

Journal of Finance and Accounting

ISSN Online: 2616-4965



Firm Characteristics and Working Capital Financing Adopted by Non-Financial Firms Listed at Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya

Gitonga Jason Kirugumi & Dr. Daniel Makori

ISSN: 2616-4965

Firm Characteristics and Working Capital Financing Adopted by Non-Financial Firms Listed at Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya

^{1*}Gitonga Jason Kirugumi & ²Dr. Daniel Makori

¹Post graduate student, Kenyatta University

²Lecturer, Department of Accounting and Finance, School of Business, Kenyatta University

*Email of the corresponding author: jasongitonga15@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Kirugumi, G., J. & Makori, D. (2022). Firm Characteristics and Working Capital Financing Adopted by Non-Financial Firms Listed at Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 6(2), 41-62. <https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

Abstract

The working capital requirement is critical to any organization. However, the working capital of numerous non-financial firms listed at NSE has been negative. Thus, the study examined the influence of firm characteristics on working capital financing. Precisely, the study examined the influence of firm size, asset tangibility, profitability and leverage on working capital financing. Five theories, namely, Baumol design, pecking order theory, trade-off concept, economies of scale theory and profit maximization theory, informed the study. The study employed an explanatory research design. The target population were 45 non-financial firms listed at NSE. The study carried out a census of all the firms. The research collected secondary panel data. The study period was between 2015 and 2019. The results from the model fitness showed that firm size (log of total assets), asset tangibility, profitability (ROA) and leverage explain 64.70% of the variations in the working capital financing of the non-financial firms. The correlation results showed that firm size measured through the log of total assets, asset tangibility and profitability were positively associated with working capital financing. In contrast, leverage was found to be negatively associated with working capital financing. The regression results showed that firm size, asset tangibility and profitability have a significant positive effect on working capital financing. However, the regression results revealed that leverage has a significant negative effect on working capital financing. The study recommended non-financial firms listed at NSE look for strategies that increase their assets. Enormous firms are expected to be more financially stable with more investments, thus reducing borrowing. In addition, the firms should look for ways to increase asset tangibility. The firms can invest in more assets such as plant and equipment, buildings, computer equipment, software, furniture, land, machinery, and vehicles. Moreover, the non-financial firms listed at NSE to look for strategies to reduce the leverage levels. External funding of the operations, such as debts, should be used if all the other internal financing options are exhausted.

Keywords: *Firm size, asset tangibility, profitability, leverage, working capital financing, non-financial firms listed at NSE, Kenya*

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

1.0 Introduction

The working capital requirement is critical in an organization because it shows whether it can meet short-term obligations. The proficiency in working capital among many firms in the World has been a challenge (Arene & Okpukpara, 2014; Begbies, 2018; Njuguna, 2018). Companies all over the World support that working capital is one of the internal constituents that influence performance. The Working capital can enable the organizations to meet the daily operations of the activities with easiness (Wahome, Memba & Muturi, 2015). Globally, Quayyum (2016) established that working capital has been negative to some companies in Bangladesh, with the most affected being the non-financial and about 24% of these non-financial firms have ceased operations due to financial constraints of meeting the short-term debts. In Italy, Pozzoli and Paolone (2017) indicated that more than 13% of the manufacturing sector are financially distressed and cannot produce optimal cash flows from their functions to cater for their short-term debts. Further, Raheman and Nasr (2017) established that negative working capital among some of the manufacturing firms in Pakistan had been an obstacle that has prevented some of those manufacturing firms from expanding.

In Africa, the creditworthiness of several countries such as Gabon, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa and Zambia experienced total and unfavorable outlooks in 2017 (IMF, 2018). Bassey, Arene and Okpukpara (2014) revealed that about 41% of agro-allied firms in Nigeria rely much on debts to finance their operations, leading to closure risks. A study by Andani and Al-hassan (2016) indicates that working capital determines more than 60% of the survival of the listed firms in the Ghana Stock Exchange. Also, Kasozi (2017) established that working capital in more than 37% of the listed manufacturing firms in South Africa is negative. This implies that companies borrow more than they get from the operations of the activities. In Ghana, Korankye and Adarquah (2014) reported that working capital has been ineffective to most non-financial firms compared to financial firms. In Kenya, Wahome, Memba and Muturi (2015) revealed that negative working capital is mostly found in the non-financial firms listed and about 21% of the firms are unable to balance between the cash outflow and cash inflow which leads to loss-making. Likewise, Kaguri (2016) indicated that most non-financial firms borrow a lot of resources from financial institutions despite, in some cases, those borrowing being expensive. Moreover, Chesang (2017) established that around 19% of the non-financial firms listed on the Nairobi Stock Exchange tend to report negative working capital. Most sustainable businesses have positive working capital because it signifies that the cash inflow exceeds the cash outflow (Onchangwa, 2019; Ooko, Githui & Omurwa, 2018). This formed the rationale to conduct the study among the non-financial firms rather than the financial firms.

The working capital is essential for everyday operations (Njeri, Namusonge & Mugambi, 2017). As Mwangi, Makau and Kosimbei (2014) indicated, the motivation behind the working capital policy is to ensure that the organization can continue with its tasks and have sufficient income for daily actions (Mwangi, Makau & Kosimbei, 2014). The effective management of the working capital can enhance smooth functions of the operations. Successful capital administration is an everyday undertaking that guarantees that the firm has abundant assets to continue with its capacities (Sanghani, 2014). The firms need precise amounts of working funds to manage change in a company (Kasozi, 2017). Companies tend to get the working capital from borrowing and internal earnings (Sharma & Kumar, 2016). Short-term funding is an integral part of working

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

capital strategies. Working capital is the only investment a company makes without anticipating a specified return (Quayyum, 2014). According to Shrivastava, Kumar and Kumar (2017), Singhanian and Mehta (2017), Njuguna (2018) and Vaghfi, Moghaddam and Khoshrou (2014), the components of working capital management contain cash management, accounts payable management and receivables management.

