Asian Journal of Managerial Science
ISSN: 2249-6300 (Print) | 2583-9810 (Online)
Journal Homepage: https://ajmsjournal.org/
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70112/ajms-2026.15.1.4308

Research Article

Sustainable Working Capital Management in Green Supply Chains

Amit Das[1*] **and Amalendu Bhunia**[2]
[1*]Department of Commerce, Surendranath Evening College, West Bengal, India
[2]Department of Commerce, University of Kalyani, West Bengal, India

Article Information

Article History
Received: 16 October 2025
Revised: 19 November 2025
Accepted: 30 December 2025
Published online: 7 February 2026

Keywords
Working Capital Efficiency
Green Supply Chains
Sustainable Finance
Panel Data Regressions

Correspondence
amitdas8121984@gmail.com

ORCID
Amit Das
https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4593-0817
Amalendu Bhunia
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3142-1822

Abstract

Sustainable working capital management in green supply chains represents a strategic fusion of financial efficiency and environmental stewardship, aimed at enhancing both economic performance and ecological responsibility. This study investigates the dynamics of sustainable working capital management practices within green-oriented supply networks, particularly focusing on how efficient management of current assets and liabilities aligns with sustainable environmental objectives. By analyzing secondary data from selected environmentally responsible manufacturing firms listed on BSE Ltd., the research uses panel data regression to explore the impact of inventory turnover, receivables collection period, and payable deferral strategies on firm profitability and liquidity. The random-effects model test results indicate that SI, firm size, leverage, inflation, GDP growth, profitability, and technology adoption remain significant (positively or negatively) determinants of working capital efficiency. The findings reveal that firms integrating green practices into their working capital structures experience improved operational efficiency, cost savings, and better market valuations. Moreover, sustainable supply chain financing and reduced carbon footprints emerge as significant mediators in strengthening firm resilience and stakeholder trust. The implications are particularly relevant for India, where sustainable industrial growth is crucial.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the evolving landscape of global business, the intersection of financial efficiency and environmental responsibility has given rise to a new paradigm in supply chain and financial management—sustainable working capital management (SWCM) within green supply chains (GSCs). The growing urgency to address climate change, resource depletion, and environmental degradation has compelled corporations across the world to rethink traditional financial practices and embrace sustainability not just as a social or environmental goal but as a strategic financial imperative (Golicic & Smith, 2013; Dass, 2019). Amidst the rise of green consumerism, stricter regulatory frameworks, and stakeholder activism, green supply chains, defined as environmentally conscious integration of supply chain activities including sourcing, production, and distribution, have emerged as critical tools for balancing ecological concerns with corporate profitability (Srivastava, 2007). At the core of green supply chains lies the need to optimize the flow of resources and information while minimizing ecological impact. Conventionally, working capital management (WCM) has focused on maintaining an optimal balance of current assets and liabilities to ensure liquidity, solvency, and operational efficiency (Deloof, 2003). However, in the context of GSCs, WCM must now account for environmental variables such as carbon emissions, waste management, energy use, and reverse logistics, thereby evolving into a more complex, sustainability-oriented discipline (Zhu & Sarkis, 2004). The transformation of working capital management into a sustainable practice requires the integration of environmental and financial performance indicators, necessitating innovative strategies for managing cash, receivables, payables, and inventories within eco-efficient frameworks.

The importance of SWCM is underscored by the strategic trade-offs between financial performance and environmental compliance. For instance, maintaining eco-friendly inventories demands sourcing from certified green suppliers, which may lead to longer lead times or higher procurement costs (Testa & Iraldo, 2010). Similarly, companies embracing extended payment terms to support green vendors might face liquidity constraints, influencing their working capital cycle. On the other hand, investments in sustainable practices such as energy-efficient production processes, biodegradable packaging, or renewable inputs enhance brand reputation, reduce long-term costs, and unlock new markets, thereby contributing to both financial and environmental sustainability (Chen, 2001; Carter & Rogers, 2008; Bakshi, 2024). Therefore, understanding the financial implications of green initiatives across supply chains and integrating them into WCM decisions is a growing necessity for sustainable enterprise development.

In recent years, empirical research has explored the relationship between sustainability practices and financial performance. Studies by Klassen and McLaughlin (1996) and Rao and Holt (2005) found positive correlations between environmental initiatives and firm competitiveness, arguing that green supply chain integration enhances innovation, reduces waste, and improves overall efficiency. Moreover, incorporating green practices in inventory management and procurement has been associated with better control over operational risks, improved supply chain resilience, and enhanced stakeholder trust (Gold *et al*., 2010). However, much of the literature has examined sustainability and financial performance as distinct fields, with limited focus on how environmental concerns specifically influence working capital policies. The present study attempts to bridge this gap by investigating how green supply chain practices reshape the financial dimensions of WCM, particularly in industries where environmental compliance is a critical success factor.

Sustainable WCM encompasses the development of eco-conscious approaches to managing the cash conversion cycle (CCC), the time taken to convert resource inputs into cash flows from sales. A shorter CCC generally reflects better liquidity and operational efficiency (Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006). However, in GSCs, firms encounter sustainability-related delays in procurement, processing, and delivery stages. For example, compliance with environmental regulations or sourcing raw materials with minimal carbon footprint may result in extended lead times or higher inventory holding periods, thereby affecting CCC (Sarkis, 2003). Balancing such delays with cost-efficiency and customer service requires sophisticated decision-making frameworks that incorporate both financial metrics and environmental performance indicators (Ahi & Searcy, 2013). Accordingly, this study seeks to identify how firms reconfigure their WCM practices to align with environmental goals without compromising financial performance.

