A ES
ISSN: 2096-3246
Volume 54, Issue 02, December, 2022
Special Issue

RELATIONAL STUDY OF WC MANAGEMENT, CASH HOLDING AND PROFITABILITY: AN EVIDENCE OF INDIAN CORPORATE

Sunil Kumar, Gunjan Tripathi, Nishith Mishra
SGT University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

Alka Jain
Babu Banarasi Das University, Lucknow (U.P.) India

Abstract

Purpose: For corporations in order to deal with poor financial conditions and increased economic insecurity, efficient WC management has become essential. This study examines the effect on the profitability of the WC(WC) of corporations. The study also investigates the impact of companies' cash levels on the WC and profitability relationship.

Design/Methodology/Approach:
The study is based on analytical model to estimate the impact relationship of cash levels and profitability on WC utilizing the financial information from S&P BSE 500 companies. Using the OLS model & GMM, the mathematical model proposed in the paper was examined.

Findings: This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the interactions between components of WC and shows the non-linear connection involving the link between WC and profitability of companies.

Research Limitations: The findings are subject to competitive market variations. Also, the limits of the basic statistical approach used to validate the model.

Keywords: WC, WC Management, Cash Holding, Profitability, BSE India

INTRODUCTION:

Two critical decisions are crucial and necessary in financial management. They are decisions about real assets and fixed capital and decisions about WC and existing assets. Both are critical, and a company must constantly assess their impact on profitability and risk. The funds invested in fixed or permanent assets such as property, buildings, equipment, and so on are referred to as fixed capital. On the other hand, WC refers to funds held in materials, work in progress, finished goods, receivables, currency, and other assets. WC can thus be described as "capital invested in current assets" in simple terms. Current assets can be turned into cash in a short period and then re-invested in these assets with the cash collected. As a result, it is constantly receiving or circulating information. As a result, WC is often referred to as revolving or floating capital.

WC is a form of short-term investment that deals with decisions about current assets and liabilities. WC is considered one of the determining factors in a company's growth. WC refers to the funds needed to keep a business running on a day-to-day basis. As a result, WC management is concerned with the issues that occur when handling existing assets, current liabilities, and interrelationships.The current assets(CA) and liabilities(CL) constitute the most fundamental factors of WC.

A company’s critical survival factors are liquidity and profitability. A company can exist even if it isn't profitable, but it can't survive if it lacks liquidity. WC management is a continuous function that

involves maintaining a balance between liquidity and profitability by controlling day-to-day expenses and the flow of financial resources circulating in the company.

Cash holding:

One of the most important financial decisions that an organization's manager could make is cash holding. Some businesses used to have much cash on hand, while others had a lot less. But the question is how much to keep. Similar policies are framed for each of these. These policies are considered to be one of the most significant financial policies in business management.

Profitability

WC is stock that has a conversion or resale value to make a profit. It represents a company's highest cost, especially in manufacturing. WC makes up about 30% to 40% of a company's overall investment in normal circumstances. WC investment influences a firm's profitability to a significant degree. On the other hand, excessive current assets (CA) may easily result adverse impact on return on investment, while companies in absence of sufficient current assets can face shortages and have difficulty maintaining smooth operations.

As a result a company's liquidity and profitability is profoundly affected by the management of WC. It focuses on a company's current assets and liabilities. Current assets make up more than half of a traditional manufacturing company's total assets.

The CA are regularly used in creation of new assets thus managers spend a lot of time on day-to-day WC management. The ongoing firm's liquidity is determined by the operating cash flows provided by its assets rather than the assets' liquidation value. As a result, WC management is a delicate topic in financial management. It entails deciding on the sum and composition of current assets, as well as their funding.

Effective WC management entails managing and monitoring current assets and current liabilities to balance liquidity and profitability. The ultimate goal of any business is to maximize shareholder capital, and the best way to do that is to maximize profit. A company that wants to optimize profits must balance current assets and liabilities and stay on top of the liquidity and benefit trade-off. Maintaining the firm's liquidity and profitability is a critical goal, like increasing profit at the cost of liquidity or vice versa will result in severe problems for the business. WC management is a critical component of analyzing a company's success when running day-to-day operations. During the life cycle, there is a risk that current assets and current liabilities will be out of balance, affecting profitability. This is why, in recent years, the analysis of the effect of WC on a firm's profitability has piqued the interest of academics.

