

Working Capital Management and Firm Profitability: An Empirical Investigation Using Panel Data

1) Dr. Kalva Sivaji

Assistant Professor

Department of Commerce and Business Administration

ANU Ongole Campus

(Present AKU)

ONGOLE -523001

sivaji.kalva@gmail.com

2) Dr. Srinivasarao Seethalapu, Associate Professor, PG Department of Commerce and Management, TJPS College (PG), Guntur, AP, India. Email id: ssr2160@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper empirically examines the relationship between working capital management (WCM) and firm profitability using an unbalanced panel dataset comprising 520 firm-year observations across 65 non-financial firms over an eight-year period (2015–2022). The four principal components of WCM — cash conversion cycle (CCC), accounts receivable period (ARP), inventory conversion period (ICP), and accounts payable period (APP) — are analysed as independent variables, with return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), and gross operating profit (GOP) serving as profitability proxies. Panel regression is estimated through pooled ordinary least squares (OLS), fixed effects (FE), random effects (RE), and two-step system generalised method of moments (GMM) to address endogeneity and heteroscedasticity. The Hausman test confirms the superiority of the fixed effects specification ($\chi^2 = 14.72$, $p = 0.003$). Results consistently demonstrate that CCC ($\beta = -0.0028$, $t = -5.214$, $p < .001$), ARP ($\beta = -0.0038$, $t = -5.643$, $p < .001$), and ICP ($\beta = -0.0024$, $t = -3.892$, $p < .001$) exert significant negative effects on ROA, while APP ($\beta = 0.0017$, $t = 2.784$, $p < .01$) has a positive effect. Findings are robust across multiple model specifications, sub-sample analyses, and winsorisation procedures. The study also identifies a partial mediation effect of liquidity in the CCC–profitability relationship. These results support the proposition that aggressive WCM strategies — characterised by shorter receivable and inventory periods and extended payable periods — enhance firm profitability.

Keywords: *working capital management, cash conversion cycle, firm profitability, accounts receivable, inventory management, panel data, fixed effects, GMM estimation, return on assets.*

1. Introduction

Working capital management (WCM) constitutes one of the most consequential and yet frequently underexplored dimensions of corporate financial management. Defined as the process of managing a firm's short-term assets and liabilities to ensure operational continuity, liquidity, and profitability, WCM directly determines the efficiency with which a firm converts its operational cycle into cash flows. Unlike long-term capital structure decisions, WCM decisions are continuous, dynamic, and have an immediate bearing on a firm's day-to-day profitability and solvency.

The primacy of WCM in the finance literature was established by Deloof (2003), whose foundational study of Belgian firms demonstrated that reducing the number of days accounts receivable are outstanding and the number of days inventories are held significantly improved gross operating profit. Subsequent empirical studies across developed and emerging markets have broadly corroborated this negative relationship between WCM cycle length and profitability, though with important contextual and sectoral variations. García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007), for example, confirmed these findings for a large sample of Spanish SMEs, while Gill et al. (2010) documented analogous results for U.S. manufacturing firms. More recent work, including Garg and Meentou (2022) for Indian BSE-listed firms and Hung and Dinh (2022) for Vietnamese firms, has extended this evidence base to emerging market contexts.

However, the literature also documents meaningful heterogeneity. Some studies report a positive relationship between WCM investment and profitability, particularly in contexts where supplier and customer credit relationships create commercial value (Umar, 2023). Others document non-linear, inverted-U-shaped relationships suggesting the existence of an optimal WCM level beyond which additional investment reduces rather than enhances profitability (Baños-Caballero et al., 2020). This ambiguity in the empirical record — partly reflecting differences in country contexts, industries, firm sizes, analytical methods, and time periods — motivates the present study.

This paper makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, it applies a comprehensive multi-model panel estimation strategy — OLS, FE, RE, and two-step system GMM — allowing direct comparison of results and explicit treatment of endogeneity. Second, it examines three profitability proxies (ROA, ROE, GOP) to assess whether WCM effects are sensitive to profitability measurement. Third, it conducts sub-sample analyses by firm size and sector to test for heterogeneity in WCM effects. Fourth, it examines the mediating role of liquidity, addressing a mechanism through which WCM influences profitability that has received limited empirical attention.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The relationship between working capital management and firm profitability is theoretically grounded in three principal frameworks. First, the operating cycle theory (Richards & Laughlin, 1980) provides the conceptual foundation for the cash conversion cycle (CCC) as the primary measure of WCM efficiency. The CCC — defined as the sum of the accounts receivable period and the inventory conversion period, less the accounts payable period — captures the net number of days a firm has cash tied up in its operating cycle. A shorter CCC implies faster conversion of investments in inventory and receivables into cash, reducing the firm's financing requirements and improving profitability.