From a strategic management perspective, SWCM is not only a response to external environmental pressures but also a proactive initiative to achieve long-term competitive advantage. Porter and Linde (1995) emphasized that environmental regulation can stimulate innovation, which in turn can enhance resource efficiency and reduce costs, benefits that directly influence WCM. For example, green product design and just-in-time (JIT) inventory systems reduce material waste and storage costs, improving both ecological and financial outcomes. Similarly, reverse logistics and closed-loop supply chains are key components of GSCs, demanding advanced inventory and receivable management techniques, requiring businesses to reorient their working capital strategies to include end-of-life product recovery and recycling programs (Guide & Wassenhove, 2009).

Moreover, the digitalization of supply chains through technologies like blockchain, Internet of Things (IoT), and artificial intelligence (AI) is further transforming the scope of sustainable working capital practices. These technologies enable real-time tracking of green compliance metrics, improve supplier collaboration, and streamline receivables and inventory management, all of which are essential for effective SWCM in green supply chains (Tachizawa *et al.,* 2015). For example, AI-based demand forecasting models can reduce excess inventory while maintaining sustainability targets; blockchain can ensure transparency and traceability of green credentials across the supply chain, thus facilitating trust and efficiency in accounts payable and receivable operations (Saberi *et al.,* 2019).

In the Indian context, the growing regulatory focus on sustainability, exemplified by the Companies Act 2013's CSR requirements and the Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR) mandates by SEBI, has intensified the need for corporations to align financial and environmental strategies. Indian industries, especially in manufacturing, FMCG, and pharmaceuticals, are increasingly integrating green practices such as solar energy usage, water recycling, and biodegradable inputs into their supply chains. These transitions have significant implications for working capital cycles, particularly in terms of inventory valuation, procurement planning, and credit management. However, scholarly investigations into how Indian firms manage their working capital in light of sustainability objectives remain sparse. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by empirically exploring the relationship between green supply chain integration and working capital efficiency in Indian firms, offering practical insights for corporate managers, policymakers, and investors.

Theoretically, this study is grounded in the Resource-Based View (RBV) and Stakeholder Theory. The RBV posits that sustainability-oriented capabilities such as green procurement and eco-efficient operations can be sources of competitive advantage when they are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (Hart, 1995). Efficient SWCM practices that align with green objectives can therefore enhance operational agility and financial resilience. On the other hand, Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984) emphasizes that businesses must address the expectations of a wide range of stakeholders, including customers, suppliers, regulators, and communities, many of whom now prioritize environmental sustainability. Effective SWCM strategies signal financial prudence and environmental accountability, thereby improving stakeholder relationships and long-term firm value.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The emergence of sustainability as a strategic priority for businesses has significantly influenced traditional financial disciplines, especially working capital management (WCM). Conventional WCM focused on managing the firm's short-term assets and liabilities to ensure operational liquidity and profitability (Deloof, 2003). However, with increasing environmental concerns, legislative pressures, and global shifts toward ecological responsibility, researchers have begun exploring the transformation of WCM into Sustainable Working Capital Management (SWCM), a practice that integrates environmental sustainability into financial decision-making. The intersection of SWCM with Green Supply Chain Management (GSCM) has emerged as a distinct research niche aimed at examining how organizations manage liquidity and cash flow while maintaining eco-friendly operations (Golicic & Smith, 2013; Ahi & Searcy, 2013). GSCM, by its definition, involves incorporating environmental thinking into supply chain activities such as product design, material sourcing, manufacturing processes, and end-of-life management (Srivastava, 2007). In this context, SWCM acts as a financial enabler that supports sustainable goals while safeguarding financial viability.

One of the core components of WCM is the cash conversion cycle (CCC), which reflects the time lag between outflows for inputs and inflows from product sales (Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006). The integration of sustainability principles into GSCs can significantly affect CCC. Environmentally preferred sourcing might involve suppliers located farther away or with limited capacity, thus increasing lead times and inventory holding periods (Sarkis, 2003). Moreover, sustainable procurement may require upfront payments or capital investments in green materials, influencing receivables and payables management (Testa & Iraldo, 2010). In contrast, some green practices, such as lean production, just-in-time (JIT) inventory systems, and energy-efficient logistics, can shorten the CCC by reducing waste and inefficiencies (Gold *et al.,* 2010). Accordingly, the literature reflects both positive and negative impacts of green initiatives on WCM, highlighting the importance of strategic alignment between environmental and financial goals.

The theoretical underpinnings of SWCM draw heavily from the Resource-Based View (RBV) and the Stakeholder Theory. RBV suggests that firms can gain competitive advantage by developing internal capabilities such as green innovation, eco-efficient logistics, and sustainability-oriented WCM (Hart, 1995). These capabilities, when aligned with strategic goals, are difficult for competitors to imitate, thus providing long-term value. Stakeholder Theory, on the other hand, emphasizes the role of diverse stakeholders: investors, regulators, customers, suppliers, and communities who increasingly demand sustainable practices (Freeman, 1984). The integration of sustainability into WCM thus serves a dual function: improving operational agility and fulfilling stakeholder expectations. Porter and van der Linde (1995) further argue that environmental regulations can foster innovation, leading to cost savings and improved resource efficiency benefits that directly contribute to WCM effectiveness. For instance, reverse logistics not only support circular economy objectives but also enable firms to reclaim value from returned goods, thereby enhancing receivable efficiency and inventory turnover (Guide & Van Wassenhove, 2009).

Multiple empirical studies have highlighted the link between green practices and financial performance, though few have specifically addressed WCM. Klassen and McLaughlin (1996) found that environmental management initiatives improve firm reputation and reduce regulatory risks, thereby enhancing market value. Rao and Holt (2005) demonstrated that GSCM leads to improved competitiveness through cost reductions and market access, while Zhu and Sarkis (2004) emphasized that green initiatives improve operational efficiency. Chen (2001) examined green product innovation and found it to be positively associated with profitability and differentiation. While these studies provide indirect support for the efficacy of SWCM, they lack a direct examination of working capital metrics such as inventory days, payables periods, or receivables turnover. Deloof (2003) and García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) confirmed that efficient WCM improves firm profitability, but their analyses do not consider the environmental dimension.

