Available online at www.rajournals.in

International Journal of Management and Economics Invention

ISSN: 2395-7220

DOI: 10.47191/ijmei/v10i7.03

Volume: 10 Issue: 07 July 2024

International Open Access

Impact Factor: 8.473 (SJIF)

Page no. 3331-3341

A Thorough Examination of Agency Theory and Agency Costs in M&A

Hasan Yalçın

Crowe HSY, Bomonti Business Center No:8 Kat 4 Şişli-Istanbul

ARTICLE INFO

Published Online: 05 July 2024

Corresponding Author: Hasan Yalçın

ABSTRACT

M&A decisions are often aimed at strategic goals like economies of scale, market expansion, or diversifying operations. Yet, these objectives can be impeded by agency costs stemming from conflicts between shareholders and managers. Agency costs manifest in forms such as high executive pay, managerial turnover, and resource misallocation. Therefore, grasping and scrutinizing agency costs in M&A is crucial for mitigating adverse impacts on transaction success. This analysis intends to highlight various facets of agency costs in M&A, covering types, causes, and organizational mitigation strategies.

KEYWORDS: Mergers and acquisitions, Agency costs, Stakeholders, Corporate governance mechanisms

I. INTRODUCTION

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) are complex strategic initiatives that involve either merging companies into a new entity or one company acquiring another, becoming its owner. M&A activities primarily aim to create value and synergies unattainable by independent operations. However, these transactions face numerous challenges and risks, notably agency costs due to conflicts between shareholders and managers. This paper seeks to explore and manage these agency costs to enhance the success of M&A transactions.

Grasping agency costs in M&A is vital for companies and investors. Agency costs refer to conflicts of interest between shareholders and managers or between different stakeholders in the M&A process, leading to resource diversion, opportunistic actions, and value destruction. By understanding and managing agency costs, companies can minimize adverse impacts and maximize M&A benefits, aiding shareholders and investors in making informed decisions and assessing deal value. This also allows for the design of optimal governance mechanisms and incentive structures, aligning involved parties' interests. Ultimately, understanding agency costs enhances transparency and accountability, reducing M&A risks and improving the likelihood of success

This paper thoroughly examines agency costs in M&A, defining agency theory and the principal-agent relationship in these transactions. It investigates primary agency cost sources like information asymmetry, moral hazard, and conflicts of interest, and discusses mechanisms like due diligence, monitoring systems, and managerial financial incentives to reduce costs. It also delves into corporate governance's role in managing agency costs, emphasizing independent boards and aligning shareholder-manager interests, with real-life examples linking agency costs and firm performance. The practical implications are significant, suggesting that companies use this knowledge to craft optimal governance structures and incentives, thereby mitigating M&A risks and enhancing success rates. and investors to formulate decisions that are more informed and to better evaluate the actual worth of an arrangement

II. DEFINITION AND EXPLANATION OF AGENCY COSTS

Pertaining to M&A, the term 'agency costs' denotes the expenditure and conflicts of interest arising when a firm's managers (agents) make choices that diverge from shareholders' (principals) best interests. Such costs are chiefly due to the division of ownership and control typical in contemporary businesses. Managers serve as the shareholders' proxies, with decision-making power delegated to them. However, the interests of these managers may not align perfectly with those of the shareholders. This misalignment often results in agency costs, as managers may prioritize their interests or engage in activities diminishing firm value (Hendrastuti & Harahap, 2023). Predominant agency costs in M&A encompass managerial self-benefit, authority dominance, inefficient investment decisions, and prioritizing short-term gains over long-term value. Grasping agency costs is vital for shareholders and acquirers alike, fostering the ability to detect potential conflicts of interest and establish mechanisms to harmonize managers' and shareholders' interests.

Definition of Agency Theory

Agency theory stands as an established framework within management and corporate finance, exploring the nexus between shareholders (principals) and managers (agents). The theory asserts a fundamental conflict of interest between these parties, given that managers might act in their self-interest rather than optimizing shareholders' wealth. The agency problem emerges from differing objectives and asymmetric information between shareholders and managers (Kivistö & Zalyevska, 2015). Entrusted with decision-making on behalf of shareholders, managers might exhibit distinct risk preferences, objectives, and motives. Consequently, managers might engage in actions misaligned with shareholders' interests, such as excessive risk-taking, favoring their compensation, or depleting corporate resources for personal gain. Agency theory imparts valuable insights into managers' motivations and behaviors and suggests mechanisms to mitigate these conflicts, aligning shareholders' and managers' interests (Bendickson et al., 2016).

Furthermore, Agency Theory has been applied to scrutinize agency relationships across various levels, such as between shareholders and managers within a firm (Kivistö & Zalyevska, 2015). The agent, a pivotal element in Agency Theory, is obligated to complete tasks designated by the principal. Nevertheless, the agent has personal interests, which may not always align with those of the principal, leading to a conflict of interest—an integral concept of Agency Theory. The theory delves into several aspects of the principal-agent dynamic, including the public agency dilemma, where the agent acts favoring personal interests over the client's (Ross, 1979).

Explanation of the Various Types of Agency Costs

A fundamental notion in Agency Theory is agency costs, representing the expenses tied to the principal-agent relationship due to conflicts of interest. Researchers employ various measures of agency costs, such as the 'expense ratio' and 'asset utilization ratio' (Rashid, 2015). Generally, agency costs are pivotal in grasping the potential expenses and challenges within principal-agent relationships. 'Moral hazard', another key term in Agency Theory, pertains to the agent's risk of actions adverse to the principal's interests (Lei et al., 2013). 'Adverse selection' describes the risk that the agent may possess private information unknown to the principal, leading to suboptimal agent selection (Carlier, 2001). The normativity of Agency Theory resides in its proficiency to investigate to elucidate principal-agent interrelationships alongside the consequent expenditures. The conceptual framework aids in discerning possible interest clashes between principal and agent and proffers guidance on how to structure such affiliations to harmonize the interests of both entities (Bendickson et al., 2016).

