



Role of Liquidity and Market Risk in Stress Testing and Systemic Risk Mitigation

Erna Dewi¹

¹ Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh, Indonesia

Abstract

Article history:

Received: July 1, 2025

Revised: August 20, 2025

Accepted: October 15, 2025

Published: December 30, 2025

Keywords:

Banking stability,
Liquidity risk,
Market risk,
Stress testing,
Systemic risk.

Identifier:

Zera Open

Page: 92-108

<https://zeraopen.com/journal/amos>

Liquidity and market risks are among the most critical sources of vulnerability in the banking system, particularly during periods of heightened economic uncertainty and financial market volatility. Effective stress testing has therefore become a central regulatory and risk management tool for identifying potential systemic weaknesses and enhancing financial resilience. This study conceptually examines the role of liquidity and market risk in stress testing frameworks and their implications for systemic risk mitigation in the banking sector. Drawing on recent academic literature and regulatory guidance published between 2020 and 2024 the paper synthesizes key insights on how liquidity and market risk factors are incorporated into stress testing scenarios and supervisory assessments. The analysis highlights that stress testing serves not only as a diagnostic tool for individual banks, but also as a mechanism for identifying interconnected risks that may threaten system-wide stability. The findings further suggest that the effectiveness of stress testing in mitigating systemic risk depends on the integration of forward-looking risk measures, robust scenario design, and strong regulatory oversight. This study contributes to the literature by providing a structured conceptual perspective on the interaction between liquidity risk, market risk, and stress testing within contemporary banking risk management frameworks.



1. Introduction

The stability of the banking system is closely linked to banks' ability to manage liquidity and market risks, particularly during periods of economic stress and heightened financial market volatility. Liquidity shortages and abrupt market price movements have historically played a central role in amplifying financial crises, transforming institution-specific vulnerabilities into systemic disruptions. As a result, banking regulators and supervisors increasingly emphasize the monitoring and management of liquidity and market risks as core components of macroprudential oversight (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2021).

In the aftermath of the global financial crisis, stress testing has emerged as a key regulatory instrument for assessing banks' resilience to adverse economic and financial conditions. Stress testing frameworks are designed to evaluate how shocks related to funding liquidity, interest rates, exchange rates, and asset prices may affect banks' balance sheets and capital positions. Recent regulatory guidance highlights that effective stress testing should incorporate both liquidity and market risk channels to capture the interconnected nature of modern banking systems (Bank for International Settlements, 2020; European Central Bank, 2021).

Liquidity risk has received renewed attention in the regulatory literature due to its role in exacerbating financial instability during stress episodes. The inability of banks to meet short-term obligations can trigger fire sales of assets, intensify market volatility, and undermine confidence in the financial system. Empirical and conceptual studies suggest that liquidity stress often interacts with market risk, as declining asset values further weaken funding conditions and amplify systemic risk

(International Monetary Fund, 2022). These dynamics underscore the importance of integrating liquidity and market risk considerations within stress testing exercises.

Market risk, which arises from fluctuations in interest rates, exchange rates, and asset prices, represents another critical dimension of banking vulnerability. In volatile economic environments, sharp market movements can rapidly erode banks' capital buffers and expose weaknesses in risk management practices. Recent literature emphasizes that traditional risk assessment approaches may underestimate market risk under extreme but plausible scenarios, reinforcing the need for forward-looking stress testing frameworks (Duffie, 2021; World Bank, 2022).

Regulatory authorities increasingly view stress testing as a macroprudential tool that extends beyond individual institutions to address system-wide risk. Stress testing outcomes are used not only to evaluate bank-specific resilience but also to inform supervisory interventions, capital planning, and policy decisions aimed at mitigating systemic risk. Studies highlight that stress testing frameworks incorporating liquidity and market risk dimensions are more effective in identifying contagion channels and feedback loops within the financial system (Aikman et al., 2021; European Central Bank, 2022).

