



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Non-Linearities in the relation between
oil price, gold price and stock market
returns in Iran: a multivariate
regime-switching approach**

Mamipour, Siab and Vaezi Jezeie, Fereshteh

University of Kharazmi, Economic Department, Tehran, Iran

10 June 2015

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/66202/>
MPRA Paper No. 66202, posted 25 Aug 2015 06:13 UTC

Non-Linearities in the Relation between Oil Price, Gold Price and Stock Market Returns in Iran: a Multivariate Regime-Switching Approach

Siab Mamipour* (PhD)

Assistant Professor in Economics, University of Kharazmi, Economic Department, Tehran, Iran

Email: mamipours@gmail.com

Fereshteh Vaezi Jezeie

MSc Student of Economic and Social Systems, University of Kharazmi, Economic Department, Tehran, Iran

Email: f.vaezi.92@gmail.com

Abstract

Iran Stock Exchange is the most important component of Iran capital market and more attention has been paid to it in recent years. Many factors affect the Iran stock exchange. In this paper, the effects of oil price and gold price on stock market index are investigated and a three regime Markov Switching Vector Error Correction model is used to examine the nonlinear properties model during the period January 2003 to December 2014. The results of the study shows that the relationships between variables can be analyzed in three different status, so that the three regimes, respectively, represents the “great depression”, “mild depression” and “expansion” period. The results of the model show that the impact of oil price on stock returns is negative and significant in all three regimes; this means that with rising oil price, stock market returns are reduced. But the relationship between gold price and stock market returns varies during the period, according to market conditions. It means that positive shock inflicted on the price of gold in the short-run (10 months) leads to reduce the stock returns and in the medium-term and long-run, it leads to increase the stock returns.

Keywords: Stock Market Price, Oil Price, Gold Price, Markov Switching-Vector Error Correction Model (MS-VECM)

JEL Classification: E32, E37, C32, G17

* corresponding author

1. Introduction

The stock market in economy is known as an organized and official market of capital and its most important task is mobilization and allocation of financial resources and turning them into capital. Achieving the desired economic growth and development without long-run financial resource mobilization is impossible. Yet, one of the main characteristics of developing countries is that they suffer from fragmentation and scarcity of savings and capital and the capital is not being conducted to optimum routes of production. Thus, it is necessary to form a strong and efficient capital markets in order to optimize the circulation of financial resources and conduct them to optimum routes of economy (Dimson, 1988).

One of the important components of capital market is the stock exchange. The existence philosophy of capital market and also stock market is that they transfer funds from sector with surplus to funds from sectors in need of cash. If the sectors invest the funds in producing the capital, it is expected to be added to the wealth of society. Accordingly, increase the returns of capital markets is the primary objective of market policy makers and legislators (Barvch, 1998). It has been argued that the most common method for making investment decision in the stock market is study and awareness of the stock price trend. Stock price index shows the general trend of the stock market moves. In fact, the degree of capital market success or failure is detected according to the trend. Thus, portfolio managers and other natural and legal persons who deal with stock trading and other financial assets in the market need various factors affecting the stock price under different economic conditions, in order to maintain and increase their value of portfolio.

Several factors affect the returns of the stock exchange. One of the affecting factors is oil price. Oil and its products are used as the main source of energy in manufacturing processes in the world; thus, volatilities in oil price can affect the cost of production and profitability of production companies. Oil is the most important source of income for some exporting countries and through this, its price and volatilities can affect natural sector and also the capital market, so that in many countries with poor management of oil revenues, oil prices is coupled with an increase in government revenue and monetary base and has the inflation effects. Rising inflation will have a positive effect on the stock price.

Iran has 11 percent of world oil reserves and is the second largest producer in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Based on the time series data of the central bank of the Islamic republic of Iran, 80 to 90 percent of total export revenue and 40 to 50 percent of the annual government budget come from oil exports. In addition, the sale of oil is over 20 percent of GDP of Iran; so Iran's economy is largely dependent on exports of crude oil. Shocks in world oil markets can have a great impact on the economic structure of Iran. Another factor affecting the capital markets is the price of gold. Gold is considered as the most important world monetary standard and most is used in coins and gold bullion as an international monetary reserve. Gold metal is considered as a national capital and economic support, thus informing on statistics of prices, production, storage, etc. of the expensive metal in Iran compared to other countries is useful and even necessary in order to better planning for the extraction and use of it. From the

economic point of view, gold can be considered strategic because it is a monetary support and plays a great role in world markets.

Depression and expansion of stock exchange is affecting not only the national but also the global economy. It is clear that depression and expansion of stock exchange may be caused by many factors in the economy. If the market does not have a logical relationship with other sectors, problems and shortcomings will be in its performance. As a powerful exogenous variable, the world oil price would affect many macroeconomic variables such as stock price index. On the other hand, the world gold price as an important variable is also representing many of the international monetary and financial developments.

Therefore, the main problem of this study is that what is the effect of oil and gold price on the stock market due to their interaction with exogenous volatilities and how is the effect on stock market conditions?

2. Literature Review

Several studies have been done on the relationships between different markets (gold, oil and capital) which can be presented in different categories. It has been tried to classify and present the studies based on result analysis method, namely linear and nonlinear time series methods.

