Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のので

Conclusion

# Skewness in Expected Macro Fundamentals and the Predictability of Equity Returns: Evidence and Theory

Ric Colacito, Eric Ghysels, Jinghan Meng, and Wasin Siwasarit



Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

# Introduction

- Long-Run Risks Model: time-varying expected growth rate
   → This paper: we look at the cross-section of analysts'
   foreasts
  - forecasts
- At each point in time we look at:
  - Mean of all forecasts
  - Volatility of all forecasts
  - Skewness of all forecasts
- We find:
  - 1. Evidence of persistence for all the moments
  - 2. Skewness predicts future Mean
- Questions
  - How much larger is the premium to compensate for the risk of time-varying moments of the distribution of expected GDP forecasts?

 $\rightarrow$  Bansal and Yaron (2004), Bansal, Kiku, Shaliastovich, and Yaron (2012) look at time varying means and variances

2. What is the use of this information for forecasting stock market returns?

-> Campbell and Diebold (2009) look at first two moments are a set of the set

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

## Battle plan

- 1. The Empirical Evidence
  - A look at the data
  - Time series properties of the cross-section of expected GDP growth
  - Predictive Regression
- 2. Models
  - 1 A model with time-varying mean and skewness
  - 2 A model with time-varying volatility and skewness
- 3. Comparison with other models .
  - How large is the skewness premium?
  - How different of the dynamic of the conditional skewness of expectant consumption growth?

▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

## Data on Expected Real GDP/GNP growth rates

#### 1. Livingston Survey:

- Time series size: forecasts from 06/1946 to 06/2011, twice per year;
- Forecast horizon: 6 months and 12 months from now;
- Cross-sectional size: 19-50+ economists in each period, from 11 sectors (e.g., industry, government, banking, academia, etc).
- 2. Blue Chip Economic Indicators:
  - Time series size: forecasts from 09/1984 to 06/2011, every month;
  - Forecast horizon: 1, 2, up to 6 quarters ahead;
  - Cross-sectional size: 40-50 economists in each period.

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Moments of Expected GDP Forecasts



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

Models

Comparison With Other Models

#### Transition dynamics of conditional moments

|                                    | Mean             | Volatility       | Third Moment <sup>1/3</sup> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Lagged Mean                        | 0.496<br>[0.070] | _                | _                           |
| Lagged Volatility                  | _                | 0.886<br>[0.058] | _                           |
| Lagged Third Moment <sup>1/3</sup> | _                | _                | 0.329<br>[0.077]            |

Models

Comparison With Other Models

#### Transition dynamics of conditional moments

|                                    | Mean    | Volatility | Third Moment <sup>1/3</sup> |
|------------------------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Lagged Mean                        | 0.480   | -0.038     | -0.094                      |
|                                    | [0.056] | [0.019]    | [0.055]                     |
| Lagged Volatility                  | 0.183   | 0.818      | -0.258                      |
|                                    | [0.785] | [0.052]    | [-0.164]                    |
| Lagged Third Moment <sup>1/3</sup> | 0.302   | -0.085     | 0.275                       |
|                                    | [0.093] | [0.026]    | [0.068]                     |

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

#### **Correlation between Predictors**

|                  | $V[\cdot]$ | $S[\cdot]$ | cay    | default | term.  | DP     | VIX <sup>2</sup> | VRP    | RV     | fear   |
|------------------|------------|------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| E[·]             | 0.352      | -0.148     | -0.044 | -0.254  | 0.247  | -0.263 | -0.649           | -0.206 | -0.583 | -0.237 |
| V[·]             |            | -0.076     | -0.122 | 0.109   | -0.278 | 0.616  | 0.622            | 0.159  | 0.576  | 0.231  |
| S[·]             |            |            | 0.044  | 0.087   | -0.013 | -0.105 | 0.346            | 0.204  | 0.265  | 0.168  |
| cay              |            |            |        | -0.100  | 0.274  | 0.006  | -0.133           | 0.228  | -0.248 | 0.353  |
| default          |            |            |        |         | 0.149  | 0.301  | 0.814            | -0.046 | 0.875  | 0.418  |
| term pr.         |            |            |        |         |        | -0.290 | 0.134            | 0.044  | 0.120  | 0.434  |
| DP               |            |            |        |         |        |        | 0.006            | -0.155 | 0.080  | 0.241  |
| VIX <sup>2</sup> |            |            |        |         |        |        |                  | 0.325  | 0.893  | 0.510  |
| VRP              |            |            |        |         |        |        |                  |        | -0.134 | 0.427  |
| RV               |            |            |        |         |        |        |                  |        |        | 0.309  |

Note: This table reports the correlation between equity return predictors. *E*[*growth*], *V*[*growth*], and *S*[*growth*] refer to the median, volatility, and skewness of the cross-sectional distribution of expected GDP growth rate at the beginning of each six months interval from 1952 to 2010. The predictors *cay*, the term premium, the dividend yield, and the default spread are from Lettau and Ludvigson (2005), from 1952 to 2010. VIX<sup>2</sup>, VRP and RV are from Bollerslev, Tauchen and Zhou (2010), from1990 to 2010. Fear is from Bollerslev and Todorov (2011) starting in 1996.

