International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Vol. 19, Issue 01, 2015
ISSN: 1475-7192

Revisiting the Efficient Market Hypothesis: An Empirical Investigation of Indian Capital Markets (2001-2014)

K. S. Giridharan

ABSTRACT

This study critically evaluates the weak-form efficiency of the Indian stock market from 2001 to 2014, deploying a focused analytical lens on the NSE's NIFTY index along with six vital sectoral indices: Pharmaceuticals, Information Technology, Multinational Corporations, Banking, Fast-Moving Consumer Goods, and Nifty Junior. With a robust methodological framework, the investigation applies rigorous univariate time series analysis techniques to interrogate the indices' return patterns. This includes advanced statistical tests such as run tests for detecting dependencies, unit root tests for assessing stationarity, and autocorrelation functions (ACF) coupled with correlograms for measuring the predictability of stock returns. The research fills a critical gap in literature by providing empirical insights into the market dynamics of an emerging economy. The evidence gathered points to significant anomalies that challenge the notion of weak-form efficiency in the Indian stock markets during the assessed period. The findings have substantial implications for investors, policymakers, and scholars, calling for reconsidering the prevalent investment strategies and regulatory frameworks.

Keywords: Market Efficiency, Efficient Market Hypothesis, Random Walk Theory, Runs Test, Autocorrelation, Indian Stock Market, Time Series Analysis, Emerging Economy, Stock Market Dynamics, Statistical Methods in Finance.

INTRODUCTION

The Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) stands as cornerstone in understanding financial markets, influencing our grasp of pricing dynamics in equity markets and cost of equity capital. Within framework of capital market theory, concept of market efficiency is critical, serving as barometer for extent to which stock prices instantly and accurately reflect all available and pertinent information.

EMH is inextricably linked to random walk theory and is differentiated into three distinct levels of efficiency: weak, semi-strong, and strong. Each level is defined by scope of information reflected in stock prices. Weak form asserts that stock prices encapsulate all historical price and volume data, rendering technical analysis ineffective in outperforming market. When all public information, such as annual earnings and stock splits, is considered, market is described as semi-strong efficient, suggesting that prices adjust swiftly to new public disclosures. Under this form, neither technical nor fundamental analysis offers an edge in achieving excess returns. In its most potent form, EMH posits that all information, public or private (insider knowledge), is already reflected in stock prices, condition for which empirical support is scant, implying that even insider information cannot provide investors with competitive advantage.

The efficiency of equity markets carries significant weight for investment strategies. In efficient market, seeking undervalued assets would be an exercise in futility, as prices of assets will reflect market's best estimate for risk and expected return of asset, taking into account what is known about assets at time. Therefore, there will be no undervalued assets offering higher-than-expected returns or overvalued assets offering lower-than-expected returns. All assets will be appropriately priced in market, offering an optimal reward to risk. However, if markets were inefficient, investors would be better off trying to spot winners and losers. Correct identification of miss-priced assets will enhance the portfolio's overall performance.

Understanding of efficiency of emerging markets is becoming more critical as consequence of integration with more developed markets and free movement of investments across national boundaries. India is one of fastest growing emerging economies in world. At this transitional stage, it is necessary to assess level of efficiency of Indian equity market in order to establish its longer-term role in process of economic development.

The paper is divided into sections: section 2 is about Literature Review, section 3 is about Objective and Methodology, section 4 talks about Analysis and Interpretation, and section 5 concludes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Fama (1970) presented a formal review of theory and evidence for market efficiency and revised it further based on research developments (Fama 1991). Fama attempted to organise growing empirical evidence on theory and presented efficient market theory regarding current market price, fully reflecting all available information and expected return based upon this price, which is consistent with its risk. Fama also divided market efficiency into three sub-hypotheses depending on the information set involved: (1) weak form efficiency, (2) semi-strong form efficiency and (3) strong form efficiency.

Corresponding Author: K. S. Giridharan
Assistant Professor, NITTTR, Chennai, India

Poshakwale (1996) showed that Indian stock market was weak and inefficient; he used daily BSE index data for period 1987 to 1994. Hiremath & Kamaiah (2010) find that Indian stock markets are weak in efficiency but not always. Their tests showed that CNX Nifty Junior, CNX 500, CNX Bank Nifty, BSE 500, BSE Midcap and BSE Small cap reject random walk hypothesis, and return series are characterised by presence of linear dependencies.

