Tests of Random Walk in Indian Stock Market Returns: An Application of Variance Ratio Test

K. BANUMATHY AND R. AZHAGAIAH

The primary objective of the study is to test the random walk hypothesis (RWH) for Indian stock returns. The daily closing prices of 24 firms of BSE 500 were collected for the period of 10 years ranging from 1st January 2003 to 31st December 2012, which were selected based on Multi-Stage Non-Random Sampling Technique. The study used normality test, stationarity test and the variance ratio (VR) test for the hypothesis that the stock market (SM) returns follow a random walk. Overall, the study found that the RWH is rejected for all the firms implying that there exists a non-random behaviour of returns and the Indian SMdoes not show the characteristics of random walk which means that the mean reverting tendencies of return series exists in both long-run as well as in the short-run period.

Keywords: Random walk hypothesis, stock market returns, variance ratio test. JEL Classification: C22 and G14.

Introduction

A random walk (RW) is a useful model in understanding stochastic processes across a variety of scientific disciplines. If a stock price series follows a RW, the return has no mean-reversion tendency and, hence, a shock to the price will lead to increasing deviations from its long-run equilibrium. If, on the other hand, a stock price series does not follow a RW it follows that future equity prices are predictable based on past prices. Thus, it is possible to design profitable trading schemes based on historical equity data. Lo and MacKinlay (1988) proposed to test RWH using variance ratio (VR) test to find out the permanent and temporary components in stock returns. They proposed a test statistic which is robust under the heteroscedastic RWH. The VR test assesses the null hypothesis that a univariate time series is a RW.

K. Banumathy, Ph.D. is Faculty in India International School, Mangaf, Kuwait, E.Mail: banukarunanithy@gmail.com

Dr. R. Azhagaiah, Associate Professor and Head of the Department, Department of Commerce, Avvaiyar Government College for Women (Affiliated to Pondicherry University), Karaikal, Puducherry (U.T.), India. E.Mail: drrazhagaia@yahoo.co.in

One of the recent additions to the VR test literature is the mean reversion and overreaction of stock prices. Mean reversion is often attributed to overreaction by investors, in which any information shock to the price series is temporary and the effect dies down quickly. De BondtandThaler (1990) argued investors in the SM overreact to new information.

The objective of the paper is to investigate whether prices in Indian stock market (SM) follow a RW process as it is the oldest SMincorporated in 1875. The name of the first share trading association in India was 'Native Share and Stock Broker Association which later came to be known as Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE). The BSE India SENSEX is the India's first SMindex and is tracked worldwide. It is an index of 30 stocks representing 12 major sectors. In August 9, 1999, BSE Limited constructed a new index, called BSE-500, consisting of 500 scrips, which represents nearly 93% of the total market capitalization on BSE. BSE 500 covers 20 major industries of the economy. The presence and absence of RW is evaluated using BSE 500 stocks. Hence, the study is made comprehensive including the stocks of BSE firms in India.

Literature of Review

Attempts have been made by researchers to investigate the behaviour of SM in many countries. A number of studies tested the hypothesis that the return series exhibit random walk (RW) behaviour. For instance, Smith and Ryoo (2003) examined the RWHof stock indices of five European markets viz., Greece, Hungary, Poland, Portugal and Turkey. Using the multiple VR test the study found that the hypothesis of RWis rejected for all the four markets except for Turkey, whereas it follows a RW. Chen (2009) examined the RWH for ten Pacific Basin foreign-exchange markets and rejected the RWH using the Lo and MacKinlay VR tests. Madhusoodanan (1998) applied VR test at aggregate level of indices and disaggregate level of individual stocks and found that at aggregate level, the RWH cannot be accepted and the movement is persistent, whereas at the disaggregate level of 120 individual stocks, it shows significant autocorrelation. The individual stocks also showed evidence on persistence.

