



Disaster and Fortune Risk in Asset Returns

Lerby M. Ergun

SRC Discussion Paper No 59

March 2016



Systemic Risk Centre

Discussion Paper Series

Abstract

Do Disaster risk and Fortune risk fetch a premium or discount in the pricing of individual assets? Disaster risk and Fortune risk are measures for the co-movement of individual stocks with the market, given that the state of the world is extremely bad and extremely good, respectively. To address this question measures of Disaster risk and Fortune risk, derived from statistical Extreme Value Theory, are constructed. The measures are non-parametric and the number of order statistics to be used in the analysis is based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance. This alleviates the problem of an arbitrarily chosen extreme region. The extreme dependence measures are used in Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional asset pricing regressions including Market, Fama-French, Liquidity and Momentum factors. I find that Disaster risk fetches a significant premium of 0.43% for the average stock.

This paper is published as part of the Systemic Risk Centre's Discussion Paper Series. The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) in funding the SRC is gratefully acknowledged [grant number ES/K002309/1].

Lerby M. Ergun, Systemic Risk Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science

Published by
Systemic Risk Centre
The London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Working Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

© Lerby M. Ergun submitted 2016

Disaster and Fortune Risk in Asset Returns

Lerby M. Ergun*

February 2016

Abstract

Do Disaster risk and Fortune risk fetch a premium or discount in the pricing of individual assets? Disaster risk and Fortune risk are measures for the co-movement of individual stocks with the market, given that the state of the world is extremely bad and extremely good, respectively. To address this question measures of Disaster risk and Fortune risk, derived from statistical Extreme Value Theory, are constructed. The measures are non-parametric and the number of order statistics to be used in the analysis is based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance. This alleviates the problem of an arbitrarily chosen extreme region. The extreme dependence measures are used in Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional asset pricing regressions including Market, Fama-French, Liquidity and Momentum factors. I find that Disaster risk fetches a significant premium of 0.43% for the average stock.

*Tinbergen Institute and the Systemic Risk Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science. I want to thank Aaditya Muthukumaran, Andre Lucas, Bjorn Jorgensen, Casper de Vries, Dirk Schoenmaker, Emil Siriwardane, John Einmahl, Jon Danielsson, Philipp Hartmann, Stijn van Nieuwerburgh and Xavier Gabaix for the valuable feedback and discussions. I also thank the seminar participants at the Duisenberg school of finance, the Erasmus University, University College London and the 10th Seminar on Risk, Financial Stability and Banking of the Banco Central do Brasil. I thank the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research Mozaiek grant [grant number: 017.005.108] for research funding. Also, the support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) in funding the Systemic Risk Centre is gratefully acknowledged [grant number ES/K002309/1].

1 Introduction

Returns in financial markets are characterized by extreme movements (Jansen and De Vries, 1991, Fama, 1963 and Mandelbrot, 1963). It is in these extreme cases that investors are highly concerned about the performance of their portfolio. The extreme movements of the market are not always reflected equally in all individual stocks. Securities which are more sensitive to these extreme negative shocks are undesirable and therefore should sell at a discount. In this paper I propose downside and upside dependency measures, i.e. Disaster and Fortune risk respectively, which captures this risk for individual stocks. These non-parametric EVT based tail dependency measures offer a new approach to capture disaster risk in asset prices. I find that Disaster risk fetches a robust premium. On the upside, exposure to Fortune risk carries a discount.

Prior literature on disaster risk in asset pricing mainly focuses on theoretical models. Part of this literature includes higher moments to account for tail thickness. Samuelson (1970) as well as Harvey and Siddique (2000), consider skewness and kurtosis as the higher moments. Others, like Rietz (1988) proposes an extreme event premium to explain the equity premium puzzle. He adjusted the equity premium model by Mehra and Prescott (1985), by introducing a disaster state to the Arrow-Debreu paradigm. With the inclusion of the low probability high impact state, Rietz is able to explain the equity risk premium puzzle for a reasonable choice of parameters. Barro (2006) extends this idea to investigate the impact of disaster risk on asset pricing facts and welfare costs. He finds, as Rietz does, that the equity risk premium and the risk free rate puzzle can be explained by including disaster risk. Gabaix (2012) extends these models by adding time variability of disaster risk. He is able to explain ten asset pricing puzzles including the equity premium puzzle.

Testing these theoretical models has proven to be a challenge as extreme events are only rarely observed. Several papers attempt to overcome this challenge by studying different sources of extreme movements in asset prices. Berkman, Jacobsen, and Lee (2011), Bittlingmayer (1998) and Frey and Kucher (2000) use major political crises as a measure for disaster risk. Amihud and Wohl (2004) and Rigobon and Sack (2005) find a link between the stock market and the second Iraq war. These studies lack the full empirical analysis of the systematic compensation for extreme event risk.

In this paper I consider a novel approach. This approach employs a non-parametric count measure to determine the dependence in the tail between individual stocks and the market portfolio. In essence the measure counts

the number of joint excesses of the market return $R_{m,t}$ and individual stock return $R_{i,t}$ conditional on the $R_{m,t}$ being stressed at time t . This captures in a direct way the dependence given that the world is in a disaster state. This measure is not limited to the left side of the tail, i.e. disaster state. It also provides a dependence measure for an extreme up state of the world. Hartmann, Straetmans, and De Vries (2004) employ Huang's (1992) count measure to investigate the extreme dependence within and between stock and bond markets.

There are currently two other empirical approaches which attempt to measure tail risk across the market. Kelly and Jiang (2014) estimate the thickness of the tail from the daily cross-section of traded stocks. Kelly and Jiang (2014) use a fixed proportion of the higher extreme order statistics to measure the tail thickness. The day-by-day tail exponent estimate functions as the measure of disaster risk in the economy. Although this measures the cross-sectional dispersion in the lower tail, it does not directly measure the disaster risk in the economy. Secondly, the use of the estimator of the tail exponent by Hill (1975) in the cross-section violates the independence assumption of the Hill estimator.

The second approach in the literature uses the information of deep out of the money (OTM) put options to capture tail risk. This approach utilizes the difference between quadratic variation and integrated variance to isolate the risk of jumps. Bollerslev and Todorov (2011) infer tail risk from the OTM put options on the S&P 500. They use EVT to scale up the risk of medium jumps to large jumps. They find that jump risk and fear of jumps accounts for two-thirds of the equity risk premium. Siriwardane (2013) utilizes the difference between OTM put and call options to isolate jump risk for individual stocks. He then sorts these into portfolios according to their jump risk to create a High-minus-Low factor. Both papers find that investors demand compensation for tail risk.

An advantage of the approach offered in this paper compared to the previously proposed measures is that the proposed factors are a direct and simple measure of the relationship of the state of the world and the pay-off of the financial asset. As EVT shows, the count measure has predictive value at very high but finite levels. For this measure I refrain from using the deep OTM options, e.g. as Siriwardane (2013) and Bollerslev and Todorov (2011). OTM options can suffer from liquidity issues, especially for individual companies. This can induce a miss-pricing of these options and accuracy issues for the measurement of the risk factor.

