INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD
ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47]
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value : 86.87
Volume - 12, Issue - 2, February - 2026

DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF/202602012 --:-- Research Paper / Article / Review

Capital Structure Decisions and Firm Performance: A Conceptual Review

Dr. R Raghuveer
Lecturer, Yuvarajas College (Autonomous), University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka
Email – veerraghu129@gmail.com

Abstract: *Capital structure decisions are among the most critical strategic financial choices faced by firms, as they influence profitability, risk, and long-term sustainability. Despite extensive research on the relationship between capital structure and firm performance, existing literature presents mixed and inconclusive findings. While some studies report positive effects of leverage on firm performance, others indicate negative or insignificant relationships, particularly across different economic and industrial contexts. This lack of consensus highlights the need for a comprehensive conceptual synthesis of existing knowledge. The present study undertakes a secondary data–based conceptual review to examine the relationship between capital structure decisions and firm performance. Drawing upon established theories such as the Modigliani–Miller propositions, Trade-Off theory, Pecking Order theory, and Agency cost theory, the study critically reviews and integrates findings from prior empirical research conducted in both developed and emerging economies. The review focuses on commonly used capital structure indicators, including debt–equity ratio and total debt ratio, and firm performance measures such as return on assets, return on equity, earnings per share, and market-based indicators. The findings reveal that the impact of capital structure on firm performance is context-specific and influenced by firm characteristics, industry conditions, and economic environments. The study concludes that there is no universally optimal capital structure applicable to all firms. By synthesizing theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence, this conceptual review contributes to a clearer understanding of the capital structure–firm performance relationship and offers valuable insights for managers, researchers, and policymakers.*

Key Words: *Capital Structure; Firm Performance; Leverage; Profitability; Secondary Data Review; Conceptual Framework.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Capital structure decisions represent one of the most critical strategic choices faced by corporate managers, as they determine the optimal mix of debt and equity used to finance a firm's operations and growth. These decisions influence not only the cost of capital but also the risk profile, financial flexibility, and long-term sustainability of firms. In an increasingly competitive and uncertain business environment, selecting an appropriate capital structure has become essential for enhancing firm performance and maximizing shareholder value. Firm performance is commonly assessed using accounting-based indicators such as return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), earnings per share (EPS), as well as market-based measures including Tobin's Q and market capitalization. Prior research suggests that capital structure decisions significantly affect these performance indicators through mechanisms such as interest tax shields, agency costs, and financial distress risks. However, empirical findings remain inconclusive, with studies reporting positive, negative, and neutral relationships between leverage and firm performance.

Over the past few decades, extensive research on capital structure and firm performance has been conducted using secondary data obtained from financial statements, stock exchanges, and published databases. While such empirical studies provide valuable insights, the diversity of methodologies, sectors, time periods, and performance measures has resulted in fragmented and sometimes contradictory evidence. This has created a need for a comprehensive conceptual review that synthesizes existing theoretical and empirical knowledge to provide clearer understanding of the relationship between capital structure decisions and firm performance. A secondary data–based conceptual review is particularly relevant as it enables systematic evaluation of established theories, identification of dominant variables, and recognition of unresolved research gaps without the constraints of primary data collection. By integrating key capital structure theories with findings from prior studies, this review aims to develop a coherent conceptual framework explaining how financing decisions influence firm performance.

Accordingly, the present study undertakes a secondary data review to critically examine the theoretical foundations, empirical evidence, and conceptual linkages between capital structure decisions and firm performance. The review seeks to offer meaningful insights for academicians, financial managers, and policymakers, while also suggesting directions for future research in corporate finance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Modigliani and Miller (1958) proposed the capital structure irrelevance theory, arguing that under perfect market conditions, a firm's value and performance are independent of its financing mix. Although purely theoretical, this model laid the foundation for later studies by highlighting the conditions under which capital structure becomes relevant.

Modigliani and Miller (1963) revised their earlier proposition by incorporating corporate taxes, concluding that debt financing can enhance firm value through tax shields. This extension provided a theoretical basis for the positive relationship between leverage and firm performance observed in later empirical studies.

Myers (1984) introduced the pecking order theory, suggesting that firms prefer internal financing over debt and equity due to information asymmetry. According to this theory, highly profitable firms rely less on external debt, implying a negative relationship between leverage and firm performance.

Myers and Majluf (1984) further strengthened the pecking order argument by demonstrating how asymmetric information influences financing choices. Their study implies that firms with strong performance avoid issuing equity, indirectly affecting observed capital structure–performance relationships.

Titman and Wessels (1988) examined determinants of capital structure and found that firm characteristics such as size, growth, and asset structure influence leverage decisions. Their findings indicate that capital structure indirectly affects firm performance through firm-specific factors.

