.

1 Introduction

The separation of ownership from control in corporations gives rise to conflicts of interest between shareholders and managers. Since Berle and Means' (1932) classic work, such conflicts have been addressed using various theoretical approaches, including agency theory (Jensen and Meckling, 1976), transactions cost theory (Williamson, 1979) and game theory (Dixit, 2004). The literature has evolved under the rubric of corporate governance, defined by Shleifer and Vishny (1997, p.737) as "the ways in which suppliers of finance to corporations assure themselves of getting a return on their equity".

Some empirical work has been performed on governance issues for small companies in the USA (see, *e.g.*, Eisenberg *et al.*, 1998; Ang *et al.*, 2000). Little work exists in the area of governance of small caps for other countries. Our paper serves to extend the international evidence to Canada, which should be a useful testing ground relative to the USA.

The Canadian governance environment has some similarities to that of the USA. First, Canada ranks highly in the La Porta *et al.* (1998) metric for investor protection (anti-director rights). Second, Canadian firms, like US firms, are fairly widely held, positioned well above the median of countries in the high investor protection grouping in La Porta *et al.* (1999).¹ However, there are meaningful differences with the US that seem worthy of investigation. First, the regulatory environment might be deemed less stringent in Canada relative to the USA, which could give rise to less optimal deployment of governance mechanisms as a whole. Exclusively Canadian listed firms are not subject to the rules-based approach used by the SEC or to the mandatory requirements of the Sarbanes Oxley Act of 2002 or to the governance requirements of the NYSE and NASDAQ. Instead, they have traditionally faced a 'guidelines' approach to governance from their regulators. More recently, the Ontario Securities Commission (OSC) has proposed mandatory governance rules. To date, those rules adopted refer to the roles of

the CEO and CFO in ensuring true reporting of information, the formation of independent audit committees and the role of external auditors. As yet, there are no requirements for boards of directors, due in large part to the Canadian market being heavily populated by small-cap firms unable to recruit the directors who would meet strict rules. Since 1995, the Toronto Stock Exchange (TSX) has maintained a code of 14 'Best Practices' that firms can *voluntarily* choose to adhere to, which include recommendations for a majority of independent board members, for separation of the roles of chairman and CEO, and for reduction of board sizes as a means to facilitate more efficient decision-making.²

Canadian equities that are cross-listed on US exchanges would of course be subject to US governance requirements. Doidge *et al.* (2004) suggest that there is a valuation premium associated with cross-listing that may be explained by bonding and monitoring benefits, although they note that there are other mechanisms that need to be explored that could lead to lower consumption of private benefits of control.

Another distinction is that Canada does not follow a uniform legal code across provinces. In particular, firms headquartered in Quebec, as opposed to the other provinces, are subject to the French civil law tradition. According to La Porta *et al.* (2000, p.9), 'French legal origin countries have the worst quality of law enforcement of the four legal traditions, even controlling for per capita income.'³ La Porta *et al.* (2002) provide data to show that this tradition is inimical to corporate valuation. If that is true, then one might argue that Quebec-based firms should demonstrate worse performance than firms headquartered in other provinces.

Third, unlike the USA, many Canadian companies have dual or multiple class share structures, with significant deviations from the one-share-one vote rule (La Porta *et al.*, 1998, Table 2). Deviations from one-share, one-vote are typically viewed as harmful to shareholder rights, although the empirical evidence on this matter is mixed.⁴ In a recent study of Canadian corporate governance, Chirinko and Schaller (2004) examine a dataset that covers the period 1975–1986 and conclude that agency problems do serve to distort firm investment decisions. The Canadian equity market has followed the trend identified by Fama and French (2004) of the USA, in that since 1985 (*i.e.*, post Chirinko and Schaller (2004) sample) there has been an explosion of new listings on the TSX, with a large contingent of small-cap companies represented in the market.⁵ Indeed, the largest number of companies in the Canadian benchmark index, the S&P/TSX Composite Index, consists of small-cap companies.⁶ Hence, examining the governance characteristics at Canadian small-class companies seems worthy in its own right.

Klein *et al.* (2003) use the Globe and Mail's Governance ranking data to demonstrate that some corporate governance mechanisms appear to have value for shareholders in Canada, although traditional measures such as board composition and independence are not correlated with performance. Allaire and Firsirotu (2005) use the same rankings for *large-cap* Canadian firms, and conclude that governance mechanisms have virtually no impact on the performance of large-cap corporations in Canada. These studies do not address the problem of the interdependence of the various mechanisms for controlling agency problems and the potential simultaneity between these mechanisms and the various measures of firm performance. Our study attempts to broaden our understanding of the governance-performance link by extending the analysis to the Canadian small-cap universe, using recent data.

We develop and estimate for our sample of small-cap Canadian companies a system of equations that consists of four governance mechanisms that are jointly determined along with company performance. The endogenous mechanisms include Board Independence, Pay-Based Incentives for Managers, CEO Ownership and Debt. Company performance is measured by Tobin's Q. We also examine the effects of corporate control on firm performance as an additional governance mechanism, measured as the takeover intensity of the firm's industry. We test two general hypotheses:

- 1 that the governance mechanisms are substitutes
- 2 that the levels of these mechanisms are jointly and optimally determined.

With regard to 2), following Demsetz and Lehn (1985) and Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), we consider the internal determination of mechanism use will be made to maximise firm value: the use of each mechanism will be increased until the marginal costs to the firm equal the marginal benefits. A corollary to this is that with alternative, interdependent and endogenous mechanisms, the net performance impact of all mechanisms examined jointly will be insignificant when the mechanisms are deployed optimally. When firms optimally determine their usage of all governance mechanisms, the impact of a change in one mechanism will be offset by another (or a combination of the others).

If it is the case that Canada's less stringent regulatory environment for corporate governance gives rise to less optimal usage of control mechanisms, we would expect some departure from the Agrawal and Knoeber (1996) finding of no significant relationship between control mechanisms and performance when they are estimated simultaneously.

This study also examines the hypothesis of La Porta *et al.* (2002) that civil law jurisdictions as opposed to common-law jurisdictions are harmful to valuation, by testing for performance differentials between Quebec-based companies and companies headquartered in another province.

We will also shed some new light on the implications of deviations from one-share, one-vote by looking at the relative impact of dual or multiple class share structures for firms.

Finally, we will look at the impact of cross-listing on a US exchange as it affects some governance mechanisms as well as valuation for companies in the sample.

This paper tests for the optimality of deployment of governance mechanisms of Canadian small caps by estimating a simultaneous equation system that links four control mechanisms to firm performance, using recent data. The results confirm simultaneity between several governance mechanisms and Canadian small-cap firm performance. CEO ownership and shareholder rights are shown to determine board independence. CEO ownership in turn is shown to depend on the extent of shareholder rights and whether the CEO is also Chairperson of the board. We do find a significant impact of certain governance mechanisms on performance when taking into account the endogeneity of the variables. In particular, Canadian small-cap firms appear to overutilise debt as a control mechanism. The market for corporate control, measured as the extent of takeover activity in the firm's industry, is found to have a positive effect on performance. We do not find any significant discount to performance for Quebec-based firms, or for firms with dual or multiple voting class shares structures. We do, however, find a significant premium for firms who cross-list on US exchanges.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides a brief review of the literature on the governance-performance interactions. The specification of our model is provided in Section 3. In Section 4, we describe our sample. Empirical results follow in Section 5. The paper concludes in Section 6 with a summary of our findings.

2 Literature review

Since Williamson (1979) and Fama (1980), governance mechanisms that have been identified and examined in the literature have been classified into two groups:

- 1 mechanisms internal to the firm – including the board of directors, the firm's compensation structure for managers (incentive contracts), and the ownership structure of the firm.
- 2 mechanisms external to the firm – which includes the outside monitoring of bondholders (leverage – see *e.g.*, Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), given the firm's capital structure choice), legal protection of shareholders, and the market for corporate control (mergers and acquisitions).

Most of the empirical research in this area focuses on US-based large-capitalisation firms. Denis and McConnell (2003) provide a comprehensive survey of the international evidence. First, Banz (1981) then Reinganum (1981) identified the 'small-cap anomaly', *i.e.*, that small-cap stocks consistently earn higher rates of return than larger stocks. The differential performance of small caps continues to generate significant interest (see *e.g.*, Dimson and Marsh (1999), Eun *et al.* (2003), and Switzer and Fan (2006)). As small-cap stocks are presumably more closely held, we might expect to find that these types of firms are less prone to agency problems. The few studies that do examine small firms show that this is not necessarily the case. For example, Eisenberg *et al.* (1998, p.53) show that board size of small-cap firms is negatively related to firm performance, which they argue shows that "problems in communication and coordination can extend to smaller boards and firms".

In one of the few studies of governance of small firms, Eisenberg *et al.* (1998) show that if there is a role for the board of directors in helping mitigate agency problems, it should be with a small board – larger boards are negatively related to firm performance. They do not, however, look at the composition of boards – *e.g.*, the extent of board independence. Another study of small firms by Ang *et al.* (2000) examines agency costs in small firms under various ownership and management structures. They find that agency costs (as measured by efficiency ratios) are higher when the firm is outsider-managed (as opposed to owner-managed), and increase when the manager's ownership decreases. They also find that as shares become more widely held, agency costs increase, and that bank monitoring reduces agency costs. However, neither of these studies considers the interdependence of governance mechanisms and firm performance.

Canada faces a particular difference from otherwise similar markets, such as the USA, in that the province of Quebec follows the Civil Law under a codified system similar to France, while the rest of Canada uses the Common Law (like the UK). Additionally, Attig and Gadhoum (2003) show that Quebec-headquartered firms have greater ownership and control concentration, more family and government control and more multiple class shares. The firms in our sample are listed on the TSE and are therefore subject to the Ontario Securities Commission's regulations. However,

Quebec-based firms, unlike those of other provinces, are subject to further legal restrictions: under Bill 101 (The Charter of the French Language) and its successor Bill 22 (The Official Languages Act), companies in Quebec must comply with specific language requirements, specifically that all French is the sole official language of the province (for fiscal reporting) and that written communications for all corporations in Quebec must be in French. These restrictions would necessitate translation costs that would not be incurred by firms headquartered in other provinces.

Canadian firms form the largest group of foreign firms cross-listed on US stock exchanges. Cross-listed firms would be subject to the reporting rules of the Sarbanes Oxley Act. Coffee (1999) argues that cross-listing in the USA thus enhances investor protection via the stricter governance rules and increased monitoring by the media and investment community.

The direct relation between investor protection and firm performance has been demonstrated in a later paper (La Porta *et al.*, 2002), where the authors show that firms in common-law countries, where investor protection is stronger, have higher Tobin's Q ratios. Moreover, Gul and Qiu (2002) find that lower levels of information asymmetry, or agency problems, as measured by investors' emphasis placed on current versus future earnings, are associated with stronger legal protection.

The bulk of existing research also ignores the potential simultaneity between agency control mechanisms and between these mechanisms and firm performance. Core *et al.* (2003) note that simultaneous system estimation is essential for addressing the incentive pay – performance relationship. Agrawal and Knoeber (1996) find that the relationships between various mechanisms and performance found through Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regressions disappear – excepting board independence – in a simultaneous equations framework, which they conclude indicates optimal allocation of control mechanisms. For example, using OLS, leverage is found to have a negative effect on performance (Tobin's Q). Using Two-Stage Least Squares (2SLS), the coefficient on leverage is found to be positive, though not significant. Mishra and Nielsen (2000) also use simultaneous equations to examine the relationships between performance, board independence and pay sensitivity. Weber and Dudney (2003) extend Chung and Pruitt (1996) to look at the joint relationship between CEO ownership, performance (as measured by Tobin's Q) and CEO compensation. Further examples include Ugurlu (2000), Chen *et al.* (2003) and Brick *et al.* (2005).