Management of the working capital to some of the non-financial firms listed in NSE has been wanting (Nyang'oro, 2016; Ooko, Githui & Omurwa, 2018; Kinyua & Muriu, 2017). For instance, Uchumi Supermarkets was unable to meet its short-term requirements of paying its suppliers, employees and led to empty shelves and bankruptcy (Oyugi, 2017). Besides, Kenya Airways 2015 financial report showed that it financed all its working capital with short-term debt and led to a liquidity crisis when its revenues fell significantly and the management had to convert some of the short-term debt to long term to reduce their default risk (Kiiru, Kirori & Omurwa, 2019). Financial performance remains a major challenge to most non-financial companies listed at NSE (Wayongah & Ochieng, 2019). Conducting this research was based on this background.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The working capital is key to the success or failure of an organization (Njeri, Namusonge & Mugambi, 2017; Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2016). However, the working capital of numerous non-financial firms listed at NSE has been negative. For instance, in 2019, Kenya Airways reported negative working capital of Ksh. 42.155 billion (Deloitte, 2020). Moreover, the current liabilities of East African Portland Cement Company in 2018 outstripped current assets by Ksh 6.0799 billion (EAPCC, 2019). Furthermore, the current liabilities of Kenya Power and Lighting Company in 2019 exceeded the current assets by Ksh 70. 969,861 billion implying negative working capital (Auditor General, 2019). Moreover, East African Cables reported a negative working capital of 49.3532 million in 2019 (East African Cables, 2020). These cases present an overview of what might be happening to the other firms. Therefore, the research was worthy of being conducted to look at the influence of company characteristics on working capital financing adopted by firms.

There seem to be inconsistent findings on the impact of company characteristics (firm size, asset tangibility, profitability and leverage) on working capital financing. Some studies (Wahome, Momba & Muturi 2015; Nyang'oro, 2016; Koksai & Orman, 2015; Ooko, Githui & Omurwa, 2018; Panigrahi, 2014; Hossain & Hossain, 2015; Bassey, Arene & Okpukpara, 2014; Kaguri, 2016; Kinyua & Muriu, 2017; Chang, Batmunkh, Wong & Jargalsaikhan, 2019; Chesang, 2017; Minnema & Andersson, 2018) found a positive impact of company characteristics (firm size, asset tangibility, profitably and leverage) on Working Capital Financing. On the contrary, Lourenco and Oliveira (2017), Abbas (2016), Alipour, Mohammadi and Derakhshan (2015), Serrasqueiro, Matias and Salsa (2016), Saarani and Shahadan (2018), Andani and Al-hassan (2016), Eysimkele and Koori (2019) found a negative relationship between company characteristics (firm size, asset tangibility, profitably and leverage) and working capital financing.

Moreover, Eysimkele and Koori (2019) presented a conceptual gap since the study was concentrated on debt financing and the measurement of debt financing were bank loans and overdrafts, while the current focused on firm size, asset tangibility, profitability and leverage. Additionally, Bassey, Arene and Okpukpara (2014) presented a methodological gap considering

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

the data was collected between 2005 and 2010. The current study collected data from 2015 to 2019 to reflect the current situation of the companies. Moreover, Minnema and Andersson (2018) presented a methodological gap because the study collected the data up to 2016. Therefore, the current study was worthy of being conducted.

1.2 Research Objectives

- i. To examine the influence of firm size on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.
- ii. To establish the influence of asset tangibility on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.
- iii. To determine the influence of profitability on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.
- iv. To establish the influence of leverage on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.

2.0 Literature Review

The section included a discussion of the theoretical review, empirical literature review and conceptual framework.

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Baumol Model

Jack Baumol set up Baumol Model in 1952. The model assists firms with distinguishing the ideal size of money that an organization needs to maintain optimum operations. The model states that organizations need to have some cash to use and are certain about it (Moraes and Nagano, 2014). The organizations go for cheap sources of funding that are not a burden to pay back (Alvarez, & Lippi, 2017). The model notes that money management and inventory management are faced with the same issues. The model imagines that the company can forecast cash demands with confidence and that cash outflows are the same over some period. Consistency in incomes is an inconsistency of reality in that it is almost difficult to have a reliable capital stream as monetary requests vary after some time (Premachandra, 2004). It further acknowledges that the possible cost of holding real money is seen and consistent and unequivocally, the specific trade cost is upheld. The congruity of this theory is that it is a functioning capital framework and addresses the asset substance of an association, which is exceptionally crucial in the association operations (Miller, 1966). The model was relevant in the present research and expected to inform variable working capital financing. Working capital financing is all about determining the amount of capital needed in the short run to meet the operations. The risk and costs of borrowing need to be examined before choosing the financing strategy to adopt. Thus, the model was deemed appropriate in the study.

2.1.2 Pecking Order Theory

Myers and Majluf established the Pecking Theory in 1984. The theory assumes that companies like to fund internally through retained incomes instead of outside funding (Frank & Goyal, 2003). Consequently, if they should use outside funding, debt funding is much more liked over equity (Chen & Chen, 2011). As per the theory, organizations have a hierarchy with regards to raising

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

assets. They like interior funding, which contains held profit, instead of outside finance sources, including obligation and newly delivered value shares. If the internal funding is deficient, the organization look for external sources to finance its operations. The concept recommends the external sources of fundings be the last resort. The operations' internal funding is easily altered depending on the availing circumstances. Contingent upon the internal sources makes the associations significantly more beneficial and performing (Byoun & Rhim, 2005). Non-monetary organizations need to use the best financing decisions to improve Working Capital Funding. Consequently, if firms need to use outside financing, the debt is generally suitable and value to be utilized if the wide range of various financing decisions are depleted. The dependence of the internal sources of fundings facilitates the independence of the organizations. Internal sourcing is factored to be one of the critical assets of the organizations. Thus, the theory was considered to be relevant in the current study.

