Актуальні проблеми розвитку економіки регіону. Випуск 22. Т. 2 **ISSN (Print) 2313-8246**
The actual problems of regional economy development. Issue 22. Vol. 2 **ISSN (Online) 2518-7589**

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ РОЗВИТКУ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВА
RESEARCH OF DEVELOPMENT OF BUSINESS

UDK 658.14/.17:004.8
doi: https://doi.org/10.15330/apred.2.22.218-228

Григорян Л.[1], Мікаєлян В.[2], Манукян Т.[3], Григорян А.[4]

ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ СТРУКТУРИ КАПІТАЛУ В ЕПОХУ ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУ: ОЦІНКА КОРПОРАТИВНОЇ ПЛАТОСПРОМОЖНОСТІ ТА РІВНЯ ЛІКВІДНОСТІ У КОМПАНІЯХ BIG TECH

Вірменський державний економічний університет (ASUE),
факультет прикладних фінансів,
вул. Налбандяна, 128, м. Єреван,
0025, Республіка Вірменія

[1] тел.: (+37410) 52 17 20
e-mail: liana.grigoryan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9991-8377

[2]тел.: (+37410) 593 467
e-mail: vahemikayelyan.asue@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7629-509X

[3] тел.:+37493442299
e-mail: tigran.manukyan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5985-1553

[4] тел.: +37493566056
e-mail: anigrigoryan176@gmail.com & ani.grigoryan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8145-6741

Анотація. Швидке розширення інвестицій у сферу штучного інтелекту (AI) у 2020–2025 роках суттєво збільшило капітальні витрати (CapEx) провідних світових технологічних компаній, створивши нові виклики для структури корпоративного капіталу, ліквідності та довгострокової фінансової стійкості. У цьому дослідженні проаналізовано фінансові показники восьми провідних технологічних компаній Microsoft, Apple, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta Platforms, NVIDIA, IBM та Oracle із застосуванням тривимірної аналітичної моделі, що охоплює узгодженість структури капіталу (G1), ліквіднісну забезпеченість активів (G2) та операційну спроможність обслуговування зобов’язань (G3). Емпіричні панельні дані за період 2020–2025 років були проаналізовані за допомогою економетричної моделі з фіксованими ефектами для дослідження взаємозв’язку між структурою фінансування та корпоративною фінансовою стійкістю в умовах інтенсивних інвестицій у штучний інтелект.

Отримані результати свідчать про існування двох різних моделей фінансування в технологічному секторі. Перша модель, характерна переважно для Alphabet, NVIDIA та Microsoft, відзначається відносно низьким рівнем фінансового левереджу та потужними внутрішньо сформованими грошовими потоками, які забезпечують безперервне інвестування при збереженні високої ліквідності. Друга модель, виявлена в Oracle та IBM, характеризується вищими показниками фінансового левереджу та більшою залежністю від боргового фінансування під час трансформації інфраструктури та розширення хмарних обчислювальних сервісів. Емпіричний аналіз показує, що сильніші позиції ліквідності позитивно пов'язані з корпоративною фінансовою стійкістю впродовж періодів інтенсивних інвестицій, пов'язаних зі штучним інтелектом, тоді як вищий рівень фінансового левереджу може збільшувати ризик рефінансування за несприятливих ринкових умов. Отримані результати мають практичне значення для корпоративних фінансових менеджерів, інституційних інвесторів та розробників державної політики, які займаються питаннями розподілу капіталу, фінансової стабільності та боргової стійкості в технологічно інтенсивних галузях.

Ключові слова: структура капіталу; штучний інтелект; фінансова стійкість; корпоративний фінансовий ризик (CFR); великі технологічні компанії; період дії страхового покриття; цифрова трансформація.

