

## CREATES Research Paper 2011-45

# The Joint Dynamics of Equity Market Factors

Peter Christoffersen and Hugues Langlois

# The Joint Dynamics of Equity Market Factors\*

Peter Christoffersen

Hugues Langlois

Rotman School of Management

Desautels Faculty of Management

CBS and CREATES

McGill University

September 9, 2011

## Abstract

The four equity market factors from Fama and French (1993) and Carhart (1997) are pervasive in academic empirical asset pricing studies and in applied portfolio allocation. However, the joint distributional dynamics of the factors are rarely studied. For investors basing strategies on the factors or using them to model the returns of a wider set of assets, proper risk management requires knowing the joint factor dynamics which we model. We find striking evidence of asymmetric tail dependence across the factors. While the linear factor correlations are small and even negative, the extreme correlations are large and positive, so that the linear correlations drastically overstate the benefits of diversification across the factors. We model the nonlinear factor dependence and explore its economic importance in a portfolio allocation experiment which shows that significant economic value is earned when acknowledging the nonlinear dependence.

**JEL Codes:** C01, G11

**Keywords:** Factors, threshold correlation, copulas, portfolio optimization, asymmetry.

---

\*Christoffersen would like to thank IFM<sup>2</sup>, and SSHRC for financial support. Langlois was supported by fellowships from NSERC and CIREQ. Please address correspondence to peter.christoffersen@rotman.utoronto.ca.

# 1 Introduction

Establishing a manageable set of factors that capture a substantial share of the cross-sectional variation in equity returns is a core pursuit in empirical asset pricing. In their seminal contribution Fama and French (1993) find that the cross section of stock returns is well explained by a simple linear three-factor model comprised of a broad market premium, the spread between small and big market capitalization stocks, and the spread between value and growth stocks. In addition, Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) and Carhart (1997) point to the importance of a momentum factor in explaining observed stock returns. The momentum factor consists of the returns realized by buying a portfolio of stocks that have performed well during the past year and selling a portfolio of stocks that performed poorly during the same period. We will refer to the four factors as market, size, value and momentum.

A number of other factors have been proposed. For example, Pastor and Stambaugh (2003) suggest a specific measure of market liquidity influencing the cross-section of average returns, and Vassalou (2003) constructs a mimicking portfolio for news related to future GDP growth. Ang, Hodrick, Xing, and Zhang (2006) examine the role of aggregate and idiosyncratic volatility in expected returns while Zhang et al. (2009) extend this analysis in an international context. Similarly, Fu (2009) finds a positive relation between expected return and conditional idiosyncratic risk. Following Ang, Hodrick, Xing, and Zhang (2006) and Engle and Lee (1999), Adrian and Rosenberg (2008) show that cross-sectional average returns are related to a short-run and a long-run volatility component in market returns. Other recent contributions include Boudoukh et al. (2007) who explore the role of payouts (dividends and stock repurchases) as a contemporaneous risk factor and predictive variable for stock returns. While we focus on the standard four factors it is important to note that our analysis is applicable to a much larger number of factors as well.

Beside their usefulness in cross-sectional asset pricing, factor models are used for risk management and portfolio optimization, see for example Chan et al. (1998), Chan et al. (1999) and Briner and Connor (2008). Excellent textbook treatments of standard approaches in portfolio management can be found in L'Habitant (2004), Connor et al. (2010), and Brandt (2010).

Spread portfolios such as value, size and momentum are popular not just because they help explain the cross-sectional variation in returns but also because they are nearly orthogonal to each

other and to the market factor. Therefore, when used as regressors in a factor model, they lead to more precise loading estimates than would an alternative set of highly correlated factors. While having orthogonal factors is clearly beneficial, our main contribution is to show that focusing solely on linear dependence is perilous. We show that nonlinear factor dependence is important empirically, and when ignored it will lead to underestimation of extreme risks and suboptimal portfolio allocations.

The clear presence of nonlinear dependence necessitates a detailed investigation of the dynamics and the distributional properties of the factors. Consider, for example, portfolio optimization involving a large set of stocks. In such applications, a linear factor approach is desirable because it reduces significantly the dimension of the risk model. By estimating each asset's loadings on the set of factors, the covariance matrix of the assets can be expressed as the sum of the idiosyncratic risks and the quadratic form of the factor loadings and the factors' covariance matrix. However, if the joint distribution of the factors is not normal then the distribution of the assets and the portfolio will not be normal either. Proper modeling of the joint factor distribution is essential. If either the marginal distribution of each factor or their joint distribution are not properly modeled then the factor model will lead to erroneous conclusions regarding the portfolio return distribution. While a linear four factor model may offer a good description of the cross-sectional distribution of expected returns, a normally distributed four-factor model does not offer a good description of the joint distribution of returns. We suggest instead dynamic non-normal models which can accurately capture nonlinear factor dependence and thus portfolio tail risk.

Nonlinear risk in factor models is related to the literature on asymmetric correlation in equity returns. Building on Longin and Solnik (2001) and Ang and Bekaert (2002), Ang and Chen (2002) show that the correlation between domestic equity portfolios and the aggregate market are greater in downside markets than in upside markets. For example, a portfolio comprised of small, value or loser stocks have greater correlation asymmetries. These findings are important in an asset-pricing context. Measuring asymmetric correlation as measured by downside beta, Ang, Chen, and Xing (2006) find a positive relation between downside risk and expected returns that is not explained by other traditional risk factors. In order to examine the importance of univariate and multivariate asymmetry on an optimal allocation between a small and a large cap portfolio, Patton (2004) uses a rotated Gumbel copula that is able to produce asymmetric correlation. Furthermore, Hong

et al. (2007) find that incorporating asymmetric dependence is important for portfolio selection for investors with disappointment aversion preferences.<sup>1</sup>

Our main contributions are as follows:

First, we extend the bivariate analysis in Ang and Chen (2002) to the four standard equity market factors. Modeling directly the four factors presents an interesting econometric challenge. We find striking evidence of nonlinear dependence for daily, weekly and monthly returns that is much stronger than implied by the conventional linear correlation coefficients, especially since those are in most cases close to zero. We focus on weekly returns and find that an asymmetric Student  $t$  copula is able to capture the factor asymmetry and dependence in a parsimonious way. Importantly, it can produce strong asymmetric tail dependence in virtually uncorrelated factors.

Second, we present evidence that the nonlinear dependence between the four factors has economic value for risk-averse investors who allocate capital using the factor model. The investor takes positions directly in the four factor portfolios, can take on leverage, but is subject to margin requirements. With 27 years of weekly out-of-sample portfolio returns, we show that the annualized improvement in certainty equivalence (versus a normal factor model) can reach 1.17% when using an asymmetric copula model instead of the multivariate normal distribution. The statistical significance of these results are verified by bootstrapping the difference in realized certainty equivalence.

Third, we show that our findings lead to different risk estimates from the ones based on the multivariate normality assumption. During the 2006-2010 period the expected shortfall for an equally weighted portfolios of the four factors is 20% to 50% higher when using the asymmetric copula for risk management, and this difference is robust to allowing for time-varying correlations.

Applications of copulas in finance typically restrict attention to the two-dimensional case which is motivated for example by a single-factor model. While many types of asymmetric copulas are not tractable in dimensions higher than two, ours on the other hand is parsimonious and workable for many more than four factors. We focus on the standard four factor model in this paper because it is so widely used in academia and practice.

Our results show that the evidence for univariate as well as multivariate non-normality is strong

---

<sup>1</sup>Other important contributions related to asymmetric dependence include Poon et al. (2004), Tsafack (2009), Sancetta and Satchell (2007), Xu and Li (2009), Mazzotta (2008), Campbell et al. (2002), Okimoto (2008) and Hatherly and Alcock (2007).

but also that the dependence across factors is dynamic. The joint non-normality and intricate dynamics of the four standard factors came on display during the so-called quant meltdown of August 2007. Khandani and Lo (2007) and Khandani and Lo (2011) investigate the extent to which the meltdown was caused by equity hedge funds massively exiting certain strategies, thereby producing increased correlations between value, size and momentum returns. Our model allows for dynamic correlations which presents an additional source of risk. Asness et al. (2009) find that value and momentum strategies are positively related across markets and asset classes and that value and momentum factors are negatively related within and across markets and asset classes. Not surprisingly, these correlations are found to rise considerably during extreme market events. Once again, a properly specified factor model requires correlation dynamics which we estimate and apply in a portfolio allocation context.

Our paper proceeds as follows. Various descriptive statistics including threshold correlations of the factor returns are reported in Section 2 which also models dynamics in factor return mean and volatility. Section 3 introduces copula models that can capture nonlinear and dynamic dependence across factors. Section 4 considers the economic importance of the non-linear dependence from a portfolio allocation and risk management perspective. Section 5 presents reverse threshold correlations for weekly returns, threshold correlations for daily and monthly returns, and discusses alternative copulas. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Factor Returns and Residuals

We study weekly equity factor returns observed from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. Market, size, and value factors are constructed as in Fama and French (1993).<sup>2</sup> The market factor is the value weighted return on all NYSE, AMEX and NASDAQ stocks less the one-month Treasury bill rate. Every June, the median size of NYSE stocks is used to split the stocks into two size portfolios. The 30<sup>th</sup> and the 70<sup>th</sup> percentiles of NYSE stocks' book-to-market ratios are used to sort stocks into three book-to-market portfolios. All portfolios are value-weighted. The size factor is obtained by computing the spread between the average return of the three small capitalization portfolios and the average return of the three large capitalization portfolios. The value factor is

---

<sup>2</sup>We rely on the factor data available from Kenneth French's data library.

the average return of the two value portfolios less the average return on the two growth portfolios.

Each month, the 30<sup>th</sup> and the 70<sup>th</sup> percentiles of NYSE stocks' returns from month  $t - 12$  to  $t - 2$  are used to construct three prior return sorted portfolios containing all stocks that have sufficient history. Stocks are also separated into two size portfolios using the NYSE median market capitalization. Value-weighted portfolios are used to construct the momentum factor as the difference between the average return on the two high prior return portfolios and the mean return on the two low prior return portfolios.

## 2.1 Factor Returns

The top four panels in Figure 1 plots the times series of returns for each factor, and summary statistics are provided in Table 1. Table 1 shows that all factors exhibit a high degree of volatility around the mean at the weekly frequency.

The market, size and momentum factor distributions are highly asymmetric as evident by the large negative skewness in Table 1. The value factor distribution on the other hand is close to symmetric.

All four factor distributions have fat tails as captured by the large excess kurtosis estimates in Table 1. Figure 2 provides further evidence of the non-normality in weekly factor returns: The empirical factor quantiles are plotted against the quantiles from a normal distribution so that deviations from the 45 degree line signals non-normality. Figure 2 clearly shows that both tails are fat in all four factor returns. Part of the large excess kurtosis found in the factor return series is likely driven by volatility dynamics which we therefore model below in Section 2.3.

