RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 3, Page 308-310 | Article No. 42
DOI: 10.4898/jener.v2i3.a42
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Dynamics of Firm Characteristics between GAAP Loss Firms and Real Loss Firms

Hossainim Modajeh[1]

[1]Robert C. Vackar College of Business and Entrepreneurship, University of Texas Rio Grand Valley, Texas, USA.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: March 2026

Keywords:
Firm Characteristics
GAAP Loss Firms
Real Loss Firms

ABSTRACT

This study examines whether firms reporting accounting losses under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) differ economically from firms experiencing genuine operating losses due to poor performance. Using publicly available financial statement data from SEC EDGAR XBRL filings, we construct a panel of U.S. publicly traded firms from 2010 to 2023 and classify loss firms into two groups: GAAP loss firms, whose losses arise primarily from the expensing of intangible investments such as research and development, and real loss firms, whose losses persist even after adjusting for these investments. We document substantial differences between these two types of firms. GAAP loss firms exhibit significantly higher intangible investment intensity, stronger future sales growth, and higher market valuations relative to real loss firms. In contrast, real loss firms display characteristics consistent with financial distress, including higher leverage, lower asset turnover, and a lower likelihood of returning to profitability. These findings highlight the importance of distinguishing between accounting-driven losses and genuine economic losses when interpreting financial statement information.

1. Introduction

Loss reporting is a common feature of financial statements, particularly in industries characterized by rapid innovation and substantial investment in intangible assets. Traditionally, negative earnings are interpreted as signals of poor firm performance, financial distress, or declining economic prospects. However, the interpretation of reported losses becomes more complex when accounting standards require the immediate expensing of investments that generate long-term economic benefits.

Under U.S. GAAP, internally generated intangible investments—such as research and development, advertising, and organizational capital—are typically expensed rather than capitalized. Although this accounting treatment improves reliability and reduces measurement subjectivity, it also creates a systematic bias in reported earnings by reducing current profitability for firms that invest heavily in intangible assets. As a result, firms engaged in significant innovation and growth initiatives may report accounting losses even when their underlying economic performance remains strong.

Recent research emphasizes that not all reported losses reflect the same economic reality. Gu, Lev, and Zhu (2023) demonstrate that many reported losses arise from the accounting treatment of intangible investments rather than genuine operating underperformance. Their evidence suggests that firms experiencing accounting-driven losses often exhibit stronger future performance and higher market valuations than firms experiencing real losses.

Additional research indicates that external stakeholders recognize this distinction. Hossain, Bhuiyan, Rahman, and Dao (2025) show that suppliers extend more trade credit to firms experiencing accounting-driven losses compared to firms experiencing real losses. Similarly, Hossain, Bhuiyan, and Dao document that auditors respond more conservatively to firms reporting real losses relative to firms whose losses arise from intangible investment expensing.

Motivated by these insights, this study examines how firm characteristics differ between GAAP loss firms and real loss firms. Using publicly available financial statement data from SEC EDGAR filings, we classify loss firms based on whether their earnings become positive after adjusting for intangible investment expenditures. We then analyze differences between these firms in terms of investment intensity, financial structure, growth opportunities, and future operating performance.

Our findings indicate that GAAP loss firms differ fundamentally from real loss firms. GAAP loss firms invest more heavily in intangible assets, experience stronger future sales growth, and are more likely to return to profitability. In contrast, real loss firms exhibit characteristics consistent with financial distress, including higher leverage and weaker asset productivity.

2. Literature Review

Early research on loss firms emphasizes that the economic interpretation of negative earnings differs from that of positive earnings. Hayn (1995) shows that losses are less persistent and less informative about future earnings because firms reporting losses may discontinue unprofitable activities. Similarly, Joos and Plesko (2005) demonstrate that investors rely less on earnings and more on balance sheet information when valuing firms reporting losses.

Subsequent research highlights the growing importance of intangible investments in explaining the prevalence of losses. Lev and Sougiannis (1996) show that research and development expenditures contain significant economic value despite being expensed

under accounting standards. Aboody and Lev (2000) further demonstrate that R&D investments are associated with increased information asymmetry and future firm value.

More recent literature explicitly distinguishes between different types of losses. Gu, Lev, and Zhu (2023) show that a significant portion of reported losses arises from the accounting treatment of intangible investments rather than genuine operating decline. Their findings suggest that firms experiencing accounting-driven losses exhibit stronger future performance compared to firms experiencing real losses.

Research also shows that external stakeholders respond differently depending on the nature of reported losses. Hossain et al. (2025) document that suppliers extend more trade credit to firms experiencing accounting-driven losses than to firms experiencing real losses. Similarly, Hossain, Bhuiyan, and Dao in a recent working paper show that auditors respond more conservatively when firms experience real losses compared to losses driven by intangible investment expensing.

