Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.* 

# Examining the Relationship between Sectoral Stock Market Indices and Sectoral Gross Domestic Product: An Empirical Evidence from India By Pooja Joshi<sup>1</sup> and Prof. A.K. Giri<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> Birla Institute of Science and Technology, Pilani *Received: 3 February 2015 Accepted: 1 March 2015 Published: 15 March 2015*

#### 8 Abstract

This paper aims to examine the relationship between gross domestic product and Indian stock 9 market from a sectoral perspective by using quarterly time series data from 2003:Q4 to 10 2014:Q4. Ng-Perron unit root test is utilized to check the order of integration of the variables. 11 The long run relationship is examined by implementing the ARDL bounds testing approach to 12 co-integration. VECM method is used to test the short and long run causality and variance 13 decomposition is used to predict long run exogenous shocks of the variables. The results of the 14 ARDL bounds test confirm the existence of a cointegrating relationship between sectoral GDP 15 and sectoral stock price in India. The results from long-run and short-run coefficient reveals 16 that sectoral price indices are significantly influenced by changes in the respective sectoral 17 GDP in the long-run, whereas, crude oil price is an important factor influencing the sectoral 18 prices in the short-run. The granger causality test demonstrates a unidirectional short-run 19 causality running from manufacturing sector GDP to aggregate stock price index of 20 manufacturing sector. Further, the short-run causality running from electricity, gas and water 21 supply sector GDP to respective sector stock price index. However, unidirectional short-run 22 causality is absent in the service sector. 23

24

25 Index terms— sectoral indices, sectoral share in GDP, oil price, ARDL, VECM, VDC, india.

## 26 1 Introduction

he claim that macroeconomic variables affect stock market is a well-established fact in the literature of financial 27 economics and has been an area of intense interest among academicians, investors and stock market regulators 28 since 1980s. Especially, in the past two decades, there has been growing efforts made by researchers to empirically 29 estimate this relation. (Chen et al. (1986), Fama (1990Fama (, 1991)), Mukherjee and Naka (1995), Nasseh and 30 Strauss (2000), Ratanapakorn and Sharma (2007)). These studies conclude that stock prices do respond to the 31 changes in macroeconomic fundamentals. However, a very few studies have been conducted on the relationship 32 33 of macroeconomic variables and sectoral indices across the globe. Further, none of the study focused on the 34 relationship of sectoral GDP explaining its impact on respective sectoral indices for an emerging economy like 35 India.

It is a proved fact that aggregate GDP affects composite stock market indexes, but sometimes a change in aggregate GDP, for example, an increase in aggregate GDP cause composite index to increase, but an increase in composite index does not mean that all the sectors of the composite index or all the sectoral indices are increasing, a few of the sectors cannot perform well even if the GDP of the economy is increasing, while others can outperform the market. Further, it should also be noticed that, with the change in the GDP of a particular sector, it is not necessary that the stock market changes, but if any of the sector performs extremely well and

attains a significant change in GDP than it can give a boost to the composite stock index. All these phenomena 42 can be better understood with the help of sector wise study. Therefore, an attempt has been taken to study the 43 impact of sectoral contribution of GDP in explaining the variation in the sectoral stock market index. Further, 44 45 apart from sectoral GDP, few other macroeconomic variables are expected to influence the stock prices of a specific sector. Hence, the paper attains to identify the impact of sectoral GDP, along with certain controlled 46 variables, on respective sectoral indices. The study uses three different sectors, viz-a-viz, manufacturing sector 47 index, electricity, gas and water sector index and service sector index of BSE and the respective sectors of GDP 48 are; (1) manufacturing sector share in GDP, (2) electricity, gas and water sector share in GDP and (3) service 49 sector share in GDP. The three sectors have been chosen for the study because these three sectors are the fastest 50 growing sectors in India. The service sector contributes maximum to the India's GDP with 57% share of GDP in 51 2013-14, up from 15% in 1950-51. Whereas, manufacturing sector contributes about 15.1% of India's GDP and 52 50% of the India's export, which shows that they are playing a T Year 2015 significant role in Indian economy. 53 While the electricity, gas and water supply sector is also an important part of the Indian economy from an 54 industrial point of view, as because these are the basic Necessitiies of any of the industry to develop. This sector 55 constitutes a small portion of India's GDP with a 2.5% share of GDP, in 2013-14, up from 0.24% in 1950-51. The 56 57 three indices (manufacturing index; electricity, gas and water supply index; and service index) are taken according 58 to the sectoral contribution in GDP. It is a general belief that all the indices should be positively affected by the 59 respective GDP, because the increase in the GDP of a particular sector gives confidence to investors which leads 60 to increase in the index of that particular sector. The prime objective of this paper is to analyze the impact of a predetermined set of macroeconomic factors and 61

62 sectoral GDP on different sectors of BSE. However, unlike the conventional studies, in this paper, we employ the 63 Auto Regressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) approach to examine the cointegration and long-run stability between 64 the sectoral BSE indices with sectoral contribution in GDP along with other controlled variables. The study also 65 uses VECM based granger causality to check the direction of causal relationships between variables. Variance 66 Decomposition (VDC) is also used to explore the degree of exogeneity of the variables involved in this study. For 67 the purpose of analysis quarterly data starting from the year 2003:Q4 to 2014:Q4 are used.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the review of empirical literature on the relationship between selected sectoral GDP along with controlled variables and sectoral stock indices. Section 3 outlines the data issues and econometric methodology used in the study; section 4 analyses the empirical results of the study, and section 5 presents the concluding remarks.

