

International Research Journal of Management and Commerce

ISSN: (2348-9766)

Impact Factor 7.098 Volume 10, Issue 01, January 2023 ©Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

www.aarf.asia, **Email** : editoraarf@gmail.com

Review of the Impact of Financing Decisions on Business Performance

Dr Manohar Goel, Associate Professor Mukand Lal National College Yamuna Nagar (Haryana)

Abstract: The use of debt or equity to finance the urge of an organization; have always been the matter of debate as these decisions are of irreversible in nature. The present study aims to feed the famine urge of existing literature pertaining to the ambiguous outcomes of measuring the role of funding sources on corporate performance. The study incorporates all the related previous published researches during the tenure of 2008-2020 from the database of Google Scholar, after which certain filtration has been performed. Studies having only selected variables have been elected to make a thorough analysis. The crux of these studies has been served in the format of a tabular literature and concluded that funding choices (DTA) has an adverse influence on fiscal health of the company while the other indicator DER demonstrate a mixed efficacy. Control attributes liquidity, corporate size and growth opportunities have demonstrates an affirmative influence on firm performance whereas tangibility negatively relates with firm performance. The study results can benefits the investors and policy-makers in deciding about the proportion of debt-equity mix.

Keywords: Financing decisions, capital structure decisions, firm performanceand profitability.

Introduction:

Because of how crucial and long-lasting financing decisions are, they have long been a source of intense anxiety. The argument arose after Miller and Modigilani proposed in 1958 that debt-equity decisions are immaterial. In their research, they made some unreal assumptions about perfect markets, which prompted the researchers to do additional research to validate the impacts of using debt on a corporation's value and profitability. However, Modigilani and Miller stated in 1963 that the use of fixed-income securities might result in

tax benefits, thereby improving an organization's total yields. However, the outcomes of these investigations create contradicting conclusions in different settings. Since then, numerous theoretical theories and practical research have emerged. Borrowing as a technique of achieving tax benefits has received special attention in trade-off theory (Myers, 1984). However, according to the pecking-order theory, when it comes to addressing the needs of the firm, internal resources are prioritized over external financing options. (Myers and Majluf, 1984). On the other side, agency cost theory as propounded by Jensen and Meckling (1976) favored the use of debt portion in a capital structure to cut down the cost arisen from principle-agent conflicts. They further explained it as the debt-holders can create burden on management to pay back their loans and interest payments timely and ultimately the mangers have to enrich the performance level to meet such expenses which can positively affect the revenue generating capacity of the enterprise.

Various empirical studies have been conducted to examine and verify the actual impact of funding decisions or capital structure decisions on the earning capabilities of the organization. While some studies (Dawar (2014), Nisha and Ghosh (2018), Sutomo et al. (2019)) utilize for greater internal finance, others (Mursalim et al. (2015), Murniati et al. (2019)) advocate for debt or external borrowings. Several studies have found that employing debt or equity has little influence on one's financial well-being. This theory is supported by Modigilani and Miller (1958), Khan et al. (2017), and Domenichelli (2018).

Such conflicting results can be served as a research gap and produce an urge to further elaborate the literature and squeeze the crux out of it. Debt-equity ratio and the debt-assets ratio have been recognized as independent factors whereas liquidity, tangibility, corporate size & growth opportunities have been identified as control attributes of the study. The main implication of research is for investors at the time of making investment choices and for managers to make decisions regarding funding sources choices.

Review of Related Literatures:

To understand the role of financing decisions on the fiscal performance of the organization, it is required to thoroughly examine the previous literatures concerning about the same.

Sr.	Authors'	Ohioationa	Research	N	lajor Findings
No.	Name	Objectives	Methodology	Positive	Negative No impact
	Ahmed	To ascertain	Panel Regression		DTA has
	(2008)	the role of	Model has been		an adverse
		financing	employed to		impressio
		decisions on	analyze the		n on
		performance	gathered data.		Tobin's Q.
		of 100	DTA portrays the		
		composite	financing		
		corporations	decision while		
		quoted at	Tobin's Q		
		Kuala Lumpur	describes the		
		stock	performance of		
		exchange over	the corporation.		
		the time span			
		from 1999-			
		2002.			
	Amjed	To explore the	OLS regression	Size and	STD &
	(2011)	efficacy of	model has been	growth rate	LTD with
		financial	employed for	of the	ROE and
		structure	analysis	corporation	ROA
		choices on	purposes. ROA &	have been	portrays
		performance	ROE has been	positively	an adverse
		of 270	deployed to	connected	linkage.
		chemical	gauge the fiscal	with its	Total debt
		sector	performance of	performance	also
		companies	the concern.	indicators.	influence
		quoted at	STD, LTD and		the
		Karachi Stock	total debt ratios		profitabilit
		Exchange	describe the debt-		у
		during the	equity mixture of		measures
		tenure of 6	financial		negatively
		years from	structure. Growth		
		2001 tp 2006.	opportunities and		
			the size of the		
			organization		
			represented as		
			control variables.		
	Moradi	To encounter	Simple and	DPR	DTA

