UDC 33 **DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.99.54.064**

Business Administration: Research on Equity Financing Strategies and Corporate Growth of Technological Innovation Enterprises

Qiu Xiangyao

Post-doctoral Researcher,
Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov,
119234, 1 ter. Leninskie Gory, Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: 1789840678@qq.com

Abstract

Equity finance plays a pivotal role in shaping how technology-intensive ventures create, appropriate, and scale economic as well as knowledge value. By examining 218 firms operating in six technology subsectors between 2018 and 2023 and by conducting seventeen embedded case studies, this inquiry disentangles the mechanisms through which alternative equity structures influence heterogeneous growth paths. The evidence demonstrates that milestone-driven, sequential financing programmes accelerate revenue expansion by 27.8 per cent and employee growth by 34.2 per cent relative to single-round strategies. Conversely, ventures that welcome domain-specialised strategic investors achieve a 3.4-fold improvement in R&D productivity compared with companies funded chiefly by financial investors. Cluster analysis reveals four archetypal patterns—Rapid Scalers, Innovation Focusers, Balanced Developers, and Conservative Growers—each associated with distinct performance profiles and dilution dynamics. Beyond capital provision, investor expertise alignment, governance architecture, and capital-deployment tempo emerge as high-leverage variables shaping innovation output, market expansion velocity, and the durability of competitive advantage. These findings refine corporate-finance theory by specifying contingencies and mediation channels and furnish entrepreneurs with empirically grounded guidance for tailoring financing tactics to their technological domain, life-cycle stage, and strategic aspirations.

For citation

Qiu Xiangyao (2025) Business Administration: Research on Equity Financing Strategies and Corporate Growth of Technological Innovation Enterprises. *Ekonomika: vchera, segodnya, zavtra* [Economics: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow], 15 (6A), pp. 645-654. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.99.54.064

Keywords

Equity financing; corporate growth; technological innovation; venture capital; strategic investment; financing strategy; innovation capacity; growth metrics.

Introduction

Technological innovation enterprises sit at the crux of rapid knowledge creation, uncertain market adoption, and volatile competitive landscapes. Capital structures that would appear unremarkable in conventional manufacturing can exert outsized, asymmetric effects on the trajectory of a software platform, a genomic therapy, or a hydrogen-storage start-up. Scholarship has probed discrete instruments—venture capital, corporate venture capital, angel syndication, or public-market flotation—yet often in isolation, thereby overlooking how hybrid or staged combinations of these instruments mould multidimensional growth [Zacharakis, Shepherd, 2021]. Simultaneously, the construct of "corporate growth" has expanded from simple revenue curves toward layered indicators: innovation throughput, intangible-asset accumulation, organisational learning elasticity, and ecosystem position [Sapienza, Manigart, Vermeir, 2016]. While resource-based views stress factor endowments, dynamic-capability perspectives underscore the redeployment, recombination, and rapid reconfiguration of those resources once acquired [Park, Steensma, 2019]. Capital-intensive technological ventures live and die by the calibre of the equity they attract, yet orthodox finance theory still treats equity as a fungible commodity rather than a strategic design parameter. Recent meta-analyses reveal that the same absolute cheque size can either catalyse or cripple growth depending on contractual tempo, governance covenants and investor knowledge complementarity [Nanda, Rhodes-Kropf, 2018]. A founder who accepts a single, undifferentiated round at a lofty valuation may celebrate headline dilution today only to discover tomorrow that the board lacks the scientific depth to shepherd clinical trials or the distribution muscle to unlock late-stage markets [Hellmann, Puri, 2020]. Conversely, an entrepreneur who sequences smaller tranches tied to verifiable milestones may trade near-term ownership for a stepwise de-risking path that maximises option value at exit [Park, Steensma, 2019]. These divergent outcomes signal that *how* equity is architected matters as much as *how much* equity is raised.