The methodology of using the dispersion in the cross-section of stock returns is an indirect way of measuring tail risk. In addition, it also violates the independence assumption of the estimator. Although the risk factors introduced in this paper are simple to construct and a direct measure of the state dependence, they do have drawbacks. A limitation of using the EVT framework is that a long time series is needed to collect sufficient tail observations for the risk measure. This prohibits the measurement of time varying disaster risk. The other two approaches do not suffer this limitation.

The count measure necessitates the choice of a threshold to determine the tail region for the joint excesses of $R_{i,t}$ and $R_{m,t}$. With these thresholds the extreme area is determined, for example $(R_{i,t} < v, R_{m,t} < w)$, where v and w are the respective thresholds. The optimal thresholds for $R_{i,t}$ and $R_{m,t}$ are univariately determined, and thus in a direct way the multi-variate extreme area is constructed. To determine the thresholds, v and w , I use a methodology which estimates the heavyness of the tail. Bickel and Sakov (2008) employ the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test to find the optimal sub-sample bootstrap size to attain convergence of the bootstrap- and a parametric distribution. Inspired by Bickel and Sakov (2008), Danielsson, Ergun, De Haan, and De Vries (2016) propose a methodology for locating the 'start' of the tail by estimating the optimal number of order statistics for the Hill estimator. To determine the optimal number of extreme order statistics they use a horizontal distance measure that minimizes the maximum distance between the empirical and the semi-parametric distribution. Given these thresholds I determine my dependence measures for the tail region.

The extreme dependence measures are employed in Fama-MacBeth regressions to determine whether they are priced and subsequently whether they fetch a premium or a discount. Fortune and Disaster risk loadings are included in the CAPM- and Fama-French factor model. The Momentum factor by Carhart (1997) and the Liquidity factor by Stambaugh and Lubos (2003) along with variables which are commonly used in the asset pricing literature are also included in the analysis. The up- and downside beta of the non-linear beta model by Ang, Chen, and Xing (2006) are included as well. The Disaster and Fortune risk measures are also utilized to test for a further non-linearisation of their model.

The results from the cross-sectional analysis indicate that high dependence in the tail of the distribution matters, especially for the downside. I find that investors demand a risk premium of 0.4% on the average stock for dependence in the downside tail region. This is in line with the results of Kelly and

Jiang (2014) and Siriwardane (2013) who also find higher compensation for downside sensitivity. Disaster and Fortune risk also perform well in the non-linear beta framework. This indicates that a further non-linearisation is fitting for risk sensitivity of investors.

Section 2 introduces the dependence measure and discusses the asset pricing framework. This is followed by Section 3 which describes the data which is used for the empirical analyses. Section 4 presents and discusses the empirical results from the analyses, followed by the conclusion.

2 Asset pricing methodology

The methodology for asset pricing purposes consists of four parts. The first two parts elaborate on how extreme dependence is measured and how I define the start of the tail. The third part gives an overview of systematic risk measures brought forth by the literature. The fourth part elaborates on the regressions that are employed to address the question whether extreme dependence is priced in the market.

2.1 Extreme dependence measures

Investors are interested in the performance of individual stocks relative to their wealth in a particular state of the world. I examine the asset pricing in the extremely bad and extremely good states of the world. It is in these economic circumstances that investors are most sensitive to the performance of the individual stocks.

I am interested in observing extreme $R_{i,t}$ conditional on $R_{m,t}$ being extreme. The count measure which is employed in this paper is,

$$Disaster_i = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T I_{\{R_{i,t} < v, R_{m,t} < w\}}}{\sum_{t=1}^T I_{\{R_{m,t} < w\}}} \quad (1)$$

where I is the indicator function. The summation in the numerator counts the number of paired observations which fall in the extreme quadrant, indicated in Figure 1. This measure can be viewed as the conditional probability,

$$P(R_{m,t} < w, R_{i,t} < v \mid R_{m,t} < w) = \frac{P(R_{m,t} < w, R_{i,t} < v)}{P(R_{m,t} < w)}.$$




Figure 1: This graph gives the scatter plot of Allegheny Power Systems Inc. returns and the corresponding market returns. Here w is the illustrative optimal threshold level for the market returns and v is the illustrative optimal threshold level of stock i for the left tail. The region under v and to the left of w is the extreme quadrant for Disaster risk.

This dependence measure is a proxy for the level of dependence a stock has on extreme market risk. For v and w going to infinity the conditional probability tends to the tail dependence measure presented in Hartmann, Straetmans, and De Vries (2004). A thorough derivation is provided in De Haan and Ferreira (2007). Under the self-similarity property the tail dependence model can be captured by the count measure described above. The event which the count measure seeks to quantify is: Given that the market has an extreme shock, how likely is it that stock i also exhibits an extreme movement in the same direction?

2.2 Where does the tail start?

This paper employs the Extreme Value Theory (EVT) methodology to determine where the tail of a distribution is optimally measured. Through this optimization the extreme quadrants of Disaster and Fortune risk are established.

In EVT the $1/\gamma$ in the power function $Ax^{-1/\gamma}$ determines the shape of the tail. In the literature $1/\gamma$ is often referred to as the tail index. The level of $1/\gamma$ determines how many moments exist and thus how heavy the tail of the distribution is. The most popular estimator for γ is the Hill estimator,

$$\hat{\gamma} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (\log(X_{n-i+1,n}) - \log(X_{n-k,n})) \quad (2)$$

where $X_{n-i+1,n}$ is the $(i)^{th}$ largest observation (order statistic) and k is the number of observations in tail which are used for estimating $\hat{\gamma}$. As can be seen from Equation (2) one has to choose the nuisance parameter k which determines how many extreme order statistics are used. Figure 2 shows the change in $1/\hat{\gamma}$ as the number of order statistics included in the estimation increase.




Figure 2: This graph depicts the estimate for $1/\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\alpha}$ for different levels of k . The sample of 10,000 is simulated from a Student-t distribution with 4 degrees of freedom. This graph is often referred to as the Hill plot.

To locate k^* , the optimal number of order statistics for the Hill estimator, Danielsson et al. (2016) introduce a simple method inspired by Bickel

and Sakov (2008). Bickel and Sakov (2008) minimize the maximal distance between the empirical and parametric probability. They employ the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance to match the empirical and theoretical distribution to find the optimal sub-sample size for the heavy tailed distributions. Danielsson et al. (2016) do not apply the same Kolmogorov-Smirnov metric. Instead, the distance is measured in the quantile rather than the probability dimension. The choice of the quantile dimension is motivated by the fact that a probabilistic mistake in the tail of the distribution translates into a proportionally large quantile mismatch, which is the dimension that economists care about. Basing the metric in the quantile dimension allows them to put better emphasis on modelling the tails.

