https://doi.org/10.62836/emi.v4i4.481

Global Science Publishing

EMI

Economics & Management Information

https://ojs.sgsci.org/journals/emi

Article

The Effect of Varied Incentive Durations on Business Environment, Leadership Compensation, and Organizational Innovation: A Comprehensive Analysis

Jiang Zhao [1] and Dan Wu [2,*]

[1] *School of Business, Shaoxing University, Shaoxing 312000, China*

[2] *Cai Yuanpei School of Art and Design, Shaoxing University, Shaoxing 312000, China*

Abstract: This analytical review examines the impact of varied incentives on the business environment, leadership compensation, and organizational innovation. This study focuses on the pivotal role of risk-taking in driving innovation and suggests that suitable long-term incentives, such as stock options, can effectively motivate executives to undertake innovative endeavors. The analysis highlights the criticality of adaptable leadership compensation mechanisms that synchronize with strategic objectives and demonstrate responsiveness to evolving market dynamics. Additionally, external factors like industry competitiveness and regulatory environment can influence the effectiveness of incentive contracts in promoting innovation. The findings underscore the need for a holistic approach in designing incentive programs that consider contextual factors and align with long-term organizational goals. By creating a conducive environment for innovation, a business environment can attract and retain top talent, leading to sustainable growth and success.

Keywords: business environment; leadership compensation; organizational innovation

1. Background

China's economy is navigating a pivotal transition towards advanced development paradigms, where the strategic deployment of the "mass entrepreneurship and innovation" initiative assumes paramount significance. Enterprise innovation dynamics are shaped by multifaceted determinants, encompassing both exogenous elements–such as industry-wide strategic decisions, equitable market regulation, and environmental governance frameworks–and endogenous factors including dedicated R&D investment and technological infrastructure [1]. Additional factors affecting innovation are the company's managers, their social relationships, stability, doctoral education background in management, gender heterogeneity, psychological security factors, and the crossover effect [2]. These determinants significantly contribute to the elevation of corporate research and development capabilities, thereby fostering enhanced innovation potential.

Within the corporate governance framework, the critical role of executive compensation mechanisms in shaping risk propensity and R&D investment decisions warrants significant attention. The inherent divergence in strategic orientations between principals and agents often manifests in managerial myopia, where executives may prioritize immediate financial gains through short-term investment strategies while underappreciating the long-term value potential of strategic innovation initiatives [3]. This behavioral pattern becomes particularly

Received: 1 August 2025; Accepted: 27 August 2025.

* Corresponding: Dan Wu (woshiweimo007@126.com)

problematic in evaluating complex innovation projects, as risk-averse decision-making may systematically exclude investments with substantial long-term developmental prospects. Addressing these agency dilemmas necessitates a comprehensive incentive architecture that integrates both intrinsic motivators (e. g., professional reputation and career advancement) and extrinsic rewards, particularly equity-based compensation structures [4]. Additionally, a supportive corporate culture that values innovation and risk-taking can create an environment that fosters creativity and generates new ideas [4]. The influence of internal governance mechanisms on innovation strategy extends beyond executive compensation frameworks, encompassing broader governance dimensions including board composition and equity ownership structures. Research indicates that firms with balanced governance architectures demonstrate greater propensity for R&D investment, contrasting with short-termist shareholder orientations that emphasize immediate financial returns [5,6].

2. The Nexus between Executive Compensation and Corporate Innovation

Executive compensation mechanisms constitute a pivotal determinant in driving corporate innovation, particularly within the context of China's ongoing economic transformation and industrial upgrading. The innovation landscape is shaped by multifaceted determinants, encompassing both external environmental factors—including industry dynamics, market regulatory frameworks, environmental policies, innovation funding mechanisms, and technological infrastructure [7]—and internal organizational elements. The latter includes managerial composition (spanning board members and senior executives), professional networks, leadership stability, advanced educational qualifications in management, gender diversity, psychological security factors, and cross-functional integration, all of which significantly influence corporate R&D capabilities and innovation outcomes [8]. Within the corporate governance framework, the strategic role of managerial incentives in shaping executive risk propensity and R&D investment decisions emerges as a critical consideration. Empirical evidence suggests that the implementation of equity-based compensation plans enables firms to transcend traditional salary structures, mitigate agency costs, and diversify investment portfolios, thereby reducing corporate risk exposure [9]. This has prompted Chinese scholars to investigate the multifaceted implications of equity incentives, inspired by their widespread adoption in developed economies. Recent studies have demonstrated the impact of equity incentives on merger and acquisition strategies [10], operational leverage decisions [11], and financial performance metrics [12]. Furthermore, short-term compensation structures have been shown to optimize strategic decision-making processes and resource allocation efficiency [13], while simultaneously enhancing operational performance [14]. Particularly for senior executives, well-designed compensation packages serve as effective mechanisms for curbing earnings manipulation practices and improving financial reporting quality [15].

