



Received: 08-06-2026
Accepted: 18-07-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Capital Structure Decisions from Optimal Leverage to Financial Flexibility

Hasnat Karim

Department of Management, The University of Comilla, Kotbari, Comilla 3506, Bangladesh

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2026.6.4.6668>

Corresponding Author: **Hasnat Karim**

Abstract

Capital structure research began with a deceptively simple question: does the division of financing between debt and equity change firm value? The literature gradually widened that question by adding taxes, bankruptcy costs, agency conflicts, private information, market timing, adjustment costs, national institutions, managerial traits, debt design, and intangible capital. This narrative review examines how those additions changed both theory and practice. It draws on influential foundational papers and selected empirical studies from developed and emerging economies. The evidence does not identify one theory that explains every

firm or period. Instead, leverage reflects several forces whose importance varies with cash-flow stability, assets, investment opportunities, access to lenders, institutional conditions, and managerial judgment. Recent work places particular emphasis on maturity, covenants, refinancing risk, unused borrowing capacity, and the ability to finance future investment. The review concludes that capital structure has shifted from a largely static search for one optimal debt ratio toward an adaptive financing policy. Classical theories remain useful, but their insights are now applied within a broader concern for resilience and financial flexibility.

Keywords: Capital Structure, Debt Policy, Trade-off Theory, Pecking Order, Financial Flexibility, Institutional Environment

1. Introduction

Few questions in corporate finance have lasted as long as the choice between debt and equity. The question seems simple when it is presented as a balance-sheet ratio, but the choice reaches much further. Borrowing can lower taxes and preserve ownership, yet it also creates fixed commitments and may restrict investment when cash flows weaken. Equity avoids scheduled interest payments, but a new issue can dilute existing owners and may be interpreted by investors as a signal that the firm's shares are expensive. Managers therefore choose financing while considering value, control, risk, and the possibility that capital may not be available later on acceptable terms.

Recent assessments of the field argue that firms rarely have enough information to identify a precise leverage optimum and that actual financing decisions are shaped by a mixture of theory, market access, organizational habits, and managerial judgment^[1, 2]. This is not evidence that the older theories have failed. It means that each theory captures a different part of a decision that changes across firms and over time.

The aim of this review is to explain that change. It begins with the Modigliani-Miller benchmark, then follows the literature through taxes and expected distress, agency conflicts, information asymmetry, empirical determinants, market timing, dynamic adjustment, institutional differences, debt composition, managerial effects, and financial flexibility. The review is selective rather than exhaustive. Its purpose is to show how the central question moved from finding an ideal debt-equity ratio to designing a financing policy that remains workable when investment needs and market conditions change.

2. Materials and Methods

This paper uses a narrative review approach. The source set was built around peer-reviewed studies that either introduced a major capital structure theory, provided influential empirical evidence, or extended the discussion to institutions, debt design, managerial characteristics, emerging markets, or intangible capital. Foundational papers older than ten years were retained because the historical development of the subject cannot be explained without them. More recent papers were included when they reconsidered the capital structure puzzle or offered evidence on proactive adjustment and financial flexibility.

The papers were read comparatively rather than combined through a statistical meta-analysis. For each study, attention was given to the financing mechanism being proposed, the type of evidence used, and the part of observed corporate behavior that

remained unexplained. International evidence was selected to avoid treating United States capital markets as the universal setting. Bangladesh, India, and China were included because their bank dependence, market development, and institutional constraints provide useful contrasts with mature public debt markets. The reference list consists mainly of published research. One recent conference paper supplied by the author is included because it directly extends the discussion of founder leadership to financial resilience.

Because this is a mini review, the method is intended to organize and interpret an established literature rather than claim an exhaustive systematic search. The discussion therefore emphasizes conceptual development and recurring empirical findings. Claims about individual studies are paraphrased and cited to the original sources.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Classical foundations: Irrelevance, taxes, and the trade-off

Modigliani and Miller established the benchmark for modern capital structure research [3]. In their frictionless setting, the value of a firm does not change when the same operating cash flows are divided differently between creditors and shareholders. The assumptions are deliberately unrealistic: taxes, transaction costs, bankruptcy costs, and information differences are absent. That is precisely why the proposition remains useful. If financing affects value in practice, the explanation must lie in one or more departures from that benchmark.

