

Financial stress index, growth and price stability in India: Some recent evidence

Jayantee SAHOO

School of Economics, University of Hyderabad, India
email-jayantisahoo827@gmail.com

Abstract. *This paper examine aggregate financial stress index for India is constructed by taking monthly data from different segments of the financial market like money market, bond market, equity market, foreign exchange market, and the banking sector, for the period March 2007 to December 2016. The interrelationship and feedback effect between financial stress, economic growth and price stability are tested by using correlation and an unrestricted VAR model. The impulse response function of the VAR model shows that financial stress leads to decline in growth after a lag period and higher growth rate for a longer period of time increases stress in the financial system. The variance decomposition result shows that the contribution of FSI to the variation of other variables are not much high but other variables can contribute to the variation in FSI to some extent.*

Keywords: financial stress, economic growth, price stability, VAR.

JEL Classification: C32, E31, G10.

1. Introduction

Maintaining financial and monetary stability are the most important factors for an effective or smooth functioning of a market economy and for achieving higher economic growth. The financial system all over the world has been undergoing significant changes over the last few decades. The nature and function of the financial system has been changed due to significant expansion in financial transaction, growing financial liberalization, increasing financial integration, and introduction of complex financial instruments. With all of these changes, the possibility of larger financial instability has been increasing, which can have adverse effect on the overall economic performance.

Safeguarding the stability of financial system has become an increasing concern of policy makers since the early 1990s and especially after the global financial crisis of 2008-2009 it has become one of the crucial central bank objectives. During 1980s the main focus of the central bank monetary policy was to maintain price stability or inflation targeting. The issue of financial stability had not gotten much importance then. The concern about the issue was taken into consideration only if imbalances in the financial system affected the objective of inflation stabilization. In addition, under this framework, it was believed that achievement of price stability was necessary and sufficient condition of the overall economic and financial stability. But the financial crisis of 2008-2009 has changed this view as the crisis has occurred during the period when the global economy was in a state of low and stable inflation. Thereafter, financial stability has witnessed increased attention all over the world. The 2008-2009 crises revealed that instability in the financial system not only affects the financial sector but also adversely affects the real economy by decreasing production, investment and growth. The adverse consequences of the financial crisis compel the policy makers and researchers all over the world to think more about financial stability and of later on defining and, measuring financial stability and examining linkages between financial stability and the macro economy. There is yet no universally accepted definition of financial stability. Some authors define it in terms of its absence i.e. financial instability or stress. According to Crockett (1997) financial stability is the stability of both financial markets and institutions. According to The South Arabian Reserve Bank (SARB), financial instability can be seen through systemic risk, failure of banks, large asset price volatility, exchange rate and interest rate volatility and the collapse of market liquidity. In addition, financial stability can be described as a situation where there is absence of macroeconomic cost of financial system disturbances. Gadanecz and Jayaram (2009) define “financial stability is a situation when there is absence of excess volatility, stress or crises”.

For analyzing and monitoring of the risk in the financial system one needs a measure or indicator of financial (in)stability, which will help to identify the stress in the financial system and can show when the system is relatively stable, and when it is unstable. A financial system consists of different financial institution and different types of financial market like stock market, money market, and exchange market and so on. A single indicator representing a specific sector of the financial system may not be able to indicate the health of the overall financial system. Therefore, it will be better to use an aggregate measure, which should include indicators from different segment of the financial market to measure

the health of the financial system or to measure its stability. A good example of such a systemic measure of financial (in) stability is a financial stress index. An FSI (financial stress index) is a composite index which combines different market specific indicators of financial stress like asset price volatilities, risk spreads, credit growth etc. into a single index to measure financial stress.

According to Cardarelli et al. (2011) a financial system can be said to be in a period of stress when there is large fluctuation in asset prices, rapid increase in uncertainty, financial illiquidity, and problem in the banking system.

The above discussion implies that financial stability is now receiving greater attention since the global financial crisis. The debate of late has evolved around this broader concept of financial stability at global level. Many works have been done in construction of FSI and testing its interrelation with real economic variables at national and international level. But in case of India very few works has been done.

In view of this gap in research, in this paper an attempt is made to construct a composite indicator that is Financial Stress Index (FSI) for India. The interrelationship and feedback effect between financial stress, economic growth and price stability are also tested by using correlation and an unrestricted VAR model. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes literature review, Section 3 discusses the data and methodology, Section 4 describes in detail the construction of a Financial Stress Index for India, Section 5 presents the empirical results and analysis. Finally, section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Review of literature

Financial in(stability) and real economic growth:

The global financial crisis has shown that instability in the financial system can have an adverse effect on not only the financial system but also overall economic system. Period of financial crisis are always followed by high recession in the economy. As there is high interconnectedness between the financial and real sector the problem in one sector can hamper the other sector.

In their paper Hakkio and Keeton (2009) has identified three important channels through which increasing stress in financial system can lead to a decrease in overall economic activity or growth. *First*, due to the uncertainty in the economic outlook and return on asset prices. *Second* channel is through the increasing financing cost for the businessman and households due to higher financial stress. The *third* channel is that, during the stress period banks tighten their credit standards which may adversely affect economic activity.

In his famous financial instability hypothesis, Minsky (1991) explained about the interrelation between economic prosperity or growth and financial instability. He claimed that during period of higher economic growth or economic prosperity there will be higher flow of cash to the corporate sector which develops a speculative euphoria and encourages the financial institution to take more risky activity. Such speculative activity increases the amount of debt. And such an excess leveraged situation can lead to financial crisis.