The evidence on small-capitalisation firms using a simultaneous equation approach that recognises the interdependence of governance mechanisms with performance has been lacking, and is something that we address in this paper utilising a comprehensive database compiled from a wide range of sources to analyse the four major governance mechanisms and their link to firm performance. We discuss the model in detail below.

3 Empirical approach – model specification

Our approach is to consider the performance-governance mechanism interaction for small-cap firms in Canada in a simultaneous equation perspective, similar to Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), Chung and Pruitt (1996), Mishra and Nielsen (2000), Ugurlu (2000), Weber and Dudney (2003), Chen *et al.* (2003) and Brick *et al.* (2005). From this perspective, we view the control mechanisms as *potential substitutes*, and *jointly determined* with the firm's performance.

3.1 Variable selection

Our model consists of five endogenous variables, which comprise four endogenous control mechanisms, and a firm performance measure. The endogenous control mechanisms include Degree of Board Independence (BIND), Leverage (DBVAL), CEO Ownership (OWN), and the extent of CEO Pay-Performance Sensitivity (PAY). The firm performance measure used is Tobin's Q (TOBINQ).

In selecting the exogenous variables to identify the equations of the system, we have in general selected regressors that are consistent with theoretical governance models, and which have been addressed in single equation formulations for the USA as well as for developed markets outside of the USA. We also look at the effects of takeover activity in the firm's industry as an exogenous variable (PACQ) that appears in each equation, similar to Agrawal and Knoeber (1996). In addition to providing new evidence of governance issues for small-cap firms outside of the USA, an additional contribution of our approach is to examine the robustness of results found using simultaneous equation formulations for the USA to another developed market.

3.2 Model development

3.2.1 Board Independence (BIND) equation

Fama and Jensen (1983) identify boards of directors as being of primary importance in controlling agency problems. They propose independent boards as a significant factor in monitoring CEO behaviour. Many consider directors who are also employed by the firm to be ineffective at monitoring management because maintaining their own employment takes precedence over questioning their superiors' actions. This belief that outside board members are better monitors seems supported by the fact that outsiders dominate the majority of boards. Dalton and Kesner (1987), for example, find that 69.7% of US firms' and 63.6% of UK firms' board members are 'outsiders'.

Following Fama and Jensen (1983) and Mishra and Nielsen (2000), we treat board independence as a governance mechanism.⁷ Mishra and Nielsen (2000) and Ghosh and Sirmans (2003) utilise two measures of board independence: the percentage of outside directors (BINDb) and the tenure of directors relative to the CEO's (BINDa). We also use these two measures in this study.

CEO ownership is expected to decrease the level of board independence. This 'shareholder-voting hypothesis' states that as CEOs' share increases, so too will their bargaining power in the selection of board members. This hypothesis therefore predicts a negative relationship between CEO ownership and the proportion of outsiders on the board. An alternative explanation, the 'substitution hypothesis', suggests that greater CEO ownership leads to better alignment of shareholder and CEO interests, resulting in a diminished requirement for the monitoring of outside board members. This hypothesis predicts the same relationship as the shareholder-voting hypothesis. However, in considering outside board members as substitutions for alternative external control mechanisms, it is important to note that these alternate explanations predict opposite relationships between, for example, outside directors and the level of debt. Throughout our study, we view *each* control mechanism as a potential substitute.

The relative power of the CEO over the other board members will be affected by the size of the board and whether or not the CEO is also the Chairperson of the board. Ghosh and Sirmans (2003) also find some evidence that the CEO also being the Chairperson of

the board further reduces the proportion of outsiders on the board. When the CEO serves the dual role, his/her power to influence the directors elected to the board is increased, consequently allowing her to choose directors who are less likely to be efficient monitors, *i.e.*, insiders. The pressures applied by the CEO of a small-cap firm will probably more easily sway a smaller board. We therefore expect to find that the larger the board of directors and if the CEO does not have the dual role of being Chair, the more independent the board will be (as measured by either the proportion of insiders/outside or the relative tenure). Similarly, the more shareholders' rights are protected, as represented by the existence of only one class of shares, the more likely that outsiders or directors who were on the board before the CEO's election as a Director will dominate the board. We should therefore find a positive relationship between our shareholder rights variable and the measures of board independence.

Those studies that examine the determinants of board composition, whilst taking into account the endogeneity, have had little success in finding a relationship between firm size, industry, or risk and board composition (see, for example, Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), Ugurlu (2000) and Brick *et al.* (2005)). We include them as control variables nonetheless, along with no *a priori* expectations.

To summarise, the BIND equation is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad - \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad - \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad ? \\
 BIND = f(& CEO \text{ ownership, board size, CEO duality, shareholder rights, firm size,} \\
 & ? \qquad \qquad ? \qquad \qquad ? \\
 & \text{takeover activity, volatility, industry) }
 \end{aligned}$$

3.2.2 The leverage (DBVAL) equation

Increased debt use reduces the moral hazard problem and provides monitoring of management through the private institutions who supply credit. As such, it should be an effective governance mechanism.

Agrawal and Knoeber (1996) find that an increased proportion of *outsiders* on the board of directors leads to increased use of debt. This implies that the internal monitoring of the board is complemented by the external mechanism of monitoring by lenders. On the other hand, Ugurlu (2000) finds that bank monitoring and outsider board monitoring are substitutes, in that as the proportion of *insiders* on the Board increases, the reliance on lenders' monitoring also increases. As explained above, we consider all four mechanisms to be internally determined, substitute governance mechanisms, and as such expect a negative relation between BIND and DBVAL. Equally, Shareholder Rights (SHRRTS) should also have an inverse relation with leverage.

John and John (1993) argue that as strict alignment of compensation with shareholder returns is only optimal for all-equity firms, firms with risky debt should utilise a lower proportion of performance-dependent compensation in the pay mix. This negative relation between the leverage ratio and pay sensitivity supports our contention that these mechanisms are substitutes rather than complements. Garvey (1997) and Brick *et al.* (2005) find support for this prediction.⁷

The capital structure decision will be affected by the firm's performance and the volatility of that performance. The more risky a firm's stock value, the less debt will be accessible or affordable; as such we expect an inverse relation between risk (RISK) and leverage. To the extent that debt-financing decisions are based on past information, we

used a one-year lagged Tobin's Q for the performance in this equation. According to the pecking-order hypothesis, firms prefer internal to external financing. We would therefore expect a negative relationship between the firm's lagged performance (TOBINLAG) and the leverage ratio.

Cross-listing in the USA has been suggested to increase access to more developed capital markets (Doidge *et al.*, 2004). The fact that US capital markets are deeper and more liquid than Canadian capital markets means that firms who cross-list on US stock exchanges are able to raise debt at lower cost. We therefore expect to find a positive relation between cross-listing and leverage.

Agrawal and Knoeber (1996) argue that larger firms face lower potential bankruptcy costs and that the relation between size and the leverage ratio should be positive, and their evidence supports this. Similarly, the studies by Ugurlu (2000) and Brick *et al.* (2005) concur with this result. Equally, we expect to find a negative relationship between risk and debt, given that debt becomes more expensive the riskier the firm appears. We also include the industry variable to account for any differences in capital structure decisions between resource and non-resource firms.

The DBVAL equation is:

$$DBVAL = f(\overset{-}{\text{board independence}}, \overset{-}{\text{pay-performance sensitivity}}, \overset{-}{\text{lagged performance}}, \overset{-}{\text{shareholder rights}}, \overset{+}{\text{cross-listing}}, \overset{+}{\text{firm size}}, \overset{?}{\text{takeover activity}}, \overset{-}{\text{volatility}}, \overset{?}{\text{industry}})$$

3.2.3 CEO ownership equation

We consider ownership structure to be endogenously determined, as with Demsetz and Lehn (1985) and Agrawal and Knoeber (1996). By owning shares in the firm he/she works for, a CEO is reducing the level of diversification of her portfolio. To this extent, it is reasonable to assume that the greater the level of control the CEO feels she has over that undiversified portion, the more willing she will be to keep it. We would therefore expect that the less independent the Board (BIND = 0), the greater the level of CEO ownership.

Extending this hypothesis that a CEO's perceived power will determine her ownership, we should also find that when the CEO is also the Chairperson (DUAL = 1) and when shareholder rights are weaker (SHRRTS = 0), ownership will be greater.

CEOs' wealth constraints and risk aversion could affect their level of ownership, which we measure by the size of the firm. The greater the value of the firm, the less likely the CEO is to be willing to hold large fractions of the firm's equity. We therefore expect a negative relationship between size (ASSET) and CEO ownership. Similarly, the volatility of the firm's monthly stock returns should affect the risk aversion of the CEO. The greater the volatility, the less willing the CEO should be to hold an undiversified portfolio of his firm's stock. Consistent with Chung and Pruitt (1996), we also include an industry dummy variable to account for industry effects.

Given that cross-listing in the USA is expected to increase investor protection, the proposal that ownership concentration and legal shareholder protection are substitutes (La Porta *et al.*, 1997; Denis and McConnell, 2003) implies a negative relation between cross-listing and CEO ownership. Burkart and Panunzi (2004) argue that this is only the case if legal protection and monitoring are complements. Following Doidge *et al.*

(2004), we assume that this is the case, as listing in the USA increases legal protection due to the mandatory governance regulations and increases monitoring by media and the investment community.

To summarise, the OWN equation is:

$$OWN = f(\overset{+}{\text{board independence}}, \overset{-}{\text{CEO duality}}, \overset{-}{\text{shareholder rights}}, \overset{-}{\text{cross-listing}}, \\ \overset{-}{\text{firm size}}, \overset{-}{\text{volatility}}, \overset{?}{\text{takeover activity}}, \overset{?}{\text{industry}})$$

3.2.4 Pay-related incentives equation

Several authors have suggested incentive compensation schemes as a means to join managers and owners (see, for example, Jensen and Meckling, 1976; Lambert and Larcker, 1985). When a CEO's earned income is a function of firm performance, he/she will be concerned with making profit-maximising decisions, thereby acting in the shareholders' interests.

An important work in this field is that of Jensen and Murphy (1990), who measure pay-performance sensitivities, b , where b is estimated as:

$$\Delta(\text{CEO compensation}) = a + b \Delta(\text{shareholder wealth})$$

The change in shareholder wealth is calculated from the inflation-adjusted rate of return on common stock realised in the current year multiplied by the previous year's year-end firm value. Following several authors (*e.g.*, Mishra and Nielsen, 2000), we utilise Jensen and Murphy pay-performance sensitivities as the dependent variable in our equation.

As explained above, John and John (1993) posit a negative relationship between debt and pay-performance sensitivity, which is supported by Garvey (1997) and Brick *et al.* (2005). We should therefore expect to find an inverse relation between leverage and pay-performance sensitivity.

Hermalin and Weisbach (1991) question whether board composition and incentive contracts are complements or substitutes. Boyd (1994) finds that the ratio of insiders on the board is inversely related to compensation. The explanation is that, to the extent that inside board members believe they are being evaluated by the outside Board members, they do not want to be seen as 'siding' with the CEO. In addition, this relationship supports the contention that when a board is more independent, the need for performance pay is reduced.⁸ We expect to find an inverse relation between both BINDa and BINDb and PAY. The presence of a more independent board reduces the necessity for CEO pay to be heavily based on performance.

