

1. Determine whether there exists significant Jensen Alpha.

. 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

. 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

Form the regression on CAPM and FF models, Jensen Alpha is statistically insignificant since p-value of t-test is 0.505 and 0.562, respectively, which exceed the critical region at 95% confidence level of 0.05. Then, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and there is no significant Jensen Alpha.

2. Determine whether portfolio j has the same risk as the market.

From the regression, we perform hypothesis testing that $H_0: \beta_{j1} = 1$ in order to test that the risk of portfolio j is equal to the market or not. The result shows that for both CAPM and FF models, we cannot reject the null hypothesis since the p-value of market risk in CAPM and FF models are 0.6813 and 0.6651, respectively. Therefore, if market risk increases by 1 unit portfolio j's risk also increases by 1 unit too. The portfolio j has the same risk as to the market.

3. Determine whether there exists a significant size premium.

```
. test smb  
  
( 1)  smb = 0  
  
      F( 1, 11955) =   36.84  
      Prob > F =   0.0000
```

To test the significant we perform hypothesis testing that $\beta_{j2} = 0$, the result shows that size premium is statistically significant at 95% confidence level since the p-value is 0.00, meaning that β_{j2} is not equal to 0. There is a significant size premium effects.

4. Determine whether there exists significant growth (value) premium.

```
. test hml  
  
( 1)  hml = 0  
  
      F( 1, 11955) =   85.42  
      Prob > F =   0.0000
```

To test the significant we perform hypothesis testing that $\beta_{j3} = 0$, the result shows that size premium is statistically significant at 95% confidence level since the p-value is 0.00, meaning that we reject the null hypothesis. So, β_{j3} is not equal to 0, presenting that a significant value premium exists.

5. Compare CAPM and FF models and determine which model is the most appropriated model. why?

```
. test smb hml  
  
( 1)  smb = 0  
( 2)  hml = 0  
  
      F( 2, 11955) =   61.20  
      Prob > F =   0.0000
```

CAPM and FF models are nested models according to the same independent variable (market risk premium). We perform hypothesis testing that $\beta_{j2} = \beta_{j3} = 0$. The result of the test is statistically significant at 95% confidence level since the p-value is 0.00. We reject the null

hypotheses. Therefore, we should not eliminate the size premium and value premium from the model. The FF model is more appropriate.

6. Determine whether there exist significant January effects.

```
. reg 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

According to the result from regression, the January effects are statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level. The p-value of γ_j (0.239) is higher than 0.05. So, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the relationship between excess return on portfolio j and the January effects have a significant relationship.

7. Make an interpretation of the estimated result of the model (3) (including (1) sign, (2) overall test, (3) R-square, and (4) individual test).

All of the independent variables have positive coefficients. For the January effect, it is reasonable that it yields higher returns because the investors usually sell stocks at the end of the year due to the tax purpose and buy it again in January. As demand increases, the price goes up and raises the capital gain. For market risk premium, it implies that the excess return on portfolio j will move in the same direction with market return. Besides, a positive coefficient of size premium shows that the portfolio j has weighted toward small-capital stocks. If the variable is significant, the return should go up with the impact on small minus big effects. Lastly, the positive value premium coefficient indicates that the weight of portfolio j is slightly dependent more on value stocks which usually outperforms the growth stocks. If the significant High minus low effects exist, the return should increase.

For the overall test, the p-value of F-test is 0.00, meaning that the model is statistically significant at 95% confidence level. All explanatory variables can significantly explain the dependent variables.

The R-squared of this model is 0.3406, implying that the model can explain the dependent variable or the data is fit to the model by 34.06%.

From the individual test, market risk, size premium and growth premium are statistically significant since the p-value is only 0.00 which is less than 0.05. However, the p-value of January effect is 0.2388 which is higher than 0.05, indicating that the variable is statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level.

(8) Perform Chow-test (using Intercept and Slope Dummy) whether January and other month share the same structure of the Fama-French model (Model (2) vs Model (4)).

```
. reg rj rm smb hml 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
Total	34308.669	11,958	2.86909759	R-squared	=	0.3406
				Adj R-squared	=	0.3402
				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

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

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

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

From performing the hypotheses testing that $\gamma_j = \beta_{j1}D_{1t} = \beta_{j2}D_{2t} = \beta_{j3}D_{3t} = 0$, the results imply that all testing variables are statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level because the p-value is 0.6844 which is larger than critical region of 0.05. We cannot reject our null hypotheses. Therefore, January and other month share the same structure of the FF model.