Financial sector risk can affect the real sector through the balance sheet channel which is explained by Bernanke and Gertler (1989) through the financial accelerator mechanism. According to them the shock due to financial instability decreases the asset prices and deteriorates the balance sheet and net worth of borrower and increases the external finance premium. This reduces the ability of the borrower to borrow and invest and again this leads to decrease in their net worth further. The financial accelerator in this way creates a vicious cycle of decrease in asset price, tightening credit condition, fall in economic activity and prices. Mishkin (2000) also explain the balance sheet channel through which financial instability affect the real economic activity.

According to Demirgüç and Detragiache (1997), banking crisis can have an adverse effect on the economy. They explained that the crisis in the banking sector hamper the well-functioning of payment system and leads to disruption in the credit flow to the household and enterprises which reduces the consumption and investment activity in the economy and adversely affect the economic growth.

Financial (in)stability and price stability

Papademos (2006) defines Price stability as a state in which the general level of price is stable or the rate of inflation is sufficiently low and stable.

There are two approaches regarding the relationship between price stability and stability of the financial system. One approach is called the conventional approach which believes that these two types of stability supports and reinforce each other or they have a positive relationship. And the second approach is the new environment hypothesis who's profounder believes that price stability may not lead to financial system stability. They said that controlling of inflation at a lower level may not guaranty the stability of the financial system.

The conventional wisdom regarding the relationship between price and financial stability has been given by Schwartz (1995) which is popularly known as Schwartz hypothesis. She has explained two channels, both a micro and macro channel through which inflation affects financial condition of household, business firm, financial intermediaries and the whole financial system. Inflation creates uncertainty about the future value of assets, future return on investment, affects the stock market valuation of firms, and leads to increase in speculative investment and thereby increasing the risk in the financial system. So she advocated that a regime of monetary stability or price stability is the root of stability in the financial system.

Bordo and Wheelock (1998) was the supporter of the conventional approach. According to them the relative shock in the prices especially the sharp fall in the commodity and real estate market following several years of price increase were the cause of distress in the financial system. So they said that a central bank can contribute to the financial stability by focusing on price level stability. Bordo, Duker and Wheelock (2001), constructed a financial condition index for the period 1790-1997 and by using a dynamic Probit model they found that aggregate price shock can contribute to financial sector instability.

It was stated by Demirgüç and Detraïache (1997) that most of the crisis has occurred under weak macroeconomic condition of higher inflation and lower growth. The higher inflation increases the banking sector risk because higher inflation is always associated with higher interest rate which creates difficulty for the banking sector to perform their maturity transformation. Thus, the higher rate of interest associated with the high rate of inflation increases the likelihood of crisis in the banking sector.

Papademos (2006) in a speech said that price stability also contribute to the stability and efficiency of the financial system by anchoring inflation expectation and eliminating market uncertainty which may arise due to inflation. In another way monetary policy by maintaining stability of prices, reduces the balance sheet problem of banks and the borrowers which may be caused by unexpected deflation. Unanticipated deflation increases the debt burden which leads to loan default and ultimately creates financial instability. Issing (2000) also supports the conventional approach and states that in long run both price and financial stability reinforce each other.

Many authors of the new environment hypothesis have criticized the conventional wisdom of the relation between price stability and financial stability. They advocated that price stability or lower inflation may not guarantee stability of the financial system. Borio and Lowe (2002) said that the price stability or lower inflation may increase the imbalances in the financial system. The credible stabilization policy by anchoring price expectation generates optimism about future economic prospects which leads to credit and asset price boom which are the seeds of future problem. Lower inflation leads to a loose monetary policy which can create situation of imbalances.

Leijonhufvud (2007) advocated that maintaining of the stability of CPI or its growth rate does not assure the financial system stability. Rajan (2005) also pointed out that monetary stability can create problem in the financial system stability in the sense that low inflation allows the interest rate to be low which may incentivize the participants in search for higher yield and increasing risk taking. This lower interest rate can create the asset price bubble which is riskier for financial stability.

Empirical literature on Measuring financial (in) stability and its relation with growth and inflation (price stability)

Attempts have been made over the last two decades by researchers to measure the condition of the financial system stability with the help of different indicator of financial risk. Gadanecz and Jayaram (2009) have discussed in their paper about different measures of stability of financial system. According to them aggregate measure of stability or stress are helpful to the policy makers and participants in the financial system because it helps to monitor the level of stability or instability of the whole system and predict the sources of stress and its impact.

Illing and Liu (2006) were the first to develop a FSI for Canada by taking high frequency variables from banking sector, foreign exchange, and equity and debt market and by using different weighting methods like factor analysis, credit weight and variance equal weights method. They stated that there is not much significant differences between the indices constructed by using different methods of weighting. Balakrishnan et al. (2009) have

