

# Portfolio Diversification: A and well In roland !


Kpa JAOUTE  
HSBC c Bank (Suisse) SA

Jea re DANTHINE  
HEC- y of Lausanne, CEPR and FAME

Resea r N° 32  
July 20

FAME - al Center for Financial Asset Management and Engineering





INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR  
FINANCIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING

## RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

The International Center for Financial Asset Management and Engineering (FAME) is a private foundation created in 1996 at the initiative of 21 leading partners of the finance and technology community together with three Universities of the Lake Geneva Region (Universities of Geneva, University of Lausanne and the Graduate Institute of International Studies).

Fame is about *research*, *doctoral training*, and *executive education* with “interfacing” activities such as the FAME lectures, the Research Day/Annual Meeting, and the Research Paper Series.

The *FAME Research Paper Series* includes three types of contributions:

- First, it reports on the research carried out at FAME by students and research fellows.
- Second, it includes research work contributed by Swiss academics and practitioners interested in a wider dissemination of their ideas, in practitioners' circles in particular.
- Finally, prominent international contributions of particular interest to our constituency are included as well on a regular basis.

FAME will strive to promote the research work in finance carried out in the three partner Universities. These papers are distributed with a ‘double’ identification: the FAME logo and the logo of the corresponding partner institution. With this policy, we want to underline the vital lifeline existing between FAME and the Universities, while simultaneously fostering a wider recognition of the strength of the academic community supporting FAME and enriching the Lemanic region.

Each contribution is preceded by an Executive Summary of two to three pages explaining in non-technical terms the question asked, discussing its relevance and outlining the answer provided. We hope the series will be followed attentively by all academics and practitioners interested in the fields covered by our name.

I am delighted to serve as coordinator of the FAME Research Paper Series. Please contact me if you are interested in submitting a paper or for all suggestions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

Prof. Martin Hoesli  
University of Geneva, HEC  
40 bd du Pont d'Arve  
1211 Genève 4  
Tel: +41 (022) 705 8122  
Martin.Hoesli@hec.unige.ch

**PORTFOLIO DIVERSIFICATION:  
Alive and well in Euroland !**

Kpate ADJAOUTÉ  
Jean-Pierre DANTHINE

July 2001

# **Portfolio Diversification : Alive and well in Euroland !**

**Kpate Adjaouté**  
HSBC Republic Bank (Suisse) SA

and

**Jean-Pierre Danthine**  
University of Lausanne, CEPR and FAME

July 2001

## **Abstract.**

Diversification opportunities in Euroland appear to have improved significantly since the advent of the euro, thus invalidating the prospects identified in the last years of the convergence-to-EMU period. We identify low frequency movements in the time series of return dispersions suggestive of cycles and long swings in return correlations. The most recent post-euro period is clearly associated with an important upswing with return dispersions exceeding for the first time their peaks of the early nineties.

JEL codes: F30;G11;G15

Key words: portfolio diversification, return dispersion, euro

## **Executive summary**

What are the implications for financial returns and diversification opportunities in Europe of the all important process of economic and monetary integration at work since the beginning of the nineties? This fascinating question had lead us to look at the time evolution of the matrix of return correlations a few months only after the birth of the euro. With little choice at the time, we had defined two post-convergence to the euro periods, one defined with the onset of the Maastricht Treaty in January 1995, the other one beginning in August 1997. The latter was motivated by poll results indicating that by that date the overwhelming majority of 200 financial and economic forecasters predicted that all 10 of the first euro countries would indeed join EMU, with the remaining uncertainty essentially resolved by January 1998. With this limited post-convergence and post-euro data, we consistently obtained results showing that return correlations had been higher in the later “convergence” period than in the pre-convergence one. The picture was unambiguous: the convergence (cum beginning of the euro) period appeared less favorable to portfolio diversification. We speculated on the causes of this phenomenon and its implications for the home bias and the country allocation paradigm.

