
A Framework for Exploring the Macroeconomic Determinants of Systematic Risk

Author(s): Torben G. Andersen, Tim Bollerslev, Francis X. Diebold and Jin (Ginger) Wu

Source: *The American Economic Review*, May, 2005, Vol. 95, No. 2, Papers and Proceedings of the One Hundred Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, Philadelphia, PA, January 7-9, 2005 (May, 2005), pp. 398-404

Published by: American Economic Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4132855>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/4132855?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Economic Review*

JSTOR

A Framework for Exploring the Macroeconomic Determinants of Systematic Risk

By TORBEN G. ANDERSEN, TIM BOLLERSLEV, FRANCIS X. DIEBOLD, AND JIN (GINGER) WU*

The increasing availability of high-frequency asset return data has had a fundamental impact on empirical financial economics, focusing attention on asset return volatility and correlation dynamics, with key applications in portfolio and risk management. So-called “realized” volatilities and correlations have featured prominently in the recent literature, and numerous studies have provided direct characterizations of the unconditional and conditional distributions of realized volatilities and correlations across different assets, asset classes, countries, and sample periods. For overviews see Andersen et al. (2005a, b).

In this paper we selectively survey, unify and extend that literature. Rather than focusing exclusively on characterization of the properties of realized volatility, we progress by examining economically interesting *functions* of realized volatility, namely, realized betas for equity portfolios, relating them both to their underlying realized variance and covariance parts and to underlying macroeconomic fundamentals.

[†] *Discussant*: Michael Brandt, Duke University.

* Andersen: Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208; Bollerslev: Duke University, Durham, NC 27708; Diebold and Wu: University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104. We thank the National Science Foundation for research support, and Boragan Aruoba, Paul Labys, and Heiko Ebers for useful conversations and productive research collaboration. Finally, we acknowledge discussions with Eric Ghysels, who drew our attention to related ongoing work in Ghysels and Jacquier (2005).

I. Realized Volatility

Let the $N \times 1$ logarithmic vector price process, p_t , follow a multivariate continuous-time stochastic volatility diffusion,

$$(1) \quad dp_t = \mu_t dt + \Omega_t dW_t$$

where W_t denotes a standard N -dimensional Brownian motion, both the $N \times N$ positive definite diffusion matrix, Ω_t , and the N -dimensional instantaneous drift, μ_t , are strictly stationary and jointly independent of W_t (extensions to allow for leverage effects, or nonzero correlations between W_t and Ω_t , and/or jumps in the price process could in principle be incorporated as well). Also, suppose that the N th element of p_t contains the log price of the market, and the i th element of p_t contains the log price of the i th individual stock, so that the corresponding covariance matrix contains both the market variance, say, $\sigma_{M,t}^2 = \Omega_{(NN),t}$, and the individual equity covariance with the market, say, $\sigma_{iM,t} = \Omega_{(iN),t}$.

Conditional on the realized sample paths of μ_t and Ω_t , the distribution of the continuously compounded h -period return, $r_{t+h,h} \equiv p_{t+h} - p_t$, is then

$$(2) \quad r_{t+h,h} | \sigma\{\mu_{t+\tau}, \Omega_{t+\tau}\}_{\tau=0}^h \sim N\left(\int_0^h \mu_{t+\tau} d\tau, \int_0^h \Omega_{t+\tau} d\tau\right)$$

where $\sigma\{\mu_{t+\tau}, \Omega_{t+\tau}\}_{\tau=0}^h$ denotes the σ -field generated by the sample paths of $\mu_{t+\tau}$ and $\Omega_{t+\tau}$

for $0 \leq \tau \leq h$. The integrated diffusion matrix $\int_0^h \Omega_{t+\tau} d\tau$ therefore provides a natural measure of the true latent h -period volatility. Under weak regularity conditions, it follows from the theory of quadratic variation that

$$(3) \quad \sum_{j=1, \dots, [h/\Delta]} r_{t+j\Delta, \Delta} \cdot r'_{t+j\Delta, \Delta} - \int_0^h \Omega_{t+\tau} d\tau \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely (a.s.) for all t as the return sampling frequency increases ($\Delta \rightarrow 0$). Thus, by using sufficiently finely sampled high-frequency returns, it is possible in theory to construct a *realized* diffusion matrix that is arbitrarily close to the integrated diffusion matrix (for a survey of the relevant theory, see Andersen et al. [2005c]). In practice, market microstructure frictions limits the highest feasible sampling frequency ($\Delta \geq \delta > 0$), and the best way to deal with this, whether using the simple estimator in (3) or some variant thereof, is currently a very active area of research.