Beyond the already enumerated agency costs, mergers and acquisitions (M&A) encounters might prompt additional agency costs. These costs fragment into monitoring, attachment, and residual losses categories. Monitoring costs encapsulate the outlays borne by the principal to oversee and regulate the agent's endeavors. Particularly, in a monitoring lens, agency costs are the expenses undertaken to ensure managers operate in shareholders' best interests (Şişmanoğlu et al., 2020). Within M&A scenarios, monitoring costs hold significance in alleviating intrinsic interest conflicts amid shareholders and managers. Shareholders, compelled by the necessity of perpetual oversight and dominion over managerial resolutions, especially those concerning resource allocation and strategic schemas, incur these costs. Oversight costs span varied activities including regular audits, efficient reporting system implementations, and transparent performance assessment mechanisms' establishment.

Furthermore, another pivotal agency cost aspect in mergers and acquisitions encompasses linkage costs (Ekinci, 2017). Linkage costs pertain to the systems instigated to mesh the interests of the acquiring firm with those of its managers. Managers, prone to advancing personal interests over shareholders' wealth maximization, breed agency conflicts. Employing various binding mechanisms like executive stock options and restricted stock grants can restrain this discord. These mechanisms tether executive remuneration to the firm's performance and long-haul value generation (Lee & Wingreen, 2010). By harmonizing executive and shareholder interests, linkage costs mitigate agency costs and bolster the M&A success rate.

Residual loss manifests as the detrimental financial outcomes befalling from agency tribulations within M&A. Causes for residual loss range from inordinate executive pay, autocratic conduct, to personal gain pursuits throughout the M&A procedure. These residual losses not only depreciate shareholder value but also erode M&A market efficiency. Mitigating residual loss can be achieved through mechanisms like meticulous manager selection, apt monitoring and incentive frameworks, and sound corporate governance practices. Addressing agency dilemmas and curtailing residual loss can enhance M&A strategic effectiveness, augmenting value creation for shareholders and stakeholders alike.

Agency Theory in Mergers and Acquisitions

Agency theory, a scholarly framework, probes into principal-agent relationships in the business sphere, striving to resolve the quandaries inherent within agency affiliations. Principals denote shareholders or company proprietors, while agents embody individuals or groups acting on principals' behalf, such as company management. The theory centralizes around agency costs, the expenses principals absorb to ensure agents act in their interests (Junni & Teerikangas, 2019). Within M&A transactions, agency theory assists in navigating the intricacies of engaging with disparate partners harboring divergent motivations and agendas. Recognizing stakeholder interest misalignments, the theory critically evaluates the challenges from varied vantage points. Practically, agency theory elucidates the principal-agent dynamics between investors (principals) and a company's management team (agents) (Sarabia et.al., 2019). During M&A, investors confer authority upon management to make decisions aimed at augmenting shareholder value. This delegation, however, of authority introduces a potential for conflict, as managers might prioritize their earnings, personal job stability, or other goals over the interests of investors. Agency theory offers a framework to identify and analyze these conflicts and underscores situations where agents' interests may diverge from those of principals (Alvarez et al., 2020).

Agency theory is crucial for understanding adversarial situations that could surface between shareholders during M&A transactions. Companies involved in M&As face different motivations: acquirers aim for growth, targets aim for a successful exit, and investors seek value appreciation (Battisti et al., 2021). These differing objectives can cause conflicts, leading to ownership issues. Agency theory aids in analyzing these conflicts by focusing on information asymmetry and shifting risk expectations, which can pose obstacles during negotiations, independent oversight, and post-merger integration.

Junni and Teerikangas (2019) assert that agency theory is a fundamental framework for comprehending interactions and conflicts in M&A transactions. Within this context, agency theory helps comprehend the challenges associated with involving various partners who have contrasting motivations and agendas (Junni & Teerikangas, 2019). It acknowledges that in M&A activities, investors delegate decision-making authority to management to bolster shareholder value, but this delegation can lead to conflicts of interest if managers prioritize their own interests over those of investors. Agency theory, thus, offers a framework to analyze these conflicts (Alvarez et al., 2020).

In M&A transactions, agency theory gains more relevance when different parties with differing objectives are involved. Acquirers pursue growth opportunities, targets seek a successful exit, and investors expect value appreciation. Such differing objectives can foster conflicts between the parties, leading to partnership issues. By focusing on information asymmetry and shifting risk expectations, agency theory helps to analyze these conflicts, presenting challenges during negotiations, independent oversight, and post-merger integration (Battisti et al., 2021). Generally, agency theory provides valuable insights into M&A dynamics and potential conflicts, assisting companies in addressing these challenges more effectively.

III. Factors Contributing to Agency Costs in Mergers and Acquisitions

An understanding of the factors contributing to agency costs in M&As is essential. Firstly, a misalignment of interests between a firm's managers and shareholders may result in agency costs. Managers might prioritize objectives like personal wealth maximization and job security over the interests of shareholders, leading to non-value-maximizing decisions (Bettignies & Ross, 2013). Secondly, the complexity and uncertainty inherent in M&As can enhance agency costs; the high-risk nature of these transactions might prompt managers to engage in risk-averse behaviors, creating costs for shareholders. Additionally, information asymmetry between managers and shareholders can increase agency costs, as managers with more information may exploit this advantage to make decisions that do not align with shareholders' interests. Understanding these contributing factors enables firms to devise strategies to reduce and manage agency costs, fostering more successful M&As.