All The studies done by Papapetrou (2001), Maghyereh (2004), Park and Ratti (2008), Fiad and Dolly (2011) and MohdHussin and et al. (2013) have used vector auto regression method (VAR) on the markets of stock, oil and in some cases gold in different countries. The results have been interpreted in the following.

Papapetrou (2001) shows that oil price affect real activities of Greece's economy and employment, while no evidence of relationship between oil prices and stock returns can be found. Maghyereh (2004) tested the dynamic relationship between crude oil price and stock returns in twenty-two emerging market economies. She showed that oil price shocks do not have significant impact on the stock index returns.

Park and Ratti (2008) studied the oil market price volatilities on key financial variables such as stock prices in the United States and thirteen developed countries. The results of their studies indicate that there is statistically a significant relationship between oil price volatility and stock index in the mentioned markets. However, type of the relationship depends on countries whether they are exporter or importer and this is evident with regard to the short time period of one month. Fiad and Dolly (2011) compared the effect of oil price shocks on the stock returns in GCC countries, America and the UK. They have concluded that the predictive power of oil price in the stock market has been increased after a rise in oil price during the global crisis and the response to oil price shocks in the global crisis period has increased. Qatar and the UAE among GCC countries and the UK responded more to the shocks than other countries in this study and finally Mohd Hussin and et al. (2013) by using vector auto regression calculation (VAR), applying correlation analysis, Granger causality test, Impulse Response Function (IRF) and Variance decomposition (VDC) on the strategic goods (i.e. oil and gold price) and the stock market in Malaysia, showed that the stock returns do not have integrated correlation with

strategic goods in the long run. According to Granger causality, it was observed that the two-way causality relationship is only between stock returns and oil price. So only oil price variables among the strategic goods will affect stock returns in the short-run in Malaysia. This proves that the gold price is not a valid variable to predict the stock price changes.

The non-linear methods have been used in all the studies done by Maghyereh and Al-Kandari (2007), Arouri and Fouquau (2009), Arouri and et al (2010), Nguyena and Bhatti (2012) and MansoorBaig and Shahbaz (2013), on the markets of stock, oil and in some cases gold in different countries. The results have been interpreted in the following.

Maghyereh and Al-Kandari (2007) studied the relationship between oil price and stock markets in Arabic countries located around the Persian Gulf and used the non-linear correlation analysis and error correction mechanism in their studies. They showed that in the mentioned countries, oil price will affect the index of stock prices in the long-run but the relationship is non-linear. Arouri and Fouquau (2009) examined short-run relationships between oil price and stock markets of Arabic countries located around the Persian Gulf, by using nonparametric Kernel regression method with the Gaussian Kernel. The result is that the relationship between stock returns and oil price in Qatar, Oman and United Arabic Emirates is nonlinear and there is asymmetry between changes of oil price and stock returns in these countries. They did not find a significant relationship in other Arabic countries in the Persian Gulf region. Afterward in 2010, Arouri and et al. studied the stock market responses of Arabic countries in the Persian Gulf region to volatilities of the oil price. They showed that the stock market returns significantly respond to oil price volatilities in Qatar, Oman, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Moreover, the relationship between the oil price and stock market in the countries is non-linear and depend on the oil price. However, the significant relationships were not seen between mentioned variables in Bahrain and Kuwait. Also Nguyena and Bhatti (2012) studied the relationship between the oil price and stock market in China and Vietnam by using copula functions and parametric and nonparametric methods. They found that there is tail dependence between oil world price and stock market index of Vietnam; however this relationship has the opposite result for stock market of China. Finally, MansoorBaig and Shahbaz (2013) studied the relationship between the oil price, gold price and stock market returns of Karachi in Pakistan and concluded that there is not a significant relationship between gold price growth, oil price growth and stock market returns of Karachi in the long-run.

3. Data

The monthly index data in this study is taken from Iran's stock market and then transform into the natural logarithms to examine the economic relationship between oil price (LnOil) and gold price (LnGold) effect on Stock market returns (LnStock). The sample size of the study is 144 observations that are start from January 2003 until December 2014. The study structure was a quantitative approach and several steps are undergo before applied MS-VECM on examine the economic relationship model.

Figure (1) shows the diagrams of logarithm values of the oil price (OPEC basket oil (dollars)), gold price (World Gold ounces (dollars)) and the stock price (total index of stock exchange) in Iran. As it can be seen, the diagram related to the total index of stock has volatility and reached its peak in December 2013 and its minimum in March 2003. The diagram related to the oil price has a lot of volatilities and these volatilities are more tangible during July 2008 (peak) to December 2008. The diagram related to the gold price approximately kept its upward trend until September 2011 and afterward has started to decline.




Figure 1: the variables in level

Figure (2) shows the diagrams of logarithm values of the stock price, oil price and gold price after taking the first differencing process. The diagram of stock market returns shows a lot of volatilities, as the maximum returns were in July 2003 and the minimum was in December 2008. Also the diagram related to oil price shows the maximum amount of changing in June 2009 and minimum in October 2008 and finally the diagram related to gold price shows the maximum positive change in August 2011 and the minimum negative change in June 2006.




