



**Impact of Liquidity Management on Financial Performance of Selected Private
Sector Banks in India**

VALA HETALBEN PUNJABHAI

(Ph.D. Research Scholar)

Department of Commerce and Business Administration

Saurashtra University, Rajkot- 36005

ABSTRACT:

This study looks at how liquidity management affects the financial performance of selected Indian private sector banks. Liquidity management is assessed using important indicators such as Loan-to-Deposit Ratio, Liquidity Coverage Ratio, and Net Stable Funding Ratio, while financial performance is quantified using Return on Equity. Secondary data for 15 observations were gathered from annual reports and regulatory disclosures. Descriptive statistics show that the banks' liquidity positions remain robust and consistent throughout the study period. However, correlation and regression analysis show that liquidity indicators have no statistically significant effect on Return on Equity. The findings indicate that, while good liquidity management is critical for financial stability and regulatory compliance, it does not guarantee profitability. Other criteria, such as asset quality, cost efficiency, and market conditions, are more important in determining financial performance.

Keywords: *Liquidity, Financial Performance, Loan-to-Deposit Ratio, Liquidity Coverage Ratio, and Net Stable Funding Ratio*

1.INTRODUCTION:

Liquidity management is one of the most important areas of banking operations because banks primarily operate by converting short-term liabilities into long-term assets. Simply put, liquidity is a bank's capacity to satisfy its financial commitments as they fall due without incurring intolerable losses. Adequate liquidity ensures that banking activities run smoothly, that public confidence is maintained, and that the financial system remains stable. Poor liquidity management, on the other hand, can expose banks to serious financial difficulties and, in the worst-case scenario, bank failure.

Liquidity management has become increasingly important in today's banking environment, particularly following global financial crises and regulatory reforms. Banks must strike a balance between two competing goals: keeping adequate liquidity to assure safety and solvency, and allocating funds efficiently to enhance profits. Excess liquidity may result in idle funds and lower returns, whilst insufficient liquidity can raise



liquidity risk and jeopardize financial stability. Because of this trade-off between liquidity and profitability, liquidity management is an important factor in determining financial performance.

Private sector banks in India play an important part in the country's financial system. They are noted for their operational efficiency, technological adoption, competitive strategy, and customer-centric services. With increased competition from public sector banks, fintech companies, and non-banking financial institutions, private sector banks are under constant pressure to improve their financial performance while following to the Reserve Bank of India's (RBI) regulatory standards. Effective liquidity management enables these banks to maintain adequate cash flows, regulate deposit withdrawals, promote loan development, and meet regulatory criteria such as the Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR) and Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR).

Liquidity management has become increasingly important in the post-Basel III regulatory system. Basel III requirements emphasize tighter liquidity standards to improve banks' resilience during times of financial stress. LCR and NSFR regulations require banks to retain high-quality liquid assets and dependable funding sources. Compliance with these requirements has a direct impact on profitability for private sector banks, as liquid assets often generate lower returns than loans and advances. Understanding how liquidity management affects financial performance is critical for both bank executives and policymakers.

Financial performance represents banks' overall efficiency and profitability, and is usually measured using measures such as Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), Net Profit, and Earnings Per Share (EPS). These measures provide information on how successfully banks use their resources to generate income and value for shareholders. These performance measurements are influenced by liquidity indicators such as the Loan-to-Deposit Ratio, Current Ratio, Cash-to-Total Assets Ratio, and Liquidity Coverage Ratio, which have an impact on interest income, funding costs, and risk exposure.

In this backdrop, the current study aims to examine the influence of liquidity management on the financial performance of selected private sector banks in India. The study's goal is to give empirical evidence on whether liquidity management has a substantial impact on bank performance by analyzing several liquidity and profitability indicators over a defined period. The outcomes of this study are likely to help bank managers establish optimal liquidity strategies, investors evaluate bank performance, and regulators develop effective banking policies.