constructed an Emerging Market Financial Stress Index (EMFSI) using a variance equal weighting method. Sandahl et al. (2011) have constructed a financial stress index for Sweden using the same method. Hakkio and Keenton (2009) constructed the Kansas City Financial Stress Index (KCFSI) by using PCA method taking 11 variables. Morales and Estrada (2010) have constructed a financial stability index for Colombia using 3 different weighting methods like variance-equal approach, the principal components method and count data models. The index presents the similar behaviour under the three methodologies. Cardarelli et al. (2011) developed a financial stress index by using variance equal weighting method for 17 advanced economies. Brave and Butter (2011) constructed a high frequency financial condition index for USA by using PCA method and taking 100 indicators of financial health. Van Roye (2011) developed a Financial Market Stress Index (FMSI) by applying dynamic factor model for German and Euro area. Dhal, Kumar, and Ansari (2011) used CAMEL indicators for the period 1997 Q: 1 to 2012 Q: 3 for constructing Financial Stability Index. Hollo et al. (2012), developed a Composite Indicator of Systemic Stress (CISS) for Euro area by using portfolio theory approach. Aboura and Roye (2013) construct a FSI for France using 17 financial variables through the dynamic approximate factor model. SHANKAR (2014) has constructed a financial condition index for India by taking monthly data from Jan 2004 to Aug. 2013 using PCA method. Cevik, Dibooglu and Kenc (2016) construct a financial stress index by using dynamic factor model for some south-east Asian economies for the period 1995-2013. Stolbov and Shchepelevab (2016) constructed a FSI for 14 emerging countries for the period Feb 2008 to Sept 2015 using a principal component analysis method. Venkateswarlu (2017) constructed a FSI for India using credit weight method and taking quarterly data of 4 variable including NIFTY index, govt security index, NIFTY bank index and exchange rate for the period 2002 to 2014.

Most of the empirical findings shows that financial stress have a negative relation with growth or economic activity (Hakkio and Keenton, 2009; Cardarelli et al., 2011; Van Roye, 2011; Hollo et al., 2012; Aboura and Roye, 2013; Mallik and Sousa, 2013; Mittnik and Semmler, 2013; Shankar, 2014; Apostolakis and Papadopoulos, 2015; Cevik et al., 2016; Stolbov and Shchepelevab, 2016; Venkateswarlu, 2017).

The empirical literature on the relationship between financial stability and price stability is very rare. Some of the studies found that financial stress have a negative impact on inflation (Van Roye, 2011; Apostolakis and Papadopoulos, 2015; Venkateswarlu, 2017). Blot et al. (2015) investigate the relationship between price stability and financial stability by using 3 different methods such as simple correlation, VAR and a DCC method for US and Euro zone. Against the conventional hypothesis they find that all the three method show negative relation or no significant positive relationship between price and financial stability and DCC method shows unstable relationship between price and financial stability where the correlation change sign over time.

3. Data source and empirical methodology

Data sources

For the purpose of this study secondary time series data are taken from three sources i.e., RBI's Handbook of statistics on Indian economy, National stock exchange of India (NSE) and Economic and Political Weekly (EPW) publication on time series data for the Indian economy. Monthly data for the period March 2007 to December 2016 is used in the study. For the construction of Financial Stress Index (FSI) the following variables are used. They are monthly average call money rate, policy repo rate, exchange rate of rupee vis-à-vis dollar, foreign exchange reserve, credit to private sector, NSE nifty-fifty price index, NSE bank index and the Govt. yield spread data. For real economic variable monthly average of WPI and IIP are taken. I have used log changes in IIP and log changes in WPI as a proxy for economic growth and inflation respectively.

Empirical methodology

Methodology of FSI construction

To construct the FSI we have used the variance equal weighting method which is used by (Balakrishnan et al., 2009; Carderelli et al., 2011 etc.). In this method first all the variables included in the composite index are standardized and then given equal weights. For standardization all the variables are demeaned and then divided by their standard deviation.

$$X_s = (x - \mu_x) / \sigma_x \quad (1)$$

Where:

X_s = standardized variable;

μ_x = mean of the variable;

σ_x = standard deviation of the variable.

And the final FSI is calculated as the weighted average of these standardized variables.

$$\text{So, FSI} = \sum_{i=0}^n w_i x_{si} \quad (2)$$

A simple correlation and an unrestricted VAR model is used to empirically analyze the interaction between financial instability (stress), growth (IIP) and price stability (inflation). Before running the VAR model the stationarity of all the variables are tested by using Augmented dickey fuller test (ADF), and Phillips-Perron test (PP test). GARCH(1,1) model is used to measure the volatility of stock market. The maximum lag of the variables to be included in the VAR model are decided by various lag length selection criteria like LR, FPE, AIC, SIS, and HQ. The impulse responses are tested to show responsiveness of one variable to a unit shock in another variable in the VAR system. The variance decomposition of the VAR model shows how many percentage of the variation in one variable is explained by the other variable.

4. Construction of a financial stress index for India

The aggregate financial stress index for India is constructed by taking monthly data from different segments of the financial market like money market, equity market, bond market, foreign exchange market, and the banking sector. The selection of the variables is done according to the literature on the financial stress index and by taking into account the availability of data. There are six variables which are aggregated to construct the index of financial stress and the six variables include- a call spread, growth rate of credit to the private sector, a yield spread, stock market volatility, beta of the banking sector, and an exchange market pressure index (EMPI). The data are collected from RBI website, NSE website and from EPW time series data. All the variables are of monthly frequency and data period is from March 2007 to December 2016. A brief description of the variables included in the construction of the FSI is given below.

Call spread

The call spread (Shankar, 2004) is used for calculating the money market risk. It is the difference between weighted average call money rate and the official repo rate. Usually during normal times the call rate moves around the policy rate but during stress period the call rate becomes higher than the policy rate. Hence higher the call rate from the policy rate higher will be stress in the money market. A higher call spread may indicate the shortage of liquidity or liquidity risk in money market and thus affect the cost of funds.

So call spread = weighted average call rate – policy repo rate.

Inverted yield spread

To take into account the bond market risk an inverted yield spread is used which is proposed by (Cardarelli et al., 2011). A yield spread is basically the difference between yields on two different debt instruments of different maturities, different credit rating, and risk. Inverted yield spread is the difference between short-term govt. security yield and long-term security yield. According to Cardarelli et al., banks usually earn income in the form of intermediating short-term liabilities into longer-term assets. So, when there is a negative sloping yield curve or in other words when there is negative term spread the profitability of banks is seriously jeopardized. The confidence of the investor and economist and the overall health of the economy can be judged from the slope of the yield curve.

