

FORTHCOMING IN ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL

**WHY “GOOD” FIRMS DO BAD THINGS:
THE EFFECTS OF HIGH ASPIRATIONS, HIGH EXPECTATIONS AND
PROMINENCE ON THE INCIDENCE OF CORPORATE ILLEGALITY**

Yuri Mishina
Eli Broad School of Business
N 475 North Business Complex
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-353-6422
mishina@bus.msu.edu

Bernadine J. Dykes
Department of Business Administration
Alfred Lerner College of Business & Economics
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-1808
bjdykes@UDel.Edu

Emily S. Block
Management Department
University of Notre Dame
375 MCOB
Notre Dame, IN 46556
574-631-3299
eblock1@nd.edu

Timothy G. Pollock
Smeal College of Business
The Pennsylvania State University
417 Business Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-863-0740
tpollock@psu.edu

We would like to thank Associate Editor Gerry Sanders and the three anonymous AMJ reviewers for their many helpful comments and suggestions. We would also like to thank Ruth Aguilera, Gerry McNamara, Abhijeet Vadera, John Wagner and Bob Wiseman, who provided us with insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper, Cindy Devers and Edward Voisin, who assisted us with information on environmental violations, and FX Nursalim Hadi and Zvi Ritz, who helped us track down the historical names of firms in our sample.

**WHY “GOOD” FIRMS DO BAD THINGS:
THE EFFECTS OF HIGH ASPIRATIONS, HIGH EXPECTATIONS AND
PROMINENCE ON THE INCIDENCE OF CORPORATE ILLEGALITY**

ABSTRACT

Researchers have long argued that the potential costs of getting caught breaking the law decrease a high-performing firm's need and desire to engage in illegal activities. However, the recent history of high-profile corporate scandals involving prominent and high-performing firms casts some doubt on these assertions. In this study, we explain this paradoxical organizational phenomenon by using theories of loss aversion and hubris to examine the propensity of a sample of S&P 500 manufacturing firms to engage in illegal behavior. Our results demonstrate that both performance above internal performance aspirations and performance above external expectations increase the likelihood a firm will engage in illegal activities, and that the prominence of these firms further enhances the effects of performance above expectations on the likelihood they engage in illegal actions. We also find that prominent and less prominent firms display different patterns of behavior when their performance fails to meet aspirations.

Keywords: prospect theory, reputation, corporate illegality

Research in a variety of disciplines and drawing on a variety of theoretical perspectives has long suggested that good performance provides a variety of benefits and opportunities for organizations that not only decrease the need to consider engaging in unethical, illegitimate or illegal activities, but provide strong disincentives to do so (e.g., Barney, 1991; Coleman, 1988; Fombrun, 1996; Harris & Bromiley, 2007; Karpoff, Lee, & Martin, 2009; Karpoff & Lott, 1993). Researchers have argued that a firm could suffer numerous negative consequences if it was caught engaging in illegal activities, including damaged firm performance (Davidson & Worrell, 1988), loss of access to important resources, and severely tarnished reputations for both the firm and its managers (e.g., Karpoff et al., 2009; Karpoff & Lott, 1993; Wiesenfeld, Wurthmann, & Hambrick, 2008). Further, research also suggests that these losses can be greater for prominent firms than for less prominent and less well-regarded companies (e.g., Fombrun, 1996; Rhee & Haunschild, 2006; Wade, Porac, Pollock, & Graffin, 2006).

Consistent with these arguments, prior research on corporate illegality has argued that high performing firms are less likely to feel the strains that can trigger the use of illegal activities (e.g., Baucus & Near, 1991; Clinard & Yeager, 1980; Harris & Bromiley, 2007; Staw & Sz wajkowski, 1975). However, empirical tests of this relationship have not yielded consistent results (e.g., Baucus & Near, 1991; Clinard & Yeager, 1980; Hill et al., 1992; McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Simpson, 1986; Staw & Sz wajkowski, 1975). Recent history further illustrates the complexity of this issue. Many of the firms involved in corporate scandals, such as Arthur Andersen, Enron, World Com, Tyco, and several leading investment banks were generally viewed as prominent and/or high-performing companies until their scandals were uncovered.

Thus, although prior research has identified strong disincentives for high performing and prominent firms to engage in illegal activity, research on corporate illegality provides little

guidance in explaining why and under what conditions prominent and successful firms would take such risks. This is the paradoxical question we attempt to address in this study. We argue that in order to unpack this riddle it is necessary to consider a firm's performance *relative* to the performance of its industry peers, rather than its absolute level of performance, which is what most prior research has considered. In exploring this issue, we draw on the literatures in social cognition and behavioral economics to explore how the pressures associated with one's own high performance aspirations (Lant, 1992) and others' expectations that high relative levels of performance will be maintained (Adler & Adler, 1989) can influence the collective perceptions and risk taking of high performing and/or prominent organizations. We argue that the threat of declines in future relative performance and the potential costs to the organization and its managers of not meeting internal aspirations and external expectations increase the likelihood of illegal behavior, and that the likelihood is even greater when a firm is also prominent.

Our arguments and findings contribute to the literatures on corporate illegality and managerial decision making in several ways. First, this study contributes both theoretically and empirically to the literature on corporate illegality by differentiating between a firm's performance relative to the performance of its industry peers (which we label performance relative to internal aspirations), its current market performance relative to its prior market performance (which we label performance relative to external expectations) and absolute levels of performance. Doing so allows us to delineate the theoretical mechanisms that can make both strong performance relative to internal aspirations and external expectations potential drivers of corporate illegality. Because we consider how relative, rather than absolute levels of performance can lead to illegal actions, we are able to consider a wider array of theoretical explanations than previous studies to help explain the inconsistencies in this research. To date, a

recent study by Harris and Bromiley (2007) is the only research we are aware of that has considered the effects of relative performance on corporate malfeasance, and this study focused primarily on performance below aspirations. No research we are aware of explains why performing above aspirations can increase the likelihood of illegal actions, or has considered how external performance expectations affect the incidence of corporate illegality and how a firm's prominence is likely to moderate these relationships. Finally, our study contributes to the growing literature exploring how cognitive biases and limitations shape top management team (TMT) decision making by discussing the mechanisms that can lead TMTs to engage directly in illegal actions and/or create the conditions that lead others in the firm to do so, even when past performance has been good (e.g., Carpenter, Pollock & Leary, 2003; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Hayward & Hambrick, 1997).

We explore these issues by studying how high performance relative to internal aspirations and external expectations influence the propensity of a sample of S&P 500 manufacturing firms to engage in illegal behavior during the period 1990 through 1999. We further examine how firm prominence might amplify the influence of high performance relative to aspirations and expectations on the likelihood of engaging in illegal activity.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Corporate illegality is defined as *an illegal act meant to primarily benefit the firm by potentially increasing revenues or decreasing costs* (e.g., McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Szwajkowski, 1985). This definition expressly excludes illegal activities that are primarily meant to benefit the specific individual engaging in the act. Thus, a CFO's embezzlement of corporate funds, for example, would not fall under the rubric of corporate illegality because it is a transgression intended to benefit the individual embezzler at the expense of the firm and its

shareholders. In contrast, violating an environmental regulation by inappropriately disposing of hazardous materials would be an instance of corporate illegality because it is an act meant to lower the compliance costs for a firm, thereby increasing firm profitability and the value of the firm's stock¹. As such, corporate illegality can be a way for a firm to boost its performance as it faces pressures to meet financial goals and expectations.

Empirical research on corporate illegality has considered a number of factors that can predict which organizations are more likely to engage in illegal behavior (for reviews see Birkbeck & LaFree, 1993; Hill et al., 1992; McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Vaughan, 1999). Theoretically, this stream of research has built on the general premise that firms are more likely to engage in corporate illegality when the upside benefits of doing so are perceived as outweighing the downside risks (e.g., Braithwaite, 1985; Coleman, 1987; Ehrlich, 1974; Sutherland, 1961). Based on this notion, scholars have examined the effects of firm performance; firm structure; executive compensation; and various environmental factors, including market booms and busts, on the incidence of corporate illegality (e.g., Baucus & Near, 1991; Clinard et al., 1979; Harris & Bromiley, 2007; Hill et al., 1992; Johnson, Ryan & Tian, 2008; McKendall et al., 2002; McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Povel, Singh & Winton, 2007; Simpson, 1986; Staw & Szwajkowski, 1975; Vaughan, 1999).

In this study, we focus on the relationship between prior firm performance that exceeds aspirations and/or exceeds market expectations and corporate illegality, and seek to understand the role these factors play in determining why and when successful firms are likely to perceive that the potential benefits of illegality outweigh the costs. Other scholars have recently begun to consider why "good" firms may engage in illegal actions (Johnson et al., 2008) or why firms

¹ Such an action is considered an example of corporate illegality even if individual executives benefit from the resultant stock increase (Zhang, Bartol, Smith, Pfarrer & Khanin, 2008), because the illegal action was intended to enhance corporate performance and the stock price increase benefits all shareholders, not just executives.

might engage in illegal actions during “good times” (Povel et al., 2007). However, whereas these studies have focused on either executives’ personal compensation incentives (Johnson et al., 2008), or processes associated with general market conditions (i.e., market booms) that are not specific to individual firms (Povel et al., 2007), we focus on firm-level antecedents and argue that high-performing firms may engage in corporate illegality in order to maintain their performance relative to unsustainably high internal aspirations and external expectations and that these pressures may be greater for prominent firms. These pressures can drive firms to take illegal actions even when they have, and continue to, perform well on an absolute basis.