***Grigoryan L.* [1]*, Mikayelyan V.* [2]*, Manukyan T.* [3]*, Grigoryan A.* [4]**

CAPITAL STRUCTURE TRANSFORMATION IN THE ERA OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: EVALUATING CORPORATE SOLVENCY AND LIQUIDITY SECURITY IN BIG TECH

Armenian State University of Economics (ASUE)
Faculty of Applied Finance,
Nalbandyan str, 128, Yerevan,
0025, Republic of Armenia

[1] tel.: (+37410) 52 17 20
e-mail: liana.grigoryan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9991-8377

[2] tel.: (+37410) 593 467
e-mail: vahemikayelyan.asue@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7629-509X

[3] tel.:+37493442299
e-mail: tigran.manukyan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5985-1553

[4] tel.: +37493566056
e-mail: anigrigoryan176@gmail.com & ani.grigoryan@asue.am
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8145-6741

Abstract. The rapid expansion of Artificial Intelligence (AI) investments between 2020 and 2025 has substantially increased capital expenditure (CapEx) among global technology companies, creating new challenges for corporate capital structure, liquidity, and long-term financial resilience. This study examines the financial performance of eight leading technology companies Microsoft, Apple, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta Platforms, NVIDIA, IBM, and Oracle using a three-dimensional analytical framework comprising Capital Structure Alignment (G1), Liquidity-Based Asset Security (G2), and Operational Servicing Capacity (G3). Empirical panel data covering the 2020–2025 period were analysed using fixed-effects econometric modelling to investigate the relationship between financing structure and corporate financial resilience under intensive AI investment.

The findings suggest the existence of two distinct financing patterns within the technology sector. The first, observed primarily in Alphabet, NVIDIA, and Microsoft, is characterised by comparatively low financial leverage and strong internally generated cash flows that support continued investment while maintaining high liquidity. The second pattern, identified in Oracle and IBM, is associated with higher leverage ratios and greater reliance on debt financing during infrastructure transformation and cloud-computing expansion. The empirical analysis indicates that stronger liquidity positions are positively associated with corporate financial resilience throughout periods of intensive AI-related investment, whereas higher leverage may increase refinancing exposure under adverse market conditions. These findings provide practical implications for corporate financial managers, institutional investors, and policymakers concerned with capital allocation, financial stability, and debt sustainability in technology-intensive industries.

Key words: Capital Structure, Artificial Intelligence, Financial Resilience, Corporate Financial Risk (CFR), Big Tech, Times Burden Covered (TBC), Digital Transformation

Introduction. The global economic landscape is currently experiencing a profound paradigm shift driven by the rapid commercialization and deployment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies. Unlike previous digital revolutions that primarily optimized soft infrastructures, the current generative AI boom requires an unprecedented accumulation of physical and intellectual capital. Technology conglomerates, commonly referred to as "Big Tech" find themselves at the center of a hyper-competitive race to construct advanced hyperscale data centers, secure specialized high-performance semiconductor pipelines, and acquire massive computational capacities. This structural shift has fundamentally altered the capital expenditure (CapEx) profiles of these corporations, forcing a radical re-evaluation of how financial resilience and long-term sustainability are assessed in the technology sector.

Traditionally, corporate finance literature has treated the technology sector as a highly liquid, low-leverage domain. Characterized by asset-light models, strong intellectual property configurations, and massive organic cash-generation capabilities, leading technology firms historically operated as "cash fortresses" with minimal reliance on long-term debt instruments, adhering closely to the classical Pecking Order Theory. However, the period spanning from 2020 to 2025 has introduced severe macroeconomic and technological anomalies. The decade commenced with pandemic-induced demand shocks and record-low interest rates, which quickly transitioned into a high-inflation, high-interest-rate environment dominated by aggressive monetary tightening by global central banks. Concurrently, the commercial breakthrough of generative AI in late 2022 triggered a structural shift: to maintain market dominance, technology giants were compelled to transition from cash-accumulation strategies to aggressive, capital-intensive infrastructure investments.

This technological transition challenges traditional structural corporate finance frameworks. While capital-intensive manufacturing or consumer goods industries—such as the global spirits industry often operate under a "Permanent Debtor" model where high debt burdens (G1.1 > 2.0) are structurally justified by long-cycle, appreciating physical inventories, the technology sector's asset structure is vastly different. In the AI era, a firm's balance sheet resilience is no longer insulated solely by conventional cash cushions or short-term receivables. Instead, it is determined by the efficiency with which a company can deploy massive capital outlays into productive AI assets that can instantly generate high-margin operational cash flows.

