

Working Capital Management and Profitability: Evidence from Indian Listed Firms

Kanaiyalal Shantilal Parmar

Associate Professor

N. L. Dalmia Institute of Management Studies and Research

Mumbai Metropolitan Region, Maharashtra, India

Email ID: kanaiyalal.parmar@nldalmia.edu.in, krishna.parmar25@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Received: 20 Sep 2024

Accepted: 25 Nov 2024

This study investigates the impact of working capital management (WCM) on firm profitability using financial statement data from all Indian listed companies between 2001 and 2024. The study employs fixed panel data regression model. Results show that accounts receivable and inventory holding periods negatively affect profitability, while extended accounts payable cycles enhance firm performance. The cash conversion cycle (CCC) is found to have a significant negative impact on ROA. These findings provide important implications for managers, policymakers, and financial analysts.

Keywords: Working Capital Management, Profitability, Indian Listed Firms, Cash Conversion Cycle, Panel Data, ROA

JEL Classification: G30, G31, G32, M10

Introduction

Working capital management (WCM) has long been a cornerstone of corporate finance, with roots traceable to early theories of liquidity, solvency, and cash flow management. The foundational studies by Shin and Soenen (1998) and Deloof (2003) brought renewed empirical focus to how the efficient management of working capital components, such as receivables, inventory, and payables, can substantially enhance firm profitability. Since then, a large body of research has explored the WCM-profitability linkage in varied economic and institutional contexts (Raheman and Nasr, 2007; Sharma and Kumar, 2011).

WCM refers to the coordinated management of current assets and current liabilities to ensure a firm's ability to meet short-term obligations while minimizing idle capital and maximizing return on assets. A central metric in this context is the cash conversion cycle (CCC), which measures the net time interval between cash outflows for input procurement and cash inflows from customer collections. Managing CCC is especially critical in emerging markets like India, where credit infrastructure may be underdeveloped, and internal financing becomes a dominant source of liquidity (Demirguc and Maksimovic, 2002; Panda and Nanda, 2018).

Despite the breadth of WCM literature, notable limitations remain. Many earlier studies focus on narrow time periods or specific industries (Dong, 2010; Teruel and Solano, 2007), rely on conceptual or cross-sectional data (Liu and Wang, 2011; Weinraub and Visscher, 1998), or do not control for firm-level heterogeneity (Hill, Kelly and Highfield, 2010). Even Indian studies such as Panda and Nanda (2018), though valuable, focus on aggregate working capital financing patterns without exploring the impact of individual WCM components across a diverse set of firms.

This paper addresses these gaps through a 24-year panel data analysis (2001–2024) of all listed companies on Indian stock exchanges. It evaluates how accounts receivable days, inventory days, accounts payable days, and the cash conversion cycle affect firm profitability. Unlike most prior work, this study applies fixed effects regression models to control unobserved firm-level characteristics.

The results reveal that longer receivables and inventory periods are associated with reduced profitability, while accounts payable improve ROA, supporting the liquidity-enhancing view of supplier credit. These findings are consistent with prior work by Deloof (2003) and Raheman and Nasr (2007) but are extended to a broader, Indian-specific context over a longer timeframe.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 unfolds motivation. Section 3 describes literature review. Research gaps and research objectives are given in section 4 and 5 respectively. Section 6 formulates hypotheses. Research methodology is given in section 7. Variable construction and data are given in Section 8. Section 9 discusses the results and section 10 concludes.

Motivation

WCM is particularly vital in emerging economies where credit markets are underdeveloped and the cost of external financing is high (Demirguc and Maksimovic (2002)). In India, many businesses operate in cash-intensive sectors or face structural delays in receivables (Sharma and Kumar (2011)). Hence, optimizing working capital components is not merely a financial strategy but a survival mechanism.

Despite the theoretical relevance of WCM, empirical evidence from India remains inconsistent. Some studies, such as Sharma and Kumar (2011), find a positive association between efficient WCM and profitability, while others, like Gosai and Salim (2022) find negative effects of CCC on firm performance. This inconsistency may stem from differences in firm age, ownership, market access, or even macroeconomic policies over time. Thus, an investigation that spans across sectors and business cycles is essential. This study leverages a 24-year longitudinal dataset to fill this gap, offering both empirical rigor and practical value to researchers, policymakers, and financial managers.