Because of the issue we are studying and the methods we employ, we are not able to directly assess the *ex ante* aspirations and perceptions of firms’ top management teams (TMTs). Thus, in developing our theory and hypotheses we make two important assumptions. First, consistent with decades of study on upper echelons (see Finkelstein, Hambrick & Canella [2009] for a recent and exhaustive review), we assume that the perceptions of a firm’s TMT matter and will affect the firm’s actions. Thus, even though we operationalize our constructs at the organizational level, we employ individual-level theories of psychological processes and cognitive biases to develop our hypotheses. Our empirical approach and the measures we employ to operationalize our constructs are consistent with the literature on firm performance relative to aspirations (Harris & Bromiley, 2007; Greve, 2003; Mezas, Chen & Murphy, 2002), which has explored related issues at the firm, industry and inter-industry levels. Second, we cannot definitively determine which individual, or group of individuals, is involved in a given illegal act; further, the particulars are likely to differ across firms and events. We therefore assume that whether TMT members themselves decided to commit the illegal act or whether it was an individual or group lower in the organization’s hierarchy, the culture of the organization, the

aspiration levels set, and the pressure to continue meeting or exceeding aspirations are established and fostered by the TMT.

High Aspirations and Expectations and Illegal Behavior

Researchers in behavioral economics and psychology have long studied individual decision making processes, and have found that individuals frequently act in ways that violate traditional economic assumptions of rationality in decision making. Rather than explaining these behaviors away as merely irrational or idiosyncratic, they have proposed a variety of psychological processes that can explain these seemingly aberrant outcomes. Key to these theories is the insight that absolute levels of performance are less meaningful than performance relative to some reference point that actors will aspire to meet or exceed (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Thaler & Johnson, 1990). We focus on three processes that could explain why firms with high relative performance may be more likely to engage in illegal actions: loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), the house money effect (Thaler & Johnson, 1990) and executive hubris (Hayward & Hambrick, 1997). Although these processes have been used to examine individual decision making more generally, a number of authors have suggested that they can be applied specifically to the decision making of CEOs and TMTs (e.g., Fiegenbaum, Hart, & Schendel, 1996; Fiegenbaum & Thomas, 1988; Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Sanders, 2001; Wiseman & Gomez-Mejia, 1998). We use these processes to understand how both a firm's internal aspirations and investors' expectations can shape managers' framing and perceptions of the riskiness of illegal practices.

Loss aversion. A key theoretical perspective that has emerged from research on cognitive biases is prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). This perspective states that the manner in which individuals frame choices affects how the choice is evaluated, and that the framing can

be influenced by whether or not actors perceive themselves to be in a gain or loss position. Prospect theory suggests that individuals evaluate choices by gauging whether the choice represents a potential gain, a sure gain, a potential loss, or a sure loss, and that they will behave in a risk-averse manner to protect sure gains and in a risk-seeking manner to avoid sure losses (e.g., Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). Extending these ideas, Tversky and Kahneman (1991) suggested that choices are also dependent on the reference point used, such that even positive outcomes can be framed as losses, and negative outcomes as gains. Further, they argued that even if potential gains and losses are of similar magnitude, the negative consequences of losses will loom larger than the potential positive consequence of the gains and will therefore dominate decision making; a phenomenon they labeled “loss aversion.”

Research in both management and finance has demonstrated that the aspirational reference point used to evaluate performance increases quickly when actors experience performance gains, and that these reference points can be either self-referencing, or relative to some other actor or group. For example, in a set of experiments using teams of managers in an executive education program and teams of MBA students, Lant (1992) found that the teams’ aspiration levels adjusted to performance feedback with an optimistic bias. That is, the teams’ aspiration levels used in determining success or failure increased when they received positive performance feedback. However, as aspirations increase so does the likelihood that the team will fail to meet its aspirations, as ever higher levels of performance will be required just to maintain the status quo. In competitive strategy this phenomenon is known as the “Red Queen Effect” (Derfus, Maggitti, Grimm & Smith, 2008); that is, a circumstance where a firm must perform better and better relative to its competition just to maintain its current market position². However,

² The term is drawn from Alice's conversation with the Red Queen in *Through the Looking Glass*. “Alice realizes that although she is running as fast as she can, she is not getting anywhere, relative to her surroundings. The Red

performance cannot continue to increase at the same rate indefinitely; thus, performance levels are likely to eventually peak and flatten out. When this occurs, teams whose aspirational reference points have increased will perceive a loss because their relative performance has declined, even if their absolute level of performance is still quite high. Given that losses loom larger than gains, prior research has suggested that individuals will fight harder to retain what they currently possess than they will to gain something they have never owned (Cialdini, 2004). Thus, it is easy to see how high performers can experience pressures to maintain or exceed their performance aspirations that make them more willing to take risky illegal actions.

External investors' expectations based on historically high stock performance can create similar pressures and perceptions. Research in finance has found that investors tend to extrapolate trends (DeBondt, 1993), and strong current firm performance leads to excessively optimistic expectations about future performance from both equity analysts (DeBondt & Thaler, 1990; Rajan & Servaes, 1997) and investors (DeBondt & Thaler, 1985, 1986; La Porta, 1996). At the same time, it becomes increasingly difficult to meet these high expectations. Firms face a tradeoff between current performance and future performance and growth (Penrose, 1959). Further, because firms' stock prices tend to be mean-reverting³ (e.g., Brooks & Buckmaster, 1976), the likelihood of a high performer maintaining or improving its performance in the following period is rather low. High current firm performance, therefore, has the unintended effect of increasing the likelihood that the firm will be unable to meet future expectations.

Unfortunately, unexpected negative information is disproportionately influential (Rozin & Royzman, 2001), and the tendency of both analysts and financial markets is to overreact to

Queen responds: 'Here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!'" (quoted in Derfus et al., 2008: 61).

³ That is, higher than average performance tends to be followed by performance declines, and lower than average performance tends to be followed by performance increases.

unexpected news (e.g., DeBondt & Thaler, 1985). Thus, any indication that a firm may not be able to meet expectations often results in a drop in the firm's stock price (e.g., Beneish, 1999). For example, Google Inc.'s stock price dropped by 12.4 percent after announcing its results for the fourth quarter of 2005, despite strong performance, because it was below the market's expectations (Liedtke, 2006). Similarly, Amazon.com shares dropped 16 percent on the day after it reported its earnings for the third quarter of 2007, despite beating earnings estimates, because the market expected even greater performance (Martin, 2007). While the inability to meet investors' and analysts' expectations can be detrimental to any firm, it is particularly damaging to firms that have a history of high performance. Skinner and Sloan (2002), for example, found that the stocks of firms the financial market was particularly optimistic about tended to have asymmetrically large negative price reactions to negative earnings surprises.

Taken together, this suggests that firms with high expectations are the most likely to face costly negative market reactions in the future due to the combination of shifts in reference point (e.g., De Bondt & Thaler, 1985, 1986; La Porta, 1996; Lant, 1992), difficulties in maintaining high performance (e.g., Brooks & Buckmaster, 1976; Penrose, 1959), and the punitive nature of market judgments (e.g., Skinner & Sloan, 2002)⁴. Consequently, the CEOs and managers of firms experiencing high external expectations are likely to frame the future as a choice between an almost certain loss if they fail to make changes or a chance to stave off that loss if they engage in riskier behaviors (e.g., Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981, 1991). Indeed, Beneish (1999) found that the primary characteristic of earnings manipulators was that they had high growth in the periods prior to those in which they engaged in earnings

⁴ Punitive market judgments also appear to extend to the labor market. For example, Semadini, Cannella, Fraser, and Lee (2008) found that executives of banks that received FDIC intervention were more likely to suffer negative career consequences such as demotion and transfer to geographic locations where they did not possess an existing set of client relationships.

manipulation, and argued this was because the firms' financial positions and capital needs put pressure on managers to achieve earnings targets. We suggest that CEOs and managers of firms facing a potential loss in future stock price performance (due to high current performance) may also view illegal activities as a stop-gap solution to keep from disappointing these constituents.

The house money effect and hubris. It is also possible that another set of psychological processes associated with high performance could increase the likelihood of corporate illegality; the "house money effect" (Thaler & Johnson, 1990) and hubris (Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Thaler & Johnson, 1990). Based on the idea of mental accounting (Thaler, 1985), where gains and losses are coded according to a prospect theory value function, Thaler and Johnson (1990) found that prior gains and prior losses could influence risk-taking, such that prior gains tended to lead to higher levels of risk-seeking. They labeled this phenomenon the "house money effect" based on the notion that individuals with prior gains perceive themselves to be gambling with "the house's" money (i.e., the profits from prior winning bets) rather than their own capital. Prior losses, on the other hand, lead to risk aversion, except when individuals believe that there is a chance to break even or end up ahead, in which case it also leads to risk seeking.

Since the manner in which decisions are framed affects the willingness to take risks (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981, 1986), high performance will not necessarily induce loss aversion (Tversky & Kahneman, 1991). Rather, the nature of the mental accounting rules (Thaler, 1985) used by managers will determine whether prior gains or losses are readily assimilated into their reference points and affect aspirations and subsequent decision making. Traditional economic reasoning suggests that prior gains and losses represent "sunk costs" and should have no bearing on subsequent decision making (e.g., Denzau, 1992). However, researchers have found that individuals nonetheless often take sunk costs into account

when making decisions (Thaler, 1980). As discussed previously, if a company has experienced substantial gains its CEO and managers may become more risk seeking, since they are now betting with “the house’s” money.

Thaler and Johnson (1990) note that, in addition to framing downside costs as less expensive, prior success can also engender hubris (e.g., Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Roll, 1986). They suggest extended periods of high performance can make organizational managers excessively confident in their own infallibility, leading them to become more risk seeking. Because they believe they cannot fail, the downside consequences of a risky activity are ignored and only the upside potential of its successful execution is considered. In our research context, this would imply that hubristic managers would be more likely to believe they could outsmart regulatory authorities or the market and avoid detection of their illegal activities, thus increasing the likelihood that they engage in corporate illegality due to high aspirations and expectations.

