

CURRENCY-ADJUSTED STOCK INDEX CAUSALITY AND COINTEGRATION: EVIDENCE FROM INTRADAY DATA

Terrance Jalbert, University of Hawaii at Hilo

ABSTRACT

Currency adjusted stock indices consider the impact of both stock value changes and underlying currency value changes on total wealth changes. This paper explores causality and cointegration of currency-adjusted indices using intraday data. This paper examines tick-by-tick data for seven currently available stock indexes, the Philadelphia Housing Index and the Dollar Index for the period 2002-2013. Results show cointegrating relationships between each combination of series examined. The analysis reveals a higher level of causality than found in previous research. The results show bidirectional Granger causality for every index pairwise combination examined.

JEL: F15, G11, D14

KEYWORDS: Cointegration, Stock Index, Currency-Adjusted Stock Index, Dow Jones Industrial Average

INTRODUCTION

urrency adjusted indexes control for two impacts on investor wealth. Standard stock indexes aggregate stock prices for many stocks into an index. Currency adjusted stock indexes simultaneously consider the impact of stock prices and underlying currency values. By considering both elements, currency adjusted indexes provide a measure of total portfolio value change. Many individuals live in one country but invest in another. Some authors suggest individuals do this to achieve international diversification benefits (Christoffersen, Errunza, Jacobs and Langlois, 2012; Berger, Pukthuanthong and Yang, 2011). Other motivations can drive this behavior as well. This investor behavior may be done for investment familiarity reasons, to retain an original country return option, or because of investment or tax regulations that limit the ability to relocate the funds or make such a relocation costly.

Investors living internationally but investing domestically, convert domestic investment earnings into domicile country currency for consumption. Two factors affect the purchasing power of these individuals. Purchasing power depends on performance of their investments and the exchange rate at which earnings convert to domicile country currency. Currency adjusted indices measure the combined effect of stock and currency changes on individual wealth.

Other individuals also face exposure to international markets. Individuals who use investment earnings to travel internationally, face exposure to both investment and currency risk. They wish to know the international purchasing power of their investments. Other individuals purchase items manufactured in non-domicile countries. These individuals desire to know the extent to which their domestic investments afford the international purchase. Currency adjusted indices more precisely measure the extent to which individuals achieve their goals.

This paper examines time-series properties of currency adjusted stock indices developed in Jalbert, 2012, 2014, 2015 and 2016. These earlier works make use of varying starting indexes, index observation frequencies, statistical techniques and cover different time periods. This work makes advances on the statistical sophistication of the analysis and examines a higher frequency dataset. The paper utilizes cointegration and Granger causality analyses to examine tick-by-tick trading data on a different series of indexes than examined in earlier studies. Several previous articles in this series examines close of day data. While close-of-day research is useful, news outlets regularly report index levels throughout the day. This paper provides an examination of stock indexes in a minute-by-minute setting thereby providing additional precision in the analysis.

The remainder of the paper begins with a review of the relevant literature. Next, the paper provides a description of the data and methodology used in the paper. The following section presents empirical results. The paper closes with some concluding comments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Currency value adjusted stock indexes were first introduced by Jalbert (2012). He developed indices based on day-end closing values of existing stock indexes. He used United States Federal Reserve currency value data to adjust existing index values to reflect changes in the U.S. dollar value. Federal Reserve currency index data tracks U.S. dollar value against an international currency basket. His examination reveals large differences between original index and currency value adjusted index returns. For example, in 1981, the Standard and Poor's 500 Index produced a -10.237 percent return. However, the currency-adjusted version of the same index produced a -0.608 percent return. Similarly, in 2007, the Standard and Poor's 500 Index produced a 3.469 percent return, but the currency-adjusted version of the same index produced a -7.024 percent return. In as many as 15.49 percent of all daily returns, the original and currency-adjusted indices indicate different signs. Thus, one index indicates the market has increased but the other indicates the market has declined. He finds mixed evidence on index volatility. Currency adjusting indexes increased volatility in some instances but decreased volatility in other instances.