Information Asymmetry

Information asymmetry occurs when one transaction party possesses more knowledge than the other (Gompers, 2022). Within mergers and acquisitions (M&A), such asymmetry significantly affects the transaction's outcome. The acquiring firm often has incomplete information about the target firm's operations, financials, or potential risks, potentially resulting in flawed decisions and integration issues. In M&A, such imbalanced information access necessitates considerable expenditures. Those managing the process must obtain thorough and precise details regarding the target company's financial status, risks, growth potentials, and unforeseen challenges (Jensen & Meckling, 2019). This requirement for detailed information can complicate assessments, leading to varied levels of awareness and subsequent misinformed decisions that fail to accurately reflect the intended outcome's core value. Additionally, this information gap might influence the target firm's valuation, preventing the acquirer from fully recognizing its true worth. Moreover, information asymmetry can cause conflicts of interest between the acquirer's and target firm's management teams, whose motivations and goals—such as growth aspirations or shareholder value enhancement—may differ.

A concrete example of information asymmetry's impact is observed in the AOL-Time Warner merger of 2001. Driven by aspirations to expand digitally, AOL's strategy was based on idealistic synergies and growth forecasts. However, undisclosed operational challenges, mismatched corporate cultures, and the media industry's complexities led to misguided calculations and underappreciated obstacles (Baker, 2019). This information asymmetry resulted in significant investor value destruction, as expected synergies failed to materialize, highlighting the costs associated with insufficient or unbalanced information.

Additionally, information asymmetry can facilitate strategic maneuvers where the better-informed party exploits the gap to secure disproportionately advantageous terms. The

Hewlett-Packard (HP) and Compaq merger exemplifies this scenario. HP's leadership utilized superior information to craft a deal that met its strategic aims, disregarding substantial investor opposition, which foresaw potential value losses (Baker, 2019). The lack of balanced information led to decisions that imposed corporate costs, as the merged entity fell short of anticipated benefits.

Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest are crucial in examining agency costs during M&A. These conflicts appear when various firm stakeholders have diverging interests, resulting in potential inefficiencies and wealth redistribution. Shareholders, managers, and other stakeholders often have different objectives and preferences, which may not align with the firm's overall interests. These conflicts can obstruct decision-making and introduce agency costs, such as excessive monitoring and incentive alignment processes. Agency costs in M&A transactions manifest in various forms, including opportunistic behavior, excessive risk-taking, and ensuing value destruction, all indicative of misaligned incentives between management and shareholders. Management actions may favor personal gain or job security over the merged entity's long-term success.

Opportunistic behavior, a significant agency cost, can lead to value reduction. Management teams might exploit their authoritative positions to further personal interests at the entity's expense. of shareholders. Illustrative of recent opportunistic behavior is the 2012 merger between Volkswagen (VW) and Porsche. VW's management executed maneuvers within the financial markets to obtain control over Porsche’s share price, leading to distorted value and impacting investor returns (Battisti et al., 2021). This case exemplifies how strategies employed by entrepreneurs can result in a lack of transparency, distortion in value, and financial repercussions.

A different critical exhibit of agency problems is excessive risk-taking by management, who may adopt risky strategies or ventures aimed at achieving short-term rewards or meeting personal performance metrics, often at the expense of the long-term stability of the merged entity. For example, in the 2015 merger of Kraft and Heinz, severe cost-reduction initiatives compromised product quality and innovation, leading to brand deterioration and a decline in market share (Yen & André, 2019). This scenario underscores how agency costs stemming from excessive risk-taking can undermine long-term prospects and shareholder value. Another instance of value erosion due to agency problems is the 2006 merger of Alcatel and Lucent Technologies. The executives' pursuit of synergies led to hurried integration decisions, disrupting R&D efforts and innovation channels (Sarabia et al., 2019). The integration process, marred by cultural clashes and the loss of vital employees, resulted in a sharp decline in market capitalization and shareholder value, thus illustrating how agency costs can negate value creation.

Moral Hazard

Moral hazard represents a notable form of agency cost frequently emerging in M&A activities, characterized by misaligned incentives and the potential for risky behavior. Moral hazard arises when an agent engages in riskier actions due to incomplete information or insufficient accountability, with the principal bearing the repercussions (Emmerich & Norwitz, 2020). In M&A contexts, moral hazard can manifest when acquiring firm managers are incentivized to engage in risky actions, like pursuing potentially value-destroying acquisitions without shouldering the full costs of these decisions.

A recent pertinent example is SoftBank's Vision Fund acquisition of WeWork. WeWork's executives embarked on an aggressive expansion strategy, aiming for a high valuation grounded in profitability projections that were later scrutinized. SoftBank's subsequent investment at a markedly lower valuation signaled governance and operational issues within WeWork (Kline & Brown, 2019). Shielded from the immediate financial fallout of WeWork’s risky expansion, the management showcased moral hazard by striving for ambitious growth amid uncertainties, impacting SoftBank's investment and shareholder value.

Moral hazard-induced risk behavior is also evident in the financial sector. Post-2008 financial crisis, numerous financial entities engaged in perilous lending and trading practices, bolstered by the notion of being "too big to fail." Managers, driven by significant bonuses and short-term profit pursuits, embraced excessive risks, confident that taxpayers and governments would intervene if their decisions led to financial disaster (Galeja, 2019). This situation highlights agency costs associated with moral hazard, as management’s risky decisions with limited accountability inflict broad economic ramifications.

Additionally, moral hazard may surface in post-merger scenarios, where managers might undertake high-risk projects they would typically avoid, believing the consequences of potential failure will be mitigated within the larger amalgamated company. For instance, Bayer's absorption of Monsanto in 2018 presented the leadership at Bayer with a series of legal complications tied to glyphosate, Monsanto’s major herbicide component (El Diri et al., 2020). Nonetheless, the management, incentivized by the prospects of preserving Monsanto's market position, pursued risky strategies influenced by moral hazard, thereby subjecting Bayer to considerable financial and reputational threats.