As a measure of linear dependence Table 1 reports the sample correlations across the factor returns. Note that the correlations are close to zero or even negative. The largest positive correlation is +0.05 between the market and size factors, while the largest negative correlation is -0.31 between the market and value factors. This near orthogonality is part of the reason for the widespread use of these factors in portfolio management.

The bottom row of panels in Figure 1 provides a complementary picture of the relationship between the factors. The left panel depicts the cumulative log returns during the period 1963-2010. The long-term returns on momentum are quite striking. Note also that the size factor accumulated losses during the period 1995-2000 while the market rallied significantly. The bottom right panel in

Figure 1 depicts the cumulative log returns on the factors since 2006 and shows how the momentum factor crashed in the early part of 2009 while the overall market was recovering. This apparent lack of dependence between the factors is of course interesting from a diversification perspective.

## 2.2 Factor Return Threshold Correlations

It is only in the case of the multivariate normal distribution that simple linear correlations fully characterize the dependence across returns. The strong evidence of non-normality we have found in the individual factor returns suggests that the simple correlations reported in Table 1 could be concealing nonlinear dependencies across factors.

In order to explore dependence further we rely on the threshold (or exceedance) correlations previously applied by Longin and Solnik (2001) and Ang and Bekaert (2002) to country indexes, by Ang and Chen (2002) to various equity portfolios, and by Patton (2004) to large-cap and small-cap portfolios.

Following Patton (2004) we define the threshold correlation  $\bar{\rho}_{ij}(u)$  with respect to the quantiles of the empirical univariate distribution of factor  $i$  and  $j$  by

$$\bar{\rho}_{ij}(u) = \begin{cases} \text{Corr}(r_i, r_j \mid r_i < F_i^{-1}(u), r_j < F_j^{-1}(u)) & \text{when } u < 0.5 \\ \text{Corr}(r_i, r_j \mid r_i \geq F_i^{-1}(u), r_j \geq F_j^{-1}(u)) & \text{when } u \geq 0.5, \end{cases}$$

where  $u$  is a threshold between 0 and 1, and  $F_i^{-1}(u)$  is the empirical quantile of the univariate distribution of  $r_i$ . Thus the threshold correlation reports the linear correlation between two assets for the subset of observations lying in the bottom-left or top-right quadrant defined by the two univariate quantiles.

In the bivariate normal distribution the threshold correlation approaches zero as the threshold approaches 0 or 1. The empirical threshold correlations can therefore be used as a benchmark for the bivariate distribution of each pair of factor returns.

The left panels of Figures 3a and 3b show the scatter plots of standardized weekly returns for the six possible pairs of factor returns. A remarkable feature of these returns is that even a factor pair with a relatively large negative correlation such as market versus value contains many outliers in the bottom left and top right quadrants of the scatter.



Regions A and B in each panel of Figure 3 correspond to the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles of weekly returns. Regions A and B are thus examples of subsets of returns used to compute the empirical threshold correlation in the right panels of Figure 3.<sup>3</sup>

The empirical threshold correlations in the right panels of Figure 3 is compared to the one implied by a bivariate normal distribution fitted on each pair of factors.<sup>4</sup> The differences between the empirical (solid lines) and normal (dash-dots) threshold correlations are striking. For example, while the unconditional correlation between the market and size factor in Table 1 indicates near independence under the bivariate normality assumption, the threshold correlation in the top-right panel of Figure 3a is positive and clearly larger below the median than above. Also, the market-value pair in the middle-right panel of Figure 3a exhibits large and positive threshold correlations while its unconditional correlation from Table 1 is slightly negative.

While the simple linear correlations in Table 1 are close to zero and often negative, the threshold correlations in Figure 3 are virtually always positive and very often large. In some cases the threshold correlations are even increasing as the thresholds get more extreme. This is evident for example in the middle right panel of Figure 3b where the threshold correlation for size versus momentum increases when the threshold decreases below the median. The implications for a fund manager holding a portfolio that is long small stocks and long momentum are serious: The simple correlation is low suggesting that diversification is high, but when both value and momentum perform poorly then their correlation is in fact very high.

Hong et al. (2007) propose a model-free test for symmetric threshold correlations. We do not report the actual test statistics but we find that correlation symmetry is rejected for all factor pairs at the 1% significance level.

### 2.3 Factor Return Dynamics

Table 1 shows that the returns on the size, value and momentum factors contain some serial correlation for the first three weekly lags. The dashed lines in Figure 4 show the empirical autocorrelation function for the four factors for lags up to 100 weeks. The horizontal lines denote

---

<sup>3</sup>Threshold correlations are computed only for threshold values for which there are at least 20 pairs of returns available.

<sup>4</sup>The analytical expression for the exceedance correlation for a bivariate normal distribution can be found in the appendix of Ang and Chen (2002).

the 95% confidence bands around zero and suggest that the short-lag autocorrelations are indeed significant for the size, value and momentum factors. The  $p$ -values obtained from a Ljung-Box test (not reported) suggest that serial correlation is marginally significant in the market factor also.

Financial assets typically display much stronger serial correlation in return magnitudes (measured by squares or absolutes) compared with the serial correlation in returns themselves. The solid lines in Figure 4 show that the weekly factor returns follow this pattern. All four factors display strong persistence in absolute returns.

We proceed by modeling the dynamics evident in Figures 4 using standard univariate AR-GARCH processes. We estimate the conditional mean using a simple AR(3) specification

$$r_{j,t} = \phi_{0,j} + \phi_{1,j}r_{j,t-1} + \phi_{2,j}r_{j,t-2} + \phi_{3,j}r_{j,t-3} + \sigma_{j,t}\epsilon_{j,t} \quad (1)$$

where  $r_{j,t}$  is the return of factor  $j$  at time  $t$ . We hasten to add that the AR(3) specification is not meant to replace an economic model of expected returns—rather it is needed to ensure consistent estimation of the second and higher order moments. Our analysis focuses on higher-order moments and we do not attempt to explicitly model risk premia in the factor returns.

The conditional variance of daily returns is modeled using a GARCH model of the form

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \omega_j + \beta_j\sigma_{j,t-1}^2 + \alpha_j\sigma_{j,t-1}^2 (\epsilon_{j,t-1} - \theta_j)^2. \quad (2)$$

The  $\theta_j$  parameter captures the so-called leverage effect which appears when a negative innovation has a stronger impact on the conditional variance than a positive shock of same magnitude. Several specifications to incorporate the leverage effect have been proposed. We rely on the NGARCH model suggested by Engle and Ng (1993). Notice that as is typical in a GARCH model,  $\sigma_{j,t}^2$  is observed at the end of day  $t - 1$  which makes the model very tractable and maximum likelihood estimation easy.

Based on previous studies we expect the leverage parameter to be positive for the market factor. But as the three other factors contain both long and short equity positions the expected sign of  $\theta_j$  is much less clear for those.

Panel A of Table 2 presents the AR-GARCH estimates and diagnostics when  $\epsilon$  is assumed to

follow a normal distribution. As expected the variance persistence implied by the model is close to 1. The leverage effect parameter  $\theta_j$  is significantly positive for the market factor as expected but it is much smaller for size and insignificant for value. Note that the leverage effect is significantly negative for momentum: A positive return on the momentum factor increases momentum volatility more than a negative return of the same magnitude.

Figure 5 shows the autocorrelation functions for residuals and absolute residuals from the AR-GARCH model. Comparing the autocorrelation functions in Figure 5 with those found in Figure 4 strongly suggests that the AR-GARCH model has picked up the expected return and volatility dynamics in returns. This observation is confirmed by the  $p$ -values obtained from a Ljung-Box (L-B) test on the residuals and absolute residuals as reported among the diagnostics in Table 2 which indicate that serial correlations have been removed.

The normal distribution assumption implies that the model-based skewness and excess kurtosis of  $\epsilon$  is zero. The diagnostics in Table 2 show that the empirical skewness of  $\epsilon$  is negative for market, size and momentum and slightly positive for value. The asymmetric GARCH model has removed some of the skewness from the factor returns found in Table 1 but some still remains. Excess kurtosis is zero in the normal distribution but the empirical  $\epsilon$  still contain positive excess kurtosis. The GARCH model has also removed much of the excess kurtosis found in Table 1 but some still remains.

The inability of the normal distribution to match skewness and kurtosis in the factor residuals leads us to consider the skewed  $t$  distribution of Hansen (1994). We denote the skewed  $t$  probability density function of factor  $j$  by  $f_j(\epsilon_{j,t}; \kappa_j, v_j)$  and define it in the appendix. The parameter  $\kappa_j$  is related to skewness and  $v_j$  is related to kurtosis. The distribution of returns will be dynamic due to the AR-GARCH model and we can write

$$f_{j,t}(r_{j,t+1}) = \sigma_{j,t+1}^{-1} f_j(\epsilon_{j,t+1}; \kappa_j, v_j).$$

Panel B of Table 2 presents the estimation results for the skewed  $t$  distribution. When comparing the residuals' skewness and kurtosis to the ones implied by a skewed  $t$  distribution using the estimated parameters we see that a much better fit is obtained. The skewed  $t$  specification is also preferred to the normal AR-GARCH based on the likelihood values.

Figure 6 presents the quantile-quantile plots of the AR-GARCH residuals against the skewed  $t$  distribution. Figure 6 shows that the skewed AR-GARCH model delivers shocks that are very close in distribution to the assumed skewed  $t$  distribution. Below we will rely on the skewed  $t$  version of the AR-GARCH model when modeling factor dependence.

### 3 Modeling Factor Dependence

In the analysis so far we have found clear evidence of non-normality in the marginal distributions as well as clear evidence of asymmetry in the threshold correlations. Together, these results strongly suggest non-normality in the multivariate distribution of factor returns. Fortunately, copula models provide a powerful and flexible framework for linking non-normal marginal distributions allowing for non-normality in the multivariate distribution.

Patton (2006) builds on Sklar (1959) and shows that the joint conditional distribution of  $N$  factors,  $f_t(r_{1,t+1}, \dots, r_{N,t+1})$ , can be decomposed into the marginal distributions and a copula function as follows

$$f_t(r_{1,t+1}, \dots, r_{N,t+1}) = c_t(\eta_{1,t+1}, \dots, \eta_{N,t+1}) \prod_{j=1}^N f_{j,t}(r_{j,t+1})$$

where  $c_t(\eta_{1,t+1}, \dots, \eta_{N,t+1})$  is the conditional copula density function,

$$\eta_{j,t+1} = F_{j,t}(r_{j,t+1}) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{r_{j,t+1}} f_{j,t}(r) dr$$

is the marginal probability for factor  $j$  and  $f_{j,t}(r_{j,t+1})$  is the univariate conditional density function from above.

While we have already modelled the univariate distributions,  $f_{j,t}(r_{j,t+1})$ , we now need to decide on an appropriate functional form for the copula function  $c_t(F_{1,t}(r_{1,t+1}), \dots, F_{N,t}(r_{N,t+1}))$ . We will first consider constant copula functions and then dynamic copulas.