Jalbert (2014) utilizes the Dollar Index (DXY) as an alternative measure of U.S. dollar value. This index has advantages over the Federal Reserve indexes used in his earlier study. His analysis uses close-of-day data. He finds that currency value changes explain a larger portion of wealth changes than identified in Jalbert (2012). He finds currency level changes explain as much as 14.9 percent of wealth changes compared to 8.4 percent in Jalbert (2012). Jalbert (2015) examines intraday data from 2002-2013 including over one million tick-by-tick data observations for each index examined. His results show significant differences between the within-tick spreads for adjusted and raw indices. His results also show that Dollar Index changes explain more of total wealth changes than identified in his earlier works. Jalbert (2016) examined cointegration and causality between currency-adjusted indexes using close-of-day data. His results show cointegration exists between each pairwise combination of currency-adjusted indexes. His results further show that about half the pairwise combinations of currency-adjusted and raw indexes examined display bidirectional Granger causality.

The relationship between stock prices and exchange rates is relevant for the study at hand. Chien-Chung and Cheng-Few (2001) examine stock prices and exchange rates using data for G-7 countries. They find no long-run relationship between stock prices and exchange rates. They further find the relationship between stock prices and dollar values cannot be reliably used to predict future stock prices. Lin (2012) examines comovement between exchange rates and stock prices. She finds that comovement between stock prices and exchange rates becomes stronger during crisis periods. Chkili and Nguyen (2014) examine linkages between exchange rates and stock market returns for BRICS (Brasil, Russia, India, China and South Africa). They find that stock market returns impact exchange rates, but exchange rates do not impact

stock market returns. Caporale, Hunter and Ali (2014) find univariate Granger causality from stock returns to echange rates in the U.S and U.K, but find an opposite effect for Canada.

The extant literature examines relationships between stock indexes of various exchanges and countries. Madaleno and Pinho (2012) examine correlation among four stock indexes of different countries. They find that geographically and economically closer markets display higher correlation and more short-run comovements. Wang, Podobnik, Horvatic and Stanley (2011) develop a model in which all index returns fluctuate in response to a single global factor. They find that a significant amount of index cross corelations are explainable by the global factor. Lee and Rui (2002) examine the relationship between trading volume, returns and volatility. They find trading volume does not Granger cause market returns. They further find that U.S. trading volume contains considerable predictive power for financial market variables of other countries.

Hammes and Wills (2005) examined the 1970's Oil Price Shock around the end of the Brenton Woods Agreement which implied fixed exchange rates. The end of the Brenton Woods Agreement resulted in a floating U.S. dollar value relative to other currencies. Oil prices were denominated in U.S. dollars before and after dissolution of the Brenton Woods Agreement. The authors argue these events, combined with a decline in dollar value, imply the 1970's oil price shock was a normal reaction. The shock simply maintained oil prices at approximately an equal amount of gold.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data for seven U.S. Stock Indices, the Philadelphia Housing Index and the U.S. Dollar Index were obtained from Pi Trading (Pi Trading, 2013). Pi Trading provides open, high, low and close data for each minute throughout the trading day. Data for this study covers the period August 5, 2001 through April 5, 2013. Dollar Index data and stock index data were matched for each trading tick. The Dollar Index is based on U.S. dollar value relative to a basket of six major currencies. The dollar index started in March of 1973 with value of 100. Higher index levels imply a stronger dollar relative to March of 1973. The Dollar Index level displays considerable variation over time. The Index level ranges from a high of 164.72 in February 1985 to a low of 70.698 in March 2008. The index is widely quoted in the popular press. This research analyzes seven stock indices: The Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA), The NASDAQ Composite (COMPX), NASDAQ 100 (NDX), S&P 500 (SPX), S&P 400 (MID), Russell 3000 (RUA), and Russell 1000 (RUI). The paper also examines the Philadelphia Housing Index (HGX) which measures real estate values. The final dataset includes as many as 1,101,000 observations for each series.