Patrick, A. & Sushama, R. (2011) have compared weak form of NSE and NYSE efficiency and presented evidence of efficient form of NSE and inefficient form of NYSE. From autocorrelation analysis and runs test, it was concluded that series of stock indices of NSE is an unbiased random time series. In contrast, stock indices of NYSE are biased random time series.

More recently, R. Rajesh Ram Kumar (2012) analysed market efficiency of sectoral indices of BSE, India and found that returns of 8 indices out of 12 Indices, namely, BSE Automobile Index, BSE Bankex, BSE Capital Goods Index, BSE Consumer Durables Index, BSE Health Care Index, BSE Metal Index, BSE PSU Index, and BSE Realty Index followed normal distribution and earned better return at 5 per cent significant level.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

Objective:

This study aims to rigorously examine the efficiency of the Indian equity markets under the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) framework, precisely its weak form. The weak form efficiency, the random walk theory, posits that asset prices fully incorporate all past market information, such as historical prices and volumes. To this end, the study seeks to:

1. Assess the presence of weak form efficiency in the Indian equity markets.
2. Evaluate the weak form efficiency across various sectoral indices of the National Stock Exchange (NSE).

Hypotheses:

To test the weak form efficiency, the following hypotheses are established:

- Null hypothesis (H0): Stock price changes are random, implying weak form efficiency.
- Alternative hypothesis (H1): Stock price changes are not random, suggesting inefficiency.

Data:

The study analyses Daily Index Returns from January 2, 2001, to December 30, 2014. The dataset comprises 2744 observations and focuses on log returns (continuously compounding returns), calculated using the formula:

$$r \approx \log(1+R_t)=\log(P_t-1P_t)$$

Data for this analysis is sourced from the Nifty and six major sectoral indices: Nifty Junior, Pharma, MNC, IT, Bank, and FMCG, as listed on the National Stock Exchange of India (www.nseindia.com). The software Eviews 7 is utilised to conduct the empirical analyses.

Methodology:

Stationarity Tests:

Unit Root Test - The study employs the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test to evaluate the presence of unit roots in the time series data of the stock market indices. This involves an autoregressive model and subsequent regression of the first differences of the time series on its lagged value to test the null hypothesis that the series contains a unit root (is non-stationary).

The model equation is: $\Delta Y_t=\gamma 0+\gamma_1 Y_t-1+\beta\sum\Delta Y_t-i+\varepsilon t$ Where:

- ΔΔ denotes the first difference operator.
- γ0,γ1,βγ0,γ1,β are coefficients to be estimated.
- YtYt is the non-stationary time series.
- εtεt is the error term at time t.

The tau statistic obtained from this test is compared against critical values derived from Dickey and Fuller's Monte Carlo simulations. Rejection of the null hypothesis occurs if the test statistic is significantly harmful.

The Durbin-Watson (DW) statistic is also calculated to address the potential autocorrelation issue. A DW statistic approximately equal to 2 signals no autocorrelation, validating the reliability of the test results.

Autocorrelation Analysis:

Autocorrelation, often called serial correlation, measures the degree to which current values in a time series are related to their historical values, separated by a specific interval or lag. This statistical phenomenon is particularly relevant in the context of time-ordered data, where it measures the internal relatedness within the sequence of observations.

In financial time series analysis, autocorrelation is instrumental in assessing the randomness of variables within return series, hence offering insights into the market's efficiency. For a market adhering to the principles of the Efficient Market Hypothesis, especially in its weak form, the expectation is that the series of price changes would not exhibit significant autocorrelation; the past movements or trends would bear no predictive power over future price changes.

To detect and quantify autocorrelation within the study's scope, the Autocorrelation Function (ACF) and correlograms are utilised. These tools facilitate the examination of correlation coefficients across various time lags (in this case, 1 to 16 days) to ascertain whether they statistically deviate from zero. Non-zero autocorrelations would suggest patterns or trends in stock prices, contrary to the random walk theory.