2.1.3 Trade-off Theory

The advocates of trade-off theory were Modigliani and Miller in 1958. According to the theory, the funding choices are dependent on the risks of the debts. The idea indicates that organizations would by and considerable support utilizing momentary obligation since it savors the experience of an expense advantage over enduring financing. Simultaneously, it has significant dangers that cause high monetary trouble costs (Dierker, Lee & Seo, 2019). The theory shows that momentary obligation is commonly more affordable than durable financing since moneylenders join a higher risk to a significantly longer subsidizing period, subsequently prompting a higher inclining yield bend. According to Ai, Frank and Sanati (2020), short-term debt has a couple of commitments, which decrease loan style and tracking expenses. It additionally sends out favorable signals to the market regarding the quality of the company's investments. For most cases, the liquidity of a firm is essential in projecting more about the future. The liquidity ratio is established as a ratio between existing assets and present liabilities (short-term debts). This adaptability saves the organization from paying interest on inactive capital. The concept is relevant to the current research. This concept discusses the relationship between liquidity and funding of working capital approaches. According to Dereeper and Trinh (2015), fixed resources offer greater security than present resources. This recommends that organizations with high levels of current resources in their resource structure probably forestall obligation because of its high default danger and utilize much greater value to back their functioning capital requests. The hypothesis, for that reason, anticipates an adverse relationship between liquidity and funding of working capital demands.

2.1.4 Economies of Scale Theory

Marshall developed the economies of scale theory in the 1890s. The theory assumes that the availability of external economies to firms increases with the scale of industry output. Investors prefer companies with massive assets and are confident that their returns are guaranteed (Matějová, Plaček, Krápek, Půček & Ochrana, 2014). There is a favorable effect between firm size and returns (Wicker, Breuer, Lamprecht & Fischer, 2014). The stocks of larger companies often pay good dividends to investors to capture some of their investment returns. Larger firms are expected to have more reliable information concerning their performance, increasing investor confidence and lowering moral hazards (Bejan, Almerbati, & Lorente, 2017). Further, the theory establishes that large firms can spread risk, thus producing a higher income (Struk, 2015). Larger firms can venture

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

into areas that are not attractive to smaller firms, thus expanding their revenue base and gaining monopoly status. Furthermore, the larger firms have greater access to funding, thus enhancing their performance by investing in modern technologies, hiring qualified staff and investing further, which became advantageous to the investors by earning the dividends (Toukoushian & Lee, 2018). Besides, firm size enables the company to conduct research and development efforts to remain competitive and attract more investors (Callaghan 2019). Hence, the theory is significant to the present research and informed the variable of firm size.

2.1.5 Profit Maximization Theory

The theory assumes that it is easier for a profit-making organization to access more funding's from institutions and investors. There is a guarantee that profit-making organizations can repay debts on time through diversification and expansion of their operations (Young & Makhija, 2014). Every organization develops mechanisms and strategies that strengthen the magnitude of profitability. The business's profitability motivates the company to expand its operations and production (Day, Aigner & Smith, 2001). Institutions are mandated to develop mechanisms and strategies that enhance profit maximization, facilitating a competitive advantage. More profitable businesses can get funding from various sources since they seem proficient in repaying. One of the factors that determine the financing strategies of companies is the degree of profitability (Abbas, 2016). The theory reports that the only reason why some of the companies perform better than others is because of the strategies been developed to expand their profitability (Jafar, Muda, Zainal & Yasin, 2010).

A higher profitability level facilitates an easy expansion of the business to other regions. Companies are mandated to develop mechanisms that enhance profit maximization, facilitating a competitive advantage (Divya & Jayanthi 2020). A profitable business has a positive impact on society in the form of employment creation. The only way a business can remain positive in the minds of people in society is through its contribution to socio-economic empowerment. Most of the performing business engages in sponsoring the events, which increases their visibility to the people (Luo, Tan, & Xia, 2014). The theory shows that profit maximization is among the motivating factors of conducting business. The higher the profits, the more sustainable the business and thus, the owners are willing to expand the operations even to other regions (Jahn & Brühl, 2018). More profitable companies can get funding from multiple sources since they seem capable of repaying. One of the constituents that determine the financing strategies of companies is the extent of the profitability. Hence, the theory is essential to the research and informed the variable profitability

2.2 Empirical Literature Review

Wahome (2018) sought to examine the impact of company size on capital financing decisions of Insurance firms in Kenya. The research population included all the registered insurance companies that have actually functioned in the recent past. The analysis was done utilizing the statistical package (EViews version 8). The research concluded that firm size is positively and significantly related to the capital structure. However, research was conducted in a financial institution (insurance) and, therefore, a contextual gap. Moreover, Abbas (2016) mentioned that company size does not determine the working capital requirement. The exploration noted that the company size is not factored to be vital in determining the operational capital requirement in some cases.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

Other segments such as strategies adopted can influence the working capital requirements. Nevertheless, the research was performed in Norway and thus presents a contextual gap. Further, Nyang'oro (2016) revealed that company size is positively and significantly related to working capital demands. Research offers a methodological gap since the research was conducted between 2003 and 2012. A lot of advancements concerning the operations of the companies listed at NSE have changed from 2012 to 2019. Moreover, Lourenco and Oliveira (2017) focused on determining whether the size of the company can affect the working capital requirement. The outcome of the exploration indicated that the size of the company has a negative effect on working capital requirements.

Chauhan, Gaurav and Pradip Banerjee (2018) indicated that tangible assets are vital in ensuring the firms have an adequate resource for the smooth operation of the activities. It was indicated that a positive relationship was found to exist between asset tangibility and the working capital requirement. Nevertheless, the research was focused on small and medium-sized firms and, therefore, a contextual gap. Singh and Kumar (2017) evaluated the determinants of the structure of the resource of listed manufacturing firms in India. Results revealed a considerable favorable relationship between asset tangibility on the capital framework. From this outcome, it was concluded that companies with more current assets in their asset framework would certainly have much less collateral, which lending institutions need for debt issuance. Therefore, companies with even more present assets contrasted to short-term liabilities certainly have a favorable capital structure. The research concluded that asset tangibility is significant in identifying the capital framework among manufacturing companies in India. However, the research was conducted in India and, therefore, a contextual gap.

Chang, Batmunkh, Wong and Jargalsaikhan (2019) performed research on the effect of profitability on working capital demands. The outcomes of the research discovered a negative connection in between profitability and equity. Nonetheless, the research noted that productivity was favorably related to debts, especially the short-term debts. The research concluded that companies need to fund the majority of their operations utilizing short-term debts because it has a favorable effect on profitability. Furthermore, Altaf and Ahmad (2019) sought to determine the impact of capital leverage on working capital requirements among the Indian machinery industry. Secondary data was collected from the firms. The results revealed there is a significant positive relationship between financial leverage and working capital requirements. Nevertheless, research was conducted in India and thus presents a contextual gap. Moreover, Minnema and Andersson (2018) reported the relationship between leverage and the working capital requirements is negative. However, the study was conducted in Sweden and thus a contextual gap. Further, it was found by Aziidah (2017) that leverage has a negative relationship with the capital structure.