This study establish a connection between firms' liquidity and profitability trade-off management in relation with WC management and the the cash conversion cycle (CCC)) and its effect on profitability to. Furthermore, since the CCC encompasses WC management, this paper investigates how the CCC's components affect profitability.

Literature Review:

WC is characterized as the difference between CA & CL and is instrumental in calculating company wide liquidity. With the CCC, which refers to how much time is needed to turn receivables; stocks and AP into cash rather than conventional WC calculation, the researcher investigated the impact of a company's WC on its profitability (Jose et al. 1996). The CCC only represents the operating side

of a company (e.g., account accounts payable, account accounts payable, and inventories) (e.g., cash and current debts). Researchers using CCC thus investigate the impact of the operating part of WC on the profitability of a business. This study also shows that the company's cash level is a key factor for the effective management of WC. The findings showed that work capital, cash levels and profitability have interactive effects. Jose and others (1996) concluded the relations between the Cash Conversion Cycles (CCCs) and the profitability of companies in seven industries for twenty years (1974-1993 Shin and Soenen (1998) also supported the strong adverse connection between the CCC-like net trading cycle and the money profit of the business. In addition, a shortened net trading period may lead to higher returns on inventory, highlighting the importance of effective management of WC to create shareholder value.

The role of WC management in small and medium-sized enterprises was noted by García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007). Their study makes a difference to the Indian company as SMEs are financially more restricted than the average Indian company. Recently concluded an inverted U-form link between the network cycle of a company and its results.

They proposed that a company raise accounts for receivables, inventories and revenues if net trading times are too short. However, when the net trade period is too long, the impact of the net trading periods on corporate results can be negative at some stage. In order to optimize the value of the business, managers should also find and retain the best account receivables, accounts payable and inventory (Banos-Caballero et al., 2014).

Cash holding:

Companies have gained more publicity because of the recent growth of Indian corporates' significant cash holdings (Bates et al., 2009). Cash is the tiniest but most liquid commodity. If economic circumstances are healthy, extra cash may not be kept due to higher opportunities, whereas in the opposite case, more cash may be beneficial for future income inequality risks. In short, the core of cash management is cash. The principle of transaction costs states that companies in order to reduce transactions cost the companies need to retain cash (Keynes, 1934). In case a company is facing cash shortage and is unable to pay its bills, it must borrow funds through foreign financial sources before non-cash assets are converted into cash, resulting in additional interest and transaction charges. Smaller companies are more vulnerable to operational and financial risks (Opler et al., 1999; Kim et al., 1998; Fazzari and Petersen, 1993). In other words, the cost of the deal varies with a company's amount of liquid asset holdings, the cost of collecting foreign funds, the length of the financial strength and the length of the cash conversion cycle. This precautionary motive explains the need for more investments to include extra cash. When a company has insufficient cash or liquid assets, it raises the risk of investing in successful ventures. So, when managers expect more investment opportunities soon, companies seem to have extra money.

Insufficient current assets will hinder a company's ability to operate effectively and further increase its insurance danger (Dunn and Cheatham, 1993).

The key to the management of WC requires the management of liquidity in a regular way to make sure that companies are operating smoothly and fulfil their obligation (Eljelly, 2004). An analysis of the management of work capital is of primary importance to financial analysts because of their close connection with a company's everyday operations. The favoured swaps between liquidity and

profitability are to be achieved when handling liquidity (Raheman& Nasr, 2007). Concerning the risk and return principle, however, a risk-enhancing investment results in higher yields. There is also a strong lack of operating risk for companies that maintain liquidity or WC at a higher level leading to lower profitability. Instead, companies that maintain their liquidity and WC at a lower level face high risks and high returns. Therefore, companies should consider all the components of liquidity or WC in optimum WC management and try to balance risks and returns (Lee et al., 2008).

On the other hand, the trade credit may increase sales by allowing the customer to evaluate before payment the excellence of the goods (Long et al., 1993, and Deloof&Jegers, 1996). The Cash Conversion Period (CCC), which defines the time difference in payments for raw materials and the selling assortment of finished products, is well-accepted WC steps. Thus, the longer the distance, the bigger the investment in WC (Deloof 2003).