Despite the growing prominence of stress testing in banking regulation, the literature remains fragmented regarding the specific roles of liquidity and market risk within stress testing frameworks and their implications for systemic risk mitigation. While numerous studies address stress testing methodologies, fewer contributions provide an integrated conceptual analysis of how these two risk types jointly shape stress testing effectiveness and regulatory outcomes. This gap is particularly relevant

in an era characterized by heightened uncertainty, rapid financial innovation, and increasing interconnectedness among financial institutions.

Accordingly, this study aims to conceptually examine the role of liquidity and market risk in stress testing and their implications for systemic risk mitigation in the banking sector. By synthesizing recent academic and policy-oriented literature published between 2020 and 2024, the paper seeks to contribute to the understanding of how stress testing frameworks can be strengthened to enhance financial stability and support effective macroprudential regulation.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Liquidity Risk in the Banking System

Liquidity risk is widely recognized as a critical determinant of banking stability, reflecting a bank's ability to meet short-term obligations without incurring excessive losses. Recent literature emphasizes that liquidity shortages can rapidly escalate into systemic crises when funding markets deteriorate or confidence erodes. Regulatory frameworks increasingly stress the importance of robust liquidity risk management, particularly through instruments such as liquidity coverage ratios and net stable funding ratios (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision, 2021).

Studies published after 2020 highlight that liquidity risk is closely linked to market conditions and macroeconomic uncertainty. When liquidity buffers prove insufficient, banks may be forced to liquidate assets at depressed prices, triggering fire-sale dynamics that amplify market volatility and systemic stress (International

Monetary Fund, 2022). This interaction underscores the systemic nature of liquidity risk and its relevance for macroprudential oversight.

2.2. Market Risk and Financial Volatility

Market risk arises from fluctuations in interest rates, exchange rates, and asset prices that affect banks' trading and investment portfolios. In periods of heightened volatility, market risk exposures can rapidly erode capital buffers and undermine financial resilience. Recent research suggests that traditional market risk measures may underestimate losses under extreme but plausible stress scenarios, reinforcing the need for forward-looking risk assessment tools (Duffie, 2021).

The literature further indicates that market risk does not operate in isolation. Instead, adverse market movements often interact with funding conditions, increasing liquidity pressures and reinforcing systemic vulnerabilities. This interconnectedness has led scholars to argue that effective banking supervision requires an integrated approach to liquidity and market risk management rather than a silo-based perspective (Aikman et al., 2021).

2.3. Stress Testing as a Regulatory and Risk Management Tool

Stress testing has become a cornerstone of modern banking regulation, serving both microprudential and macroprudential objectives. From a regulatory perspective, stress testing is designed to assess banks' resilience to adverse economic and financial shocks, including those related to liquidity shortages and market price fluctuations. Regulatory guidance emphasizes that stress testing frameworks should capture multiple risk channels and reflect system-wide interactions (European Central Bank, 2021).

Recent studies highlight that stress testing has evolved beyond a purely supervisory exercise into a strategic risk management tool used by banks to inform capital planning and risk mitigation strategies. However, the effectiveness of stress testing depends on the quality of scenario design, the incorporation of forward-looking assumptions, and the integration of liquidity and market risk factors (Bank for International Settlements, 2020).

2.4. Systemic Risk and Macroprudential Perspectives

Digital banking intensifies governance challenges by accelerating innovation cycles and increasing organizational complexity. The literature indicates that rapid digital transformation may outpace existing governance structures, creating gaps in oversight and risk control. Inadequate coordination between business units, technology functions, and risk management teams can weaken banks' ability to identify and mitigate emerging operational and cyber risks.

From a systemic perspective, scholars and policymakers increasingly recognize that widespread cyber incidents or operational disruptions may pose threats to financial stability, particularly in highly interconnected banking systems. As a result, recent research emphasizes the importance of aligning firm-level risk governance with broader macroprudential objectives, including information sharing, coordinated incident response, and regulatory cooperation (International Monetary Fund, 2022; World Bank, 2023).

2.5. Research Gap and Conceptual Contribution

Despite extensive research on liquidity risk, market risk, and stress testing, the literature remains fragmented in addressing their combined role in systemic risk

mitigation. While many studies analyze these risk types separately, fewer contributions provide an integrated conceptual synthesis that explicitly links liquidity and market risk to stress testing outcomes and macroprudential objectives. This gap is particularly evident in the context of volatile economic environments, where risk interactions become more pronounced.