Onchangwa (2019) determined the impact of leverage on working capital financial strategies. The research indicated financial leverage was negatively related to working capital financial strategies. The study concluded that financial leverage is fundamental and they define financial stability. However, the findings of the research cannot be used to give inferences concerning current research because it did sample and not all the firms were included in the study as in the case with the current research. Therefore, the study presents a methodological gap. In addition, Makau (2019) stated that leverage negatively and significantly related to capital structure.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

2.3 Conceptual Framework

The framework is presented in Figure 1.

Independent Variables




Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
 Researcher (2022)

3.0 Research Methodology

The study used explanatory research design. The researcher examined the relationship between firm characteristics and working capital financing, thus making the explanatory design suitable. The study included eight categories of firms as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Target Population

Sector	Number of Firms	Percentage
Agriculture	6	13
Automobile	1	3
Commercial Service	12	27
Construction and Allied	5	11
Energy and Petroleum	5	11
Investment Services	6	13
Manufacturing and Allied	10	22
Total	45	100

Source: NSE (2021)

The researcher conducted a census. Census is conducted where targeted population is small and manageable (Charman *et al.*, 2015). The target population of non-financial firms was 45. These 45 firms were few and manageable; hence, the census was appropriate. The research used secondary panel data. The researcher collected the data using secondary data collection sheet and used five years- period ranging between 2015 and 2019. The basis for choosing the period between 2015 and 2019 was that most firms were active within this period. The researcher ensured the data collected for the analysis was audited to make it reliable for the study. The data was also obtained from authorized bodies such as NSE and CBK. The data was analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics. STATA version 14.1 was used to generate a quantitative report.

4.0 Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The study results presented in Table 2 depicts the descriptive statistics of firm size, asset tangibility, profitability, leverage and working capital financing.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Observation	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Working Capital Financing	225	.1699432	1.094949	-6.44482	8.089778
Firm Size	225	9.932223	1.552628	7.305357	11.26642
Asset Tangibility	225	0.130642	0.0953917	0.4063204	0.832684
Profitability	225	0.087141	1.163299	-9.01826	8.986891
Leverage	225	0.189029	0.051316	0.08788	0.290375

Source: Study Data (2022)

The rationale of having descriptive statistics is to describe what the data is all about without making any conclusions extending beyond the immediate data alone. The study results presented in Table 2 indicate that the mean of working capital financing measured through the short-term debt divided by the working capital requirement (current assets minus accounts payable) was found to be .1699432 with a minimum of -6.44482 and a maximum of 8.089778. The negative value (-6.44482) implies that accounts payable to some firms exceeded the current assets. This signified that some of the firms are facing liquidity. Moreover, the mean of the log of the total assets was found to be 9.932223 (Ksh. 8,555,058,823) with a minimum of 7.305357 (Ksh. 20,200,262) and a maximum of 11.26642 (Ksh.184,680,057,034). The rationale for using the logarithm was that the values of the total assets were large. The results imply that all the non-financial firms have enormous assets that are important and can help to generate revenue.

The study found that the mean of the asset tangibility was 0.130642, with the minimum being 0.4063204 and a maximum of 0.832684. The results imply that non-financial firms meet their cash obligations as the asset tangibility was found to be positive. Moreover, most non-financial firms

have more current assets than fixed assets because the mean score was found to be 0.4063204. Thus, non-financial firms are more interested in having more current assets to finance their day-to-day activities. Moreover, it was found that the minimum return on assets was 0.087141, with the minimum being -9.01826 and a maximum of 8.986891. The study results imply that some non-financial firms have been reporting losses. Further, the study found that the minimum leverage among the firms was 0.189029, with the minimum being 0.08788 and a maximum of 0.290375. The results imply that some non-financial firms use debt to undertake investment or projects.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

The study results in Table 3 show the association between firm characteristics (firm size, asset tangibility, profitability, leverage) and working capital financing.

Table 3: Correlation Results

		Working Capital Financing	Firm size	Asset Tangibility	Profitability	Leverage
Working Capital Financing	Pearson Correlation	1.000				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
Firm size	Pearson Correlation	.01843	1.000			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006				
Asset Tangibility	Pearson Correlation	0.6531	-0.0363	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000			
Profitability	Pearson Correlation	0.7675	0.0121	0.7383	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000		
Leverage	Pearson Correlation	-0.3218	0.0715	-0.3978	-0.2812	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Table 3 shows that firm size, asset tangibility and profitability are positively and significantly associated with working capital financing ($r = 0.01843$, $p = 0.006$; $r = 0.6531$, $P = 0.000$; $r = 0.7675$, $p = 0.000$) respectively. In contrast, leverage is negatively and significantly associated with working capital financing ($r = -0.3218$, $P = 0.000$). The results imply that working capital financing increases as firm size, asset tangibility and profitability increase. In contrast, the working capital financing decreases as the leverage increases. The results are consistent with Nyang'oro's (2016) findings, which revealed that company size is positively related to working capital demands. Further, Saarani and Shahadan (2018) revealed that profitability is an essential variable in identifying the short-term debt of both SMEs. In addition, Kinyua and Muriu (2017) established that positive and significant relationships exist between profitability and working capital requirement. Moreover, Minnema and Andersson (2018) reported the negative relationship between leverage and working capital requirements.

4.3 Diagnostics Tests

Some diagnostics tests were carried out to ensure the regression assumptions were met.

4.3.1 Normality Test

The study findings of the normality test are as depicted below in Table 4

Table 4: Normality Test

Variable	Observation	Pr(Skewness)	Pr(Kurtosis)	adj chi2(2)	Prob>chi2
Working capital financing	225	0.0033	0.0001	18.57	0.0701
Firm size (Log of total assets)	225	0.0023	0.4012	8.91	0.5960
Asset tangibility	225	0.0025	0.0001	20.01	0.9761
Profitability (ROA)	225	0.076	0.0146	29.96	0.2107
Leverage	225	0.0012	0.6816	9.44	0.0890

Source: Study Data (2022)

The p values of the variables (working capital financing, firm size (log of total assets), asset tangibility, profitability (ROA) and leverage) presented in Table 4 were greater than 0.05. Thus, data was normally distributed. Ghasemi and Zahediasl (2012) indicate that if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the data is normal, otherwise not. The significance of the normally distributed data is that it shows that most data points are relatively similar and thus have low possibilities of outliers.

