

Solution Assignment 1

In the recent finance literatures, it is suggested that asset prices are well described by a so-called factor model. Excess returns are linearly explained from excess returns on a number of factor portfolios. According to CAPM, the intercept term should be zero, just like the coefficient for any other variable included in the model the value of which is known in advance (e.g. a January Dummy). The data set *project1.dta* contains excess returns on three-factor portfolio model. Extended from CAPM, the three-factors model includes two additional variables into the model. The portfolios are re-formed each month on the basis of the most recent available information on firm size and book-to-market value of equity. In addition to risk premium of market portfolio (r_m), the r_{smb} factor is based on the firm size and reflects the difference in returns between a portfolio of stocks with a small firm size and a portfolio of stock with a big firm size. The r_{hmlt} factor classifies the stocks based on the ratio of book value to market value of equity and computes the difference in returns between a portfolio of stocks with a high book-to-market ratio (value stocks) and a portfolio of stocks with a low book-to-market ratio (growth stocks).

$$\text{CAPM:} \quad r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_{j1} r_{mt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Fama- French:} \quad r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_{j1} r_{mt} + \beta_{j2} r_{smbt} + \beta_{j3} r_{hmlt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (2)$$

Where: r_{jt} = excess return on portfolio j at time t and
 j = 1, 2, ..., 20 portfolios categorized by four groups of firm size and five groups of value of the stock.
 r_{mt} = excess return on market portfolio at time t – representing market risk premium.
 r_{smbt} = return on a small-stock portfolio minus the return on a large-stock portfolio (Small Minus Big) at time t – representing size premium.
 r_{hmlt} = return on a value-stock portfolio minus the return on a growth-stock portfolio (High Minus Low) at time t – representing value premium.

(1) Regress the excess returns on portfolio upon the excess return on the market portfolio with constant term, noting that this corresponds to the CAPM (model (1)).

```
. reg rj r_mf
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37136.0054	1	37136.0054	F(1, 1046)	=	17487.59
Residual	2221.24787	1,046	2.12356393	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9436
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4572

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104191	.0083499	132.24	0.000	1.087806 1.120575
_cons	.3707874	.045301	8.18	0.000	.2818963 .4596786

```
. est store capm
```

- (2) Make interpretation of the estimated β coefficients, t -test, F -test, R^2 and Adjusted- R^2 .
- (3) Perform hypothesis testing whether your estimated portfolio has the same risk as the market.

```
. test r_mf=1
```

```
( 1)  r_mf = 1
```

```
      F( 1, 1046) = 155.70
      Prob > F   =  0.0000
```

- (4) Test the validity of the CAPM by testing whether the constant terms in regression is zero. What are the differences between regressing the models with and without constant term.

```
_cons | .3707874 .045301 8.18 0.000 .2818963 .4596786
```

- (5) Test whether there exists significant January effect in the regression models.

```
. g jan=(month==1)
```

```
. reg rj r_mf jan
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37140.8477	2	18570.4239	F(2, 1045)	=	8755.66
Residual	2216.40555	1,045	2.12096225	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9437
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9436
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4564

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.103777	.0083492	132.20	0.000	1.087394 1.12016
jan	.2465016	.1631396	1.51	0.131	-.0736168 .5666201
_cons	.350576	.047208	7.43	0.000	.2579428 .4432092

- (6) Regress the three-factor model (2) by using OLS. Compare the estimated results with the one-factor (CAPM) model (1).

```
. reg rj r_mf
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37136.0054	1	37136.0054	F(1, 1046)	=	17487.59
Residual	2221.24787	1,046	2.12356393	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9436
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4572

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104191	.0083499	132.24	0.000	1.087806 1.120575
_cons	.3707874	.045301	8.18	0.000	.2818963 .4596786

```
. est store capm
```

```
. reg rj r_mf r_smb r_hml
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37836.295	3	12612.0983	F(3, 1044)	=	8657.06
Residual	1520.95827	1,044	1.45685658	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9614
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9612
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.207

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104191	.0083499	132.24	0.000	1.087806 1.120575
r_smb	0.000000	0.000000	0.00	1.000	-0.000000 0.000000
r_hml	0.000000	0.000000	0.00	1.000	-0.000000 0.000000
_cons	.3707874	.045301	8.18	0.000	.2818963 .4596786

r_mf	1.042735	.0074665	139.66	0.000	1.028084	1.057386
r_smb	.2281417	.0120183	18.98	0.000	.2045589	.2517244
r_hml	.1124214	.010856	10.36	0.000	.0911193	.1337235
_cons	.307938	.0376921	8.17	0.000	.2339772	.3818989

```
. est store ff
```

```
. estimates table capm ff, stat(r2 F rss) star(0.1 0.05 0.01)
```