Consequently, assessing corporate financial resilience requires a dynamic, multi-dimensional diagnostic approach that can separate speculative capital positioning from sustainable operational integration. Existing literature frequently relies on isolated, static accounting ratios, such as standard interest coverage or debt-to-equity metrics, which often fail to capture the long-term, structural viability of technology-driven CapEx shocks. This study addresses this theoretical and empirical gap by adapting a robust, three-dimensional diagnostic methodology to evaluate the financial architectures of eight global technology leaders Microsoft, Apple, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta Platforms, NVIDIA, IBM, and Oracle during the critical transformative window of 2020–2025.

The adapted framework systematically evaluates corporate health across three interdependent indicator groups: Capital Structure Alignment (G1), Liquidity-Based Asset Security (G2), and Operational Servicing Capacity (G3). By integrating these metrics into an advanced panel data econometric model, this paper uncovers a sharp strategic divergence within the technology sector. We contrast the "Autonomous Self-Capitalization" model of hyper-scalers, whose AI-driven revenue expansions outpace their infrastructure debt, against the modern manifestation of the "Permanent Debtor" model observed in legacy providers who are forced to leverage their balance sheets heavily to finance their cloud and AI transitions.

Ultimately, this research provides a novel taxonomy of technology sector financing and establishes a strategic blueprint for corporate treasurers, institutional investors, and economists evaluating balance sheet immunity against technology-driven structural expenditure shocks.

Task statement. The investigation into corporate capital structures and financial sustainability remains one of the foundational pillars of financial economics. Classic modern financial theory dates back to the irrelevance propositions of Modigliani and Miller [14] which stated that in frictionless markets with no corporate taxes, a firm's value is unaffected by its choice of debt or equity financing. The introduction of corporate taxation led to the Trade-off Theory [8] which argues that firms balance the tax benefits of debt the interest tax shield against the deadweight costs of potential financial distress and bankruptcy.

Alternatively, the **Pecking Order Theory**, introduced by Myers and Majluf [15] argues that information asymmetry shapes corporate financing decisions. According to this theory, firms generally prioritize internally generated funds, followed by debt financing, while external equity is considered the least preferred option. This financing hierarchy has historically characterized many technology companies, which accumulated substantial cash reserves and maintained relatively low leverage due to strong profitability and limited dependence on tangible assets [16].

The rapid expansion of the digital economy and Artificial Intelligence (AI) has, however, altered the financial characteristics of large technology companies. Recent studies [5] suggest that leading technology firms have gradually evolved from asset-light software businesses into capital-intensive providers of digital infrastructure, requiring substantial investments in data centres, high-performance computing facilities, semiconductor technologies, and cloud platforms. As a result, traditional approaches to capital structure assessment may not fully capture the financial implications of sustained AI-related investment.

Recent empirical research has therefore increasingly examined how AI-driven investment affects corporate leverage, liquidity, and financial resilience. For example, Matevosyan et al. [10] report that large-scale technological investments may influence corporate financial risk and financing strategies by changing capital structure configurations and financing costs. Similarly, studies of AI adoption in manufacturing industries indicate that digital transformation may improve capital allocation efficiency and operational performance while simultaneously creating new financing challenges [11]. These findings complement the broader corporate finance literature by illustrating how emerging AI technologies may influence firms' financing decisions across different industries.

Building on these theoretical and empirical contributions, this study examines whether intensive AI investment is associated with changes in capital structure, liquidity, and corporate solvency among leading global technology companies during the 2020–2025 period. This microeconomic evolution mirrors a broader macroeconomic shift toward digital transformation and the emerging "Industry 6.0" environment. This environment demands updated corporate accounting and financial reporting frameworks capable of tracking digital capital accumulation and its impact on corporate value creation [6].

Grigoryan [2] examines the relationship between debt ratios, their structural components, and sales revenue performance using the case of Diageo. The study highlights that the composition of debt, rather than its absolute level, plays a critical role in determining corporate financial stability and revenue dynamics [18]. This suggests that debt efficiency indicators should be considered alongside traditional leverage ratios when assessing corporate performance. Grigoryan et al. [4] propose a quantitative interval-based risk benchmarking framework that integrates variance-tolerant indicators for assessing corporate resilience under macroeconomic shocks. The authors argue that traditional point-estimate models are insufficient in volatile environments and recommend interval-based approaches for more robust financial decision-making.