Li and Liu (2012)analysed the RWH of 34 MSCI country indices from 1988 to 2010 and pointed out that out of 34 markets, 25 markets follow a RW. In the same way, Smith et al. (2002) examined the RWH for eight African SMs, in which seven markets showed that the return does not follow a RWand the hypothesis is rejected because of autocorrelation. Wen (2009) reported that the prices or returns in the spot energy markets are unpredictable and therefore the market participants are unable to make abnormal returns in future. Mbululu et al. (2013) used nominal USD / ZMK exchange rates from 2003 to 2012 to investigate the validity of RWH in the Zambian foreign exchange market. The result rejected the **RWH** and supported for the violation of the weak form market-efficiency hypothesis.

Charles and Darne (2009) pointed out that Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico rejected the RWH indicating that these markets have not been weakform efficient. Chen (2008) used Lo and MacKinlay's (1988) conventional VR test, Chow and Denning's (1993) simple multiple VR test, and Wright's (2000) non-parametric ranks and signs-based VR tests to test the RWH of the Euro/ US dollar exchange-rate market using data from 1999 to 2008. The results supported the RWH and concluded that the Euro/US dollar exchange-rate market was regarded as weak-form efficient. On the other hand, many studies viz., Poterba and Summers (1988); Black (1990); Cecchetti et al. (1990) and Jog and Schaller (1994) found evidence of mean reversion in the return series. To sum up, although the literature on RWH is vast, there is no consensus among the researchers regarding long-run and short-run behaviour of the return in Indian SM. The review of previous research works show mixed empirical evidence regarding the behaviour of the stock returns. Moreover; there is very little work which has tested the **RWH** for Indian SM. Hence, the present study investigates the behaviour of return in both the long-run as well as the short-run periods in Indian SM.

Objective and Hypothesis Developed for the Study

The objective of the study is to investigate whether stock price returns on the *BSE* depict a random sequence. The hypothesis developed for the study is as follows:

 H_0 : Returns of BSE 24 firms follows a random walk H_i : Returns of BSE 24 firms follows non-random walk

The above hypothesis is tested using VR test using Eviews 7 package.

Research Methodology

Data Source and Period of the Study

The stock price behavior follows RW is an on-going debatable issue and it inspires to use the latest data for further testing RWH. Initially, the daily closing prices of BSE 500 firms from 1st January 2003 to 31st December 2012 were collected using the data source called Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy Pvt. Ltd. (CMIE) Prowess package.Next, the BSE 500 firms are classified in to seven sectors viz., Basic Material, Consumer Cyclical, Consumer Non-cyclical, Energy & Utilities, Industrial and Technology Sectors.

Using Multi-Stage Non-Random Sampling Technique, the stocks have been selected for the study (vide figure 1). The present study used only the

Basic Material sector in to consideration, which comprises 24 firms. The RWbehavior of SMreturn on 24 firms of Basic Material sector is tested.

Figure 1

Sampling Design for Stock Selection BSE 500 (launched in 9th August 1999 with 500 scrips) =500 firms as on 1st January 2003 Out of 500 firms, full-fledged data were available in the data source for the study period (from 1st January 2003 to 31st December 2012)= 140 firms 140 firms were categorised in to seven sectors; in which the firms of Basic Material sector are only taken for the study Final sample = 24 firms of Basic Material Sector

Research Tools Used for the Study

The daily return is calculated, which is the first difference in logarithm of closing prices as given below:

$$r_t = \log\left(\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}}\right) \times 100$$

Where P_{\parallel} and P_{\parallel} are the closing market prices of individual firms at the current day and previous day respectively.

First, the distributional properties of daily price return series (r,) of the selected 24 firms under Basic Materials ector are computed using descriptive statistics. Second, the study tested for stationarity in the data series. The formal method to test the stationarity of a series is the unit root test, which is used to detect the presence and form of non-stationarity. Finally, the variance ratio (VR) is employed to analyse the behavior of returns in short-run and longrun periods for all the firms of BSE.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics provides the historical account of return behaviour, which includes mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis including the Jarque-Bera statistics, which tests for normality. If the residuals are normally distributed, the histogram should be bell-shaped and the Jarque-Bera statistic should not be significant. It strongly rejects the hypothesis of normal distribution.

