

Impact Factor: **9.3**

5-Year Impact Factor:

 Contents More

## Abstract

This study examines the impact of competition-reducing resistance on the target firm during the takeover battle relative to gains obtained when the initial takeover offer is supported. Competition-reducing resistance is shown to have the opposite effect.



## Get full access to this article

View all access and purchase options for this article.

Get Access 

1 Though tender offer responses may have important implications for employees, creditors, or other groups, this article focuses only on their implications for shareholders of the target firm.

2 Targeted share repurchases ("greenmail") are premium share repurchases from a potential acquirer, excluding all other shareholders from the offer. Standstill agreements often accompany greenmail transactions. These agreements limit the percentage of voting shares that a substantial stockholder may own (Bradley & Wakeman, 1983).

3 Poison pill securities assume a variety of forms. Generally, they give shareholders of the target firm the right to purchase stock in their firm or the acquiring firm at a substantial discount if an outside investor obtains a major block of stock, usually 20%-30% (Malatesta & Walkling, 1988).

4 Antitakeover charter amendments ("shark repellents") limit the control of the acquirer in partial acquisitions. For example, fair price provisions require the acquirer to pay minority shareholders at

least the tender price in any subsequent mergers. Super-majority provisions require more than 50% control to affect mergers or major asset sales (Jarrell & Poulsen, 1987).

5 Counter tender offers ("Pac Man" strategies) are offers by the target firm to buy the shares of the would-be acquirer.

6 Dissagregation strategies involve selling assets particularly valued by the would-be acquirer ("crown jewel" sales) or granting another firm an option to purchase them in the event of a takeover ("lock-up" agreements).

7 Intrafirm tender offers and large scale open market repurchases are methods for the target firm to buy back their shares. "White squire" arrangements involve issuance of common stock to a firm expected to follow management recommendations toward the tender offer.

8 Several alternative measures of risk-adjusted returns were estimated including mean-adjusted returns (Masulis, 1980); cumulative abnormal residuals; standardized cumulative abnormal residuals (Dodd & Warner, 1983); and market -adjusted returns (Brown & Warner, 1985). The results remained essentially unchanged across risk-adjustment techniques.

9 The market model methodology assumes stationarity of the return process throughout the estimation period and event period. Uncertainty regarding target management response and the outcome of the offer suggests that takeover contests will increase the variance in daily security returns. In fact, for this sample, the average event period return variance is 3.81 times larger than the estimation period variance. This suggests that hypothesis tests based on methods that assume variance stationarity may be misspecified.

A simple cross-sectional regression provides a second test of hypotheses 3 and 5. This involves using ordinary least squares to estimate the following equation:

$$TR_j = a + b_1 TR_{mj} + b_2 D_1 TR_{mj} + b_3 D_2 TR_{mj} + b_4 D_1 + b_5 D_2 + e_j,$$

where  $TR_j$  = the total unadjusted return of security j during the event period,

$TR_{mj}$  = the total return of the market portfolio during the event period of firm j,

$D_1$  = 1 if the firm responds with auction-inducing resistance, 0 otherwise, and

$D_2$  = 1 if the firm responds with competition-reducing resistance, 0 otherwise.

The estimates of  $b_4$  and  $b_5$  reflect the effect of management response strategies on shareholder wealth. Estimates of  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ , and  $b_3$  reflect the relative sensitivity of returns to passive, auction-inducing, and competition-reducing firms to market returns. If the estimate of  $b_4$  exceeds 0, auction-inducing firms earn greater risk-adjusted returns during takeover contests than passive firms. An estimate of  $b_5$  less than 0 indicates that competition-reducing firms earn lower risk-adjusted returns during takeover contests than passive firms.

The results indicate that auction-inducing firms earned 19.38% more than passive firms ( $t = 2.74$ ), on average. Competition-reducing firms earned returns 25.96% lower than passive firms, on average, after

controlling for market fluctuations ( $t = -2.71$ ). These results are consistent with those presented in Table 4 and support hypotheses 3 and 5.