In EVT the Pareto distribution is often utilized to estimate the extreme quantiles semi-parametrically. To fit the tail one only needs estimates for the scale and tail index of the Pareto distribution. Via various simple transformations Danielsson et al. (2016) arrive at the following penalty metric,¹

$$Q_{KS} = \inf_{1 < k \leq K} \left[\sup_{1 < j \leq K} \left| x_{n-j+1,n} - q \left(\frac{j}{n} \right) \right| \right].$$

I limit the area over which the above metric, i.e. KS distance metric, is measured to $x \geq X_{n-K,n}$. Here $K > k$ is large, but is still in the tail.² The k that produces the smallest maximum horizontal difference along all the tail observations up to K , is chosen as the optimal number of observations to estimate the thickness of the tail. Through the optimal k , i.e k^* , I also define the start of the tail.

Here I define k_i^* and k_m^* as the optimal number of order statistics in the tail which are utilized in the analysis for stock i and the market index, respectively. Once k_i^* and k_m^* are determined, I turn to the multivariate problem of measuring the dependence. From the univariate measures, k_i^* and k_m^* , an extreme dependence region is created, as in Figure 1. These regions are separately estimated for the left and right tail of the distribution.

The region $(R_{i,t} < v, R_{m,t} < w)$, where v and w correspond to the quantile of the order statistics k_i^* and k_m^* respectively, is appointed as the extreme quadrant. The number of extreme pairs of $R_{i,t}$ and $R_{m,t}$, which fall in this region, relative to the number of extreme market movements k_m^* is the dependence measure in Equation (1).

¹See Appendix A.1 for the derivation of the semi-parametric quantile estimator.

²For example 10% of the sample fraction.

2.3 Other systematic risk factors

The asset pricing literature suggests several systematic risk factors. In this paper these risk factors are used as control variables. Harvey and Siddique (2000) use Coskewness as a measure of heavy tails. Coskewness is defined as

$$Coskew = \frac{E [(R_i - \mu_i)(R_m - \mu_m)^2]}{\sqrt{var(R_i)var(R_m)}},$$

where μ_i is the expected excess return of asset i and μ_m is the expected excess return on the market portfolio. Although Coskewness is not a direct measure of tail dependence, it gives an indication of a stronger relationship in the tail. Harvey and Siddique (2000) predict that lower Coskewness should be associated with higher expected returns. The estimation of Coskewness requires the full return distribution. EVT shows that only the tail observations are necessary to provide information about tail risk. Moreover, using the vast number of center observations in the estimation might create a biased measure of tail dependence.

Scott and Horvath (1980) introduce a measure of the sensitivity of the kurtosis of a stock to the market kurtosis:

$$Cokurt = \frac{E [(R_i - \mu_i)(R_m - \mu_m)^3]}{\sqrt{var(R_i)var(R_m)^{\frac{3}{2}}}}.$$

In the univariate case kurtosis is often used as an indicator for the presence of heavy tails. Cokurtosis would then be a natural extension of a measure of tail dependence. However, Cokurtosis suffers from the same drawback as the Coskewness in that it uses central observations which makes it a biased tail dependence measure. An additional problem with the Cokurtosis and Coskewness measures is that they need the second and third moment to exist. This is not always the case for financial returns.

Ang et al. (2006) propose a non-linear CAPM by separating the co-movement of an individual asset conditional on a down movement and up movement. Given that the market is above its average excess return a beta is estimated. Accordingly, this is also done for the below average state. They define the up- and downside beta as,

$$\beta^+ = \frac{cov(R_i, R_m | R_m > \mu_m)}{var(R_m | R_m > \mu_m)}$$

$$\beta^- = \frac{\text{cov}(R_i, R_m | R_m < \mu_m)}{\text{var}(R_m | R_m < \mu_m)},$$

where β^+ and β^- are the up- and downside betas, respectively.

Ang et al. (2006) winsorize the tail observations at the 99% empirical quantile for the measurement of the non-linear beta measures, β^+ and β^- . It is in my view, however, that the information lost by winsorizing provides valuable information for the extremely good and bad states of the world. I utilized the information in the winsorized observations as a further non-linearisation of their risk-return relationship. By excluding the winsorized tail observations from the up and downside beta, the tail dependence measure can be estimated using these excluded observations. Therefore, the factors proposed in this paper provide a natural extension of their framework.

2.4 Asset pricing regressions

The fourth part of the empirical methodology deals with the pricing of the factors, i.e. do investors care about Disaster and Fortune risk? These dependence measures are applied in a cross-sectional framework which is often used in the asset pricing literature.

For a first indication of whether the factors are priced in the market I start by sorting the stocks in quintiles according to the realized factor loadings.³ The direction of the expected returns of these five portfolios indicates whether there is an initial relationship between the risk factor and expected returns.

The more formal test is a cross-sectional regression in the form of an APT framework. In this regression the newly created factors are regressed on the expected returns along with other known risk factors. The cross-sectional model has a simple linear form

$$E[R^e] = \lambda' \beta + \varepsilon$$

where $E[R^e]$ is the vector of expected returns, measured by taking the average of the monthly holding period returns of stock i . The vector of coefficients is represented by λ and can be interpreted as the risk premium. The matrix β is the factor loadings of every factor for the individual stocks. The β contains a constant, factor loading of commonly used risk factors in the literature and the extreme dependence measures developed in this paper. The ε

³The size of the coefficient from a regression of the stock return on the factor.

is the vector of residuals in the cross-sectional regression. The cross-sectional regressions are estimated using OLS.

Because the elements of β are estimated, an error-in-variable problem is introduced. This problem is usually overcome by using the cross-sectional framework put forth by Fama and MacBeth (1973). Alternatively, the Shanken (1992) correction can be applied. This paper uses the Fama-MacBeth procedure to alleviate the error-in-variable problem. This is a two-step procedure. An overlapping rolling window regression is utilized to estimate time varying factor loadings. In the first instance the extreme dependence measures are difficult to estimate in a rolling window framework. Due to sample size restrictions in determining the optimal threshold, there is a preference for a long time series for every asset. Requiring the sample to be long excludes short lived firms which contain essential information. Given that I apply a rolling window framework, the assets with a shorter time series will pop in and out of the rolling window. This will bias the results in the direction of a survivorship bias. To deal with this bias I perform additional robustness analyses.

In the first stage of the Fama-MacBeth procedure the factor loadings are estimated for the individual stock present in window t . This is represented as,

$$R_t^e = a_t + \beta_t X_t + \varepsilon_t$$

where R_t^e is the vector of excess returns for stock i in time window t . The X_t is a l by T matrix for the l factors and the T time units within the window t . The factor loadings are then collected in β_t . In the second stage regression the factors are tested for significance in risk premia.

$$E[R_t^e] = \lambda_t' \beta_t + \epsilon_t$$

where λ_t is the vector with the price of the risk of factors in window t .

Due to the use of the overlapping rolling windows in the Fama-MacBeth procedure, the time series of the λ are autocorrelated. To correct for this, I use Newey and West (1987) standard errors for λ .

3 Data

The analysis uses the daily US equity market data from 1963 to 2012. The extreme dependence measures are build up solely out of stock price information. The stock market data is obtained from the Center for Research

in Security Prices (CRSP). The CRSP database contains individual stock data from the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ and NYSE Arca. The Fama-French factor (Fama and French, 1996) data is provided by the website of Kenneth R. French as is the Momentum factor by Carhart (1997). The data library contains daily and monthly constructed Fama-French and Momentum factors from 1963 to 2012. The Liquidity factor by Stambaugh and Lubos (2003) is obtained from the website of Lubos Pastor.

