© International Academic Research Journal of Economics and Finance
Volume 9, Issue No: 1, April 2026 Page no. 56-61
ISSN: 2227-6254
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19820737

Financialization of the Indian Economy: Has the Stock Market Become Detached from Real Economic Activity?

Kaushal Bajaj
Student, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, India
Email: bajajkaushal100@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper empirically examines whether India's stock market has become detached from real economic activity during 2014–2024. Using 43 quarterly observations sourced from the Reserve Bank of India, OLS multiple regression and Granger causality tests are applied with Nifty 50 returns as the dependent variable and the Market Capitalization-to-GDP ratio (McapGDP), Foreign Portfolio Investment (FPI), real GDP, USD/INR exchange rate change, and CPI inflation as independent variables. Results show that the McapGDP ratio positively and significantly drives equity returns ($\beta = +0.083$, $p = 0.001$), while GDP growth is negatively associated with returns ($\beta = -4.2\times10^{-6}$, $p = 0.002$). Granger causality tests confirm that GDP does not predict Nifty returns at any horizon up to four quarters. These findings support the financialization hypothesis, indicating a progressive and statistically significant decoupling between India's financial markets and its real economy.

Keywords: Financialization, Indian Stock Market, GDP Decoupling, Nifty 50, Emerging Markets, Market Capitalization

INTRODUCTION

The decade from 2014 to 2024 represents one of the most structurally significant periods in the evolution of the Indian economy. India underwent major structural reforms including demonetization (2016), GST implementation (2017), the NBFC liquidity crisis (2018), and the COVID-19 pandemic (2020). Despite these macroeconomic disruptions, Indian equity markets demonstrated remarkable resilience. Benchmark indices the Sensex and Nifty 50 consistently reached historic highs, with the Market Capitalization-to-GDP (McapGDP) ratio nearly tripling from ~238% in 2014 to ~600% by mid-2024.

This divergence raises a fundamental question: Has the Indian stock market become detached from real economic activity? Financialization the growing dominance of financial markets, institutions, and shareholder motives over productive economic activity provides a theoretical lens for examining this phenomenon. If stock markets primarily respond to liquidity cycles, valuation expansion, and capital flows rather than output, employment, or investment, this constitutes evidence of structural decoupling with significant implications for policy, investors, and financial stability.

Literature Review

The financialization literature originates primarily in studies of advanced economies. Epstein (2005) defines financialization as the increasing role of financial motives, markets, and institutions in domestic and international economies. Krippner (2005) empirically demonstrates that U.S. corporations increasingly derive profits from financial rather than productive channels. Stockhammer (2004) and Orhangazi (2008) show that financial expansion can crowd out real investment by incentivizing short-term shareholder returns over capital formation. Palley (2007) links financialization to macroeconomic instability and wage stagnation.

The counterposition is provided by the Efficient Market Hypothesis (Fama, 1970), which holds that equity prices reflect all available macroeconomic information. Shiller (2000), however, documents excess market volatility relative to fundamentals, supporting the possibility of persistent divergence. Minsky's Financial Instability Hypothesis (1986) adds a dynamic dimension, arguing that prolonged stability encourages speculative behavior and asset price inflation beyond real fundamentals.

On financial development and growth, Levine and Zervos (1998) and King and Levine (1993) find positive causal links, while Arcand, Berkes, and Panizza (2015) and Cecchetti and Kharroubi (2012) identify a nonlinear "too much finance" threshold beyond which financial expansion harms growth. For India specifically, Chakrabarti (2001) documents rising sensitivity of domestic markets to FII flows; Ghosh and Chandrasekhar (2009) find increased volatility following financial liberalization; and Nagaraj (2013) documents stagnation in private capital formation despite financial sector expansion. Empirical literature specific to the 2014–2024 reform and disruption period remains limited, constituting a gap this study addresses.

Research Methodology

Data and Variables

The study uses 43 quarterly observations (2014Q2–2024Q4) sourced exclusively from the RBI Database on Indian Economy (DBIE). The dependent variable is the quarterly percentage return of the Nifty 50 index. Independent variables comprise: (1) McapGDP ratio total NSE market capitalization divided by nominal quarterly GDP, serving as the primary

financialization proxy; (2) FPI net equity inflows (₹ Crore) capturing external liquidity influence; (3) GDP at current prices (₹ Crore) representing real economic performance; (4) USD/INR quarterly percentage change a financial and monetary channel variable; and (5) CPI inflation (%) averaged over the three months in each quarter. Monthly data (FPI, IIP, CPI) were aggregated to quarterly totals or averages; GDP was restructured from India's financial year to a calendar-year quarterly format for alignment.