Adverse Selection

Adverse selection is a central agency cost in M&A activities and denotes the possibility of detrimental agreements stemming from information imbalances and undisclosed dangers. It transpires when one party possesses superior insights compared to the other, prompting involuntary engagements in agreements that might undermine their interests (Wu & Reuer, 2021). This is particularly critical in mergers and acquisitions as the acquiring entity might lack a thorough understanding of the target's operational difficulties, financial condition, or concealed risks.

A notable instance of adverse selection is observable in the 1997 Boeing-McDonnell Douglas merger. Boeing aimed to bolster its market dominance by integrating McDonnell Douglas; however, misvaluation of McDonnell Douglas’s aircraft portfolio and marketing endeavors led to adverse selection (Cao et al., 2022). An incomplete grasp of McDonnell Douglas’s financial situation and challenges in amalgamating diverse product lines undermined Boeing’s ability to achieve the anticipated synergies, illustrating how informational disparities can culminate in risky deals.

An additional instance of adverse selection is found in Verizon Communications' 2017 acquisition of Yahoo. Verizon intended to expand its digital advertising and media capacities through Yahoo's assets (Baysinger & Butler, 2019). However, the exposure of a massive data breach affecting over a billion Yahoo accounts underscored adverse selection, revealing cybersecurity issues undisclosed during negotiations, which led to financial and reputational detriment for Verizon (Ajay et al., 2019). This underscores the deleterious impact that incomplete information can have in M&A.

Adverse selection is markedly apparent in acquisitions involving distressed companies since management might obscure poor financial performance or looming litigations to secure a purchase and ameliorate their firm’s distress. Unaware of such hidden challenges, buyers might inadvertently expose themselves to significant risks (Wu & Reuer, 2021).

IV. THE PROXY ISSUE IN MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS

In the realm of M&A, the Proxy Issue arises across the negotiation, decision-making, and integration phases, often propelled by conflicts of interest, information gaps, and organizational hurdles. Divergences in incentives, cultural discord, and short-term perspectives can thwart decision-making and impair merger success.

The negotiation phase, crucial for any business transaction, entails discussions, bargaining, and agreement on terms (Jensen & Meckling, 2019). Compliance complications emerge during M&A negotiations due to adversarial stances and informational inequities among involved parties. Successfully executing an acquisition necessitates balancing the acquirer's growth ambitions, cooperative efforts, and market dynamics. influence and the target's interests in autonomy, valuation, and reputation protection (Maas et al., 2019). Such differing motivations can give rise to alignment difficulties as governing bodies strive to meet their goals while serving investors' interests. The disequilibrium in information dissemination worsens compliance problems during negotiations. Buyers and targets often hold contrasting views on their financial health, growth potential, and competitive stance. For instance, the 2001 merger between AOL and Time Warner underscores the ramifications of uneven information sharing. AOL, eager to leverage Time Warner's extensive media assets, proceeded with the deal despite discrepancies in corporate culture, values, and long-term objectives (Wu & Reuer, 2019). This imbalance in information dissemination can have adverse outcomes, leading to investor losses and hurdles during transactions. Divergent interests among the acquirer, target, and investors can intensify compliance challenges in negotiations.

Investors may seek optimal valuations, while governing bodies emphasize operational stability, incentives, and business growth (Yen & Andre, 2019). Such conflicting aims can result in flawed decisions, hasty deals, and insufficient exchange of input. The 2002 merger of Hewlett-Packard (HP) and Compaq illustrates these issues. HP's management pursued the merger despite significant opposition from the Hewlett and Packard families, who were major investors (Song & Zhang, 2019). This conflict highlighted the importance of aligning managerial decisions with investors' interests.

The decision-making phase encompasses evaluating options, scrutinizing information, and selecting a course of action from the available alternatives. The decision-making stage of M&A transactions is pivotal, where agency issues frequently emerge due to conflicting interests and information asymmetry. As the managing partners of acquiring and target firms mull various mediation options, the stakes of different stakeholders may be compromised. The 1998 merger between Daimler-Benz and Chrysler exemplifies this issue. Daimler-Benz aimed to bolster its presence in the US market by acquiring Chrysler (Song et al., 2019). Nevertheless, organizational challenges surfaced during integration, with management teams struggling over corporate cultures, decision-making processes, and product strategies. Daimler-Benz's focus on cost control clashed with Chrysler's innovation-driven approach. These disparate philosophies hindered synergy, leading to poor financial performance and the eventual dissolution of the merger (Schäuble, 2019). The dissonance in incentives and core visions between the governing bodies illustrates the effect of organizational dilemmas on decision-making during integration. The decision-making phase also brings to light the impact of information asymmetry on strategic choices. Management teams with superior access to information may make decisions that favor their interests over those of investors. For example, eBay's acquisition of Skype in 2005 was driven by eBay's expectation of synergies between online business and the communication platform (Lund, 2019). However, anticipated synergies failed to materialize due to information asymmetries about user behavior and technological compatibility. This gap between expected and actual outcomes shows how information biases can lead to adverse decisions impacting the collective asset and investor value.

The integration phase is a crucial period post-merger or acquisition, where the primary focus is on merging the resources, operations, and cultures of the involved entities to realize synergies and strategic aims. However, this phase is susceptible to organizational problems due to conflicting interests, information asymmetry, and challenges inherent to the convergence of two distinct organizations. A notable illustration of organizational issues arising during the integration phase is the 2011 merger of HP and Freedom. The management at HP anticipated that acquiring Freedom, a product-focused entity, would enhance its market stance (Kumar and Kumar, 2019a). Nonetheless, tensions surfaced as post-acquisition assessments unveiled discrepancies in financial results and valuations. Misalignment between Freedom's leadership and HP's investors' incentives instigated disagreements, culminating in a considerable loss of investor value (Junni and Teerikangas, 2019). This case accentuates the organizational difficulties during integration due to information asymmetry, influencing the financial robustness and alignment of newly formed synergies.