Corporate taxation supplied the first major departure. Modigliani and Miller later showed that interest deductibility creates a tax advantage for debt [4]. If this benefit were the only consideration, firms would borrow far more than they actually do. Kraus and Litzenberger addressed that problem by balancing the tax shield against expected bankruptcy costs [5]. Miller introduced personal taxes [6], while DeAngelo and Masulis showed that depreciation and other non-debt tax shields can reduce the value of additional interest deductions [7]. These contributions produced the familiar trade-off view: debt adds value until its next unit brings more expected cost than benefit.

The theory still provides sound intuition. A mature firm with stable cash flows and assets that lenders can value should generally be able to support more debt than a young firm whose value rests on uncertain projects. The less convincing part is the idea that managers can identify and remain close to a sharply defined target. Graham estimated that many firms could have obtained larger tax benefits by borrowing more [8]. His evidence does not make taxes irrelevant; it suggests that managers protect themselves against risks that are difficult to express in a single leverage ratio.

3.2 Agency, information, and financing hierarchies

Research in the 1970s and 1980s made the financing problem more behavioral. Jensen and Meckling showed that debt and equity change the incentives of managers, shareholders, and creditors [9]. Debt can discipline managers by committing cash to interest and principal payments, especially when a mature firm has limited investment opportunities [10]. Yet the same borrowing can encourage shareholders to prefer risky projects after creditors have supplied funds. High leverage can also cause a firm to reject

a good investment because much of the benefit would flow to existing lenders. Myers described this latter problem as debt overhang [11].

Information asymmetry offered another explanation for observed financing patterns. In Myers and Majluf, managers know more about the firm's prospects than outside investors [12]. A new equity issue may therefore be read as evidence that management believes the shares are overvalued. Myers used this reasoning to describe a pecking order in which firms prefer retained earnings, use debt next, and issue equity only when other sources are insufficient [13]. Ross reached a related conclusion through signaling theory: financing choices can convey information even when communication is not the manager's main purpose [14].

By the early 1990s, capital structure was no longer only a balance between tax benefits and distress costs. It had become a question about incentives, investment, control, and the information released to the market. Harris and Raviv captured this wider field by organizing the theories around agency conflicts, information, product-market interaction, and corporate control [15].

3.3 Empirical determinants, market timing, and dynamic adjustment

As richer firm-level data became available, researchers asked which theoretical forces were visible in actual financing choices. Titman and Wessels and, later, Rajan and Zingales identified recurring associations between leverage and asset tangibility, size, profitability, and market-to-book ratios [16, 17]. Frank and Goyal found that a relatively small set of firm and industry variables accounts for much of the evidence that remains stable across samples [18]. These results gave the field an empirical core, but they did not produce a decisive theoretical winner.

Direct comparisons were mixed. Shyam-Sunder and Myers found that firms often financed deficits in a way consistent with the pecking order [19]. Frank and Goyal reported weaker support, especially among smaller firms, even though information problems should make the hierarchy particularly relevant there [20]. Fama and French found results consistent with both trade-off and pecking-order arguments, together with important observations that neither theory explained well [21]. The negative relation between profitability and leverage remained especially influential because profitable firms often borrow less rather than more. Market timing and adjustment costs made the evidence less mechanical. Baker and Wurgler argued that firms are more willing to sell equity when valuations are high, leaving a lasting imprint on future leverage [22]. Welch showed that stock-price movements alter market leverage and that firms often reverse only part of the change [23]. In dynamic models, allowing leverage to drift can be rational when financing transactions are costly [24]. Evidence from Leary and Roberts and from Flannery and Rangan supports gradual rather than continuous adjustment toward targets [25, 26].

Even these models leave a large amount unexplained. Lemmon, Roberts, and Zender documented persistent firm-level differences in leverage that common observable variables do not capture [27]. DeAngelo and Roll showed that capital structures can also change substantially within the same firm over long periods [28]. More recent evidence from corporate filings suggests that genuinely proactive leverage adjustments occur less frequently than accounting data alone

may imply, because some apparent changes arise from credit-line use, option exercises, or temporary liquidity events rather than deliberate movement toward a target ^[29].

3.4 Institutions, capital supply, and the manager

A firm's desired financing policy matters only if the required capital is available. Faulkender and Petersen showed that access to public bond markets is associated with greater leverage among otherwise similar firms ^[30]. Rauh and Sufi demonstrated that debt composition matters as well ^[31]. Bank loans, public bonds, secured claims, and subordinated obligations carry different maturities, monitoring arrangements, control rights, and refinancing risks. An aggregate debt ratio can therefore conceal important differences.