Empirical Evidence

Vodels

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

## **Predicting returns**

| Panel A: Livingston (Up to 98) + Blue Chip, 1951-2010 |  |
|---|--|
|---|--|

|                                       | [1]               | [2]              | [3]               | [4]               | [5]               | [6]               | [7]               |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| E[growth]                             | -0.020<br>(0.006) | -                | -                 | -                 | -0.023<br>(0.005) | -                 | -                 |
| V[growth]                             |                   | 0.009<br>(0.008) | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.005<br>(0.005)  |                   |
| S[growth]                             | -                 | -                | -0.019<br>(0.003) | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.012<br>(0.021)  |
| $S[\cdot]^{1/3} \cdot V[\cdot]^{1/2}$ | -                 | -                | -                 | -0.021<br>(0.004) | -0.026<br>(0.003) | -0.023<br>(0.003) | -0.035<br>(0.023) |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>                   | 0.034             | -0.002           | 0.028             | 0.045             | 0.093             | 0.039             | 0.038             |

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **Predicting returns**

Papel A: Livingston (Lipto 08) - Plue Chip 1051 2010

| Fai                                   | raner A. Livingston (Opto 90) + Bide Chip, 1931-2010 |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                                       | [8]  | [9]               | [10]              | [11]              | [12]              | [13]              |  |  |  |  |
| E[growth]                             | -  | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.025<br>(0.005) | -0.025<br>(0.009) |  |  |  |  |
| V[growth]                             | -  | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.005<br>(0.005) | -                 |  |  |  |  |
| S[growth]                             | -  | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.008<br>(0.011)  | -                 |  |  |  |  |
| $S[\cdot]^{1/3} \cdot V[\cdot]^{1/2}$ | -0.024<br>(0.005)                                    | -0.023<br>(0.005) | -0.023<br>(0.006) | -0.021<br>(0.006) | -0.035<br>(0.011) | -0.023<br>(0.007) |  |  |  |  |
| cay                                   | 0.017<br>(0.006)                                     | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.009<br>(0.010)  |  |  |  |  |
| default                               | -  | 0.010<br>(0.008)  | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.002<br>(0.008) |  |  |  |  |
| term pr.                              | -  | -                 | 0.014<br>(0.008)  | -                 | -                 | 0.022<br>(0.011)  |  |  |  |  |
| DP                                    | -  | -                 | -                 | 0.012<br>(0.011)  | -                 | 0.10<br>(0.012)   |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>                   | 0.066  | 0.048             | 0.060             | 0.048             | 0.079             | 0.125             |  |  |  |  |

Empirical Evidence

Vodels

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **Predicting returns**

Panel B: Livingston (Up to 98) + Blue Chip, 1990-2010

|                                       | [1]               | [2]               | [3]               | [4]               | [5]               | [6]               | [7]               |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| E[growth]                             | -0.011<br>(0.008) | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.019<br>(0.003) | -                 | -                 |
| V[growth]                             |                   | -0.006<br>(0.018) | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.019<br>(0.016) |                   |
| S[growth]                             | -                 | -                 | -0.021<br>(0.005) | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.029<br>(0.016)  |
| $S[\cdot]^{1/3} \cdot V[\cdot]^{1/2}$ | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.030<br>(0.006) | -0.034<br>(0.004) | -0.030<br>(0.009) | -0.056<br>(0.013) |
| Adj. R <sup>2</sup>                   | -0.007            | -0.031            | 0.38              | 0.100             | 0.127             | 0.074             | 0.099             |

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **Predicting returns**

| Panel B: Livingston (Up to 98) + Blue Chip, 1990-2010 |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |  |  |  |  |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
|   | [8]               | [9]               | [10]              | [11]              | [12]              | [13]              |  |  |  |  |
| E[growth]   | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.028<br>(0.015) | -0.013<br>(0.015) |  |  |  |  |
| V[growth]   | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -0.018<br>(0.018) | -                 |  |  |  |  |
| S[growth]   | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.021<br>(0.030)  | -                 |  |  |  |  |
| $S[\cdot]^{1/3} \cdot V[\cdot]^{1/2}$                 | -0.031<br>(0.005) | -0.028<br>(0.005) | -0.032<br>(0.006) | -0.029<br>(0.006) | -0.052<br>(0.024) | -0.032<br>(0.008) |  |  |  |  |
| VIX <sup>2</sup>                                      | 0.017<br>(0.007)  | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 | -                 |  |  |  |  |
| VRP   | -                 | 0.012<br>(0.006)  | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.010<br>(0.005)  |  |  |  |  |
| RV  | -                 | -                 | 0.013<br>(0.008)  | -                 | -                 | 0.006<br>(0.016)  |  |  |  |  |
| fear  | -                 | -                 | -                 | 0.017<br>(0.017)  | -                 | -<br>-            |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>                            | 0.121             | 0.097             | 0.100             | 0.040             | 0.118             | 0.094             |  |  |  |  |

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

# A Model with Time-Varying Mean and Skewness

#### Preference

Agents have recursive risk-sensitive preferences:

$$U_t = (1-\delta)\log C_t + \delta\theta\log E_t \exp\left\{\frac{U_{t+1}}{\theta}\right\}$$

where  $\theta = 1/(1-\gamma)$ .



◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ● ● ● ● ● ●

# A Model with Time-Varying Mean and Skewness

#### Preference

Agents have recursive risk-sensitive preferences:

$$U_t = (1-\delta) \log C_t + \delta E_t [U_{t+1}]$$

where  $\theta = 1/(1-\gamma)$ . If  $\theta \to -\infty$ : time additive case.

# A Model with Time-Varying Mean and Skewness

#### Preference

Agents have recursive risk-sensitive preferences:

$$U_t = (1-\delta)\log C_t + \delta\theta\log E_t \exp\left\{\frac{U_{t+1}}{\theta}\right\}$$

where  $\theta = 1/(1-\gamma)$ .



▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

# A Model with Time-Varying Mean and Skewness

#### Preference

Agents have recursive risk-sensitive preferences:

$$U_t \approx (1-\delta)\log C_t + \delta E_t[U_{t+1}] + \frac{\delta}{2\theta}V_t[U_{t+1}] + \frac{\delta}{6\theta^2}E_t(U_{t+1} - E_tU_{t+1})^3 + \dots$$
  
where  $\theta = 1/(1-\gamma)$ .

- Standard Expected Utility term
- Utility variance matters ( $\gamma > 1 \Rightarrow \theta < 0$ : agents dislike variance)
- Higher order conditional moments are potentially important...

Empirical Evidence

 Comparison With Other Models

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 ● ●

Conclusion

## Dynamics of consumption growth

$$\Delta y_{t+1} = \underbrace{\mu_c + x_t}_{E_t[\Delta y_{t+1}]} + \sqrt{\sigma_t^c} \varepsilon_{t+1}^c$$
$$x_{t+1} = \rho x_t + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_t^x} \varepsilon_{t+1}^x$$

where  $\varepsilon_{t+1}^{x} \sim$  Skew-Normal with the shape parameter  $\phi_{t+1} \in [-1, 1]$ The probability distribution function of  $\varepsilon_{t+1}^{x}$  is:

$$2 \cdot \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(\varepsilon_{t+1}^{x})^{2}}{2}\right\}}_{\text{Normal pdf}} \cdot \underbrace{\int_{-\infty}^{\frac{\varphi_{t+1}}{\sqrt{1-\varphi_{t+1}^{2}}}\varepsilon_{t+1}^{x}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(t)^{2}}{2}\right\} dt}_{\text{Normal CDF}}.$$

• Skewness is time-varying:  $\phi_{t+1} = \rho_{\phi} \phi_t + \sqrt{\sigma_{\phi}} \epsilon^{\phi}_{t+1}$ 

• Volatility is constant: 
$$\sigma_t^c = \sigma_t^x = \bar{\sigma}$$

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **Skew Normal**

$$\phi = -0.995(\nu = -10), \phi = 0(\nu = 0), \phi = 0.894(\nu = 2)$$



Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ● ● ● ● ●

Conclusion

#### Financial Market and Equilibrium

In equilibrium, 
$$\Delta c_{t+1} = \Delta y_{t+1}$$
.

 $P_t$  of any asset associated to the sequence of stochastic cash flows  $\{D_j\}_{j=t}^{\infty}$  satisfies

$$P_t = E_t [M_{t+1}(P_{t+1} + D_{t+1})],$$

where

$$M_{t+1} = \frac{\partial U_t / \partial C_{t+1}}{\partial U_t / \partial C_t}.$$

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のので

Conclusion

#### SDF and Equity Return

$$m_{t+1} - E_t m_{t+1} = -\left(1 - \frac{1}{\theta}\right) \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}} \varepsilon_{t+1}^c + \frac{V_{\phi} \sqrt{\sigma_{\phi}}}{\theta} \varepsilon_{t+1}^{\phi} + \frac{B \varphi_e \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}}}{\theta} \varepsilon_{t+1}^{\chi}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$B = \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta \rho_x}, \ V_{\phi} = \frac{0.8 \phi_e B \delta \rho_{\phi}}{1 - \delta \rho_{\phi}} \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}}, \ \theta = \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}.$$

(High economic growth (large  $\varepsilon^c$ )) (High expected growth (large  $\varepsilon^x$ )

High skewness of expected growth (large  $\epsilon^{\phi}$ )

Large Equity Premium

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

A D > 4 目 > 4 目 > 4 目 > 3 Q Q

Conclusion

#### SDF and Equity Return

Assume

$$\Delta d_t = \mu_c + \lambda \left( x_{t-1} + \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}} \varepsilon_t^c \right) + \sqrt{\sigma_d} \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}} \varepsilon_t^d,$$

where the innovation  $\varepsilon_t^d$  is *i.i.d* distributed as a standard normal.

