

# Do Managers Value Stock Options and Restricted Stock Consistent with Economic Theory?\*

Frank D. Hodge, Shiva Rajgopal, Terry Shevlin

First published: 18 January 2010

<https://doi.org/10.1506/car.26.3.11>

Citations: 37

\* Accepted by Michel Magnan. We acknowledge helpful comments from Michel Magnan (editor), Bob Bowen, Mark Bradshaw, Dave Burgstahler, Steve Huddart, Chris Ittner, Avi and Israela Kamara, Yuping Jia, Jim Jiambalvo, Jane Kennedy, Susan Krische, Mark Lang, Dawn Matsumoto, Steve Matsunaga, Maarten Pronk, Ed Rice, Lisa Sedor, D. Shores, Lan Shi, Arnie Wright, two anonymous reviewers, and workshop participants at Pennsylvania State University, Tilburg University Spring Camp, University of Melbourne, and the University of Washington. We thank Bob Bowen, Emer Dooley, Crystal Eney, Jim Jiambalvo, Jane Kennedy, and Avi and Israela Kamara for their help in recruiting participants for our field study and interviews. We are grateful to the executives and managers who participated in this project. Frank Hodge acknowledges the support of the Lane A. Daley Fellowship, Shiva Rajgopal acknowledges the support of the Herbert Whitten Professorship, and Terry Shevlin acknowledges the support of the Paul Pigott-PAC-CAR Professorship.

---

# Do Managers Value Stock Options and Restricted Stock Consistent with Economic Theory?\*

FRANK D. HODGE, *University of Washington Foster School of Business*

SHIVA RAJGOPAL, *University of Washington Foster School of Business*

TERRY SHEVLIN, *University of Washington Foster School of Business*

## 1. Introduction

We investigate whether current mid-level and future entry-level managers subjectively value stock options and restricted stock consistent with economic theory. We also investigate whether managers' subjective valuations are sensitive to changes in key characteristics of these equity instruments. We believe our investigation is important for three reasons. First, in recent years firms have granted the vast majority of options to employees who are not senior-level executives (Jensen, Murphy, and Wruck 2005).<sup>1</sup> Indirect anecdotal evidence suggests that these employees are less likely than senior-level executives to understand how stock options work.<sup>2</sup> Second, a fundamental premise underlying the traditional economics-based literature on stock options is that employees understand how to value them. If this premise does not hold, the efficacy of stock options as an incentive mechanism, and the findings from the literature relying on this premise, are called into question. Third, in 2005 the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) began requiring firms to recognize the fair value of stock options on the income statement. Since that time, many firms have considered cutting broad-based stock option plans or switching from broad-based option plans to restricted stock plans (Deloitte 2005). If employees perceive the relative value of stock options and restricted stock differently than firms do, switching from stock options to restricted stock could create ill will, increase employee turnover, and dilute the incentive effects of issuing equity compensation.

\* Accepted by Michel Magnan. We acknowledge helpful comments from Michel Magnan (editor), Bob Bowen, Mark Bradshaw, Dave Burgstahler, Steve Huddart, Chris Ittner, Avi and Israella Kamara, Yuping Jia, Jim Jiambalvo, Jane Kennedy, Susan Krische, Mark Lang, Dawn Matsu-moto, Steve Matsunaga, Maarten Pronk, Ed Rice, Lisa Sedor, D. Shores, Lan Shi, Arnie Wright, two anonymous reviewers, and workshop participants at Pennsylvania State University, Tilburg University Spring Camp, University of Melbourne, and the University of Washington. We thank Bob Bowen, Emer Dooley, Crystal Eney, Jim Jiambalvo, Jane Kennedy, and Avi and Israella Kamara for their help in recruiting participants for our field study and interviews. We are grateful to the executives and managers who participated in this project. Frank Hodge acknowledges the support of the Lane A. Daley Fellowship, Shiva Rajgopal acknowledges the support of the Herbert Whitten Professorship, and Terry Shevlin acknowledges the support of the Paul Pigott-PAC-CAR Professorship.

