

SIMPLIFY INPUTS --

SINGLE INDEX CASE

September 2000

A little later we will look at the solution after we have put some more structure on the problem. This will give us greater insight.

inputs		N = 10	N = 100	N = 200
\bar{R}_i	N	10	100	200
s_i	N	10	100	200
r_{ik} or s_{ik}	$\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$	<u>90</u>	<u>9,900</u>	<u>39,800</u>
	2	2	2	2

Analysts may be able to estimate \bar{R}_i and s_i , but covariance comes from models. Thus, index models were developed to estimate covariances. Many more uses have been developed for them and they have become very important.

Index Models

- A. Single index = splits return into unique and systematic.

Unique Part

$$R_{it} = a_i + b_i R_{mt} + e_{it}$$

Systematic Part

Where

$$(1) E(e_i) = 0$$

$$(2) E(e_i e_j) = 0 \quad \text{all } i \text{ and } j$$

$$(3) E(R_m e_i) = 0$$

$$(4) a_i \text{ and } b_i \text{ are constants}$$

1. Expected Value

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}_i &= E(R_i) = E(a_i + b_i R_{mt} + e_{it}) \\ &= E(a_i) + E(b_i R_{mt}) + E(e_{it}) \\ &= a_i + b_i \bar{R}_m\end{aligned}$$

2. Variance

$$s_i^2 = E\left(R_{it} - \bar{R}_i\right) = E\left[\left(a_i + b_i R_{mt} + e_{it}\right) - \left(a_i + b_i \bar{R}_m\right)\right]^2$$

$$= E\left[b_i \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m\right) + e_{it}\right]^2$$

$$s_i^2 = E\left[b_i^2 \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m\right)^2 + 2b_i e_{it} \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m\right) + e_{it}^2\right]$$

$$= b_i^2 E\left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m\right)^2 + E\left(e_i\right)^2$$

3. Covariance

$$\mathbf{s}_{ij} = E \left[\left(R_{it} - \bar{R}_i \right) \left(R_{jt} - \bar{R}_j \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[\left(\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{b}_i R_{mt} + \mathbf{e}_{it} \right) - \left(\mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{b}_i \bar{R}_{mt} \right) \right]$$

$$\left[\left(\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{b}_j R_{mt} + \mathbf{e}_{jt} \right) - \left(\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{b}_j \bar{R}_{mt} \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[\left(\mathbf{b}_i \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m \right) + \mathbf{e}_{it} \right) \left(\mathbf{b}_j \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m \right) + \mathbf{e}_{jt} \right) \right]$$

$$= \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{E} \left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m \right)^2 + \mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{E} \left[\left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m \right) \mathbf{e}_{it} \right]$$

$$+ \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{E} \left[\left(R_{mt} - \bar{R}_m \right) \mathbf{e}_{jt} \right] + \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j \right)$$

$$= \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{s}_{\bar{R}_m}^2 + \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j \right)$$

Date	Observe	
	Return GM	Return Market
Dec	11	5
Nov	3	4
Oct	7	7
Sept	0	-2
Aug	6	4
July	<u>9</u> 36	<u>6</u> 24

Good Fairy says Beta = 1

Return Gm	(constant) + <u>a_i</u>	Beta (return market) <u>$b_i R_{mt}$</u> +	<u>e_{it}</u>
11	2	5	4
3	2	4	-3
7	2	7	-2
0	2	-2	0
6	2	4	0
<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>+1</u>
36	12	24	0

Did the Good Fairy lie???