Scholars have long invoked the resource-based view to explain performance heterogeneity, positing that firms secure advantage by commanding valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable assets. Yet financial capital rarely ticks all four boxes; almost any venture can, in principle, access money. What distinguishes superior financing strategies is their capacity to import *embedded knowledge*—technical, regulatory, relational—that is not reproducible through cash alone [Manigart, Baeyens, Van Hyfte, 2017]. Strategic corporate investors epitomise this logic. When a diagnostics start-up recruits an established medical-device manufacturer as shareholder, it receives, in codependence with capital, tacit production expertise and a pre-vetted distribution lattice that would otherwise take years to assemble [Guerini, Quas, 2018]. In biotechnology, where epistemic opacity and regulatory drag are endemic, such knowledge infusion short-circuits the notorious "valley of death" between discovery and first-in-human studies [Ferriani, Garnsey, Lorenzoni, 2019]. Our data confirm a 3.4-fold lift in R&D productivity under predominantly strategic syndicates—evidence that knowledge-rich capital behaves more like an enabling resource than a simple financial input.

Macro-economic liquidity cycles add further texture. During frothy windows—2000, 2015 and 2021, for instance—venture capital inflows overshoot historical trendlines, bidding up valuations and compressing diligence horizons [Croce, Martí, Murtinu, 2020]. Empirically, we observe that start-ups accepting exuberant term-sheets in these periods often face a *post-euphoria hangover*: subsequent down-round risk, investor-founder misalignment, and a governance gridlock triggered by over-protective anti-dilution clauses. Conversely, ventures financed in capital-scarce epochs display more granular milestone architectures and tighter board monitoring, which, paradoxically, correlate with higher survivorship seven years out [Drover et al., 2017]. These patterns amplify the case for viewing

financing strategy as a dynamic capability—an organisational skill in timing, structuring and sequencing capital in concert with exogenous cycles [Sapienza, Manigart, Vermeir, 2016].

Jurisdictional idiosyncrasies compound these temporal effects. In the United States, dual-class share structures and permissive evergreen funds grant founders extended strategic horizon, whereas European prudential regimes constrain protective provisions, nudging ventures toward earlier strategic partnerships [Lerner, Nanda, 2020]. East Asian ecosystems, characterised by conglomerate-led keiretsu and chaebol architectures, embed corporate venturing within broader alliance portfolios that conflate equity with supply-chain entrenchment [Croce, Martí, Murtinu, 2020]. Our panel traverses eighteen nations and documents how ventures arbitrage these regulatory asymmetries: Singaporean robotics firms court Japanese manufacturing investors for credibility in ISO-orientated tenders, while Nordic clean-tech start-ups leverage trans-Atlantic special purpose acquisition companies (SPACs) to bypass domestic IPO thresholds. Such strategic arbitrage accentuates the salience of *geofinancial literacy*—the ability to choreograph capital across borders, exploiting differential listing rules, tax incentives and disclosure standards [Zacharakis, Shepherd, 2021].

A second theoretical lacuna concerns *capital-deployment velocity*. Classic pecking-order theory implies that cash is king and sticky; yet empirical evidence from software as a service (SaaS) cohorts shows that ventures hoarding war-chests without congruent absorption capacity underperform peers that deploy money in lockstep with validated learning cycles [Chemmanur, Krishnan, Nandy, 2018]. Excess capital can inflate acquisition costs, erode pricing discipline and encourage premature scaling—symptoms of what Nanda and Rhodes-Kropf term "hot-market myopia" [Croce, Martí, Murtinu, 2020]. Our findings corroborate and nuance this argument: while rapid spend correlates positively with market-share capture in winner-take-most arenas (e.g., social gaming), the same haste is outright deleterious in science-based hardware domains where regulatory sequencing dictates pace. The implication is that optimal deployment velocity is *contingent* on technology complexity and clock-speed of competitive rivalry.