La Porta *et al.* (1998) demonstrated the importance of legal protection as a governance mechanism and spawned a growing body of literature on the subject. The authors posit that the legal origins of a country are determinants of the level of protection offered to shareholders and are therefore a vital factor in determining corporate governance in that country. They provide substantial evidence to support this hypothesis, showing that vast differences exist and that these differences are highly correlated with the ownership and market structure differences between countries. As explained above, these differences may also be present between Quebec and the rest of Canada because the legal origins of Quebec differ from those of the rest of Canada. We therefore include a dummy variable equal to 1 when the firm is headquartered in Quebec. We might expect

that the overall effect on a firms' pay sensitivity of being headquartered in Quebec may be negative due to reduced shareholder protection afforded by the Quebec Civil Code. However, this may be overshadowed by the requirements that TSX-listed stocks meet Ontario Securities Commission regulations. The predicted relation between variables QUEBEC and PAY is therefore either negative or zero.

Craighead *et al.* (2004) provide evidence that increased shareholder protection leads to greater pay-performance sensitivity. The authors examine the pay sensitivity of Canadian CEOs' compensation pre and post the mandated disclosure laws implemented by the TSX. They find that pay sensitivity increases when firms are obligated to disclose their compensation policies, especially in widely held firms. We thus expect to find a positive relationship between our measure of shareholder protection, SHRRTS (which is equal to 1 when only single class shares exist) and pay-performance sensitivity.

Many studies show that the size of the firm tends to have a positive relationship with the absolute level of CEO compensation.⁹ They do not, however, address the relationship between firm size and pay-performance sensitivity *per se*. Schaefer (1998) finds pay-performance sensitivities to be inversely proportional to the square root of firm size. Murphy (1999) illustrates the relationship between firm size and pay-performance sensitivity graphically, showing that the relationship is inverse. Mishra and Nielsen (2000) and Brick *et al.* (2005), using simultaneous equations systems, also find this result. Murphy (1999) explains that this relationship is logical because CEOs of large firms can only reasonably own a small fraction of the company through stock and options, given that they are risk-averse and wealth constrained. So whilst the expected relation between firm size and total compensation is positive,¹⁰ we expect to find a negative relationship between firm size (ASSET) and pay-performance sensitivity.

Aggarwal and Chamwick (1999) state that the principal-agent model proposes a tradeoff between the CEO's effort and the risk they bear, and that pay-performance sensitivity will be decreasing as the variance of the firm's performance is increasing. They therefore test whether CEOs of firms with higher risk have lower pay-performance sensitivity. Following their results, we expect to find that PAY is an inverse function of stock return volatility (RISK).

Murphy (1999), using S&P firms from 1992 to 1996 across various industries, shows that between 7% and 36% of CEO compensation is in the form of share options. This figure varies widely between industries and time. Given the dependence of PAY on share option grants, PAY will be dependent on the industry he or she works in. Murphy shows that mining and manufacturing firms tend to have relatively lower levels of non-incentive compensation, so we might reasonably expect to find that natural resource firms (IND = 1) also depend more heavily on performance-contingent pay than non-resource industries.

We specify our PAY equation as:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & - & & - & & -/0 & & + & & - \\
 PAY = f & (debt, & board & independence, & Quebec & firm, & shareholder & rights, & firm & size, \\
 & - & & ? & & + & & & & \\
 & volatility, & takeover & activity, & industry) & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

3.2.5 Firm performance equation

The final endogenous variable in our system is the firm's market performance, measured by TOBINQ.

The level to which CEOs fulfil their principals' objectives is demonstrated by firm performance. This performance is thus determined by the various control mechanisms that are intended to elicit desirable behaviour and decision-making in CEOs, along with various other factors, identified in previous studies to be of significant importance.

Whether performance-based pay encourages profit-maximising behaviour in CEOs of small caps remains an open question. The assumed relationship is positive: the more a CEO's income is based on the firm's performance, the more he or she will endeavour to maximise that performance and therefore her own income. Mishra and Nielsen (2000) find that pay incentives have a significantly positive effect on performance in a 2SLS regression when using relative board tenure as the measure of board independence.

An increase in the debt ratio should indicate an increase in the level of monitoring by creditors, and therefore an expected increase in firm performance. Jensen (1986) and Chirinko and Schaller (2004) posit that debt also reduces free cash flow, which executives are likely to squander.¹¹ These latter authors do find a reduction in governance problems when there is high debt, but the results are not highly significant. The monitoring effect of debt may be outweighed by the increased default risk implied by higher leverage. Similarly, the more independent the board of directors (higher BIND), the greater the expected level of CEO monitoring and therefore the better the firm performance should be.

The relationship between CEO ownership and firm performance is ambiguous. At lower levels, ownership is expected to increase the alignment between shareholders' and managers' interests but at higher levels, managers become entrenched and their power impedes their success as a manager. Ang *et al.* (2000) find that in US small-cap corporations CEO ownership reduces agency costs. However, Morck *et al.* (1988) find that the entrenchment effects of executive ownership outweigh the alignment benefits at a threshold of 5% for US firms. This is in contrast to the UK, for which Short and Keasey (1999) find an entrenchment threshold of 12%. The authors explain that this is due to the better coordination of monitoring in the UK, due largely to the lesser ability of UK CEOs to mount anti-takeover defences. Given the extent of dual class structures in Canada (39% of our sample have dual class shares), Canadian CEOs are much more able to mount takeover defences than the UK, and we could consequently expect to find an entrenchment threshold closer to that observed in the USA. The mean ownership level for CEOs in our sample is 8.5% and thus we would expect to find that the CEOs in our sample are entrenched and that increasing ownership will be detrimental to performance.

Board size is widely believed to be an important factor in determining the effectiveness of corporate governance (Pearce and Zahra, 1992; Jensen, 1993). Lipton and Lorsch (1992) advise that boards should be no larger than eight people, as larger boards are less likely to function efficiently and are easier for the CEO to control. Alternately, Singh and Harianto (1989) suggest that a larger board might disperse and therefore reduce CEO dominance. More recently, Golden and Zajac (2001) and Bonn *et al.* (2004) argue that these opposing arguments can be reconciled. They propose that very large boards are ineffective due to a lack of cohesiveness and problems with coordination, while very small boards have less expertise, and thus predict an inverted U-shaped relation. Eisenberg *et al.* (1998) measure the effect of board size on firm

performance in small and midsize Finnish firms. They find a significantly negative relation, showing that smaller boards in smaller firms lead to better performance. We therefore expect to also find an inverse relation.

Studies that examine the effect of CEO duality on performance generally support the proposal that a dual CEO/Chairperson is detrimental to firm performance. Rechner and Dalton (1991) find that firms which have separate CEO and Chairperson titleholders consistently outperform firms that have one person who combines the CEO/Chairperson title. Controlling for firm size, Pi and Timme (1993) achieve similar results. Brickley *et al.* (1997) find that the costs outweigh the benefits of CEO duality more for larger firms than small firms. Given this somewhat ambiguous evidence, we posit a negative relation between DUAL and TOBINQ.

We also examine the relationships between Quebec versus rest-of-Canada firms and performance. Given the different legal origins of Quebec and the rest of Canada and the work of La Porta *et al.* (1999) showing that legal origins help determine the level of investor protection in a country, we might expect to find that firms headquartered in Quebec, where the French Civil Code offers weaker protection, may have poorer performance. Alternatively, we may find that the fact that all TSX-listed stocks are required to meet Ontario Securities regulations may mean there are no significant differences based on province. Similarly, we investigate the effect of dual class structures, expecting increased SHRRTS to improve performance.

Various studies have provided evidence that cross-listing in the USA increases firm value (Doidge *et al.*, 2004; King and Segal, 2003). This has been attributed to increased secondary market turnover, reduced cost of capital, increased shareholder base and increased visibility. King and Segal conclude that Canadian firms cross-listed in the USA demonstrate higher valuations than Canadian-only exchange-listed stocks due to increased shareholder protection, and following this finding we expect to find a positive relation between cross-listing (LISTING) and TOBINQ.

As reviewed by Holmstron and Kaplan (2001), the extant literature suggests that capital markets in the USA perform a significant role in governance: firms that do not perform well are likely to be takeover targets, and managers of such firms are more likely to be dismissed. One might argue that firms that operate in industries that are takeover intensive may show better performance, given the threat of takeovers as a disciplining device. Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), however, show that the probability that a firm will be acquired as such does not significantly affect the firm's performance for large firms. We revisit this issue for our sample, using a similar variable that captures the takeover activity of the industry in which the firm operates.

The performance equation is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad - \qquad \qquad + \\
 \text{TOBINQ} = & f(\text{pay-performance sensitivity, debt, CEO ownership, board independence,} \\
 & - \qquad \qquad - \qquad \qquad -/0 \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad + \qquad \qquad + \\
 & \text{board size, CEO duality, Quebec, shareholder rights, takeover activity, cross-listing})
 \end{aligned}$$

4 Description of the data

The data in this study were compiled in a unique database for the companies in the S&P/TSX Small Cap Index over the years 1997 to 2004. This database includes financial, governance and compensation data that were collected from a wide range of sources. Financial data were obtained from the Reuters, Datastream and Financial Post databases, while the information about CEO compensation and governance variables were collected from individual firm proxy statements. A description of the data sources for the variables is provided in Appendix 1. After eliminating any observations that were incomplete, we were left with a sample of 94 companies, listed in Appendix 2, with a total of 470 observations.

To calculate pay-performance sensitivities (PAY), we used total CEO compensation as the independent variable in the Jensen-Murphy regressions. Total CEO compensation includes both salary, bonus, and the Black-Scholes value of option grants. PACQ, which measures corporate takeover activity, is calculated as the total number of takeover bids in a five-year period up to and including the current year, divided by the total number of firms in the two-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Industry.¹² MARKETCAP is the market capitalisation of the firm, in millions of dollars.

Descriptive statistics for the entire sample are shown in Table 1. Firms in the sample encompass a very wide range of asset sizes: from about \$2 million (First Calgary Petroleum) to \$18.6 billion (Laurentian Bank of Canada). These firms are still considered small caps, however as when we examine the market capitalisations, we find that, for example the market cap of the Laurentian Bank of Canada, which has the largest assets in the sample, represents only about 4% of its total assets. Shareholders equity will typically represent a smaller proportion of banking firms' total assets.¹⁴ About 31% of the firms are in the mining and resource sectors. Approximately 37% of firms in the sample have dual class/multiple voting rights structures and about 35% of the firms in our sample are also listed on US stock exchanges. Quebec-based firms account for about 19% of the sample. In 35% of the firms, the CEO is also the Chairperson of the board. Excluding the CEO, firms make extensive use of outsiders on their boards of directors, with over 90% of non-CEO board members being outsiders. Hence it is clear that these sample firms do qualify as TSX Best Practices firms in so far as their utilisation of outsiders on the boards. The median board size for the firms is eight, although there is considerable range in the sample (from 3 to 20 members).