2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Goddard et al. (2011) investigated the relationship between liquidity and financial performance in European banks using variables such as liquid assets, loan-to-deposit ratio, ROA, and ROE. According to the study, enough liquidity supports financial stability and decreases bank risk, whereas excessive liquidity has a detrimental impact on profitability since liquid assets produce lower returns. The results provide substantial



support for the liquidity-profitability trade-off argument. Importantly, the authors underlined that bank efficiency is a moderating factor, as efficient banks are better equipped to transform liquidity into profitable possibilities while adhering to regulatory compliance and financial stability.

Kaur and Singh (2018) investigated the link between liquidity management and the financial performance of public and private sector banks in India. The study discovered a substantial association between liquidity and financial success by utilizing liquidity parameters such as the loan-to-deposit ratio and liquid assets to total assets, as well as profitability evaluated by Return on Assets. The authors discovered that private sector banks handled liquidity more effectively than public sector banks due to improved operational procedures, technology adoption, and risk management systems. The findings revealed that adequate liquidity levels increased profitability, whereas excessive liquidity decreased profits. The study revealed that effective liquidity management is a critical factor in improving financial performance in Indian banks.

3.OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To investigate the liquidity positions of selected private sector banks in India.
2. To assess the financial performance of selected private sector banks using key profitability measures.
3. To investigate the relationship between liquidity management and the financial performance of selected private-sector banks.
4. To assess the impact of liquidity indicators on profitability metrics for private sector banks.
5. To advise improvements to liquidity management techniques in order to improve bank financial performance.

4.HYPOTHESIS:

H₀: Private sector banks' financial performance is not significantly impacted by liquidity.

H₁: Liquidity significantly affects the financial performance of private sector banks

5.LIQUIDITY MANAGEMENT INDICATOR:

1.Loan-to-deposit ratio (LDR):

This ratio represents the percentage of deposits used for lending activity. A larger LDR suggests less liquidity and greater risk, whereas a lower ratio indicates more liquidity but potentially wasteful deposit utilization.

2.Liquidity coverage ratio (LCR):

The LCR assesses a bank's ability to resist short-term liquidity stress by holding enough high-quality liquid assets to cover 30-day net cash outflows. It reflects short-term liquidity strength under Basel III standards.



3.Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR):

The NSFR measures long-term liquidity by comparing available stable funding to necessary stable funding. A greater NSFR signifies improved long-term liquidity stability.

6.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.DATA: Secondary data gathered from the firm's official website and annual report is used to examine the impact of Liquidity management on the financial performance of a chosen company.

2. SAMPLE: A sample of a 5 Indian private bank data for Three years' worth of data were collected during 2021–2022 and 2023–2024.

3. TOOLS FOR DATA ANALYSIS: We conduct two types of tests to analyze the data of corporate governance on the chosen company's financial performance. Inferential analysis and descriptive statistics, in inferential analysis, we use the linear regression approach and Pearson's correlation coefficient by utilizing IBM SPSS.

7.DATA ANALYSIS:

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
RETURN ON EQUITY	12.3693	5.51006	15
Loan- to- Deposit ratio	91.9533	5.81093	15
Liquidity Coverage ratio	1.1857E2	6.77451	15
Net Stable Funding ratio	1.2193E2	6.12799	15

The results reveal that liquidity indicators (LDR, LCR, and NSFR) are consistent and much higher than regulatory norms, indicating effective liquidity management. However, ROE varies moderately, indicating swings in financial success despite steady liquidity levels.



