

## 1. CAPM model

. regress rj rm

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11449.5344	1	11449.5344	F(1, 11957)	=	5988.94
Residual	22859.1346	11,957	1.91177842	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3337
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3337
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3827

  

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	.9947206	.0128536	77.39	0.000	.9695254 1.019916
_cons	.0084273	.0126552	0.67	0.505	-.0163789 .0332335

## FF model

. regress rj rm smb hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

  

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

From CAPM model, Jensen alpha is "insignificant". Because, t-test falls into rejection region at 95% confidence interval.  $P(t > 0.67) > 0.05$

From FF model, it has no Jensen alpha  $P(t > 0.58) > 0.05$ .

## 2. CAPM model

```
. regress rj rm
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11449.5344	1	11449.5344	F(1, 11957)	=	5988.94
Residual	22859.1346	11,957	1.91177842	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3337
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3337
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3827

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	.9947206	.0128536	77.39	0.000	.9695254 1.019916
_cons	.0084273	.0126552	0.67	0.505	-.0163789 .0332335

```
. test rm=1
```

```
( 1) rm = 1
```

```
F( 1, 11957) = 0.17
Prob > F = 0.6813 > 0.05
```

## FF model

```
. regress rj rm smb hml
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

```
. test rm=1
```

```
( 1) rm = 1
```

```
F( 1, 11955) = 0.19
Prob > F = 0.6651 > 0.05
```

CAPM

$$H_0: \beta_j = 1$$

$$H_a: \beta_j \neq 1$$

FF

$$H_0: \beta_j = 1$$

$$H_a: \beta_j \neq 1$$

From the test above, it used to test whether portfolio  $j$  has the same risk as the market. From the result, it can see that both CAPM model and FF model has the same risk as market ( $\beta_j = 1$ ). Because, the p-value of both model are more than 0.05. It means that we can't reject null hypothesis. Then, portfolio  $j$  has the same risk as market.

## 3. FF model

. regress rj rm smb hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

From FF model, we have to set hypothesis by

$$H_0: \beta_2 = 0$$

$$H_2: \beta_2 \neq 0$$

From FF model,  $Pct > 6.07 < 0.05$ . We reject null hypothesis that  $\beta_2 = 0$ . So, it means that there exists significant size premium.

## 4. FF model

```
. regress rj rm smb hml
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

  

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

From FF model, we have to set hypothesis by

$$H_0: \beta_3 = 0$$

$$H_1: \beta_3 \neq 0$$

From FF model,  $P(t > 9.24) < 0.05$ . We reject null hypothesis that  $\beta_3 = 0$ . So it means that there exists significant growth premium.

5. . regress rj rm smb hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

. test smb hml

- ( 1) smb = 0  
( 2) hml = 0

F( 2, 11955) = 61.20  
Prob > F = 0.0000

We have to set hypothesis by

$$H_0: \beta_{smb} = \beta_{hml} = 0$$

$$H_1: \beta_{smb} \neq 0 \text{ or } \beta_{hml} \neq 0$$

From the test, it can see that  $\text{Prob} > F = 0.0000 < 0.05$ . It means that the null hypothesis is rejected ( $\beta_{smb} \neq 0$  or  $\beta_{hml} \neq 0$ ). So, FF model is more appropriate.

6. . regress rj d1 rm smb hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11683.8263	4	2920.95657	F(4, 11954)	=	1543.31
Residual	22624.8427	11,954	1.89265875	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3406
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3757

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
d1	.05393	.045781	1.18	0.239	-.0358082 .1436682
rm	1.005405	.0128275	78.38	0.000	.9802607 1.030549
smb	.0369291	.0061214	6.03	0.000	.0249302 .048928
hml	.0562495	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443121 .0681868
_cons	.0028773	.0131425	0.22	0.827	-.0228842 .0286388

From  $r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_j D_{1t} + \beta_1 V_{mt} + \beta_2 V_{smbt} + \beta_3 V_{hmlt} + \epsilon_{jt}$ , we can set hypothesis as

$$H_0: \beta_j = 1$$

$$H_1: \beta_j \neq 1$$

From the test,  $P < 0.05$ , we cannot reject Null hypothesis. So,  $\beta_j \neq 1$ , it is insignificant and have no January effect.

7.

. regress rj d1 rm smb hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11683.8263	4	2920.95657	F(4, 11954)	=	1543.31
Residual	22624.8427	11,954	1.89265875	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3406
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3757

  

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
d1	.05393	.045781	1.18	0.239	-.0358082 .1436682
rm	1.005405	.0128275	78.38	0.000	.9802607 1.030549
smb	.0369291	.0061214	6.03	0.000	.0249302 .048928
hml	.0562495	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443121 .0681868
_cons	.0028773	.0131425	0.22	0.827	-.0228842 .0286388

. test d1 rm smb hml

- ( 1) d1 = 0  
 ( 2) rm = 0  
 ( 3) smb = 0  
 ( 4) hml = 0

F( 4, 11954) = 1543.31  
 Prob > F = 0.0000 < 0.05

(1) sign

All independent variable (d1, rm, smb, hml) have positive correlation with dependent variable (rj)

(2) Overall test

From F-test, it can see that Prob > F = 0.0000 < 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis is rejected. It is significant.

(3) R-square

In this case,  $R^2$  equals to 34.06%. It represent that the model can explain 34.06% of the variation in the response variable around its mean.

(4) Individual test

From t-test, it can see that p-value of rm, smb and hml less than 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. It is insignificant. However, p-value of d1 is more than 0.05. It means that the null hypothesis is rejected. It is significant.

2. The result from chow test is represented by the following table.

