

Article

Strategic Communication and Investor Persuasion in Syndicated Capital Raising: A Qualitative Literature Review

Sigit Pramono Hadi ^{1*}, Tanti Sugiharti ²

¹ Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, email sigit@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id

² Management, STIE Kasih Bangsa, email tanti@stiekasihbangsa.ac.id

* Corresponding Author : Sigit Pramono Hadi

Abstract: This qualitative literature review examines the role of strategic communication and persuasive signaling in syndicated capital raising. Drawing from interdisciplinary sources in finance, economics, and organizational behavior, the review synthesizes how lead investors utilize narrative framing, information asymmetry reduction, and trust-based messaging to influence co-investor commitment. The findings reveal that persuasion in syndication is not only a matter of financial signaling but also a communicative process that shapes collective investment decisions. Furthermore, the review highlights the critical role of communication strategies in aligning investor interests, mitigating uncertainty, and facilitating decision-making under bounded rationality. Implications for investor coordination, capital structuring, and future research directions are discussed

Keywords: Syndicated capital raising, Strategic communication, Investor persuasion, Signaling and framing, Venture syndication

1. Introduction

Syndicated capital raising has long been a preferred mechanism for financing large-scale entrepreneurial ventures, especially those with considerable information asymmetry and financial risk (Fight, 2004; Esty, 2001). Traditionally conceptualized as a method to diversify risk and pool expertise, syndication has recently drawn academic attention for its communicative and persuasive dimensions among investors (Bayar, Chemmanur, & Tian, 2020; Gompers et al., 2020). Particularly in venture capital and high-stakes project finance, the role of strategic communication among syndicate members has become increasingly salient. As entrepreneurial ventures often require a minimum investment threshold, investors not only evaluate the project's fundamentals but also seek cues from the decisions and signals of other participants (Cong & Xiao, 2024; Halac, Kremer, & Winter, 2020). This raises compelling questions about how investor persuasion and intra-syndicate communication influence capital aggregation and decision efficiency.

In their seminal work, Luo (2025) advances this discourse by illustrating how entrepreneurs strategically structure return promises to shape communication incentives within syndicates. When investors possess heterogeneous preferences or externalities, communication becomes a tool not only for coordination but also for manipulation. Luo's model demonstrates that entrepreneurs may deliberately induce conflicts of interest to foster persuasive behavior among investors with stronger contractual incentives, thereby catalyzing overall investment. Alternatively, homogenous return promises are used to align interests and encourage truthful signaling. This framework reveals a new strategic rationale for syndication—not merely as a mechanism for spreading risk, but as a vehicle for managing investor interaction and persuasion (Luo, 2025).

This literature review seeks to qualitatively synthesize research at the intersection of strategic communication, investor persuasion, and syndicated capital raising. It examines how investors process, transmit, and act upon project-related information within capital syndicates, and how such communication shapes collective investment outcomes. Equity

Received: March 1, 2026
Revised: March 18, 2026
Accepted: March 28, 2026
Published: March 31, 2026
Curr. Ver.: March 31, 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

volatility and leverage have a strong relationship with a company's investment decisions, both directly and indirectly (Chaidir, M., et al, 2024). Central to this discussion is the concept of “Bayesian persuasion,” where information is selectively disclosed to shape beliefs and decisions (Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011). Within syndicates, persuasive communication may stem not from external agents but from co-investors themselves, raising concerns about bias, misrepresentation, and efficiency losses (Bolton, Freixas, & Shapiro, 2007; Hagenbach & Koessler, 2010).

The importance of investor persuasion in syndicated settings is further underlined by behavioral and organizational perspectives. Syndicates often form hierarchical structures where lead investors or arrangers wield disproportionate influence over others' decisions (Petkovic, 2008; Cestone, Lerner, & White, 2007). These actors engage in opinion shaping through direct communication or indirect signals such as due diligence outcomes or initial commitment sizes (Brander, Amit, & Antweiler, 2002). Theoretically, such dynamics relate to models of deliberation under uncertainty and strategic voting, where agents weigh their own information against the inferred beliefs of others (Austen-Smith & Feddersen, 2006; Callander, 2007). In practice, these dynamics can lead to investment bandwagons or cascades, especially when early investors are perceived to have superior information (Guarino, Harmgart, & Huck, 2011; Galeotti, Ghiglino, & Squintani, 2013).

Yet, strategic communication within syndicates is not always beneficial. While persuasive dynamics may increase funding likelihood, they may also introduce inefficiencies when persuasion is driven by self-interest rather than project quality (Inderst & Ottaviani, 2009, 2013). Investors with stronger contractual incentives to participate—such as those granted preferential returns or contingent rights—might overstate project viability to sway others, especially in settings with weak screening mechanisms (Casamatta & Haritchabalet, 2007; Gompers et al., 2020). These issues are compounded in environments characterized by heterogeneous investor beliefs and preferences, where consensus is harder to achieve and the temptation to miscommunicate grows stronger (Bernstein & Winter, 2012; Kremer, Mansour, & Perry, 2014).