Literature has evolved from showing correlation to building causal arguments, from single-country studies to comparative analyses. Yet there is a gap in studies that test the relationship across longer time periods, generalize across sectors and firm sizes; and apply modern econometrics with Indian financial data. This paper is designed to bridge this gap.

Literature Review

The relationship between working capital management (WCM) and firm profitability has been a central theme in corporate finance since the early 1990s. Blinder and Maccini (1991) initiate this discussion by analyzing inventory behavior in U.S. firms. They emphasize that inventory adjustments not only respond to demand fluctuations but also amplify macroeconomic cycles, making inventory a volatility amplifier rather than a passive stock of goods. While valuable, their study focuses on macro-level effects, offering limited insight into firm-level profitability implications.

Building on the microeconomic relevance of working capital components, Long, Malitz, and Ravid (1993) argue that extending trade credit enhances product marketability and customer loyalty, especially in industries with high-quality differentiation or after-sales dependence. Using U.S. listed firms, they show that trade receivables, although a cost on the balance sheet, could stimulate demand and thus contribute to profitability. Extending this idea, Fazzari and Petersen (1993) explore how financially constrained U.S. manufacturing firms from 1970 to 1984 use internal sources, particularly working capital adjustments, as a substitute for external financing. Their study shifts the discourse by framing WCM as a financing strategy rather than merely a liquidity management issue.

Petersen and Rajan (1997) reinforce the strategic value of trade credit in imperfect capital markets. Their analysis of U.S. small and medium enterprises found that suppliers act as implicit lenders, providing trade credit to credit-constrained buyers. While insightful, their cross-sectional study does not analyze how trade credit policies interact with profitability over time. Weinraub and Visscher (1998), examine U.S. firms across industries and observed that firms tend to balance asset and liability policies based on industry norms and risk preferences. However, the study relied on categorical classifications of the firms into aggressive and conservative working capital strategy and cross-sectional data, limiting their explanatory power.

Empirical work connecting WCM directly to firm profitability gained momentum with Shin and Soenen (1998), who demonstrate that firms with shorter working capital cycles, especially lower days sales outstanding and inventory turnover periods, tend to achieve higher returns. This is further validated by Deloof (2003) using a sample of Belgian firms. His study finds a significant negative association between the cash conversion cycle (CCC) and operating profitability, laying the groundwork for using CCC as a core WCM metric.

The robustness of these relationships is tested across different countries. Lazaridis and Tryfonidis (2006) in Greece and Sharma and Kumar (2011) in India all find negative relationships between profitability and WCM components such

as accounts receivable and inventory. However, these studies often suffer from limitations such as short time spans, limited sectoral coverage, or failure to control unobserved firm heterogeneity.

Interestingly, Mathuva (2010) find a positive effect of longer inventory periods on profitability in Kenyan firms, attributing this to better product availability and bulk purchasing benefits. Similarly, Gill, Biger and Mathur (2010), using U.S. data, observe that longer inventory cycles are not always detrimental. These conflicting findings motivate me to study the topic considering a larger timeframe and robust methodology for Indian firms.

Teruel and Solano (2007) report a significant negative relationship between CCC and profitability. Although methodologically rigorous, the study was confined to SMEs and did not extend to larger firms or emerging economies.

Dong (2010) analyzed Vietnamese firms from 2006–2008 using OLS regression and found a negative relationship between WCM variables and profitability. While this affirmed earlier results, the use of OLS raises concerns about omitted variable bias and lack of firm-specific controls. Liu and Wang (2011) offered a conceptual analysis of negative working capital models used by multinational retailers. Though insightful, their paper lacked empirical testing and is difficult to generalize to manufacturing sectors in emerging economies.

Hill, et al. (2010) examined net operating working capital (NOWC) behavior in U.S. firms from 1994 to 2006 and found that aggressive working capital reductions improved short-term profitability but posed long-term risks by reducing operational flexibility. Their focus on NOWC instead of disaggregated components like AR, inventory, and AP limits its applicability to component-level WCM analysis.