Meanwhile, key empirical findings for realized volatility include lognormality and long memory of volatilities and correlations (Andersen et al., 2001a, b), as well as normality of returns standardized by realized volatility (Andersen et al., 2000). Those properties, as distilled in the lognormal/normal mixture model of Andersen et al. (2003), have important implications for risk management and asset allocation.

II. Realized Beta and Its Components

Although characterizations of the properties of realized variances and covariances are of interest, alternative objects are often of greater economic significance with a leading example being the market beta of a portfolio. If either the market volatility or its covariance with portfolio returns is time-varying, then the portfolio beta will generally be time-varying. Hence it is clearly of interest to explore the links between time-varying volatilities, time-varying correlations, and time-varying betas. One may construct realized betas from underlying realized

covariance and variance components, or conversely, decompose realized betas into realized variance and covariance components.

Armed with the relevant realized market variance and realized covariance measures, we can readily define and empirically construct “realized betas.” Using an initial subscript to indicate the corresponding element of a vector, we denote the realized market volatility by

$$(4) \quad \hat{v}_{M,t,t+h}^2 = \sum_{j=1, \dots, [h/\Delta]} r_{(M),t+j\Delta, \Delta}^2$$

and the realized covariance between the market and the i th portfolio return by

$$(5) \quad \hat{v}_{iM,t,t+h} = \sum_{j=1, \dots, [h/\Delta]} r_{(i),t+j\Delta, \Delta} \cdot r_{(N),t+j\Delta, \Delta}$$

Now defining the realized beta as the ratio between the two, it follows under the assumptions above that

$$(6) \quad \hat{\beta}_{i,t,t+h} \equiv \frac{\hat{v}_{iM,t,t+h}}{\hat{v}_{M,t,t+h}^2} \rightarrow \beta_{i,t,t+h} \equiv \frac{\int_0^h \Omega_{(iN),t+\tau} d\tau}{\int_0^h \Omega_{(NN),t+\tau} d\tau}$$

a.s. for all t as $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, so that realized beta is consistent for the corresponding true integrated beta.

By comparing the properties of directly measured betas to those of directly measured variances and covariances, we can decompose movements in betas in informative ways. In particular, because the long memory in underlying variances and covariances may be common, it is possible that betas may be only weakly persistent (short-memory, $I(d)$, with $d \approx 0$), despite the widespread finding that realized variances and covariances are long-memory (fractionally integrated, $I(d)$, with $d \approx 0.4$). Recent work (Andersen et al., 2005d) indicates that the relevant realized variances and covariances are indeed reasonably well-characterized as nonlinearly fractionally cointegrated in this fashion (as beta is an a priori known ratio of the two measures).

III. A State-Space Framework Facilitating the Inclusion of Macroeconomic Fundamentals

Although the decomposition of realized betas into contributions from underlying variances and covariances is intriguing, a more thorough economic analysis would seek to identify the fundamental determinants of realized variances and covariances that impact realized betas. Here we take some steps in that direction, directly allowing for dependence of betas on underlying macroeconomic fundamentals.

First, in parallel to the volatility model in Ole Barndorff-Nielsen and Neil Shephard (2002), the time-varying integrated/realized beta may be conveniently cast in state-space form. The realized beta equals the true latent integrated beta, plus a weak white-noise measurement error, asymptotically Gaussian in the sampling frequency ($\Delta \rightarrow 0$). Normalizing $h \equiv 1$ and suppressing the subscripts:

$$(7a) \quad \hat{\beta}_t = \beta_t + u_t.$$

We can easily allow for dynamics in β_t , as exemplified by the first-order autoregressive representation

$$(7b) \quad \beta_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \beta_{t-1} + v_t$$