Hypotheses

H_0: Stock market movements are significantly and positively related to real GDP growth (Nifty 50 returns reflect underlying economic fundamentals).

H_1: Stock market movements are increasingly driven by financial factors, exhibiting a weak or negative relationship with real economic activity — consistent with the financialization hypothesis.

Analytical Methods

Analysis proceeds in four stages: (1) descriptive statistics and trend analysis; (2) Pearson correlation matrix; (3) OLS multiple regression (Nifty Return = β_0 + β_1FPI + β_2McapGDP + β_3GDP + β_4USD_QoQ + β_5CPI + ε); and (4) Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) test for multicollinearity and Granger causality test (lags 1–4 quarters) to assess directional predictability. All computations used Python 3.12 with statsmodels, pandas, scipy, and matplotlib.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Trend Analysis

The Nifty 50 delivered a mean quarterly return of 3.34% (SD = 8.50%), with extremes of −29.34% (2020Q1, COVID crash) and +24.31% (2020Q4, liquidity-driven recovery). FPI flows were highly erratic (mean ₹4,317 Cr; SD ₹11,288 Cr), with significant outflows during global monetary tightening in 2018 and 2022. The McapGDP ratio rose from ~238% in 2014 to a peak of 600% in 2024Q3 a near-tripling that signals structural transformation. GDP grew steadily in nominal terms except for a sharp contraction in 2020Q2. The contrast between the McapGDP trajectory and GDP growth is visually striking and analytically central to this study.

OLS Regression Results

Table 1 presents OLS regression results. The model explains 44.8% of variation in Nifty returns (R^2 = 0.448, Adj. R^2 = 0.373, F = 5.997, p = 0.0004). The Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.067 confirms no meaningful serial autocorrelation.

The McapGDP ratio is the most consistently significant positive predictor (β = +0.083, p = 0.001). A one-percentage-point rise in the ratio is associated with a ~0.083pp increase in quarterly returns; given the 360pp rise over the study period, the cumulative effect is substantial. GDP, by contrast, carries a statistically significant negative coefficient (p = 0.002), meaning quarters with higher nominal output are associated with lower returns directly contrary to conventional theory. The USD/INR change is numerically the largest predictor (β = −1.710, p = 0.001): each 1% rupee depreciation is associated with a ~1.71pp decline in returns, operating through FPI exit incentives and margin compression. FPI and CPI are not statistically significant.

Granger Causality Test

Table 2 reports Granger causality results across four lag specifications.

GDP fails to Granger-cause Nifty returns at any lag (all p > 0.25). Past GDP values carry no predictive power over future equity returns at any horizon up to one year, reinforcing the contemporaneous decoupling evidenced in the regression.

Multicollinearity Check

Despite a high bivariate correlation between McapGDP and GDP (r = 0.833), all VIF values are below 5 (GDP: 3.69; McapGDP: 3.46; FPI: 1.14; USD: 1.08; CPI: 1.10), confirming that multicollinearity does not distort coefficient estimates.

DISCUSSION

The empirical findings converge on a coherent narrative: India's equity market has developed a financial logic of its own, increasingly shaped by the scale of financial markets (McapGDP) and monetary-financial conditions (exchange rate) rather than by the productive performance of the economy (GDP). This is consistent with Epstein's (2005) financialization thesis and contradicts the strong-form EMH as applied to macroeconomic fundamentals.

The negative GDP coefficient is particularly revealing. Rather than indicating that GDP "causes" poor market performance, it reflects that periods of high nominal GDP many of which coincide with post-crisis recoveries driven by fiscal stimulus do not coincide with equity market strength, while financial factors dominate in those same periods. The COVID-19 episode crystallizes this: GDP contracted sharply in 2020Q2, but markets recovered by 2020Q4 on the back of global liquidity a textbook demonstration of financial-sector decoupling.

The insignificance of FPI is theoretically interesting. When exchange rate movements are controlled for, FPI loses explanatory power, suggesting both variables respond to the same underlying global financial conditions. This implies that the transmission mechanism runs through monetary and currency channels, not through the direct volume of foreign capital flows.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings support the "too much finance" nonlinear threshold of Arcand et al. (2015) at McapGDP ratios exceeding 400–600%, financial markets may be absorbing resources and attention from productive investment rather than channeling capital toward it. The Minsky (1986) framework is also relevant: post-2020 liquidity expansion encouraged speculative momentum, inflating valuations well beyond what fundamentals would justify.

CONCLUSION

Table 3 summarizes the hypotheses testing outcomes.

This study provides robust empirical evidence that India's stock market has experienced statistically significant and growing decoupling from real economic activity between 2014 and 2024. H_0 is rejected; H_1 is supported. The McapGDP ratio and exchange rate both financial-sector variables are the primary drivers of equity returns, while real GDP growth is negatively associated with returns contemporaneously and carries no predictive power over time.

