OPEN ACCESS

Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies
Abbreviated Key Title: Saudi J Bus Manag Stud
ISSN 2415-6663 (Print) |ISSN 2415-6671 (Online)
Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Journal homepage: https://saudijournals.com

Review Article

Investment–Cash Flow Sensitivity: A Theoretical Review in Light of Financing Constraints and Financial Disclosure Quality: *A Theoretical Review*

Shahad Abdullrhman Alqussair[1]*, Ezzeddine Ben Mohamed[1]

[1]Department of Accounting, College of Business and Economics, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36348/sjbms.2026.v11i05.002 | **Received:** 17.03.2026 | **Accepted:** 05.05.2026 | **Published:** 07.05.2026

***Corresponding author:** Shahad Abdullrhman Alqussair
Department of Accounting, College of Business and Economics, Qassim University, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

This study aims to examine, on theoretical grounds, the sensitivity of corporate investment to internally generated cash flow in light of two central explanatory frames: financing constraints and the quality of financial disclosure. First, the study explores the emergence of investment–cash flow sensitivity as a research construct. In this part, we introduce the concept of cash flow sensitivity, then highlight the principal motives behind its emergence, its importance, and its objectives. Second, the study focuses on the role of financing constraints in shaping cash flow sensitivity. In this part, we examine the principles of the financing constraints theory, its implementation through standard empirical proxies, and its main determinants. Third, the paper examines the relationship between financial disclosure quality and investment–cash flow sensitivity. In this part, based on existing research, we clarify the role of high-quality disclosure in mitigating information frictions and reducing the dependence of investment on internal cash flow. Finally, we summarize how financing frictions and disclosure quality jointly shape the conversion of cash flow into productive investment, with consequences for capital allocation and the broader economy.

Keywords: Investment–Cash Flow Sensitivity, Financing Constraints, Financial Disclosure Quality, Information Asymmetry, Agency Theory, Investment Efficiency.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between corporate investment and internally generated cash flow has stood at the center of empirical corporate finance for nearly four decades. The basic premise is that capital market frictions break the Modigliani–Miller separation between real and financial decisions, so firms that cannot tap external finance freely must lean on retained earnings, and the tighter that constraint, the more sharply real investment moves with cash flow (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988). Out of this idea grew a long line of research that produced what is now called the investment–cash flow sensitivity literature, joined later by parallel work on the cash flow sensitivity of cash holdings (Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004).

Yet the sensitivity of investment to cash flow is not a uniform phenomenon. Firms differ in the depth of their access to external capital, in the quality of the information they release to outside investors, and in the strength of governance arrangements that mitigate agency conflicts. Two channels have proven particularly central in the recent literature. The first runs through financing constraints: firms facing higher information costs and limited collateral pay an external finance premium that mechanically forces investment to track internal funds (Whited & Wu, 2006; Hadlock & Pierce, 2010). The second runs through the quality of financial disclosure: more transparent financial reporting reduces adverse selection, narrows the wedge between internal and external funding costs, and ultimately weakens the cash flow sensitivity of investment (Biddle, Hilary, & Verdi, 2009; Chen, Hope, Li, & Wang, 2011).

The remainder of the paper is divided as follows: the second section explores the emergence of investment–cash flow sensitivity. The third section focuses on the role of financing constraints in shaping that sensitivity. The fourth section examines the relationship between financial disclosure quality and investment–cash flow sensitivity. Finally, we summarize how financing frictions and disclosure quality together shape the responsiveness of corporate investment to cash flow.

2. The Emergence of Investment–Cash Flow Sensitivity

2.1. The concept of investment–cash flow sensitivity:

Investment–cash flow sensitivity refers to the strength of the empirical relationship between a firm's capital expenditure and its internally generated cash flow, conditional on investment opportunities (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988). Operationally, it is the coefficient on cash flow in a regression of investment on Tobin's Q and cash flow, where Q is meant to capture growth opportunities and the cash flow term is meant to capture the influence of liquidity on investment beyond what fundamentals alone would predict (Hovakimian & Hovakimian, 2009).