Given the data available to us we cannot adjudicate which process—loss aversion, the house money effect and/or hubris—is operating in a given situation; however, while different psychological processes may be at work across events, all three suggest that high performance relative to aspirations and high stock price performance relative to expectations should increase the likelihood that a firm will engage in corporate illegality. Therefore we hypothesize⁵,

Hypothesis 1: High firm accounting performance relative to aspirations will be positively related to the likelihood that a firm engages in corporate illegality.

Hypothesis 2: High firm stock price performance relative to expectations will be positively related to the likelihood that a firm engages in corporate illegality.

The Moderating Effects of Prominence

⁵ Because our theoretical focus is on high performance relative to aspirations and expectations we do not develop specific hypotheses about the effects of performance below aspirations and expectations. However, we do include measures for performance below aspirations and expectations in our empirical analysis, and discuss the implications of our findings with respect to these measures in the discussion section.

A firm's prominence reflects the degree to which external audiences are aware of an organization's existence, as well as the extent to which it is viewed as relevant and salient by those audiences (e.g., Brooks, Highhouse, Russell & Mohr, 2003; Ocasio, 1997; Rindova, Petkova & Kotha, 2007; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova & Sever, 2005). Prominence can confer many benefits on a firm, including price premiums (Rindova et al., 2005), an enhanced ability to form strategic alliances (Pollock & Gulati, 2007), and heightened investor and media attention and positive evaluations (Pollock et al., 2008). On the other hand, prominence also makes firms more likely to be targeted for attacks by activists (Edelman, 1992; Briscoe & Safford, 2008) and potential competitors (Chen, 1996; Chen, Su, & Tsai, 2007; Ocasio, 1997). In fact, external audiences monitor the activities and characteristics of prominent firms more closely (Brooks et al., 2003), amplifying the effects of both positive and negative firm actions and outcomes. Thus, the prominence of the firm may moderate the influence of high performance relative to aspirations and market expectations on illegal activities.

We argue that the increased attention prominent firms receive can exacerbate the pressures associated with trying to meet or exceed high internal aspirations and external expectations. Stakeholders are likely to scrutinize firm performance in order to make inferences about a firm's ability to provide value to a relationship (e.g., Pollock & Gulati, 2007), the likelihood that the firm will gain in value or take newsworthy actions (e.g., Pollock et al., 2008), and the firm's ability to attack and retaliate (e.g., Chen, 1996; Chen et al., 2007). If prominence increases the volume of investor attention (Pollock et al., 2008), organizational audiences are much more likely to notice how well a firm performs relative to their expectations, thereby amplifying any analyst and market reactions to stock price performance shortfalls (e.g., Brooks et al., 2003; DeBondt & Thaler, 1985). Additionally, because a prominent firm's performance

will garner substantial stakeholder attention, its managers are likely to be even more acutely aware that failure to achieve its aspirations will be noticed by others, further increasing the pressure from external expectations (Salancik, 1977). We therefore hypothesize that,

Hypothesis 3a: The more prominent a firm, the greater the effect of high performance relative to aspirations on the likelihood the firm will engage in corporate illegality.

Hypothesis 3b: The more prominent a firm, the greater the effect of high firm stock price performance relative to expectations on the likelihood the firm will engage in corporate illegality.

METHOD

Data

Our sample consists of all manufacturing firms that were part of the S&P 500 between 1990 and 1999 and had December 31 fiscal year ends.⁶ The resulting dataset consists of 194 firms and 1749 firm-year observations.

Dependent Variable

Corporate illegality. This dichotomous variable was coded “1” if the focal firm engaged in any incident of corporate illegality in a given year and “0” otherwise (e.g., Baucus & Near, 1991; Schnatterly, 2003). While some studies on corporate illegality have used the number (e.g., Kesner, Victor, & Lamont, 1986; McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Simpson, 1987) and/or severity (e.g., McKendall et al., 2002) of crimes committed, we used a dichotomous variable in this study as a more conservative test of the propensity of organizations to engage in any act of corporate illegality. If all crimes are subject to underreporting and provide only a “crude approximation” of the actual amount of criminality (Simpson, 1986: 863), it becomes difficult to make fine-grained distinctions about the number or severity of particular incidents. In particular, the potential for underreporting implies that each incident is *at least as severe* as it appears—there may be other

⁶ In order to avoid any potential biases associated with using firms that have different fiscal year-ends (Porac, Wade & Pollock, 1999)

undetected incidents. Consequently, we felt that examining the antecedents of an illegal action without attempting to distinguish its severity would be the most conservative approach.

We coded both convictions and settlements as violations, and violations were coded according to the year in which they were committed, as opposed to the year that they were detected, reported, or when criminal charges were brought. Whenever the original source document did not identify the exact time period in which a particular violation occurred, we utilized other sources (e.g., contacting regulatory agencies, company SEC filings, etc.) to determine the year(s) of the violation.

We followed a two-step process in order to ensure completeness in our sample. First, since S&P 500 firms are chosen as the “leading companies in leading industries of the U.S. economy” (Standard & Poor’s, 2004: 1), these firms would be likely to receive substantial media coverage. Thus, following Schnatterly (2003), we searched for particular terms and phrases in various media sources using three different databases. We searched all publications under the Business & Finance source list under Business News in the Lexis-Nexis database, all publications in the Infotrac database, and the Popular Press, Guildenstern’s List, Newspapers: Top 50 US newspapers, and Major News and Business Publications: U.S. in the Factiva database. We used a broad range of search terms in order to identify potential articles, but selected only incidents that were consistent with our definition of corporate illegality as acts meant to primarily benefit the firm by potentially increasing revenues or decreasing costs (e.g., McKendall & Wagner, 1997; Szwajkowski, 1985).⁷ The illegal acts we considered in this study were environmental violations, anticompetitive actions, false claims and fraudulent actions.

After searching the databases, one of the authors read each article to ensure that it was discussing an incident of corporate illegality, then gathered information regarding the identity of

⁷ A list of search terms is available from the authors upon request.

the perpetrating firm and the year in which the violation occurred. In each case, we searched for all available dates in the databases, but we limited ourselves to crimes committed between 1990 and 1999. As a second step, we also searched all issues of the Corporate Crime Reporter, a legal newsletter devoted to reporting instances of criminal and civil cases involving corporations, between 1990 and 2003. Each incident that we identified in the first step relating to one of our violation categories was identified in the Corporate Crime Reporter during our second step.

Our search identified 469 incidents of corporate illegality for the firms in our sample between 1990 and 1999, of which 162 were environmental violations, 96 were fraud-related, 124 were false claims-related, and 87 were anticompetitive violations. Since we measured corporate illegality as a dichotomous variable that indicated whether or not a firm engaged in *any* incident of corporate illegality in a given year, these 469 incidents yielded 270 firm-year observations coded as “1” for our sample, with the rest coded as “0.”

Independent Variables

Performance Relative to Aspirations. Consistent with recent research, we defined performance relative to aspirations as a spline function based on the difference between a firm's performance and the performance of a relevant comparison group (Greve, 2003; Greene, 2003). A spline was employed to isolate the effects of performance above aspirations, and to see if performance above and below aspirations had different effects on corporate illegality. We used return on assets (ROA) as the performance measure (e.g., Greve, 2003; Harris & Bromiley, 2007), and coded the variables so that larger positive values represented greater distance from aspirations for both measures. In order to do this, we created two separate variables:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Performance Above Aspirations}_{it} &= \text{ROA}_{it} - \text{Aspirations}_{it} && \text{if } \text{ROA}_{it} > \text{Aspirations}_{it}, \\ &= 0 && \text{if } \text{ROA}_{it} \leq \text{Aspirations}_{it} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Performance Below Aspirations}_{it} &= \text{Aspirations}_{it} - \text{ROA}_{it} && \text{if } \text{ROA}_{it} < \text{Aspirations}_{it}, \\ &= 0 && \text{if } \text{ROA}_{it} \geq \text{Aspirations}_{it} \end{aligned}$$

Prior research has considered performance relative to both the performance of others (social aspirations) and the firm's past performance (historical aspirations) (e.g., Baum et al., 2005; Greve, 2003; Harris & Bromiley, 2007). Some scholars combine these two types of aspirations into a single measure (e.g., Greve, 2003), while others include separate splines for each aspirational referent (e.g., Baum et al., 2005; Harris & Bromiley, 2007). We explored both approaches, and found that while performance relative to historical aspirations was not significant in any of our models, performance relative to social aspirations and the combined social and historical aspirations measure yielded the same pattern of results. Since our results were the same whether or not performance relative to historical aspirations was included separately in the model with social aspirations, we include only performance relative to social aspirations in our reported analyses.