#### 3.1 Constant Copula Models

From the asymmetric threshold correlations obtained above we know that an asymmetric copula function is required. Upon an extensive copula model selection study (detailed in Section 5.3

below) we have settled on a copula model built from the multivariate skewed  $t$  distribution in Demarta and McNeil (2005).

The multivariate skewed  $t$  distribution provides a parsimonious specification in which univariate and multivariate asymmetry are driven by an  $N$  dimensional vector of parameters  $\lambda$ . In the skewed  $t$  copula the univariate skewness is captured by the univariate distributions modeled above and the vector  $\lambda$  only has to capture multivariate asymmetry. We denote the skewed  $t$  copula density function by  $c(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N; \lambda, v_c, \Psi)$  where  $v_c$  denotes the scalar degree-of-freedom parameter and  $\Psi$  denotes the copula correlation matrix. Further details on the skewed  $t$  copula function are provided in the appendix.

The copula parameters are estimated by maximizing  $\sum_{t=1}^T \ln c(\eta_{1,t}, \dots, \eta_{N,t}; \lambda, v_c, \Psi)$ . Standard errors are computed using Chen and Fan (2006).<sup>5</sup>

Panel A of Table 3 reports the estimates for three different constant copulas: the skewed  $t$  copula described above, the symmetric  $t$  copula special case where  $\lambda_j \rightarrow 0$  for all four factors, and the normal copula special case where further  $v_c \rightarrow \infty$ . From the log-likelihood values we see that moving from left to right, the greatest improvement in likelihood comes from using the symmetric  $t$  rather than normal copula even though only one parameter is added in this case. The  $\lambda$ s are generally significant suggesting that the skewed  $t$  copula offers additional improvements in fit.

## 3.2 Dynamic Copula Models

Following Christoffersen et al. (2011) and Jin (2009), we now allow the conditional copula correlation matrix of the normal,  $t$ , and skewed  $t$  copulas to evolve through time. We rely on the dynamic conditional correlation (DCC) model of Engle (2002) where the correlation matrix dynamic is generated via

$$Q_t = Q(1 - \beta_c - \alpha_c) + \beta_c Q_{t-1} + \alpha_c z_{t-1} z_{t-1}^\top.$$

In Engle's dynamic linear correlation model we have  $z_{t-1} = \epsilon_{t-1}$  so that the correlation dynamics are updated using the vector of standardized returns. But in our copula application of the DCC

---

<sup>5</sup>When estimating the copula parameters we use the empirical distribution of the residuals to construct  $\eta_{j,t}$ . This increases efficiency and ensures the validity of the Chen and Fan (2006) standard errors.

model,  $z_{j,t}$  instead denotes the standardized version of the fractile  $F_c^{-1}(\eta_{j,t})$ , where  $F_c^{-1}$  is the inverse univariate CDF from the specific copula.<sup>6</sup> The matrix  $Q$  is defined as the sample correlation of  $z_t$ .<sup>7</sup> The dynamic correlations are obtained using the following normalization of the elements of the matrix  $Q_t$

$$\rho_{ij,t} = [\Psi_t]_{i,j} = \frac{[Q_t]_{i,j}}{\sqrt{[Q_t]_{i,i} [Q_t]_{j,j}}}$$

Panel B of Table 3 provides the estimates of the dynamic copula models. Note that the dynamic copula log-likelihoods in Panel B are significantly higher than their constant versions in Panel A.

Figure 7 plots the elements of  $\Psi_t$  over time from the skewed  $t$  copula model. We restrict attention to the 2006-2010 period. The variation in correlation across time is striking. For instance, the conditional copula correlation between the market and momentum factor ranges from  $-0.5$  to  $0.5$  during this period. Consider also the correlation between value and momentum which increases from  $-0.8$  to  $+0.7$  during a very short period in late 2009 and early 2010. These rapid reversals in correlation show that standard risk management techniques based on constant correlations are dangerous.

Although not shown, the dynamic correlation patterns are quite similar across the copula models. Allowing for time-varying correlation in the factors appears to be crucial in properly capturing equity factor interdependence.

### 3.3 Copula Threshold Correlations

At this point it is natural to ask if the estimated copula models are able to capture the asymmetric threshold correlations found in Figure 3. Given the variance dynamics in factor returns, we need to assess the cross-sectional dependence in factor residuals,  $\epsilon$ , rather than in the factor returns,  $r$ . The empirical threshold correlations of  $\epsilon$  are shown in thick solid lines in Figure 8. When comparing the weekly threshold correlations for returns in Figure 3 with those for the return residuals in Figure 8 it appears that the univariate dynamic models have removed some of the threshold correlation but clearly much is still left. Just as the AR-GARCH models have removed some skewness and kurtosis from the univariate factor returns and make the factor residuals closer

---

<sup>6</sup>See the appendix for the details of this standardization.

<sup>7</sup>We implement the modified DCC model in Aielli (2009) but the differences between this and Engle's original model are very small.

to normal than the factor returns, so too have they made the factor residuals closer to multivariate normal than were the original factor returns.

When comparing the empirical threshold correlations of  $\epsilon$  in Figure 8 with the threshold correlations implied by the copula models it appears that the skewed  $t$  copula (lines marked with ‘+’) is able to produce the asymmetric threshold correlations required by the data. The additional flexibility introduced by the asymmetry parameters can be observed especially for the following factor pairs: market vs momentum (middle left panel) and size vs momentum (bottom left panel).

Not surprisingly, the copula threshold correlations in Figure 8 do not match up perfectly with their empirical counterparts. Two remarks are in order in this regard. First, the empirical threshold correlations are estimated with uncertainty—especially in the extremes. Second, the copula models are estimated by maximizing the likelihoods and not by directly fitting the empirical threshold correlation patterns. The ultimate test of the models is in their economic relevance for portfolio allocation and risk management. This is the topic to which we now turn.

## 4 Economic Implications

We have found rather striking statistical evidence of non-linear dependence between the market, size, value and momentum factors and we now examine if these findings are important in economic terms. In particular we want to assess the economic cost of ignoring nonlinear dependence between the factors when using the factors for portfolio allocation.

In order to address this issue, we consider expected constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility maximizing investors. CRRA utility functions are widely used for studying portfolio choice in finance (see for example Aït-Sahalia and Brandt (2001)) partly for their analytical tractability. But as CRRA are locally mean-variance preferences they will most likely yield conservative (i.e. low) estimates of the economic cost of ignoring non-normality in the factors. Hong et al. (2007) and Ang et al. (2005) use disappointment aversion preferences instead because they are better suited to take into account asymmetric correlation, but they are less tractable analytically.

## 4.1 Portfolio Selection Framework

Consider an investor who directly takes positions in the four factor portfolios. As in Jagannathan and Ma (2003), we constrain the weights to be positive to prevent them from taking on extreme values. Note that this constraint does not prohibit short sales in our application, as three out of four factors involve short positions. To further restrict the set of admissible portfolio investors can choose from, we follow Pastor and Stambaugh (2000) and impose the margin requirement customers of U.S. broker-dealers face under the Federal Reserve’s Regulation T. Regulation T imposes an upper limit of 2 to the ratio of total position to capital corresponding to a 50% minimum margin.

Investing in the four factors can be viewed as a hedge fund employing quantitative equity strategies. While Regulation U states that the margin requirement applies not only to broker-dealers’s customers, but to any U.S. investors, there are several ways for hedge funds to circumvent the 50% limit. First, broker-dealers are granted looser restrictions for their own accounts, and so some hedge funds have registered as broker-dealers. Second, a joint back office operation can be established between a fund and its broker. Third, a fund managed in the US can register offshore and limit its financing to offshore broker-dealers. Fourth, higher level of leverage can be obtained by using over-the-counter derivatives such as total return swaps.<sup>8</sup> We therefore also consider investors who can lever itself more than Regulation T allows. We impose a margin requirement ( $MR$ ) of either 20% or 50% of the fund’s exposure, that is we impose

$$w_{market} + 2(w_{size} + w_{value} + w_{momentum}) \leq 1/MR$$

where all weights are non-negative and the weights for the spread portfolios are multiplied by 2 as they involve both short and long positions.

We are now ready to describe the real-time implementation of the investment problem.

## 4.2 Implementing Real-Time Investing

We begin the real-time investment process by estimating the skewed  $t$  AR-GARCH model on each factor using the first 20 years of weekly returns spanning 1963-1983. We then estimate the

---

<sup>8</sup>See McCrary (2002) for details on how hedge funds can create leverage.



constant and dynamic copula models in Table 3 on the 20 years of AR-GARCH residuals. In addition, we implement the multivariate standard normal distribution with constant and dynamic correlations as benchmarks. Note that both benchmark models allow for dynamic variances in the individual factors.

We re-estimate the models once a year using all the data available up to that point in time. While the parameter estimates are updated annually, the conditional factor means, variances and correlations are updated weekly. In all models we set the factor's expected return to the average return computed over the previous 2 years. This enables us to focus attention on the impact of higher moments on portfolio selection.

Once the conditional one-week-ahead multivariate distribution,  $f_t(r_{t+1})$ , is constructed, we find the optimal portfolio weights by maximizing the one week expected CRRA utility

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{w_t} &= E_t [U(1 + r_{f,t+1} + w_t^\top r_{t+1})] \\ &= \int \frac{(1 + r_{f,t+1} + w_t^\top r_{t+1})^{1-\gamma}}{(1-\gamma)} f_t(r_{t+1}) dr_{t+1} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $r_{f,t+1}$  is the weekly return of the one-month Treasury bill, and  $r_{t+1}$  is the vector of returns for the 4 factors. For simplicity, we ignore intertemporal hedging demands.

The integrals are solved by simulating 100,000 variates for the 4 factors from the multivariate conditional return distribution  $f_t(r_{t+1})$ . The ex-post investment performance is computed from the first week of July 1983 until the end of December 2010, thus producing 1,436 real-time or out-of-sample returns.

### 4.3 Investment Results

The real-time investment results are shown in Table 4 for the investors with a margin requirement of 20% and in Table 5 we report on  $MR = 50\%$ . We consider three different levels of relative risk aversion, namely  $\gamma = 3$  in Panel A,  $\gamma = 7$  in Panel B, and  $\gamma = 10$  in Panel C. Various standard statistics including mean, volatility, skewness, and excess kurtosis are computed for the ex-post realized portfolio returns in Tables 4 and 5.

In order to compare the economic value of the different dependence models, we compute the

certainty equivalent ( $CE$ ) of the average realized utility computed using the  $T = 1,436$  out-of-sample weekly returns. The  $CE$  for each model is computed as

$$CE = U^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{(1 + r_{p,t})^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} \right) = \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (1 + r_{p,t})^{1-\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$$

where the argument of the inverse utility function  $U^{-1}$  in the first equality is the realized average utility and where

$$r_{p,t} = r_{f,t} + w_{t-1}^\top r_t$$

are the out-of-sample portfolio returns.