where v_t is weak white noise. We therefore have a state space system, with measurement equation (7a) and transition equation (7b), so that the Kalman filter may be used for extraction and prediction of the latent integrated β_t based on the observed $\hat{\beta}_t$ (a more refined approach in which the nonconstant variance of u_t is equated to the asymptotic, for $\Delta \rightarrow 0$, expression in Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard [2004] could also be applied). Note, that the system in (7) is distinctly different from the one in which the measurement equation is replaced by a conditional capital asset pricing model (CAPM), $r_t = \alpha + \beta_t r_{M,t} + \varepsilon_t$ (see e.g., Andrew Ang and Joseph Chen, 2004; Gergana Jostova and Alexander Philipov, 2005) (for an alternative intra-day-based beta estimation procedure, see e.g., Qianqiu Liu [2003]). The *smoothed* version of β_t extracted by the Kalman filter from (7) in particular, should compare favorably to

the standard practice of assuming that the sampling frequency is so high that $\hat{\beta}_t$ is effectively indistinguishable from β_t , or $u_t \approx 0$ (see also Dean Foster and Dan Nelson [1996], who argue for smoothing of realized betas, from a very different and complementary perspective).

Second, note that we may readily include macroeconomic fundamentals in the state space dynamics, by augmenting the state vector as in the system:

$$(8a) \quad \hat{\beta}_t = z' B_t + u_t$$

$$(8b) \quad B_t = \Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1 B_{t-1} + v_t$$

where $z' \equiv (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $u_t \sim (0, \sigma_u^2)$, Γ_0 is a vector of intercepts, Γ_1 is a matrix of coefficients, $B_t' \equiv (\beta_t, x_t)$, x_t is a column vector of macroeconomic variables, and $v_t \sim (0, \Sigma)$ is a vector of transition disturbances. The vector autoregressive transition equation (8b) permits interaction between beta and macroeconomic fundamentals, both dynamically (via Γ_1) and contemporaneously (via the covariances in Σ). For illustration, in this paper, we only explore macroeconomic indicators one at a time, under an assumption of recursive transition dynamics. That is, letting $\Sigma = \text{diag}(\sigma_{v1}^2, \sigma_{v2}^2)$, we estimate the system

$$(9a) \quad \hat{\beta}_t = \beta_t + u_t$$

$$(9b)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \beta_t \\ x_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{01} \\ \gamma_{02} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{11} & \gamma_{12} \\ 0 & \gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{t-1} \\ x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} v_{1t} \\ v_{2t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For simplicity, we further assume homoscedastic measurement errors for monthly realized betas. This is clearly not true for daily data, but a more palatable approximation at the monthly level that is relevant for the analysis below. It follows that inference based on the standard Kalman filter is valid.

IV. An Illustrative Application

We use underlying 15-minute returns for individual NYSE-listed stocks and the value-weighted market portfolio. We construct all returns from the TAQ dataset, 1 February 1993–31




FIGURE 1. SMOOTHED EXTRACTIONS OF MARKET BETAS, FEBRUARY 1993–MAY 2003

May 2003, excluding real estate investment trusts, stocks of companies incorporated outside the United States, and closed-end mutual funds. Next, we sort the firms into 25 portfolios, corresponding to various combinations of the five market capitalization (“size”) and five book-to-market (“value”) quintiles, month-by-month, rebalancing each month. We denote the 25 portfolios by ij , for $i, j = 1, \dots, 5$, where i refers to size quintile and j refers to value quintile (from low to high). Finally, for each of the 25 portfolios, we use the 15-minute portfolio and market returns to construct monthly realized covariances of each portfolio return with the market return, the realized variance of the market return, and the ratio, or “realized beta.” To adjust for asynchronous trading, we use an equally weighted average of contemporaneous realized beta and four leads and lags.

In Figure 1, we show extractions of the latent integrated betas obtained using the Kalman smoother. Substantial and highly-persistent time variation is evident for all the realized betas, but they do not appear to be trending or

otherwise nonstationary; instead reverting to fixed means. We have also shaded the March–November 2001 recession for visual reference. Looking across the columns from low- to high-value portfolios, the betas for many portfolios appear to increase substantially during and around the recession, and the high-value portfolio betas seem to be more responsive over the cycle.