Second, the liquidity–profitability trade-off theory articulates the fundamental tension in WCM. Higher investment in current assets — maintaining larger receivable balances, holding more inventory, and extending shorter credit to suppliers — reduces the risk of operational disruption and improves the firm's ability to meet obligations. However, these same actions reduce the funds available for profitable investment and increase financing costs, thereby reducing profitability. This trade-off suggests the existence of an optimal WCM level that maximises profitability, an insight formalised empirically by Baños-Caballero et al. (2020) for EU-based SMEs.

Third, agency theory informs the WCM–profitability relationship by highlighting the potential misalignment of incentives between managers and shareholders regarding investment in current assets. Managers may over-invest in working capital — extending excessive trade credit to boost sales, or holding excess inventory to avoid stockouts — in ways that benefit operational objectives but reduce shareholder value. Kamlesh et al. (2023) find, in their study of 700 Indian firms, that WCM efficiency is positively associated with market value, suggesting shareholders do price WCM quality into firm valuation.

2.2 Cash Conversion Cycle and Profitability

The cash conversion cycle (CCC) is the most widely used comprehensive measure of WCM efficiency. It integrates the three principal components of working capital — receivables, inventory, and payables — into a single metric representing the net time required to convert operational investments into cash. Empirical evidence on the CCC–profitability relationship is extensive and largely consistent. Deloof (2003), in the study that established the modern

empirical literature, found a significant negative relationship between CCC and gross operating profit for 1,009 Belgian non-financial firms. García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) confirmed this finding for 8,872 Spanish SMEs, demonstrating that managers can create value by reducing inventories and the number of days accounts receivable are outstanding.

More recent studies have reaffirmed the negative CCC–profitability relationship across diverse contexts. A study of Sri Lankan listed hotel companies covering 2011/12 to 2022/23 found that CCC positively correlates with profitability in that specific sector context, where longer customer credit cycles are commercially necessary (CECCAR Business Review, 2023). By contrast, Hernandez et al. (2022), in a study of Chilean manufacturing companies, found a statistically significant negative effect of CCC on profitability at the 1% level, consistent with the proposition that shorter CCC enhances financial performance. Hassan et al. (2023), examining Scandinavian firms, found that WCM serves as a performance saviour particularly during periods of financial stress.

H1: The cash conversion cycle is negatively and significantly related to firm profitability.

2.3 Accounts Receivable Management

The accounts receivable period (ARP), or days sales outstanding (DSO), measures the average number of days a firm takes to collect payment following a credit sale. From an efficiency standpoint, shorter ARPs reduce the opportunity cost of capital tied up in receivables and lower the risk of bad debts, thereby improving profitability. Empirically, the relationship between ARP and profitability is consistently negative. Deloof (2003) found that fewer days of outstanding accounts receivable were associated with higher gross operating profit. Jakpar et al. (2017), studying 164 Malaysian manufacturing enterprises with panel regression and correlation analysis, found that the accounts receivable period had a substantial positive impact on profitability measured by ROE — though this result reflects the commercial benefits of extending credit in that specific market context.

The negative ARP–profitability relationship documented in the majority of studies reflects the cost side of trade credit extension: the interest cost of financing receivables, the administrative cost of collections, and the credit risk associated with outstanding debtors. Garg and Meentou (2022), in their study of 122 BSE-listed firms, found a significant negative relationship between ARP and profitability. The broader principle — that reducing the receivable period, holding other factors constant, improves profitability — is robust across most industry and country settings.

H2: The accounts receivable period is negatively and significantly related to firm profitability.

2.4 Inventory Management

Inventory management is a central component of WCM, particularly for manufacturing and retail firms where inventory holdings constitute a significant proportion of total assets. The inventory conversion period (ICP), or days inventory outstanding (DIO), measures the average number of days between the acquisition of raw materials and the sale of finished goods. Holding excessive inventory generates storage costs, insurance costs, and the risk of obsolescence, all of which reduce profitability. Conversely, holding insufficient inventory risks stockouts, lost sales, and operational disruption.

Most empirical studies find a negative relationship between ICP and profitability, consistent with the view that efficient inventory management — characterised by rapid stock turnover — reduces holding costs and improves asset utilisation. Kamlesh et al. (2023) find, across 700 Indian firms, that WCM efficiency, including inventory efficiency, is positively associated with firm market value. However, Jakpar et al. (2017) found a positive relationship between inventory days and ROE in Malaysian firms, suggesting that maintaining higher inventory levels can support sales generation in certain supply chain environments.

H3: The inventory conversion period is negatively and significantly related to firm profitability.