Consider a stock index with level, RI_t at time *t*. Consider also the Dollar Index with base level of 100 and level, DI_t at time *t*. Then the currency adjusted stock index, CAI_t , at time *t* equals:

$$CAI_t = RI_t X \frac{DI_t}{100} \tag{1}$$

Consider an unadjusted index with a level of 1,000 occurring at the same time the Dollar Index equals 110. Equation 1 produces an adjusted index level equaling 1,100. A Dollar index of 100 results in equal raw and adjusted indices. A Dollar Index level above 100, implies currency-adjusted index levels exceed raw index levels. Similarly, Dollar Index levels below 100 imply raw index levels exceed the currency-adjusted index level.

This paper examines tick-by-tick index levels, index changes and index returns. Consider a currencyadjusted stock index level at time t, CAI_t , and previous period level, CAI_{t-1} . Computation of index changes, and returns follow Equations 2 and 3 respectively: $Index \ Change = CAI_t - CAI_{t-1} \tag{2}$

$$Index Return = ln(\frac{CAI_t}{CAI_{t-1}})$$
(3)

The analysis involves calculating index changes and returns using closing data for each trading minute. The examination analyzes these figures using cointegration and Granger causality techniques.

RESULTS

Augmented Dickey-Fuller statistics (Dickey and Fuller 1979 & 1981) provide a method for examining time-series stationairity. The process tests for unit roots in the data. The analysis here allows for a maximum of 32 lags. Shwartz (1978) Information Criteria methodology is used to determine exact lag length. Augmented Dickey-Fuller results for index levels are presented in Table 1, Panel A. Level form results indicate a failure to reject the presence of a unit root for any of the stock series or the Philadelphia Housing series. It does indicate rejection of a unit root for the Dollar Index. The results show rejection of a unit root for each data series in first difference form.

| | Level Form | | | First Differences | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Variable | Lag Length | T-Statistic | Prob. | Lag Length | T-Statistic | Prob. |
| Panel A: Index Levels | | | | | | |
| Currency Adjusted DJIA | 4 | -2.1578 | 0.2221 | 3 | -502.69 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted NASDAQ Composite | 2 | -1.4391 | 0.5646 | 1 | -681.11 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted NASDAQ 100 | 4 | -1.0379 | 0.7418 | 3 | -512.05 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted S&P 500 | 2 | -2.3057 | 0.1702 | 1 | -672.80 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted S&P 400 | 6 | -0.5456 | 0.8799 | 5 | -383.22 | 0.0001*** |
| Philadelphia Housing | 6 | -1.9525 | 0.3083 | 5 | -382.57 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted Russell 3000 | 5 | -1.8483 | 0.3573 | 4 | -434.67 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted Russell 1000 | 5 | -1.8434 | 0.3597 | 4 | -436.96 | 0.0001*** |
| Dollar Index | 1 | -3.0389 | 0.0314** | 0 | -1037.7 | 1.0000 |
| Panel B: Index Returns | | | | | | |
| Currency Adjusted DJIA | 10 | -311.24 | 0.0001*** | 121 | -160.15 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted DJ Transport | 1 | -680.89 | 0.0001*** | 121 | -159.01 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted DJ Utilities | 6 | 389.60 | 0.0001*** | 121 | -159.97 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted NASDAQ 100 | 3 | -494.60 | 0.0001*** | 121 | -160.98 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted NYSE Composite | 5 | -384.22 | 0.0001*** | 120 | -153.42 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted S&P 500 | 14 | -249.64 | 0.0001*** | 119 | -144.36 | 0.0000*** |
| Currency Adjusted Russell 3000 | 4 | -435.73 | 0.0001*** | 120 | -158.53 | 0.0001*** |
| Currency Adjusted Russell 1000 | 3 | -487.44 | 0.0001*** | 120 | -155.87 | 0.0001*** |
| Dollar Index | 0 | -1,036.6 | 1.000 | 121 | -159.06 | 0.0001*** |

Table 1: Unit Root Tests on Currency Adjusted Stock Indexes

This table shows Augmented Dickey-Fuller unit root test results on currency adjusted stock indexes and the Philadelphia Housing Index. *** indicates significance at the 1 percent level.