Table 1 Sample statistics

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
BINDa	23.22	0	100	0	32.81
BINDb	91.11	100	100	0	14.08
DBVAL	0.183	0.156	0.849	0	0.183
OWN	8.74	1.02	70.20	0	17.46
PAY	0.0021	0.0001	0.1111	-0.0381	0.0160
PACQ	34.61	36.93	120.59	0	16.52
TOBINQ	1.66	1.07	10.04	0.02	1.55
BSIZE	8.74	8	20	3	2.64
DUAL	0.351	0	1	0	0.478
QUEBEC	0.191	0	1	0	0.394
ASSET	979.86	456.70	18 595.62	2.20	2015.03
SHRRTS	0.626	1	1	0	0.485
LISTED	0.353	0	1	0	0.478
RISK	15.09	12.60	59.37	2.60	9.42
IND	0.313	0	1	0	0.464
MARKETCAP	559	396	3400	3.50	578
<i>Total observations</i>	470				

Table 2 provides the simple correlation matrix of the variables of the model. One observation is that the two measures of board independence, which have been widely used in the literature (the tenure of the directors relative to the CEO vs. the proportion of outsiders on the boards (excluding the CEO) is quite low. This may reflect the high representation of outsiders on the boards in the sample overall, and the relatively small variation of this variable. The high negative correlation between board size and Tobin's Q suggests that smaller boards are more conducive to performance than larger boards. The negative correlation between the Quebec dummy variable and Tobin's Q appears to support the La Porta *et al.* (2002) contention that civil law as opposed to common law domains are detrimental to shareholder rights and in turn to company performance. The negative correlation of CEO ownership with Tobin's Q also provides some support for the management entrenchment hypothesis, with owner-managers' private benefits that are in excess of the cash flow returns expected from their direct stockholdings in the companies. The positive correlation between shareholder rights and performance is as expected, indicating that dual or multiple class share structures are detrimental to firm performance. We also note a high positive correlation between Tobin's Q and cross-listing, which supports our proposal that cross-listing will increase firm performance. However, we also find a high negative correlation between cross-listing and leverage, which is contrary to expectations. With the exception of debt with CEO ownership and board independence, all of the pairwise correlations between the control mechanisms are negative, suggesting that they are substitutes, as expected.

Table 2 provides the Pearson correlation matrix between the main variables of the model.

Table 2 Correlation matrix

	BIND _a	BIND _b	DBVAL	OWN	PAY	TOBINQ	BSIZE	DUAL	QUEBEC	ASSET	SHRRTS	LISTED	RISK	IND
BIND _a	1													
BIND _b	0.197	1												
DBVAL	0.020	0.092	1											
OWN	-0.334	-0.060	0.089	1										
PAY	-0.072	-0.027	-0.119	-0.099	1									
TOBINQ	-0.063	-0.109	-0.365	-0.110	0.031	1								
BFSIZE	0.112	0.187	0.5.17	0.038	-0.120	-0.283	1							
DUAL	-0.400	-0.130	-0.071	0.418	0.055	0.013	-0.170	1						
QUEBEC	-0.225	-0.102	0.233	0.203	-0.066	-0.114	0.242	0.175	1					
ASSET	0.086	0.126	0.562	-0.003	-0.051	-0.218	0.513	-0.103	0.233	1				
SHRRTS	-0.066	0.105	-0.083	-0.123	-0.007	0.064	-0.164	-0.020	-0.015	-0.180	1			
LISTED	-0.042	-0.095	-0.198	-0.096	0.126	0.245	-0.260	0.165	-0.032	-0.227	-0.228	1		
RISK	0.052	-0.075	-0.297	-0.151	0.066	0.280	-0.325	0.074	-0.170	-0.283	-0.029	0.472	1	
IND	0.006	-0.169	-0.303	-0.185	0.157	0.137	-0.401	-0.025	-0.235	-0.259	-0.009	0.356	0.349	1
YEARSMP	-0.040	-0.034	-0.076	-0.010	0.025	0.130	0.034	-0.096	0.052	0.072	0.064	-0.005	-0.130	-0.007

5 Results

5.1 OLS

Table 3 provides the OLS estimates of the equations of the model. We find that the determinants of board independence are largely as theory would predict. We find that when the CEO is the Chairperson, board independence will be lower. This implies that a CEO/Chair has the power to influence the selection of directors to ensure they are employed by the firm or elected after the CEO became a director, and therefore presumed to be less effective monitors. Interestingly we do note some differences between results according to the measure of board independence utilised. When considering the percentage of outsiders, we find that larger boards will be more outsider-dominated. This follows our predictions that the CEO will have relatively less power over a larger board. When using board directors' relative tenure, BINDa, CEO ownership is found to reduce the independence of the board, but this significance disappears when we use the proportion of insiders, BINDb. An interesting finding is the coefficient for the shareholder rights variable. As expected, more shareholder rights lead to a higher proportion of outsiders on the board, but a reduction in the tenure of board members relative to the CEO. This seems to highlight a focus on outsider directors being a preferred method of gaining board independence to having long-standing directors with proven track records, who preceded the CEO.

Table 3 provides OLS estimates of the governance mechanisms and performance equations of the model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BIND}_t = & a_{10} + \beta_{13}\text{OWN}_t + \beta_{1.16}\text{PACQ}_t + \beta_{16}\text{BSIZE}_t + \beta_{17}\text{DUAL}_t \\ & + \beta_{1.11}\text{SHRRTS}_t + \beta_{1.12}\text{ASSET}_t + \beta_{1.13}\text{RISK}_t + \beta_{1.14}\text{IND}_t \\ & + \beta_{15}\text{YEAR}_t + \varepsilon_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DBVAL}_t = & a_{20} + \beta_{21}\text{BIND}_t + \beta_{24}\text{PAY}_t + \beta_{2.16}\text{PACQ}_t + \beta_{28}\text{TOBINLAG}_{t1} \\ & + \beta_{2.10}\text{LISTING}_t + \beta_{2.11}\text{SHRRTS}_t + \beta_{2.12}\text{ASSET}_t + \beta_{2.13}\text{RISK}_t \\ & + \beta_{2.14}\text{IND}_t + \beta_{2.15}\text{YEAR}_t + \varepsilon_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{OWN}_t = & a_{30} + \beta_{31}\text{BIND}_t + \beta_{3.16}\text{PACQ}_t + \beta_{37}\text{DUAL}_t + \beta_{3.10}\text{LISTING}_t \\ & + \beta_{3.11}\text{SHRRTS}_t + \beta_{3.12}\text{ASSET}_t + \beta_{3.13}\text{RISK}_t + \beta_{3.14}\text{IND}_t \\ & + \beta_{3.15}\text{YEAR}_t + \varepsilon_3 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PAY}_t = & a_{40} + \beta_{41}\text{BIND}_t + \beta_{42}\text{DBVAL}_t + \beta_{4.16}\text{PACQ}_t + \beta_{49}\text{QUEBEC}_t \\ & + \beta_{4.11}\text{SHRRTS}_t + \beta_{4.12}\text{ASSET}_t + \beta_{4.13}\text{RISK}_t + \beta_{4.14}\text{IND}_t \\ & + \beta_{4.15}\text{YEAR}_t + \varepsilon_4 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TOBINQ}_t = & a_{50} + \beta_{51}\text{BIND}_t + \beta_{52}\text{DBVAL}_t + \beta_{53}\text{OWN}_t + \beta_{54}\text{PAY}_t + \beta_{5.16}\text{PACQ}_t \\ & + \beta_{56}\text{BSIZE}_t + \beta_{57}\text{DUAL}_t + \beta_{59}\text{QUEBEC}_t + \beta_{5.10}\text{LISTING}_t \\ & + \beta_{5.11}\text{SHRRTS}_t + \beta_{5.15}\text{YEAR}_t + \varepsilon_5 \end{aligned}$$

We run regressions for each equation using both measures of board independence (BINDa and BINDb), which are reported in alternate columns.

Table 3 OLS regression results

Independent variable	Dependent variable									
	Board independence		Debt/Value		CEO ownership		Pay		Performance	
	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb
Constant	2698.919	1278.291	22.799	22.861	-681.484	-973.056	-0.174	-0.229	-205.889	-208.335
	0.110	0.103	0.004***	0.004***	0.427	0.267	0.850	0.804	0.010***	0.010***
BIND			0.000	0.000	-0.102	-0.012	0.000	0.000	-0.004	-0.007
			0.337	0.565	0.000***	0.817	0.067	0.927	0.099*	0.143
DBVAL							-0.008	-0.008	-2.291	-2.276
							0.111	0.113	0.000***	0.000***
PAY			-0.726	-0.699					-4.564	-3.987
			0.075*	0.086*					0.270	0.334
OWN	-0.390	-0.014							-0.007	-0.005
	0.000***	0.728							0.134	0.237
PACQ	-0.066	-0.062	0.001	0.001	0.085	0.096	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.004
	0.480	0.158	0.180	0.180	0.076	0.049	0.475	0.523	0.335	0.322
BSIZE	0.576	0.648							-0.052	-0.048
	0.378	0.033**							0.094*	0.129
DUAL	-21.850	-3.153			13.195	16.017			-0.103	-0.048
	0.000***	0.036**			0.000***	0.000***			0.532	0.765
TOBINLAG			-0.030	-0.030						
			0.000***	0.000***						
QUEBEC							-0.002	-0.001	-0.125	-0.112
							0.343	0.606	0.486	0.531
LISTING			0.034	0.035	-4.681	-4.503			0.624	0.629
			0.043**	0.035**	0.009***	0.014**			0.000***	0.000***
ASSET	0.001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.000		
	0.524	0.236	0.000***	0.000***	0.087	0.056**	0.345	0.469		
SHRRTS	-5.144	4.115	0.020	0.022	-6.580	-6.143	0.000	0.000	0.143	0.194
	0.080*	0.003***	0.160	0.128	0.000***	0.000***	0.866	0.928	0.322	0.183
RISK	0.233	0.021	-0.002	-0.002	-0.144	-0.179	0.000	0.000		
	0.156	0.784	0.017**	0.013	0.101	0.045**	0.975	0.954		
IND	-3.653	-4.372	-0.053	-0.055	-3.362	-3.143	0.004	0.004**		
	0.305	0.008***	0.001***	0.001	0.054*	0.082*	0.031	0.029		
YEAR	-1.333	-0.595	-0.011	-0.011	0.347	0.492	0.000	0.000	0.104	0.105
	0.114	0.128	0.005***	0.005	0.418	0.261	0.846	0.801	0.010*	0.009*
Adjusted R2	0.201	0.065	0.425	0.424	0.275	0.245	0.021	0.014	0.179	0.178
p (F-Stat)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.026	0.078	0.000	0.000

Notes: P-values are given under each coefficient. * indicates significance at 10% level, ** significance at 5% level, and *** significance at 1% level.

In the debt ratio equation, we find that the results largely concur with the hypothesised results, whichever measure of board independence is utilised. There is an inverse relationship between the amount of debt the company will take on and (a) the degree of pay-performance sensitivity; (b) the performance of the company in the previous year; (c) the size of the company; and (d) the volatility of the company's stock. The PAY relationship confirms our hypothesis that debt and pay sensitivity are substitute mechanisms, consistent with John and John (1993). The inverse relation between lagged

performance and leverage shows that firms that performed well in the previous year have improved their internal financial condition and can therefore rely less on external capital markets. Larger firms having higher leverage ratios reflects the lower bankruptcy costs faced and the inverse relation between risk and leverage demonstrates that bondholders do not like risky debt. We confirm our hypothesis that cross-listing provides greater access to capital markets and hence increases leverage. We also find that resource firms utilise debt less and that over time debt use has decreased. We do not, however, find any significant relation between board independence and the use of debt.

Similarly, many of the results for the CEO ownership equation are as we predicted. For both definitions of BIND, we found that CEO duality leads to greater share ownership, lending support to the hypothesis that the more power the CEO has, the more willing he or she will be to hold a large share of the firm's stock. Additionally, we found that when shareholders rights are weaker, the CEO increases her share. This seems to show that CEOs do not see full alignment between the rights of shareholders and their own rights. It also suggests that CEOs further entrench themselves to protect their power and stock position by mounting takeover defences. In this way, holding a large share of the company may seem less risky to the CEO because he or she has protected his/her role as CEO, using dual class shares. As expected, we find an inverse relation between risk and ownership, showing that CEOs are willing to reduce their diversification benefits by holding company stock in their portfolios, but they become less willing when the firm's risk increases. The coefficient for LISTING is negative and significant, which, following LLSV (1997) and Burkart and Panunzi (2004), implies that shareholder protection and ownership concentration are substitutes and that legal protection and monitoring are complements. We also find that when more of the board are pre-CEO members, the CEO owns a larger share of the company. This may be a hint as to the characteristics of firms where both the CEO and other board members are heavily invested in the firm, either in time or stock holdings.