Since prior research suggests that the two-digit SIC code of a firm's primary industry is a useful indicator that companies themselves find informative (Porac et al., 1999), we defined the relevant peer group as firms in the S&P 500 in a given year that had the same two-digit SIC code as the focal firm (excluding the focal firm). Social aspirations were calculated using the following formula, where t is time, i refers to the focal firm, j refers to S&P 500 firms in i 's two-digit SIC code, and N is the total number of S&P 500 firms in i 's two-digit SIC code, including i .

$$\text{Social Aspirations}_{it} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} \text{ROA}_{jt}}{N - 1}$$

Stock Price Performance Relative to External Expectations was operationalized using abnormal returns. Abnormal returns refer to the difference between a firm's observed and

expected stock market returns, where the following model is assumed to be descriptive of a firm's market returns (e.g., Zajac & Westphal, 2004).

$$\text{Firm Returns}_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i \text{Market Returns}_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

In this model, t is time, i refers to the focal firm, α_i is the firm's rate of return when the market returns equal zero and β_i is the firm's beta, or systematic risk, and ε_{it} is a serially-independent error term. Abnormal Returns are then calculated as follows, where a_i and b_i are least squares estimates of α_i and β_i , respectively (Zajac & Westphal, 2004):

$$\text{Abnormal Returns}_{it} = \text{Firm Returns}_{it} - a_i - b_i \text{Market Returns}_t$$

We calculated a_i and b_i by regressing a firm's monthly returns on S&P 500 Composite Index returns for the prior 60 months. A new a_i and b_i were estimated for each year in our observational period for each firm in order to account for changing relationships between firm and market returns over time. Thus, we used returns from 1984-1988 to calculate a_i and b_i to predict abnormal returns in 1989, and 1985-1989 returns to calculate a different a_i and b_i to predict abnormal returns in 1990. The 1989 and 1990 abnormal returns were used to predict illegal activities in 1990 and 1991, respectively. As with performance relative to social aspirations, we created a spline function for this measure. *Positive abnormal returns* equaled the value of the abnormal return if it was greater than zero, and zero otherwise; *negative abnormal returns* equaled the absolute value of the abnormal return if it was less than zero, and zero otherwise. Hence, larger values of each measure represent greater distance away from the level of external expectations. Both firm and market returns were collected from the CRSP database.

Prominence. We used presence on *Fortune's* Most Admired Companies list as an indication of prominence. *Fortune's* annual list of Most Admired companies is based on a survey of executives, directors, and securities analysts who are asked to identify and rate the ten largest

companies in their industry. Since not all of the firms in our sample appeared on *Fortune's* Most Admired Companies list, we created a dichotomous variable that took on the value “1” if the firm appeared on the list in a given year and “0” otherwise. Consistent with the notion that being on the list represents prominence, this variable was correlated 0.34 with another indicator of prominence, the number of analysts covering the firm (e.g., Pollock & Gulati, 2007).⁸

Control Variables

We controlled for a number of firm- and industry-level factors that may affect the propensity to engage in corporate illegality, including a firm’s corporate governance structures, levels of slack resources, and characteristics of the industry environment.

Corporate governance structures. We controlled for four corporate governance characteristics associated with effective monitoring and control of managerial behavior. *CEO/chair separation* was measured as a dichotomous variable coded “1” if the CEO and chairperson were different individuals. *Board size* was measured as the total number of directors on the board. *Proportion of outside directors* was calculated as the number of directors with no substantial business or family ties with management (e.g., Baysinger & Butler, 1985) divided by the total number of directors. *Equity ownership* was measured as the natural log of the percentage of outstanding shares beneficially owned by all managers and directors, and was gathered from the beneficial ownership table in the proxy statements. The data were gathered from company proxy statements, 10-K statements, and annual reports from Lexis-Nexis and the SEC’s EDGAR database.

⁸ We do not use analyst coverage as an indicator of prominence because this measure is also significantly correlated with other firm dimensions we measure, thus reducing the discriminant validity of our measures. Because we do not have actual rankings values for firms not included on the *Fortune* Most Admired list, we do not consider how favorably the firm was assessed (Rindova et al., 2005).

We were unable to obtain governance data for firms prior to the 1992 fiscal year, thus we imputed missing values for these variables in 1989, 1990, and 1991.⁹ Scholars have suggested that when some data are missing, multiple imputation of the missing data can be reliably employed to estimate values for the missing cases. Multiple imputation injects the appropriate amount of uncertainty when computing standard errors and confidence intervals (e.g., Fichman & Cummings, 2003) by deriving multiple predicted values for each missing case and using these predicted values to generate a range of possible parameter estimates. It then combines these estimates, approximating the error associated with sampling a variable assuming the reasons for non-response are known (i.e., measurement error) as well as the uncertainty associated with the reasons the data may be missing, thereby producing an average parameter estimate and appropriate standard error. Doing so increases the variance in the imputed data, making it less likely that significant results will be due to the use of imputed values.

Following Jensen and Roy (2008), we employed multiple imputation using the *ice* command in Stata 9.2 (Royston, 2005a, 2005b) to impute values for our governance variables that had missing values. We used 20 imputations (rather than the typical 3 to 5 imputations [e.g., Fichman & Cummings, 2003]) to increase the amount of variance incorporated in the estimates and thereby make our tests more conservative. We also specified a particular random number seed so that we could replicate the imputed data sets in the future.

Firm Size. We operationalized firm size as the number of employees reported annually in the Compustat database. The number of employees was transformed into its natural logarithm to reduce the potential effects of extreme values. Because firm size is highly correlated with other variables in our study, particularly prominence (.60) and board size (.36), we partialled the

⁹ Post-hoc analyses with models excluding the first three years suggest that imputing values did not result in spurious relationships.

common variance shared by these measures out of the size control by regressing prominence and board size on the logged number of employees, and used the residuals from this regression in our models (e.g., Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003: 613). By doing so, we control for the elements of firm size that might have a potential impact on the incidence of illegal activity, such as firm complexity, but that are not related to prominence or board size (e.g., Brown & Perry, 1994; Cohen et al., 2003). We also ran a robustness check, assigning the shared variance to the size control by regressing logged number of employees on prominence instead. We obtained the same pattern of results as our normal analyses, although the board size control and the main effect of the prominence residual were not significant. We also considered sales and total assets as indicators of size, but they yielded the same pattern of results as number of employees and were more highly correlated with the other independent variables.

Slack variables. We controlled for three types of slack resources, because firms with more slack resources have less need to pursue risky alternatives (i.e., illegal activities) to maintain their performance (Cyert & March, 1963; Greve, 2003). *Absorbed slack* was measured as the ratio of selling, general, and administrative expenses to sales; *unabsorbed slack* was measured as the ratio of cash and marketable securities to liabilities; and *potential slack* was measured as the ratio of debt to equity (Greve, 2003).

Year indicators. Nine year indicators were constructed to control for systematic differences in the incidence of corporate illegality. 1990 was the omitted year.

Environmental conditions. We controlled for environmental munificence and dynamism to capture industry-level differences in the environments that firms faced. Consistent with prior work, we calculated environmental *munificence* as the regression slope coefficient divided by the mean value for the regression of time against the value of shipments for the firm's industry for

the preceding five years. *Dynamism* was calculated as the standard error of the regression slope divided by the mean value of shipments using the same regression models as were used in calculating market growth (e.g., Dess & Beard, 1984; Mishina, Pollock, & Porac, 2004). For both measures, we used four-digit SIC codes to determine a firm's industry. Value of shipment data was gathered from the Annual Survey of Manufacturers by the U.S. Census Bureau and the NBER-CES Manufacturing Industry Database (Bartelsman, Becker, & Gray, 2000).

All of the independent and control variables were calculated using values from the end of the prior year. We used logistic regression to test our hypotheses since our dependent variable was dichotomous. We specified robust standard errors to control for potential heteroskedasticity and provide a more conservative test of our hypotheses (e.g., White, 1980)¹⁰. We used the *mim* command in Stata 9.2 to analyze the imputed data and combined the parameter estimates using Rubin's (1987) rules to obtain valid estimates¹¹. We also ran collinearity diagnostics to check for potential multicollinearity in our models. Condition numbers for every model were below the threshold of 30 (ranging between 13.81 and 22.27), suggesting that collinearity was not likely to be a significant issue in our models (Belsley, Kuh, & Welsch, 2004).

RESULTS

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Table 1 provides pair-wise correlations and descriptive statistics for each of the variables in our study. Table 2 presents the results of our analyses predicting corporate illegality. The predicted likelihood of engaging in illegal activity was 15.4 percent for our sample. Several

¹⁰ We also ran two different robustness checks using rare events logistic regression models (Tomz, King, & Zeng, 1999) to deal with the fact that corporate illegality was a relatively rare outcome in our sample. The robustness checks provided results that were consistent with our original analyses, suggesting that our findings are robust and can be interpreted with confidence.

¹¹ The rareness of our DV and the lack of variance in many of our measures, as well as the Stata's use of the Gauss-Hermite quadrature method to calculate logistic regressions made both random- and fixed-effect procedures unstable and infeasible. Although the independent and control variables only control for *visible* firm heterogeneity, their stability over time implies that visible firm differences capture a large proportion of the overall firm heterogeneity.

control variables were significant in our models. The 1999 year dummy was significant and negative in six of our seven models, suggesting that there were fewer incidences of corporate illegality in 1999 compared to 1990 (the excluded category). Additionally, both environmental munificence and dynamism were linked with higher incidences of corporate illegality; the latter effect is consistent with the results found by Baucus and Near (1991). The firm-level controls for board size, firm size, and prominence had positive main effects in all models, and unabsorbed slack had a positive main effect in three of the seven models¹². Additionally, equity ownership, absorbed slack, and potential slack had negative main effects on the likelihood of corporate illegality in five of the seven models.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

[Insert Table 3, Figure 1, and Figure 2 about here]

Hypothesis 1 predicted that high performance relative to aspirations would be positively related with a firm's propensity to engage in corporate illegality. Performance above social aspirations was positive and significant in all models, providing good support for H1. In addition, performance below social aspirations was negative and significant in Models 2 and 4. Figure 1 graphs the main effect of performance relative to social aspirations. Table 3 summarizes the likelihoods of illegal behavior when performance meets aspirations, for performance levels one and two standard deviations above and below aspirations, and for the maximum and minimum values in our sample¹³.

Hypothesis 2 predicted high stock price performance relative to expectations (hereafter referred to as positive abnormal returns) would be positively related with a firm's propensity to

¹² For our sample, prominent firms had a baseline likelihood of engaging in illegal activity of 18.43 percent compared to 10.20 percent for less prominent firms.