In a frictionless capital market, the cash flow coefficient should be statistically indistinguishable from zero, since firms could finance any positive net-present-value project at the prevailing cost of capital. The fact that the coefficient is positive and economically meaningful in most large samples is taken as evidence that capital market imperfections matter (Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004; Bates, Kahle, & Stulz, 2009).

2.2. The genesis of investment–cash flow sensitivity and the motivation behind its emergence:

The interest in cash flow sensitivity grew out of a series of empirical findings in the late 1980s that could not be reconciled with the Modigliani–Miller benchmark, especially after the introduction of the asymmetric information framework of Myers and Majluf (1984). We mention the principal motives:

- **The asymmetric information revolution in corporate finance:** Pioneering work by Myers and Majluf (1984) and Jensen and Meckling (1976) showed that information frictions and agency conflicts create a wedge between the cost of internal and external funds, opening the door for investment to depend on cash flow even after controlling for opportunities.
- **Empirical anomalies in corporate investment regressions:** Studies in the late 1980s consistently found a positive cash flow coefficient even after including Tobin's Q, suggesting that financial structure matters for real decisions (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988).
- **The need to test the financial constraints hypothesis:** Researchers needed an observable; replicable measure of how tightly firms were bound by external finance limits. The cash flow sensitivity coefficient offered exactly that, becoming the workhorse metric for the next two decades (Kaplan & Zingales, 1997; Cleary, 1999).
- **Cross-country and cross-sector heterogeneity:** Subsequent work documented systematic differences in cash flow sensitivities across firm types, sectors, and countries, prompting the development of complementary measures such as the cash flow sensitivity of cash holdings (Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004).

2.3. The importance of investment–cash flow sensitivity:

The importance of investment–cash flow sensitivity comes from its broad relevance to firms, investors, and policymakers. Its main dimensions can be summarized as follows:

Companies:

A higher sensitivity signals that the firm is unable to fully smooth investment through external markets, exposing capital expenditure to fluctuations in operating performance and increasing the risk of underinvestment during downturns (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988; Hovakimian & Hovakimian, 2009).

Investors and shareholders:

The metric helps investors gauge how vulnerable a firm's growth program is to cash flow shocks, which has direct implications for valuation, dividend expectations, and the assessment of payout policy (Bates, Kahle, & Stulz, 2009).

Other stakeholders:

Suppliers, creditors, and employees benefit from understanding how a firm's investment plan responds to liquidity, since investment cycles affect order books, hiring, and counterparty risk (Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004).

Standard setters and policymakers:

Cash flow sensitivity offers a window into the broader allocation of capital across the economy. Persistent high sensitivities at the aggregate level suggest weakness in financial markets or accounting institutions and provide an empirical basis for reforms aimed at reducing information frictions (Bushman & Smith, 2001; Healy & Palepu, 2001).

2.4. The objectives of studying investment–cash flow sensitivity:

The study of cash flow sensitivity serves a number of practical and analytical objectives. The principal aims include the following:

- Identifying firms whose investment is constrained by limited access to external finance, in order to direct attention to the structural causes of underinvestment (Kaplan & Zingales, 1997).

- Testing competing theories of capital market imperfections, including the asymmetric information channel and the agency conflicts channel (Myers & Majluf, 1984; Jensen & Meckling, 1976).
- Evaluating how firm-level information environment, governance, and disclosure practices affect the responsiveness of investment to internal funds (Biddle, Hilary, & Verdi, 2009).
- Measuring the spillovers from financial reporting reforms and improvements in disclosure standards on real corporate decisions (Chen, Hope, Li, & Wang, 2011).
- Supporting comparative research across countries and institutional settings, where differences in legal protection and reporting quality produce sharply different sensitivities (Lambert, Leuz, & Verrecchia, 2007).

3. Investment–Cash Flow Sensitivity in Light of Financing Constraints

3.1. Principles of the financing constraints framework:

The financing constraints framework rests on the idea that information costs and contracting problems make external finance more expensive than internal funds, generating a wedge that varies systematically across firms. Smaller, younger, less collateralized firms typically face larger wedges, which in turn translate into a tighter dependence of investment on cash flow (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988). The theoretical scaffolding draws on Myers and Majluf (1984) and Jensen and Meckling (1976), who modeled the gap between internal and external financing costs as the outcome of adverse selection and agency conflict, respectively. Almeida, Campello, and Weisbach (2004) extended the same logic to liquidity management, showing that constrained firms also save more cash out of every dollar of cash flow as a precautionary buffer.