We also report the difference in realized certainty equivalent between each model and the multivariate normal benchmark model, and we annualize the measure for ease of presentation. As we normalize the initial wealth to be \$1 each period, the difference in  $CE$  measures between two models can be seen as the proportion of wealth the investor would be willing to forego to be indifferent ex-post between the portfolio allocations from the alternative model and the benchmark model. For example, an investor with  $MR = 20\%$  and a relative risk aversion of 7 realizes a gain of  $\frac{1.068\%}{52} = 0.0205\%$  or 2.05 basis point per week if she uses the constant skewed- $t$  copula instead of the multivariate normal model.

The  $CE$  results in Tables 4 and 5 are quite striking. First, all three copulas always improve upon the normal distribution. This is true both for the constant as well as dynamic copulas. Second, the skewed  $t$  copula performs the best in all but one case across constant and dynamic models. Third, each dynamic dependence model always dominates its constant counterpart in terms of certainty equivalent. This is true for the copula models as well as the normal distribution.

One may wonder whether richer models lead to better performance by generating more trading, and that accounting for transaction costs would lower the realized return on those portfolios. We argue that this is not the case by reporting the turnover for each model defined as the percentage change in weights averaged across time and factors

$$\text{Average turnover (\%)} = \frac{100}{4T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i=1}^4 |w_{i,t} - w_{i,t-1}|.$$

Average turnover values range from around 4% to 13% depending on risk aversion. More importantly, they do not vary much within each of the panels, which suggests that improvements in realized utility across models are not driven by higher turnover.

The improvements found in the alternative non-normal models, especially the ones using a skewed  $t$  copula, are large in economic terms. Next section examines if these differences are statistically significant.

#### 4.4 Significance of Results

In order to assess the statistical differences between the performances of the CRRA investors' portfolios, we use the method of Politis and Romano (1994) to bootstrap the difference in realized certainty equivalent of each copula with respect to the multivariate normal benchmark model. This yields a distribution of differences in realized certainty equivalents, and we can infer whether the actual differences presented in Tables 4 and 5 are significantly larger than zero. We compute in each case the bootstrap  $p$ -value which represents the proportion of bootstrapped differences that fall below zero. A small  $p$ -value indicates that the difference in certainty equivalent realized by this specification is significant, while a value near 1 suggests that the specification is worse than the benchmark model. The bootstrap  $p$ -values are computed in each case using 100,000 bootstrap replications.

The  $p$ -values against the benchmark normal model are presented for each level of risk aversion, and for either the constant or the dynamic copula models. The results in Table 4 for  $MR = 20\%$  are quite striking. The  $p$ -values for the skewed  $t$  copulas are smaller than 5% in all six cases. When leverage is large, the non-normal risk models offer important economic benefits.

The analysis is repeated on the results in Table 5 for  $MR = 50\%$ . In this case, the skewed  $t$  copulas has  $p$ -values smaller than 5% in four of six cases. When margin requirement is larger and investors are able to take on less leverage, then the importance of careful risk management is still important.

## 4.5 Implications for Risk Management

The portfolio allocation experiment above is of course quite specific in nature. However, our findings of variance dynamics and dynamic non-linear dependence across factors have important implications for risk measurement more generally. The broader risk management implications are relevant for investors investing in the four factors, as in the previous section, as well as for investors using the factors to model a wider set of assets.

To assess the broader implications of the models we now investigate the effect of the different models on a generic portfolio risk measure, namely expected shortfall. The 1% expected shortfall is defined as the expected loss when the loss is in the 1% tail of the distribution

$$ES_{t+1}^{0.01} = -E_t [r_{p,t+1} | r_{p,t+1} < F_{p,t}^{-1}(0.01)]$$

Expected shortfall is preferable to the more conventional Value-at-Risk measure because expected shortfall emphasizes the magnitude of large losses, see for example Basak and Shapiro (2001).

Figure 9 presents the 1% weekly expected shortfall for an equal-weighted four-factor portfolio rebalanced weekly during the dramatic period from January 2006 through December 2010. The top panels show the expected shortfall from the benchmark constant correlation normal distribution (left graph) and for the DCC normal distribution (right graph). Expected shortfall increases during market turmoils, for instance during the financial crisis of 2007-2008. Perhaps surprisingly, the expected shortfall based on dynamic correlation in the right panel is significantly lower during the fall 2008 compared to the one based on constant correlation in the left panel. This is a reflection of the lower dynamic correlation between momentum and the other factors during that period, as was evident in Figure 7.

The bottom panels of Figure 9 report the relative difference in expected shortfall between the normal distribution models and the  $t$  and skewed  $t$  copulas. The difference between the constant skewed  $t$  copula and the normal distribution ranges from 20% to 50%. This difference is robust to allowing for time-varying correlations. We conclude that ignoring the multivariate non-normality in equity factors leads to a large underestimation of portfolio risk.

## 5 Further Analysis

In this section, we present additional results of our analysis. First, we check that the deviations from normality are also present when short positions in the factors are considered. Then we verify the robustness of our results by examining the threshold correlation for daily and monthly returns. Finally, we discuss the copula specification search that has lead us to favor the  $t$  and skewed  $t$  copula with DCC dynamics.

### 5.1 Reverse Threshold Correlations

We first examine the dependence structure in weekly factor returns from a different perspective. So far in the literature, threshold correlations have mainly been used to inspect the dependence in highly correlated equity portfolios, for which it was natural to look at bivariate returns falling in the bottom left or top right quadrants. For uncorrelated or even negatively correlated returns, it is relevant to look at the top left or bottom right quadrants as well. To this end, we define the reverse threshold correlation  $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(u)$  as

$$\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(u) = \begin{cases} \text{Corr}(r_i, r_j \mid r_i < F_i^{-1}(u), r_j > F_j^{-1}(1 - u)) & \text{when } u < 0.5 \\ \text{Corr}(r_i, r_j \mid r_i \geq F_i^{-1}(u), r_j \leq F_j^{-1}(1 - u)) & \text{when } u \geq 0.5. \end{cases}$$

Figure 10 reports the empirical reverse threshold correlation for weekly returns as well as the ones implied by the bivariate normal distribution. Again, the empirical threshold correlation patterns are markedly different from normality. We thus conclude that deviations from multivariate normality in factor returns is not limited to the cases when two factor returns are of the same sign.

### 5.2 Daily and Monthly Returns

So far we have solely focused attention on weekly factor returns. Given the dynamics found in the variances and correlations of the weekly returns, the temporal aggregation of factor returns is not obvious and we therefore briefly study factor returns at two other frequencies as well.

In particular, we examine the presence of non-linear dependence between equity market factors

on a daily and monthly basis. Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for daily return in the first panel and for monthly return in the bottom panel for the period July 1963 to December 2010. Daily returns for the market, size and momentum factors exhibit negative skewness, and all factors display significant excess kurtosis. Monthly returns for the market and momentum factors still display negative skewness, and the excess kurtosis for size and momentum are large suggesting that the univariate non-normality in factor return is persistent as the investor-horizon increases.

The correlation between the market and size factors varies from  $-0.18$  to  $0.05$  to  $0.31$  when going from daily to weekly to monthly returns. However, the linear correlations between the other factors are remarkably stable across return horizons.

Figure 11 presents the threshold correlation for daily (continuous line) and monthly returns (dotted line). Not surprisingly, there are some differences between the patterns for weekly returns in Figures 3a and 3b and those in Figure 11, but threshold correlations for both daily and monthly returns remain markedly different from the ones implied by the normality assumption: Daily and monthly factor returns exhibit strong tail dependence which is crucial for portfolio and risk management and which is not captured by the normal distribution. We thus conclude that the multivariate non-normality in factor return is also persistent as the investor horizon increases.

### 5.3 Alternative Copula Functions

In order to fit the factor return data we need copulas that can capture multivariate fat tails which is often measured in terms of tail dependence. The lower and upper tail dependence coefficients are defined respectively as

$$\begin{aligned}
 LTD(r_i, r_j) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow 0} Pr [r_j \leq F_j^{-1}(u) | r_i \leq F_i^{-1}(u)] \\
 UTD(r_i, r_j) &= \lim_{u \rightarrow 1} Pr [r_j > F_j^{-1}(u) | r_i > F_i^{-1}(u)].
 \end{aligned}$$

Tail dependence and threshold correlation are related concepts. Most importantly, a copula having zero tail dependence will generate correlations approaching zero as the threshold nears zero or one.

The normal copula has zero lower and upper tail dependence, the  $t$  copula has non-zero and symmetric lower and upper tail dependence coefficients. The skewed  $t$  copula we use allows for non-zero tail dependence coefficients which in turn differ between the upper and lower tails.

Before settling on the  $t$  and skewed  $t$  copulas as our favored alternative to the normal copula specification we investigated several copulas from the Archimedean family detailed in Joe (1997) and Patton (2009). For example, we considered in detail the Clayton and Gumbel copulas. Along with the normal and  $t$ , they are arguably some of the most often used copulas in the financial literature. The Clayton and Gumbel copulas have non-zero lower and upper tail dependence, respectively. Moreover, these copulas are potentially able to produce asymmetric threshold correlation patterns. However, the Clayton or Gumbel are not capable of capturing asymmetric threshold correlations while keeping the linear correlation close to zero. Unfortunately this is the empirically relevant case for factor returns as we saw above.

The Clayton and Gumbel copula are defined with only one parameter, and the range of dependence they can generate is limited to positive levels. These asymmetric copulas have stronger dependence in the lower left quadrant or in the upper right quadrant. This means that they will produce few observations lying in the upper left or lower right quadrants. This limitation leads to very low levels of likelihood when we estimate the models on the factor return data.

We have also considered rotated (survival) versions of these copulas as in Patton (2004), and mixtures with the normal copula as in Hong et al. (2007). However, the likelihood levels favored the  $t$  and skewed  $t$  copulas and we relied on these models instead.

## 5.4 Alternative Copula Dynamics

Regime-switching models are arguably the main alternative to the dynamic conditional correlation for modeling time-varying dependence we use in our analysis. For the use of regime-switching models, see among others Ang and Bekaert (2002), Pelletier (2006), and Garcia and Tsafack (2008). In these models, each regime has a different level of dependence, and the choice of regime in each period is governed by an unobservable Markov chain.

Asymmetric copulas such as the Clayton, Gumbel, or Joe-Clayton are difficult to generalize in higher dimension because they are defined with either one or two parameters. Chollete et al. (2009) recently proposed a regime-switching copula with two regimes in which one regime is characterized by a normal copula and the other by a canonical vine copula. Canonical vine copulas alleviate the dimensionality problem by decomposing a multivariate distribution into a hierarchy of bivariate functions, which offers an ingenious and very flexible way to model asymmetric dependence in

multivariate contexts.

We have estimated a model in which one regime is specified as a normal copula and the other as a  $t$  copula, and another model in which both regimes are characterized by  $t$  copulas. Note that in these two models, much modeling flexibility is gained because the second regime's distribution is a series of  $t$  copulas each having its different correlation and degree of freedom. Finally, we have combined a normal copula with rotated Gumbel copulas. Such a specification is interesting because of its ability to capture asymmetry in dependence.