¹³ 50.4% of the observations had performance above social aspirations, and 49.6% of the observations had performance below aspirations. Performance relative to aspirations had a mean of 0.001 and a standard deviation of 0.080.

engage in illegal activity. Positive abnormal returns were positive and significant, but only in the models that included no interactions with prominence. Thus, there was only partial support for H2. In addition, negative abnormal returns were negative and significant in Model 3, when the performance relative to aspirations measures were not included in the model, but was not significant when these measures are included. Figure 2 graphs the main effect relationship between stock price performance relative to expectations and the likelihood of corporate illegality, and Table 3 summarizes the likelihoods of illegal behavior when stock price performance meets expectations, for performance levels one and two standard deviations above and below expectations, and for the maximum and minimum values in our sample¹⁴.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that the relationship between performance above social aspirations and illegal behavior would be stronger for firms that are more prominent. This hypothesis was not supported. The interaction between performance above aspirations and prominence was not significant. However, we also tested the interaction between prominence and performance below social aspirations, and this interaction was negative and significant. In order to interpret this interaction, we graphed the effects using the method advocated by Hoetker (2007), who suggests calculating the predicted values by taking all other variables at their observed value and then averaging the responses across the observations. Figure 3 displays the predicted probability of illegal activity for the entire range of performance relative to aspirations for both prominent and less prominent firms. The results presented in Figure 3 suggest that less prominent firms have a greater likelihood of engaging in illegal behavior than prominent firms when performance is below social aspirations, but there is essentially no difference between

¹⁴ 42.0% of the observations had positive abnormal returns and 58.0% had negative abnormal returns. Stock price performance relative to external expectations had a mean of -0.100 and a standard deviation of 0.526.

prominent and less prominent firms when performance is above social aspirations. Both become more likely to engage in illegal behavior when their performance exceeds social aspirations.

[Insert Figure 3 about here]

Hypothesis 3b predicted that the positive relationship between positive stock price performance and illegality would be increased for prominent firms. This hypothesis is supported. The interaction between positive abnormal returns and prominence was positive and significant in all models in which it was included. Figure 4 graphs the interaction and shows that while prominent firms react to performance above and below expectations as we predicted, for less prominent firms the relationship was essentially flat when performance was below expectations and declined as performance exceeded expectations. Table 4 displays the likelihoods of illegal behavior for both prominent and less prominent firms at different levels of relative performance for both performance relative to aspirations and stock price performance relative to expectations.

[Insert Figure 4 and Table 4 about here]

Taken together, these results suggest that performance which exceeds social aspirations and external expectations increased the likelihood managers would engage in corporate illegality. However, prominence appeared to moderate the effect of relative performance differently, depending on whether it was relative to internal aspirations or external expectations. Prominence decreased the likelihood that firms with performance below social aspirations would engage in illegal behavior, while it appeared to increase the likelihood that firms with stock price performance above expectations would engage in illegal activities.

Prior Illegal Behavior

One factor we do not control for in this study is a firm's general propensity to take illegal actions. Although our sample makes this a difficult methodological issue to deal with (see

footnote 11), the results of supplementary analyses including a lagged measure of prior criminal behavior (not reported here) provide general support for our arguments. Further, it would be a very large coincidence if those firms with a higher propensity to engage in illegal activities also happened to have higher performance relative to aspirations and expectations and tended to be prominent. Indeed, to say that corporate illegality is just about propensity (i.e., that “only bad firms engage in bad behaviors”) is tautological—by definition, then, a firm is not a bad firm until it engages in illegal activity and gets caught. Social psychologists suggest that, regardless of a pre-existing propensity to behave criminally, situational factors play a large role in shaping why and when individuals engage in violent and/or criminal behaviors (e.g., Bakan, 2004; Milgrom, 1963; Miller, 2004; Waller, 2002; Zimbardo, 2007). So, although our empirical results should be interpreted with caution, we believe that our theoretical arguments are sound. Future research should verify our findings and explore whether a firm’s general propensity to engage in illegal actions affects our substantive interpretations.

DISCUSSION

In this study we applied insights from social psychology and behavioral economics to demonstrate that, despite the apparent disincentives, even high-performing and prominent firms may have reasons to engage in illegal activities. We argued that strong pressures to maintain high relative performance may induce risk-seeking behavior due to either loss aversion (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1991), house money effects (e.g., Thaler & Johnson, 1990), and/or managerial hubris (e.g., Hayward & Hambrick, 1997; Roll, 1986), and that prominence may intensify these effects. We found support for the notion that performance above social aspirations increased the likelihood of corporate illegality, and that performance below social aspirations decreased the likelihood of corporate illegality, particularly for prominent firms. We also found that pressures

on organizations to meet or exceed the expectations of shareholders and financial markets can spur illegal activity, but only for prominent firms. These findings offer a number of theoretical, empirical and practical contributions.

Theoretical Contributions

First, we contribute both theoretically and empirically to the literature on corporate illegality by focusing on firms' relative, rather than absolute levels of performance, differentiating between internal aspirations and external expectations, and by considering the moderating effects of firm prominence. This allowed us to take a more nuanced approach to examining the relationship between performance and corporate illegality using prospect theory and related psychological processes to explain why firms with high relative performance and/or that are prominent—those with potentially the most to lose—may engage in illegal and illegitimate behaviors.

Similar to Harris and Bromiley (2007), we found that performance above aspirations and stock price performance above expectations were associated with a greater likelihood of corporate illegality. They anticipated the opposite relationship, and did not offer an explanation for this unexpected finding. Our theorizing suggests that loss aversion, the house money effect, and/or hubris can explain these relationships. One possibility is that the more a firm's performance exceeded its aspirations and expectations, the more it perceived it had to lose from a relative performance decrease, and thus the more risk seeking it became in order to avoid this loss. Alternatively, it is possible that strong relative performance may have either made illegal activities appear less risky because they had performed better than anticipated, or because the firm's high performance relative to aspirations and expectations engendered a sense of infallibility or invulnerability. Our results appear to be consistent with all three of these

explanations, although our data does not allow us to distinguish which mechanisms might have been at play in a particular situation.

Further, our results suggested that while there does not appear to be a significant difference between prominent and less prominent firms in the likelihood of committing illegal acts as their performance surpasses social aspirations, there was a dramatic difference in how they responded to high external expectations. Whereas prominent firms became increasingly likely to engage in corporate illegality the higher investors' expectations, the propensity of less prominent firms to engage in illegal actions remained relatively stable regardless of their performance relative to investor's expectations. While we cannot definitively explain why less prominent firms reacted so differently, we can speculate about a possible explanation. It is possible that executives at less prominent firms view internal and external pressures differently. If less prominent firms are not as salient and cognitively available to organizational audiences (Ocasio, 1997; Pollock et al., 2008), then the executives at these firms may feel somewhat less pressure to maintain abnormally high market performance. Conversely, because performance above aspirations is an internal evaluation of performance (since a TMT's aspirations are less visible to external observers), the pressure to meet or exceed aspirations may be ever-present, regardless of the prominence of the firm.

Finally, we contribute to the literature on cognitive biases in managerial decision making (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2003; Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007; Hayward & Hambrick, 1997) by demonstrating how the decision calculus utilized by organizational managers may be influenced by both internal performance evaluation procedures and concerns about meeting external expectations, and how these concerns may be exacerbated when a firm is prominent. These findings suggest that future researchers in this area should give additional consideration to how

relative comparisons of strategic and performance information affect managers' perceptions and decision making processes.

Practical Implications

Our results also provide several practical implications for regulators and investors. Because prominence magnifies both positive and negative firm actions and outcomes (Brooks et al., 2003), prominent firms may be the most likely to acutely feel the pressures to maintain or improve their relative performance. In addition, our findings suggest that the prospect of poor *future relative* performance may compel high-performing firms to engage in illegal activities. Thus, regulators should endeavor to monitor the activities of both high and low performing firms to detect illegal corporate behavior, and consider a firm's prominence and performance relative to industry peers in assessing which firms should receive closer attention. Investors should also be more cognizant of this dynamic, because prominent and high-performing firms may be the most likely to take illegal actions that are damaging to the organization and its stakeholders¹⁵.

Finally, our results suggest that analysts, investors, and directors may also need to be careful about the manner in which they evaluate firm performance and the pressure they place on management to constantly top their prior accomplishments. Although we believe that a firm's TMT is responsible for ensuring that the firm and its employees conduct themselves in an ethical and legal manner, at least some blame also lies with those who constantly pressure executives for better and better relative performance, and are unforgiving of any slips in performance. Despite research suggesting that it is unrealistic to expect such outcomes, analysts and investors still show tendencies to extrapolate trends (DeBondt, 1993), become overly optimistic (DeBondt & Thaler, 1985, 1986, 1990; La Porta, 1996), and overreact to unexpected negative news (DeBondt

¹⁵ This is also consistent with the persistent finding in the finance literature that glamour stocks tend to underperform value stocks (e.g., La Porta, 1996; La Porta et al., 1997).

& Thaler, 1985; Skinner & Sloan, 2002). Although it will largely be up to investors and analysts to police their own behaviors, corporate directors can help reduce the undesirable effects of these pressures for unrealistic levels of short-term performance by reducing the unhealthy focus on quarterly earnings and designing systems that evaluate executives based on their firms' long-term performance. Doing so may reduce the likelihood executives will look to stop-gap measures such as corporate illegality to maintain unsustainable levels of short-term performance.

Future Directions

While our study takes a first step in considering the psychological processes that may influence organizational decisions to engage in corporate illegality, our results also suggest several future research opportunities. First, although we proposed three psychological processes that could lead managers of high performing firms to engage in illegal corporate behavior, we were unable to directly observe whether or not these psychological processes mediated the relationship between high relative firm performance and illegal activity. Unfortunately, we did not have direct information on the managerial perceptions and cognitions we theorized about. Indeed, this data is notoriously difficult to obtain, particularly because managers are likely to engage in socially desirable responses and self-serving attributions (e.g., Salancik & Meindl, 1984; Staw, McKenchie, & Puffer, 1983) due to the nature of the outcome being studied. Future research should continue to explore this important issue, and attempt to differentiate between the different cognitive processes that may be at play¹⁶.

