

Detection of Structural Regimes and Analyzing the Impact of Crude Oil Market on Canadian Stock Market: Markov Regime-Switching Approach

Mohammadreza Mahmoudi^a, Hana Ghaneei^b

^a*Department of Economics, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, USA.*

Email: mmahmoudi@niu.edu

^b*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, USA.*

Email: z1939548@niu.edu

Correspondence

Mohammadreza Mahmoudi, , *Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, USA.*

Email: mmahmoudi@niu.edu

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the impact of the crude oil market on the Toronto Stock Exchange Index (TSX) based on monthly data from 1979 to 2018 using a nonlinear Markov regime-switching approach. The results indicate that TSX return contains two regimes, including: positive return (regime 1), when growth rate of stock index is positive; and negative return (regime 2), when growth rate of stock index is negative. The findings also show the crude oil market has positive effect on the stock market in both regimes, however, the effect of oil price on the stock market in regime 1 is more than regime 2. Moreover, two period lag of oil price increases stock price in regime 1, while it decreases stock price in regime 2.

Keywords: Toronto Stock Exchange Index; crude oil market; Markov switching VAR model

1. Introduction

The impact of the financial crisis in 2007 on the global economy strongly proves the pivotal role of the stock market on the economy. The stock market through different financial instruments could provide diverse funding for companies and motive economic growth. These positive effects of the stock market in developed countries like Canada are more obvious. Canada is the world's second-largest country by total area, and its advanced economy is the tenth-largest in the world. Moreover, this country has the sixteenth-highest nominal per-capita income globally as well as the twelfth-highest ranking in the Human Development Index. The TSX is the ninth-largest stock exchange in the world by market capitalization. As summarized in Table 1, stock market capitalization for Canada was 1.937 trillion dollars in 2018. The percent of stock market capitalization in the economy (113%) and stock traded in percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (80.2%) shows the important role of the stock market in Canadian economy.

Table 1. Economic data of Canada

		Rank in the World
GDP (constant 2010 Trillion USD)	\$ 1.904	17
GDP growth (annual %)	1.88	
Population	37,058,856	38
Population growth (annual %)	1.41	
GDP per capita (constant 2010 USD)	51382.42	18
GDP per capita growth (annual %)	0.45	
Stock Market Capitalization (Trillion USD)	\$ 1.937	9
Market Capitalization in percent of GDP	113.2 %	
Stocks traded (Trillion USD)	\$1.373	
Stocks traded in percent of GDP	80.2	
Listed domestic companies	3,330	
S&P Global Equity Indices	-19.4 %	
2018 Crude Oil Exports (Billion USD)	\$66.9	4
Oil Export in percent of World Total	5.9	

Note. Data are from Word Bank

The stock price index shows the general trend of the stock market fluctuations. In fact, the degree of capital market success or failure is detected according to the trend. Thus, portfolio managers and investors 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.

Moreover, 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 around the world; thus, volatilities in oil price can affect the cost of production and company profitability [Ahamed \(2021\)](#). Oil is the most important source of income for exporting countries like Canada, therefore, its price and volatilities can affect the natural sector and the capital market. Based on Table 1, Canada exported 66.9 billion dollars of, in oil in 2018, 5.9 percent of total oil market. Canada is the fourth largest producer and exporter of oil in the world and 96% of Canada's proven oil reserves are located in the oil sands. (Data are from Word Bank)

All in all, the oil market plays a pivotal role in the economics of Canada. In addition, nowadays stock markets have inevitable role in growth economics of developed country such as Canada. Because of these issues we want to analyze the effect of oil market on stock market in Canada. In this paper, we use a Markov switching var model to examine this relationship. First, we introduce some important papers, which use different Markov switching models, to analyze the relationship between oil price and the stock market. Then, we use data and run the MSI-VAR model to find the best fitted model to show the relation between TSX and West Texas Intermediate Crude Oil (WTI). Finally, we discuss main results and provide conclusion.