Assume $b = 1.5$

Return GM	a_i	$b_i R_m$	$+e_i$
11	0	7.5	3.5
3	0	6	-3
7	0	10.5	-3.5
0	0	-3	3
6	0	6	0
$\frac{9}{36}$	$\frac{0}{0}$	$\frac{9}{36}$	$\frac{0}{0}$

Covariance with market

$$\underline{b = 1}$$

$$1 * 4 = 4$$

$$0 * -3 = 0$$

$$3 * -2 = -6$$

$$-6 * 0 = 0$$

$$0 * 0 = 0$$

$$\frac{2 * 1 = 2}{0}$$

$$\underline{b = 1.5}$$

$$1 * 3.5 = 3.5$$

$$0 * -3 = 0$$

$$3 * -3.5 = -10.5$$

$$-6 * 3 = -18$$

$$0 * 0 = 0$$

$$\frac{2 * 0 = 0}{-25}$$

$$b_i = \frac{\text{cov}(R_i, R_m)}{\text{Var}(R_m)}$$

Note:

(1). Mean return unchanged

$$\bar{R}_i = a_i + b_i \bar{R}_m$$
$$6 = 2 + 1 \cdot 4$$

(2). Standard deviation unchanged

$$s_i^2 = b_i^2 s_m^2 + s_{e_i}^2$$
$$13\frac{1}{3} = 1^2 \cdot 8\frac{1}{3} + 5$$

(3). Only change is covariance

$$E\left(\begin{matrix} e_i \\ e_j \end{matrix}\right) = 0$$

True only by assumption.

Economic content is only reason securities move together is common response to market movements.

Consider Ford

<u>Month</u>	<u>Return</u>	<u>a_i</u>	<u>$b_i R_m$</u>	<u>e_i</u>
Dec	9.5	2	7.5	0
Nov	7.5	2	6	-1.5
Oct	9.5	2	10.5	-3
Sept	-2	2	-3	-1
Aug	11	2	6	+3
July	<u>12.5</u> 48	<u>2</u> 12	<u>9</u> 36	<u>1.5</u> 0

$$\underline{\text{cov}\begin{pmatrix} R_i & R_j \end{pmatrix}}$$

$$5 * 1.5 = 7.5$$

$$-3 * -.5 = +1.5$$

$$1 * 1.5 = 1.5$$

$$-6 * -10 = 60$$

$$0 * 3 = 0$$

$$3 * 4.5 = \frac{13.5}{84}$$

$$\underline{E\begin{pmatrix} e_i & e_j \end{pmatrix}}$$

$$4 * 0 = 0$$

$$-3 * -.5 = +1.5$$

$$-2 * -3 = 6$$

$$0 * -1 = 0$$

$$0 * 3 = 0$$

$$1 * 1.5 = \frac{1.5}{9}$$

$$\text{cov}\begin{pmatrix} R_i & R_j \end{pmatrix} = b_i \cdot b_j \cdot s_m^2 + E\begin{pmatrix} e_i & e_j \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= 1 \cdot (1.5) \left(8 \frac{1}{3}\right) + 1.5$$

$$14 = 12 \frac{1}{2} + 1.5$$

Adjusting Beta

<u>True</u>			observe		
	.6	.8	1.0	1.2	1.4
1.2			.2	.6	.2
1.0		.2	.6	.2	
.8	.2	.6	.2		

Extremely high betas likely upper
Tail of a true lower beta thus

- (1) Improve if adjust to mean
- (2) Improve if use information about company

Some Adjustment Techniques

I. Blumes

Companies	1985-1990	1990-1995
1	b_{11}	b_{21}
2	b_{12}	b_{22}
3	b_{13}	b_{23}

Get adjustment from first to second period

$$b_{i2} = a + b b_{i1} + e_i$$

This shows normal adjustment to forecast for 1995-2000.

$$b_{\text{adj}} = \hat{a} + \hat{b} b_{i2}$$

II. Vasicek

$$b_{adj} = \frac{s_{b_{il}}^2}{s_{b_1}^2 + s_{b_{il}}^2} b_{il} + \frac{s_{\bar{b}_1}^2}{s_{\bar{b}_1}^2 + s_{b_{il}}^2} \bar{b}_1$$

Puts more weight on mean if imperfect estimates of Beta.

III. Fundamentals

$$b_{adj} = b_{hist} + \text{fundamentals}$$

a. Dividend Payment

b. Growth

+ firm variables