3.2. The implementation of financing constraints measurement:

The proper application of the financing constraints framework depends on the choice of empirical proxy. Through these proxies, the extent to which a firm is bound by external finance limits is determined. The main indices used in the literature are (Hadlock & Pierce, 2010):

- The KZ index of Kaplan and Zingales (1997): Constructed from cash flow, leverage, dividends, and Tobin's Q. Originally proposed to challenge the FHP interpretation, it became one of the standard proxies although later research raised concerns about its reliance on endogenous financial variables.
- The WW index of Whited and Wu (2006): Derived from a structural model of investment under constraints and based on cash flow, dividend payment status, leverage, firm size, industry, and sales growth. Designed to capture the shadow cost of external finance more directly.
- The SA index of Hadlock and Pierce (2010): Built only on firm size and age, both of which are exogenous to financial policy. The index has gained ground precisely because it avoids the endogeneity issues that affect KZ and similar measures.
- Categorical and qualitative classifications: Researchers often supplement index-based measures with sample splits on payout policy, bond ratings, group affiliation, and direct narrative classifications drawn from financial statement disclosures (Cleary, 1999; Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004).

3.3. Determinants of financing constraints:

For financing constraints to bind in a meaningful way, they must reflect both internal firm characteristics and external institutional features that shape the cost of accessing capital, and those determinants are as indicated (Hadlock & Pierce, 2010; Whited & Wu, 2006):

- **Internal determinants:** These consist of a set of firm-level factors that define how easily the company can raise external funds. They include firm size, age, asset tangibility, leverage, profitability and cash flow volatility, and the structure of ownership and governance. Their importance lies in the fact that they directly shape lender perception of credit risk and equity holder concerns about adverse selection.
- **External determinants:** These refer to the broader institutional and macroeconomic climate and include the following:
  - The depth and liquidity of capital markets, which determine the marginal cost of external finance.
  - Legal protection of investor rights and creditor enforcement mechanisms, which influence the cost of debt and equity.
  - The quality of accounting standards and the rigor of disclosure regulation, which affect the magnitude of information asymmetry between firms and outside capital providers (Bushman & Smith, 2001).
  - Macroeconomic conditions and the stage of the business cycle, which determine the availability of credit and the strength of investor demand.

4. Financial Disclosure Quality and Cash Flow Sensitivity

Firms always strive to convert internally generated funds into productive investment, while regulators and standard setters work to design reporting frameworks that make this conversion more efficient. Financial disclosure quality acts as a key institutional lever in this process. A growing body of research indicates that high-quality disclosure has a meaningful impact on investment–cash flow sensitivity and, more broadly, on investment efficiency, although the magnitude of the effect varies across markets and firm types (Biddle, Hilary, & Verdi, 2009; Chen, Hope, Li, &

Wang, 2011). The literature generally agrees that disclosure quality has a strong, robust relationship with cash flow sensitivity, and that this relationship differs from one country to another according to the strength of the legal environment, the depth of capital markets, and the credibility of accounting institutions (Healy & Palepu, 2001; Lambert, Leuz, & Verrecchia, 2007).

4.1. Cash flow sensitivity and disclosure quality measures:

The performance indicators used in this stream of research to measure cash flow sensitivity and disclosure quality fall into two related families. They reflect, respectively, how firms allocate internal funds across investment and liquidity, and how clearly, they convey information about those decisions to outside parties. We will limit ourselves in this review to the following measures:

- **Investment–cash flow sensitivity (ICFS):** The coefficient on cash flow in a regression of investment on Tobin's Q and cash flow. Higher values indicate stronger dependence of capital expenditure on internally generated funds, which is typically interpreted as evidence of binding financing constraints (Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen, 1988).
- **Cash flow sensitivity of cash (CFSC):** The coefficient on cash flow in a regression of changes in cash holdings on cash flow and other controls. A positive coefficient is associated with precautionary saving by constrained firms (Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach, 2004).
- **Accruals quality:** Standard proxies are based on the Dechow–Dichev model and its extensions, which capture the precision with which accruals map into past, present, and future cash flows. Lower variability in residuals indicates higher accruals quality and a cleaner information environment (Dechow, Ge, & Schrand, 2010).
- **Disclosure indices and conditional conservatism:** Composite scores of voluntary and mandatory disclosures, together with measures of conditional conservatism such as the Basu C-score, are widely used to operationalize disclosure quality. Both metrics are intended to capture the timeliness and credibility of accounting information released to capital providers (Verrecchia, 2001; Biddle & Hilary, 2006).

4.2. A theoretical framework on the relationship between disclosure quality and cash flow sensitivity:

The asymmetric information theory is one of the theories widely used in previous studies to explain the relationship between disclosure quality and corporate investment, such as the studies of Myers and Majluf (1984), Diamond and Verrecchia (1991), and Biddle, Hilary, and Verdi (2009). Within this framework, higher disclosure quality reduces the wedge between internal and external financing costs by mitigating adverse selection, lowering the firm's cost of capital, and improving the precision with which outside investors can assess the value of new projects. As a result, more transparent firms are better able to access external capital markets, which weakens the dependence of investment on internal cash flow.

The agency theory of Jensen and Meckling (1976) complements this view by arguing that strong disclosure also disciplines managerial behavior, reducing overinvestment financed by free cash flow and underinvestment caused by managerial risk aversion (Biddle, Hilary, & Verdi, 2009). The results of recent empirical studies indicate that high-quality reporting contributes to reducing the consequences of information frictions and improves the allocation of capital across investment opportunities (Chen, Hope, Li, & Wang, 2011; McNichols & Stubben, 2008). Furthermore, the results of Biddle and Hilary (2006) show that accounting quality is positively associated with capital investment efficiency in U.S. firms, while the results of Chen, Hope, Li, and Wang (2011) reveal a similar pattern in private firms across emerging markets, where disclosure regulation is less developed but the marginal value of credible information is correspondingly higher. Foreign studies (e.g., Yi, 2023; Li & Song, 2018) reveal a robust effect of disclosure and information environment on investment–cash flow sensitivity in Chinese listed firms, with the magnitude of the effect being more pronounced for firms operating under weak governance arrangements. Lambert, Leuz, and Verrecchia (2007) provide the asset-pricing rationale for these results, deriving conditions under which higher disclosure quality lowers the firm's cost of capital and, by extension, the rents extracted by external financiers.

Table 1: Shows a summary of previous studies on the impact of financing constraints and disclosure quality on cash flow sensitivity

Authors / Year	Country / Sample	Findings
1. Fazzari, Hubbard, & Petersen (1988)	United States	Investment is significantly more sensitive to cash flow for firms that retain most of their earnings, providing the first systematic evidence consistent with binding financing constraints in U.S. manufacturing firms.
2. Kaplan & Zingales (1997)	United States	Investment–cash flow sensitivity is not a monotonic function of financing constraints. The least constrained firms in their reclassified sample displayed the largest sensitivities, casting doubt on the FHP interpretation and motivating new measures.

Authors / Year	Country / Sample	Findings
3. Cleary (1999)	United States	Investment of firms classified as financially healthy is more sensitive to cash flow than that of firms in distress, reinforcing the Kaplan–Zingales critique and pointing to nonlinearities in the financing constraints relationship.
4. Almeida, Campello, & Weisbach (2004)	United States	Financially constrained firms exhibit a positive cash flow sensitivity of cash, while unconstrained firms do not. The result establishes the precautionary saving response as a complementary measure of constraints.
5. Whited & Wu (2006)	United States	Constructs the WW index of financing constraints from a structural model of investment. Constrained firms earn higher returns and display tighter cash flow sensitivities, consistent with a financing-related risk factor.
6. Hadlock & Pierce (2010)	United States	Develops the SA index based on firm size and age. Argues that purely financial indices like KZ load on endogenous outcomes, and that the SA index provides cleaner identification of financing constraints in empirical work.
7. Hovakimian & Hovakimian (2009)	United States	Within-firm timing of cash flow shocks generates substantial variation in measured investment–cash flow sensitivities. Aggregating across firm-years masks meaningful heterogeneity tied to investment opportunities.
8. Bates, Kahle, & Stulz (2009)	United States	U.S. corporate cash holdings have risen sharply over time. Precautionary motives, R&D-intensity, and rising idiosyncratic risk explain most of the increase, with implications for the cash flow sensitivity of cash.
9. Biddle & Hilary (2006)	International (multi-country)	Higher accounting quality is associated with lower investment–cash flow sensitivity. The effect is stronger in firms that rely more on public capital markets for financing.
10. Biddle, Hilary, & Verdi (2009)	United States	Firms with high financial reporting quality deviate less from the predicted level of investment, both by reducing overinvestment and by reducing underinvestment. Disclosure quality improves investment efficiency through both channels.
11. McNichols & Stubben (2008)	United States	Firms that manage earnings invest substantially more during periods of misreporting and reduce investment after restatement. Earnings management distorts the link between cash flow and capital expenditure.
12. Chen, Hope, Li, & Wang (2011)	21 emerging markets	Higher financial reporting quality improves investment efficiency in private firms operating in emerging markets, where the marginal value of credible disclosure is highest.
13. Lambert, Leuz, & Verrecchia (2007)	United States (theory)	Provides an asset-pricing model showing how higher disclosure quality lowers the cost of capital and, by extension, the rents extracted by external financiers in capital allocation.
14. Li & Song (2018)	China	Strong corporate governance and a richer accounting information environment significantly reduce investment–cash flow sensitivity in Chinese listed firms, with the effect concentrated in firms facing weaker external monitoring.
15. Yi (2023)	China	Improved corporate governance and higher information disclosure quality jointly reduce investment–cash flow sensitivity, supporting the view that the two institutional levers reinforce each other in mitigating financing frictions.
16. Dechow, Ge, & Schrand (2010)	Review article	Comprehensive review of earnings quality proxies, their determinants, and their consequences. Provides the methodological foundation for using accruals quality as a measure of disclosure quality in empirical work.

5. CONCLUSION

Investment–cash flow sensitivity has become the focus of attention of many financial economists, accounting researchers, and policymakers, because of its great importance in capturing how capital market frictions translate into real corporate decisions, as the construct itself is closely related to the successive financial reporting reforms and corporate governance debates that have shaped the global business environment over the last three decades. Indeed, cash flow sensitivity reflects two interconnected forces at once: the depth of the financing constraints faced by the firm and the quality of the information environment in which it operates. These forces emphasize the importance of accounting for both the firm-level information regime and the broader institutional context when modeling the responsiveness of investment to internal cash flow.

In this study we have investigated the impact of financing constraints and financial disclosure quality on the investment–cash flow sensitivity of firms. First, the study has explored the emergence of investment–cash flow sensitivity as a research construct. We have introduced the concept of cash flow sensitivity and highlighted the principal motives giving birth to its

formal measurement, its importance, and its objectives. Second, the study has focused on the role of financing constraints in shaping cash flow sensitivity. In this part, we have examined the principles of the framework, its implementation through the KZ, WW, and SA indices, and its main determinants. Third, we have examined the relationship between financial disclosure quality and investment–cash flow sensitivity. In this part, based on existing research, we have clarified the role of accounting quality and disclosure transparency in mitigating information frictions and reducing the dependence of investment on internal funds. Finally, financing constraints and disclosure quality jointly play a significant role in determining how firms convert cash flow into productive investment, with consequences for capital allocation, investor protection, and the broader economy. So, the application of high-quality reporting and the easing of financing constraints together increase the capability of firms to develop and grow, on a footing similar to that of large firms operating in deep, transparent capital markets.

