

Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)

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

. 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

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 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.

As the result shows, according to CAPM, we cannot reject null hypothesis: $H_0: \alpha_j = 0$. Therefore, Jensen Alpha is insignificant where p-value = 0.505 is greater than 0.05.

From regressing FF model, we also found that Jensen Alpha is insignificant since p-value = 0.562 is greater than 0.05.

So, we cannot reject $H_0: \alpha_j = 0$.

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

According to CAPM, we cannot reject the null hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{j1} = 1$ since $F = 0.17$ with p-value = 0.6813 is greater than 0.05. At 95% level of significant, we cannot reject null hypothesis, that is portfolio j has the same risk as the market.

We also found the same result with FF model, we cannot reject the null hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{j1} = 1$ since $F = 0.19$ with p-value = 0.6651 is greater than 0.05. Therefore, portfolio j has the same risk as the market.

(3) Determine whether there exists significant size premium.

By regress FF model, we reject null hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{j2} = 0$ at 95% level of significant where $t = 6.07$ and p-value = 0.000 is less than 0.05. So, there exists significant size premium.

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

By regress FF model, we reject null hypothesis: $H_0: \beta_{j3} = 0$ at 95% level of significant where $t = 9.24$ and p-value = 0.000 is less than 0.05. So, there exists significant growth premium.

(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
```

Since the coefficients of both size premium and value premium are significant, including both variables in the model will be able to explain more of observation as R-squared is higher. Therefore, FF model is more appropriate.

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

$$r_{jt} = \alpha_j + \gamma_j D_{1t} + \beta_{j1} r_{mt} + \beta_{j2} r_{smbt} + \beta_{j3} r_{hmlt} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (3)$$

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

. 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

(6) Determine whether there exist significant January effects.

We cannot reject the null hypothesis: $H_0: \gamma_j = 0$ since at $t=1.18$, $p\text{-value} = 0.239$ is greater than 0.05. Therefore, January effect is insignificant.

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

7.1)

$\alpha_j = .0028773$

$\gamma_j = .05393$; The January effect has positive effect to excess return on portfolio j

$\beta_{j1} = 1.005405$, $\beta_{j2} = .0369291$, $\beta_{j3} = .0562495$; As return on market portfolio, size premium, and value premium, increase the higher excess return on portfolio j

7.2) As $\text{Prob} > F = 0.0000$ is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Therefore, the model is significant.

7.3) $R\text{-squared} = 0.3406$ can be interpreted as model (3) can explain 34.06% of observed data.

7.4) Coefficients of r_m , smb , hml are significant at 95% level of significant since p-value are equal to 0.000 which is less than 0.05. While γ_j and α_j are insignificant since p-value from the regression is equal to 0.239 and 0.827 greater than 0.05. So, we cannot reject the null hypothesis: $H_0: \gamma_j = 0$, $H_0: \alpha_j = 0$

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

(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)).

```
. g drm=d1*rm  
  
. g dsmb=d1*smb  
  
. g dhml=d1*hml
```

```
. reg rj rm drm smb dsmb hml dhml d1
```

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
drm	-.035594	.0475853	-0.75	0.454	-.1288689	.0576808
smb	.0364768	.0064084	5.69	0.000	.0239153	.0490383
dsmb	.0037628	.0217997	0.17	0.863	-.0389682	.0464937
hml	.0553364	.0063695	8.69	0.000	.0428511	.0678216
dhml	.0106311	.0218876	0.49	0.627	-.0322721	.0535344
d1	.0552912	.0461135	1.20	0.231	-.0350988	.1456811
_cons	.0027652	.0131445	0.21	0.833	-.0230002	.0285307

```
. test drm dsmb dhml d1
```

- (1) **drm = 0**
- (2) **dsmb = 0**
- (3) **dhml = 0**
- (4) **d1 = 0**

```

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

```

As $d1 = 0$, there is no significant January effect, therefore, other months share the same structure of FF model. That is we can estimate every month by one model.