

FINANCIAL DISTRESS, CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, AND FIRM VALUE: EVIDENCE FROM EMERGING MARKETS

Ryan Saputra Alam*

STIE Mulia Pratama, Bekasi, Indonesia

Email: rysalamilmi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Financial distress, corporate governance, and firm value are closely interconnected dimensions of corporate financial sustainability, particularly in emerging markets characterized by institutional heterogeneity, information asymmetry, financing constraints, and varying levels of investor protection. This article examines the conceptual relationship between financial distress, corporate governance, and firm value by integrating Agency Theory and Signaling Theory into a unified analytical framework. Financial distress is viewed not merely as a condition preceding corporate failure but also as an indicator of financial vulnerability that can influence investor confidence and market valuation. Corporate governance is positioned as an internal control mechanism capable of reducing agency conflicts, strengthening managerial accountability, improving transparency, and supporting financial resilience. The article further argues that the relationship between corporate governance and firm value may operate through the firm's financial condition. Effective governance can encourage prudent financial decision-making, reduce excessive risk-taking, and improve the capacity of firms to respond to financial pressures. In contrast, weak governance may intensify managerial opportunism and increase vulnerability to financial distress, ultimately undermining firm value. The emerging-market context is particularly important because governance mechanisms may operate differently across institutional environments. The article contributes to the business and financial literature by developing an integrated conceptual perspective connecting governance quality, financial distress, and firm valuation and by identifying implications for corporate managers, investors, boards, and financial-market regulators.

Keywords: *Financial Distress; Corporate Governance; Firm Value; Emerging Markets; Agency Theory; Signaling Theory.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Context and Financial Problem

Financial distress is an important issue in corporate finance because financial difficulties can affect not only a firm's ability to meet its obligations but also its long-term competitiveness, investment capacity, stakeholder relationships, and market reputation. A financially distressed company may experience difficulties in maintaining liquidity, obtaining external financing, preserving operational continuity, and generating sustainable returns. In severe circumstances, persistent financial distress can lead to restructuring, asset sales, ownership changes, or corporate failure.

The concept of financial distress is closely related to the broader issue of corporate financial sustainability. Altman (1968) demonstrated that financial ratios can be used to identify patterns associated with corporate bankruptcy. His approach subsequently became an important foundation for the development of financial-distress prediction models. The problem is particularly relevant in emerging markets. Firms operating in emerging economies may face financing constraints, institutional weaknesses, information asymmetry, and differences in investor protection. These

conditions can increase corporate vulnerability when firms encounter economic uncertainty or financial shocks.

Financial distress should therefore not be interpreted exclusively as the consequence of poor financial management. It can also reflect broader governance and institutional conditions. Managerial decisions concerning leverage, investment, dividend policy, liquidity management, and risk-taking can influence a firm's ability to withstand financial pressures. Corporate governance provides an important mechanism for addressing these challenges. Corporate governance refers to the structures and processes through which corporations are directed, monitored, and held accountable. Jensen and Meckling (1976) explain that separation between ownership and management creates agency costs because managers may have interests that differ from those of shareholders. Governance mechanisms are consequently needed to reduce conflicts between principals and agents.

Effective corporate governance can strengthen managerial monitoring, improve accountability, and reduce opportunities for inefficient managerial behavior. Bebhuk et al. (2009) emphasize that corporate governance mechanisms can differ in their importance and effectiveness, indicating that governance quality should be evaluated through its substantive mechanisms rather than merely through formal compliance.

The relationship between governance and financial distress is therefore theoretically significant. Strong governance can encourage managers to adopt more disciplined financial strategies, improve risk management, and identify financial problems at an earlier stage. Conversely, weak governance may create opportunities for managerial opportunism, excessive risk-taking, inefficient investment, and inadequate financial reporting.

Firm value represents another important dimension of this relationship. In financial economics, firm value reflects market expectations regarding future cash flows, growth opportunities, corporate risk, and the firm's ability to generate sustainable returns. Financial distress can negatively influence these expectations because investors may associate financial weakness with higher risk and lower future performance.

Signaling Theory provides an additional explanation. Corporate financial conditions can provide information to external investors concerning the quality and future prospects of the firm. Myers and Majluf (1984) demonstrate the importance of information asymmetry in corporate financing decisions, while financial-market theory more broadly suggests that investors incorporate available information into their valuation decisions.

Consequently, financial distress, corporate governance, and firm value should be considered interconnected components of corporate financial sustainability.