Some studies have begun addressing this gap. Golicic and Smith (2013), through a meta-analysis, found that sustainable supply chain practices correlate with improved financial outcomes, especially in terms of cost control and risk mitigation. Ahi and Searcy (2015) proposed integrated performance measurement frameworks that include both environmental and financial indicators for evaluating supply chain sustainability. They emphasized the role of financial practices such as working capital policy in enabling green supply chain strategies. More recently, Bag (2020) investigated the impact of green procurement on cash flow stability in Indian manufacturing firms, revealing that firms with greener suppliers demonstrated more consistent liquidity performance. These findings suggest that sustainable supplier selection and green inventory management can significantly influence the working capital cycle. Green procurement, the first stage of GSCs, plays a pivotal role in SWCM. It involves sourcing raw materials and services with lower environmental impacts, such as biodegradable materials, certified sustainable inputs, or locally sourced goods to reduce emissions (Zhu & Geng, 2013). While this may entail higher upfront costs and more complex logistics, it leads to long-term savings and enhanced supplier relationships. Testa and Iraldo (2010) found that firms adopting green procurement practices faced initial working capital challenges but eventually achieved greater cost stability. Similar patterns were observed by Walker and Jones (2012), who noted that collaboration with sustainable suppliers improved inventory efficiency and reduced disruptions. These results underscore the need for dynamic WCM policies that can accommodate the evolving nature of green inputs and regulatory compliance.

Inventory management is another critical dimension of SWCM. In traditional WCM, minimizing inventory holding costs is central to enhancing cash flow and reducing operational inefficiencies (Shin & Soenen, 1998). However, green supply chains demand a more nuanced approach, where sustainability considerations may require stocking environmentally compliant products with limited shelf lives or variable demand patterns. According to Brandenburg *et al.* (2014), green inventory policies must balance ecological goals with financial constraints. For example, holding recycled or reusable materials might reduce environmental impact but requires innovative storage and tracking systems (Prabha *et al.,* 2024). The application of AI and IoT technologies in green inventory management has been found to improve demand forecasting and reduce overstocking, thereby optimizing working capital use (Tachizawa *et al.,* 2015).Accounts receivable and payable management, key levers of WCM, also undergo substantial transformation in GSC contexts. Environmentally responsible customers may demand flexible payment terms or value-added green features, thereby impacting receivables turnover. Conversely, supporting green suppliers might involve early payments or extended terms to promote sustainability (Simpson *et al.,* 2007). Studies by Carter and Rogers (2008) and Beske and Seuring (2014) emphasize the need for collaborative financial arrangements in green supply chains to align incentives and cash flows across partners. These arrangements include shared investment in eco-technology, joint forecasting systems, and co-financing of sustainability programs, which reshape the structure of payables and receivables.

Technological advancement is another emerging theme in the literature on SWCM. The digitalization of supply chains has enabled firms to integrate environmental data with financial systems, thereby improving the visibility and responsiveness of WCM practices. Blockchain, for example, allows real-time tracking of carbon emissions and product life cycles, which facilitates better credit decisions and inventory valuation (Saberi *et al.,* 2019). AI-based analytics optimize procurement and inventory by predicting demand patterns based on environmental constraints. These innovations enhance not only sustainability compliance but also financial agility, thus supporting a more robust and responsive SWCM system (Rajeev *et al.,* 2017).

Contextual research in India further enriches the literature. Indian industries, driven by policies such as the National Action Plan on Climate Change and SEBI's BRSR framework, are increasingly integrating environmental concerns into financial decision-making. Sharma and Ruud (2003) observed that Indian firms engaging in green manufacturing improved not only environmental performance but also inventory control and supplier coordination. Bag (2020) noted that SMEs in India adopting green practices faced working capital constraints initially but developed more resilient cash flow structures over time. Moreover, large Indian corporations in sectors like FMCG, auto, and pharmaceuticals have begun integrating sustainability KPIs into treasury and financial planning functions (CII, 2022). These findings validate the relevance of SWCM in emerging economies and underscore the need for sector-specific and country-specific analyses.

Despite growing interest, several gaps remain in the literature. First, there is a paucity of comprehensive frameworks that integrate environmental indicators with classical WCM metrics. While some scholars have proposed dual-objective models for sustainable supply chains (Brandenburg *et al.,* 2014), very few have applied these to working capital policy decisions. Second, empirical studies suffer from a lack of longitudinal data or ignore variations across industries and firm sizes. Third, much of the existing research focuses on operational or strategic sustainability outcomes (innovation, brand equity) rather than short-term financial health indicators like liquidity, solvency, and cash flow efficiency. Lastly, there is a limited understanding of the mediating role of technology, regulation, and stakeholder pressure in shaping SWCM practices. To address these gaps, researchers have begun advocating for multi-dimensional frameworks that consider financial, environmental, and technological variables simultaneously. For instance, Rajeev *et al.* (2017) proposed a triadic model linking supply chain digitization, sustainability orientation, and financial resilience. Similarly, Agyabeng-Mensah *et al.* (2020) argued that green logistics and smart inventory systems mediate the relationship between sustainability goals and financial liquidity. These approaches provide a richer, more integrative understanding of SWCM, though empirical validation across sectors and geographies remains limited.

III. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

To empirically examine the impact and patterns of sustainable working capital management (SWCM) within green supply chains (GSCs), this study adopts a quantitative panel data analysis. The primary data sources include secondary financial data obtained from annual reports, sustainability/ESG disclosures, and business responsibility and sustainability reports (BRSR) of selected publicly listed manufacturing firms from India, covering a time frame from 2015 to 2024. These firms were selected based on their active participation in GSC initiatives (as identified in their disclosures or sustainability rankings) and represent diverse sectors, including automotive, pharmaceuticals, fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG), steel, and energy, all of which are characterized by high inventory intensity and environmental sensitivity (Bag, 2020; CII, 2022). The sampling frame includes 100 firms listed on BSE Ltd., which publish both financial statements and environmental data. Firm selection was performed using stratified random sampling to ensure sectoral representation and control for size effects. The unit of analysis is the firm-year observation, providing a balanced panel structure conducive to econometric testing. The dataset was compiled by manually extracting financial data from CMIE Prowess and Bloomberg, while ESG-related indicators such as carbon emissions, energy consumption, green certifications, and sustainability scores were sourced from company-specific sustainability reports. Variables related to working capital management include Inventory Turnover Ratio (ITR), Accounts Receivable Days (ARD), Accounts Payable Days (APD), and Cash Conversion Cycle (CCC), following the definitions of Lazaridis & Tryfonidis (2006) and Deloof (2003). These are computed using the following formulas:

$$\text{CCC} = \text{Inventory Days} + \text{Receivable Days} - \text{Payable Days}$$

$$\text{Inventory Days} = (\text{Inventory} / \text{Cost of Goods Sold}) \times 365$$

$$\text{Receivable Days} = (\text{Accounts Receivable} / \text{Sales}) \times 365$$
$$\text{Payable Days} = (\text{Accounts Payable} / \text{COGS}) \times 365$$

The sustainability orientation of firms was measured using multiple proxies: (i) Green Procurement Intensity (measured through percentage of green-certified suppliers), (ii) Environmental Innovation Score (qualitative ranking from ESG databases), (iii) Energy Efficiency Ratio (revenue per unit of energy consumed), and (iv) a composite Sustainability Index (SI) created using principal component analysis (PCA) of various environmental indicators. This multidimensional index captures the overall sustainability embeddedness in supply chain operations (Ahi & Searcy, 2015; Zhu & Sarkis, 2004). Control variables include firm size (log of total assets), leverage (debt-to-equity ratio), profitability (ROA), industry dummies, and macroeconomic factors such as GDP growth and inflation (Bag, 2020; García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007; Gadasandula, 2019).For empirical analysis, the study employs panel regression techniques using both fixed effects (FE) and random effects (RE) models, with the Hausman test applied to determine the more appropriate estimator (Baltagi, 2008). The model is specified as:

$$WCMit = \alpha + \beta 1 Sustainabilityit + \beta 2 Controlsit + \mu i + \varepsilon it$$

Where WCM denotes working capital performance metrics such as CCC, Sustainability denotes green supply chain variables, and μi captures firm-specific effects.

To assess causality and dynamic effects, Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) estimations are also employed, particularly the System GMM estimator developed by Arellano & Bover (1995) and Blundell & Bond (1998), which addresses potential endogeneity among variables, especially the bidirectional relationship between green initiatives and liquidity outcomes. It not only identifies statistical relationships but also reveals the real-world constraints and institutional mechanisms underlying sustainable liquidity practices in green supply chains. By combining quantitative rigor with contextual richness, the methodology enhances the validity, generalizability, and practical relevance of findings, contributing meaningfully to both the academic literature and managerial practice in sustainable finance.

IV. EMPIRICAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

A. Descriptive Statistics

In order to assess how green supply chain practices influence working capital performance, measured primarily by the CCC, we first generate descriptive statistics for all key variables. These descriptive statistics (Table I) provide insights into the data quality before estimating regressions. All variables are winsorized at the 1% and 99% levels to mitigate the influence of outliers (García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007; Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006).

TABLE I DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Variable	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max	Obs.
CCC (days)	45.27	18.45	10.12	123.54	1000
Sustainability Index (SI)	0.32	0.14	0.04	0.789	1000
Inventory Turnover Ratio (ITR)	4.12	1.38	1.58	8.91	1000
Accounts Receivable Days (ARD)	60.45	15.23	22.13	110.74	1000
Accounts Payable Days (APD)	78.50	20.67	30.65	140.32	1000
Firm Size (Ln(Total Assets))	5.41	0.68	3.21	6.99	1000
Leverage (Debt-to-Equity)	1.25	0.64	0.12	3.94	1000
Profitability (ROA, %)	8.36	4.12	–3.45	21.30	1000
Technology Adoption Index (TechIndex)	0.46	0.14	0.105	0.79	1000

CCC is measured as Inventory Days + ARD – APD (Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006). SI is a principal-component composite of green procurement intensity, energy efficiency, and environmental innovation scores (Ahi & Searcy, 2015;

Zhu & Sarkis, 2004). ITR = COGS/Inventory; ARD = (Accounts Receivable/Sales) × 365; APD = (Accounts Payable/COGS) × 365 (Deloof, 2003). TechIndex captures the adoption of ERP, IoT, and AI for supply chain processes, scaled between 0 and 1 (Rajeev *et al.,* 2017).

From Table I, the average CCC is approximately 45 days, indicating firms convert inputs to cash inflows within roughly a month and a half on average, and is broadly consistent with values reported for Indian manufacturing in earlier studies (Bag, 2020; García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007). The standard deviation of 18.45 days suggests considerable heterogeneity in liquidity cycles, stemming from sector-specific inventory practices and payment terms. The minimum CCC of 10.12 days indicates some firms (likely those with very efficient just-in-time operations or exceptionally long payables terms) maintain extremely tight working capital cycles. By contrast, the maximum CCC of 123.54 days implies other firms face substantial delays, possibly due to long receivable days in B2B contexts or high inventory holdings, which aligns with findings that sectors such as heavy machinery and steel exhibit extended CCC (Shin & Soenen, 1998).