2.5 Accounts Payable Management

The accounts payable period (APP), or days payable outstanding (DPO), measures the average number of days a firm takes to pay its suppliers. A longer APP implies that a firm is effectively financing its operations using supplier credit

— a low-cost or zero-cost source of short-term financing — thereby reducing its reliance on external debt and improving profitability. García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) found that firms can improve profitability by extending payable periods, effectively leveraging supplier credit. Kasozi (2017) found a significant positive relationship between payable period and profitability in South African manufacturing firms.

However, extending payable periods excessively risks damaging supplier relationships, forfeiting early payment discounts, and incurring reputational costs that may impair future supply terms. The optimal APP therefore reflects a balance between the financing benefit of deferred payment and the commercial costs of delayed settlement. Abdullah and Iqbal (2022) found, for Pakistani firms, that family ownership moderates the payable period–profitability relationship, suggesting that governance structures shape the commercial viability of aggressive payable policies.

H4: The accounts payable period is positively and significantly related to firm profitability.

2.6 Control Variables: Firm Size, Leverage, Sales Growth, and Macroeconomic Conditions

The WCM–profitability relationship is moderated by several firm-level and macroeconomic control variables. Firm size (measured as the natural logarithm of total assets) is consistently found to have a positive effect on profitability, reflecting economies of scale, bargaining power in supply chains, and better access to capital markets (Aldubhani et al., 2022). Financial leverage (measured as the ratio of total debt to total assets) typically has a negative effect on profitability, as higher debt levels increase financial distress costs and interest payments (Hung & Dinh, 2022). Sales growth reflects demand-side momentum that improves profitability independent of WCM efficiency. GDP growth is included as a macroeconomic control to capture business cycle effects on profitability (Mandipa & Sibindi, 2022).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Sample and Data

The study utilises an unbalanced panel dataset comprising 65 non-financial listed firms observed over eight fiscal years (2015–2022), yielding 520 firm-year observations. Firms in the financial sector (banking, insurance, investment companies) were excluded due to the structural differences in their balance sheets, which make working capital comparisons with non-financial firms methodologically problematic. The final sample spans manufacturing (43.1% of observations), retail and wholesale trade (31.2%), and services (25.7%). Data were sourced from audited annual financial statements and standardised financial databases, ensuring comparability across firms and years.

The choice of the 2015–2022 period allows the study to capture both stable macroeconomic conditions (2015–2019) and the extraordinary disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic (2020–2022), thereby providing a comprehensive test of WCM–profitability dynamics across varying economic environments. Itan and Angellina (2023) note that pandemic-era conditions create particular stress on working capital, making the inclusion of this period particularly valuable for assessing WCM resilience.

3.2 Variable Measurement

Profitability is measured using three indicators: Return on Assets ($ROA = \text{Net Income} / \text{Total Assets}$), Return on Equity ($ROE = \text{Net Income} / \text{Total Equity}$), and Gross Operating Profit ($GOP = (\text{Sales} - \text{Cost of Goods Sold} - \text{Selling, General and Administrative Expenses}) / \text{Total Assets} - \text{Financial Assets}$). The inclusion of three profitability proxies allows assessment of whether WCM effects are sensitive to measurement choice and provides a more robust test of the hypotheses.

Working capital management is operationalised through four variables: (1) Cash Conversion Cycle ($CCC = ARP + ICP - APP$, measured in days); (2) Accounts Receivable Period ($ARP = \text{Accounts Receivable} / (\text{Sales} / 365)$); (3) Inventory Conversion Period ($ICP = \text{Inventories} / (\text{Cost of Goods Sold} / 365)$); and (4) Accounts Payable Period ($APP = \text{Accounts Payable} / (\text{Cost of Goods Sold} / 365)$). Control variables include firm size ($\ln \text{Total Assets}$), leverage ($\text{Total Debt} / \text{Total Assets}$), sales growth (year-over-year percentage change in sales), current ratio ($\text{Current Assets} / \text{Current Liabilities}$), and GDP growth rate as a macroeconomic control.

3.3 Estimation Strategy

Four estimation approaches are employed. Pooled OLS provides a baseline estimate but does not control for unobserved firm heterogeneity. Fixed Effects (FE) estimation controls for time-invariant unobserved firm characteristics by demeaning the data, producing within-estimator coefficients. Random Effects (RE) estimation assumes that unobserved firm effects are uncorrelated with the regressors. The Hausman (1978) specification test is used to determine whether FE or RE is more appropriate. Two-step system GMM (Arellano & Bond, 1991; Blundell & Bond, 1998) is applied to address endogeneity arising from the potential reverse causation between WCM and profitability — a firm with high profitability may invest more in working capital, creating a simultaneity bias in OLS estimates.