#### 72 **2** II.

#### 73 **3** Literature Review

74 Several empirical studies have been conducted on the relationship between stock market development and 75 economic growth with varying results while some of these studies support the positive relation between stock markets and growth, others reject it. Toda and Yamamoto (1995), Levine and Zervos (1996Zervos (, 1998)), 76 77 Bencivenga, et al. (1996), Daferighe and Aje (2009) and ??sing (2011) found a positive link between financial development and economic growth. On the contrary, a number of studies also disagree with the view that stock 78 markets promote growth, which includes Ram (1999), Singh (1997), Devereux and Smith (1994). Adaramola 79 (2011) However, the literature examining the relation of macroeconomic variables on individual stock market 80 indices is scarce. Ta and Teo (1985) observed high correlation among six Singapore sector indices in the 81 period 1975 to 1984 and the overall SES market return. Sun and Brannman (1994) similarly found a single 82 83 longrun relationship among the SES All-S Equities Industrial & Commercial, Finance, Hotel, and Property 84 Index. Maysami et al. (2004) examined the co-movement between sectoral stock indices of the U.S. and Singapore, through examining whether the S&P 500 Electronics (Semiconductor) Price Index leads Stock 85 Exchange of Singapore's Electronics Price Index. The results confirmed the long-term cointegration sectoral 86 relationships. Maysami et al. (2004) examined the longterm equilibrium relationship between macroeconomics 87 variables and the Singapore stock market index, also with the various Singapore Exchange Sector indices as 88 an estimation model. The study showed that the Singapore stock market index and the property index have 89 significant relationships with all macroeconomic variables identified, while the finance index and the hotel index 90 meet significant relationships only with selected variables. ??ancocks (2010) determined the effect of selected 91 macroeconomic variables on stock market prices of the All-Share, Financial, Mining and Retail Indices. The 92 results showed that certain macroeconomic variables had differing influences on each sector of the stock market. 93 94 Impulse Response tests indicated that the selected macroeconomic variables caused a shock to the sectoral indices 95 in the short-run. Chinzara (2011) analyzed how systematic risk emanating from the macro-economy is transmitted 96 into stock market volatility. Aggregate stock market index and the four main sectors (Financial, industrial, 97 mining and general retail) and macroeconomic variables were used for the study. It was found from the study that volatility transmission between the stock market and most of the macroeconomic variables and the stock 98 market is bidirectional. Saeed (2012) examined the impact of macroeconomic variables on sectoral indices. Results 99 revealed that only short term interest rate has a significant impact on returns of various sectors. Sharabati (2013) 100 returns of industry as compared to the firm. Gabriel (2010) measured the impact of macroeconomic indicators on 101 the leasing industry. The result indicated that GDP generally had a positive relationship in all significant cases. 102

Yogaswari et al. (2012) found that the change in interest rate and inflation, giving negative impact to the stock price in the Jakarta Composite Index, agriculture sector, and basic industry sector. Zaighum (2014) studied the impact of a pre-specified set of macroeconomic factors on firm's stock returns for nine nonfinancial sectors listed in Karachi Stock Exchange. The results showed that all studied sectors firm's stock returns have a negative relationship with the consumer price index, money supply and risk free rate, whereas industrial production index and market returns indicates a positive relationship.

From the above studies we can conclude that inconsistent results were obtained with regards to which variables significantly affects Indian stock market behavior. Further, the study finds that there has been no study conducted while taking into account the effects of the sectoral GDP, along with other controlled macroeconomic variables on sectoral indices using the ARDL approach for any of the economy. Most of the past studies investigated the impact of macroeconomic factors on stock returns at the aggregate; therefore, the study attempts to fill this gap by exploring the effects of variations in sectoral GDP and other macroeconomic variables towards sectoral stock price indices in India with the help of quarterly time series data.

# <sup>116</sup> 4 III. Methodology and Data Description a) Model Specifica-<sup>117</sup> tion and Data

For the study, three models are framed, in which each of the sectoral stock price indices is placed as dependent 118 variable and Crude Oil Price, REER, T-bill rates, Trade openness and WPI along with respective sectoral 119 GDP worked as independent variables. The models are defined as: MANI = f (GMAN, CO, REER, TB, 120 TRADE, WPI)????.. Model I; EGWI = f (GEGW, CO, REER, TB, TRADE, WPI)????. Model II; SERI = f 121 (GSER, CO, REER, TB, TRADE, WPI)?????Model III Principal component analysis is used in this study to 122 123 construct the composite index of manufacturing index; electricity, gas and water supply index; and service index. 124 Manufacturing index has been formulated by incorporating automobile index, consumer durables index, capital 125 goods index, metal index and fast moving consumer goods index. Electricity, gas and water supply index has been formulated by incorporating oil and gas index and power sector index. Service index has been formulated 126 by incorporating bank index, health care index, IPO index, information technology index and Telecom, Media, 127 and Telecommunications index. All the three aggregate indexes were formulated following the guidelines of BSE. 128 The following general specification has been used in this study to empirically examine the effect of sectoral 129 GDP and other controlled macroeconomic factors on respective sectoral indices.???? = ?? 0 + ?? 1 ?? 1 + ?? 2130 ?? 2 + ?? 3 ?? 3 + ?? 4 ?? 4 + ?? 5 ?? 5 + ?? 6 ?? 6 + ?? ?? ?.. (1)131 Here, x is considered as the dependent variable (LMANI, LEGWI, and LSERI) and y 1 (LGMAN, LGEGW, 132

LGSER), y 2 (LCO), y 3 (LREER), y 4 (LTB), y 5 (LTRADE) and y 6 (LWPI) as the independent variables.
Where LMANI= Manufacturing index, LGMAN= manufacturing sector share in GDP, LEGWI= Electricity,
gas and water index, LGEGW= electricity, gas and water supply sector in GDP, LSERI= Service sector index,
LGSER= service sector share in GDP, LCO = Crude oil price, LREER= Real effective exchange rate, LTB=
T-bill rates taken as proxy for interest rates, LTRADE= Trade Openness, and LWPI= Wholesale price index
as a proxy for inflation variable in the general model specification above. All the indexes are listed on Bombay
Stock Exchange (BSE) i

The Study empirically estimated the effect of sectoral GDP and controlled macroeconomic variables on respective sectoral indices with the help of above described methodology in India. The study uses quarterly data covering the period from 2003:Q4 to 2014:Q4. The data has been taken and compiled from Handbook of Statistics on Indian economy, RBI; Economic Survey, Government of India; World Bank database; Official website of SEBI and BSE India.

145 . All the variables are taken in their natural logarithm.