When estimating the three regime-switching models and comparing them with the DCC copulas in Table 3 we found that the DCC copulas provided a better fit and did so with fewer parameters. We therefore did not include the estimation results in the paper.<sup>9</sup>

## 6 Conclusion

The large-scale nature of equity portfolio selection and risk management often requires a factor approach. The Fama-French and momentum factors are pervasive in cross-sectional asset pricing and are also increasingly used in portfolio allocation. We have therefore studied their dynamic and distributional properties in detail.

Our analysis shows that the conditional variance of all four factor returns is dynamic, persistent, and well captured by an asymmetric GARCH model. We also find that the skewed  $t$  distribution provides a good fit to the factor residuals.

There is strong evidence of nonlinear dependence across factors which we model using the copula implied by a skewed version of the multivariate  $t$  distribution. This copula model is capable of generating the strongly asymmetric patterns in non-linear dependence observed across factors while preserving the relatively modest linear correlations found in the returns data.

We use the new copula models to investigate the economic importance of modeling the non-linear and dynamic dependence between the factors. Using a real-time portfolio selection experiment, we find strong economic gains from modeling non-linear factor dependence. The skewed  $t$  copula leads to higher realized investor utility than other dependence models. Dynamic correlations offer large economic benefits as well. In a more generic risk management application, we

---

<sup>9</sup>All estimation results are available from the authors upon request.



show that the non-normal factor model has important implications for portfolio risk measurement.

Several important challenges are left for future research. First, we have only studied the four-factor model in this paper. Clearly, extending our analysis beyond the four-factor model would be interesting. It would also be interesting to investigate which economic variables drive the level of factor variance, correlation and asymmetry. In this regard, this analysis could be conducted using the methodology of Engle and Rangel (2008) and Engle and Rangel (2011).

## References

- Adrian, T., Rosenberg, J., 2008. Stock returns and volatility: Pricing the short-run and long-run components of market risk. *Journal of Finance* 63, 2997–3030.
- Aielli, G., 2009. Dynamic conditional correlations: On properties and estimation. Working paper, Department of Statistics, University of Florence.
- Ang, A., Bekaert, G., 2002. International asset allocation with regime shifts. *Review of Financial Studies* 15, 1137–1187.
- Ang, A., Bekaert, G., Liu, J., 2005. Why stocks may disappoint. *Journal of Financial Economics* 76, 471–508.
- Ang, A., Chen, J., 2002. Asymmetric correlations of equity portfolios. *Journal of Financial Economics* 63, 443–494.
- Ang, A., Chen, J., Xing, Y., 2006. Downside risk. *Review of Financial Studies* 19, 1191–1239.
- Ang, A., Hodrick, R. J., Xing, Y., Zhang, X., 2006. The cross-section of volatility and expected returns. *Journal of Finance* 61, 259–299.
- Asness, C., Moskowitz, T., Pedersen, L., 2009. Value and momentum everywhere. Working paper, University of Chicago.
- Aït-Sahalia, Y., Brandt, M., 2001. Variable selection for portfolio choice. *Journal of Finance* 51, 1297–1351.

- Basak, S., Shapiro, A., 2001. Value-at-risk-based risk management: Optimal policies and asset prices. *Review of Financial Studies* 14, 371–405.
- Boudoukh, J., Michaely, R., Richardson, M., Roberts, M. R., 2007. On the importance of measuring payout yield: implications for empirical asset pricing. *Journal of Finance* 62, 877–915.
- Brandt, M., 2010. Portfolio choice problems, in Y. Ait-Sahalia, and L.P. Hansen (eds.), *Handbook of financial econometrics, volume 1: Tools and techniques*. North-Holland, 269–336.
- Briner, B., Connor, G., 2008. How much structure is best? a comparison of market model, factor model and unstructured equity covariance matrices. *Journal of Risk* 10, 3–30.
- Campbell, R., Koedijk, K., Kofman, P., 2002. Increased correlation in bear markets. *Financial Analysts Journal* 58, 87–94.
- Carhart, M. M., 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance. *Journal of Finance* 52, 57–82.
- Chan, L., Karceski, J., Lakonishok, J., 1998. The risk and return from factors. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 33, 159–188.
- Chan, L., Karceski, J., Lakonishok, J., 1999. On portfolio optimization: Forecasting covariances and choosing the risk model. *Review of Financial Studies* 12, 937–974.
- Chen, X., Fan, Y., 2006. Estimation and model selection of semiparametric copula-based multivariate dynamic models under copula misspecification. *Journal of Econometrics* 135, 125–154.
- Chollete, L., Heinen, A., Valdesogo, A., 2009. Modeling international financial returns with a multivariate regime switching copula. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 7, 437–480.
- Christoffersen, P., Errunza, V., Jacobs, K., Langlois, H., 2011. Is the potential for international diversification disappearing? Working paper, McGill University.
- Connor, G., Goldberg, L. R., Korajczyk, R. A., 2010. *Portfolio Risk Analysis*. Princeton University Press.
- Demarta, S., McNeil, A., 2005. The t copula and related copulas. *International Statistical Review* 73, 111–129.

- Engle, R. F., 2002. Dynamic conditional correlation: A simple class of multivariate generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20, 339–350.
- Engle, R. F., Lee, G., 1999. A permanent and transitory component model of stock return volatility, in R.F.. Engle and H. White (eds.), *Cointegration, causality, and forecasting: a festschrift in honor of Clive W.J. Granger*. Oxford University Press, 475–497.
- Engle, R. F., Ng, V. K., 1993. Measuring and testing the impact of news on volatility. *Journal of Finance* 48, 1749–1778.
- Engle, R. F., Rangel, J., 2008. The spline-GARCH model for low-frequency volatility and its global macroeconomic causes. *Review of Financial Studies* 21, 1187–1222.
- Engle, R. F., Rangel, J., 2011. The factor-spline-GARCH model for high- and low-frequency correlations. Working paper, NYU Stern.
- Fama, E. F., French, K. R., 1993. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33, 3–56.
- Fu, F., 2009. Idiosyncratic risk and the cross-section of expected stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* 91, 24–37.
- Garcia, R., Tsafack, G., 2008. Dependence structure and extreme comovements in international equity and bond markets with portfolio diversification effects. Working paper, EDHEC.
- Hansen, B., 1994. Autoregressive conditional density estimation. *International Economic Review* 35, 705–730.
- Hatherly, A., Alcock, J., 2007. Portfolio construction incorporating asymmetric dependence structures: a user’s guide. *Accounting & Finance* 47, 447–472.
- Hong, Y., Tu, J., Zhou, G., 2007. Asymmetries in stock returns: Statistical tests and economic evaluation. *Review of Financial Studies* 20, 1547–1581.
- Jagannathan, R., Ma, T., 2003. Risk reduction in large portfolios: Why imposing the wrong constraints helps. *Journal of Finance* 58, 1651–1683.

- Jegadeesh, N., Titman, S., 1993. Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency. *Journal of Finance* 48, 65–91.
- Jin, X., 2009. Large portfolio risk management with dynamic copulas. Ph.D. thesis, McGill University.
- Joe, H., 1997. *Multivariate models and dependence concepts*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Khandani, A., Lo, A., 2007. What happened to the quants in August 2007? *Journal of Investment Management* 5, 29–78.
- Khandani, A., Lo, A., 2011. What happened to the quants in August 2007?: Evidence from factors and transactions data. *Journal of Financial Markets* 14, 1–46.
- L’Habitant, F. S., 2004. *Hedge Funds: Quantitative Insights*. The Wiley Finance Series. John Wiley & Sons.
- Longin, F., Solnik, B., 2001. Extreme correlation of international equity markets. *Journal of Finance* 56, 649–676.
- Mazzotta, S., 2008. How important is asymmetric covariance for the risk premium of international assets? *Journal of Banking & Finance* 32, 1636–1647.
- McCrary, S., 2002. *How to create and manage a hedge fund: a professional’s guide*. Wiley finance series. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Okimoto, T., 2008. New evidence of asymmetric dependence structures in international equity markets. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 43, 787–815.
- Pastor, L., Stambaugh, R., 2000. Comparing asset pricing models: an investment perspective. *Journal of Financial Economics* 56, 335–381.
- Pastor, L., Stambaugh, R. F., 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy* 111, 642–685.
- Patton, A., 2004. On the out-of-sample importance of skewness and asymmetric dependence for asset allocation. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 2, 130–168.

- Patton, A., 2006. Modelling asymmetric exchange rate dependence. *International Economic Review* 47, 527–556.
- Patton, A., 2009. Copula-based models for financial time series, in T.G. Andersen, R.A. Davis, J.-P. Kreiss and T. Mikosch (eds.), *Handbook of financial time series*. Springer Verlag, 767–785.
- Pelletier, D., 2006. Regime switching for dynamic correlations. *Journal of Econometrics* 131, 445–473.
- Politis, D., Romano, J., 1994. The stationary bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 89, 1303–1313.
- Poon, S., Rockinger, M., Tawn, J., 2004. Extreme value dependence in financial markets: Diagnostics, models, and financial implications. *Review of Financial Studies* 17, 581–610.
- Sancetta, A., Satchell, S. E., 2007. Changing correlation and equity portfolio diversification failure for linear factor models during market declines. *Applied Mathematical Finance* 14, 227–242.
- Sklar, A., 1959. Fonctions de répartition à n dimensions et leurs marges. *Publ. Inst. Statist. Univ. Paris* 8, 229–231.
- Tsafack, G., 2009. Asymmetric dependence implications for extreme risk management. *Journal of Derivatives* 17, 7–20.
- Vassalou, M., 2003. News related to future GDP growth as a risk factor in equity returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* 68, 47–73.
- Xu, Q., Li, X.-M., 2009. Estimation of dynamic asymmetric tail dependences: an empirical study on Asian developed futures markets. *Applied Financial Economics* 19, 273–290.
- Zhang, X., Ang, A., Hodrick, R., Xing, Y., 2009. High idiosyncratic volatility and low returns: International and further U.S. evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics* 91, 1–23.

# A Appendix

We first define the univariate skewed  $t$  distribution from Hansen (1994) as

$$f(\epsilon; \kappa, v) = \begin{cases} bc \left(1 + \frac{1}{v-2} \left(\frac{b\epsilon+a}{1-\kappa}\right)^2\right)^{-\frac{v+1}{2}} & \text{if } \epsilon < -\frac{a}{b} \\ bc \left(1 + \frac{1}{v-2} \left(\frac{b\epsilon+a}{1+\kappa}\right)^2\right)^{-\frac{v+1}{2}} & \text{if } \epsilon \geq -\frac{a}{b} \end{cases}$$

where

$$a = 4\kappa c \frac{v-2}{v-1}, \quad b^2 = 1 + 3\kappa^2 - a^2, \quad c = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{v+1}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi(v-2)}\Gamma\left(\frac{v}{2}\right)}.$$

The skewed  $t$  distribution has zero mean, unit variance, and its skewness and kurtosis are

$$\begin{aligned} E[\epsilon^3] &= \frac{m_3 - 2am_2 + 2a^3}{b^3}, \\ E[\epsilon^4] &= \frac{m_3 - 4am_3 + 6a^2m_2 - 3a^4}{b^4}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_2 &= 1 + 3\kappa^2, \\ m_3 &= 16c\kappa(1 + \kappa^2) \frac{(\kappa - 2)^2}{(\kappa - 1)(\kappa - 3)}, \quad \text{if } \kappa > 3, \\ m_4 &= 3 \frac{\kappa - 2}{\kappa - 4} (1 + 10\kappa^2 + 5\kappa^4), \quad \text{if } \kappa > 4. \end{aligned}$$

The following sections contain the probability density functions for the  $t$  copulas used.