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

г		T 2				1
et.	al.	the influence	multivariate	affirmativel	adversely	
(2012	2)	of corporate	regression	y affect both	affect both	
		governance	analysis has been	measures	profitabilit	
		and choices of	emphasized.	whether	y proxies	
		funding on	Tobin's Q and	ROI or	(ROI &	
		profitability	ROI indicate the	Tobin's Q.	Tobin's	
		efficiency of	profitability	Institutional	Q). Non-	
		84 enterprises	efficiency of the	investors	executive	
		quoted at	companies	with ROI	members	
		Tehran Stock	whereas funding	and Non-	with ROI	
		Exchange over	decisions	executives	depict an	
		the 5 years	followed by	members	opposite	
		from 2007-	DPR, DTA, Non-	with	relationshi	
		2011.	executive	Tobin's Q	p whereas	
			member ratio,	found to	institution	
			institutional	have an	al	
			investor ratio.	confirmator	investors	
				y linkage.	conversely	
					affect	
					Tobin's Q	
					measure.	
Murs	alim	To discover	Partial Least	ROI,		No
et.	al.	the link	Square has been	Innovation		considera
(2015		among	adopted. Capital	aspect and		ble
	,	funding	structure,	capital		influence
		decisions,	dividend ratio	structure		of
		innovations,	and ROI have	ratio		dividend
		profitability	been used to			policy on
		capacity and	demonstrate the	affirmative		MBV.
		value of 13	financial	influence on		
		enterprises	decisions. MBV	both		
		listed at Stock	and Tobin's Q	Tobin's Q		
		Exchange of	has been	and MBV.		
		Indonesia	occupied as an	Dividend		
		during the	indicator of	policy also		
		period from	corporate	positively		
		2008-2013.	performance and	affect		
			its value.	Tobin's Q.		
Daud	et	To identify the	Balanced Panel	Size of the	Liquidity	DTAportr
al. (20		role of	data series with	conglomerat	connotes a	ays a
an. (2)	-10)	financing	multiple	e	negative	insignific
		choice on	regression model.	demonstrate	effect on	ant
		performance	ROA signifies as	s a	performan	influence
		perrormance	NOA signifies as	s a	herrorman	minuence

	1	of 76	main proxy for	significant	ce provi	on ROA.
		publicaly	gauging firm	positive	ce proxy.	on KOA.
		quoted	performance	reaction on		
		Malaysian	whereas size,	ROA.		
		•	,	KOA.		
		corporations	DTA and			
		scheduled	liquidity as a			
		during the	marker for			
		period of	financing			
	1 0	1994-2007.	decision.		222	
	shraf	To delve out	Multiple	LTDR,	DER,	
et		the efficacy of	regression	DTR, board	STDR,	
(2	2017)	governance	technique of	size,	board	
		mechanism	econometric	managerial	meeting &	
		and funding	models has been	ownership,	size of	
		decisions on	employed. NPM,	DPR with	firm	
		profitability	EPS with ROA &	ROA found	portrays a	
		proxies of 19	ROE recognized	positively	negative	
		organizations	as performance	linked.	associatio	
		engaged in	proxies whereas	DPR,	n. STDR,	
		cement	DER, DTS,	LTDR,	firm size,	
		business	STDR, LTDR,	DTR &	DER,	
		quoted at	DPR, board size,	board size	board	
		Karachi Stock	board meetings,	affirmativel	meeting &	
		Exchange	size of firms and	y affect	manageria	
		during the	managerial	ROE. Size	1	
		time duration	ownership has	of firm,	ownership	
		of 11 years	been termed as	DER, DPR,	found	
		•	factors	,	negatively	
		2016.	determining the	board	connected	
			governance and	meetings	with ROE.	
			funding decision	with EPS.	Board	
			of a concern.	DER,	size,	
			or a concern.	STDR,	STDR,	
				LTDR,	LTDR &	
				board size,	manageria	
				firm size,	liialiageria	
				DTS	ownership	
				upbeats	with EPS.	
				NPM.	DPR,	
				1 7171.	,	
					board	
					meetings	
					& .	
					manageria	

