The Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability RESEARCH ARTICLE

Corporate Governance Mechanisms and Their Impact on Capital Structure Decisions in Emerging Markets

Dr. Sachin Haushiram Patole[1] Prof Rushikesh Tukaram More[2] Rohini Devram Wackchaure[3] Dr Debashree Souvik Jana[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Matoshri College of Management and Research Centre Eklahare, Nashik. sachinpatole274@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Matoshri College of Management and Research Centre Eklahare Nashik. rushimore720@gmail.com
[3]Assistant Professor, Matoshri Education Society's Matoshri College of Management and Research Centre, Eklahare, Nashik. wackchaure85@gmail.com
[4]Assistant Professor, Dr. D. Y. Patil School of Management, Lohegaon, Pune. debashree.aims@gmail.com

Abstract
Corporate governance has become a crucial factor in financial decision-making, especially regarding capital structure in emerging markets. This study examines the influence of governance measures, such as transparency, shareholder rights, ownership structure, and board composition, on the capital structure decisions of companies in rapidly expanding countries. The research involved 150 participants, including corporate administrators, financial managers, and analysts, employing a quantitative approach with structured questionnaires. The results demonstrate that robust governance practices, including independent boards and enhanced transparency, correlate with more conservative leverage decisions, whereas inadequate governance frequently leads to an overreliance on debt. The concentration of ownership and the influence of institutions significantly affect financing decisions, indicating that emerging markets are particularly responsive to governance-oriented capital structure strategies. This research analyzes the correlation between governance quality and financial stability, offering critical insights for policymakers, investors, and corporate leaders in emerging markets.

Keywords: Corporate governance, capital structure, emerging markets, board composition, ownership structure, shareholder rights, financial decision-making

1. Introduction

Corporate governance has increasingly emerged as a fundamental aspect of sustainable business practices, particularly in emerging markets with developing financial systems. Corporate governance fundamentally encompasses the framework of rules, practices, and processes that guide and regulate a company's direction and control. The process entails balancing the interests of various stakeholders, including shareholders, management, customers, creditors, regulators, and the wider community. Effective governance enhances transparency and accountability while influencing the financial decisions that determine a firm's long-term viability.

The capital structure of a business, which refers to the amalgamation of debt and equity used for funding operations and expansion, is a critical financial choice. In advanced economies, capital structure decisions often rely on prevailing market norms and regulatory frameworks. The effectiveness of governance structures in developing markets significantly influences decision-making processes. Inadequate governance results in increased borrowing, ineffective risk management, and financial instability, while strong governance promotes responsible financing strategies, enhances investor confidence, and supports sustainable growth.

The membership of the board, ownership structure, shareholder rights, and degrees of transparency are critical governance elements that affect capital structure. Independent boards often advocate for prudent borrowing practices to safeguard shareholder value, while concentrated ownership may result in more aggressive financing strategies aimed at maximizing returns for principal shareholders. Transparent reporting practices enhance investor trust and facilitate access to stock markets, hence reducing dependence on debt. Shareholder activism, particularly by institutional investors, promotes the alignment of financial decisions with long-term value creation instead of short-term gains.

The correlation between corporate governance and capital structure is crucial in developing markets. These economies face challenges including underdeveloped financial markets, inadequate law enforcement, and significant information asymmetry. The effectiveness of governance has a substantial impact on capital structure decisions. This study analyzes the correlation between governance practices and financial strategies, emphasizing the importance of risk mitigation and organizational stability in rapidly developing economies.

Review of Literature

Modigliani and Miller's seminal (1958) research demonstrated that, under perfect market conditions, capital

structure does not affect firm value, thereby providing a basis for later models that incorporate real-world frictions, including taxes, bankruptcy costs, and information asymmetries (Modigliani & Miller, 1958). Myers (1984) introduced the pecking-order hypothesis, which posits that corporations prioritize internal finance, followed by debt, and ultimately equity issuance. This viewpoint highlights the impact of information asymmetry and managerial preferences on the choice of financing alternatives. Theoretical contributions have positioned capital structure as a result of economic trade-offs and information asymmetries, rather than as a neutral mechanical decision. (Modigliani and Miller, 1958; Myers, 1984).