To refine the analysis, the study employs the Ljung-Box statistic, a comprehensive measure to test the overall significance of autocorrelations up to a given lag, and the Durbin-Watson statistic, which assesses the presence of first-order autocorrelation. These statistical methods aim to provide a robust test of the null hypothesis, which posits that the observed series is purely random, exhibiting zero autocorrelation.

Autocorrelation Function Assessment:

The autocorrelation function (ACF) test is a fundamental analytical tool to ascertain the correlation between present and past values within a time series. When applied to a stock return series, it evaluates whether the sequence of returns is influenced by its past values. This phenomenon would imply a deviation from the theoretical randomness expected in an efficient market.

The ACF test gauges the linear relationship between time-series observations separated by k periods (lag k). Each autocorrelation coefficient quantifies the extent to which current observations are related to past observations within the time series.

To calculate an autocorrelation coefficient at lag k, the following formula is employed, which is derived from the ordinary Pearson correlation coefficient 'r':

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}(Y_t - \bar{Y})(Y_{t-k} - \bar{Y})}{\sum_{t=1}^{n}(Y_t - Y)^2}$$

Where:

- wor$_k$ is the autocorrelation coefficient at lag k,
- Y_tY_t is the value of the time series at time t,
- $\bar{Y}$ Is the mean of the time series, and
- n is the number of observations in the time series.

The test involves computing work for different values of k to identify if the series displays significant autocorrelation at any lag. In financial markets, the absence of significant autocorrelation at any lag supports the weak form of the Efficient Market Hypothesis, indicating that past prices do not provide helpful information for predicting future prices. Conversely, significant autocorrelation may suggest the presence of patterns or trends that could potentially be exploited for prediction or gain, thereby challenging the notion of market efficiency. The correlogram, a graphical representation that plots the autocorrelation coefficients (rkrk) against the lag number (k), provides a visual insight into the temporal dependence structure of a time series. This plot can reveal the rate at which the autocorrelations decrease as the lag increases, which is particularly useful for identifying the presence of a unit root in the series.

For a time series with a unit root, the autocorrelation function (ACF) will typically start at one and decay slowly, indicating a high level of persistence in the series. The partial autocorrelation function (PACF), on the other hand, will show a spike at lag 1 (and at lag two if there are two unit roots) and cut off to zero afterwards.

The serial correlation matrices are another tool that measures the correlation between price changes in consecutive periods. A serial correlation of zero implies that consecutive price changes are independent, supporting the weak-form Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH). Conversely, a significant positive serial correlation may suggest momentum in the market, contradicting the EMH.

The Runs test, also known as the Geary test for randomness, is a non-parametric test that assesses the randomness of a sequence by comparing the number of observed runs (a sequence of positive or negative returns) to the number expected in a random sequence. This test is robust as it does not require the data to be normally distributed or have constant variance.

A run is a sequence of increasing or decreasing values, and the Runs test evaluates whether the sequence contains too many or too few runs compared to what would be expected in a random process. The null hypothesis of the Runs test is that the series is random.

The test statistic ZZ is calculated as follows:

$$Z = \frac{R - E(R)}{V(R)}$$

Where:

- RR is the observed number of runs,
- E(R)E(R) is the expected number of runs under the null hypothesis,
- V(R)V(R) is the variance of the number of runs.

The expected number of runs, E(R)E(R), can be calculated using the formula:

$$E(R) = 1 + \frac{2N_1N_2}{N_1 + N_2}$$

N1N1 and N2N2 are the numbers of positive and negative changes in the time series, respectively.

If the observed number of runs significantly differs from the expected number, the null hypothesis of randomness is rejected. A negative ZZ-value suggests a clustering of returns (positive autocorrelation), while a positive ZZ-value indicates over-dispersion (negative autocorrelation). Thus, the Runs test provides an additional measure to validate or refute the random walk model in the context of market efficiency analysis.