Third, equity strategy intersects with human capital in subtle, recursive ways. Board composition not only disciplines managerial behaviour; it also influences the venture's attractiveness to *next-round* investors and key hires. Data scientists and senior engineers increasingly evaluate cap-table hygiene when choosing employers: opaque preference stacks or ratchet-laden terms erode perceived upside and moral tenor. Thus, financing design reverberates through the talent market, shaping the very absorptive capacity it sought to augment [Adams, Bessant, Phelps, 2021]. Paradoxically, founders fixated on minimising dilution often undermine their ability to recruit the specialised labour needed to exploit fresh capital efficiently.

Three gaps merit attention. First, qualitative aspects of financing—timing, governance rights, investor complementarity—remain under-specified relative to headline ticket size or valuation [Nanda, Rhodes-Kropf, 2018]. Second, little theory integrates how optimal structures mutate across gestation, break-even, and pre-exit phases, nor how technology-domain idiosyncrasies moderate such evolution [Manigart, Baeyens, Van Hyfte, 2017]. Third, the relation between equity infusion and innovative output is paradoxically documented as both catalytic and constraining, depending on the study design, suggesting missing mediator variables such as strategic alignment or knowledge transfer [Lerner, Nanda, 2020; Hsu, 2016; Hellmann, Puri, 2020]. To add complexity, the rise of corporate and ecosystem-oriented investors has blurred the line between strategic and financial motives, and globalisation has introduced jurisdiction-specific patterns of investor protection, board entrenchment, and listing thresholds [Guerini, Quas, 2018; Ferriani, Garnsey, Lorenzoni, 2019].

Against this backdrop, the present research develops an integrative framework linking investor

attributes, contractual provisions, and capital-deployment rhythms to distinct dimensions of growth. Mixed-methods analysis tests the framework, producing guidance for founders and policymakers seeking to match financing blueprints with innovation intensity, market turbulence, and competitive pressure.

Materials

A convergent mixed-methods design combined a longitudinal financial panel with qualitative process tracing. The quantitative backbone comprises 218 firms distributed across enterprise software (47), biotechnology (35), advanced manufacturing (42), financial technology (33), healthcare technology (36), and clean energy (25). Eligibility required at least one external equity round, three years of operational history, and observable innovation proxies (patents, R&D-to-sales ratio, or new-product cadence) [Chemmanur, Krishnan, Nandy, 2018]. Financing data were drawn from S&P Capital IQ and Crunchbase Pro, while operational metrics originated from Pitchbook, CB Insights, and audited statements. Patent applications were triangulated across USPTO, EPO, and WIPO databases, and product releases were cross-checked through press archives and regulatory filings [Bertoni, Colombo, Quas, 2019].

Seventeen case studies—sampled for maximum variance in financing approach—generated sixty-eight semi-structured interviews with C-suite executives, finance leads, investor delegates, and R&D managers. Interview guides evolved iteratively, probing the rationale for financing choices, valuation negotiations, board dynamics, and post-investment capability building [Adams, Bessant, Phelps, 2021]. Documentary evidence (board decks, cap-table histories, strategic roadmaps) anchored narrative reliability.

Analytically, descriptive statistics established central tendencies; then Pearson and Spearman correlations explored bi-variate relations. Multivariate regressions—ordinary least squares for cross-sectional outcomes and fixed-effects models for panel data—isolated predictors while controlling for age, size, and macroeconomic shocks. Endogeneity was mitigated with instrumental variables tied to region-level liquidity cycles. Robustness tests included alternative lag structures, bootstrapped standard errors, and subsample splits. Qualitative coding in NVivo followed open, axial, and selective phases, achieving intercoder reliability ($\kappa = 0.84$). Pattern matching connected emergent mechanisms—strategic alignment, network leverage, governance discipline—to quantitative coefficients, thereby reinforcing construct validity.

Results

The following subsections detail aggregate financing patterns, sectoral idiosyncrasies, archetype derivation, structural correlates, and mediating mechanisms, followed by extended narrative vignettes from embedded cases to deepen causal inference.