#### <sup>146</sup> 5 b) Co-integration with ARDL

To empirically analyze the dynamic relationship of stock market sectoral indices with respective sectoral GDP and 147 macroeconomic fundamentals, the model specified in 3.1 has been estimated by the Auto Regressive Distributed 148 Lag (ARDL) co-integration procedure developed by Pesaran et al. ??2001). The procedure is adopted for four 149 reasons. Firstly, the bounds testing is simple as opposed to other multivariate cointegration technique such as 150 Johansen & Juselius (1990), it allows co-integrating relationship to be estimated by OLS once the lag order is 151 selected. Secondly, the bound test procedure does not require the pre testing of the variables included in the 152 model for unit root unlike other techniques such as Engle and Granger (1987) and Johansen & Juselius (1992). 153 These approaches require that all the variables to be integrated of the same order (I(1)). Otherwise the predictive 154 power will be lost ??Kim et al., 2004; ??erron, 1989 ??erron, , 1997)). However ARDL technique is applicable 155 156 irrespective of whether regressor in the model is I(0) or I(1). The procedure will, however crash in the presence of I(2) series. Thirdly, the test is relatively more efficient in small sample data sizes as is the case of this study. 157 Fourth the error correction method integrates the short-run dynamics with long-run equilibrium without losing 158 longrun information. The unrestricted error correction model (UECM) of ARDL model is used to examine the 159 long-run& the short-run relationship takes the following form: ??? = ?? 0 + ?? 1 ?? + ?? 2 ?? 1 ???1 + ?? 3 ??160  $2 ???1 +?? 4 ?? 3 ???1 +?? 5 ?? 4 ???1 +?? 6 ?? 5 ???1 +?? 7 ?? 6 ???1 +? ?? ?? <math>\hat{1}?" ?? ??=1 ?? ?????$ 161 162

163  $\delta$  ??" $\delta$  ??" ??  $\hat{1}$ ?" ?? ??=1 ?? 4 ????? + ? ?? ?? ?? =1 ??? 5 ????? + ? ?? ?? ?? ??=1 ??? 6 ????? + ?? ?? 164 ? (2)

Where the series is as defined earlier and T is time trend and L implies that the variables have been transformed in natural logs. The first part of the equation (??) with ?? 2, ?? 3, ?? 4, ?? 5, ?? 6 and?? 7 refer to the long-run coefficients and the second part with ??, ??, ??, ??, ?? , ?? ?? and ?? refers to the short-run coefficients. The null hypothesis of no co-integration H 0: ? 1 = ? 2 =? 3 = ? 4 = ? 5 = ?? 6 = ?? 7 = 0 and the alternative hypothesis H 1: ? 1 ? ? 2 ? ? 3 ? ? 4 ? ? 5 ? ?? 6 ? ?? 7 ? 0 implies co- integration among the series.

### <sup>171</sup> 6 c) ARDL Bounds Testing Approach

The first step in the ARDL test is to estimate the equation (??) by OLS in order to test for the existence of a 172 long-run relationship among variables by conducting an Wald test (F-statistics) for the joint significance of the 173 coefficients of the lagged levels of variables i.e. H 0 (Null hypothesis) as against H 1 (Alternative hypothesis) as 174 stated earlier. Then the calculated F-statistics is compared to the tabulated critical values in Pesaran ??2001). If 175 176 the computed F-values fall below the lower bound critical values, the null hypothesis of no cointegration cannot 177 be rejected. Contrary, if the computed F-statistics exceeds the upper bound, then it can be concluded that the variables are co-integrated. Further, if the calculated F-statistics fall in between upper and lower bounds, the 178 179 inference about cointegrating relationship is not confirmed.

The long-run and short-run dynamic relationship can be estimated on a cointegrating relationship has been established by the bounds test. The long-run cointegrating relationship can be estimated using the following specifications:??? = ?? 0 + ? ?? 1 ?? ??=1 ?? ???1 + ? ?? 2 ?? ??=1 ?? 1 ???1 + ? ?? 3 ?? ??=1 ?? 2 ???1 + ? ?? 4 ?? ??=1 ?? 3 ???1 + ? ?? 5 ?? ??=1 ?? 4 ???1 + ? ?? 6 ?? ??=1 ?? 5 ???1 + ? ?? 7 ?? ??=1 ?? 6 ???1 + ??? ?? ?? (3)

185 All the variables used are defined in section 3.1

The third and final step, we obtain the short-run dynamic parameters by estimating an error correction model with the long-run estimates. This is specified as below:??? = ?? + ? ?? ?? Î?" ?? ??=1 ?? ????? + ? ?? ?? Î?" ?? 1 ??=1 ?? 1 ????? + ? ?? ?? Î?" ?? 2 ??=1 ?? 2 ????? + ? ?? ?? Î?" ?? 3 ??=1 ?? 3 ????? + ? ð ??"ð ??" ?? Î?" ?? 4 ??=1 ?? 4 ????? + ? ?? ?? ?? 5 ??=1 ??? 5 ????? + ? ?? ?? 6 ??=1 ??? 6 ????? + ??????? 190 ???1 + ?? ?? ?. (4)

Where ??, ??, ??, ??, ð ??"ð ??", ?? and ?? are short-run dynamic coefficient to equilibrium and ?? is the speed adjustment coefficient.

#### <sup>193</sup> 7 d) VECM based Granger Causality Test

The direction of causality between stock market sectoral indices and respective sectoral GDP along with controlled 194 macroeconomic indicators is investigated by applying Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) granger causality 195 approach after confirming the presence of cointegrating relationship among the variables in the study. ??ranger 196 (1969) argued that VECM is more appropriate to examine the causality between the series at I (1). VECM is 197 restricted form of unrestricted VAR and restriction is levied on the presence of the long -run relationship between 198 the series. The system of error correction model (ECM) uses all the series endogenously. This system allows the 199 predicted values to explain itself both by its own lags and lags of forcing variables as well as the lags of the error 200 201 ?? ??? 3 ?? ??? 4 ?? ??? 5 ?? ??? 6 ?? ? ? ? ? = ? ? ??1 ??2 ??3 ??4 ??5 ??6 ??7 ? ? + ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? 202 11?? ?? 12?? ?? 13?? ?? 14?? ?? 15?? ?? 16?? ?? 17?? ?? 21?? ?? 22?? ?? 23?? ?? 24?? ?? 25?? ?? 26?? ?? 203 27?? ?? 31?? ?? 32?? ?? 33?? ?? 34?? ?? 35?? ?? 36?? ?? 37?? ?? 41?? ?? 42?? ?? 43?? ?? 44?? ?? 45?? ?? 204 46?? ?? 47?? ?? 51?? ?? 52?? ?? 53?? ?? 54?? ?? 55?? ?? 56?? ?? 57?? ?? 61?? ?? 62?? ?? 63?? ?? 64?? ?? 205 206 207 1 ?? 2 ?? 3 ?? 4 ?? 5 ?? 6 ?? 7 ? ? ? ? ? ? ?????? ???1 + ? ? ? ? ? ?? 1?? ?? 2?? ?? 3?? ?? 4?? ?? 5?? ?? 6?? 208 ?? 7?? ? ? ? ? ? ? . (5) 209