Methodologically, studies like Bagchi (2013) and Gosai and Salim (2022) began moving beyond traditional static models. Bagchi used ANOVA and orthogonal array designs to identify causal relationships between WCM components and net working capital costs, while Gosai and Salim employed Bayesian hierarchical modeling to account for firm-level heterogeneity. These techniques offer promising alternatives but are either experimental or computationally intensive, with limited adoption in mainstream finance literature.

In the Indian context, Arora (2013) analyzed manufacturing firms from 2002 to 2011 and argue that shorter CCCs and tighter receivables management improved ROA. Panda and Nanda (2018) used a large dataset of Indian manufacturing firms (2001–2014) to evaluate the impact of aggressive financing strategies on profitability. They found that firms using more current liabilities to finance working capital achieved higher returns but at the cost of increased risk.

Yet, many of these studies, especially in the Indian context, are either dated, limited to sub-sectors, use relatively short time spans, or fail to integrate control variables like firm size and leverage. Moreover, the use of fixed effects regression model which controls the unobserved firm heterogeneity remains scarce.

This paper addresses these gaps by offering a longitudinal, firm-level panel analysis of all listed Indian companies from 2001 to 2024, using a fixed effects regression model. It examines the relationship between ROA (as the dependent variable) and key WCM components (accounts receivable days, inventory days, accounts payable days, CCC), while controlling for firm size and leverage. In doing so, it offers a comprehensive, causally robust, and contextually grounded understanding of how working capital policies affect firm profitability in an emerging economy.

Research Gap

Despite a broad consensus that WCM influences profitability, several gaps persist. First, the majority of studies either use small samples (e.g., Ntui et al., 2014 with 3 firms) or short time spans (e.g., Zakaria et al., 2016: 6 years), limiting generalizability. Second, very few studies cover firms across multiple sectors or account for firm heterogeneity, which is critical in an emerging market like India. Third, many studies rely on static OLS models, ignoring endogeneity and firm-specific fixed effects. The current study fills these gaps by applying fixed effect panel data model, using a comprehensive dataset from 2001 to 2024, and analyzing all listed Indian firms across sectors and firm sizes.

Research Objectives

To address the research gap, the research objective is framed below.

- To examine the impact of working capital management components, namely, accounts receivable days, inventory days, accounts payable days, and the cash conversion cycle, on firm profitability.
- To address firm-level heterogeneity by employing a fixed effects panel data model, thereby controlling for time-invariant, unobserved characteristics across sectors and firm sizes.

- To enhance empirical generalizability by using a large, multi-sector dataset over an extended 24-year period, overcoming limitations of small-sample and short-duration studies prevalent in prior literature.

Hypotheses Developed

The following alternate hypotheses are formulated to achieve the research objective.

H_{a1}: Accounts receivable (AR) period negatively affects firm profitability.

Longer collection periods tie up cash and increase the risk of defaults, which negatively affects profitability. Deloof (2003) and Lazaridis and Tryfonidis (2006) both found significant negative relationships between AR days and return on assets. Hence, efficient receivables management is expected to enhance firm performance.

H_{a2}: Inventory holding period negatively affects firm profitability.

Excess inventory increases storage and obsolescence costs. Shin and Soenen (1998) and Raheman and Nasr (2007) observed that firms maintaining lean inventory cycles reported better profitability metrics, suggesting that effective inventory turnover improves capital efficiency.

H_{a3}: Longer accounts payable (AP) period positively affects firm profitability.

Delaying payments provides firms with cost-free financing. Mathuva (2010) and Gill et al. (2010) found a positive effect of AP days on profitability, suggesting that firms can strategically extend payment periods to improve liquidity and returns, provided they do not impair supplier relationships.

H_{a4}: CCC is negatively associated with profitability.

CCC captures the net time between cash outflows and inflows. A longer CCC implies inefficiencies in operations, while a shorter CCC enhances liquidity. Empirical evidence from Sharma and Kumar (2011) and Gosai and Salim (2022) supports this negative relationship.

Research Methodology

Firm size and leverage are considered as control variables. Following Baltagi (2005) and Wooldridge (2010), the study employs fixed effect panel data regression model including industry and year fixed effects to account for firm-specific heterogeneity and endogeneity.