The conditional equity risk premium:

$$E_t\left[r_{t+1}^d - r_t^f\right] = \bar{r} - \left[\alpha \frac{K_1(\lambda - 1)}{1 - K_1 \rho_x} \varphi_e \sqrt{\bar{\sigma}} \rho_\phi\right] \cdot \phi_t$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is related to the slope of the normal cdf,  $K_1 \in (0, 1)$  is the slope of the Campbell Shiller approximation.

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ □ のQ@

#### A Model with Time-Varying Volatility and Skewness

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○ ● ●

#### A Model with Time-Varying Volatility and Skewness

Dynamics of consumption growth

$$\Delta c_{t+1} = \underbrace{\mu_c + x_t}_{E_t[\Delta c_{t+1}]} + \sqrt{\sigma_t^c} \varepsilon_{t+1}^c$$
$$x_{t+1} = \rho x_t + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_t^x} \varepsilon_{t+1}^x$$

#### where

 $\epsilon_{t+1}^{x} \sim S$ kew-Normal with the shape parameter  $\phi_{t+1}$ 

- Skewness is time-varying:  $\phi_{t+1} = \rho_{\phi}\phi_t + \sqrt{\sigma_{\phi}}\epsilon^{\phi}_{t+1}$
- Volatility is time-varying:  $\sigma_t^c = \sigma_t^x = \sigma_t = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \rho_{\sigma}) + \rho_{\sigma}\sigma_{t-1} + \sqrt{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\varepsilon_t^{\sigma}$

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Conclusion

#### **GMM** estimation

We use GMM to estimate the parameters governing the dynamics of  $x_t$ ,  $\sigma_t$ , and  $\phi_t$ .

$$\begin{split} \widehat{E}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_{t}^{i}(\Delta c_{t+1}) \\ \widehat{V}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ E_{t}^{i}(\Delta c_{t+1}) - \widehat{E}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) \right]^{2} \\ \widehat{S}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) &= \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ E_{t}^{i}(\Delta c_{t+1}) - \widehat{E}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) \right]^{3}}{\left( \widehat{V}_{t}^{cs}(\Delta c_{t+1}) \right)^{3/2}} \end{split}$$

Panel A: dynamics of mean, variance, and skewness

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Calibration-(Semi-annual)

| Parameter                  | Description   | Model                   | GMM   |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| ρχ                         | AR coefficient of the expected consumption growth rate        | 0.690                   | 0.540<br>(0.073)                                    |
| ō                          | Unconditional variance of the short-run shock                 | $3.13\!\times\!10^{-4}$ | $_{(4.44\times10^{-5})}^{3.85\times10^{-4}}$        |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_{\epsilon}}$ | Conditional volatility of the variance of the short-run shock | $1.50 \times 10^{-4}$   | $\substack{2.81\times10^{-4}\\(4.89\times10^{-5})}$ |
| ρσ                         | AR coefficient of the variance of the short-run shock         | 0.464                   | 0.407<br>(0.075)                                    |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\varphi}$    | Conditional volatility of skewness                            | 0.425                   | 3.644<br>(1.796)                                    |
| $\rho_{\phi}$              | AR coefficient of skewness                                    | 0.307                   | 0.185<br>(0.087)                                    |

Notes - Panel A reports the calibration of the parameters associated to the transition dynamics of  $x_t$ ,  $\sigma_t$ , and  $\phi_t$  (column labeled "Model"), along with the GMM estimated values (column labeled "GMM"). The numbers in parenthesis are the standard errors of the estimated coefficients. Panel B reports the calibration of all the remaining parameters of the model. The calibration is set to semi-annual frequency.

go to GMM estimation

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ ● ● ●

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ● ● ● ● ●

Conclusion

#### Calibration-(Semi-annual)

Panel B: other parameters

| Parameter      | Description  | Model |  |
|----------------|--|-------|--|
| γ              | Risk aversion  | 10    |  |
| δ              | Subjective discount factor                               | 0.993 |  |
| $\mu_{c}$      | Average consumption growth                               | 0.008 |  |
| φ <sub>e</sub> | Ratio of long-run shock and short-run shock volatilities | 0.200 |  |
| λ2             | Leverage coefficient                                     | 4.500 |  |
| σ <sub>d</sub> | Scale parameter of dividends' volatility                 | 28    |  |

Notes - Panel A reports the calibration of the parameters associated to the transition dynamics of  $x_t$ ,  $\sigma_t$ , and  $\phi_t$  (column labeled "Model"), along with the GMM estimated values (column labeled "GMM"). The numbers in parenthesis are the standard errors of the estimated coefficients. Panel B reports the calibration of all the remaining parameters of the model. The calibration is set to semi-annual frequency.