Ainslie, G., and N. Haslam. 1992. Hyperbolic discounting. In *Choice over Time*, eds. G. Lowenstein and J. Elster, 57–92. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

[Google Scholar](#)

Arya, A., and B. Mittendorf. 2005. Offering stock options to gauge managerial talent. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 40: 189–210.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Barber, B., and T. Odean. 2001. Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 116 (1): 261–92.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Benartzi, S. 2001. Excessive extrapolation and the allocation of company stock to retirement accounts. *Journal of Finance* 56 (5): 1747–64.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Bergman, N., and D. Jenter. 2007. Employee sentiment and stock option compensation. *Journal of Financial Economics* 84 (3): 667–712.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Bettis, J., J. Bizjak, and M. Lemmon. 2005. Exercise behavior, valuation, and the incentive effects of employee stock options. *Journal of Financial Economics* 76 (2): 445–70.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Brav, A., J. Graham, C. Harvey, and R. Michaely. 2005. Payout policy in the 21st century. *Journal of Financial Economics* 77 (3): 483–527.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Choi, J., D. Laibson, B. Madrian, and A. Metrick. 2004. Employees' investment decisions about company stock. NBER paper no. 10228.

[Google Scholar](#)

Core, J., and W. Guay. 2001. Stock option plans for non-executive employees. *Journal of Financial Economics* 61 (2): 253–87.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

De Bondt, W. 1993. Betting on trends: Intuitive forecasts of financial risk and return. *International Journal of Forecasting* 9 (3): 355-71.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Deloitte. 2005. *Options take a hit, but what will take their place?* The 2005 Deloitte Stock Compensation Survey. New York: Deloitte Development LLC.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Devers, C., R. Wiseman, and R. Holmes. 2007. The effects of endowment and loss aversion in managerial stock option valuation. *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (1): 191-208.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Farrell, A., S. Krische, and K. Sedatole. 2008. *Employees' subjective valuations of their stock options: Evidence on the use of heuristics*. Working paper, University of Illinois and Michigan State University.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Fidelity Investments. 2003. *Maximizing employee stock option plans*. Boston: Fidelity Investments.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Gebhardt, W., C. M. C. Lee, and B. Swaminathan. 2001. Toward an implied cost of capital. *Journal of Accounting Research* 39 (1): 135-76.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Goldstein, D., E. Johnson, and W. Sharpe. 2006. *Measuring consumer risk-return tradeoffs*. Working paper, London Business School, Columbia University, and Stanford University.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Golec, J., and M. Tamarkin. 1998. Bettors love skewness, not risk, at the horse track. *Journal of Political Economy* 106 (1): 205-25.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Graham, J., C. Harvey, and S. Rajgopal. 2005. The economic implications of corporate financial reporting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 40: 3-73.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Hall, B., and K. Murphy. 2002. Stock options for undiversified executives. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 33: 3-42.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Heath, C., S. Huddart, and M. Lang. 1999. Psychological factors and stock option exercise. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114 (2): 601–28.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Heisler, J. 1994. Loss aversion in a futures market: An empirical test. *Review of Futures Markets* 13: 793–822.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Hemmer, T., S. Matsunaga, and T. Shevlin. 1994. Estimating the "fair value" of employee stock options with expected early exercise. *Accounting Horizons* 8 (4): 23–42.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Hitt, M., M. Dacin, E. Levitas, J. Edhec, and A. Borza. 2000. Partner selection in emerging and developed market contexts: Resource-based and organizational learning perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal* 43 (3): 449–67.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Hodder, L., W. Mayew, M. McAnally, and C. Weaver. 2006. Employee stock option fairvalue estimates: Do managerial discretion and incentives explain accuracy?. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 23 (4): 933–75.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Huddart, S., and M. Lang. 1996. Employee stock option exercises: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 21: 5–43.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Ingersoll, J. 2006. The subjective and objective evaluation of incentive stock options. *Journal of Business* 79 (2): 453–87.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Jensen, N., K. Murphy, and E. Wruck. 2005. *Remuneration: Where we've been, how we got to here, what are the problems, and how to fix them*. Working paper, Harvard Business School.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Johnston, D. 2006. Managing stock option expense: The manipulation of option-pricing model assumptions. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 23 (2): 395–425.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Kahl, M., J. Liu, and F. Longstaff. 2002. Paper millionaires: How valuable is stock to a stockholder who is restricted from selling it? Working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Kahneman, D., and A. Tversky. 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica* 47 (2): 263–91.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Karolyi, A. 2001. *Why stock return volatility really matters*. Working paper, Ohio State University.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Kedia, S., and Mozumdar, A. 2002. *Performance impact of employee stock options*. Working paper, Harvard University.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Kim, D. C. 1992. Risk preferences in participative budgeting. *The Accounting Review* 67 (2): 303–18.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Klassen, K., and A. Mawani. 2000. The impact of financial and tax reporting incentives on option grants to Canadian CEOs. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 17 (2): 227–62.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Kloss, A., E. Weber, and M. Weber. 2005. Investment decisions and time horizons: Risk perception and risk behavior in repeated gambles. *Management Science* 51 (12): 1777–90.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Korniotis, G., and A. Kumar. 2007. *Does investment skill decline due to cognitive aging or improve with experience?* Working paper, University of Texas at Austin.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Lambert, R., D. Larcker, and R. Verrecchia. 1991. Portfolio considerations in valuing executive compensation. *Journal of Accounting Research* 29 (1): 129–49.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Liang, N., and S. Weisbenner. 2002. *Investor behavior and the purchase of company stock in 401(k) plans* — The importance of plan design. Working paper, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.