						<u> </u>
	nan et. (2017)	To investigate the influence of financing decisions on performance of Karachi Stock Exchange listed 100 Industrial firms throughout the period of 2004-2009.	OLS regression technique is adopted to accomplish the task. Debt-Equity Ratio signifies the financing decision whereas ROA, Market cap, ROE and Tobin's Q epitomize the performance of the corporation. Size of the concern is taken as control	Size of the organization positively affects the ROE, market cap & ROA. DER affirmativel y linked with Tobin's Q.	l ownership portrays adverse link with NPM. Size conversely affect the Tobin's Q.	DER portrays no significan t link with market cap and ROE.
hel	omenic Ili 018)	of financing choice and corporate governance on performance of 983 large	Multiple regression model has been implemented in which ROA & ROE indicates dependent variables whereas LTD, size, age, STD, debt-equity ratio, solvency as independent ones.	Size positively affects both profitability measures. Solvency positively hits the ROA.	Solvency, debt-equity ratio conveys an adverse relation with ROE. Age negatively affect both parameter s. Debt-equity ratio linked negatively with	LTD & STD describes no link with ROE and ROA.

				ROA.	
Muiruri	To ascertain	Multiple	DER		DER
and	the role of	regression model	positively		insignific
Wepukhu	funding	has been	affects		ant but
lu (2018)	decisions with	emphasized.	ROE. CR		affirmativ
	investment,	DER represents	and the		ely
	liquidity and	funding	choices of		related
	dividend	decisions, current	investment		with
	choices on	ratio portrays	alternatives,		ROA.
	performance	liquidity	signifies an		DPR
	of 66 NSE	decisions	upbeat		insignific
	quoted	whereas DPR	relation with		antly but
	companies of	signifies the	both ROA		adversely
	India during	choice of	& ROE.		influence
	the tenure of 5	dividend and			both
	years from	long term			measures;
	2012-2016.	investments			ROA and
		represents the			ROE.
		investing choices			
		of the concern.			
		While ROA and			
		ROE depicts an			
		association's			
		fiscal			
		performance.			
Murniati	To recognize	SEM has been	Financing	Dividend	
et. al.	the effect of	employed by	and	choices	
(2019)	investing,	using financial	investment	depicts an	
	dividend and	decisions as	choices of	insignifica	
	financing	exogenous	the firm	nt but	
	choices on	factors whereas	evidenced	adverse	
	monetary	profitability and	as favorable	influence	
	value of 62	firm value as	to both	on firm	
	corporations	intervening and	profitability	value and	
	listed under	endogenous	& value of	its	
	Indonesia	variables	the firm.	profitabilit	
	Stock	respectively.		у.	
	Exchange over				
	the tenure of				
	2012-2016.				
Sule	To empirically	OLS regression	Size depicts	Tangibilit	Leverage
(2019)	probe the link	-	a positive	y aspect	on ROA
	of financing	leverage as key	influence on	portrays	& ROE

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

			a		
	decisions with	independent	profitability	an adverse	signifies
	monetary	determinant of	proxies.	associatio	affirmativ
	health of the	financing		n with	e
	organizations	decision. ROA &		profitabilit	insignific
	working under	ROE as proxy of		у.	ant
	the FTSE 100	profitability and			impressio
	& FTSE 250,	tangibility, size			n.
	of United	as control			
	Kingdom	attributes.			
	during the				
	tenure of				
	2015.				
Sutomo	To identify the	Path analysis has	Size, growth	DTA	
et. al.	determinants	been employed	rate,	demonstra	
(2019)	of funding	with the aid of	investment	te an	
(2017)	sources as	LISREL. ROA as	opportunitie	adverse	
	well as	profitability	s and risk	link with	
	investigating	proxy whereas	factor	ROA.	
	the link			KOA.	
	between		depicts an affirmative		
	corporate	funding decision.	association		
	debt,	Risk, growth,	with		
	profitability	investment	profitability.		
	aspects and	opportunity and			
	growth	corporate size			
	opportunities	have been			
	of 150	recognized as			
	corporations	explanatory			
	operating at	variables.			
	Indonesian				
	Stock				
	Exchange				
	during the				
	time span				
	from 2012-				
	2017.				
Afsar and	To explore the	Fixed effect	Current	DTR	
Karacayi	influence of	panel regression	ratio found	adversely	
r (2020)	financing &	model has been	to have a	influence	
	investing	employed. DTR	positive	the firm	
	decisions on	and current ratio	efficacy on	value of	
	profitability of	signifies the role	firm value.	organizati	
	100	of financing		ons.	
 <u> </u>	1	<u>&</u>	l .		