We now assess these graphically motivated conjectures more rigorously by estimating the time-varying beta model in (9) explicitly allowing for macroeconomic influences. In Andersen et al. (2005e), we study all 25 portfolios and several macroeconomic indicators, alone and in combination, including industrial production, the term premium, the default premium, the consumption/wealth ratio, the consumer price index, and the consumer confidence index. Here we merely sketch some illustrative results, focusing on representative large-capitalization portfolios 51, 53, and 55, and a central macroeconomic indicator, industrial production growth (IP).

TABLE 1—PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR MODEL (10)

Parameter	Portfolio51		Portfolio53		Portfolio55	
	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE	Coef.	SE
γ_{01}	0.092*	0.036	0.032	0.028	0.042*	0.020
γ_{02}	0.002**	0.0005	0.002**	0.0005	0.002**	0.0005
γ_{11}	0.915**	0.031	0.971**	0.034	0.971**	0.024
γ_{12}	0.920	1.114	-3.486 [†]	2.156	-6.101**	1.706
γ_{22}	0.191*	0.088	0.191*	0.088	0.191*	0.088

[†] Statistically significant at the 10-percent level.

* Statistically significant at the 5-percent level.

** Statistically significant at the 1-percent level.

We display the estimation results in Table 1. The β own-lag coefficients γ_{11} indicate substantial own persistence, while the IP own-lag coefficients γ_{22} are obviously much smaller. This is natural as the IP variable is a growth rate (change in logarithm). The key macro-finance interaction coefficient, γ_{12} , summarizes the response of β_t to movements in IP_{t-1} . Interestingly, and in keeping with our earlier conjecture, both the statistical and economic significance of the estimates of γ_{12} increase with value, as measured by book-to-market. For portfolio 51, the point estimate of γ_{12} is near zero and statistically insignificant at any conventional level, while for portfolio 53, the point estimate is substantially larger in magnitude (-3.4) and significant at the 10-percent level. For portfolio 55, the point estimate is statistically significant at the 1-percent level, and quite large at -6.1, implying that an additional percentage point of IP_{t-1} growth produces a -0.061 decrease in $\beta_{55,t}$. Hence as IP_{t-1} varies over the cycle from, say, -0.05 to +0.05, $\beta_{55,t}$ will move substantially.

Impulse response functions provide a more complete distillation of the dynamic response patterns. Although the recursive structure automatically identifies the vector autoregression (10b), we still normalize by the Cholesky factor of Σ to express all shocks in standard deviation units. We report results in Figure 2. In parallel with the impact estimates in Table 1, the beta for the growth portfolio 51 shows no dynamic response, but as we move upward through the value spectrum, we find progressively larger effects, with positive IP_{t-1} shocks producing sharp decreases in β_t , followed by very slow reversion to the mean. These are, of course, only partial effects, and a more complete anal-




FIGURE 2. IMPULSE RESPONSE FUNCTIONS

ysis would have to jointly consider the influence of other business cycle variables as in (8a,b).

V. Concluding Remarks

There is an emerging empirical consensus that expected excess returns are countercyclical, not only for stocks, as in Martin Lettau