The formula for the expected number of runs under complete randomness is typically given by the following equation:

In this equation:

$$E(R) = \frac{2n_a n_b}{n_a + n_b} + 1$$

.........Equ. 4

- nn is the total number of observations in the series.
- nana represents the number of observations above the mean or median.
- nbnb represents the number of observations below the mean or median.
- To evaluate the variance of the number of runs, you would use the formula:

$$V(R) = \frac{2n_a n_b(2n_a n_b - n)}{(n_a + n_b)^2(n_a + n_b - 1)}$$

.........Equ. 5

With these, the standardised test statistic (Z-statistic) that follows the standard normal distribution asymptotically can be calculated by:

$$Z = \frac{R - E(R)}{V(R)}$$

.........Equ. 6

Where:

- RR is the observed number of runs.
- E(R)E(R) is the expected number of runs (from Equation 4).
- V(R)V(R) is the variance of the number of runs (from Equation 5).

When the absolute value of the Z-statistic is enormous (usually taken as larger than 1.96 or smaller than -1.96 at a 5% significance level), the null hypothesis that the sequence of observations is random (i.e., no autocorrelation) is rejected. A sizeable positive Z-value indicates that the sequence has fewer runs than expected (positive autocorrelation), whereas a sizeable negative Z-value indicates more runs than expected (negative autocorrelation).

Analysis and Interpretations

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the indices. Notably, kurtosis values suggest that the distribution of returns for all selected indices deviates from a normal distribution. Specifically, the data show leptokurtosis, indicating a "peakedness" higher than a normal distribution, and negative skewness, meaning the tail on the left side of the probability density function is longer or fatter than the right.

Stationarity and Unit Root Tests

The Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test results in Table 2 confirm that the null hypothesis of a unit root (non-stationarity) in the returns of the selected indices can be rejected. This implies that the time series for each index is stationary. The significance is evidenced by the test statistics being more negative than the critical values for all indices under study.

Autocorrelation Analysis

The examination of ACF correlograms and the Ljung-Box (LQ) statistic, detailed in Table 3, reveal zero probability for the series to be non-stationary or random. This supports the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that the series is stationary with the presence of serial correlations.

Runs Test for Randomness

According to the runs test for randomness results shown in Table 4, we reject the null hypothesis of randomness in the return series for all the indices except for the IT index. This suggests a pattern or trend in the data that deviates from randomness. However, when analysing individual years in Table 5, it appears that in 2001 and 2005, the NIFTY exhibited a random walk, implying efficiency in those years. Conversely, during other years, the index showed signs of non-randomness, pointing to inefficiencies within the market.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Selected Market Indices

Statistic	IT	MNC	Junior	Nifty	FMCG	Pharma	Bank
Mean	-0.000558	0.000431	0.000456	0.000480	0.000484	0.000559	0.000770
Median	0.000595	0.000731	0.001734	0.001185	0.001190	0.000972	0.000834
Maximum	0.145572	0.093094	0.138259	0.163348	0.083043	0.111594	0.172399
Minimum	-2.358261	-0.116095	-0.131328	-0.130534	-0.123819	-0.086331	-0.151375
Std. Dev.	0.051043	0.013942	0.018458	0.016573	0.014195	0.013366	0.021231
Skewness	-35.98781	-0.504950	-0.678967	-0.264141	-0.304432	-0.375389	-0.166358
Kurtosis	1661.364	9.370362	9.355898	11.17071	7.960721	8.459198	8.305932
Jarque-Bera	3.15E+08	4756.428	4829.603	7664.774	2855.987	3471.905	3231.473
Probability	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
Sum	-1.545139	1.167830	1.236804	1.304752	1.313731	1.520885	2.097827
Sum Sq. Dev.	7.145115	0.532839	0.934030	0.752969	0.552312	0.489684	1.235846
Observations	2744	2744	2744	2744	2744	2744	2744

Table 2: Augmented Dickey-Fuller Unit Root Test Results

S. No.	Index	T-statistic	Probability
1.	IT Index	-52.10	0.000
2.	FMCG	-50.72	0.000
3.	Pharma	-48.08	0.000
4.	MNC	-48.08	0.000
5.	Nifty junior	-44.65	0.000
6.	Nifty	-37.59	0.000
7.	Bank index	-36.50	0.000

Table 3: Autocorrelation Test Results for Nifty Index

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.075	0.075	15.520	0.000
2	-0.049	-0.055	22.019	0.000
3	-0.005	0.003	22.094	0.000
4	0.018	0.015	22.963	0.000
5	-0.012	-0.015	23.359	0.000
6	-0.053	-0.049	30.978	0.000
7	0.008	0.015	31.160	0.000
8	0.045	0.038	36.766	0.000