The optimal contracting framework posits that equity-based compensation mechanisms establish implicit governance constraints on executive decision-making, effectively mitigating opportunistic behavior and myopic tendencies in innovation strategies [16]. This alignment of interests fosters greater executive commitment to research and development initiatives [4]. Empirical evidence suggests that beyond specific threshold levels, equity incentives enhance managerial risk tolerance and capacity to absorb systemic innovation risks [5]. Such compensation structures promote sustainable strategic orientations in corporate decision-making, discouraging innovation abandonment due to risk aversion. While equity incentives can potentially strengthen long-term technological innovation capabilities, they may also degenerate into rent-seeking instruments rather than solutions to agency problems [17].

Excessive managerial equity ownership creates both capability and motivation for performance manipulation to meet vesting conditions, while enabling risk-averse decision-making and accounting information distortion to serve personal interests [18]. Research reveals a complex, non-linear relationship between equity incentives and innovation outcomes. While moderate equity alignment can harmonize stakeholder interests and stimulate innovation [19], excessive equity concentration may foster conservative decision-making and power centralization, ultimately hindering innovation [20]. In contrast to equity incentives tied to long-term corporate performance, compensation-based mechanisms represent short-term incentive structures. These performance-contingent contracts establish executive remuneration benchmarks to calibrate incentive effects and risk preferences [21]. Innovative compensation frameworks that provide substantial

monetary rewards for innovation contributions offer executives institutional safeguards for short-term economic needs. Reward systems that tolerate early-stage failures while recognizing long-term successes are particularly effective in attracting and retaining entrepreneurial executives [22]. Such executives proactively develop multifaceted strategies to execute corporate innovation agendas, including external resource mobilization and collaborative R&D partnerships, while simultaneously safeguarding their negotiation positions and professional reputations in subsequent contractual engagements [23].

The tenure duration of senior executives exhibits phased characteristics and operational flexibility. Within the compensation incentive framework, short-term performance metrics emerge as pivotal determinants of managerial remuneration. As rational economic actors, executives tend to prioritize personal economic benefits—including salaries, bonuses, and organizational support—while adopting a risk-averse and conservative stance toward high-innovation projects characterized by significant positive externalities [24]. Compared to larger corporations, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in China encounter more substantial challenges in accessing capital, acquiring human resources, and accumulating technological assets, thereby facing greater difficulties in establishing distinctive competitive advantages [25]. Under resource-constrained conditions, managers often enhance resource utilization efficiency through integrated enterprise management mechanisms that synergize knowledge, technology, and capital, thereby fostering innovation capabilities and competitive positioning [26]. Equity-based compensation mechanisms serve dual purposes in the innovation context. First, they provide financial buffers for short-term innovation failures while aligning with extended R&D cycles. These mechanisms offer substantial post-exercise rewards as motivational incentives, attracting and retaining talent willing to undertake innovation risks, thereby optimizing human capital value [27]. Second, given SMEs' constrained access to bank loans and exclusive resources, equity and compensation incentives function as signaling mechanisms for improved corporate governance and project excellence. By leveraging innovation resources and policy advantages, these incentives facilitate profit maximization and developmental opportunities, thereby enhancing SMEs' independent innovation capabilities [28].

Consistent with the Internal Factor Growth Theory, SME development trajectories are intrinsically linked to executive motivation and behavioral patterns. Through the pursuit of cutting-edge technologies, SMEs seek developmental opportunities and enhanced market recognition [29]. The performance-based "exercise conditions" associated with these incentives motivate management to focus on enterprise development quality, promote innovation project implementation, and facilitate the transformation of innovation outcomes [27]. Given SMEs' typically limited financial resources and challenges in securing adequate funding for innovation-driven growth strategies, governmental and financial institutions can provide diversified financial support mechanisms, including low-interest loans, subsidies, and venture capital, to alleviate financial constraints and facilitate business expansion.

3. The Regulatory Influence of Market Ecosystems on Organizational Innovation Capabilities

Drawing upon Resource Dependence Theory, organizational survival and development are contingent upon the acquisition of external resources. Through strategic connections with external resource networks, organizations can effectively secure distinctive environmental resources [30]. Regional disparities in economic policies, cultural contexts, and geographical positioning contribute to substantial heterogeneity in business environments. As an external institutional framework, the business environment exerts significant influence on local economic development and collaborative innovation ecosystems [31]. An optimal business environment is characterized by favorable market opportunities, robust legal frameworks, and conducive economic conditions. Furthermore, consistent with Resource Dependence Theory, the business environment plays a pivotal role in facilitating enterprise financing mechanisms [28]. Challenges stemming from technological obsolescence and environmental uncertainty often lead to reduced R&D investment, resulting in diminished resource allocation for innovative initiatives. Such constraints impede organizations' capacity to engage in value-creating and strategically significant R&D activities [32].

