Corporate Cash Holdings: Determinants, Agency Costs, and the Cash Flow Puzzle

Zheng Jianguo
Taiyuan University of Technology, China

ABSTRACT

Corporate cash holdings—firms' decisions to hold liquid assets rather than investing in real projects or returning capital to shareholders—have increased dramatically over the past three decades. U.S. non-financial corporations held approximately $2.3 trillion in cash and short-term investments in 2022, with cash-to-asset ratios roughly doubling from approximately 10% in 1980 to 20% by 2020. This secular rise in cash holdings is the 'cash puzzle'—a violation of the Modigliani-Miller principle that firms without profitable investment opportunities should return capital to shareholders rather than holding depreciating real balances. Bates, Kahle, and Stulz (2009) in the Journal of Finance documented the rising cash trend and identified its principal drivers: increased cash flow volatility (raising precautionary demand for liquid buffers), reduced capital expenditure intensity (declining tangible asset collateral), increased R&D intensity (more reliance on intangible assets with high financial distress costs), and more broadly, the shift toward knowledge-intensive industries where human capital is the primary asset. This paper reviews cash holding theories, the secular rise evidence, and the role of multinational taxation and financial constraints.

Keywords: Corporate Cash Holdings; Precautionary Motive; Agency Costs; Tax Repatriation; Bates Kahle Stulz; Financial Constraints; Cash Puzzle.

1. INTRODUCTION

Standard corporate finance theory predicts that rational value-maximizing firms should not hold excess cash beyond their transactions and precautionary needs: holding cash earns the risk-free rate while the firm's cost of capital exceeds this, making net cash holding value-destructive. The Modigliani-Miller framework implies that investors can achieve any desired liquidity in their own portfolios, so corporate liquidity management adds no investor value. Against this theoretical expectation, U.S. corporations have systematically increased their cash holdings since the 1980s, suggesting either that the standard theory is missing something or that agency problems allow managers to hold excess cash contrary to shareholder interests.

2. THEORIES OF CASH HOLDINGS

2.1 Precautionary Motive

The precautionary motive for cash holding—maintaining liquid buffers against the risk that profitable investment opportunities arise when external financing is unavailable or expensive—is the theoretically most compelling driver of corporate cash demand. Almeida, Campello, and Weisbach (2004) in the Journal of Finance develop an investment-cash flow sensitivity framework showing that financially constrained firms save a significantly higher fraction of their incremental cash flows than unconstrained firms—consistent with precautionary saving against future financing constraints. The rise in cash flow volatility (Irvine and Pontiff, 2009) and the growth of firms whose assets are primarily intangible (less collateral for debt financing) both increase the value of precautionary cash holdings.

2.2 Agency Costs of Cash

Jensen (1986) identified the agency cost of free cash flow: managers with excess cash pursue value-destroying acquisitions, maintain inefficient operations, and consume private perquisites rather than returning capital to shareholders. The agency theory of cash holdings predicts that poorly governed firms hold more cash than well-governed firms, with excess cash destroying rather than preserving value. Dittmar and Mahrt-Smith (2007) in the Journal of Finance find that $1 of cash held by poorly governed firms is valued at approximately $0.42-$0.88 by the market, substantially below the $1 intrinsic value—suggesting that investors discount cash held by firms with weak governance for the risk of agency waste.

3. MULTINATIONAL TAX AND THE CASH ACCUMULATION PUZZLE

Table 1. Drivers of corporate cash holdings and supporting evidence.

Driver	Effect on Cash Holdings	Evidence
Precautionary: cash flow volatility	Higher volatility → larger precautionary buffer required	Bates et al. (2009): cash flow volatility explains most of secular cash rise
Investment opportunity increase	More valuable future opportunities → more valuable option to invest rapidly	Q ratio positively correlated with cash-to-asset ratios
Tax: repatriation costs	Pre-TCJA: repatriation tax incentivized offshore cash accumulation	Apple, Microsoft, GE: cash concentrated in foreign subsidiaries pre-2017
Agency: weak governance	Entrenched managers hoard cash for discretionary use	Dittmar & Mahrt-Smith (2007 JF): market discounts cash in weak governance firms
Industry shift: intangibles	Tech/pharma: less tangible collateral → higher precautionary buffer	R&D intensity positively predicts cash holdings across studies

4. CASH HOLDING CONSEQUENCES

The value of cash holdings depends critically on the firm's governance quality and investment opportunity set. Faulkender and Wang (2006) in the Journal of Finance estimate that the marginal value of cash for the median firm is approximately \$0.94 per \$1 of cash—close to but below face value, consistent with modest average agency and tax costs of cash. However, cash value varies substantially: for firms with high leverage and limited external financing capacity, the marginal value of an additional dollar of cash exceeds \$1.50, while for firms with poor governance and abundant cash, marginal value falls below \$0.50. This dispersion in cash value underscores that cash holding decisions reflect genuine trade-offs between precautionary benefits and agency and opportunity costs.

5. CONCLUSION

The secular rise in corporate cash holdings reflects a genuine transformation in the structure of the U.S. economy toward more volatile, more intangible, and more internationally distributed business models that increase the precautionary value of liquid buffers. Tax incentives—particularly the pre-TCJA repatriation tax—concentrated cash offshore for large multinationals. Agency costs allow some managers to maintain excess cash beyond what precautionary motives justify, with the market discount on poorly governed firms' cash providing direct evidence of this agency problem. The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act's repatriation provisions prompted large-scale cash repatriation and shareholder distribution, providing a natural experiment on how tax policy affects cash holding decisions. Future research should examine how digital payment systems and the declining role of transactions precautionary demand change optimal corporate cash levels.

REFERENCES

[1] Almeida, H., Campello, M., & Weisbach, M. S. (2004). The cash flow sensitivity of cash. Journal of Finance, 59(4), 1777–1804.

[2] Bates, T. W., Kahle, K. M., & Stulz, R. M. (2009). Why do U.S. firms hold so much more cash than they used to? Journal of Finance, 64(5), 1985–2021.

[3] Dittmar, A., & Mahrt-Smith, J. (2007). Corporate governance and the value of cash holdings. Journal of Financial Economics, 83(3), 599–634.

[4] Faulkender, M., & Wang, R. (2006). Corporate financial policy and the value of cash. Journal of Finance, 61(4), 1957–1990.