2. Literature Review

Regime switching models have been used considerably in computational economics and econometric time series analysis. The majority of these models introduce two regimes with a state process determining one of the regimes to take place in each period. The bivalued state process is typically modeled as a Markov

chain. [Hamilton \(1988\)](#) conducted the autoregressive model with this type of Markov switching in the mean. In [Hamilton \(1989\)](#), a two-state Markov switching model in which the mean growth rate of Gross national product (GNP) is subject to regime switching was specified, where the errors followed a regime-invariant AR(4) process. The Hamilton method was further analyzed by [Kim \(1994\)](#). Several authors introduced Markov switching in a more general class of models such as regression models and volatility models. [Filardo \(1994\)](#) used an MSAR(4) switching mean model to simulate the log growth rate of industrial production (DLOGIP). He used the log growth rate of the Composite Index of Eleven Leading Indicators (DLOGIDX) as a business-cycle predictor. [Krolzig \(2000\)](#) studied the common business cycle of six Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries across four continents by using Markov switching Vector Autoregressions (MSVAR). Moreover, various statistical characteristics of the Markov Switching model have been analyzed by [Garcia \(1998\)](#), [Timmermann \(2000\)](#), [Cho and White \(2007\)](#), and [\(Mohammad and Mohammad 2010\)](#).

On the other hand, there are several important papers which focused on the relation between the oil market and the stock market in different countries. [Park and Ratti \(2008\)](#) examined the effect of oil market price volatilities on key financial variables such as stock prices in the United States and thirteen developed countries. The result showed a statistically significant relationship between oil price volatility and stock index, however, the type of the relationship depends on whether the countries are oil exporters or importers. [Fayyad and Daly \(2011\)](#) compared the effect of oil prices shocks on the stock returns in GCC countries, the United States and the United Kingdom. They found that the rise in oil price during the global crisis increased the predictive power of oil prices on the stock market. In addition, the stock markets in Qatar and the United Arab Emirates among GCC countries and the UK responded more to the shocks than other countries. [Hussin, Muhammad et al. \(2013\)](#) and [Alam \(2021\)](#) by vector auto regression calculation (VAR), correlation analysis, Granger causality test, Impulse Response Function (IRF) and Variance decomposition (VDC) analyzed the relationship between the strategic goods (gold price, oil and i.e.) and the stock market in Malaysia. The result showed that the stock returns do not have integrated correlation with strategic goods

in the long term. Moreover, according to Granger causality, only oil price variables among the strategic goods will affect stock returns in the short term in Malaysia. [Balcilar, Gupta et al. \(2015\)](#) analyzed the non-linear relationship of US crude oil and stock market prices from 1859 to 2013 using the Markov switching vector error-correction model (MS-VECM). The results showed a two-regime model that divides the sample into high- and low-volatility regimes based on the variance–covariance matrix of the oil and stock prices.

3. Methodology

Based on ([Hamilton 1989](#)), the MS-AR model of order k with regime shifts in the mean and variance for a time series variable y_t is shown as follows:

$$y_t = \mu(s_t) + \left[\sum_{i=1}^k a_i (y_{t-i} - \mu(s_{t-i})) \right] + \sigma(s_t)u_t \quad (1)$$

$$u_t | s_t \sim NID(0, \sigma^2) \text{ and } s_t = 1, 2$$

where a_i indicates the autoregressive coefficients. μ is the mean, σ is the standard deviations which depends on s_t , the regime at time t .

We could extend Equation 1 further to specify MSM(M)-VAR(k) model as follows:

$$y_t - \mu(s_t) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i (y_{t-i} - \mu(s_{t-i})) + u_t \quad (2)$$

where y_t represents a k dimensional time series vector, μ is the vector of means, $a_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ are matrices of the autoregressive parameters and u_t is a white noise vector process dependent on s_t .

In the above equations, we assumed the state variables, s_t , which specify the switching behavior of time series variable, y_t , follows an irreducible ergodic two-state Markov process. This assumption indicates that a current regime s_t depends on the regime one period ago, s_{t-1} . Hence, the transition probability between states is as follows:

$$Pr(S_t = j | S_{t-1} = i, S_{t-2} = k, \dots) = Pr(S_t = j | S_{t-1} = i) = p_{ij} \quad (3)$$

p_{ij} denotes the transition probability from state i to state j .