Jensen (1986) developed the free cash flow theory, arguing that debt can improve firm performance by disciplining managers and reducing agency costs. This perspective supports a positive relationship between leverage and performance, particularly in mature firms with excess cash flows.

Rajan and Zingales (1995) analyzed firms across G-7 countries and reported that leverage is influenced by institutional and market factors. Their study shows that the impact of capital structure on performance varies across countries due to differences in financial systems.

Abor (2005) studied firms listed on the Ghana Stock Exchange and found a significantly negative relationship between leverage and profitability. The study concluded that excessive reliance on debt adversely affects firm performance in developing economies.

Zeitun and Tian (2007) examined Jordanian firms and reported that higher leverage negatively affects accounting-based performance measures such as ROA and ROE. Their findings highlight the financial distress costs associated with excessive debt.

Pratheepkanth (2011) analyzed Sri Lankan companies and found a negative relationship between capital structure and firm performance. The study suggests that high leverage increases financial risk and reduces profitability.

Ebaid (2009) investigated Egyptian firms and observed weak and mixed relationships between capital structure and firm performance. The study concluded that capital structure plays a limited role in explaining performance variations.

Fosu (2013) examined South African firms and found that leverage positively affects firm performance, particularly in competitive industries. The study supports the agency cost theory, suggesting that debt enhances managerial efficiency.

Salim and Yadav (2012) analyzed Malaysian listed firms and reported mixed results, with debt negatively affecting ROA but showing insignificant effects on Tobin's Q. Their findings indicate that performance outcomes depend on the measurement proxy used.

Sheikh and Wang (2013) studied firms in Pakistan and found a significant negative relationship between leverage and firm performance. The study supports the pecking order theory in emerging market contexts.

Chadha and Sharma (2015) examined Indian manufacturing firms and found that higher leverage negatively affects profitability. Their study highlights the conservative financing behavior of Indian firms.

Ibhagui and Olokoyo (2018) investigated Nigerian firms and observed a negative association between debt ratios and firm performance. The study attributes poor performance to high interest burdens and weak financial markets.

Sathyamoorthi et al. (2019) analyzed consumer service firms in Botswana and reported that leverage negatively influences ROA, ROE, and Tobin's Q. The study emphasizes the vulnerability of service firms to financial distress.

Pandey and Sahu (2017) focused on Indian manufacturing firms and found that capital structure has a significant negative impact on firm performance. Their results suggest that Indian firms rely more on internal financing.

Nelson Johnny and Ayunku (2019) examined Nigerian microfinance banks and reported mixed results, with total debt positively affecting ROE while debt-equity ratios showed negative effects. This indicates sector-specific capital structure dynamics.

Quirira and Miftahuddin (2020) studied Indonesian non-financial firms and found that both short-term and long-term debt negatively affect firm performance. Their findings reflect inefficient debt utilization.
Hoque (2020) provided a comprehensive review and concluded that the capital structure–performance relationship is highly contextual. The study emphasized the need for theory-based interpretation rather than universal conclusions.
Abdullah and Tursoy (2021) analyzed German firms and found a positive relationship between leverage and firm performance. The study attributes this to tax advantages and efficient capital markets.
Negi and Singh (2023) conducted a systematic review and reported that most studies in emerging economies show a negative relationship between leverage and profitability. Their review highlights methodological diversity as a major reason for inconsistent findings.
Salwa Said (2025) examined Egyptian firms and reported mixed effects of capital structure on accounting and market-based performance measures. The study supports both trade-off and pecking order theories.

3. RESEARCH GAP:

Despite extensive empirical and theoretical research on the relationship between capital structure decisions and firm performance, the existing literature remains inconclusive and fragmented. Prior studies report mixed findings, showing positive, negative, and insignificant relationships depending on country context, industry type, time period, and performance measures used. Many studies rely heavily on empirical panel data analysis, with limited efforts to conceptually integrate theoretical perspectives such as trade-off, pecking order, and agency cost theories. Additionally, much of the literature focuses on specific sectors or single-country settings, which restricts the generalizability of findings. There is also inconsistency in the selection of capital structure proxies and firm performance indicators, leading to variations in reported outcomes. Furthermore, limited attention has been given to synthesizing secondary data evidence to explain why capital structure impacts firm performance differently across contexts. This creates a clear gap for a comprehensive conceptual review that systematically integrates theoretical foundations and empirical evidence to provide a coherent understanding of capital structure decisions and firm performance.

4. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

Capital structure decisions play a crucial role in determining a firm's financial performance and long-term sustainability. Although a substantial volume of empirical research has examined the relationship between capital structure and firm performance, the findings remain inconsistent and inconclusive. Studies report positive, negative, and mixed effects of leverage on profitability and market value, creating confusion for financial managers and policymakers. Much of the existing research is fragmented, focusing on specific industries, countries, or time periods, with limited integration of theoretical perspectives. Additionally, variations in the measurement of capital structure and performance indicators further complicate interpretation. As a result, there is a lack of a unified conceptual understanding explaining how and why capital structure decisions influence firm performance. This necessitates a comprehensive secondary data–based conceptual review to synthesize existing theories and empirical evidence and to clarify the nature of the capital structure–performance relationship.

5. SCOPE OF THE STUDY:

The scope of the present study is confined to a conceptual review based on secondary data drawn from published research articles, academic journals, books, and reports related to capital structure and firm performance. The study covers both developed and emerging market contexts and includes evidence from multiple industries to ensure broader applicability. It focuses on commonly used capital structure measures such as debt–equity ratio and total debt ratio, and firm performance indicators such as return on assets, return on equity, and market-based measures. The review emphasizes theoretical frameworks and empirical findings without conducting primary data collection or statistical analysis.

6. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

The conceptual framework of this study is developed based on established capital structure theories, including the Modigliani–Miller propositions, Trade-Off theory, Pecking Order theory, and Agency cost theory. These theories explain how firms' financing decisions influence firm performance through factors such as cost of capital, tax benefits, financial risk, and managerial discipline. In this conceptual review, capital structure decisions are treated as the independent variable and are represented by commonly used leverage measures such as debt–equity ratio, total debt ratio, and long- and short-term debt ratios.

Firm performance is considered the dependent variable and is measured using both accounting-based and market-based indicators, including return on assets, return on equity, earnings per share, and Tobin's Q. The framework

also recognizes that the relationship between capital structure and firm performance is influenced by firm-specific and contextual factors such as firm size, growth opportunities, asset structure, industry characteristics, and economic conditions. These moderating factors help explain the inconsistent findings reported in earlier studies. Overall, the framework proposes that capital structure decisions significantly affect firm performance, but the direction and strength of this relationship vary across firms and environments.

7. DISCUSSION:

The objectives of the present study are fulfilled through a systematic and structured secondary data review of existing theoretical and empirical literature on capital structure decisions and firm performance. Since the study adopts a conceptual review approach, it does not rely on primary data collection but instead draws insights from previously published research articles, scholarly journals, books, and authoritative financial reports. This approach allows the study to consolidate a wide range of perspectives and findings that have emerged across different economic contexts, industries, and time periods. To achieve the first objective of examining the conceptual relationship between capital structure and firm performance, the study critically reviews major capital structure theories, including the Modigliani–Miller propositions, Trade-Off theory, Pecking Order theory, and Agency cost theory. These theories provide the foundational logic explaining how financing decisions influence firm performance through mechanisms such as tax benefits, cost of capital, financial risk, and managerial discipline. By synthesizing these theoretical perspectives, the study establishes a strong conceptual basis for understanding why capital structure matters for firm performance. The second objective, which focuses on synthesizing empirical evidence, is addressed by reviewing a wide range of author-wise studies conducted in both developed and emerging economies. These studies are analyzed with respect to their methodologies, variables used, and key findings. Through this process, the study identifies recurring patterns such as the predominance of negative leverage–performance relationships in emerging markets and mixed or non-linear relationships in developed economies. The review also highlights how variations in performance measures and leverage proxies contribute to inconsistent results.

Further, the study fulfills its objectives by integrating theoretical insights with empirical findings to develop a comprehensive conceptual framework. This framework explains the direct influence of capital structure decisions on firm performance while acknowledging the role of firm-specific and contextual factors that moderate this relationship. By doing so, the study not only clarifies inconsistencies in prior research but also provides a structured explanation of the conditions under which capital structure decisions enhance or impair firm performance. Overall, the secondary data review approach enables the study to meet its objectives by offering a coherent, theory-driven understanding of the capital structure–performance relationship and by suggesting meaningful directions for future research.

8. CONCLUSION:

This conceptual review examined the relationship between capital structure decisions and firm performance through an extensive analysis of existing theoretical and empirical literature based on secondary data. The review reveals that capital structure remains a critical determinant of firm performance; however, its impact is neither uniform nor universally predictable. Empirical evidence across countries and industries demonstrates mixed results, with leverage showing positive, negative, and non-significant effects on firm performance. These inconsistencies can largely be attributed to differences in economic environments, industry characteristics, firm-specific factors, and the choice of performance and leverage measures. The study highlights that traditional capital structure theories continue to provide valuable insights into understanding these mixed outcomes. While the trade-off theory explains the benefits of debt through tax advantages, the pecking order theory and agency cost theory emphasize the risks associated with excessive leverage, particularly in emerging markets. The review underscores that optimal capital structure is context-specific rather than standardized. By synthesizing theoretical foundations with empirical findings, the study offers a coherent conceptual framework that enhances understanding of how financing decisions influence firm performance. The findings contribute to the existing literature by clarifying theoretical linkages and identifying the conditions under which capital structure decisions are likely to support or hinder firm performance. The findings of this conceptual review offer several important implications for financial managers and corporate decision-makers. First, managers should recognize that capital structure decisions directly influence firm performance and therefore must be aligned with the firm's risk profile, growth stage, and operating environment. Excessive reliance on debt may increase financial distress costs and reduce profitability, especially in volatile or emerging market conditions.