International evidence makes the supply side difficult to ignore. Booth and coauthors found that familiar firm characteristics also help explain leverage in developing economies, although their effects depend on legal and financial institutions ^[32]. Oztekin and Flannery showed that institutional quality is also related to the speed of capital structure adjustment ^[33]. Studies of Bangladeshi manufacturing firms report roles for profitability, size, asset structure, and other standard determinants, but those decisions are made in a market with substantial bank dependence and more limited access to public equity and long-term debt ^[34, 35]. A low debt ratio in that setting may represent managerial caution, but it may also reflect restricted supply.

Evidence from India and China provides a useful comparison. Bhaduri found that growth, cash flow, size, product characteristics, and industry conditions help explain Indian corporate financing ^[36]. Chakraborty reported that listed Indian nonfinancial firms display features associated with both pecking-order and trade-off behavior ^[37]. Huang and Song found that several standard determinants retain explanatory power among Chinese listed companies, although the maturity structure of debt differs from patterns often observed in developed markets ^[38]. The central theories therefore travel across countries, but they do not arrive unchanged. Banking systems, market depth, regulation, and creditor protection influence how firms can put those theories into practice.

The manager has also entered the empirical model. Bertrand and Schoar showed that executives carry recognizable policy styles from one firm to another ^[39]. Malmendier, Tate, and Yan linked financing choices to overconfidence and formative managerial experiences ^[40]. Research on founder chief executive officers asks whether founders' close connection to their companies is also reflected in financial policy ^[41]. A related 2026 conference paper by Alam, Alam, and Nazrul extends this question to financial resilience in U.S. critical infrastructure firms, focusing on solvency, stability, and bankruptcy risk ^[42]. This evidence does not imply that personality overrides economic conditions. It shows that managers facing similar constraints may still choose different financing paths.

3.5 Financial flexibility, debt design, and intangible capital

Financial flexibility was discussed before the global financial crisis, but disruptions in credit markets made its value more visible. Survey evidence shows that chief financial officers attach considerable importance to credit

ratings and the ability to raise funds when needed ^[43]. DeAngelo, DeAngelo, and Whited model debt as partly transitory: A firm may borrow when an investment opportunity appears and later reduce leverage to restore capacity ^[44]. Denis and McKeon likewise show that firms sometimes raise debt proactively and later use the funds in ways consistent with a desire for flexibility ^[45].

Recent work also treats capital structure as a package of contractual choices rather than one debt-to-assets number. Following an investment-opportunity shock in the pharmaceutical industry, firms changed leverage, maturity, security, covenants, and equity issuance in ways that preserved financing capacity ^[46]. This matters because two firms with identical leverage can face very different risks. Long-term unsecured bonds do not create the same refinancing pressure as short-term secured loans, and a flexible lender does not exercise control in the same way as a dispersed group of bondholders.

The persistence of firms with little or no debt is another challenge to a universal target. Strebulaev and Yang documented a sizable group of zero-leverage firms ^[47]. Some may be conservative by choice, while others have strong internal cash generation or valuable growth opportunities that make fixed claims unattractive. Intangible capital strengthens this explanation. Software, data, brands, knowledge, and organizational systems can create large economic value without serving as easily transferable collateral. Falato and coauthors connect the growth of intangible capital with lower debt capacity and higher corporate saving ^[48].

A long historical perspective confirms that capital structure changes with the surrounding financial system. Graham, Leary, and Roberts showed that aggregate United States leverage shifted substantially over a century as taxes, institutions, macroeconomic conditions, and the composition of the corporate sector changed ^[49]. What appears to be a new managerial preference may therefore be a response to a different set of financing opportunities.

3.6 Review synthesis and opinion

The literature does not require one theory to defeat the others. Taxes and expected distress remain relevant, so the trade-off framework still has practical value. The pecking order helps explain reliance on retained earnings and the sensitivity of equity issues to information. Agency models clarify how financing changes incentives, while market-timing and dynamic-adjustment studies explain why observed leverage may reflect both deliberate policy and the residue of earlier events.

The main change is instead a change in what an optimal policy means. Earlier models often treated the problem as choosing a debt-equity mix that maximizes value under a known set of conditions. Managers do not enjoy that certainty. They must decide how much borrowing capacity to leave unused, whether maturities remain manageable in a downturn, which lenders are likely to renegotiate, and whether investment can continue if public markets close. A low current interest rate may not be attractive if it creates a concentrated refinancing need at the wrong time.