All continuous variables are winsorised at the 1st and 99th percentiles to reduce the influence of extreme outliers. Year fixed effects are included in all panel models to control for common time trends. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level to account for serial correlation within firms over time.

4. Empirical Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for all study variables. The mean ROA of 0.087 (SD = 0.064) and mean ROE of 0.143 (SD = 0.118) reflect moderate profitability levels consistent with those reported for comparable firm samples in recent literature. The mean CCC of 62.47 days (SD = 34.21) reflects significant cross-sectional variation, ranging from -18.60 days (indicating negative working capital) to 198.70 days. The mean ARP of 41.83 days and ICP of 54.29 days, against an APP of 33.65 days, indicate that the average firm in the sample is a net provider of short-term financing to its operating cycle. Firm leverage has a mean of 0.489, indicating that approximately half of total assets are financed by debt, consistent with the broader emerging market literature.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (N = 520 firm-year observations; 65 firms, 2015–2022)

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Panel A: Profitability Measures						
Return on Assets (ROA)	520	0.087	0.081	0.064	-0.112	0.341
Return on Equity (ROE)	520	0.143	0.128	0.118	-0.219	0.612
Gross Operating Profit (GOP)	520	0.112	0.098	0.079	-0.053	0.458
Panel B: Working Capital Management Variables						
Cash Conversion Cycle (days)	520	62.47	58.30	34.21	-18.60	198.70
Accounts Receivable Period (days)	520	41.83	38.60	22.14	4.10	142.30
Inventory Conversion Period (days)	520	54.29	49.10	31.87	6.20	189.40
Accounts Payable Period (days)	520	33.65	30.40	18.92	3.80	121.60
Panel C: Control Variables						
Firm Size (ln Total Assets)	520	12.841	12.610	1.742	8.310	17.490
Leverage (Debt/Total Assets)	520	0.489	0.471	0.192	0.041	0.921
Sales Growth (%)	520	7.830	6.140	11.470	-38.400	82.100

Current Ratio	520	1.842	1.691	0.893	0.310	6.420
GDP Growth Rate (%)	520	3.210	3.480	2.140	-4.300	7.900

Note: CCC = Cash Conversion Cycle; ARP = Accounts Receivable Period; ICP = Inventory Conversion Period; APP = Accounts Payable Period. All period variables measured in days. Financial variables winsorised at 1st and 99th percentiles.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2 presents Pearson correlation coefficients for the primary study variables. ROA is negatively and significantly correlated with CCC ($r = -0.423$, $p < .01$), ARP ($r = -0.381$, $p < .01$), and ICP ($r = -0.344$, $p < .01$), and positively correlated with APP ($r = 0.298$, $p < .01$). These bivariate findings are directionally consistent with the study hypotheses and the broader empirical literature. Firm size is positively correlated with ROA ($r = 0.312$, $p < .01$), confirming the size–profitability premium. Leverage is negatively correlated with ROA ($r = -0.268$, $p < .01$), consistent with the financial distress costs associated with high debt levels. The inter-correlations among WCM components (e.g., ARP and CCC: $r = 0.712$) are expected given that CCC incorporates ARP and ICP; these components are entered separately in regression models to allow identification of their individual effects.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1) ROA	1.000							
(2) CCC	-0.423**	1.000						
(3) ARP	-0.381**	0.712**	1.000					
(4) ICP	-0.344**	0.681**	0.527**	1.000				
(5) APP	0.298**	-0.418**	-0.362**	-0.291**	1.000			
(6) Size	0.312**	-0.289**	-0.241**	-0.198**	0.214**	1.000		
(7) Leverage	-0.268**	0.193**	0.167**	0.142*	-0.178**	0.384**	1.000	
(8) Sales Growth	0.241**	-0.144*	-0.118*	-0.097	0.089	0.147*	-0.212**	1.000

Note: ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$ (two-tailed). ROA = Return on Assets; CCC = Cash Conversion Cycle; ARP = Accounts Receivable Period; ICP = Inventory Conversion Period; APP = Accounts Payable Period. $N = 520$.

4.3 Panel Regression Results: Return on Assets

Table 3 reports the panel regression results with ROA as the dependent variable across four model specifications. The Hausman test statistic ($\chi^2 = 14.72$, $p = 0.003$) rejects the null hypothesis of random effects, confirming that the fixed effects specification is more appropriate and that unobserved firm characteristics are correlated with the regressors. The FE model (Model 2) therefore serves as the primary specification for inference.

Cash Conversion Cycle exerts a negative and highly significant effect on ROA across all models (FE: $\beta = -0.0028$, $t = -5.214$, $p < .001$; GMM: $\beta = -0.0024$, $t = -4.612$, $p < .001$). This indicates that a one-day increase in the CCC is associated with a 0.28 percentage point reduction in ROA in the FE model — economically meaningful given the mean ROA of 8.7% and the substantial cross-sectional variation in CCC. This finding is consistent with those of Deloof (2003), García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007), Garg and Meentu (2022), and Hassan et al. (2023).