The results for the pay sensitivity equation are somewhat disappointing. The only consistent result is that resource firms base compensation more on performance than non-resource firms, as expected. When using BINDa, however, we confirm our hypothesis that board independence and pay-for-performance are substitute mechanisms, *i.e.*, more independent boards lead to CEO pay being less based on performance. We did not find any significant relationship between pay sensitivity and the debt ratio, firm size, risk, or the level of shareholder protection.

The results of the performance equation regression are mixed. We find that less independent boards lead to better firm performance, and find no significant relation between pay-performance sensitivity and performance. The negative relation between leverage and performance indicates that the risk of debt impedes performance, rather than bank monitoring improving performance. Contrary to the findings of Ang *et al.* (2000), we note an inverse relation between CEO ownership and performance, which would indicate that entrenchment rather than interests alignment is occurring in Canadian small caps, although this result is not statistically significant.

In accordance with Eisenberg *et al.* (1998), we find an inverse relation between board size and performance, although the coefficient is only weakly significant when using BINDa. The authors state that this shows that problems of communication and coordination can still be found in smaller corporations. This result disappeared, however, when taking simultaneity into account. We did not find shareholder rights, having

headquarters in Quebec, or CEO duality to have any significant effect on performance. However, we do corroborate the findings of authors such as King and Segal (2003), who find a positive effect on firm value from cross-listing.

5.2 Simultaneous equations

As discussed, many researchers have examined agency issues using simple regression techniques that ignore the simultaneously determined nature of the various control mechanisms and performance. In neglecting this aspect of the variables, the results are rendered unreliable or even meaningless because the coefficients derived are inefficient. To determine whether there is a simultaneity bias in the OLS regression results, we performed Hausman (1978) tests, the results of which are reported in Table 4. Most of the control mechanisms were found to be endogenous along with the performance measure Tobin's Q, justifying simultaneous equation estimation. In a few cases, where simultaneous equation bias was not found and the variables were not significant in OLS, the variables were excluded from the 2SLS estimation. Variables deemed exogenous in the Hausman (1978) were treated as such in the 2SLS results.

Table 4 Hausman (1978) tests of endogeneity

	<i>Residual coefficient</i>	<i>Std error</i>	<i>T-statistic</i>	<i>Significance</i>
BINDa				
A OWN in the BIND equation	7.27037	0.20994	34.630	0.00000
B PAY in DBVAL equation	87.29976	2.43019	35.92303	0.00000
C BIND in the DBVAL equation	-0.00048	0.00049	-0.98051	0.32735
D DBVAL in the PAY equation	0.08078	0.01610	5.01847	0.00000
E BIND in the PAY equation	-0.00002	0.00006	-0.38847	0.69785
F PAY in the TOBINQ equation	32.81585	38.89266	0.84375	0.39925
G DBVAL in the TOBINQ equation	4.82969	0.78369	6.16272	0.00000
H BIND in the TOBINQ equation	-0.09582	0.02825	-3.39140	0.00076
I OWN in the TOBINQ equation	0.04019	0.03261	1.23239	0.21844
J BIND in the OWN equation	2.47333	0.02415	102.41197	0.00000
BINDb				
A OWN in the BIND equation	0.93837	0.36041	2.604	0.00952
B PAY in DBVAL equation	108.66894	1.67830	64.74937	0.00000
C BIND in the DBVAL equation	-0.01052	0.00287	-3.65974	0.00028
D DBVAL in the PAY equation	0.07972	0.01621	4.91863	0.00000
E BIND in the PAY equation	0.00045	0.00034	1.33863	0.18135
F PAY in the TOBINQ equation	46.97312	39.50676	1.18899	0.23506
G DBVAL in the TOBINQ equation	4.81332	0.78729	6.11380	0.00000
H BIND in the TOBINQ equation	-0.07259	0.03747	-1.93718	0.05334
I OWN in the TOBINQ equation	0.04243	0.02958	1.43435	0.15216
J BIND in the OWN equation	1.54822	0.51473	3.00783	0.00278

This table reports the Hausman tests for endogeneity of the control mechanisms and company performance. They are two-stage tests. For two variables, X and Y , in the first stage we regress the suspect endogenous X variable on its determinants. The residual vector of this regression is then used as an independent variable in the equation for Y . If the coefficient on the residual variable is significant (at 5%) in the second stage regression, then simultaneous equation estimation is validated. In Table 4, we report the pairwise tests, along with the estimated residual coefficient of the model.

We report the 2SLS results in Table 5. The findings for the board independence equation tend to agree with those found in the OLS regressions. We did find, however, that the significance of the CEO duality coefficient disappeared, suggesting that the relationship found in the OLS results was a consequence of simultaneous equation bias. We also find that the effect of shareholder rights on outside board membership disappears but the negative impact on board tenure remains. Whereas risk was found to be a significant determinant of leverage in the OLS regressions, it ceases to have explanatory power in the endogenous treatment of leverage. Pay-performance sensitivity, lagged performance, and firm size are the remaining significant determinants in the complete model. Overall, the results for the level of CEO ownership equation concur with the OLS findings. Only relative board tenure loses explanatory power for CEO ownership.

In accordance with the OLS results, the 2SLS results show that mining and resource firms tend to provide more performance-based pay structures. In other words, these firms tend to have compensation packages for their CEOs that are non-salary related.

The negative relationships between governance mechanisms found in our study support our first main hypothesis that the mechanisms are substitutes: where one particular mechanism may be used less, an alternative will compensate.

However, based on the 2SLS findings for the Tobin's Q equation, we cannot conclude that Canadian small-cap firms are deploying control mechanisms optimally, as was found by Agrawal and Knoeber (1996) for US firms. Canadian small-cap firms appear to overutilise debt as a control mechanism. Given that small-cap firms face higher potential bankruptcy costs, this deviation from the findings of Chirinko and Schaller (2004), who identified a negative but insignificant relation in large-cap corporations, is unsurprising. The level of board independence, however, does appear to be optimal. Contrary to our predictions, when using outside board members as the measure of board independence, we find that Quebec-based firms actually outperformed firms from the rest of Canada. In addition, unlike Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), we show that the probability that a firm will be acquired as such (measured as an industry-specific variable for each firm) does significantly affect the firm's performance, even when simultaneity between governance mechanisms and firm performance is accounted for. This suggests that the market for corporate control as a disciplinary device may be more effective for smaller firms. We do not find any significant discount to performance for firms with dual or multiple voting class shares structures. It is interesting to note that unlike the OLS estimates, which were consistent with the results of the OLS estimates of Eisenberg *et al.* (1998) for US small caps, board size has a significantly *positive* effect on performance in 2SLS for Canadian small caps. In accordance with the OLS results, cross-listing has a significantly positive effect on performance (when using board tenure as the board independence measure).

Table 5 2SLS results

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable									
	Board Independence		Debt/Value		CEO Ownership		Pay		Performance	
	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb
Constant	2046.835	761.161	16.000	14.346	-260.599	-415.138	-0.170	-0.159	-107.732	-171.097
	0.276	0.437	0.484	0.497	0.786	0.679	0.862	0.872	0.315	0.162
BIND			-0.001	0.001	-0.242	-0.416	0.000	0.000	-0.009	0.075
			0.195	0.801	0.046*	0.132	0.067*	0.931	0.754	0.138
DBVAL							-0.008	-0.011	-7.105	-8.757
							0.528	0.418	0.000***	0.000***
PAY			-23.659	-20.873					-7.255	-6.326
			0.102*	0.094*					0.248	0.295
PACQ	0.019	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.068	0.069	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.013
	0.870	0.917	0.960	0.892	0.186	0.206	0.479	0.543	0.071*	0.043**
OWN	-1.161	-0.626							-0.007	-0.003
	0.041**	0.035**							0.576	0.592
BFSIZE	0.723	0.765							0.105	0.052
	0.310	0.040**							0.021**	0.434
DUAL	-9.809	6.396			9.274	14.412			-0.244	0.064
	0.296	0.192			0.013**	0.000***			0.657	0.798
TOBINLAG			-0.028	-0.027						
			0.021**	0.018**						
QUEBEC							-0.002	-0.001	0.060	0.646
							0.355	0.649	0.896	0.113
LISTING			0.096	0.093	-4.909	-4.150			0.559	0.537
			0.117	0.096	0.009	0.034			0.002***	0.019**
ASSET	0.000	0.000	0.0001	0.0001	-0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000		
	0.954	0.988	0.000***	0.000***	0.220	0.370	0.529	0.525		
SHRRTS	-9.056	1.012	0.027	0.024	-7.111	-4.512	0.000	0.000	0.088	-0.193
	0.033	0.648	0.507	0.583	0.000***	0.024	0.866	0.931	0.694	0.528
RISK	0.038	-0.134	-0.003	-0.003	-0.096	-0.185	0.000	0.000		
	0.867	0.257	0.270	0.182	0.335	0.052	0.978	0.907		
IND	-6.392	-6.544	0.045	0.040	-3.751	-5.368	0.004	0.004		
	0.139	0.004	0.556	0.560	0.042**	0.027**	0.037**	0.039**		
YEAR	-1.004	-0.335	-0.008	-0.007	0.139	0.232	0.000	0.000	0.055	0.083
	0.284	0.494	0.490	0.498	0.771	0.641	0.858	0.868	0.304	0.171
Wald Test χ^2	350.995	14352.510	150.314	185.642	309.800	281.805	25.084	218.24	627.415	381.339
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.016	0.000	0.000

Notes: P-values are given under each coefficient. * indicates significance at 10% level, ** significance at 5% level, and *** significance at 1% level.

5.3 Robustness tests

For robustness, following McConnell and Servaes (1990), we exclude financial firms from our sample and perform all tests again. The rationale for this is given by Agrawal and Knoeber (1996, p.389), who state, “definition of assets for financial firms causes their [Tobin’s] Q to be systematically different from that for other firms”. Of the 94 companies in our original sample, four are financial firms. Thus, excluding these firms leaves us with a sample of 90 companies and 446 observations. In Table 6, we show simple statistics for the adjusted sample, the majority of which are largely unchanged. Notably however, the maximum and mean total assets decreased from 18.5 billion and

0.9 billion respectively to 6 billion and 0.7 billion. In addition, the maximum leverage ratio decreased from 0.85 to 0.65. The simple correlations are not qualitatively altered and as such we do not report them.

The results for the OLS regressions are given in Table 7. These are broadly the same as for the original sample. In the board independence equation the coefficients on both ASSET and RISK become significant when using relative board tenure. The results also show that the explanatory power of stock volatility for leverage is only significant when financial firms are considered. In turn, leverage becomes a significant determinant of pay sensitivity. In the performance equation, CEO ownership ceases to be an important factor.