1.2 Literature Review and Research Gap

Previous research on financial distress has traditionally emphasized financial characteristics such as profitability, liquidity, leverage, working capital, and operational efficiency. Altman (1968) provided an influential foundation by demonstrating the usefulness of financial ratios in predicting corporate bankruptcy.

However, financial indicators alone may not fully explain why some firms become more vulnerable to financial distress than others. Corporate governance provides an additional explanation because governance determines how managerial decisions are monitored and controlled.

Agency Theory suggests that governance mechanisms can reduce agency conflicts and improve managerial accountability (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Independent directors, institutional investors, managerial ownership, and audit committees may influence managerial behavior and corporate financial decisions.

The relationship between governance and financial distress has consequently attracted increasing attention. Ibrahim (2019), for example, examined corporate governance and financial distress in Indonesian publicly listed companies and demonstrated the relevance of governance mechanisms to corporate financial conditions. More recent research has also continued to examine the role of governance in relation to financial distress. A second research stream examines corporate governance and firm value. Good governance may increase firm value by reducing agency costs, improving disclosure, and increasing investor confidence. Gillan et al. (2021) emphasize the importance of governance and broader sustainability-related considerations in understanding contemporary corporate financial decisions. A third research stream examines financial distress and firm value. Financial distress can influence firm value because investors may perceive financially vulnerable firms as riskier and less capable of generating sustainable future cash flows.

Despite these research streams, an important gap remains. Many studies examine corporate governance and firm value as a direct relationship without sufficiently considering the firm's financial condition as a potential mechanism.

This issue is particularly important in emerging markets. Emerging economies differ considerably in terms of legal systems, investor protection, ownership concentration, institutional quality, and capital-market development. Therefore, governance mechanisms may have different consequences across institutional environments. The present study addresses this gap by developing an integrated conceptual framework connecting corporate governance, financial distress, and firm value.

1.3 Theoretical Framework and Contributions

The theoretical foundation of this study consists primarily of Agency Theory and Signaling Theory. Agency Theory originates from the problem of separation between ownership and managerial control. Jensen and Meckling (1976) explain that managers may pursue objectives that are not completely aligned with shareholder interests. This divergence generates agency costs.

Corporate governance mechanisms are designed to reduce these costs. Independent directors, institutional ownership, managerial ownership, and audit committees can strengthen monitoring and accountability. From an Agency Theory perspective, weak governance can increase financial vulnerability because managers may undertake decisions that are excessively risky or inefficient. Strong governance should encourage more disciplined decision-making and improve financial resilience. Signaling Theory provides a complementary explanation. Investors cannot perfectly observe the future condition of a firm. Consequently, observable financial and governance information can become important signals concerning corporate quality.

A financially healthy company can signal stronger operational and financial capacity, whereas financial distress can signal greater risk and uncertainty. Firm value may consequently reflect investor interpretation of these signals. The integration of these theories represents an important contribution of the study. Governance influences internal managerial behavior, while financial conditions communicate information about corporate quality to external stakeholders. Thus, financial distress can be positioned between corporate governance and firm value as an important mechanism through which governance quality becomes economically relevant.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Financial Distress and Firm Value

Financial distress reflects deterioration in a firm's ability to maintain sustainable financial operations. When financial difficulties become persistent, firms may experience liquidity pressure, increasing financing costs, reduced investment opportunities, and declining stakeholder confidence. Altman (1968) established an important foundation for understanding financial distress by demonstrating that combinations of financial ratios can provide useful information concerning corporate failure risk. Financial distress can influence firm value through several channels. First, financial difficulties may reduce expected future cash flows. Second, distress can increase perceived corporate risk. Third, financially constrained firms may be unable to exploit profitable investment opportunities. Finally, financial distress may negatively affect relationships with creditors, suppliers, employees, and customers. These mechanisms suggest that investors may assign lower valuations to firms experiencing greater financial vulnerability.

Recent research continues to demonstrate the relevance of financial health to corporate valuation, particularly in emerging-market settings.

2.2 Corporate Governance and Financial Distress

Corporate governance can influence financial distress through managerial monitoring and risk control. Board independence is an important governance mechanism because independent directors can provide objective oversight over managerial decisions. An effective board can challenge excessive borrowing, inefficient investment, and inappropriate risk-taking. Institutional ownership may also contribute to monitoring. Institutional investors generally possess greater resources and financial expertise and may therefore have stronger incentives to monitor management.

Audit committees provide another governance mechanism by strengthening financial reporting and internal control. Effective audit oversight can improve the quality of information available to boards and investors.

