

**The CAPM with Human Capital:
Evidence from Japan**

Ravi Jagannathan, Keiichi Kubota & Hitoshi Takehara

Working Paper No. 106

Ravi Jagannathan
University of Minnesota
& Hong Kong University of Science & Technology

Keiichi Kubota
Musashi University

Hitoshi Takehara
University of Tsukuba

This paper was presented at the conference *Emerging Trends in Japanese Financial Markets* held at Columbia University on December 8-9, 1995. The conference was sponsored by the Center on Japanese Economy and Business and organized by Professor Yasushi Hamao

**Working Paper Series
Center on Japanese Economy and Business
Graduate School of Business
Columbia University
February 1996**

Preliminary
Please do not quote

The CAPM with Human Capital: Evidence from Japan¹

Ravi Jagannathan
University of Minnesota and
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Keiichi Kubota
Musashi University

Hitoshi Takehara
University of Tsukuba

¹ Please do not quote without the authors' permission. This is a preliminary draft describing work in progress. We benefited from discussions with Murray Frank. All errors are our own. Ravi Jagannathan gratefully acknowledges financial support from the National Science Foundation (grant SBR-9409824).

Abstract

We find that the CAPM beta has little ability to explain the cross section of average returns on Japanese stocks when the TOPIX return is used as the proxy for the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio. The relation between average return and beta is flat, with an R-Square of less than 3%. The empirical performance of the CAPM improves substantially if a measure of the return on human capital is also included when measuring the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio -- the R-Square rises to 75%. There is little evidence against the CAPM specification with this modification. It performs almost as well as the linear factor model which, following Fama and French, uses the TOPIX return and the payoffs on portfolios that capture the size and book to price effects found in the data as the three factors.

1. INTRODUCTION

A substantial part of the research effort in finance is directed towards improving our understanding of how investors value financial assets. A number of asset pricing models have been proposed in the literature. The Sharpe-Lintner-Black Capital Asset Pricing Model¹ (CAPM) is probably viewed as the most important of these models. According to the CAPM, in equilibrium, the expected return on any asset is a linear function of its *beta*, where *beta* is the sensitivity of the return on the asset to the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio of all agents in the economy. Over the past twenty years a number of empirical studies have examined the CAPM using return data on stocks traded in exchanges in the U.S.A. These studies find that when the return on the value weighted index of stocks is used as a proxy for the return on the market portfolio of all assets in the economy, there is little empirical support for the CAPM.

The general reaction to the lack of empirical support for the CAPM has been to focus on alternative asset pricing models. Several asset pricing models have been proposed in the literature. These models can be classified into three classes: (a) linear factor models which owe their origin to Ross (1976); (b) dynamic versions of the CAPM that owe their origin to Merton (1973); and (c) consumption based intertemporal asset pricing models that owe their origin to Breeden (1977) and Lucas² (1978). The empirical support for the consumption based models has been equally weak³. The support for the linear factor models and the dynamic version of the CAPM has been more promising⁴. The relatively more successful empirical implementations of the dynamic CAPM and the linear factor models use technical or macro-economic variables identified using prior analysis of the data as the state variables or factors. Prominent among this class of models is the three factor model proposed by Fama and French (1993) which uses two technical variables as factors, in addition to the return on the stock index portfolio. The two technical factors were designed by Fama and French (1993) to capture the well documented size and book to price effects found in the data⁵.

In contrast, in this article, we explore whether the lack of empirical support for the CAPM may be due to the inappropriateness of the auxiliary assumptions that had been made to facilitate the empirical analysis of the CAPM. In order to empirically examine the CAPM, it is necessary to measure the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio of all agents in the economy. In empirical studies of the CAPM it is generally assumed that the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio is a linear function of the return on some portfolio of actively traded stocks. Following Mayers (1972), we take the stand that it is important to include human capital when empirically examining the CAPM. The reason we do this is because human capital probably forms over two third of the total wealth in most developed countries in the world. The importance of human capital is also illustrated by the observation that the better educated persons tend to earn relatively more [see Becker⁶ (1993)]. We assume that the growth rate in aggregate per capita labor income is a measure of the return on human capital, as in Jagannathan and Wang (1993). The CAPM, with this assumption leads to a two beta model -- one of the betas is computed using the return on the stock index portfolio and the other using the growth rate in aggregate per capita income.

Like all models, the CAPM too is only an approximation of reality. Hence, to examine how well it performs, it is necessary to compare its performance against a reasonable bench mark. In view of its recent empirical success, we use the 3 factor linear beta pricing model proposed by Fama and French (1993) as the bench mark. The two technical factors identified by Fama and French (1993) can also be justified on theoretical grounds. However, these theoretical arguments suggest that these two factors may be able to explain the cross section of expected returns on stocks even when the expected return differentials arise for no fundamental reasons and reflect mispricing or fads⁷.

In our empirical analysis we use data for Japan. Our interest in Japan comes from the following observation. Since our objective is to examine the extent to which the performance of the CAPM can be improved by including the return on human capital while measuring the return on aggregate wealth, we need to pick a country where investment in human capital played a key role in its economic development. As Becker (1993) observes, the investment in human capital that has taken place, and the resultant increase in scientific knowledge and technical skills, probably explains the sustained spectacular growth in per capita income in Japan, United States and many western European countries during this century. Japan is the second largest economy in this list (and in the world) with a per capita GNP that surpasses that of the USA⁸. Although the Japanese equity market is second only to the USA in size⁹, there has been relatively fewer studies examining the cross section of average returns on Japanese stocks when compared to those that use data for the USA. Hence, if we were to find empirical support for the CAPM specification with human capital, using Japanese data, it would be difficult to attribute the findings to "data snooping"¹⁰.

One of the earliest studies that used Japanese data was by Maru and Yonezawa (1984). They used the Fama and MacBeth (1974) methodology and monthly returns data from 1953 to 1981 for stocks traded in the Tokyo Stock Exchange (TSE). They found that beta as well as idiosyncratic risk mattered in explaining the cross section of average returns on stocks. For smaller firms, idiosyncratic risk was relatively more important, i.e., the data did not support the CAPM. They conjectured that this may be evidence in support of the view that investors, for some reason, were not holding well diversified portfolios. Chan, Hamao and Lakonishok (1991), using data for the period July 1971 to December 1988 found that, in addition to betas, cash flow yield and the ratio of book value to market value of equity were helpful in explaining the cross section of average returns on stocks -- which can be viewed as additional evidence against the CAPM. Kubota and Takehara (1995a) examined the ability of the CAPM to explain the cross section of average returns on 100 portfolios of stocks traded in the first section of the TSE where the portfolios were constructed using the procedure described in Fama and French (1992). Using data for the period 1981-93 they found that the relation between average return and beta is flat -- but Book to Price Ratio and Log Size explained the cross section of average returns rather well.

To summarize, the consensus appears to be that the data do not support the CAPM when the return on the index portfolio of stocks traded in the Tokyo Stock Exchange (TOPIX) is used as the proxy for the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio for Japan. The data appear to favor the linear multi-beta models,

which is similar to the findings for the USA. For example, Elton and Gruber (1988) using factor analytic methods found empirical support for a four factor model whereas Sakuraba (1987)¹¹ found that even seven factors may not be enough to explain the cross section of stock returns. Hamao (1988) used monthly return data on the first section of TSE stocks for the period January 1975 to December 1984 and found that the CAPM beta does not explain what is left unexplained by betas computed with respect to Japanese macro economic variables. Kubota and Takehara (1995b) sort stocks based on size, book to price ratio, leverage and earnings to price ratio. They then form "factors" that capture these effects by taking the return differential between portfolios in the highest and lowest deciles for each of the four attributes. They find that a linear combination of the book to price factor and the size spread factor betas help in explaining the cross section of average returns across the 100 size-beta sorted portfolios.

As we argued earlier, one interpretation of this lack of empirical support for the CAPM is that the stock index portfolio is probably a poor proxy for the aggregate wealth portfolio. There are some a priori reasons to suspect that this may indeed be the case, i.e., the return on the index portfolio of stocks traded in Japan may be a poor proxy for the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio in Japan. For example, the total value of all financial assets in Japan at the end of 1991 was ¥3,804,276 billion. Of this ¥586,500 billion (15%) was stocks of corporations. Hence, stocks formed less than a sixth of the total value of all financial assets. Even when stocks form only a small fraction of the total assets, they can be an excellent proxy if the return on the stock index portfolio is very highly correlated with the return on the index portfolio of all other assets in the economy. This will be the case if, for example, stocks bear most of the residual risk from the aggregate cash flow in the economy -- which is unlikely to be true. In Japan, larger companies purchased about 70% of their parts from subcontractors (as opposed to the 30% in the USA). These subcontractors typically employ less than 30 employees. [see Hsu (1994)]. Of the total of 55.014 million employed by private establishments in Japan in 1991, 30.317 million (55%) were employed by firms with less than 30 employees. These companies are not listed in the TSE, but the value of these companies fluctuate relatively more with the business cycle in Japan and they are also more prone to go bankrupt during business downturns. Hence the return on the index portfolio of TSE stocks is likely to be a poor proxy for the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio in Japan.

Jagannathan and Wang (1993) observed that human capital forms a substantially large part of the aggregate capital stock, in the USA. This is true for Japan as well. Total national income in Japan in 1991 was ¥355,799 billion [see Japan Statistical Year Book, 1993/94]. Of this, ¥251,966 billion (71%) was wages and salaries and ¥43,003 (12%) was property income and ¥60,830 billion (17%) was entrepreneur's income. Dividends income (which is included in property income) amounted to only ¥9,993 billion (3%). These numbers are comparable to the ones for the USA reported in Jagannathan and Wang (1993).

In view of these observations, we assume that the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio is a linear function of the return on the index portfolio of stocks listed in the TSE, and a measure of the return

on human capital¹². With these modifications we find that the CAPM is able to explain the cross section of average returns on TSE stocks about as well as the 3-factor bench mark we use.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the econometric specifications and the statistical tests. We describe the data and the empirical results in Section 3 and conclude in Section 4.

2. ECONOMETRIC SPECIFICATIONS

We need the following notation. Let R_{it} denote the month t gross return on any asset i and R_{mt} denote the corresponding gross return on the market portfolio of all assets in the economy. The CAPM is given by:

$$E[R_{it}] = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \beta_i \quad (1)$$

where $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation operator. Let $Cov[\cdot]$ denote the covariance operator and $Var[\cdot]$ denote the variance operator, and β_i denotes,

$$\beta_i = \frac{Cov[R_{it}, R_{mt}]}{Var[R_{mt}]} \quad (2)$$

The Black (1972) version of the CAPM given in (1) does not assume that the borrowing and lending rates are the same. If the borrowing and lending rates in the economy are different, then the zero beta return, γ_0 , will in general be different from the short term money market return. The slope coefficient, γ_1 represents the expected return on the market portfolio in excess of the zero beta rate, γ_0 . Equation (1) forms the basis for our empirical work.

There is one major difficulty in empirically examining the specification given in (1). As Roll (1977) pointed out, the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio of all assets in Japan is not observed by the econometrician. Hence we need to use a proxy for the return on the market portfolio, R_{mt} .

2.1 The proxy for the return on the market portfolio

Following the practice in the USA, empirical studies of the CAPM in Japan typically assume that the return on the value weighted index of stocks traded in the TSE, R_t^s , is a reasonable proxy for the return on the market portfolio of all assets in the economy. The implicit assumption is that there are constants a_0 and a_s such that:

$$R_{mt} = a_0 + a_s R_t^s \quad (3)$$

Let S -beta be given by, $\beta_i^s = \frac{Cov[R_{it}, R_t^s]}{Var[R_t^s]}$. Substituting this expression for R_{mt} into (1) and (2) gives:

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s \quad (4)$$

The specification in (4) is commonly used in empirical studies of the CAPM. Hence, empirical rejection of the specification in (4) can be viewed as the rejection of either the model given in (1) or the assumption given in (3). In this empirical study we examine whether the latter possibility is more likely.

The total value of corporate stocks at the end of 1991 in Japan was ¥586,500 billion of which ¥365,939 billion was due to stocks listed in the TSE. Hence the total value of TSE stocks formed a major part of the value of stocks as a whole in Japan. However, stocks alone accounted for about 8% of total financial and tangible assets in Japan at the end of 1991¹³. When we take human capital also into account, stocks formed an even smaller fraction of the total wealth.

As we pointed out earlier, labor income is the single largest component of income (about 70%), suggesting that human capital is probably the largest component of the capital stock of Japan. Hence we include a measure of the return on human capital while constructing a proxy for the return on the aggregate wealth portfolio¹⁴. Following Jagannathan and Wang (1993) we assume that the return on human capital is a linear function of the growth rate in per capita labor income, R_t^{labor} , where:

$$R_t^{labor} = \frac{L_t - L_{t-1}}{L_{t-1}},$$

and L_t is *per capita labor income during month t*. A similar specification was considered by Fama and Schwert (1977). Campbell (1993) arrived at a related measure of return on human capital based on some what different arguments. This leads us to the following specification where the return on the market portfolio of all assets is a linear function of the return on the stock index portfolio and the growth rate in per capita labor income, i.e.,

$$R_{mt} = a_0 + a_s R_t^s + a_{labor} R_t^{labor} \quad (5)$$

Let Labor-beta be given by:

$$\beta_i^{labor} = \frac{Cov[R_{it}, R_t^{labor}]}{Var[R_t^{labor}]}$$

Then equation (5) implies that:

$$\beta_i = b_s \beta_i^s + b_{labor} \beta_i^{labor} \quad (6)$$

for some constants b_s and b_{labor} . Substituting the expression for β_i given in equation (6) into the CAPM relation in equation (1) gives the following CAPM specification in terms of betas computed with respect to observable variables.

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{labor} \beta_i^{labor} \quad (7)$$

In our empirical work we examine the specification given in equation (7) using (a) the cross sectional regression approach and (b) the generalized method of moments.

2.2 Statistical Tests

According to equation (7) the expected return on every asset, i , is linear function of only S-beta and Labor-beta. One way to examine the adequacy equation (7) describes the cross section of expected returns is to check if there are any residual size effects. The use of relative size of the firm to detect specification errors in an asset pricing model is common in the empirical finance literature. Theoretical justification for such an approach is given in Berk (1992). For this purpose we consider the following empirical specification:

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_{size} \log(ME_i) + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{labor} \beta_i^{labor} \quad (8)$$

where ME_i denotes the average market value of the equity of firm i and $\log(\cdot)$ denotes the natural logarithm. $\log(ME_i)$ is measured as deviations from the average value of the corresponding variable in the cross section. If the CAPM specification given in (7) holds then c_{size} given in (8) should be zero, i.e., whatever cross sectional variation in expected return that is left unexplained by S-beta and Labor-beta should be unrelated to the size variable.

The parameters in (8) can be consistently estimated by the intuitively appealing cross sectional regression method of Black, Jensen and Scholes (1972) and Fama and MacBeth (1973). Notice that the specification in (8) nests the standard version of the CAPM specification given in equation (4). Following Jagannathan and Wang (1993), we use the cross sectional R-Square as an informal measure to compare the different model specifications¹⁵. We also examine whether (a) the estimated values of the parameter, c_{size} , is different from zero only because of sampling errors, and (b) if the parameter c_{labor} is positive. For this purpose we compute the standard errors of the parameters in (8) using the classical Fama-MacBeth procedure as well as the Jagannathan-Wang (1995) method¹⁶. The latter method corrects for the bias in the Fama-MacBeth procedure that arises due to ignoring the measurement error in estimated betas.

An alternative way to examine whether the data support the specification in (7) is to use the Generalized Method of Moments of Hansen (1982). For this purpose, we follow Jagannathan and Wang (1993) and consider the stochastic discount factor representation of the linear beta model given in equation (7)¹⁷:

$$E[R_{it}(\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{labor} R_t^{labor})] = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (9)$$

where, δ_0 , δ_s , and δ_{labor} are constants given below:

$$\delta_0 = \frac{1}{c_0} + \frac{1}{c_0} \left[\frac{c_s E[R_t^s]}{Var[R_t^s]} + \frac{c_{labor} E[R_t^{labor}]}{Var[R_t^{labor}]} \right]$$

$$\delta_\alpha = -\frac{c_\alpha}{c_0 Var[R_t^\alpha]}, \quad \alpha = s, labor.$$

Equation (9) can be written as $E[\mathbf{R}_t d_t - \mathbf{1}] = \mathbf{0}$, where d_t is commonly referred to as the stochastic discount factor or pricing kernel, $\mathbf{1}$ is a N vector of ones and $\mathbf{0}$ is a N vector of zeros and N is the number of assets available to the econometrician. Let δ denote the K vector of parameters, δ_0 , δ_s , and δ_{labor} , with $K = 3$. Define $w_t(\delta) = \mathbf{R}_t d_t(\delta) - \mathbf{1}$ where \mathbf{R}_t denotes the N vector of date t returns on the N assets. Then, equation (9) can be written compactly as $E[w_t(\delta)] = \mathbf{0}$. The left side is usually referred to as the vector of model pricing errors and it should equal the right side, the zero vector, if the model is true.

When the parameter vector, δ , as well as the expectations of agents are known we can evaluate the different competing model specifications by the vector of pricing errors. It is more convenient for comparison purposes to convert the vector of pricing errors into a scalar measure, even though some information is lost when a vector is converted into a scalar. For this purpose, we follow Hansen and Singleton (1982) and consider the quadratic form, $E[w_t(\delta)]' A E[w_t(\delta)]$, where A is a positive definite weighting matrix. Since we do not observe $E[w_t(\delta)]$, for any given value for the parameter vector δ , we replace $E[w_t(\delta)]$ by its sample analogue, $w_T(\delta)$, which is the average of $w_t(\delta)$, computed using a time series of length T . We then estimate δ by δ_T that minimizes $T w_T(\delta)' A E[w_T(\delta)]$.

Hansen (1982) and Hansen and Singleton (1982) suggested using the *optimal* weighting matrix, $A = (\text{Var}[w_t(\delta)])^{-1}$. Hansen (1982) showed that when this weighting matrix is used, and the model specification is true, the minimized values of the quadratic form has an asymptotic Chi-Square distribution with $N-K$ degrees of freedom. While the minimized value of this quadratic form can be used to test the null hypothesis that the model is true, it may at times be misleading to compare the minimized value of the quadratic form across models to determine which model performs better. The difficulty arises from the fact that the weighting matrix is model dependent. A model with more "noise" will typically result in a smaller value for the quadratic form and it will indeed be incorrect to conclude that a model performs better only because it has more "noise" and hence there is little evidence against it. Hansen and Jagannathan (1994) suggested using the weighting matrix, $A = E[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}']^{-1}$. Jagannathan and Wang (1993) showed that, when the model is true, the minimized value of the quadratic form with this choice of the weighting matrix is asymptotically distributed as a weighted sum of K Chi-Square (1) random variables. We use the *optimal weighting matrix*, $(\text{Var}[w_t(\delta)])^{-1}$, as well as the *HJ weighting matrix*, $E[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}']^{-1}$, in our empirical analysis.

Another way to evaluate the empirical support for the CAPM specification with human capital performs is to compare its performance against an interesting bench mark. Fama and French (1993) demonstrated that the book to market and size effects can be captured by two factors which they refer to as the HML and SMB factors. Kubota and Takehara (1995b) constructed similar factors by taking the return differential between (a) TSE stocks in the highest and the lowest book to market price ratio deciles (book to price spread factor -- BSPR for short) and (b) TSE stocks in the largest and the smallest size deciles (size spread factor -- SSPR for short). Kubota and Takehara (1995b) reported that the correlation between these

two factors is -0.1009 which is not much different from the correlation of -0.08 between the HML and SMB factors for the USA reported by Fama and French (1993). Let R_t^{bspr} denote the BSPR factor and R_t^{sspr} denote the SSPR factor. Let β_i^{bspr} and β_i^{sspr} denote the corresponding betas for any portfolio, $i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

We compare the performance of the CAPM specification with human capital with that of this three factor model (TOPIX, BSPR and SSPR) as the bench mark. We examine the performance of this three factor model using the GMM, by considering its stochastic discount factor representation given by:

$$E[R_{it}(\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{bspr} R_t^{bspr} + \delta_{sspr} R_t^{sspr})] = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (10)$$

We also examine the performance of the three factor model using the cross sectional regression methods using its linear beta specification given by:

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{bspr} \beta_i^{bspr} + c_{sspr} \beta_i^{sspr} \quad (11)$$

Note that the relative performance of our CAPM specification with human capital and the three factor model given above can be examined by considering the following specifications which nest the two models:

$$E[R_{it}(\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{labor} R_t^{labor} + \delta_{bspr} R_t^{bspr} + \delta_{sspr} R_t^{sspr})] = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (12a)$$

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{labor} \beta_i^{labor} + c_{bspr} \beta_i^{bspr} + c_{sspr} \beta_i^{sspr} \quad (12b)$$

If the SSPR and BSPR variables are proxying for the risk associated with labor income, then the p-values associated with the estimates of the coefficients in (12a) and (12b) should be larger than that for the corresponding coefficients in (10) and (11).

3. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

3.1 Description of the Data

We use monthly returns on manufacturing and nonmanufacturing firms listed in the First Section of the TSE for the period September 1981 to June 1993. We consider two sets of portfolios of stocks. In the first set, firms are first sorted into 10 size deciles based on the market value of their equity and next into 10 book value to market value of equity ratio (BPR) deciles. In order to keep the dimensionality of the estimation problem reasonable, we pick the 25 portfolios that belong to size and BPR deciles 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10. Each portfolio formation year begins in September. For each portfolio formation year, firms are assigned to one of the 25 portfolios based on information that was available as of the beginning of September of the previous year. For example, book value to market value ratios are computed based on book value at the end of the fiscal year that ended on or before the 31st of March and market values were based on the prices of shares at the end of August of the year. Portfolio returns are obtained by equally weighting the return on all stocks that are assigned to a particular portfolio for that month. This gives a time series of monthly return on 25 portfolios with portfolio composition changing once every year. The second set of portfolios are obtained in a similar way but by first sorting stocks into six size classes and then into six historical beta classes. Historical betas are estimated using time series data for the immediately

preceding 36 months. This gives a time series of monthly returns on 36 portfolios where the portfolio composition is changed once a year.

We obtained the data for our analysis from Mitsubishi Trust Company and MTB Investment Technology Institute Co. Ltd. The primary source for the accounting variables is the Nikkei NEEDS (PORTFOLIO) data base supplied by the Nihon Keizai Shinbun Inc (Economic Information Department, Data Bank Bureau). Unlike the COMPUSTAT, this data base has no survivorship bias. The primary source for the return data for the period ending in December 1989, is the Japan Securities Research Institute monthly stock return tape. For the period 1990 onwards the primary source for the return data is Nikkei NEEDS data service. Nikkei provides on-line data service and the return data were updated once every month on a continuing basis by Mitsubishi Trust and Banking Co. The data included returns on TSE firms that were delisted. Hence there is no survivorship bias in this data set either. The number of firms in the intersection of the two data bases varies from 792 in 1981 to 1023 in 1993. This gives us a time series of 142 monthly returns for each set of portfolios.

Total wage income data for Japan is from the monthly survey, MOL. The data series starts in January 1970 and normalized in such a way that the average value for 1990 is 100. The survey covers organizations employing 30 persons or more. It is rather difficult to pin down when the data is available to investors. There are over 10 kinds of labor income indices. Nikkei provides a "prompt" report on a couple of these indices with about a month of reporting delay. The regular reports follow with a 2 month lag -- i.e., data for December is typically reported in February. Let W_t denote the total wage income in month t and Pop_t denote the total population at the end of month t . Let $L_t = W_t/Pop_{t-1}$ denote *per capita* labor income for month t . Following Jagannathan and Wang (1993) we assume that the return on human capital is a linear function of the percentage growth rate in labor income, R_t^{labor} , where:

$$R_t^{labor} = \frac{L_t - L_{t-1}}{L_{t-1}} \times 100$$

We assume that financial markets are informationally efficient only in the semi-strong form. This implies that the information in R_t^{labor} is fully reflected in prices of securities only at date $t+2$. We therefore match R_{it} with R_{t-2}^{labor} while computing β_i^{labor} .

Table 1 gives the summary statistics for the monthly rates of return on TOPIX, SSPR, BSPR, and the growth rate in per capita labor income. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of the 25 size-BPR sorted portfolios. The average return on these portfolios vary from a low of 0.14% to 2.33% per month. The book to price ratio varies from a low of 5.83% to a high of 74.26%. It is interesting to note that all the 25 average book to price ratios are less than 100%. In contrast, the book to price ratios for the 25 USA stock portfolios considered by Fama and French (1993) varies from a low of 29% to a high of 180%. The earnings to price ratios vary from a low of 1.91% to 8.45% -- in contrast, the corresponding numbers for the 25 US portfolios studied by Fama and French (1993) are 2.42% and 13.92%. These differences are to be

expected since the US interest rates were higher than Japanese interest rates during this period. The portfolio S-betas do not exhibit much dispersion -- they vary from a low of 0.77 to a high of 1.03. Firms with high BPR tend to have lower leverage and lower S-beta in this sample. Labor betas vary from a low of -0.2421 to a high of 1.787. Larger firms have a negative labor beta whereas smaller firms have a positive labor beta.

Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of the 36 size-beta sorted portfolios. The average monthly returns exhibit a somewhat smaller dispersion when compared to the 25 size-BPR sorted portfolios. They vary from a low of 0.48% to a high of 2.20%. The book to price ratios do not show much dispersion -- they vary from a low of 28.37% to a high of 42.94% only. The dispersion in earnings to price ratios is also smaller when compared to the 25 size-BPR sorted portfolios. However, the S-betas of the portfolios vary from a low of 0.66 to a high of 1.12 -- a somewhat larger dispersion than that for the 25 portfolios. Labor betas are negative except for firms in the smallest size class. Smaller firms tend to have larger labor betas, indicating that they are more prone to Labor risk.

3.2 Empirical Results

Tables 4 and 5 give the results for the 25 Size-BPR sorted portfolios. As can be seen from panel A of Table 4, the standard CAPM (with the stock index portfolio as the market proxy) does rather poorly. As can be seen from Figure 1A, the relation between average return and S-beta is flat. The R-Square is 2.78 percent which is not different from zero after taking sampling errors into account. As can be seen from Figure 1B, when $\log(\text{ME})$ is also included in the cross sectional regressions, the R-Square rises to 55 percent. These results are similar to those reported by Fama and French (1992) and Jagannathan and Wang (1993) for the USA.

Including a measure of the return on human capital, R^{labor} , improves the performance of the CAPM remarkably, as can be seen from panel B of Table 4, and Figure 1C.. The R-Square goes up to 75.5 percent. The slope coefficient for Labor is positive as predicted by theory and is statistically significantly different from zero. As can be seen from Figure 1D, and panel C of Table 4, there are no residual size effects. Also, there is no evidence against this CAPM specification using the GMM test with the standard or the HJ weighting matrix. However, the slope coefficient corresponding the S-beta remains negative, although not statistically significantly different from zero. If we take this model at face value then stocks, save those in the smallest size decile, provide a good hedge against erosion in the value of human capital (see Tables 2 and 3).

The corresponding results for the linear factor models with the stock index portfolio return plus either the BSPR or the SSPR factors are given in Table 5 and Figure 2. The R-Square for the linear factor model with the stock index portfolio and BSPR variable is 60 percent. Unlike in the case of the specification with Labor-beta, the slope coefficient for S-beta becomes positive and is different from zero even after taking sampling errors into account. In a way this suggests that the BSPR variable may be capturing some thing that is missing in the CAPM that is not captured by the Labor variable. Also, the

GMM-Dist and the HJ-Dist measures are lower for the S-beta plus BSPR-beta specification than for any of the other specifications. The R-Square for the S-beta plus SSPR-beta model is 59 percent -- not much different than that for the S-beta plus BSPR-beta model. However the GMM-Dist and HJ-Dist measures are larger. The slope coefficient corresponding to S-beta remains negative as with the Labor specification. A comparison of Figures 2A and 2B with Figure 1C suggests that the CAPM specification with human capital performs as well or better than the two factor models with the TOPIX return as the first factor and either BSPR or SSPR as the second factor.

Panel C of Table 5 and Figure 2C give the results for the model with both BSPR-beta and SSPR-beta (in addition to S-beta). The R-Square goes up to 88.4 percent. The coefficient corresponding to SSPR-beta is not significant at the conventional levels indicating that both variables are capturing to some extent the same aspect of reality that is missing in the standard CAPM specification. Panel D of Table 5 and Figure 2D give the results for the case when Labor, BSPR and as well as SSPR are included at the same time. The R-Square does not change much but the p-value for SSPR goes up from 8.67 percent to 21.8 percent and the p-value for BSPR goes up from 0.07 percent to 1.10 percent. This suggests that both SSPR and BSPR may be proxying for Labor to a significant extent. Only the slope coefficient corresponding to BSPR-beta remains significant at the 1 percent level, once again confirming the view that it may be capturing an aspect of reality that is probably not captured by Labor or SSPR in this data set.

Tables 6 & 7 and Figures 3 & 4 give the results for the 36 Size-Beta sorted portfolios. The standard CAPM specification has an R-Square of 2.39 percent -- the relation between average return and S-beta is once again flat. When $\log(\text{ME})$ is also included in the cross sectional regressions, the R-Square rises to 70 percent -- a much larger number when compared to corresponding number for the 25 Size-BPR sorted portfolios. There is not much evidence against the CAPM specification with human capital (Labor). The R-Square goes up to 76 percent, and the slope coefficient corresponding to labor is positive as predicted by theory. The slope coefficient for S-beta is also positive -- though not statistically different from zero after taking sampling errors into account. As can be seen from a comparison of Figures 3C and 3D, $\log(\text{ME})$ has no residual explanatory power either. There is also not much evidence against the CAPM specification with Labor using the GMM test statistics.

Unlike in the case of the 25 Size-BPR sorted portfolios, BSPR-beta has little ability to explain the cross section of average returns in the 36 Size-Beta sorted portfolios. This is evident from Figure 4A. The R-Square goes up to 17 percent. However, this specification performs almost as well as the CAPM specification with Labor using the GMM-Dist and the HJ-Dist measures. Hence this specification can explain the features that are most anomalous from the point of the standard CAPM about as well as the other specifications -- although, it does rather poorly on average. The R-Square for the specification with SSPR is 75.4 percent -- not much different from that for the model with Labor, as can be seen by comparing Figure 3B with Figure 4B. There is evidence against the specification using HJ-Dist even though the HJ-Dist itself is smaller than that for Labor. This suggests that we are probably measuring everything more

precisely when SSPR is included. When both BSPR as well as SSPR are included, the coefficient corresponding to BSPR-beta is not different from zero at conventional significance levels. In addition, when Labor-beta is also included, the p-values for corresponding to the BSPR and SSPR betas increase. Only the slope coefficient corresponding to Labor is marginally significant in the cross sectional regressions. There is much less evidence against the CAPM specification with human capital in this data set.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The CAPM is a theoretically attractive model. However, the empirical support for the CAPM is rather weak. This has resulted in a variety of multifactor models being considered. The prominent among the multifactor models are those that use variables that are related to firm size and book to price ratios. The use of firm size and book to price ratios has some theoretical support. Berk (1992) showed that these variables will be able to explain the cross sectional variation in expected returns. What Berk (1992) did not highlight is that this will be the case even when these expected return differentials are not related to economic fundamentals and arise due to fads. In view of this, it is of interest to find out the extent to which the observed average return differentials across different assets are related to economic fundamentals and perceived differences in the risk characteristics of these assets.

Empirical studies of the CAPM use the stock index return as the proxy for the return on the market portfolio of all assets in the economy. Mayers (1972) argued that it is important to take the income from human capital also into account while studying the CAPM. Human capital probably forms the largest component of aggregate wealth in most developed economies. Jagannathan and Wang (1995) found some empirical support for the CAPM with human capital using stock return data for the USA. In this study, we follow Mayers (1972) and Jagannathan and Wang (1995) and assume that the return on aggregate wealth portfolio is a linear function of the return on the stock index portfolio and the growth rate in aggregate per capita labor income. We examine whether the size and book to price effects are proxying for the risk in the return on human capital that has been omitted from consideration in earlier studies of the CAPM.

Our objective in this study is to use a data set that is less subject to the data snooping bias pointed out by Lo and MacKinlay (1990). Hence we chose to use the stock return data for Japan. While the Japanese economy is second only to the USA in size, with a per capita GNP that surpasses that of the USA, there have been relatively fewer studies of the Japanese capital markets. Hence if we were to find support for the CAPM with human capital using this data set, our findings are less likely to be due to the data snooping bias.

We examine the empirical performance of the CAPM using monthly returns on stocks traded in the First Section of the Tokyo Stock Exchange for the period September 1982 to June 1993. We find that there is little empirical support for the standard CAPM, which assumes that the index portfolio of stocks traded in the Tokyo Stock Exchange is a reasonable proxy for the market portfolio of all relevant wealth. The relation between average return on stocks and betas is flat -- which is similar to the results reported in the literature by studies that use data for the USA. In contrast, the CAPM specification with human capital

performs well. Including Labor-beta in the standard CAPM specification substantially improves the performance of the CAPM. There is little empirical evidence against the CAPM with this modification. Relative market value of firms as well as the size and book to market price factors similar to the ones identified by Fama and French (1993) using data for the USA are also able to explain the cross section of average returns well. It appears that the size factor beta may be proxying for the risk associated with the return on human capital as measured by our Labor-beta variable.

Our empirical work is in the spirit of most other empirical work in this area that examine the ability of linear factor models to explain the cross section of average return on various assets. However, in order to convincingly argue that the cross sectional variations in average returns that we observed are, to a large extent, related to economic fundamentals, we have to relate the observed risk premium for the various measures of aggregate risk in a quantitative way to the risk-preferences of agents and the underlying technological shocks that affect the real side of the economy. For this we need a model that facilitates measuring the return on human capital in a better way. We intend focusing on this issue in our future work.

REFERENCES (incomplete)

- Abel, A.B., 1990, Asset prices under habit formation and catching up with the Joneses, *American Economic Review* 80, 38-42.
- Black, Fishcer, 1972, Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing, *Journal of Business*, 45, 444-455.
- Black, Fischer, Michael C. Jensen, and Myron Scholes, 1972, The capital asset pricing model: Some empirical tests, in: M. Jensen, ed., *Studies in the theory of capital markets* (Praeger, New York, NY).
- Bansal R., and S. Viswanathan, 1993, No Arbitrage and Arbitrage Pricing: A New Approach, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, 1231-1262.
- Bansal R., David Hsieh and S. Viswanathan, 1993, A New Approach to International Arbitrage Pricing, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 5, 1719-1747.
- Banz, Rolf W., 1981, The relationship between return and market value of common stocks, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 9, 3-18.
- Becker, Gary S., 1993, *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, Third Edition, The University of Chicago Press.
- Breeden, Douglas T., 1979, An intertemporal asset pricing model with stochastic consumption and investment opportunities, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 7, 265-96.
- Brown, David P., and Michael R. Gibbons, 1986, A simple econometric approach for utility-based asset pricing models, *Journal of Finance* 40, 359-81.
- Campbell, John Y., 1993, Understanding risk and returns, Working paper, Princeton University.
- Chan, L.K.C., Yasushi Hamao, and Josef Lakonishok, 1991, Fundamentals and Stock Returns in Japan, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. XLVI, No. 5, December 1991, 1749-1764.
- Chen, Nai-fu, Richard Roll, and Stephen A. Ross, 1986, Economic forces and the stock market, *Journal of Business*, 59, 383-403.
- Cochrane, John H., 1992, A cross-sectional test of a production based asset pricing model, NBER Working Paper 4025.
- Connor, Gregory and Robert A. Korajczyk, 1988, Risk and return in an equilibrium APT: Application of a new test methodology, *Journal of Financial Economics* 21, 255-289.
- Constantinides, George M., 1990, Habit formation: A resolution of the equity premium puzzle, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 519-43.
- Dunn, Kenneth B., and Kenneth J. Singleton, 1986, Modelling the term structure of interest rates under non-separable utility and durability of goods, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 17, 27- 55.

- Eichenbaum, Martin S., Lars Peter Hansen and Kenneth J. Singleton, 1988, A time series analysis of representative agent models of consumption and leisure choice under uncertainty, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 103, 51-78.
- Elton, Edwin and Martin Gruber, 1988, A multi-index risk model of the Japanese stock market, *Japan and the World Economy*, 1, 21-44.
- Epstein, Larry G., and Stanley E. Zin, 1991, Substitution, risk aversion, and temporal behavior of consumption and asset returns: An empirical analysis, *Journal of Political Economy*, vol 99, no. 2.
- Fama, Eugene F., and Kenneth R. French, 1992, The cross-section of expected stock returns, *Journal of Finance*, 47, 427-466.
- Fama, Eugene F., and Kenneth R. French, 1993, Common risk factors in the returns on bonds and stocks, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33, 3-56.
- Fama, Eugene F., and James D. MacBeth, 1973, Risk, return and equilibrium: empirical tests, *Journal of Political Economy*, 71, 607-636.
- Fama, Eugene F., and G. William, Schwert, 1977, Human capital and capital market equilibrium, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 4, 115-146.
- Ferson, W. and G. Constantinides, 1991, Habit persistence and durability in aggregate consumption: empirical tests, *Journal of Financial Economics* 29, 199-240.
- Ferson, W. and C. R. Harvey, 1992, Seasonality and consumption-based asset pricing models, *Journal of Finance* 47, 511-552.
- Hamao, Yasushi, 1988, An empirical examination of the arbitrage pricing theory, *Japan and the World Economy*, 1, 45-61.
- Hansen, Lars Peter, 1982, Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators, *Econometrica*, 50, 1029-1054.
- Hansen, L.P., and R. Jagannathan, 1991, Implications of security market data for models of dynamic economies, *Journal of Political Economy* 99, 225-262.
- Hansen, L.P., and R. Jagannathan, 1994, Assessing specification errors in stochastic discount factor models, NBER technical working paper 153.
- Hansen, Lars Peter and Kenneth J. Singleton, 1982, Generalized instrumental variables estimation in nonlinear rational expectations models, *Econometrica*, 50, 1269-1286.
- Hansen, L.P., and K.J. Singleton, 1983, Stochastic consumption, risk aversion and the temporal behavior of asset returns, *Journal of Political Economy* 91, 249-266.
- Harvey, C.R., 1989, Time-varying conditional covariances in tests of asset pricing models, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 24, 289-318.
- Heaton, John, 1993, An empirical investigation of asset pricing with temporally dependent preferences, *Econometrica*.

- Hsu, Robert C., 1994, *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Japanese Economy*, The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Jagannathan, Ravi, 1985, An investigation of commodity futures prices using the consumption-based intertemporal asset pricing model, *Journal of Finance*.
- Jagannathan, Ravi and Zhenyu Wang, 1993, *The CAPM is Alive and Well*, Staff Report #165, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
- Jagannathan, Ravi and Zhenyu Wang, 1995, *The conditional CAPM and the cross-section of expected returns*, manuscript, University of Minnesota.
- Japan Statistical Handbook 1993-94, 1995, Statistical Bureau, Management and Co-ordination Agency, Japan.
- Kandel, Shmuel and Robert F. Stambaugh, 1995, Portfolio inefficiency and the cross-section of expected returns, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 50, No.1, 157-184.
- Kato, Kiyoshi and James Schallheim, 1985, Seasonal and size anomalies in the Japanese stock markets, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 20, 261-272.
- Kubota, Keiichi and Hitoshi Takehara, 1995a, *The cross-section risk and return of Tokyo Stock Exchange Firms*, to appear in T.Boss and T.Fetherstone eds., *Advances in the Pacific Basin Capital Market Research II*, JAI Press Inc.
- Kubota, Keiichi and Hitoshi Takehara, 1995, *Common risk factors in Tokyo Stock Exchange Firms: In Finding the Mimicking Portfolios*, Working Paper, Musashi University.
- Lehmann, Bruce N., and David M. Modest, 1988, *The empirical foundations of the Arbitrage Pricing Theory*, *Journal of Financial Economics* 21, 213-54.
- Lintner, J. B., 1965, *The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets*, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 47, 13-37.
- Lo, Andrew and A. Craig MacKinlay, 1990, *Data-snooping biases in tests of financial asset pricing models*, *Review of Financial Studies*, 3, 431-467.
- Lucas, Robert E., Jr., 1978, *Asset prices in an exchange economy*, *Econometrica*, 46, 1429-45.
- MacKinlay, A. Craig and M.P. Richardson, 1991, *Using generalized method of moments to test mean variance efficiency*, *Journal of Finance*, 46, 323-362
- Maru, J. and Y. Ynezawa, 1984, *Nihon no Kabushikishijou (Japanese Stock Market in Japanese)*, Toyokeizai-shinpousha, 1984.
- Mayers, David, 1972, *Nonmarketable assets and capital market equilibrium under uncertainty*, in Michael C. Jensen ed.: *Studies in the Theory of Capital Markets* (Praeger, New York).
- Merton, Robert C., 1973, *An intertemporal capital asset pricing model*, *Econometrica*, 41, 867-87.
- Rosenberg, Barr, Kenneth Reid and Ronald Lanstein, 1984, *Persuasive evidence of market inefficiency*, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 11, 9-17.
- Ross, Stephen A., 1976, *The arbitrage pricing theory of capital asset pricing*, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 13, 341-360.

- Sakuraba, C., 1987, Nihon ni okeru Kabuka Hendou no Mekanizumu ni tsuite (On the Mechanism of Stock Price Variations in Japan), Bank of Japan Kinyuu Kenkyu, Vol. 6, No. 3, 41-80.
- Shanken, Jay, 1992, On the estimation of beta-pricing models, Review of Financial Studies, 5, 1-33.
- Sharpe, William F., 1964, Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk, Journal of Finance, 19, 425-442.
- Stambaugh, Robert F., 1982, On the exclusion of assets from tests of the two-parameter model: A sensitivity analysis, Journal of Financial Economics 10, 237-68.
- Sundaresan, Mahadevan, 1989, Intertemporally dependent preferences and the volatility of consumption and wealth, Review of Financial Studies, 73-89.
- Tokyo Stock Exchange 1994 Fact Book, 1994, International Affairs Department, Tokyo Stock Exchange, 2-1, Nihombashi-Kabuto-cho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 103.

TABLE 1
Summary Statistics for the Factors

The data consists of 142 monthly observations for the period September 1981 to June 1993. TOPIX represents the value weighted index of stocks traded in the Tokyo Stock Exchange (TSE), First Section. S-SPR represents the return spread between the TSE First Section stocks in the smallest size decile and the largest size decile. B-SPR represents the return spread between TSE First Section stocks in the lowest Book to Price Ratio decile and the highest Book to Price Ratio decile. LABOR denotes the percentage growth rate in monthly per capita income in Japan.

	TOPIX	S- SPR.	B-SPR.	LABOR
Average	0.78%	1.40%	-1.24%	0.25%
Std.Dev	5.97%	6.56%	3.89%	0.43%

Lag	Auto-Correlation			
1	0.00	0.09	0.13	0.21
2	0.04	-0.18	0.14	-0.40
3	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.23
4	-0.03	0.03	-0.09	-0.09
5	0.12	0.05	0.08	0.08
6	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04	0.11
7	-0.02	0.03	0.11	0.08
8	0.03	-0.01	-0.09	-0.07
9	0.05	0.06	-0.02	-0.19
10	0.08	-0.17	-0.08	-0.34
11	0.01	-0.08	-0.19	0.15
12	0.01	0.15	0.08	0.80

TABLE 2
Characteristics of the 25 Size-BPR Sorted Portfolios

Average Monthly Return

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	1.62	1.75	2.23	2.33	2.21
3	0.87	1.46	1.51	1.67	1.81
5	0.19	0.82	1.48	1.11	1.43
	0.68	1.02	1.13	1.17	1.39
Large	0.14	0.63	0.78	0.84	1.25

Standard Deviation of Monthly Return

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	9.28	8.81	9.00	8.56	8.07
3	7.53	7.54	7.74	7.47	6.80
5	7.42	7.02	6.89	6.36	6.64
7	7.29	6.58	6.38	6.15	5.95
Large	6.48	6.47	6.33	5.66	5.95

Sample Average of Ln(Market Value)

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	8.98	9.07	9.09	9.13	9.11
3	9.89	9.94	9.96	9.95	9.94
5	10.49	10.56	10.62	10.57	10.59
7	11.29	11.32	11.36	11.34	11.32
Large	12.81	12.89	12.94	12.79	12.95

Sample Average of B/P (in Percent)

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	5.83	25.43	35.54	49.25	74.26
3	12.98	28.60	37.64	49.43	74.05
5	14.21	28.30	37.47	48.10	73.20
7	14.66	28.79	37.98	47.20	66.51
Large	11.83	24.15	30.97	39.99	58.88

Sample Average of E/P (in Percent)

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	1.91	3.98	4.07	6.77	5.89
3	3.52	4.30	5.42	5.75	7.27
5	3.36	4.59	5.32	5.79	6.77
7	3.34	5.08	5.42	6.75	8.45
Large	3.70	4.73	5.85	6.50	7.94

Sample Average of D/P (in Percent)

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	0.12	0.62	0.72	1.14	1.29
3	0.41	0.77	1.04	1.06	1.26
5	0.42	0.85	1.06	1.21	1.19
7	0.49	0.92	0.98	1.18	1.30
Large	0.44	0.78	0.98	1.15	2.11

Sample Average of Leverage Ratio (in Percent)

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	86.18	80.15	73.86	67.32	58.58
3	79.45	69.98	65.64	56.55	54.81
5	77.82	65.56	60.97	56.78	52.08
7	68.94	66.12	63.42	55.98	51.66
Large	64.68	63.12	62.56	62.52	61.66

S-Beta

	Low	3	5	7	High
mall	0.98	1.01	0.95	0.93	0.78
3	0.87	0.93	0.86	0.85	0.77
5	0.93	0.92	0.90	0.78	0.81
7	1.03	0.96	0.90	0.86	0.79
Large	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.84	0.77

Labor Beta

	Low	3	5	7	High
mall	0.506	1.1901	0.0948	1.787	0.924
3	-1.420	0.0771	0.1491	-0.586	-0.418
5	-1.907	-0.7799	-0.8687	-0.519	-0.773
7	-0.649	-1.4736	-0.6356	-1.011	-1.651
Large	-2.421	-1.6686	-1.3827	-1.697	-0.235

SSPR-Beta

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	0.97060	0.8708	0.953	0.846	0.8148
3	0.59249	0.6408	0.628	0.653	0.5717
5	0.41356	0.4877	0.455	0.499	0.4316
7	0.28266	0.2836	0.322	0.274	0.2796
Large	-0.00688	-0.0641	-0.118	-0.136	-0.0355

BSPR-Beta

	Low	3	5	7	High
Small	0.554	0.366	0.242	0.0739	-0.2120
3	0.693	0.364	0.193	0.1563	-0.0408
5	0.827	0.429	0.292	0.0327	-0.1233
7	0.629	0.411	0.194	0.2187	-0.1123
Large	0.874	0.594	0.390	0.2876	-0.1223

TABLE 3
Characteristics of the 36 Size-Beta Sorted Portfolios

Average Monthly Return

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	2.00	1.92	2.20	2.00	1.79	1.85
2	1.13	1.64	1.37	1.53	1.44	1.70
3	0.75	1.21	1.14	1.24	1.33	1.10
4	1.04	1.18	1.23	1.02	0.82	0.86
5	1.07	0.91	0.91	1.02	0.92	0.95
Large	1.08	0.92	0.97	0.60	0.65	0.48

Standard Deviation of Monthly Return

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	7.61	7.63	7.85	8.09	8.16	8.48
2	6.24	7.11	6.58	7.18	7.71	8.03
3	6.06	6.50	6.48	6.79	7.21	7.29
4	6.30	6.31	6.45	6.88	7.11	7.64
5	6.41	6.17	5.88	6.17	6.65	7.59
Large	5.89	5.80	5.77	6.25	6.79	7.34

Sample Average of Ln(Market Value)

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	9.19	9.24	9.23	9.22	9.22	9.26
2	9.82	9.85	9.85	9.86	9.86	9.87
3	10.30	10.33	10.31	10.33	10.33	10.32
4	10.82	10.85	10.84	10.84	10.83	10.83
5	11.42	11.40	11.43	11.47	11.47	11.46
Large	12.50	12.55	12.52	12.53	12.68	12.68

Sample Average of B/P (in Percent)

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	37.79	39.32	40.41	37.42	37.40	35.31
2	36.97	40.27	42.94	41.54	40.88	35.97
3	39.68	41.55	40.37	40.59	39.22	34.17
4	37.44	42.37	41.85	40.02	38.64	33.91
5	35.92	40.15	39.79	38.68	37.14	33.88
Large	35.24	37.35	33.08	31.39	30.77	28.37

Sample Average of E/P (in Percent)

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	4.15	4.68	5.20	4.67	4.65	4.48
2	4.94	5.34	5.77	5.63	5.51	4.62
3	4.66	5.54	5.30	5.43	5.69	5.06
4	5.39	5.74	5.66	5.29	5.49	5.34
5	6.41	5.88	6.29	6.07	5.87	5.63
Large	5.99	6.84	5.73	5.33	5.09	5.18

Sample Average of D/P (in Percent)

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	0.67	0.82	0.89	0.85	0.89	0.79
2	0.87	0.93	1.00	1.04	0.99	0.86
3	0.82	1.00	1.01	1.03	0.96	0.89
4	0.91	1.07	1.07	0.97	0.97	0.91
5	0.91	1.05	1.01	0.97	0.97	0.85
Large	1.06	1.29	1.00	0.97	0.98	0.83

Sample Average of Leverage Ratio (in Percent)

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	71.46	70.73	70.72	71.57	71.15	71.53
2	65.58	65.28	63.45	63.96	66.72	66.54
3	64.36	62.30	64.16	64.38	62.45	65.52
4	63.18	60.49	61.44	60.38	62.79	64.31
5	60.45	58.85	58.55	58.76	60.31	65.43
Large	56.93	59.94	61.11	63.36	65.73	67.46

S-Beta

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	0.78	0.87	0.94	0.91	0.95	0.98
2	0.66	0.84	0.86	0.89	0.98	0.91
3	0.66	0.83	0.82	0.90	0.94	0.93
4	0.78	0.89	0.89	0.97	1.01	1.07
5	0.86	0.86	0.88	0.92	0.97	1.12
Large	0.72	0.83	0.90	1.00	1.06	1.05

Labor-Beta

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	1.2895	0.422	0.218	0.201	0.486	0.121
2	-0.1898	-0.266	-0.133	-0.217	-0.305	-0.799
3	-0.4017	-0.615	-0.517	-0.748	-1.289	-1.951
4	-0.4142	-1.116	-1.195	-1.750	-1.728	-1.747
5	-0.2319	-1.059	-1.085	-1.507	-2.312	-2.042
Large	-0.0885	-1.051	-1.533	-1.638	-2.416	-2.491

SSPR-Beta

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	0.8555	0.8072	0.79329	0.882	0.8533	0.852
2	0.6206	0.7024	0.57120	0.629	0.6668	0.614
3	0.5483	0.5252	0.55925	0.556	0.5351	0.461
4	0.4027	0.4098	0.44748	0.400	0.3918	0.344
5	0.3339	0.2799	0.25532	0.255	0.2245	0.204
Large	0.0319	0.0705	0.00452	-0.041	-0.0876	-0.134

BSPR-Beta

	Low	2	3	4	5	High
Small	0.13993	0.1722	0.109	0.260	0.254	0.416
2	0.06753	0.0492	0.236	0.261	0.375	0.535
3	0.08428	0.0236	0.101	0.330	0.354	0.521
4	-0.00776	0.2588	0.189	0.365	0.469	0.666
5	0.01171	0.0621	0.251	0.353	0.486	0.745
Large	-0.08555	0.0902	0.302	0.602	0.633	0.888

TABLE 4

Comparing the Performance of the two CAPM Specifications using the 25 Size-BPR sorted portfolio returns

This table gives the estimated values of the parameters in the cross sectional regression model,

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_{size} \log(ME_i) + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{labor} \beta_i^{labor}$$

and the stochastic discount factor model for moments,

$$E[R_{it} (\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{labor} R_t^{labor})] = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 25$$

, where R_{it} denotes the return on portfolio i , R_t^s denotes the month t return on TOPIX, and R_t^{labor} denotes the growth rate in per capita labor income lagged by 2 months. Betas represent the slope coefficient in the univariate regression of R_{it} on the relevant variable. The cross sectional regression model parameters are estimated using the Fama-MacBeth procedure. The corrected t-values and p-values are computed using the procedure described in Jagannathan and Wang (1995). The stochastic discount factor models for moments are estimated using Hansen's (1982) generalized method of moments. GMM refers to the use of the optimal weighting matrix described in Hansen (1982) and HJ refers to the use of the inverse of the second moment matrix of returns as the weighting matrix. Dist refers to the minimized value of the criterion function. We use 142 monthly observations from September 1982 to June 1993.

Table 4, Panel A

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{labor}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	2.46	-1.28			2.78
t-value	2.61	-1.10			
%p-value	0.91	27.10			
Corrected t-value	2.55	-1.08			
Corrected p-value	1.08	28.00			
Estimate	6.46	-1.73		-0.32	54.70
t-value	3.33	-1.51		-2.44	
%p-value	0.09	13.20		1.46	
corrected t-value	3.19	-1.46		-2.35	
corrected p-value	0.14	14.50		1.89	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{labor}	GMM-Dist	
Estimate	0.99	-0.04			0.466
t-value	36.27	-0.17			
%p-value	0.00	98.68			9.85
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{labor}	HJ-Dist	
Estimate	0.99	-0.04			0.521
t-value	36.27	-0.16			
%p-value	0.00	98.73			1.32

Table 4, Panel B

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{labor}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	3.38	-1.96	0.51		75.50
t-value	3.32	-1.67	3.57		
%p-value	0.09	9.44	0.04		
Corrected t-value	2.06	-1.04	2.26		
Corrected p-value	3.92	29.55	2.39		
Estimate	4.45	-1.97	0.42	-0.10	77.9
t-value	2.33	-1.69	3.61	-0.71	
%p-value	1.96	9.17	0.03	47.53	
corrected t-value	1.61	-1.17	2.55	-0.49	
corrected p-value	10.73	24.09	1.07	62.23	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{labor}	GMM-Dist	
Estimate	1.45	3.41	-187		0.351
t-value	8.45	0.92	-3.71		
%p-value	0.00	35.70	0.21		69.20
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{labor}	HJ-Dist	
Estimate	1.40	1.50	-171		0.438
t-value	8.09	0.40	-3.21		
%p-value	0.00	69.10	0.14		66.40

TABLE 5
Comparing the Performance of the Size Spread Factor and Book to Price Spread Factor
using the 25 Size-Book to Market sorted portfolio returns

This table gives the estimated values of the parameters in the cross sectional regression model,

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{bspr} \beta_i^{bspr} + c_{sspr} \beta_i^{sspr}$$

and the stochastic discount factor model for moments,

$$E[R_{it} (\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{bspr} R_t^{bspr} + \delta_{sspr} R_t^{sspr})] = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 25,$$

where R_{it} denotes the return on portfolio i , R_t^s denotes the month t return on TOPIX, R_t^{bkr} denotes the growth rate in the number of business failures lagged by one month, R_t^{bspr} and R_t^{sspr} respectively denote the book to price spread factor and the size-spread factor. Betas represent the slope coefficient in the univariate regression of R_{it} on the relevant variable. The cross sectional regression model parameters are estimated using the Fama-MacBeth procedure. The corrected t-values and p-values are computed using the procedure described in Jagannathan and Wang (1995). The stochastic discount factor models for moments are estimated using Hansen's (1982) generalized method of moments. GMM refers to the use of the optimal weighting matrix described in Hansen (1982) and HJ refers to the use of the inverse of the second moment matrix of returns as the weighting matrix. Dist refers to the minimized value of the criterion function. We use 142 monthly observations from September 1982 to June 1993.

Table 5, Panel A

Coefficient	c_0	c_s	c_{bspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	-1.30	3.61	-2.02			60.00
t-value	-1.30	2.57	-4.46			
%p-value	19.10	1.02	0.00			
Corrected t-value	-1.09	2.15	-3.76			
Corrected p-value	27.80	3.17	0.02			
Estimate	2.51	2.20	-1.57		-0.24	86.20
t-value	1.27	1.82	-3.80		-1.81	
%p-value	20.50	6.89	0.01		7.02	
corrected t-value	1.15	1.66	-3.52		-1.65	
corrected p-value	25.00	9.74	0.04		10.01	
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.20	-6.62	10.70			0.358
t-value	16.49	-2.44	4.03			
%p-value	0.00	1.46	0.00			65.00
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.18	-5.65	10.40			0.404
t-value	15.79	-1.95	3.79			
%p-value	0.00	5.12	0.00			50.50

Table 5, Panel B

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{hspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	2.43	-1.92		1.39		58.90
t-value	2.57	-1.67		2.52		
%p-value	1.01	9.51		1.18		
Corrected t-value	2.40	-1.57		2.40		
Corrected p-value	1.63	11.61		1.65		
Estimate	-3.20	-2.15		3.23	0.44	61.10
t-value	-0.78	-1.85		2.28	1.41	
%p-value	43.80	6.49		2.25	15.90	
corrected t-value	-0.66	-1.59		1.98	1.21	
corrected p-value	50.70	11.14		4.80	22.80	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.03	1.00		-3.42		0.443
t-value	24.38	0.36		-2.57		
%p-value	0.00	71.78		1.02		14.40
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.03	0.18		-3.10		0.482
t-value	24.34	0.06		-2.29		
%p-value	0.00	94.95		2.19		3.99

Table 5, Panel C

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{hspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	-0.42	1.95	-1.53	1.04		88.40
t-value	-0.45	1.60	-3.68	1.87		
%p-value	65.40	10.90	0.02	6.18		
Corrected t-value	-0.41	1.45	-3.40	1.71		
Corrected p-value	68.60	14.70	0.07	8.67		
Estimate	-4.12	1.74	-1.50	2.28	0.30	89.30
t-value	-0.99	1.43	-3.63	1.62	0.95	
%p-value	32.00	15.20	0.03	10.50	34.40	
corrected t-value	-0.87	1.25	-3.25	1.42	0.83	
corrected p-value	38.70	21.10	0.12	15.50	41.00	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.20	-5.79	9.38	-2.14		0.343
t-value	16.74	-2.13	3.58	-1.66		
%p-value	0.00	3.33	0.03	9.71		68.50
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.19	-5.09	9.63	-2.39		0.375
t-value	15.80	-1.73	3.49	-1.80		
%p-value	0.00	8.41	0.05	7.12		59.10

Table 5, Panel D

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{Labor}	c_{hspr}	c_{sspr}	%R-Square
Estimate	0.27	1.28	0.12	-1.28	0.83	89.30
t-value	0.26	1.00	0.94	-2.77	1.35	
%p-value	79.70	32.00	34.80	5.67	17.70	
Corrected t-value	0.23	0.90	0.85	-2.54	1.23	
Corrected p-value	81.60	37.00	39.60	1.10	21.80	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{Labor}	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}	GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.36	-3.61	-70.19	9.12	-0.99	0.319
t-value	9.97	-1.01	-1.24	2.98	-0.70	
%p-value	0.00	31.16	21.40	2.85	48.20	77.20
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{Labor}	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}	HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.34	-5.69	-76.06	8.09	-1.71	0.360
t-value	9.22	-1.85	-1.28	2.52	-1.14	
%p-value	0.00	6.44	19.90	1.17	25.40	70.20

TABLE 6

Comparing the Performance of the two CAPM Specifications using the 36 Size-Beta sorted portfolio returns

This table gives the estimated values of the parameters in the cross sectional regression model,

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_{size} \log(ME_i) + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{labor} \beta_i^{labor}$$

and the stochastic discount factor model for moments,

$$E[R_{it} (\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{labor} R_t^{labor})] = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, 25$$

, where R_{it} denotes the return on portfolio i , R_t^s denotes the month t return on TOPIX, and R_t^{labor} denotes the growth rate in per capita labor income lagged by 2 months. Betas represent the slope coefficient in the univariate regression of R_{it} on the relevant variable. The cross sectional regression model parameters are estimated using the Fama-MacBeth procedure. The corrected t-values and p-values are computed using the procedure described in Jagannathan and Wang (1995). The stochastic discount factor models for moments are estimated using Hansen's (1982) generalized method of moments. GMM refers to the use of the optimal weighting matrix described in Hansen (1982) and HJ refers to the use of the inverse of the second moment matrix of returns as the weighting matrix. Dist refers to the minimized value of the criterion function. We use 142 monthly observations from September 1982 to June 1993.

Table 6, Panel A

Coefficient	c_0	c_s	c_{labor}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	1.89	-0.67			2.39
t-value	1.85	-0.59			
%p-value	6.46	55.50			
Corrected t-value	1.84	-0.59			
Corrected p-value	6.63	55.70			
Estimate	4.85	0.14		-0.33	69.80
t-value	2.55	0.13		-2.48	
%p-value	1.07	89.70		1.30	
corrected t-value	2.55	0.13		-2.48	
corrected p-value	1.07	89.70		1.31	
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{labor}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.00	-1.17			0.531
t-value	45.60	-0.61			
%p-value	0.00	54.10			17.10
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{labor}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.00	-1.12			0.62
t-value	45.80	-0.58			
%p-value	0.00	56.10			0.90

Table 6, Panel B

Coefficient	c_0	c_s	c_{labor}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	-0.64	1.99	0.52		75.60
t-value	-0.08	1.83	3.20		
%p-value	93.71	6.72	0.13		
Corrected t-value	-0.05	1.16	2.06		
Corrected p-value	96.00	24.42	3.88		
Estimate	2.15	1.45	0.34	-0.17	83.70
t-value	1.16	1.55	2.60	-1.18	
%p-value	24.80	12.10	0.94	23.90	
corrected t-value	0.91	1.22	2.07	-0.93	
corrected p-value	36.30	22.10	3.82	35.40	
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{labor}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.37	-3.37	-127.00		0.527
t-value	8.86	-1.53	-2.69		
%p-value	0.00	12.50	0.72		15.60
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{labor}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.25	-1.91	-93.70		0.595
t-value	8.64	-0.86	-1.99		
p-value	0.00	39.20	4.61		8.51

TABLE 7

Comparing the Performance of the Size Spread Factor and Book to Price Spread Factor using the 36 Size-Beta sorted portfolio returns

This table gives the estimated values of the parameters in the cross sectional regression model,

$$E[R_{it}] = c_0 + c_s \beta_i^s + c_{bspr} \beta_i^{bspr} + c_{sspr} \beta_i^{sspr}$$

and the stochastic discount factor model for moments,

$$E[R_{it} (\delta_0 + \delta_s R_t^s + \delta_{bspr} R_t^{bspr} + \delta_{sspr} R_t^{sspr})] = 1, i = 1, 2, \dots, 25,$$

where R_{it} denotes the return on portfolio i , R_t^s denotes the month t return on TOPIX, R_t^{bkr} denotes the growth rate in the number of business failures lagged by one month, R_t^{bspr} and R_t^{sspr} respectively denote the book to price spread factor and the size-spread factor. Betas represent the slope coefficient in the univariate regression of R_{it} on the relevant variable. The cross sectional regression model parameters are estimated using the Fama-MacBeth procedure. The corrected t-values and p-values are computed using the procedure described in Jagannathan and Wang (1995). The stochastic discount factor models for moments are estimated using Hansen's (1982) generalized method of moments. GMM refers to the use of the optimal weighting matrix described in Hansen (1982) and HJ refers to the use of the inverse of the second moment matrix of returns as the weighting matrix. Dist refers to the minimized value of the criterion function. We use 142 monthly observations from September 1982 to June 1993.

Table 7, Panel A

Coefficient	c_0	c_s	c_{bspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	-0.02	1.90	-1.38			16.80
t-value	-0.03	2.17	-2.22			
%p-value	97.46	3.01	2.67			
Corrected t-value	-2.96	2.02	-2.07			
Corrected p-value	97.64	4.31	3.83			
Estimate	3.47	1.76	-0.89		-0.31	75.70
t-value	1.96	2.02	-1.48		-2.35	
%p-value	5.00	4.36	13.80		1.88	
corrected t-value	1.87	1.94	-1.42		-2.24	
corrected p-value	6.16	5.27	15.70		2.50	
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}		GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.08	-2.70	4.98			0.522
t-value	18.67	-1.31	1.75			
%p-value	0.00	19.20	8.10			17.60
Coefficient	δ_0	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}		HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.06	-2.19	4.08			0.610
t-value	18.23	-1.03	1.36			
%p-value	0.00	30.40	17.50			0.89

Table 7, Panel B

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{bspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	0.34	0.36		1.41		75.40
t-value	0.39	0.33		2.57		
%p-value	70.00	74.20		1.01		
Corrected t-value	0.38	0.32		2.57		
Corrected p-value	70.70	74.80		1.03		
Estimate	-5.61	0.58		3.22	0.44	78.00
t-value	-1.33	0.58		2.16	1.26	
%p-value	18.40	56.00		3.08	20.90	
corrected t-value	-1.19	0.52		1.96	1.12	
corrected p-value	23.50	60.10		5.04	26.10	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}	GMM-Dist	
Estimate	1.07	-0.72		-4.28		0.502
t-value	24.57	-0.38		-3.30		
%p-value	0.00	70.60		0.10		27.60
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}	HJ-Dist	
Estimate	1.05	-1.22		-3.32		0.581
t-value	25.50	-0.63		-2.49		
%p-value	0.00	52.80		1.28		3.29

Table 7, Panel C

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{bspr}	c_{sspr}	c_{size}	%R-Square
Estimate	-0.44	1.47	-0.62	1.34		78.10
t-value	-0.75	1.68	-1.01	2.38		
%p-value	45.20	9.37	31.20	1.71		
Corrected t-value	-0.71	1.60	-0.96	2.31		
Corrected p-value	47.60	11.00	33.70	2.10		
Estimate	-3.81	1.22	-0.41	2.47	0.27	78.80
t-value	-1.11	1.40	-0.69	2.03	1.02	
%p-value	26.80	16.10	49.00	4.23	30.90	
corrected t-value	-1.01	1.29	-0.63	1.88	0.93	
corrected p-value	31.00	19.70	52.70	5.96	35.20	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}	GMM-Dist	
Estimate	1.07	-0.97	0.60	-4.10		0.505
t-value	18.10	-0.46	0.20	-3.06		
%p-value	0.00	64.80	84.20	0.22		22.20
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{bspr}	δ_{sspr}	HJ-Dist	
Estimate	1.09	-1.90	2.64	-3.12		0.577
t-value	17.30	-0.87	0.85	-2.31		
%p-value	0.00	38.40	39.70	2.09		3.45

Table 7, Panel D

Coefficient	c₀	c_s	c_{Labor}	c_{hspr}	c_{sspr}	%R-Square
Estimate	-0.31	1.70	0.27	-0.21	0.81	84.80
t-value	-0.53	1.93	2.21	-0.35	1.23	
%p-value	59.20	5.33	2.74	72.60	19.40	
Corrected t-value	-0.44	1.59	1.83	-0.29	1.08	
Corrected p-value	66.00	11.12	6.70	77.30	28.10	
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{Labor}	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}	GMM-Dist
Estimate	1.23	-2.10	-57.88	0.62	-3.81	0.505
t-value	8.58	-0.91	-1.22	0.20	-2.60	
%p-value	0.00	36.20	22.10	83.90	0.94	19.0
Coefficient	δ₀	δ_s	δ_{Labor}	δ_{hspr}	δ_{sspr}	HJ-Dist
Estimate	1.23	-2.38	-60.49	2.60	-2.54	0.567
t-value	8.30	-1.01	-1.23	0.82	-1.72	
%p-value	0.00	31.40	22.10	41.30	8.58	7.52

¹ See Black (1972), Lintner (1965), and Sharpe (1964)

² Sundaresan (1989), Constantinides (1990), Abel (1990) obtain related models by taking different stands regarding the form of the period utility function of the representative agent in the economy. However, all these models assume that the representative agent's preferences satisfy the Expected Utility axioms.

Epstein and Zin (1991) derive an asset pricing model where the representative agent's preferences do not satisfy the Expected Utility axioms.

³ See Hansen and Singleton (1982, 1983), Brown and Gibbons (1985), Dunn and Singleton (1986), Cochrane (1992), Jagannathan (1985), Harvey (1989), Ferson and Harvey (1992), Eichenbaum, Hansen and Singleton (1988), Ferson and Constantinides (1991), Hansen and Jagannathan (1991, 1994), and Heaton (1993).

⁴ See Connor and Korajczyk (1988), Lehmann and Modest (1988) and Chen, Roll and Ross (1986), Ferson and Harvey (1992), Bansal and Viswanathan (1993), Bansal, Hsieh and Viswanathan (1993) and Jagannathan and Wang (1995)

⁵ The size effect was first documented in a systematic way by Banz (1981). The book to market effect was documented by Rosenberg, Reid and Lanstein (1984). Kato and Schallheim (1985) study the size effect in Japan

⁶ According to Becker (1993), "The outstanding economic records of Japan, Taiwan, and other Asian economies in recent decades dramatically illustrate the importance of human capital to growth. Lacking natural resources -- e.g., they import practically all their sources of energy -- and facing discrimination from the West, these so-called Asian tigers grew rapidly by relying on a well-trained, educated, hard-working, and conscientious labor force".

⁷ . Berk (1992) pointed out, relative size and relative book to price ratio of firms will in general be correlated with the expected return on stocks of the firms, in the cross section. However, Berk's (199.) arguments do not explain why the size and the book to price *factor betas* can explain the cross section of expected return on stocks.

⁸ The per capita GNP in Japan was \$19,959 (\$15,760 if inflation adjusted and a 3 year average exchange rate was used) in 1987 and rose to \$28,937 (\$26,930 if inflation adjusted and a 3 year average exchange rate was used) in 1991. The corresponding numbers for the USA are \$18,530 and \$22,240 [see R.C. Hsu (1994)]. In 1993 the GDP per capita was \$37,040 in Japan and \$25,790 in the USA (source: EIU)

⁹ According to the Tokyo Stock Exchange Fact Book (1994), at the end of 1992, the total market value of stocks listed in the Tokyo Stock Exchange was \$2,321 billion. The corresponding number for New York Stock Exchange was \$3,878 billion. The total market value of stocks listed in the London Stock Exchange, which was the third largest, was \$933 billion.

¹⁰ See Lo and MacKinlay (1990) for an excellent discussion of "Data-snooping biases in tests of financial asset pricing models".

¹¹ Sakuraba (1987) used 208 stocks included in the Nikkei 225 index return for the period 1963 to 1984.

¹² Stambaugh (1982) was the first to empirically compare the relative performance of various market proxies. He found that the inferences about the CAPM was not sensitive to the choice of the proxy used. However, he did not consider the return on human capital in his otherwise extensive study.

¹³ See the table giving "Closing stocks of Assets and Liabilities", Japan Statistical Year Book 1993/94.

¹⁴ See Mayers (1972) for the development of a version of the CAPM which takes the return on human capital into account.

¹⁵ The limitations of the OLS R-Square metric is discussed in Jagannathan and Wang (1993) and Kandel and Stambaugh (1995). However, these limitations do not invalidate the use of the OLS R-Square for the purposes we use in this article.

¹⁶ The Black, Jensen and Scholes (1972) and the Fama and MacBeth (1972) procedure for computing the sampling errors associated with the parameters estimated using the cross sectional regression method ignores the error introduced by replacing the betas by their estimates. Shanken (1992) was the first to show how to overcome this difficulty, under normality. Jagannathan and Wang (1995) provide asymptotic justifications that do not rely on normality.

¹⁷ See Hansen and Jagannathan (1991 and 1994), Jagannathan and Wang (1993) and Bansal and Viswanathan (1993), Bansal, Hsieh and Viswanathan (1993) and MacKinlay and Richardson (1991) for a

discussion of empirically examining linear factor models using their stochastic discount factor representation and the GMM.