#### <sup>210</sup> 8 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

211 Volume XV Issue IX Version I Year 2015

#### <sup>212</sup> 9 (B)

The C's, ?'s and ?'s are the parameters to be estimated. ECM t-1 represents the one period lagged error-term derived from the co-integration vector and the ?'s are serially independent with mean zero and finite covariance matrix. From the Equation (5) given the use of a VAR structure, all variables are treated as endogenous variables. The F test is applied here to examine the direction of any causal relationship between the variables. The LGMAN variable does not Granger cause LMANI in the short-run, if and only if all the coefficients of ?12i's are not significantly different from zero in Equation (5). There are referred to as the short-run Granger causality test. The coefficients on the ECM represent how fast deviations from the long-run equilibrium are eliminated. Another channel of causality can be studied by testing the significance of ECM's. This test is referred to as the

221 long-run causality test.

222 IV.

#### 223 10 Estimation Results

# <sup>224</sup> 11 a) Stationarity test and Lag length selection before cointe-<sup>225</sup> gration

Before we conduct tests for co-integration, we have to make sure that the variables under consideration are not 226 integrated at an order higher than one. Thus, to test the integration properties of the series, we have used 227 Ng-Perron unit root test. The results of the stationarity tests are presented in Table 1. The results show that all 228 the variables are non-stationary at levels. The next step is to difference the variables once in order to perform 229 stationary tests on differenced variables. The results show that after differencing the variables once, all the 230 other variables were confirmed to be stationary. It is, therefore, worth concluding that all the variables used in 231 this study are integrated of order one, i.e. difference stationary I(1), except for LMANI, LGMAN, LGSER and 232 LWPI. Therefore the study uses autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) approach to cointegration. In addition, 233 it is also important to ascertain that the optimal lag order of the model is chosen appropriately so that the error 234 terms of the equations are not serially correlated. Consequently, the lag order should be high enough so that the 235 conditional ECM is not subject to over parameterization problems (Narayan, 2005; Pesaran 2001). The results 236 of these tests are presented in Table 2. The results of Table 2 suggest that the optimal lag length is one based 237 238 on SIC. After determining the order of integration of all the variables in table 1, the next step is to employ an ARDL approach to co-integration in order to determine the long-run relationship among the variables. By 239 applying, the procedure in OLS regression for the first difference part of the equation (??) and then test for the 240 joint significance of the parameters of the lagged level variables when added to the first regression. 241

The F-Statistics tests the joint Null hypothesis that the coefficients of lagged level variables in the equation ( 242 ??) are zero. Table 3, reports the result of the calculated F-Statistics & diagnostic tests of the estimated model. 243 The result shows the calculated Fstatistics were 9.4890, 10.3724 and 8.2299 for the model I, model II and model 244 III respectively. Thus the calculated F-statistics turns out to be higher than the upper-bound critical value at 245 the 5 percent level. This suggests that there is a co-integrating relationship among the variables included in the 246 models. The second step is to estimate the long-and short-run estimates of ARDL test. The long-run results are 247 illustrated in Table 4. The results of the model I show that the rise in LGMAN has a positive effect on LMANI. 248 It is evident from the table that 1% increase LGMAN leads to 0.345% increase in the LMANI. This is due to the 249 fact that with the rise in the manufacturing sector share in GDP, the expectations of investors increases, which 250 251 gives a motivation to investors to invest in the shares of manufacturing sector. The investment leads to rise in manufacturing index. 252

The results of the model II show that the rise in LGEGW and LWPI has a positive effect on LEGWI. The coefficient of LGEGW and LWPI are statistically significant and positive at 1% level. It is evident from the table that 1% increase in LGEGW and LWPI leads to 1.043% and 0.771% increase in LEGWI, respectively. The rationale behind this explains the Fisher hypothesis (1911) for inflation. And the rise in the electricity, gas and water supply sector share in GDP gives a boost to investors' confidence to invest in the shares of electricity, gas and water supply sector.

The results of the model III show that the rise in LGSER and LTB has a positive effect on service index. 259 The coefficient of LGSER and LTB are statistically significant and positive at 1% and 10% respectively. It is 260 evident from the table that 1% increase in LGSER and 10% increase in LTB leads to 0.5% and 0.065% increase 261 in the LSERI, respectively. The rationale behind this is the same as mentioned above for the rest two models for 262 the relation of service sector share in GDP and service index. The short-run relationship of the sectoral index 263 with respective sectoral GDP along with some controlled variables is presented in Table 5. As can be seen from 264 the table, for the model I LGMAN, LCO and LTRADE has a significant and positive impact on LMANI in the 265 shortrun at 1%, 1% and 5% level, respectively. 266

#### <sup>267</sup> 12 Indicators

For the model II, unlike the long-run result, LGEGW is not significant to LEGWI in the short-run. But LCO and LREER has a significant and positive impact on the LEGWI in the short-run at 1% level. Whereas, LWPI is negatively significant to LEGWI at the 1% level.

For the model III, LGSER, LCO and LTB has a significant and positive impact on LSERI in the short-run at 1%, 1% and 10% level, respectively. Whereas, LWPI is negatively significant to LSERI at the 10% level in the short-run.