Variable	capm	ff
r_mf	1.1041908***	1.042735***
r_smb		.22814165***
r_hml		.11242138***
_cons	.37078743***	.30793805***
r2	.94356192	.96135507
F	17487.585	8657.0624
rss	2221.2479	1520.9583

Legend: * p<.1; ** p<.05; *** p<.01

- (7) Test whether there exists a significant first order autocorrelation in the estimated regression model. In case of autocorrelation, what are the consequences of the problem? And how can we solve the problem.

```
. reg rj r_mf r_smb r_hml
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37836.295	3	12612.0983	F(3, 1044)	=	8657.06
Residual	1520.95827	1,044	1.45685658	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	R-squared	=	0.9614
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9612
				Root MSE	=	1.207

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.042735	.0074665	139.66	0.000	1.028084 1.057386
r_smb	.2281417	.0120183	18.98	0.000	.2045589 .2517244
r_hml	.1124214	.010856	10.36	0.000	.0911193 .1337235
_cons	.307938	.0376921	8.17	0.000	.2339772 .3818989

```
. estat dwatson
```

Durbin-Watson d-statistic(4, 1048) = 1.829536

```
. prais rj r_mf r_smb r_hml, corc
```

Iteration 0: rho = 0.0000
Iteration 1: rho = 0.0837
Iteration 2: rho = 0.0855
Iteration 3: rho = 0.0855
Iteration 4: rho = 0.0855

Cochrane-Orcutt AR(1) regression -- iterated estimates

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,047
Model	37240.7344	3	12413.5781	F(3, 1043)	=	8573.85
Residual	1510.09858	1,043	1.4478414	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Total	38750.833	1,046	37.0466855	R-squared	=	0.9610
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9609
				Root MSE	=	1.2033

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.045358	.0074378	140.55	0.000	1.030764 1.059953
r_smb	.2268022	.0119303	19.01	0.000	.2033921 .2502122
r_hml	.1094813	.0109429	10.00	0.000	.0880086 .1309539
_cons	.3081707	.04105	7.51	0.000	.2276208 .3887206

rho	
rho	.085518

Durbin-Watson statistic (original) 1.829536
Durbin-Watson statistic (transformed) 2.004839

(8) Test whether your estimated portfolio has size premium.

```
r_smb | .2268022 .0119303 19.01 0.000 .2033921 .2502122
```

(9) Test whether your estimated portfolio has value premium.

```
r_hml | .1094813 .0109429 10.00 0.000 .0880086 .1309539
```

(10) Perform F -test for the hypothesis that the coefficients for the two new factors are jointly equal to zero.

```
. test r_smb r_hml
( 1) r_smb = 0
( 2) r_hml = 0

F( 2, 1043) = 237.12
Prob > F = 0.0000
```

(11) Perform Chow-test whether January and other month share the same structure of the Fama-French model (2).

```
. g jan_rmf=r_mf*jan
. g jan_rsmb=r_smb*jan
. g jan_rhml=r_hml*jan
. reg rj r_mf jan_rmf r_smb jan_rsmb r_hml jan_rhml jan
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37863.8479	7	5409.12114	F(7, 1040)	=	3766.88
Residual	1493.40533	1,040	1.43596667	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9621
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9618
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.1983

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.041944	.0076958	135.39	0.000	1.026843 1.057045
jan_rmf	-.0270275	.0301801	-0.90	0.371	-.0862484 .0321934
r_smb	.2427885	.0126738	19.16	0.000	.2179194 .2676576
jan_rsmb	-.0565731	.0484615	-1.17	0.243	-.1516666 .0385205
r_hml	.1238979	.0115231	10.75	0.000	.1012868 .1465091
jan_rhml	-.0379402	.0379196	-1.00	0.317	-.1123479 .0364674
jan	-.2750941	.1702533	-1.62	0.106	-.6091732 .0589849
_cons	.3439995	.0388991	8.84	0.000	.2676699 .420329

```
. test jan jan_rmf jan_rsmb jan_rhml
( 1) jan = 0
( 2) jan_rmf = 0
( 3) jan_rsmb = 0
( 4) jan_rhml = 0

F( 4, 1040) = 4.80
Prob > F = 0.0008
```

However, some other literatures have claimed that macroeconomic factors play important role in determining the return of the portfolio. Then, the model should be arbitrage pricing model as

$$\text{APT: } r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_{j1}r_{mt} + \gamma_{j2}r_{int} + \gamma_{j3}r_{fxt} + \gamma_{j4}r_{goldt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (3)$$

Where: r_{intt} = interest rate at time t – expected to have negative relationship.
 r_{fxt} = change in exchange rate at time t – expected to have negative impacts.
 r_{goldt} = change in gold price at time t – expected to have negative impacts.