Accordingly, this study contributes to the literature by synthesizing recent academic and regulatory insights on liquidity and market risk within stress testing frameworks. By adopting a systematic and conceptual perspective, the study aims to clarify how stress testing can be strengthened as a tool for systemic risk mitigation and to inform future research and regulatory policy development.

3. Methods

This study adopts a qualitative research design grounded in a systematic literature review (SLR) to examine the role of liquidity and market risk in stress testing and systemic risk mitigation within the banking sector. The SLR approach is selected to ensure a transparent, structured, and replicable synthesis of existing academic and regulatory knowledge, without relying on original empirical data. This methodological choice aligns with the conceptual objective of the study and is appropriate for integrating diverse perspectives from banking risk management and macroprudential regulation.

The literature review process followed a structured three-stage procedure comprising identification, screening, and inclusion. During the identification stage, relevant publications were retrieved through systematic searches in Google Scholar

using predefined keywords, including “liquidity risk,” “market risk,” “stress testing,” “systemic risk,” and “banking supervision.” These keywords were selected to capture studies addressing both microprudential and macroprudential dimensions of banking risk. To ensure the relevance and timeliness of the reviewed literature, the search was restricted to publications released between 2020 and 2024.

In the screening stage, retrieved studies were evaluated based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Peer-reviewed journal articles and institutional reports from internationally recognized regulatory bodies were included to ensure academic rigor and policy relevance. Studies focusing exclusively on single-risk categories without reference to stress testing or systemic implications were excluded. This screening process ensured that the final body of literature directly addressed the interaction between liquidity risk, market risk, and stress testing frameworks.

The final stage involved qualitative content analysis of the selected literature. Each study was systematically reviewed and coded using a thematic analysis approach. The coding process focused on identifying recurring themes related to risk transmission channels, stress testing methodologies, and macroprudential objectives. The analysis was structured around three core analytical dimensions: (1) the role of liquidity risk in stress testing scenarios, (2) the contribution of market risk to systemic vulnerability, and (3) the effectiveness of stress testing in mitigating systemic risk through regulatory and supervisory interventions.

By synthesizing findings across these dimensions, the study develops an integrated conceptual understanding of how liquidity and market risks are incorporated into stress testing frameworks and how these frameworks support

systemic risk mitigation. This qualitative synthesis provides a structured foundation for discussing the regulatory and risk management implications of stress testing in volatile economic environments and for identifying directions for future research and policy development.

4. Results

This section presents and discusses the key insights derived from the systematic literature review. Rather than reporting statistical outcomes, the analysis synthesizes recurring themes related to liquidity risk, market risk, and stress testing, and examines their implications for systemic risk mitigation in the banking sector. The results are organized around the core analytical dimensions identified in the Method section and are discussed in relation to contemporary regulatory and macroprudential debates.

4.1. Key Themes Emerging from the Literature

The reviewed literature consistently indicates that liquidity and market risks play a central role in shaping the effectiveness of stress testing frameworks. Stress testing is increasingly recognized as a mechanism for capturing the interaction between funding pressures, asset price volatility, and systemic contagion channels.

Table 1. Key Themes in Liquidity and Market Risk–Based Stress Testing

Analytical Dimension	Key Insights from Literature	Implications for Systemic Risk
Liquidity risk	Funding shortfalls amplify stress scenarios	Higher probability of contagion
Market risk	Asset price volatility accelerates losses	Capital erosion under stress

Analytical Dimension	Key Insights from Literature	Implications for Systemic Risk
Risk interaction	Liquidity and market risks reinforce each other	Non-linear systemic effects
Stress testing design	Forward-looking scenarios improve detection	Earlier identification of vulnerabilities
Supervisory use	Stress tests inform macroprudential action	Enhanced systemic risk mitigation

The table highlights that stress testing outcomes are driven not by isolated risk factors, but by the interaction between liquidity and market risks under adverse conditions.