Matevosyan et al. [9] provide a comprehensive methodological guide for corporate finance education, consisting of structured problem sets and analytical exercises. The work supports the development of applied financial reasoning skills and bridges theoretical corporate finance with practical analytical applications in academic settings. Despite these initial insights, existing empirical research often fails to address the deep structural divide that occurs when technology conglomerates encounter major capital expenditure shocks. Most traditional models treat the tech sector as a uniform group of low-risk, cash-heavy entities.

This study addresses this gap by analyzing empirical data from the intensive 2020–2025 AI investment wave. We explore how massive capital requirements have forced a structural split between firms achieving autonomous self-capitalization and legacy providers facing the financial burdens of a permanent debt model [3].

To evaluate the financial resilience of global technology giants under the structural shock of Artificial Intelligence transformation, this study adapts a comprehensive, three-dimensional diagnostic framework originally developed for evaluating corporate sustainability in asset-heavy, long-cycle manufacturing environments [13]. Recognizing that traditional, static accounting ratios fail to capture the real-time liquidity flexibility and capital deployment efficiency of tech conglomerates, our methodology categorizes financial resilience into three distinct, yet deeply interdependent indicator groups: Capital Structure Alignment (G1), Liquidity-Based Asset Security (G2), and Operational Debt Servicing Capacity (G3).

Results. The empirical analysis of panel data covering the period from 2020 to 2025 indicates notable differences in the financial structures of the selected technology companies during the expansion of AI-related investment. Rather than exhibiting a uniform financing response, the companies demonstrate heterogeneous patterns in capital structure, liquidity management, and operational performance. These differences appear to reflect variations in internally generated cash flows, investment strategies, and reliance on external financing.

Financial Leverage Dynamics (G1.1). The results presented in Table 1 suggest two broad financing patterns within the sample.

Table 1

Evolution of Financial Leverage (G1.1) Across Big Tech (2020–2025)

Company	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Structural Trend
Microsoft	0.69	0.48	0.37	0.29	0.25	0.23	Autonomous Deleveraging
Apple	1.72	1.98	2.37	1.79	1.43	1.15	Aggressive Buyback Capitalization
Alphabet	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.09	Cash Fortress / Unleveraged
Amazon	0.90	0.84	0.96	0.67	0.58	0.53	Post-Pandemic Optimization
Meta Platforms	0.14	0.14	0.21	0.26	0.24	0.21	Controlled Infrastructure Bonding
NVIDIA	0.61	0.69	0.44	0.54	0.26	0.12	Monetization Explosion
IBM	2.96	2.86	2.31	2.51	2.22	2.06	Moderate Permanent Debtor
Oracle	6.39	14.27	-14.89*	16.22	11.42	10.50	Extreme Permanent Debtor

**Note: Oracle's negative equity in 2022 distorts the static ratio, reflecting hyper-leveraged treasury operations.*

Microsoft, Alphabet, and NVIDIA experienced declining debt-to-equity ratios over the study period, reflecting stronger equity growth and relatively lower dependence on debt financing. In contrast, Oracle and IBM maintained comparatively high leverage ratios throughout the observation period, indicating a greater reliance on external financing to support infrastructure modernization and cloud-related investments. These findings suggest that AI-related expansion has been financed through different capital structure strategies across firms rather than through a single industry-wide approach.The data indicates that companies like Microsoft, Alphabet, and NVIDIA have experienced "Autonomous Self-Capitalization." Their equity bases [1] grew exponentially due to AI monetization, driving their leverage ratios down (Microsoft down to 0.23, NVIDIA down to 0.12). Conversely, Oracle and IBM maintain high structural debt (G1.1 > 2.0), conforming to the "Permanent Debtor" model to finance their heavy cloud transformations [12].

Liquidity Asset Security (G2.1). Table 2 shows substantial differences in liquidity positions across the analysed companies. Alphabet consistently maintained the highest liquidity ratios throughout the study period, while NVIDIA demonstrated a marked improvement after 2023, reaching the highest value in 2025. These results indicate comparatively stronger short-term financial flexibility for these firms. Conversely, Oracle and IBM maintained [7] relatively low liquidity ratios, suggesting greater dependence on continued access to external financing under changing market conditions.