This perspective explains why one leverage rule cannot fit every company. A regulated utility, an early-stage biotechnology firm, and a manufacturer operating in a bank-centered emerging economy do not have the same collateral, cash-flow stability, growth options, or access to securities

markets. Modern capital structure is therefore better understood as an adaptive policy shaped by strategy, assets, liabilities, institutions, capital supply, and managerial judgment. The account is less tidy than a single target ratio, but it is more consistent with the decisions firms actually face.

4. Conclusion

Capital structure research has moved from a clean irrelevance benchmark to a layered explanation of financing under market imperfections. Taxes and bankruptcy costs led to the trade-off theory. Agency conflicts and information asymmetry introduced incentives, control, and financing hierarchies. Empirical research added recurring firm characteristics, market timing, persistent heterogeneity, and gradual adjustment. Later studies showed that institutions, access to capital, managerial traits, debt composition, and intangible assets also shape the financing decision.

The classical theories remain useful, but they now explain parts of a broader process. A firm may have a preferred leverage range without being able to identify one exact optimum. It may borrow because debt is tax efficient, refrain because future investment needs are large, or redesign maturity and covenants because refinancing is uncertain. The modern question is therefore not only how much debt a firm should use. It is also what type of debt is appropriate, when funds should be raised, and how much financing capacity should remain available for an uncertain future.

5. Recommendations

Managers should evaluate capital structure as a set of linked decisions rather than rely on one leverage benchmark. Debt amount, maturity, collateral, covenants, lender type, and unused credit capacity should be reviewed together. Stress tests should consider cash-flow declines, interest-rate changes, refinancing delays, and the loss of access to a preferred source of capital.

Researchers should give more attention to how private credit and other nonbank lenders affect financial flexibility, particularly in emerging markets. More evidence is also needed on intangible assets outside developed economies and on the interaction between managerial characteristics and legal institutions. Future work should distinguish deliberate financing choices from balance-sheet changes caused by market prices, contractual events, or short-term liquidity needs.

6. Acknowledgement

The author received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. No additional acknowledgements are reported.

7. References

- DeAngelo H. The capital structure puzzle: What are we missing? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 2022; 57(2):413-454.
- Graham JR. Presidential address: Corporate finance and reality. *Journal of Finance*. 2022; 77(4):1975-2049.
- Modigliani F, Miller MH. The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *American Economic Review*. 1958; 48(3):261-297.
- Modigliani F, Miller MH. Corporate income taxes and the cost of capital: A correction. *American Economic Review*. 1963; 53(3):433-443.
- Kraus A, Litzenberger RH. A state-preference model of optimal financial leverage. *Journal of Finance*. 1973; 28(4):911-922.
- Miller MH. Debt and taxes. *Journal of Finance*. 1977; 32(2):261-275.
- DeAngelo H, Masulis RW. Optimal capital structure under corporate and personal taxation. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1980; 8(1):3-29.
- Graham JR. How big are the tax benefits of debt? *Journal of Finance*. 2000; 55(5):1901-1941.
- Jensen MC, Meckling WH. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1976; 3(4):305-360.
- Jensen MC. Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *American Economic Review*. 1986; 76(2):323-329.
- Myers SC. Determinants of corporate borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1977; 5(2):147-175.
- Myers SC, Majluf NS. Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information that investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1984; 13(2):187-221.
- Myers SC. The capital structure puzzle. *Journal of Finance*. 1984; 39(3):575-592.
- Ross SA. The determination of financial structure: The incentive-signalling approach. *Bell Journal of Economics*. 1977; 8(1):23-40.
- Harris M, Raviv A. The theory of capital structure. *Journal of Finance*. 1991; 46(1):297-355.
- Titman S, Wessels R. The determinants of capital structure choice. *Journal of Finance*. 1988; 43(1):1-19.
- Rajan RG, Zingales L. What do we know about capital structure? Some evidence from international data. *Journal of Finance*. 1995; 50(5):1421-1460.
- Frank MZ, Goyal VK. Capital structure decisions: Which factors are reliably important? *Financial Management*. 2009; 38(1):1-37.
- Shyam-Sunder L, Myers SC. Testing static tradeoff against pecking order models of capital structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1999; 51(2):219-244.
- Frank MZ, Goyal VK. Testing the pecking order theory of capital structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2003; 67(2):217-248.
- Fama EF, French KR. Testing trade-off and pecking order predictions about dividends and debt. *Review of Financial Studies*. 2002; 15(1):1-33.
- Baker M, Wurgler J. Market timing and capital structure. *Journal of Finance*. 2002; 57(1):1-32.
- Welch I. Capital structure and stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy*. 2004; 112(1):106-131.
- Fischer EO, Heinkel R, Zechner J. Dynamic capital structure choice: Theory and tests. *Journal of Finance*. 1989; 44(1):19-40.
- Leary MT, Roberts MR. Do firms rebalance their capital structures? *Journal of Finance*. 2005; 60(6):2575-2619.
- Flannery MJ, Rangan KP. Partial adjustment toward target capital structures. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2006; 79(3):469-506.
- Lemmon ML, Roberts MR, Zender JF. Back to the beginning: Persistence and the cross-section of corporate capital structure. *Journal of Finance*. 2008; 63(4):1575-1608.