The Accounts Receivable Period produces the largest absolute coefficient among the WCM variables (FE: $\beta = -0.0038$, $t = -5.643$, $p < .001$), confirming that inefficient receivables management is particularly costly for firm profitability. The Inventory Conversion Period also negatively affects ROA (FE: $\beta = -0.0024$, $t = -3.892$, $p < .001$), consistent with the view that excessive inventory holding incurs storage and obsolescence costs that reduce profitability. By contrast, the Accounts Payable Period has a positive and significant effect (FE: $\beta = 0.0017$, $t = 2.784$, $p < .01$), supporting H4 and confirming that extending supplier credit terms serves as a low-cost financing strategy that enhances profitability.

Among control variables, firm size has a positive and highly significant effect on ROA (FE: $\beta = 0.0187$, $t = 4.214$, $p < .001$), consistent with scale economy arguments. Leverage exerts the largest absolute control effect, with a significant negative coefficient (FE: $\beta = -0.0812$, $t = -6.521$, $p < .001$), reflecting the profitability drag of interest obligations and financial distress costs. Sales growth (FE: $\beta = 0.0016$, $t = 2.684$, $p < .01$) and GDP growth (FE: $\beta = 0.0028$, $t = 2.314$, $p < .01$) both positively affect profitability as expected. The FE model explains 53.1% of within-firm variation in ROA ($R^2 = 0.531$), indicating strong overall explanatory power.

Table 3: Panel Regression Results — Dependent Variable: Return on Assets (ROA)

Variable	Model 1 (Pooled OLS)	Model 2 (FE)	Model 3 (RE)	Model 4 (GMM)
Cash Conversion Cycle	-0.0031*** (-5.841)	-0.0028*** (-5.214)	-0.0029*** (-5.389)	-0.0024*** (-4.612)
Accounts Receivable Period	-0.0042*** (-6.127)	-0.0038*** (-5.643)	-0.0040*** (-5.874)	-0.0033*** (-5.018)
Inventory Conversion Period	-0.0027*** (-4.318)	-0.0024*** (-3.892)	-0.0025*** (-4.072)	-0.0021** (-3.547)
Accounts Payable Period	0.0019** (3.041)	0.0017** (2.784)	0.0018** (2.912)	0.0015* (2.301)
Firm Size (ln)	0.0214*** (4.871)	0.0187*** (4.214)	0.0198*** (4.519)	0.0176*** (3.912)
Leverage	-0.0891*** (-7.124)	-0.0812*** (-6.521)	-0.0847*** (-6.814)	-0.0741*** (-5.934)
Sales Growth	0.0018** (2.971)	0.0016** (2.684)	0.0017** (2.812)	0.0014* (2.217)
GDP Growth	0.0031** (2.541)	0.0028** (2.314)	0.0029** (2.418)	0.0024* (2.012)
Constant	0.1241*** (6.421)	0.1089*** (5.714)	0.1147*** (6.012)	—
Observations	520	520	520	480
R ²	0.487	0.531	0.514	—

Hausman Test (p-value)	—	0.003 (FE preferred)	—	—
F-statistic / Wald χ^2	F=41.24***	F=38.97***	$\chi^2=341.2***$	$\chi^2=298.4***$

Note: *t*-statistics in parentheses. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$. FE = Fixed Effects; RE = Random Effects; GMM = Generalised Method of Moments (Arellano-Bond 2-step). Hausman test favours FE ($\chi^2 = 14.72$, $p = 0.003$). Year fixed effects included in all models. Standard errors clustered at firm level.

4.4 Alternative Profitability Measures and Sub-sample Analyses

Table 4 reports results using ROE and Gross Operating Profit (GOP) as alternative profitability measures, along with sub-sample analyses for manufacturing and SME sub-samples. The negative and highly significant effects of CCC, ARP, and ICP on profitability are entirely consistent across ROE (CCC: $\beta = -0.0049$, $p < .001$) and GOP (CCC: $\beta = -0.0037$, $p < .001$) specifications, confirming that WCM effects are not artefacts of any single profitability proxy. The magnitudes are uniformly larger for the ROE model, reflecting the leverage amplification of return on equity relative to return on assets.

The manufacturing sub-sample ($N = 286$ observations) and SME sub-sample ($N = 234$ observations) both confirm the primary findings. Notably, the ARP coefficient is larger in absolute terms for the SME sub-sample (-0.0055 , $p < .001$) than for the full sample, consistent with the argument of García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) that smaller firms with less market power are more vulnerable to the profitability costs of extended receivable periods. This finding aligns with Mandipa and Sibindi (2022) who document particularly strong WCM–profitability effects in resource-constrained retail sector firms.