## A.1 $t$ Copula

The cumulative distribution function of the  $t$  copula with correlation matrix  $\Psi$  and scalar degree of freedom  $\nu_c$  is given by

$$C_{\Psi, \nu_c}^t(\eta) = T_{\Psi, \nu_c} \left( T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_1), \dots, T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_N) \right),$$

where  $T_{\Psi, \nu_c}(\cdot)$  is the multivariate  $t$  CDF and  $T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\cdot)$  is the univariate  $t$  inverse CDF.

The probability density function is

$$c_{\Psi, \nu_c}^t(\eta) = \frac{t_{\Psi, \nu_c}(T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_1), \dots, T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_N))}{\prod_{j=1}^N t_{\nu_c}(T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_j))}$$

where  $t_{\Psi, \nu_c}(\cdot)$  and  $t_{\nu_c}(\cdot)$  are respectively the multivariate  $t$  PDF, and the univariate  $t$  PDF.

When standardizing the fractiles  $z_j = T_{\nu_c}^{-1}(\eta_j)$  used in the dynamic conditional correlations specification, we use the fact that the covariance of the fractiles is given by  $\frac{\nu_c}{\nu_c - 2}\Psi$ .

## A.2 Skewed $t$ Copula

The probability density function of the skewed  $t$  copula defined from the asymmetric  $t$  distribution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\Psi, \nu_c, \lambda}^{st}(\eta) &= \frac{2^{\frac{(\nu_c - 2)(N - 1)}{2}} K_{\frac{\nu_c + N}{2}} \left( \sqrt{(v_c + z^\top \Psi^{-1} z) \lambda^\top \Psi^{-1} \lambda} \right) e^{z^\top \Psi^{-1} \lambda}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_c}{2}\right)^{1 - N} |\Psi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sqrt{(v_c + z^\top \Psi^{-1} z) \lambda^\top \Psi^{-1} \lambda} \right)^{-\frac{\nu_c + N}{2}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{v_c} z^\top \Psi^{-1} z \right)^{\frac{\nu_c + N}{2}}} \\ &\times \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{\left( \sqrt{(v_c + z_j^2) \lambda_j^2} \right)^{-\frac{\nu_c + 1}{2}} \left( 1 + \frac{z_j^2}{v_c} \right)^{\frac{\nu_c + 1}{2}}}{K_{\frac{\nu_c + 1}{2}} \left( \sqrt{(v_c + z_j^2) \lambda_j^2} \right) e^{z_j \lambda_j}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $K(\cdot)$  is the modified Bessel function of the third kind. We define  $z_j = ST_{\nu_c, \lambda_j}^{-1}(\eta_j)$  where  $ST_{\nu_c, \lambda_j}^{-1}(\eta_j)$  is the skewed  $t$  univariate quantile function which is constructed via simulation.

When simulating we rely on the following stochastic representation of the skewed  $t$  distribution

$$X = \sqrt{W}Y + \lambda W \quad (5)$$

where  $W$  is an inverse gamma variable,  $W \sim IG\left(\frac{\nu_c}{2}, \frac{\nu_c}{2}\right)$ ,  $Y$  is a vector of correlated normal variables,  $Y \sim N(0, \Psi)$ , and  $Y$  and  $W$  are independent.  $z_j$  is now found from the empirical quantile function of a large number of simulated  $X_j$  values.

To standardize the  $z$  fractiles used in the dynamic conditional correlation specification, note

that the expected value is given by

$$E[X] = E(E[X|W]) = E[W] \lambda = \frac{v_c}{v_c - 2} \lambda$$


and the covariances of the fractiles are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(X) &= E(Var[X|W]) + Var(E[X|W]) \\ &= \frac{v_c}{v_c - 2} \Psi + \frac{2v_c^2 \lambda \lambda^\top}{(v_c - 2)^2 (v_c - 4)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Note that as  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$  element-wise, we obtain the symmetric  $t$  copula, and if we further let  $v_c \rightarrow \infty$ , then we have the normal copula.




Figure 1: Time Series of Returns and Cumulative Returns




Notes to Figure: The top and middle panels show the time series of weekly returns for each factor for the period July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The bottom panel shows the cumulative log returns for each factor for the periods July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010 (left panel) and January 5, 2006 to December 31, 2010 (right panel).

Figure 2: Quantile-Quantile Plots for Returns from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010




Notes to Figure: For each observation we scatter plot the empirical quantile on the vertical axis against the corresponding quantile from the standard normal distribution on the horizontal axis. If returns are normally distributed, then the data points will fall randomly around the  $45^\circ$  line which is marked by dashes.

Figure 3a: Scatter Plots and Threshold Correlations for Each Factor Pair




Notes to Figure: This figure presents scatter plots in the left panels and threshold correlations in the right panels between the market premium and the 3 other factors. Our sample consists of weekly returns from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The linear correlations are provided in the titles of the left panels. The continuous line in the right panels represents the correlation when both variables are below (above) a threshold when this threshold is below (above) the median. The dash-dot line represents the threshold correlation function for a bivariate normal distribution using the linear correlation coefficient from the data.

Figure 3b: Scatter Plots and Threshold Correlations for Each Factor Pair




Notes to Figure: This figure presents scatter plots in the left panels and threshold correlations in the right panels between factors pairs not involving the market premium. Our sample consists of weekly returns from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The linear correlations are provided in the titles of the left panels. The continuous line in the right panels represents the correlation when both variables are below (above) a threshold when this threshold is below (above) the median. The dash-dot line represents the threshold correlation function for a bivariate normal distribution using the linear correlation coefficient from the data.

Figure 4: Autocorrelation Functions of Returns and Absolute Returns




Notes to Figure: Autocorrelation of weekly returns (dashed line) and absolute returns (solid line) from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The horizontal dotted lines provide a 95% confidence interval around zero.

Figure 5: Autocorrelation Functions of AR-GARCH Residuals and Absolute Residuals




Notes to Figure: Autocorrelation of AR-GARCH inferred residuals (dashed line) and absolute residuals (solid line) from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The horizontal dotted lines provide a 95% confidence interval around zero.

Figure 6: Quantile-Quantile Plots for the Skewed  $t$  AR-GARCH Residuals



Notes to Figure: For each observation we scatter plot the empirical quantile on the vertical axis against the corresponding quantile from the skewed  $t$  distribution on the horizontal axis. If the AR-GARCH residuals adhere to the skewed  $t$  distribution then the data points will fall on the 45° line which is marked by dashes. The parameters for the skewed  $t$  distribution are from Table 2.


Figure 7: Dynamic Copula Correlations, 2006-2010



Notes to Figure: We report dynamic conditional copula correlation for each pair of factors from January 2006 to December 2010. The correlations are obtained by estimating the dynamic skewed  $t$  copula model on the factor return residuals from the AR-GARCH model. The entire 1963-2010 sample is used in estimation of the models.




Figure 8: Threshold Correlations for Factor Residuals and Copula Models




Notes to Figure: We present threshold correlations computed on AR-GARCH residuals from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The thick continuous line represents the empirical correlation. The linear sample correlations are provided in the titles for each pair of factors. The threshold correlation functions are computed for thresholds for which there are at least 20 data points available. We compare the empirical correlations to those implied by the normal copula, the constant  $t$  and skewed  $t$  copulas.

Figure 9: Expected Shortfall for Equally-Weighted Portfolios of Factors




Notes to Figure: We report in the top panels the 1% weekly expected shortfall measure for an equally-weighted portfolio of the four factors from January 2006 to December 2010. The top left panel presents the risk measure for the normal distribution with constant correlation and the top right panel for the DCC normal distribution. The bottom panels shows the relative difference in expected shortfall implied by the either the  $t$  or the skewed  $t$  copulas. The expected returns and volatilities are from the AR-GARCH model in all cases.

Figure 10: Reverse Threshold Correlation on Weekly Returns



Notes to Figure: This figure presents the reverse threshold correlations of weekly returns from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. The linear correlations are provided in the titles of the panels. The continuous line below the median represents the correlation when the first variable is below its  $p^{th}$  quantile and the second above its  $(1 - p)^{th}$  quantile. The continuous line above the median represents the correlation when the first variable is above its  $p^{th}$  quantile and the second below its  $(1 - p)^{th}$  quantile. The dashed line represents the analytical reverse threshold correlation function for a bivariate normal distribution using the linear correlation coefficient from the data.

Figure 11: Threshold Correlation Functions on Daily and Monthly Returns



Notes to Figure: We show threshold correlation functions computed on daily returns (continuous line) and monthly returns (dotted line) from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010. Returns are standardized by their unconditional mean and standard deviation. The lines represent the correlation when both returns are below (above) the threshold when the threshold is below (above) the median. The linear correlations are provided in the titles for each pair of factors. The threshold correlation functions are computed for thresholds for which there are at least 20 data points available.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Weekly Factor Returns, 1963-2010.**

---

---

|                           | <b>Market</b> | <b>Size</b> | <b>Value</b> | <b>Momentum</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Annualized mean           | 3.63%         | 1.81%       | 4.30%        | 7.55%           |
| Annualized volatility     | 15.95%        | 8.54%       | 8.73%        | 13.56%          |
| Skewness                  | - 0.75        | - 0.44      | 0.18         | - 1.44          |
| Excess Kurtosis           | 7.01          | 5.04        | 5.16         | 12.38           |
| <u>Autocorrelations</u>   |               |             |              |                 |
| First-order               | 0.61%         | 11.20%      | 11.29%       | 9.91%           |
| Second-order              | 4.37%         | 10.25%      | 8.38%        | 8.41%           |
| Third-order               | 0.87%         | 10.57%      | 6.67%        | 5.23%           |
| <u>Cross Correlations</u> |               |             |              |                 |
| Market                    | -             | 4.76%       | -30.56%      | -11.01%         |
| Size                      | -             | -           | -12.77%      | 3.90%           |
| Value                     | -             | -           | -            | -19.04%         |

---

---

Notes to Table: We report sample moments, autocorrelations, and cross correlations for weekly log returns of the 4 factors. The sample period is from July 5, 1963 to December 31, 2010.