4. Conclusions

Beyond the established findings, this comprehensive analysis reveals additional critical dimensions

concerning the interplay between temporal incentive structures, managerial compensation frameworks, and organizational innovation within varying market contexts. One important finding is the role of risk-taking in driving innovation. The study suggests that by providing executives with appropriate long-term incentives, such as stock options, companies can encourage them to take calculated risks in pursuing innovative endeavors. This incentivizes executives to explore new markets, invest in research and development, and embrace technological advancements, ultimately leading to higher levels of innovation within the organization. Moreover, the review emphasizes the need for flexibility in executive incentive contracts. It suggests that aligning incentives with the specific goals and objectives of the organization, as well as adapting them to changing market conditions, can enhance the effectiveness of such contracts in driving innovation. This implies that companies should regularly evaluate and adjust their incentive structures to ensure they remain relevant and motivational in a dynamic business environment. Another significant finding is the potential influence of external factors, such as industry competitiveness and regulatory environment, on the effectiveness of incentive contracts in promoting innovation. Understanding and adapting to these external factors is essential for designing incentive programs that effectively drive innovation in specific business contexts.

Collectively, this analysis illuminates the intricate dynamics among temporal incentive mechanisms, market ecosystems, managerial compensation structures, and organizational innovation processes. The findings emphasize the necessity of adopting an integrated framework that considers multifaceted contextual elements while ensuring incentive alignment with strategic organizational objectives. By doing so, businesses can create an environment that fosters innovation, attracts and retains top talent, and ultimately drives sustainable growth and success.

Funding

We acknowledge the Special Project for Leading Talents in Philosophy and Social Sciences Planning of Zhejiang Province (No. 25 "The Mechanism of Government Regulation Empowering Corporate Green Innovation Elements and Collaborative Pathways under the Perspective of Carbon Neutrality"), the foundation of the Research Project of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Ministry of Education (No. 24YJAZH173), Zhejiang Provincial Education Science Planning Project (No. 2025SCG137), and Intelligent Education Branch Project of Zhejiang Provincial Education Association (No. ZNJY2507).

Author Contributions

Writing—original draft, J.Z. and D.W.; writing—review and editing, J.Z. and D.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1 Peng Z, Lian YJ, Dai YY. Corporate Innovation Incentive: An Explanation Made with the Peer Effect. *Science Research Management* 2020; **41**(**4**): 45–53. https://doi.org/10.19571/j.cnki.1000-2995.2020.04.005.

2 Griffin D, Li K, Xu T. Board Gender Diversity and Corporate Innovation: International Evidence. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 2021; **56**(**1**): 123–154. https://doi.org/10.1017/S002210901900098X.

3 Tsang A, Wang KT, Liu S, *et al*. Integrating Corporate Social Responsibility Criteria into Executive Compensation and Firm Innovation: International Evidence. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2021; **70**: 102070. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.102070.

4 Liu GC, Li YZ, Li M. Private Equity Investment, Executive Incentives, and Corporate Innovation Performance: An Examination from the Perspective of Patent Heterogeneity. *Business and Management Journal* 2022; **8**: 116–134. https://doi.org/10.19616/j.cnki.bmj.2022.08.007.

5 Armstrong C, Nicoletti A, Zhou FS. Executive Stock Options and Systemic Risk. *Journal of Financial Economics* 2022; **146**(**1**): 256–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2021.09.010.

6 Tian X, Meng QY. Do Stock Incentive Schemes Spur Corporate Innovation? *South China Journal of Economics* 2018; **21**(**3**): 176–190. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1008-3448.2018.03.017.

7 Genin AL, Tan J, Song J. State Governance and Technological Innovation in Emerging Economies: State-Owned Enterprise Restructuration and Institutional Logic Dissonance in China's High-Speed Train Sector. *Journal of International Business Studies* 2021; **52**(**4**): 621–645. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00342-w.

8 He Z, Hirshleifer D. The Exploratory Mindset and Corporate Innovation. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 2022; **57**(**1**): 127–169. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109020000800.

9 Brisley N, Cai J, Nguyen T. Required CEO Stock Ownership: Consequences for Risk-Taking and Compensation. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2021; **66**: 101850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2020.101850.

10 Pan XY, Shen YF. Equity Incentive, M&A, and Profit Manipulation. *Business and Management Journal* 2021; **43**(**10**): 99–118. https://doi.org/10.19616/j.cnki.bmj.2021.10.006.

11 Wang BQ, Huang J, Lu J. Do Equity Incentives Have an Influence on Operating Leverage Decisions? Evidences from A-Share Listed Companies. *Journal of Central University of Finance & Economics* 2021; **9**: 59–71. https://doi.org/10.19681/j.cnki.jcufe.2021.09.006.

