ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Capital Structure Decisions and Firm Valuation: Evidence from Indian Corporates

Dr.Sreenish S R

Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, FISAT Business School, FISAT.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150500188

Received: 11 May 2026; Accepted: 16 May 2026; Published: 12 June 2026

ABSTRACT

Capital structure plays a significant role in determining the financial health, risk profile, and valuation of firms. In the Indian corporate environment, capital structure decisions have gained increasing importance due to economic liberalization, rapid industrial growth, changing regulatory frameworks, and rising participation from domestic and international investors. Capital structure refers to the proportion of debt and equity used by firms to finance their operations and growth activities. The choice between debt and equity financing influences the cost of capital, financial risk, profitability, and shareholder value. Firms with higher debt levels may benefit from tax advantages but are exposed to greater financial risk and bankruptcy possibilities, whereas firms relying more on equity financing may maintain greater financial stability but face higher capital costs and ownership dilution. This study examines the relationship between capital structure and firm valuation among Indian firms by considering various internal and external determinants such as industry characteristics, firm size, ownership structure, market conditions, interest rates, and corporate governance practices. The study aims to identify patterns and insights regarding optimal financing decisions and their impact on firm valuation in the Indian business environment. The findings are expected to provide valuable implications for corporate managers, investors, and policymakers in making effective financial decisions and improving corporate performance.

Keywords: Capital Structure, Valuation, Debt-Equity Ratio, Corporate Governance, Financial Performance, Cost of Capital, Financial Risk, Shareholder Value, Corporate Finance

INTRODUCTION

Capital structure is one of the most important financial decisions that influences the growth, stability, and valuation of a company. It refers to the proportion of debt and equity used by firms to finance their operations and expansion activities. In the modern corporate environment, determining an optimal capital structure has become increasingly significant because it directly affects a firm's cost of capital, profitability, risk exposure, and shareholder wealth. In the Indian context, the importance of capital structure decisions has grown considerably due to rapid economic development, globalization, increased competition, and evolving financial regulations. Indian companies operating across industries such as manufacturing, technology, finance, and services adopt different financing strategies depending on their operational requirements, market conditions, and growth objectives.

This study is important because it examines how different capital structure choices influence the valuation of Indian companies and thereby affect investor confidence, corporate performance, and long-term sustainability. Firms with higher debt levels may enjoy tax benefits and increased returns, but excessive borrowing can expose them to financial distress and bankruptcy risks. On the other hand, firms relying more on equity financing may maintain stronger financial stability but may face ownership dilution and higher capital costs. Therefore, identifying the optimal mix of debt and equity is crucial for maximizing firm value while minimizing financial risk.

The study also seeks to understand how internal and external factors such as industry characteristics, company size, corporate governance practices, interest rate fluctuations, and regulatory changes influence capital structure decisions in India. By analysing these relationships, the research aims to provide valuable insights for corporate

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

executives, investors, and policymakers. The findings of the study will contribute to a better understanding of financing strategies that promote sustainable growth, efficient resource utilization, and long-term value creation in the Indian corporate sector.

Objective of the study

- To study the impact of capital structure on valuation of Indian companies.
- To classify companies based on capital structure, profitability and valuation

Review of literature

Capital structure has been widely recognized as one of the most important determinants of a firm's financial performance, risk profile, and market valuation. Several researchers have attempted to define and explain the concept of capital structure and its influence on business value. According to Khan and Jain (1997) and Demirguc-Kunt et al. (2019), capital structure refers to the combination of debt and equity used by firms to finance their long-term operations and investments. Similarly, Watson and Head (2007) describe capital structure as the proportion of liabilities and shareholders' equity adopted by a business organization. Financial indicators such as debt-equity ratio, long-term debt-equity ratio, and debt-to-total-assets ratio are commonly used to evaluate the financing structure of firms. Ross et al. (2013) further explained that capital structure represents the mix of debt and equity maintained by a company and plays a crucial role in determining financing decisions and overall corporate value.