Inverted yield spread = short term yield – long term yield

For calculating this we have used one year and ten year govt. security yield.

Banking sector beta

The most commonly used measure of systemic risk in the banking sector is the banking sector beta which is used by many authors in constructing their financial stress index (Illing and Liu, 2006, Balakrishna et al., 2009; Cardarelli et al., 2011; VanRoye, 2011). Beta of a stock measures the volatility of the stock's return in relation to the overall market return. The beta of the banking sector is calculated by dividing the covariance between the banking sector equity return and overall stock market return by the variance of the overall market return.

Mathematically:

$$\beta = cov(br, mr)/var(mr) \quad (15)$$

Where, β = banking sector beta; br = banking stock return; mr = overall stock market return.

In accordance with the CAPM (capital asset pricing model) when the value of beta exceeds 1 this indicates that the banking stock is more volatile than the overall stock market which can be interpreted that the banking sector is in risk and there can be a higher likelihood of banking crisis. So higher is the value of beta more risky is the banking sector.

Credit growth

Credit related indicator like credit to GDP gap or growth rate of credit are often used as indicator of financial fragility. According to Fouejieu (2017) rapid credit growth may lead to declining loan standard, and increasing macroeconomic and financial instability. Higher credit growth may increase speculative activity, asset price bubble or may lead to increase in loan default. So here we have used the growth rate of credit to private sector (percentage change in non-food credit to the private sector) as an indicator of financial instability.

Exchange market pressure index

To capture the risk in the foreign exchange market most of the authors (Balakrishnan et al., 2011; Cevik et al., 2013) used an aggregate index which is the EMPI which captures not only changes in the exchange rate but also changes in the foreign exchange reserve. Fluctuation of exchange rate has an impact on macroeconomic variables like output, trade balance, inflation etc. The exchange rate of a currency comes under pressure when there is selling pressure of domestic currency or excess demand for foreign currency. With the help of EMPI, currency crisis can be defined as a period in which an attack on domestic currency leads to either depreciation of domestic currency or loss in foreign exchange reserve or a combination of the two. When there is significant increase in EMPI, the currency market is said to be in stress period.

The EMPI is calculated as:

$$empi = \frac{\Delta ex - \mu \Delta ex}{\sigma \Delta ex} - \frac{\Delta res - \mu \Delta res}{\sigma \Delta res} \quad (16)$$

Where Δex and Δres are the month-over-month changes in the exchange rate and the total foreign exchange reserve respectively and the symbols μ and σ stands for the mean and the standard deviation of the relevant series. The exchange rate is taken as the exchange rate of rupee vis-a-vis dollar.

Stock market volatility

Rapid growth or fluctuation in the share prices can be considered as a source of financial stress because it may be a signal of creation or amplification of a financial bubble. Stock markets affect the economy through the wealth and the confidence channel. Higher fluctuation in the stock market may affect the investors' confidence in the market and may adversely affect domestic and foreign investment.

To capture the stock market movement we have used the volatility of the month over month changes in the return of the NSE S&P CNX Nifty index. The stock market volatility is calculated by using GARCH (1, 1) model which is proposed by Bollerslev (1986). The model can be represented as

$$\sigma_t^2 = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \mu_{t-1}^2 + \lambda_2 \sigma_{t-2}^2 \quad (17)$$

Where, σ_t^2 is the conditional variance of stock return which depends not only on the previous year return square but also on the previous year variance.

Estimation of the financial stress index for India

Various methods have been used by different authors for the construction of financial stress. The two main methods are variance equal weighting method and the method of principal component analysis. Illing and Liu (2006) have stated that there are not much significant differences between the indices constructed by using different methods of weighting. So in this paper the FSI is constructed by using the most commonly used and simple method of constructing the financial stress index which is the variance equal weighting method used by many authors (Balakrishnan et al., 2009; Carderelli et al., 2011 etc.)

The main advantage of using this method is that it is simple to construct and can be easily interpreted. In variance equal weighting method all the variables are first standardized so that they can be expressed in the same units and then they have given equal weights. The standardization is done by subtracting each series from their respective mean and then divided by their standard deviation. The aggregate FSI is the weighted average of the different variables where each variable has given equal weights.

And the final FSI is weighted average of these standardized variables.

$$\text{So, FSI} = \sum_{i=0}^n w_i x_{si} \quad (18)$$

Since here we have taken six variables for FSI so,

$$\text{FSI} = W_1 * X_{S1} + W_2 * X_{S2} + W_3 * X_{S3} + W_4 * X_{S4} + W_5 * X_{S5} + W_6 * X_{S6} \quad (19)$$

Here $W_1 = W_2 = \dots = W_6 = 1/6$

Here for equal weight

$$\text{FSI} = 1/6 * \text{CL} + 1/6 * \text{YS} + 1/6 * \text{BETA} + 1/6 * \text{CREDIT} + 1/6 * \text{EMPI} + 1/6 * \text{NIFTY} \quad (20)$$

Here,

CL = call spread;

YS = yield spread;

BETA = banking sector beta;

CREDIT = growth rate of private sector credit;

EMPI = exchange market pressure index;

NIFTY = time varying volatility of S&P CNX Nifty index.

The interpretation of the financial stress is very simple. In this case a higher value of the FSI will indicate period of higher financial stress or instability and the lower value of the FSI will indicate that there is lower stress in the financial system or the financial system is relatively stable.