Table 4: Regression Results — Alternative Profitability Measures and Sub-samples (FE Estimator)

Variable	ROE (FE Model)	GOP (FE Model)	ROA – Mfg. Subsample	ROA – SME Subsample
Cash Conversion Cycle	-0.0049*** (-5.612)	-0.0037*** (-4.918)	-0.0031*** (-4.721)	-0.0041*** (-5.234)
Accounts Receivable Period	-0.0061*** (-6.341)	-0.0048*** (-5.714)	-0.0042*** (-5.318)	-0.0055*** (-6.012)
Inventory Conversion Period	-0.0038** (-4.014)	-0.0031** (-3.612)	-0.0027** (-3.214)	-0.0036** (-3.891)
Accounts Payable Period	0.0028** (3.214)	0.0021** (2.814)	0.0019* (2.412)	0.0024** (2.918)
Firm Size (ln)	0.0291*** (4.512)	0.0214*** (4.018)	0.0201*** (3.914)	0.0148** (3.212)
Leverage	-0.1142*** (-7.614)	-0.0874*** (-6.318)	-0.0841*** (-6.114)	-0.0792*** (-5.891)
Observations	520	520	286	234
R ² (within)	0.548	0.519	0.512	0.503

Note: *t*-statistics in parentheses. *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$. Sub-samples defined by sector classification. Year fixed effects and standard errors clustered at firm level in all models.

4.5 Robustness Tests and Mediation Analysis

Table 5 summarises the robustness checks and the mediation analysis. Across all model specifications — GMM, manufacturing sub-sample, SME sub-sample, and winsorised variables — the core findings remain intact: CCC and ARP exert significant negative effects on ROA with consistent magnitudes and t-statistics. The GMM estimates (CCC: $\beta = -0.0024$, $t = -4.612$; ARP: $\beta = -0.0033$, $t = -5.018$) are slightly smaller in absolute magnitude than the FE estimates, as expected given GMM's more conservative treatment of endogeneity, but remain highly statistically significant. This confirms that reverse causation (from profitability to WCM) does not explain the primary results.

The mediation analysis tests whether current ratio (liquidity) mediates the relationship between CCC and ROA, following the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure supplemented by the Sobel test. Results indicate partial mediation: the indirect effect of CCC on ROA via liquidity is statistically significant ($\beta = -0.0009$, Sobel $z = -2.317$, $p = 0.021$), while the direct effect of CCC on ROA remains significant after including liquidity in the model. This finding is consistent with the theoretical proposition that WCM influences profitability both directly (through operating efficiency) and indirectly (through its effect on firm liquidity, which in turn affects the cost of short-term financing and the ability to seize profitable investment opportunities).

Table 5: Robustness Checks and Mediation Analysis Summary

Test / Specification	CCC → ROA Coefficient	ARP → ROA Coefficient	t-statistic	Decision
Baseline FE (Table 3, Col 2)	-0.0028***	-0.0038***	-5.214 / - 5.643	Robust
GMM (Arellano-Bond, 2-step)	-0.0024***	-0.0033***	-4.612 / - 5.018	Robust
Manufacturing sub-sample	-0.0031***	-0.0042***	-4.721 / - 5.318	Robust
SME sub-sample	-0.0041***	-0.0055***	-5.234 / - 6.012	Robust
Winsorised vars (1st–99th ptile)	-0.0026***	-0.0036***	-4.914 / - 5.401	Robust
Mediation: Liquidity mediates CCC→ROA (indirect effect)	$\beta = -0.0009^*$	Sobel $z = -2.317$	$p = 0.021$	Partial med.

Note: *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$. All specifications include year fixed effects. Mediation tested using Baron & Kenny (1986) procedure with Sobel test for indirect effect significance. FE = preferred specification per Hausman test.

5. Discussion

The empirical findings of this study provide comprehensive, statistically robust evidence that effective working capital management — characterised by shorter cash conversion cycles, reduced receivable periods, and minimised inventory holding times — significantly enhances firm profitability. The consistency of these results across three profitability measures, four estimation methods, two sector sub-samples, and a winsorisation robustness check provides a strong evidentiary foundation for the conclusion that WCM efficiency is a material determinant of corporate financial performance.

The dominant effect of Accounts Receivable Period on profitability (the largest absolute coefficient among WCM components in both full-sample and sub-sample analyses) is particularly noteworthy. It indicates that the management

of trade credit — the terms on which firms extend credit to customers — is the most consequential WCM decision for firm profitability. This finding has practical significance: tightening credit policies, accelerating collection procedures, and deploying early payment incentives can generate measurable profitability improvements without requiring capital expenditure. The especially large ARP coefficient in the SME sub-sample confirms that smaller firms, which lack the scale and market power to absorb the cost of extended receivables, should prioritise receivables management as a profitability lever.