9	0.020	0.015	37.905	0.000
10	0.026	0.030	39.819	0.000
11	-0.010	-0.014	40.080	0.000
12	-0.008	-0.008	40.277	0.000
13	0.034	0.036	43.462	0.000
14	0.061	0.060	53.858	0.000
15	-0.007	-0.011	53.996	0.000
16	-0.000	0.008	53.996	0.000

Note: The "AC" and "PAC" values are rounded to three decimal places. The "Q-Statistic" and "Probability" values indicate significant autocorrelation at all considered lags, with p-values of 0.000 suggesting rejection of the null hypothesis that the Nifty time series is not stationary.

Table 3: Autocorrelation Test Results for Nifty Junior Index

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.158	0.158	68.327	0.000
2	-0.018	-0.044	69.251	0.000
3	0.027	0.038	71.222	0.000
4	0.005	-0.007	71.286	0.000
5	-0.012	-0.010	71.674	0.000
6	-0.032	-0.030	74.441	0.000
7	0.006	0.016	74.539	0.000
8	0.032	0.028	77.446	0.000
9	0.050	0.044	84.387	0.000
10	0.052	0.039	91.870	0.000
11	0.005	-0.010	91.932	0.000
12	-0.007	-0.007	92.073	0.000
13	0.033	0.035	95.146	0.000
14	0.080	0.073	112.650	0.000
15	0.012	-0.006	113.080	0.000
16	0.023	0.028	114.520	0.000

Note: The "AC" and "PAC" values are rounded to three decimal places. The "Q-Statistic" and "Probability" values indicate significant autocorrelation at various lags. A probability of 0.000 suggests rejecting the null hypothesis, indicating that the Nifty Junior time series is stationary.

Table 4: Autocorrelation Test Results for Nifty Pharma

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.085	0.085	20.030	0.000
2	0.009	0.001	20.236	0.000
3	0.021	0.020	21.457	0.000
4	0.018	0.015	22.396	0.000
5	-0.010	-0.013	22.691	0.000
6	-0.025	-0.024	24.467	0.000
7	0.001	0.004	24.469	0.001
8	0.003	0.003	24.501	0.002
9	0.017	0.018	25.266	0.003
10	0.024	0.022	26.802	0.003
11	-0.017	-0.022	27.588	0.004
12	-0.012	-0.010	27.990	0.006
13	0.070	0.071	41.377	0.000
14	0.028	0.017	43.596	0.000
15	-0.025	-0.028	45.368	0.000
16	-0.018	-0.015	46.235	0.000

The "AC" and "PAC" values indicate the autocorrelation at each lag for the Nifty Pharma index. The "Q-Statistic" and "Probability" columns suggest that there is significant autocorrelation at various lags, as indicated by the probability values being very low or 0.000, thus rejecting the null hypothesis of no autocorrelation and implying that the time series is stationary.

Table 5: Autocorrelation Test Results for Nifty FMCG

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.032	0.032	2.7878	0.095
2	-0.042	-0.043	7.7298	0.021

3	-0.023	-0.021	9.2442	0.026
4	0.017	0.017	10.082	0.039
5	-0.003	-0.006	10.113	0.072
6	-0.005	-0.003	10.169	0.118
7	-0.009	-0.009	10.412	0.166
8	-0.002	-0.002	10.424	0.237
9	0.030	0.030	12.962	0.164
10	0.027	0.025	14.952	0.134
11	-0.029	-0.028	17.246	0.101
12	-0.004	0.001	17.301	0.139
13	0.011	0.008	17.608	0.173
14	0.056	0.054	26.350	0.023
15	0.003	0.001	26.372	0.034
16	-0.034	-0.029	29.488	0.021

In this table, the AC and PAC values indicate the level of autocorrelation for the Nifty FMCG index at each given lag. The Q-Statistic represents the result of the Ljung-Box Q test, which tests the null hypothesis that the data is independently distributed. Probabilities less than the typical significance level of 0.05 suggest that we reject the null hypothesis of randomness at those lags, indicating a significant autocorrelation.