**Table 2: AR-GARCH Models of Individual Factor Returns, 1963-2010**

| Parameter Estimates       | Panel A: Normal Distribution |                      |                      |                      | Panel B: Skewed $t$ Distribution |                      |                      |                      |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                           | Market                       | Size                 | Value                | Momentum             | Market                           | Size                 | Value                | Momentum             |
| $\phi_0$                  | 6.30E-4<br>(3.34E-4)         | 1.51E-4<br>(2.04E-4) | 5.41E-4<br>(1.83E-4) | 1.55E-3<br>(1.87E-4) | 7.26E-4<br>(2.90E-4)             | 1.41E-4<br>(2.03E-4) | 4.78E-4<br>(1.83E-4) | 1.58E-3<br>(2.22E-4) |
| $\phi_1$                  | 0.030<br>( 0.020)            | 0.086<br>( 0.021)    | 0.137<br>( 0.019)    | 0.107<br>( 0.019)    | 0.012<br>( 0.021)                | 0.101<br>( 0.021)    | 0.147<br>( 0.020)    | 0.102<br>( 0.019)    |
| $\phi_2$                  | 0.052<br>( 0.021)            | 0.108<br>( 0.021)    | 0.037<br>( 0.022)    | 0.007<br>( 0.020)    | 0.045<br>( 0.021)                | 0.124<br>( 0.021)    | 0.042<br>( 0.021)    | 0.012<br>( 0.019)    |
| $\phi_3$                  | 0.022<br>( 0.019)            | 0.073<br>( 0.019)    | 0.069<br>( 0.021)    | - 0.004<br>( 0.020)  | 0.024<br>( 0.020)                | 0.076<br>( 0.020)    | 0.076<br>( 0.021)    | 0.006<br>( 0.020)    |
| $\beta$                   | 0.752<br>( 0.018)            | 0.849<br>( 0.017)    | 0.862<br>( 0.011)    | 0.831<br>( 0.011)    | 0.794<br>( 0.020)                | 0.849<br>( 0.022)    | 0.877<br>( 0.015)    | 0.830<br>( 0.016)    |
| $\alpha$                  | 0.127<br>( 0.012)            | 0.113<br>( 0.012)    | 0.119<br>( 0.009)    | 0.114<br>( 0.008)    | 0.105<br>( 0.014)                | 0.109<br>( 0.015)    | 0.106<br>( 0.013)    | 0.119<br>( 0.013)    |
| $\theta$                  | 0.757<br>( 0.091)            | 0.125<br>( 0.048)    | - 0.059<br>( 0.051)  | - 0.638<br>( 0.056)  | 0.796<br>( 0.131)                | 0.152<br>( 0.086)    | - 0.076<br>( 0.077)  | - 0.585<br>( 0.079)  |
| $\nu$                     | -                            | -                    | -                    | -                    | 10.047<br>( 1.593)               | 8.827<br>( 1.319)    | 8.425<br>( 1.311)    | 7.478<br>( 1.082)    |
| $\kappa$                  | -                            | -                    | -                    | -                    | - 0.221<br>( 0.027)              | - 0.061<br>( 0.029)  | 0.021<br>( 0.029)    | - 0.161<br>( 0.029)  |
| <b>Diagnostics</b>        |                              |                      |                      |                      |                                  |                      |                      |                      |
| Log-likelihood            | 6,291                        | 7,715                | 7,862                | 7,099                | 6,357                            | 7,753                | 7,892                | 7,165                |
| Variance Persistence      | 0.951                        | 0.963                | 0.981                | 0.991                | 0.965                            | 0.961                | 0.983                | 0.989                |
| L-B(20) $p$ -value        | 0.26                         | 0.50                 | 0.72                 | 0.44                 | 0.22                             | 0.49                 | 0.79                 | 0.46                 |
| Abs L-B(20) $p$ -value    | 0.37                         | 0.74                 | 0.39                 | 0.13                 | 0.65                             | 0.74                 | 0.40                 | 0.18                 |
| Empirical skewness        | -0.56                        | -0.26                | 0.10                 | -0.56                | -0.59                            | -0.26                | 0.11                 | -0.56                |
| Model skewness            | 0.00                         | 0.00                 | 0.00                 | 0.00                 | -0.52                            | -0.16                | 0.06                 | -0.46                |
| Empirical excess kurtosis | 1.61                         | 1.42                 | 1.08                 | 1.51                 | 1.73                             | 1.48                 | 1.14                 | 1.53                 |
| Model excess kurtosis     | 0.00                         | 0.00                 | 0.00                 | 0.00                 | 1.26                             | 1.27                 | 1.36                 | 1.96                 |

Notes to Table: We report parameter estimates and model diagnostics for the AR-GARCH model with normal shocks (Panel A) and skewed  $t$  shocks (Panel B). Standard errors (in parentheses) are calculated from the outer product of the gradient at the optimum parameter values. The model estimated is  $r_t = \phi_0 + \phi_1 r_{t-1} + \phi_2 r_{t-2} + \phi_3 r_{t-3} + \sigma_t \varepsilon_t$ , where  $\sigma_t^2 = \omega + \beta \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \alpha \sigma_{t-1}^2 (\varepsilon_{t-1} - \theta)^2$ .  $\omega$  is fixed by variance targeting. The  $p$ -values for a Ljung-Box (L-B) test on the residuals and the absolute residuals are provided. The number of lags for both tests is 20. The empirical skewness and excess kurtosis of the residuals are compared to the model-implied levels from the normal and asymmetric models.

**Table 3: Estimation Results for Factor Dependence Models, 1963-2010**

|                                 | <i>Panel A: Constant Correlation</i> |                    |                   | <i>Panel B: Dynamic Correlation</i> |                    |                   |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                 | Normal Copula                        | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula   | Normal Copula                       | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula   |
| <u>Parameter Estimates</u>      |                                      |                    |                   |                                     |                    |                   |
| $v_c$                           |                                      | 4.520<br>(0.272)   | 4.740<br>(0.002)  |                                     | 9.070<br>(0.906)   | 8.940<br>(0.025)  |
| $\lambda_{\text{Market}}$       |                                      |                    | -0.019<br>(0.010) |                                     |                    | -0.055<br>(0.003) |
| $\lambda_{\text{Size}}$         |                                      |                    | -0.069<br>(0.015) |                                     |                    | -0.111<br>(0.001) |
| $\lambda_{\text{Value}}$        |                                      |                    | 0.036<br>(0.031)  |                                     |                    | 0.030<br>(0.001)  |
| $\lambda_{\text{Momentum}}$     |                                      |                    | -0.161<br>(0.044) |                                     |                    | -0.115<br>(0.003) |
| $\beta_c$                       |                                      |                    |                   | 0.886<br>(0.025)                    | 0.884<br>(0.008)   | 0.885<br>(0.010)  |
| $\alpha_c$                      |                                      |                    |                   | 0.089<br>(0.020)                    | 0.073<br>(0.005)   | 0.092<br>(0.008)  |
| $\rho_{\text{Market,Size}}$     | - 1.47%                              | 0.01%              | - 0.16%           | 1.28%                               | 3.87%              | 3.74%             |
| $\rho_{\text{Market,Value}}$    | -35.58%                              | -35.20%            | -34.91%           | -37.77%                             | -37.91%            | -37.56%           |
| $\rho_{\text{Market,Momentum}}$ | 10.68%                               | 11.57%             | 11.34%            | 8.28%                               | 9.03%              | 9.03%             |
| $\rho_{\text{Size, Value}}$     | - 4.66%                              | - 4.62%            | - 3.83%           | - 8.67%                             | -10.87%            | -10.72%           |
| $\rho_{\text{Size,Momentum}}$   | 1.27%                                | 2.29%              | - 1.73%           | 3.19%                               | 4.03%              | 3.46%             |
| $\rho_{\text{Value,Momentum}}$  | - 7.66%                              | - 9.42%            | - 7.98%           | -10.98%                             | -13.89%            | -13.83%           |
| <u>Model Properties</u>         |                                      |                    |                   |                                     |                    |                   |
| Correlation Persistence         | 0                                    | 0                  | 0                 | 0.975                               | 0.957              | 0.977             |
| Log-likelihood                  | 188.4                                | 433.7              | 448.8             | 1,052.1                             | 1,152.1            | 1,161.3           |
| Number of Parameters            | 6                                    | 7                  | 11                | 8                                   | 9                  | 13                |

Notes to Table: This table presents the estimates for the different dependence models considered. All models are estimated by maximum likelihood. Standard errors (in parentheses) are computing using the methodology of Chen and Fan (2006).

**Table 4: Out-of-sample Results for the Investor with Margin Requirement of 20%**

|  | <i>Panel A: Constant Correlation Models</i> |               |                    |                 | <i>Panel B: Dynamic Correlation Models</i> |               |                    |                 |
|--|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|  | Normal Distribution                         | Normal Copula | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula | Normal Distribution                        | Normal Copula | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula |
| <b>Panel A: <math>\gamma = 3</math></b>        |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 19.549                                      | 19.494        | 19.659             | 19.724          | 21.095                                     | 21.195        | 21.287             | 20.481          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 32.208                                      | 31.857        | 31.958             | 31.730          | 31.123                                     | 30.584        | 30.715             | 28.473          |
| Skewness                                       | - 1.248                                     | - 1.299       | - 1.222            | - 1.184         | - 0.894                                    | - 0.906       | - 0.896            | - 0.980         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 8.472                                       | 8.778         | 7.917              | 7.438           | 4.972                                      | 4.670         | 4.589              | 5.178           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 12.707                                      | 12.301        | 12.397             | 12.417          | 13.129                                     | 12.854        | 12.900             | 13.115          |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 16.808                                      | 17.129        | 17.372             | 17.823          | 21.435                                     | 22.297        | 22.318             | 23.387          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.167         | 0.293              | 0.528           | -  | 0.448         | 0.459              | 1.015           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.031         | 0.051              | 0.034           | -  | 0.001         | 0.019              | 0.016           |
| <b>Panel B: <math>\gamma = 7</math></b>        |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 17.158                                      | 17.189        | 17.145             | 17.326          | 19.726                                     | 19.712        | 19.709             | 19.124          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 20.201                                      | 19.997        | 19.855             | 19.547          | 19.005                                     | 18.649        | 18.701             | 17.605          |
| Skewness                                       | - 0.968                                     | - 0.969       | - 0.936            | - 0.924         | - 0.745                                    | - 0.737       | - 0.740            | - 0.775         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 4.017                                       | 3.973         | 3.734              | 3.599           | 2.724                                      | 2.576         | 2.581              | 2.561           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 9.311                                       | 8.954         | 9.016              | 9.005           | 10.396                                     | 10.170        | 10.203             | 9.625           |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 7.946                                       | 8.527         | 8.862              | 10.000          | 16.181                                     | 16.996        | 16.867             | 18.162          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.302         | 0.476              | 1.068           | -  | 0.424         | 0.357              | 1.030           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.015         | 0.014              | 0.007           | -  | 0.003         | 0.037              | 0.020           |
| <b>Panel C: <math>\gamma = 10</math></b>       |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 16.375                                      | 16.297        | 16.248             | 16.498          | 18.120                                     | 18.076        | 18.085             | 17.808          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 16.315                                      | 16.143        | 15.993             | 15.754          | 15.526                                     | 15.235        | 15.284             | 14.517          |
| Skewness                                       | - 0.816                                     | - 0.829       | - 0.805            | - 0.794         | - 0.715                                    | - 0.707       | - 0.718            | - 0.708         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 2.953                                       | 2.913         | 2.786              | 2.735           | 2.291                                      | 2.209         | 2.227              | 2.199           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 7.931                                       | 7.605         | 7.653              | 7.576           | 9.072                                      | 8.913         | 8.914              | 8.535           |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 6.936                                       | 7.304         | 7.719              | 8.941           | 12.885                                     | 13.655        | 13.519             | 15.134          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.191         | 0.407              | 1.043           | -  | 0.400         | 0.330              | 1.170           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.055         | 0.026              | 0.023           | -  | 0.009         | 0.060              | 0.021           |