Second, there may also be a benefit to examining the manner by which executives attempt to manage the expectations of investors and external stakeholders. Many studies have

¹⁶ The results of post hoc analyses using Hayward and Hambrick's (1997) pay gap measure provided some evidence that hubris may indeed play a role in the decision to engage in corporate illegality in highly prominent firms, but this finding does not change our other results, and is consistent with our theory and expectations that loss aversion and/or the house money effect may also be at work in some instances.

examined how managers make self-serving attributions (e.g., Bettman & Weitz, 1983; Clapham & Schwenk, 1991; Salancik & Meindl, 1984; Staw, McKenchie, & Puffer, 1983; Wade, Porac & Pollock, 1997), but if strong performance can lead to higher performance pressures, it may be that managers would actively manage external expectations to try and keep them from becoming too optimistic or unrealistic (Elsbach, Sutton & Principe, 1998).

Third, while we examined the moderating effects of one dimension of corporate reputation —firm prominence— there may be benefits to studying other aspects of reputation, such as favorability, strategic content, and exemplar status (Rindova, et al., 2007); reputations for particular types of behaviors; reputations with particular stakeholder groups (e.g., between the firm and its consumers); or other types of social evaluations, such as firm celebrity (e.g., Rindova et al., 2006) or status (e.g., Washington & Zajac, 2005). Additionally, there may be other factors in the firm's social environment that need to be explored in order to fully flesh out a theory of corporate illegality. For example, institutional configurations may influence the degree to which organizations face pressures to consider the interests of broader groups of stakeholders (e.g., Aguilera, 2005) or promote corporate social responsibility as a primary organizational goal (Aguilera, Rupp, Williams, & Ganapathi, 2004).

Finally, our findings imply that corporate governance structures may have a more complex relationship with illegal behavior than previously theorized. Although we only used governance characteristics as controls in our analyses, we found that various governance characteristics influenced corporate illegality differently. Specifically, while executive and director equity ownership were negatively related to corporate illegality, board size was positively related. These findings stand in contrast to prior research which has found that governance structures such as CEO duality and board composition had no direct affect on a

firm's involvement in illegal activities (e.g., Kesner, Victor, & Lamont, 1986; Schnatterly, 2003). Future research should continue to examine the manner in which particular governance mechanisms affect firm behaviors by prioritizing different stakeholder interests.

CONCLUSION

In this study, we show that the mixed findings in the corporate illegality literature can begin to be reconciled by considering relative performance and applying research on psychological biases to the study of corporate illegality. Our results demonstrate that internal performance aspirations, external performance expectations, and firm prominence interact in particular ways to predict illegal behavior. In doing so, it suggests that seemingly "good" firm attributes, such as strong performance and firm prominence can bring with them differing incentives and pressures that can lead to decisions that may ultimately be detrimental to the firm.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. & Adler, P. 1989. The gloried self: The aggrandizement and the construction of self. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 52: 299-310.
- Aguilera, R.V. 2005. Corporate governance and director accountability: An institutional comparative perspective. *British Journal of Management*, 16: S39–S53.
- Aguilera, R.V., Rupp, G.N., Williams, C.A. & Ganapathi, J. 2004. Putting the s back in corporate social responsibility: A multi-level theory of social change in organizations. *Illinois CIBER Working Paper* 04-0107.
- Bakan, J. 2004. *The corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power*. New York: Free Press.
- Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17: 99-120.
- Bartelsman, E.J., Becker, R.A., & Gray, W.B. 2000. NBER-CES Manufacturing Industry Database (1958-1996). *National Bureau of Econ. Research and U.S. Census Bureau's Center for Econ. Studies*. <http://www.nber.org/nberces/nbprod96.htm>.
- Baucus, M.S. & Near, J.P. 1991. Can illegal corporate behavior be predicted? An event history analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1): 9-36.
- Baum, J.A.C., Rowley, T.J., Shipilov, A.V., & Chuang, Y. 2005. Dancing with strangers: Aspiration performance and the search for underwriting syndicate partners. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50: 536-575.
- Baysinger, B. & Butler, H. 1985. Corporate governance and the board of directors: Performance effects of changes in board composition. *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 1: 101-124.
- Belsley, D.A., Kuh, E. & Welsch, R.E. 2004. *Regression Diagnostics: Identifying Influential Data and Sources of Collinearity*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Beneish, M.D. 1999. The detection of earnings manipulation. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 55(5): 24-36.
- Bettman, J.R., & Weitz, B.A. 1983. Attributions in the board room: Causal reasoning in corporate annual reports. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(2): 165-183.
- Birkbeck, C. & LaFree, G. 1993. The situational analysis of crime and deviance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19, 113-137.
- Braithwaite, J. 1985. *To punish or persuade: Enforcement of coal mine safety*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Briscoe, F. & Safford, S. 2008. The Nixon-in China effect: Activism, imitation and the institutionalization of contentious practices. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(3): 460-491.
- Brooks, L.D. & Buckmaster, D.A. 1976. Further evidence of the time series properties of accounting income. *Journal of Finance*, 31(5): 1359-1373.

- Brooks, M., Highhouse, S., Russell, S., & Mohr, D. 2003. Familiarity, ambivalence, and organization reputation: Is organization fame a double-edged sword? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 904-914.
- Brown, B., & Perry, S. 1994. Removing the financial performance halo from Fortune's "Most Admired" companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (5): 1347-1359.
- Carpenter, M.A., Pollock, T.G., & Leary, M.M. 2003. Testing a model of reasoned risk-taking: Governance, the experience of principals and agents, and global strategy in high-technology IPO firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 803-820.
- Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D.C. 2007. It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 351-386.
- Chen, M.J. 1996. Competitor analysis and inter-firm rivalry: Towards a theoretical integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 100-134.
- Chen, M.J., Su, K.S. & Tsai, W. 2007. Competitive tension: The awareness-motivation-capability perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 101-118.
- Cialdini, R.B. 2004. The Science of Persuasion. *Scientific American*, Mind (Special Edition): 70-77.
- Clapham, S.E., & Schwenk, C.R. 1991. Self-serving attributions, managerial cognition, and company performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(3): 219-229.
- Clinard, M.B. & Yeager, P.C. 1980. *Corporate Crime*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Clinard, M.B., Yeager, P.C., Brissette, J., Petrashek, D., & Harries, E. 1979. *Illegal Corporate Behavior*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. 2003. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 3rd Ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coleman, J. 1987. Toward an integrated theory of white-collar crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2): 406-439.
- Coleman, J.S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94: S95-S120.
- Cyert, R.M., J.G. March. 1963. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Davidson, W.N., & Worrell, D.L. 1988. The impact of announcements of corporate illegalities on shareholder returns. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(1): 195-200.
- De Bondt, W. 1993. Betting on trends: Intuitive forecasts of financial risk and return. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 9: 355-371.
- De Bondt, W.F.M., & Thaler, R. 1985. Does the stock market overreact? *Journal of Finance*, 40(3): 793-805.
- De Bondt, W.F.M., & Thaler, R. 1986. Further evidence on investor overreaction and stock market seasonality. *Journal of Finance*, 42(3): 557-581.

- De Bondt, W.F.M., & Thaler, R. 1990. Do security analysts overreact? *American Economic Review*, 80(2): 52-57.
- Denzau, A.T. 1992. *Microeconomic Analysis: Markets & Dynamics*. Homewood, IL : Irwin.
- Derfus, P.J., Maggitti, P.G., Grimm, C.M., & Smith, K.G. 2008. The Red Queen Effect: Competitive Actions and Firm Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1): 61-80.
- Dess, G.G. & Beard, D.W. 1984. Dimensions of Organizational Task Environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 52-73.
- Edelman, L.B. 1992. Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6): 1531-1576.
- Ehrlich, I. 1974. Participation in illegitimate activities: An economic analysis. In G.S. Becker and W.M. Landes (Eds.), *Essays in the Economics of Crime and Punishment*, 68-134. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research
- Elsbach, K.D., Sutton, R.I., & Principe, K.E. 1998. Averting expected challenges through anticipatory impression management: A study of hospital billing. *Organization Science*, 9(1): 68-86.
- Fichman, M., & Cummings, J.N. 2003. Multiple imputation for missing data: Making the most of what you know. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6: 282-308.
- Fiegenbaum, A., Hart, S. & Schendel, D. 1996. Strategic reference point theory. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(3): 219-235.
- Fiegenbaum, A., & Thomas, H. 1988. Attitudes toward risk and the risk-return paradox: Prospect theory explanations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(1): 85-106.
- Finkelstein, S, Hambrick, D. & Cannella, A. 2009. Strategic leadership: Theory and research on executives, top management teams and boards. Minneapolis, MN: West.
- Fombrun, C.J. 1996. *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Greene, W.H. 2003. *Econometric Analysis, 5th Ed*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Greve, H.R. 2003. A behavioral theory of R&D expenditures and innovations: Evidence from shipbuilding. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6): 685-702.
- Harris, J. & Bromiley, P. 2007. Incentives to cheat: The influence of executive compensation and firm performance on financial misrepresentation. *Organization Science*, 18(3): 350-367.
- Hayward, M.L.A. & Hambrick, D.C. 1997. Explaining the premiums paid for large acquisitions: Evidence of CEO hubris. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1): 103-127.
- Hill, C.W.L., Kelley, P.C., Agle, B.R., Hitt, M.A. & Hoskisson, R.E. 1992. An empirical examination of the causes of corporate wrongdoing in the United States. *Human Relations*, 45(10): 1055-1076.
- Hoetker, G. 2007. The use of logit and probit models in strategic management research: Critical issues. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28: 331-343.