Figure 2: the variables in first differencing

4. Econometrics Method: MS-VECM

Various time series models are used to analyze the behavior of economic and financial variables. Linear models such as Auto Regression model (AR), Moving Averages (MA) and their combination means the (ARMA) model are the common models which are used. Although these

linear models in many cases are good fitting, but they are not able to illustrate non-linear dynamic patterns of variables due to their ability to detect asymmetry (including structural break in time series). Thus, non-linear models are presented.

Recently, Markov Switching model (MS) has increasingly been used in international studies and is one of the popular models of nonlinear time series. This model consists of multiple structures which can check the behavior of the time series of different regimes. A new form of Markov Switching model is the conversion and transmission mechanisms between different structures and regimes which are controlled by invisible status variable which is following the Markov first order chain. The main form of regime shift model is changing all or some of the parameters based on Markov processes in different conditions or regimes. Different situations are shown by invisible variable. The logic of this kind of modeling is the combination of different distribution with different characteristics. The current value of variables is extract from this model, according to the more probable state (invisible) which is determined by observation.

The Markov switching model was introduced by Quandt (1972), Goldfeld and Quandt (1973) for the first time and then, was developed for the extraction of business cycles by Hamilton (1989). Unlike other nonlinear methods such as Artificial Neural Network (ANN) and Smooth Transition Autoregressive (STAR) which the transition from one regime to another is a gradual switching, in Markov model sudden switching is done.

Also vector auto regression method is one of the methods used in studying the relationships among economic variables. One of the disadvantages of the method is it assumes that all the variables considered in the model are stationary, but in fact they are not. When all variables or one of them are not stationary, vector error correction model could be a good alternative for vector auto regression model. Vector error correction model (VECM) relates the short-run volatilities of variables to the long-run equilibrium values and considers short-run dynamic response of variables. Vector error correction model is a model for linking the short-run to long-run relationships based on VAR model with the convergence characteristics.

When the series are non-stationary in levels and cointegrated, a bivariate vector error correction model (VECM) of order p can be used to jointly modeling rates behavior. Formally:

$$\Delta y_t = \nu + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \Pi y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

Where $y_t = [\text{LnStock} \ \text{LnOil} \ \text{LnGold}]'$ is a three-dimensional vector of Stock, Oil and Gold Market; LnStock is the natural logarithm of total price index differential as stock market return; LnOil represent the oil price differential and LnGold is the gold price differential. Γ_i is 3×3 autoregressive short-run parameters matrices and Π is the long-run impact matrix, whose rank r determines the number of cointegrating vectors. In the bivariate case, Π can be partitioned into a 3×1 vector β of long-coefficients, representing the long-run relationship between variables, and a 3×1 vector α containing the equilibrium correction (speed of adjustment) coefficients ($\Pi = \alpha\beta'$).

Model (1) assumes that the relationships between stock market, gold and oil price rates are symmetric and linear. Stock market return series are characterized by occasional jumps or structural changes in their levels or volatility. The presence of important discrete economic events induces substantial non-linearities in the stochastic process and distorts inference if it is not appropriately modelled. However, most of studies adopt a deterministic approach, which consists in identifying structural breaks in the series and modelling these shifts by augmenting the empirical specification with an appropriate set of dummy variables or by conducting split sample analyses (Blot and Labondance, 2011; Panagopoulos and Spiliotis, 2012). When regime shifts are stochastic rather than deterministic, these approaches may lead to biased or at least inefficient results (Dahlquist and Gray, 2000; Clarida et al., 2006). In such cases, a multivariate generalization of the univariate Markov-switching (MS) model proposed by Hamilton(1989) represents a viable alternative to allow for stochastic behavioural changes. Multivariate generalized Markov switching model is introduced by Krolzig (1997) as Markov Switching-Vector Error Correction Model (MS-VECM) and is related to the concept of multiple equilibriums in dynamic economic theory.

According to Krolzig study (1996), a Markov Switching-Vector Error Correction Model (MS-VECM) in the form of equation (2) is a model with regime dependent parameters:

$$\Delta y_t = v(s_t) + \alpha(s_t) [\beta' x_{t-1} - \gamma t] + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i(s_t) \Delta y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (2)$$

The model is related to the concept of multiple equilibriums in dynamic economic theory. From now on, every regime which is defined by a system with the phrase $\delta(s_t)$ and long-run equilibrium $\eta(s_t)$, would be determined in the form of equation (3):

$$\Delta y_t - \delta(s_t) = \alpha [\beta' y_{t-1} - \eta(s_t) - \gamma t] + \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i [\Delta y_{t-k} - \delta(s_t)] + u_t \quad (3)$$

In the model, it is assumed that a regime which is occurs in t time, is invisible and depends on (s_t) an invisible process.

