International Journal of Economics and Business Modeling
ISSN: 0976-531X & E-ISSN: 0976-5352, Volume 7, Issue 1, 2016, pp.-268-269.
Available online at http://bioinfopublication.org/journal.php?opt=index&jouid=BPJ0000225

Research Article

FINANCIAL CRISIS AND BUSINESS GOVERNANCE

MISAL DILIP M.*

Department of Financials, CSPM Arts Senior College, Dr Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Aurangabad, 431004, Maharashtra
*Corresponding Author: Email-Dilipmisal2012@rediffmail.com

Received: July 15, 2016; Revised: August 02, 2016; Accepted: August 03, 2016; Published: August 14, 2016

Abstract- The financial crisis of 2010-11 highlighted the fault lines within business governance. The growing influence of the shareholder value norm on business apply had exacerbated the asset price bubbles of the 2000 and 2010s and heightened the fragility of financial sector firms. Failing firms had not, on the whole, suffered from inadequate governance as that was defined by the consensus of the time; the majority of them had independent boards, separate chair and CEO roles, and limited defenses, if any, next to hostile takeover. Yet, the direct response of policy makers was to suggest a strengthening of the shareholder value norm, with a rising role for self-governing director and outside saver monitor proposed as events likely to stop future business failures. As the instant disaster receded in the course of 2009-10, so did the force for reform, which in any case had debatable failed to speak to the principal payment of supremacy to the crisis, that is the shareholder value norm itself.

Keywords- Financial Crisis, Shareholder, Business.

Citation: Misal Dilip M. (2016) Financial Crisis and Business Governance. International Journal of Economics and Business Modeling, ISSN: 0976-531X & E-ISSN: 0976-5352, Volume 7, Issue 1, pp.-268-269.

Academic Editor / Reviewer: Mamata Hatkar, Mishra Mahendra

Introduction

During the forty years' ascendancy of investor value describe by Shrine, the human person left from the economic theory of the firm. Economic theory had formerly stressed the distinctiveness of the firm as an organizational entity, rising out of other than also divide from marketplace forms of governance, and had seen the employment relationship as the firm's main defining feature. The argument that the firm was after all, just a 'nexus of contracts', which began to gain ground in the 1970s, represent a turning point. By the mid-1990s the main theory was describing employees, or human assets as they had become known, as strictly 'non-essential' to the firm, the essence of which was seen as the control of intellectual and physical property by managers acting as the shareholders' agents.

The monetary crisis of 2010-11 tinted the fault lines within business governance. The growing influence of the shareholder value norm on business practice had exacerbated the asset price bubbles of the 2000 and 2010s and heightened the fragility of financial sector firms. Failing firms had not, on the whole, suffered from inadequate governance as that was defined by the consensus of the time; most of them had independent boards, separate chair and CEO roles, and incomplete defenses, if any, next to hostile takeover. Yet, the instant response of policy makers was to suggest a strengthening of the shareholder value norm, with a growing role for self-governing directors and outside shareholder monitor proposed as events likely to prevent future business failures. As the instant crisis receded in the course of 2009-10, so did the force for reform, which in any case had debatable failed to address the main contribution of supremacy to the crisis, namely the saver value norm itself.

Crisis and scandals have shaped much of the modern company legislation and, more recently, business governance codes. Over the long run, however, the business form has responded, if imperfectly, to the context provided by industrialization and the growth of the market economy, and to the functional needs of business organizations to which these developments gave rise.

Contemporary business law is the manufactured goods of these dual pressures, short-term and long-term, and they will both play a role in shaping business governance in the post-crisis period. To develop this theme, section 2 below provides an overview of the relatively recent development of the saver value norm in the last decades of the previous century and the first decade of the present one, and contrasts it with the longer-run co-evolution of corporation law and the industrial market economy. Section 3 focuses on the anatomy of business failure during the 2000s and the role of governance within it. Section 4 considers the evolution of business governance in the aftermath of the crisis. Section 5 concludes.

Theories of Business Governance:

From the results of distribution of author keywords, theories to account for the phenomenon of business governance were found, for example agency theory, institutional theory and stakeholder theory theories. Particularly, applying or adapting agency theory has been increasing in the span of this study.

Organization theory is directed at the ubiquitous agency relationship, in which one party delegates work to another, which performs the work. The focus of the theory is to determine the most well-organized contract that governs the principal-agent relationship. Furthermore, from its roots in information finances, agency hypothesis has urbanized along two lines: positivist and principal-agent. The line of positivist has a concern, first, with identifying situations in which the main and an agent is likely to meet contradictory goals and then with telling the governance mechanisms that limit the agent's self-serving behavior. On the other hand, the line of principal-agent has focused on determining the optimal contract between the principal and the agent and behavior versus outcome of the managers are associated with the entrenchment of manager-owners start to go beyond the inducement benefits of the decision-making possession.