5. Empirical results and analysis


Trend of FSI of India

The trend of FSI of India is shown in the Figure 1 given below. In this Figure 1, it can be shown that during most of the period the FSI hover around its mean value showing normal periods, but there are also some stress periods where the value of FSI increases. During period of 2007 the financial sector was at lower stress where there was higher growth in the economy.


The FSI has increased during the second quarter of 2008 and remain high till the first quarter of 2009 which is due to the effect of global financial crisis. The adverse impact of GFC on Indian financial market is felt especially after the collapse of Lehman brothers in Sep 2008 when there was withdrawal of funds from equity market and reduction of access of Indians to funds from international market putting pressure in the domestic foreign exchange market.

The index shows that, the effect of the crisis remains for a longer period. Then the FSI decreases and remain within its average. In Dec 2010 there was slight increase in FSI because during this period the interest rate was high and also some liquidity problem was there. Another peak is in Sep 2013 where there was higher volatility in the financial market due to the US tapering announcement which created pressure in equity and foreign exchange market.

Figure 1. *Trend of FSI*



Source: Author's estimation.

Figure 2. Trends of the individual variables

Source: Author's estimation.

This Figure 2 shows the trend of the aggregate FSI and its individual components. All the variables have high value during 2008-09 crisis periods.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of all the variables

VARIABLES	FSI	GIIP	INF	R
Mean	0.002541	0.003898	0.003709	6.706017
Median	-0.070122	0.000453	0.003649	7.125000
Maximum	1.286090	0.139244	0.025459	12.42000
Minimum	-1.555480	-0.150016	-0.019094	0.510000
Std. Dev.	0.419438	0.058268	0.007859	1.906598
Skewness	0.368196	-0.192005	-0.325660	-0.672214
Kurtosis	5.177700	3.272330	3.525641	3.755945
Jarque-Bera	25.98287	1.089671	3.444204	11.69646
Probability	0.000002	0.579937	0.178690	0.002885
Sum	0.299797	0.459975	0.437689	791.3100
Sum Sq. Dev.	20.58362	0.397234	0.007226	425.3084
Observations	118	118	118	118

Note: FSI is the financial stress index, GIIP is the log changes in the IIP, INF is the log changes in WPI to calculate inflation, R is the monthly average short term interest rate.

Source: Author's estimation.

Table 2. Correlation between price stability, financial stability and GIIP

Variables	GIIP	INF	FSI	FSIL1
GIIP	1.000000 ----- -----			
INF	-0.126168 [-1.363902] (0.1753)	1.000000 ----- -----		
FSI	0.276449 [3.084803] (0.0026)	-0.003438 [-0.036869] (0.9707)	1.000000 ----- -----	
FSIL1	-0.186214 [-2.032468] (0.0444)	0.033605 [0.360582] (0.7191)	0.256290 [2.843373] (0.0053)	1.000000 ----- -----

Note: Value in [] and () represents t-statistics and p-value respectively.

Source: Author's estimation.

The result of the correlation test shows that the correlation between FSI and GIIP is positive that is 0.28 but the correlation between FSI at one lag period and GIIP is negative i.e. -0.19. This can be interpreted in this way that the stress in the financial stability can have an adverse effect on the growth after a lag period. The positive correlation can be interpreted in accordance with the Minsky instability hypothesis that higher growth or prosperity increases speculative activity and thereby increases risk in the financial system. The correlation between FSI and INF is negative i.e. -0.0034 which is very negligible. But the relation between INF and FSI at one period lag is positive (0.03) which is also very negligible. While the relation between FSI and GIIP is significant but the relation between INF and FSI are not significant.

Table 3. ADF and Phillips-Perron test @ level

Variables	ADF test statistics	Probability	95% critical ADF value	Remark	PP test statistics	Probability	95% critical PP value	Remark
FSI	-8.594432	0.0000	-3.448681	I(0)	-9.668784	0.0000	-3.448681	I(0)
GIIP	-4.225522	0.0058	-3.452764	I(0)	-39.53194	0.0001	-3.448681	I(0)
INF	-6.292844	0.0000	-3.448681	I(0)	-6.306224	0.0000	-3.448681	I(0)
R	-4.501129	0.0023	-3.448681	I(0)	-4.811976	0.0008	-3.448681	I(0)

Source: Author's estimation.

It is also clear from the ADF and Phillips-Perron test that all the variables are stationary at 5% level of significance as their test statistics are higher than their 95% critical value.

VAR model

Following the literature an unrestricted VAR model is used to empirically analyze the interaction between financial instability (stress), growth (IIP) and price stability (inflation). A conventional macro VAR model which was used for monetary policy transmission mechanism includes mainly three variables like output, inflation and interest rate. So to include the shock of financial stress a FSI is included in the VAR model. So in this model there are four endogenous variables such as, IIP growth, inflation, and interest rate and FSI. So the VAR model represented as:

$$\text{VAR (P)} = f [\text{GIIP}_t, \text{INF}_t, \text{R}_t, \text{FSI}_t] \quad (21)$$

The ordering of the variables are done following the literature such that GIIP, INF and R shocks can have contemporaneous effect on FSI while FSI shock impact others with a lag.