The mean Sustainability Index (SI) of 0.32 [on a (0,1) scale] reflects that most firms are at an intermediate level of green integration; the relatively large standard deviation of 0.14 underscores a wide dispersion in sustainability practices. Some firms in the sample score as low as 0.04, indicating negligible formal green supply chain engagement, whereas top performers reach 0.79, exhibiting advanced practices such as renewable-energy sourcing and closed-loop logistics (Testa & Iraldo, 2010). The ITR average of 4.12 times (standard dev. = 1.38) suggests an average inventory holding period of roughly 88 days, which, combined with ARD and APD, produces the reported CCC. Moreover, the mean ARD of 60.45 days and APD of 78.50 days indicate that, on average, firms collect receivables two months after sale but defer payment to suppliers by over two and a half months, consistent with documented trade credit patterns in India (Simpson *et al.,* 2007). Therefore, payables are a critical buffer in working capital management, as a higher APD reduces CCC, enhancing short-term liquidity (García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007). The control variables reveal an average firm size (logged total assets) of 5.41, indicating the sample is skewed toward mid-large capitalized firms. Leverage averages 1.25, which is moderate for manufacturing firms where capital intensity is high (Baltagi, 2008). The average ROA of 8.36% signals overall profitability in the sample, albeit with a low of –3.45% for some loss-making firms and a high of 21.30% for highly efficient enterprises. Finally, the TechIndex mean of 0.46 suggests partial adoption of digital supply chain tools, in line with Rajeev *et al.* (2017), who argue that around 40–50% of Indian manufacturers have integrated at least basic ERP or inventory management systems by 2023.

B. Correlation Analysis

Before estimating causal linkages, it is essential to examine pairwise correlations (Table II) among core variables to detect multicollinearity and assess bivariate associations.

TABLE II CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Variable	CCC	SI	ITR	ARD	APD	Size	Leverage	ROA	TechIndex
CCC	1.00								
SI	–0.34	1.00							
ITR	–0.26	0.20	1.00						
ARD	0.61	–0.12	–0.34	1.00					
APD	–0.47	0.19	0.14	–0.28	1.00				
Size	–0.05	0.20	0.10	–0.03	0.14	1.00			
Leverage	0.17	–0.08	–0.05	0.09	–0.01	0.27	1.00		
ROA	–0.21	0.16	0.19	–0.18	0.10	0.34	–0.31	1.00	
TechIndex	–0.29	0.30	0.15	–0.13	0.18	0.42	–0.09	0.27	1.00

The correlation analysis in Table II reveals that SI and CCC have a moderate negative correlation of –0.34, suggesting that firms with higher sustainability integration tend to have shorter cash conversion cycles. This bivariate association indicates that green supply chain practices (captured by SI) reduce CCC by enabling leaner inventories, more efficient receivables/pricing strategies, or stronger supplier collaboration (Carter & Rogers, 2008; Ahi & Searcy, 2015). ITR and CCC show a negative correlation (–0.256), reflecting the mechanical relationship whereby higher inventory turnover reduces days inventory, thereby shortening CCC (Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006). The positive correlation between SI and ITR (0.20) suggests that sustainable firms hold lower inventories, possibly because green-oriented procurement emphasizes just-in-time sourcing and waste minimization (Gold *et al.,* 2010). ARD and CCC associate positively (0.61), which is expected as longer receivable days directly extend the CCC (Shin & Soenen, 1998). The negative correlation between SI and ARD (–0.12) hints that more sustainable firms collect faster, potentially due to stronger relationships with customers who share green values or value-added credit terms tied to sustainability performance (Simpson *et al.,* 2007). APD and CCC exhibit a strong negative correlation (–0.47) because longer payables reduce working capital needs, thereby shortening CCC. The positive correlation between SI and APD (0.19) indicates that sustainable firms negotiate longer supplier payment terms, perhaps to support small green vendors or invest in supplier sustainability upgrades (Testa & Iraldo, 2010). Among controls, Firm Size has modest correlations: positive with SI (0.20), indicating larger firms tend to adopt more sustainability measures, consistent with stakeholder-theory arguments that larger firms face greater stakeholder scrutiny (Freeman, 1984). Size correlates negatively with CCC (–0.05), implying larger firms have marginally shorter CCCs, possibly due to economies of scale in procurement and stronger bargaining power. Leverage shows a slight positive correlation with CCC (0.16), suggesting that highly leveraged firms maintain longer CCCs, perhaps due to liquidity constraints forcing them to hold higher inventories or experience delays in receivables. ROA correlates negatively with CCC (–0.21), confirming that firms with shorter CCCs are more profitable, as found by García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano (2007) and Lazaridis & Tryfonidis (2006). Finally, TechIndex is negatively correlated with CCC (–0.29), indicating that technology adoption shortens CCC by improving forecasting and process efficiencies (Rajeev *et al.,* 2017). Its positive correlation with SI (0.30) suggests digitalization accompanies sustainability initiatives, in line with the concept of "Industry 4.0 for green SCM" (Tachizawa *et al.,* 2015). Taken together, these bivariate patterns justify moving to multivariate panel regression to disentangle the net effect of SI on CCC after controlling for confounders.

C. Panel Regression Analysis

To capture both observed and unobserved heterogeneity, we estimate the following panel model:

$$CCCit=\alpha+\beta1\ SIit+\beta2\ Sizeit+\beta3\ Leverageit+\beta4\ ROAit+\beta5\ TechIndexit+\beta6\ GDPGrowtht+\beta7\ Inflationt+\mu i+\varepsilon it.$$

Where i indexes firms, t indexes years, μi captures time-invariant firm-specific effects, and εit is the idiosyncratic error. We run both Fixed Effects (FE) and Random Effects (RE) estimations, then apply the Hausman test to choose the consistent estimator (Baltagi, 2008). All regressions include year dummies to control for macroeconomic shocks; robust standard errors clustered at the firm level mitigate serial correlation and heteroskedasticity (Arellano & Bond, 1991).
1. Fixed Effects Regression Results: Robust standard errors clustered by firm. Year dummies are jointly significant by the F-test.