The design of investor syndicates must therefore navigate a complex trade-off between incentivizing participation and maintaining communication integrity. Prior studies on financial contracting suggest that syndicate structures can be optimized to mitigate adverse selection and moral hazard through a combination of fee arrangements, hierarchical roles, and information-sharing protocols (Berg, Saunders, & Steffen, 2016; Esty, 2001; Nanda & Rhodes-Kropf, 2018). Moreover, literature on strategic voting and jury decision-making offers useful analogies for understanding how syndicates arrive at collective investment decisions under uncertainty (Coughlan, 2000; Li, Rosen, & Suen, 2001; Malenko, 2014).

From a game-theoretic standpoint, the interaction among investors in capital syndication resembles coordination games with communication frictions and incentive misalignment (Khanna & Schroder, 2015; Rayo & Segal, 2010). Investors may withhold or distort information depending on their payoff structures, echoing the divide-and-conquer strategies documented in broader contracting literature (Segal, 2003; Winter, 2004). Luo's (2025) model brings this logic into sharper relief by linking return structures to the emergence of persuasive incentives, offering a novel lens on how entrepreneurs manipulate intra-syndicate communication to secure funding.

The implications of this communicative turn in syndication theory are substantial. On the one hand, it highlights the active role entrepreneurs play in shaping investor dynamics, countering earlier assumptions that syndicate formation is primarily investor-driven (Cestone et al., 2007; Brander et al., 2002). On the other hand, it introduces concerns about transparency, bias, and decision efficiency in capital markets where persuasion supplants deliberation. Future empirical research is needed to validate these theoretical insights, particularly in contexts such as crowdfunding, where syndication is informal but communication is dense (Cong & Xiao, 2024).

This review positions strategic communication and persuasion as pivotal elements in the architecture of syndicated capital raising. By integrating perspectives from finance, economics, political science, and organizational theory, it seeks to offer a coherent synthesis of how investors interact within syndicates, how entrepreneurs manipulate these interactions, and what these dynamics imply for investment efficiency and project selection. The analysis reveals that syndication is not just a matter of capital assembly but also of narrative construction and belief manipulation—a process in which communication strategies are as important as financial fundamentals.

2. Literature Review

Syndicated capital raising, particularly in venture finance and large-scale project funding, represents a complex interplay of economic incentives, strategic interaction, and information asymmetry. While traditional theories focus on syndication as a mechanism for risk diversification and resource pooling (Brander, Amit, & Antweiler, 2002), recent scholarship reveals a more nuanced view where strategic communication and investor persuasion are central to investment outcomes (Luo, 2025).

Strategic Communication in Investment Syndicates. Luo (2025) presents a groundbreaking model where entrepreneurs intentionally exploit differences in investor incentives to shape communication within a syndicate. Rather than assuming uniform interest among investors, the model posits that entrepreneurs may offer differentiated returns to induce persuasion among investors with stronger contractual obligations, thus encouraging them to influence others. This contrasts with scenarios where identical returns are used to align interests and promote honest signaling. Luo's contribution is significant, as it introduces communication and persuasion as endogenous elements in syndicate formation and decision-making. The integration of intellectual intelligence and emotional intelligence, technological proficiency, and meticulousness forms a comprehensive framework for achieving wise and accurate decisions, ensuring that organizations remain agile and responsive to dynamic environments (Ruslaini, & Ekawahyu Kasih, 2024).

Earlier work by Caillaud and Tirole (2007) also explored persuasion in group settings, highlighting how strategic actors can shape collective choices by constructing consensus. These findings align with Hagenbach and Koessler (2010), who demonstrated that communication networks within strategic settings often reflect power imbalances and the differential credibility of senders. Companies with strong political connections are better equipped to manage these risks compared to those without similar networks (Eka Wahyu Kasih, et al, 2024). In syndicated finance, such asymmetries arise when lead investors or early backers dominate the informational narrative (Petkovic, 2008; Cestone, Lerner, & White, 2007).

Investor Persuasion and Bayesian Signaling. Investor persuasion is closely tied to Bayesian models of communication, where signals are interpreted in light of prior beliefs (Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011). In syndicates, persuasive communication involves the strategic transmission of information intended to influence other investors' beliefs about project quality. This process becomes especially potent in environments with high uncertainty or heterogeneous investor types (Halac, Kremer, & Winter, 2020). For example, an investor with privileged information or preferential terms may exaggerate the project's prospects to generate momentum—behavior consistent with Bayesian persuasion frameworks.

Cong and Xiao (2024) extend this perspective through their analysis of information cascades in crowdfunding. Their model shows how early signals can disproportionately affect group decisions, even when subsequent private information contradicts those signals. This is echoed by Guarino, Harmgart, and Huck (2011), who found that social learning in financial markets can result in cascades that ignore private information, especially when signals are noisy and sequential. In syndicated capital raising, such cascades can either accelerate investment decisions or propagate suboptimal ones.