These findings have direct implications. For retail investors, macroeconomic optimism about India's growth story is not a reliable guide to short or medium-term equity returns financial and monetary signals are more actionable. For regulators, the McapGDP ratio at 600% warrants scrutiny: systemic risk from a market correction of the magnitude seen in

2020Q1 is now macro-economically significant. For policymakers, ensuring that financial market growth translates into productive investment rather than self-referential valuation expansion remains an unfinished policy challenge.

Future research should extend analysis to other emerging markets for cross-country comparison, incorporate geopolitical risk indices, formally test for structural breaks around demonetization and the COVID shock, and examine domestic institutional investor flows alongside FPI to provide a more complete picture of financialization dynamics.

REFERENCES

Arcand, J. L., Berkes, E., & Panizza, U. (2015). Too much finance? Journal of Economic Growth, 20(2), 105–148.

Cecchetti, S. G., & Kharroubi, E. (2012). Reassessing the impact of finance on growth (BIS Working Paper No. 381). Bank for International Settlements.

Chakrabarti, R. (2001). FII flows to India: Nature and causes. Money and Finance, 2(7), 61–81.

Epstein, G. A. (2005). Introduction: Financialization and the world economy. In G. A. Epstein (Ed.), Financialization and the world economy (pp. 3–16). Edward Elgar.

Fama, E. F. (1970). Efficient capital markets: A review of theory and empirical work. Journal of Finance, 25(2), 383–417.

Ghosh, J., & Chandrasekhar, C. P. (2009). The costs of coupling: The global crisis and the Indian economy. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 33(4), 725–739.

King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993). Finance and growth: Schumpeter might be right. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 108(3), 717–737.

Krippner, G. R. (2005). The financialization of the American economy. Socio-Economic Review, 3(2), 173–208.

Levine, R., & Zervos, S. (1998). Stock markets, banks, and economic growth. American Economic Review, 88(3), 537–558.

Minsky, H. P. (1986). Stabilizing an unstable economy. Yale University Press.

Nagaraj, R. (2013). India's dream run, 2003–08: Understanding the boom and its aftermath. Economic and Political Weekly, 48(20), 39–51.

Orhangazi, Ö. (2008). Financialisation and capital accumulation in the non-financial corporate sector. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 32(6), 863–886.

Palley, T. I. (2007). Financialization: What it is and why it matters (Working Paper No. 525). Levy Economics Institute.

Reserve Bank of India. (2024). Database on Indian Economy (DBIE). https://dbie.rbi.org.in

Shiller, R. J. (2000). Irrational exuberance. Princeton University Press.

Stockhammer, E. (2004). Financialisation and the slowdown of accumulation. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 28(5), 719–741.

Table 1: OLS Regression — Determinants of Nifty 50 Quarterly Returns

Variable	Coeff.	Std. Error	t-Stat	p-value
Constant	-7.842	5.605	-1.399	0.170 (ns)
FPI Net Inflows	-0.0001	0.0001	-1.026	0.311 (ns)
McapGDP Ratio* **	**+0.0827**	0.023	**3.590**	**0.001*** **
GDP (Current Prices)* **	**-4.2e-6**	1.3e-6	**-3.280**	**0.002*** **
USD/INR QoQ Change* **	**-1.710**	0.486	**-3.517**	**0.001*** **
CPI Inflation	+1.046	0.801	1.306	0.200 (ns)
Model: R^2 = 0.448 | Adj. R^2 = 0.373 | F = 5.997 (p = 0.0004) | N = 43 | DW = 2.067 *** p < 0.01; ns = not significant				

Table 2: Granger Causality — Does GDP Cause Nifty 50 Returns?

Lag (Quarters)	F-Statistic	p-value	df	Decision
1	0.0501	0.8241	39	Fail to Reject H_0
2	0.8826	0.4225	36	Fail to Reject H_0
3	0.7700	0.5191	33	Fail to Reject H_0
4	1.4103	0.2545	30	Fail to Reject H_0

.

Table 3: Summary of Key Research Findings

Variable	Finding	p-value	Conclusion
McapGDP Ratio	Positive & significant — financialization drives returns	0.001	Supports H_1
GDP	Negative & significant — real economy inversely related	0.002	Rejects H_0
USD/INR Change	Negative & significant — rupee depreciation hurts returns	0.001	Supports H_1
FPI	Not significant — foreign flows not independent driver	0.311	Neutral
CPI Inflation	Not significant at quarterly frequency	0.200	Neutral
Granger (GDP)	GDP does not cause Nifty at any lag (1–4 qtrs)	>0.25	Supports H_1