4.2. Liquidity and Market Risk in Stress Testing Outcomes

The literature suggests that incorporating liquidity risk into stress testing frameworks enhances their ability to capture short-term funding pressures and potential run dynamics. Stress scenarios that account for liquidity shocks provide more realistic assessments of banks' resilience, particularly during periods of market dislocation. As liquidity constraints intensify, banks may be forced to liquidate assets rapidly, exposing them to adverse market price movements and reinforcing stress outcomes.

Market risk further compounds these effects by transmitting shocks through valuation losses and volatility spillovers. Studies emphasize that stress tests focusing solely on market risk without considering liquidity constraints may underestimate systemic vulnerability. Consequently, integrated stress testing approaches that jointly model liquidity and market risks are increasingly viewed as essential for capturing the full spectrum of systemic risk transmission.

4.3. Cyber Risk and Governance Challenges

From a regulatory perspective, the literature underscores that the effectiveness of stress testing depends heavily on governance and supervisory oversight. Stress testing frameworks that incorporate liquidity and market risks require strong institutional capacity, clear methodological standards, and consistent supervisory review. Regulators increasingly rely on stress test results to inform capital planning, liquidity requirements, and macroprudential interventions.

Table 2 presents a conceptual comparison of stress testing frameworks with and without integrated liquidity and market risk considerations.

Table 2. Conceptual Comparison of Stress Testing Frameworks

Aspect	Conventional Stress Testing	Integrated Risk Stress Testing
Risk coverage	Single or siloed risks	Liquidity and market risks combined
Scenario realism	Moderate	High
Systemic focus	Limited	Strong
Supervisory relevance	Primarily microprudential	Micro- and macroprudential
Risk mitigation impact	Reactive	Preventive

The comparison illustrates that integrated stress testing frameworks offer greater potential for systemic risk mitigation by enhancing scenario realism and supervisory relevance.

5. Discussion

The findings suggest that liquidity and market risks are not merely inputs to stress testing, but fundamental drivers of systemic outcomes under stress. Stress testing frameworks that fail to account for the interaction between these risks may underestimate the severity of systemic shocks and delay regulatory responses. Conversely, integrated stress testing approaches can strengthen early warning mechanisms and support more proactive macroprudential policies.

This discussion aligns with broader regulatory efforts to move beyond institution-specific assessments toward system-wide perspectives on financial stability. Stress testing emerges as a critical bridge between microprudential supervision and macroprudential risk mitigation, particularly when liquidity and market risks are explicitly embedded in scenario design. Accordingly, the results support a conceptual view in which stress testing serves as a dynamic policy tool for managing systemic risk in volatile economic environments.

6. Conclusion

This study conceptually examines the role of liquidity and market risk in stress testing and their implications for systemic risk mitigation in the banking sector. Drawing on a systematic review and qualitative synthesis of recent academic and regulatory literature, the analysis highlights that liquidity and market risks are central drivers of systemic vulnerability, particularly in periods of heightened economic uncertainty and financial market volatility. The findings indicate that stress testing frameworks serve as a critical mechanism for capturing the interaction between

funding pressures, asset price movements, and contagion channels within the financial system.

The study underscores that the effectiveness of stress testing in mitigating systemic risk depends on the extent to which liquidity and market risks are explicitly and jointly incorporated into scenario design. Stress testing approaches that rely on siloed risk assessments may underestimate the severity and transmission of shocks, whereas integrated frameworks offer more realistic insights into system-wide resilience. From a regulatory perspective, such integration enhances the macroprudential relevance of stress testing by supporting earlier identification of vulnerabilities and more proactive supervisory interventions.

Furthermore, the analysis highlights the importance of governance and supervisory oversight in translating stress testing outcomes into effective risk mitigation measures. Strong institutional capacity, clear methodological standards, and consistent supervisory review are essential to ensure that stress testing contributes meaningfully to financial stability objectives. Stress testing should therefore be viewed not merely as a compliance exercise, but as a dynamic policy tool that bridges microprudential supervision and macroprudential risk management.