Objective & Hypothesis

(1) Identifying the optimum amount of WC for Indian companies;

(2) Examining the moderating effect of corporate cash on the association between WC and their profit;

(3) Investigating the consequences of WC upon corporate profitability (ROA) (ROA).

Hypothesis

$H_{01:}$ Indian corporate WC (W.C.) and its profitability do not have an inverted U-shaped relationship.

$H_{02:}$ Indian corporate WC is positive; its WC negatively influence its profitability (ROA).

$H_{03:}$Indian corporate WC is negative; the firm's WC positively influences its profitability (ROA).

H04:WC in Indian corporations is positive; however, the negative association between WC and profitability varies greatly depending on cash levels (positive or negative).

$H_{05:}$ The WC of an Indian corporate company is -ve, and the favourable association(+ve) between its WC and profitability varies greatly contingent on its cash level (+ve or -ve).

Research Methodology

Samples and data:

The data for this analysis came from the Prowess database archive, which covered the years 2010 to 2020. Firms with significant data gaps were removed from the analysis. The survey included 3223 firm-year panel data from 293 different firms.

Variables:

. The return on assets (ROA) is determined by dividing revenue by total assets. The effects of increases in WC ratios on operational efficiency within companies and in the sector were investigated in this report. To put it another way, the study aims to determine the real direct influence of a firm's current assets (i.e. account receivables, inventories, cash etc.) and current liabilities (i.e. account receivables, current debt etc.) on financial results rather than the market's perceptions.

WC rate (WCR) is an independent variable calculated as the ratio of WC to revenue. The three distinct variables are ARR, INVR)and APR.

The research divided Indian corporations into two classes depending on their WCR to investigate the

effect of WCR on business results. There are two explanations for this. First, Indian corporations had a larger WCR (from 30% to 56%). The researcher discovered a potential non-linear association between a company's WC and money profit. Second, previous research on WC management has shown two viewpoints. One is the widely held belief that increasing a company's operating capital would help it increase sales, profits, and, ultimately, value. Another viewpoint is that having more WC necessitates higher investment costs, which makes a business less profitable. As a result, the researcher contends that it is not fair to examine all Indian companies without taking into account their +ve and -ve WC ratios..

Statistical analysis:

The ordinary least-squares regression model (OLS) was used to analyze the data in this report, as seen in Eq (1). This research includes the effects of additional regression methods and the OLS model to ensure the validity of our findings. This research used a Fixed-effects panel model with Eq. to eliminate the possible impact of serially clustered errors (3).. The report found that the Random-effects model was unreliable, and the Fixed-effects model was favoured because the null hypothesis of the Hausman test was dismissed. when errors I t are not serially correlated. Wooldridge (1995/2002) proposed that reporting all data sets and comparing the variations is beneficial. As a result, both First-difference and Fixed-effects panel data analyses were performed.

OLS regression model

$$ROA = \beta_0+\beta_1 * WCR + \beta_2 * WCR^2 + \beta_3 * SIZE + \beta_4 * GROWTH + \beta_5 * GDP + \beta_6 * LEV + \varepsilon(1)$$

FIRST –DIFFERENCE MODEL

$$\Delta ROA = \beta_1 * \Delta WCR_{i,t} + \beta_2 * \Delta WCR_{i,t}^2 + \beta_3 * \Delta SIZE_{i,t} + \beta_4 * \Delta GROWTGH_{i,t} + \beta_5 * \Delta GDP_t + \beta_6 * \Delta LEV_{i,t} + \Delta\varepsilon_{i,t}(2)$$

FIXED –EFFECTS MODEL

$$ROA_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * WCR_{i,t} + \beta_2 * WCR_{i,t}^2 + \beta_3 * SIZE_{i,t} + \beta_4 * GROWTH_{i,t} + \beta_5 * GDP_t + \beta_6 * LEV_{i,t} + a_i + \varepsilon_{i,t}(3)$$

$$\Delta ROA_{i,t} = \beta_1 * \Delta WCR_{i,t} + \beta_2 * \Delta WCR_{i,t}^2 + \beta_3 * \Delta SIZE_{i,t} + \beta_4 * \Delta GROWTH_{i,t} + \beta_5 * \Delta GDP_t + \beta_6 * \Delta LEV_{i,t} + \Delta\varepsilon_{i,t}(4)$$