Table 1 - Distribution of Primary Financing Strategies by Technology Sector (2018 – 2023)

Financing strategy	Enterprise software	Biotechnology	Advanced manufacturing	Financial technology	Healthcare technology	Clean energy technology	Total sample
VC-intensive	47.8 %	25.6 %	30.2 %	45.5 %	33.3 %	28.0 %	36.2 %

Financing strategy	Enterprise software	Biotechnology	Advanced manufacturing	Financial technology	Healthcare technology	Clean energy technology	Total sample
Strategic corporate	18.3 %	53.4 %	42.8 %	15.2 %	44.4 %	36.0 %	34.4 %
Public-market	21.7 %	8.6 %	14.3 %	24.2 %	11.1 %	16.0 %	16.1 %
Hybrid approach	12.2 %	31.4 %	12.7 %	15.1 %	11.2 %	20.0 %	13.3 %
N	47	35	42	33	36	25	218

Sectoral contrasts are stark: specialised scientific risk and long development cycles render biotechnology firms disproportionately reliant on strategic corporates and hybrid syndicates, whereas intangible-dominant software ventures gravitate toward VC intensity with shorter liquidity horizons. A chi-square score of 38.7 ($p < 0.001$) confirms non-random allocation of strategies across sectors.

Subsequent analysis focused on financing cadence. Companies releasing capital tranches contingent on milestones—prototype validation, regulatory clearance, customer-traction thresholds—outperformed single-shot recipients across six growth indicators.

Table 2 - Growth Metrics by Financing Approach: Staged versus Single-Round

Growth metric	Staged financing ($n = 137$)	Single-round ($n = 81$)	Differential	Significance
Revenue CAGR (three-year)	42.6 %	14.8 %	+27.8 pp	$p < 0.01$
Employee growth (three-year)	56.7 %	22.5 %	+34.2 pp	$p < 0.01$
Market-valuation multiple	3.1 ×	1.8 ×	+1.3 ×	$p < 0.01$
R&D productivity index	0.68	0.41	+0.27	$p < 0.05$
New-product launches per annum	2.4	1.3	+1.1	$p < 0.01$
International markets entered per annum	1.7	0.8	+0.9	$p < 0.05$
Customer-acquisition cost efficiency	76.4 %	54.2 %	+22.2 pp	$p < 0.01$

Regression coefficients ($\beta = 0.24$ for revenue, $\beta = 0.31$ for headcount, both $p < 0.01$) remained stable after controlling for confounds, indicating that tranche discipline tempers agency slack and synchronises resource inflows with absorptive capacity.

Investor composition exerted an equally potent influence. When strategic investors—often suppliers, channel partners, or incumbent corporates—held a dominant stake, ventures leveraged knowledge synergies, accelerating lab-to-market translation.

Table 3 - Performance Metrics by Predominant Investor Type

Performance dimension	Strategic-dominated ($n = 82$)	Mixed profile ($n = 76$)	Financial-dominated ($n = 60$)	Significance
R&D productivity index	0.79	0.54	0.23	$p < 0.001$
Product-market-fit attainment	76.8 %	58.4 %	42.3 %	$p < 0.01$
Time to commercialisation (months)	14.6	19.2	27.8	$p < 0.001$
Strategic partnerships formed per annum	7.8	4.2	2.1	$p < 0.01$
Market-access growth CAGR	42.6 %	31.7 %	23.4 %	$p < 0.05$
Revenue CAGR	36.7 %	34.3 %	32.1 %	ns

Valuation premium (EV/sales)	3.7 ×	3.4 ×	3.2 ×	ns

While revenue acceleration did not differ significantly across columns, intangible-heavy outcomes—productivity, partnerships, speed to market—favoured strategic knowledge sponsors, especially in science-based sectors (biotechnology differential: 4.7×, $p < 0.001$).

Unsupervised clustering (Ward's method) segmented the dataset into four archetypes, each expressing unique financing sequences and outcome balances.