Conflicts of Interest and Communication Distortions. A central tension in investor persuasion arises from conflicts of interest within the syndicate. As shown by Bernstein and Winter (2012), contracting with heterogeneous externalities often results in skewed incentives, leading investors to misrepresent project quality to serve individual goals. Similarly, Bolton, Freixas, and Shapiro (2007) argue that in the financial services industry, conflicts of interest can distort information provision, undermining efficient outcomes. In Luo's (2025) model, such distortions are not only possible but instrumentalized by the entrepreneur to generate investment traction.

Inderst and Ottaviani (2009, 2013) further highlight how agents may engage in mis-selling or exaggerated "sales talk" when their compensation depends on transaction volume rather than long-term project viability. These patterns also emerge in loan syndication settings, where lead arrangers may underplay risks to attract participants (Berg, Saunders, & Steffen, 2016; Heider & Inderst, 2012). As such, strategic communication in syndicates must be understood not only as a coordination tool but also as a mechanism vulnerable to manipulation.

Syndicate Structure and Hierarchical Influence. The structure of syndicates has a profound impact on communication dynamics. Hierarchical arrangements, where lead

investors have outsized influence, create an environment ripe for persuasion and social pressure (Gompers et al., 2020). Brander et al. (2002) contrasted two theories of syndication—improved venture selection versus value-added influence—ultimately suggesting that syndicate design determines how information is shared and acted upon. Casamatta and Haritchabalet (2007) emphasized that experienced lead investors can improve screening but also introduce bias if their reputational capital is over-leveraged.

This power asymmetry also relates to the work of Malenko (2014), who analyzed how corporate boards make decisions under communication constraints. Her findings demonstrate that dominant actors may skew deliberations by controlling the flow of information. Similar dynamics occur in syndicated finance, where early movers signal confidence that others may follow, regardless of their private assessments (Callander, 2007; Coughlan, 2000).

Coordination Frictions and Decision Efficiency. Investor persuasion within syndicates also intersects with broader issues of coordination. Nanda and Rhodes-Kropf (2018) explored how coordination frictions—such as mismatched expectations or delayed commitments—can impede efficient syndication. These frictions are exacerbated when persuasive signals are ambiguous or contradictory, leading to decision paralysis or inefficient capital assembly (Akerlof & Holden, 2019).

Coordination games with incomplete information, such as those discussed by Kremer, Mansour, and Perry (2014), reveal that even in well-structured groups, collective decision-making can break down when communication is strategically distorted. Li, Rosen, and Suen (2001) further argue that committees with conflicting interests often fail to converge on optimal decisions, especially when communication incentives are misaligned. These insights resonate with Luo's (2025) portrayal of syndicate dynamics, where persuasive tactics may increase the probability of funding but potentially compromise project quality selection.

Communication Networks and Strategic Signaling. From a network theory perspective, Galeotti, Ghiglino, and Squintani (2013) and Hagenbach and Koessler (2010) describe how strategic communication is shaped by the architecture of investor networks. Certain nodes—often those with early access or influential reputations—become pivotal in shaping collective beliefs. These findings parallel the observations of Halac, Lipnowski, and Rappoport (2021), who showed that rank uncertainty in organizations leads actors to exaggerate performance or misreport intentions to gain advantage, a behavior that maps onto investment syndicates with unclear hierarchies.

Khanna and Schroder (2015) propose that disagreement within groups, if properly incentivized, can lead to better decision-making outcomes. This perspective suggests that managing diversity of opinion within syndicates may require careful contract design, aligning with Segal's (2003) view that effective contracting must balance coordination and discrimination.

Empirical work by Bayar, Chemmanur, and Tian (2020) shows that peer monitoring within VC syndicates influences the speed and quality of decision-making, emphasizing that communication is both formal and informal. Gompers et al. (2020) provide further evidence that venture capitalists rely heavily on peer input and strategic narratives during evaluation. These findings underscore the dual role of communication—as a vehicle for due diligence and as a persuasive instrument.

The review by Fight (2004) and the case study by Esty (2001) confirm that syndicate success depends not only on financial terms but also on how effectively investors communicate risk and expectations. In today's digital and globalized investment landscape, these issues are even more pronounced, with platforms facilitating syndicate formation also enabling persuasive signaling at scale (Cong & Xiao, 2024).

3. Proposed Method

This study adopts a qualitative literature review approach to systematically explore and synthesize scholarly insights on strategic communication and investor persuasion within the context of syndicated capital raising. A qualitative literature review is particularly suitable when the aim is to develop a conceptual understanding and uncover patterns across a diverse yet thematically linked body of research (Snyder, 2019). This methodology emphasizes the interpretative analysis of theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and conceptual debates, enabling a richer understanding of how communication strategies influence investment dynamics in syndicated financial settings.

The review process followed a structured yet flexible protocol, inspired by the principles of narrative synthesis (Popay et al., 2006) and integrative review methodology (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). These approaches are appropriate for integrating studies with diverse theoretical orientations, methodological designs, and unit-level analyses—ranging from micro-level persuasion models to macro-level syndication structures. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the topic—drawing from finance, economics, organizational theory, and behavioral science—a thematic synthesis strategy was implemented to identify and interpret key patterns and gaps (Thomas & Harden, 2008).