 H_0 : Series is normally distributed (JB=0) H_i : Series is not normally distributed (JB"0)

Testing for Stationary

Unit root tests are used to test for stationarity. The well known unit root test, namely Augmented Dickey Fuller (*ADF*) test (**Dickeyand Fuller**, 1979) is applied to examine the unit root in the time series data. The hypothesis is stated below:

 H_0 : Series is non-stationary (There is unit root) H_1 : Series is stationary (There is no unit root)

If the series is stationary then the unit root will be absent and vice versa. If the test statistics value is more than the critical values, the H_0 cannot be rejected.

Variance Ratio Test

The study undertaken by Lo and MacKinlay (1988) is the foundation of the VR test approach. It is by far the most important study on the RWH. Hence, it is used for identifying how do the stock returns of the selected firms under Basic Materialsector behave, i.e. whether they behave in long-run or in short-run.Lo and Mackinlay (1988) test the RWH using the VR test using the statistics mentioned below:

$$X_{i} = \mu + X_{i-1} + \varepsilon_{i}$$

Where

 $X_r = \log \text{ price process}$

 μ = drift parameter

 $\varepsilon_r = \text{random disturbance error}$

The
$$VR$$
 is given by the formula: $VR(q) = \frac{\frac{1}{q} Var(p_{t-1} - p_{t-q})}{Var(p_{t-1} - p_{t-1})} = \frac{\sigma^2(q)}{\sigma^2(1)}$

Where, Var is the variance operator and q is the positive integer and the null hypothesis VR(q) = 1.

Ha: Returns of BSE firms follows a random walk H₁: Returns of BSE firms follows non-random walk

The **RWH** requires that the **VR** for all the chosen intervals(q) be equal to one. If VR is less than one then the series is said to be 'mean reverting' and if VR is greater than one then the series is said to be 'persistent'.

Results and Discussion

Table 1shows that the daily return is positive for all the 24 firms. It ranges between 0.187% for SESAGOA and 0.031% for HINDAL. From the σ , it is inferred that the volatility in daily share price returns is high for $JSWSTL(\sigma = 3.68)$ and it is low for $ASIAN(\sigma = 1.69)$. The S is close to zero for few number of firms viz., AMBUJA, ASIAN, CHAMBAL, GUJNARM and JINDSAW. The negative and positive S for most of the firms indicates that the daily return series of Basic Material firms are departure from normality.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Returns of Basic Material Stocks for the period from 2003 to 2012

S.No.	Firms	Mean (\bar{X})	Standard Deviation (\sigma)	Skewness (S)	Kurtosis (K)	Jarque- Bera Statistic	Sig
1.	ACC	0.087	2.23	-0.403	7.33	2014.23*	0.0000
2.	AKZO	0.081	1.93	0.067	10.72	6205.75*	0.0000
3.	AMBUJA	0.089	2.28	-0.039	5.90	873.72*	0.0000
4.	ASIAN	0.121	1.69	-0.025	8.52	3168.63*	0.0000
5.	BASF	0.075	2.30	0.766	9.93	5235.23*	0.0000
6.	CASTROL	0.071	1.94	0.913	8.44	3423.04*	0.0000
7.	CHAMBAL	0.070	3.37	0.019	13.31	11056.70*	0.0000
8.	DEEPAK	0.079	2.87	0.270	8.39	3053.35*	0.0000
9.	GUJALKA	0.061	3.19	-0.074	15.03	15062.24*	0.0000
10.	GUJFERT	0.102	3.06	0.187	8.52	3183.39*	0.0000
11.	GUJNARM	0.039	2.64	0.020	7.25	1877.91*	0.0000
12.	HINDAL	0.031	2.84	-0.230	6.90	1605.10*	0.0000
13.	HINDZINC	0.175	3.25	0.327	7.71	2350.60*	0.0000
14.	INDCEM	0.063	3.29	0.150	6.44	1238.92*	0.0000
15.	JINDSAW	0.080	3.08	0.003	6.93	1603.94*	0.0000
16.	JSWSTL	0.121	3.68	0.407	6.97	1707.64*	0.0000
17.	MADCEM	0.099	2.55	0.261	8.60	3288.77*	0.0000
18.	MAHSEAM	0.053	2.45	-0.345	14.51	13824.47*	0.0000
19.	PIDILITE	0.117	2.13	0.506	13.22	10970.35*	0.0000
20.	PRISM	0.086	3.36	0.541	6.36	1292.84*	0.0000
21.	SAIL	0.088	3.35	0.197	7.84	2451.87*	0.0000
22.	SESAGOA	0.187	3.43	0.235	6.25	1118.64*	0.0000
23.	TATCHEM	0.073	2.47	-0.114	7.20	1841.64*	0.0000
24.	TATSTL	0.060	2.95	-0.319	6.36	1214.42*	0.0000
ALL	Firms (Average)	0.088	1.71	-0.718	8.75	3647.73*	0.0000