Analysis

Pearson correlation

Table 4a and 4b and figure 1 shows the correlations among the variables. If the table 4 is referred then it can be said that there is statistically significant positive correlations between WCR and ROA i.e. .061 for all the firms taken as sample. One of the variables i.e. CASHR shows the positive significant association with ROA as 0.69 however all other variables shows low degree of correlation with ROA as 0.151with ARR, 0.061 with INVR and 0.221 with APR. Conversely, owing to the trade-off effects among the components of WCR, the value of CCR .017 do not display a substantial association with ROA, which was unexpected to perceive. There is positive correlation within all the components of WCR. The high degree of relationship is seen with CASHR as 0.879 and 0.591 which is the lowest degree of correlation among the components. Other components such as control variables shows the favorable association with ROA i.e. 0.115 with AT, 0.151 with REV and 0.115 with growth. LEV shows the low degree of negative correlation with ROA as -.237. Also GROWTH

and AT had were shown negative correlation values with WCR as -0.83, -.092 with REV and -0.339 with LEV whereas it was found to be positively correlated with GROWTH as 0.213. Contrary to it, there is low degree of correlation between CASHR and other variables such as AT i.e. -0.129, -0.149 with REV, and -.395 with LEV. Positive correlation is seen only with Growth i.e. 0.231.

Table4

Pearson's correlations for all selected firms

	ROA	**WCR**	**CASHR**	**CCR**	**ARR**	**INVR**	**APR**	**AT**	**REV**	**GROWTH**	**GDP**	**LEV**
ROA	1											
WCR	0.061***	1										
CASHR	0.069***	0.879***	1									
CCR	−0.017	0.381***	−0.095***	1								
ARR	−0.151***	0.323***	0.014***	0.662***	1							
INVR	−0.061***	0.259***	−0.069**	0.701***	0.325***	1						
APR	−0.221***	0.0591**	0.0892**	−0.053***	0.549***	0.264***	1					
AT	0.115***	−0.083***	−0.129***	0.092***	0.085***	0.011	−0.017	1				
REV	0.151***	−0.092***	−0.149***	0.115***	0.064***	0.039**	−0.045**	0.939***	1			
GROWTH	0.115***	0.213***	0.231***	−0.005	0.052***	0.059***	0.129***	−0.081***	−0.088***	1		
GDP	0.007	0.031	0.039**	−0.008	0.011	0.045**	0.071***	−0.113***	−0.102***	0.096***	1	
LEV	−0.237***	−0.339***	−0.395***	0.049***	0.169***	0.034*	0.171***	0.151***	0.148***	−0.191***	−0.061***	1

Table 1a represents the values correlation of the firms having positive WCR, however Table 1b illustrates the values of correlation of the firms having negative WCR. The outcomes disclose that there is a negative association between WCR and ROA i.e. -.117 of the firms which belongs to positive WCR group, however a positive connection between WCR and ROA i.e. -.249 between the firms in the group of negative WCR. This indicates that there is a non-linear association between the WCR and ROA of selected Indian firms. There is a positive correlation between ROA and WCR in

both the groups as .117 for the firms with positive WCR and .249 with negative WCR firms in comparison to CCR i.e. .105 in positive WCR Group and .047 in negative WCR group. Additionally, it is seen among the constituents of CASHR, there is a high degree of correlation with WCR.

Conversely, the firms with positive WCR, shows negative associations with ROA i.e. 0117 and CCR as .105, and if seen in negative WCR group of firms WCR as .249 and CASHR as .209 displayed comparable positive relations with ROA, representing that WCR and CCR are connected. Thus it can be said that, the association between WCR and ROA may vary according to CASHR for the firms from having positive WCR on the other hand the association between ROA & WCR depends upon CCR for the firms having negative WCR. Another interesting conclusion which can be drawn is that relationship between ARR, INVR, APR, and ROA all are found to be -ve for all the firms may be having negative or positive WCR.

WCR shows a negative degree of correlation with revenue as .085 and 0.269 with leverage for the firms having positive WCR and the businesses sales increments have a positive correlation with WCR as .221 for the firms having negative WCR. On the same lines, the firms with negative WCR leverage shows a negative correlation with WCR i.e. -0.227 whereas sales growth shows positive correlation with WCR indicating a positive relationship. To conclude it can be said that financial leverage puts negative effect on firm's WC and a firm having good sales growth have a positive impact on the WC of the firms.