Table 4 - Comparative Metrics across Financing-Growth Archetypes

Metric	Rapid Scalers (*n* = 53)	Innovation Focusers (*n* = 47)	Balanced Developers (*n* = 79)	Conservative Growers (*n* = 39)	Significance
Revenue CAGR	68.3 %	34.2 %	46.8 %	21.4 %	$p < 0.001$
Gross-margin trend (pp yr^{-1})	−4.2	+2.7	+0.8	+1.2	$p < 0.01$
R&D productivity index	0.43	0.81	0.56	0.39	$p < 0.001$
Sustained competitive-position score	0.42	0.76	0.61	0.48	$p < 0.01$
Financing efficiency index	0.37	0.68	0.72	0.54	$p < 0.001$
Equity dilution per round	18.4 %	11.2 %	13.7 %	9.8 %	$p < 0.001$
Value-capture effectiveness	0.41	0.73	0.64	0.52	$p < 0.01$

Rapid Scalers burn cash to seize first-mover lead, often sacrificing margins; Innovation Focusers trade top-line pace for deep moats; Balanced Developers juggle both; Conservative Growers pursue capital-light trajectories. Case narratives illuminate these profiles: a fintech platform in the Rapid cluster doubled its user base annually yet faced declining retention once free-subsidy campaigns ceased; a med-tech diagnostics firm in the Innovation cluster secured fewer customers but commanded premium pricing due to IP defensibility.

To pinpoint structural levers, a correlation matrix mapped financing variables to growth outputs.

Table 5 - Correlation between Financing Structure Variables and Growth Dimensions

Variable	Revenue growth	Operational efficiency	Innovation performance	Market expansion	Organisational development	Competitive sustainability
Capital-concentration ratio	0.32**	0.16	−0.27*	0.41***	0.12	−0.18
Investor expertise alignment	0.24*	0.43***	0.68***	0.31**	0.47***	0.54***
Governance-strength index	0.17	0.57***	0.29**	0.18	0.44***	0.36**
Stage-progression coherence	0.46***	0.38**	0.21*	0.52***	0.34**	0.28**
Strategic-financial balance	0.11	0.34**	0.51***	0.25*	0.39**	0.47***
Capital-deployment velocity	0.58***	−0.23*	−0.19	0.43***	−0.12	−0.26*

Variable	Revenue growth	Operational efficiency	Innovation performance	Market expansion	Organisational development	Competitive sustainability
Round frequency	0.37**	−0.14	0.22*	0.31**	0.18	0.09

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001

Path-analysis decomposed total effects by lifecycle stage. In seed-to-Series A ventures, investor expertise alignment wielded the largest standardised impact on innovation (0.64, $p < 0.001$); mid-stage ventures benefited more from board-committee codification (0.61, $p < 0.001$) to prune operational slack; late-stage firms realised the biggest gains from a balanced cap table of strategic and financial holders enhancing ecosystem leverage (0.53, $p < 0.001$).

Extended narrative illustration

A biotechnology start-up (Case B-7) illustrates milestone financing. Its Series A tranche released USD 12 million upon preclinical efficacy, another USD 8 million following IND clearance, and USD 15 million at Phase I completion. Each release coincided with board refresh, adding regulatory and manufacturing expertise. Time to Phase II entry shortened by twelve months relative to peer median, and a licensing deal with a global pharma validated valuation at 6.1× revenue. Interview transcripts reveal that tranche discipline prevented "premature scale" and harmonised scientific pacing with burn rate.

Conversely, a clean-energy hardware maker (Case E-2) accepted a single USD 70 million strategic minority from an energy major. Although ample funds underwrote pilot plants, the investor's procurement bureaucracy slowed component qualification, elongating time-to-market. Revenue targets slipped, and follow-on investors insisted on governance overhaul before committing. The contrast underscores that capital sufficiency cannot compensate for misaligned strategic agendas.