In the present paper, we have revisited this important issue at the light of more recent data containing almost two and a half years of post-euro return observations. The more recent data convey a radically different message. Indeed the pure euro sample is characterized by lower return correlations than those obtained for the immediately preceding period of the same length, whether these correlations are computed at the country or at the sector level. These conflicting results have lead us to adopt an alternative, more discriminating, methodology. Focusing on the time series of return dispersions, we identified interesting low frequency movements in dispersions suggestive of cycles and long swings in return correlations. The most recent post-euro period is clearly associated with a significant upswing with dispersions exceeding for the first time their peaks of the early nineties. In the absence of the later data, the peaks of the early nineties were conditioning our previous results. Whether the recent increase in dispersions (decrease in correlations) is indicative of a trend shift, possibly associated with the advent of the euro, or constitutes a purely cyclical phenomenon, only the future will tell. The fact of the matter is, however, that our results clearly invalidate the hypothesis, previously entertained, that diversification opportunities in the Euro-area have been permanently impaired as a consequence of the process of economic and monetary integration. They strongly confirm, on the other hand, the superiority of a model where diversification is sought after simultaneously across country and sector dimensions over the traditional country allocation model. In fact our analysis tend to

suggest that the superiority of the former model may have increased over the very recent past, too recent however to make much of this tantalizing observation.

## 1. Introduction

In a study building on the first few months of the euro (Adjaouté and Danthine, 2000), we found that the conditions under which portfolio investors diversify across the Euro-area equity markets had changed materially in the 1990's. In particular, we identified a significant increase in the degree of correlation between national stock indices implying that diversification opportunities had been significantly reduced over that period. We proposed that the process of economic and monetary integration at work in Euroland since at least the mid-90's and culminating with the advent of the euro on January 1, 1999 was the likely culprit. Within this process, however, the disappearance of currency risk appeared less important for investors than the convergence of economic structures and/or the homogenisation of economic shocks (across the Euro-15 member states). That is, the increased stock return correlation was as manifest when we abstracted from currency fluctuations than when they were computed using effective monetary returns.

We observed that this evolution should mark the end of pure country allocation strategies within Europe: the increased conformity of stock returns implied that international diversification across the Euro-area on the basis of a pure country allocation model had increasingly smaller benefits. We also argued that the changing economic structures within Europe and the disappearance of currency risks could have lowered the cost of the home bias within Euroland and confirmed this intuition if the alternative to staying at home was to diversify with the use of a pure country allocation model. Further analysis however showed that diversification across both countries and sectors remained the much superior investment strategy and that, in light of this option, the cost of the home bias continued to be significant in Europe.

In the present paper, we revisit these issues with the benefit of more than two years of data since the formal advent of the euro. In particular, we construct weekly returns for country and sectors indices, starting from October 7, 1988 to March 30, 2001 (652 observations); as in our first paper, we use Datastream total market indices and the full sample is partitioned in appropriate sub-samples to study the dynamics of the Euro-land investment opportunity set. Although the effective replicability and investibility of these indices can be questioned, they nevertheless represent the theoretical ideal benchmarks to assess portfolio diversification opportunities.

## 2. The long sample

We start by taking full advantage of our sample data to revisit some of the questions addressed in our previous study. We define a pre-convergence period extending from October 7, 1988 to December 31, 1994, and a convergence period going from the signature of the Maastricht treaty, January 1, 1995, to the limit of our data sample, March 30, 2001. We concentrate on the variance-covariance matrix of returns within Euroland. Building on the results of our previous research, we exclusively take the viewpoint of Euro investors. That is, we abstract from currency risk and focus on the changes in the correlation of returns expressed at constant (December 31, 1998) conversion rates.

As mentioned earlier, the full sample consists of weekly index returns from October 7, 1988 to March 30, 2001, for the ten early entrants in EMU (Luxembourg has been ignored from the analysis; note that data for Portugal are not available before February 1990). For each country, the Datastream total market country index returns and sector indices returns are collected. Datastream defines 10 sector groups by country, leading in theory to 10 country indices and 100 sector indices for the consolidated data sample. However, some sectors do not exist in certain countries or do not have a sufficient data history to be considered in the study. This is the case for the utilities sector, which is not constructed for Ireland, or the information technology sector which is formally in existence in Portugal since July 1999 only. The consolidated data sample, comprised of 10 country indices and 86 sector indices is summarized in Table 1 below. Table 2 provides summary statistics on annualized weekly returns using country index returns. As Table 2 shows, there is a noticeable dispersion of risks and returns both within each sub-sample and across sub-samples. In fact, in the pre-convergence period, the minimum average return is  $-2.37\%$  (Portugal) versus a maximum return of  $+12.91\%$  (Austria) while the comparable statistics are  $+1.78\%$  (Austria) and  $25.36\%$  (Finland), respectively, during the convergence sub-sample. The strict euro period shows a minimum country return of  $-9.13\%$  (Belgium) and a maximum of  $18.12\%$  (Finland).