Table 4. Lag order selection criteria of the VAR model

Lag	LogL	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ
0	279.1671	NA	7.89e-08	-5.003038	-4.904838	-4.963208
1	446.1952	318.8718	5.07e-09	-7.749003	-7.258007*	-7.549853
2	471.8838	47.17369	4.25e-09*	-7.925161*	-7.041367	-7.566689*
3	486.5699	25.90090	4.37e-09	-7.901271	-6.624680	-7.383479
4	495.5196	15.13318	5.00e-09	-7.773084	-6.103696	-7.095972
5	516.5966	34.10635	4.60e-09	-7.865393	-5.803208	-7.028959
6	528.3273	18.12932	5.03e-09	-7.787770	-5.332788	-6.792016
7	539.1155	15.88801	5.64e-09	-7.693009	-4.845230	-6.537934
8	563.5889	34.26275*	4.96e-09	-7.847070	-4.606494	-6.532675

* indicates lag order selected by the criterion.

Source: Author's calculation.

LR: sequential modified LR test statistic (each test at 5% level); FPE: Final prediction error; AIC: Akaike information criterion; SC: Schwarz information criterion.

The result of the lag length selection criteria is given in the Table 4 which shows that the appropriate lag length to be included in the model is two.

System equations of the VAR model

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GIIP} = & -0.810 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-1) - 0.265 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-2) - 2.179 \cdot \text{INF}(-1) + 0.957 \cdot \text{INF}(-2) - \\ & - 0.004 \cdot \text{R}(-1) + 0.002 \cdot \text{R}(-2) + 0.013 \cdot \text{FSI}(-1) - 0.012 \cdot \text{FSI}(-2) + 0.027 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$


$$\begin{aligned} \text{INF} = & 0.015 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-1) - 0.012 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-2) + 0.525 \cdot \text{INF}(-1) + 0.012 \cdot \text{INF}(-2) + \\ & + 0.0002 \cdot \text{R}(-1) - 0.001 \cdot \text{R}(-2) - 0.0008 \cdot \text{FSI}(-1) - 0.0007 \cdot \text{FSI}(-2) + 0.006 \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FSI} = & -2.075 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-1) - 1.347 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-2) - 9.905 \cdot \text{INF}(-1) + 7.038 \cdot \text{INF}(-2) + \\ & + 0.065 \cdot \text{R}(-1) - 0.080 \cdot \text{R}(-2) + 0.239 \cdot \text{FSI}(-1) + 0.305 \cdot \text{FSI}(-2) + 0.123 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{R} = & -3.352 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-1) - 2.996 \cdot \text{GIIP}(-2) + 3.869 \cdot \text{INF}(-1) - 3.552 \cdot \text{INF}(-2) + \\ & + 0.973 \cdot \text{R}(-1) - 0.140 \cdot \text{R}(-2) - 0.524 \cdot \text{FSI}(-1) - 0.209 \cdot \text{FSI}(-2) + 1.117 \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Impulse response analysis of the VAR model

Figure 3. Impulse response of GIIP AND INF TO FSI
Response to Cholesky One S.D. (d.f. adjusted) Innovations ± 2 S.E.




Source: Author's estimation.

From this Figure 3 it is shown that with a one unit shock in FSI the GIIP first increases then falls and after 5 month period it is stabilized. The result shows that increasing financial stress does not have immediate negative impact on the growth rate. Therefore it can be concluded that financial instability or stress can adversely affect the growth rate but with certain time lag. Here financial stress negatively affects growth after two month period. The shock is absorbed after 5 month period.

This Figure 3 also shows the impulse response of inflation to one standard deviation shock to financial stress. This result shows that a positive shock to financial stress leads to a negative impact on inflation for a long period of time. This result is similar to the result of Bolt et al. (2015) who said that higher financial fragility leads to decrease in inflation and debt deflation. We can interpret it in other way that stress may negatively affect inflation in indirect way by lowering growth rate and thereby prices.

Figure 4. Impulse response of FSI to GIIP and INF

Response to Cholesky One S.D. (d.f. adjusted) Innovations ± 2 S.E.



Source: Author's estimation.

This Figure 4 shows the impact of Cholesky one standard deviation shock to growth rate of IIP on financial stress. The figure shows that with a one standard deviation shock to GIIP, the FSI first falls, and then slightly increase and after 5 month period it is stabilized. The immediate impact of GIPP on FSI is negative. Which indicate that higher growth rate can lead to lower financial stress or instability.

This result is in confirmation with the result of many other papers in empirical literature. It can be explained that higher growth may increase the net worth of borrower, may strengthen the balance sheet of borrowers and reduces loan default and thereby reduces financial stress and foster stability. But after some time lag higher growth leads to increase in stress or instability in the financial system. This may be due to the fact that prolonged period of economic growth may lead to higher risk taking and thereby increasing financial stress.

This Figure 4 also shows the response of financial stress to one standard deviation shock to inflation. The result shows that inflation shock has an immediate negative impact on FSI and after two lag period in has positive impact on FSI and the shock is absorbed after four month period.

From this result it can be concluded that higher inflation leads to lower FSI or in other way lower inflation leads to higher FSI in short run, which is in accordance with the new environment hypothesis that lower inflation corresponds with lower interest rate and

increases risk taking (Rajan, 2005; Leijonhufvud, 2007). But after 2 lag period increase in inflation leads to increase in financial stress. This may be due to the fact that increase in inflation leads to increase in uncertainty as described by Schwartz (1995). So it is concluded that price stability or lower inflation leads to financial instability in the short run but in the long run price stability leads to financial stability.