(12) Regress the APT (model (3)) of your portfolio. Make interpretation of the estimated result.

```
. reg rj r_mf r_int r_fx r_gold
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37142.1595	4	9285.53988	F(4, 1043)	=	4372.19
Residual	2215.09376	1,043	2.12377158	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9437
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4573

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104281	.0083563	132.15	0.000	1.087884 1.120678
r_int	.1588066	.1384347	1.15	0.252	-.1128356 .4304488
r_fx	-.0210917	.0222047	-0.95	0.342	-.0646627 .0224793
r_gold	-.0031087	.0036353	-0.86	0.393	-.010242 .0040245
_cons	.063137	.293473	0.22	0.830	-.5127278 .6390017

```
. est store apm
```

(13) Whether there exists serious multicollinearity problem in model (3). Should any independent variables in model (3) be dropped? Give explanation of your decision.

```
. pwcorr rj r_mf r_int r_fx r_gold
```

	rj	r_mf	r_int	r_fx	r_gold
rj	1.0000				
r_mf	0.9714	1.0000			
r_int	-0.0018	-0.0103	1.0000		
r_fx	-0.0312	-0.0250	0.0082	1.0000	
r_gold	0.0196	0.0265	0.0148	-0.0041	1.0000

```
. estat vif
```

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
r_mf	1.00	0.998568
r_gold	1.00	0.999060
r_fx	1.00	0.999299
r_int	1.00	0.999602
Mean VIF	1.00	

```
. reg rj r_mf r_fx
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37137.8735	2	18568.9367	F(2, 1045)	=	8743.23
Residual	2219.37982	1,045	2.12380844	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9436
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4573

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.103995	.008353	132.17	0.000	1.087604 1.120385
r_fx	-.0208242	.0222041	-0.94	0.349	-.0643939 .0227454
_cons	.3903649	.0498815	7.83	0.000	.2924855 .4882442

```
. est store apm2
```

```
. reg rj r_mf
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37136.0054	1	37136.0054	F(1, 1046)	=	17487.59
Residual	2221.24787	1,046	2.12356393	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9436
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4572

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104191	.0083499	132.24	0.000	1.087806 1.120575
_cons	.3707874	.045301	8.18	0.000	.2818963 .4596786

```
. est store capm
```

```
. est table apm apm2 capm, stat(r2 F rss) star(0.1 0.05 0.01)
```

Variable	apm	apm2	capm
r_mf	1.1042805***	1.1039949***	1.1041908***
r_int	.1588066		
r_fx	-.0210917	-.02082424	
r_gold	-.00310872		
_cons	.06313695	.39036486***	.37078743***
r2	.94371828	.94360938	.94356192
F	4372.1933	8743.2258	17487.585
rss	2215.0938	2219.3798	2221.2479

Legend: * p<.1; ** p<.05; *** p<.01

(14) Which of the following hypotheses about the coefficients can be tested using a t -test? Which of them can be tested using an F -test? In each case, state the number of restrictions.

(i) $H_0: \beta_1 = 1$

(ii) $H_0: \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 = 1$

(iii) $H_0: \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 = 1$ and $\gamma_4 = 1$

(iv) $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_2 = 0$ and $\gamma_3 = 0$ and $\gamma_4 = 0$

(v) $H_0: \gamma_2 \gamma_3 = 1$

(15) In question (14) which would you expect to be bigger – the unrestricted residual sum of squares or the restricted sum of squares, and why?

(16) From CAPM model (1), what would be the conceptual differences if we (a) regress the excess returns on portfolio upon the excess return on the market portfolio with constant term or (b) regress the excess return on the market portfolio upon the excess returns on portfolio with constant term? Make comparison of (a) and (b).

```
. reg rj r_mf
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
Model	37136.0054	1	37136.0054	F(1, 1046)	=	17487.59
Residual	2221.24787	1,046	2.12356393	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.9436
				Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
Total	39357.2533	1,047	37.5904998	Root MSE	=	1.4572

rj	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
r_mf	1.104191	.0083499	132.24	0.000	1.087806 1.120575
_cons	.3707874	.045301	8.18	0.000	.2818963 .4596786

```
. reg r_mf rj
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	1,048
				F(1, 1046)	=	17487.59

Model		28739.3768		1	28739.3768	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Residual		1719.0131		1,046	1.64341596	R-squared	=	0.9436

Total		30458.3899		1,047	29.0911079	Adj R-squared	=	0.9435
						Root MSE	=	1.282

r_mf		Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]		

rj		.854528	.0064619	132.24	0.000	.8418482		.8672078
_cons		-.2824635	.0401698	-7.03	0.000	-.3612861		-.2036409