Source: Computed results based on compiled data collected from CMIE Prowess package. *Significant at 1% level.

From *K* of daily share price return series of all basic metal firms under study, which are positive and are above three, it is inferred that the daily return series are leptokurtic and fat tailed. The Jarque-Bera statistics, which are significant at 1% level for all the firms, strongly reveal the fact that the daily returns of 24 firms of *Basic Material* sector under study do not conform to the normal distribution. Hence the null hypothesis of normality is rejected.

Table 2. Results of Unit Root Test for Basic Material Stocks for the period from 2003 to 2012

S.No.	Firms	Levels	3	First Difference			
		ADF Statistics	Sig	ADF Statistics	Sig		
1.	ACC	0.83	0.8904	-47.06	0.0001		
2.	AKZO	1.33	0.9541	-51.60	0.0001		
3.	AMBUJA	-1.08	0.2557	-49.90	0.0001		
4.	ASIAN	3.67	1.0000	-47.90	0.0001		
5.	BASF	1.13	0.9339	-45.32	0.0001		
6.	CASTROL	-0.71	0.4108	-48.96	0.0001		
7.	CHAMBAL	-0.46	0.5144	-29.54	0.0000		
8.	DEEPAK	-0.16	0.6281	-48.34	0.0001		
9.	GUJALKA	-0.36	0.5566	-47.80	0.0001		
10.	GUJFERT	-0.88	0.3336	-49.20	0.0001		
11.	GUJNARM	-0.49	0.5053	-47.52	0.0001		
12.	HINDAL	-1.37	0.1598	-49.90	0.0001		
13.	HINDZINC	-1.26	0.1909	-50.15	0.0001		
14.	INDCEM	-0.68	0.4247	-49.65	0.0001		
15.	JINDSAW	-1.41	0.1479	-49.65	0.0001		
16.	JSWSTL	-0.40	0.5413	-46.11	0.0001		
17.	MADCEM	-2.07	0.0365	-52.62	0.0001		
18.	MAHSEAM	-0.59	0.4623	-48.77	0.0001		
19.	PIDILITE	-1.62	0.0997	-52.63	0.0001		
20.	PRISM	-0.18	0.6197	-37.41	0.0000		
21.	SAIL	-0.60	0.4584	-47.79	0.0001		
22.	SESAGOA	-1.60	0.1036	-48.46	0.0001		
23.	TATCHEM	0.09	0.7124	-44.80	0.0001		
24.	TATSTL	-0.48	0.5062	-47.89	0.0001		
ALL I	Firms (Average)			-42.89	0.0001		
MacKi	innon One Sided		1% level	5% level	10% level		
Test C	Critical values		-2.57	-1.94	-1.62		

Source: Computed results based on compiled data collected from CMIE Prowess package.

The results of *ADF* test investigating whether the daily share price (levels) and its returns (first difference) are stationary for the firms under *Basic Material* sector are shown in *table* 2. From the table, it is inferred that the *ADF* test statistics are insignificant thereby it reveals that the stock prices are non-stationary. However, the *ADF* test statistics are highly significant

at 1 % level for the first difference, i.e., for return series, which led to reject the null hypothesis of unit root. The H_0 is accepted, which implies that the series are non-stationary and has unit root, i.e. integrated of order zero. However, H_0 of unit root is rejected at first difference for all the firms, as the ADF statistics are significant at 1% level, which implies that the return series are stationary and are integrated of order one. That is, though share prices are non-stationary, daily price return series are stationary for all the firms of Basic Material sector.

Table 3. Results of Variance Ratio Test for Daily Return Series of Basic Material Stocksfor the period from 2003 to 2012

Firms	Estimates	Lags (q Days)								
	& Test Statistics	q=30	q=60	q=90 q	=120	q=180	q=240	q=360	q=480	q=500
	VR	0.035	0.017	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.002
ACC	Z(q)	-7.82*	-5.56*	-4.54*	-3.94*			-2.28**	-1.97**	-1.93
	Z*(q)	-6.39*	-4.70*	-3.93*	-3.46*	-2.87*	-2.52*	-2.10**	-1.85	-1.82
	VR	0.031	0.016	0.011	0.008	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.031
AKZO	Z(q)	-7.85*	-5.56*	-4.55*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.85*
	Z*(q)	-5.31*	-4.20*	-3.64*	-3.27*	-2.81*	-2.51**	-2.13**	-1.89	-5.31*
	VR	0.034	0.017	0.011	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.034
AMBUJA	Z(q)	-7.83*	-5.56*	-4.55*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.83*
	Z*(q)	-5.88*	-4.33*	-3.64*	-3.22*	-2.71*	-2.39**	-2.02**	-1.80	-5.88*
	VR	0.032	0.016	0.011	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.032
ASIAN	Z(q)	-7.84*	-5.57*	-4.55*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.84*
	Z*(q)	-6.18*	-4.74*	-4.01*	-3.54*	-2.96*	-2.60*	-2.15**	-1.89	-6.18*
	VR	0.036	0.018	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.036
BASF	Z(q)	-7.81*	-5.55*	-4.54*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.81*
	Z *(q)	-6.56*	-4.93*	-4.13*	-3.64*	-3.04*	-2.67*	-2.22**	-1.94	-6.56*
	VR	0.034	0.018	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.034
CASTRO	L = Z(q)	-7.83*	-5.56*	-4.54*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.83*
	Z*(q)	-5.73*	-4.33*	-3.67*	-3.25*	-2.73*	-2.41**	-2.02**	-1.79	-5.73*
	VR	0.034	0.018	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.034
CHAMB	AL Z(q)	-7.82*	-5.56*	-4.54*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.82*
	$Z^*(q)$	-4.61*	-3.59*	-3.05*	-2.70*	-2.27**	-2.00**	-1.69	-1.51	-4.61*
	VR	0.035	0.017	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.035
DEEPAK	Z(q)	-7.81*	-5.56*	-4.54*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.81*
	Z*(q)	-5.31*	-4.04*	-3.44*	-3.06*	-2.59*	-2.30**	-1.95	-1.73	-5.31*
	VR	0.034	0.017	0.011	0.009	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.034
GUJALK.	A = Z(q)	-7.82*	-5.56*	-4.55*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.82*
	Z*(q)	-5.61*	-4.23*	-3.57*	-3.16*	-2.66*	-2.35**	-1.99**	-1.77	-5.61*
	VR	0.036	0.018	0.012	0.009	0.006	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.036
GUJFERT	Z(q)	-7.81*	-5.55*	-4.54*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.81*
	Z*(q)	-6.07*	-4.57*	-3.85*	-3.39*	-2.82*	-2.47**	-2.06**	-1.83	-6.07*
	VR	0.036	0.018		0.009		0.004	0.003	0.002	0.036
GUJNAR	M = Z(q)	-7.81*	-5.55*	-4.55*	-3.94*	-3.22*	-2.79*	-2.28**	-1.97**	-7.81*

```
Z*(q) -5.73* -4.33* -3.67* -3.25* -2.73* -2.41** -2.02**
                                                                   -1.79 -5.73*
                 0.037
                         0.019 0.013 0.009 0.007 0.005
                                                          0.003 0.002 0.037
HINDAL
            Z(q) -7.80* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94*
                                            -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.80*
            Z*(q) -5.96* -4.42* -3.70* -3.27* -2.72* -2.39** -1.99**
                                                                   -1.75 -5.96*
                 0.035
                        0.018 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.004
                                                          0.003 0.002 0.035
HINDZINC
            Z(q) -7.82* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.82*
            Z*(q) -5.95* -4.40* -3.68* -3.25* -2.73* -2.41** -2.04**
                                                                  -1.81 -5.95*
             VR 0.035 0.018 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.004 0.003 0.002 0.035
            Z(q) -7.82* -5.56* -4.55* -3.94*
INDCEM
                                            -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.82*
            Z*(q) -6.27* -4.70* -3.96* -3.50* -2.94* -2.58* -2.15** -1.90 -6.27*
             VR 0.037 0.019 0.013 0.009
                                            0.006 0.005 0.003 0.002 0.037
JINDSAW
            Z(g) -7.80* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.80*
            Z*(q) -6.26* -4.65* -3.92* -3.47* -2.90* -2.56** -2.14**
                                                                  -1.88 -6.26*
             VR 0.037 0.019 0.013 0.010 0.006 0.005 0.003 0.002 0.037
JSWSTL
            Z(q) -7.80* -5.55* -4.54* -3.93* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.80*
            Z*(q) -6.21* -4.63* -3.90* -3.44* -2.89* -2.54** -2.13**
                                                                   -1.88 -6.21*
             VR 0.033 0.017 0.011 0.008 0.006 0.004 0.003 0.002 0.033
            Z(q) -7.83* -5.56* -4.55* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.83*
MADCEM
            Z*(q) -5.65* -4.39* -3.75* -3.34* -2.82* -2.49** -2.08**
                                                                  -1.84 -5.65*
             VR 0.036 0.017 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.004 0.003 0.002 0.036
MAHSEAM
            Z(q) -7.81* -5.56* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.81*
            Z*(q) -5.22* -4.05* -3.48* -3.12* -2.64* -2.34** -1.96**
                                                                   -1.73 -5.22*
                                                          0.003 0.002 0.036
                 0.036
                        0.018 0.012 0.009
                                            0.006 0.005
PIDILITE
            Z(q) -7.81* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.81*
            Z^*(q) -5.49* -4.32* -3.70* -3.32* -2.82* -2.48** -2.05** -1.80 -5.49*
             VR 0.037 0.018 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.004 0.003 0.002 0.037
            Z(q) -7.80* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.80*
PRISM
            Z*(q) -6.12* -4.59* -3.84* -3.38* -2.83* -2.49** -2.08**
                                                                  -1.84 -6.12*
             VR 0.036 0.018 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.004 0.003 0.002 0.036
SAIL
            Z(q) -7.81* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.81*
            Z^*(q) -5.60* -4.29* -3.64* -3.23* -2.74* -2.43** -2.05** -1.82 -5.60*
             VR 0.035 0.018 0.012 0.009 0.006 0.005
                                                          0.003 0.002 0.035
SESAGOA
            Z(q) -7.82* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.82*
            Z^*(q) -6.60* -4.86* -4.05* -3.56* -2.96* -2.59* -2.16** -1.90 -6.60*
             VR 0.038 0.019 0.013 0.010 0.006 0.005 0.003 0.002 0.038
TATCHEM
            Z(q) -7.79* -5.55* -4.54* -3.94* -3.22* -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.79*
            Z*(q) -5.78* -4.33* -3.66* -3.23* -2.70* -2.37** -1.98**
                                                                   -1.75 -5.78*
                 0.037
                        0.018 0.013 0.009 0.006 0.005
                                                           0.003
                                                                   0.002 0.037
TATSTL
            Z(q) -7.80* -5.56* -4.54* -3.94*
                                            -3.22*
                                                   -2.79* -2.28** -1.97** -7.80*
            Z*(q) -5.50* -4.08* -3.44* -3.04* -2.54** -2.24*
                                                            -1.89
                                                                   -1.68 -5.50*
```

Source: Computed results based on compiled data collected from CMIE Prowess package.

To analyze the share price returns of the selected 24 firms under *Basic Material* sector and to study their behavior in short-run and long-run, *VR*

VR - Variance Ratio

Z(q) Estimated with assumption of homoscedasticity

Z*(q) Estimated with assumption of heteroscedasticity robustness

^{*}Significant at 1% level, **Significant at 5% level.

test is used for both the short lags and long lags (from lag of 30 days to lag of 500 days) and the results are shown in table 3.

In the table, for shorter and longer lags, the VR is shown along with test statistics under the assumption of both the homoscedasticity (Z(q)) and the heteroscedasticity $(Z^*(q))$. It is inferred from the table that the VR is less than one for all the selected lags of all the 24 firms, which evidences for negative serial correlation in the share price returns.

The VR decreases with the interval length of q expand. This scenario is visible for all the firms, which shows that there has been a mean reverting tendency of return series in both the short-run as well as the long-run. The test statistics estimated under the assumption of homoscedasticity are significant for all the lags of all the firms, which rejects RW in the return series in terms of both the short-run as well as the long-run. However, the rejection may be attributed to the presence of heteroscedasticity or serial correlation in the data series.

Hence, the test-statistics $Z^*(q)$ robust to heteroscedasticity is estimated for all lags. If the behavior of RW robust to heteroscedasticity is also rejected in time series data, then it may be due to serial correlation in the data series. Here, heteroscedastic robust test statistic $Z^*(q)$ are also significant for all the firms in respect of all the lags ranging from 30 to 500. At one per cent level for all the intervals, the H_0 "returns of BSE 24 firms follows a random walk of RW" is rejected, hence it is concluded that there is a non-random behavior in both the short-run as well asthe long-run and such behavior is not due to heteroscedasticity but likely due to serial correlation in respect of daily share price return series for all the firms.

Summary and Conclusion

The objective of the paper is to investigate whether prices in Indian SM returns follow a random-walk process. The study used the daily closing prices of 24 firms of BSE 500. First, the descriptive statistics were calculated in order to know the distributional properties and the normality of the returns of 24 firms during the study period of 10 years. Secondly, the study used ADF test to investigate whether the daily returns are stationary series. Finally, the VR test suggested by Lo and MacKinlay (1988) is used to test RWin the stock returns for homoscedasticity and heteroscedasticity assumptions. The results of VR test reveals that Indian stock return does not follow a RWH, in other words, there exists a non-random behaviour of return both in longrun and short-run lags. The VR test concludes that the RWH is rejected for all the 24 firms, and the tendency is towards mean reversion (VR < 1). The results of the study confirm the mean reverting behaviour of stock returns and overreaction of stock price during the study period.

REFERENCES

- Black, F, 1990. "Mean Reversion and Consumption Smoothing". Review of Financial Studies.3(1): 107-114.
- Cecchetti, S. G., L. Pok-Sam, and N. C. Mark, 1990. "Mean Reversion in Equilibrium Asset Prices". American EconomicReview,80(3): 398-418.
- Charles, A., and O. Darne, 2009. "Variance Ratio Tests of Random Walk: An Overview". Journal of Economic Surveys, 23(3): 503-527.
- 4. Chen, J. H, 2008. "Variance Ratio Tests of the Random Walk Hypothesis of the Euro Exchange Rate". International Business & Economics Research Journal, 7(12): 97-106.
- Chen, S, 2009. "Random Walks in Asian Foreign Exchange Markets: Evidence from New Multiple Variance Ratio Tests". Economics Bulletin, 29(2): 1296-1307.
- Chow, K.V., and K. C. Denning, 1993. "A Simple Multiple Variance Ratio Test". Journal of Econometrics, 58(3): 385-401.
- 7. De Bondt, W. F. M., and R. Thaler, 1990. "Do Security Analysts Overreact?" American Economic Review, 80(2): 52-57.
- Dickey, D. A., and W. A. Fuller, 1979."Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root". Journal of American Statistical Association, 74(366): 427-31.
- 9. Jog, V., and H. Schaller, 1994. "Finance Constraints and Asset Pricing: Evidence on Mean Reversion". Journal of EmpiricalFinance,1(2): 193-209.
- Li, B., and B. Liu, 2012."A Variance-Ratio Test of Random Walk in International Stock Markets". The Empirical Economics Letters 11(8): 775-782.
- Lo, A.W., and C. A. MacKinlay, 1988. "Stock Prices Do Not Follow Random Walks: Evidence From a Simple Specification Test". Review of Financial Studies, 1(1): 41-66.
- 12. Madhusoodanan, T. P, 1998. "Persistence in Indian Stock Market Returns: An Application of Variance Ratio Test". Vikalpa, 23(4): 61-73.
- 13. Mbululu, D., C. J. Auret, and L. Chiliba, 2013. "Do Exchange Rates Follow Random Walk? A Variance Ratio Test of the Zambian Foreign-Exchange Market". Southern African Business Review, 17(2): 45-66.
- 14. Poterba, J. and L. Summers, 1988. "Mean Reversion in Stock Returns: Evidence and Implications". Journal of FinancialEconomics, 22(1): 27-59.
- 15. Smith, G, and H. J. Ryoo, 2003."Variance Ratio Tests of the Random Walk Hypothesis for European Emerging Stock Markets". The European Journal of Finance, 9(3): 290-300.
- Smith, G, K. Jeferis, and H. J. Ryoo, 2002. "African Stock Markets: Multiple Variance Tests of Random Walks". Applied Financial Economics, 12(7): 475-484.
- Wen, C. C, 2009."A Variance Ratio Test of Random Walk in Energy Spot Markets".
 Journal of Quantitative Economics, 8(1): 105-117.
- 18. Wright, J, 2000. "Alternative variance ratio tests using ranks and signs". Journal of Business and Economics Statistics, 18(1): 1-9.



Appendix - A LIST OF FIRMS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY WITH ABBREVIATION

S.No.	Firms	Abbreviation		
l	A C C Ltd.	ACC		
2.	Akzo Nobel India Ltd.	AKZO		
3.	Ambuja Cements Ltd.	<i>AMBUJA</i>		
4.	Asian Paints Ltd.	ASIAN		
5.	B A S F India Ltd.	BASF		
6.	Castrol India Ltd.	CASTROL		
7.	Chambal Fertilisers & Chemicals Ltd.	CHAMBAL		
8.	Deepak Fertilisers & Petrochemicals Corpn. Ltd.	DEEPAK		
9.	Gujarat Alkalies & Chemicals Ltd.	GUJALKA		
10.	Gujarat State Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd.	GUJFERT		
11.	Gujarat Narmada Valley Fertilizers & Chemicals Ltd.	GUJNARM		
12.	Hindalco Industries Ltd.	HINDAL		
13.	Hindustan Zinc Ltd.	HINDZINC		
14.	India Cements Ltd.	INDCEM		
15.	J S W Steel Ltd.	JINDSAW		
16.	Jindal Saw Ltd.	JSWSTL		
17.	Madras Cements Ltd.	MADCEM		
18.	Maharashtra Seamless Ltd.	MAHSEAM		
19.	Pidilite Industries Ltd.	PIDILITE		
20.	Prism Cement Ltd.	PRISM		
21.	Steel Authority Of India Ltd.	SAIL		
22.	Sesa Goa Ltd.	SESAGOA		
23.	Tata Chemicals Ltd.	TATCHEM		
24.	Tata Steel Ltd.	TATSTL		

Source: CMIE Prowess package.