---

Longstaff, F. 1995. How much can marketability affect security values?. *The Journal of Finance* 50 (5): 1767-74.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Longstaff, F. 2001. Optimal portfolio choice and the valuation of illiquid securities. *Review of Financial Studies* 14 (2): 407-31.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Magnan, M., and S. St-Onge. 2005. The impact of profit sharing on the performance of financial services firms. *Journal of Management Studies* 42 (4): 761-91.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

March, J., and Z. Shapira. 1987. Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking. *Management Science* 33 (11): 1404-18.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Meulbroek, L. 2001. The efficiency of equity-linked compensation: Understanding the full cost of awarding executive stock options. *Financial Management* 30 (2): 5-30.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Nofsinger, J. 2008. *The psychology of investing*, 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Olsen, R. 1997. Investment risk: The experts' perspective. *Financial Analysts' Journal* 53 (2): 62-6.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Oyer, P., and S. Schaefer. 2005. Why do some firms give stock options to all employees? An empirical examination of alternative theories. *Journal of Financial Economics* 76 (1): 99-133.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Pratt, S. 1989. *Valuing a business*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

[Google Scholar](#)

---

Sanders, W. 2001. Behavioral responses of CEOs to stock ownership and stock option pay. *Academy of Management Journal* 44 (3): 477-92.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

St-Onge, S., M. Magnan, L. Thorne, and S. Raymond. 2001. The effectiveness of stock option plans: A field investigation of senior executives. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 10 (3): 250–66.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Slovic, P., and S. Lichtenstein. 1971. Comparison of Bayesian and regression approaches to the study of information processing in judgment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 6 (6): 649–744.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Taylor, S., and J. Brown. 1988. Illusion of well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin* 103 (2): 193–210.

[CAS](#) | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Tversky, A., and D. Kahneman. 1974. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science* 185 (4157): 1124–30.

[CAS](#) | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Weinstein, N. 1980. Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39 (5): 806–20.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Weinstein, N. 1987. Unrealistic optimism about illness susceptibility: Conclusions from a community-wide sample. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 10 (5): 481–500.

[CAS](#) | [PubMed](#) | [Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

---

Yates, F., and E. Stone. 1992. The risk construct. In *Risk-Taking Behavior*, ed. F. Yates, 1–25. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

[Web of Science®](#) | [Google Scholar](#)

Citing Literature



Download PDF



[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[About Cookies](#)

[Manage Cookies](#)

[Accessibility](#)

[Wiley Research DE&I Statement and Publishing Policies](#)

[Developing World Access](#)

#### **HELP & SUPPORT**

[Contact Us](#)

[Training and Support](#)

[DMCA & Reporting Piracy](#)

#### **OPPORTUNITIES**

[Subscription Agents](#)

[Advertisers & Corporate Partners](#)

#### **CONNECT WITH WILEY**

[The Wiley Network](#)

[Wiley Press Room](#)

---

Copyright © 1999-2025 John Wiley & Sons, Inc or related companies. All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies.

**WILEY**