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **Utility Function**



- Time-varying skewness amplifies the uncertainty of lifetime utility
- Skewness interacts with variance:
  - $\rightarrow$  high variance is welfare increasing with positive skewness
  - $\rightarrow$  high variance is welfare decreasing with negative skewness =

# Model-implied predictive regressions at semiannual frequency

|               |         | Benchm  | ark model s | imulation |         | Data    |         |         |         |         |
|---------------|---------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|               | (1)     | (2)     | (3)         | (4)       | (5)     | (1)     | (2)     | (3)     | (4)     | (5)     |
| $(V_t)^{1/2}$ | 0.015   | -       | -           | -         | -       | 0.009   | -       | -       | -       | -       |
|               | (0.003) |         |             |           |         | (0.014) |         |         |         |         |
| Vt            | -       | 0.015   | -           | -         | 0.015   | -       | 0.009   | -       |         | 0.005   |
|               |         | (0.003) |             |           | (0.003) |         | (0.010) |         |         | (0.010) |
| St            | -       | -       | -0.009      | -         | -       | -       | -       | -0.019  | -       | -       |
|               |         |         | (0.003)     |           |         |         |         | (0.009) |         |         |
| $(S_t)^{1/3}$ | -       | -       | -           | -0.007    | -0.007  | -       | -       | -       | -0.024  | -0.023  |
| $(V_t)^{1/2}$ |         |         |             | (0.003)   | (0.003) |         |         |         | (0.009) | (0.010) |



Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ● ● ●

## Quantitative Performance

#### [2]Correlation of Excess Returns: Quintile Analysis

Step1 Solve the model and compute the conditional risk premium.

Step2 Plug the time series of the cross-sectional moments of the distribution of analysts' forecasts in the conditional risk premium.

Step3 Calculate the correlation between these expected returns predicted by the model and the actual subsequent excess returns in the data.

Step4 Compare with the same set of correlations for the model in which any time-variation in skewness has been shut down.

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○ ● ●

## A Model with Time-Varying Volatility and Skewness

Dynamics of consumption growth

$$\Delta c_{t+1} = \underbrace{\mu_c + x_t}_{E_t[\Delta c_{t+1}]} + \sqrt{\sigma_t^c} \varepsilon_{t+1}^c$$
$$x_{t+1} = \rho x_t + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_t^x} \varepsilon_{t+1}^x$$

#### where

 $\epsilon_{t+1}^{x} \sim S$ kew-Normal with the shape parameter  $\phi_{t+1}$ 

- Skewness is time-varying:  $\phi_{t+1} = \rho_{\phi}\phi_t + \sqrt{\sigma_{\phi}}\epsilon^{\phi}_{t+1}$
- Volatility is time-varying:  $\sigma_t^c = \sigma_t^x = \sigma_t = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \rho_{\sigma}) + \rho_{\sigma}\sigma_{t-1} + \sqrt{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\epsilon_t^{\sigma}$

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

# A Model with Time-Varying Volatility and Skewness is Shutdown

Dynamics of consumption growth

$$\Delta c_{t+1} = \underbrace{\mu_c + x_t}_{E_t[\Delta c_{t+1}]} + \sqrt{\sigma_t^c} \varepsilon_{t+1}^c$$
$$x_{t+1} = \rho x_t + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_t^x} \varepsilon_{t+1}^x$$

where

$$rac{arepsilon^{ extsf{x}}}{t+1}$$
  $\sim$  Normal

- Skewness is shut down:  $\phi_{t+1} = \rho_{\phi} \phi_t + \sqrt{\sigma_{\phi} \varepsilon_{t+1}^{\phi}}$
- Volatility is time-varying:  $\sigma_t^c = \sigma_t^x = \sigma_t = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \rho_{\sigma}) + \rho_{\sigma}\sigma_{t-1} + \sqrt{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\epsilon_t^{\sigma}$

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Correlation of Excess Returns: Quintile Analysis

#### Panel A: Correlations by Skewness based Quintiles

|             | Q1       | Q2      | Q3     | Q4      | Q5      |
|-------------|----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| No Skewness | 0.096    | 0.126   | 0.325  | 0.073   | 0.122   |
| Benchmark   | 0.219    | 0.155   | 0.327  | 0.092   | 0.141   |
| % Change    | (128.6%) | (23.3%) | (0.8%) | (26.0%) | (16.0%) |

#### Panel B: The Role of Volatility

|                 | Q1    | Q2     | Q3    | Q4    | Q5     |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| Low $\sigma_t$  | 0.157 | -0.319 | 0.086 | 0.131 | -0.099 |
| High $\sigma_t$ | 0.101 | 0.402  | 0.289 | 0.209 | 0.228  |

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ・三 の々ぐ

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Comparison With Other Models