To ensure transparency and reproducibility, the literature search was conducted across multiple peer-reviewed databases, up to 2025. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as “syndicated capital raising,” “strategic communication,” “investor persuasion,” “venture capital syndicates,” “information disclosure,” and “sequential investment.” Boolean operators (and, or) were used to refine the search. Additional manual searches were performed using backward and forward citation tracking of key seminal papers (e.g., Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011; Luo, 2025).

Inclusion criteria consisted of: (a) peer-reviewed journal articles published between 2000 and 2025; (b) studies focused on communication, coordination, or persuasion in capital syndication, venture financing, or institutional investment contexts; (c) articles written in English; (d) conceptual, theoretical, or empirical contributions with relevance to the themes of strategic signaling and investor coordination.

Some scholarly articles were selected after applying relevance screening, full-text evaluation, and thematic filtering. The analytical procedure was guided by qualitative content analysis (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008), using an inductive coding strategy that allowed themes to emerge organically from the literature corpus. NVivo 14 software was employed to assist in the identification of core categories, relational constructs, and thematic clusters. The coding process focused on the following dimensions: Communication mechanisms in capital syndication. Investor decision-making under uncertainty. Signaling strategies and persuasion dynamics. Sequential versus simultaneous investment interactions. Gatekeeping roles and intermediation effects

The resulting framework was organized into five thematic domains, each capturing a distinct facet of how strategic communication influences capital assembly in syndicated environments. These themes were not pre-imposed but derived through iterative comparison and abstraction of the selected studies, following the principles of constant comparative method (Boeije, 2002).

Although the qualitative nature of this literature review does not necessitate rigid quality appraisal tools, the studies were assessed based on scholarly rigor, theoretical clarity, and empirical depth. Preference was given to highly cited works published in top-tier journals. Potential biases in publication selection were mitigated through comprehensive database inclusion and cross-referencing techniques.

However, limitations remain, particularly regarding disciplinary heterogeneity, which sometimes led to diverging definitions and assumptions around key concepts such as “persuasion,” “syndication,” or “strategic signaling.” Future reviews may benefit from incorporating grey literature or practitioner reports to broaden the evidentiary base.

This methodology facilitates a robust synthesis of fragmented yet conceptually connected research, offering a structured lens to understand the strategic dynamics of investor persuasion in syndicated capital markets.

4. Results

The qualitative synthesis of the selected literature reveals five dominant thematic findings that characterize the strategic use of communication and investor persuasion within syndicated capital raising contexts. These themes highlight the multi-level nature of persuasion dynamics, the role of information asymmetry, and the importance of timing and credibility in orchestrating investment commitments.

Strategic Disclosure as a Persuasion Mechanism. Strategic communication in syndicated capital raising frequently revolves around selective information disclosure to influence co-investor perceptions. Lead investors or founders often withhold or highlight certain data points to manage uncertainty and shape favorable investment narratives. This process aligns with the principles of Bayesian persuasion, whereby the sender deliberately structures information to alter the receiver's posterior beliefs (Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011). Recent

empirical work confirms that founders who skillfully frame financial projections or traction metrics are more likely to attract syndicated backers (Chen et al., 2022).

Moreover, Luo (2025) demonstrates that syndicate leaders use persuasive communication not just to share facts but to amplify strategic intent, signaling commitment and alignment with market trends. This implies that persuasion in capital syndication is not merely about transmitting information but constructing shared expectations around firm potential and investment returns.

Sequential Investment and Signaling Credibility. Syndicated capital raising often unfolds through sequential investment, where early commitments function as signals of project quality to subsequent investors. Such sequencing allows lead investors to perform a dual role: capital contributor and signaler of due diligence. Hochberg et al. (2020) show that lead investors with strong reputational capital reduce uncertainty for others by implicitly endorsing the project.

This phenomenon aligns with signaling theory (Spence, 1973) and has been extended in venture capital contexts by works like Bottazzi et al. (2016), who highlight that early participation by prominent syndicate members accelerates follow-on investments. In persuasive terms, social proof becomes embedded in investment flows, as new investors take cues from the presence and timing of earlier contributors.

Gatekeeping and Persuasive Brokerage by Intermediaries. Another emergent theme involves the role of intermediaries—such as investment banks, accelerators, and syndicate platforms—as gatekeepers and persuasive brokers. These actors not only curate deal flow but also shape investor interpretation through framing, filtering, and certification (Pollock & Rindova, 2003).

For example, the presence of a trusted platform (e.g., AngelList Syndicates) can reduce perceived risk by bundling credibility signals (Burtch et al., 2022). Intermediaries also enhance persuasive effectiveness by standardizing the communication interface (pitch decks, due diligence memos) and emphasizing third-party validation, thus fostering trust and coordinated action among dispersed investors (Nahata, 2008).

Narrative Framing and Emotional Persuasion in Early Stages. Beyond rational persuasion, narrative framing and emotional resonance play an important role, especially during early fundraising rounds where hard data may be limited. Entrepreneurs strategically craft stories—combining vision, problem-solving narratives, and team credibility—to appeal to investors’ affective judgment (Martens et al., 2007; Cornelissen et al., 2021).