Table 1, Panel B shows results for currency-adjusted index returns. The results indicate rejection of a unit root, for each series, in both level form and first difference form. To confirm result robustness, the analysis is completed with and without an intercept term. The results of the two methodologies are not discernably different. Phillips (1987) and Phillips and Perron (1988) developed an alternate test specification for detecting unit roots in data. Tests results using the Augmented Dickey Fuller test and the Phillips and Perron test produce similar results, further attesting to the robustness of the findings. Based on these results, the remaining analysis examines index level changes and index returns without adjustment.

| Index 1 Index 2 | | Hypothesized Relations | Eigenvalue | Trace Statistic | P-Value | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ Comp | None | 0.1930 | 400,820 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1591 | 179,108 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 400 | None | 0.2018 | 388,610 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1429 | 157,855 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.1883 | 400,654 | 1.0000 | |
| be maastrais | | At Most 1 | 0.1638 | 184,924 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1762 | 347,839 | 1.0000 | |
| Do industriuis | Thin: Housing | At Most 1 | 0.1507 | 159,068 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 3000 | None | 0.2141 | 419,059 | 1.0000 | |
| D5 Industriais | Russen 5000 | At Most 1 | 0.1524 | 170,524 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 1000 | None | 0.2188 | 427,900 | 1.0000 | |
| DJ IIIuusulais | Russell 1000 | | 0.1549 | 173,444 | 0.0000*** | |
| DJ Industrials | C & D 500 | At Most 1 None | | , | | |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 500 | | 0.2271 | 444,258 | 1.0000 | |
| | COD 100 | At Most 1 | 0.1579 | 177,766 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | S&P 400 | None | 0.2095 | 399,809 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1440 | 159,134 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.1996 | 396,156 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1482 | 165,893 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1711 | 342,838 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1515 | 160,078 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | Russell 3000 | None | 0.2021 | 405,937 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1544 | 173,063 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1989 | 402,745 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1555 | 174,205 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ Comp | S&P 500 | None | 0.1981 | 405,629 | 1.0000 | |
| and build comb | 5001 2000 | At Most 1 | 0.1575 | 177,245 | 0.0000*** | |
| S&P 400 | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.2048 | 393,813 | 1.0000 | |
| 5001 400 | TURBERIQ 100 | At Most 1 | 0.1441 | 159,214 | 0.0000*** | |
| S&P 400 | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1621 | 323,013 | 1.0000 | |
| 5 & F 400 | Fill. Housing | At Most 1 | 0.1460 | 152,282 | 0.0000*** | |
| C & D 400 | Russell 3000 | | | | | |
| S&P 400 | Russell 5000 | None | 0.2015 | 387,983 | 1.0000 | |
| C 0 D 400 | D II 1000 | At Most 1 | 0.1434 | 158,079 | 0.0000*** | |
| S&P 400 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1996 | 384,458 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1428 | 157,251 | 0.0000*** | |
| S&P 400 | S&P 500 | None | 0.1970 | 383,222 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1434 | 158,476 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ 100 | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1768 | 349,477 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1514 | 159,954 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ 100 | Russell 3000 | None | 0.1954 | 396,749 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1540 | 172,480 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ 100 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1937 | 396,362 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1557 | 174,487 | 0.0000*** | |
| NASDAQ 100 | S&P 500 | None | 0.1935 | 401,569 | 1.0000 | |
| x · · · | | At Most 1 | 0.1590 | 179,175 | 0.0000*** | |
| Phil. Housing | Russell 3000 | None | 0.1647 | 335,197 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1517 | 160,088 | 0.0000*** | |
| Phil. Housing | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1661 | 336,165 | 1.0000 | |
| mi. mousing | Kussen 1000 | At Most 1 | 0.1515 | 159,642 | 0.0000*** | |
| Dhil Housing | S&D 500 | | | , | | |
| Phil. Housing | S&P 500 | None | 0.1703 | 341,784 | 1.0000 | |
| | D 11 1000 | At Most 1 | 0.1513 | 159,898 | 0.0000*** | |
| Russell 3000 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.2778 | 506,729 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1532 | 171,348 | 0.0000*** | |
| Russell 3000 | S&P 500 | None | 0.2614 | 484,587 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1534 | 171,894 | 0.0000*** | |
| Russell 1000 | S&P 500 | None | 0.3020 | 545,842 | 1.0000 | |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1562 | 175,086 | 0.0000*** | |