To complete the model, characteristics of s_t process should be identified. s_t in the Markov switching model is considered as a first degree Markov process. This assumption reflects the fact that s_t only depends on last period regime, means s_{t-1} . In the following, we would complete the model by introducing the equation (4) the transition probabilities from one state to another one:

$$\Pr = [s_t = j | s_{t-1} = i, s_{t-2} = k, \dots; y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, \dots] = \Pr [s_t = j | s_{t-1} = i] = p_{ij} \quad (4)$$

Transition between regimes can be shown by transition probability matrix. For example, the matrix is in the form of equation (5) for a two-regime model:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \Pr(s_t = 1 | s_{t-1} = 1) & \Pr(s_t = 2 | s_{t-1} = 1) \\ \Pr(s_t = 1 | s_{t-1} = 2) & \Pr(s_t = 2 | s_{t-1} = 2) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} \\ p_{21} & p_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

In equation (5), $p_{ij}(i, j = 1, 2)$ shows the probability of transition from $s_t = j$, assuming $s_{t-1} = i$

and $p_{i1} + p_{i2} = 1$.

The MS-VECM model allows all the variables in it to be shocked, in the context of the model. When the system is affected by the regime transition, impulse response is checked by considering the transition of variables of dependent on VAR feature regime and hidden Markov chain. Impulse responses are often used in examining the relationship between the dynamic model variables. So that the ultimate impact of impulse on the system is being followed over time.

In Krolzig and Toro (1999) study, at first MS(M) -VECM(P-1) model is considered in the form of equation (6) to analysis the impulse response in Markov switching model:

$$\Delta y_t = M \xi_t + \alpha \beta' y_{t-1} + \Gamma_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + \Gamma_{p-1} y_{t-p+1} + u_t \quad (6)$$

In equation (6): $M = [1 : \dots : M]$. MS(M)-VAR(P) model corresponded to equation (6) is in the form of equation (7).

$$y_t = M \xi_t + A_1 y_{t-1} + A_p y_{t-p} + u_t \quad (7)$$

In equation (7), $A_j = \Gamma_j - \Gamma_{j-1}$ and $A_1 = I_k + \alpha \beta' + \Gamma_1$ for $A_j = \Gamma_j - \Gamma_{j-1}$ and $1 < j < p$ are equal to $\Gamma_p = 0_k$. A show of MS(M)-VAR(1) accumulated with a process of MS(M)-VAR(P) is used to calculate the impulse response function. By considering $y_t = (y'_t, \dots, y'_{t-p+1})'$ equation (7) is rewritten as equation (8):

$$y_t = H \xi_t + J A y_{t-1} + u_t \quad (8)$$

The state-space representation is completed in the form of equation (9) by the VAR(1) representation of the Markov chain (Hamilton, 1994):

$$\xi_{t+1} = F \xi_t + v_t \quad (9)$$

In equation (9), ξ_t is the unobservable ($M \times 1$) state vector consisting of the indicator variables $I(S_t = m)$ for $m = 1, \dots, M$; Hence the expectation of y_{t+h} conditional upon $\{u_t, \xi_t, y_{t-1}\}$ is given by equation (10):

$$y_{t+h|t} = H \xi_{t+h|t} + J A y_{t+h-1|t} \quad (10)$$

In equation (10), conditional expectation of ξ_{t+h} is as equation (11):

$$\xi_{t+h|t} = F^h \xi_t \quad (11)$$

According to equation (11), impulse response analyses (response of system to normal shifts in variables) of linear VAR models are as equation (12):

$$\frac{\partial y_{t+h}}{\partial u_{jt}} = J A^h t_j \quad (12)$$

In equation (12), t_j is the j th column of the identity matrix. If variance-covariance matrix Σ_u is regime-dependent the standardized and orthogonalized impulse-responses also become regime-dependent:

$$\frac{\partial y_{t+h}}{\partial u_{jt}} = JA^h D(\xi_t) \iota_j \quad (13)$$

In equation (13), $u_t = D(\xi_t)\varepsilon_t$ and $D(\xi_t)$ is a lower triangular matrix resulting from Choleski decomposition of $\Sigma u(\xi_t) = D(\xi_t)D(\xi_t)'$

5. Empirical Results and Discussion

5.1. Unit root test

At first should be ensured of stationary of variables to avoid false estimate of econometrics. In this section, stationary of variables are checked by the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF), Dickey Fuller GLS (ERS) and Kwiatkowski-Philips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS) tests. If the variables in the time series are non-viable, we need to convert the series to a viable series by a process of differencing.

Table (1) shows the results of the existence of unit root in the time series used in this study by tests of (GLS (ERS)), (ADF) and (KPSS). The results indicate that all variables in level do not rule out the null hypothesis based on existence of a unit root, but by one time differencing, variables rule out the null hypothesis based on existence of a unit root; thus all the variables are integrated in order one I(1).

Table 1: Unit root test

	Ln(stock)		Ln(oil)		Ln(gold)	
	Level	First diff.	Level	First diff.	Level	First diff.
a) Unit root test						
ADF	-0.6374 (0.8574)	-6.2123 (0.000)	-2.0693 (0.2574)	-7.5060 (0.000)	-1.6817 (0.4384)	-10.6824 (0.000)
DF-GLS	0.8738 (0.3837)	-6.0998 (0.000)	-1.0174 (0.3107)	-7.2494 (0.000)	0.7368 (0.4624)	-10.7053 (0.000)
b) Stationary test						
KPSS	1.1160	0.1674	1.2106	0.1684	1.3077	0.380

The value in parentheses is represent to the p-value

5.2. Cointegration test

To estimate the cointegration model of Johansen, The optimal interval of variables must be provided at first. Thus LR test and information criterion are used to identify the optimal interval and also the optimal number of regime and optimal model in Markov switching model. The model is optimal when the amount of its information criterion is minimum. Three of the most common information criterion includes:

The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) Test:

$$AIC = 2k - 2\log(L) \quad (14)$$

The Schwarz Information Criterion (SC) Test:

$$SC = k \ln(n) - 2\log(L) \quad (15)$$

The Hannan-Quinn Information Criterion (HQ) Test:

$$HQ = 2k \ln(\ln(n)) - 2\ln(l) \quad (16)$$

Where k represents the number of parameters, n is the number of observations and L is the maximized likelihood value.

To indicate the optimal lag of VAR model and According to the table (2), the number 8 is considered for maximum of optimal interval in the model. The optimal interval is 2, According to the existed criteria.

Table 2: VAR Lag Order Selection Criteria

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-181.3006	NA	0.003017	2.710303	2.774552	2.736412
1	616.0590	1547.816	2.78e-08	-8.883220	-8.626221	-8.778782
2	650.5638	65.45768*	1.91e-08*	-9.258291*	-8.808543*	-9.075525*
3	659.4575	16.47950	1.92e-08	-9.256728	-8.614231	-8.995633
4	667.0748	13.77844	1.96e-08	-9.236395	-8.401148	-8.896972
5	669.6355	4.518813	2.16e-08	-9.141699	-8.113703	-8.723947
6	678.2555	14.83151	2.17e-08	-9.136111	-7.915366	-8.640031
7	685.1897	11.62494	2.25e-08	-9.105731	-7.692237	-8.531323
8	692.8311	12.47349	2.30e-08	-9.085752	-7.479508	-8.433015

* indicates lag order selected by the criterion, LR: sequential modified LR test statistic (each test at 5% level), FPE: Final prediction error

At this point, we determine the number of cointegration vectors. This is a means of testing for cointegration in a multivariate context, where there is the possibility of more than one cointegrating vector being present. It follows the same principles as the Engle-Granger approach to cointegration, in so far as the order of integration of the variables are first assessed, if the variables are I(1) the Johansen Maximum Likelihood (ML) procedure can then be used to determine whether a stable long-run relationship exists between the variables.

Johansen cointegration method based on $\hat{\lambda}_{trace}$, trace test and $\hat{\lambda}_{max}$, maximum eigenvalue test is used to determine the number of cointegration vectors. Summary of the results of maximum eigenvalue test and trace test is in table (3). According to results of table (3), all two statistics of $\hat{\lambda}_{trace}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{max}$ confirm the existence of a cointegration vector; because null hypothesis of no convergence vector is ruled out by both statistics but the hypothesis of presence of more than one integration vector is not ruled out.

Table 3: Johansen test outputs

Hypothesized No. of CE(s)	Trace statistics		Maximum Eigenvalue statistics		Eigenvalue
	$\hat{\lambda}_{trace}$	5% critical value	$\hat{\lambda}_{max}$	5% critical value	
None*	41.2697* (0.0098)	35.1927	25.6711* (0.0163)	22.2996	0.1664
At most 1	15.5985 (0.1940)	20.2618	12.1865 (0.1754)	15.8921	0.0828
At most 1	3.4119 (0.5067)	9.1645	3.4119 (0.5067)	9.1645	0.0239

The value in parentheses is represent the p-value

* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.05 level

Table 4 shows the convergent and normalized vector of the model. As it is clear, the cointegration vector under consideration is normalized with regard to Variable of Lnstock.

Based on the results of linear error correction, stock price index has a reverse relation with oil price and a direct relation with gold price in long-run. Since, the variables used in this model are logarithmic; we can interpret coefficients as elasticity. The long-run elasticity of stock price index with regard to oil price is -5.2399, this means that one percent increase in oil price decreases the stock price index up to 5.2399 percent. Also, the long-run elasticity of stock price index with regard to gold price is 4.5395 which mean that one percent increase in gold price increases the stock price index up to 4.5395 percent in long-run.

On the one hand, oil price increase together with increase in oil incomes will disrupt the allocation of financial sources in government sector and will develop marginal investments and unfinished projects; on the other hand, increase in importing consumer will decrease the competitiveness power of internal products and output of private sector investments. As a result, those who work in private sectors are not motivated to invest in exchangeable products sector and this issue affects on capital market. The direct relation between stock price and gold price has somewhat encountered difficulty in long-run. Considering such results, we should take necessary caution. Such unexpected result may be due to stock market inefficiency and lack of currency basket among people. Other reason of such results may be the fact that gold price in Iran is affected by two sides. On the one hand, it is affected by world gold price and on the other hand, it is affected by assessed economic policies.

Table 4: Cointegration Vector of Linear

Cointegrating Eq:	CoinEq1
Lnstock(-1)	1.0000
Lnoil(-1)	5.2399 (1.4500) [3.6135]
Lngold(-1)	-4.5395 (1.2388) [-3.6643]
C	-2.2744 (3.8802) [-0.5861]

The value in () is represent to the standard errors
The value in [] is represent to the t-statistics

5.3. MS-VECM Result

5.3.1. Testing for non-linearities and regime characteristics

Markov Switching models are created through change in mean, intercept, heteroskedasticity and autoregression coefficients. Two conditions are required for selecting an optimum model. Firstly, the null hypothesis which is based on not changing regime in the model must be rejected.

Secondly, the mentioned model must be more appropriate in terms of information criteria than the probable models in which the first condition is proved.

Through investigating various techniques, taking into consideration the nature of data and the optimum interval, we could identify three regimes. Then, the models were compared based on AIC, SC, and HQ criteria and LR test. At the end, MSIH(3)-VECM(1) model was selected as the superior one. In this model, intercept and heteroskedasticity variance depend on the regime.

Table 5 shows the results of estimating parameters of the above model by using maximum likelihood method. The statistical amount of LR test based on the linearity behavior of variables is 78.7059 and based on the p-value number related to Davises Statistics, this hypothesis is rejected and the non-linearity relation between these variables is confirmed.

Table 5: Criterion test results on the Markov switching models

	MSIH(3) – VECM(1)	Linear VECM
Log-likelihood	706.626	667.2740
AIC criterion	-9.3187	-9.1025
HQ criterion	-8.9380	-8.9248
SC criterion	-8.3820	-8.6653
LR linearity test:	78.7059	
DAVIES=[0.0000]	Chi(18) =[0.0000]	Chi(24)=[0.0000]

The results of estimating MSIH(3)-VECM(1) model for investigating the impact of stock market return on oil price and gold price are presented in Table 6. As it shows, during this study the impact of stock price on oil price and gold price can be divided into three regimes and also the variable coefficients are statistically significant. Since, the intercept of regime 1 is less than regimes 2 and 3, we can say that stock output in regime one is less than the two other regimes. So, regime one is considered as deep recession, regime two as less recession and regime three as expansion situation.

Coefficients of variables are significant. As you can see in Table 6, the sign related to independent variable, oil price, is positive which shows that there is a direct relation between oil price and stock output in short run. Moreover, gold price has negative effect on stock market returns.

CYN coefficient which shows the adjustment rate demonstrates that for the total index of stock exchange in each period 0.6 percent is adjusted which indicates low rate of adjustment in the model.

The results in Figure (3) show that the three regime MS-VECM model is suitable for estimating the variables in the financial relationship model because the fitted and 1-step predicted probabilities for all variables in the system fit to the mean.

Table 6: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) outputs

	$DLN(stock)_t$	$DLN(oil)_t$	$DLN(gold)_t$
Intercepts			
Const (Regime 1)	-0.0523 (-6.4493)	-0.1248 (-4.0419)	-0.0179 (-1.0383)
Const (Regime 2)	-0.0077 (-1.5396)	0.0015 (0.1549)	0.0042 (0.7935)
Const (Regime 3)	0.0546 (5.9902)	0.0021 (0.0902)	0.0193 (1.5447)
Coefficients			
Autoregressive coefficients			
$DLN(stock)_{t-1}$	0.3017 (4.5659)	0.0807 (0.5100)	-0.0557 (-0.6108)
$DLN(oil)_{t-1}$	0.0513 (1.2705)	0.1970 (2.0761)	0.0263 (0.5794)
$DLN(gold)_{t-1}$	-0.2335 (-3.5185)	-0.0004 (-0.0035)	0.1265 (1.4918)
Adjustment coefficient			
CYN	-0.006 (-2.7001)	-0.0124 (-2.6621)	-0.0013 (-0.5220)
Standard Error			
SE (Regime 1)	0.0266	0.0922	0.0603
SE (Regime 2)	0.0241	0.0731	0.0336
SE (Regime 3)	0.0389	0.0400	0.0406

The value in () is represent to the t-statistics




Figure 3: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) Fit

Based on the results in Table 7, the dominant economical regime is the second regime so that markets under investigation are in normal conditions or recession (regime 2) with the probability of 0.5756 and the average survival duration of 4.04, in prosperity duration (regime 3) with the probability of 0.326 and the average survival duration of 2.38, and in slump situation (regime 1) with the probability of 0.098 and the average survival duration of 1.63.

Table 7: Regime properties

Regime properties			
	No. of observations	Probability	Duration
Regime 1	14.3	0.0984	1.63
Regime 2	81.4	0.5756	4.04
Regime 3	46.4	0.3260	2.38

The situations of the three regimes are presented in Figure 4.



Figure 4: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) probabilities sketched

In order to investigate the degree of regimes instability and probabilities of transfer of each regime to another, we have extracted Matrix of transition probability. As Table 8 indicates, the probability of transfer from regime one (deep recession) to regime 2 (less recession) is 0.61 and

from regime 2 to regime 1 is 0.009. Probability values show that regime 2 is more stable than regime 1. Also, the probability of transfer from regime 1 to regime 3 (expansion) is very low and from regime 3 to regime 1 is 0.168. As a result, regime 1 is more stable than regime 3. At most, the probability of move from regime 2 to regime 3 is 0.237 and from regime 3 to regime 2 is 0.251. So, the stability of regimes 2 and 3 is almost the same.

In addition, the probability of transfer from regime 2 to regime 2 is 0.75 which is more stable than the other ones. The results obtained from regimes transfer is in line with economic cycles theories and are expected so that change of stagnation condition into prosperity condition happens with less probability and in long time, while change of prosperity condition into stagnation condition happens with more probability and in a short time.

Table 8: Matrix of transition probabilities

Matrix of transition probabilities			
	Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 3
Regime 1	0.3860	0.6140	1.846e-006
Regime 2	0.0096	0.7526	0.2377
Regime 3	0.1683	0.2515	0.5803

5.3.2. Impulse response analysis

In next stage, the impact of shock on the particular variable on other variables is investigated through Impulse Response Function (IR). The analysis of active reciprocal impacts of created impulses in the system is done through variance decomposition and Impulse Response Functions.

Impulse Response Functions (IRF) shows the active behavior of pattern variables at the time of creating impulses on each of the pattern variables in the duration. These impulses are usually selected as one standard deviation. The origin or the beginning point of response variable movement is the values related to the stable situation of system (without impulse).

Figure 5 shows the response of stock price index, oil price and gold price toward one shock standard deviation to each variable in different three regimes.

The response of stock market to the shock on gold price in each of the three regimes is similar and it is negative in short time, also it decreases the stock price. But, little by little the effects disappear and after about 10 months, the gold price shock will have a positive effect on stock market and it will have a positive and stable long term effect.

Moreover, the results show that the response of stock market to the positive shock on oil price in each of the situations decreases stock price. This effect is stable in all the short term and long term durations.




Figure 5 : Impulse response analysis

6. CONCLUSION

In this study, the impact of oil price and gold price oscillations on the output of Iran's stock market was investigated through monthly data during January 2003 to December 2014. To this end, nonlinear cointegration method was used. So, first, variables were analyzed through unit root test. After selecting optimum intervals with regard to decrease in information criteria, we recognized that the results of model showed one convergent vector. After that, the optimum model was selected based on different criteria which were mentioned in the methodology. Then, the results were analyzed and the impact of shocks on each variable was investigated and was anticipated.

The results of analysis show three different regimes. Regime 1 shows deep recession, regime 2 shows less recession condition and regime 3 shows expansion condition. The results obtained from the model shows that the impact of oil price on stock output in each regime is negative and it is statistically significant. This means that if oil price increases, stock market output decreases. Also, the results show that the response of stock market toward the positive shock on oil price in each situation decreases stock price. This impact is stable in all the short-run and long-run durations.

The relation between gold price and stock market output in time duration and based on the conditions of market is different. So that, the response of stock market to the shock on gold price in each regime is similar and it is negative in short-run and decreases stock price. But, little by

little the effects disappear and after about 10 months, the gold price shock will have a positive effect on stock market and it will have a positive and stable long-run effect.

So, Iran's stock exchange market is affected by oil price and gold price. Considering these two variables stock market output can be predicted. So, policy makers of investment market must consider the effects of oil price and gold price on the stock market returns. The analysis of expected changes to increase economic growth of the country is useful. Also, financial managers of companies must pay more attention to the real performance of companies and their interests and consider long-run vision in their analysis and decisions to prevent from going astray and making wrong decisions. In addition, considering oil and gold prices changes, investors can also anticipate the changes of the total stock price index and consider them while investing in stock market.

References

- Aroui, M. E. H. and Fouquau, J., 2009. On the short-term influence of oil price changes on stock markets in GCC countries: linear and nonlinear analyses, *Cornell University Library*.
- Aroui, M. E. H. and Nguyen, D. K., 2010. Oil prices, stock markets and portfolio investment: Evidence from sector analysis in Europe over the last decade, *Energy Policy*, Volume 38, Issue 8, 4528–4539.
- Barvch, L., 1988. Toward a Theory of Equitable and Efficient Accounting policy, *The Accounting Review*, Vol.63, PP: 15-37.
- Blot, C., Labondance, F., 2011. Bank interest rate pass-through in the euro zone: monetary policy transmission during the boom and since the financial crash, paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference on Macroeconomic Analysis and International Finance.
- Clarida, R. H., Sarno, L., Taylor, M. P., Valente, G., 2006. The role of asymmetries and regime shifts in the term structure of interest rates. *Journal of Business*, vol. 79, no. 3, pp.1193-1224.
- Dahlquist, M., Gray, S. F., 2000. Regimes switching and interest rates in the European monetary system. *Journal of International Economics*, 50, 399–419.
- Dimson, E, Mussavian, M., 1998. A brief history of market efficiency, *European Financial Management*, Vol.4, PP: 91-193.
- Engle, R F. & Granger, C.W. J., 1987. Cointegration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing. *Econometrica*, 55, 251-276.
- Hamilton J.D., 1989. A New Approach to the Economic Analysis of Nonstationary Time Series and the Business Cycle , *Econometrica*, 57 , 357-384.
- Hamilton J.D., 1990. Analysis of Time Series Subject to Changes in Regime, *Journal of Econometrics*, 45 , 39–70.
- Hamilton J.D., 1993. *Estimation, Inference and Forecasting of Time Series Subject to Changes in Regime*, Maddala, Rao, and Vinod (eds.), Handbook of Statistics, North-Holland, 11, 231-260.
- Hamilton J.D., 2008. *Oil and the Macroeconomy*, In: Durlauf, S., Blume, L. (Eds.), The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, 2nd Ed. Palgrave MacMilan Ltd.

- Hamilton J.D., 2003, What is an Oil Shock?, *Journal of Econometrics*, 113, 363–398.
- Hamilton J.D., 1996. Specification Testing in Markov-Switching Time Series Models, *Journal of Econometrics*, 70, 127–157.
- Krolzig, H.M., 1996. Statistical analysis of cointegrated VAR processes with Markovian regime shifts. SFB 373 *Discussion Paper 25/1996*, Humboldt Universit  at zu Berlin.
- Krolzig H.M., 1997. Markov Switching Vector Autoregressions: Modelling, Statistical Inference and Application to Business Cycle Analysis,,: *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*, Springer-Verlag.
- Krolzig, H. M., 1998. Econometric modelling of Markov-switching vector autoregressions using MSVAR for Ox. *Discussion Paper*, Department of Economics, University of Oxford:<http://www.econ.ox.ac.uk/research/hendry/krolzig>.
- Krolzig, H. M., 2001. Business cycle measurement in the presence of structural change: International evidence. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 17, 349–368.
- Krolzig, H. M., and Toro, J., 1998. A new approach to the analysis of shocks and the cycle in a model of output and employment. *Working paper ECO 99/30*, EUI, Florence.
- Krolzig, H.M., Toro, J., 1999, A new approach to the analysis of shocks and the cycle in a model of output and employment. European University Institute. *Working paper ECO*, no. 99-30.
- Krolzig, H. M., 2001. Business cycle measurement in the presence of structural change: International evidence. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 17, 349–368.
- Maghyereh, A., 2004. Oil price shocks and emerging stock market: a generalized VAR approach, *International Journal of Applied Econometrics and Quantitative Studies*. Vol.1-2.
- Maghyereh, A. and Al-Kandari, A., 2007. Oil prices and stock markets in GCC countries: new evidence from nonlinear cointegration analysis, *Managerial Finance*, Volume 33, Issue 7.
- MansoorBaig M. and Shahbaz, M. Imran, M., Jabbar, M. and Ain, Q.U., 2013. Long Run Relationship between Gold Prices, Oil Prices and Karachi Stock Market, *ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DANUBIUS*, Vol 9, No 5.

Panagopoulos, Y., Spiliotis, A., 2011. Is the Eurozone homogeneous and symmetric? An interest rate pass-through approach before and during the recent financial crisis. Paper presented at the 15th *Annual Conference on Macroeconomic Analysis and International Finance*.

Park, J. and Ratti, R. A., 2008. Oil price shocks and stock markets in the U.S. and 13 European countries, *Energy Economics*, Volume 30, Issue 5, 2587–2608.

Papapetrou, E., 2001. Oil price shocks, stock market, economic activity and employment in Greece, *Energy Economics*, Volume 23, Issue 5, 511–532.

Goldfeld, S. M. and Quandt, R. E., 1973. A Markov model for switching regressions, *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol 1, Issue 1, 3-15.


Quandt, R. E., 1972. A New Approach to Estimating Switching Regressions, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Volume 67, Issue 338.

Appendix:


A1: Regime classification

Regime 1	Regime 2	Regime 3
2003:3 - 2003:3 [0.9756]	2003:4 - 2003:4 [0.9999]	2003:5 - 2003:8 [0.9993]
2003:9 - 2003:9 [0.9990]	2003:10 - 2003:10 [0.9979]	2003:11 - 2004:1 [0.9321]
2004:2 - 2004:2 [0.6931]	2004:3 - 2004:6 [0.9544]	2004:7 - 2004:7 [0.9884]
2006:6 - 2006:6 [0.9874]	2004:8 - 2005:11 [0.9528]	2005:12 - 2005:12 [0.9806]
2008:8 - 2008:12 [0.9996]	2006:1 - 2006:4 [0.9546]	2006:5 - 2006:5 [0.9700]
2009:12 - 2009:12 [0.9029]	2006:7 - 2007:8 [0.9118]	2007:9 - 2007:10 [0.8875]
2011:5 - 2011:5 [0.9693]	2007:11 - 2007:12 [0.9547]	2008:1 - 2008:1 [0.9957]
2011:10 - 2011:11 [0.7666]	2008:2 - 2008:5 [0.8729]	2008:6 - 2008:7 [0.9999]
2014:12 - 2014:12 [1.0000]	2009:1 - 2009:7 [0.9363]	2009:8 - 2009:11 [0.8971]
	2010:1 - 2010:2 [0.9769]	2010:3 - 2010:4 [0.8850]
	2010:5 - 2010:6 [0.8638]	2010:7 - 2010:9 [0.9069]
	2010:10 - 2010:12 [0.8245]	2011:1 - 2011:4 [0.9037]
	2011:6 - 2011:7 [0.8996]	2011:8 - 2011:9 [0.9565]
	2011:12 - 2012:8 [0.8976]	2012:9 - 2012:12 [0.8980]
	2013:1 - 2013:3 [0.8131]	2013:4 - 2013:12 [0.9153]
	2014:1 - 2014:11 [0.8463]	

A2: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) Diagrams



A3: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) Residuals



A4: MSIH(3)-VECM(1) Regime Shifts