Result of the variance decomposition of the VAR model

Table 5. *Variance decomposition of GIIP*

Period	S.E.	GIIP	INF	R	FSI
1	0.039938	100.0000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
2	0.054507	92.63227	6.320134	0.340715	0.706883
3	0.057249	90.15287	8.054965	0.310806	1.481360
4	0.057580	89.14064	8.235361	0.336546	2.287451
5	0.057952	89.09449	8.195930	0.332237	2.377339
6	0.058191	89.00989	8.287947	0.333945	2.368215
7	0.058235	88.95597	8.337023	0.336544	2.370466
8	0.058239	88.94869	8.340057	0.336493	2.374763
9	0.058249	88.94878	8.339379	0.337159	2.374677
10	0.058254	88.94745	8.341120	0.337144	2.374283

Source: Author's estimation.

It is clearly shown in the Table 5 that most of the variation in IIP is explained by its own shock over the 10 month period. The variable which explained the second most variation in GIIP is inflation.

However our intention here is to see how many % of variation in GIIP is explained by FSI. The contribution of FSI to the variation in GIIP is 0.7% in the 2nd month and gradually it increases though it is not very high. In the 10th month the contribution of FSI is 2.37%.

Table 6. *Variance decomposition of inflation*

Period	S.E.	GIIP	INF	R	FSI
1	0.006424	2.224448	97.77555	0.000000	0.000000
2	0.007324	3.931198	95.85492	0.065347	0.148539
3	0.007577	4.281791	94.01879	1.197860	0.501563
4	0.007779	4.364526	91.46549	3.378972	0.791012
5	0.007878	4.269586	89.41414	5.544888	0.771387
6	0.007949	4.200252	87.83933	7.194896	0.765527
7	0.007999	4.181762	86.75288	8.196303	0.869052
8	0.008033	4.146671	86.02694	8.777779	1.048608
9	0.008057	4.122564	85.52343	9.115508	1.238494
10	0.008075	4.106362	85.15031	9.304707	1.438623

Source: Author's estimation.

In the Table 6 it is shown that most of the variation in inflation is explained by its own shock. The contribution of FSI in the total variation in inflation is very low. The contribution of FSI in total variation in inflation is increasing, in 2nd month it is 0.14%, in 3rd month it is 0.50% and in the 10th month its contribution is 1.43%.

Table 7. Variance decomposition of FSI

Period	S.E.	GIIP	INF	R	FSI
1	0.365286	4.566022	0.582492	7.455371	87.39611
2	0.393162	6.701621	2.324988	11.19782	79.77557
3	0.410328	6.186341	2.896962	11.06333	79.85336
4	0.414331	6.153449	2.845363	11.10691	79.89428
5	0.417147	6.278034	2.813259	10.95903	79.94968
6	0.418228	6.299469	2.845495	10.93656	79.91848
7	0.419258	6.270358	2.831647	10.96534	79.93265
8	0.419852	6.254700	2.824230	11.03348	79.88759
9	0.420417	6.242124	2.817848	11.09239	79.84764
10	0.420835	6.230228	2.812707	11.14374	79.81332

Source: Author's estimation.

The above Table 8 shows the variance decomposition of FSI. In the first maximum % of the variation in FSI is explained by its own shock but other variables also contribute to its variation. In first month the variation of FSI explained by FSI, GIIP, inflation and interest rate are 87.39%, 4.56%, 0.58% and 7.45% respectively. Excluding its own shock the other variable which explain large % of variation in FSI is interest rate, next GIIP and the least is the inflation. In the 10th month period the variation in FSI explained by GIIP, inflation, interest rate and its own shock is 6.23%, 2.81%, 11.14% and 79.81% respectively. The result shows that financial stability in India can be influenced by growth, inflation and interest rate.

6. Conclusion

In this paper an attempt is made to construct an aggregate financial stress index for India by taking monthly data from different segments of the financial market like money market, bond market, equity market, foreign exchange market, and the banking sector, for the period March 2007 to December 2016. An FSI (financial stress index) is a composite index which combines different market specific indicators of financial stress like asset price volatilities, risk spreads, credit growth etc. into a single index to measure financial stress. The FSI of India effectively pointed out the period of instability in the financial system. The period of global financial crisis is captured by the FSI.

So this FSI can be used as a leading indicator of financial instability. Hence it will benefit the participants in the financial market and policy makers to monitor the functioning or working of the financial system, as it gives information about the stress events which were not captured by the stress indicator of individual sector or market and it can also tell about the sources of financial stress.

The interrelationship and feedback effect between financial stress, economic growth and price stability are also tested by using correlation and an unrestricted VAR model. The correlation result indicates that financial stress can have negative relation with growth after one period lag. And inflation has a negative relation with FSI and a positive relation with 1 period lag of FSI, though the result is not significant. The impulse response function of the VAR model shows that financial stress leads to decline in growth after a lag period and

higher growth rate for a longer period of time increases stress in the financial system. The result also shows that in short run price stability or lower inflation increases financial stress but in the long run the result is opposite. The variance decomposition result shows that the contribution of FSI to the variation of other variables are not much high but other variables can contribute to the variation in FSI to some extent. So it is clear that instability in the financial sector can have an adverse effect on growth and price stability. Hence emphasis should also be given to the objective of maintaining financial stability like other objective such as price stability and growth.