- Jensen, M., & Roy, A. 2008. Staging exchange partner choices: When do status and reputation matter? *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(3): 495-516.
- Johnson, S., Ryan, H. & Tian, Y. 2008. Managerial incentives and corporate fraud: The sources of Incentives Matter. *Review of Finance*, 0: 1-31.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2): 263-292.
- Karpoff, J.M., & Lott, J.R. 1993. The reputational penalty firms bear from committing criminal fraud. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 36: 757-802.
- Karpoff, J.M., Lee, D.S., & Martin, G.S. 2009. The cost to firms of cooking the books. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 43(3): 581-611.
- Kesner, I., Victor, B. & Lamont, B.T. 1986. Board composition and the commission of illegal acts: An investigation of Fortune 500 companies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4): 789-799.
- La Porta, R. 1996. Expectations and the cross-section of stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 51(5): 1715-1742.
- La Porta, R., Lakonishok, J., Shleifer A., & Vishny, R. 1997. Good news for value stocks: Further evidence on market efficiency. *Journal of Finance*, 52(2): 859-874.
- Lant, T.K. 1992. Aspiration level adaptation: An empirical exploration. *Management Science*, 38(5): 623-644.
- Liedtke, M. 2006. Google earnings disappoint; Shares plunge. *Associated Press*. Tuesday, January 31. http://biz.yahoo.com/ap/060131/earns_google.html?v=13 Accessed 03/16/2006.
- Martin, S. 2007. Amazon delivers; Shares don't. *Red Herring*. October 24, 2007. <http://www.redherring.com/Home/23031> Accessed October 25, 2007.
- McKendall, M., DeMarr, B. & Jones-Rikkens, C. 2002. Ethical compliance programs and corporate illegality: Testing the assumptions of the corporate sentencing guidelines. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 37(4): 367-383.
- McKendall, M.A. & Wagner, J.A. 1997. Motive, opportunity, choice, and corporate illegality. *Organization Science*, 8: 624-647.
- Mezias, S.J., Chen, Y., & Murphy, P.R. 2002. Aspiration-level adaptation in an American financial services organization: A field study. *Management Science*, 48(10): 1285-1300.
- Milgram, S. 1963. Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(4): 371-378.
- Miller, A.G. (Ed.) 2004. *The social psychology of good and evil*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mishina, Y., Pollock T.G., & Porac, J.F. 2004. Are more resources always better for growth? Resource stickiness in market and product expansion. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25 (12): 1179-1197.
- Ocasio, W. 1997. Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18: 187-206.

- Penrose E. 1959. *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Pollock, T.G., & Gulati, R. 2007. Standing out from the crowd: The visibility-enhancing effects of IPO-related signals on alliance formation by entrepreneurial firms. *Strategic Organization*, 5(4): 339-372.
- Pollock, T.G., Rindova, V.P., & Maggitti, P.G. 2008. Market watch: Information and availability cascades among the media and investors in the U.S. IPO market. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2): 335 – 358.
- Porac, J.F., Wade, J.B., & Pollock, T.G. 1999. Industry categories and the politics of comparable firm in CEO compensation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(1): 112-144.
- Povel, P., Singh, R. & Winton, A. 2007. Booms, busts and fraud. *Review of Financial Studies*, 20(4): 1219:1254.
- Rajan, R., & Servaes, H. 1997. Analyst following of initial public offerings. *Journal of Finance*. 52(2): 507-529.
- Rhee, M., & Haunschild, P.R. 2006. The liability of good reputation: A study of product recalls in the U.S. automobile industry. *Organization Science*, 17(1): 101-117.
- Rindova, V., Petkova, A.P., & Kotha, S. 2007. Standing out: How new firms in emerging markets build reputation in the media. *Strategic Organization*, 5: 31-70.
- Rindova, V.P., Pollock, T.G., & Hayward, M.L.A. 2006. Celebrity firms: The social construction of market popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1): 50-71.
- Rindova, V.P., Williamson, I.O., Petkova, A.P., & Sever, J.M. 2005. Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6): 1033-1049.
- Roll, R. 1986. The hubris hypothesis of corporate takeovers. *Journal of Business*, 59(2): 197-216.
- Royston, P. 2005a. Multiple imputation of missing values: Update. *The Stata Journal*, 5(2): 1-14.
- Royston, P. 2005b. Multiple imputation of missing values: Update of ice. *The Stata Journal*, 5(4):527-536.
- Rozin, P., & Royzman, E.B. 2001. Negativity bias, negativity dominance, and contagion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(4): 296-320.
- Rubin, D.B. 1987. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Salancik, G.R. 1977. Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B.M. Staw & G.R. Salancik [Eds.] *New directions in organizational behavior*: 1-54. Chicago, IL: St. Clair Press.
- Salancik, G.R., & Meindl, J.R. 1984. Corporate attributions as strategic illusions of management control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29: 238-54.
- Sanders, G. 2001. Behavioral responses of CEOs to stock ownership and stock option pay. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3): 477-492.

- Schnatterly, K. 2003. Increasing firm value through detection and prevention of white-collar crime. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(7): 587-614.
- Semadini, M., Cannella, A.A., Fraser, D.R., & Lee, D.S. 2008. Fight or flight: Managing stigma in executive careers. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29: 557-567.
- Simpson, S.S. 1986. The decomposition of antitrust: Testing a multi-level, longitudinal model of profit-squeeze. *American Sociological Review*, 51(6): 859-875.
- Simpson, S.S. 1987. Cycles of illegality: Antitrust violations in corporate America. *Social Forces*. 65(4): 943-963.
- Skinner, D.J., & Sloan, R.G. 2002. Earnings surprises, growth expectations, and stock returns, or don't let an earnings torpedo sink your portfolio. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 7: 289-312.
- Standard & Poor's. 2004. *S&P 500 Fact Sheet*.
<http://www2.standardandpoors.com/spf/pdf/index/500factsheet.pdf>. Accessed September 25, 2004.
- Staw, B., & Sz wajkowski, E. 1975. The scarcity-munificence component of organizations environments and the commission of illegal acts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20: 345-354.
- Staw, B.M., McKechnie, P.I., & Puffer, S.M. 1983. The justification of organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 582-600.
- Sutherland, E. 1961. White collar crime. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sz wajkowski, E. 1985. Organizational illegality: Theoretical integration and illustrative application. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 558-567.
- Thaler, R. 1980. Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 1: 39-60.
- Thaler, R. 1985. Mental accounting and consumer choice. *Marketing Science*, 4(3): 199-214.
- Thaler, R.H., & Johnson, E.J. 1990. Gambling with the house money and trying to break even: The effects of prior outcomes on risky choice. *Management Science*, 36(6): 643-660.
- Tomz, M., King, G., & Zeng, L. 1999. *ReLogit: Rare events logistic regression, version 1.1 for Stata*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1981. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481): 453-458.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1986. Rational choice and the framing of decisions. *Journal of Business*, 59(4): S251-S278.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1991. Loss aversion in riskless choice: A reference-dependent model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4): 1039-1061.
- Vaughan, D. 1999. The dark side of organizations: Mistake, misconduct, and disaster. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 271-305.
- Wade, J.B., Porac, J.F. & Pollock, T.G. 1997. Worth, words and the justification of executive pay. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18: 641-664.

- Wade, J.B., Porac, J.F., Pollock, T.G., & Graffin, S.D. 2006. The burden of celebrity: The impact of CEO certification contests on CEO pay and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4): 643-660.
- Waller, J. 2002. *Becoming evil: How ordinary people commit genocide and mass killing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Washington, M. & Zajac, E.J. 2005. Status evolution and competition: Theory and evidence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2): 282-296.
- White, H. 1980. A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*, 48(4): 817-838.
- Wiesenfeld, B.M., Wurthmann, K., & Hambrick, D.C. 2008. The stigmatization and devaluation of elites associated with corporate failures: A process model. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (1): 231-251.
- Wiseman R.M., & Gomez-Mejia, L.R. 1998. A behavioral agency model of managerial risk taking. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1): 133-153.
- Zajac, E.J., & Westphal, J.D. 2004. The social construction of market value: Institutionalization and learning perspectives on stock market returns. *American Sociological Review*, 69(3): 433-457.
- Zhang, X., Bartol, K.M., Smith, K.G., Pfarrer, M.D., & Khanin, D.M. 2008. CEOs on the edge: Earnings manipulation and stock-based incentive misalignment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2): 241-258.
- Zimbardo, P. 2007. *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn evil*. New York: Random House Trade Paperbacks.