Employee motivation constitutes another domain where challenges may arise amid the integration phase. This was discernible in the 2014 amalgamation of Microsoft and Nokia’s Devices and Services division. In this instance, issues regarding employee motivation were prominent. As Microsoft endeavored to harness Nokia’s proficiency to bolster its mobile market presence, conflicting and incompatible objectives disturbed both organizations’ workforce and management (Çakalı, 2022). The uncertainty in job security and alterations in job roles triggered dissatisfaction among the team and management, consequently impacting the merger's success. Moreover, insecurity and dissatisfaction can emanate from clashing organizational norms. Such a scenario was visible in the 2010 merger of Kraft Food Corporation and Cadbury. Kraft’s initiative to integrate Cadbury's strengths to penetrate the global market encountered resistance from Cadbury management, aiming to uphold their corporate identity and heritage (Çakalı, 2022). This misalignment in cultural values impeded the merger process. The requisite organizational and managerial transformations for a successful merger conflicted with retaining Cadbury’s cultural identity, erecting barriers to integration. Therefore, the integration phase of mergers or acquisitions is susceptible to organizational challenges from conflicting interests, information asymmetry, and cultural disparities.

V. IMPLICATIONS OF AGENCY COSTS ON MERGED ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE

In an amalgamating company, agency costs can profoundly influence its financial performance. These costs emanate from interest conflicts among stakeholders like shareholders and management. Post-merger, these conflicts can intensify, adversely impacting financial metrics. A prominent consequence is the potential diminution of profits. Resource misallocation may occur if management prioritizes their interests, such as maximizing their compensation, over the company’s overall financial well-being (Baysinger & Butler, 2019). Excessive remuneration and executive benefit expenses can redirect funds from investments essential for growth and profitability, leading to decreased operational efficiency and lower net income, thus affecting the merged company’s financial performance. Additionally, proxy costs could precipitate a decline in shareholder value. With sustaining conflicts of interest, shareholders might perceive management decisions that misalign with their objective of maximizing investment returns. Misaligned interests can foster short-term-focused decisions or strategies favoring management over long-term value creation (Kumar & Kumar, 2019b). This misalignment could erode investor confidence, diminishing the merged entity’s stock price and total market value. Consequently, agency costs detract from outcomes and undermine financial performance by lessening shareholders' expected value from their investments.

Agency issues notably influence the strategic decision-making process in a merged entity. When management's interests deviate from shareholders', decisions might focus on short-term objectives rather than fostering sustainable growth. This skewed perspective can result in overlooked chances to establish the merged entity as a market leader (Song & Zhang, 2019). For instance, if management is driven by the pursuit of immediate financial milestones for personal incentives, they might implement cost-cutting strategies that harm long-term investments in R&D, marketing, or human resources (Lund, 2019). Such a short-term approach may impair the merged company's ability to adjust to market shifts, exploit new trends, and sustain competitiveness. Furthermore, agency conflicts can stifle innovation within the merged firm. Innovation necessitates risk-taking and openness to unconventional ideas. However, misaligned incentives due to agency costs may deter employees from engaging in innovative activities. If innovation is not appropriately incentivized or is only focused on metrics advantageous to management, employees may become risk-averse and reluctant to share their creative ideas (Kumar & Kumar, 2019b). This can limit the merged firm's ability to stand out, create new products or services, and secure long-term sustainable growth.

The effects of agency costs on a merged firm's organizational efficiency go beyond financial metrics and strategy. They influence workplace culture, decision-making approval processes, and daily operations. A workplace dominated by internal conflicts can harm employee morale and job satisfaction. When employees notice that organizational actions favor personal interests over the company's welfare, they might feel undervalued and demotivated (Gompers, 2022). This can result in lower commitment, decreased productivity, and higher turnover, weakening the firm's collective efficiency. Additionally, internal conflicts can constrain the firm's growth and diversity potential. Progress demands an environment that supports experimentation and the implementation of well-designed strategies. However, if employees believe their efforts will not be adequately recognized or rewarded due to biased incentives and internal conflicts, they may hesitate to propose innovative ideas or initiatives (Yen & André, 2019). This can impede the firm's ability to respond to changing market conditions and seize exceptional opportunities, potentially causing stagnation and the loss of its competitive edge.

VI. THE IMPORTANCE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE IN MITIGATING AGENCY COSTS

Understanding the role of corporate governance mechanisms is crucial when examining agency costs in mergers and acquisitions. Corporate governance encompasses the practices, norms, policies, laws, and institutions that govern a company's control and management. One such mechanism is board oversight, which ensures that managers act in shareholders' best interests (El Diri et al., 2020). Independent directors on the board can impartially assess M&A transactions and mitigate management's self-interest. These non-executive or independent directors do not partake in daily operations, thus diminishing conflicts of interest (Sarabia et al., 2019). Their independence and expertise lead to better decision-making and evaluation of a transaction's potential benefits and risks. Additionally, separating the roles of CEO and chairman prevents an excessive concentration of power and guarantees independent oversight (Maas et al., 2019). An independent chairman can oversee the evaluation of the strategic rationale, financial feasibility, and potential impact on shareholder value.

Effective monitoring mechanisms, especially the board's role, are critical in reducing agency costs. An impartial and independent directors committee ensures fair oversight of executive actions and decisions. These directors introduce diverse perspectives and scrutinize assumptions, with the intent to sync fundamental choices with investors' prolonged interests (Schäuble, 2019). Oversight by the board is paramount, especially during mergers and acquisitions where complex scenarios and disparities in information often exist. Transparency and prompt communication between the board and shareholders enhance the oversight process by reducing information voids and ensuring shareholders are adequately informed, thus participating effectively in decision-making (Junny & Teerikangas, 2019).