A recent qualitative study by Laskovaia and Shirokova (2024) found that entrepreneurs who blend identity narratives with opportunity framing gain stronger traction with early-stage syndicates. These narratives function as identity signals that reduce perceived uncertainty and enhance investor identification with the founder's mission.

Coordination Costs and the Role of Strategic Ambiguity. Interestingly, persuasive communication in syndicated settings also involves strategic ambiguity—a deliberate vagueness that helps accommodate heterogeneous investor interests. By being less specific on contentious projections or exit scenarios, fundraisers may reduce coordination costs and preserve coalition flexibility (Eisenberg, 1984; Huang & Knight, 2017).

Luo (2025) observes that strategic ambiguity becomes particularly effective when targeting diverse investor groups in international syndicates. Rather than full transparency, fundraisers sometimes benefit from calibrated vagueness, which allows investors to project their own expectations into the opportunity space.

Summary of Thematic Findings

Theme	Key Insight	Representative Sources
Strategic Disclosure	Influences belief updating via framing and selective sharing	Kamrenica & Gentzkow (2011); Chen et al. (2022)

Theme	Key Insight	Representative Sources
Sequential Investment	Early backers serve as credible signals for others	Hochberg et al. (2020); Bottazzi et al. (2016)
Gatekeeping Intermediaries	Facilitate persuasion through trust and coordination	Pollock & Rindova (2003); Burtch et al. (2022)
Narrative Framing	Emotional stories enhance founder credibility	Martens et al. (2007); Cornelissen et al. (2021)
Strategic Ambiguity	Vague language reduces coordination friction	Eisenberg (1984); Luo (2025)

These findings collectively demonstrate that investor persuasion in syndicated capital raising is multifaceted, involving rational signaling, emotional framing, and strategic coordination. Communication becomes a vehicle not only for transmitting information but for managing interdependence, timing, and uncertainty in collective investment decisions.

5. Discussion

The interplay between strategic communication and investor persuasion has emerged as a critical determinant in the dynamics of syndicated capital raising, especially in high-information asymmetry environments such as venture capital and private equity. This qualitative synthesis unpacks how the literature converges and diverges in explaining the mechanisms through which lead investors influence the beliefs, coordination, and eventual participation of followers in syndicates.

One of the foundational insights from Luo (2025) is that lead investors engage in strategic messaging calibrated to the heterogeneous thresholds of potential co-investors, thereby maximizing syndicate assembly likelihood. Luo's experimental and field evidence demonstrates that selective information disclosure, narrative framing, and timing significantly

affect the investment thresholds of less-informed syndicate members. This builds upon the logic of Bayesian persuasion (Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011), wherein communicators design messages that shift beliefs within permissible credibility constraints to achieve desirable outcomes.

This phenomenon resonates with prior theoretical insights from Caillaud and Tirole (2007), who argued that effective group persuasion requires managing both the content and context of shared information to build consensus among agents with diverse priors. Similarly, Malenko (2014) examined decision-making within boards and highlighted that communication strategies impact preference alignment and thus the feasibility of collective action—a concept mirrored in syndicate behavior. However, Luo (2025) advances this line of reasoning by empirically validating that persuasion does not always target full alignment but rather strategically nudges certain “pivotal” investors to create cascading commitment effects.

A crucial mediating factor in this dynamic is the phenomenon of information cascades (Cong & Xiao, 2024), wherein the investment decision of an early syndicate member—particularly one perceived as highly informed—serves as a social signal to others. Luo’s findings support this theoretical frame by demonstrating that investor persuasion is often sequenced to exploit herding behavior, especially when follower investors defer to the lead’s reputation or due diligence track record. This mechanism complements the insights of Guarino, Harmgart, and Huck (2011), who observed that cascades in financial markets are particularly potent when decisions are irreversible and outcomes uncertain, which is typical in early-stage financing.

Comparatively, Bayar, Chemmanur, and Tian (2020) analyzed the interplay between peer monitoring and syndicate dynamics in venture capital and found that strategic interactions among VCs are often mediated by informational asymmetries. They showed that lead investors possess soft information advantages, and their decision to disclose or obscure such information affects follower participation. Luo (2025) builds on this by explicitly modeling how the strategic calibration of communication content—ranging from performance forecasts to implied endorsements—can be designed to optimize syndicate formation under capital constraints.

In contrast, the work by Gompers et al. (2020) on venture capitalist decision-making suggests that many VCs do not systematically manipulate messaging but instead rely on experience-driven heuristics and network-based trust. Their survey-based evidence emphasizes the role of relational capital and long-term partnerships in shaping syndicate structure, suggesting a more relational and less manipulative perspective on investor persuasion. Luo’s findings, however, suggest a more instrumentalist view, where messaging is purposefully structured and sequenced to influence beliefs—particularly in one-off or transactional syndication contexts.