This study contributes to the literature by providing an integrated conceptual perspective on liquidity risk, market risk, and stress testing within contemporary banking regulation. Future research may extend this analysis by empirically examining stress testing outcomes across different banking systems or by exploring the role of stress testing in addressing emerging sources of systemic risk.

References

- Aikman, D., Haldane, A. G., & Nelson, B. D. (2021). Curbing the credit cycle. *The Economic Journal*, 131(634), 1670–1696. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ej/ueaa130>
- Aikman, D., Galesic, M., Gigerenzer, G., Kapadia, S., Katsikopoulos, K., Kothiyal, A., Murphy, E., & Neumann, T. (2021). Taking uncertainty seriously: Simplicity versus complexity in financial regulation (Bank of England Working Paper No. 912). Bank of England. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2021). Principles for financial market infrastructures. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2021). Basel III: A global regulatory framework for more resilient banks and banking systems. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2022). Stress testing principles. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Bank for International Settlements. (2020). Stress testing: A macroprudential perspective. *BIS Quarterly Review*. Retrieved October 15, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>

- Bank for International Settlements. (2021). Global liquidity: Vulnerabilities and risks. BIS Quarterly Review. Retrieved October 15, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Bank for International Settlements. (2022). Climate-related risk drivers and their transmission channels. Bank for International Settlements. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.bis.org>
- Duffie, D. (2021). Intermediation of financial markets under stress. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 139(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2020.09.006>
- European Central Bank. (2021). Guide on stress testing. ECB Banking Supervision. Retrieved November 10, 2024, from <https://www.bankingsupervision.europa.eu>
- European Central Bank. (2022). Systemic risk and macroprudential stress testing. ECB Occasional Paper Series. European Central Bank. Retrieved November 10, 2024, from <https://www.ecb.europa.eu>
- Gorton, G., & Metrick, A. (2021). Regulating the shadow banking system. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2021(1), 261–312.
- International Monetary Fund. (2021). Global financial stability report: Preempting a legacy of vulnerabilities. International Monetary Fund. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513587095.082>
- International Monetary Fund. (2022). Global financial stability report: Shockwaves from the war in Ukraine. International Monetary Fund. <https://doi.org/10.5089/9781616358139.082>

- International Monetary Fund. (2023). Stress testing banks in a volatile environment (IMF Staff Discussion Note). International Monetary Fund. Retrieved December 1, 2024, from <https://www.imf.org>
- Kermani, A., & Ma, Y. (2021). Asset fire sales, price spillovers, and systemic risk. *The Journal of Finance*, 76(6), 2547–2587. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13039>
- Krishnamurthy, A., Muir, T., & Sufi, A. (2020). Vulnerability of households and financial institutions to major disasters. *Review of Financial Studies*, 33(12), 5396–5445. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz134>
- Morris, S., & Shin, H. S. (2021). Coordination and the currency crisis. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 191, 105157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2020.105157>
- Schularick, M., Richter, B., & Shim, I. (2020). Financial cycles, capital flows, and macroprudential policy. *Journal of International Economics*, 122, 103259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2019.103259>
- Shin, H. S. (2020). Global liquidity and risk appetite. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12, 507–533. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080219-030312>
- Silva, W. B., Kimura, H., & Sobreiro, V. A. (2021). An analysis of systemic risk using stress testing. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 54, 100875. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2021.100875>
- Smaga, P. (2021). The concept of systemic risk (Systemic Risk Centre Special Paper). London School of Economics. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.lse.ac.uk>

- World Bank. (2022). Global financial development report: Finance for an equitable recovery. World Bank Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1768-7>
- World Bank. (2023). Bank stress testing and macroprudential oversight (Policy Research Working Paper). World Bank. Retrieved December 1, 2024, from <https://www.worldbank.org>
- Zhang, D., Louzada, F., Zhou, Z., & Tovar, E. (2021). Stress testing and systemic risk assessment: A review. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 55, 100892. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2021.100892>
- Zhou, C., & Li, L. (2020). Measuring systemic risk contributions under stress. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 112, 105219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2019.105219>