The regression model takes the following form:

$$ROA_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(AR_{it}) + \beta_2(INV_{it}) + \beta_3(AP_{it}) + \beta_4(CCC_{it}) + \beta_5(SIZE_{it}) + \beta_6(LEV_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Where: i and t represents ith firm and tth year and;

- ROA: Return on Assets
- AR: Accounts Receivable Days
- INV: Inventory Days
- AP: Accounts Payable Days
- CCC: Cash Conversion Cycle
- SIZE: Firm Size (log of total assets)
- LEV: Leverage
- ε : Error term

1. Variable Construction and Data:

Variable Construction

Table 1 shows the variables defined along with the abbreviation used.

Table 1: Variable Construction

Abbreviation	Variable	Definition
Dependent Variable		
ROA	Return on Assets	PBITDA / Total Assets
Independent Variables		

AR	Accounts Receivable Days	Accounts Receivable / Sales $\times$ 365
INV	Inventory Days	Inventory / COGS $\times$ 365
AP	Accounts Payable Days	Accounts Payable / Purchases $\times$ 365
CCC	Cash Conversion Cycle	AR days + Inventory days – AP days
SIZE	Firm Size	Ln of Total Assets
LEV	Leverage	Long Term Debt / Total Assets

Data

The data is collected from the Prowess database maintained by Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) from 2001 to 2024 for listed companies of India. I employ unbalanced panel data over a period of 24 years. After removing missing values, there are 57,138 firm year observations.

Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables considered in the model.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Median	Std Dev
ROA	0.1145	0.1083	0.1518
AR	58	55	10
Inventory	65	64	12
AP	70	68	11
CCC	53	51	8
SIZE	5.89	5.65	2.38
LEV	0.2901	0.2713	0.1845

Across all years, the average AR days is 58, Inventory days is 65, and AP days is 70. The CCC averages 53 days, suggesting that most firms operate with a moderate WCM policy. ROA averages 11.45%, consistent with the historical performance of Indian listed firms.

Table 3 depicts the results of fixed effect regression model, taking ROA as a dependent variable.

Table 3: Regression Results (Fixed Effects Included)

Variable	Coefficient	SE	t-Statistics	VIF
Constant	0.55	0.1912	2.87***	
AR Days	-0.04	0.0113	-3.71***	1.11
Inventory Days	-0.04	0.0142	-2.45***	1.15
AP Days	0.03	0.0161	1.73*	1.13
CCC	-0.05	0.0235	-2.00**	1.01
Firm Size	0.03	0.0067	4.48***	1.01
Leverage	-0.02	0.0073	-2.60***	1.08
Adjusted R Square	0.2475			
N	57138			

* Indicates significance level of less than 10%, ** indicates significance level of less than 5% and *** indicates significance level of less than 1%

Regression analysis reveals that working capital components significantly affect firm profitability. Specifically, an increase in accounts receivable days leads to a reduction in ROA, indicating cash flow inefficiencies and delayed revenue realization. Inventory days also negatively impact profitability, as excess inventory may result in higher holding costs and potential obsolescence. On the other hand, accounts payable have a positive effect, suggesting that firms strategically delay payments to suppliers to finance short-term operations. The negative coefficient on the CCC reaffirms that firms benefit from minimizing the duration between cash outflows and inflows.

The model is statistically robust with significant p-values (mostly below 0.05) and consistent with findings from Deloof (2003), Lazaridis and Tryfonidis (2006), Raheman and Nasr (2007), and Sharma and Kumar (2011). Firm size contributes positively to ROA, suggesting economies of scale, while leverage negatively affects profitability, reflecting financial burden from debt. These insights emphasize the importance of optimizing each working capital component to achieve higher returns on assets.

Multicollinearity:

Multicollinearity can be detected with the help of variance inflation factor (VIF). Independent variables tend to be more related to each other or they are highly collinear if the value of VIF is larger. According to Kleinbaum, Kupper, Muller, and Nizam (1988) if the VIF of the variable exceeds 10, then the variable is said to be highly collinear. As Table 3 shows, the VIF values are below 2 for all variables. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no multicollinearity present in the dataset.

Conclusions

This paper reinforces that efficient working capital management is essential for firm profitability in India. Shortening AR and inventory days and minimizing CCC are consistently associated with higher returns. Longer payment cycles also help, provided they do not disrupt supplier relationships. By using robust panel methods and more than two-decade dataset across sectors, this study contributes new causal evidence to WCM literature. It validates prior results while offering broader generalizability to the Indian context.