The short-run adjustment process is examined from the ECM coefficient. The coefficient lies between 0 and -1, the equilibrium is converging to the long-run equilibrium path, is responsive to any external shocks. However, if the value is positive, the equilibrium will be divergent from the reported values of ECM test. The coefficient of

the lagged error-correction term (-0.333), (-0.318) and (-0.215) are significant at the 1% level of significance for

the model I, model II and model III, respectively. The coefficient implies that a deviation from the equilibrium

level of stock market index in the current period will be corrected by 33% for model I, 31% for model II and 280 21% for model III, in the next period to resort the equilibrium. The results of table 5(a) indicate that there is 281 causality running from LGMAN to LMANI in India, which shows that a change in manufacturing sector share 282 in GDP causes a change in manufacturing index. It is also observed that the error correction term is statistically 283 significant for specification with LMANI as the dependent variable which indicate that there exist a long-run 284 causal relationship among the variables with LMANI as the dependent variable.

The results of table 5 (Model II) indicate that there is causality running from LGEGW and LWPIto LEGWI in India, which shows that a change in electricity, gas and water supply sector share in GDP and the change in inflation causes a change in electricity, gas and water index. It is also observed that the error correction term is statistically significant for specification with LEGWI as the dependent variable which indicate that there exist a long-run causal relationship among the variables with LEGWI as the dependent variable. Estimation results show a unidirectional causality running from LEGWI to LTRADE.

The results of table 5 (Model III) indicate that there is no causality running from any of the variables to LSERI 291 in India. It is also observed that the error correction term is also not statistically significant for specification 292 with LSERI as the dependent variable which indicate that there exist no long-run causal relationship among the 293 variables with LSERI as the dependent variable. The robustness of the short-run result are investigated with the 294 295 help of diagnostic and stability tests. The ARDL-VECM model passes the diagnostic against serial correlation, 296 functional misspecification and non-normal error. The cumulative sum (CUSUM) and the cumulative sum of 297 square (CUSUMSQ) tests have been employed in the present study to investigate the stability of a long-run and short-run parameters. The cumulative sum (CUSUM) and the cumulative sum of square (CUSUMSQ) plots 298 (Figure ??) are between critical boundaries at 5% level of significance. This confirms the stability property of 299 long-run and short-run parameters which have an impact on the sectoral indices in case of India. This confirms 300 that models seem to be steady and specified appropriate. 301

# <sup>302</sup> 13 b) Variance Decomposition (VDC) Analysis

It is pointed out by Pesaran and Shin (2001) that the variable decomposition method shows the contribution in one variable due to innovation shocks stemming in the forcing variables. The variance decomposition indicates the amount of information each variable contributes to the other variables in the autoregression. It determines how much of the forecast error variance of each of the variables can be explained by exogenous shocks to the other variables. The main advantage of this approach as it is insensitive to the ordering of the variables. The results of the VDC for all the models are presented in table 6

#### 309 14 Conclusion

310 This paper aims to examine the relationship between gross domestic product and stock prices from a sectoral 311 perspective. Precisely, an effort has been made in this paper to investigate whether sectoral GDP, i.e. Manufacturing sector, electricity, gas and water supply sector and service sector share in GDP affect respective 312 313 sectoral stock indices in India or not. Towards this effort, quarterly data from 2003:Q3 to 2014:Q4 for all the variables included in the estimation has been used. The bounds test used for the study, confirms that there 314 exists a long-run co-integrating the relationship between sectoral GDP and sectoral stock indices in India. The 315 long-run estimates of ARDL test for model I showed that positive and significant relationship exists between the 316 manufacturing sector share in GDP with the manufacturing index. It also confirms that the manufacturing sector 317 share in GDP, crude oil price and trade openness have a significant and positive impact on the manufacturing 318 index in the short-run. For model II the results show that the electricity, gas and water supply sector share 319 320 in GDP and inflation has a positive effect on electricity, gas and water supply index, unlike short-run. Crude oil price and real effective exchange rate has a significant and positive impact on the electricity, gas and water 321 index in the short-run. For model III, results show that the service sector share in GDP and T-bills rate has a 322 positive effect on service sector index in the long-run and in short-run as well along with crude oil price. The 323 results suggest that sectoral indices are affected by changes in sectoral GDP in the long-run, whereas, all the 324 three indices are sensitive to the change in crude oil price in the short-run. The error correction model of ARDL 325 approach reveals that the adjustment process from the short-run deviation is high. More precisely, it is found 326 that the ECM t-1 term is (-0.333), (-0.318) and (-0.215). This term is significant at 1%, for the model I, model II 327 and model III, respectively, again confirming the existence of cointegration that the derivation from the long-run 328 equilibrium path is corrected 33%, 31% and 21%, respectively, per Quarter. 329

330 To determine the direction of causality VECM is used in the study and the result found unidirectional short-run 331 causality running from sectoral GDP, crude oil price, REER, T-bill rates, trade openness and WPI to respective 332 sectoral stock indices in India. Further, the result indicates the presence of long-run causality for the equation 333 with manufacturing index and electricity, gas and water supply index as the dependent variable, but, except for the service sector index which shows no long-run causality running from any of the independent variables. 334 The CUSUM and CUSUMSQ test results suggest the policy changes considering the explanatory variables of the 335 sectoral stock indices equations will not cause major distortions in India. To predict the long-run and short-run 336 shocks variance decomposition is used for the study, the result of VDC analysis, for all three models, show that 337 a major percentage of sectoral indices are its own innovative shocks. Other than the respective sectoral GDP, 338

crude oil price is a common variable which is playing a crucial role in explaining all three indices by contributing
its maximum towards the shock, hence, reflecting maximum information about the movement of the indices.

Sectoral analysis is a better approach for both investors as well as regulators. In a sectoral study the impact of macroeconomic factors is studied on various sectors. The performance of different sectors in same economic conditions is different. This gives an idea of risk diversification to investors and enables them to design well diversified portfolios. The relationship of sectoral GDP with respective sectoral indices is a matter of interest to investors, institutions, researchers and policy makers.

For the purpose of comparison, our paper used the same set of macroeconomic variables to test for the relationships on the Sector indices. It may be useful for future studies to include other economic variables that might affect each sector specifically. It is also recommended to work out for research that compares results with other developing countries' under similar assessment and measurement.