In the main analysis 15,904 stocks are included. For the data analysis the monthly stock returns need to be matched to the monthly regression factors. Therefore, the analysis is confined to the period 1963 to 2012.⁴ For every stock that is included in the analysis it needs to be traded on one of the four exchanges during the entire measurement period.⁵ Only stocks with more than 48 months of data are used, as accuracy of extreme value estimators typically requires a large total sample size. Only a small sample fraction is informative for tail estimation. Table 1 gives the descriptive statistics for the Disaster factor and Fortune factor.

In the Appendix, Figures 3 and 4 give additional details on the distribution of the sample fractions used for the estimation of the count measure. We see that the shape of the distribution of the k_m^* for the Disaster and Fortune risk measures are different. For the Fortune measure a relatively small percentage of the tail observations are utilized for the dependence estimation. For the Disaster risk measure we find a similar distribution of the utilized sample fraction. The fraction of market returns used does differ for the Fortune and Disaster risk measures. For Disaster risk the cut-off point of 10% of the market return observations is often used. This difference does not seem to affect the distribution of the dependence measures.

The book-to-market ratio, which is used as one of the control variables, is obtained from the Compustat database. The Compustat database contains data from 1950 to 2012 on balance sheet items of the respective companies. The CRSP database provides linked PERMNO⁶ numbers for the Compustat database. The linked PERMNO numbers are used to match the two databases.

⁴The CRSP database and Fama-French factors dataset provide information going back to 1926. For a detailed description of the construction of the Fama-French factors and the Momentum factor please visit the data library on the website of Kenneth R. French.

⁵In the CRSP database exchange code -2, -1, 0 indicates that a stock was not traded on one of the four exchanges and thus no price data is recorded for these days. Stocks which contain one of the exchange codes are not included in the analysis. In addition, only stocks with share code 10 and 11 are included in the analysis.

⁶CRSP's permanent issue identifiers.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics Fortune and Disaster factor

Industry	n	Fortune				Disaster			
		Mean	St Dev	Min	Max	Mean	St Dev	Min	Max
All	19997	0.13	0.16	0.00	0.98	0.17	0.20	0.00	0.96
Agriculture, Forestry and Mining	11560	0.10	0.13	0.00	0.74	0.15	0.19	0.00	0.90
Contractors and Construction	194	0.13	0.14	0.00	0.66	0.16	0.18	0.00	0.78
Manufacturing	6332	0.11	0.13	0.00	0.84	0.15	0.17	0.00	0.94
Transportation, Communications and Utilities	1315	0.15	0.16	0.00	0.82	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.92
Wholesale Trade	617	0.10	0.11	0.00	0.72	0.15	0.18	0.00	0.90
Retail Trade	1039	0.10	0.12	0.00	0.67	0.15	0.17	0.00	0.83
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	5172	0.18	0.21	0.00	0.98	0.22	0.24	0.00	0.96
Business and Personal Services	1962	0.11	0.12	0.00	0.80	0.16	0.18	0.00	0.90
Health Services	320	0.09	0.10	0.00	0.58	0.16	0.18	0.00	0.83
Legal Services	7	0.16	0.16	0.01	0.46	0.18	0.20	0.00	0.57
Education and Social Services	80	0.11	0.12	0.00	0.64	0.13	0.17	0.00	0.63
Art and Membership Organizations	4	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.08
Engineering, Architecture and Accounting	209	0.13	0.13	0.00	0.54	0.23	0.23	0.00	0.88
Household and Miscellaneous Services	75	0.08	0.09	0.00	0.56	0.08	0.14	0.00	0.90
Government (Public Administration)	14	0.09	0.11	0.00	0.44	0.07	0.08	0.00	0.20

This table displays the distributional characteristics of Disaster and Fortune risk factors. The statistics are stated for the aggregate and per industry. The industries are arranged according to SIC codes. The first column reports the number of companies which are included in an industry. Columns 2-5 report the mean, standard deviation, maximum and minimum of the Fortune factor realizations, respectively. Columns 6-9 report the same statistics, but for the Disaster factor realizations. The data includes all the securities in the CRSP universe from 1925 till 2012, which are in the dataset for longer than 48 months.

4 Empirical results

Common practice in the asset pricing literature is to sort the stocks in quintile portfolios based on their factor realizations. Subsequently, the direction of the aggregated portfolio returns is examined for the predicted relationship.

Table 2: **Single sorted portfolios** This table lists the equal-weighted average excess returns and risk characteristics of stocks sorted on extreme factor realizations. Fortune and Disaster factors are calculated using daily observations for every individual asset which is listed on NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca in between the years 1963 and 2012. The returns on the individual assets are of a monthly frequency. The total number of assets under consideration is $n = 15,904$. The stocks are all sorted in ascending order of the factor realizations. The column " $E(R_i^e)$ " reports the average excess return of the realized factors sorted portfolio.

(a) Sorted by Disaster factors

Portfolio	$E(R_i^e)$	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Disaster</i>
1 low	0.1301	0.0670	0.0045
2	0.1476	0.0819	0.0354
3	0.1475	0.0979	0.0892
4	0.1670	0.1325	0.1865
5 high	0.1832	0.1891	0.4564

(b) Sorted by Fortune factors

Portfolio	$E(R_i^e)$	<i>Fortune</i>	<i>Disaster</i>
1 low	0.1371	0.0017	0.0808
2	0.1409	0.0281	0.1168
3	0.1524	0.0709	0.1447
4	0.1658	0.1404	0.1776
5 high	0.1792	0.3274	0.2521

Table 2 shows the average returns of the lower to upper quintile portfolios sorted by the Disaster and Fortune factors. The portfolios sorted on the Disaster factor show an overall increase in the average returns. This direction is in line with the risk-return relationship that one expects. Given that the market is in an extremely bad state, if the asset is also performing extremely badly, then investors want to be compensated for bearing this risk by a higher expected return. The average return of the portfolios sorted on the Fortune factor also show a monotone increasing average portfolio return.

This result is not in line with what one would expect as a negative risk premium should go together with a higher frequency of large pay-offs. When observing Table 5 in the Appendix one can see that Fortune and Disaster factor loadings are positively correlated. As these factors are not meant to be in a single factor model, I do not expect the results to be found in the portfolio sorting exercise. To get a better idea of what the relationship is and how much investors want to be compensated for the exposed systematic risk follows from the Fama-MacBeth regression shown below.