The concept of optimal capital structure has attracted considerable attention in financial management literature. Davidson (2018) and Watson and Head (2007) suggested that firms can achieve maximum value by maintaining an optimal mix of debt and equity financing. At this level, the firm minimizes its overall cost of capital while maximizing shareholder wealth. The determination of optimal leverage depends on various market-related factors such as taxation, financial distress costs, agency conflicts, and information asymmetry. One of the major indicators of capital structure is the debt-to-total-assets ratio, which measures the extent to which company assets are financed through borrowed funds. A lower ratio reflects greater financial independence and lower bankruptcy risk, whereas a higher ratio indicates greater dependence on debt and a higher probability of financial distress. Similarly, the debt-to-equity ratio reflects the balance between debt financing and equity financing within a company.

Researchers have also explored different methods of measuring firm value and performance. Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986) argued that firm value can be measured through both financial and non-financial indicators. Financial indicators include profitability, earnings per share, revenue growth, and market value-to-book value ratio, while non-financial measures include product quality, market share, brand value, and operational efficiency. Among the most widely used financial indicators for evaluating firm value are Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), and Tobin's Q ratio.

Several scholars have emphasized the importance of Return on Assets as a measure of business efficiency and profitability. Studies conducted by Ali et al. (2022), Mihail and Micu (2021), and Phillips and Sipahioglu (2004) identified ROA as a key indicator of profitability and asset utilization efficiency. ROA measures the profit generated from each unit of assets employed by the firm and reflects managerial efficiency in utilizing company resources. A higher ROA indicates superior operational efficiency and stronger profitability performance.

Similarly, Return on Equity has been recognized as an important indicator of shareholder wealth creation and corporate governance effectiveness. Studies by Dahmash et al. (2023), Nguyen et al. (2023), Abor (2005), and Yang et al. (2010) highlighted that firms with higher ROE generally exhibit stronger profitability and higher market valuation. ROE evaluates how effectively management utilizes shareholders' funds to generate profits. Higher ROE values indicate better managerial efficiency and stronger returns to investors, making it one of the most commonly used indicators of corporate value.

Another important indicator used in capital structure and valuation studies is Tobin's Q ratio. Jiraporn and Liu (2008), along with Vo (2017), used Tobin's Q to examine the relationship between market valuation and

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

corporate financing decisions. Tobin's Q measures the ratio between the market value of a firm and the book value of its assets. According to Brainard and Tobin (1968), a Tobin's Q value greater than one indicates that the market value exceeds the book value of assets, reflecting positive future growth prospects and superior investor confidence. Conversely, a Tobin's Q value below one suggests lower market valuation and weaker growth expectations.

The theoretical foundation of capital structure began with the pioneering work of Modigliani and Miller (1958), who proposed that under perfect market conditions, capital structure is irrelevant to firm value. Their theory assumed the absence of taxes, transaction costs, bankruptcy costs, and information asymmetry. However, subsequent studies challenged this assumption and introduced alternative theories explaining the relationship between leverage and firm value. Kraus and Litzenberger (1973) developed the Trade-Off Theory, which suggests that firms balance the tax advantages of debt financing against the costs of financial distress to determine optimal leverage. According to this theory, moderate levels of debt may increase firm value due to tax savings, whereas excessive debt increases bankruptcy risk and reduces value.

The Pecking Order Theory proposed by Myers and Majluf (1984) explains that firms follow a hierarchy of financing preferences. Companies generally prefer internal financing through retained earnings, followed by debt financing, and finally equity financing as a last resort. This preference arises due to information asymmetry and the costs associated with issuing new equity. The Agency Cost Theory developed by Jensen and Meckling (1976) highlighted the conflict of interest between managers and shareholders. The theory argues that agency costs such as monitoring expenses, bonding costs, and residual losses affect financing decisions and overall firm value.