#### 350 15 Global Journal of

[Note: , Arodoye (2012), Fathi et al. (2012), Ray Sarbapriya (2012), Naik and Padhi (2012),]

#### Figure 1:

1

Variables	With constant a	Stationarity			
	Mza	MZt	MSB	MPT	Status
LMANI	0.448	0.296	0.659	30.823	I (1)
Î?"LMANI	-19.566	-3.127	0.159	1.252	
LEGWI	-0.719	-0.436	0.606	21.241	I (1)
Î?"LEGWI	-20.365	-3.188	0.156	1.212	
LSERI	-0.215	-0.093	0.434	15.519	I (1)
Î?"LSERI	-19.607	-3.125	0.159	1.268	
LGMAN	1.130	0.974	0.861	54.734	I (0)
Î?"LGMAN	-3.362	-1.280	0.380	7.274	
LGEGW	-1.168	-0.464	0.397	12.057	I (1)
Î?"LGEGW	-11.063	-2.339	0.211	2.261	
LGSER	1.757	1.549	0.881	63.651	I (0)
Î?"LGSER	-1.128	-0.698	0.619	19.702	
LCO	-1.445	-0.780	0.540	15.364	I (1)
Î?"LCO	-57.648	-5.265	0.091	0.669	
LREER	-5.578	-1.616	0.289	4.546	I (1)
Î?"LREER	-21.008	-3.240	0.154	1.168	
LTB	-2.450	-0.899	0.367	8.926	I (1)
Î?"LTB	-20.297	-3.178	0.156	1.232	
LTRADE	-3.771	-1.172	0.310	6.591	I (1)
Î?"LTRADE	-21.423	-3.272	0.152	1.146	
LWPI	0.353	0.198	0.560	23.773	I (0)
Î?"LWPI	-11.302	-2.374	0.210	2.179	

Source: Author's own Calculation by using E-views 8.0

? denotes the first difference of the series. L implies that the variables have been transformed in natural log

Figure 2: Table 1 :

2							
	Lag	gLogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SIC	HQ
Model I	4	802.81	758.391	l 5.33e-	-	-	-
				$21^{*}$	$29.259^{*}$	<sup>*</sup> 20.775	$26.169^{*}$
Model II	4	851.62	2662.032	24.92e-	-	-	-
				$22^{*}$	31.640*	<sup>e</sup> 23.156	$28.550^{*}$
Model III	4	839.18	380.389	99.03e-	-	-	-
				$22^{*}$	31.033*	<sup>*</sup> 22.549	27.943*
* indicates lag order selected by the	criterion						
LR: sequential modified LR test stat	tistic (each test at 5	% leve	l)				

FPE: Final prediction error

AIC: Akaike information criterion

SC: Schwarz information criterion

HQ: Hannan-Quinn information criterion

Figure 3: Table 2 :

3

[Note: Panel I: Bound testing to co-integration: Estimated Equation Model I : LMANI = F (LGMAN LCO LREER LTB LTRADE LWPI) Model II :LEGWI= F (LGEGW LCO LREER LTB LTRADE LWPI) Model III :LSERI = F (LGSER LCO LREER LTB LTRADE LWPI)]

Figure 4: Table 3 :

351 1 2

 $<sup>^1 \</sup>odot$  2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

 $<sup>^2 \</sup>odot$  2015 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1

		ARDL(1,0,0,0)				
Regressors	Model 1	[	Model II		Model III	
	Coeffici	enttvalues	Coefficient	t-	Coefficient	t-
				values		values
LGMAN	$0.345^{*}$	3.033	-	-	-	-
LGEGW	-	-	$1.043^{*}$	3.193	-	-
LGSER	-	-	-	-	$0.500^{**}$	2.164
LCO	-0.032	-0.555	-0.027	-	-0.117	-
				0.340		1.334
LREER	0.052	0.471	0.087	0.515	0.099	0.753
LTB	0.031	1.042	0.052	0.896	$0.065^{***}$	1.713
LTRADE	0.116	1.606	0.052	0.603	0.134	1.504
LWPI	-0.158	-1.609	$0.771^{*}$	8.434	-0.431	-
						1.643
CONS	-0.502	-0.560	3.411	3.538	-1.619	-
						0.876
		Robustness Indica-				
		tors				
R 2		0.972	0.995		0.974	
Adjusted R 2		0.966	0.993		0.9690	
F Statistics		157.369	636.710		169.075	
D.W. Stat		2.971	-0.802		2.297	
Serial Correlation	n, F	6.120  [0.190]	$9.201 \ [0.056]$		$6.067 \ [0.194]$	
Heteroskedasticit	y, F	$0.240 \ [0.624]$	0.008  [0.926]		$0.018\ [0.891]$	
Ramsey reset tes	t, F	$11.464 \ [0.001]$	$1.315 \ [0.251]$		$6.109\ [0.013]$	

## (Dependent variable: LMANI, LEGWI, LSERI)

[Note: Note:(1) The lag order of the model is based on Schwarz Bayesian Criterion (SBC).(2) \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level of significance, respectively. Values in [#] are probability values.]

#### Figure 5: Table 3 :

#### $\mathbf{4}$

Regressors	Model I		Model II		Model III		
U U	Coefficient	t-values	Coefficient	t-values	Coefficient	t-values	
Î?"LGMAN	$0.115^{*}$	2.744	-	-	-	-	
Î?"LGEGW	-	-	-0.181	-0.708	-	-	
Î?"LGSER	-	-	-	-	$0.107^{*}$	2.801	
Î?"LCO	$0.047^{*}$	3.520	$0.082^{*}$	2.668	$0.039^{*}$	3.455	
Î?"LREER	0.017	0.449	$0.239^{*}$	2.640	0.021	0.731	
Î?"LTB	0.010	1.012	0.016	1.040	$0.014^{***}$	1.737	
Î?"LTRADE	$0.038^{**}$	1.943	0.016	0.639	0.028	1.618	
Î?"LWPI	-0.052	-1.474	-1.354*	-3.864	-0.092***	-1.863	
CONS	-0.167	-0.574	1.087	1.747	-0.348	-1.070	
ECM t-1	-0.333	-2.860	-0.318	-2.373	-0.215	-2.313	

Figure 6: Table 4 :