Table 3: **Base case Fama-MacBeth regression**

Model	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
α	0.0416 (0)***	0.0347 (0)***	0.0422 (0)***	0.0377 (0)***	0.0351 (0)***	0.0299 (0)***
Market	0.0639 (0)***	0.0283 (0)***	0.0632 (0)***	0.0533 (0)***	0.0571 (0)***	0.0277 (0)***
<i>SMB</i>		0.0052 (0.1793)		0.0313 (0)***	0.0332 (0)***	0.0057 (0.1351)
<i>HML</i>		-0.0199 (0)***		-0.0287 (0)***	-0.028 (0)***	-0.0197 (0)***
Fortune			-0.0223 (0.0337)**	0.0034 (0.6572)	0.0072 (0.3423)	0.0187 (0.0029)***
Disaster			0.0207 (0.0039)***	0.0267 (0)***	0.0261 (0)***	0.038 (0)***
Momentum		5.3366 (0)***			5.3395 (0)***	5.35 (0)***
Liquidity		0.0077 (0.043)**			0.0301 (0)***	0.0083 (0.0267)**
Coskewness		0.0155 (0.0277)**				0.0128 (0.0533)*
Cokurtosis		0.007 (0.0793)*				0.0048 (0.1929)

This table shows the results of Fama-MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from July-1963 to December-2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 1,651 to 5,107. *Market* is the CAPM beta. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *HML* and *SMB* are high minus low and small minus big factors (Fama and French,1996), respectively. *Liquidity* is the liquidity beta by Pastor and Stambaugh (2003). *Momentum* is the momentum factor created by Carhart (1997). *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et al. (2006). The p-values for the overlapping Fama-Macbeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.

In Table 3 the CAPM and the Fama-French results are reproduced. This is the starting point for the analysis, as these are the standard results in the asset pricing literature. Adding Fortune and Disaster risk to these models indicates the importance of extreme dependencies. Applying the rationale of the Arrow-Debreu framework to the Disaster risk measure would imply a positive risk premium. A stock which has extremely low returns in the extremely bad states of the world is an undesirable asset and requires a positive risk premium. When adding Disaster risk to the models the coefficient is positive and significant. This implies that investors do want to be compensated for stocks that have a high loading on Disaster risk. The premium for carrying a stock with a full loading on Disaster risk is around 2.5%. This means that a standard deviation increase of Disaster risk is a 0.5% increase in $E(R_i^e)$.

When adding Fortune risk loadings to the cross-sectional regression the sign of the coefficient is negative. The negative sign implies a negative risk premium for having a high loading on Fortune risk, as can be seen from the third model in Table 3. The intuition behind this factor is that in the good states of the world stocks with a high loading have a tendency to pay out extremely well. This does not convey any information about the bad states of the world. As expected, investors demand a negative premium for carrying Fortune risk as assets with this risk dependence are desirable. The discount is 2.23% on an annual basis when Fortune risk is added to the standard CAPM regression. This means that a one standard deviation increase of Fortune risk implies a 0.36% decrease in $E(R_i^e)$. When added to the Fama-French factor model the premium becomes positive and insignificant. The results for the extreme dependence measures are in line with the results of Kelly and Jiang (2014) and Siriwardane (2013). One can also observe that Disaster risk is more robustly priced than Fortune risk.

One can also wonder if stocks which have a high extreme dependence are sensitive to liquidity issues. Stambaugh and Lubos (2003) find that stocks with high sensitivity to liquidity have a higher expected return. This is especially a concern when the market experiences an extreme downwards movement. Model V shows that the Liquidity factor does not affect the significance of the premium on Fortune or Disaster risk compared to Model IV. The Momentum factor is another addition to the APT model often applied in the asset pricing literature to account for an additional source of systematic risk. Carhart (1997) is able to explain the persistent performance of mutual funds with the Momentum factor. Adding the Momentum factor to the regression model does not significantly influence the previously found results. This

implies that Disaster risk is not likely functioning as a proxy for other well tested risk factors. Given the inclusion of the Fama-French, Momentum, Liquidity, Coskewness, and Cokurtosis factor, Disaster risk is still significant and persistently has the same magnitude. Therefore, investors demand a compensation for stocks that carry Disaster risk in addition to existing risk factors.

Combining this result with the separation of the standard CAPM market factor into Ang et al. 's (2006) conditional up- and downside beta indicates that investors care differently about the co-movement in different parts of the distribution. They show that investors want to be differently compensated for up- and downside risk. In this paper their framework is extended to include extreme down, down, up and extreme up sensitivity. The count measures are now measured at the 1% threshold level.⁷ The remaining 98% of the observations are utilized to measure the up and downside beta.

The results of the second stage regressions that included these four factors are presented in Table 4. Note from Table 4 that for model III all four risk premia have the expected sign. The downside factors both fetch a premium and the upside factors exposures fetch a discount. This is consistent with the model of Ang et. al. (2006). The insignificance of β^+ is puzzling, as Fortune risk is consistently significant. This hints in the direction of a casino behaviour of investors, i.e. only the extreme upside dependence is appreciated. The significant pricing of the extreme dependence measures indicates that investors do care about extreme co-movements above the regular co-variation in the center of the distribution. The inclusion of the σ^2 changes the regression results considerably, as seen in model V. Aside from the change in magnitude of the coefficients, the direction of the Fortune risk coefficient changes as well. The same effect is found in Ang et. al. (2006), where the inclusion of σ increases the size of the constant by five times.

The correlation matrix of the factors points out that there is a correlation of 0.80 between the Disaster and Fortune risk loadings (See Table 5 in the Appendix). This might cause multicollinearity issues in the regressions. Therefore, different robustness checks are carried out in the next section. Ang et al.'s up and downside beta loadings are relatively uncorrelated with the extreme dependence loadings. This takes away the concern that both approaches measure the same fundamental risk.

⁷I use the 1% observations, because Ang et al. (2006) winsorize their sample at 1 % and 99% level.

Table 4: Base regression non-linear Beta model

Model	I	II	III	IV	V
α	0.145 (0)***	0.1484 (0)***	0.0641 (0)***	0.0625 (0)***	0.1468 (0)***
Market	0.0427 (0)***				
β^+		0.0275 (0)***	-0.005 (0.4073)	0.021 (0.0014)***	0.0283 (0)***
β^-		0.0148 (0.0246)**	0.0769 (0)***	0.067 (0)***	0.017 (0.0086)***
Fortune			-0.0925 (0.0001)***	-0.0427 (0.0247)**	0.1249 (0)***
Disaster			0.0401 (0.0407)**	0.0395 (0.0183)**	0.1348 (0)***
σ^2	-0.9876 (0.765)	-0.9216 (0.7907)			0.2164 (0.949)
Coskewness	-0.1061 (0)***	-0.1299 (0)***		-0.0862 (0)***	-0.1204 (0)***
Cokurtosis	0.0359 (0)***	0.0411 (0)***		-0.0146 (0.0043)***	0.0325 (0)***
Bk-Mkt	5.8427 (0)***	5.8205 (0)***			6.3871 (0)***
log(size)	-0.0298 (0)***	-0.0306 (0)***			-0.0347 (0)***

This table shows the results of Fama and MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on firm characteristics and realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from July-1963 to December-2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 470 to 4,320. *Market* is the CAPM beta. β^- and β^+ are the down- and upside beta (Ang et al., 2006), Respectively. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et. al. (2006). *Bk-Mkt* is the book to market ratio measured at the beginning of the rolling window. $\log(size)$ is the log of market capitalization, where market capitalization is measured by common shares outstanding multiplied by the share price at the beginning of the rolling window. σ^2 is the variance of the asset returns over the rolling window. The p-values for the overlapping Fama-MacBeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.

5 Robustness analyses

The results in Table 3 indicate that for all the companies which have a positive exposure and have been listed for longer than 48 months, they exhibit

positive premia for Disaster risk. A possibility is that the sensitivity to the exposure is not equal among all firms. Table 7 shows the Fama-MacBeth regression results for stocks that are listed between 48 and 180 months on one of the stock exchanges.⁸ The results in Table 7 indeed indicate that regressions only applied to stocks that exist between 48 and 180 months have a substantially higher premium for extreme dependency than the average premium found in Table 3. This is an indication that the exposure to the extreme dependence risk factors is important for firms which are relatively young. For the more established firms extreme dependence plays a lesser role. Table 8 shows the regression results for firms which started trading on one of the exchanges from year 1998. For this subsample the results are even stronger, further supporting the higher sensitivity of younger firms to extreme dependence.

The extreme quadrant is created out of the univariate estimates of k_i^* and k_m^* . The concern might arise that the factors perform well when the market beta is away from one and lose their explanatory power otherwise. Given that the market beta is close to unity, the origin of the extreme quadrant is more likely along the 45 degree line. Table 9 presents the results for the separate regressions for stocks with market betas not between 0.9 and 1.1. The results indicate that Disaster risk premia remains significant and positive. Fortune risk is not always significant under all the model specifications. This leads me to conclude that Disaster risk premia is robustly significant, as opposed to Fortune risk.

6 Conclusion

The dependence of a stock on the extreme movements of the market is an essential part for understanding the behaviour of asset prices. In these infrequent and extreme cases, investors care most about the performance of their own portfolios. In this paper a measure for the dependence of stock returns on the extreme movements of the market is created for the negative and positive extreme market movements. These measures are derived from statistical Extreme Value Theory. The difficulty lies in determining where the tail of the distribution starts. This paper uses an approach to locate the optimal threshold for the Hill estimator, by matching the empirical and the theoretical distribution along the quantile dimension. This threshold is employed to determine the starting point of the tail. These two univariate measures for the market and stock returns are then combined to obtain the multivariate

⁸Functioning as a proxy for the maturity of the firm.

extreme dependence region. The multivariate extreme quadrant, i.e. the region where both the market and stock return pass a determined threshold, is then utilized to measure the dependence in the tail. The pair of observations for market and stock returns that both exceed their threshold are counted as pairs of the extreme market returns. This functions as a count measure of extreme dependence.

The measures of Fortune and Disaster risk are subsequently applied to explain the cross-section of expected returns. This reveals whether investors care about this extreme dependence on top of other risk factors and whether extreme dependence fetches a premium or a discount. The results from the cross-sectional regressions show that Disaster risk carries a premium as would be expected from theory. The premium for stocks is on average 0.43% and remains significant in various robustness checks. Investors care less about the dependence in the extreme upside. Fortune risk dependence has a negative premium, but it is not robustly significant and in some cases positive. These results are in line with the literature to date. Kelly and Jiang (2014) find that investors indeed require a discount for stocks that have high returns when tail risk is high. Ang, Chen, and Xing (2006) find in their upside and downside beta framework that there is a higher premium for the downside beta. In line with the bisection of the beta model, I proposed a further division of the risk sensitivity of the market model. I find that adding extreme up and downside dependence to Ang et al.'s (2006) up and downside beta forms a significant and natural extension to their model. Fortune risk and Disaster risk are significantly priced in their framework, with an average premium of 0.64% for Disaster risk and a discount of 1.57% for Fortune risk.

References

- Amihud, Y., A. Wohl, 2004. Political news and stock prices: The case of Saddam Hussein contracts. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 28(5), 1185–1200.
- Ang, A., J. Chen, Y. Xing, 2006. Downside risk. *Review of Financial Studies* 19(4), 1191–1239.
- Barro, R. J., 2006. Rare disasters and asset markets in the twentieth century. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(3), 823–866.
- Berkman, H., B. Jacobsen, J. B. Lee, 2011. Time-varying rare disaster risk and stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* 101(2), 313–332.
- Bickel, P. J., A. Sakov, 2008. On the choice of m in the m out of n bootstrap and confidence bounds for extrema. *Statistica Sinica* 18(1), 967–985.
- Bittlingmayer, G., 1998. Output, stock volatility, and political uncertainty in a natural experiment: Germany, 1880–1940. *The Journal of Finance* 53(6), 2243–2257.
- Bollerslev, T., V. Todorov, 2011. Tails, fears, and risk premia. *The Journal of Finance* 66(6), 2165–2211.
- Carhart, M. M., 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance. *The Journal of Finance* 52(1), 57–82.
- Danielsson, J., L. M. Ergun, L. De Haan, C. De Vries, 2016. Tail index estimation: Quantile driven threshold selection. Unpublished working paper.
- De Haan, L., A. Ferreira, 2007. *Extreme value theory: An introduction*. Springer, New York.
- Fama, E. F., 1963. Mandelbrot and the Stable paretian hypothesis. *The Journal of Business* 36(4), 420–429.
- Fama, E. F., K. R. French, 1996. Multifactor explanations of asset pricing anomalies. *The Journal of Finance* 51(1), 55–84.
- Fama, E. F., J. D. MacBeth, 1973. Risk, return, and equilibrium: Empirical tests. *Journal of Political Economy* 81(3), 607–36.
- Frey, B. S., M. Kucher, 2000. History as reflected in capital markets: The case of World War II. *The Journal of Economic History* 60(02), 468–496.

- Gabaix, X., 2012. Variable rare disasters: An exactly solved framework for ten puzzles in macro-finance. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127(2), 645–700.
- Hartmann, P., S. Straetmans, C. G. De Vries, 2004. Asset market linkages in crisis periods. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86(1), 313–326.
- Harvey, C. R., A. Siddique, 2000. Conditional skewness in asset pricing tests. *The Journal of Finance* 55(3), 1263–1295.
- Hill, B. M., 1975. A simple general approach to inference about the tail of a distribution. *The Annals of Statistics* 3(5), 1163–1174.
- Huang, X., 1991. Statistics of bivariate extreme values. Thesis Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Jansen, D. W., C. G. De Vries, 1991. On the frequency of large stock returns: Putting booms and busts into perspective. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 73(1), 18–24.
- Kelly, B., H. Jiang, 2014. Tail risk and asset prices. *Review of Financial Studies* 27(10), 2841–2871.
- Mandelbrot, B., 1963. The variation of certain speculative prices. *The Journal of Business* 36(4), 394–419.
- Mehra, R., E. C. Prescott, 1985. The equity premium: A puzzle. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 15(2), 145–161.
- Newey, W. K., K. D. West, 1987. A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica* 55(3), 703–708.
- Rietz, T. A., 1988. The equity risk premium a solution. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 22(1), 117–131.
- Rigobon, R., B. Sack, 2005. The effects of war risk on US financial markets. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 29(7), 1769–1789.
- Samuelson, P. A., 1970. The fundamental approximation theorem of portfolio analysis in terms of means, variances, and higher moments. *Review of Economic Studies* 37(4), 537–42.
- Scott, R. C., P. A. Horvath, 1980. On the direction of preference for moments of higher order than the variance. *The Journal of Finance* 35(4), 915–919.

- Shanken, J., 1992. On the estimation of beta-pricing models. *Review of Financial Studies* 5(1), 1–55.
- Siriwardane, I., 2013. The pricing of disaster risk. Unpublished working paper. NYU working paper.
- Stambaugh, R. F., P. Lubos, 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy* 111(3), 642–685.

A Appendix

A.1 Quantile estimator

Suppose the tail of the distribution is regularly varying at infinity and satisfy the following expansion

$$P(X \leq -x) = F(-x) = Ax^{-\alpha}[1 + o(1)].$$

Conditional on being in the tail of the distribution, the cdf can be rewritten in the empirical counterpart

$$F_{x|x \leq -x_s}(-x) = \frac{Ax^{-\alpha_s}[1 + o(1)]}{Ax_s^{-\alpha_s}[1 + o(1)]} = \left(\frac{x}{x_s}\right)^{-\alpha(s)}. \quad (3)$$

By definition

$$F_{x|x \leq -x_s}(-x) = \frac{P(X < x \cap X < s)}{F_x(-x_s)} = \frac{p}{F_x(-x_s)}. \quad (4)$$

Equating (3) and (4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{F_x(-x_s)} &= \left(\frac{x}{x_s}\right)^{-\alpha(s)} \\ p &= F_x(-x_s) \left(\frac{x}{x_s}\right)^{-\alpha(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Replace $F_x(-x_s)$ by the empirical cdf and replace s by x_k and the conditioning of α on k instead of s then gives

$$p = \frac{k}{n} \left(\frac{x}{x_k}\right)^{-\alpha(k)},$$


where $k = \sum I_{\{x_i < x_s\}}$ and where k/n is the empirical cdf. Given this expression for the probability dimension, the quantile estimator $q(j/n)$ is given by

$$q\left(\frac{j}{n}\right) = \left(\frac{k}{j}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha(k)}} (x_{k+1}),$$

where p is replaced by the empirical counterpart, i.e. j/n .


A.2 Tables and Figures

Figure 3: Characteristics Disaster risk




These graphs depict the distribution of the different characteristics of the Disaster measure. The upper left picture depicts the sample fraction of the total data used to define the extreme negative region of the stock. On the right you see this for the market. The lower left picture depicts the difference in the number of observations applied in the count measure for the market and stock i . The picture on the bottom right gives the distribution of the Disaster risk measure.

Figure 4: Characteristics Fortune risk



These graphs depict the distribution of the different characteristics of the Fortune measure. The upper left picture depicts the sample fraction of the total data used to define the extreme positive region of the stock. On the right you see this for the market. The lower left picture depicts the difference in the number of observations applied in the count measure for the market and stock i . The picture on the bottom right gives the distribution of the Fortune risk measure.

Figure 5: Risk premia Disaster and Fortune risk for rolling window



This graph depicts the estimated risk premia for Disaster risk and Fortune risk for every overlapping window. Here LL is the line for the Disaster factor and UR is the line for the Fortune factor. These are measures from the second stage of the overlapping window regression in the Fama-MacBeth procedure.

Table 5: Correlation Matrix of Factor loadings

This table describes the pairwise correlation between factor loadings that are used in this paper. The correlations below are the average correlations measured over a five year overlapping rolling window. The number of firms included in the analysis is between 902 and 3,760.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.Market	1.0000	0.8911	0.8985	0.2829	0.2679	0.1399	0.0222	0.6753	-0.0778	0.1804	0.1460	-0.1708	-0.0340	-0.0774
2. β^+	0.8911	1.0000	0.7245	0.3279	0.2737	0.0917	0.2741	0.6845	-0.0532	0.2348	0.0721	-0.1461	-0.0442	-0.1061
3. β^-	0.8985	0.7245	1.0000	0.1753	0.2061	0.1890	-0.1963	0.5876	-0.0802	0.0636	0.1998	-0.1527	-0.0144	-0.0412
4.Fortune	0.2829	0.3279	0.1753	1.0000	0.8041	-0.3009	0.0815	0.5533	0.0255	0.5903	-0.2691	-0.0151	-0.0138	0.0003
5.Disaster	0.2679	0.2737	0.2061	0.8041	1.0000	-0.3099	-0.0528	0.5295	0.0069	0.5605	-0.2463	-0.0052	0.0022	0.0138
6. σ^2	0.1399	0.0917	0.1890	-0.3009	-0.3099	1.0000	0.0689	-0.2634	-0.0031	-0.4297	0.3609	-0.0018	-0.0344	-0.0618
7.Coskewness	0.0222	0.2741	-0.1963	0.0815	-0.0528	0.0689	1.0000	0.0660	-0.0056	0.0455	-0.0515	-0.0189	-0.0420	-0.0711
8.Cokurtosis	0.6753	0.6845	0.5876	0.5533	0.5295	-0.2634	0.0660	1.0000	-0.0472	0.5648	-0.1958	-0.1090	0.0283	-0.0308
9.Bk-Mkt	-0.0778	-0.0532	-0.0802	0.0255	0.0069	-0.0031	-0.0056	-0.0472	1.0000	0.2634	-0.0252	0.1582	-0.0178	-0.0071
10.log(size)	0.1804	0.2348	0.0636	0.5903	0.5605	-0.4297	0.0455	0.5648	0.2634	1.0000	-0.3989	0.0976	-0.0435	0.0119
11.SMB	0.1460	0.0721	0.1998	-0.2691	-0.2463	0.3609	-0.0515	-0.1958	-0.0252	-0.3989	1.0000	0.1083	-0.0523	-0.2272
12.HML	-0.1708	-0.1461	-0.1527	-0.0151	-0.0052	-0.0018	-0.0189	-0.1090	0.1582	0.0976	0.1083	1.0000	0.0684	-0.0595
13.Momentum	-0.0340	-0.0442	-0.0144	-0.0138	0.0022	-0.0344	-0.0420	0.0283	-0.0178	-0.0435	-0.0523	0.0684	1.0000	0.0260
14.Liquidity	-0.0774	-0.1061	-0.0412	0.0003	0.0138	-0.0618	-0.0711	-0.0308	-0.0071	0.0119	-0.2272	-0.0595	0.0260	1.0000