Table1a

Pearson's correlation coefficient matrix by positive WCR.

	ROA	WCR	CASHR	CCR	ARR	INVR	APR	AT	REV	GROWTH	GDP	LEV
ROA	1											
WCR	−0.117***	1										
CASHR	−0.051***	0.849***	1									
CCR	−0.105***	0.123***	−0.419***	1								
ARR	−0.301***	0.123***	−0.210***	0.656***	1							
INVR	−0.119***	0.165***	−0.333***	0.715***	0.284***	1						
APR	−0.311***	0.081***	0.065+***	0.017	0.584***	0.279***	1					
AT	0.046*	−0.013	−0.078***	−0.201***	0.176***	−0.008	0.031	1				
REV	0.113***	−0.085***	−0.148***	−0.125***	0.128***	0.039	−0.003	0.876***	1			

GROWTH	0.096***	0.221***	−0.241***	−0.067***	0.003	0.001	0.139***	−0.091***	−0.099***	1		
GDP	0.035	0.017	−0.014	−0.010	−0.004	0.031	0.042	−0.079***	−0.053***	0.182***	1	
LEV	−0.041***	−0.269***	−0.341***	−0.269***	0.362***	0.161***	0.221***	0.199***	0.192***	−0.196***	0.005	1

Table1b

Pearson's correlation coefficient matrix by negative WCR.

	ROA	**WCR**	**CASHR**	**CCR**	**ARR**	**INVR**	**APR**	**AT**	**REV**	**GROWTH**	**GDP**	**LEV**
ROA	1											
WCR	0.249***	1										
CASHR	0.209***	0.829***	1									
CCR	0.047*	0.308***	−0.302***	1								
ARR	−0.149***	0.113***	−0.209***	0.522***	1							
INVR	−0.019	0.165***	−0.133***	0.465***	0.134***	1						
APR	−0.221***	−0.147***	0.067***	−0.365***	0.489***	0.209***	1					
AT	0.161***	−0.007	−0.117***	0.191***	0.106***	0.129***	−0.045	1				
REV	0.185***	0.021	−0.124***	0.248***	0.088***	0.179***	−0.075***	0.946***	1			
GROWTH	0.106***	0.061**	0.099***	−0.061**	0.027	0.025	0.105***	−0.058**	−0.076***	1		
GDP	−0.037	−0.031	0.034	−0.121***	−0.027***	0.018	0.109***	−0.126***	−0.136***	0.109***	1	
LEV	−0.225***	−0.227***	−0.234***	−0.000	0.152***	0.163***	0.181***	0.095***	0.097***	−0.145***	−0.113***	1

Table 5a

The analyses of the relationship between WC and profitability [OLS]

Dependent variable: ROA	Overall	Positive WCR	Negative WCR
WCR	0.1009***	−.2456***	.4102***
WCR2	−.8105***		
SIZE	.0139***	.0137***	.0163***
Growth	.0299***	.0257***	.0322***
GDP	0.0003	.0019*	−.0006
Leverage	−.0989***	−.1402***	−.0706***
R2	0.19	0.19	0.2

Table5b

The analyses of the relationship between WC and profitability [First-difference]

Dependent variable: ROA	Overall	Positive WCR	Negative WCR
WCR	0.0619*	−.0805***	.1418**
WCR2	−0.4121***		
SIZE	−0.05016***	−.0479***	−.0512***
Growth	0.0452***	.0375***	.0402***
GDP	0.0023***	.0022***	0.0011
Leverage	−.1315***	−.1452***	−.1511***
R2	0.16	0.18	0.13

Table5c

The analyses of the relationship between WC and profitability [Fixed-effects]

Dependent variable: ROA	Overall	Positive WCR	Negative WCR
WCR	.1021**	−.01001**	.2045***
WCR2	−.5123**		
SIZE	−.0069**	−.0059**	−.0106**
Growth	.0262***	.0197**	.0343***
GDP	0.0005	0.0006	−.0005
Leverage	−.0827***	−.1306***	−.0328
R2	0.14	0.12	0.09

Hausman Test – Result

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob
Cross-section random	18.4429	5	0.0031

Hausman test supports us to assess if a statistical model agrees to the data.