Table 2: Johanson Cointegration Analysis on Currency Value Adjusted Index Level Changes

This table shows Johanson cointegration test results for currency-adjusted index changes. The first and second columns indicate the two series under examination. The third column indicates the hypothesized number of cointegrating relations. The fourth column shows the ordered eigenvalues. The fifth and sixth columns show the Trace statistic and P-value respectively. ***, ** and * indicate significance at the one, five and ten percent levels respectively.

| Index 1 | Index 2 | Hypothesized Relations | Eigenvalue | Trace Statistic | P-Value |
|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ Comp | None | 0.1997 | 409,782 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1594 | 179,501 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 400 | None | 0.2129 | 403,516 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1434 | 158,444 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.1934 | 407,865 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1643 | 185,614 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1784 | 354,288 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1539 | 162,838 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 3000 | None | 0.2224 | 430,769 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1530 | 171,269 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 1000 | None | 0.2264 | 438,634 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1554 | 174,117 | 0.0000*** |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 500 | None | 0.2322 | 451,768 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1585 | 178,457 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ Comp | S&P 400 | None | 0.2141 | 406,640 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1448 | 160,054 | 0.0000 *** |
| NASDAQ Comp | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.2007 | 398,890 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1492 | 167,166 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ Comp | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1760 | 351,581 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1541 | 163,042 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ Comp | Russell 3000 | None | 0.2062 | 412,015 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1550 | 173,807 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ Comp | Russell 1000 | None | 0.2033 | 409,073 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1560 | 174,787 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ Comp | S&P 500 | None | 0.2034 | 413,083 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1580 | 177,914 | 0.0000*** |
| S&P 400 | NASDAQ 100 | None | 0.2074 | 398,135 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1449 | 160,193 | 0.0000*** |
| S&P 400 | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1695 | 333,034 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1473 | 153,768 | 0.0000*** |
| S&P 400 | Russell 3000 | None | 0.2140 | 404,819 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1440 | 158,799 | 0.0000*** |
| S&P 400 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.2115 | 400,445 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1434 | 157,967 | 0.0000*** |
| S&P 400 | S&P 500 | None | 0.2094 | 399,882 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1440 | 159,230 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | Phil. Housing | None | 0.1802 | 357,335 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1547 | 163,781 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | Russell 3000 | None | 0.1978 | 401,094 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1549 | 173,679 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1997 | 401,016 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1565 | 175,447 | 0.0000*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | S&P 500 | None | 0.1967 | 406,841 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1600 | 180,303 | 0.0000*** |
| Phil. Housing | Russell 3000 | None | 0.1684 | 343,025 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1548 | 163,605 | 0.0000*** |
| Phil. Housing | Russell 1000 | None | 0.1692 | 343,492 | 1.0000 |
| D1 '1 XX ' | 00D 500 | At Most 1 | 0.1548 | 163,395 | 0.0000*** |
| Phil. Housing | S&P 500 | None | 0.1731 | 349,188 | 1.0000 |
| D 11.0000 | D 11 4 6 6 6 | At Most 1 | 0.1548 | 163,907 | 0.0000*** |
| Russell 3000 | Russell 1000 | None | 0.3002 | 540,264 | 1.0000 |
| D 11.0000 | 00D 500 | At Most 1 | 0.1540 | 172,380 | 0.0000*** |
| Russell 3000 | S&P 500 | None | 0.2809 | 513,145 | 1.0000 |
| D 11 1 0 0 0 | 00 D 500 | At Most 1 | 0.1541 | 172,758 | 0.0000*** |
| Russell 1000 | S&P 500 | None | 0.3166 | 568,357 | 1.0000 |
| | | At Most 1 | 0.1568 | 175,826 | 0.0000*** |

| | Table 3: Johanson | Cointegration A | Analysis on Curren | cy Adjusted Index Returns |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
|--|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------|

This table shows Johanson cointegration test results for currency-adjusted index returns. The first and second columns indicate the two series under examination. The third column indicates the hypothesized number of cointegrating relations. The fourth column shows the ordered eigenvalues. The fifth and sixth columns show the Trace statistic and P-value respectively. *** indicates significance at the one percent level.