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

	companies	decisions while			
	scheduled under Borsa	firm value reflected by lastly			
	Istanbul	closed share			
	Industrial	price.			
	Index during	price.			
	the tenure of				
	2003-2018.				
Doan	To recognize	GMM model has	Inflation	Short-	Economy
(2020)	the role of	been executed.	rate	term, total	growth
	financing	ROA signifies	affirmativel	and long	and
	decisions on	the performance	y affect the	term debt	company
	monetary	measure while	ROA.	as	size found
	health of 102	LTDA, STDA		indicator	to have
	non-financial	and TDA		of	insignific
	corporations	represent the		financing	ant effect
	quoted on	financing		health,	on ROA.
	HOSE (Ho	decisions of the		portrays	
	Chi Minh	enterprise. Size,		adverse	
	Stock	rate of inflation		influence	
	Exchange) for	& growth of		on ROA.	
	the duration of	economy used as			
	10 years from	control factors			
T 11	2008-2018.	for the study.	D.T.D.	D.D.	27
Imelda and	To examine	T-test with	DTR affirmativel	RR	No considera
Himelda	the efficacy of capital	multiple regression	y connected	negatively associated	ble link
(2020)	structure while	analysis has been	with	with	has been
(====)	considering	employed.	Tobin's Q.	Tobin's Q.	recognize
	financing	Tobin's Q			d between
	decisions as	represented as			DTR and
	mediating	performance			RR.
	factor affecting the	indicator while TDR as capital			
	monetary	structure ratio.			
	wealth of 42	Retention Ratio			
	banking	has been			
	organizations	employed as			
	operated at	financing			
	Indonesia Stock	decision.			
	Exchange over				
	the years from				
	2016-2018.				

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To explore the influence of financing or funding decisions on monetary health of organizations, previous literatures have been scrutinized thoroughly and evidenced a sort of mixed outcomes presenting in the form of different variables. Some studies depict a negative association of funding decisions with performance while some signifies an affirmative link among the two. There are studies which shows no or insignificant efficacy of financing choices with firm value. The reason might be the selection of different variables, different sample selection or the prevailing circumstances of different economy.

Based on previous research, it is clear that most studies employ the debt-equity and debtassets ratios as extra tools to evaluate investment decisions, whereas Tobin's Q, ROA, and ROE are used as major measurements of firm performance. The majority of studies' control variables have been liquidity, growth potential, tangibility, and corporate size. Following a thorough analysis, it was discovered that the debt-to-equity ratio has contradictory associations with a company's profitability variables. The firm of the money raised through debts is dependent on the firm's ability to create profits. Debt will help the firm's financial status if it can generate the income required to repay past-due debts and associated interest. This study's findings are equivalent to those of Ashraf et al. (2017), Khan et. al. (2017) and Muiruri and Wepukhulu (2018), in which they describes that debt-equity ratios signals a mixed (positive and negative) impression on monetary performance of the organization. Another variable debt to assets found to have a negative association with firm performance proxies which means an organisation's assets are not capable enough to generate sufficient earnings to pay back dues. The findings of the study are in lined with Moradi et. al. (2012), Sutomo et. al. (2019), Ahmed (2008), Amjed (2011), Doan (2020), in which they summarized that debt-to-assets ratio signifies an adverse impression on monetary performance. These studies carry some control variables with them which indirectly influence the financial health of the association. As majority of previous researches indicates liquidity, tangibility of assets, growth opportunities and corporate size as most occurring control variables. As a result, the relationship between these variables and the monetary health of the organization has also been investigated. Asset liquidity improves corporate performance and demonstrates that a company manages its working capital properly. It can help the firm make the most use of its current assets and pay its interest commitments on schedule. The study's findings support those of Muiruri and Wepukhulu (2018) and Afsar and Karacayir (2020), who found that an asset's liquidity has a positive impact on the state of the economy's money

