

From the given data set, estimate the following models:

Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)

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

Fama & French three-factor Model (FF)

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

. reg 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

. 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

. test rm=1

(1) rm = 1

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

1. Determine whether there exists significant Jensen Alpha.

Jensen alpha is insignificant because p-value in CAPM equals to 0.505 and p-value in FF model equals to 0.562 which are greater than 0.05.

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

If beta equals to 1, it means portfolio j has the same risk as the market. Therefore, we have to perform hypothesis testing.

After running the hypothesis testing, in CAPM model, p-value equals to 0.6813 which is higher than 0.05 so we fail to reject null hypothesis.

Hence, portfolio j has the same risk as the market.

In FF model, p-value equals to 0.6651 which is greater than 0.05 so we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Hence, portfolio j also has the same risk as the market.

3. Determine whether there exists significant size premium

Using the data from FF model, p-value is rejected (p-value: 0.000<0.05). Therefore, there exists significant size premium.

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

Using the data from FF model, p-value is rejected (p-value: 0.000<0.05). Therefore, there exists significant growth premium.

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

To find the most appropriated model, we have to test the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$

```
. test smb hml
```

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

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

We can see that p-value which is 0.0000 is less than 0.05 so p-value is rejected. Hence, FF model is the most appropriate model.

To study calendar effect (January effects) from the data set, estimate the following models:

$$r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \gamma_j D_{jt} + \beta_{j1} r_{mt} + \beta_{j2} r_{smbt} + \beta_{j3} r_{hmlt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (3)$$

where: $D_{jt} = 1$ on January and $= 0$ otherwise.

6. Determine whether there exist significant January effects.

```
. reg rj rm smb hml d1
```

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]
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
d1	.05393	.045781	1.18	0.239	-.0358082 .1436682
_cons	.0028773	.0131425	0.22	0.827	-.0228842 .0286388

From the table, we can see that January effects(D1) is insignificant because p-value, which is 0.239 greater than 0.05, is rejected.

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

From the table above, we can interpret that the return on market portfolio (1.01), SMB, HML, D1, and interception are positive. For the overall test, F-test indicates that p-value for F-test is significant since null hypothesis is rejected (p-value: 0.0000<0.05). It means that the 4 variables are adequate to explain portfolio j. For the R-square, it indicates variation in rj by 34.06%. For the individual test, SMB and HML generate the significant variables because p-value is rejected (p-value: 0.0000<0.05). However, D1 is failed to reject since p-value is 0.239 which higher than 0.05. To conclude, January effects does not affect portfolio j.

$$r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \beta_{j1}r_{mt} + \beta_{j2}r_{smbt} + \beta_{j3}r_{hmlt} + \gamma_j D_{1t} + \beta_{j1}D_{1t}r_{mt} + \beta_{j2}D_{1t}r_{smbt} + \beta_{j3}D_{1t}r_{hmlt} + \epsilon_{jt} \quad (4)$$

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
```

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+n3-2*4))

. sca list Chowtest

Chowtest = .

```
. g rmd1=rm*d1
. g smbd1=smb*d1
. g hml1d1=hml*d1
. reg rj rm smb hml d1 rmd1 smbd1 hml1d1
```

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
rmd1	-.035594	.0475853	-0.75	0.454	-.1288689	.0576808
smbd1	.0037628	.0217997	0.17	0.863	-.0389682	.0464937
hml1d1	.0106311	.0218876	0.49	0.627	-.0322721	.0535344
_cons	.0027652	.0131445	0.21	0.833	-.0230002	.0285307

```
. test d1 rmd1 smbd1 hml1d1
```

- (1) d1 = 0
- (2) rmd1 = 0
- (3) smbd1 = 0
- (4) hml1d1 = 0

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

Chow Test and FF model failed to reject January effect since $H_0: d1=rmd1=smbd1=hml1d1=0$ is failed to reject. Hence, there is no structure change (p-value: 0.6844>0.05)