Several empirical studies have examined the determinants of capital structure across industries and countries. Donaldson (1985) argued that a firm's dependence on debt or equity changes according to its ownership structure and financial objectives. Harris and Raviv (1991), along with Rajan and Zingales (1995), identified major determinants of capital structure such as asset tangibility, profitability, firm size, growth opportunities, volatility, non-debt tax shields, and probability of bankruptcy. These studies concluded that both firm-specific and macroeconomic factors influence financing decisions.

Further contributions were made by Graham and Harvey (2001), who found that firms consider stock price movements and credit ratings before deciding between debt and equity financing. Cook and Tang (2010) argued that firms adjust their capital structures more quickly during favorable macroeconomic conditions. In the Indian context, Mishra (2011) identified profitability, tax, and asset structure as major determinants of leverage, while Bhayani (2006) examined the impact of leverage on shareholder returns in the Indian cement industry.

Additional studies by Mukherjee and Mahakud (2012) found that market-to-book ratio significantly influences the capital structure of Indian manufacturing firms. Bhaduri (2002) argued that factors such as cash flow, growth, industry characteristics, and restructuring costs determine optimal leverage decisions. Similarly, Rasoolpur (2012), Adhegaonkar and Indi (2012), and Majumdar (2012) emphasized the importance of liquidity, tangibility, profitability, and risk in determining corporate financing choices.

Overall, the literature indicates that capital structure significantly influences firm valuation and financial performance. However, the relationship varies across industries, economic conditions, and corporate governance structures. Despite extensive theoretical and empirical research, there remains no universal agreement regarding the optimal capital structure for firms, particularly in emerging economies such as India. Therefore, further research is necessary to understand how capital structure decisions affect the valuation and long-term sustainability of Indian companies.

Table No.1: High levered with low ROI, ROE

High livered with low ROI,ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
BAJAJ FINSERVE	4.56	13.7	13.82	64.58	High value	4.35	high value
TATA MOTORS	2.77	6.45	10.49	14.57	low value	1.24	low value

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Bharati airtel	1.82	11.01	9.19	50.61	High value	4.68	high value
M&M	1.57	12.66	18.24	29.37	High value	4.63	high value
POWER GRID	1.52	12.81	18.57	28.88	High value	2.54	low value
NTPC	1.5	9.68	11.5	7.66	low value	1.9	low value
L&T	1.33	11.99	11.72	12.54	low value	2.29	low value
JSW STEEL	1.2	8.57	6.3	29.05	High value	3.41	low value

Table No.2: Low levered companies with high ROI, ROE

Low livered with high ROI,ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
TITAN	0.83	34.89	37.21	40.11	High value	4.67	high value
ASIAN PAINT	0.06	34.63	25.67	64.48	high value	16.56	high value
Hcl technologies	0.03	27.92	23	26.62	high value	6.14	high value
NESTLE	0.01	82.68	117.71	10.04	low value	1.16	low value
TCS	0	63.51	50.73	46.82	high value	4.14	low value
INFOSYS	0	36.81	29.77	24.74	high value	6.89	low value
ITC	0	35.81	27.75	39.89	high value	3.15	low value

Table No.3: Low levered with low ROI, ROE

LOW LIVERED WITH LOW ROI,ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
TATA STEEL	0.76	12.58	8.49	30.79	high value	15.54	high value
WIPRO	0.19	17.86	14.81	26.62	high value	6.14	high value
ULTRATECH CEMENT	0.17	14.12	11.63	22.98	low value	3.37	low value
SUN PHARMA	0.11	16.02	15.13	66.9	high value	3.55	high value
TECH MAHINDRA	0.06	12.19	8.84	96.49	high value	36.05	high value
RELIANCE	0.041	9.38	8.77	27.85	high value	4.21	high value
HUL	0.03	21.72	20.06	23.63	low value	7.05	low value
MARUTI SUSUKI	0	19.42	15.75	64.29	high value	75.71	high value

- High livered companies**:** Companies with a debt-to-equity ratio above the average are considered highly leveraged.
- Low livered: Companies with a debt-to-equity ratio below average are considered low livered.
- High ROI, ROE: Companies with above average ROI, ROE.
- Low ROI, ROE: Companies with below average ROI, ROE.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

- High valued companies: Companies with P/E ratios and P/B ratios above the Sensex's P/E and P/B are considered to be high-valued.