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

#### **Comparison With Other Models**

$$\begin{split} \Delta c_{t+1} &= \mu_c + x_t + \sqrt{\sigma_t} \boxed{\varepsilon_{t+1}^c} \\ \Delta d_{t+1} &= \lambda \Delta c_{t+1} + \sqrt{\sigma_d} \sqrt{\sigma_t} \boxed{\varepsilon_{t+1}^d} \\ x_{t+1} &= \rho_x x_t + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_t^x} \boxed{\varepsilon_{t+1}^x} + J_{t+1}^x \\ \sigma_{t+1} &= (1 - \rho_\sigma) \overline{\sigma} + \rho_\sigma \sigma_t + \sqrt{\sigma_\varepsilon} \boxed{\varepsilon_{t+1}^\sigma} + J_{t+1}^\sigma \\ \sigma_t^x &= \sigma_t \left(1 - 2(E_t[\varphi_{t+1}])^2 / \pi\right)^{-1} \\ &= \varepsilon_{t+1}^x \sim SKN(0, 1, \varphi_{t+1}), \end{split}$$

and  $J_{t+1}^{x}$  and  $J_{t+1}^{\sigma}$  are modeled as jump processes

$$J_{t+1}^{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{t+1}^{\sigma}} \xi_{j,t+1}^{x}, \quad N_{t+1}^{x} \sim Poisson(l_{1}^{x}\sigma_{t}), \quad \xi_{j,t+1}^{x} \sim -exp(\mu^{x}) + \mu_{x}$$
  
$$J_{t+1}^{\sigma} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{t+1}^{\sigma}} \xi_{j,t+1}^{\sigma}, \quad N_{t+1}^{\sigma} \sim Poisson(l_{1}^{\sigma}\sigma_{t}), \quad \xi_{j,t+1}^{\sigma} \sim exp(\mu^{\sigma}) - \mu_{\sigma}.$$

|   | i |   |  |  | 6 |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Ļ | 1 |  |  |   |  |  |

Models

Comparison With Other Models

## Calibration

| γ                      | Risk aversion   | 10                   |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| δ                      | Subjective discount factor  | 0.998                |
| $\mu_c$                | Average consumption growth  | 0.001                |
| $\rho_x$               | Autoregressive coefficient of the expected consumption growth rate $x_t$                                  | 0.9619               |
| φ <sub>e</sub>         | Ratio of long-run shock and short-run shock volatilities  | 0.05                 |
| $\mu_X$                | Location parameter of skew normal distribution of the innovations to $x_t$                                | 0                    |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\sigma}$ | Conditional volatility of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                       | $3.80 	imes 10^{-6}$ |
| $\rho_{\sigma}$        | Persistence of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                                  | 0.93                 |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\nu}$    | Conditional volatility of the scale parameter $\nu$ of the skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$ | 0.4696               |
| $\rho_{\nu}$           | Persistence of the scale parameter $v$ of skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$                  | 0.8                  |
| λ                      | Leverage  | 3                    |

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

Models

Comparison With Other Models

## Calibration

| γ                      | Risk aversion   | 10                   |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| δ                      | Subjective discount factor  | 0.998                |
| $\mu_c$                | Average consumption growth  | 0.001                |
| $\rho_x$               | Autoregressive coefficient of the expected consumption growth rate $x_t$                                  | 0.9619               |
| $\phi_e$               | Ratio of long-run shock and short-run shock volatilities  | 0.05                 |
| $\mu_X$                | Location parameter of skew normal distribution of the innovations to $x_t$                                | 0                    |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\sigma}$ | Conditional volatility of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                       | $3.80 	imes 10^{-6}$ |
| $\rho_{\sigma}$        | Persistence of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                                  | 0.93                 |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\nu}$    | Conditional volatility of the scale parameter $\nu$ of the skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$ | 0.4696               |
| $\rho_{\nu}$           | Persistence of the scale parameter v of skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$                    | 0.8                  |
| λ                      | Leverage  | 3                    |

|   | i |   |  |  | 6 |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Ļ | 1 |  |  |   |  |  |

Models

Comparison With Other Models

## Calibration

| γ                      | Risk aversion   | 10                    |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| δ                      | Subjective discount factor  | 0.998                 |
| $\mu_c$                | Average consumption growth  | 0.001                 |
| ρ <sub>x</sub>         | Autoregressive coefficient of the expected consumption growth rate $x_t$                                | 0.9619                |
| φ <sub>e</sub>         | Ratio of long-run shock and short-run shock volatilities  | 0.05                  |
| $\mu_{x}$              | Location parameter of skew normal distribution of the innovations to $x_t$                              | 0                     |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_\sigma}$ | Conditional volatility of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                     | $3.80 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| ρ <sub>σ</sub>         | Persistence of the variance of the short-run shock to consumption growth                                | 0.93                  |
| $\sqrt{\sigma_{\nu}}$  | Conditional volatility of the scale parameter $v$ of the skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$ | 0.4696                |
| $\rho_{\nu}$           | Persistence of the scale parameter $v$ of skew normally distributed innovations to $x_t$                | 0.8                   |
| λ                      | Leverage  | 3                     |