In this vein, transparent communication alongside accurate and timely disclosure of information is vital in M&A transactions (Baysinger & Butler, 2019). Open channels lower information asymmetry, aiding shareholders in making well-grounded decisions. Advocating for shareholder rights and spurring shareholder activism can diminish agency costs (Song & Zhang, 2019). Shareholders ought to have the ability to vote on critical decisions such as M&A transactions and voice concerns when managers seem self-serving. Moreover, investor activism empowers institutional investors to sway board resolutions and hold leadership accountable. The activist campaign by Third Point LLC against Sony in 2013, leading to strategic changes that uplifted the company's financial performance and shareholder value, is a notable instance (Emmerich & Norwitz, 2020). Institutional investors, like pension and mutual funds, hold substantial stakes in companies and can sway corporate governance practices and proxy voting settlements (Sarabia et al., 2019). In the sphere of M&A transactions, these investors can leverage their voting prowess to support or oppose deals based on their potential impact on shareholder value. A robust corporate governance framework features a code of conduct and ethics guidelines steering managerial actions (Kline & Brown, 2019). These policies mandate honesty, integrity, and ethical behavior. Adherence to such standards in M&A transactions minimizes decisions favoring executives over shareholders. Such mechanisms foster transparency, thwart value destruction, and synchronize management's actions with shareholders' interests.

Aligning executive compensation with shareholders' interests is extremely important (Yen & André, 2019). Compensation schemes integrating performance-based elements linked to deal success motivate executives to make decisions that maximize long-term shareholder value. By tugging executive compensation to the company's enduring performance, boards can be propelled to concentrate on activities that generate genuine value (Schäuble, 2019). Incentive-based compensation, like performance-based shares or investment chances, can effectively align board priorities with those of shareholders. For instance, in Microsoft’s 2016 acquisition of LinkedIn, a portion of LinkedIn executives' compensation was structured in the form of Microsoft shares to ensure the plan's success (Galeja, 2019). This arrangement fueled the merger process, augmenting value creation and minimizing conflicts from differing objectives.

External auditors are crucial in assuring the accuracy and reliability of financial statements and reports, providing shareholders an independent assurance that the financial information is credible and not manipulated (Lund, 2019). Their role becomes even more significant in M&A transactions where precise financial data is crucial for valuation and decision-making. Aligning incentives between management and shareholders is a crucial element of corporate governance aimed at mitigating agency costs.

Overall, efficient corporate governance mechanisms like board oversight and independence, the roles of non-executive directors, the CEO/chairman separation, and transparency in disclosure, Shareholder rights and activism, harmonization of executive compensation, external auditors, institutional investors, and robust codes of conduct and ethics policies form essential elements within an effective corporate governance system. These mechanisms collectively aim to promote transparency, accountability, and the safeguarding of shareholder interests during mergers and acquisitions (M&A) activities. They serve to align the interests of directors with shareholders, minimize agency costs, and ensure that shareholders are confident that decisions reflect their best interests. Elements such as independent oversight, unbiased evaluation, precise financial reporting, adherence to ethical standards, and fostering shareholder engagement create a more solid and dependable M&A milieu.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDRESSING AGENCY COSTS IN M&A TRANSACTIONS

Several best practices can help reduce agency costs in the context of mergers and acquisitions. A primary step is ensuring effective communication and transparency between the acquiring and target companies. Conducting comprehensive due diligence to identify and manage potential risks and conflicts of interest is also crucial. The composition of the board should be such that it includes members with the requisite skills and qualifications to oversee the M&A process proficiently. Aligning the interests of both parties involved in the transaction is necessary, which can be achieved through tailored incentives, such as performance-based remuneration schemes that drive directors to act in shareholders' best interests.

Continuous and open communication is vital throughout all phases of an M&A transaction, from pre-merger discussions to post-merger integration. Transparent communication mitigates issues arising from information imbalances and conflicting interests, fostering trust among stakeholders like leaders, representatives, and investors, and thereby resulting in more effective guidance and reduced vulnerability (Baker, 2019). Transparency during negotiations helps identify key objectives, synergies, and potential challenges. Balanced evaluations of a merger's benefits and risks lead to better-informed decision-making and decrease biases. Effective communication in the post-merger phase is critical to addressing employee concerns, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and ensuring harmonious adaptation to processes, structures, and cultures (Cao et al., 2022). An example is the merger of United Airlines and Continental Airlines in 2010, where open communication and transparency were pivotal in merging two distinct corporate cultures, enhancing employee engagement, and achieving operational efficiency (Das, 2019). Furthermore, direct communication aids in addressing and resolving potential issues during the integration, demonstrating a commitment to problem-solving and keeping the merged entity aligned with its goals.

Thorough due diligence is crucial in minimizing the risks of information asymmetry and related agency costs. Both acquirer and target companies need to conduct in-depth assessments of each other's financial status, operational performance, risks, and growth prospects (Kline & Brown, 2019). Transparent communication and the sharing of essential information at this stage can reduce vulnerabilities and prevent hidden problems from emerging post-consolidation. An example underscoring the importance of thorough due diligence is Facebook's acquisition of WhatsApp in 2014. Facebook's detailed involvement in the acquisition allowed them to comprehensively understand WhatsApp's user base, growth trajectory, and development plans (Jensen & Meckling, 2019), substantially mitigating the risk of information asymmetry. and potential operational challenges is key to achieving the successful conclusion of the acquisition and promoting the continued growth of WhatsApp within the larger Facebook ecosystem. A higher level of due diligence should encompass an evaluation of cultural compatibility and employee motivation. Recognizing the organizational culture and foreseeing the consolidation's potential effects on employees can preemptively tackle resistance issues and reduced engagement during the integration phase.

