LIQUIDITY AND PROFITABILITY ANALYSIS OF SESHAYEE PAPER AND BOARD LIMITED (SBPL), ERODE

Dr. K. Ramesh Kumar* J. Jeyanthi**
**Head, PG and Research Department of Commerce,Valluvar College of Science and Management, Karur.*
***Ph.D Research Scholar &Assistant Professor of Commerce, Sri Sarada Niketan College of Science for Women, Karur.*

Abstract
Liquidity and Profitability are two important and major aspects of business life. Liquidity is the ability of an organization to meet its financial obligations during the short-term and to maintain long-term debt paying ability. The long-term survival depends on the satisfactory income earned by it. A sound liquidity leads to better profitability. Further, no industry can survive, if it has no liquidity. An industry may exist without making profits but cannot survive without liquidity. An industry not making profits may be treated as a sick unit, but one having no liquidity, may soon meet with its downfall and ultimately closed down. So, there is need of close relationship between liquidity and profitability. A sound and systematic approach to the working capital management should ensure trade of between profitability and liquidity. Managerial decisions relating to cash, receivable, inventory and marketable securities are ultimately reflected in liquidity risk and profitability and turn in the value of the firm.

Keywords: Working Capital, Profitability and Liquidity.

Introduction
Liquidity has an important relationship with profitability. If we have enough liquid resources, we may be able to get benefit of cash discount on purchases and consequently that will be result in increasing profits. If we cannot pay the creditors for goods in the given period, we have to pay interest on the amount of purchases. Thus, shortage of liquid resources will result in low of cash discount and payment of interest. Both the losses will certainly decrease over profits. Secondly, we may keep the stock at desired manners and that will benefit us in circulation of business activities. Contrary to this, if we are not able to keep sufficient stock due to shortage of liquid resources, then the production cycle may not be continued and that will result in heavy losses. Liquid resources of a business concern for all over to expand huge business activities more, and less in financial. In case of paper industry in India, the management of liquid resources plays a greater role because in comparison to others industries, this industry has capacity to pay its obligations promptly.

Statement of the Problem
Liquidity is the ability of an organization to meet its financial obligations during the short - term and to maintain long - term debt - paying ability. The long - term survival depends on satisfactory income earned by it. A sound liquidity leads to better profitability, and in turn reduces the profitability of default risk in the future. The concern of business owners and managers all over the world is to devise a strategy which will help in maintaining liquidity as well as to increase profitability and shareholder’s wealth. Liquidity and Profitability are the pre-requisite for the survival of every firm or company. The Finance Manager is always faced with the dilemma of liquidity Vs. profitability as these two concepts conflict in most of the financial decisions. So, the Finance Manager has to watch the relationship between operating risk and profitability of a company also. Hence, this study has been made an attempt to know the relationship between liquidity and profitability of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited (SPBL).

Objectives of Study
The specific objectives of the study are:
- To analysis the short -term financial position through liquidity analysis.
- To examine the profitability of the company over the study period.
- To test the correlation between liquidity and profitability.
- To offer suggestions for the improvement liquidity and profitability position of SPBL.

Methodology
The study was concerned with paper manufacturer and it has been confined to only one Private Sector Limited viz., Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited, known as SPBL This study covers a time period of ten years from 2006 – 2007 to 2015 – 2016. This study is based on secondary data which is collected from annual reports of company, CMIE prowess database and from different websites concerned. The collected data has been tabulated, analysed and interpreted with the help of different financial ratios and statistical tools.

Review of Literature
Nandi Chandra Kartik (2012) in his paper on “Trends in Liquidity Management and Their Impact on Profitability: A Case Study” makes an attempt to assess the trends in liquidity management and their impact on profitability. An attempt has been