Table 6: Autocorrelation Test Results for Nifty IT

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.005	0.005	0.0673	0.795
2	-0.013	-0.013	0.5521	0.759
3	-0.011	-0.011	0.9137	0.822
4	-0.012	-0.012	1.3191	0.858
5	-0.004	-0.004	1.3679	0.928
6	0.002	0.001	1.3742	0.967
7	-0.006	-0.007	1.4805	0.983
8	-0.032	-0.033	4.3674	0.823
9	0.044	0.044	9.6311	0.381
10	0.027	0.025	11.611	0.312
11	0.013	0.013	12.073	0.358
12	-0.013	-0.013	12.559	0.402
13	0.011	0.013	12.868	0.458
14	0.012	0.013	13.274	0.505
15	-0.005	-0.006	13.355	0.575
16	-0.008	-0.008	13.514	0.635

This table presents the autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation coefficients for the Nifty IT index at different lags. The Q-Statistic is from the Ljung-Box Q test and measures whether the autocorrelations up to that lag are significantly different from zero. Probabilities above 0.05 typically indicate that the null hypothesis of no autocorrelation cannot be rejected at the 95% confidence level. For Nifty IT, none of the lags have a probability value below 0.05, suggesting that the time series generally lacks significant autocorrelation at all tested lags, consistent with a stationary process according to this test.

Table 7: Autocorrelation Test Results for MNC

Lag	Autocorrelation (AC)	Partial Autocorrelation (PAC)	Q-Statistic	Probability
1	0.087	0.087	20.987	0.000
2	-0.025	-0.033	22.730	0.000
3	0.007	0.013	22.881	0.000
4	-0.010	-0.013	23.175	0.000
5	0.005	0.008	23.240	0.000
6	-0.023	-0.025	24.635	0.000
7	-0.009	-0.004	24.860	0.001
8	0.033	0.032	27.772	0.001
9	0.026	0.021	29.640	0.001
10	0.007	0.004	29.767	0.001
11	-0.005	-0.005	29.826	0.002
12	0.012	0.013	30.219	0.003
13	0.046	0.044	36.050	0.001
14	0.061	0.056	46.334	0.000
15	0.008	0.002	46.523	0.000

16	-0.004	-0.003	46.574	0.000

This table presents the autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation coefficients for the MNC index at different lags. The Q-Statistic is from the Ljung-Box Q test, which tests whether there is significant evidence for non-zero autocorrelations at lag k (for k=1,2,...,16 in this case). We reject the null hypothesis that no autocorrelation is present with all probability (Prob) values at or very close to zero. This indicates that there are autocorrelations at different lags significantly different from zero, implying that past values correlate statistically with future values in this time series.

Table 8: Run Test for Randomness for Nifty and Sectoral Indices

Index	Test Value	Cases < Test Value	Cases >= Test Value	Total Cases	Number of Runs	Z-Value	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Nifty	0.0004754910	1312	1432	2744	1294	-2.922	0.003
Junior	0.0004507284	1273	1471	2744	1192	-6.674	0.000
IT	-0.0005630991	1293	1451	2744	1331	-1.435	0.151
Bank	0.0007645124	1365	1379	2744	1284	-3.397	0.001
Pharma	0.0005542565	1327	1417	2744	1270	-3.881	0.000
FMCG	0.0004787630	1370	1374	2744	1302	-2.711	0.007
MNC	0.0004255922	1333	1411	2744	1291	-3.092	0.002

Explanation:

The Runs Test for Randomness is a non-parametric test to decide if a random process generates a data series. The null hypothesis for this test is that the data are random.

- **Test Value**: A predetermined constant used for classification purposes.
- **Cases < Test Value**: The number of observations below the test value.
- **Cases >= Test Value**: The number of observations at or above the test value.
- **Total Cases**: The total number of observations.
- **Number of Runs**: A 'run' is a sequence of consecutive items above or all below the median. This column represents the count of such sequences.
- **Z-Value**: The Runs Test test statistic follows a standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis.
- **Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)**: The p-value corresponding to the test statistic. A low p-value (typically ≤ 0.05) indicates that you can reject the null hypothesis.