This paper conducts Johanson cointegration analysis (Johanson, 1991). The methodology involves pairwise cointegration tests of each two-index pairwise currency adjusted index combination. The test specification incorporates EViews software options of intercept, trend in CE intercept in VAR and Lag intervals equaling 1.4. The analysis uses MacKinnon, Haug and Michelis (1999) p-values. Table 2 shows results for tick-by-tick currency-adjusted index level changes. The results reveal two cointegrating equations for each index combination. For each index combination the data rejects the test for at most one cointegrating relationship. Table 3 shows results of cointegration analysis on currency adjusted tick-by-tick index returns. The results here also show two cointegrating equations for each pairwise combination of indexes.

The next analysis involves conducting Granger causality tests between pairwise combinations of adjusted indices (Granger 1969). The test specification permits up to ten lags. Table 4, shows results of tests on currency adjusted index level changes and returns. The tests determine if the index listed in column, Index 1, Granger causes the index listed in column, Index 2. The analysis involved conducting fifty-six pairwise tests. The results show bi-directional causality for each index pair. These findings differ from those of Jalbert (2016), who found, using daily data and a different combination of indexes, that about half of all index combinations display bi-directional causality. The combined results show more pronounced elements of Granger causality in higher frequency series. This causality exists in both index-level changes and index returns.