made to establish the linear relationship between liquidity and profitability with the help of a multiple regression model. On the basis of overall analysis, it is therefore important to state that the selected company always tries to maintain adequate amount of net working capital in relation to current liabilities so as to keep a good amount of liquidity throughout the study period. **Dr. Shivubhai C. Vala (2011)** he has done his Ph.D. on “A comparative study of profitability vis-a-vis liquidity of co-operative milk producers unions of Gujarat state.” in February – 2011. Under this study he has given clear idea and importance of profitability and liquidity. By the term liquidity is meant the debt – repaying capacity of an undertaking. It refers to the firm’s ability to meet the claims of suppliers of goods services and capital. For this purpose, he has used many accounting tools and techniques like common size statement, Ratio analysis etc. He has also used some statistical techniques like mean, regression, F-test, T-test, Diagrammatic and graphic presentation of data. **Elijelly (2004)** in the study on “Liquidity – profitability tradeoff: An empirical investigation in an emerging market” empirically examined the relation between profitability and liquidity, as measured by current ratio and cash gap (cash conversion cycle) on a sample of joint stock companies in Saudi Arabia. The study found significant negative relation between the firm’s profitability and its liquidity level, as measured by current ratio.” **Sherin (2010)** in her article on “Liquidity v/s profitability - Striking the right balance” writes about the implications of liquidity and profitability in a pharmaceutical company. A firm is required to maintain a balance between liquidity and profitability while conducting its day to day operations. Investments in current assets are inevitable to ensure delivery of goods or services to the ultimate customers. A proper management of the same could result in the desired impact on either profitability or liquidity. **Bardia (2004)** made an attempt to examine the liquidity position of Steel Authority of India Ltd. (SAIL) for the period 1991-92 to 2001-02 and this study also analyzed the relationship between profitability and liquidity of the company. The data and information were collected from the annual reports of the company. The analysis and interpretation of important liquidity ratios showed that SAIL was not in comfortable position to meet its current obligation on time in most of the years under study. The study revealed that the performance of inventory management of the company was moderately satisfied whereas the position of credit management was alarming during the study period. The study identified that the company possessed the soundest liquidity position in the year 1995-96. A positive correlation between liquidity and profitability was observed in the company during the period under study.

Data Analysis and Interpretation
I. Liqudity Analysis

Table 1: Current Ratio *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Current Assets	Current Liabilities	Ratio
2006-07	215.12	187.74	1.15
2007-08	235.35	209.46	1.12
2008-09	212.46	196.42	1.08
2009-10	227.09	194.97	1.16
2010-11	364.67	350.19	1.04
2011-12	323.41	308.21	1.05
2012-13	356.68	452.98	0.79
2013-14	362.76	394.54	0.92
2014-15	383.75	423.96	0.91
2015-16	373.74	393.53	0.95
Average	**305.50**	**311.20**	**1.02**
Standard Deviation	**73.33**	**105.59**	**0.12**
Growth rate	**73.74**	**109.61**	**-17.12**
Co-efficient of Variance	**24.00**	**33.93**	**205.79**
r	**+ 0.96**		

Source: Computed from Annual Report

The current ratio of SPBL from 2006 – 2007 to 2015 – 2016. It can be inferred from the above table that current assets increased from 215.12 crores in 2006 – 2007 to Rs. 373.74 crores in 2014 – 2015, registering growth rate of 73.74%. As against this, the total amount of current liabilities increased from Rs. 187.74 crores in 2006 – 2007 to Rs. 393.54 crores in 2014 – 2015 depicting and growth rate 109.61%. It could be noted that the current ratio declined from 1.15 times in 2006 – 2007 to 0.95 times in 2015 – 2016. The average current ratio during the study period was 1.02, which is less than the rule of thumb 2:1. It indicates the liquidity position of the concern was not sound. So, the management should concentrate on current ratio in future. There is a positive relationship between current assets and current liabilities of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited.

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

Table 2: Quick Ratio *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Quick Assets	Quick Liabilities	Quick Ratio
2006-07	160.15	187.74	0.85
2007-08	164.83	209.46	0.79
2008-09	144.01	196.42	0.73
2009-10	179.08	194.97	0.92
2010-11	319.79	350.19	0.91
2011-12	237.21	308.21	0.77
2012-13	269.55	452.98	0.60
2013-14	250.47	394.54	0.63
2014-15	249.32	423.96	0.59
2015-16	259.67	393.53	0.66
Average	**223.43**	**311.20**	**0.75**
Standard Deviation	**57.75**	**105.59**	**0.12**
Growth rate	**62.14**	**109.61**	**-22.65**
Co-efficient of Variance	**25.85**	**33.93**	**16.70**
r	**+ 0.85**		

Source: Computed from Annual Report

The ratio of Quick assets to Quick liabilities was high 0.85 in the year 2006 – 2007 and as low as 0.66 in the year 2015 – 2016. As a rule of thumb or as a convention Quick ratio of 1:1 is considered satisfactory. Throughout the study period, the company did not satisfy the standard norms of Quick ratio. So, the management should concentrate on Quick ratio in future.