Aligning incentives is crucial to mitigating agency costs and ensuring the merger's success. Management incentives should be intrinsically connected to the company's financial performance and strategic achievements. Compensation plans must adequately reward board members for their role in fostering long-term value creation (Lund, 2019). Tying executive compensation to essential financial metrics such as revenue growth, productivity, and investor returns encourages leaders to make decisions in line with investor interests. An illustrative example is the 2015 merger between Allergan and Actavis, in which Actavis adopted a compensation plan linking incentives to specific revenue and productivity targets. This approach pushed management to focus on operational excellence and collaboration while aligning earnings with investor expectations (Kumar & Kumar, 2019a). Consequently, the merger successfully realized value creation and operational synergies, showcasing the positive impact of well-structured incentive plans in M&A transactions. Moreover, compensation plans should contain elements that encourage leaders to stay dedicated to the merged entity for a substantial period post-deal completion. This practice can avert short-termism and opportunistic behaviors that lead to organizational issues. Instruments like restricted stock grants, vesting periods, and performance-based bonuses extended beyond the initial integration phase can guide leaders to prioritize the merged company's long-term success (Kumar & Kumar, 2019b).

Stringent and equitable oversight is essential for addressing agency costs in the M&A process. Independent boards and committees are crucial in providing this oversight. Independent directors contribute diverse perspectives and an impartial viewpoint, helping to prevent conflicts and address informational imbalances that can lead to corporate malfunctions (Sarabia et al., 2019). Forming an independent M&A advisory team within the board of directors, dedicated solely to overseeing the M&A process, can enhance transparency and accountability. This team should comprise experts with pertinent expertise who are not directly involved in the daily operations of the organizations involved (Ajay et al., 2019). Their duties encompass assessing the strategic rationale, incorporating input from a variety of stakeholders, evaluating potential risks, and ensuring that deal terms are equitable and serve investor interests. A prime example of effective corporate governance structures is seen in IBM's 2019 acquisition of Red Hat. IBM instituted a separate independent board of directors responsible for appraising and sanctioning the transaction (Battisti et al., 2021). This board was critical in ensuring a thorough and seamless integration process, aligning with IBM's core goals and safeguarding investor interests. The supervisory oversight by the board significantly contributed to a successful acquisition that generated value for both entities. Additionally, sound corporate governance frameworks should extend to cover post-merger integration. An independent oversight board can persistently monitor the integration process, ensuring that anticipated synergies are accomplished, cultural issues are managed, and value creation is achieved as projected (Alvarez et al., 2019).

VIII. CONCLUSION

Grasping and managing agency costs in mergers and acquisitions is imperative... imperative in the fluctuating business milieu of today. Agency costs, pertaining to the frictions between shareholders and managers, necessitate vigilant oversight and regulation to synchronize the interests of both entities. Within the realms of mergers and acquisitions (M&A), these costs gain pronounced importance, as amalgamating organizations grapple with the consolidation of disparate corporate cultures, strategies, and management styles. An inability to aptly comprehend and govern agency costs can culminate in substantial financial detriments, missed synergies, and organizational ineffectiveness. By grasping the essence and origins of agency costs, enterprises can enforce robust governance mechanisms and control frameworks to curb these expenditures. Furthermore, executives can ensure the alignment of shareholder and managerial interests through crafting suitable remuneration plans that motivate the realization of merger-associated goals. A thorough comprehension and handling of agency costs are indispensable to the thriving and enduring development within M&A endeavors. This examination elucidates the convoluted dynamics prevalent during such transactions by scrutinizing various agency costs and their repercussions across multiple stages of the M&A procedure. The outcomes underscore the exigency of recognizing agency costs and their ramifications on firm value and operational performance. Agency costs may emanate from internal and external domains, including managerial opportunism and informational asymmetry. Such costs can engender suboptimal decision-making processes, diminished shareholder value, and latent conflicts of interest. Consequently, managers and stakeholders must evaluate and regulate agency costs throughout the M&A progression to assure value generation and seamless integration.

Further scholarly inquiry into agency costs within M&A is requisite to deepen the comprehension of this intricate phenomenon. One prospective research avenue could explore the efficacy of corporate governance mechanisms in mitigating agency costs. Specifically, subsequent studies could scrutinize the impact of varying board structures and executive compensation frameworks in alleviating agency conflicts amidst M&As. The cultural elements influencing agency costs also warrant attention. Cross-cultural investigations can elucidate how agency dilemmas manifest in diverse cultural milieus and the influence of cultural variances on the efficacy of governance mechanisms in abating agency expenditures. Additionally, longitudinal inquiries are imperative to evaluate the prolonged impact of agency costs on post-merger performance. Through executing such research, academics can aid in the formation of more holistic paradigms and furnish practitioners with pivotal insights to enhance decision-making in M&A contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Ajay, S., Fuhrmann, J., & Kryut, B. (2019). Deal Logic Red Hat Inc. / IBM Corp. Retrieved from https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4whu/frontdoor/index/index/docId/764
2. Alvarez, S., Zander, U., Barney, J. B., & Afuah, A. (2020). Developing a theory of the firm for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Review, 45*(4), 711-716. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2020.0372
3. Baker, R. M. (2019). The agency of the principal-agent relationship: An opportunity for HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 21*(3), 303-318. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422319851274
4. Battisti, E., Christofi, M., Vrontis, D., & Nirino, N. (2021). Past, present, and future of mergers and acquisitions in the MENA region: A systematic review and integrative framework. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 51*(3), 276-296. https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.2021.1959876