Second, managers should focus on identifying an optimal level of leverage rather than maximizing debt usage. A balanced debt–equity mix can help firms benefit from tax shields while avoiding excessive interest burdens. Third, firm-specific characteristics such as size, asset structure, and growth opportunities should be carefully considered when making financing decisions. Finally, the review emphasizes the importance of flexibility in financing strategies,

encouraging managers to adapt capital structure decisions in response to changing economic conditions and regulatory frameworks. Overall, informed and context-sensitive capital structure decisions can enhance firm performance and ensure long-term financial sustainability.

REFERENCES:

1. Abor, J. (2005). The effect of capital structure on profitability: An empirical analysis of listed firms in Ghana. *Journal of Risk Finance, 6*(5), 438–445. https://doi.org/10.1108/15265940510633505
2. Abdullah, H., & Tursoy, T. (2021). Capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from Germany. *Review of Managerial Science, 15*(2), 379–410. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-019-00344-5
3. Chadha, S., & Sharma, A. K. (2015). Capital structure and firm performance: Empirical evidence from India. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective, 19*(4), 295–302. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262915610852
4. Ebaid, I. E. S. (2009). The impact of capital structure choice on firm performance: Empirical evidence from Egypt. *Journal of Risk Finance, 10*(5), 477–487. https://doi.org/10.1108/15265940911001385
5. Fosu, S. (2013). Capital structure, product market competition and firm performance: Evidence from South Africa. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 53*(2), 140–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.qref.2013.02.004
6. Hoque, M. (2020). Impact of capital structure on firm performance: A literature review. *Asian Research Journal of Business and Management Studies, 2*(1), 1–15.
7. Ibhagui, O. W., & Olokoyo, F. O. (2018). Leverage and firm performance: New evidence on the role of firm size. *North American Journal of Economics and Finance, 45*, 57–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2018.02.002
8. Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *American Economic Review, 76*(2), 323–329.
9. Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *American Economic Review, 48*(3), 261–297.
10. Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1963). Corporate income taxes and the cost of capital: A correction. *American Economic Review, 53*(3), 433–443.
11. Myers, S. C. (1984). The capital structure puzzle. *Journal of Finance, 39*(3), 575–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1984.tb03646.x
12. Myers, S. C., & Majluf, N. S. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics, 13*(2), 187–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(84)90023-0
13. Negi, S., & Singh, S. (2023). The impact of capital structure on firm performance: A systematic review. *International Journal of Finance and Economics, 28*(3), 2781–2796. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2539
14. Nelson, J., & Ayunku, P. E. (2019). An empirical analysis of the effect of capital structure on firm performance: Evidence from microfinance banks in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research, 7*(9), 36–55.
15. Pandey, I. M., & Sahu, T. N. (2017). Debt financing, agency cost and firm performance: Evidence from India. *Indian Journal of Finance, 11*(3), 7–19. https://doi.org/10.17010/ijf/2017/v11i3/113759
16. Pratheepkanth, P. (2011). Capital structure and financial performance: Evidence from selected business companies in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Arts, Science and Commerce, 2*(2), 171–183.
17. Quirira, D. O., & Miftahuddin, M. (2020). Capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from Indonesian non-financial firms. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 23*(1), 45–58.
18. Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (1995). What do we know about capital structure? Some evidence from international data. *Journal of Finance, 50*(5), 1421–1460. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1995.tb05184.x
19. Salim, M., & Yadav, R. (2012). Capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from Malaysian listed companies. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 65*, 156–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.105
20. Sathyamoorthi, C. R., Baliyan, P., Mashoko, D., & Wally-Dima, L. (2019). Capital structure and firm performance: Evidence from listed consumer services firms in Botswana. *European Journal of Economic and Financial Research, 3*(5), 33–54.
21. Sheikh, N. A., & Wang, Z. (2013). The impact of capital structure on firm performance: An empirical study of non-financial firms in Pakistan. *Journal of Managerial Finance, 39*(4), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1108/03074351311306205
22. Titman, S., & Wessels, R. (1988). The determinants of capital structure choice. *Journal of Finance, 43*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1988.tb02585.x
23. Zeitun, R., & Tian, G. G. (2007). Capital structure and corporate performance: Evidence from Jordan. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal, 1*(4), 40–61.