There is a positive relationship between Quick and Quick liabilities of SPBL.

Table 3: Inventory to Current Assets *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Inventory	Current Assets	Ratio
2006-07	57.97	215.12	0.26
2007-08	70.52	235.35	0.30
2008-09	68.45	212.46	0.32
2009-10	47.81	227.09	0.21
2010-11	44.38	364.67	0.12
2011-12	86.2	323.41	0.27
2012-13	87.13	356.68	0.24
2013-14	112.29	362.76	0.31
2014-15	134.42	383.75	0.35
2015-16	114.07	373.74	0.31
Average	**82.07**	**305.50**	**0.27**
Standard Deviation	**30.42**	**73.33**	**0.07**
Growth rate	**107.51**	**73.74**	**19.44**
Co-efficient of Variance	**37.07**	**24.00**	**24.45**
r	**+ 0.67**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

The ratio of inventories to current assets has increased from 0.26 to 0.31 during the study period. The highest (0.35) and the lowest (0.12) ratio were registered in 2014 – 2015 and 2010 – 2011 respectively. The average inventories (Rs. 82.07 crores) for 10 years were less in comparison to the current assets average (Rs. 305.50 crores). This is also a true increase of standard deviation of current assets (Rs. 30.42 crores). According to the co-variance, the inventories (37.07%) were more variable than the current assets (24%) during the study period. Therefore, the management has to take all possible steps to reduce the inventory level in order to increase the sales level. There is a positive relationship between inventory and current assets of SPBL.

Table 4: Current Assets Turn Over Ratio *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Sales	Current Assets	Ratio
2006-07	457.6	215.12	2.13
2007-08	495.04	235.35	2.10
2008-09	529.11	212.46	2.49
2009-10	509.26	227.09	2.24
2010-11	573.47	364.67	1.57
2011-12	611.42	323.41	1.89
2012-13	834.49	356.68	2.34
2013-14	1010.85	362.76	2.79
2014-15	1014.12	383.75	2.64
2015-16	1031.5	373.74	2.76
Average	**706.69**	**305.50**	**2.30**
Standard Deviation	**238.76**	**73.33**	**0.39**
Growth rate	**125.42**	**73.74**	**29.75**
Co-efficient of Variance	**33.79**	**24.00**	**17.01**
r	**+ 0.82**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

Table shows sales to current assets of SPBL from 2006 – 2007 to 2015 – 2016. The sales of SPBL increased from Rs. 457.6 crores in 2006 – 2007 to Rs. 1031.5 crores in 2015 – 2016 registering a growth rate of 125.42%. The growth rate of sales (125.42%) was more than the growth rate of current assets, which was 73.74% during the study period. An analysis of the above table revels that the ratio varied from 1.57 in 2010 – 2011 to 2.79 in 2013 – 2014, which indicate that the sales were managed efficiently, but the current assets was not utilized to a maximum extent. There is a positive relationship between sales and current assets of SPBL.

Table 5: Working Capital Turnover Ratio *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Sales	Working Capital	Ratio
2006-07	457.6	27.38	16.71
2007-08	495.04	25.89	19.12
2008-09	529.11	16.04	32.99
2009-10	509.26	32.12	15.85
2010-11	573.47	14.48	39.60
2011-12	611.42	15.2	40.22
2012-13	834.49	-96.3	-8.67
2013-14	1010.85	-31.78	-31.81
2014-15	1014.12	-40.21	-25.22
2015-16	1031.5	-19.79	-52.12
Average	**706.69**	**-5.70**	**4.67**
Standard Deviation	**238.76**	**40.98**	**32.31**
Growth rate	**125.42**	**-172.28**	**-411.87**
Co-efficient of Variance	**-719.40**	**33.79**	**691.93**
r	**- 0.75**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