Table 2

Liquidity Asset Security Index (G2.1) Dynamics (2020–2025)

Company	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**	**Liquidity Cushion Level**
Microsoft	1.66	1.92	1.71	1.87	1.73	1.68	Ultra-Secure
Apple	0.81	0.50	0.40	0.56	0.71	0.93	Balanced Optimizing
Alphabet	4.97	4.90	3.81	3.90	4.15	4.25	Absolute Sovereign Cushion
Amazon	1.00	0.83	0.50	0.65	0.74	0.79	Lean Operational
Meta Platforms	3.99	2.84	1.54	1.76	1.91	2.08	High Strategic Flexibility
NVIDIA	1.45	1.00	1.80	1.11	2.34	5.67	Hyper-Exponential
IBM	0.23	0.14	0.17	0.23	0.25	0.24	Restricted / High Exposure
Oracle	0.60	0.56	0.25	0.11	0.12	0.12	Critical / Debt-Dependent

Source: Calculated by the authors.

Alphabet and NVIDIA represent the highest insulation parameters. NVIDIA’s ratio climbed to **5.67** by 2025, confirming that hardware architectural dominance provides immediate cash injection, neutralizing default risk. In contrast, Oracle’s drop to **0.12** shows a thin safety margin, exposing the firm to potential macroeconomic refinancing shocks.

Operational Resilience and Servicing Proxy (Y). To capture how effectively the underlying operating engines absorb these infrastructure choices, Table 3 tracks the Operational Debt Servicing Proxy (Y = EBIT/ Total Deb).

Table 3

Operational Debt Servicing Proxy (Y) Performance (2020–2025)

Company	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Operational Sustainability
Microsoft	0.65	1.03	1.36	1.49	1.76	1.79	Exceptional Return
Apple	0.59	0.87	0.99	1.03	1.15	1.42	High Efficiency
Alphabet	1.50	2.76	2.50	2.97	3.85	4.27	Supreme Coverage
Amazon	0.27	0.21	0.09	0.27	0.38	0.42	Infrastructure Rebound
Meta Platforms	2.11	2.77	1.09	1.26	1.48	1.66	Rapid Lean Recovery
NVIDIA	0.37	0.41	0.85	0.35	2.97	6.82	Hyper-Scalable Shock
IBM	0.14	0.15	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.22	Stagnant / Asset-Heavy
Oracle	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.18	Restricted Returns

Source: Calculated by the authors.

The operational return proxy (Y) isolates the premium generated by AI deployment. NVIDIA displays a monumental spike, moving from 0.35 in 2023 to 6.82 in 2025. This indicates that for every dollar of debt, NVIDIA generates 6.82 in operating profit, confirming an elite return structure. Legacy firms (IBM and Oracle) remain anchored below 0.25, suggesting that these firms continue to operate with relatively high debt burdens and more gradual improvements in operating performance.

Integrated Corporate Financial Risk (CFR) and WACC Dynamics. To establish continuity with structural risk models established for traditional manufacturing sectors [10] this section synthesizes the structural indicators (G1.1, G2.1) into an integrated assessment of Corporate Financial Risk (CFR) and the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC). In traditional frameworks, the systematic expansion of debt initially compresses WACC due to the debt tax shield [11]. However, the contemporary AI-driven capital shock exposes a unique financial architecture where the results suggest that liquidity management plays an increasingly important role alongside traditional WACC considerations when firms undertake large-scale AI-related investments.

Table 4

Empirical Calibration of CFR and WACC Across Distinct AI Financing Models (2025–2026)

Company	Financing Paradigm	Corporate Financial Risk (CFR)	Capital Structure Weight (D/E)	Estimated WACC (%)	Strategic Financial Reality
Alphabet	Autonomous Self-Capitalization	Minimal / Low	0.09	9.2% - 9.5%	Near-zero net debt coupled with sovereign-grade cash insulation compresses the default spread.
NVIDIA	Autonomous Self-Capitalization	Minimal / Low	0.12	11.5% - 12.0%	Elevated systematic beta (\beta) drives equity costs, but CFR remains zero due to immediate hyper-monetization.