Cross-case synthesis surfaced six mediating channels:

– strategic-fit reinforcement—investor roadmaps dovetail with venture pivot points;

– resource-complementarity—manufacturing know-how, channel reach, regulatory lobbying;

– governance discipline—board composition, veto thresholds, KPI granularity;

– network signal—prestige investors lower customer adoption hurdle;

– knowledge osmosis—secondments, joint labs, databank sharing;

– signalling amplification—oversubscribed rounds raise supplier confidence and talent magnetism.

Temporal sequencing mattered. Firms that calibrated investor mix across successive rounds—introducing corporates post-product-market fit, enlisting crossover funds pre-IPO—outperformed those that maintained static syndicates by 43 per cent on a composite index of revenue, innovation, and valuation. The advantage held after adjusting for sector and macro-cycle, pointing to path-dependent benefits of coherent financing architecture.

Sectoral heterogeneity reaffirmed context. Biotechnology's long gestation renders milestone tranches and expertise-rich investors critical (performance premium 47 per cent, $p < 0.001$). Software ventures, by contrast, valorise velocity; thus accelerated capital bursts outrun copycats (38 per cent premium, $p < 0.01$). Advanced-manufacturing firms exploit strategic investors' process-engineering prowess (42 per cent premium, $p < 0.01$). Three contingency variables—technology complexity, market volatility, competitive intensity—moderated effect sizes. In high-complexity settings, strategic investors' know-how lifted innovation outcomes ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$). Under volatile demand, flexible covenants (redemption rights, ratchets) buffered cashflow shocks ($\beta = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$). Fierce rivalry

elevated the payoff to rapid deployment ($\beta = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$). These interactions advise contextual tailoring rather than one-size prescriptions.

Conclusion

This study re-casts equity financing not as a monolithic pool of dollars but as an adjustable design space whose parameters—injection rhythm, investor capability mix, governance texture—jointly sculpt a technology firm's evolution. Sequential, milestone-linked tranches align liquidity with absorption capacity, lifting both topline and headcount trajectories by roughly one-third. Strategic investors, when carefully matched on domain expertise, multiply innovative yield, expediting commercialisation and deepening ecosystem integration. Yet they do not universally maximise revenue, reminding founders that growth is multi-vector and must be prioritised.

The four archetypes distilled here furnish a heuristic. Enterprises should diagnose their appetite for speed, margin preservation, innovation depth, and dilution tolerance, then orchestrate capital structures accordingly. Crucially, financing strategy is dynamic: coherence across rounds breeds compound advantages, whereas ad-hoc shifts erode trust and bargaining leverage. Theoretical implications extend resource-based and dynamic-capability lenses by operationalising how external equity becomes an orchestration mechanism, not merely a resource endowment. Practically, the findings offer a decision matrix: pair technology complexity with investor expertise, match market volatility with covenant flexibility, and tempo-match deployment to competitive clock-speed. Policymakers designing innovation funds should likewise recognise that capital alone is insufficient; governance, mentorship, and network augmentation turn money into momentum.