Null Hypothesis for Hausman Test is as follows.
Ho: preferred model is random effect
H1: preferred model is fixed effect.
Hausman test demonstrated the outcomes out of two effects which one is extra applicable through null hypothesis that Fixed Effect is suitable and alternative hypothesis is that Fixed Effect is appropriate. Above Result of Hausman test displays that p value is less than 0.05, then do not accept the null hypothesis that favoured model is random effect. Hence, the results of the fixed effects are measured for the statistical examination.
Above Result of Hausman test expresses that p value is less than 0.05 (0.0031), then reject the null hypothesis that favored model is random effect. Hence, the consequences of the fixed effects are reflected for the statistical analysis.

Table5d

The analyses of the relationship between WC and profitability [GMM]

Dependent variable: ROA	**Overall**	**Positive WCR**	**Negative WCR**
WCR	0.0446	−.1093***	.1617**
WCR2	−.3998***		
SIZE	−.0153***	−.0128***	−.0227***
Growth	.0357***	.0342***	.0418***
GDP	0.0006	.0017***	0.0002
Leverage	−.0802***	−.1618***	−.0799***
R2	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arellano–Bond			
1st order	−5.3215***	−2.3914**	−3.4213***
2nd order	−.1153	0.7253	−.98,638

Looking at Equations (1) to (4) the relationship between WC Ratio and Return on Assets could be examined also results of OLS, first difference, fixed effects and Regression values are shown in the tables 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d respectively.
To analyze each model of WCR2 is tested to see the impact of WCR of profitability shown by Return on assets. The linear link between the two variables is proposed in hypothesis 1. It is seen that a U shaped inverted significant association is present between the 2 variables for all models which depicts the hypothesis is accepted. For all the combinations the optimal point is found out by using partial differentiation method in terms of WC Ratio and Profitability. The results discovered that a firm can touch an optimal level when WC is found to be 6.01% of sales in the model of OLS, 6.25% of sales in the model of First-difference, 13.36% of sales in the model of Fixed-effects, and 4.85% of sales in the model of GMM.
The sample was divided in two groups i.e. one for +ve WC and other for -ve WC group were also analyzed individually so as to find the variances between the groups as mentioned and see their distinct relationship patterns. After seeing the results in Tables 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d, the values of

coefficients of ROI i.e. return on investment for all models on WC were significantly -ve for the firms with +ve WC, thus hypothesis 2 is justified. In disparity, the values of coefficients of (ROA) return on assets on WC ratio (WCR) are all found to be significantly positive for the firms having negative WC, this validates the Hypothesis 3. One exciting remark is that the degrees of the constants of WCR for the firms having negative WCR are significantly greater than those firms which have positive WCR, this is not unexpected.

We establish that the instrument variables were usable and the representations were correctly quantified based on the outcomes of association analysis on the GMM models obtainable in Tables 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2d. The null hypothesis could not be rejected of no serial correlation of 2nd order for any of the models. As a result, the contributory variables in the models of GMM are not linked with errors, and the models gives the most vigorous outcomes in terms of endogeneity matters, which cannot be achieved by Ist-difference, OLS, or FEM. For that reason, the consequences of the GMM model are the utmost dependable of the models employed in this study, and we can study them to be the best irrepressible.

Table 3

Interaction effects of WCR and Cash Level in the GMM model.

Dependent Variable: ROA	GMM - Positive WCR	GMM - Negative WCR
WCR	0.0543	.1815***
Cash Level(dummy)	.0089**	−.0139*
WCR*Cash Level(dummy)	−.1738*	0.3115
SIZE	−.0133***	−.0216***
Growth	.0392***	.0502***
GDP	0.0012	0.0003
Leverage	−.1762***	−.0904***
Arellano–Bond		
1st order	−2.2815**	−3.4416***
2nd order	0.6318	−1.1015

The variable of Cash Level was comprised in the GMM model so as todefine whether a firm's liquidity levels (Cash Level) shows a regulating consequence on the association between WCR and ROA. The outcomes of this study are shown in Table 3. The dummy variables is Cash Level, as formerly cited, through a value of 1 for optimistic cash levels and 0 for adverse cash levels. Table 6 displays that for firms having positive WC shows significant negative collaboration impact on the linking between WCR and ROA (WCR*Cash Level:17.38%). In another words, if a firm has optimistic WC, increasing cash levels (Cash Level) shows a negative effect on the relation between WCR and ROA (return on assets).The findings of firms with positive WC, validate Hypothesis 4, which checks that the Money Level has a controlling effect on the association between WCR and return on assets (ROA). This reading exposed that there were no important interface terms for firms with negative WC. Therefore, these results do not sustenance Hypothesis 5, which proposes that cash level does not play a controlling role in the association between WCR and return on assets for

companies having negative WC.

