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***CHAPTER 1***

**INTRODUCTION TO CORPORATE FINANCE**

**Answers to Concept Questions**

**1.** The three basic forms are sole proprietorships, partnerships, and corporations. Some disadvantages of sole proprietorships and partnerships are: unlimited liability, limited life, difficulty in transferring ownership, and hard to raise capital funds. Some advantages are: simplicity, less regulation, the owners are also the managers, and sometimes personal tax rates are better than corporate tax rates. The primary disadvantage of the corporate form is the double taxation to shareholders on distributed earnings and dividends. Some advantages include: limited liability, ease of transferability, ability to raise capital, and unlimited life. When a business is started, most take the form of a sole proprietorship or partnership because of the relative simplicity of starting these forms of businesses.

**2.** To maximize the current market value (share price) of the equity of the firm (whether it’s publicly traded or not).

**3.** In the corporate form of ownership, the shareholders are the owners of the firm. The shareholders elect the directors of the corporation, who in turn appoint the firm’s management. This separation of ownership from control in the corporate form of organization is what causes agency problems to exist. Management may act in its own or someone else’s best interests, rather than those of the shareholders. If such events occur, they may contradict the goal of maximizing the share price of the equity of the firm.

**4.** Such organizations frequently pursue social or political missions, so many different goals are conceivable. One goal that is often cited is revenue minimization; i.e., provide whatever goods and services are offered at the lowest possible cost to society. A better approach might be to observe that even a not-for-profit business has equity. Thus, one answer is that the appropriate goal is to maximize the value of the equity.

**5.** Presumably, the current stock value reflects the risk, timing, and magnitude of all future cash flows, both short-term *and* long-term. If this is correct, then the statement is false.

**6.** An argument can be made either way. At the one extreme, we could argue that in a market economy, all these things are priced. Thus, there is an optimal level of, for example, unethical and/or illegal behavior, and the framework of stock valuation explicitly includes these. At the other extreme, we could argue that these are non-economic phenomena and are best handled through the political process. A classic (and highly relevant) thought question that illustrates this debate goes something like this: “A firm has estimated that the cost of improving the safety of one of its products is $30 million. However, the firm believes that improving the safety of the product will only save $20 million in product liability claims. What should the firm do?”

**7.** The goal will be the same, but the best course of action toward that goal may be different because of differing social, political, and economic institutions.

**8.** The goal of management should be to maximize the share price for the current shareholders. If management believes that it can improve the profitability of the firm so that the share price will exceed $35, then they should fight the offer from the outside company. If management believes that this bidder or other unidentified bidders will actually pay more than $35 per share to acquire the company, then they should still fight the offer. However, if the current management cannot increase the value of the firm beyond the bid price, and no other higher bids come in, then management is not acting in the interests of the shareholders by fighting the offer. Since current managers often lose their jobs when the corporation is acquired, poorly monitored managers have an incentive to fight corporate takeovers in situations such as this.

**9.** We would expect agency problems to be less severe in other countries, primarily due to the relatively small percentage of individual ownership. Fewer individual owners should reduce the number of diverse opinions concerning corporate goals. The high percentage of institutional ownership might lead to a higher degree of agreement between owners and managers on decisions concerning risky projects. In addition, institutions may be better able to implement effective monitoring mechanisms on managers than can individual owners, based on the institutions’ deeper resources and experiences with their own management. The increase in institutional ownership of stock in the United States and the growing activism of these large shareholder groups may lead to a reduction in agency problems for U.S. corporations and a more efficient market for corporate control.

**10.** How much is too much? Who is worth more, Larry Ellison or Tiger Woods? The simplest answer is that there is a market for executives just as there is for all types of labor. Executive compensation is the price that clears the market. The same is true for athletes and performers. Having said that, one aspect of executive compensation deserves comment. A primary reason that executive compensation has grown so dramatically is that companies have increasingly moved to stock-based compensation. Such movement is obviously consistent with the attempt to better align stockholder and management interests. When stock prices soar, management cleans up. It is sometimes argued that much of this reward is due to rising stock prices in general, not managerial performance. Perhaps in the future, executive compensation will be designed to reward only differential performance, i.e., stock price increases in excess of general market increases.
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***CHAPTER 1***

**EAST COAST YACHTS**

**1.** An LLC (limited liability company) is essentially a hybrid form of a partnership (or sole proprietorship) and a corporation. The goal is to operate like a partnership or sole proprietorship but have limited liability for the owner(s). The advantages to an LLC are: 1)Reduction of personal liability. A sole proprietor has unlimited liability, which can include the potential loss of all personal assets. 2) Taxes. Forming an LLC may mean that more expenses can be considered business expenses and be deducted from the company’s income. 3) Improved credibility. The business may have increased credibility in the business world compared to a sole proprietorship. 4) Ability to attract investment. Corporations, even LLCs, can raise capital through the sale of equity. 5) Continuous life. Sole proprietorships have a limited life, while corporations have a potentially perpetual life. 6) Transfer of ownership. It is easier to transfer ownership in a corporation through the sale of stock. 7) Potential for reduced agency problems compared to a corporation.

The biggest disadvantage is the potential cost, although the cost of forming an LLC can be relatively small. Another potential disadvantage is double taxation, which applies to corporations and LLCs, but can be avoided for the LLC if certain specific criteria are met. There are also other potential costs, including more expansive record-keeping.

**2.** Forming a corporation has the same advantages as forming an LLC, but the costs are likely to be higher.

**3.** As a small company, changing to an LLC is probably the most advantageous decision at the current time. If the company grows, and Larissa is willing to sell equity ownership, the company can reorganize as a corporation at a later date. Additionally, forming an LLC is likely to be less expensive than forming a corporation.
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