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Comparison of models

|                         |       |        | [1]       | [2]             | [3]         |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------------|-------------|
|                         | Da    | ata    | Benchmark | No Skewness     | No Skewness |
|                         |       |        |           | w/ Constant Vol |             |
| $E[r_t^d - r_t^f]$      | 4.84  | (1.90) | 5.49      | 1.91            | 3.81        |
| $\sigma[r_t^d - r_t^f]$ | 16.40 | (1.75) | 18.11     | 13.70           | 13.67       |
| $Skew[r_t^d - r_t^f]$   | 0.65  | (0.23) | 0.03      | 0.00            | 0.01        |
| $E[r_t^f]$              | 1.75  | (0.50) | 2.23      | 2.23            | 2.22        |
| $\sigma[r_t^f]$         | 2.30  | (0.3)  | 2.02      | 1.23            | 1.23        |
| $Skew[r_t^f]$           | -0.74 | (0.35) | -0.02     | 0.01            | -0.03       |
| E[p/d]                  | 3.43  | (0.26) | 3.02      | 4.40            | 3.47        |
| $\sigma[ ho/d]$         | 0.43  | (0.12) | 0.16      | 0.09            | 0.09        |
| Skew[p/d]               | 0.36  | (0.89) | 0.03      | -0.03           | -0.04       |
| $AC_1[p/d]$             | 0.97  | (0.23) | 0.41      | 0.28            | 0.27        |

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─臣 ─の�?

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Comparison of models

|  |       |        | [1]       | [4]           | [5]               |
|--|-------|--------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|
|  | Data  |        | Benchmark | Adjusted Mean | Negative Skewness |
| $\overline{E[r_t^d - r_t^f]}$          | 4.84  | (1.90) | 5.49      | 2.14          | 8.98              |
| $\sigma[r_t^d - r_t^f]$                | 16.40 | (1.75) | 18.11     | 14.12         | 14.17             |
| $Skew[r_t^d - r_t^f]$                  | 0.65  | (0.23) | 0.03      | 0.01          | 0.03              |
| $E[r_t^f]$                             | 1.75  | (0.50) | 2.23      | 2.23          | 2.42              |
| $\sigma[r_t^f]$                        | 2.30  | (0.3)  | 2.02      | 1.19          | 1.50              |
| $Skew[r_t^f]$                          | -0.74 | (0.35) | -0.02     | -0.04         | 0.19              |
| E[p/d]                                 | 3.43  | (0.26) | 3.02      | 4.19          | 2.53              |
| $\sigma[ ho/d]$                        | 0.43  | (0.12) | 0.16      | 0.10          | 0.11              |
| $\mathit{Skew}[\mathit{p}/\mathit{d}]$ | 0.36  | (0.89) | 0.03      | -0.04         | 0.04              |
| $AC_1[p/d]$                            | 0.97  | (0.23) | 0.41      | 0.26          | 0.36              |

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### Comparison of models

|                               |       |        | [1]       | [6]           |
|-------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|---------------|
|                               | Da    | ata    | Benchmark | DY Jump Model |
| $\overline{E[r_t^d - r_t^f]}$ | 4.84  | (1.90) | 5.49      | 4.49          |
| $\sigma[r_t^d - r_t^f]$       | 16.40 | (1.75) | 18.11     | 18.87         |
| $Skew[r_t^d - r_t^f]$         | 0.65  | (0.23) | 0.03      | 0.23          |
| $E[r_t^f]$                    | 1.75  | (0.50) | 2.23      | 2.02          |
| $\sigma[r_t^f]$               | 2.30  | (0.3)  | 2.02      | 2.27          |
| $Skew[r_t^f]$                 | -0.74 | (0.35) | -0.02     | -1.05         |
| E[p/d]                        | 3.43  | (0.26) | 3.02      | 3.34          |
| $\sigma[ ho/d]$               | 0.43  | (0.12) | 0.16      | 0.14          |
| Skew[p/d]                     | 0.36  | (0.89) | 0.03      | -1.06         |
| $AC_1[p/d]$                   | 0.97  | (0.23) | 0.41      | 0.33          |

Models 0000000000000000 Comparison With Other Models

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のので

# The different dynamics of the conditional skewness of expected consumption growth

In the Drechsler and Yaron (2011):

•  $V_t[x_{t+1}] = (\varphi_e^2 + l_1^x \mu_x^2) \sigma_t$ 

• 
$$E_t\left[(x_{t+1}-E_t[x_{t+1}])^3\right] = -2\mu_x^3 l_1^x \sigma_t$$

• Skewness<sub>t</sub>[
$$x_{t+1}$$
] =  $-\frac{2\mu_x^3 l_1^x}{(\varphi_e^2 + l_1^x \mu_x^2)^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_t}}$ 

Equity risk premia ==> an increasing function of skewness!

We need a model that allows us to disentangle variance from skewness.

Our model with time-varying Skew-Normal innovations has this property!