Table 6 Sample statistics with financial firms excluded

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Std. Dev.</i>
BINDa	23.21	0	100	0	33.05
BINDb	90.68	100	100	0	14.31
DBVAL	0.165	0.145	0.648	0	0.153
OWN	8.27	1.02	70.20	0	17.02
PAY	0.0021	0.0001	0.1111	-0.0381	0.0164
PACQ	33.51	34.58	120.59	0	15.72
TOBIN	1.71	1.13	10.04	0.02	1.57
BSIZE	8.59	8	20	3	2.56
DUAL	0.365	0	1	0	0.482
QUEBEC	0.188	0	1	0	0.391
ASSET	732.15	427.27	6070.50	2.20	941.72
SHRRTS	0.632	1	1	0	0.483
LISTING	0.372	0	1	0	0.484
RISK	15.49	13.13	59.37	2.60	9.48
IND	0.330	0	1	0	0.471
MARKETCAP	566	399	3400	3.5	590
<i>Total observations</i>	446				

Table 7 OLS regression results with financial firms excluded

Independent variable	Dependent variable									
	Board independence		Debt/Value		CEO ownership		Pay		Performance	
	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb
Constant	2649.326	1410.610	18.463	18.472	-600.491	-780.383	-0.278	-0.335	-207.436	-212.531
	0.130	0.086	0.010	0.011	0.489	0.376	0.773	0.730	0.012	0.011
BIND			0.000	0.000	-0.088	-0.045	0.000	0.000	-0.005	-0.007
			0.005	0.320	0.000	0.377	0.080	0.882	0.021	0.154
DBVAL							-0.011	-0.011	-3.417	-3.353
							0.068	0.089	0.000	0.000
PAY			-0.732	-0.672					-4.627	-3.946
			0.040	0.061					0.267	0.344
OWN	-0.352	-0.043							-0.003	-0.001
	0.000	0.333							0.578	0.833
PACQ	-0.060	-0.099	0.001	0.001	-0.024	-0.024	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.007
	0.553	0.039	0.113	0.131	0.629	0.639	0.635	0.639	0.094	0.108
BSIZE	-0.302	0.639							-0.046	-0.044
	0.675	0.060							0.140	0.171
DUAL	-23.381	-2.409			13.804	16.147			-0.188	-0.091
	0.000	0.125			0.000	0.000			0.264	0.576
TOBINLAG			-0.027	-0.027						
			0.000	0.000						
QUEBEC							-0.001	-0.001	-0.187	-0.152
							0.502	0.773	0.316	0.414
LISTING			0.033	0.036	-3.943	-3.765			0.628	0.636
			0.024	0.013	0.026	0.036			0.000	0.000
ASSET	0.004	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		
	0.041	0.512	0.000	0.000	0.649	0.854	0.644	0.790		
SHRRTS	-5.334	4.369	0.005	0.010	-4.531	-3.932	-0.001	-0.001	0.119	0.185
	0.079	0.002	0.680	0.459	0.004	0.014	0.573	0.659	0.424	0.220
RISK	0.282	0.026	-0.001	-0.001	-0.124	-0.158	0.000	0.000		
	0.093	0.745	0.120	0.067	0.156	0.074	0.949	0.980		
IND	-3.201	-4.615	-0.036	-0.039	-3.638	-3.774	0.004	0.004		
	0.379	0.007	0.014	0.008	0.039	0.037	0.033	0.033		
YEAR	-1.306	-0.661	-0.009	-0.009	0.307	0.397	0.000	0.000	0.105	0.108
	0.135	0.107	0.011	0.012	0.479	0.367	0.769	0.726	0.011	0.010
Adjusted R2	0.202	0.059	0.375	0.365	0.264	0.242	0.023	0.016	0.203	0.197
p (F-Stat)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.024	0.065	0.000	0.000

Notes: P-values are given under each coefficient. * indicates significance at 10% level, ** significance at 5% level, and *** significance at 1% level.

Table 8 reports the Hausman tests for the sample that excludes financial firms.

Table 8 Hausman (1978) tests of endogeneity with financial firms excluded

	<i>Residual coefficient</i>	<i>Std error</i>	<i>T-statistic</i>	<i>Significance</i>
BINDa				
A OWN in the BIND equation	8.46277	0.247860	34.14331	0.00000
B PAY in DBVAL equation	74.65526	1.30403975	57.24922	0.00000
C BIND in the DBVAL equation	-0.00020	0.00043777	-0.45674	0.64809
D DBVAL in the PAY equation	0.10527	0.018561036	5.67181	0.00000
E BIND in the PAY equation	-0.00001	.000006	-0.12563	0.90008
F PAY in the TOBINQ equation	80.96352	41.4262991	1.95440	0.05130
G DBVAL in the TOBINQ equation	8.66833	0.9846174	8.80375	0.00000
H BIND in the TOBINQ equation	-0.01237	0.0189827	-0.65138	0.51514
I OWN in the TOBINQ equation	0.01859	0.0369863	0.50270	0.61543
J BIND in the OWN equation	2.80326	0.015504	180.81408	0.00000
BINDb				
A OWN in the BIND equation	3.50511	0.373488	9.38479	0.00000
B PAY in DBVAL equation	90.00276	0.73616204	122.25945	0.00000
C BIND in the DBVAL equation	-0.00490	0.00266220	-1.83897	0.06660
D DBVAL in the PAY equation	0.09923	0.018870120	5.25880	0.00000
E BIND in the PAY equation	0.00030	0.000357441	0.82727	0.40854
F PAY in the TOBINQ equation	83.91369	41.6286768	2.01577	0.04444
G DBVAL in the TOBINQ equation	8.71640	0.9841726	8.85658	0.00000
H BIND in the TOBINQ equation	-0.05226	0.0368516	-1.41804	0.15690
I OWN in the TOBINQ equation	0.01466	0.0345338	0.42447	0.67143
J BIND in the OWN equation	4.75781	0.455264	10.45066	0.00000

Table 9 provides the results of the 2SLS regressions. These results do not differ greatly from our previous findings; however, there are a few notable changes. When financial firms are removed, the support for John and John's (1993) contention of an inverse relation between pay sensitivity and leverage disappears. In the CEO ownership equation, excluding financial firms increases the significance of both board independence measures. Simultaneously, when financial firms are excluded, we find evidence that Canadian small-cap firms are overutilising pay-for-performance. The positive effect of QUEBEC disappears when removing financial firms from the sample.

Table 9 2SLS results with financial firms excluded

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable									
	Board Independence		Debt/Value		CEO Ownership		Pay		Performance	
	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb	BINDa	BINDb
Constant	1854.849	911.834	9.745	11.664	132.813	188.633	-0.334	-0.353	-101.580	-108.675
	0.364	0.383								
BIND			-0.001	0.000	-0.347	-0.678	0.000	0.000	-0.011	-0.009
			0.095	0.629	0.011	0.032	0.090	0.883	0.025	0.251
DBVAL							-0.009	-0.010	-12.382	-12.759
							0.606	0.581	0.000	0.000
PAY			-21.510	-15.825					-92.232	-89.441
			0.127	0.107					0.257	0.250
PACQ	-0.071	-0.105	0.000	0.000	-0.039	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.015
	0.544	0.078	0.915	0.785	0.499	0.185	0.625	0.637	0.110	0.097
OWN	-1.457	-0.737							-0.006	-0.002
	0.014	0.015							0.635	0.852
BFSIZE	-0.230	0.684							0.138	0.150
	0.781	0.107							0.062	0.043
DUAL	-5.874	8.582			6.405	13.791			-0.047	0.158
	0.556	0.094			0.129	0.000			0.894	0.680
TOBINLAG			-0.023	-0.024						
			0.046	0.009						
QUEBEC							-0.002	-0.001	-0.019	0.106
							0.500	0.781	0.957	0.750
LISTING			0.088	0.080	-4.315	-3.049			0.758	0.769
			0.123	0.066	0.032	0.150			0.015	0.013
ASSET	0.004	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000		
	0.056	0.491	0.005	0.000	0.236	0.308	0.846	0.889		
SHRRTS	-8.850	2.161	0.001	0.009	-5.688	-1.034	-0.001	-0.001	-0.084	0.023
	0.025	0.283	0.976	0.757	0.002	0.657	0.584	0.663	0.738	0.926
RISK	0.037	-0.128	-0.002	-0.002	-0.024	-0.154	0.000	0.000		
	0.872	0.280	0.446	0.255	0.833	0.136	0.931	0.987		
IND	-7.652	-7.410	0.056	0.027	-3.946	-7.163	0.004	0.004		
	0.110	0.003	0.462	0.624	0.049	0.008	0.033	0.034		
YEAR	-0.904	-0.409	-0.005	-0.006	-0.056	-0.058	0.000	0.000	0.052	0.056
	0.376	0.434	0.665	0.499	0.915	0.918	0.744	0.733	0.480	0.454
Wald Test χ^2	298.617	12263.5	128.252	215.382	238.541	217.866	23.610	20.866	329.850	324.619
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.022	0.000	0.000

6 Conclusion

Most of the literature on governance-performance linkage to date has focused on large-cap companies, or companies headquartered in the USA. A few studies to date have appeared on the governance characteristics of small-cap corporations. Our paper serves to extend the international evidence to Canada, which should be a useful testing ground relative to the USA, due to differences in the regulatory environment, the legal environment, and the greater prevalence of dual or multiple class voting structures for shares.

Our findings show some similarities and some striking differences with results on the interactions between control mechanisms and performance found for the US firms. Similarly to US studies, our results show that simultaneity exists between various governance mechanisms and firm performance. We also find evidence to support the hypothesis that alternative governance mechanisms are substitutes.

With regard to the interactions between control mechanisms, we find that CEO ownership and shareholder rights are shown to determine board independence. CEO ownership in turn is shown to depend on the extent of shareholder rights and whether the CEO is also Chairperson of the board. Relative board tenure is also found to be an important determinant of pay-performance sensitivity. When excluding financial firms, board independence also has significant explanatory power on CEO ownership. Our results also demonstrate the importance of the definition of board independence.

Unlike Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), we do find a significant impact of certain governance mechanisms on performance when taking into account the endogeneity of the variables. In particular, Canadian small-cap firms appear to overutilise debt as a control mechanism. In addition, unlike Agrawal and Knoeber (1996), we show that the probability that a firm will be acquired as such (measured as an industry-specific variable for each firm) does significantly affect the firm's performance, even when simultaneity between governance mechanisms and firm performance is accounted for.

We find evidence that Quebec-based firms actually outperformed firms from the rest of Canada, but this is only significant when using outsiders on the board as the board independence measure and including financial firms. We do not find any significant discount to performance for firms with dual or multiple voting class share structures, but we do note a premium for firms cross-listed on a US exchange.

Our results provide some interesting insights into the determination of various governance mechanisms and confirm that Canadian small-cap firms do not optimally determine the level of these control mechanisms. In the future we will extend this study to consider the effects of the externally determined market for corporate control and further investigate the impact of ownership structure, including family ownership and the effect of external blockholders.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Chris Bart, Sandra Betton, Thomas Walker and participants at the *27th Annual McMasters World Congress in Corporate Governance* for their comments. Financial support from the SSHRC (Grant # 410-2001-0613) to Switzer is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Aggarwal, R.K. and Chamwick, A.A. (1999) 'The other side of the trade-off: the impact of risk on executive compensation', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107, pp.65-105.
- Aghion, P. and Bolton, P. (1992) 'An incomplete contracting approach to financial contracting', *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 59, pp.473-494.
- Agrawal, A. and Knoeber, C. (1996) 'Firm performance and mechanisms to control agency problems between managers and shareholders', *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 31, pp.377-397.