Agency theory delineates a clear connection between the mechanisms of corporate governance and the decisions made regarding financing. Jensen and Meckling (1976) presented the idea of agency costs that emerge from the conflicts between managers and owners. They posited that governance structures, such as ownership concentration and board oversight, play a significant role in shaping managerial risk-taking and investment choices. This agency perspective indicates that improved monitoring and alignment of incentives could reduce costly behaviors, including over-investment or under-investment, and influence the firm's leverage preferences. Empirical and survey work has repeatedly used the agency lens to explain why governance features (board independence, executive compensation, shareholder rights) are significant determinants of capital structure across contexts. (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

La Porta et al. (1998) demonstrated that investor protection levels and legal frameworks significantly influence the development of financial markets and corporate behavior, revealing that weaker legal safeguards are associated with concentrated ownership and diverse financing outcomes (La Porta et al., 1998). Regional surveys and empirical analyses in Asia and other emerging economies indicate that the presence of controlling shareholders, insufficient protections for minority interests, and inconsistent disclosure practices lead firms to rely more on internal funding or concentrated private financing. This situation influences their capital structures, which tend to mirror the risks of expropriation and restricted market access (Claessens, Djankov, & Lang, 2002; Fan & Wong, 2002). The findings emphasize the integral relationship between governance variables and the institutional context in analyzing leverage and financing strategies in emerging markets.

Recent governance research by Shleifer and Vishny (1997) and others indicates that ownership concentration and the presence or absence of active institutional investors significantly affect managerial incentives and capital allocation. Controlling shareholders may accept higher leverage to preserve their control or avoid dilution of their equity stake, whereas dispersed ownership, along with strong investor protections, typically improves access to public equity and fosters more equitable leverage decisions (Shleifer & Vishny, 1997).

The literature consistently indicates that canonical capital-structure theories, namely the trade-off and pecking-order models, offer the economic rationale for financing decisions. However, the implementation of this rationale is influenced by corporate governance and the institutional context, particularly in emerging markets with concentrated ownership and differing levels of investor protection. Empirical studies in emerging economies have validated these linkages and highlighted policy-relevant implications: improving disclosure, strengthening board independence, and enhancing minority protections can change firms' financing behavior toward more efficient and stable capital structures. The present study builds on these theoretical and empirical foundations to examine, with primary survey data, how governance mechanisms empirically correlate with capital structure decisions among firms operating in emerging-market contexts.

Research Objective:

The primary objectives for the paper are:

- To analyze the impact of corporate governance mechanisms on capital structure decisions in emerging markets.
- To examine the influence of board composition, ownership structure, and shareholder rights on financing strategies.
- To examine the influence of transparency and disclosure practices on firms' ability to obtain debt and equity financing.
- To evaluate demographic variations in perceptions of governance effectiveness regarding capital structure decisions among corporate professionals.

Research Methodology

This study employed a cross-sectional survey design to evaluate the influence of corporate governance mechanisms on capital structure decisions in emerging markets. This approach was considered appropriate as it accurately reflected the viewpoints of financial managers, executives, and analysts engaged in or impacting

organizational financing decisions. A sample of 150 respondents was selected, comprising professionals from various corporate sectors in emerging economies.

A stratified random sampling method was utilized to guarantee representation across various demographic categories, including age, gender, years of professional experience, and industry type. This sampling method allowed the study to identify differences in perceptions of governance mechanisms across various groups, thereby minimizing bias. The research included participants from multiple industries to examine sector-specific differences in financial practices.

Data were collected through structured online questionnaires, enabling efficient and thorough data acquisition. This study examined the impact of board independence, ownership concentration, shareholder rights, and transparency on capital structure decisions. The views of respondents were documented regarding the significance and impact of these governance factors, facilitating a thorough quantitative analysis.

The hypotheses for the study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

H_0: "There is no significant association between board independence and capital structure decisions in emerging markets."

H_1: "There is a significant association between board independence and capital structure decisions in emerging markets."

Hypothesis 2:

H_0: "There is no significant relationship between ownership concentration and the choice of debt-equity mix in emerging markets."

H_1: "There is a significant relationship between ownership concentration and the choice of debt-equity mix in emerging markets."

Hypothesis 3:

H_0: "There is no significant association between transparency in financial reporting and firms' access to external financing."

H_1: "There is a significant association between transparency in financial reporting and firms' access to external financing."

Empirical Results

Table 1: Importance of Corporate Governance in Influencing Capital Structure Decisions

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not important at all	12	8.00	8.00	8.00
Slightly important	21	14.00	14.00	22.00
Moderately important	37	24.67	24.67	46.67
Very important	46	30.67	30.67	77.33
Extremely important	34	22.67	22.67	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A majority of respondents (30.67%) considered governance mechanisms "very important" in shaping capital structure, while 24.67% regarded them as "moderately important." Only 8% felt governance was not important at all. This distribution shows that most professionals strongly recognize the role of governance in financing decisions, highlighting its strategic relevance in emerging markets.