supply. However, the conclusions of this study contradict those of Daud et al (2016). The other control variable, asset tangibility, was revealed to have a negative relationship with firm profitability, indicating that the connected firms lack the ability to efficiently manage the ratio of tangible to intangible assets. Sule's (2019) outcomes, which reveal a poor association between debt and monetary performance, are supported by the research. The total value of a company's assets can be estimated to determine its size, which is another significant control variable. The great majority of studies suggest a positive relationship between company size and financial performance. A large sized company found to have a positive impact on its performance. The reason might be the economies of scale enjoyed by the firm at the time of producing large amount of products and a considerable impression on overall market. The s of this research is favored by the findings of Amjed (2011), Daud et. al. (2016), Ashraf et. al. (2017), Khan et. al. (2017), Domenichelli (2018), Sule (2019), Sutomo et. al. (2019). A company's growth rate is one of its significant aspect and as per the findings of the study, growthopportunities portrays a positive link with fiscal health of a company. The firms having more growth opportunities tends to have a more profitable future as it can invest the funds in most beneficial and favourable opportunity and can multiply the earnings of the company. The result of the study is supported by Amjed (2011) and Sutomo et. al. (2019).

	evious		DER	DTAR	Liquidity	Tangibility	Size	Growth
literature								
Ahmed (2008)		Tobin's Q		-ve				
A : 1(2011)		ROA		-ve			+ve	+ve
Amjed (2011)		ROE		-ve			+ve	+ve
Moradi et. al. (20	12)	Tobin's Q		-ve				
Moradi et. al. (20	12)	ROI		-ve				
Mursalim et. al. (20	015)	Tobin's Q		+ve				
Mursaiiii et. ai. (2)	013)	MBV		+ve				
Daud et. al. (201	6)	ROA		Insign.	-ve		+ve	
		ROA	+ve				+ve	
Ashraf et. al. (20)	17)	ROE	-ve				-ve	
Ashrai et. al. (2017)		EPS	+ve				+ve	
		NPM	+ve				+ve	
		ROA	-ve				+ve	
Khan et. al. (201		ROE	Insign.				+ve	
	,	Tobin's Q	+ve				-ve	
Domenichelli (20	18)	ROA	-ve				+ve	
	<i>′</i>	ROE	-ve				+ve	
Muiruri and Wepuk	chulu	ROA	Insign.		+ve			
(2018)		ROE	+ve		+ve			
Sule (2019)		ROA	Insign.			-ve	+ve	
<u> </u>		ROE	Insign.			-ve	+ve	
Sutomo et. al. (20	19)	ROA		-ve			+ve	+ve
Afsar and Karacayir	(2020)	Closing Price	-ve		+ve			
Doan (2020)		ROA		-ve				Insign.
Imelda and Himelda	(2020)	Tobin's Q		+ve				

Table depicting summarized results of selected studies. (Source: Author's own Compilation)

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

CONCLUSION

The present study aims to feed the famine urge of existing literature pertaining to the ambiguous outcomes of measuring the role of funding sources on corporate performance. After a thorough analysis of previous related literatures, mostly occurred determinants representing funding choices and fiscal performance has been identified. To gauge the funding sources of the company debt-equity ratio and debt-assets ratio has been elected whereas to demonstrate the financial health ROA, Tobin's Q & ROE has been chosen. Debtequity ratio recognized to have a mixed impression on firm performance indicators while debt-assets ratio portrays a negative impression on most of profitability proxies. The control factors of the study embraces liquidity position, tangibility of assets, size of corporation and its growth opportunities. The study deduced that liquid assets make the firm more capable to maintain its reputation by paying debts on time and firm can grab the opportunities accordingly. Also, it is originated that tangibility of assets signifies a negative association with profit earning capacity which indicates that firm's management isn't efficient enough to maintain a balance between tangible and intangible assets. Apart from this, size has also taken as a considerable attribute and deduced that large sized corporation tends to provide a fruitful future due to economies of scale. Same goes with the growth opportunities. Firms have more opportunities for growth can grow better in future as compared to the companies having less opportunity. As per the results of mainstream researches, it can be summarized that funding choices negatively affect the monetary health of an organization.

Every study poses certain limitation with itself, so as this study contains. The outcomes of the study have been driven on the basis of selected past researches which have been elected via hand searched by the researcher. No statistical tools have been applied, as the use of statistical tool can make the results more authentic. Also the time period of the study ranges only from 2008-2020. Further only Google Scholar has been used as a source to collect studies. Future studies can include the whole time span and different databases to make the results more validate.