Table4

The relationship between WCR and ROA according to Cash Level in the GMM model

Dependent variable: ROA	GMM	Positive WC group	
	Overall	Positive Cash Level group	Negative Cash Level group
WCR	−0.1107***	−0.1198***	0.0673
SIZE	−0.0131***	−0.0145**	−0.0119
Growth	0.0357***	0.0402***	0.0718***
GDP	0.0017***	0.0015**	0
Leverage	−0.1674***	−0.1410***	−0.2652***
Arellano–Bond			
1st order	−2.313**	−0.1372	−2.015**
2nd order	0.7534	0.7851	−0.5362

For an additional wide-ranging thoughtful of the controlling role of Cash Level, this research analyzed cash levels (both positive and negative cash levels) for the firm with the positive WCR group, which exposed that money levels had a chief role as indicated in Table 3. Seeing the values in table 4 showing all the firms with positive WCR, the value of coefficient of WCR is 10.58%. This shows that if a firm raises its WCR by one unit, then its return on assets (ROA) will be dropped by .508%. A comparable arrangement can be detected for companies in the group of companies having positive Cash Level, where the values of coefficient of WCR is 11.07%, which specifies a uncertain failure when linked to the whole positive WCR group. Because of the cumulative cash levels, this outcome offers provision to our clarification of Hypothesis 4, which says that a rise in WC for companies with positive WC and optimistic cash levels produces extra opportunity costs, which shows a negative influence on productivity. Though, once the Cash Levels of companies having positive WCR in the group shows negative, the coefficient of WCR is optimistic (6.73%), but it is not statistically substantial. Rendering to these results, the undesirable link between WC and profitability for the sample selected Indian companies with optimistic WC but negative liquidity levels will recover as WC progresses. Hence, as per Table 4, this portion of the analysis contributes more evidence to sustenance the explanations for Hypothesis 4.

Conclusion

This paper examined the association between WC and functioning profitability in Indian firms. This study revealed that WC shows an extensive U Shaped and inverted association with effectiveness and profitability (Hypothesis 1), which is reliable with former results (ROA). Also, cumulative WC has an opposing outcome on profit limits in organizations with optimistic WC (Hypothesis 2) and a beneficial result on turnover margins in firms with negative WC (H 3). Fascinatingly, these conclusions were corresponding with the results of Banos Caballero et al. (2014), who demanded that an ideal level of WC happens for a firm's achievement. In agreement with GMM variables, the

results of this reading suggest that the greatest optimum WC degree is 4 percent of total income. We were able to switch possible endogeneity matters by the GMM models, subsequent in the greatest vigorous outcomes possible. Assumed that their ultimate WC rate is tremendously near to zero, the results recommended that nominated Indian firms would have to regulate their WC very prudently in order to endure competitive.

This study likewise meant to examine the collaborating purpose of cash levels in the association between a WC of firm and its complete operative efficiency (or performance). Conventionally, the part of cash level for WC match has not been considered important, it justifies in contrast to the other components of WC. Additionally, former Cash Conversion Cycle (CCC) readings are unsuccessful to take into deliberation the cash balances of companies. Though, rendering to the conclusions of this study, cash levels of enterprises having positive WC shows a curbing effect on their profits. If seen specifically, if a business has both optimistic cash levels and optimistic WCs, the WC determination has an adverse effect on the company's large operative profit. Companies with adverse cash levels but optimistic WC, instead, will not know-how an undesirable influence on operational profit due to the WC. Consequently, in firms with optimistic WC, the cash level of a company was the most significant indicator of well-organized WC administration in those companies. If we talk about these businesses, optimistic cash levels designate unproductive cash-generating competences, while negative cash levels specify effectual cash-generating skills.