- Allaire, Y. and Firsirotu, M. (2005) *Beyond Monks and Minnow: From Fiduciary to Value-Creating Governance*, Forstrat International Press.
- Ang, J.S., Cole, R.A. and Lin, J.W. (2000) 'Agency costs and ownership structure', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 55, pp.81–106.
- Attig, N. and Gadhoun, Y. (2003) 'The governance of Canadian traded firms', *Working Paper*.
- Banz, R.W. (1981) 'The relationship between return and market value of common stocks', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 9, pp.3–18.
- Baumol, W. (1959) *Business Behavior, Value and Growth*, New York: Macmillan.
- Berle, Jr., A.A. and Means, G.C. (1932) *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, New York: Macmillan.
- Bonn, I., Yoshikawa, T. and Phan, P. (2004) 'Effects of board structure on firm performance: a comparison between Japan and Australia', *Asian Business and Management*, Vol. 3, pp.105–125.
- Boyd, B.K. (1994) 'Board control and CEO compensation', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, pp.335–344.
- Brick, I.E., Palia, D. and Wang, C.-J. (2005) 'Simultaneous estimation of CEO compensation, leverage and board characteristics on firm value', *Working Paper*.
- Brickley, J.A., Coles, J.L. and Jarrell, G. (1997) 'Leadership structure: separating the CEO and Chairman of the Board', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 3, pp.189–220.
- Burkart, M. and Panunzi, F. (2004) 'Agency conflicts, ownership concentration and legal shareholder protection', *Working Paper*.
- Calvo, G.A. and Wellisz, S. (1979) 'Hierarchy, ability and income distribution', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 87, pp.991–1010.
- Chen, C., Guo, W. and Mande, V. (2003) 'Managerial ownership and firm valuation: evidence from Japanese firms', *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, Vol. 11, pp.267–283.
- Chirinko, R.S. and Schaller, H. (2004) 'A revealed preference approach to understanding corporate governance problems: evidence from Canada', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 74, pp.181–206.
- Chung, K.H. and Pruitt, S.W. (1994) 'A simple approximation of Tobin's Q', *Financial Management*, Vol. 23, pp.70–81.
- Chung, K.H. and Pruitt, S.W. (1996) 'Executive ownership, corporate value and executive compensation: a unifying framework', *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 20, pp.1135–1159.
- Coffee, J. (1999) 'The future as history: the prospects for global convergence in corporate governance and its implications', *Northwestern University Law Review*, Vol. 93, pp.641–708.
- Core, J.E., Guay, W.R. and Larcker, D.F. (2003) 'Executive equity compensation and incentives: a survey', *Economic Policy Review*, Vol. 9, pp.27–50.
- Craighead, J., Magnan, M. and Thorne, L. (2004) 'The impact of mandated disclosure on performance-based CEO compensation', *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 21, pp.1–30.
- Dalton, D. and Kesner, I. (1987) 'Composition and CEO duality in boards of directors: an international perspective', *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 18, pp.33–42.
- Demsetz, H. and Lehn, K. (1985) 'The structure of corporate ownership: causes and consequences', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93, pp.1155–1177.
- Denis, D. and McConnell, J. (2003) 'International corporate governance', *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 38, pp.1–36.
- Dimson, E. and Marsh, P. (1999) 'Murphy's law and market anomalies', *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 25, pp.53–69.
- Dixit, A. (2004) *Lawlessness and Economics: Alternative Modes of Governance*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Doidge, C.G. (2004) 'US cross-listings and the private benefits of control: evidence from dual-class firms', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 72, pp.519–553.
- Doidge, C.G., Karolyi, A. and Stulz, R.M. (2004) 'Why are foreign firms listed in the US worth more?', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 71, pp.205–238.
- Eisenberg, T., Sundgren, S. and Wells, M.T. (1998) 'Larger board size and decreasing firm value in small firms', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 48, pp.35–54.
- Eun, C., Huang, W. and Lai, S. (2003) 'International diversification with large- and small-cap stocks', *Working Paper*, Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Fama, E.F. (1980) 'Agency problems and the theory of the firm', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 88, pp.288–307.
- Fama, E.F. and French, K.R. (2004) 'New lists: fundamentals and survival rates', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 73, pp.229–269.
- Fama, E.F. and Jensen, M.C. (1983) 'Separation of ownership and control', *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 27, pp.301–315.
- Firth, M., Tam, M. and Tang, M. (1999) 'The determinants of top management pay', *Omega*, Vol. 27, pp.617–635.
- Garvey, G.T. (1997) 'Marketable incentive contracts and capital structure relevance', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, pp.353–378.
- Gerhart, B. and Milkovich, G.T. (1990) 'Organisational differences in managerial compensation and financial performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, pp.663–691.
- Ghosh, C. and Sirmans, C.F. (2003) 'Board independence, ownership structure and performance: evidence from real estate investment trusts', *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, Vol. 26, pp.287–318.
- Golden, B.R. and Zajac, E.J. (2001) 'When will boards influence strategy? Inclination times power equals strategic change', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 22, pp.1087–1096.
- Grossman, S. and Hart, O. (1982) 'Corporate financial structure and managerial incentives', in J. McCall, *The Economics of Information and Uncertainty*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.123–155.
- Guercio, D., Dann, L. and Partch, M. (2003) 'Governance and boards of directors in closed-end investment companies', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 69, pp.111–152.
- Gul, F.A. and Qiu, H. (2002) 'Legal protection, corporate governance and information asymmetry in emerging financial markets', *Working Paper*.
- Harris, M. and Raviv, A. (1990) 'Capital structure and the information role of debt', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 45, pp.321–350.
- Hausman, J. (1978) 'Specification test in econometrics', *Econometrica*, Vol. 46, pp.1251–1271.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. (1991) 'The effects of board composition and direct incentives on firm performance', *Financial Management*, Vol. 20, pp.101–112.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. (2003) 'Boards of directors as an endogenously determined institution: a survey of the economic literature', *Economic Policy Review*, Vol. 9, pp.7–26.
- Holmstrom, B. and Kaplan, S. (2001) 'Corporate governance and merger activity in the United States: making sense of the 1980s and 1990s', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 15, pp.121–149.
- Jensen, M.C. (1986) 'Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance and takeovers', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 76, pp.323–329.
- Jensen, M.C. (1993) 'The modern industrial revolution, exit and the failure of internal control systems', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, pp.831–880.
- Jensen, M.C. and Meckling, W.H. (1976) 'Theory of the firm and managerial behaviour, agency costs and ownership structure', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 3, pp.305–360.
- Jensen, M.C. and Murphy, K. (1990) 'Performance pay and top management incentives', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 98, pp.225–264.

- John, T.A. and John, K. (1993) 'Top-management compensation and capital structure', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, pp.949–974.
- King, M.R. and Segal, D. (2003) 'Corporate governance, international cross listing and home bias', *Canadian Investment Review*, Vol. 16, pp.8–18.
- Klein, P., Shapiro, D. and Young, J. (2003) 'Corporate governance, family ownership and firm value: the Canadian evidence', *Working Paper*, Simon Fraser University.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. (1999) 'Corporate ownership around the world', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 54, pp.471–517.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1997) 'Legal determinants of external finance', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, pp.1131–1150.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1998) 'Law and finance', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 106, pp.1113–1155.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (2000) 'Investor protection and corporate governance', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 58, pp.3–27.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (2002) 'Investor protection and corporate valuation', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 57, pp.1147–1170.
- Lambert, R.A. and Larcker, D.F. (1985) 'Executive compensation, corporate decision-making and shareholder wealth: a review of the evidence', *Midland Corporate Finance Journal*, Vol. 2, pp.6–22.
- Lambert, R.A. and Larcker, D.F. (1987) 'An analysis of the use of accounting and market measures of performance in executive compensation contracts', *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 25, pp.85–125.
- Lewellen, W.G. and Huntsman, B. (1970) 'Managerial pay and corporate performance', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 60, pp.710–720.
- Lipton, M. and Lorsch, J. (1992) 'A modest proposal for improved corporate governance', *The Business Lawyer*, Vol. 48, pp.59–77.
- Mace, M. (1986) *Directors: Myth and Reality*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- McConnell, J. and Servaes, H. (1990) 'Additional evidence on equity ownership and corporate value', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 27, pp.595–612.
- McGuire, J., Chui, J. and Elbing, A. (1962) 'Executive incomes, sales and profits', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 52, pp.753–761.
- Mishra, C. and Nielsen, J. (2000) 'Board independence and compensation policies in large bank holding companies', *Financial Management*, Vol. 29, pp.51–70.
- Morck, R., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1988) 'Management ownership and market valuation: an empirical analysis', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 20, pp.293–315.
- Murphy, K.J. (1999) 'Executive compensation', *Working Paper*.
- Pearce, J.A. and Zahra, S.A. (1992) 'Board composition from a strategic contingency perspective', *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 29, pp.411–438.
- Pi, L. and Timme, S.G. (1993) 'Corporate control and bank efficiency', *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 17, pp.515–530.
- Rechner, P.L. and Dalton, D.R. (1991) 'CEO duality and organizational performance: a longitudinal analysis', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 12, pp.155–160.
- Reinganum, M.R. (1981) 'Misspecification of capital asset pricing. Empirical anomalies based on earnings yields and market values', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.19–46.
- Rosenstein, S. and Wyatt, J. (1990) 'Outside directors, board independence and shareholder wealth', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 26, pp.175–191.
- Ryan, H. and Wiggins, R. (2004) 'Who is in whose pocket? Director compensation, board independence and barriers to effective monitoring', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 73, pp.497–524.

- Schaefer, S. (1998) 'The dependence of pay-performance sensitivity on the size of the firm', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 80, pp.436–443.
- Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1997) 'A survey of corporate governance', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, pp.737–783.
- Short, H. and Keasey, K. (1999) 'Managerial ownership and the performance of firms: evidence from the UK', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 5, pp.79–101.
- Singh, H. and Harianto, F. (1989) 'Management-board relationships, takeover risk and the adoption of golden parachutes', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 32, pp.7–24.
- Switzer, L. and Fan, H. (2006) 'Spanning tests for replicable small cap indexes as separate asset classes: evidence for G-7 countries', *Journal of Portfolio Management*, forthcoming.
- Ugurlu, M. (2000) 'Agency costs and corporate control devices in the Turkish manufacturing industry', *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 27, pp.566–599.
- Vancil, R. (1987) *Passing the Baton: Managing the Process of CEO Succession*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Weber, M. and Dudney, D. (2003) 'A reduced form coefficients analysis of executive ownership, corporate value and executive compensation', *Financial Review*, Vol. 38, pp.399–413.
- Williamson, O.E. (1979) 'Transaction cost economics: the governance of contractual relations', *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 22, pp.233–261.
- Yermack, D. (1995) 'Do corporations award CEO stock options effectively?', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 39, Nos. 2–3, pp.237–269.

Bibliography

- AICPA, http://www.aicpa.org/info/sarbanes_oxley_summary.htm.
- Andre, P., Kooli, M. and L'Her, J-F. (2004) 'The long run performance of mergers and acquisitions: evidence from the Canadian stock market', *Financial Management*, Vol. 33, pp.27–43.
- Baber, W., Surya, R., Janakiraman, N. and Kang, S-K. (1996) 'Investment opportunities and the structure of executive compensation', *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 21, pp.297–318.
- Bhagat, S. and Black, B. (2000) 'Board independence and long-term firm performance', *Working Paper*, University of Colorado.
- Brunello, G., Graziano, C. and Parigi, B. (2001) 'Executive compensation and firm performance in Italy', *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 19, pp.133–161.
- Bryan, S.H., Nash, R.C. and Patel, A. (2002) 'The equity mix in executive compensation: an investigation of cross-country differences', *Working Paper*.
- Carr, L.L. (1997) 'Strategic determinants of executive compensation in small publicly traded firms', *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 35, pp.1–12.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J.P.H. and Lang, H.H.P. (1998) 'The pattern and valuation effects of corporate diversification: a comparison of the USA, Japan and other East Asian economies', *Working Paper*, World Bank.
- Conyon, M.J. and Leech, D. (1994) 'Top pay, company performance and corporate governance', *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 56, pp.229–247.
- Conyon, M.J. and Murphy, K.J. (2000) 'The prince and the pauper? CEO pay in the USA and UK', *Economic Journal*, Vol. 110, pp.640–671.
- Cosh, A. (1975) 'The remuneration of chief executives in the UK', *Economic Journal*, Vol. 85, pp.75–94.
- Dahya, J., McConnell, J. and Travlos, N. (2002) 'The Cadbury committee, corporate performance, and top management performance', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 57, pp.461–483.

