Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Business and Policy Studies
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

The Impact of Capital Structure on the Firm Performance Across Industries

Boru Lei

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China
20050914d@connect.polyu.hk

Abstract: The objective of the paper is to discuss the impact of capital structure on corporate performance across the real estate, manufacturing, retail, technology, and pharmaceutical industries. Capital structure can be referred as the firm's mix of debt, equity, and internal financing used to fund operations and growth. Due to the uniqueness in the characteristics of the industries' capital intensiveness, investment cycle, and type of asset that shapes their financing requirements and propensity for risk, firms showcase different capital structure preferences. Capital-intensive industries, like real estate and manufacturing, are generally dependent on debt financing to manage high upfront costs and long investment cycles. In contrast, retail firms, since their investment cycles are generally far shorter and have far lower capital requirements, have typically adopted conservative capital structures. Equity financing is favored by technology firms because of the nature of the intangible assets in the business and the huge growth potential at an early stage. The mature ones borrow, taking leverage from stable cash flows. At the initial stages, pharmaceutical companies, due to high research and development costs, are more inclined towards equity financing and resort to debt in later stages. This paper deals with these sectors regarding their balance between debt and equity financing, taking cognizance that capital structure is a determinant for performance and sustainability in the long term.

Keywords: Capital Structure, Corporate Performance, Industry Financing Preferences.

1. Introduction

Capital structure is the internal mix of debt-equity finance that a firm deploys in funding its operations and growth. The implications of capital structure differ across industries, as each industry has a set of unique characteristics that impact its need for capital. Capital-intensive industries, such as real estate or manufacturing, are typically characterized by a long investment cycle, high upfront costs, and cyclic demand. These industries are highly amenable to debt financing. Other industries, such as retail, would exhibit a completely different set of financing needs with a much shorter investment cycle.

Ever since the capital structure literature was truly born with the seminal work of Modigliani and Miller in the 1950s, establishing the basic theory that, under given assumptions, capital structure is a matter of indifference and does not affect firm value, the literature on capital structure has evolved considerably [1]. Subsequently, real-world evidence proved that capital structure indeed matters and that different factors at the market level, industry, and firm-specific level drive the financing choice

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

of a firm. Studies by Titman and Wessels emphasize the role of asset tangibility and firm size in determining leverage levels, while other research highlights the influence of macroeconomic conditions, taxation, and firm risk profiles on financing choices [2]. For example, according to Harris and Raviv, the consensus is that "leverage increases with fixed assets, nondebt tax shields, investment opportunities, and firm size and decreases with volatility, advertising expenditure, the probability of bankruptcy, profitability and uniqueness of the product" [3]. Ultimately, the choice of capital structure reflects a trade-off between debt's tax advantages and the associated costs of bankruptcy and agency [4].

There are also some cases in practice that show us how capital structure could influence firm performance. Huawei constitutes its capital mainly using equity for flexibility, considering the radical innovation cycle and intellectual dependence of the industry. In contrast, Evergrande, a real estate giant in China, liberally used debt to finance its extensive property development projects, leading to a liquidity crisis when the market soured. These highlight how capital structure decisions have deeply impacted companies, especially for those industries that have a high linkage to market cycles, an external shock, or even economic cyclicality.

The relationship between capital structure and firm performance in different industries is important, particularly in an era of growing concern for firm performance. This paper tries to find out how capital structure influences firm performance within a wide array of industries: real estate, manufacturing, retail, technology, and pharmaceuticals. By comparing similarities and differences in capital structures across these sectors, this paper aims to offer insight into how firms could make better financing choices to optimize performance, reduce risks, and achieve sustainability in the long run.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the second part describes various capital structures in the Real Estate/Manufacturing area, the third part stresses the capital structures in the Retailing companies, the fourth part reviews the capital structure of the Tech companies, the fifth part looks at the capital structure of the Pharmaceutical companies and the final part sums up the paper.

2. Capital Structure in Real Estate & Manufacturing

Capital structure can, in both real estate and manufacturing industries, have a wide influence on firm performance due to long investment cycles and capital intensity. Most industries in this category require high up-front costs and large financing needs, where access to debt financing is quite appealing. However, while leverage creates the potential for greater returns, it also presents significant risks, particularly during economic fluctuations or periods of reduced demand.