TABLE III FIXED EFFECTS REGRESSION TEST RESULTS

Regressor	Coef.	S.E.	t-Stat	p-Value
SI	–23.81	3.45	–6.88	0.00
Firm Size	–1.92	0.84	–2.28	0.02
Leverage	7.13	2.14	3.33	0.00
ROA (%)	–0.71	0.18	–3.78	0.00
TechIndex	–14.50	4.02	–3.60	0.00
GDP Growth (%)	–0.73	0.32	–2.26	0.02
Inflation (%)	1.05	0.41	2.55	0.01
Year Dummies (2016–2024)	Yes	—	—	—
Constant	62.49	10.32	6.05	0.00
Observations	1,000	—	—	—
R^2 (Within)	0.36	—	—	—
R^2 (Between)	0.05	—	—	—
R^2 (Overall)	0.19	—	—	—

Notes: All regressors are expressed in their natural units (SI on a 0–1 scale).

Table III shows that, for a one-unit increase in the sustainability index, the CCC shortens by 23.81 days, holding all else constant. This finding corroborates prior theoretical predictions (Carter & Rogers, 2008; Ahi & Searcy, 2015) that enhanced green practices, such as supplier collaboration, lean inventory, and efficient reverse logistics, translate into shorter liquidity cycles. Larger firms (by asset base) have slightly shorter ccc. A 1% increase in total assets reduces CCC by about 1.92 days. This supports the notion that economies of scale and bargaining power in procurement allow larger firms to negotiate better payment terms and manage inventories more efficiently (Baltagi, 2008). Higher debt-to-equity ratios lengthen CCC by approximately 7.13 days per unit increase in leverage, suggesting that firms with heavier debt burdens face liquidity constraints that hamper efficient working capital management (García-Teruel & Martínez-solano, 2007).

More profitable firms have shorter CCC: a 1% increase in ROA reduces CCC by 0.71 days, reflecting superior operational efficiency and stronger bargaining positions with both customers and suppliers (Shin & Soenen, 1998).

Adoption of digital tools (ERP, AI, IoT) shortens CCC by 14.5 days per 1-unit increase in the TechIndex. Since TechIndex ranges from 0 to 1, firms with advanced technology adoption (frequent use of AI forecasting) exhibit significantly leaner working capital cycles, as predicted by Rajeev et al. (2017). A growing economy slightly shortens CCC, presumably because higher aggregate demand accelerates receivables turnover and inventory movement (Gujarati, 2003). Higher inflationary environments lengthen CCC by 1.05 days per 1% increase in inflation, likely due to slower collections as customers manage rising input costs (Baltagi, 2008). An R^2 (Within) of 0.36 implies that 36.2% of the within-firm variation in CCC is explained by changes in SI and controls. The R^2 (0.19) is characteristic of panel regressions on financial data (Arellano & Bover, 1995).

2. Random Effects Regression Results: Hausman Test: $\chi^2(7) = 12.94$, $p = 0.07 \rightarrow$ fail to reject H_0 of no systematic difference between FE and RE, suggesting RE is consistent (Baltagi, 2008).

TABLE IV RANDOM EFFECTS REGRESSION TEST RESULTS

Regressor	Coef.	S.E.	t-Stat	p-Value
SI	–19.20	4.01	–4.78	0.00
Firm Size	–1.42	0.70	–2.03	0.04
Leverage	6.18	1.87	3.29	0.00
ROA (%)	–0.61	0.17	–3.49	0.00
TechIndex	–12.87	3.62	–3.54	0.00
GDP Growth (%)	–0.66	0.30	–2.19	0.02
Inflation (%)	0.95	0.37	2.54	0.01
Year Dummies (2016–2024)	Yes	—	—	—
Constant	58.30	9.46	6.15	0.00
Observations	1,000	—	—	—
R^2 (Within)	0.36	—	—	—
R^2 (Between)	0.10	—	—	—
R^2 (Overall)	0.24	—	—	—

Notes: Breusch–Pagan LM test for random effects vs. OLS: $\chi^2(1) = 355.74$, $p < 0.001$.

Table IV reveals that the negative coefficient remains significant, though somewhat smaller in magnitude than in FE. Under re, a one-unit increase in SI reduces CCC by 19.2 days. This difference reflects that re exploits both within- and between-firm variation, whereas FE relies solely on within-firm changes. The sustained significance reaffirms that green supply chain integration robustly shortens ccc across firms.

Again, significant and negative, indicating that larger firms manage working capital more efficiently, albeit the effect size is slightly attenuated compared to FE. Leverage confirms that indebted firms operate with longer CCC, like FE results. Both maintain a negative and significant influence on ccc, underscoring that profitability and technology adoption are essential for efficient WCM within GSC contexts (Rajeev *et al.,* 2017; García-Teruel & martínez-solano, 2007). The sign and significance of the macroeconomic controls (GDP Growth, Inflation) are consistent with FE estimates, suggesting that cyclical economic conditions affect liquidity cycles (Gujarati, 2003). The Hausman test statistic fails to reject the null that RE is consistent; thus, we proceed with RE estimates primarily, noting that both FE and RE yield qualitatively similar results (Baltagi, 2008).

D. Dynamic Panel Estimation

To address potential endogeneity, particularly the reverse causality between CCC and SI, we implement the System GMM estimator (Arellano & Bover, 1995; Blundell & Bond, 1998). The model includes lagged CCC as an explanatory variable to capture persistence:

$$CCCit=\gamma\ CCCi,t-1+\delta\ SIit+\theta\ Xit+\mu i+\eta t+\nu it$$

Where Xit includes Size, Leverage, ROA, TechIndex, GDP Growth, and Inflation. Instruments are generated using lagged levels and differences of regressors. We test for over identifying restrictions using the Hansen J-test and for autocorrelation using the Arellano–Bond tests for AR(1) and AR(2) in residuals.

TechIndex (Arellano & Bover, 1995). Hansen J-test $p = 0.24$ indicates no overidentificationproblem.
AR(1) $p = 0.00$, AR(2) $p = 0.09$: first-order autocorrelation expected;
no second-order autocorrelation validates instrument set.

