Research Proposal

Title: *Connected Stocks via Business Groups: Evidence from an Emerging Market*

Author: *Seyyed Morteza Aghajanzadeh*

Supervisors: *Dr. Mahdi Heidari, Dr. Mahdi Mohseni*

Institution: *Tehran Institute for Advanced Studies*

Research Objective

Related literature points out that common ownership and business groups are non-fundamental factors that lead to co-movement in stock returns. Using unique Iran's financial market context, this paper attempts to find which factors intensively and extensively affect co-movement.

Motivation

The phenomenon of "co-movement" has been observed by researchers and analysts. There is an increase in interest in risk models, notably after the financial crisis of 2008. According to these models, price correlation plays a significant role in risk measurement. While first coming investigations attributed the companies' return co-movement to their fundamentals, (e.g. Shiller (1989)), recent findings have focused on the role of non-fundamental characteristics. Barberis and Shleifer (2003) and Barberis et al. (2005) provided theoretical models for predicting the co-movement between fundamentally unrelated companies. Trying to explain factors affecting co-movement, Anton and Polk (2014) suggest that common ownership positively affects co-movement[1]. Subsequently, Koch et al. (2016) provides evidence that even

[1]There are some factors like, Index inclusion (Barberis et al. (2005)), investors' attention to the companies (Wu and Shamsuddin (2014)), Investment banks' underwriting

owners' liquidity needs' correlation can result in co-movement independent of direct common ownership.

As an emerging literature, the pros and cons of business groups have been the subject of the debates [Khanna and Palepu (2000)]. While the co-movement in business groups is accepted, the co-movement channels remain undiscovered. Both Cho and Mooney (2015) and Kim et al. (2015) studied the South Korean market and suggested two different sources for the co-movement in business groups. The first paper attributed co-movement to the companies' fundamentals. However, the second paper presents that the investors' category/habitat behavior is responsible for co-movement.

Data

We use a unique data set that includes the daily report of the block-holder's ownership, defined as a shareholder who owns at least 1% of the total outstanding shares. The set of variables contains firms' characteristics like market cap and book value, detailed information on daily trade like volume and return, and members of business groups. The time period of the study is from 2015 to 2020.

Methodology

We use the same methodoloy as Anton and Polk (2014) to compose pairs, define control variables, and calculating co-movement. A method wildly used in the Emperical asset pricing is the two-step approach of Fama and MacBeth (1973). In the first step, for each time period, cross-sectional regressions are used to obtain estimates of the parameters of interest. Then, in the second step, the time series of these estimates are used to obtain final estimates for the parameters and standard errors so that t-statistics can be computed. [Skoulakis (2008)]

Contribution

According to the restrictions of data in the US that quarterly fund ownership data is available, investigations in this area are limited to the fund ownership impact on co-movement. This type of owners perform particular

(Grullon et al. (2014)), correlated beliefs (David and Simonovska (2016)), shareholders' coordination (Pantzalis and Wang (2017)), and preference for companies' dividends (Hameed and Xie (2019)) that have been identified by researchers.

types of behavior due to their needs and the fact that they are intermediates. Nevertheless, in Iran, the block holders' daily ownership data, including mutual fund ownership, is publicly accessible. So research through this data can show whether common ownership other than mutual fund ownership can lead to co-movement or not.

In this paper, we consider the co-movement of the companies in business groups. Best of our knowledge, it is the first study that compares direct and indirect common ownership. Also, a modified measurement is introduced in this paper to calculate the common ownership of the companies.

References

Anton, M. and Polk, C. (2014). Connected stocks. *The Journal of Finance*, 69(3):1099–1127.

Azar, J. (2011). A new look at oligopoly: Implicit collusion through portfolio diversification.

Azar, J., Schmalz, M. C., and Tecu, I. (2018). Anticompetitive effects of common ownership. *The Journal of Finance*, 73(4):1513–1565.

Barberis, N. and Shleifer, A. (2003). Style investing. *Journal of financial Economics*, 68(2):161–199.

Barberis, N., Shleifer, A., and Wurgler, J. (2005). Comovement. *Journal of financial economics*, 75(2):283–317.

Cho, C. H. and Mooney, T. (2015). Stock return comovement and korean business groups. *Review of Development Finance*, 5(2):71–81.

David, J. M. and Simonovska, I. (2016). Correlated beliefs, returns, and stock market volatility. *Journal of International Economics*, 99:S58–S77.

Fama, E. F. and MacBeth, J. D. (1973). Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(3):607–636.

Freeman, K. (2019). The effects of common ownership on customer-supplier relationships. *Kelley School of Business Research Paper*, (16-84).

Gilje, E. P., Gormley, T. A., and Levit, D. (2020). Who's paying attention? measuring common ownership and its impact on managerial incentives. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 137(1):152–178.

Grullon, G., Underwood, S., and Weston, J. P. (2014). Comovement and investment banking networks. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 113(1):73–89.

Hameed, A. and Xie, J. (2019). Preference for dividends and return comovement. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 132(1):103–125.

Hansen, R. G. and Lott Jr, J. R. (1996). Externalities and corporate objectives in a world with diversified shareholder/consumers. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, pages 43–68.

Harford, J., Jenter, D., and Li, K. (2011). Institutional cross-holdings and their effect on acquisition decisions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 99(1):27–39.

He, J. and Huang, J. (2017). Product market competition in a world of cross-ownership: Evidence from institutional blockholdings. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(8):2674–2718.

He, J., Huang, J., and Zhao, S. (2019). Internalizing governance externalities: The role of institutional cross-ownership. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 134(2):400–418.

Khanna, T. and Palepu, K. (2000). Is group affiliation profitable in emerging markets? an analysis of diversified indian business groups. *The journal of finance*, 55(2):867–891.

Kim, M.-S., Kim, W., and Lee, D. W. (2015). Stock return commonality within business groups: Fundamentals or sentiment? *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 35:198–224.

Koch, A., Ruenzi, S., and Starks, L. (2016). Commonality in Liquidity: A Demand-Side Explanation. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 29(8):1943–1974.

Lewellen, K. and Lowry, M. (2021). Does common ownership really increase firm coordination? *Journal of Financial Economics*.

Newham, M., Seldeslachts, J., and Banal-Estanol, A. (2018). Common ownership and market entry: Evidence from pharmaceutical industry.

Pantzalis, C. and Wang, B. (2017). Shareholder coordination, information diffusion and stock returns. *Financial Review*, 52(4):563–595.

Shiller, R. J. (1989). Comovements in stock prices and comovements in dividends. *The Journal of Finance*, 44(3):719–729.

Skoulakis, G. (2008). Panel data inference in finance: Least-squares vs fama-macbeth. *Available at SSRN 1108865*.

Wu, Q. and Shamsuddin, A. (2014). Investor attention, information diffusion and industry returns. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 30:30–43.