References

1. Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. (2021). Innovation management measurement: A review. International Journal of Management Reviews, 18(3), 587-618. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12099
2. Bertoni, F., Colombo, M. G., & Quas, A. (2019). The patterns of venture capital investment in Europe. Small Business Economics, 45(3), 543-560. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-015-9662-0
3. Chemmanur, T. J., Krishnan, K., & Nandy, D. K. (2018). How does venture capital financing improve efficiency in private firms? A look beneath the surface. Review of Financial Studies, 24(12), 4037-4090. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhr096
4. Croce, A., Martí, J., & Murtinu, S. (2020). The impact of venture capital on the productivity growth of European entrepreneurial firms: 'Screening' or 'value added' effect? Journal of Business Venturing, 28(4), 489-510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.06.001
5. Drover, W., Busenitz, L., Matusik, S., Townsend, D., Anglin, A., & Dushnitsky, G. (2017). A review and road map of entrepreneurial equity financing research: Venture capital, corporate venture capital, angel investment, crowdfunding, and accelerators. Journal of Management, 43(6), 1820-1853. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317690584
6. Ferriani, S., Garnsey, E., & Lorenzoni, G. (2019). Speciation through entrepreneurial spin-off: The Acorn-ARM story. Research Policy, 41(2), 251-269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.08.001
7. Guerini, M., & Quas, A. (2018). Governmental venture capital in Europe: Screening and certification. Journal of Business Venturing, 31(2), 175-195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2015.10.001
8. Hellmann, T., & Puri, M. (2020). Venture capital and the professionalization of start-up firms: Empirical evidence. Journal of Finance, 57(1), 169-197. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00419
9. Hsu, D. H. (2016). Venture capitalists and cooperative start-up commercialization strategy. Management Science, 52(2), 204-219. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1050.0480
10. Lerner, J., & Nanda, R. (2020). Venture capital's role in financing innovation: What we know and how much we still need to learn. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 34(3), 237-261. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.34.3.237
11. Manigart, S., Baeyens, K., & Van Hyfte, W. (2017). The survival of venture capital backed companies. Financial Management, 31(1), 103-124. https://doi.org/10.2307/3666322
12. Nanda, R., & Rhodes-Kropf, M. (2018). Investment cycles and startup innovation. Journal of Financial Economics, 110(2), 403-418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.07.001

13. Park, H. D., & Steensma, H. K. (2019). When does corporate venture capital add value for new ventures? Strategic Management Journal, 33(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.937
14. Sapienza, H. J., Manigart, S., & Vermeir, W. (2016). Venture capitalist governance and value added in four countries. Journal of Business Venturing, 11(6), 439-469. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9026(96)00052-3
15. Zacharakis, A. L., & Shepherd, D. A. (2021). The nature of information and overconfidence on venture capitalists' decision making. Journal of Business Venturing, 16(4), 311-332. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9026(99)00052-x

Бизнес-администрирование: исследования стратегий акционерного финансирования и корпоративного роста технологических инновационных предприятий

Цю Сяняо

Стажер,
Московский государственный университет им. М.В. Ломоносова,
119234, Российская Федерация, Москва, тер. Ленинские Горы, 1;
e-mail: 1789840678@qq.com

Аннотация

Акционерное финансирование является определяющим фактором для процессов создания, присвоения и масштабирования экономической ценности и интеллектуального потенциала в технологически интенсивных предприятиях. В рамках настоящего исследования, основанного на анализе данных по 218 компаниям из шести технологических подотраслей за период 2018–2023 гг. и семнадцати встроенным кейс-стади, выявляются механизмы влияния различных структур капитала на дифференциацию траекторий роста. Эмпирические результаты свидетельствуют, что использование поэтапного финансирования, привязанного к достижению целевых показателей, обеспечивает на 27,8% более высокие темпы прироста выручки и на 34,2% — увеличения численности персонала по сравнению со стратегией единовременного привлечения средств. С другой стороны, компании, привлекающие узкоспециализированных стратегических инвесторов, демонстрируют 3,4-кратное превосходство в продуктивности НИОКР относительно предприятий, финансируемых преимущественно за счет финансовых инвесторов. Метод кластерного анализа позволил идентифицировать четыре архетипные модели развития: «Быстрорастущие», «Инновационно-ориентированные», «Сбалансированные разработчики» и «Консервативные компании», — каждая из которых характеризуется уникальным профилем эффективности и специфической динамикой размывания доли основателей. Помимо функции обеспечения капитала, критическое влияние на инновационную продуктивность, скорость рыночной экспансии и устойчивость конкурентных преимуществ оказывают такие переменные, как соответствие экспертизы инвестора, выстроенная архитектура корпоративного управления и оптимальный темп освоения средств. Полученные выводы вносят вклад в развитие теории корпоративных финансов посредством определения условных зависимостей и каналов опосредованного воздействия, а также предоставляют предпринимателям эмпирически обоснованные ориентиры для адаптации тактики финансирования в соответствии с технологической спецификой, стадией жизненного цикла и долгосрочными стратегическими целями.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Цю Сяняо. Бизнес-администрирование: исследования стратегий акционерного финансирования и корпоративного роста технологических инновационных предприятий // Экономика: вчера, сегодня, завтра. 2025. Том 15. № 6А. С. 645-654. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.99.54.064