References

- Aboura, S. and van Roye B., 2013. Financial stress and economic dynamics: an application to France. Kiel Institute for the World Economy Working Paper No. 1834, March.
- Apostolakis and Papadopoulos, 2015. Financial stress spillover across banking securities and foreign exchange market. *Journal of financial stability*, 19, pp. 1-21.
- Balakrishnan, R., Danninger, S., Elekdag, S. and Tytell, R., 2009. The Transmission of Financial Stress from Advanced to Emerging Economies. *IMF Working Paper*, No 09/133.
- Bernanke, B. and Gertler, M., 1989. Agency costs, net worth and business fluctuations. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 791, pp. 14-31.
- Bollerslev, T., 1986. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *J. Econom.* 31, pp. 307-327.
- Blot, C., Creel, J., Hubert, P., Labondance, F. and Saraceno, F., 2015. Assessing the link between price and financial stability. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 16, pp. 71-88.
- Bordo, M., Dueker, M.J. and Wheelock, D.C., 2001. Aggregate price shocks and financial instability: a historical analysis. FRB of Saint Louis, Working Paper 2000-2005.
- Bordo, M. and Wheelock, D.C., 1998. Price Stability and Financial Stability: the Historical Record. *FRB of Saint Louis Review*, September/October, pp. 41-62.
- Borio, C. and Lowe, P., 2002. Asset prices, financial and monetary stability: exploring the nexus. BIS Working Paper, p. 114.
- Brave, S.A. and Butcher, R.A., 2011. Monitoring financial stability – A financial conditions index approach. *Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago Economic Perspectives*, pp. 22-43, First Quarter.
- Cardarelli, R., Elekdag, S. and Lall, S., 2011. Financial stress and economic contractions. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 7(2), pp. 78-97.
- Cevik, Dibooglu and Kenc, 2016. Financial stress and economic activity in some emerging Asian economies, *Research in international business and finance*. 36, pp. 127-139.
- Čihák, M., 2006. Central Banks and Financial Stability: A Survey of Financial Stability Reports. *Seminar on Current Developments in Monetary and Financial Law* Washington, D.C., October pp. 23-27.
- Crockett, A., 1997. Why is Financial Stability a Goal of Public Policy?. *Economic Review*, issue Q IV, No. 82, No. 4, pp. 5-22.

- Demirguc-Kunt, A. and Detragiache, E., 1998. The Determinants of Banking Crises in Developing and Developed Countries. *IMF Staff Papers* 45 (1), pp. 81-109.
- Dhal, S., Kumar, P. and Ansari, J., 2011. Financial Stability, Economic Growth, Inflation and Monetary Policy Linkages in India: An Empirical Reflection, *Reserve Bank of India Occasional Papers*, Vol. 32, No. 3.
- Financial Stress, Downturns, and Recoveries. World Economic out Oct 2008. IMF.
- Financial Stability Reports (March 2010 till date) *RBI*.
- Ferguson, R., 2002. Should Financial Stability Be an Explicit Central Bank Objective? (Washington: Federal Reserve Board).
- Gadanez, B. and Jayaram, K., 2009. Measures of Financial Stability – A Review. *BIS IFC Bulletin* No. 31.
- Goodhart, C., 2010. The changing role of central banks. *BIS working paper* No. 326.
- Granville, B., Mallick, S., 2009. Monetary and financial stability in the euro area: pro-cyclicality versus trade-off. *J. Int. Financ. Mark., Inst. Money* 19, pp. 662-674.
- Hakkio, C.S. and Keeton, W.R., 2009. Financial Stress: What Is It, How Can It Be Measured, and Why Does It Matter?. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. *Economic Review* Second Quarter
- Hollo, D., Kremer, M. and Duca, M., 2012. CISS – a Composite Indicator of Systemic Stress in the financial system. *ECB Working Paper* No. 1426, March.
- Illing, M. and Liu, Y., 2006. Measuring financial stress in a developed country: an application to Canada. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 2(4), pp. 243-265.
- IMF, 2015. Monetary Policy and Financial Stability. *IMF Policy Paper*, August 28, 2015.
- Issing, O., 2003 Monetary and financial stability: is there a trade-off? Paper Presented at a BIS Conference, <www.bis.org>
- Koonga, S.S., Lawb, S.H. and Ibrahimc, M.H., 2017. Credit expansion and financial stability in Malaysia. *Economic Modelling*, 61, pp. 339-350.
- Leijonhufvud, A., 2007. Monetary and financial stability. *CEPR Policy Insight* 14.
- Mallick S.K. and Sousa, R.M., 2013. The real effects of financial stress in the Eurozone. *Int. Rev. Financial Analysis*, 30, pp. 1-17.
- Minsky, H.P., 1992. The Financial Instability Hypothesis. *The Jerome Levy Economics Institute Working Paper* No. 74.
- Mishkin, F., 2000. Financial Stability and the Macroeconomy. *Central Bank of Iceland Working Paper* No. 9.
- Mittnik, S. and Semmler, W. 2013. The real consequences of financial stress. *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control*, 37, pp. 1479-1499.
- Morales, M. and Estrada, D., 2010. A financial stability index for Colombia, *Annals of Finance* 6(4), pp. 555-581.
- Papademos, L., 2006. Price stability, financial stability and efficiency, and monetary policy, Speech at the Third conference of the Monetary Stability Foundation on “Challenges to the financial system – ageing and low growth” *ECB* July.
- Rajan, R.G., 2005. Has Financial Development Made the World Riskier? *NBER working paper* No. 11728.
- Ramesh, T. and Venkateswarlu, M., 2017. Dynamics of Financial Stress and Economic Performance of India. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, Vol. 15, No. 5.
- Van Roye, B., 2011. Financial stress and economic activity in Germany and the Euro Area. *Kiel Working Paper*, No. 1743.

- Sankar, A., 2014. A Financial Conditions Index for India, RBI W.P S (DEPR): 08.
- Schwartz, A.J., 1995. Why Financial Stability Depends on Price Stability, *Economic Affairs*, pp. 21-25.
- Stolbov, M. and Shchepeleva, M., 2016. Financial stress in emerging market: patterns, real effects and cross country spillover, *Review of development finance*, No. 6, pp. 71-81.