10. Several researchers have argued that related acquisitions offer greater potential gains than unrelated acquisitions (Kusewitt, 1985; Lubatkin, 1983, 1987; Porter, 1980, 1987; Salter & Weinholdt, 1978; Singh & Montgomery, 1987). Similarly, the size or financial resources available to the target firm may influence the gain available from an acquisition (Jemison & Sitkin, 1986). If any of these factors are correlated with response strategy and in fact influence gains to target shareholders during the post-announcement period, the observed relationship between response strategy and target shareholder gains may be spurious.

To address this possibility, the cross-sectional regression test described in footnote 9 was repeated controlling for firm size, liquidity, financial leverage, and various measures of relatedness with the acquiring firms. Controlling for these variables, however, had no material impact on the results.

## References

Austin, D. V., & Bernard, C. D. 1985. Tender offer update: 1985. *Mergers & Acquisitions*, Spring: 67-69.

[Google Scholar](#)

Balakrishnan, S. 1988. The prognostics of diversifying acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 185-196.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Barney, J. 1988. Returns to bidding firms in mergers and acquisitions: Reconsidering the relatedness hypothesis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 71-78.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Bradley, M., Desai, A., & Kim, E. 1983. The rationale behind interfirm tender offers: Information or synergy? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 183-206.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Bradley, M., & Wakeman, L. 1983. The wealth effects of targeted share repurchases. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 301-328.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Brown, S. J., & Warner, J. B. 1985. Using daily stock returns: The case of event studies. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 14: 3-31.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Dann, L. Y., & DeAngelo, H. 1983. Standstill agreements, privately negotiated stock repurchases, and the market for corporate control. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 275-300.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

DeAngelo, H., & Rice, E. M. 1983. Antitakeover charter amendments and stockholder wealth. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 329-360.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Dodd, P., & Warner, J. 1983. On corporate governance: A study of proxy contests. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 401-438.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. 1981. The proper role of a target's management in responding to a tender offer. *Harvard Law Review*, 94 (6): 1161-1204.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Fama, E. F., Fisher, L., Jensen, M. C., & Roll, R. 1969. The adjustment of stock prices to new information. *International Economic Review*, 10: 1-21.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Fowler, K. L., & Schmidt, D. R. 1989. Determinants of tender offer post-acquisition financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 339-350.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Hoffmeister, J. R., & Dyl, E. A. 1981. Predicting outcomes of cash tender offers. *Financial Management*, Winter: 51-58.

[Google Scholar](#)

Hopkins, H. D. 1987. Acquisition strategy and the market position of acquiring firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8: 535-547.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Hoskisson, R. E., Hitt, M. A., Turk, T. A., & Tyler, B. 1989. Balancing corporate strategy and executive compensation: Agency theory and corporate governance. In G.R. Ferris & K.M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 7: 25-57. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Huang, Y., & Walkling, R. A. 1987. Target abnormal returns associated with acquisitions announcements. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19: 329-349.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jarrell, G. A. 1985. The wealth effects of litigation by targets: Do interests diverge in a merge? *Journal of Law and Economics*, 28: 151-177.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jarrell, G. A., & Bradley, M. 1980. The economic effects of federal and state regulations of cash tender offers. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 23: 371-407.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jarrell, G. A., Brickley, J. A., & Netter, J. M. 1988. The market for corporate control: The empirical evidence since 1980. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2 (1): 49-68.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jarrell, G. A., & Poulsen, A. B. 1987. Shark repellents and stock prices: The effects of antitakeover amendments since 1980. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19: 127-168.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jemison, D. B., & Sitkin, S. B. 1986. Corporate acquisitions: A process perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 145-163.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jensen, M. C., & Ruback, R. S. 1983. The market for corporate control: The scientific evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 5-50.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Keown, A. J., & Pinkerton, J. M. 1981. Merger announcements and insider trading activity: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Finance*, 36: 855-868.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kosnik, R. D. 1987. Greenmail: A study of board performance in corporate governance. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 32: 1163-1185.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kosnik, R. D. 1990. The effect of board demography and directors' incentives on corporate greenmail decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 129-150.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kummer, D. R., & Hoffmeister, J. R. 1978. Valuation consequences of cash tender offers. *Journal of Finance*, 33: 505-516.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kusewitt, J. B. 1985. An exploratory study of strategic acquisitions factors relating to performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6: 151-169.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Linn, S. C., & McConnell, J. J. 1983. An empirical investigation of the impact of "antitakeover" amendments on common stock prices. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 11: 361-399.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Lubatkin, M., & Shrieves, R. E. 1986. Toward a reconciliation of market performance measures to strategic management research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 497-512.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Lubatkin, M. 1987. Merger strategies and stockholder value. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8: 39-53.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Malatesta, P. H., & Walkling, R. A. 1988. Poison pill securities: Stockholder wealth, profitability, and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20: 347-376.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Masulis, R. 1980. The effects of capital structure change on security prices: A study of exchange offers. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 8: 139-178.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Maupin, R. J. 1987. Financial and stock market variables as predictors of management buyouts. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8: 319-327.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Mikkelson, W. H., & Ruback, R. S. 1988. *Targeted repurchases and common stock returns*. Working paper, University of Oregon.