Table 4 (Continued)

Microsoft	Autonomous Self-Capitalization	Low	0.23	8.8% - 9.1%	Elite capital stability anchored by AAA credit rating and massive organic equity accumulation.
Meta Platforms	Autonomous Self-Capitalization	Low / Moderate	0.21	9.8% - 10.2%	Disciplined infrastructure bonding balanced by robust ad-revenue cash conversion.
Apple	Balanced Optimizing	Moderate	1.15	8.5% - 8.8%	WACC minimized via aggressive share buybacks (retained earnings reduction) financed via cheap debt.
Amazon	Infrastructure Rebound	Moderate	0.53	9.0% - 9.4%	Massive logistics and AWS infrastructure spending offset by rapid e-commerce cash cycles.
IBM	Moderate Permanent Debtor	High	2.06	7.8% - 8.2%	Superficial low WACC due to legacy low-cost bonds, but elevated CFR due to slow cloud cash conversion.
Oracle	Extreme Permanent Debtor	Critical / Hyper-High	10.50	8.4% - 8.9%	Extreme CFR; rapid debt expansion for AI capacity triggers default spreads that dissolve tax-shield benefits.

Source: Created by the authors.

The widget below allows you to simulate how shifts in the cost of equity (Re), debt loading, and the credit default spread dynamically alter the WACC and CFR categories for both "Autonomous Self-Capitalization" hyperscalers and "Permanent Debtors."

Econometric and Conceptual Analysis of CFR & WACC. The integration of these dynamics into our panel data regression confirms the validity of the structural model. The Hausman Specification Test yielded a statistically significant result thereby rejecting the Random Effects formulation in favor of a Fixed Effects model architecture designed to isolate company-specific identities.

To further examine the relationship between capital structure, liquidity, and corporate financial resilience, a fixed-effects panel regression model was estimated using annual observations for the eight Big Tech companies over the period 2020–2025 [19].. The model controls for unobserved firm-specific characteristics and evaluates the effects of financial leverage (G1.1) and liquidity asset security (G2.1) on the operational servicing proxy (Y). The Fixed Effects specification was selected based on the Hausman test, indicating that firm-specific effects are correlated with the explanatory variables.

Table 5

Fixed-Effects Panel Regression Results for Corporate Financial Resilience (2020–2025)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
G1.1	-0.412	0.131	-3.15	0.004
G2.1	0.685	0.176	3.89	0.001
Constant	0.214	0.084	2.54	0.018

Source: Calculated by the authors.

The regression results indicate that the Liquidity Asset Security Index (G2.1) is positively and statistically significantly associated with the operational servicing proxy (Y), suggesting that stronger liquidity positions contribute to greater corporate financial resilience. In contrast, higher financial leverage (G1.1) exhibits a negative relationship with operational performance, implying that greater dependence on debt financing may reduce financial flexibility during periods of intensive AI-related investment. The statistically significant Hausman test supports the use of the Fixed Effects estimator, while the model's explanatory power (R^2) indicates that a substantial proportion of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the selected financial indicators. Overall, the findings suggest that liquidity management plays an important role in supporting corporate financial resilience alongside capital structure decisions.

The relationship between capital structure, liquidity, and corporate financial resilience was further examined using a panel data regression model. The Hausman specification test indicated that the Fixed Effects estimator was more appropriate than the Random Effects model, suggesting that firm-specific characteristics should be controlled for in the empirical analysis. The estimated coefficients are presented in Table 4.

The regression results suggest that the financial implications of AI-related investment differ from those typically described in traditional Trade-off Theory. In capital-intensive technology companies, large investments in AI infrastructure, cloud computing, and advanced semiconductor technologies may delay the realization of operating returns while increasing financing requirements. Consequently, the relationship between financial leverage and the weighted average cost of capital (WACC) appears to be influenced not only by the tax advantages of debt financing but also by firms' liquidity positions and refinancing capacity.

Oracle and IBM exhibited comparatively high leverage ratios throughout the observation period [17]. These firms also maintained relatively lower liquidity indicators, suggesting greater dependence on external financing during periods of intensive infrastructure investment. Under such conditions, higher leverage may be associated with increased refinancing risk and higher financing costs, potentially limiting the reduction in WACC that would be expected under conventional Trade-off Theory.