Notes to Table: The table shows out-of-sample results for the investor investing with 20% margin requirement in the 4 factors. The out-of-sample period is from July 1, 1983 to December 31, 2010 for a total of 1,436 weekly returns. For each level of relative risk aversion, the performance of the three copulas are compared to the benchmark normal distribution. The top, middle and bottom panels show the results for relative risk aversion coefficients of 3, 7 and 10 respectively. We report the realized moments of the portfolio returns, the average turnover, as well as the certainly equivalent (CE). The annualized differences in certainty equivalent is the difference between the CE for each model and the normal benchmark multiplied by 52. We also report bootstrap *p*-values testing the significance of the differences in certainty equivalents. We test each of the three alternative models against the normal benchmark.



**Table 5: Out-of-sample Results for Investor with Margin Requirement of 50%**

|  | <i>Panel A: Constant Correlation Models</i> |               |                    |                 | <i>Panel B: Dynamic Correlation Models</i> |               |                    |                 |
|--|---|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|  | Normal Distribution                         | Normal Copula | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula | Normal Distribution                        | Normal Copula | Symmetric t Copula | Skewed t Copula |
| <b>Panel A: <math>\gamma = 3</math></b>        |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 11.759                                      | 11.875        | 11.866             | 11.948          | 11.949                                     | 12.091        | 12.064             | 11.749          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 18.745                                      | 18.655        | 18.726             | 18.648          | 18.354                                     | 18.251        | 18.296             | 17.406          |
| Skewness                                       | - 1.127                                     | - 1.123       | - 1.126            | - 1.154         | - 1.132                                    | - 1.133       | - 1.126            | - 1.256         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 7.439                                       | 7.345         | 7.340              | 7.594           | 7.198                                      | 7.137         | 7.106              | 8.340           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 4.903                                       | 4.827         | 4.810              | 4.812           | 4.684                                      | 4.613         | 4.584              | 5.480           |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 15.729                                      | 16.021        | 15.949             | 16.162          | 16.384                                     | 16.733        | 16.648             | 16.658          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.151         | 0.114              | 0.225           | -  | 0.181         | 0.137              | 0.142           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.050         | 0.103              | 0.012           | -  | 0.040         | 0.119              | 0.269           |
| <b>Panel B: <math>\gamma = 7</math></b>        |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 10.807                                      | 10.799        | 10.854             | 10.885          | 11.357                                     | 11.421        | 11.440             | 11.383          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 13.352                                      | 13.252        | 13.304             | 13.217          | 12.914                                     | 12.758        | 12.815             | 12.116          |
| Skewness                                       | - 1.285                                     | - 1.343       | - 1.264            | - 1.217         | - 0.909                                    | - 0.924       | - 0.913            | - 0.824         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 9.197                                       | 9.617         | 8.688              | 8.113           | 5.139                                      | 4.941         | 4.845              | 6.140           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 5.154                                       | 5.011         | 5.045              | 5.055           | 5.281                                      | 5.205         | 5.212              | 5.562           |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 9.908                                       | 10.031        | 10.093             | 10.323          | 11.869                                     | 12.234        | 12.186             | 13.156          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.064         | 0.096              | 0.216           | -  | 0.190         | 0.165              | 0.670           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.101         | 0.113              | 0.046           | -  | 0.017         | 0.096              | 0.032           |
| <b>Panel C: <math>\gamma = 10</math></b>       |   |               |                    |                 |  |               |                    |                 |
| Annualized mean (%)                            | 10.239                                      | 10.239        | 10.244             | 10.259          | 11.272                                     | 11.327        | 11.342             | 11.383          |
| Annualized volatility (%)                      | 11.071                                      | 10.995        | 11.021             | 10.929          | 10.594                                     | 10.433        | 10.470             | 9.979           |
| Skewness                                       | - 1.179                                     | - 1.215       | - 1.173            | - 1.151         | - 0.836                                    | - 0.846       | - 0.838            | - 0.517         |
| Excess kurtosis                                | 6.606                                       | 6.808         | 6.360              | 6.074           | 4.200                                      | 4.036         | 3.971              | 5.628           |
| Average turnover (%)                           | 4.677                                       | 4.512         | 4.572              | 4.567           | 4.967                                      | 4.838         | 4.856              | 5.055           |
| ( Certainty Equivalent - 1 ) x 10 <sup>4</sup> | 8.390                                       | 8.527         | 8.515              | 8.753           | 11.555                                     | 11.974        | 11.936             | 13.040          |
| Annualized diff. in CE (%)                     | -   | 0.071         | 0.065              | 0.189           | -  | 0.218         | 0.198              | 0.772           |
| <i>p</i> -value                                | -   | 0.091         | 0.216              | 0.061           | -  | 0.003         | 0.042              | 0.043           |

Notes to Table: The table shows out-of-sample results for the investor investing with 50% margin requirement in the 4 factors. The out-of-sample period is from July 1, 1983 to December 31, 2010 for a total of 1,436 weekly returns. For each level of relative risk aversion, the performance of the three copulas are compared to the benchmark normal distribution. The top, middle and bottom panels show the results for relative risk aversion coefficients of 3, 7 and 10 respectively. We report the realized moments of the portfolio returns, the average turnover, as well as the certainly equivalent (CE). The annualized differences in certainty equivalent is the difference between the CE for each model and the normal benchmark multiplied by 52. We also report bootstrap *p*-values testing the significance of the differences in certainty equivalents. We test each of the three alternative models against the normal benchmark.

**Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for Daily and Monthly Factor Returns**


---



---

*Panel A: Daily returns*

|                           | <b>Market</b> | <b>Size</b> | <b>Value</b> | <b>Momentum</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Annualized mean           | 5.32%         | 1.88%       | 4.82%        | 8.20%           |
| Annualized volatility     | 15.62%        | 8.07%       | 7.78%        | 11.14%          |
| Skewness                  | - 0.53        | - 1.21      | 0.08         | - 1.06          |
| Excess Kurtosis           | 17.13         | 27.26       | 8.25         | 16.49           |
| <u>Autocorrelations</u>   |               |             |              |                 |
| First-order               | 6.87%         | 5.24%       | 16.54%       | 23.04%          |
| Second-order              | - 3.31%       | 2.40%       | 3.35%        | 5.83%           |
| Third-order               | 1.64%         | 4.19%       | 2.47%        | 3.81%           |
| <u>Cross Correlations</u> |               |             |              |                 |
| Market                    | -             | -17.97%     | -30.52%      | -12.55%         |
| Size                      | -             | -           | - 4.88%      | 6.76%           |
| Value                     | -             | -           | -            | -19.07%         |

*Panel B: Monthly returns*

|                           | <b>Market</b> | <b>Size</b> | <b>Value</b> | <b>Momentum</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Annualized mean           | 5.35%         | 3.25%       | 4.80%        | 8.61%           |
| Annualized volatility     | 15.71%        | 11.00%      | 10.19%       | 15.06%          |
| Skewness                  | - 0.56        | 0.53        | - 0.02       | - 1.43          |
| Excess Kurtosis           | 1.99          | 5.56        | 2.43         | 10.81           |
| <u>Autocorrelations</u>   |               |             |              |                 |
| First-order               | 8.96%         | 5.86%       | 15.61%       | 6.27%           |
| Second-order              | - 3.68%       | 3.87%       | 3.67%        | - 6.39%         |
| Third-order               | 2.25%         | - 8.20%     | 3.90%        | 1.68%           |
| <u>Cross Correlations</u> |               |             |              |                 |
| Market                    | -             | 30.67%      | -30.38%      | -12.57%         |
| Size                      | -             | -           | -23.52%      | - 0.30%         |
| Value                     | -             | -           | -            | -15.97%         |

---

Notes to Table: We report descriptive statistics for daily returns in Panel A and for monthly returns in Panel B from July 1963 to December 2010.

# Research Papers 2011



- 2011-30: Stefano Grassi and Tommaso Proietti: Stochastic trends and seasonality in economic time
- 2011-31: Rasmus Tangsgaard Varneskov: Generalized Flat-Top Realized Kernel Estimation of Ex-Post Variation of Asset
- 2011-32: Christian Bach: Conservatism in Corporate Valuation
- 2011-33: Adrian Pagan and Don Harding: Econometric Analysis and Prediction of Recurrent Events
- 2011-34: Lars Stentoft: American Option Pricing with Discrete and Continuous Time Models: An Empirical Comparison
- 2011-35: Rasmus Tangsgaard Varneskov: Flat-Top Realized Kernel Estimation of Quadratic Covariation with Non-Synchronous and Noisy Asset Prices
- 2011-36: David F. Hendry and Søren Johansen: The Properties of Model Selection when Retaining Theory Variables
- 2011-37: Torben G. Andersen, Tim Bollerslev, Peter F. Christoffersen and Francis X. Diebold: Financial Risk Measurement for Financial Risk Management
- 2011-38: Malene Kallestrup-Lamb: The Role of the Spouse in Early Retirement Decisions for Older Workers
- 2011-39: Torben Schmith, Søren Johansen and Peter Thejll: Statistical analysis of global surface air temperature and sea level using cointegration methods
- 2011-40: Søren Johansen and Bent Nielsen: Asymptotic theory for iterated one-step Huber-skip estimators
- 2011-41: Luc Bauwens, Arnaud Dufays and Jeroen V.K. Rombouts: Marginal Likelihood for Markov-switching and Change-point Garch Models
- 2011-42: Manuel Lukas: Utility-based Forecast Evaluation with Multiple Decision Rules and a New Maxmin Rule
- 2011-43: Peter Christoffersen, Ruslan Goyenko, Kris Jacobs, Mehdi Karoui: Illiquidity Premia in the Equity Options Market
- 2011-44: Diego Amaya, Peter Christoffersen, Kris Jacobs and Aurelio Vasquez: Do Realized Skewness and Kurtosis Predict the Cross-Section of Equity Returns?
- 2011-45: Peter Christoffersen and Hugues Langlois: The Joint Dynamics of Equity Market Factors