

Category: Growth Strategy

Subject: Growth Isn't the Only Way for Companies to Create Value

Title:

Publication date: Y°Y0 / 1Y / YE

IT'S A BASIC goal of most companies: to grow revenue each year. But as globalization recedes, populations in many nations grow older (and buy less), and sustainability concerns lead more people to scrutinize the necessity of every purchase, companies are facing headwinds to growth. And while growth can be a particularly powerful differentiator in such a challenging context, it is also particularly risky. Pushing for growth at all costs can end up destroying value rather than creating it, through wasteful investments and the diversion of resources from the core strengths of the firm.

The question thus arises: How can companies build lasting value without growth?

Stability Has Its Perks To find answers, we studied more than 10,000 companies from North America, Europe, and Japan over the past Yo years. From that cohort, we identified 1YY stable firms, defined by steady, near-zero revenue growth throughout the period. These stable companies delivered shareholder returns similar to market averages, but at 1Y% lower volatility. This low volatility also correlates with both greater resilience and longevity: Stable firms were half as likely as the average firm to suffer severe value collapse by losing 90% or more of their market capitalization over the Yo-year period we assessed. They are also nearly twice as old as the typical S&P 000 company, averaging almost 100 years of age. Finally, of these stable firms, 0Y of them—one in three—managed to outperform the market in terms of total shareholder return (TSR).

If we look more closely at those δY companies that outperformed, our analysis reveals that these successful, stable companies do not conform to a single profile: They sell to both consumers and businesses, offer products as well as services, and appear across a wide range of industries (though less frequently in fast-growing sectors, where they may be left behind by competitors). Still, they share some notable similarities. For one, Yδ% of stable outperformers had an owner with a controlling interest, compared with less than λ% of companies in the S&P 10·0·—suggesting that a sense of ownership may play a role in enabling a disciplined, long-term oriented approach to value creation. That is consistent with the observation that stable firms steered clear of the risks that often accompany aggressive growth, such as overly ambitious largescale mergers or acquisitions, which have a failure rate of Yo% to Yo%.

Instead, these businesses used four distinct strategies to achieve outperformance in the absence of growth:

1. At your service: The asset-light play. Many businesses facing low-growth prospects react by seeking to acquire new customers—often at high cost—but stable outperformers are more likely to maximize value from existing customer relationships. They do this by shifting from physical products with declining demand to asset-light services and software. This approach not only deepens customer ties but also improves margins and lowers asset intensity.

The stable outperformers that made this shift increased their earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT) margins by eight percentage points between  $Y \circ \mathcal{E}$  and  $Y \circ Y \mathcal{E}$  on average, driven by  $\phi \circ \mathcal{K}$  lower capital expenditures and  $Y \circ \mathcal{K}$  lower cost of sales. This enabled them to also achieve an average annual TSR of  $\varphi \mathcal{K}$ .

This path is most common in asset heavy industries undergoing digital transformations or in IT companies becoming more service oriented. More broadly, it may offer an interesting path for businesses facing commoditization or pressure from competitors.

A case in point is Siemens: In Yole it announced an increased focus on software-as-a-service and digital twin technology. This move reflected a shift from traditional industrial conglomerate to digital industrial innovation leader, embedding software and data-driven services into its core offerings and creating more-resilient revenue streams and deeper customer integration. We found that while pursuing this strategy over the past decade, Siemens achieved an annual TSR of 11%.

Y. Take the high-end road: The gross margin play. Mature businesses are often tempted to rely on a strong brand image while cutting costs. However, enhancing quality can be a more sustainable path to value creation, helping firms establish a difficult-to-erode position and improve their gross margins. The stable outperformers who "took the high-end road" increased their gross margin by, on average, 1Y percentage points over the Yo-year sample period. This enabled them to achieve an average annual TSR of 9%, driven mainly by margin expansion and a strong cashflow contribution.

While we generally observed this strategy among consumer businesses, it may be relevant to many companies operating within a niche—whether because of product uniqueness or specialized expertise. By becoming irreplaceable, these businesses can strengthen their pricing power and move upmarket, whether they produce luxury goods or industrial components. For example, Morgan Advanced Materials, a UK-based manufacturer of ceramics and carbon materials, developed products with superior thermal resistance, electrical insulation, and mechanical strength to better serve its customers in sectors such as aerospace, semiconductors, and electric vehicles, where components must operate reliably under extreme conditions. We found that Morgan's superior products led to improved pricing power, doubling its margins over the Yo-year period and achieving an annual TSR more than Y% above that of the FTSE 100—while not growing revenues in real terms.

W. No place like in-house: The balance sheet play. When revenue growth is out of reach, balance sheet expansion offers another alternative to create value. Stable outperformers often grow their asset base through vertical integration to control a larger share of the profit pool and increase their value added. This approach also helps them build a unique asset portfolio that strengthens their differentiated value propositions and competitive moats. On average the stable outperformers that followed this strategy doubled their total asset base as they vertically integrated. Their control of a larger share of the value chain allowed them to expand their gross margins by eight percentage points on average throughout our observation period. Their investments also yielded high returns: On average firms following this strategy achieved an annual TSR of 9%, driven by a cash flow contribution of 6%.