Table V Illustrates that the positive and significant ccc coefficient persistence parameter indicates that roughly 62% of last year's CCC carries over to the current year, consistent with findings that working capital cycles are highly persistent (Arellano & Bond, 1991). Even after controlling for dynamic endogeneity, a one-unit increase in SI reduces CCC by approximately 16.9 days. Although smaller than FE/RE estimates, this still confirms a robust negative impact of sustainability on liquidity cycles (Blundell & Bond, 1998). Size & leverage become statistically insignificant at the 5% level, suggesting that once we account for lagged CCC and endogeneity, the pure effects of size and leverage on CCC weaken (arellano & bover, 1995). Profitability and technology adoption remain significant determinants of working capital efficiency, though attenuated compared to FE/RE. GDP growth and inflation lose significance, indicating that the dynamic panel specification absorbs some macro-temporal variation through the lagged dependent variable. The hansen j-test supports the validity of instruments, and the absence of ar(2) in stills confidence that the arellano–bond estimator is well-specified (Baltagi, 2008). Overall, these dynamic results reinforce the conclusion that green supply chain integration has a significant, negative, and causal impact on CCC.

TABLE V GMM TEST RESULTS

Regressor	Coef.	S.E.	z-Stat	p-Value
CCC (t–1)	0.62	0.03	20.22	0.00
SI	–16.90	5.18	–3.26	0.00
Size	–1.11	0.92	–1.20	0.22
Leverage	4.87	2.78	1.74	0.08
ROA	–0.54	0.23	–2.27	0.02
TechIndex	–10.71	4.50	–2.37	0.01
GDP Growth	–0.50	0.43	–1.15	0.24
Inflation	0.77	0.48	1.59	0.11
Observations (Firm-Years)	1,000	—	—	—
Number of Firms	100	—	—	—
Hansen J-Test (p-Value)	0.24	—	—	—
Arellano–Bond AR(1) Test (p)	0.00	—	—	—
Arellano–Bond AR(2) Test (p)	0.09	—	—	—

Notes: Instruments: lagged CCCi,t−2, lagged differences of SI, Leverage, ROA,

V. CONCLUSION

The results accompanying the interpretations above demonstrate several key findings, each aligning with or extending prior literature. Across FE, RE, and System GMM models, the coefficient on SI is consistently negative and highly significant. This aligns with Golicic & Smith's (2013) meta-analysis, which reported that sustainable supply chain practices correlate with superior financial metrics, particularly cost reduction and inventory efficiency. By explicitly linking SI to CCC, our study contributes novel evidence that green supply chain integration is not merely a branding or regulatory compliance tool but yields tangible working capital benefits. These results echo Carter & Rogers (2008) and Ahi & Searcy (2015), who argue that sustainability and financial efficiency can be synergistic rather than conflicting. The FE estimate implies that a move from the median to the top quartile of SI shortens CCC by almost 7.6 days. Given an average CCC of 45 days, this constitutes a 17% reduction, which is economically meaningful for liquidity-constrained firms. Bag (2020) reported similar magnitudes in Indian manufacturing, where greener firms observed 10–15% faster inventory turnover. This suggests that even moderate improvements in environmental performance can yield sizable liquidity enhancements.The negative coefficients on Size and ROA corroborate established WCM literature that larger, more profitable firms enjoy superior working capital efficiency (Lazaridis & Tryfonidis, 2006; García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007). Conversely, positive Leverage coefficients reflect the liquidity-constraining effect of high debt levels (Shin & Soenen, 1998). These control relationships hold across FE, RE, and GMM, though GMM attenuates the direct role of Size/Leverage once dynamic persistence is accounted for (Arellano & Bond, 1991). This supports the view that past CCC is a key determinant of current liquidity, with firm fundamentals playing subsidiary roles (Baltagi, 2008). The GMM results confirm that SI's impact persists even after controlling for past CCC, thus reducing endogeneity concerns. The sizeable persistence coefficient aligns with Arellano & Bond (1991), who argue that working capital is inherently sticky over time due to contract terms, production cycles, and customer–supplier relationships. The maintained significance of SI underlines that sustainability investments have dynamic, not just cross-sectional, effects on firm liquidity. The insignificance of Size and Leverage in GMM suggests that past liquidity conditions dominate current working capital decisions, supporting the argument that firms build on entrenched financing and investment patterns (Baltagi, 2008). While FE/RE models find GDP Growth and Inflation significant, GMM estimates show these lose significance, indicating that once firm-level dynamics are considered, macro shocks have muted direct effects on CCC. Gujarati (2003) and Baltagi (2008) note that dynamic panel models subsume macro trends in the lag structure, which is observed here. For managers, this means that while macroeconomic vigilance is important, sustaining green supply chain practices will have a more consistent impact on liquidity than transient economic fluctuations. The consistent negative SI–CCC relationship suggests that supporting green supply chain initiatives can be financially self-enforcing. Policymakers and regulators (SEBI's BRSR guidelines) should consider incentivizing sustainable procurement, eco-certifications, and technology adoption as part of broader working capital credit schemes, for instance, offering favourable financing rates to firms with verified green supply chain practices. Stakeholders, lenders, investors, and customers can interpret high SI scores as indicators of robust liquidity management, reducing perceived credit risk (Carter & Rogers, 2008; Beske & Seuring, 2014). While the results convincingly demonstrate a negative SI–CCC relationship, limitations remain: (i) Although panel coverage spans 2015–2024, longer time horizons (including pre-2015) might capture earlier green transitions; (ii) The composite SI, while comprehensive, may mask specific green practices (renewable energy vs. recycled inputs) whose individual impacts on CCC could differ; (iii) Future research could employ sector-specific SI variants or examine cross-country samples to determine whether institutional frameworks effects; (iv) Qualitative interviews (beyond our current scope) could further elucidate implementation challenges, especially in SME segments where resource constraints are more binding (Ahi & Searcy, 2015; Bag, 2020).

Declaration of Conflicting Interests
The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding
The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (Ai)-Assisted Technology For Manuscript Preparation
The authors confirm that no AI-assisted technologies were used in the preparation or writing of the manuscript, and no images were altered using AI.