Both of these industries represent very long investment cycles where large amounts of capital are usually bound to assets that cannot be liquidated or repurposed in the short term. That is particularly true in real estate, specifically in real property development, where there is a great deal more upfront expenditure without the capacity to recuperate fast. Manufacturing firms, too, spend a lot on machinery, plant infrastructure, and equipment, with long depreciation periods and a slow turnover in capital. These long cycles are such that firms need to be able to raise adequate patient funds to be in operation with as small financing costs as possible.

The common characteristics make the two industries both tend to be highly leveraged, with a significant reliance on debt financing. In real estate, firms rely heavily on debt to finance the acquisition and development of properties. The real estate market is often volatile, subject to market fluctuations, interest rate changes, and varying demand. Thus, real estate firms may use debt to transfer some risks from equity holders to creditors, but they are also exposed to financial risk if asset values decline or if they fail to meet debt obligations during market downturns. Similarly, manufacturing firms, although somewhat less reliant on debt than real estate firms, still tend to carry significant debt to finance capital expenditures on machinery and technology. According to

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

Modigliani & Miller, firms that utilize debt can benefit from tax shields and low interest rates, but they also face the challenge of maintaining sufficient cash flows to meet their debt obligations [1].

The impact of capital structure on firms' performance is two-sided. On one hand, firms with higher dependency on debt usually have more access to cheaper capital and more funds to expand or invest. On the other hand, firms with higher debt-to-equity ratio also face greater risks, particularly when they are unable to generate consistent cash flows, while firms with a conservative capital structure are usually less vulnerable to external shocks.

Both industries also face unique challenges regarding their capital structure decisions. For example, the long investment cycles in these sectors mean that firms must manage debt carefully. Excessive leverage increases vulnerability during economic downfalls, while too little debt hinders the expansion or pursuit of new opportunities [3]. Furthermore, both real estate and manufacturing firms also have a cyclic risk because demand has quite frequently depended on the state of the general economy. Hence, a flexible and balanced capital structure is important for long-term survivability and profitability.

In summary, capital structure in long-cycle, asset-heavy industries like real estate and manufacturing is inextricably linked with firm performance, with leverage providing opportunities for growth but also yielding the risk of financial distress.

3. Capital Structure in Retailing

Retailing, being a short cycle and a light-asset industry, has capital structure characteristics that are different from those typical of capital-intensive industries. In general, retail companies depend less on fixed capital investment and more on flexibility in operations, inventory management, and external finances provided as trade credit [5]. Given the characteristics of the industry investment cycles, low capital intensity, and heavy dependence on consumer demand, firms typically have a low level of debt ratio.

Companies tend to be more conservative in their attitudes toward borrowing in retailing than in capital-intensive industries. Because the retail industry is largely free of giant fixed investments in facilities and heavy equipment, the long-term capital requirements of retail firms tend to be less than those of nonretail firms. They are relatively dependent upon working capital and inventory financing for day-to-day operations, which allows them to hold relatively low leverage ratios and flexible capital structures. Moreover, retail firms are more sensitive to customer preference changes and economic cycles, whereby there could be great volatility in revenue and profitability in the short run. And such high volatility has also made them less eager to borrow large amounts of debt.

The capital structure decision in retailing influences firm performance directly regarding financial stability, operational flexibility, and growth potential. A well-balanced capital structure avoids excessive leverage that could facilitate the ability of retail firms to respond to volatile market conditions and shifts in consumer preference. This is because the retail industry is quite sensitive to changes in uncontrolled macroeconomic factors, seasons, and fluctuations in consumers' spending. For instance, during economic booms, firms may borrow to finance new store openings, product line extensions, and advertising campaigns to stimulate consumer demand. However, in downturns, the demand for liquidity becomes stronger, and firms with low levels of debt tend to perform better since they are in a better position to sustain periods of low demand or sliding sales [6].

The cost of capital reflects how the capital structure affects the performance of the firms. Firms with high levels of debt enjoy the tax shield associated with debt financing in the competitive retail markets, hence, the cost of capital and profitability [7]. However, this gain is often offset by the risks of the financial leverage itself, which are adverse and profound, especially for those firms whose earnings are volatile or highly competitive. On the other hand, less indebted retailers may have to bear a higher cost of capital, though they would be in a better position to enjoy greater financial

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

stability and flexibility. The important trade-off between risk and return will be considered in exploring how capital structure affects performance in the retail sector.

In summary, capital structure assumes such importance in the performance of retail companies that it impinges upon the financial stability, operational flexibility, and prospects for growth of the firm. Retail companies have to balance the trade-off of the advantages of debt finance, namely, tax shields and access to capital, against the risk of financial distress and reduced flexibility.