The above table illustrate sales to Net working capital ratio of SPBL from 2006 – 2007 to 2015 – 2016. The sales of SPBL increased from Rs. 457.6 crores in 2006 – 07 to Rs. 1031.50 crores in 2015 – 16 registering a growth rate of Rs. 125.42%. The Networking capital of SPBL decreased from Rs. 27.38 crores in 2006 – 2007 to Rs. -19.79 crores in 2015 – 2016. The amount of net working capital decreased from 2006 – 2007 to 2015 – 2016 registering a growth rate of -172.28%. The growth rate of sales (125.42%) was more than the growth rate of Networking capital which was -172.28% during the study period. The average of sales during 10 years was Rs. 706.69 crores against networking capital average. The standard deviation of sales was Rs. 238.76 crores more in comparison with the standard deviation of (Rs. 40.98 crores) net working capital. The co-variance of sales (33.79%) is more variable than Networking capital (-719.40%). The concern has to take all possible steps to avoid negative ratio in future. There is a negative relationship between sales working capital of SPBL.

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

II. Profitability Analysis

Table 6: Gross Profit Ratio ***(Rs. in crores)***

Years	Gross Profit	Net Sales	Ratio
2006-07	58.53	457.6	12.79
2007-08	77.93	495.04	15.74
2008-09	50.2	529.11	9.49
2009-10	93.32	509.26	18.32
2010-11	94.76	573.47	16.52
2011-12	79.22	611.42	12.96
2012-13	65.61	834.49	7.86
2013-14	90.21	1010.85	8.92
2014-15	54.71	1014.12	5.39
2015-16	70.03	1031.5	7.66
Average	**74.35**	**706.69**	**11.57**
Standard Deviation	**16.27**	**238.76**	**4.34**
Growth rate	**35.02**	**125.42**	**-340.10**
Co-efficient of Variance	**21.88**	**33.79**	**37.52**
r		**- 0.01**	

Source: Computed from Annual Report

The above table shows that the ratio of GP to sales was high 12.79 in the year 2006 – 07 and as low as 7.66 in the year 2015 – 16. The growth rate of sales was higher when compared with growth rate of growth profit throughout the study period. During the study period, the growth profit ratio was decreased from 12.79% to 7.66%. The growth rate of growth profit shows a negative (–40.10%). The highest ratio indicates an increase in the selling price of the goods sold without any corresponding increasing in the cost of goods sold. A lower ratio may be a result of unfavorable purchasing policies. From the table, it can be inferred that the ratio fluctuated over a period of time. It shows the poor progress of the company. There is a negative relationship between gross profit and sales of SPBL.

Table 7: Net Profit Ratio ***(Rs. in crores)***

Years	Net Profit	Net Sales	Ratio
2006-07	41.4	457.6	9.05
2007-08	45.79	495.04	9.25
2008-09	15.03	529.11	2.84
2009-10	39.93	509.26	7.84
2010-11	65	573.47	11.33
2011-12	34.1	611.42	5.58
2012-13	20.51	834.49	2.46
2013-14	26.79	1010.85	2.65
2014-15	17.35	1014.12	1.71
2015-16	35.58	1031.5	3.45
Average	**34.15**	**706.69**	**5.62**
Standard Deviation	**15.14**	**238.76**	**3.48**
Growth rate	**-14.06**	**125.42**	**-61.87**
Co-efficient of Variance	**44.34**	**33.79**	**61.98**
r		**-0.45**	

Source: Computed from Annual Report

It can be observed from the above table that the net profit ratio of the company was volatile during the study period. The lowest Net profit ratio percent was observed in the year 2014 – 2015, where it was 1.71% and the highest value was observed during the year 2010 – 2011, when it was 11.33 percent, with the exception of 2006 – 2007, 2007 – 2008, 2009 – 2010 and 2010 – 2011, for all other year of the study period the Net Profit Ratio was lower in comparison with the average Net Profit Ratio which was 5.62%. The co-efficient of variation was 61.98%. It showed a fluctuating trend during the study period and a poor performance was observed during second half of the study period. There is a negative relationship between Net Profit and Sales of SPBL.

Table 8: Operating Profit Ratio *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Operating Profit	Net Sales	Ratio
2006-07	69	457.6	15.08
2007-08	90.51	495.04	18.28
2008-09	76.29	529.11	14.42
2009-10	121.72	509.26	23.90
2010-11	116.72	573.47	20.37
2011-12	103.55	611.42	16.94
2012-13	110.07	834.49	13.19
2013-14	128.92	1010.85	12.75
2014-15	91.92	1014.12	9.06
2015-16	111.32	1031.5	10.79
Average	**102.01**	**706.69**	**15.48**
Standard Deviation	**19.64**	**238.76**	**4.50**
Growth rate	**61.33**	**125.42**	**-28.43**
Co-efficient of Variance	**19.25**	**33.79**	**29.04**
r	**+ 0.43**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

The operating profit ratio of SPBL showed average progress. During the study period. The lowest ratio (9.06) was observed in the year 2014 – 2015 and the highest ratio (about – 23.90) was evidenced in the year 2009 – 2010. The co-efficient of variance was 15.48 during the study period. There is positive relationship between operating profit and sales of SPBL.