REFERENCES

- Almeida, H., Campello, M., & Weisbach, M. S. (2004). The cash flow sensitivity of cash. The Journal of Finance, 59(4), pp. 1777–1804. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6261.2004.00679.x. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2004.00679.x
- Bates, T. W., Kahle, K. M., & Stulz, R. M. (2009). Why do U.S. firms hold so much more cash than they used to? The Journal of Finance, 64(5), pp. 1985–2021. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01492.x. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01492.x
- Biddle, G. C., & Hilary, G. (2006). Accounting quality and firm-level capital investment. The Accounting Review, 81(5), pp. 963–982. doi:10.2308/accr.2006.81.5.963. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2006.81.5.963
- Biddle, G. C., Hilary, G., & Verdi, R. S. (2009). How does financial reporting quality relate to investment efficiency? Journal of Accounting and Economics, 48(2-3), pp. 112–131. doi:10.1016/j.jacceco.2009.09.001. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2009.09.001
- Bushman, R. M., & Smith, A. J. (2001). Financial accounting information and corporate governance. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 32(1-3), pp. 237–333. doi:10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00027-1. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00027-1
- Chen, F., Hope, O.-K., Li, Q., & Wang, X. (2011). Financial reporting quality and investment efficiency of private firms in emerging markets. The Accounting Review, 86(4), pp. 1255–1288. doi:10.2308/accr-10040. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10040
- Cleary, S. (1999). The relationship between firm investment and financial status. The Journal of Finance, 54(2), pp. 673–692. doi:10.1111/0022-1082.00121. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-1082.00121
- Dechow, P., Ge, W., & Schrand, C. (2010). Understanding earnings quality: A review of the proxies, their determinants and their consequences. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 50(2-3), pp. 344–401. doi:10.1016/j.jacceco.2010.09.001. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2010.09.001
- Diamond, D. W., & Verrecchia, R. E. (1991). Disclosure, liquidity, and the cost of capital. The Journal of Finance, 46(4), pp. 1325–1359. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6261.1991.tb04620.x. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1991.tb04620.x
- Fazzari, S. M., Hubbard, R. G., & Petersen, B. C. (1988). Financing constraints and corporate investment. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1988(1), pp. 141–206. doi:10.2307/2534426. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/2534426
- Hadlock, C. J., & Pierce, J. R. (2010). New evidence on measuring financial constraints: Moving beyond the KZ index. The Review of Financial Studies, 23(5), pp. 1909–1940. doi:10.1093/rfs/hhq009. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhq009
- Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 31(1-3), pp. 405–440. doi:10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00018-0. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00018-0
- Hovakimian, A., & Hovakimian, G. (2009). Cash flow sensitivity of investment. European Financial Management, 15(1), pp. 47–65. doi:10.1111/j.1468-036X.2007.00420. x. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-036X.2007.00420.x
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), pp. 305–360. doi:10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X
- Kaplan, S. N., & Zingales, L. (1997). Do investment–cash flow sensitivities provide useful measures of financing constraints? The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112(1), pp. 169–215. doi:10.1162/003355397555163. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555163
- Lambert, R., Leuz, C., & Verrecchia, R. E. (2007). Accounting information, disclosure, and the cost of capital. Journal of Accounting Research, 45(2), pp. 385–420. doi:10.1111/j.1475-679X.2007.00238. x. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-679X.2007.00238.x
- Li, Y., & Song, Y. (2018). Corporate governance, accounting information environment and investment–cash flow sensitivity. International

Journal of Accounting & Information Management, 26(4), pp. 492–507. doi:10.1108/IJAIM-04-2017-0049. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-04-2017-0049

- McNichols, M. F., & Stubben, S. R. (2008). Does earnings management affect firms' investment decisions? The Accounting Review, 83(6), pp. 1571–1603. doi:10.2308/accr.2008.83.6.1571. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2308/accr.2008.83.6.1571
- 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), pp. 187–221. doi:10.1016/0304-405X(84)90023-0. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(84)90023-0
- Verrecchia, R. E. (2001). Essays on disclosure. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 32(1-3), pp. 97–180. doi:10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00025-8. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-4101(01)00025-8
- Whited, T. M., & Wu, G. (2006). Financial constraints risk. The Review of Financial Studies, 19(2), pp. 531–559. doi:10.1093/rfs/hhj012. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhj012
- Yi, J. (2023). Corporate governance, information disclosure and investment–cash flow sensitivity. Finance Research Letters, 55, p. 103942. doi: 10.1016/j.frl.2023.103942. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.103942