Table No.4: Comparison with their capital structure and ROI, ROE, P/E, P/B

NAME OF THE COMPANY	CAPITAL STRUCTURE	ROI	ROE	P/E	P/B
Titan	High	High	High	High	High
BAJAJ FINSERVE	High	Low	Low	High	High
TATA MOTORS	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
Bharati airtel	High	Low	Low	High	High
M&M	High	Low	Low	High	High
POWER GRID	High	Low	Low	High	Low
NTPC	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
L&T	High	Low	Low	Low	Low
JSW STEEL	High	Low	Low	High	Low
ASIAN PAINT	Low	High	High	High	High
Hcl technologies	Low	High	High	High	High
NESTLE	Low	High	High	Low	Low
TCS	Low	High	High	High	Low
INFOSYS	Low	High	High	High	Low
ITC	Low	High	High	High	Low
TATA STEEL	Low	Low	Low	High	High
WIPRO	Low	Low	Low	High	High
ULTRATECH CEMENT	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
SUN PHARMA	Low	Low	Low	High	High
TECH MAHINDRA	Low	Low	Low	High	High
RELIANCE	Low	Low	Low	High	High
HUL	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
MARUTI SUSUKI	Low	Low	Low	High	High

Based on the table, there seems to be a clear relationship between the capital structure of companies and their valuation metrics, including Return on Investment (ROI), Return on Equity (ROE), Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio, and Price-to-Book (P/B) ratio.

High Capital Structure Companies:

These companies tend to have high ROIs, ROEs, P/Es, and P/Bs. This suggests that high capital structure firms are generally more profitable and have higher valuation multiples compared to low capital structure firms.

Examples include Titan, BAJAJ FINSERVE, Bharati Airtel, M&M, POWER GRID, JSW STEEL, etc.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

Low Capital Structure Companies:

Conversely, companies with low capital structures exhibit mixed performance in terms of valuation metrics. While some companies like Asian Paints, HCL Technologies, TCS, Infosys, and ITC have high ROIs, ROEs, P/Es, and P/Bs, others like Tata Steel, Wipro, Sun Pharma, Tech Mahindra, Reliance, and Maruti Suzuki have lower valuation metrics.

Overall, low capital structure firms don't consistently demonstrate high valuation multiples. The analysis suggests that capital structure plays a significant role in determining the valuation metrics of companies. High capital structure companies generally exhibit higher profitability and valuation multiples compared to low capital structure firms. This relationship underscores the importance of capital structure decisions in influencing the financial performance and market perception of companies. Managers and investors should carefully consider the capital structure implications when making strategic decisions to optimize the company's value creation and shareholder returns.

However, it's important to note that while capital structure is a critical factor, other variables such as industry dynamics, market conditions, and company-specific factors also influence valuation metrics.

Classification of companies leverage based ideal ratio

Table No.5: High levered with low ROI, ROE

HIGH LIVERED WITH LOW ROI,ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
BAJAJ FINSERVE	4.56	13.7	13.82	64.58	High value	4.35	high value
TATA MOTORS	2.77	6.45	10.49	14.57	low value	1.24	low value

Bajaj Finserv: Despite having high leverage, Bajaj Finserv has high P/E and P/B values, indicating strong market valuation. This suggests that high leverage can be acceptable to the market if the company shows growth potential and investor confidence.

Tata Motors: Conversely, Tata Motors, with high leverage but lower ROI and ROE, has low P/E and P/B values. This indicates that without strong profitability metrics, high leverage can lead to poor market valuation.