Table 9: Return on Total Assets *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Net Profit	Total Assets	Ratio
2006-07	41.4	575.96	7.19
2007-08	45.79	748.07	6.12
2008-09	15.03	748.6	2.01
2009-10	39.93	743.07	5.37
2010-11	65	873.83	7.44
2011-12	34.1	809.22	4.21
2012-13	20.51	1116.65	1.84
2013-14	26.79	1093.55	2.45
2014-15	17.35	1100.58	1.58
2015-16	35.58	1112.10	3.20
Average	**34.15**	**892.16**	**4.14**
Standard Deviation	**15.14**	**93.09**	**2.26**
Growth rate	**-14.06**	**198.39**	**-55.49**
Co-efficient of Variance	**44.34**	**22.22**	**54.47**
r	**- 0.38**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

It could be inferred from the table that the net profit after tax decreased form Rs. 41.4 crores in 2006 – 2007 to Rs. 35.58 crores in 2015 – 2016. The growth rate of Net profit after tax during the study period -14.06% against the growth rate of total assets of 93.09%. The average amount of Net profit after tax and total assets value was Rs. 34.15 crores and Rs. 892.16 crores with Standard division of Rs. 15.14 crores and Rs. 198.20 crores respectively. The co-efficient of variation was lower with 22.22% in case of total assets in comparison with Net Profit after tax which was 44.34%. During the study period Return on Total Assets of SPBL was not well. Hence the management should take necessary steps to use the total assets in an effective manner. There is negative relationship between net profit after tax and total assets of SPBL.

Table 10: Return on Net Worth *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Net Profit	Net Worth	Ratio
2006-07	41.4	141.08	29.35
2007-08	45.79	182.11	25.14

IJBARR
E- ISSN -2347-856X
ISSN -2348-0653

2008-09	15.03	192.53	7.81
2009-10	39.93	224.59	17.78
2010-11	65.0	283.05	22.96
2011-12	34.1	310.61	10.98
2012-13	20.51	363.24	5.65
2013-14	26.79	384.13	6.97
2014-15	17.35	392.99	4.41
2015-16	35.58	420.97	8.45
Average	**34.15**	**289.53**	**13.95**
Standard Deviation	**15.14**	**100.03**	**9.09**
Growth rate	**-14.06**	**198.39**	**-71.20**
Co-efficient of Variance	**44.34**	**34.55**	**65.16**
r	**- 0.32**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

The highest value of Return on Net Worth was 29.35%, and the least value was about 4.41 and the mean value was observed at about 13.95% and the co-efficient of variation was 65.15%. Hence the Return on Net Worth showed a fluctuating trend over the study period. The Net Worth of SPBL gradually increased during the study period from a minimum of Rs. 141.08 crores to a maximum of Rs. 420.97 crores, whereas the net profit after tax fluctuated at a minimum value of Rs. 15.03 crores and a maximum value of Rs. 65 crores.

Table 11: Return on Capital Employed *(Rs. in crores)*

Years	Net Profit	Capital Employed	Ratio
2006-07	41.4	388.22	10.66
2007-08	45.79	538.61	8.50
2008-09	15.03	552.18	2.72
2009-10	39.93	548.1	7.29
2010-11	65	523.64	12.41
2011-12	34.1	501.01	6.81
2012-13	20.51	663.67	3.09
2013-14	26.79	699.01	3.83
2014-15	17.35	676.62	2.56
2015-16	35.58	718.57	4.95
Average	**34.15**	**580.96**	**6.28**
Standard Deviation	**15.14**	**105.09**	**3.46**
Growth rate	**-14.06**	**85.09**	**-53.47**
Co-efficient of Variance	**44.34**	**18.09**	**54.99**
r	**-0.47**		

