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Overview

- Background
  - Various types of financial risk
  - Avoiding some of these risks, or at least deciding if the risk is one worth taking

- Statistical issues
  - Multiplicity
  - Transformations to obtain “independence”
  - Orthogonality
  - Robust tests

- Examples
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Clearly Risky Time to Invest

- Financial risks are much more apparent now than several years ago.

![Graph showing the value of $100 investment over years from 2000 to 2010 for Case-Shiller Housing and Total Stock Market. The graph indicates a rising trend for both investments with fluctuations.](image)
Corporate Bonds Risky Too

- Default rates
  - Junk bonds frequently default.
  - Never seen an Aaa immediately fail.
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Credit Spreads

- Lower ratings mean higher credit spreads
- Evident recent increase anticipates increase in default rates?

Why not zero?
Many Types of Financial Risk

- Default risk
- Credit risk
- Settlement risk
- Liquidity risk

- Variety of other types of risk beyond default
  - Correlation risk
  - Regulatory risk
  - Reputation risk
  - Operational risk
  - Systemic risk, market risk
  - Specific risk, idiosyncratic risk
  - Model risk

- Focus on a particular problem...
Should I invest in an asset?

- Stocks in general?
  - Take perspective that investors are not so risk averse that the answer to this is yes.

- Buy specific stocks?
  - Berkshire-Hathaway
  - Exxon

- Rely on a special investment strategy?
  - TEAM
  - Bob Fund
  - Details of these in the accompanying paper
Formulating an Answer

- Multiplicity
  - How many assets have you looked at in order to find one that “looks good”?

- Independence (or close to it)
  - Returns answer the important question “What have you done for me lately?”

- Orthogonality, regression, and CAPM
  - Risk-free rates
  - Market risk vs idiosyncratic risk

- Robust test using martingale (CERT)
  - Unrealized volatility
  - Distributional assumptions
Cumulative Performance

- Value of $1 initially invested in 1980 and reinvested

Convincing going forward?
Returns

Sequence of “bets” that appear nearly independent, but correlation remains between assets.

\[ R_t = \frac{(P_t - P_{t-1})}{P_{t-1}} \]

risk = variation in returns
Capital Asset Pricing Model

- Model describes some properties of returns
- Linear equation
  - Regress returns on asset on returns on market
    \[ R_t - r_f = \alpha + \beta (M_t - r_f) + \epsilon_t \]
  - \( r_f \) = risk-free rate, \( M_t \) = market return
  - \( \alpha = 0 \)
- Orthogonal
  - Divide risk into systemic and specific components
  - Intrinsic returns uncorrelated with market
    \[ (R_t - r_f) - \beta (M_t - r_f) = \alpha + \epsilon_t \]
- If \( \alpha \neq 0 \)?
  - Intrinsic variation of asset has non-zero mean
  - Buy (or sell) some amount of it.
CAPM Regressions

Correlation with market (systematic risk) explains much of the dependence

\[ M_t - r_f = \text{market excess return} \]
CAPM Residuals

Residuals need not look “well-suited” for the usual tests of regression parameters.
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Testing Alpha

- Example: Exxon
- Regress out market risk, obtaining estimates of α and β.
  - beta = 0.56
  - alpha = 0.0062
- Test H₀: α = 0
- Standard procedure relies on t-distribution to obtain p-value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>0.5623</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>estimate of alpha</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exxon</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>-0.0008</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you believe these results?
Testing Alpha

- Standard test procedure
  - Regress out the market
  - Test $H_0: \alpha = 0$ using regression estimates

- Model risk
  - Doubts about standard test.
  - What’s the distribution of the t-statistic?
    Some investments produce returns that are far from Gaussian, with large outliers (fat tails)
  - Evident lack of independence in CAPM residuals
  - ARCH processes

- Nonetheless want a p-value
Martingale Test for Alpha

- Intrinsic returns after removing market
  \[ w_t = (R_t - r_f) - \beta (M_t - r_f) = \alpha + \varepsilon_t \]

- Null hypothesis \( H_0: \alpha = 0 \)
  - Implies does not “beat the market”
  - Assume \( E(w_t | w_{t-1}, w_{t-2}, \ldots) = 0 \)

- Compound returns are non-negative martingale
  \[ C_t = (1+w_1)(1+w_2)\ldots(1+w_t) \quad t = 1,2,\ldots,n \]

- CERT p-value from Doob’s inequality
  \[ P(\max C_1,\ldots,C_n \geq \gamma) \leq 1/\gamma \]

- Easy to use
  To reject \( H_0 \) at 0.05 level, compound returns have to exceed 20 during observed period
Example

- “Residual” returns for Exxon,
  \[(R_t - r_f) - b (M_t - r_f)\]

- Since the martingale test does not depend on \(n\), we can use finely spaced data that essentially reveal \(\beta\) (if you believe it’s fixed!)
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CERT Results

Only Berkshire Hathaway rejects the null, and then we have to consider multiplicity.
Discussion

Multiplicity
A p-value of 1/20 does not overcome adjustments for multiplicity.

Bonferroni p-value
Multiply the p-value from martingale test by number of assets considered.
I bet that you have considered more than 4.

Power
The test is “tight” in the sense that there are processes you would not want to consider for which it gets the right answer.
Bob Fund

- How do you guarantee 2% above benchmark returns?

- Unobserved volatility
  - $R_t = 1/k$ w.p. $k/(k+1)$
  - $R_t = -1$ w.p. $1/(k+1)$ busted
  - $E(R_t) = 0$

- Example
  - $k = 49$, so returns a bit more than 2% growth
  - Smaller $k$ give more exciting performance

- Similar “unacceptable” funds obtain CERT bound
  - $P(\max C_t > 20) = 1/20$

- Martingale test protects against the “until it happens” unobserved volatility
Summary

- Principles
  - Focus on returns, not cumulative value
  - Remove market performance
    Regress out market from returns
  - Adjust for multiplicity
    Bonferroni does fine, particularly since it’s so hard to “count” the considered alternatives

- Use martingale test (CERT) to adjust for hidden volatility and avoid model risk.

Thanks!
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