REFERENCES

- Afsar, A. and Karacayir, E. (2020). Effect of Investment and Finaning Decision on Firm value; Example of Bist Industrial Index. *Usak University Journal of Social sciences*, 8(2), pp. 13-24.
- Ahmed, H.J.A. (2008). The impact of Financing Decision, Dividend policy and Corporate Ownership on Firm performance at present or absence of Growth opportunity: A Panel data approach, Evidence from Kuala Lumpur Stock exchange. *Corporate Ownership & control*, 6(1), pp. 485-491.
- Amjed, S. (2011). Impact of Financial structure on Firm's fianancial performance: A Study of pakistan's chemical sector. SIBR Conference on Interdisciplinary Business & Economics Research: Advancing Knowledge from Interdisciplinary Perspectives (Archive). DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.1867882
- Ashaf, M. Iqbal, T. and Tariq, S. (2017). Corporate Governance and Corporate financing Decisisons Impact on Firm performance a Cement Industry Perspective of Pakistan. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 36(3), pp. 20-35.
- Daud, W. M. N. W., Norwani, N. M., Mansor, A. A. and Endut, W. A. (2016). Does Fiancing Decision Influence Corporate Performance in Malaysia? *International Journal of Economics and Financial Inssues*, 6 (3), pp. 1165-1171.
- Dawar, Varun (2014). Agency theory, capital structure and firm performance: some Indian evidence. *Managerial Finance*, 40(2), 1190-1206. https://doi.org/10.1108/MF-10-2013-0275
- Doan, T.T.T. (2020). Financing Decision and Firm performance: Evidence from an Emerging country. *Management Science Letters*, 10, pp. 849-854.
- Domenichelli, O. (2018). Performance, Financing Decisions and Corporate Governance of Italian Medium and Large Family Firms. *African Journal of Business Management*, 12(19), pp. 574-585.
- Imelda, E. and Himelda, D. (20200. Financing Decision as a Mediating variable between Capital Structure and Firm Performance. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 174(9), pp. 266-270.
- Jensen, M. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance and takeovers. *AmericanEconomic Review*,76(2), pp. 323-339.
- Jensen, M. and Meckling, W. (1976). Theory of the firm, managerial behavior, agency costs andownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), pp. 305-360.

- Khan, A., Shaikh, M., Shah, A. B., Zahid, I and Shaikh, F. M. (2017). Impact of Financing decisions on Firm's Performance: An Empirical Stucy of Pakistani Listed Firm's in KSE. *International Journal of Management and Information technology*, 12(1), pp. 3050-3056.
- Modigilani, F. & Miller, M.H. (1958). The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theoryof investment. *The American economic review*, 48(3), 261-297. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1809766?seq=1
- Modigliani, F. and Miller, M. (1963). Corporate income taxes and the cost of capital: a correction. *The American Economic Review*, 53(3), 443-453.
- Moradi, N. S., Aldin, M. M., Heyrani, F. and Iranmahd, M. (2012). The effect of Corporate Governance, Corporate Financing Decision and Ownership Structure on Firm performance: A Penal Data Approach from Tehran Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 4 (6), pp. 86-93.
- Muiruri, W. N. and Wepukhulu, J. M. (2018). Effect of Financing Decisions on Financial Performance of Listed Companies at the Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya. *Journal of International Business, Innovation and Strategic Management*, 1(7), pp. 101-114.
- Mursalim, H., Alamzah, N. and Sanusi, A. (2015). Financial Decision, Innovation, Profitability and Company Value: Study on Manufacturing company listed in Indonesian Stock Exchange. *Information management and business Review*, 7(2), pp. 72-78.
- Musniati, S., Mus, H. A. R., Semmaila, H. B. and Nur, H. A. N. (2019). Effect of Investment Decisions, Financing Decisions and Dividend Policy on Profitability and Value of The Firm. *International journal of Accounting & Finance in Asia Pecific*, 2(1), pp. 1-10.
- Myers, S. (1984). The capital structure puzzle. *Journal of Finance*, 39(3), pp. 575-592.
- Myers, S. and Majluf, N. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firmshave information that investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 13(2),pp. 187-221.
- Nisha, N. and Ghosh, B. (2018). Causal Relationship between Leverage and Performance: Exploring Dhaka Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Business and Globalization*, 20(1), pp. 31-49.
- Sule, B. (2019). The Impact of Financing Decisions on Firm Performance. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, 10(1), pp. 79-92.
- Sutomo, S., Wahyudi, S., Pangestuti, I. R. D. and Muharam, H. (2019). Determinants of Financing decision: Empirical evidence on manufacturing Firms in Indonesia. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 16(2), pp. 159-170.

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)