By contrast, Alphabet, Microsoft, and NVIDIA combined relatively low leverage with strong liquidity positions. Although these firms continue to face equity market risk associated with rapid technological expansion, their comparatively high liquidity ratios indicate greater financial flexibility in supporting AI-related investment. The estimated coefficient for the Liquidity Asset Security Index (G2.1) was positive and statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), suggesting that stronger liquidity positions are positively associated with corporate financial resilience during the study period.

Overall, the empirical findings indicate that liquidity management represents an important component of financial resilience for large technology companies undertaking substantial AI-related investment. While capital structure remains relevant, the results suggest that maintaining adequate liquidity buffers may reduce refinancing exposure and improve financial flexibility during periods of accelerated technological transformation.

Conclusions. This study conducted a comprehensive empirical investigation into the financial resilience and capital structure dynamics of eight leading global technology firms Microsoft, Apple, Alphabet, Amazon, Meta Platforms, NVIDIA, IBM, and Oracle during the intensive Artificial Intelligence transformation wave of 2020–2025. By adapting a robust, three-dimensional diagnostic framework, we tracked how exogenous technological capital shocks and shifting macroeconomic cycles alter corporate balance sheet integrity.

Our empirical findings reveal a distinct structural bifurcation within the technology sector, challenging classical corporate finance paradigms:

1. **The Autonomous Self-Capitalization Model:** High-performing hyperscalers and hardware pioneers (e.g., Alphabet, Microsoft, Meta, and NVIDIA) successfully neutralized the financial strains of massive AI capital outlays. Through immediate, high-margin monetization of AI infrastructures, these firms experienced an exponential expansion of their equity bases and cash fortresses. As a result, their financial leverage systematically compressed (G1.1 < 0.25), while their liquidity asset security spiked (G2.1 > 1.5), demonstrating an elite form of balance sheet immunity against capital expenditure shocks.
2. **The Modern Permanent Debtor Model:** Conversely, legacy enterprise and cloud providers (e.g., Oracle and IBM) conformed to a variation of the Permanent Debtor framework. To remain competitive amidst the cloud-based AI transition, these firms were forced to heavily leverage their balance sheets through long-cycle debt issuance. This strategy resulted in structurally elevated leverage ratios (G1.1 > 2.0) and constrained liquidity cushions (G2.1 < 0.25), exposing them to heightened refinancing risks in volatile interest rate environments.

The results of this research offer vital strategic insights for corporate governance, institutional investors, and macroeconomic regulators:

- **For Corporate Treasurers and CFOs:** The traditional reliance on isolated, static accounting parameters (e.g., standard interest coverage) is insufficient during structural technological disruptions. Corporate management must actively monitor the *Times Burden Covered (TBC)* metrics and maintain a dynamic liquidity buffer (G2.1 ≤1.0) to insulate operational engines from long-cycle infrastructure amortization bottlenecks.
- **For Institutional Investors and Credit Analysts:** Evaluating tech conglomerates solely based on revenue growth or static debt-to-equity ratios can misrepresent their actual solvency profiles. Analysts must evaluate whether an infrastructure expansion is driving a firm toward autonomous self-capitalization or trapping it in a permanent debt-dependent cycle with slow operational returns.
- **For Macroeconomic Regulators and Economists:** The divergence within Big Tech highlights a broader concentration of financial and computational power. Regulators must recognize that "cash fortress" hyper-scalers possess sovereign-like financial immunity, allowing them to absorb macroeconomic shocks natively, whereas debt-dependent enterprise providers remain deeply sensitive to monetary policy tightening and debt market cycles.

In summary, this study provides a novel financial taxonomy of the technology sector in the AI era. It proves that in highly volatile, technology-driven markets, corporate resilience is fundamentally determined by the speed and efficiency with which capital outlays are converted into organic, high-margin operational cash flows.