[Google Scholar](#)

Office of the Chief Economist, Securities and Exchange Commission. 1984. *The impact of targeted share repurchases (greenmail) on stock prices*, Washington, DC.

[Google Scholar](#)

Reinganum, M. R. 1981. Misspecification of capital asset pricing: Empirical anomalies based on earnings yields and market values. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 9: 19-46.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Rude, D. E. 1988. A test of the efficacy of two takeover defenses: The super majority rule and staggered director terms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management.

[Google Scholar](#)

Scholes, M., & Williams, J. 1977. Estimating betas from non synchronous data. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 4: 309-327.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Shelton, L. M. 1988. Strategic business fits and corporate acquisition: Empirical evidence. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 279-287.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Singh, H., & Montgomery, C. A. 1987. Corporate acquisition strategies and economic performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 8: 377-386.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Stulz, R. M., Walkling, R. A., & Song, M. H. 1989. *The distribution of target ownership and the division of gains in successful takeovers*. Working paper, Ohio State University.

[Google Scholar](#)

Travlos, N. G. 1987. Corporate takeover bids, methods of payment, and bidding firms' stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 42: 943-963.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Turk, T. A. 1989a. Golden parachutes as incentive alignment tools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management.

[Google Scholar](#)

Turk, T. A. 1989b. *The economic incentives of top executives and tender offer resistance: A test of the implications of agency theory for strategic management*. Working paper, Texas A&M University.

[Google Scholar](#)

Walkling, R. A., & Long, M. S. 1984. Agency theory, managerial welfare, and takeover bid resistance. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 15 (1): 54-68.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Walsh, J. P. 1988. Top management turnover following mergers and acquisitions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 173-183.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Walsh, J. P. 1989. Doing a deal: Merger and acquisition negotiations and their impact upon target company top management turnover. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 307-322.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Wansley, J. W., Lane, W. R., & Yang, H. C. 1983. Abnormal returns to acquired firms by type of acquisition and method. *Financial Management*, Spring: 16-23.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

Similar articles:

---



Restricted access

[The Equity Wealth Effects of Method of Payment in Takeover Bids for Privately Held Firms](#)

Show Details ▾

---



Restricted access

[Assessing Competition in The Market for Corporate Control: Australian Evidence](#)

Show Details ▾

---



Restricted access

[Taking Stock of What We Know About Mergers and Acquisitions: A Review and Research Agenda](#)

Show Details ▾

---

[View More](#)

Sage recommends:

---

**SAGE Knowledge**

Entry

[Greenmail](#)

Show Details ▾

---

**SAGE Knowledge**

Whole book

[Mergers, Acquisitions and Corporate Restructuring](#)

Show Details ▾

---

**SAGE Knowledge**

Entry

[Hostile Takeovers](#)

Show Details ▾

[View More](#)

You currently have no access to this content. Visit the [access options](#) page to authenticate.

[Download PDF](#)

## Also from Sage

### CQ Library

Elevating debate

### Sage Data

Uncovering insight

### Sage Business Cases

Shaping futures

### Sage Campus

Unleashing potential

### Sage Knowledge

Multimedia learning resources

### Sage Research Methods

Supercharging research

### Sage Video

Streaming knowledge

### Technology from Sage

Library digital services