28. DeAngelo H, Roll R. How stable are corporate capital structures? *Journal of Finance*. 2015; 70(1):373-418.
29. Korteweg A, Schwert M, Strebulaev IA. Proactive capital structure adjustments: Evidence from corporate filings. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 2022; 57(1):31-66.
30. Faulkender M, Petersen MA. Does the source of capital affect capital structure? *Review of Financial Studies*. 2006; 19(1):45-79.
31. Rauh JD, Sufi A. Capital structure and debt structure. *Review of Financial Studies*. 2010; 23(12):4242-4280.
32. Booth L, Aivazian V, Demircug-Kunt A, Maksimovic V. Capital structures in developing countries. *Journal of Finance*. 2001; 56(1):87-130.
33. Oztekin O, Flannery MJ. Institutional determinants of capital structure adjustment speeds. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2012; 103(1):88-112.
34. Akhter A, Maruf-Ul-Alam M. Determinants of optimal capital structure: An empirical study on manufacturing companies in Bangladesh. *Journal of Banking and Financial Services*. 2019; 11(2):225-252.
35. Islam R, Maruf-Ul-Alam M. Capital structure and firms performance: Evidence from manufacturing sector of Bangladesh. *Jagannath University Journal of Business Studies*. 2021; 9(1-2):61-90.
36. Bhaduri SN. Determinants of capital structure choice: A study of the Indian corporate sector. *Applied Financial Economics*. 2002; 12(9):655-665.
37. Chakraborty I. Capital structure in an emerging stock market: The case of India. *Research in International Business and Finance*. 2010; 24(3):295-314.
38. Huang G, Song FM. The determinants of capital structure: Evidence from China. *China Economic Review*. 2006; 17(1):14-36.
39. Bertrand M, Schoar A. Managing with style: The effect of managers on firm policies. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 2003; 118(4):1169-1208.
40. Malmendier U, Tate G, Yan J. Overconfidence and early-life experiences: The effect of managerial traits on corporate financial policies. *Journal of Finance*. 2011; 66(5):1687-1733.
41. Alam MAU, Alam MMU, Nazrul T. Founder CEOs and utility firms' financial choices. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. 2025; 18(10):531.
42. Alam MAU, Alam MMU, Nazrul T. Founder CEO leadership and financial resilience in U.S. critical infrastructure firms: Evidence on solvency, stability and bankruptcy risk. 40th Annual Meeting of the Pennsylvania Economic Association, 2026.
43. Graham JR, Harvey CR. The theory and practice of corporate finance: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2001; 60(2-3):187-243.
44. DeAngelo H, DeAngelo L, Whited TM. Capital structure dynamics and transitory debt. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2011; 99(2):235-261.
45. Denis DJ, McKeon SB. Debt financing and financial flexibility: Evidence from proactive leverage increases. *Review of Financial Studies*. 2012; 25(6):1897-1929.
46. Giambona E, Golec J, Lopez-de-Silanes F. Do firms purposefully change capital structure? Evidence from an investment-opportunity shock to drug firms. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*. 2021; 56(3):915-944.
47. Strebulaev IA, Yang B. The mystery of zero-leverage firms. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2013; 109(1):1-23.
48. Falato A, Kadyrzhanova D, Sim J, Steri R. Rising intangible capital, shrinking debt capacity, and the U.S. corporate savings glut. *Journal of Finance*. 2022; 77(5):2799-2852.
49. Graham JR, Leary MT, Roberts MR. A century of capital structure: The leveraging of corporate America. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 2015; 118(3):658-683.