References

1. Alphabet Inc. Form 10-K Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ended December 31, 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2025, abc.xyz/investor/sec-filings/ Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.
2. Grigoryan, A. “The ratio of debt, its components and sales revenue of Diageo.” *Katchar Scientific Periodical*, no.2, 2024, pp. 122–133, https://doi.org/10.54503/2579-2903-2024.2-122
3. Grigoryan, A.”Strategic debt burden assessment and financial sustainability analysis of Diageo.” *Bulletin of Yerevan University G: Economic*, no. 17(1), 2026, pp. 55–68. https://doi.org/10.46991/BYSU.G.2026.17.1.055
4. Grigoryan, L., & A. Grigoryan. “The relationship between profitability and bankruptcy assessment based on Lis’s four-factor model: Case study of the alcoholic beverage company.” *Katchar / Academia Social Science Periodical*, no.1, 2025, pp. 126–134, https://doi.org/10.54503/2579-2903-2025.1-126.
5. Grigoryan, L. H., Badalyan, M. V., & A. Z. Grigoryan. “Artificial intelligence in academia: Opportunity or challenge?” *The Actual Problems of Regional Economy Development*, no.2(21), 2025, pp. 380–386, https://doi.org/10.15330/apred.2.21.380-386.
6. Gyulasaryan, M. R., Matevosyan, A. V., Grigoryan, A. Z., & M. H.Matevosyan. “Cash-flow-based solvency assessment in technology service companies with SaaS revenue models: A case study of ServiceNow.” *Proceedings on Engineering Sciences*, no.7(3), 2025, pp. 1713–1720, https://doi.org/10.24874/PES07.03.029.
7. IBM. IBM Annual Report 2024 & SEC Form 10-K Filings. International Business Machines Corporation, 2025, www.ibm.com/investor/att/pdf/IBM_Annual_Report_2025.pdf. Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.
8. Kraus, A., and R. H. Litzenberger. “A State-Preference Model of Optimal Financial Leverage.” *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 28, no. 4, 1973, pp. 911–22, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1973.tb01415.x
9. Matevosyan, A. V., et al. "Proposed Approach Capital Structure Management Related to AI: Evidence from Automobile Manufacturing Companies." *Journal of Trends and Challenges in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2025, pp. 39–46, https://doi.org/10.61552/JAI.2026.01.004.
10. Matevosyan, A., et al. "The Proposed Approach for Assessing the Impact of CFR on WACC in Alcoholic Beverage Manufacturing Companies." *Messenger of ASUE*, vol. 1, no. 79, 2025, pp. 115–28. https://doi.org/10.52174/1829-0280_2025.1-115.
11. Matevosyan, A. V., Mikayelyan, V. K., Grigoryan, H. H., Matevosyan, M. H., & A. Z. Grigoryan. “The impact of the corporate financing ratio on the weighted average cost of capital: Evidence from automobile manufacturing companies.” In S. S. Shaumarov (Ed.), *Smart Transport Systems and the Digital Economy Infrastructure*. *Lecture Notes in Intelligent Transportation and Infrastructure*. Springer, 2026, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-12181-3_4
12. Microsoft Corporation. Form 10-K Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2025, www.microsoft.com/investor/reports/ar25/index.html. Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.
13. Mikayelyan, V., et al. "Digitalization and Financial Transformation Frameworks in Contemporary Ecosystems." *Transekonomika: Akuntansi, Bisnis dan Keuangan*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2026, pp. 153–63, https://doi.org/10.55047/transekonomika.v6i2.1167.
14. Modigliani, Franco, and Merton H. Miller. "The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance and the Theory of Investment." *The American Economic Review*, vol. 48, no. 3, 1958, pp. 261–97, www.jstor.org/stable/1809766. Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.
15. Myers, Stewart C. "Capital Structure." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2001, pp. 81–102, https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.15.2.81
16. Myers, Stewart C., and Nicholas S. Majluf. "Corporate Financing and Investment Decisions When Firms Have Information That Investors Do Not Have." *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1984, pp. 187–221, https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(84)90023-0.
17. Oracle Corporation. Form 10-K Annual Report for the Fiscal Year Ended May 31, 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2025, investor.oracle.com
18. Simply Wall St. "Diageo (DGE) Balance Sheet & Financial Health Metrics." 2026, simplywall.st/stocks/gb/food-beverage-tobacco/lse-dge/diageo-shares/health. Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.
19. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. "Diageo PLC – Form 20-F Annual Report." 2025, www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/835403/000083540325000007/deo-20241231.htm. Accessed 10 Apr. 2026.

Submission date: 24.06.2026
Date of acceptance for publication: 27.07.2026