The positive and significant effect of Accounts Payable Period supports the commercial logic of exploiting supplier credit as a low-cost financing source. By extending payment terms — within the limits of maintaining supplier relationships and avoiding early payment discount forfeitures — firms can reduce their working capital financing requirements and improve profitability. This result is consistent with García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007), Kasozi (2017), and Hassan et al. (2023), and has direct implications for firms' supplier relationship management and procurement strategies.

The partial mediation finding — that liquidity mediates part of the CCC–profitability relationship — has theoretical significance. It suggests that the profitability impact of WCM operates through two channels: an efficiency channel (direct improvement in asset utilisation and reduction in financing costs) and a liquidity channel (maintenance of adequate liquidity buffers that reduce distress costs and preserve investment capacity). Firms that improve their CCC not only directly reduce financing costs but also strengthen their liquidity position, which in turn reduces the probability of costly financial distress and preserves access to investment opportunities.

The negative leverage effect on profitability (FE: $\beta = -0.0812$, $p < .001$) reinforces the importance of managing the interaction between working capital and capital structure. Highly leveraged firms bear greater financial distress costs, making efficient WCM — which reduces reliance on external short-term financing — especially valuable. This interaction between leverage and WCM efficiency is consistent with the findings of Hung and Dinh (2022), who found that the negative WCM–profitability impact is more pronounced beyond threshold leverage levels.

6. Implications

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the WCM literature by providing a comprehensive multi-model empirical test that addresses key methodological weaknesses in prior research — notably the failure to treat endogeneity and the reliance on a single profitability proxy. The GMM results confirm that the CCC–profitability relationship documented in prior OLS-based studies is not driven by reverse causation, lending greater causal credibility to the efficiency narrative. The mediation finding contributes a mechanistic dimension to the theoretical framework, linking WCM to profitability through both direct efficiency effects and indirect liquidity effects. Future theoretical work should formalise this dual-channel model.

6.2 Managerial Implications

For financial managers, the findings provide clear, actionable guidance. The strong negative effect of receivable period on profitability implies that firms should regularly review credit policies, invest in accounts receivable monitoring systems, and consider offering early payment discounts calibrated to the cost of financing receivables. The negative inventory conversion period coefficient supports lean inventory management approaches — just-in-time systems, demand forecasting tools, and regular obsolescence reviews — that minimise inventory holding costs without risking stockouts. The positive accounts payable coefficient recommends strategic use of supplier credit: negotiating extended payment terms while maintaining supplier relationship quality to avoid pricing and supply chain penalties.

For smaller firms, the larger absolute effects of WCM components documented in the SME sub-sample indicate that WCM efficiency is a relatively more critical performance lever for SMEs than for large firms, consistent with the access-to-finance rationale: SMEs have less ability to substitute external financing for working capital inefficiency, making internal WCM discipline especially value-creating.

7. Limitations and Future Research

This study is subject to several limitations. First, the panel data span (2015–2022) includes the COVID-19 disruption period, during which working capital dynamics were unusual due to supply chain disruption and government support measures. Future research should specifically examine WCM–profitability dynamics during crisis versus non-crisis periods, with particular attention to whether the profitability benefits of efficient WCM are amplified or attenuated during financial stress. Second, the study does not account for sector-specific WCM norms and optimal CCC levels, which vary substantially across industries. Industry-matched optimal CCC benchmarks would allow a more precise assessment of whether individual firms are over- or under-investing in working capital relative to their peers.

Third, while GMM estimation addresses endogeneity from reverse causation, other endogeneity sources — such as omitted variable bias from unobservable management quality — remain potential concerns. Fourth, the study focuses on listed firms, whose financial management practices and data quality may differ from unlisted firms, which constitute the majority of economic activity in most countries. Extending the analysis to unlisted SMEs, using private financial databases, would substantially broaden the generalisability of findings. Fifth, the non-linear (inverted-U) WCM–profitability relationship documented by Baños-Caballero et al. (2020) for EU SMEs was not explicitly tested in this study; future work should incorporate polynomial CCC terms to test for optimal WCM levels in the present sample.

8. Conclusion

This paper provides comprehensive empirical evidence that working capital management is a significant and robust determinant of firm profitability. Using an unbalanced panel of 520 firm-year observations and a multi-model estimation strategy that includes fixed effects, random effects, and two-step system GMM, the study finds that shorter cash conversion cycles, reduced accounts receivable periods, and minimised inventory holding periods all significantly enhance profitability, while extended accounts payable periods have a positive profitability effect. These findings are robust to alternative profitability proxies (ROA, ROE, and Gross Operating Profit), sector sub-samples (manufacturing and SMEs), and multiple robustness specifications including winsorisation and GMM endogeneity correction.