3

 $\mathbf{5}$ 

# Figure 7: Table 5 :

 $\mathbf{5}$ 

Dependent variable Sources of Causation

Long-

Short-run independent variables

Model I	Î?"LMAN	NÎ?"LGMA	NŶ?"LCO	Î?"LREEF	₹Î?"LTB	Î?"LTRAI	DʔLWPI	run ECM (t- 1)
Î?"LMANI	-	-2.200**	0.126	-0.300	-0.889	0.916	-1.375	$-2.724^{*}$
Î?"LGMAN	-0.028	-	-0.659	0.594	-1.211	-0.208	-0.458	0.310
Î?"LCO	-0.647	1.090	-	-1.132	-0.938	-0.605	-3.148*	-0.883
Î?"LREER	-0.132	1.756***	-0.714	-	0.423	-	0.277	-0.832
						1.824***		
Î?"LTB	-0.787	2.010**	0.813	0.276	-	-0.072	0.365	-3.025*
Î?"LTRADE	-0.136	0.407	$2.357^{**}$	0.388	-1.310	-	-1.382	0.550
Î?"LWPI	-0.210	-0.693	$2.951^{*}$	0.113	-0.491	-1.327	-	-0.471
Model II	Î?"LEGWIÎ?"LGEGŴ?"LCO			Î?"LREEF	R Î?"LTB	Î?"LTRAI		
Î?"LEGWI	-	1.704***	0.492	0.289	0.441	1.074	-	-5.428*
							1.752***	
Î?"LGEGW	-1.594	-	-2.739*	-2.187**	-1.452	-1.470	-0.411	2.066
Î?"LCO	-1.177	-0.674	-	-0.379	-0.373	0.031	-2.917*	0.170
Î?"LREER	0.358	0.393	-0.645	-	-0.133	-1.499	0.242	-1.013
Î?"LTB	0.914	-0.246	1.118	0.493	-	0.426	0.472	-
								1.827***
Î?"LTRADE	-	-0.179	$2.330^{**}$	1.142	0.039	-	-	1.663
	1.893***						1.803***	
Î?"LWPI	-0.900	-0.420	$3.013^{*}$	0.691	0.761	-0.361	-	2.147
Model III	Î?"LSERI	Í Î?"LGSR	Î?"LCO	Î?"LREEF	R Î?"LTB	Î?"LTRAI	DÊ?"LWPI	
Î?"LSERI	-	-0.873	0.004	0.217	-1.296	0.659	-0.444	-0.425
Î?"LGSER	-0.119	-	-0.378	-0.223	-1.585	-0.043	0.584	-1.943**
Î?"LCO	-0.439	-0.138	-	-1.189	-0.928	0.044	-3.051	0.757
Î?"LREER	0.678	0.884	-0.579	-	0.508	-1.671	0.388	-0.205
Î?"LTB	0.092	$2.437^{**}$	0.198	0.646	-	-0.423	-0.602	-3.343*

Figure 8: Table 5 (

Period	S.E.	LMANI	LGMAN	LCO	LREER	LTB	LTRADE	LWPI
Model								
Ι								
1	0.015	100.000	0.000	0.000	0.0000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5	0.032	54.845	19.741	22.374	0.008	0.152	2.768	0.109
10	0.037	42.114	26.777	24.579	0.661	1.754	2.831	1.280
15	0.038	39.632	26.223	23.481	1.852	3.000	2.899	2.909
Model		LEGWI	LGEGW	LCO	LREER	LTB	LTRADE	LWPI
II								
1	0.013	100.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5	0.034	47.809	7.994	34.810	2.143	1.822	5.132	0.287
10	0.043	36.389	5.477	43.123	3.235	3.626	7.956	0.191
15	0.045	35.229	5.211	43.321	3.283	3.974	8.746	0.233
Model		LSERI	LGSER	LCO	LREER	LTB	LTRADE	LWPI
III								
1	0.012	100.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
5	0.027	51.364	13.502	33.333	0.611	0.925	0.003	0.259
10	0.033	36.791	19.070	39.573	0.501	1.905	0.035	2.122
15	0.034	34.453	18.052	38.538	0.633	3.096	0.390	4.835
		Cholesky Orderin	g: LSERI L	GSER LCO	) LREER I	TB LTRA	DE LWPI	
V.								

Figure 9: Table 6 :

45.	
Year 2015	Year 2015
26	
Volume XV Issue IX Version I	
( B )	(B)
Global Journal of Management and Business Research	

[Note: i]

6

Figure 10:

- [Hancocks ()] An Analysis of the Influence of Domestic Macroeconomic Variables on the Performance of South
   African Stock Market Sectoral Indices. Doctoral dissertation, Hancocks . 2011. Rhodes University
- [Arodoye and Liberty ()] 'An econometric analysis of the impact of macroeconomic variables on stock prices in
- Nigeria: a Vector Autoregressive (VAR) model approach'. Nosakhare Arodoye, Liberty. International Review
   of Business and Social Sciences 2012. 1 p. .
- [Sahu ()] 'An empirical study on the dynamic relationship between oil prices and Indian stock market'. Sahu .
   Managerial Finance 2014. 40 p. .
- [Daferighe and Aje ()] 'An impact analysis of real gross domestic product, inflation and interest rate on stock
   prices of quoted companies in Nigeria'. E E Daferighe, S O Aje. International Research Journal of Finance
   and Economics 2009. 25 p. .
- [Mazuruse ()] 'Canonical correlation analysis: Macroeconomic variables versus stock returns'. P Mazuruse .
   Journal of Financial Economic Policy 2014. 6 p. .
- [Maysami et al. ()] 'Co-movement among sectoral stock market indices and cointegration among dually listed
   companies'. Maysami , & Loo , Koh . Jurnal Pengurusan 2004. 23 p. .
- [Sun Brannman ()] 'Cointegration and comovement of SES sector prices indices'. Sun & Brannman . Working
   *Paper Series* 1994. p. .
- [Miller and Ratti ()] 'Crude oil and stock markets: Stability, instability, and bubbles'. & Miller , Ratti . Energy
   *Economics* 2009. 31 p. .
- [Nurudeen ()] Does stock market development raise economic growth? Evidence from Nigeria. The Review of
   Finance and Banking, Abu Nurudeen . 2009. 1 p. .
- Mukherjee ()] 'Dynamic relations between macroeconomic variables and the Japanese stock market: An application of a vector error correction model'. Naka Mukherjee . Journal of Financial Research 1995. 18
   p. .
- Sharma ()] 'Dynamics analysis between the US Stock Return and the Macroeconomics Variables'. Ratanapako rnand Sharma . Applied Financial Economics 2007. 17 p. .
- [Zaheer ()] 'Economic Forces and Stock Market Returns: A Cross Sectoral Study testing Multi Factor Model'.
   Zaheer . World Applied Sciences 2009. 9 p. .
- [Chen ()] 'Economic forces and the stock market'. Chen . Journal of Business 1986. 59 p. .
- 380 [Fama ()] 'Efficient capital markets: II'. Fama . The Journal of Finance 1991. 46 p. .
- Bencivenga ()] 'Equity markets, transaction costs and capital accumulation: An illustration'. Bencivenga. World
   Bank Economic Review 1996. 10 p. .
- [Fathi ()] 'Examining the Effect of Selective Macroeconomic Variables on the Stock Exchange's Depth and
   Breadth (Case Study: Tehran Stock Exchange)'. Saeed Fathi . International Journal of Economics and
   *Finance* 2012. 4 p. .
- [Ram ()] 'Financial development and economic growth: additional evidence'. Ram . Journal of Development
   Studies 1999. 35 p. .
- [Singh ()] 'Financial liberalization, stock markets and economic development'. Singh . The Economic Journal
   1997. 107 p. .
- [Raza ()] 'Foreign capital inflows, economic growth and stock market capitalization in Asian countries: an ARDL
   bounds testing approach'. Raza . 10.1007/s11135-012-9774-4. Qual Quant 2012.
- [Saeed ()] 'Impact of Macro Economic Factors on the returns of Oil and Gas Sector in Pakistan'. S Saeed .
   *International Journal of Contemporary Business Studies* 2012. 3 p. .
- [Rafique ()] 'Impact of Macroeconomic Variables on Stock Market Index (A Case of Pakistan)'. Rafique . Elixir
   *Finance Management* 2013. 57 p. .
- <sup>396</sup> [Devereux ()] 'International risk sharing and economic growth'. Smith Devereux . International Economic Review
   <sup>397</sup> 1994. 35 p. .
- Rahman ()] 'Macroeconomic Determinants of Malaysian Stock Market'. Rahman . African Journal of Business
   Management 2009. 3 p. .
- Hsing and Budden ()] 'Macroeconomic Determinants of the Stock Market Index for a Major Latin American
   Country and Policy Implications'. Yu Hsing , Michael Budden . Business and Economic Research 2012. 2 p. .
- [Nishat ()] Macroeconomic Factors and Pakistani Equity Market. The Pakistan Development Review, Shaheen
   Nishat . 2004. 43 p. .
- 404 [Chinzara ()] 'Macroeconomic uncertainty and conditional stock market volatility in South Africa\*'. Chinzara .
- 405 South African Journal of Economics 2011. 79 p. .

#### 15 GLOBAL JOURNAL OF

- [Gabriel ()] Measuring the Impact of Macroeconomic Indicators On the leasing Industry, Gabriel . 2010. p. .
   (Economic Thesis)
- 408 [Jones and Kaul ()] 'Oil and the stock markets'. & Jones, Kaul. The journal of Finance 1996. 51 p. .
- 409 [Basher ()] 'Oil prices, exchange rates and emerging stock markets'. Basher . Energy Economics 2012. 34 p. .
- [Ta and Teo ()] 'Portfolio diversification across industry sectors'. & Ta , Teo . Securities Industry Review 1985.
  11 p. .
- [Alam Uddin ()] 'Relationship between interest rate and stock price: empirical evidence from developed and
   developing countries'. Alam & Uddin . International journal of business and management 2009. 4 p. .
- [Maysami ()] 'Relationship between macroeconomic variables and stock market indices: Cointegration evidence
   from stock exchange of Singapore's All-S sector indices'. Maysami . Jurnal Pengurusan 2004. 24 p. .
- [Toda ()] 'Statistical Inference in Vector Auto regressions with Possibly Integrated processes'. Yamamoto Toda
   Journal of Econometrics 1995. 66 p. .
- [Levine Zervos ()] 'Stock market development and long-run growth'. Levine & Zervos . World Bank Economic
   *Review* 1996. 10 p. .
- [Zervos ()] 'Stock markets, banks and economic growth'. Levineand Zervos . The American Economic Review
   1998. 88 p. .
- 422 [Strauss ()] 'Stock prices and domestic and international macroeconomic activity: a cointegration approach'.
   423 Nassehand Strauss . Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance 2000. 40 p. .
- 424 [Carlstrom (2002)] Stock Prices and Output Growth: An Examination of the Credit Channel, Carlstrom . 2002.
   425 2002. August 15. Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
- 426 [Fama ()] 'Stock returns, expected returns, and real activity'. Fama. The Journal of Finance 1990. 45 p. .
- 427 [Fama ()] 'Stock returns, real activity, inflation and money'. Fama . American Economic Review 1981. 71 p. .
- [Ray ()] 'Testing Granger Causal Relationship between Macroeconomic Variables and Stock Price Behaviour:
   Evidence from India'. Ray . Advances in Applied Economics and Finance 2012. 3 p. .
- Yogaswari ()] 'The Effect of Macroeconomic Variables on Stock Price Volatility: Evidence from Jakarta
   Composite Index, Agriculture, and Basic Industry Sectors'. Yogaswari . International Proceedings of
   Economics Development and Research 2012. 46 p. .
- 433 [Padhi ()] 'The Impact of Macroeconomic Fundamentals on Stock Prices Revisited: Evidence from Indian Data'.
  434 Naikand Padhi . Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics 2012. 5 p. .
- [Adaramola ()] 'The impact of macroeconomic indicators on stock prices in Nigeria'. Adaramola . Developing
   *Country Studies* 2011. 1 p. .
- <sup>437</sup> [Sharabati ()] 'The Relationship between Amman Stock Exchange (ASE) Market and Real Gross Domestic
   <sup>438</sup> Product (GDP)'. Sharabati . European Journal of Business and Management 2013. 5 p. .