Table 1: Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

ID	Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
1	Corporate Illegality	0.154	0.361	1																								
2	91 Dummy	0.098	0.298	.02	1																							
3	92 Dummy	0.097	0.296	.01	-.11	1																						
4	93 Dummy	0.104	0.305	.01	-.11	-.11	1																					
5	94 Dummy	0.104	0.305	.02	-.11	-.11	-.12	1																				
6	95 Dummy	0.102	0.302	.02	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	1																			
7	96 Dummy	0.101	0.301	.01	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	1																		
8	97 Dummy	0.102	0.302	-.01	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	1																	
9	98 Dummy	0.100	0.300	-.03	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	1																
10	99 Dummy	0.095	0.293	-.06	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	-.11	1															
11	Munificence	0.049	0.046	.04	.12	-.05	-.14	-.15	-.06	.09	.07	.06	-.04	1														
12	Dynamism	0.015	0.012	.07	.01	.01	-.03	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.03	-.01	.03	.01	1													
13	CEO/Chair Separation	0.135	0.342	-.03	.09	.10	-.05	-.04	-.05	-.05	-.03	-.01	-.03	.07	-.01	1												
14	Board Size	12.607	3.756	.10	.20	.23	-.05	-.08	-.10	-.09	-.11	-.11	-.12	-.09	.00	.05	1											
15	% Outsiders on Board	0.657	0.207	.00	-.17	-.37	.08	.09	.09	.11	.14	.14	.18	-.03	-.06	-.19	-.28	1										
16	Ln Equity Ownership	1.652	0.956	-.14	.22	.24	-.09	-.09	-.09	-.10	-.11	-.11	-.11	.11	-.04	.17	.14	-.39	1									
17	Size Residual (Employees)	0.000	0.780	.23	-.04	-.06	.01	.02	.02	.02	.03	.01	.04	-.03	.00	-.07	.00	.16	-.34	1								
18	Absorbed Slack	0.224	0.137	-.08	-.01	.01	.00	.00	-.01	-.01	.00	.01	.03	.19	-.26	.02	-.01	-.01	.06	-.13	1							
19	Unabsorbed Slack	0.183	0.511	-.02	.02	.03	.02	.02	-.02	-.02	-.01	-.02	-.02	.19	.01	.16	-.13	-.11	.12	-.24	.19	1						
20	Potential Slack	0.597	1.979	.00	.00	-.04	.01	.01	.01	-.01	-.01	.04	.00	-.05	.04	-.06	.06	.05	.00	.09	-.03	-.07	1					
21	Prominence	0.593	0.491	.16	-.01	.00	.00	-.01	-.01	.00	.00	.02	.02	-.08	-.03	-.12	.19	.08	-.20	.00	-.10	-.15	.10	1				
22	Perf. Above Aspirations	0.026	0.048	.08	-.02	-.02	.05	.01	.00	.00	-.03	.01	.04	.14	-.06	.04	-.11	-.03	.02	-.20	.24	.29	-.08	.03	1			
23	Perf. Below Aspirations	0.025	0.054	-.08	-.01	.04	-.03	.01	-.05	-.01	.03	.04	.01	-.06	.09	-.01	.01	-.02	.02	.05	-.02	-.07	.05	-.03	-.25	1		
24	Pos. Abnormal Ret.	0.148	0.298	.06	-.04	.04	-.03	.04	.00	-.05	.01	.07	.03	-.06	.04	.06	-.06	.00	.02	-.02	.05	.05	-.01	-.03	.07	-.05	1	
25	Neg. Abnormal Ret.	0.247	0.338	-.11	.00	.00	-.05	-.05	-.08	.13	.01	-.03	-.06	.18	.08	.01	-.03	-.09	.13	-.11	-.05	.05	-.03	-.14	-.13	.17	-.36	1

Table 2: Multiple-imputation estimates of logistic regression models predicting the incidence of corporate illegality

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
91 Dummy	0.151 (0.496)	0.119 (0.538)	0.047 (0.507)	0.054 (0.548)	0.115 (0.547)	0.039 (0.503)	0.040 (0.554)
92 Dummy	0.155 (0.511)	0.183 (0.571)	0.047 (0.524)	0.095 (0.582)	0.203 (0.582)	0.028 (0.528)	0.098 (0.596)
93 Dummy	0.132 (0.471)	-0.011 (0.503)	0.001 (0.480)	-0.083 (0.510)	-0.037 (0.514)	-0.015 (0.479)	-0.108 (0.522)
94 Dummy	0.197 (0.481)	0.154 (0.514)	0.039 (0.490)	0.041 (0.521)	0.139 (0.523)	0.014 (0.491)	0.012 (0.531)
95 Dummy	0.232 (0.472)	0.176 (0.503)	0.091 (0.477)	0.096 (0.508)	0.168 (0.513)	0.089 (0.473)	0.092 (0.514)
96 Dummy	-0.021 (0.479)	-0.054 (0.511)	-0.046 (0.487)	-0.067 (0.517)	-0.057 (0.520)	-0.102 (0.484)	-0.103 (0.522)
97 Dummy	-0.131 (0.482)	-0.099 (0.515)	-0.285 (0.490)	-0.209 (0.521)	-0.104 (0.525)	-0.293 (0.488)	-0.216 (0.530)
98 Dummy	-0.427 (0.497)	-0.493 (0.529)	-0.607 (0.506)	-0.624 (0.536)	-0.495 (0.537)	-0.624 (0.507)	-0.620 (0.544)
99 Dummy	-0.775 (0.525)	-0.939* (0.557)	-0.930* (0.532)	-1.038* (0.562)	-0.962* (0.565)	-0.990* (0.533)	-1.103* (0.570)
Munificence	4.583** (1.729)	3.828** (1.688)	5.729*** (1.727)	4.785*** (1.694)	3.718** (1.701)	5.994*** (1.717)	4.914*** (1.699)
Dynamism	13.552** (5.859)	16.258*** (5.896)	13.499** (5.916)	15.725** (5.937)	16.126*** (5.865)	13.155** (5.910)	15.390** (5.884)
CEO/Chair Separation	-0.126 (0.343)	-0.142 (0.347)	-0.181 (0.351)	-0.193 (0.356)	-0.120 (0.348)	-0.175 (0.358)	-0.167 (0.361)
Board Size	0.076** (0.038)	0.099** (0.039)	0.077* (0.039)	0.098** (0.040)	0.102** (0.040)	0.076* (0.039)	0.101** (0.041)
% Outsiders on Board	-0.193 (0.735)	0.128 (0.780)	-0.160 (0.764)	0.151 (0.798)	0.243 (0.779)	-0.127 (0.772)	0.264 (0.802)
Ln Equity Ownership	-0.298* (0.152)	-0.260* (0.151)	-0.294* (0.153)	-0.261* (0.152)	-0.249 (0.152)	-0.288* (0.152)	-0.242 (0.151)
Size Residual (Employees)	0.777*** (0.106)	0.932*** (0.114)	0.750*** (0.108)	0.902*** (0.117)	0.956*** (0.116)	0.740*** (0.109)	0.912*** (0.119)
Absorbed Slack	-1.045 (0.707)	-1.815** (0.762)	-1.229* (0.708)	-1.890** (0.762)	-1.798** (0.760)	-1.099 (0.711)	-1.745** (0.763)
Unabsorbed Slack	0.316*** (0.108)	0.154 (0.123)	0.320*** (0.106)	0.160 (0.126)	0.144 (0.158)	0.297*** (0.109)	0.125 (0.169)
Potential Slack	-0.073** (0.031)	-0.063* (0.034)	-0.084** (0.033)	-0.070* (0.036)	-0.052 (0.038)	-0.067** (0.033)	-0.047 (0.039)
Prominence	0.895*** (0.178)	0.815*** (0.182)	0.845*** (0.181)	0.785*** (0.184)	1.104*** (0.231)	0.760*** (0.273)	0.940*** (0.317)
Perf. Above Aspirations		8.134*** (1.593)		7.725*** (1.561)	10.040** (4.232)		9.796** (4.415)
Perf. Below Aspirations		-6.214** (2.373)		-5.243** (2.199)	1.330 (1.684)		1.469 (1.725)
Pos. Abnormal Ret.			0.545*** (0.203)	0.579*** (0.209)		-0.590 (0.588)	-0.542 (0.612)
Neg. Abnormal Ret.			-0.838** (0.356)	-0.477 (0.360)		-0.333 (0.512)	-0.140 (0.500)
Perf. Above X Prominence					-2.383 (4.132)		-2.785 (4.249)
Perf. Below X Prominence					-13.289** (5.037)		-11.511** (4.502)
Pos. Abnormal Ret. X Prominence						1.697** (0.679)	1.640** (0.697)
Neg. Abnormal Ret. X Prominence						-0.895 (0.691)	-0.660 (0.683)
Constant	-3.031*** (0.964)	-3.466*** (1.018)	-2.843*** (1.010)	-3.391*** (1.059)	-3.795*** (1.036)	-2.841*** (1.031)	-3.655*** (1.095)
Imputations	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Minimum Observations	1749	1749	1749	1749	1749	1749	1749
Minimum Degrees of Freedom	61.0	56.9	56.9	54.1	56.8	55.0	52.9
* p < 0.10		** p < 0.05	*** p < 0.01				

Table 3: Predicted Likelihood of Illegal Activity at Different Levels of Performance Relative to the Aspiration or Expectation level

	Performance Relative to Aspirations	Abnormal Returns
At Sample Minimum	7.30%	4.72%
2 Std. Dev. Below	6.88%	9.51%
1 Std. Dev. Below	9.76%	12.08%
At Aspiration/Expectation	14.61%	15.28%
1 Std. Dev. Above	22.00%	19.56%
2 Std. Dev. Above	31.90%	25.01%
At Sample Maximum	80.73%	54.53%

Table 4: Predicted Likelihood of Illegal Activity at Different Levels of Performance Relative to the Aspiration or Expectation level for both Prominent and Less Prominent Firms

	Performance Relative to Aspirations		Abnormal Returns	
	Less Prominent	Prominent	Less Prominent	Prominent
2 Std. Dev. Below	9.76%	5.23%	9.85%	9.43%
1 Std. Dev. Below	8.87%	10.13%	10.45%	13.15%
At Aspiration/Expectation	8.05%	18.28%	11.08%	17.91%
1 Std. Dev. Above	14.93%	26.23%	8.80%	26.24%
2 Std. Dev. Above	25.58%	35.88%	6.93%	36.40%

Figure 1: Main Effect of Performance Relative to Social Aspirations on Illegal Behavior




Figure 2: Main Effect of Stock Price Performance Relative to Expectations on Illegal Behavior




Figure 3: Interactive Effects of Performance Relative to Aspirations and Prominence on Illegal Behavior




Figure 4: Interactive Effects of Stock Price Performance Relative to External Expectations and Prominence on Illegal Behavior