**Table 1: Consolidated sample information**

Sample	Range	Max. # observations per series	Min. # observations per series
<b>Whole</b>	<b>07/10/88 - 30/03/01</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>402</b>
<b>Pre convergence</b>	<b>07/10/88 - 30/12/94</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Convergence</b>	<b>06/01/95 - 30/03/01</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>
<b>Pre euro</b>	<b>10/11/96 - 01/01/99</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Euro</b>	<b>08/01/99 - 30/03/01</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>




**Table 2: Summary statistics on annualized weekly country returns**

	<b>Austria</b>	<b>Belgium</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Spain</b>	<b>Finland</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>Ireland</b>	<b>Italy</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>	<b>Portugal</b>
<b>PANEL A: PRE CONVERGENCE</b>										
<b>Mean</b>	<b>12.91</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>5.78</b>	<b>7.27</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>8.48</b>	<b>-2.37</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>9.82</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>8.81</b>	<b>-1.13</b>	<b>-4.26</b>	<b>12.87</b>	<b>-0.92</b>	<b>7.70</b>	<b>11.26</b>	<b>-2.61</b>
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>22.62</b>	<b>11.71</b>	<b>14.69</b>	<b>16.63</b>	<b>21.96</b>	<b>14.88</b>	<b>16.94</b>	<b>20.47</b>	<b>10.19</b>	<b>14.00</b>
<b>Jarque-Bera</b>	<b>408.39</b>	<b>27.41</b>	<b>23.75</b>	<b>10.17</b>	<b>21.76</b>	<b>7.16</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>12.36</b>	<b>15.27</b>	<b>17.91</b>
<b>Probability</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Observations</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>260</b>
<b>PANELB: CONVERGENCE</b>										
<b>Mean</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>12.13</b>	<b>12.77</b>	<b>17.45</b>	<b>25.36</b>	<b>16.89</b>	<b>17.11</b>	<b>14.77</b>	<b>16.83</b>	<b>12.39</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>5.49</b>	<b>19.52</b>	<b>17.97</b>	<b>25.75</b>	<b>45.71</b>	<b>14.38</b>	<b>22.02</b>	<b>9.76</b>	<b>26.32</b>	<b>10.25</b>
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>14.33</b>	<b>15.60</b>	<b>18.52</b>	<b>18.94</b>	<b>34.21</b>	<b>18.27</b>	<b>17.66</b>	<b>21.15</b>	<b>16.85</b>	<b>18.14</b>
<b>Jarque-Bera</b>	<b>34.20</b>	<b>51.39</b>	<b>62.79</b>	<b>73.05</b>	<b>79.09</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>153.12</b>	<b>20.31</b>	<b>90.70</b>	<b>313.51</b>
<b>Probability</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Observations</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>326</b>
<b>PANEL C: STRICT EURO</b>										
<b>Mean</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>-9.13</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>-1.16</b>	<b>18.12</b>	<b>13.24</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>5.27</b>	<b>4.91</b>	<b>-4.06</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>11.09</b>	<b>6.17</b>	<b>13.76</b>	<b>12.25</b>	<b>32.02</b>	<b>15.73</b>	<b>-2.28</b>	<b>17.72</b>	<b>20.53</b>	<b>-5.19</b>
<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>14.03</b>	<b>17.02</b>	<b>21.03</b>	<b>18.19</b>	<b>45.40</b>	<b>19.62</b>	<b>18.81</b>	<b>19.18</b>	<b>15.76</b>	<b>16.79</b>
<b>Jarque-Bera</b>	<b>16.67</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>5.71</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>5.44</b>
<b>Probability</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.07</b>
<b>Observations</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>

We start by using country index returns to compute the 10x10 unconditional correlation matrix for the pre convergence period, which runs from October 7, 1988 to December 30, 1994 (326 observations). These correlation pairs are sorted in ascending order and plotted against the country pairs. The correlation pairs for the convergence period, covering January 6, 1995 to March 30, 2001 are then computed and plotted along the pre-convergence correlation pairs.

Our results are illustrated in Figure 1. They are entirely in accordance with what was found in our previous study. Return correlations are significantly and almost uniformly larger in the second period than in the first. This supports, for an appropriately long sample of post-January 1, 1999 observations, the views expressed before and summarized in our introduction.