REFERENCES

Agyabeng-Mensah, Y., Ahenkorah, E., Ai, C., & Afum, E. (2020). Examining the influence of internal green supply chain practices on operational performance: The mediating role of green innovation. Journal of Cleaner Production, 265, 121681.

Ahi, P., & Searcy, C. (2013). A comparative literature analysis of definitions for green and sustainable supply chain management. Journal of Cleaner Production, 52, 329–341.

Ahi, P., & Searcy, C. (2015). An analysis of metrics used to measure performance in green and sustainable supply chains. Journal of Cleaner Production, 86, 360–377.

Arellano, M., & Bond, S. (1991). Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. The Review of Economic Studies, 58(2), 277–297.

Arellano, M., & Bover, O. (1995). Another look at the instrumental variable estimation of error-components models. Journal of Econometrics, 68(1), 29–51.

Bag, S. (2020). Sustainable supply chain management practices and performance: The role of cloud-based collaborative system. Sustainable Production and Consumption, 21, 1–13.

Bakshi, P.K. (2024). The Impact of Global Value Chains on the International Competitiveness of Chinese Banks: A Quantitative Analysis. Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 13(1), 16-22. https://doi.org/10.70112/ajms-2024.13.1.4232.

Baltagi, B. H. (2008). Econometric Analysis of Panel Data (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Beske, P., & Seuring, S. (2014). Putting sustainability into supply chain management. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 19(3), 322–331.

Blundell, R., & Bond, S. (1998). Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. Journal of Econometrics, 87(1), 115–143.

Brandenburg, M., Govindan, K., Sarkis, J., & Seuring, S. (2014). Quantitative models for sustainable supply chain management: Developments and directions. European Journal of Operational Research, 233(2), 299–312.

Carter, C. R., & Rogers, D. S. (2008). A framework of sustainable supply chain management: Moving toward new theory. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 38(5), 360–387.

Chen, Y. S. (2001). The determinants of green product development performance: Green dynamic capabilities, green transformational leadership, and green creativity. Journal of Business Ethics, 116(1), 107–119.

CII. (2022). Sustainability and ESG Trends in Indian Business. Confederation of Indian Industry Report.

Dass, J. (2019). An Assessment of Supply Chain Finance and Working Capital Management in Organizations. Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 8(2), 28-33. https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2019.8.2.1555.

Deloof, M. (2003). Does working capital management affect profitability of Belgian firms? Journal of Business Finance & Accounting, 30(3-4), 573–588.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman.

Gadasandula, K. (2019). Effect of Macroeconomic Determinants on Indian Stock Market. Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 8(2), 22-27. https://doi.org/10.51983/ajms-2019.8.2.1556.

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.

Gold, S., Seuring, S., & Beske, P. (2010). Sustainable supply chain management and inter-organizational resources: A literature review. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 17(4), 230–245.

Golicic, S. L., & Smith, C. D. (2013). A meta-analysis of environmentally sustainable supply chain management practices and firm performance. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 49(2), 78–95.

Guide Jr, V. D. R., & Van Wassenhove, L. N. (2009). The evolution of closed-loop supply chain research. Operations Research, 57(1), 10–18.

Gujarati, D. N. (2003). Basic Econometrics (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Hart, S. L. (1995). A natural-resource-based view of the firm. Academy of Management Review, 20(4), 986–1014.

Klassen, R. D., & McLaughlin, C. P. (1996). The impact of environmental management on firm performance. Management Science, 42(8), 1199–1214.

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.

Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Green and competitive. Harvard Business Review, 73(5), 120–134.

Prabha, A., Malini, T. N. & Jyothi, G. (2024). Inventory Management Practices and Their Impact on Operational Efficiency: A Case Study of MGSSK Sugars Ltd. Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 13(2), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.70112/ajms-2024.13.2.4240.

Rajeev, A., Pati, R. K., Padhi, S. S., & Govindan, K. (2017). Evolution of sustainability in supply chain management. Omega, 66, 168–190.

Rao, P., & Holt, D. (2005). Do green supply chains lead to competitiveness and economic performance? International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 25(9), 898–916.

Saberi, S., Kouhizadeh, M., Sarkis, J., & Shen, L. (2019). Blockchain technology and its relationships to sustainable supply chain management. International Journal of Production Research, 57(7), 2117–2135.

Sarkis, J. (2003). A strategic decision framework for green supply chain management. Journal of Cleaner Production, 11(4), 397–409.

Sharma, S., & Ruud, A. (2003). On the path to sustainability: Integrating social dimensions into the research and practice of environmental management. Business Strategy and the Environment, 12(4), 205–214.

Shin, H. H., & Soenen, L. (1998). Efficiency of working capital and corporate profitability. Financial Practice and Education, 8(2), 37–45.

Simpson, D., Power, D., & Klassen, R. (2007). When do firms invest in sustainable supply chains? International Journal of Production Research, 45(21), 4959–4975.

Srivastava, S. K. (2007). Green supply-chain management: A state-of-the-art literature review. International Journal of Management Reviews, 9(1), 53–80.

Tachizawa, E. M., Alvarez-Gil, M. J., & Montes-Sancho, M. J. (2015). How smart cities will change supply chain management. Supply Chain Management Review, 19(1), 18–25.

Testa, F., & Iraldo, F. (2010). Shadows and lights of GSCM (Green Supply Chain Management): determinants and effects of these practices based on a multi-national study. Journal of Cleaner Production, 18(10-11), 953–962.

Walker, H., & Jones, N. (2012). Sustainable supply chain management across the UK private sector. Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 17(1), 15–28.

Zhu, Q., & Geng, Y. (2013). Drivers and barriers of extended supply chain practices for energy saving and emission reduction among Chinese manufacturers. Journal of Cleaner Production, 40, 6–12.

Zhu, Q., & Sarkis, J. (2004). Relationships between operational practices and performance among early adopters of green supply chain management practices in Chinese manufacturing enterprises. Journal of Operations Management, 22(3), 265–289.