This strategy is most prevalent in asset-intensive sectors such as industrials, utilities, and materials—but any business with an already-differentiated product and significant market share facing cost pressures from suppliers may find vertical integration a compelling path to value creation.

The hospitality industry offers a striking example. Unlike most hotel chains that franchise their brands to accelerate revenue growth, Whitbread, owner of Premier Inn, the largest hotel brand in the UK, owns all its hotels, directly manages their operations, and even controls digital distribution as well as revenue management by centralizing bookings on a proprietary platform. Although this integrated strategy constrains rapid

- expansion, consistently delivering a high-quality customer experience is an essential pillar of its competitive advantage—which we found has allowed the company to deliver \o'\text{.' annualized TSR over the past Yo years.
- E. Take it to the bank: The dividend play. Rather than aggressively pursuing growth, stable and mature companies often prioritize returning cash to their shareholders. However, without significant revenue growth, it can be challenging for these companies to meet dividend growth expectations and therefore to achieve high TSR. Our analysis identified an alternative strategy for value creation through dividends: providing consistent and predictable payouts that make their stocks behave like bonds. This approach exhibited dividend volatility one standard deviation below the market average and offered investors greater stability and reduced risk, enabling these companies to outperform the market despite limited growth in revenues, margins, or dividends. These stable outperformers built financial slack, for example, by reducing their debt-to-equity ratios by \(\mathbb{P}\circ\forall\) on average. In this way, they not only achieved a high and stable cash-flow contribution to TSR but also enhanced their valuation multiples by an average of \(\mathbb{P}\forall\) per year.

This strategy can be observed in all industries and sectors but is most applicable for companies with predictable streams of revenues and little fluctuation in investment patterns. Take GATX, a railcar leasing company: It has paid out uninterrupted quarterly dividends since 1919. Over the past Yo years, the firm has not had a reduction in dividend payouts for a single year and has maintained dividend volatility 1/0 standard deviations below the average of our sample—driving annualized TSR of 17%, fueled almost entirely by cash flow contributions and multiple expansion.

## What About Talent and Innovation?

Pursuing low-growth strategies does come with several challenges. For one, growth typically means opportunity—for career progression, new skill development, and other means of advancement. If a company isn't actively growing, these opportunities may be more limited, which could make it challenging to attract and retain top talent. To counter this, companies executing a low-growth approach must be intentional in how they design their talent strategy. Some of the companies in our study leverage their stability to invest in long-term initiatives and partnerships to attract and develop talent. These efforts might include targeted recruiting programs, apprenticeship opportunities focused on specialized skills, industry certifications, or partnerships with local educational institutions. Such channels build community ties and create a consistent stream of candidates.

For example, the UK home builder Persimmon launched the Persimmon Academy in collaboration with local colleges to tap into overlooked labor markets in the regions where it operates. The program, which helps the company access new talent, shape skill development to align with its business needs, and foster stronger engagement across its workforce, has recently been expanded to new regions after its initial success.

Beyond talent pipelines, stable companies can also foster long-term engagement by reimagining the employee value proposition—for example, by highlighting perks such as opportunities for horizontal rather than vertical mobility and focusing on job security, enabled by the reduced volatility of a low-growth strategy. This approach may be particularly appealing to younger workers, many of whom have spent their careers in economically uncertain environments. For example, Mondelēz International's internal talent marketplace, Match & Grow, lets employees take on short-term projects beyond their usual roles or functions, gaining exposure to new experiences and collaborating with different teams. Since its launch in Yoyw, more than Yoyoo employees have participated in the program.

Another potential challenge for low growth companies is maintaining an innovative culture—one in which creativity and imagination thrive. Without such a culture, complacency may set in. Yet rather than chasing disruption or innovating to unlock new markets, many of the stable firms in our sample highlight the power of continuous, incremental improvements. For example, Diageo introduced an innovation team that focuses on integrating emerging technologies and experiences to enhance their existing portfolio; this team developed the world's lightest whiskey bottle for Johnnie Walker Blue Label, as well as an AI-powered virtual concierge that provides personalized cocktail and gift recommendations to consumers of its Seed lip brand.

Counterintuitively, constraints imposed by low growth can even become powerful catalysts for innovation. In fact, rapidly expanding companies sometimes purposefully introduce limitations to their use of resources to encourage creative problem-solving. Patagonia, for instance, has been growing at more than 9% per year (and is therefore not part of our sample), but it self-enforces strict sustainability standards that limit the materials used in making its products. By using only organic or recycled fabrics and urging customers to purchase fewer items, Patagonia has developed pioneering programs like its famous repair and buyback initiatives, central to its value proposition.

THE STRATEGIES AND success of stable outperformers show that growth is not the only path to value creation. However, company leaders should bear in mind that, while the stable companies we identified could sustain outperformance over decades, their levers may be exhausted at some point: Margins cannot be increased beyond 100%, and dividend volatility cannot fall below zero. Pursuing a strategy of stability does not absolve leaders from having to continue to explore and revisit growth opportunities as conditions evolve.