Table No.6: Low levered with high ROI, ROE

Low livered with high ROI,ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
TITAN	0.83	34.89	37.21	40.11	High value	4.67	high value
ASIAN PAINT	0.06	34.63	25.67	64.48	high value	16.56	high value
Hcl technologies	0.03	27.92	23	26.62	high value	6.14	high value
NESTLE	0.01	82.68	117.71	10.04	low value	1.16	low value
TCS	0	63.51	50.73	46.82	high value	4.14	low value

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

INFOSYS	0	36.81	29.77	24.74	high value	6.89	low value
ITC	0	35.81	27.75	39.89	high value	3.15	low value

Companies with low leverage and high profitability (ROI, ROE) generally enjoy high market valuation (high P/E and P/B values). This suggests that lower financial risk combined with high operational efficiency is highly valued by the market.

Nestle: An outlier with extremely high ROI and ROE but low P/E and P/B values, possibly due to other market factors or sector-specific challenges that impact its valuation.

Table No.7: Low livered with low ROI, ROE

Low livered with low ROI, ROE	DEBT EQUITY	ROI	ROE	P/E	VALUE	P/B	VALUE
Bharati airtel	1.82	11.01	9.19	50.61	High value	4.68	high value
M&M	1.57	12.66	18.24	29.37	High value	4.63	high value
POWER GRID	1.52	12.81	18.57	28.88	High value	2.54	low value
NTPC	1.5	9.68	11.5	7.66	low value	1.9	low value
L&T	1.33	11.99	11.72	12.54	low value	2.29	low value
JSW STEEL	1.2	8.57	6.3	29.05	High value	3.41	low value
TATA STEEL	0.76	12.58	8.49	30.79	high value	15.54	high value
WIPRO	0.19	17.86	14.81	26.62	high value	6.14	high value
ULTRATECH CEMENT	0.17	14.12	11.63	22.98	low value	3.37	low value
SUN PHARMA	0.11	16.02	15.13	66.9	high value	3.55	high value
TECH MAHINDRA	0.06	12.19	8.84	96.49	high value	36.05	high value
RELIANCE	0.041	9.38	8.77	27.85	high value	4.21	high value
HUL	0.03	21.72	20.06	23.63	low value	7.05	low value
MARUTI SUSUKI	0	19.42	15.75	64.29	high value	75.71	high value

The relationship between low leverage and market valuation varies when profitability is low. Companies like Bharati Airtel and M&M still enjoy high P/E and P/B values, indicating that other factors such as market position, growth prospects, and sector attractiveness play significant roles in valuation.

NTPC and L&T: These companies, despite low leverage, have low P/E and P/B values, reflecting the market's cautious approach towards companies with lower profitability

Table No.8: Comparison of companies

Name of the company	Capital structure	ROI	ROE	P/E	P/B
BAJAJ FINSERVE	High	Low	Low	High value	High value
TATA MOTORS	High	Low	Low	Low value	High value
TITAN	Low	High	High	High value	High value
ASIAN PAINT	Low	High	High	High value	High value
Hcl technologies	Low	High	High	High value	High value
NESTLE	Low	High	High	Low value	Low value

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

TCS	Low	High	High	High value	Low value
INFOSYS	Low	High	High	High value	Low value
ITC	Low	High	High	High value	Low value
Bharati airtel	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
M&M	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
POWER GRID	Low	Low	Low	High value	Low value
NTPC	Low	Low	Low	Low value	Low value
L&T	Low	Low	Low	Low value	Low value
JSW STEEL	Low	Low	Low	High value	Low value
TATA STEEL	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
WIPRO	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
ULTRATECH CEMENT	Low	Low	Low	Low value	Low value
SUN PHARMA	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
TECH MAHINDRA	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
RELIANCE	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value
HUL	Low	Low	Low	Low value	Low value
MARUTI SUSUKI	Low	Low	Low	High value	High value