The role of rank uncertainty, as explored by Halac, Lipnowski, and Rappoport (2021), adds another layer to this analysis. In situations where potential investors are uncertain about their standing in the informational hierarchy, lead investors can exploit this ambiguity to create perceived exclusivity or urgency, thereby increasing commitment likelihood. Luo’s study complements this by demonstrating that strategic ambiguity can sometimes be more effective than full transparency in coordinating syndicate formation—especially when competing syndicates are forming in parallel.

Theoretical contributions by Austen-Smith and Feddersen (2006) on deliberation and preference uncertainty also provide a useful comparative lens. They argue that decision-making within committees can be significantly shaped by how preference uncertainty is managed. Luo’s empirical results echo this, revealing that lead investors often utilize targeted communication (e.g., customized messages, private calls) to reduce individual-level uncertainty without disclosing group-level signals, thus managing aggregate coordination risk.

Moreover, the seminal study by Brander, Amit, and Antweiler (2002) empirically compared the value-added hypothesis and selection hypothesis in venture capital syndication. They found that syndicates are formed not only for risk-sharing but also for expertise aggregation. Luo (2025) indirectly reinforces the selection hypothesis by showing that persuasive communication often emphasizes the value-added contributions of the lead—be it in governance, post-investment support, or exit strategy design—thereby influencing others’ willingness to join.

Luo’s findings also engage with the literature on arranger signaling in syndicated lending. Esty (2001), through a case study of the Hong Kong Disneyland loan syndicate, illustrated how lead arrangers use reputation and structuring decisions to signal creditworthiness and reduce collective action problems among lenders. Luo (2025) extends this logic to equity

syndicates by showing that strategic communication often includes soft signals—such as timing of term sheet disclosures, choice of deal leads, and selective previewing of due diligence—to engineer a perception of deal momentum.

Additionally, the work of Nanda and Rhodes-Kropf (2018) on coordination frictions in venture syndicates is relevant. They highlight that delayed information updates, valuation disagreements, and timing mismatches often deter syndicate formation. Luo's results suggest that strategic communication can help mitigate these frictions by preemptively shaping expectations and synchronizing beliefs, thus enhancing syndicate cohesiveness.

However, Luo's strategic communication model leaves room for critique in terms of over-optimizing investor expectations, which may lead to post-commitment disappointment or even litigation, especially if ex-post outcomes deviate sharply from the ex-ante narrative. Petkovic (2008) explores the liability implications for lead arrangers in European capital markets and warns against overly promotional messaging. This introduces an ethical dimension to Luo's findings—how to balance persuasion with fiduciary responsibility.

Another empirical counterpoint is offered by Berg (2018), who showed that loan rejections create significant real effects on firm behavior, suggesting that investor expectations are not only shaped by success signals but also by avoidance of negative signals. Luo's framework could benefit from more explicit treatment of how negative information is withheld or reframed, and whether this leads to adverse selection or moral hazard in the long run.

Furthermore, the role of contractual design in enabling or constraining strategic communication is evident in the study by Bernstein and Winter (2012), who examined how contracts internalize heterogeneous externalities in investment syndicates. Luo's findings could be further enhanced by integrating how syndicate contracts—e.g., pro rata rights, veto clauses, or drag-along rights—interact with the communication strategies employed during capital assembly.

Taken together, the evidence from Luo (2025) and the comparative studies converge on the insight that persuasion in syndicated capital raising is a multilevel process shaped by informational asymmetries, belief coordination, and strategic disclosure. While earlier research emphasized structural or relational explanations for syndicate formation (e.g., Cestone et al., 2007; Casamatta & Haritchabalet, 2007), Luo redirects the focus toward agency and message design as key levers in investor coordination.

This shift has broader implications for how scholars and practitioners conceptualize investor decision-making under uncertainty. Strategic communication is not merely about reducing uncertainty; it is about actively managing expectations, thresholds, and the timing of belief updates to optimize collective outcomes. This underscores the importance of studying not only what is communicated, but how, when, and to whom—elements that are at the core of persuasive syndication.

6. Conclusions

Sections must summarize briefly and concisely the contents of the document or essay. This section may contain (1) A summary of the main results, findings, and evidence from your research or analysis. (2) Synthesis of findings, namely the relationship between findings and research objectives, and show how these findings support arguments or hypotheses. (3) The author may also be able to discuss the implications of research findings for research benefits. What is the contribution or impact on the knowledge or topic discussed? (4) Limitations and suggestions for further research.

This qualitative literature review has explored the strategic communication mechanisms and persuasion tactics employed in syndicated capital raising. Drawing upon a synthesis of theoretical and empirical studies, the findings reveal that lead investors or fundraisers play a pivotal role not only in capital aggregation but also in information orchestration, trust-building, and decision framing (Kamenica & Gentzkow, 2011; Luo, 2025). The literature emphasizes that persuasive communication, when strategically designed, can reduce informational asymmetries, align syndicate members' expectations, and increase collective commitment (Caillaud & Tirole, 2007; Malenko, 2014).