4. Capital Structure in Technology

The technology sector's rapid velocity, high rate of innovation, and reliance on intangible assets mark it as dissimilar from traditional industries in its capital structure characteristics. Unlike capital-intensive sectors, such as manufacturing or real estate, technology firms usually have a low level of physical investment in assets and thus engender different financing requirements. Whereas other sectors usually invest much in fixed assets, such as machinery or real estate, technology firms basically invest in research and development (R&D), intellectual property (IP), software, and talent. Those characteristics drive their capital structure in terms of how much debt they take on, how they manage equity, and how they fund innovation and growth.

Technology companies are considered to have unlimited growth and are often found to be adopting very aggressive funding strategies in the initial days of operation. Most technology companies start their life cycle with venture capital (VC) or private equity funding; in a bid to retain maximum flexibility and control, they avoid debt and instead use equity financing [8]. Typically, venture capitalists invest capital for equity and allow companies to grow without taking on the risks associated with debt.

A major distinguishing feature of the capital structure of technology firms is the use of equity financing instead of debt. This primarily arises from the uncertainty and volatility characteristic of technology markets. In the initial stages, technology firms are faced with unpredictable cash flow and high risks, making it extremely difficult for the firm to service the debt. Titman and Wessels in their study also report that when the future cash flow of the company is unstable or at high risk, the managers may want to avoid signaling negatively to the market and hence prefer equity financing [2]. Furthermore, technology companies have high intangible assets in the form of patents, software, and R&D, which usually are not accepted as collaterals for traditional debt financing. Due to this fact, equity financing seems more suitable for these companies in the form of venture capital or public offerings.

Nevertheless, as technology firms grow and mature, they may start adding debt to their capital structure in order to take advantage of low interest rates. Debt financing is a worthwhile option for technology firms because of its tax advantages and because firms can leverage increasing cash flows to fund further expansion without diluting equity. However, technology firms seem to be very wary of excessive leverage. Because of the high-speed nature and the time of rapid technological change, most of the technology firms prefer to have a low ratio of debt. This kind of conservative approach avoids the financial distress related to product failures, alterations in market demand, and other exogenous shocks [9].

The factor that may influence the impact of capital structure on the performance of technology firms is the risk-return trade-off indigenous within the industry. As technology firms are usually burdened with high volatility and uncertainty, debt amplifies both returns and risks. While indebtedness on one side increases profitability owing to low interest rates and leveraged financing for expansion, too much debt is never good considering its contribution to financial distress from the thin cash flows that might not withstand competition, market saturation, or the pressures of regulatory changes.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

In summary, the capital structure in the technology industry is affected by the features of this very industry: high growth potential, dependence on intangible assets, and rapid changes in technology. Early-stage firms rely more on equity financing in order not to assume a lot of risks, while mature firms can include debt in their capital structure for optimization in order to finance their expansion.

5. Capital Structure in Pharmaceutical

The healthcare and pharmaceutical industries are characterized by high capital needs involving research and development (R&D), regulatory compliance, and infrastructures while presenting enormous market risks and uncertainties [10]. Many firms operating in the health and pharmaceutical business work in a highly regulated environment in which success lies not only in innovative products and services but also in liaison with government departments. As a result, the capital structure of a healthcare or pharmaceutical company might be determined by a combination of the intensity of intangible assets, the protracted cycle of product development, and cash flow which determines whether to resort to more debts or equity financing.

In the pharmaceutical industry, capital structure choices are closely linked to the nature of the product development: very lengthy and uncertain R&D with considerable upfront investment. Typically, it takes upwards of ten-plus years to bring a drug to market and involves huge financial investments in areas such as clinical trials, regulatory approvals, and large-scale manufacturing facilities [11]. Due to the high degree of investment involved and the risks accompanying it, pharmaceutical firms very often employ equity financing, especially in the early stages, to avoid risks that come with taking on debt. Once equity is taken on early, these companies will have greater flexibility and avoid the onus of carrying debt during costly and uncertain periods of R&D. Once a pharmaceutical company reaches a more advanced stage, particularly after a successful drug has been brought to market or when a company begins to generate steady cash flow, the capital structure may evolve to include debt financing.

The most significant effect of capital structure on firm performance is the trade-off between risk and return. For pharmaceutical firms, debt amplifies returns when the cash flows are good. However, high leverage significantly raises the risk of financial distress if things go bad. Industries in this field - with their long product development cycles and high fixed costs - are particularly risky to leverage if expected returns from new products or services do not come through as planned.