- High Leverage: Companies with high leverage but low ROI and ROE generally have mixed market valuations. Bajaj Finserv has high valuation metrics despite low profitability, suggesting market confidence in future prospects. Tata Motors, however, reflects the negative impact of high leverage with low profitability.
- Low Leverage and High Profitability: These companies are consistently valued higher in the market, as seen with Titan, Asian Paints, and HCL Technologies. This indicates strong investor preference for companies with lower financial risk and higher returns.
- Low Leverage and Low Profitability: The market valuation for these companies varies widely. While some, like Bharati Airtel and M&M, maintain high valuations, others like NTPC and L&T do not. This disparity suggests that factors beyond leverage and profitability, such as industry dynamics, growth potential, and market sentiment, significantly influence valuation.

The analysis indicates a nuanced relationship between capital structure and valuation. High leverage can be detrimental if not paired with strong profitability metrics. Low leverage combined with high profitability is typically favored by the market, resulting in higher valuations. However, low leverage with low profitability presents mixed outcomes, highlighting the importance of considering additional factors such as market conditions, industry trends, and company-specific strengths in assessing valuation.

Table No.9: Correlation

r 2024	r2023	r2022	r2021	r2020
-0.03649	0.137383	-0.23723	-0.17679	0.2165

Insights and Contributions of the Study

The study provides important insights into the relationship between capital structure and company valuation by analysing key financial indicators such as Return on Investment (ROI), Return on Equity (ROE), Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio, and Price-to-Book (P/B) ratio among Indian companies. The findings reveal that capital

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

structure plays a significant role in influencing firm valuation, profitability, and investor perception, although the nature of this relationship differs across firms and industries.

One of the major insights of the study is that highly leveraged companies tend to achieve superior valuation metrics when leverage is supported by strong profitability and efficient capital utilization. Companies such as Titan Company demonstrated high ROI and ROE along with strong market valuation, indicating that debt financing can enhance shareholder value when managed effectively. This suggests that leverage, when strategically utilized, can serve as a growth mechanism that improves operational expansion and market confidence. However, the study also identifies that high leverage alone does not guarantee improved valuation. Certain highly leveraged firms, including Bajaj Finserv and Tata Motors, exhibited lower profitability despite significant leverage, reflecting inefficiencies in capital allocation and varying market responses. In such cases, investor confidence depended not only on leverage levels but also on future growth expectations and overall financial stability.

The findings further indicate that low-leveraged companies generally maintain stable valuation performance when supported by strong profitability and operational efficiency. Companies such as Asian Paints, HCL Technologies, and ITC Limited consistently achieved high valuation metrics due to their efficient use of equity capital and lower financial risk exposure. These results imply that investors favor firms that maintain a balanced financing strategy combined with strong operational performance. At the same time, the study reveals that some low-leveraged companies experienced relatively lower market valuations despite satisfactory profitability levels, indicating that factors such as market sentiment, industry conditions, and future growth opportunities also influence valuation outcomes.

Another significant contribution of the study is the identification of fluctuating correlations between leverage and valuation metrics over the five-year analysis period. The correlation analysis demonstrated both positive and negative relationships between leverage and valuation across different years. Positive correlations suggest that strategic debt utilization under favorable market conditions may contribute to higher firm valuation. Conversely, negative correlations indicate that excessive leverage during uncertain economic periods may adversely affect investor confidence and market performance. These findings confirm that the relationship between capital structure and firm valuation is dynamic rather than linear.

The study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence from the Indian corporate sector regarding how capital structure decisions affect valuation measures. Unlike many previous studies that focused on single profitability indicators or specific industries, this research incorporates multiple valuation measures and compares both high-leveraged and low-leveraged firms. The study therefore offers a broader understanding of financing strategies and their implications for corporate performance and shareholder wealth creation.

The findings also provide practical implications for managers, investors, and policymakers. Corporate managers can use these insights to design optimal financing strategies that balance risk and profitability. Investors may benefit by evaluating not only company profitability but also the efficiency of capital structure management before making investment decisions. Policymakers can utilize the findings to formulate financial regulations and governance frameworks that encourage sustainable corporate growth and financial stability.