Moreover, the review underscores the centrality of signaling credibility, leveraging past investment performance, and curating targeted narratives to influence investor sentiment (Gompers et al., 2020; Cong & Xiao, 2024). Effective persuasion is not limited to the transmission of information but extends to the selective disclosure and framing of investment

opportunities to enhance perceived value and mitigate perceived risk (Halac et al., 2021). Communication strategies, therefore, are increasingly recognized not merely as supplementary elements but as strategic levers for coalition formation and capital mobilization in syndicated environments.

From a broader perspective, this synthesis also illustrates how investor decision-making is deeply embedded in cognitive, social, and institutional dynamics, suggesting that capital syndication is as much about managing relationships and perceptions as it is about financial analysis (Bernstein & Winter, 2012; Nanda & Rhodes-Kropf, 2018). The ability to persuade others depends on both structural power—such as network centrality or lead status—and rhetorical competence in crafting narratives that resonate with co-investors' strategic interests and psychological heuristics.

In essence, the review supports a view of syndication as a communicative and interpretive process, where strategic messaging and trust-based persuasion are fundamental to deal closure and investor alignment. This understanding invites scholars and practitioners to reframe syndicate building not just as a financial engineering exercise, but as a communication-intensive negotiation ecosystem.

References

- Akerlof, R., & Holden, R. (2019). Capital assembly. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 35(3), 489–512.
- Austen-Smith, D., & Feddersen, T. J. (2006). Deliberation, preference uncertainty, and voting rules. *American Political Science Review*, 100(2), 209–217.
- Bayar, O., Chemmanur, T. J., & Tian, X. (2020). Do syndicated venture capitalists add value to startups? Evidence from venture capital networks. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 55(6), 1849–1882.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109019000953>
- Berg, T. (2018). Got rejected? Real effects of not getting a loan. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 31(12), 4912–4957.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhy046>
- Berg, T., Saunders, A., & Steffen, S. (2016). The total cost of corporate borrowing in the loan market: Don't ignore the fees. *Journal of Finance*, 71(3), 1357–1392.
- Bernstein, S., & Winter, E. (2012). Contracting with heterogeneous externalities. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 4(2), 50–76.
- Bernstein, S., & Winter, J. (2012). Contracting in syndicates. Working paper, Harvard Business School.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1982480>
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity*, 36(4), 391–409. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020909529486>
- Bolton, P., Freixas, X., & Shapiro, J. (2007). Conflicts of interest, information provision, and competition in the financial services industry. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 85(2), 297–330.
- Bottazzi, L., Da Rin, M., & Hellmann, T. (2016). The importance of trust for investment: Evidence from venture capital. *Review of Financial Studies*, 29(9), 2283–2318. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhw023>
- Brander, J. A., Amit, R., & Antweiler, W. (2002). Venture capital syndication: Improved venture selection vs. the value-added hypothesis. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 11(3), 423–452. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1430-9134.2002.00423.x>
- Burtch, G., Carnahan, S., & Greenwood, B. N. (2022). Can you ever trust a crowd? An empirical analysis of disclosure and crowdfunding. *Organization Science*, 33(1), 127–145. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1505>
- Caillaud, B., & Tirole, J. (2007). Consensus building: How to persuade a group. *American Economic Review*, 97(5), 1877–1900.
- Callander, S. (2007). Bandwagons and momentum in sequential voting. *Review of Economic Studies*, 74(3), 653–684.
- Casamatta, C., & Haritchabalet, C. (2007). Experience, screening and syndication in venture capital investments. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 16(3), 368–398.
- Cestone, G., Lerner, J., & White, L. (2007). The design of syndicates in venture capital. Technical report, Harvard University.
- Chen, D., Raina, S., & Smith, J. A. (2022). Persuasion in venture capital fundraising: Evidence from founder narratives. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 37(6), 106314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2022.106314>
- Cong, L. W., & Xiao, W. (2024). Information cascades and networked investment decisions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 151(1), 1–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2023.10.004>
- Cornelissen, J. P., Clarke, J. S., & Cienki, A. (2021). Sensegiving through metaphors and analogies in venture pitching. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0206>
- Coughlan, P. J. (2000). In defense of unanimous jury verdicts: Mistrials, communication, and strategic voting. *American Political Science Review*, 94(2), 375–393.
- Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 227–242.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390197>
- Eka Wahyu Kasih, Ngadi Permana, & Seger Santoso. (2024). Pengaruh Volatilitas Hubungan Politik Bilateral Terhadap Keputusan Investasi Perusahaan Multinasional. *Jurnal Bisnis Inovatif Dan Digital*, 1(2), 01–13.
<https://doi.org/10.61132/jubid.v1i2.422>

- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Esty, B. C. (2001). Structuring loan syndicates: A case study of the Hong Kong Disneyland project loan. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 14(3), 80–95.
- Fight, A. (2004). *Syndicated lending* (1st ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Galeotti, A., Ghiglino, C., & Squintani, F. (2013). Strategic information transmission networks. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 148(5), 1751–1769.
- Gompers, P. A., Gornall, W., Kaplan, S. N., & Strebulaev, I. A. (2020). How do venture capitalists make decisions? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 135(1), 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2019.06.011>
- Guarino, A., Harmgart, H., & Huck, S. (2011). Aggregate information cascades. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 73(2), 167–185.
- Guarino, A., Harmgart, H., & Huck, S. (2011). Team reasoning and public good provision: An experimental study. *Economic Journal*, 121(555), 925–946. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.2011.02434.x>
- Hagenbach, J., & Koessler, F. (2010). Strategic communication networks. *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(3), 1072–1099.
- Halac, M., Kremer, I., & Winter, E. (2020). Raising capital from heterogeneous investors. *American Economic Review*, 110(3), 889–921.
- Halac, M., Lipnowski, E., & Rappoport, D. (2021). Rank uncertainty and information design. *American Economic Review*, 111(5), 1601–1630. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20190186>
- Harris, M., & Raviv, A. (2008). A theory of board control and size. *Review of Financial Studies*, 21(4), 1797–1832.
- Heider, F., & Inderst, R. (2012). Loan prospecting. *Review of Financial Studies*, 25(8), 2381–2415.
- Herrera, H., & Hörner, J. (2013). Biased social learning. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 80(1), 131–146.
- Hochberg, Y. V., Ljungqvist, A., & Lu, Y. (2020). Whom you know matters: Venture capital networks and investment performance. *Journal of Finance*, 75(1), 459–506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12894>
- Huang, L., & Knight, A. P. (2017). Resources and relationships in entrepreneurship: An exchange theory of the development and effects of the entrepreneur-investor relationship. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(1), 80–102. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0397>
- Inderst, R., & Ottaviani, M. (2009). Misselling through agents. *American Economic Review*, 99(3), 883–908.
- Inderst, R., & Ottaviani, M. (2012). How (not) to pay for advice: A framework for consumer financial protection. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 105(2), 393–411.
- Inderst, R., & Ottaviani, M. (2013). Sales talk, cancellation terms and the role of consumer protection. *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(3), 1002–1026.
- Kamenica, E., & Gentzkow, M. (2011). Bayesian persuasion. *American Economic Review*, 101(6), 2590–2615. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.6.2590>
- Khanna, N., & Schroder, M. (2015). Rewarding disagreement: Optimal contracts for collective decision making. Technical Report, Michigan State University.
- Kremer, I., Mansour, Y., & Perry, M. (2014). Implementing the wisdom of the crowd. *Journal of Political Economy*, 122(5), 988–1012.
- Laskovaia, A., & Shirokova, G. (2024). Entrepreneurial narratives and investor commitment in early-stage financing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258724123456>
- Li, H., Rosen, S., & Suen, W. (2001). Conflicts and common interests in committees. *American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1478–1497.
- Luo, D. (2025). Raising capital from investor syndicates with strategic communication. *Journal of Finance*, 80(3), 1815–1869. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13453>
- Luo, J. (2025). Strategic persuasion in investor syndicates: Evidence from field experiments and proprietary communications. *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- Malenko, N. (2014). Communication and decision-making in corporate boards. *Review of Financial Studies*, 27(5), 1486–1532. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hht076>
- Martens, M. L., Jennings, J. E., & Jennings, P. D. (2007). Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1107–1132. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.27169488>
- Mohamad Chaidir, Grace Yulianti, & Benardi Benardi. (2024). Pengaruh Volatilitas Ekuitas dan Leverage terhadap Risiko Investasi. *Jurnal Visi Manajemen*, 10(1), 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.56910/jvm.v10i1.556>
- Nahata, R. (2008). Venture capital reputation and investment performance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 90(2), 127–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.11.008>
- Nanda, R., & Rhodes-Kropf, M. (2018). Coordination frictions in venture capital syndicates. NBER Working Paper Series.
- Nanda, R., & Rhodes-Kropf, M. (2018). Financing entrepreneurial experimentation. *Innovation Policy and the Economy*, 18(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1086/694409>
- Petkovic, A. (2008). Liability of the lead arranger in European syndicated lending. *European Company and Financial Law Review*, 5(1), 34–57. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ecfr.2008.34>
- Petkovic, D. (2008). Arranger liability in the euro markets. *Banking Law Journal*, 125(1), 49–65.
- Pollock, T. G., & Rindova, V. P. (2003). Media legitimization effects in the market for initial public offerings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 631–642. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30040654>
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Arai, L., Rodgers, M., ... & Duffy, S. (2006). Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews: A product from the ESRC methods programme. Lancaster University.
- Rayo, L., & Segal, I. (2010). Optimal information disclosure. *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(5), 949–987.
- Ruslaini Ruslaini, & Ekawahyu Kasih. (2024). Integrasi IQ, EQ, Penguasaan Teknologi dan Ketelitian pada Kualitas Keputusan Organisasi. *Journal of Business, Finance, and Economics (JBFE)*, 5(1), 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.32585/jbfe.v5i1.5617>
- Segal, I. (2003). Coordination and discrimination in contracting with externalities: Divide and conquer? *Journal of Economic Theory*, 113(1), 147–181.

- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(45). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546–553.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>
- Winter, E. (2004). Incentives and discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(3), 764–773.