In the pharmaceutical industry, firms with relatively low levels of debt can be quite flexible in financing R&D or clinical trials of new therapies. Those firms not constrained either by covenants or payments of interest on debt can easily change expenditures on promising projects. A solid equity base provides flexibility that enables firms to take risks and invest in breakthrough drugs and leads to many significant performance benefits in the case of the success of the new product. The findings by Lee & Choi showed that debt ratios negatively influence R&D investment because a firm that is exposed to financial risk is always conservative in making R&D investments because of a lack of liquidity [12].

In summary, the optimal capital structure is a balance between debt and equity that allows firms to leverage growth opportunities while setting the firm at a low risk of financial failure.

6. Conclusion

In brief, capital structure is the major determinant of firm performance across varied industries. Their characteristics are native to real estate, manufacturing, retailing, technology, and Pharmaceuticals and are wide-ranging, from capital use intensity to cycle length, which affects common leverage ratios in industries.

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/172/2025.22177

Where real estate and manufacturing are concerned, long investment cycles with long capital requirements mark the basic nature of these sectors. In both types of industries, the attractiveness of using debt financing is equally strong. Firms need to raise abundant funds that can be sustained over time to meet high capital investment with long paybacks, and this frequently involves leveraging debt. Though debt leverage amplifies returns, it places firms at risk for large losses, particularly in economic declines.

On the contrary, Retailing represents a light-asset, short-cycle industry where firms face different challenges. Retailers are bound to get more conservative capital structures since their investment cycles are short and less intensive in terms of asset requirements.

Another industry that has different capital structure dynamics is the technology sector. Because this industry is highly full of intangible assets, such as intellectual property and research and development, most technology firms, at an early stage of operation, would prefer equity financing to avoid the risks of debt. When the firms are mature, and their cash flows are more predictable, debt can be added to capture lower interest rates that finance further growth.

The pharmaceutical industry is one in which capital structure is strongly driven by the intensity of advanced investments in research and development. This long, mostly uncertain product development cycle implies that firms tend to use equity financing in their early stages of operation in order to avoid the risks of debt. Once a company attains a steady cash flow, debt can then be used strategically to fund further growth and expansion.

While capital structure is no doubt important in all industries, the consequences of this on firm performance would be different with respect to characteristics of industry investment cycles, asset structure, and volatility of revenue streams. Firms should adopt capital structures that best suit them and balance advantages from debt against risks that may possibly affect their long-term financial stability and growth. This balance is essential for achieving optimized performance and ensuring sustainable success within a dynamically competitive market environment.

References

[1] *Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance and the Theory of Investment. The American Economic Review, 48(3), 261-297.*

[2] *Titman, S., & Wessels, R. (1988). The determinants of capital structure. Journal of Finance, 43(1), 1-19.*

[3] *Harris, M., & Raviv, A. (1991). The theory of capital structure. Journal of Finance, 46(1), 297-355.*

[4] *Miao, J. (2005). Optimal capital structure and industry dynamics. Journal of Finance, 60(6), 2621-2659.*

[5] *Cachon, G. P., & Terwiesch, C. (2009). Matching supply with demand: An introduction to operations management (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.*

[6] *CrowdStreet. (n.d.). Understanding recession-resistant retail. Retrieved from https://www.crowdstreet.com/resources/properties-perspectives/understanding-recession-resistant-retail/*

[7] *Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1963). Corporate income taxes and the cost of capital: A correction. American Economic Review, 53(3), 433-443.*

[8] *Minola, T., Cassia, L., & Criaco, G. (2013). Financing patterns in new technology-based firms: An extension of the pecking order theory. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business, 25(2), 212–233.*

[9] *Kedzior, M., Grabinska, B., Grabinski, K., & Kedzior, D. (2020). Capital structure choices in technology firms: Empirical results from Polish listed companies. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 13(9), 221.*

[10] *Scherer, F. M. (2000). The pharmaceutical industry. In Handbook of Health Economics (Vol. 1, pp. 1297–1336). Elsevier.*

[11] *DiMasi, J. A., Hansen, R. W., & Grabowski, H. G. (2003). The price of innovation: New estimates of drug development costs. Journal of Health Economics, 22(2), 151–185.*

[12] *Lee, M. J., & Choi, M. K. (2015). The Determinants of Research and Development Investment in the Pharmaceutical Industry: Focus on Financial Structures. Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives, 6(5), 302-309.*