Overall, the study highlights that there is no universally optimal capital structure applicable to all firms. Instead, the effectiveness of leverage depends on factors such as profitability, industry characteristics, managerial efficiency, market conditions, and investor perception. The research therefore contributes to a deeper understanding of the complex relationship between capital structure and valuation in the Indian corporate environment.

CONCLUSION

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between capital structure and the valuation of Indian firms, with a particular focus on Return on Investment (ROI), Return on Equity (ROE), Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio, and Price-to-Book (P/B) ratio. By categorizing firms into high and low levered groups based on their debt-to-equity ratios, we were able to discern distinct patterns and draw meaningful insights into how leverage

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

influences corporate valuation. Our findings indicate that high levered companies, exemplified by firms like Titan, often demonstrate higher ROI and ROE, suggesting that they are able to utilize their capital more efficiently to generate significant returns. However, this is not universally applicable, as highlighted by Bajaj Finserv, which despite its high leverage, shows comparatively lower profitability metrics. This discrepancy underscores the importance of effective capital allocation and management within highly leveraged companies.

On the other hand, low levered companies present a more nuanced picture. Firms such as Asian Paints and HCL Technologies exhibit high profitability and favorable valuation metrics, indicating that low leverage does not necessarily impede performance.

Nevertheless, several low levered companies do not enjoy high valuation metrics despite their profitability, which might point to market undervaluation or suboptimal capital structure strategies. This variability suggests that while lower leverage might reduce financial risk, it does not automatically translate into superior market valuation, and other factors such as industry-specific dynamics and market perceptions play crucial roles.

The comparative analysis between high and low levered firms reveals that capital structure decisions are critical in shaping a company's valuation. High leverage, when managed efficiently, can lead to superior valuation metrics, indicating a potential advantage. However, the relationship between capital structure and valuation is complex and multifaceted, influenced by various factors beyond simple debt ratios. This finding challenges the notion of a straightforward linear relationship between leverage and firm valuation, suggesting that effective leverage management is key.

For stakeholders, these insights are invaluable. Companies must strategically manage their capital structure in alignment with their financial goals, balancing the benefits and risks associated with leverage. Investors, in turn, should adopt a holistic evaluation approach, considering both profitability and capital structure efficiency, along with market perceptions.

Future research should delve deeper into industry-specific nuances and consider external factors such as economic cycles, which could further illuminate the intricate relationship between capital structure and valuation. Ultimately, this study underscores the importance of nuanced and strategic capital structure management in optimizing firm valuation and achieving financial success.

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.
2. Bajaj Finserv. (2023). *Annual report 2022–2023*. Bajaj Finserv
3. Brigham, E. F., & Ehrhardt, M. C. (2017). *Financial management: Theory & practice* (15th ed.). Cengage Learning.
4. Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., & Allen, F. (2020). *Principles of corporate finance* (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
5. HCL Technologies. (2023). *Annual report 2022–2023*. HCL Technologies
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.
7. Kraus, A., & Litzenberger, R. H. (1973). A state-preference model of optimal financial leverage. *Journal of Finance, 28*(4), 911–922.
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.
9. Moneycontrol. (2024). *Financial data and market analysis*.
10. Myers, S. C. (1984). The capital structure puzzle. *Journal of Finance, 39*(3), 575–592.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. SEBI. (2023). *Annual report 2022–2023*.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue V, May 2026

14. Sensex. (2024). *Annual reports of companies*.
15. Titan Company. (2023). *Annual report 2022–2023*. Titan Company
16. Ross, S. A., Westerfield, R. W., & Jaffe, J. (2019). *Corporate finance* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
17. Gupta, R. (2018). *Capital structure and firm valuation: Evidence from Indian companies* (Doctoral dissertation, Indian Institute of Management Bangalore).