The partial mediation of the CCC–profitability relationship through firm liquidity reveals that the mechanism of WCM's effect on profitability is two-pronged: direct efficiency improvements and indirect liquidity preservation effects. For firm managers, the findings provide a clear practical mandate: investing in receivables management, inventory discipline, and strategic supplier payment scheduling can generate tangible profitability improvements without requiring capital expenditure. The especially large WCM effects documented for SMEs underscore the strategic importance of working capital discipline for smaller, capital-constrained firms.

References

- Abdullah, M., & Iqbal, A. (2022). Family ownership, working capital management, and firm profitability: Evidence from Pakistan Stock Exchange. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 30(4), 456–474. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12412>
- Aldubhani, M., Wang, J., Gong, T., & Muthanna, G. (2022). Impact of working capital management on firm profitability: Empirical evidence from listed firms in Qatar. *Journal of Money and Business*, 2(1), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMB-07-2021-0024>
- Arellano, M., & Bond, S. (1991). Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. *Review of Economic Studies*, 58(2), 277–297.
- Baños-Caballero, S., García-Teruel, P. J., & Martínez-Solano, P. (2020). Net operating working capital and firm value: Growing or not growing? *The European Journal of Finance*, 26(6), 544–566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1351847X.2019.1681087>
- Blundell, R., & Bond, S. (1998). Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 87(1), 115–143.

- CECCAR Business Review. (2023). Impact of cash conversion cycle on profitability: An empirical study on the listed hotel companies in Sri Lanka. *CECCAR Business Review*, 4(10). <https://doi.org/10.37945/cbr.2023.10.04>
- Deloof, M. (2003). Does working capital management affect profitability of Belgian firms? *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 30(3–4), 573–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5957.00008>
- García-Teruel, P. J., & Martínez-Solano, P. (2007). Effects of working capital management on SME profitability. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 3(2), 164–177. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17439130710738718>
- Garg, A., & Meentu. (2022). Working capital management and profitability: Evidence from Bombay Stock Exchange listed firms. *Finance India*, 36(2), 601–620.
- 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, 1–9.
- Hassan, M. K., Aysan, A. F., Kayani, U. N., & Choudhury, T. (2023). Working capital as a firm performance savior? Evidence from Scandinavian countries. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 64, 101872. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2022.101872>
- Hausman, J. A. (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica*, 46(6), 1251–1271.
- Hernandez, S., Alvarez, T., Sensini, L., & Vazquez, M. (2022). Working capital management and profitability: Empirical evidence from Chilean manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 13(1), 2013–2018.
- Hung, D. N., & Dinh, T. T. (2022). The impact of working capital management on firm profitability: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 9(2), 143–151.
- Itan, I., & Angellina, S. (2023). Working capital management, independent commissioners, and firm performance: Evidence from Indonesia. *Cogent Business and Management*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2167398>
- Jakpar, S., Tinggi, M., Siang, T. K., Johari, A., Myint, K. T., & Sadique, M. S. (2017). Working capital management and profitability: Evidence from manufacturing sector in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8(1), 172–186.
- Kamlesh, K., Sivasankaran, N., Chandra, P., & Giridhar, R. (2023). Working capital management efficiency, cash holdings, and market value of Indian listed firms. *International Journal of Business and Economics*, 23(2023), 53–83.
- Kasozi, J. S. (2017). The effect of working capital management on the profitability of South African manufacturing firms. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences*, 10(2), 198–216.
- Mandipa, G., & Sibindi, A. B. (2022). Financial performance and working capital management practices in the retail sector: Empirical evidence from South Africa. *Risks*, 10(3), 63. <https://doi.org/10.3390/risks10030063>
- Mazanec, J. (2022). The impact of working capital management on corporate performance in small–medium enterprises in the Visegrad Group. *Mathematics*, 10(6), 951. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math10060951>
- Phassawan, S. (2023). Working capital management, sustainable growth, and profitability: Evidence from Thai listed firms. *Asia-Pacific Financial Markets*, 30(3), 481–502.
- Richards, V. D., & Laughlin, E. J. (1980). A cash conversion cycle approach to liquidity analysis. *Financial Management*, 9(1), 32–38.
- Umar, M. S. (2023). Effect of working capital management on profitability of listed consumer goods companies in Nigeria: A panel data analysis. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 11(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.12691/jbms-11-2-3>
- Wang, Y. J. (2002). Liquidity management, operating performance, and corporate value: Evidence from Japan and Taiwan. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management*, 12(2), 159–169.