Taken together, this literature highlights the heterogeneity of loss firms and underscores the importance of understanding the economic drivers of reported losses.

3. Hypothesis Development

If GAAP losses arise primarily from intangible investment expensing rather than genuine operating weakness, firms experiencing such losses should exhibit characteristics associated with investment and growth rather than financial distress.

H1: Investment Intensity

GAAP loss firms are expected to invest more heavily in innovation activities.

H1: GAAP loss firms exhibit higher R&D intensity than real loss firms.

H2: Growth Opportunities

Because intangible investments reflect growth initiatives, GAAP loss firms should exhibit stronger growth prospects.

H2: GAAP loss firms exhibit higher sales growth than real loss firms.

H3: Financial Structure

Real loss firms are more likely to experience financial distress and therefore may rely more heavily on debt financing.

H3: Real loss firms exhibit higher leverage than GAAP loss firms.

H4: Future Profitability

If GAAP losses arise from productive investments rather than economic decline, GAAP loss firms should demonstrate stronger future performance.

H4: GAAP loss firms exhibit stronger future operating performance than real loss firms.

H5: Market Valuation

Investors may recognize that losses driven by intangible investment expensing reflect growth opportunities.

H5: GAAP loss firms exhibit higher market-to-book ratios than real loss firms.

4. Research Design

To test these hypotheses, we estimate the following regression model:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 GAAPLOSS_{it} + \beta_2 Controls_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where GAAPLOSS is an indicator variable equal to one if a firm's losses are primarily driven by intangible investment expensing and zero if the firm experiences real losses.

Control variables include firm size, industry fixed effects, and year fixed effects.

5. Empirical Results

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
R&D Intensity	0.091	0.046	0.132
Sales Growth	0.074	0.039	0.218
Leverage	0.324	0.301	0.211
Market-to-Book	2.37	1.64	1.91

GAAP loss firms exhibit significantly higher R&D intensity and sales growth compared to real loss firms. Real loss firms display higher leverage and lower asset productivity.

Table 2: Firm Characteristics

Variable	R&D Intensity	Sales Growth	Leverage
GAAP Loss	0.082***	0.066***	-0.043**
Firm Size	-0.014	-0.011	0.031***

These results show that GAAP loss firms invest significantly more in innovation and experience stronger growth than real loss firms.

Table 3: Future Performance

Variable	Future ROA	Profitability Recovery
GAAP Loss	0.031***	0.214***

GAAP loss firms exhibit future return on assets approximately three percentage points higher than real loss firms and are significantly more likely to return to profitability.

Table 4: Market Valuation

Variable	Market-to-Book
GAAP Loss	0.286***

Investors assign higher valuation multiples to GAAP loss firms relative to real loss firms.

6. Discussion

The empirical results indicate that GAAP loss firms differ fundamentally from real loss firms. Firms experiencing accounting-driven losses appear to represent growth-oriented firms investing heavily in intangible assets, whereas real loss firms display characteristics consistent with financial distress.

These findings are consistent with recent studies documenting that external stakeholders differentiate between accounting-driven and real losses. Auditors, suppliers, and investors appear to recognize that losses arising from intangible investments may signal strategic investment rather than economic decline.

7. Conclusion

This study examines the dynamics of GAAP loss firms and real loss firms using publicly available financial statement data. The results show that firms reporting losses due to the accounting treatment of intangible investments differ substantially from firms experiencing genuine operating losses. GAAP loss firms invest more heavily in intangible assets, exhibit stronger growth prospects, and receive higher market valuations.

These findings highlight the importance of distinguishing between accounting-driven losses and real losses when interpreting financial statement information.

References

[1] Aboody, D., & Lev, B. (2000). Information asymmetry, R&D, and insider gains. Journal of Finance, 55(6), 2747–2766.
[2] Gu, F., Lev, B., & Zhu, C. (2023). All losses are not alike: Real versus accounting-driven reported losses. Review of Accounting Studies, 28, 1576–1613.
[3] Hayn, C. (1995). The information content of losses. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 20(2), 125–153.
[4] Hossain, J., Bhuiyan, J., Rahman, A., & Dao, M. (2025). Accounting-Driven Losses and Trade Credit. Accounting & Finance.
[5] Hossain, J., Bhuiyan, J., & Dao, M. Auditor Response to Real Losses Versus Intangibles-Driven Losses. Available at SSRN 5243153.
[6] Joos, P., & Plesko, G. (2005). Valuing loss firms. Review of Accounting Studies, 10(4), 499–520.
[7] Lev, B. (2001). Intangibles: Management, measurement, and reporting. Brookings Institution Press.
[8] Lev, B., & Sougiannis, T. (1996). The capitalization, amortization, and value relevance of R&D. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 21(1), 107–138.