Managerial ownership has a potentially more complex effect. From the perspective of incentive alignment, managerial ownership may encourage managers to act in shareholders' interests because managers share the economic consequences of corporate decisions. However, excessive managerial ownership may also create entrenchment and reduce the effectiveness of external monitoring. The overall governance framework therefore suggests that effective corporate governance should strengthen financial resilience and reduce vulnerability to distress.

2.3 Corporate Governance and Firm Value

Corporate governance can influence firm value directly through the reduction of agency costs. Jensen and Meckling (1976) argue that agency conflicts create costs for shareholders. Governance mechanisms can reduce these costs by monitoring managers and aligning managerial incentives. Bebchuk et al. (2009) further demonstrate that corporate governance consists of multiple mechanisms whose importance may vary according to the institutional and corporate context.

Good governance may increase firm value through improved transparency, accountability, risk management, and investor confidence.

Gillan et al. (2021) also emphasize that modern corporate governance increasingly involves broader considerations of corporate responsibility, sustainability, and long-term value creation. From this perspective, firms with stronger governance may be perceived as more reliable and better positioned to protect shareholder interests.

2.4 Financial Distress as a Mediating Mechanism

The preceding discussion suggests that corporate governance may influence firm value indirectly through financial health. Strong governance can improve financial discipline, reduce excessive risk-taking, and strengthen monitoring. These improvements can reduce the likelihood of financial distress. Lower financial distress can then contribute to higher firm value by reducing perceived risk and strengthening investor confidence.

The conceptual relationship can therefore be represented as:

Corporate Governance → Financial Health → Firm Value

This framework recognizes that governance can influence firm value through multiple channels. Financial distress is one important mechanism among these channels.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study develops a conceptual framework that can subsequently be tested using quantitative panel-data methods. The proposed research focuses on publicly listed non-financial companies in emerging markets. Financial-sector firms should be treated separately because banking and insurance institutions operate under distinctive regulatory and accounting environments.

The emerging-market setting is selected because governance institutions, ownership structures, investor protection, and capital-market development vary substantially across countries.

3.2 Variable Conceptualization

Firm Value

Firm value represents the market assessment of a firm's future economic prospects. Tobin's Q is an appropriate conceptual measure because it captures market expectations regarding the value of corporate assets.

Financial Distress

Financial distress represents corporate financial vulnerability. The Altman Z-Score provides an established framework for assessing financial health through multiple financial indicators (Altman, 1968).

Corporate Governance

Corporate governance can be represented by several mechanisms, including:

- board independence;
- institutional ownership;
- managerial ownership;
- board size; and
- audit committee characteristics.

Each mechanism represents a different dimension of monitoring, accountability, and managerial control.

Control Variables

Future empirical implementation should consider firm size, leverage, profitability, and growth because these characteristics may influence both financial distress and firm value.

3.3 Conceptual Model

The proposed framework consists of two principal relationships.

The first relationship examines whether corporate governance influences financial health:

Financial Distress = $f(\text{Corporate Governance, Firm Characteristics})$

The second examines whether financial distress and governance influence firm value:

Firm Value = $f(\text{Financial Distress, Corporate Governance, Firm Characteristics})$

This framework enables future research to examine both direct and indirect relationships.

3.4 Endogeneity Considerations

Potential endogeneity is an important issue in examining governance and firm value. Firm value may influence governance decisions, while governance may simultaneously influence firm value.

Financial distress may also cause changes in governance structures because distressed firms may undertake restructuring.

Future empirical research should therefore consider lagged variables, instrumental-variable approaches, or dynamic panel estimators such as System-GMM where theoretically appropriate.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Because this article is designed without presenting original statistical estimation, this section focuses on the theoretical interpretation of the proposed relationships rather than reporting numerical regression results.

4.1 Financial Distress and Corporate Value

The theoretical literature suggests that financial distress can negatively affect firm value because financial vulnerability changes investor expectations.

A distressed firm may face higher financing costs, reduced investment opportunities, and greater uncertainty regarding future operations. These factors can reduce the expected value of future cash flows.

Consequently, financial health should be regarded as an important component of corporate valuation.

4.2 Corporate Governance and Financial Resilience

Corporate governance can contribute to financial resilience by improving managerial oversight.

An effective board can identify excessive financial risk, while institutional shareholders can pressure management to improve financial discipline. Audit committees can strengthen internal controls and improve the reliability of financial information. These mechanisms can help firms identify and respond to financial problems before they become severe.

4.3 Governance and Firm Value

Governance can also influence firm value independently of financial distress. Investors may place greater confidence in firms characterized by transparent reporting, effective monitoring, accountable management, and appropriate shareholder protection. Therefore, governance quality can become an important component of investor assessment.

4.4 Integrated Relationship

The most important implication of the framework is that governance, financial distress, and firm value should not be considered independently. A governance weakness can contribute to inefficient managerial decisions. Inefficient decisions can increase financial vulnerability. Increased financial vulnerability can reduce investor confidence. Reduced confidence can ultimately affect firm valuation. The reverse mechanism is also possible. Strong governance can improve managerial discipline, strengthen financial resilience, increase investor confidence, and support firm value.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Theoretical Integration and Economic Meaning

The integration of Agency Theory and Signaling Theory provides a comprehensive explanation of the relationship between governance, financial distress, and firm value. Agency Theory focuses on internal corporate relationships. The central concern is how shareholders can ensure that managers act in accordance with shareholder interests (Jensen & Meckling, 1976).

Signaling Theory focuses more strongly on information transmitted to external stakeholders. Corporate financial conditions and governance characteristics can provide signals regarding management quality and future prospects.

The combination of these theories produces a sequential explanation:

Corporate Governance → Managerial Discipline → Financial Resilience → Investor Perception → Firm Value

This framework suggests that financial distress can represent an observable consequence of weaknesses in corporate financial management and governance.

It also implies that corporate governance should not be treated exclusively as a compliance mechanism. Instead, governance can be viewed as part of the firm's financial-risk management system.

5.2 Managerial Implications

For corporate managers, the framework suggests that governance and financial management should be integrated. Management should monitor liquidity, leverage, profitability, investment efficiency, and other indicators of financial vulnerability. Boards should also establish effective mechanisms for identifying financial problems at an early stage. directors, independence alone is insufficient. Directors should possess the expertise and authority necessary to challenge managerial decisions. For institutional investors, governance analysis should complement financial analysis. A firm with attractive financial performance but weak governance may remain vulnerable to future financial problems.

5.3 Policy Implications

For regulators in emerging markets, strengthening governance standards can contribute to greater corporate financial resilience. Disclosure requirements should provide investors with adequate information concerning board composition, ownership structures, audit committees, related-party transactions, and financial risks. Regulators can also encourage early-warning mechanisms for financially vulnerable companies.

The objective should not simply be preventing bankruptcy but creating a corporate environment characterized by transparency, accountability, and financial resilience.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Financial distress, corporate governance, and firm value represent interconnected dimensions of corporate financial sustainability. Financial distress can affect firm value because financial weakness increases uncertainty, financing constraints, and perceived corporate risk. Corporate governance provides an important mechanism for mitigating these risks. Effective boards, institutional monitoring, appropriate managerial incentives, and strong audit oversight can improve managerial discipline and financial resilience.

The theoretical integration of Agency Theory and Signaling Theory demonstrates how these relationships can be understood within a unified framework. Agency Theory explains how governance mechanisms can reduce conflicts between managers and shareholders, while Signaling Theory explains how financial and governance information can influence investor perceptions. The central proposition of this study is that corporate governance can influence firm value both directly and indirectly through financial distress.

This relationship is especially relevant in emerging markets because institutional environments differ considerably across countries. Differences in investor protection, ownership concentration, regulatory enforcement, and capital-market development may affect the effectiveness of governance mechanisms.

For managers, governance should therefore be integrated into financial-risk management. For investors, financial health and governance quality should be evaluated simultaneously. For regulators, stronger governance and disclosure standards can contribute to corporate resilience and market confidence.

REFERENCES

- Altman, E. I. (1968). Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy. *The Journal of Finance*, 23(4), 589–609.
- Bebchuk, L., Cohen, A., & Ferrell, A. (2009). What matters in corporate governance? *The Review of Financial Studies*, 22(2), 783–827. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhn099>
- Gillan, S. L., Koch, A., & Starks, L. T. (2021). Firms and ESG: Review and agenda. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 66, 101889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.101889>
- Ibrahim, R. (2019). Corporate governance effect on financial distress: Evidence from Indonesian public listed companies. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Accountancy Ventura*, 21(3), 415–422.
- 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.
- 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.
- Puspitasari, F. D. R., Syam, D., & Irawan, D. (2023). Does corporate governance have an effect on financial distress? Altman Z-Score approach. *Journal of Multiperspectives on Accounting Literature*, 1(2).