Businesses with adverse cash levels and adverse WC had better returns on assets than businesses with optimistic cash levels and adverse WC; though, the controlling effects of cash level were not seen in firms with negative WC. If firms do not consume adequate WC, the economic factors (Cash Level), the operational features (CCR), or equally, would have a damaging impression on their effective performance, the conclusions propose. Consequently, it can be contended that negative WC can be extra harmful to functional performance than optimistic WC for certain Indian firms. A supportive motive for this situation is provided by the statistic that the slope of the ratio of WC is sharper in the adverse WC group than in the optimistic WC group.

Contrasting prior studies, this reading combined the sole operative and economic structures of Indian companies, for eg. +ve/-ve WC & positive/negative cash levels, into the investigation models, since old-style WC capacities and the CCC do not give explanation for these specific features. Therefore, by defining the collaborating influences between cash levels of firms (Cash Level) and WC this research paper ties the breach between outdated WC metrics and WCR.

In accumulation, the conclusions of this examination expose that the huge majority of Indian concerns continued a very constricted control on their WC. Chiefly regarding the fact that nearly half of the companies had also -ve WC and -ve cash levels. Accordingly, Indian businesses trust widely on advances from suppliers, making them focus to unexpected operational and monetary dangers.

Reference

- Bates, T.W., Kahle, K.M., Stulz, R.M., 2009. Why do us firms hold so much more cash than they used to? J. Financ. 64 (5), 1985–2021.

- Ba˜nos-Caballero, S., García-Teruel, P.J.,Martínez-Solano,P.,2014.Workingcapital management, corporateperformance,andfinancialconstraints.J.Bus.Res.67 (3), 332–338.
- Deloof, M., 2003. Does WC management affect profitability of Belgian firms? J. Bus. Financ. Acc. 30 (3–4), 573–588.
- Deloof, M., Jegers, M., 1996. Trade credit, product quality, and intergroup trade: some European evidence. Financ. Manag., 33–43.
- Dunn, P., Cheatham, L., 1993. Fundamentals of small business financial management for startup, survival, growth, and changing economic circumstances. Manag. Financ. 19 (8), 1–13.
- Eljelly, A.M., 2004. Liquidity-profitability trade-off: an empirical investigation in an emerging market. Int. J. Commerce Manag. 14 (2), 48–61.
- Fazzari, S.M., Petersen, B.C., 1993. WC and fixed investment: new evidence on financing constraints. RAND J. Econ., 328–342.
- García-Teruel, P.J., Martínez-Solano, P., 2007. Effects of WC management on SME profitability. Int. J. Manag. Financ. 3 (2), 164–177. Han, S., Qiu, J., 2007. Corporate precautionary cash holdings. J. Corp. Financ. 13 (1), 43–57
- Jose, M.L., Lancaster, C., Stevens, J.L., 1996. Corporate returns and cash conversion cycles. J. Econ. Financ. 20 (1), 33–46.
- Keynes, J.M., 1934. The applied Theory of Money, vol. 2. Macmillan and Co. Kim, C.-S., Mauer, D.C., Sherman, A.E., 1998. The determinants of corporate liquidity: theory and evidence. J. Financ. Quant. Anal. 33 (3), 335–359.
- Nawaiseh, M. E. (2016) "IMPAIRMENT ACCOUNTING PRACTICE IN JORDANIAN FIRMS", IARS' International Research Journal. Victoria, Australia, 6(2). doi: 10.51611/iars.irj.v6i2.2016.59.
- Opler, T., Pinkowitz, L., Stulz, R., Williamson, R., 1999. The determinants and implications of corporate cash holdings. J. Financ. Econ. 52 (1), 3–46.
- Raheman, A., Nasr, M., 2007. WC management and profitability – case of Pakistani firms. Int. Rev. Bus. Res. Pap. 3 (1), 279–300.
- Sánchez, J.M., Yurdagul, E., 2013. Why are corporations holding so much cash? Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis'. Reg. Econ. 21 (1), 5–8.
- Shin, H.-H., Soenen, L., 1998. Efficiency of WC management and corporate profitability. Financ. Pract. Educ. 8, 37–45.
- Wooldridge, J.M., 1995/2002. Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data, vol. 5(1). The MIT Press, pp. 5.