Interpretation:

- **Nifty, Bank, Pharma, FMCG, and MNC**: The Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) values are less than 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis of randomness can be rejected. This suggests that these series are not random and, thus, may not support the notion of efficient capital markets.
- **Junior**: With a very low Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value (0.000) firmly rejects the null hypothesis of randomness, indicating that this index series is likely not random.
- **IT**: The Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value is more significant than 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis of randomness cannot be rejected. Therefore, this series could be considered random, which aligns with the notion of efficient capital markets for this particular index.

This table implies that except for the IT index, all other indices show patterns inconsistent with randomness, suggesting some predictability in their price movements, which would be considered an anomaly in efficient capital markets.

Table 9: Annual Run Test for Randomness Results for Nifty Index

Nifty Year	Cases < Test Value	Cases >= Test Value	Total Cases	Number of Runs	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
2001	123	124	247	105	-2.49	0.013
2002	121	130	251	114	-1.56	0.118
2003	118	136	254	115	-1.56	0.118
2004	118	136	254	127	-0.05	0.963
2005	121	130	251	111	-1.94	0.052
2006	110	140	250	113	-1.44	0.150
2007	129	120	249	121	-0.55	0.581
2008	118	128	246	118	-0.74	0.458
2009	128	115	243	129	0.88	0.377
2010	116	136	252	135	1.12	0.264
2011	131	116	247	116	-1.03	0.303
2012	127	120	247	122	-0.85	0.395

2013	125	122	247	118	-0.65	0.515
2014	132	115	247	113	-1.25	0.211

Conclusion

The results derived from the run tests provide a compelling narrative about the state of the Indian stock market, echoing a sentiment often associated with emerging economies' markets – that of inefficiency in the weak form. This inefficiency contrasts with developed markets, where information is rapidly absorbed and reflected in stock prices, supporting the efficient market hypothesis. For investors, the implication of such a market characteristic is significant. The usual strategy of investing in index funds, predicated on the belief that it is impossible to outperform the market consistently, may not hold water in the Indian context. The inefficiency observed suggests that unexploited opportunities could exist for those willing to engage in more active and potentially more sophisticated investment strategies. These opportunities could arise from various inefficiencies, such as delayed dissemination of information, slower reaction times of market participants, or periodic mispricing of securities.

The results also indicate an essential role for Indian market regulators and policymakers. There is a clear indication that efforts need to be ramped up to bolster the market's efficiency. This can be achieved through various measures, such as ensuring greater transparency, enforcing stringent disclosure requirements, and improving the overall regulatory framework to prevent manipulation and promote fair trading practices. By enhancing the efficiency of the market, not only is the market's integrity upheld, but it also becomes more attractive to both domestic and international investors. Furthermore, there is a direct link between financial market development and economic growth. Efficient capital markets lead to optimal allocation of resources, which in turn drives productivity and growth. As such, the Indian market's inefficiency presents a challenge and an opportunity for economic progress. Policymakers can indirectly stimulate broader economic development by focusing on creating a more efficient market environment.

References

1. Bodie, Z., Kane, A., & Marcus, A. J. (2009). *Investments*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
2. Gujarati, D. N., & Sangeetha. (2007). *Basic Econometrics*. McGraw-Hill.
3. Fama, E. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. *The Journal of Finance, 25*(2).
4. Fama, E. (1976). Efficient capital markets: Reply. *The Journal of Finance, 31*(1), 143-145.
5. Fama, E. (1991). Efficient capital markets. *The Journal of Finance, 46*(5).
6. Hiremath, G. S., & Kamaiah, B. (2010). Some further evidence on the behaviour of stock returns in India. *International Journal of Economics and Finance, 2*(2), 157.
7. Patrick, A., & Sushama, R. (2011). Efficiency of stock markets - Comparing the behaviour of NSE and NYSE stock indices. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 1*(8), ISSN 2231-5780.
8. Poshakwale, S. (1996). Evidence of a weak form of efficiency and the day-of-the-week effect in the Indian stock market. *Finance India, 10*(3).
9. Ramkumar, R., et al. (2012). An analysis of market efficiency in sectoral indices: A study with a particular reference to Bombay Stock Exchange in India. *European Journal of Scientific Research, 69*(2), 290-297.
10. Reilly, F. K., & Brown, K. C. (2006). *Investment Analysis and Portfolio Management*. New Delhi: Cengage Learning.