Generally, the transition probability is identified by a ($n \times n$) matrix as follows:

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & \dots & p_{1m} \\ p_{21} & p_{22} & \dots & p_{2m} \\ \vdots & & & \\ p_{m1} & p_{m2} & & p_{mm} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^m p_{ij} = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, m, \text{ and } 0 \leq p_{ij} \leq 1$$

There are many Markov switching vector auto regression models that we could use to analyze the effect of the oil market on the stock market. In Table 2 these models are summarized. All in all, we have two main Markov switching var models, Markov switching mean and Markov switching intercept. It should be noted that, MSM and MSI models are different, in that the dynamic response to a regime shift in the mean $\mu(s_t)$ causes an immediate jump of the observed time series vector onto its new level. In contrast, the dynamic response to a regime shift in the intercept term $v(s_t)$ is identical to an equivalent shock in the white noise series u_t .

Table 2. Different Markov Switching VAR model

		MSM		MSI		M: Markov switching mean I: Markov switching intercept A: Markov switching autoregressive H: Markov switching heteroskedasticity
		μ invariant	μ varying	v invariant	v varying	
A_j invariant	Σ invariant	MSM-VAR	Linear MVAR	MSI-VAR	Linear VAR	
	Σ varying	MSMH-VAR	MSH-MVAR	MSIH-VAR	MHA-VAR	
A_j varying	Σ invariant	MSMA-VAR	MSA-MVAR	MSIA-VAR	MSA-VAR	
	Σ varying	MSMAH-VAR	MSAH-MVAR	MSIAH-VAR	MSAH-VAR	

4. DATA

In this study we use monthly data for TSX from July 1979 to October 2019. Moreover, in order to analyze the effect of oil prices on the stock market we use monthly data of closing spot prices for West Texas Intermediate (WTI) crude oil, which is a global benchmark for determining the prices of other light crude oil in the United States. Some of the main statistics of data are described in Table 3. The maximum index was 16658, which was reported in October, 2019, and the minimum was 1363, which was reported in Jun, 1982. However, the WTI has experienced less volatility. The minimum quantity was 12 which was reported at December, 1998, and the maximum quantity was 133 which was reported at Jun, 2008.


Table 3. Summary Statistics of the Data

	TSX	WTI
Minimum	1363.329	12.28000
Mean	7747.418	42.17572
Median	6859.800	31.09000
Maximum	16658.60	133.9300
Standard Deviation	4708.876	27.19105
Skewness	0.348992	1.105471
Kurtosis	1.660826	3.223720
Observation	483	483

It should be noted that our analysis is based on the calculated return ($return = \ln(\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}})$) for all variables.

In Plot 1, we show the graph for natural log of TSX and WTI on the left side and we depict the return of the TSX and WTI on the right side.

Plot 1. Return of the variables



5. Empirical Results and Discussion

We tested whether our data was stationary or not. Of the different tests to examine the stationarity, we used Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF), and wiatkowski-Philips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS). Based on Table 4, all the time series data are non-stationary in the natural log level and stationary in the return level.

Table 4. Unit Root Test

	LTSX	DLTSX	LWTI	DLWTI
ADF	-1.250770 (0.6535)	-19.52376 (0.000)	-1.935789 (0.3157)	-16.14647 (0.000)
KPSS	2.717497	0.017598	1.609933	0.047755
The value in parentheses represent p-value				

Next, we wanted to recognize a long-run relationship between our return variables. In order to test cointegration in our data we should first find optimal lag. We ran the VAR model to find optimal lag. Vector autoregression (VAR) is a stochastic process model used to capture the linear interdependencies among multiple time series. VAR models generalize the univariate autoregressive model (AR model) by allowing for more than one evolving variable.

For example VAR(p) Model is as follows:

$$Y_t = a + A_1Y_{t-1} + A_2Y_{t-2} + \dots + A_pY_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t$$

As it is clear from Table 5, based on the AIC criteria the optimal lag is 2.