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

# Comparison of Conditional Skewness of Expected Consumption Growth



▲ロト ▲圖 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ▲ 臣 ▶ ● 臣 ■ ● のへで

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

#### The role of skewness in predictive regressions

| [1] Benchmark Model   |         |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|
|   | [1]     | [2]     | [3]     | [4]     | [5]     |  |  |  |
| $\overline{(\widehat{V}_t^{cs})^{1/2}}$                       | 0.013   | -       | -       | -       | -       |  |  |  |
|   | (0.003) |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |
| $\widehat{V}_t^{cs}$  | -       | 0.013   | -       | -       | 0.014   |  |  |  |
|   |         | (0.003) |         |         | (0.003) |  |  |  |
| $\widehat{S}_{t}^{cs}$  | -       | -       | -0.065  | -       | -       |  |  |  |
|   |         |         | (0.003) |         |         |  |  |  |
| $(\widehat{S}_t^{cs})^{1/3} \cdot (\widehat{V}_t^{cs})^{1/2}$ | -       | -       | -       | -0.129  | -0.138  |  |  |  |
|   |         |         |         | (0.003) | (0.003) |  |  |  |

#### The role of skewness in predictive regressions

| [2] Model with jumps  |         |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|
|   | [1]     | [2]     | [3]     | [4]     | [5]     |  |  |  |
| $\overline{(\widehat{V}_t^{cs})^{1/2}}$                       | 0.116   | -       | -       | -       | -       |  |  |  |
|   | (0.007) |         |         |         |         |  |  |  |
| $\widehat{V}_t^{cs}$  | -       | 0.124   | -       | -       | 0.121   |  |  |  |
|   |         | (0.009) |         |         | (0.017) |  |  |  |
| $\widehat{S}_{t}^{cs}$  | -       | -       | 0.037   | -       | -       |  |  |  |
|   |         |         | (0.003) |         |         |  |  |  |
| $(\widehat{S}_t^{cs})^{1/3} \cdot (\widehat{V}_t^{cs})^{1/2}$ | -       | -       | -       | -0.108  | -0.003  |  |  |  |
|   |         |         |         | (0.006) | (0.011) |  |  |  |

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ● ● ● ● ●

Conclusion

## **Concluding Remarks**

• The **entire distribution** of expected GDP growth rates matters for equity returns

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ● ● ● ● ●

Conclusion

## **Concluding Remarks**

- The **entire distribution** of expected GDP growth rates matters for equity returns
- There is a sizeable skewness premium

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

## **Concluding Remarks**

- The **entire distribution** of expected GDP growth rates matters for equity returns
- There is a sizeable skewness premium
- <u>Extensions</u>
  - Average skewness is negative: results are almost unaffected, because what matters is the volatility of the skewness and its predictive power for the mean

Empirical Evidence

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

▲ロト ▲冊 ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ▲ ヨ ▶ ● の Q @

## **Concluding Remarks**

- The **entire distribution** of expected GDP growth rates matters for equity returns
- There is a sizeable skewness premium
- <u>Extensions</u>
  - Average skewness is negative: results are almost unaffected, because what matters is the volatility of the skewness and its predictive power for the mean
  - Cross-sectional implications: assets whose skewness of expected cash flows' forecasts is more volatile should command larger risk premia
    - $\rightarrow$  Cross-section of US equities
    - $\rightarrow$  Cross-section of int'l equities

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のので

# Skewness in Expected Macro Fundamentals and the Predictability of Equity Returns: Evidence and Theory

Ric Colacito, Eric Ghysels, Jinghan Meng, and Wasin Siwasarit



Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

#### **GMM Estimation**

**Model:** The transition dynamics of the three state variables  $(x_t, \sigma_t, \phi_t)$  is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= \mu_x (1 - \rho_x) + \rho_x x_{t-1} + \varphi_e \sqrt{\sigma_{t-1}} \varepsilon_t^x \\ \sigma_t &= \bar{\sigma} (1 - \rho_\sigma) + \rho_\sigma \sigma_{t-1} + \sqrt{\sigma_e} \varepsilon_t^\sigma \\ \phi_t &= \bar{\phi} (1 - \rho_\phi) + \rho_\phi \phi_{t-1} + \sqrt{\sigma_\phi} \varepsilon_t^\phi \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon_t^x \sim SKN(0, 1, v_t)$  with  $v_t = \phi_t / \sqrt{1 - \phi_t^2}$  and  $\varepsilon_t^\sigma$ ,  $\varepsilon_t^\phi$  are standard Normal distributed. All the shocks are i.i.d.

We are going to estimate 8 parameters using GMM:  $\rho_x, \mu_x, \bar{\sigma}, \rho_{\sigma}, \sigma_{\epsilon}, \rho_{\phi}, \bar{\phi}, \sigma_{\phi}.$ 

Empirical Evidence

Models

Comparison With Other Models

Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ★ □▶ = □ の < ⊙

$$E_t(x_{t+1}) = \rho_x x_t + \left(\frac{2}{4-\pi}\right)^{1/3} V_t(x_{t+1})^{1/2} |S_t(x_{t+1})|^{1/3} \operatorname{sign}(S_t(x_{t+1})).$$
  

$$V_t(x_{t+1}) = \phi_e^2 \sigma_t^c.$$
  

$$S_t(x_{t+1}) = \frac{4-\pi}{2} \frac{\left(\sqrt{2/\pi} E_t \phi_{t+1}\right)^3}{\left(1-2\left(E_t \phi_{t+1}\right)^2/\pi\right)^{3/2}}.$$