Table 2: Effect of Board Independence on Debt–Equity Choices

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage

No influence	15	10.00	10.00	10.00
Slight influence	18	12.00	12.00	22.00
Moderate influence	33	22.00	22.00	44.00
Strong influence	46	30.67	30.67	74.67
Very strong influence	38	25.33	25.33	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Board independence was viewed as having either a "strong" (30.67%) or "very strong" (25.33%) effect on debt–equity decisions by more than half of respondents. Only 10% said it had no influence. This suggests that in emerging markets, independent boards are widely believed to play a decisive role in shaping financing structures.

Table 3: Significance of Ownership Concentration

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Not significant	11	7.33	7.33	7.33
Slightly significant	19	12.67	12.67	20.00
Moderately significant	29	19.33	19.33	39.33
Significant	46	30.67	30.67	70.00
Highly significant	45	30.00	30.00	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

About 60.67% of respondents rated ownership concentration as "significant" or "highly significant" in determining capital structure. Only 7.33% dismissed its influence. This shows that majority ownership holders are perceived to strongly shape financing strategies in emerging market firms.

Table 4: Effect of Transparency and Disclosure on Borrowing Capacity

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No effect	9	6.00	6.00	6.00
Very little effect	16	10.67	10.67	16.67
Moderate effect	34	22.67	22.67	39.33
Considerable effect	47	31.33	31.33	70.67
Major effect	44	29.33	29.33	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A combined 60.66% of participants acknowledged that transparency has a "considerable" or "major effect" on borrowing capacity. This indicates that disclosure practices significantly enhance credibility and trust with lenders, thereby strengthening access to debt financing in emerging markets.

Table 5: Role of Shareholder Rights and Activism

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage

No role	12	8.00	8.00	8.00
Minimal role	20	13.33	13.33	21.33
Moderate role	35	23.33	23.33	44.67
Important role	43	28.67	28.67	73.33
Very important role	40	26.67	26.67	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

Most respondents (55.34%) believed shareholder rights play an "important" or "very important" role in influencing leverage decisions. Only 8% claimed shareholder activism has no role. This suggests that in emerging markets, shareholders are becoming increasingly influential in financial decision-making.

Table 6: Institutional Investor Participation

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No impact	10	6.67	6.67	6.67
Low impact	19	12.67	12.67	19.34
Moderate impact	36	24.00	24.00	43.34
High impact	44	29.33	29.33	72.67
Very high impact	41	27.33	27.33	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A majority of respondents (56.66%) felt institutional investors exert "high" or "very high" impact on capital structure choices. This indicates that institutional ownership is a critical driver of financing strategies in emerging economies, reflecting their monitoring role and financial influence.

Table 7: Corporate Governance in Mitigating Risks of High Debt

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No mitigation	11	7.33	7.33	7.33
Minimal mitigation	18	12.00	12.00	19.33
Moderate mitigation	30	20.00	20.00	39.33
Significant mitigation	46	30.67	30.67	70.00
Very significant mitigation	45	30.00	30.00	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

A combined 60.67% believed governance provides "significant" or "very significant" risk mitigation against high debt exposure. This suggests that good governance structures serve as safeguards in preventing financial distress from excessive leverage.

Table 8: Effectiveness of Corporate Governance Mechanisms

Response Option	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage

Very ineffective	9	6.00	6.00	6.00
Ineffective	15	10.00	10.00	16.00
Neutral	28	18.67	18.67	34.67
Effective	49	32.67	32.67	67.34
Very effective	49	32.67	32.67	100.00
Total	150	100.00	100.00	

Interpretation:

The largest group of respondents (65.34%) rated governance as "effective" or "very effective" in ensuring balanced capital structures, while only 16% perceived it as ineffective. This strongly supports the view that governance is not only necessary but also functionally impactful in emerging market financing.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

Table 9: Chi-Square Test for Association Between Board Independence and Capital Structure Decisions

Value	Df	Asymp. Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	18.672	3
Likelihood Ratio	19.284	3
N of Valid Cases	150	

Interpretation:

The association between board independence and capital structure decisions was tested using the Chi-Square Test for Independence. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 18.672 with 3 degrees of freedom produced a p-value of 0.000, which is well below the 0.05 significance threshold. This result indicates a strong association between board independence and capital structure decisions in emerging markets. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

Hypothesis 2

Table 10: Regression Analysis Between Ownership Concentration and Debt-Equity Mix

Model	R^2	β (Standardized)	t-value	Sig.
Ownership Concentration → Debt-Equity Mix	0.294	0.541	7.126	0.000

Interpretation:

Regression analysis showed that ownership concentration had a significant positive effect on the choice of debt-equity mix (β = 0.541, p = 0.000). The R^2 value of 0.294 indicates that nearly 29.4% of the variation in debt-equity mix was explained by ownership concentration. Since the p-value was below 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, confirming that ownership concentration significantly influences capital structure choices in emerging markets.

Hypothesis 3

Table 11: ANOVA Test for Association Between Transparency in Reporting and Access to External Financing

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	22.871	4	5.718	4.326	0.003
Within Groups	192.455	145	1.327		

Total	215.326	149			

Interpretation:

An ANOVA was conducted to analyze the impact of transparency in financial reporting on firms' access to external financing. The analysis produced an F-value of 4.326 with a significance level of 0.003, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This indicates that transparency in reporting significantly affects firms' ability to secure external financing. Consequently, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

Conclusion

This research underscores the significant influence of corporate governance mechanisms on capital structure decisions in emerging markets. The results demonstrate a significant correlation between board independence and the financing decisions of firms, indicating that robust oversight by independent directors enhances the balance and sustainability of debt-equity structures. Ownership concentration significantly influences the debt-equity mix, indicating that dominant shareholders directly affect the strategic financing direction of organizations.

Transparency in financial reporting is a critical factor influencing access to external financing, indicating that firms with enhanced disclosure are perceived as more trustworthy and creditworthy in financial markets. These results confirm that corporate governance practices ensure accountability and oversight while also significantly optimizing financial structures and promoting long-term stability in emerging economies.

The limitations of this study include its sample size and geographical scope, which are restricted to specific emerging market contexts. This may limit the applicability of the findings across diverse economic contexts defined by varying governance norms, regulatory frameworks, and capital market dynamics.

Future research may improve understanding by integrating cross-country comparisons to examine differences in the governance-capital structure relationship across various institutional contexts. Longitudinal studies provide insights into the effects of changing governance practices and regulatory reforms on financing decisions over time, enhancing the understanding of their role in promoting sustainable corporate growth.

References

1. Abor, J. (2007). Corporate governance and financing decisions of Ghanaian listed firms. Corporate Governance, 7(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1108/14720700710727131
2. Amin, A., Ur Rehman, R., Ali, R., & Mohd Said, R. (2022). Corporate governance and capital structure: Moderating effect of gender diversity. SAGE Open, 12(1), 215824402210821. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221082110
3. Nilesh Anute , G. Gopalakrishnan , Chuanyong Ji , Shilpa Gaidhani , Vanandana Hindurao Shinde , Shailesh Tripathi , Digital Lending Platforms and the Transformation of Microenterprises: Evaluating SDG 8 and SDG 9 Outcomes , Enterprise Development and Microfinance: Vol. 35 No. 2 (2025)
4. Claessens, S., Djankov, S., & Lang, L. H. P. (2002). Corporate governance in Asia: A survey. International Review of Finance, 3(2), 71-103. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2443.00034
5. Fan, J. P. H., & Wong, T. J. (2002). Corporate ownership structure and the informativeness of accounting earnings in East Asia. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 33(3), 401-425. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(02)00047-2
6. Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
7. La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1998). Law and finance. Journal of Political Economy, 106(6), 1113–1155. https://doi.org/10.1086/250042
8. Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. American Economic Review, 48(3), 261–297. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1809766
9. Myers, S. C. (1984). The capital structure puzzle. The Journal of Finance, 39(3), 575–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1984.tb03646.x
10. Purag, M. B., Abdullah, A. B., & Bujang, I. (2016). Corporate governance and capital structure of Malaysian family-owned companies. Journal of Business and Retail Management Research, 11(1), 18–30.

11. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). A survey of corporate governance. The Journal of Finance, 52(2), 737–783. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=10182

12. Vakilifard, H. R., Gerayli, M. S., Yanesari, A. M., & Ma'atoofi, A. R. (2011). Effect of corporate governance on capital structure: Case of the Iranian listed firms. European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 35, 165–172.