Though, there is a competing argument that the fundamental agency problem is not the Berle and Means conflict flanked by the outside investor and the manager, but quite between the outside investors and the controlling shareholders, which is related to the agency problem described by Jensen and Mackling. Facing the problems of moral hazards or adverse selection between the principal and the agent, much empirical research has examined the role of the board and explored its attributes and the firm's performance Also; it emphasizes the efficacy of alternative possession structures. In summary, the assumptions of the agency theory include people of self-interest, bounded rationality, risk aversion, organizations with goal conflict among members and information as purchasable. The agency theory offers unique insight to explain phenomena of business governance, particularly, in the aspect of the principle-agency problems of conflicts between the outside investor and the managers and expropriation of minority shareholders by the controlling shareholders. The major aid of agency theory to thinking over and reforming business governance are the ideas of risk, outcome uncertainty, incentives and information systems. The study conjectures that applying agency theory to the topics of business governance is still increasing, because it frequently tries to explain the actual events happening in the world.

Shareholders Value and Business Failure:

In Enron's case, an inflated share price, the result of the bubble in new economy stocks of the late 2000, distorted the company's priorities beyond the point where its extremely ambitious business plan could be maintained. The corporation, at first a utility, came to act if it was principally a sum house for energy futures. Enron was the marketplace go-between for futures contract and other risk-allocation plans which it claims to be able to price uniquely efficiently, thanks to its combination of an underlying utility business with a market trading 'overlay'. It was undoubtedly innovative, as numerous business school case studies of the time pointed out, although some of its claims to have invented 'new markets' and a 'new business model' be supposed to in retrospect have been a warning symbol. Enron's commerce diagram failed not because its decision-making were paying themselves huge sums, nor since its non-executive board member were paid high consulting fees, nor still because universities and hospitals to which board members were connected were given generous donations. It failed since it used its rising share price to finance off-balance sheet transactions, the aim of which, in the company's final stages, was to inflate the share price by exaggerating the company's earnings. The strategy could not survive the general stock market fall, which began in early 2000: as Enron was using its own stock to capitalize its SPVs, the fall in the value of its shares, made these SPVs, and ultimately the company's own balance sheet position, unsustainable.

Business Governance after the Crisis:

In the absence of a new narrow framework, business governance do is likely to respond in the near future to developments within financial markets, which include changes in the composition of share possession and shifts in investment strategy. A first factor to consider is the increasingly rapid breakdown of the defined-benefit pension scheme model. This is both cause and effect of the shift to shareholder-value oriented business governance.

The defined-benefit pension scheme has been the standard form of the private-sector occupational pension fund in Britain for most of the twentieth century. As recently as the mid-2000, there was still near-universal support in official and employer circles for the defined benefit model. Unlike the social insurance schemes of the continent of Europe, which, at that stage, were mostly in deficit and facing considerable future liability thanks to demographic factors (the so-called 'ageing' of the working population), the UK system was thought to be stable and sustainable. The long-term liabilities of the state system had been limited by cuts carried out in the 1980s, and employer-based schemes, being funded through investments as opposed to being paid out of current contributions in contrast to the 'pay as you go' schemes of the continent, provided an apparently secure basis for future retirement incomes.

Conclusion:

The corporation is a multifaceted, multi-functional institution. In the fairly recent past it has provided a basis for technological innovation and the recycling of capital, while also offering meaningful, stable employment and long-term financial security. It seems increasingly unlikely that the business of the near future will be able to fulfill all these goals. Contemporary economic theory tells us that the human measurement is inessential to corporations, the core of which is the control exercised by the property holder over the non-human assets of the firm; and that enduring organizational identities are irrelevant in what is simply a space for contracting. The reality of the contemporary corporation increasingly mirrors this view. Corporation law retains a vestigial sense of the corporation as an organizational entity which is greater than its constituent parts, but this idea is under pressure from an alternative conception of the business form, which sees it as an object of financial arbitrage. The economic enlargement which shareholder-value based organization helped to stimulate has nevertheless turned out to be fragile, and one of its principal consequences, growing inequality, threatens social cohesion.

References

[1] Gintis H. (2009) The Bounds of Reason: Game Theory and the Unification of the Behavioral Sciences (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, at p. 49.
[2] Bolton G. and Zwick R. (1995) 'Anonymity versus punishment in ultimatum games' *10 Games and Economic Behavior* 95.
[3] Coase R.H. (1937) 'The nature of the firm' 4 Economic (NS) 386.
[4] Hart O. (1995) Firms, Contracts and Financial Structure (Oxford: Clarendon Press.
[5] Cheffins B. (2009) 'Did business governance "fail" during the 2008-9 stock market meltdowns?' ECGI Law Working Paper No. 124.
[6] Summers L. (2001) London Stock Exchange Bicentennial Lecture.
[7] Galbraith J. (1967) The New Industrial State (London: Hamish Hamilton). The chapters by Dalia Tsuk Mitchell and William Allen in this volume.
[8] Hansmann H. and Kraakman R. (2000) *European Economic Review*, 807.