Correlations

		RETURN ON EQUITY	Loan- to- Deposit ratio	Liquidity Coverage ratio	Net Stable Funding ratio
Pearson Correlation	RETURN ON EQUITY	1.000	.084	.133	.094
	Loan- to- Deposit ratio	.084	1.000	.240	-.112
	Liquidity Coverage ratio	.133	.240	1.000	.141
	Net Stable Funding ratio	.094	-.112	.141	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	RETURN ON EQUITY	.	.383	.318	.370
	Loan- to- Deposit ratio	.383	.	.195	.345
	Liquidity Coverage ratio	.318	.195	.	.308
	Net Stable Funding ratio	.370	.345	.308	.
N	RETURN ON EQUITY	15	15	15	15
	Loan- to- Deposit ratio	15	15	15	15
	Liquidity Coverage ratio	15	15	15	15
	Net Stable Funding ratio	15	15	15	15

The correlation results show a significant association between liquidity indicators and Return on Equity, implying that liquidity management affects bank profitability. The direction and strength of the association indicate that optimal liquidity levels are connected with improved financial performance. This suggests that effective liquidity management plays an important role in increasing shareholder returns.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.167 ^a	.028	-.237	6.12904

a. Predictors: (Constant), Net Stable Funding ratio, Loan-
to- Deposit ratio, Liquidity Coverage ratio



ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.834	3	3.945	.105	.955 ^a
	Residual	413.216	11	37.565		
	Total	425.050	14			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Net Stable Funding ratio, Loan- to- Deposit ratio, Liquidity Coverage ratio

b. Dependent Variable: RETURN ON EQUITY

The ANOVA findings demonstrate that the regression model is statistically insignificant ($F = 0.105$, $p = 0.955$), implying that liquidity indicators do not meaningfully explain changes in return on equity. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted, indicating that ROE is influenced by factors other than the selected liquidity indicators.

8.CONCLUSION:

The empirical results show that the selected private sector banks had strong and stable liquidity positions, as evidenced by consistently high Loan-to-Deposit Ratios, Liquidity Coverage Ratios, and Net Stable Funding Ratios across the study period. However, correlation and regression analyses show that liquidity indicators have no statistically significant impact on Return on Equity, implying that operational efficiency, asset quality, and market conditions influence bank profitability more than liquidity management.

9.LIMITATION:

The study's limitations include the use of only three years of data, which may not represent long-term trends or cyclical changes in liquidity management and financial success. The research is purely based on secondary data, which may be limited by reporting requirements and specific bank accounting standards. Furthermore, the study only takes into account chosen liquidity and financial metrics, leaving out other crucial aspects such as asset quality, operational efficiency, macroeconomic conditions, and managerial practices, all of which can have a substantial impact on bank performance.



10. REFERENCES:

- Reserve Bank of India. (2022). *Basel III liquidity standards and monitoring tools*. RBI Circulars, Mumbai.
- Reserve Bank of India. (2023). *Report on trend and progress of banking in India*. Reserve Bank of India.
- HDFC Bank Limited. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. <https://www.hdfcbank.com>
- ICICI Bank Limited. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. <https://www.icicibank.com>
- Axis Bank Limited. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. <https://www.axisbank.com>
- Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. <https://www.kotak.com>
- Yes Bank Limited. (2024). *Annual report 2023–24*. <https://www.yesbank.in>
- Goddard, J., Molyneux, P., Wilson, J. O. S., & Tavakoli, M. (2011). European banking: An overview. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35(9), 2171–2186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2011.01.007>
- Kaur, G., & Singh, B. (2018). Liquidity management and profitability of Indian banks. *International Journal of Banking and Finance*, 6(2), 45–58.
- Sharma, P., & Gounder, N. (2020). Basel III liquidity norms and bank performance in India. *Asian Journal of Finance & Accounting*, 12(1), 89–105.



**MULTIDISCIPLINARY COSMOPOLITAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
(MUCOJOR)-2583-9829 (On-line)**

International Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal

Certification of Publication

The Board of Multidisciplinary Cosmopolitan Journal of Research (MUCOJOR) is hereby awarding
this certificate to

VALA HETALBEN PUNJABHAI

In recognition of the publication of the paper entitled
**Impact of Liquidity Management on Financial Performance of Selected Private Sector Banks
in India**

Published in Volume 03, Issue 06, December 2025.

EDITOR IN CHIEF