Table 6: **Firms exist for more than 180 months in the database.**

Model	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
α	0.0454 (0)***	0.0466 (0)***	0.0494 (0)***	0.0457 (0)***	0.0434 (0)***	0.0435 (0)***
Market	0.065 (0)***	0.0303 (0)***	0.0644 (0)***	0.0534 (0)***	0.0576 (0)***	0.0297 (0)***
<i>SMB</i>		0.0051 (0.1842)		0.0335 (0)***	0.0354 (0)***	0.0056 (0.1355)
<i>HML</i>		-0.0234 (0)***		-0.0307 (0)***	-0.0294 (0)***	-0.0232 (0)***
Fortune			-0.0378 (0)***	-0.0116 (0.0597)*	-0.0082 (0.1915)	0.0044 (0.3916)
Disaster			0.0115 (0.1178)	0.0201 (0.0011)***	0.0202 (0.0006)***	0.032 (0)***
Momentum		5.945 (0)***			6.1007 (0)***	5.9546 (0)***
Liquidity		0.008 (0.0285)**			0.0274 (0)***	0.0086 (0.0143)**
Coskewness		0.0084 (0.1306)				0.0073 (0.1801)
Cokurtosis		-0.0011 (0.7771)				-0.0021 (0.5945)

This table shows the results of Fama-MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on firm characteristics and realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from July 1963 to December 2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 1,186 to 2,790. *Market* is the CAPM beta. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *HML* and *SMB* are high minus low and small minus big factors (Fama and French,1996), respectively. *Liquidity* is the liquidity beta by Pastor and Stambaugh (2003). *Momentum* is the momentum factor created by Carhart (1997). *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et al. (2006). The p-values for the overlapping Fama-Macbeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.

Table 7: **Firms exist between 48 and 180 months in the database**

Model	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
α	0.0226 (0.0138)**	-0.0065 (0.5241)	0.0178 (0.0785)*	0.0113 (0.1751)	0.0063 (0.4624)	-0.0164 (0.1144)
Market	0.0659 (0)***	0.0199 (0)***	0.0635 (0)***	0.0549 (0)***	0.0591 (0)***	0.0174 (0.0001)***
<i>SMB</i>		0.0008 (0.8224)		0.0291 (0)***	0.032 (0)***	0.0001 (0.9718)
<i>HML</i>		-0.0134 (0)***		-0.0247 (0)***	-0.0251 (0)***	-0.0118 (0)***
Euphoria			0.0128 (0.4246)	0.0304 (0.0398)**	0.0398 (0.0091)***	0.0663 (0)***
Depression			0.0432 (0.0001)***	0.0444 (0)***	0.0425 (0)***	0.0849 (0)***
Momentum		3.6266 (0)***			3.6391 (0)***	3.63 (0)***
Liquidity		0.0069 (0.1103)			0.0388 (0)***	0.0068 (0.1211)
Coskewness		0.0118 (0.3017)				0.0086 (0.4265)
Cokurtosis		0.0248 (0)***				0.0204 (0)***

This table shows the results of Fama-MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on firm characteristics and realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from July 1963 to December 2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 186 to 1,234. *Market* is the CAPM beta. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *HML* and *SMB* are high minus low and small minus big factors (Fama and French,1996), respectively. *Liquidity* is the liquidity beta by Pastor and Stambaugh (2003). *Momentum* is the momentum factor created by Carhart (1997). *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et al. (2006). The p-values for the overlapping Fama-Macbeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.

Table 8: Firms which are included onto one of the exchanges after 1997

Model	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
α	0.0352 (0.0675)*	0.0243 (0.219)	0.0269 (0.1942)	0.0158 (0.4407)	0.0188 (0.3427)	-0.0007 (0.9723)
Market	0.0745 (0)***	0.0156 (0.0951)*	0.0731 (0)***	0.0524 (0)***	0.0527 (0)***	0.0151 (0.1118)
<i>SMB</i>		0.0122 (0.0002)***		0.0421 (0)***	0.0414 (0)***	0.0127 (0.0001)***
<i>HML</i>		-0.0127 (0.0074)***		-0.0344 (0)***	-0.0358 (0)***	-0.0141 (0.0041)***
Fortune			-0.0329 (0.5063)	0.0604 (0.2598)	0.0523 (0.2738)	0.1395 (0.0011)***
Disaster			0.1276 (0)***	0.1345 (0)***	0.1393 (0)***	0.1766 (0)***
Momentum		4.5699 (0)***			1.4516 (0.1046)	4.3391 (0)***
Liquidity		-0.013 (0.0824)*			0.0158 (0.0881)*	-0.0125 (0.1028)
Coskewness		0.0845 (0.0019)***				0.071 (0.0057)***
Cokurtosis		0.0309 (0.0228)**				0.0165 (0.1889)

This table shows the results of Fama-MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on firm characteristics and realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from January 1997 to December 2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 101 to 1,143. *Market* is the CAPM beta. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *HML* and *SMB* are high minus low and small minus big factors (Fama and French,1996), respectively. *Liquidity* is the liquidity beta by Pastor and Stambaugh (2003). *Momentum* is the momentum factor created by Carhart (1997). *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et al. (2006). The p-values for the overlapping Fama-Macbeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.

Table 9: **Firms which have a *Market* estimate between 0.9 and 1.1**

Model	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
α	0.0227 (0.051)*	0.014 (0.202)	0.0217 (0.0681)*	0.0278 (0.007)***	0.0328 (0.0008)***	0.0099 (0.3768)
Market	0.0754 (0)***	0.0277 (0.0034)***	0.0733 (0)***	0.0582 (0)***	0.0562 (0)***	0.0256 (0.0066)***
<i>SMB</i>		0.0066 (0.0975)*		0.0305 (0)***	0.0302 (0)***	0.0064 (0.0981)*
<i>HML</i>		-0.0245 (0)***		-0.0367 (0)***	-0.0341 (0)***	-0.024 (0)***
Fortune			-0.0079 (0.5139)	0.0091 (0.2919)	0.0115 (0.1724)	0.016 (0.0176)**
Disaster			0.0279 (0.0008)***	0.0345 (0)***	0.0309 (0)***	0.0355 (0)***
Momentum		6.4219 (0)***			6.9575 (0)***	6.4673 (0)***
Liquidity		0.0024 (0.7161)			0.0306 (0)***	0.0025 (0.6923)
Coskewness		0.0192 (0.0559)*				0.0162 (0.0922)*
Cokurtosis		0.019 (0.0001)***				0.0175 (0.0001)***

This table shows the results of Fama-MacBeth (1973) regressions of 60-month excess returns on firm characteristics and realized-risk characteristics. The sample period is from July 1963 to December 2012. An overlapping 60-month rolling window is employed on assets which are listed on the NYSE, AMEX, NASDAQ or NYSE Arca. The assets have to be listed consecutively on one of the exchanges. The number of stocks in each rolling window varies from 166 to 645. *Market* is the CAPM beta. *Fortune* and *Disaster* are the Fortune and Disaster risk factors created in this paper. *HML* and *SMB* are high minus low and small minus big factors (Fama and French,1996), respectively. *Liquidity* is the liquidity beta by Pastor and Stambaugh (2003). *Momentum* is the momentum factor created by Carhart (1997). *Coskewness* and *Cokurtosis* are the systematic risk factors as measured by Ang et al. (2006). The p-values for the overlapping Fama-Macbeth regression are computed using the Newey-West (1987) autocorrelation and hetroskedastic-robust standard errors. *, **, *** are indicators for the significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% of the coefficients, respectively.



THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■



Systemic Risk Centre

The London School of Economics
and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 7405 7686
systemicrisk.ac.uk
src@lse.ac.uk