and Sydney Ludvigson (2001a), but also for bonds, as in John H. Cochrane and Monika Piazzesi (2005)—whether because risk is higher in recessions, as in George M. Constantinides and Darrell Duffie (1996), or because risk aversion is higher in recessions, as in John Campbell and Cochrane (1999). The preliminary results reported here indicate that equity market betas do indeed vary with macroeconomic indicators such as industrial production growth, and that the macroeconomic effects on expected returns are large enough to be economically important. Moreover, the preliminary results strongly indicate that the counter-cyclicality of beta is primarily a value stock phenomenon, suggesting that the well-documented and much-debated value premium (see also Ravi Jagannathan and Zhenyu Wang, 1996; Lettau and Ludvigson, 2001b; Ang and Jun Liu, 2005; Jonathan Lewellen and Stefan Nagel, 2005; Ralitsa Petkova and Lu Zhang, 2005) may at least in part be explained by an increase in expected returns for value stocks during bad economic times.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Christoffersen, Peter F. and Diebold, Francis X.** “Practical Volatility and Correlation Modeling for Financial Market Risk Management,” in M. Carey and R. Stulz, eds., *Risks of financial institutions*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005a (forthcoming).
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Christoffersen, Peter F. and Diebold, Francis X.** “Volatility Forecasting,” in G. Elliott, C. W. J. Granger, and A. Timmermann, eds., *Handbook of economic forecasting*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 2005b (forthcoming).
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim and Diebold, Francis X.** “Parametric and Nonparametric Volatility Measurement,” in L. P. Hansen and Y. Ait-Sahalia, eds., *Handbook of financial econometrics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 2005c (forthcoming).
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Ebens, Heiko.** “The Distribution of Realized Stock Return Volatility.” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2001a, 61(1), pp. 43–76.
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Labys, Paul.** “Exchange Rate Returns Standardized by Realized Volatility are (Nearly) Gaussian.” *Multinational Finance Journal*, 2000, 4(3/4), pp. 159–79.
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Labys, Paul.** “The Distribution of Realized Exchange Rate Volatility.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2001b, 96(453), pp. 42–55.
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Labys, Paul.** “Modeling and Forecasting Realized Volatility.” *Econometrica*, 2003, 71(2), pp. 579–626.
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Wu, Ginger.** “Realized Beta: Persistence and Predictability,” in T. Fomby, ed., *Advances in econometrics: econometric analysis of economic and financial time series*. Oxford, U.K.: Elsevier Science, 2005d (forthcoming).
- Andersen, Torben G.; Bollerslev, Tim; Diebold, Francis X. and Wu, Ginger.** “Betas and the Macroeconomy.” Working paper, Northwestern University, 2005e.
- Ang, Andrew and Chen, Joseph.** “CAPM over the Long-Run: 1926–2001.” Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, November 2004.
- Ang, Andrew and Liu, Jun.** “How to Discount Cashflows with Time-Varying Expected Returns.” *Journal of Finance*, 2004, 59(6), pp. 2745–83.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, Ole E. and Shephard, Neil.** “Econometric Analysis of Realized Volatility and its Use in Estimating Stochastic Volatility Models.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 2002, 64(2), pp. 253–80.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, Ole E. and Shephard, Neil.** “Econometric Analysis of Realized Covariation: High Frequency Covariance, Regression and Correlation in Financial Economics.” *Econometrica*, May 2004, 72(3), pp. 885–925.
- Campbell, John Y. and Cochrane, John H.** “By Force of Habit: A Consumption-Based Explanation of Aggregate Stock Market Behavior.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1999, 107(2), pp. 205–51.
- Cochrane, John M. and Piazzesi, Monika.** “Bond Risk Premia.” *American Economic Review*, March 2005, 95(1), pp. 138–60.

- Constantinides, George M. and Duffie, Darrell.** "Asset Pricing with Heterogeneous Consumers." *Journal of Political Economy*, 1996, 104(2), pp. 219–40.
- Foster, Dean P. and Nelson, Dan B.** "Continuous Record Asymptotics for Rolling Sample Estimators." *Econometrica*, 1996, 64(1), pp. 139–74.
- Ghysels, Eric and Jacquier, Eric.** "Market Beta Dynamics and Portfolio Efficiency." Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina, January 2005.
- Jagannathan, Ravi and Wang, Zhenyu.** "The Conditional CAPM and the Cross-Section of Stock Returns." *Journal of Finance*, 1996, 51(1), pp. 3–53.
- Jostova, Gergana and Philipov, Alexander.** "Bayesian Analysis of Stochastic Betas." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 2005 (forthcoming).
- Lettau, Martin and Ludvigson, Sydney.** "Consumption, Aggregate Wealth, and Expected Stock Returns." *Journal of Finance*, 2001a, 56(3), pp. 815–49.
- Lettau, Martin and Ludvigson, Sydney.** "Resurrecting the (C)CAPM: A Cross Sectional Test When Risk Premia Are Time-Varying." *Journal of Political Economy*, 2001b, 109(6), pp. 1238–87.
- Lewellen, Jonathan and Nagel, Stefan.** "The Conditional CAPM Does Not Explain Asset Pricing Anomalies." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2005 (forthcoming).
- Liu, Qianqiu.** "Estimating Betas from High-Frequency Data." Unpublished manuscript, Northwestern University, June 2003.
- Petkova, Ralitsa and Zhang, Lu.** "Is Value Riskier Than Growth?" *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2005 (forthcoming).