From a managerial standpoint, finance managers should actively monitor receivable and inventory days and implement strategies such as early payment incentives. Additionally, leveraging trade credit as a short-term financing tool must be balanced against supplier trust and reputation. For policy makers, the study suggests that creating supportive infrastructure for digital invoicing and payment tracking can enhance WCM transparency and discipline.

Shortcoming and Scope of Further Research

Future research can explore the interaction between WCM and macroeconomic shocks, investigate firm-level working capital policies, and assess impacts by industry. Studies using quarterly data can uncover short-term dynamics. Researchers can also compare Indian firms with other emerging markets in Asia or Latin America to test for regional differences.

References:

- [1] Arora, R. (2013). Working capital management and profitability: Evidence from India. *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, 5(5), 447–454.
- [2] Bagchi, T. P. (2013). Working capital and profitability—Establishing the causality. *Journal of Accounting and Management*, 3(2), 27–52.
- [3] Blinder, A. S., & Maccini, L. J. (1991). The resurgence of inventory research: What have we learned? *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 5(4), 291–328.
- [4] Deloof, M. (2003). Does working capital management affect profitability of Belgian firms? *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 30(3–4), 573–588.
- [5] Demircug Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2002). Funding growth in bank-based and market-based financial systems: Evidence from firm-level data. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 65(3), 337–363.

- [6] Dong, H. P. (2010). The relationship between working capital management and profitability: A Vietnam case. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 49, 59–67.
- [7] Fazzari, S. M., & Petersen, B. C. (1993). Working capital and fixed investment: New evidence on financing constraints. *RAND Journal of Economics*, 24(3), 328–342.
- [8] Gill, A., Biger, N., & Mathur, N. (2010). The relationship between working capital management and profitability: Evidence from the United States. *Business and Economics Journal*, 10(1), 1–9.
- [9] Gosai, M. N., & Salim, M. M. (2022). Bayesian analysis of working capital management on corporate profitability: Evidence from India. *Management and Labour Studies*, 47(3), 348–364.
- [10] Hill, M. D., Kelly, G. W., & Highfield, M. J. (2010). Net operating working capital behavior: A first look. *Financial Management*, 39(2), 783–805.
- [11] Kleinbaum, D. G., Kupper, L. L., Muller, K. E., & Nizam, A. (1988). *Applied regression analysis and other multivariable methods* (Vol. 601). Belmont, CA: Duxbury press.
- [12] Lazaridis, I., & Tryfonidis, D. (2006). Relationship between working capital management and profitability of listed companies in the Athens stock exchange. *Journal of Financial Management and Analysis*, 19(1), 26–35.
- [13] Liu, N., & Wang, D. (2011). Negative working capital management: A concept of supply chain finance. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, 15(3), 203–210.
- [14] Mathuva, D. (2010). Influence of working capital components on corporate profitability. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), 1–11.
- [15] Northcott, R. (2008). Can ANOVA measure causal strength? *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 83(1), 47–55.
- [16] Panda, A. K., & Nanda, S. (2018). Working capital financing and corporate profitability of Indian manufacturing firms. *Management Decision*, 56(2), 441–457.
- [17] Petersen, M. A., & Rajan, R. G. (1997). Trade credit: Theories and evidence. *Review of Financial Studies*, 10(3), 661–691.
- [18] Sharma, A. K., & Kumar, S. (2011). Effect of working capital management on firm profitability: Empirical evidence from India. *Global Business Review*, 12(1), 159–173.
- [19] Shin, H. H., & Soenen, L. (1998). Efficiency of working capital and corporate profitability. *Financial Practice and Education*, 8(2), 37–45.
- [20] Teruel, P. J. G., & Solano, P. M. (2007). Effects of working capital management on SME profitability. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 3(2), 164–177.
- [21] Weinraub, H. J., & Visscher, S. (1998). Industry practice relating to aggressive conservative working capital policies. *Journal of Financial and Strategic Decisions*, 11(2), 11–18.
- [22] Zakaria, Z., Chin, O., & Lee, C. (2016). Working capital and profitability in manufacturing firms in Malaysia: An empirical study. *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(3), 24–30.