We next perform a similar exercise at the sector level. To have a sense of the sector level dynamics, we focus on all the available sectors within the EMU countries. For each of the selected sectors, we construct the  $m \times m$  correlation matrix, where  $m$  is the number of countries in which the sector is available, and conduct the same analysis as the country level correlation. For example, for the “General industrials” sector, we have used the weekly returns of that sector in Austria, Belgium and the other eight countries to build our correlation matrix. In the absence of any country specific dimension, this correlation will be close to 1, because one is asking what is the correlation of the “General industrial” sector in France with the same sector in Belgium and so on.

Results from this exercise are fully in line with those obtained above at the country level and in our previous study at the sector level. They are not reproduced here to preserve space. When the angle of view is more than 12 years of data and convergence is identified with the advent of the Maastricht treaty, the evolution of return correlations is unambiguous.

Table 3 displays the result of a formal Jenrich stability test indicating unequivocally that the matrices of returns differ significantly over the two sub-samples. This is true at the aggregate as well as the sector levels. At this stage we are led to conclude that the adjunction of more recent data does not invalidate the results of our previous study.

**Table 3:** Jenrich test of stability of correlation matrices : Large Sample


	<b>Countries (DF=45)</b>	<b>Sectors(DF = 3655)</b>
Larger Sample	172.844 (0.0000)	10486.155 (0.0000)

The pre convergence sample goes from 7/10/88 to 30/12/1994, while the convergence sample runs from 06/01/1995 to 30/03/2001

The degrees of freedom are computed as  $n(n-1)/2$  where  $n = 10$  for countries and  $n=86$  for sectors  
p-values are given in parentheses

### 3. The euro sample

We now look more closely and in isolation at the post-January 1, 1999 data. This effectively means that we replace the broader concept of convergence, associated with the notion of economic integration, with a narrower definition of the EMU process strictly identified with the advent of the euro. We define a pre-euro period as corresponding to the same length (as our euro sample) period prior to January 1999, that is, starting from October 11, 1996. That is, we use returns from January 8, 1999 to March 30, 2001 (117 observations) for the euro period and the 117 returns preceding January 8, 1999 as the pre-euro period. Again we abstract from currency fluctuations (before January '99). Figure 2 displays the results obtained at the aggregate (country indices) level.



Somewhat to our surprise, the picture is now radically different. Out of 45 pairwise correlations, 36 are lower in the euro period than in the immediately preceding period. This picture is representative of what we obtain at the sector level for 7 out of 10 sectors. The only clear exception is the sector labelled “non cyclical services” where correlations have continued to increase, while the picture is more blurred in the case of the “cyclical services” and “utilities” sectors. Details are provided in the appendix.

Table 4 confirms that the matrices of correlation are significantly different in the two periods whether at the aggregate or the sector level.

**Table 4 :** Jenrich test of stability of correlation matrices : Euro sample

	<b>Countries (DF=45)</b>	<b>Sectors(DF = 3655)</b>
Strict euro	121.229 (0.0000)	3940.508 (0.0000)

The pre euro sample goes from 11/10/96 to 1/1/99, while the euro sample runs from 08/01/99 to 30/03/2001  
 The degrees of freedom are computed as  $n(n-1)/2$  where  $n = 10$  for countries and  $n=86$  for sectors

p-values are given in parentheses

These results indeed raise a challenge since they are in direct contradiction with those obtained up to now. Of course, we are now dealing with two relatively short sub-periods, possibly affected by specific events. A long and slow structural evolution, such as the one associated with economic and monetary integration we thought we had identified when looking at the long sample, may be temporarily concealed by one-time shocks that could colour a period as short as two years. An alternative explanation may also come from the existing literature on world market integration. Bekaert and Harvey (1995) substantiate the time-varying nature of market integration and if correlations are to be used as quantitative indicators in that sense, then the evidence presented here thus far conforms to this view. This observation is also in line with the fact that return correlations are known to have cyclical characteristics. In view of testing this hypothesis, we now turn our attention to the time evolution of the cross-sectional dispersion of equity returns for our entire sample.

**4. Cross-sectional dispersion of returns**

The evidence stemming from the above analysis suggests a possible cyclical behavior of country and sector correlations. Traditional time series analysis does not however allow to test the cyclicity of the correlation matrix. A test based on a rolling correlation matrix would make little sense, since virtually no change would be observed based on conventional testing procedures, because of overlapping data. On the other hand, the approach based on two adjacent samples does not provide any insight into cycles. The strategy we follow to shed light on the existence of cycles is based on the notion of cross-sectional dispersion introduced by Roulet and Solnik (2000). The idea behind cross-sectional dispersion is very intuitive and works as follows.

Consider  $n$  financial assets over a particular investment period; the more dispersed their returns turn out to be, the more scope there is for portfolio diversification. If on the other hand, the dispersion of returns is small, the more similar these asset returns are and the less room there is for diversification. Given that this dispersion is defined in terms of the  $n$  assets existing at time  $t$ , a time series of cross-section dispersion of returns can be generated and its properties analyzed in the standard time series framework. In particular, in the case of country indices with weekly observations, a standard deviation across the ten index returns can be calculated each week, so that using the whole sample data at hand we have a sample of 652 weekly dispersions. Similarly, the 86 sector returns can be used each week to generate a sector cross-sectional standard deviation. Table 5 below gives a summary of the computed dispersions while Figure 3 displays the results of this computation by country and sectors. As discussed by Roulet and Solnik (2000), there is a direct and inverse relation between dispersion and global correlation. Higher dispersion implies lower correlation and higher diversification gains and conversely so in the presence of lower dispersion (and higher correlation).

**Table 5: Summary statistics on cross-sectional dispersion**

	Country	Sector
<b>Mean</b>	<b>1.670</b>	<b>2.943</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>1.525</b>	<b>2.725</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>5.070</b>	<b>7.938</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>0.441</b>	<b>1.415</b>
<b>Observations</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>652</b>






Figure 3 displays the impressive high frequency variability of the weekly dispersion of returns. While the variability of weekly dispersion dwarfs lower frequency movements, periods of high dispersion followed by periods of low dispersion can be identified as well. This pattern is suggestive of cycles in the time series behaviour of cross-sectional dispersions. Observe that the sector cross-sectional dispersions are almost systematically above the country dispersions (there is a total of 5 exceptions altogether): as far as risk diversification is concerned, diversification across countries and sectors remain the much superior alternative.

In order to enlighten the cyclicity issue, a trend has to be extracted from this very volatile data. We apply the Hodrick-Prescott methodology with smoothing parameters of 270 000 and 28 800. Results, displayed in Figures 4 and 5, provide a consistent message. The following observations can be made.

1. There are significant low frequency movements in return dispersions, both at the sector and the country level.
2. The earlier part of our sample, corresponding with the pre-convergence periods, was marked by two peaks in both country and sector dispersions, leading to a high average dispersion level.
3. Return dispersions were below average in the middle of the nineties reaching a trough in late 1996. They have been mostly increasing ever since.
4. In 2000 and 2001, thus for the bulk of the euro-period, return dispersions have been above their previous peak levels reached in 1990 and 1993.
5. The post-1996 upswing in return dispersions may not have reached its summit at the country level; it appears to have peaked in mid-2000 at the sector level.
6. Dispersions, once smoothed out, are always higher at the sector level; the difference between sector dispersions and country dispersions appears to have increased in the latter part of our sample.

All in all, the more discriminating approach used in this section permits shedding light on our previous and current results. When we use sample data terminating in April 1999, the correlation comparisons are conditioned by the two peaks in the early part of the sample and the long downswing of the mid-nineties, leading to a diagnosis of decreasing dispersions and thus increasing correlations (from the pre-convergence to the convergence period). This explains our earlier results. The short euro sample, on the other hand, clearly places the stress on the above average dispersions of the last few years and thus supports the opposite diagnosis obtained in Section 3. Table 6 formally documents that the median country dispersion slightly decreased

between the pre-convergence to the convergence period while there was a much more significant upward jump from the pre-euro to the euro period. The dispersion approach illustrated in Figures 4 and 5 invalidates the hypothesis that diversification opportunities in the Euro-area have been permanently impaired as a result of the process of economic and monetary integration. In view of the low frequency movements in the dispersion of returns, two conclusions are equally plausible: increased economic and monetary integration is the cause of a permanent increase in the average dispersion level auguring well of diversification opportunities in the new Euro-area; alternatively and equally likely, the recent upswing in dispersions is a purely cyclical event, unrelated to the underlying process of integration, and likely to give way to future phases of lower return dispersions.



**Table 6: Statistics on country and sector dispersions by sub-sample period**

	Pre convergence		Convergence		Pre euro		Euro	
	Country	Sector	Country	Sector	Country	Sector	Country	Sector
Median	1.573	2.661	1.488	2.828	1.456	2.758	1.806	3.592
Maximum	4.410	7.625	5.070	7.938	4.687	6.169	5.070	7.938
Minimum	0.441	1.504	0.557	1.416	0.684	1.442	0.749	1.923

## 5. Conclusions

What are the implications for financial returns and diversification opportunities in Europe of the all important process of economic and monetary integration at work since the beginning of the nineties? This fascinating question had lead us to look at the time evolution of the matrix of return correlations a few months only after the birth of the euro. With little choice at the time, we had defined two post-convergence to the euro periods, one defined with the onset of the Maastricht Treaty in January 1995, the other one beginning in August 1997. The latter was motivated by poll results indicating that by that date the overwhelming majority of 200 financial and economic forecasters predicted that all 10 of the first euro countries would indeed join EMU, with the remaining uncertainty essentially resolved by January 1998. With this limited post-convergence and post-euro data, we consistently obtained results showing that return correlations had been higher in the later “convergence” period than in the pre-convergence one. The picture was unambiguous: the convergence (cum beginning of the euro) period appeared less favorable to portfolio diversification. We speculated on the causes of this phenomenon and its implications for the home bias and the country allocation paradigm.

In the present paper, we have revisited this important issue at the light of more recent data containing almost two and a half years of post-euro return observations. The more recent data convey a radically different message. Indeed the pure euro sample is characterized by lower return correlations than those obtained for the immediately preceding period of the same length, whether these correlations are computed at the country or at the sector level. These conflicting results have lead us to adopt an alternative, more discriminating, methodology. Focusing on the time series of return dispersions, we identified interesting low frequency movements in dispersions suggestive of cycles and long swings in return correlations. The most recent post-euro period is clearly associated with a significant upswing with dispersions exceeding for the first time their peaks of the early nineties. In the absence of the later data, the peaks of the early nineties were conditioning our previous results. Whether the recent increase in dispersions (decrease in



correlations) is indicative of a trend shift, possibly associated with the advent of the euro, or constitutes a purely cyclical phenomenon, only the future will tell. The fact of the matter is, however, that our results clearly invalidate the hypothesis, previously entertained, that diversification opportunities in the Euro-area have been permanently impaired as a consequence of the process of economic and monetary integration. They strongly confirm, on the other hand, the superiority of a model where diversification is sought after simultaneously across country and sector dimensions over the traditional country allocation model. In fact our analysis tend to suggest that the superiority of the former model may have increased over the very recent past, too recent however to make much of this tantalizing observation.

**References**


Adjaoute, Kpate, and Jean-Pierre Danthine, (2000), “EMU and Portfolio Diversification Opportunities”, FAME Research Paper # 31, International Center FAME, Geneva





Bekaert, Geert, and Campbell R. Harvey, (1997), “Time-varying World Market Integration”, *Journal of Finance*, 50, 403-444.





Solnik, Bruno, and Jacque Roulet, (2000), “Dispersion as Cross-Sectional Correlation”, *Financial Analysts Journal*, January/February 54-61.

**Appendix**


In this appendix we present the evolution of sector pair correlations for the pre-euro and the euro periods. Our results apply for a sector decomposition across 10 broad and non-overlapping sectors. With the exception of the “Non-cyclical services” sector, and to a lesser extent “Cyclical services” and “Utilities”, pairwise correlations appear to have decreased from the pre-euro to the euro period.







**Figure A10: Evolution of pair correlations, utilities: pre Euro and Euro periods**



# RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

Extra copies of research papers will be available to the public upon request. In order to obtain copies of past or future works, please contact our office at the location below. As well, please note that these works will be available on our website, [www.fame.ch](http://www.fame.ch), under the heading "Research" in PDF format for your consultation. We thank you for your continuing support and interest in FAME and look forward to serving you in the future.

- N° 31: EMU and Portfolio Diversification Opportunities**  
Kpate ADJAOUTÉ, Morgan Stanley Capital International, Geneva and Jean-Pierre DANTHINE, University of Lausanne, CEPR and FAME, *April 2000*
- N° 30: Serial and Parallel Krylov Methods for Implicit Finite Difference Schemes Arising in Multivariate Option Pricing**  
Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva, Evis KËLLEZI, University of Geneva and FAME, Giorgio PAULETTO, University of Geneva, *March 2001*
- N° 29: Liquidation Risk**  
Alexandre ZIEGLER, HEC-University of Lausanne, Darrell DUFFIE, The Graduate School of Business, Stanford University; *April 2001*
- N° 28: Defaultable Security Valuation and Model Risk**  
Aydin AKGUN, University of Lausanne and FAME; *March 2001*
- N° 27: On Swiss Timing and Selectivity: in the Quest of Alpha**  
François-Serge LHABITANT, HEC-University of Lausanne and Thunderbird, The American Graduate School of International Management; *March 2001*
- N° 26: Hedging Housing Risk**  
Peter ENGLUND, Stockholm School of Economics, Min HWANG and John M. QUIGLEY, University of California, Berkeley; *December 2000*
- N° 25: An Incentive Problem in the Dynamic Theory of Banking**  
Ernst-Ludwig VON THADDEN, DEEP, University of Lausanne and CEPR; *December 2000*
- N° 24: Assessing Market Risk for Hedge Funds and Hedge Funds Portfolios**  
François-Serge LHABITANT, Union Bancaire Privée and Thunderbird, the American Graduate School of International Management; *March 2001*
- N° 23: On the Informational Content of Changing Risk for Dynamic Asset Allocation**  
Giovanni BARONE-ADESI, Patrick GAGLIARDINI and Fabio TROJANI, Università della Svizzera Italiana; *March 2000*
- N° 22: The Long-run Performance of Seasoned Equity Offerings with Rights: Evidence From the Swiss Market**  
Michel DUBOIS and Pierre JEANNERET, University of Neuchatel; *January 2000*
- N° 21: Optimal International Diversification: Theory and Practice from a Swiss Investor's Perspective**  
Foort HAMELINK, Tilburg University and Lombard Odier & Cie; *December 2000*
- N° 20: A Heuristic Approach to Portfolio Optimization**  
Evis KËLLEZI; University of Geneva and FAME, Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva, *October 2000*
- N° 19: Banking, Commerce, and Antitrust**  
Stefan Arping; University of Lausanne; *August 2000*
- N° 18: Extreme Value Theory for Tail-Related Risk Measures**  
Evis KËLLEZI; University of Geneva and FAME, Manfred GILLI, University of Geneva; *October 2000*

- N° 17: International CAPM with Regime Switching GARCH Parameters**  
Lorenzo CAPIELLO, The Graduate Institute of International Studies; Tom A. FEARNLEY, The Graduate Institute of International Studies and FAME; *July 2000*
- N° 16: Prospect Theory and Asset Prices**  
Nicholas BARBERIS, University of Chicago; Ming HUANG, Stanford University; Tano SANTOS, University of Chicago; *September 2000*
- N° 15: Evolution of Market Uncertainty around Earnings Announcements**  
Dušan ISAKOV, University of Geneva and FAME; Christophe PÉRIGNON, HEC-University of Geneva and FAME; *June 2000*
- N° 14: Credit Spread Specification and the Pricing of Spread Options**  
Nicolas MOUGEOT, IBFM-University of Lausanne and FAME, *May 2000*
- N° 13: European Financial Markets After EMU: A First Assessment**  
Jean-Pierre DANTHINE, Ernst-Ludwig VON THADDEN, DEEP, Université de Lausanne and CEPR and Francesco GIAVAZZI, Università Bocconi, Milan, and CEPR; *March 2000*
- N° 12: Do fixed income securities also show asymmetric effects in conditional second moments?**  
Lorenzo CAPIELLO, The Graduate Institute of International Studies; *January 2000*
- N° 11: Dynamic Consumption and Portfolio Choice with Stochastic Volatility in Incomplete Markets**  
George CHACKO, Harvard University; Luis VICEIRA, Harvard University; *September 1999*
- N° 10: Assessing Asset Pricing Anomalies**  
Michael J. BRENNAN, University of California, Los Angeles; Yihong XIA, University of California, Los Angeles; *July 1999*
- N° 9: Recovery Risk in Stock Returns**  
Aydin AKGUN, University of Lausanne & FAME; Rajna GIBSON, University of Lausanne; *July 1999*
- N° 8: Option pricing and replication with transaction costs and dividends**  
Stylianios PERRAKIS, University of Ottawa; Jean LEFOLL, University of Geneva; *July 1999*
- N° 7: Optimal catastrophe insurance with multiple catastrophes**  
Henri LOUBERGÉ, University of Geneva; Harris SCHLESINGER, University of Alabama; *September 1999*
- N° 6: Systematic patterns before and after large price changes: Evidence from high frequency data from the Paris Bourse**  
Foort HAMELINK, Tilburg University; *May 1999*
- N° 5: Who Should Buy Long-Term Bonds?**  
John CAMPBELL, Harvard University; Luis VICEIRA, Harvard Business School; *October 1998*
- N° 4: Capital Asset Pricing Model and Changes in Volatility**  
André Oliveira SANTOS, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva; *September 1998*
- N° 3: Real Options as a Tool in the Decision to Relocate: An Application to the Banking Industry**  
Pascal BOTTERON, HEC-University of Lausanne; *January 2000*

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR FINANCIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING  
40 bd du Pont d'Arve • P.O. Box 3 • CH-1211 Geneva 4 • tel +41 22 / 312 0961 • fax +41 22 / 312 1026  
<http://www.fame.ch> • e-mail: [admin@fame.ch](mailto:admin@fame.ch)



**N° 2: Application of simple technical trading rules to Swiss stock prices: Is it profitable ?**

Dušan ISAKOV, HEC-Université de Genève; Marc HOLLISTEIN, Banque Cantonale de Genève; *January 1999*

**N° 1: Enhancing portfolio performance using option strategies: why beating the market is easy.**

François-Serge LHABITANT, HEC-University of Lausanne; *December 1998*

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR FINANCIAL ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING  
40 bd du Pont d'Arve • P.O. Box 3 • CH-1211 Geneva 4 • tel +41 22 / 312 0961 • fax +41 22 / 312 1026  
<http://www.fame.ch> • e-mail: [admin@fame.ch](mailto:admin@fame.ch)



## **International Center FAME - Partner Institutions**

### **The University of Geneva**

The University of Geneva, originally known as the Academy of Geneva, was founded in 1559 by Jean Calvin and Theodore de Beze. In 1873, The Academy of Geneva became the University of Geneva with the creation of a medical school. The Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences was created in 1915. The university is now composed of seven faculties of science; medicine; arts; law; economic and social sciences; psychology; education, and theology. It also includes a school of translation and interpretation; an institute of architecture; seven interdisciplinary centers and six associated institutes.

More than 13'000 students, the majority being foreigners, are enrolled in the various programs from the licence to high-level doctorates. A staff of more than 2'500 persons (professors, lecturers and assistants) is dedicated to the transmission and advancement of scientific knowledge through teaching as well as fundamental and applied research. The University of Geneva has been able to preserve the ancient European tradition of an academic community located in the heart of the city. This favors not only interaction between students, but also their integration in the population and in their participation of the particularly rich artistic and cultural life.  
*<http://www.unige.ch>*

### **The University of Lausanne**

Founded as an academy in 1537, the University of Lausanne (UNIL) is a modern institution of higher education and advanced research. Together with the neighboring Federal Polytechnic Institute of Lausanne, it comprises vast facilities and extends its influence beyond the city and the canton into regional, national, and international spheres.

Lausanne is a comprehensive university composed of seven Schools and Faculties: religious studies; law; arts; social and political sciences; business; science and medicine. With its 9'000 students, it is a medium-sized institution able to foster contact between students and professors as well as to encourage interdisciplinary work. The five humanities faculties and the science faculty are situated on the shores of Lake Lemman in the Dorigny plains, a magnificent area of forest and fields that may have inspired the landscape depicted in Brueghel the Elder's masterpiece, the Harvesters. The institutes and various centers of the School of Medicine are grouped around the hospitals in the center of Lausanne. The Institute of Biochemistry is located in Epalinges, in the northern hills overlooking the city. *<http://www.unil.ch>*

### **The Graduate Institute of International Studies**

The Graduate Institute of International Studies is a teaching and research institution devoted to the study of international relations at the graduate level. It was founded in 1927 by Professor William Rappard to contribute through scholarships to the experience of international co-operation which the establishment of the League of Nations in Geneva represented at that time. The Institute is a self-governing foundation closely connected with, but independent of, the University of Geneva.

The Institute attempts to be both international and pluridisciplinary. The subjects in its curriculum, the composition of its teaching staff and the diversity of origin of its student body, confer upon it its international character. Professors teaching at the Institute come from all regions of the world, and the approximately 650 students arrive from some 60 different countries. Its international character is further emphasized by the use of both English and French as working languages. Its pluralistic approach - which draws upon the methods of economics, history, law, and political science - reflects its aim to provide a broad approach and in-depth understanding of international relations in general. *<http://heiwwww.unige.ch>*