| Table 4: | Granger | Causality | Test | Results | on Cu | urrency | Adj | usted | Stock | Indexes |
|----------|---------|-----------|------|---------|-------|---------|-----|-------|-------|---------|
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Index 1 | Index 2 | Index Changes | Index Returns | Index 1 | Index 2 | Index Change | s Index Returns |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | | F Statistic | F Statistic | | | F Statistic | F Statistic |
| NASDAQ Cp | DJ Industrials | 341.30*** | 433.37*** | Phil. Housing | S&P 400 | 4,749.02*** | 6,567.20*** |
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ Cp | 687.02*** | 886.09*** | S&P 400 | Phil. Housing | 91.23*** | 48.05*** |
| S&P 400 | DJ Industrials | 101.46*** | 63.35*** | Russell 3000 | S&P 400 | 7,009.48*** | 8,116.25*** |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 400 | 9,167.36*** | 11,086.3*** | S&P 400 | Russell 3000 | 319.42*** | 267.50*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | DJ Industrials | 381.20*** | 485.71*** | Russell 1000 | S&P 400 | 6,599.67*** | 7,712.67*** |
| DJ Industrials | NASDAQ 100 | 459.43*** | 577.03*** | S&P 400 | Russell 1000 | 280.02*** | 215.47*** |
| Phil. Housing | DJ Industrials | 46.89*** | 62.14*** | S&P 500 | S&P 400 | 5,463.24*** | 6,785.80*** |
| DJ Industrials | Phil. Housing | 548.66*** | 712.20*** | S&P 400 | S&P 500 | 256.32*** | 182.00*** |
| Russell 3000 | DJ Industrials | 16.50*** | 9.953*** | Phil. Housing | NASDAQ 100 | 101.34*** | 111.07*** |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 3000 | 4,410.22*** | 5,011.87*** | NASDAQ 100 | Phil. Housing | 303.41*** | 475.97*** |
| Russell 1000 | DJ Industrials | 25.61*** | 16.55*** | Russell 3000 | NASDAQ 100 | 31.39*** | 44.95*** |
| DJ Industrials | Russell 1000 | 4657.36*** | 5,291.46*** | NASDAQ 100 | Russell 3000 | 1426.45*** | 1,520.70*** |
| S&P 500 | DJ Industrials | 43.70*** | 44.19*** | Russell 1000 | NASDAQ 100 | 22.72*** | 28.26*** |
| DJ Industrials | S&P 500 | 5,738.73*** | 6,101.28*** | NASDAQ 100 | Russell 1000 | 1,381.03*** | 1,511.11*** |
| S&P 400 | NASDAQ Cp | 39.36*** | 25.06*** | S&P 500 | NASDAQ 100 | 13.83*** | 22.86*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | S&P 400 | 5,616.26*** | 5,825.10*** | NASDAQ 100 | S&P 500 | 1,830.83*** | 19,33.36*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | NASDAQ Cp | 250.78*** | 288.91*** | Russell 3000 | Phil. Housing | 86.88*** | 183.13*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | NASDAQ 100 | 19.70*** | 28.92*** | Phil. Housing | Russell 3000 | 246.68*** | 385.35*** |
| Phil. Housing | NASDAQ Cp | 204.72*** | 247.88*** | Russell 1000 | Phil. Housing | 95.07*** | 176.45*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | Phil. Housing | 246.16*** | 426.49*** | Phil. Housing | Russell 1000 | 212.47*** | 355.82*** |
| Russell 3000 | NASDAQ Cp | 91.75*** | 133.35*** | S&P 500 | Phil. Housing | 73.60*** | 154.42*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | Russell 3000 | 1,384.11*** | 1,523.54*** | Phil. Housing | S&P 500 | 252.88*** | 327.12*** |
| Russell 1000 | NASDAQ Cp | 74.50*** | 100.77*** | Russell 1000 | Russell 3000 | 312.50*** | 334.58*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | Russell 1000 | 1276.06*** | 1,462.80*** | Russell 3000 | Russell 1000 | 265.13*** | 441.15*** |
| S&P 500 | NASDAQ Cp | 45.48*** | 77.53*** | S&P 500 | Russell 1000 | 224.47*** | 313.10*** |
| NASDAQ Cp | S&P 500 | 1,635.04*** | 1,804.79*** | Russell 1000 | S&P 500 | 1,087.25*** | 1,167.34*** |
| NASDAQ 100 | S&P 400 | 5,675.94*** | 5,704.49*** | S&P 500 | Russell 3000 | 210.98*** | 319.44*** |
| S&P 400 | NASDAQ 100 | 41.069*** | 33.70*** | Russell 3000 | S&P 500 | 1,319.91*** | 1.245.54*** |

This table shows Granger causality test results. The table shows results for each pairwise combination of currency value adjusted indexes. The results labeled Index Changes show the results for tests on index level changes as specified in Equation 2. Results labeled Index Returns shows results of tests based on Equation 3. ***, ** and * indicate significance at the one, five and ten percent levels respectively.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This paper examines currency-adjusted stock indexes. The construction of these indexes begins with an existing index and adjusts it to reflect changes in underlying currency value. The methodology involves

determining the U.S. dollar value as compared to a basket of six currencies using the DXY Dollar Index. This paper extends the analysis by using cointegration and Granger causality statistical techniques and by using tick-by-tick trading data. This paper examines tick-by-tick data for seven stock indexes, the Philadelphia Housing Index and the Dollar Index from 2001-2013 including more than 1,000,000 observations for each series.

In level form, for all series examined, the data fails to reject the presence of a unit root. But, in first difference form, the data rejects a unit root for each series. In contrast, the data rejects the presence of a unit root for each index return series without adjustment. The results show cointegrating relationships between pairwise index combinations of index changes and returns. Granger causality tests show bidirectional causality between each pairwise combination of indexes.

Currency value adjusting stock indexes and other asset values provides opportunities for additional research. Examining index arbitrage opportunities created by currency value adjustments might lead to interesting insights. In addition, currency adjusted examinations of real estate values may provide interesting insights.