4.3.2 Multicollinearity Test

The results are presented in Table 5

Table 5: Multicollinearity Test

Variable	VIF
Firm size	1.01
Asset tangibility	2.41
Profitability	2.21
Leverage	1.19

Source: Study Data (2022)

The results presented in Table 5 indicate the absence of multicollinearity since the VIF of all the variables were less than 10. The results are consistent with Jagpal's (1982) results, indicating that VIF values less than 10 imply no multicollinearity.

4.3.3 Panel Unit Root Test

Levi lechun (LLC) test was used and the research findings are illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Panel Unit Root Test Results

Variable	Statistic(adjusted)	P-value	Comment
Working Capital Financing	7.3244	0.000	Stationary
Firm Size	6.9054	0.000	Stationary
Asset Tangibility	5.7439	0.000	Stationary
Profitability	6.2143	0.000	Stationary
Leverage	6.0063	0.000	Stationary

Source: Study Data (2022)

The p values of the variables (working capital financing, firm size (log of total assets), asset tangibility, profitability (ROA) and leverage) were less than 0.05; hence, the data was stationary, as supported by Pesaran (2007) that p values less than 0.05 indicates data is normal.

4.3.4 Heteroskedasticity Test

The study results of the test are presented in Table 7

Table 7: Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity	
chi2(5)	= 121.25
Prob> chi2 =	0.3851

Source: Study Data (2022)

The P-value was found to be 0.3851, hence, there is no heteroskedasticity in the data. The heteroskedasticity in data occurs when the variance of the residuals in a given data is unequal (Halunga, Orme & Yamagata, 2017). The presence of heteroskedasticity in the data can result in spurious results.

4.3.5 Autocorrelation Test

The study results of the Autocorrelation Test are presented in Table 8

Table 8: Autocorrelation Test Results

Wooldridge test	
H0: no first-order autocorrelation	
Prob> F =	0.9210

Source: Study Data (2022)

The study fails to reject the null hypothesis (p-value is 0.9210); therefore, the residuals are not autocorrelated. Amaral and Anselin (2014) report that if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the

residuals are not autocorrelated; otherwise, they are. The role of examining autocorrelation is to determine whether there is a relationship between the observations after some time.

4.3.6 Hausman Test

The study results of the Hausman test is presented below in Table 9.

Table 9: Hausman Test Results

Column	(b)	(B)
	Random	Fixed
Firm Size	.133851	.1340656
Asset Tangibility	.1937947	.1998338
Profitability	.5775875	.579844
Leverage	-2.041886	-2.056171

$$\chi^2(5) = (b-B)'[(V_b - V_B)^{-1}](b-B) = 1.54$$

$$\text{Prob} > \chi^2 = 0.8192$$

Source: Study Data (2022)]

The p-value obtained was 0.8192 and thus, the most appropriate model is random. Ahn and Moon (2014) indicate that the most preferred model is random. Hence the most effective model for the study was the random effect model.

4.4 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis examined the causal relationship between variables. The model fitness, variance analysis and regression coefficients are presented in the section. The results presented in Table 10 indicate the model summary.

Table 10: Model Summary.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.804a	0.647	0.641	0.656427

Predictors: Firm size, Asset tangibility, Profitability, Leverage

Source: Study Data (2022)

Based on the study results presented in Table 10, firm size (log of total assets), asset tangibility, profitability (ROA) and leverage was found to explain 64.10% of the variations in the working capital financing. The remaining 35.90% of the variations in the working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE can be explained by other variables other than firm size, asset tangibility, profitability and leverage. Wahome (2018) stated that firm size is positively and significantly related to the capital structure. In addition, Chauhan, Gaurav and Pradip Banerjee (2018) indicated a positive relationship between asset tangibility and working capital requirement. Chang, Batmunkh, Wong and Jargalsaikhan (2019) articulated that profitability is positively

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

related to working capital demands. In addition, Onchangwa (2019) noted that financial leverage is negatively related to working capital financial strategies.

The study results presented in Table 11 provided the results on the analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 11: ANOVA Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	173.759	4	43.44	100.813	.000b
	Residual	94.797	220	0.431		
Total		268.557	224			

a Dependent Variable: Working capital financing

b Predictors: Firm size, Asset tangibility, Profitability, Leverage

Source: Study Data (2022)

The results in Table 11 indicate that the overall model is statistically significant. The results imply that firm size, asset tangibility, profitability and leverage are good predictors in explaining the working capital financing of the non-financial firms listed at NSE. Chauhan, Gaurav and Pradip Banerjee (2018) indicated that a positive relationship exists between asset tangibility and working capital requirement. Moreover, Olatunji and Buyide (2020) showed that asset tangibility is related to working capital financing. Kinyua and Muriu (2017) established positive and significant relationships between profitability and working capital requirement. Moreover, Minnema and Andersson (2018) reported the negative relationship between leverage and working capital requirements.

The regressions of coefficient results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Regression Coefficients

Variable	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P>z
Firm Size	0.133851	0.028368	4.720	0.000
Asset Tangibility	0.193795	0.071402	2.710	0.007
Profitability	0.577588	0.056005	10.310	0.000
Leverage	-2.04189	0.933526	2.190	0.029
Constant	-0.84917	0.32775	2.590	0.010

Source: Study Data (2022)

The model is;

$$Y = -0.84917 + 0.133851 \text{ Firm Size} + 0.193795 \text{ Asset Tangibility} + 0.577588 \text{ Profitability} - 2.04189 \text{ Leverage}$$

The results from Table 12 shows that firm size (total assets) has significant positive influence on working capital financing ($\beta=0.133851$, $p=0.000$). The results imply that increasing the firm size (total assets) by one unit would increase the working capital financing by 0.133851 units while

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

other factors are constant. The study tested the hypothesis to examine whether firm size has a significant influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms.

H₀₁: Firm size has no significant influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE

The p-value, as presented in Table 12, was found to be 0.000; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, firm size has a significant positive influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE. Wahome (2018) stated that firm size has a significant positive influence on capital structure. Further, Nyang'oro (2016) revealed that company size has a significant positive influence on working capital demands. The study results revealed that asset tangibility has a significant positive influence on working capital financing ($\beta=0.193795$, $p=0.007$). The results signify that an increase in asset tangibility by one unit would increase the working capital financing by 0.193795 units keeping other factors constant. The study tested the hypothesis.

H₀₂: Asset tangibility has no significant influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.

The null hypothesis was rejected since the p-value was 0.07. Hence, asset tangibility has a significant positive influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The results are consistent with Chauhan, Gaurav and Pradip Banerjee (2018), who indicated that asset tangibility significantly influences working capital requirement. Singh and Kumar (2017) revealed that asset tangibility has a significant positive influence on capital structure. Moreover, the results showed that profitability (ROA) has a significant positive influence on working capital financing ($\beta=0.577588$, $p=0.007$). The results imply that increasing profitability by one unit would increase the working capital financing by 0.577588 while other factors are held constant. The study tested the hypothesis.

H₀₃: Profitability has no significant influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.

Based on the results presented in Table 12, the p-value is 0.000 and the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, profitability has a significant positive influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The results are consistent with Chang, Batmunkh, Wong and Jargalsaikhan's (2019) findings, which stated that profitability has a significant positive influence on working capital demands. Saarani and Shahadan (2018) noted that profitability is an essential variable in identifying the short-term debt of both SMEs. Finally, the results indicate that leverage has a significant negative influence on working capital financing ($\beta=-2.04189$, $p=0.029$). The results insinuate that an increase in leverage by one unit would decrease the working capital financing by 2.04189 while other factors are constant. The study tested the hypothesis.

H₀₄: Leverage has no significant influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE.

The null hypothesis is rejected (p-value is 0.029). Therefore, leverage has a significant negative influence on working capital financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The results are consistent with the findings of Minnema and Andersson (2018), which reported leverage has a

significant negative influence on working capital requirements. Further, it was found by Aziidah (2017) that leverage has a significant negative influence on capital structure. Moreover, Makau (2019) stated that leverage has a significant negative influence on capital structure.

5.0 Conclusions

The study concluded that firm size is positively associated with working capital financing. Firm size (total assets) has a significant positive influence on working capital financing. Assets of organizations are a source of revenue, such as rent. Thus, more assets are expected to bring more income to the organizations, lowering the borrowing and increasing the working capital. The high working capital signals that a company is shrewdly managed and suggests a higher potential for strong growth. Further, larger firms are expected to be more financially stable with more net incomes, thus reducing borrowing. The reduction of the borrowing implies fewer current liabilities, thus higher working capital due to more current assets than current liabilities. The study results showed that asset tangibility is positively associated with working capital financing. It was found that asset tangibility has a significant positive influence on working capital financing. financing adopted by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The results thus imply that firms with higher asset tangibility is less borrowing, thus increasing the working capital financing that is determined as the difference between current assets and current liabilities such as debts.

The study concluded that profitability measured through the return on assets is positively associated with working capital financing. Profitability (ROA) has a significant positive influence on working capital financing. It was revealed that increase profitability would significantly increase working capital financing by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The higher the profits, the more sustainable the business will be. Profitable companies are less likely to borrow since they can use retained earnings to finance business operations. The study concluded leverage is negatively associated with working capital financing. Leverage has a significant negative influence on working capital financing. The results insinuate that an increase in leverage would significantly decrease working capital financing by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The results imply that an increase in the leverage increases the debts such as current liabilities, thus reducing the working capital because it is a function of the difference between current assets and current liabilities.

6.0 Recommendations

Based on the study findings, it is recommended that the non-financial firms listed at NSE should look for strategies that increase the assets. The study results showed that increasing the firm size (total assets) would significantly increase working capital financing by non-financial firms listed at NSE. Enormous firms are expected to be more financially stable with more investments, thus reducing borrowing. The reduction of the borrowing implies fewer current liabilities, hence higher working capital due to more current assets than current liabilities. The high working capital signals that a company is shrewdly managed and suggests a higher potential for solid growth. In addition, it is recommended that firms should look for ways to increase asset tangibility. The results showed that an increase in asset tangibility would significantly increase working capital financing by non-financial firms listed at NSE. The firms with higher asset tangibility is less borrowing. The firms can invest using the assets, thus increasing the revenue base. The investment in assets could be the foundations of increasing the revenue base in the long run. More revenue implies that there are high retained earnings, thus lower borrowing.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

Further, it is recommended that the non-financial firms listed at NSE look for approaches to increase profitability levels. The higher the profits, the more sustainable the business will be. Profitable companies are less likely to borrow since they can use retained earnings to finance business operations. The retained earnings from the profitability making are an essential source of capital, enabling institutions to build strong buffers to absorb any loss, thus lowering the possibility of external borrowing. Moreover, it is recommended that the non-financial firms listed at NSE look for strategies that reduce the leverage levels. The study results insinuate that an increase in leverage would significantly increase working capital financing by non-financial firms listed at NSE. High leverage means increasing the borrowing, thus reducing the working capital.