Table 5. var lag order selection criteria

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-789.4335	NA	0.096000	3.332352	3.349881	3.339245
1	1332.094	4216.256	1.29e-5	-5.583552	-5.530963	-5.562871
2	1358.863	52.97582*	1.17e-5*	-5.679425*	-5.591776*	-5.644957*
3	1360.335	2.899628	1.18e-5	-5.668778	-5.546070	-5.620523
4	1361.684	2.647583	1.20e-5	-5.657618	-5.499850	-5.571362
5	1363.208	2.977181	1.21e-5	-5.647192	-5.454365	-5.571362
6	1364.982	3.451311	1.22e-5	-5.637820	-5.409933	-5.548203
7	1367.407	4.696454	1.23e-5	-5.631188	-5.368242	-5.527784
8	1369.556	4.143521	1.24e-5	-5.623393	-5.325387	-5.506201

After finding the optimal lag, we can run the cointegration test. The Johansen test is a test for evaluating cointegration and it allows to test more than one cointegrating relationship. Johansen test estimates the rank (r) of a given matrix of time series with a confidence level. Based on Table 6, our data set has two time series, hence, Johansen tests the null hypothesis of $r = 0$ is that there is no cointegration at all, and the null hypothesis of $r \leq 1$ is that there is at most one cointegration relation. For $r = 0$, all of the test values are greater than the critical values, so we could not reject the null hypothesis and there is no cointegration relation at all. For $r \leq 1$, since none of the test values are greater than the critical values, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is no cointegration relation between our variables.

Table 6. Johansen cointegration test

	t-statistics	10 percent	10 percent	10 percent
$r = 0$	1.65	6.50	8.18	11.65
$r \leq 1$	9.48	15.66	17.95	23.52

In absence of cointegration, the dependent variables diverge from any possible combination of the regressors. Therefore, running a VAR in levels is not reasonable. If some or all of the variables in a regression are I(1) then the usual statistical results may or may not hold. One important case in which the usual statistical results do not hold is spurious regression, when all the regressors are I(1) and not cointegrated. To avoid spurious regression and to seek nonlinearities in relationship between oil prices and the stock index we use Markov switching VAR model. Based on the AIC criteria, the best model which fits the data is MSI(2)-VAR(2) model.

For analyzing our data, we ran MSI(2)-VAR(2) model to identify TSX index's structure. As it is shown in Table 7, TSX index has two regimes including positive return (regime 1), when the growth rate of stock index is positive, and negative return (regime 2), when the growth rate of stock index is negative.

Table 7. MSI(2)-VAR(2) Model for Stock Index in Canada

		$DLN(TSX)_t$
Intercepts	Const (Regime 1)	0.008563 (0.000)
	Const (Regime 2)	-0.017862 (0.1646)
Autoregressive Coefficients	AR(1)	0.031352 (0.4976)
	AR(2)	0.022700 (0.6429)
	The value in parenthesis represent p-value	


Then, we computed the transition probabilities of MSI(2)-VAR(2) Model for TSX index. As it is shown in Table 8, P11, which represents the probability of staying in regime 1 given that you are in regime 1, is 97%, as well as P21, which indicates the coefficients for the transition from regime 2 into regime 1, is 12%.

Table 8. Transition Probabilities of MSI (2)-VAR (2) Model for Stock Index in Canada

	Regime 1	Regime 2
Regime 1	0.976518	0.023482
Regime 2	0.128823	0.871177

The filtered probabilities of being in two regimes for TSX index is depicted in the Plot 2.

Plot 2. Filtered of Transition Probabilities



Moreover, based on the AIC criteria, MSI(2)-VAR(2) Model is the best fitted model for examining the effect of the crude oil market on the stock market. Based on Table 9, the effect of oil prices on the stock index in regime 1 is more than regime 2. Also, the effect of one period lag of oil prices on the stock price in regime 2 is more than regime 1, while this effect is very small. Moreover, two period lag of oil prices increases the stock price in regime 1, while it decreases the stock price in regime 2.

Table 9. The effect of oil price on stock index with MSI (2)-VAR (2) Model(Based on AIC criteria)

		$DLN(TSX)_t$	$DLN(WTI)_t$
Intercepts			
	Const (Regime 1)	-0.019351 (0.1397)	-0.010789 (0.4926)
	Const (Regime 2)	0.008066 (0.000)	0.003507 (0.3049)
Coefficients			
Regime 1	$DLN(TSX)_t$		0.814483 (0.0277)
	$DLN(TSX)_{t-1}$	0.137623 (0.3115)	-0.297722 (0.4507)
	$DLN(TSX)_{t-2}$	-0.3771582 (0.0258)	0.547047 (0.0929)
	$DLN(WTI)_t$	0.234637 (0.0353)	
	$DLN(WTI)_{t-1}$	-0.053833 (0.6497)	0.508366 (0.0002)
	$DLN(WTI)_{t-2}$	0.209881 (0.0597)	-0.166862 (0.2101)
Regime 2	$DLN(TSX)_t$		0.115740 (0.1109)
	$DLN(TSX)_{t-1}$	-0.006621 (0.8949)	0.165147 (0.0461)
	$DLN(TSX)_{t-2}$	0.073970 (0.1964)	0.046134 (0.5446)
	$DLN(WTI)_t$	0.030468 (0.2001)	
	$DLN(WTI)_{t-1}$	-0.014181 (0.5653)	0.117371 (0.0308)
	$DLN(WTI)_{t-2}$	-0.032455 (0.1582)	-0.54252 (0.2843)
The value in parenthesis represent p-value			

Furthermore, the transition probabilities of MSI(2)-VAR(2) Model for the effect of oil market on Canadian Stock Index is shown in Table 10. Based on this information, when we consider the effect of oil prices, P11, which represents the probability of staying in regime 1 given that you are in regime 1, is 88%, as well as P12, which indicates the coefficients for the transition from regime 1 into regime 2, is 11%.

Table 10. Transition Probabilities of MSI(2)-VAR(2) Model for the effect of oil market on Canada Stock Index

	Regime 1	Regime 2
Regime 1	0.887112	0.112888
Regime 2	0.020743	0.979257

6. Conclusion

Based on the unit root test, all variables are non-stationary in the level and stationary in the first difference. Also, the cointegration test indicates that there is no long-run relation between the crude oil market and the stock index. Hence, we cannot run a VAR model because of the spurious regression. To avoid spurious regression and in order to examine the nonlinear relationship between oil prices and the stock index we used a Markov regime switching model. Based on the MSI(2)-VAR(2) model there are two regimes for the Canadian stock index including positive return (regime 1), when growth rate of stock index is positive, and negative return (regime 2), when growth rate of stock index is negative. Moreover, this model shows the crude oil market has positive effect on the stock market in both regimes, however, the effect of oil price on the stock market in regime 1 is more than regime 2. Furthermore, a two period lag of oil price increases stock price in regime 1, while it decreases stock price in regime 2.

7. Reference

- Ahamed, F. (2021). "Impact of Public and Private Investments on Economic Growth of Developing Countries." [arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14199](#).
- Alam, M. (2021). "Output, Employment, and Price Effects of US Narrative Tax Changes: A Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregression Approach." [arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10844](#).
- Balcilar, M., R. Gupta and S. M. Miller (2015). "Regime switching model of US crude oil and stock market prices: 1859 to 2013." *Energy Economics* **49**: 317-327.
- Cho, J. S. and H. White (2007). "Testing for regime switching." *Econometrica* **75**(6): 1671-1720.
- Fayyad, A. and K. Daly (2011). "The impact of oil price shocks on stock market returns: comparing GCC countries with the UK and USA." *Emerging Markets Review* **12**(1): 61-78.
- Filardo, A. J. (1994). "Business-cycle phases and their transitional dynamics." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **12**(3): 299-308.
- Garcia, R. (1998). "Asymptotic null distribution of the likelihood ratio test in Markov switching models." *International Economic Review*: 763-788.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1988). "Rational-expectations econometric analysis of changes in regime: An investigation of the term structure of interest rates." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **12**(2-3): 385-423.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1989). "A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle." *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society*: 357-384.
- Hussin, M. Y. M., F. Muhammad, A. A. Razak, G. P. Tha and N. Marwan (2013). "The link between gold price, oil price and Islamic stock market: Experience from Malaysia." *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences* **4**(2).
- Kim, C.-J. (1994). "Dynamic linear models with Markov-switching." *Journal of Econometrics* **60**(1-2): 1-22.
- Krolzig, H.-M. (2000). *Predicting Markov-switching vector autoregressive processes*, Nuffield College.
- Mohammad, M. A. and R. I. Mohammad (2010). "Revisiting the Feldstein-Horioka Hypothesis of savings, investment and capital mobility: evidence from 27 EU countries."
- Park, J. and R. A. Ratti (2008). "Oil price shocks and stock markets in the US and 13 European countries." *Energy economics* **30**(5): 2587-2608.
- Timmermann, A. (2000). "Moments of Markov switching models." *Journal of econometrics* **96**(1): 75-111.