REFERENCES

Berger, D. K. Puktuanthong and J.J. Yang (2011) "International Diversification with Frontier Markets," *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 101(1) p. 227-242

Chien-Chung, N. and C.F. Lee (2001) "Dynamic Relationship between Stock Prices and Exchange Rates for G-7 Countires," *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, Vol. 41(4), p. 477-490

Chkili, Walid, Nguyen, D.K. (2014) "Exchange Rate Movements and Stock Market Returns in a regimeswitching environment: Evience for BRICS countries," *Research in International Business and Finance*, Vol. 31, p. 46-56

Christoffersen, P., V. Errunza, K. Jacobs, and H. Langlois (2012) "Is the Potential for International Diversification Disappearing? A Dynamic Copula Approach," *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 25(12) p. 3711-3751

Caporale, G. M., J. Hunter and F. M. Ali (2014) "ON the Linkages between Stock Prices and Exchange Rates: Evidence from the Banking Crisis of 2007-2010," *International Review of Financial Analysis*, Vol. 33, p. 87-103

Dicky, D. A. and W. A. Fuller (1979) "Distribution of Estimators for Time Series Regressions with Unit Root," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 74, p. 427-431

Dicky, D. A. and W. A. Fuller (1981) "The Likelihood Ratio Statistics for Autoregressive Time-series with a Unit Root" *Econometrica*, Vol. 49, p. 1057-1072.

Granger, C. W. J. (1969) "Investigating Casual Relations by Econometric Models and Cross-Spectral Methods," *Econometrica*, Vol. 37, p. 424-439

Hammes, D. and D Wills (2005) "Black Gold: The End of Bretton Woods and the Oil-price Shocks of the 1970s," *The Independent Review*, Vol. 9(4) p. 501-511

The International Journal of Business and Finance Research + VOLUME 9 + NUMBER 5 + 2015

Jalbert, T. (2012) "The Performance of Currency Value Adjusted Stock Indices," *Journal of Index Investing*, Vol. 3(2) p. 34-48

Jalbert, T. (2014) "Dollar Index Adjusted Stock Indices" *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 30(1) p. 1-14

Jalbert, T. (2015) "Intraday Index Volatility: Evidence from Currency Adjusted Stock Indices," *Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 31(1, January/February) p. 17-28

Jalbert, T. (2016) "Causality and Cointegration of Currency Adjusted Stock Indices: Evidence from Closeof-Day Data," *Journal of Applied Business Research,* Forthcoming

Johansen, S. (1991) "Estimatio and Hypthesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models," *Econometrica*, Vol. 59, p. 1551-1580

Lee, B.S. and O.M. Rui (2002) "The Dynamic Relationship between Stock Returns and Trading Volume: Domestic and Cross-Country Evidence," *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 26(1) p. 51-78

Lin, C.H. (2012) he Comovement between Exchange Rates and Stock Prices in the Asian Emerging Markets," *International Review of Economics & Finance*, Vol. 22(1) P. 161-172.

MacKinnon, J.G. A. A. Haug and L Michelis (1999) "ANumerical Distribution Functions of Likelihood Ratio Tests for Cointegration," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 14, p. 563-577

Madaleno M. and C. Pinho (2012) "International Stock Market Indices Comovements: A New Look," *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, Vol. 17(1) p. 89-102

Phillips, P. C. B. (1987) "Time Series Regression with a Unit Root" Econometrica, Vol. 55, 277-301

Philips, P. C., and P. Perron (1988) "Testing for a Unit Root in Time Series Regression." *Biometrika*, 75: 335-346.

Pi Trading Inc. (2013) Intraday data obtained from www.pitrading.com

Wang, D., B. Podobnik, D. Horvatic and H.E. Stanley (2011) "Quantifying and Modeling Long-Range Cross Correlations in Multiple Time Series with Applications to World Stock Indices, *Physical Review E*, Vol 83(4), p. 046121

BIOGRAPHY

Terrance Jalbert is Professor of Finance at University of Hawaii at Hilo. His research appears in journal such as *International Journal of Finance, Journal of Emerging Markets, Advances in Taxation, Financial Services Review, Journal of Index Investing* and *Journal of Applied Business Research*. He can be reached at: terrancejalbert@yahoo.com.