5. Baysinger, B. D., & Butler, H. N. (1985). Corporate governance and the board of directors: Performance effects of changes in board composition. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization, 1*(1), 101-124. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jleo.a036883.
6. Bendickson, J., Muldoon, J., & Davis, P. E. (2016). Agency theory: The times, they are a-changin. *Management Decision, 54*(1), 174-193. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-02-2015-0058
7. Bettignies, J. E., & Ross, T. W. (2013). Mergers, agency expenses, and social welfare. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization, 30*(2), 401-436. https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/ews047
8. Carlier, G. (2001). Broad existence outcome for the principal-agent dilemma with adverse selection. *Journal of Mathematical Economics, 35*(1), 129-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/S03044068(00)00057-4
9. Cakali, K. R. (2022, March 18). Agency conflict in corporate oversight: Worldcom case. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/isletme/issue/65926/1018945
10. Cervellati, E. M. & Pavla, G. (2019). Mergers and purchases in the ICT market: The example of Microsoft and LinkedIn Corp. Retrieved from http://dspace.unive.it/handle/10579/14663
11. Das, S. (2019). Influence of merger on market rate and product quality: American and US Airways. *Review of Industrial Organization, 55*(3), 339-374. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-019-09717-2
12. Ekinci, B. (2017). Favoritism connection between principal and agent with agency expenses. *Manas Journal of Social Studies, 6*(2), 73-96. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mjss/issue/40510/485577
13. El Diri, M. E., Lambrinoudakis, C., & Alhadab, M. (2020). Corporate governance and earnings management in concentrated markets. *Journal of Business Research, 108*, 291-306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.013
14. Emmerich, A. O. (2020, March 1). The fresh dealmakers and dealbreakers: M&A activism. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3557520
15. Gompers, P. A. (2022). Prime investment, monitoring, and the staging of venture capital. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 285-313). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315235110-17
16. Gökkaya, S., Liu, X., & Stulz, R. M. (2023). Do firms with specialized M&A staff conduct better acquisitions? *Journal of Financial Economics, 147*(1), 75-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2022.09.002
17. Hendrastuti, R., & Harahap, R. F. (2023). Agency theory: Examination of the theory and modern research. *Jurnal Akuntansi Aktual, 10*(1), 85-85. https://doi.org/10.17977/um004v10i12023p085
18. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics, 3*(4), 305-360. Retrieved from https://www.sfu.ca/~wainwrig/Econ400/jensen-meckling.pdf
19. Junni, P., & Teerikangas, S. (2019). Mergers and Acquisitions *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-15
20. Kivistö, J., & Zalyevska, I. (2015). Agency theory as foundation for higher education administration. In J. Huisman et al. (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of higher education policy and administration* (pp. 132-151). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5_8
21. Kline, W. A., & Brown, R. S. (2019). Merger and acquisition targets: The role of moral risk and acquiring firm manager compensation. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 119-136. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/45176611
22. Kumar, B. R. (2019a). Major acquisitions by Facebook. In *Wealth creation in the world's largest mergers and acquisitions. Management for Professionals*. Springer, Cham, 321-327. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02363-8_39
23. Kumar, B. R. (2019b). Actavis-Allergan merger deal. In *Wealth creation in the world's largest mergers and acquisitions. Management for Professionals*. Springer, Cham, 183-189. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02363-8_19
24. Lee, C., & Wingreen, S. C. (2010). Transferability of knowledge, skills, and abilities along IT career paths: An agency theory viewpoint. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 20*(1), 23-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10919390903482382
25. Lei, Q., Lin, B., & Wei, M. (2013). Types of agency expense, corporate governance and liquidity. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 32*(3), 147-172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccpubpol.2013.02.008
26. Lund, D. S. (2019). Nonvoting shares and efficient corporate governance. *Stanford Law Review, 71*, 687-720. Retrieved from

https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/stflr71&section=18

27. Maas, A., Heugens, P., & Reus, T. H. (2018). Viceroys or emperors? An institution-based insight on merger and acquisition frequency and shareholder benefit. *Journal of Management Studies*, *56*(1), 234-269. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12335
28. Rashid, A. (2015). A reexamination of agency theory: Board independence and agency cost evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *130*(1), 181-198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2211-y
29. Ross, S. A. (1979). Balance and the agency--impermissible agents in public agency issue. *The American Economic Review*, *69*(2), 308-312. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1801664
30. Sarabia, M., Crecente, F., & Castaño, R. (2019). Why do sustainable mergers fail to manage entrepreneurship? *Sustainability*, *11*(2), 525. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020525
31. Schäuble, J. (2019). The impact of external and internal corporate governance mechanisms on agency costs. *Corporate Governance*, *19*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-02-2018-0053
32. Şişmanoğlu, E., Karayiğit, D. T., & Karabinar, S. (2020). The accounting and reporting of agency costs within agency theory framework. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation Studies*, *13*(3), 975-987. https://doi.org/10.29067/muvu.655159
33. Song, H., Li, X., & Zhang, X. (2019). Research on the influence of diversification strategy model on enterprise value based on principal-agent theory. In *2019 3rd International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences (ISEMSS 2019)* (pp. 263-269). Retrieved from https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/isemss-19/125918620
34. Tekin, H., & Polat, A. Y. (2020). A review of agency theory in financial context. *Anemon Muş Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(4), 1323-1329. https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.712351
35. Wu, C.-W., & Reuer, J. J. (2021). Acquirers' perception of signals in M&A markets: Influence of acquirer experience on objective selection. *Journal of Management Studies, 58*(5), 1237-1266. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12637
36. Yen, T.-Y., & André, P. (2019). The market response to corporate social responsibility's effect on mergers and acquisitions in developing markets. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 71*, 114-131. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1062976917303873