Another study be conducted to examine the factors that include the remaining 35.90% that could also explain the variations in the working capital financing of the non-financial firms listed at Nairobi Securities Exchange. Moreover, since the study was only done in non-financial firms, another study can be conducted with the financial firms. This is key in comparison with the current research results and further identification of more research gaps.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, M. (2016). *Determinants of capital structure: Empirical evidence from listed firms in Norway* (Master's thesis). Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Oslo, Norway.
- Ahmad, N. S. M., & Atniesha, M. R. A. A. (2018). The Pecking Order Theory and Start-up Financing of Small and Medium Enterprises: Insight into Available Literature in the Libyan Context. *Journal of Finance*, 3(2), 16-21 [https://doi.org/10.21272/fmir.2\(4\).5-12.2018](https://doi.org/10.21272/fmir.2(4).5-12.2018)
- Ahn, S. C., & Moon, H. R. (2014). Large-N and large-T properties of panel data estimators and the Hausman test. In *Festschrift in Honor of Peter Schmidt* (pp. 219-258). Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-8008-3_7
- Alipour, M., Mohammadi, M.F.S., & Derakhshan, H. (2015). Determinants of Capital Structure: An empirical study of firms in Iran. *International Journal of law and management*, 57(1), 53-83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-01-2013-0004>
- Altaf, N., & Ahmad, F. (2019). Working capital financing, firm performance and financial constraints: Empirical evidence from India. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 11 (2), 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-02-2018-0036>
- Alvarez, F., & Lippi, F. (2017). Cash burns: An inventory model with a cash-credit choice. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 9(5), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2017.07.001>
- Amaral, P. V., & Anselin, L. (2014). Finite sample properties of Moran's I test for spatial autocorrelation in Tobit models. *Papers in Regional Science*, 93(4), 773-781. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pirs.12034>
- Andani, A., & Al-hassan, S. (2016). The determinants of the financing decisions of listed and non-listed firms in Ghana. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 2(7), 751-771.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

- Auditor General (2019). *Report of the Auditor General on Kenya Power and Lighting Company for the year ended 30th June 2019*. Retrieved from <https://kplc.co.ke/AR2019/Audited%20Accounts%20for%20Year%20Ended%2030.6.2019.pdf>
- Aziidah, N. (2017). *The Effect of Financial Leverage on The Financial Performance of Kenyan Energy and Petroleum Firms Listed on the NSE* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Bassey, N. E., Arene, C. J., & Okpukpara, B. C. (2014). Determinants of capital structure of listed agro firms in Nigeria. *Economic Affairs*, 59 (1), 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.5958/j.0976-4666.59.1.004>
- Baumol, W. J., & Vinod, H. D. (1970). An inventory theoretic model of freight transport demand. *Management science*, 16(7), 413-421. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.16.7.413>
- Bejan, A., Almerbati, A., & Lorente, S. (2017). Economies of scale: The physics basis. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 121(4), 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4974962>
- Byoun, S., & Rhim, J. C. (2005). Tests of the pecking order theory and the tradeoff theory of optimal capital structure. *Global Business and Finance Review*, 2(1) 1-16.
- Callaghan, C. W. (2019). Business research methodologies and the need for economies of scale in the business research process: Harnessing the innovation opportunities of novel technologies and technological change. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 17(3), pp179-190. <https://doi.org/10.34190/JBRM.17.3.007>
- Chang, C. C., Batmunkh, M. U., Wong, W. K., & Jargalsaikhan, M. (2019). Relationship between capital structure and profitability: Evidence from Four Asian Tigers. *Available at SSRN 3411977*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3411977>
- Charman, A. J., Petersen, L. M., Piper, L. E., Liedeman, R., & Legg, T. (2017). Small area census approach to measure the township informal economy in South Africa. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 11(1), 36-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815572024>
- Chauhan, Gaurav S., and Pradip Banerjee (2018). Financial constraints and optimal working capital—evidence from an emerging market. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 12(7), 38-52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-07-2016-0131>
- Chen, L. J., & Chen, S. Y. (2011). How the pecking-order theory explain capital structure. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 6(3), 92-100.
- Chesang, D. (2017). *Effect of Financial Leverage on Profitability of Listed Agricultural Firms at The Nairobi Securities Exchange* (Doctoral dissertation, Kisii University).
- Choi, S., Oh, G., & Jung, W. S. (2008). Hurst exponent and prediction based on weak-form efficient market hypothesis of stock markets. *Physical A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 387(18), 4630-4636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2008.03.035>
- Dang, C., Li, Z. F., & Yang, C. (2018). Measuring firm size in empirical corporate finance. *Journal of banking & finance*, 86, 159-176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2017.09.006>

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

- Day, R. H., Aigner, D. J., & Smith, K. R. (2001). Safety margins and profit maximization in the theory of the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 79(6), 1293-1301. <https://doi.org/10.1086/259836>
- Deloitte (2020). Kenya Airways Annual Report & Financial Statements 2019. Retrieved from [https://www.dse.co.tz/sites/default/files/Kenya%20Airways%20Plc Annual%20Report%202019.pdf](https://www.dse.co.tz/sites/default/files/Kenya%20Airways%20Plc%20Annual%20Report%202019.pdf)
- Dereeper, S., & Trinh, Q. D. (2015). Trade-Off Theory or Pecking Order Theory with a State-Ownership Structure: The Vietnam Case. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 11(1), 114-132. <https://doi.org/10.21102/irbrp.2015.03.111.08>
- Dierker, M., Lee, I., & Seo, S. W. (2019). Risk changes and external financing activities: Tests of the dynamic trade-off theory of capital structure. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 52, 178-200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jempfin.2019.03.004>
- Divya, R., & Jayanthi, V. E. (2020). Efficient optimal resource allocation for profit maximization in software defined network approach to improve quality of service in cloud environments. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 4(3), 1-10.
- East African Portland Cement Company Annual Reports (2019). Annual Report & Financial Statements 2017/2018. Retrieved from <http://www.eastafricanportland.com/images/docs/2018/EAP-PLC-Annual-Report-2018.pdf>
- Eysimkele, A., & Koori, D. J. (2019). Financial Leverage and Performance of the Agricultural Companies Listed at Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 3(5), 76-88
- Frank, M. Z., & Goyal, V. K. (2008). Trade-off and pecking order theories of debt. In *Handbook of empirical corporate finance* (pp. 135-202). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.670543>
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality Tests for Statistical Analysis: A Guide for Non-Statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486–489.
- Halunga, A. G., Orme, C. D., & Yamagata, T. (2017). A heteroskedasticity robust Breusch–Pagan test for Contemporaneous correlation in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of econometrics*, 198(2), 209-230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2016.12.005>
- Hasan, A. L. (2017). Conducting census under adverse conditions; challenges and lessons learned. *Journal of Finance and Management*, 5(2), 16-31
- Hossain, M. I., & Hossain, M. A. (2015). Determinants of capital structure and testing of theories: A study on the listed manufacturing companies in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 7(4), 176-190. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v7n4p176>