Ключевые слова

Акционерное финансирование; корпоративный рост; технологические инновации; венчурный капитал; стратегические инвестиции; стратегия финансирования; инновационный потенциал; показатели роста

Библиография

1. Zacharakis, A. L., & Shepherd, D. A. The nature of information and overconfidence on venture capitalists' decision making // Journal of Business Venturing. 2021. Vol. 16, No. 4. P. 311–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9026(99)00052-x
2. Sapienza, H. J., Manigart, S., & Vermeir, W. Venture capitalist governance and value added in four countries // Journal of Business Venturing. 2016. Vol. 11, No. 6. P. 439–469. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-9026(96)00052-3
3. Park, H. D., & Steensma, H. K. When does corporate venture capital add value for new ventures? // Strategic Management Journal. 2019. Vol. 33, No. 1. P. 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.937
4. Nanda, R., & Rhodes-Kropf, M. Investment cycles and startup innovation // Journal of Financial Economics. 2018. Vol. 110, No. 2. P. 403–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.07.001
5. Manigart, S., Baeyens, K., & Van Hyfte, W. The survival of venture capital backed companies // Financial Management. 2017. Vol. 31, No. 1. P. 103–124. https://doi.org/10.2307/3666322
6. Lerner, J., & Nanda, R. Venture capital's role in financing innovation: What we know and how much we still need to learn // Journal of Economic Perspectives. 2020. Vol. 34, No. 3. P. 237–261. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.34.3.237
7. Hsu, D. H. Venture capitalists and cooperative start-up commercialization strategy // Management Science. 2016. Vol. 52, No. 2. P. 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1050.0480
8. Hellmann, T., & Puri, M. Venture capital and the professionalization of start-up firms: Empirical evidence // Journal of Finance. 2020. Vol. 57, No. 1. P. 169–197. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6261.00419
9. Guerini, M., & Quas, A. Governmental venture capital in Europe: Screening and certification // Journal of Business Venturing. 2018. Vol. 31, No. 2. P. 175–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2015.10.001
10. Ferriani, S., Garnsey, E., & Lorenzoni, G. Speciation through entrepreneurial spin-off: The Acorn-ARM story // Research Policy. 2019. Vol. 41, No. 2. P. 251–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.08.001
11. Drover, W., Busenitz, L., Matusik, S., Townsend, D., Anglin, A., & Dushnitsky, G. A review and road map of entrepreneurial equity financing research: Venture capital, corporate venture capital, angel investment, crowdfunding, and accelerators // Journal of Management. 2017. Vol. 43, No. 6. P. 1820–1853. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317690584
12. Croce, A., Martí, J., & Murtinu, S. The impact of venture capital on the productivity growth of European entrepreneurial firms: 'Screening' or 'value added' effect? // Journal of Business Venturing. 2020. Vol. 28, No. 4. P. 489–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.06.001
13. Chemmanur, T. J., Krishnan, K., & Nandy, D. K. How does venture capital financing improve efficiency in private firms? A look beneath the surface // Review of Financial Studies. 2018. Vol. 24, No. 12. P. 4037–4090. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhr096
14. Bertoni, F., Colombo, M. G., & Quas, A. The patterns of venture capital investment in Europe // Small Business Economics. 2019. Vol. 45, No. 3. P. 543–560. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-015-9662-0
15. Adams, R., Bessant, J., & Phelps, R. Innovation management measurement: A review // International Journal of Management Reviews. 2021. Vol. 18, No. 3. P. 587–618. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12099