12 Li GZ, Zhu JQ, Li J, *et al.* Relative Performance Evaluation and Mergers and Acquisitions: Theory and Empirical Evidence. *Economic Research Journal* 2020; **3**: 65–82.

13 Yin XN, Ming H, Geng JF. Impact of Executive Compensation Incentive on The Efficiency of Enterprise Resource Allocation—Distinguish Property Right and Industry. *China Soft Science* 2021; **S1**: 260 – 267. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-9753.2021.z1.031.

14 Banerjee S, Homroy S. Managerial Incentives and Strategic Choices of Firms with Different Ownership Structures. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2018; **48**: 314–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2017.10.001.

15 Kim T, Kyung H, Ng J. Top Management Team Incentive Dispersion and Earnings Quality. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 2022; **39**(**3**): 1949–1985. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12778.

16 Shue K, Townsend RR. How Do Quasi-Random Option Grants Affect CEO Risk-Taking? *The Journal of Finance* 2017; **72**(**6**): 2551–2588. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12545.

17 Nienhaus M. Executive Equity Incentives and Opportunistic Manager Behavior: New Evidence from a Quasi-Natural Experiment. *Review of Accounting Studies* 2022; **27**(**4**): 1276–1318. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-021-09633-5.

18 Wruck KH, Wu Y. The Relation between CEO Equity Incentives and the Quality of Accounting Disclosures: New Evidence. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2021; **67**: 101895. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101895.

19 Xu N, Jiang NN, Zhang J. A Study of the Influence of Equity Incentive on Ambidextrous Innovation Strategy of SMEs. *Science Research Management* 2019; **40**(**7**): 163–172.

20 Biggerstaff L, Blank B, Goldie B. Do Incentives Work? Option-Based Compensation and Corporate Innovation. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2019; **58**: 415–430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2019.06.005.

21 Yin MQ, Sheng L, Li WB. Executive Incentive, Innovation Input and Corporate Performance: An Empirical Study Based on Endogeneity and Industry Categories. *Nankai Business Review* 2018; **21**(**1**): 109–117.

22 Xiao JH, Wang RF. Pay, Equity and Promotion, which Is More Effective Incentive for Executives in Academic Spin-offs?—Evidence from Listed Companies in China. *Management Review* 2022; **34**(**1**): 79–91. https://doi.org/10.14120/j.cnki.cn11-5057/f.2022.01.023.

23 Ma XX, Lu H. The Influence of Top Management Team and External Social Capital on Technology Innovation: Taking Executive Incentive as Moderator Variables. *Science and Technology Management Research* 2019; **39**(**1**): 162–169. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-7695.2019.01.022.

24 Li Y, Wang P. Whether the Policy of Executive Compensation Limit Affects the Innovation of State-Owned Enterprises—An Empirical Study Based on the Data of A-Share Listed Companies. *Economic Theory and Business Management* 2022; **42**(**1**), 86–99. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-596X.2022.01.007.

25 Cathcart L, Dufour A, Rossi L, *et al.* The Differential Impact of Leverage on the Default Risk of Small and Large Firms. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2020; **60**: 101541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2019.101541.

26 Kadłubek M, Thalassinos E, Domagała J, *et al.* Intelligent Transportation System Applications and Logistics Resources for Logistics Customer Service in Road Freight Transport Enterprises. *Energies* 2022; **15**(**13**): 4668. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15134668.

27 Jochem T, Ladika T, Sautner Z. The Retention Effects of Unvested Equity: Evidence from Accelerated Option Vesting. *The Review of Financial Studies* 2018; **31**(**11**): 4142–4186. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhy017.

28 Mc Namara A, Murro P, O'Donohoe S. Countries Lending Infrastructure and Capital Structure Determination: The Case of European SMEs. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2017; **43**: 122–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2016.12.008.

29 Hsu YT, Huang CW, Koedijk KG. Unintended Consequences of Compensation Peer Groups on Corporate Innovation. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2023; **78**: 102321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2022.102321.

30 Zhou ZJ, Gao TT, Zhang SG. Business Environment and Asset-Light Strategy: Based on the Contextual Analysis of Equity Incentive and Nature of Property Rights. *Journal of Shanghai University of Finance and Economics* 2020; **22**(**6**): 52–64. https://doi.org/10.16538/j.cnki.jsufe.2020.06.004.

31 de Bettignies JE, Liu HF, Robinson, DT, *et al.* Competition and Innovation in Markets for Technology. *Management Science* 2022; **69**(**8**): 4753–4773. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4574.

32 Yu WC, Liang PH. Uncertainty, Business Environment and Private Enterprises' Vitality. *China Industrial Economics* 2019; **11**: 136–154. https://doi.org/10.19581/j.cnki.ciejournal.2019.11.008.