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

- Jafar, H., Muda, I., Zainal, A., & Yasin, W. (2010). Profit Maximization Theory, Survival-based theory and contingency theory: A review on several underlying research theories of corporate turnaround. *Journal of Economy*, 13(4), 16-31
- Jagpal, H. S. (1982). Multicollinearity in structural equation models with unobservable variables. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(4), 431-439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378201900405>
- Jahn, J., & Brühl, R. (2018). How Friedman's view on individual freedom relates to stakeholder theory and social contract theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3353-x>
- Kaguri, A. W. (2016). Relationship between firm characteristics and financial performance of life insurance companies in Kenya. *Journal of Finance and accounting*, 5(12), 17-38
- Kasozi, J. (2017). The effect of working capital management on profitability: a case of listed manufacturing firms in South Africa. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 14(2), 336-346. [https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.14\(2-2\).2017.05](https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.14(2-2).2017.05)
- Kiiru, J. W., Kirori, G. N., & Omurwa, J. K. (2019). Financial Management Practices and Financial Performance of Services Industry in Kenya: Case of Kenya Airways. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 3(2), 76-93.
- Kinyua, J., B., & Muriu, P., W. (2017). Determinants of Capital Structure of Agricultural Firms in Kenya. *European Scientific Journal*, 13(7), 277-299. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2017.v13n7p277>
- Koksal, B., & Orman, C. (2015). Determinants of Capital Structure: Evidence from a major developing economy. *Small Business Economics*, 44(2), 255-282. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-014-9597-x>
- Lazaridis, I., & Tryfonidis, D. (2016). Relationship between working capital management and profitability of listed companies in the Athens stock exchange. *Journal of financial management and analysis*, 19(1), 46-58
- Miller, M. H., & Orr, D. (1966). A Model of the Demand for Money by Firms. *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 80(3), 413-435. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1880728>
- Minnema, J., & Andersson, A. (2018). The relationship between leverage and profitability: A quantitative study of consulting firms in Sweden. *Journal of Finance*, 9(4), 15-31
- Moraes, M. B., & Nagano, M. S. (2014). Evolutionary models in cash management policies with multiple assets. *Economic Modelling*, 3(9) 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2014.02.010>
- Mwangi, L. W., Makau, M. S., & Kosimbei, G. (2014). Relationship between capital structure and performance of non-financial companies listed in the Nairobi Securities Exchange, Kenya. *Global Journal of Contemporary Research in Accounting, Auditing and Business Ethics*, 1(2), 72-90.

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

- Nairobi Securities Exchange, NSE (2021) Listed Companies. Retrieved from <https://www.nse.co.ke/listed-companies/list.html>
- Njeri, W. R., Namusonge, G. & Mugambi, F. (2017). Effect of working capital management on financial sustainability of government owned entities in the ministry of agriculture, livestock and fisheries (MOALF), Kenya. *The strategic journal for Business & Change Management*, 4(3), 11.
- Njuguna, A. M. (2018). *Effect of Working Capital Management on Financial Performance of Construction and Allied Sector Firms Listed in the Nairobi Securities Exchange for the Period 2012-2016*. (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa).
- Nyang'oro, O. (2016). *Determinants of Capital Structure of Listed Firms in Kenya and the Impact of Corporate Tax*. AERC Research Paper 329, African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi.
- Onchangwa, G. A. (2019). *Effects of Working Capital Management on Financial Distress of Non-Financial Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange Market* (Doctoral dissertation, JKUAT-COHRED).
- Ooko, A., Githui, T., & Omurwa, M. J. (2018). Firm Characteristics and Financing of Working Capital Requirement in Organizations: A Case of Non-Financial Firms Listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange (NSE). *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 2(1), 34-56.
- Pozzoli, M., & Paolone, F. (2017). *Corporate financial distress: a study of the Italian manufacturing industry*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67355-4>
- Quayyum, S. T. (2014). Effects of working capital management and asset tangibility: evidence from the cement Industry of Bangladesh. *Journal of Business and Technology* 6(1), 37-47. <https://doi.org/10.3329/jbt.v6i1.9993>
- Raheman, A., & Nasr, M. (2017). Working capital management and profitability—case of Pakistani firms. *International review of business research papers*, 3(1), 279-300.
- Rahi, S. (2017). Research design and methods: A systematic review of research paradigms, sampling issues and instruments development. *International Journal of Economics & Management Sciences*, 6(2), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000403>
- Sharma, A. K., & Kumar, S. (2016). Effect of working capital management on firm profitability: Empirical evidence from India. *Global Business Review*, 12(1), 159-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097215091001200110>
- Shrivastava, A Kumar, N., & Kumar, K.P. (2017). Bayesian analysis of working capital management on corporate profitability: Evidence from India. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 44(4), 568-584. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JES-11-2015-0207>
- Struk, M. (2015). Municipality size and local public services: Do economies of scale exist? *NISPA Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 7(2), 151-171. <https://doi.org/10.2478/nispa-2014-0007>

<https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t5063>

- Tong, G., & Green, C. J. (2005). Pecking order or trade-off hypothesis? Evidence on the capital structure of Chinese companies. *Applied economics*, 37(19), 2179-2189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840500319873>
- Toutkoushian, R. K., & Lee, J. C. (2018). Revisiting economies of scale and scope in higher education. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 371-416). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72490-4_8
- Tran, H., Abbott, M., & Yap, C. J. (2017). How does working capital management affect the profitability of Vietnamese small-and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. 7(2), 16-23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-05-2016-0070>
- Vaghfi, S., Moghaddam, A., & Khoshrou, M. (2014). Impact of Working Capital Management on Profitability Ratios: Evidence from Iran. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(1), 374–381.
- Wahome, M. N. (2018). *The influence of firm-specific factors on capital structure of insurance companies in Kenya*. (South Eastern Kenya University, Doctoral dissertation).
- Wayongah, D., & Ochieng, W. (2019). *Analysis of firm size, leverage and financial performance of non-financial firms in Nairobi securities exchange, Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, Maseno University).
- Wicker, P., Breuer, C., Lamprecht, M., & Fischer, A. (2014). Does club size matter: An examination of economies of scale, economies of scope, and organizational problems. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(3), 266-280. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2013-0051>
- Young, S. L., & Makhija, M. V. (2014). Firms' corporate social responsibility behavior: An integration of institutional and profit maximization approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(6), 670-698. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.29>