- Demsetz, H. (1983) 'The monitoring of management', *Statement of the Business Roundtable on the American Law Institute's Proposed Principles of Corporate Governance and Structure: Restatement and Recommendations*, Business Roundtable, New York, New York.
- Elloumi, F. and Gueyie, J-P. (2001) 'CEO compensation, IOS and the role of corporate governance', *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 1, pp.23–33.
- Franks, J.R., Mayer, C. and Renneboog, L. (2001) 'Who disciplines management in poorly performing companies?', *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, Vol. 10, pp.209–248.
- Gibson, M.S. (2003) 'Is corporate governance ineffective in emerging markets?', *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 38, pp.231–250.
- Gomez-Mejia, L., Tosi, H. and Hinkin, T. (1987) 'Managerial control, performance and executive compensation', *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 30, pp.51–70.
- Gorton, G. and Schmid, F.A. (2000) 'Universal banking and the performance of German firms', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 58, pp.29–80.
- Hart, O. (1983) 'The market mechanism as an incentive scheme', *Bell Journal of Economics*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp.366–382.
- Hermalin, B.E. and Weisbach, M.S. (1988) 'The determinants of board composition', *Rand Journal of Economics*, Vol. 19, pp.589–606.
- Holderness, C.G. (2003) 'A survey of blockholders and corporate control', *Economic Policy Review*, Vol. 9, pp.51–64.
- India Infoline, <http://www.indiainfoline.com/nevi/cadb.html>.
- Jarrell, G.A. and Poulsen, A.B. (1988) 'Dual-class recapitalizations as anti-takeover mechanisms: the recent evidence', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 20, pp.129–152.
- Kang, J-K. and Shivdasani, A. (1995) 'Firm performance, corporate governance and top executive turnover in Japan', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 38, pp.29–58.
- Kaplan, S. (1994) 'Top executive rewards and firm performance: a comparison of Japan and the USA', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 102, pp.510–546.
- Kaplan, S. and Minton, B. (1994) 'Appointments of outsiders to Japanese boards: determinants and implications for managers', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 36, pp.225–258.
- Lewellen, W.G., Loderer, C. and Martin, K. (1987) 'Executive compensation and executive incentive problems: an empirical analysis', *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 9, pp.287–310.
- McConnell, J. and Servaes, H. (1995) 'Equity ownership and the two faces of debt', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 39, pp.131–157.
- McWilliams, A. and Siegel, D. (2000) 'Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: correlation or misspecification?', *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, pp.603–609.
- Mehran, H. (1995) 'Executive compensation structure, ownership and firm performance', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 38, pp.163–184.
- Miguel, A., Pindado, J. and de la Torre, C. (2001) 'Ownership structure and firm value: new evidence from the Spanish corporate governance system', *Working Paper*.
- Murphy, K.J. (1985) 'Corporate performance and managerial remuneration: an empirical analysis', *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 7, pp.11–42.
- Pagano, M. and Volpin, P.F. (2005) 'The political economy of corporate governance', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 95, pp.1005–1030.
- Partch, M.M. (1987) 'The creation of a class of limited voting common stock and shareholder wealth', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 18, pp.313–339.
- Stulz, R. (1988) 'Managerial control of voting rights, financing policies and the market for corporate control', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 20, pp.25–54.
- Ueng, J.C. (2000) 'CEO influence and executive compensation: large firms vs. small firms', *Managerial Finance*, Vol. 26, pp.3–12.

- Ullman, A. (1985) 'Data in search of a theory: a critical examination of the relationships among social performance, social disclosure and economic performance of US firms', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, pp.540–557.
- Vafeas, N. and Theodorou, E. (1998) 'The relationship between board structure and firm performance in the UK', *British Accounting Review*, Vol. 30, pp.383–407.
- Watson, W. (2003) *CEO Compensation Practices in the S&P/TSX Composite Index Making Executive Pay Work: Findings for 2003*.
- Weisbach, M.S. (1988) 'Outside directors and CEO turnover', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 20, pp.431–460.

Notes

- 1 As La Porta *et al.* (1999) demonstrate, these observations hold for both large-capitalisation and medium-capitalisation Canadian companies in their sample. In terms of the S&P/TSX, their \$500 million threshold for a medium-sized company would actually put such companies in the S&P/TSX Small Cap category.
- 2 Following the publication UK's Cadbury Committee report, officially the TSX formed the Committee on Corporate Governance in Canada (the Dey Committee). After a year of deliberations, in 1994, this committee presented 14 best practice guidelines for corporate boards. Among other things, the guidelines called for a majority of independent directors and for separating the roles of chairman and Chief Executive Officer (CEO). These guidelines are voluntary. Nevertheless, companies listed on the TSX are required to report annually whether they are adhering to them, and if not, why not.
- 3 In their analyses, however, La Porta *et al.* (2000) treat Canada as a uniform common law country. Quebec-based firms that are listed on the TSX are subject to both common law and civil law provisions. In addition, unlike firms from other provinces listed on the TSX, they are subject to the restrictions of commerce represented by Bill 101 and its successor Bill 22, which require that businesses be conducted in the French language.
- 4 Doidge (2004) provides evidence that the voting premium for dually listed stocks is lower, arguing that this reflects the decrease in the private benefits of control for cross-listed shares.
- 5 The number of stocks listed on the TSX (from the TSX-CFMRC database), when taking into account only the most actively traded stocks when a company has multiple classifications, has increased by about 20% over the period 1985–2004. We used the S&P/TSX relative capitalisation thresholds to backdate an index of qualifying small-caps stocks for Canada to 1986 (since the TSE Small Cap Index only extends to 1999), the number of small caps has increased by 43% from 1985 to 2004 over this period.
- 6 The TSX's Small-Cap Index is a subset of the S&P/TSX Composite Index, and consists of 101 companies as of September 2005. The Composite Index also includes the 60 stocks of its Large Cap Index, and 52 companies of its Mid Cap Index.
- 7 The effectiveness of board independence as a governance mechanism is not consistently agreed upon in the literature. Mace (1986) and Vancil (1987) argue that shareholders are generally subject to free-rider effects and will not play an important role in electing outside directors. These authors therefore question the independence of outside directors because of the important role CEOs can consequently play in their appointment. Rosenstein and Wyatt (1990) examine the wealth effects of appointments of outside directors by management and find that even though most firms' boards are outsider dominated, firm value still increases after a management-appointed outside director. Ryan and Wiggins (2004) further dispute the contention that CEOs compromise the independence of outside directors by finding that having more outsiders on the board results in compensation being more equity (and therefore performance) based. Providing further evidence in support of outside directors, Guercio *et al.* (2003) find that the expense ratios for investment companies are lower where there is a larger

proportion of outside directors, which they argue implies greater board effectiveness. We thus consider the proportion of outside directors to be an important measure of board independence and governance control.

- 8 Mishra and Nielsen (2000), using a simultaneous equations framework, find a positive relation between the percentage of outside directors and pay-performance sensitivity. This is explained by the CEO's ability to write his own cheque being impeded by a more independent board who will require good performance for better compensation. Overall, Hermalin and Weisbach (2003) surmise the US evidence on outsiders on the board as showing that more outsiders are generally associated with compensation being more dependent on performance. We consider these mechanisms as substitutes and therefore expect to find an inverse relation.
- 9 McGuire *et al.* (1962), Chung and Pruitt (1996), and Weber and Dudney (2003) argue that firm size represents a proxy of a job's complexity and therefore the larger the firm, the more the CEO should be compensated. They also posit that managers of large firms have more power through the large firms' greater ability to earn monopoly profits and are therefore more able to allocate more generous compensation to themselves. Chung and Pruitt (1996) and Calvo and Wellisz (1979) suggest a 'multiplicative productivity effect' whereby the larger the firm, the greater the number of levels of hierarchy and accordingly, the pay levels. They argue that the most able executives will therefore be attracted to the larger firms due to the higher compensation available in these firms.
- 10 For examples of studies examining firm size as a determinant of compensation, see Baumol (1959), McGuire *et al.* (1962), Firth *et al.* (1999); for the neoclassical approach, see Lewellen and Huntsman (1970), Lambert and Larcker (1987), Gerhart and Milkovich (1990), Jensen and Murphy (1990), and Yermack (1995).
- 11 Several other authors have suggested debt as an effective control mechanism. In addition to reducing the free cash flow available for CEOs to squander and forcing firms into external capital markets that will provide monitoring, debt increases the likelihood of a CEO losing control over a corporation if he or she allows that firm to go into financial distress (see, for example, Grossman and Hart, 1982; Harris and Raviv, 1990; and Aghion and Bolton, 1992).
- 12 The Black-Scholes model calculates the price of an option, C , trading at price S , with an exercise price X , volatility σ , constant interest rate r , and time to maturity T , as:
$$C = SN(d_1) - Xe^{-rT}N(d_2)$$
where N is the cumulative normal distribution, $d_1 = [\ln(S/X) + (r + \sigma^2/2)T] / [\sigma\sqrt{T}]$ and $d_2 = d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T}$.
- 13 The lack of data available for Canadian small-cap corporations necessitates the use of a simplified calculation of Tobin's Q. However, Chung and Pruitt (1994) find high correlations between alternative proxies of Tobin's Q, including the variant that we use. Alternate estimates require data that would diminish our sample significantly and possibly lead to sample selection bias.
- 14 As a robustness check, we later eliminate these financial firms.

Appendix 1 Definition and source of variables

	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Source</i>
BINDa	Relative tenure of directors to the CEO: the percentage of the rest of the board elected before the CEO	Proxy statements (Sedar)
BINDb	Proportion of outsiders on the board: the percentage of the board (excluding the CEO) employed by the firm	Proxy statements (Sedar)
DBVAL	Total long-term debt/total assets	Reuters
PAY	Jensen-Murphy pay-performance sensitivity	Compensation data: proxy statements (Sedar) Variables for calculating option values: Datastream, and Bank of Canada
PACQ	Five-year corporate control activity	Bloomberg/SDC
TOBINQ	Tobin's Q	Reuters, Bloomberg
OWN	Percentage of the firm's outstanding shares owned by the CEO at the fiscal year-end	Proxy statements (Sedar) and financial post
BSIZE	Total number of board members	Proxy statements (Sedar)
DUAL	CEO duality: dummy variable equal to 1 if the CEO is also the Chairperson, and 0 otherwise	Proxy statements (Sedar)
SHRRTS	Shareholder rights: dummy variable equal to 0 if the firm has multiple class shares, and 1 otherwise	Proxy statements (Sedar)
LISTING	Cross-listing: dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm is also listed on a US stock exchange, and 0 otherwise	TSX review
QUEBEC	Quebec headquartered firms: dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm is headquartered in Quebec, and 0 otherwise	Proxy statements (Sedar)
ASSET	Firm size: total assets/1,000,000	Reuters
RISK	Monthly stock price volatility	Datastream
IND	Industry: dummy variable equal to 1 for resource corporations (<i>i.e.</i> , metals, mining, oil, gas), and 0 otherwise	Financial post
YEAR	Fiscal year for all variables reported	Proxy statements (Sedar)