```
. reg rj rm smb hml
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11681.1999	3	3893.73328	F(3, 11955)	=	2057.22
Residual	22627.4691	11,955	1.89272013	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3405
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3403
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3758

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	-1.005554	.0128271	78.39	0.000	.9804104 1.030697
smb	.0371377	.0061189	6.07	0.000	.0251437 .0491318
hml	.0562866	.00609	9.24	0.000	.0443492 .068224
_cons	.0073088	.0125928	0.58	0.562	-.0173752 .0319928

```
. sca rss1=e(rss)
```

```
. sca n1=e(N)
```

```
. reg rj rm smb hml if d1==0
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	10,974
Model	10805.6192	3	3601.87308	F(3, 10970)	=	1887.21
Residual	20936.975	10,970	1.90856654	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3404
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3402
Total	31742.5942	10,973	2.89279087	Root MSE	=	1.3815

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	1.008159	.0134224	75.11	0.000	.9818484 1.034469
smb	.0364768	.0064347	5.67	0.000	.0238636 .04909
hml	.0553364	.0063956	8.65	0.000	.0427998 .0678729
_cons	.0027652	.0131985	0.21	0.834	-.0231062 .0286367

```
. sca rss2=e(rss)
```

```
. sca n2=e(N)
```

```
. reg rj rm smb hml if d1==1
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	985
Model	872.032797	3	290.677599	F(3, 981)	=	169.11
Residual	1686.17832	981	1.71883621	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3409
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3389
Total	2558.21111	984	2.59980804	Root MSE	=	1.311

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
rm	.9725647	.0435176	22.35	0.000	.8871664 1.057963
smb	.0402395	.0198549	2.03	0.043	.0012766 .0792024
hml	.0659675	.0199538	3.31	0.001	.0268104 .1051246
_cons	.0580564	.0421181	1.38	0.168	-.0245956 .1407084

```
. sca rss3=e(rss)
```

```
. sca n3=e(N)
```

```
. sca ChowTest=((rss1-rss2-rss3)/4)/((rss2+rss3)/(n2+n3-4*2))
```

```
. sca list ChowTest
```

```
ChowTest = .56997206
```

In this case, I also perform Chow test using dummy variable technique. The result is shown by these table.

generate d1rm = d1\*rm  
 generate d1smb = d1\*smb  
 generate d1hml = d1\*hml

} slope dummy

regress rj rm smb hml <sup>intercept dummy</sup> d1 d1rm d1smb d1hml

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	11,959
Model	11685.5157	7	1669.35938	F(7, 11951)	=	881.86
Residual	22623.1533	11,951	1.89299249	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.3406
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3402
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	Root MSE	=	1.3759

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
rm	1.008159	.0133675	75.42	0.000	.9819563	1.034361
smb	.0364768	.0064084	5.69	0.000	.0239153	.0490383
hml	.0553364	.0063695	8.69	0.000	.0428511	.0678216
d1	.0552912	.0461135	1.20	0.231	-.0350988	.1456811
d1rm	-.035594	.0475853	-0.75	0.454	-.1288689	.0576808
d1smb	.0037628	.0217997	0.17	0.863	-.0389682	.0464937
d1hml	.0106311	.0218876	0.49	0.627	-.0322721	.0535344
_cons	.0027652	.0131445	0.21	0.833	-.0230002	.0285307

→ > 0.05

From the test, variable d1rm, d1smb and d1hml are insignificant. We cannot reject null hypothesis of these variable.

```
. test d1rm d1smb d1hml d1
```

- ( 1) d1rm = 0
- ( 2) d1smb = 0
- ( 3) d1hml = 0
- ( 4) d1 = 0

```
F( 4, 11951) = 0.57  
Prob > F = 0.6844 > 0.05
```

From the test, it can see that  
Prob > F = 0.6844 > 0.05. It means that  
the null hypothesis is not rejected.  
It is insignificant

So, we can see from chen-test above that January and other month  
share the same structure of Fama-French model.