Source : Computed from Annual Report

It could be inferred from the table that the profit after tax decreased from Rs. 41.4 crores in 2006 - 2007 to Rs. 35.58 crores in 2015 – 2016. The growth rate of Net profit after tax during the study period –14.06% against the growth rate of total assets of 85.09%. The average amount of Net profit after tax and total assets value was Rs. 34.15 crores and Rs. 580.96 crores respectively. The co-efficient of variance was lower with 18.09% in case of total assets in comparison with net profit after tax which was 44.34%. During the study period ROCE (Return on Capital Employed) of SPBL was not well. Hence the management has to take appropriate steps to utilize to the capital in an effective manner. There is a negative relationship between Net profit after tax and capital employed of SPBL.

Testing the Significance of Correlation Co-Efficient
To know the impact of liquidity and profitability of the Seshasayee Paper and board Limited the researcher used ‘T’ distribution test.
Null Hypothesis (Ho)
1. There is no significant relationship between current ratio and operating profit of the Seshasayee Paper and board Limited.
2. There is no significant relationship between quick ratio and return on capital employed.

Table 12: 'T' Distribution

Relationship	Calculated Value	Degree of Freedom	Table value @ 5% Confidence	Remark
Correlation between Current ratio & operating profit ratio	2.691	8	2.306	Significant
Correlation between Quick ratio & return on capital employed	4.483	8	2.306	Significant

Source : 'T' distribution has been performed in MS Excel

Liquidity and profitability ratio of Seshasayee Paper and board Limited (SPBL) is so significant because, the calculated value of 't' distribution is greater than critical value of 't' distribution at 5% level of significance. Hence liquidity is showing a significant impact on profitability of the concern.

Suggestions

- Keeping in view the above observations relating to the study. The following measures and suggested which would go a long way to improve the management of liquidity and profitability of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited in Tamilnadu.
- The management of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited should take appropriate steps to reduce inventories in future which may improve the profitability and unnecessary investment of the inventories.
- Net working capital shows an unfavourable condition. So, necessary steps must be taken by Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited to develop the situation and keep up an optimum WC in future.
- Current Assets trend of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited was favourable throughout the study period. So, the concern may maintain the same position in the following years.
- Throughout the study period Current Liability trends shows an enormous and it is not good for the firm. So, the management has to stop this growth
- During the study period, the company did not satisfy the current ratios standard norms of 2:1. So, the management should concentrate on to Current Assets so as to pay Current Liability in future.
- In order to improve the liquidity position of the concern, the management net only give concentration to Current Liability but management also give importance to Current Assets which may improve the liquidity position in future.
- In order to improve the Return on Capital Employed, the management has to utilize the capital in the best way. Otherwise, the shareholders will be affected in future.
- The management has to utilize total assets in an effective manner.

Conclusion

The efficient working capital management is more crucial factor in maintaining survival, liquidity, solvency and profitability position of any business unit. The profitability position of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited has been showing declining trend during the study period. Liquidity position of the company was also not satisfactory during the study period. The correlation between liquidity and profitability was highest in the company which shows a high degree of positive correlation. Thus, profitability position of Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited was not good due to the adverse liquidity position of the company.

References

1. Deloof M. (2003). Does working capita magement affect profitability of Belgian firms? journal of business, finance and accounting, 30(3&4), April/May, 573-587.
2. Eljelly A.(2004). Liquidity- profitability tradeoff; An empirical investigation in an emerging market. International journal of commerce and management, 14(2), 48-61.
3. Garcia – Teruel, P.J., & Martinez – Solano P.(2007). Effects of working capital mangment on SME profitability. International journal of managerial finance, 3(2),164-186.
4. Bardia S.C. Liquidity Management - A Case Study of Steel Authority of India Ltd, The Management Accountant, Vol 33, No.6, June 2004, pp. 463-467.
5. Ramachandran Azhagaiah and Gopinathan Radhika (2012) "SMART Journal of Business Management Studies", Vol.6 No.1. July-December 2012.
6. M Y Khan and P K Jain (2003) "Financial management text and problems" Tata McGraw Hill publishing company Limited. New Delhi.
7. Prassana Chandra, (2002) "Financial management theory and practice", Tata McGraw Hill Publishing company Limited, New Delhi.
8. Shashi K. Gupta and R.K. Sharma (2013) (Management Accounting Principles and Practice" Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi.