

1 **Original Research Article**  
2 **The Dynamic Relationship between Crude Oil Prices**  
3 **and Stock Market Price Volatility in Nigeria: A**  
4 **Cointegrated VAR-GARCH Model**

5  
6  
7 **ABSTRACT**  
8

This study investigates the dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock market price volatility in Nigeria using cointegrated Vector Generalized Autoregressive conditional Heteroskedasticity (VAR-GARCH) model. The study utilizes monthly data on the study variables from January 2006 to April 2017 and employs Dickey-Fuller Generalized least squares unit root test, simple linear regression model, unrestricted vector autoregressive model, Granger causality test and standard GARCH model as methods of analysis. Results shows that the study variables are integrated of order one, no long-run stable relationship was found to exist between crude oil prices and stock market prices in Nigeria. Both crude oil prices and stock market prices were found to have positive and significant impact on each other indicating that an increase in crude oil prices will increase stock market prices and vice versa. Both crude oil prices and stock market prices were found to have predictive information on one another in the long-run. A one-way causality ran from crude oil prices to stock market prices suggesting that crude oil prices determine stock prices and are a driven force in Nigerian stock market. Results of GARCH (1,1) models show high persistence of shocks in the conditional variance of both returns. The conditional volatility of stock market price log return was found to be stable and predictable while that of crude oil price log return was found to be unstable and unpredictable, although a dependable and dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock market prices was found to exist. The study provides some policy recommendations.

9  
10 *Keywords: Cointegration; VAR; GARCH; Dynamic relationship; Crude oil price; Stock market price;*  
11 *Volatility; Nigeria.*

12  
13 **1. INTRODUCTION**

14 Crude oil prices have shown to some extent great instability in recent times. This is believed to have  
15 caused by financial, economic and political crises. Due to the extensive use of crude oil as a crucial  
16 input in the production and manufacturing process as well as a final consumption good, the  
17 fluctuations in its prices have a great impact on the overall economic activities, exchange rate,  
18 inflation, corporate earnings, and other economic variables. Because crude oil prices has been  
19 considered an underlying factor in understanding stock market price fluctuations, many scholars are  
20 particularly interested in investigating the dynamic relationship between crude oil price fluctuations  
21 and the stock market price volatility after the latest global economic and financial crisis. The  
22 asymmetric nature of crude oil price impacts on stock market return volatility has also attracted great  
23 attention of many researchers in recent times.

24 It is generally believed that increase in oil price increases the production cost of industrial oil  
25 consuming states which raises the cost of importing capital goods and consequently affect the  
26 prospects of higher profits earnings for firms trading in such countries. On the side of demand,  
27 increases in oil price will raise the general price level in the market leading to lower real disposable  
28 income which eventually reduces demand. Apart from the direct impact of oil price on general price  
29 levels, it also has secondary effects on national wages which when combined with high general prices  
30 lead to increased inflation. Any attempt by the central bank to control inflationary pressures leads to  
31 increased interest rates, a situation that makes bond investments more attractive than stock  
32 investments which eventually result in reduced stock market prices. Finally, raising import prices  
33 trigger a reduction in the terms of trade which imposes welfare losses. Oil-exporting economies,  
34 however gain on the other hand from higher export revenues, which could further cause a decline in a  
35 global oil demand [1]. An in-depth understanding of the level of susceptibility of stock market prices in  
36 developing countries to global oil prices movement is very important. This study therefore aimed at

37 investigating the dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock market price volatility in  
38 Nigeria using cointegrated Vector Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (VAR-  
39 GARCH) models with more recent data.

40 Empirical evidence on the relationship between stock market prices and oil prices are well  
41 documented in the literature both for developed and emerging economies. See for example, [2]  
42 examined the long-term and short-term relationships between three National Indices of Istanbul Stock  
43 Exchange (ISE) and international Brent oil price using econometric models. The study found a long  
44 term relationship between each of the three index and oil price. Granger causality test indicate a one  
45 way causality running from each index of the stock exchange market to oil price but oil price did not  
46 Granger cause any of the three indices. Aye [3] investigated the impact of oil price uncertainty on  
47 South Africa's stock returns using weekly data covering the period 01/07/1995 to 30/08/2014 using a  
48 bivariate GARCH-in-mean vector autoregressive model. Results showed that oil price uncertainty had  
49 negative and significant effect on stock returns. The response of stock returns to negative and  
50 positive oil price uncertainty shocks was found to be asymmetric. Olivia & Mehtap [4] investigated the  
51 relationship between oil price volatility and economic variables such as interest rate, oil price,  
52 industrial production and real stock return for US from January, 1987 to May, 2011. Their findings  
53 showed that oil price shock had negative and significant impact on the real stock return. Jiranyakul [5]  
54 investigated the impact of oil price uncertainty on the Stock Exchange of Thailand using monthly data  
55 from May 1987 to December 2013. He employed Generalized Autoregressive Conditional  
56 Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) model and pairwise Granger causality test as methods of investigation.  
57 The study found that movement in real oil price did not affect real stock market return but stock price  
58 volatility affect real stock return. The Granger causality test revealed a positive one-directional  
59 volatility transmission running from oil price to stock market. Chittedi [6] investigated the long-run  
60 dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock market prices in India over the period April  
61 2000- June 2011. He employed Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Model as method of  
62 investigation. Results revealed that volatility of stock market prices in India had a significant impact  
63 on the volatility of crude oil prices. However, a change in the crude oil prices did not have any impact  
64 on stock market prices. Buthaina & Ghazi [7] examined the asymmetric responds of the Amman stock  
65 market returns to oil price fluctuations for the quarterly period of 2000 to 2015 in Jordan using  
66 asymmetric cointegration analysis. Results provided evidence that stock returns react to oil price  
67 variations in an asymmetric manner. Increases in oil prices had a significant effect on the behaviour of  
68 stock market in Jordan. See [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] for similar contributions and more  
69 surveys on the subject matter.

70 In Nigeria [17] examined the long-run and short-run dynamic effects of oil price on stock returns in  
71 Nigeria from January, 1985 to April, 2009 using the Johansen cointegration tests. He specified a  
72 bivariate model and empirical results showed a significant positive stock return to oil price shock in the  
73 short-run and a significant negative stock return to oil price shock in the long-run. The Granger  
74 causality test result showed that oil price shock Granger caused stock returns in Nigeria indicating  
75 that variations in the Nigerian stock prices can be explained by oil price volatility. Ogiri *et al.* [18]  
76 investigated the relationship between oil prices and stock market performance in Nigeria. They  
77 employed Johansen cointegration test, Augmented Dickey-Fuller test, Vector error correction (VEC)  
78 model, as well as the Vector autoregressive (VAR) model as methods of analysis. Results showed a  
79 significant link between oil prices and stock market performance in Nigeria. Iheanacho [19] conducted  
80 a study that employed a multivariate Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) which used Granger  
81 causality test and generalized variance decomposition analysis to study the relationship between  
82 crude oil prices, exchange rate and stock market performance in Nigeria from January 1995 to  
83 December 2014. The study found a short-run positive relationship between crude oil prices and the  
84 Nigerian stock market with the direction of causality running from crude oil prices to the Nigerian stock  
85 market. The short run relationship between exchange rate and Nigerian stock market was also found  
86 to be positive and the direction of causality was from the exchange rate to the Nigerian stock market.  
87 Exchange rate was also found to be positively related to the movements in the crude oil prices in the  
88 short run with the direction of causality running from crude oil prices to exchange rate. However, the  
89 results of a multivariate Johansen cointegration test indicated the existence of negative relationship  
90 among the three study variables in the long-run. The variance decomposition analysis showed that  
91 the Nigerian stock market performance and exchange rate behaviour were strongly influenced by the  
92 movements in crude oil prices. Lawal *et al.* [20] examined the impact of both the exchange rate  
93 volatility and oil price volatility on stock market volatility in Nigeria using EGARCH model. The result

94 showed that share price volatility is induced by both the exchange rate volatility and oil price volatility.  
 95 See also [21] for more surveys in Nigeria.

96  
 97

## 98 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

99

### 100 2.1 Source of Data

101 This study utilizes monthly data on crude oil prices and all share index from January 2006 to April  
 102 2017 obtained from central bank of Nigeria's website. The monthly data are converted to monthly  
 103 returns using  $r_t = \ln(R_{t-1} - R_t) \times 100$  where  $r_t$  is the log return,  $R_{t-1}$  is the price of the previous  
 104 month while  $R_t$  is the price of the current month.

### 105 2.2 Dickey-Fuller Generalized Least Squares (DF GLS) Unit Root Test

106 We employ Dickey-Fuller Generalized Least Squares (DF GLS) unit root test to investigate the unit  
 107 root property and order of integration of oil prices and stock market prices in Nigeria. The DFGLS test  
 108 involves estimating the standard ADF test equation:

$$\Delta Y_t = \alpha Y_{t-1} + X_t' \delta + \beta_1 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta Y_{t-2} + \dots + \beta_p \Delta Y_{t-p} + v_t \quad (1)$$

109 After substituting the DFGLS detrended  $Y_t^d$  for the original  $Y_t$ , we have

$$\Delta Y_t^d = \alpha Y_{t-1}^d + \beta_1 \Delta Y_{t-1}^d + \dots + \beta_p \Delta Y_{t-p}^d + v_t \quad (2)$$

110 As with the ADF test, we consider the t-ratio for  $\hat{\alpha}$  from this test equation and evaluate

$$t_\alpha = \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{se(\hat{\alpha})} \quad (3)$$

111 Where  $\hat{\alpha}$  is the estimate of  $\alpha$ , and  $se(\hat{\alpha})$  is the coefficient standard error. The null and alternative  
 112 hypotheses may be written as:  $H_0: \alpha = 0$  against  $H_1: \alpha < 0$ . The test rejects the null hypothesis of unit  
 113 root if the DFGLS test statistic is less than the test critical values at the designated test sizes. See  
 114 [22].

### 115 2.3 Linear Regression Model Specification

116 To investigate the impact of crude oil price on stock market prices and the impact of stock market  
 117 prices on crude oil price in Nigeria, we employ a simple linear regression models specified as follows:

$$COP_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ASI_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4)$$

$$ASI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 COP_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (5)$$

118 where  $COP_t$  represents crude oil prices at time  $t$ ,  $ASI_t$  represents all share index used as proxy for  
 119 stock market prices at time  $t$ ,  $\varepsilon_t$  is the error term,  $\beta_0$  is the intercept of the regression model while  $\beta_1$   
 120 is the slope coefficient of the independent variable.

### 121 2.4 Johansen Cointegration Test

122 Johansen [23, 24] developed a Vector Autoregressive based cointegration test methodology as  
 123 follows: Let a VAR (p) model be define as:

$$Y_t = \phi_1 Y_{t-1} + \phi_2 Y_{t-2} + \dots + \phi_p Y_{t-p} + BX_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (6)$$

124 where  $Y_t$  is the  $k$ -vector of non-stationary I(1) variables,  $X_t$  is the  $d$ -vector of deterministic variables  
 125 and  $\varepsilon_t$  is a vector of innovations. We may rewrite this VAR as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \Pi Y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + BX_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (7)$$

$$\text{where } \Pi = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i - I, \quad \Gamma_i = - \sum_{j=i+1}^p A_j \quad (8)$$

126 Granger's representation theorem assumes that if the coefficient matrix  $\Pi$  has reduced rank  $r < k$ ,  
 127 then there exist  $k \times r$  matrices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  each with rank  $r$  such that  $\Pi = \alpha\beta'$  and  $\beta'Y_t$  is I(0).  $r$  is the  
 128 number of cointegrating relations (the cointegrating rank) and each column of  $\beta$  is the cointegrating

129 vector. Johansen cointegration test computes two statistics: trace statistic and maximum eigenvalue  
130 statistic. The trace statistic for the null hypothesis of  $r$  cointegrating relations is computed as:

$$LR_{tr}(r|k) = -T \sum_{i=r+1}^k \log(1 - \lambda_i) \quad (9)$$

131 The maximum eigenvalue test statistic is computed as:

$$132 \quad LR_{max}(r|r+1) = -T \log(1 - \lambda_{r+1}) = LR_{tr}(r|k) - LR_{tr}(r+1|k) \quad (10)$$

133 where  $\lambda_i$  is the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of the  $\Pi$  matrix in equation (8),  $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$ .

## 134 2.5 Vector Autoregressive (VAR) Model

135 VAR models are used for analyzing multivariate time series and each variable in VAR model is a  
136 linear function of past lags of itself and past lags of the other variables. We consider two different time  
137 series variables in this study denoted by  $ASI_{t,1}$  and  $COP_{t,2}$ . The vector autoregressive model of order  
138 1, denoted by VAR (1), is expressed as:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} ASI_{t,1} &= \alpha_1 + \phi_{11}ASI_{t-1,1} + \phi_{12}ASI_{t-1,2} + w_{t,1} \\ COP_{t,2} &= \alpha_2 + \phi_{21}COP_{t-1,1} + \phi_{22}COP_{t-1,2} + w_{t,2} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (11)$$

139 Each variable is a linear function of the lag 1 values for all variables in the set. For a VAR (p) model,  
140 the first p lags of each variable in the system are used as regression predictors for each variable.

## 141 2.6 VAR Granger Causality Test Based on Toda-Yamamoto Procedure

142 We employ Toda & Yamamoto Granger causality test procedure due to [25] to determine the direction  
143 of causality among the study variables. Toda and Yamamoto procedure uses a Modified Wald  
144 (MWALD) test for restrictions on the parameters of the VAR (k) model. The model is specified as  
145 follows:

$$COP_t = \alpha_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d} \beta_{1i}COP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d} \beta_{2i}ASI_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{xt} \quad (12)$$

$$ASI_t = \alpha_2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d} \phi_{1i}ASI_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+d} \phi_{2i}COP_{t-i} + \varepsilon_{yt} \quad (13)$$

146 where  $k$  is the optimal lag order;  $d$  is the maximal order of integration of the series in the system;  $\varepsilon_{xt}$   
147 and  $\varepsilon_{yt}$  are error terms which are assumed to be white noise. The usual Wald test is then applied to  
148 the first  $k$  coefficient matrices using the standard  $\chi^2$ -statistics. The test checks the following pairs of  
149 hypotheses:  $COP_t$  "Granger causes"  $ASI_t$  if  $\beta_{2i} \neq 0$  in equation (12) against  $ASI_t$  "Granger causes"  
150  $COP_t$  if  $\phi_{1i} \neq 0$  in equation (13)

## 151 2.7 The Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) Model

152 To further investigate the dependable relationship between crude oil price and stock market prices log  
153 returns, we apply the standard GARCH (1,1) model proposed by [26 & 27]. The time series  $\varepsilon_t$   
154 following a GARCH (p,q) model is defined as:

$$\varepsilon_t = \eta_t \sqrt{h_t} \quad (14)$$

$$h_t = \omega + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \varepsilon_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_j h_{t-j} \quad (15)$$

155 where  $\omega$ ,  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_j$  are non-negative constraints with  $\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \varepsilon_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_j h_{t-j} < 1$  in order to ensure  
156 that the conditional variance ( $h_t$ ) is positive and stationary. The GARCH (1,1) is the most popular and  
157 simplest model for explaining volatility and is expressed as:

$$\varepsilon_t = \eta_t \sqrt{h_t} \quad (16)$$

$$h_t = \omega + \alpha_1 \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 h_{t-1} \quad (17)$$

158 where  $\varepsilon_t$  is the underlying process,  $\{\eta_t\}$  are iid random variables with mean zero and variance 1 and  
159 are assumed to be standard normally distributed. For a standard GARCH (1,1) model to be stationary

160 the sum of ARCH term ( $\alpha_1$ ) and GARCH term ( $\beta_1$ ) must be less than one. If  $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 > 1$ , the  
 161 conditional variance becomes unstable, non-stationary and therefore explodes.  
 162

### 163 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 164 3.1 Unit Root Test Result

165 This study employs the Dickey-Fuller Generalized Least Squares (DF GLS) unit root test to explore  
 166 the stationarity characteristics of the study variables with the result presented in Table 1. The DF GLS  
 167 unit root test result shows that crude oil prices and stock market prices are non-stationary in levels but  
 168 stationary after the first difference.

169  
 170 **Table 1:** DF GLS Unit Root Test Results

Variable	Option	DF GLS Test Statistic	Critical Values		
			1%	5%	10%
ASI	Constant only	-1.5991	-2.5827	-1.9433	-1.6151
	Constant & trend	-2.7634	-3.5416	-2.9980	-2.7080
$\Delta$ ASI	Constant only	-4.8421**	-2.5827	-1.9433	-1.6151
	Constant & trend	-4.8907**	-3.5428	-2.9990	-2.7090
COP	Constant only	-1.9201	-2.5823	-1.9432	-1.6151
	Constant & trend	-2.5947	-3.5392	-2.9960	-2.7060
$\Delta$ COP	Constant only	-7.2307**	-2.5823	-1.9432	-1.6151
	Constant & trend	-7.3959**	-3.5392	-2.9960	-2.7060

171 **Note:** \*\*denotes significance of the DF GLS test statistic at 1% and 5% significance levels  
 172

#### 173 3.2 Simple Linear Regression Results

174 To investigate the impact of crude oil prices on stock market prices and also determine the impact of  
 175 stock market prices on crude oil prices, we estimate two simple linear regression models by using  
 176 stock market prices (ASI) as a dependent variable in one and crude oil prices (COP) as a dependent  
 177 variable in another. Results are presented in Table 2.

178  
 179 **Table 2:** OLS Estimates of Dependable Relationship between Study Variables

Dependent Variable: ASI				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	P-value
C	24106.48	2791.302	8.636288	0.0000
COP	95.62452	32.00445	2.987851	0.0033
Dependent Variable: COP				
C	61.88971	7.366047	8.402025	0.0000
ASI	0.000653	0.000219	2.987851	0.0033
R-squared	0.762460	F-statistic	8.927255	Durbin Watson
Adjusted R-squared	0.554642	Prob (F-statistic)	0.003342	1.90535

180  
 181 The estimated linear regression models in Table 2 can be represented in equation forms as shown:  
 182

$$COP_t = 24106.48 + 95.62452ASI_t + \epsilon_t \quad (3.1)$$

$$ASI_t = 61.88971 + 0.000653COP_t + \epsilon_t \quad (3.2)$$

183 All the coefficients of the estimated models are statistically significant at 1% marginal significance  
 184 level. The intercepts in both models are positively related to the dependent variables. Both crude oil  
 185 prices and stock market prices has positive and significant impact on each other indicating that an  
 186 increase in crude oil prices will increase stock market prices and vice versa, however the impact of  
 187 crude oil prices on stock market prices is much higher. The coefficient of variation has shown that  
 188 about 76.25% of the total variability in the models has been explained. The Durbin Watson statistic  
 189 value of 1.90535 which is greater than  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$  indicates that the estimated models are

190 non-spurious. This also shows the absence of positive serial correlation in the model. The overall  
 191 goodness-of-fit of the model is also adequate as the F-statistic p-value is highly statistical significant.

### 192 2.3 Johansen Cointegration Test Result

193 To determine the long-run stable relationship between crude oil prices and stock market prices in  
 194 Nigeria, we employ Johansen cointegration trace and maximum eigenvalue tests. The results are  
 195 presented in Table 3

196  
 197 **Table 3: Johansen Cointegration Test Results on the Study Variables**

Rank	Null Hypothesis	Eigen value	Trace Test		Maximum Eigenvalue Test	
			Trace stat.	P-value	$\lambda_{max}$ Stat.	P-value
0	$r = 0$	0.045809	7.857918	0.4807	6.142841	0.5949
1	$r \leq 1$	0.013007	1.715077	0.1903	1.715077	0.1903

198

199 Both the trace test and maximum eigenvalue test results reported in Table 3 indicate no cointegrating  
 200 equation at any significance level. This shows that the study variables are not cointegrated and there  
 201 is no long-run stable relationship existing between them.

### 202 3.4 Vector Autoregressive (VAR) Model Result

203 Having tested and found no cointegration relationship between the study variables, we proceed with  
 204 unrestricted VAR estimation. However, before estimating a VAR model, we conduct a VAR lag  
 205 selection test shown in Table 4. Result shows that a maximum lag of 1 should be included in the VAR  
 206 model for each study variable.

207

208 **Table 4: VAR Lag Order Selection Criteria**

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-912.4490	NA	4214.914	14.02212	14.15381	14.07563
1	-897.7918	28.19564*	3582.214*	13.85942*	14.07890*	13.94860*
2	-895.3742	4.576839	3670.285	13.88358	14.19085	14.00843
3	-890.50088	3.129636	3522.272	13.87070	14.29798	14.04415

209 **Note:** \* indicates lag order selected by the criterion

210

211 We estimate unrestricted vector autoregressive model in levels using one lag of each variable with a  
 212 constant. Result is reported in Table 5.

213

214 **Table 5: Unrestricted VAR Model Parameter Estimates**

	COP	ASI
COP(-1)	0.973873 (0.02217) [43.9323]	-0.973087 (8.13676) [-0.11959]
ASI (-1)	-0.00008 (0.00005) [-0.14109]	0.971569 (0.02118) [45.8776]
C	2.320598 (2.34188) [0.99091]	1004.570 (859.603) [1.16864]
R-squared	0.939531	0.944286
Adjusted R-squared	0.938614	0.943441
F-statistic	1025.462	1118.611


215 **Note:** Standard errors in ( ) & t-statistics in [ ]

216 The estimated unrestricted VAR model reasonably explains changes in crude oil and stock market  
 217 prices well with approximate R-squared and adjusted R-squared of 94% in the short-run. Crude oil  
 218 and stock market prices appear to have high predictive information on one another since both have  
 219 large coefficients at lag one which are statistically significant. The F-statistic which measures the  
 220 overall fitness of the model is reasonably high indicating that the estimated unrestricted VAR model is  
 221 adequate and a good fit.

222 The qualitative features of the estimated unrestricted VAR model are captured in the impulse  
 223 response functions, which aids in assessing whether crude oil prices contains information about the  
 224 stock market prices sufficiently far into the future to be operationally meaningful. Figure 1 shows the  
 225 responses to one-standard-deviation positive shocks to each variable over an expanse of 24 months.

226 The impulse responses of the VAR model showed that shocks to the stock market prices persist and  
 227 have proportional effects on their own levels in the short run and long run. A positive shock to the  
 228 stock market prices also persistently raises the crude oil prices in the long run. Responses of crude oil  
 229 prices to its own innovations also persist but it show some inconsistencies in their effects on stock  
 230 market prices. There is a little short-run effect of the crude oil prices on stock market prices.

231 The variance decomposition results for 24 months ahead reported in Table 6 support the result of  
 232 impulse response functions. Innovations to crude oil prices explain zero percent of the variance of the  
 233 stock market prices while the crude oil prices have 100 percent of their forecast-error variance  
 234 explained by own innovations in the first month. These percentages however decrease gradually  
 235 across the periods. At the 20<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> months, innovations to crude oil prices explained 34 percent  
 236 and 36 percent respectively of the variance of stock market prices while 66 percent and 64 percent  
 237 respectively of crude oil prices forecast error variance is explained by own innovations in the same  
 238 period.



239  
 240  
 241 **Figure 1:** Impulse Responses of the VAR Model of COP and ASI  
 242


243 On the other hand, stock market prices have explained about 6 percent, 28 percent and 31 percent of  
 244 the variance of crude oil prices in the first, 20<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> months respectively while 94 percent, 72  
 245 percent and 69 percent of their forecast-error variance is explained by own innovations in the same  
 246 respective periods. These results showed that crude oil prices and stock market prices have  
 247 predictive information on one another in the long-run.  
 248

249 **Table 6:** Variance Decomposition for the VAR Model

Period	Variance Decomposition of COP			Variance Decomposition of ASI		
	S.E.	COP	ASI	S.E.	ASI	COP
1	6.252805	100.0000	0.000000	2340.105	93.62062	6.379378
2	10.38845	99.51818	0.481821	3366.840	89.41141	10.58859
3	13.96569	98.88966	1.110340	4364.577	87.45393	12.54607
4	16.84012	98.13078	1.869217	5484.178	86.53812	13.46188
5	19.12320	97.12193	2.878068	6722.219	86.20419	13.79581
6	20.94578	95.77800	4.221996	8113.465	86.23551	13.76449
7	22.44311	94.00230	5.997697	9698.323	86.47269	13.52731
8	23.74017	91.68620	8.313802	11518.77	86.80737	13.19263
9	24.94916	88.71965	11.28035	13622.95	87.17287	12.82713
10	26.17190	85.00469	14.99531	16066.22	87.52934	12.47066


15	35.93018	75.42647	24.57353	35998.08	78.74042	21.25958
20	62.78933	66.18168	33.81832	80032.12	72.15568	27.84432
24	111.5203	63.72296	36.27704	151565.7	69.25210	30.74790

250  
251



252  
253  
254

**Fig. 2.** Time series plots of level series and returns of the study variables



255  
256

**Figure 3:** Time plots of residuals of level series and returns

### 257 3.4 VAR Granger Causality Test Result

258 To investigate the direction of causality between crude oil prices and stock market prices, we employ  
259 VAR Granger causality test based on Toda-Yamamoto procedure and the result is presented in Table  
260 7.

261 **Table 7:** VAR Granger Causality Test based on Toda-Yamamoto Procedure

Dependent Variable: COP				
Excluded	Chi-square	Df	P-value	
ASI	12.543948	3	0.0083**	
All	12.543948	3	0.0083**	
Dependent Variable: ASI				
Excluded	Chi-square	Df	P-value	
COP	3.141606	3	0.4988	
All	3.141606	3	0.4988	

262 **Note:** \*\*denotes the significant of the test at 5% significance level



264 The VAR Granger causality test result shown in Table 7 shows a unidirectional causality running from  
 265 crude oil prices (COP) to stock market prices (ASI). This result implies that crude oil prices Granger  
 266 causes stock market prices whereas stock market prices do not Granger cause crude oil prices. This  
 267 result suggests that crude oil prices are one of the determinants of prices and a driven force in  
 268 Nigerian stock market.

### 269 3.5 Relationship between Crude Oil and Stock Market Prices from GARCH Models

270 To further investigate the dynamic and dependable relationship between crude oil prices and stock  
 271 market prices in Nigeria, we estimate two set of GARCH models with and without independent  
 272 variable in the mean equations. The results are presented in Table 8.

273

274 **Table 8:** GARCH (1,1) Models with and without Independent Variable in the Mean Equation

Parameter	Without independent variable		With independent variable	
	RASI	RCOP	RASI	RCOP
Mean Equation				
$\mu$	1.029029	0.339422*	0.745190*	0.399996
RASI(-1)	-----	-----	-----	0.204370*
RCOP(-1)	-----	-----	0.191829*	-----
Variance Equation				
$\omega$	4.317202*	2.390080*	3.612260	4.471335*
$\alpha_1$	0.296012*	0.631016*	0.192692*	0.696597*
$\beta_1$	0.657203*	0.499231*	0.748309*	0.416798*
$\alpha_1 + \beta_1$	0.953215	1.130247	0.941001	1.113395

275 **Note:** \* denotes significant parameter while RASI(-1) and RCOP(-1) denote lagged all share index log returns and lagged crude  
 276 oil price log returns respectively.

277

278 The left panel of Table 8 shows the estimation results of GARCH (1,1) models for the stock market log  
 279 returns and crude oil price log returns without including lagged RCOP(-1) and RASI(-1) variables  
 280 respectively. The coefficients  $\alpha_1$  and  $\beta_1$  represent ARCH and GARCH terms, respectively, and are  
 281 shown to be statistically significant at the 1% marginal significance levels. The dynamics of log returns  
 282 in both models exhibit high persistence in conditional variance. While the conditional volatility of stock  
 283 market log return is stable (i.e.,  $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 0.953215 < 1$ ), the conditional volatility of crude oil price log  
 284 returns is unstable (i.e.,  $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 1.130247 > 1$ ). This result suggests that stock market prices in  
 285 Nigeria are predictable while crude oil prices are unpredictable.

286 The right panel of Table 8 shows the estimation results of two GARCH (1,1) models when lagged  
 287 crude oil price log return is included in the stock market log return mean equation and when lagged  
 288 stock market log return is incorporated into the crude oil log return mean equation respectively. The  
 289 estimated coefficients of  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\beta_1$  and the lagged variables RASI(-1) and RCOP(-1) are statistically  
 290 significant. This result indicates that incorporating these lagged variables into the respective mean  
 291 equations significantly reduce shock persistence (noise) and this lead us to conclude that crude oil  
 292 prices explains volatility in the stock market in the same way as stock market returns help in  
 293 explaining volatility in crude oil returns. This shows a dependable and dynamic relationship between  
 294 crude oil prices and stock market prices in Nigeria. The residuals of the estimated GARCH (1,1)  
 295 models are presented in Figure 3.

### 296 4. CONCLUSION

297 This study investigated the dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock market price  
 298 volatility in Nigeria using monthly data on the study variables from January 2006 to April 2017. The  
 299 study employs Dickey-Fuller Generalized least squares unit root test to investigate the order of  
 300 integration of the series, simple linear regression model to determine the impact of each variable on  
 301 one another, unrestricted vector autoregressive model to determine the predictive power of both  
 302 variables on each other, Granger causality test to investigate the direction of causality of each study  
 303 variable and standard GARCH models to determine the persistence of shocks and dependable  
 304 relationship between the study variables . Results shows that the study variables are integrated of

305 order one, no long-run stable relationship was found to exist between crude oil prices and stock  
306 market prices in Nigeria. Both crude oil prices and stock market prices were found to have positive  
307 and significant impact on each other indicating that an increase in crude oil prices will increase stock  
308 market prices and vice versa. Both crude oil prices and stock market prices were found to have  
309 predictive information on one another in the long-run. A one-way causality ran from crude oil prices to  
310 stock market prices suggesting that crude oil prices determine stock prices and are a driven force in  
311 Nigerian stock market. Results of GARCH (1,1) models show high persistence of shocks in the  
312 conditional variance of both returns. The conditional volatility of stock market price log return was  
313 found to be stable and predictable while that of crude oil price log return was found to be unstable and  
314 unpredictable although a dependable and dynamic relationship between crude oil prices and stock  
315 market prices was found to exist. The result of this study agrees with the findings of [17, 18, 19, 20]  
316 among others.

317 The findings of this study have some important policy implications. From the economic policy  
318 perspective, results of this study have shown that changes in crude oil prices can cause significant  
319 changes in Nigerian stock market. Therefore any changes in policy actions with respect to crude oil  
320 production need to consider the effect of these on stock market prices. There is need to increase the  
321 market depths for both crude oil and stock market and also allow aggressive trading on a wide range  
322 so as to make them less volatile.  
323

## 324 REFERENCES

- 325 [1] Bhar R, Nikolova B. Oil prices and equity returns in the BRIC countries. *The World Economy*,  
326 32009; 2(7): 1036-1054.
- 327 [2] Ayhan K, Yildirim B. Relationships between oil price and stock market: An empirical analysis from  
328 Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE). *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2011; 3(6): 99-106.
- 329 [3] Aye CG. Does oil price uncertainty matter for stock returns in South Africa? *Investment*  
330 *Management and Financial Innovations*, 2015; 12(1-1): 179-188.
- 331 [4] Olivia P, Mehtap K. The effect of oil price volatility on the us stock market. *International Bachelor*  
332 *Thesis for Economics and Business Economics*, Department of Economics, Erasmus University  
333 Rotterdam, 2011.
- 334 [5] Jiranyakul K. Does oil price uncertainty transmit to the Thailand stock market? *Journal of*  
335 *Economic and Financial Studies*, 2014; 2(6): 16-25.
- 336 [6] Chittedi KC. Do oil prices matters for indian stock markets? An empirical analysis. *Journal of*  
337 *Applied Economics and Business Research*, 2012; 2(1): 1-10.
- 338 [7] Buthaina MAM, Ghazi A. Oil price fluctuations and their impact on stock market returns in Jordan:  
339 Evidence from an asymmetric cointegration analysis. *International Journal of Financial Research*,  
340 2017; 8(1): 172-180.
- 341 [8] Jones C, Kaul G. Oil and stock markets. *Journal of Finance*, 1996; 51: 463-491.
- 342 [9] Sadorsky P. Oil price shocks and stock market activity. *Energy Economics*, 1999; 21: 449-469.
- 343 [10] Anoruo E, Mustafa M. An empirical investigation into the relation of oil to stock markets prices.  
344 *North American Journal of Finance and Banking Research*, 2007; 1(1): 22-36.
- 345 [11] Cong RG, Wei YM, Jiao JL, Fan Y. Relationships between oil price shocks and stock market: An  
346 empirical analysis from China. *Energy Policy*, 2008; 36: 3544-3553.
- 347 [12] Arouri MHE, Lahiani A., Bellalah M. Oil price shocks and stock market returns in oil-exporting  
348 countries: The case of GCC countries. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 2010; 2(5):  
349 132-139.
- 350 [13] Imarhiagbe S. Impact of oil prices on stock markets: empirical evidence from selected major oil  
351 producing and consuming countries. *Global Journal of Finance and Banking Issues*, 2010; 4(4): 15-  
352 31.
- 353 [14] Mollick AV, Assefa TA. US stock returns and oil prices: The tale from daily data and the 2008 -  
354 2009 financial crises. *Energy Economics*, 2013; 36: 1-18.
- 355 [15] Guliman SDO. Oil prices and stock market. A Philippine perspective. *Business and Economic*  
356 *Research*, 2015; 5(2): 112-135.
- 357 [16] Guesmi K., Boubaker H, Lai VS. From Oil to stock markets. *Journal of Economic Integration*,  
358 2016; 31(1): 103-133.
- 359 [17] Adaramola AO. Oil price shocks and stock market behaviour: The Nigerian experience. *Journal*  
360 *of Economics*, 2012; 3(1): 19-24.

- 361 [18] Ogiri IH, Amadi SN, Uddin MM, Dubon P. Oil price and stock market performance in Nigeria: An  
362 empirical analysis. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 2013; 4(1): 20-41.
- 363 [19] Iheanacho E. Dynamic relationship between crude oil price, exchange rate and stock market  
364 performance in Nigeria. *African Research Review*, 2016; 10(4): 224-240.
- 365 [20] Lawal AI, Somoye ROC, Babajide AA. Impact of oil price shocks and exchange rate volatility on  
366 stock market behaviour in Nigeria. *Binus Business Review*, 2016; 7(2): 171-177.
- 367 [21] Gunu U, Kilishi AA. Oil price shocks and the Nigeria economy: A variance autoregressive (VAR)  
368 model. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2010; 5(8): 39-49.
- 369 [22] Elliott G, Rothenberg TJ, Stock JH. Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root. *Econometrica*,  
370 1996; 64: 813-836.
- 371 [23] Johansen S. Estimation and hypothesis testing for cointegration vectors in Gaussian vector  
372 autoregressive models. *Econometrica*, 1991; 59: 1551-1580.
- 373 [24] Johansen S. Likelihood-based inference in cointegrated vector autoregressive models. Oxford  
374 University Press, Oxford, 1995.
- 375 [25] Toda HY, Yamamoto T. Statistical inference in vector autoregressions with possibly integrated  
376 processes. *Journal of Econometrics*, 1995; 66(1&2): 225-250.
- 377 [26] Engle RF. Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United  
378 Kingdom inflation, *Econometrica*, 1982; 50(4): 987-1008.
- 379 [27] Bollerslev T. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*,  
380 1986; 31: 307-327.
- 381