

Cross-sectional Tests of Conditional Asset Pricing Models: Evidence from the German Stock Market*

Andreas Schrimpf, ZEW Mannheim[†]
Michael Schröder, ZEW Mannheim
Richard Stehle, Humboldt Universität Berlin

March 10, 2006

Abstract

We study the performance of conditional asset pricing models in explaining the German cross-section of stock returns. Our test assets are portfolios sorted by size and book-to-market as in the paper by Fama and French (1993). Our results show that the empirical performance of the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) can be improved substantially when allowing for time-varying parameters of the stochastic discount factor. A conditional CAPM with the term spread as conditioning variable is able to explain the cross-section of German stock returns about as well as the Fama-French model. Parameter stability tests reveal that the model is well specified – a finding which is not true for the Fama-French model. Unconditional model specifications however do a better job than conditional ones at capturing time-series predictability of the test portfolio returns.

JEL Classification: G12

Keywords: Asset Pricing, Conditioning Information, Hansen-Jagannathan Distance, Generalized Method of Moments

*We thank Erik Lüders and seminar participants at HU Berlin for helpful comments. Access to the German interest rate and bond database of Wolfgang Bühler, University of Mannheim, is gratefully acknowledged. We also thank Stefan Frey and Joachim Grammig for helpful comments and providing us with a GMM library for GAUSS. Zohal Hessami provided excellent research assistance. This research benefitted from financial support of Fritz Thyssen Stiftung. All remaining errors and omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

[†]Corresponding author: Andreas Schrimpf, Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW), Mannheim, P.O. Box 10 34 43, 68034 Mannheim, Germany, email: schrimpf@zew.de, phone: +49 621 1235160, fax: +49 621 1235223.

1 Introduction

It is widely known that the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) by Sharpe (1964), Lintner (1965) and Black (1972) has severe problems in explaining empirical patterns of the cross-section of stock returns.¹ The most serious blow to the CAPM has been the work by Fama and French (1992) who demonstrated the inability of the CAPM's measure of systematic risk (beta) to explain the cross-section of stock returns. Instead, two variables (size and the book-to-market ratio) are found to bear a strong relation to the cross-sectional variation of average stock returns. In the light of this empirical evidence, numerous attempts have been made to extend the canonical model in order to achieve empirical success.

Several authors have argued that the empirical failure of the CAPM can be attributed to the fact that the conditional implications of the model had been neglected in previous tests [e.g. Harvey (1989), Ferson and Harvey (1991), Jagannathan and Wang (1996), Lettau and Ludvigson (2001b) etc.]. These papers are based on the literature of time series predictability of excess stock returns at long-horizons, which suggests that risk premia are time-varying.² The implication for the econometric testing of asset pricing models is that the parameters of the stochastic discount factor (SDF) are potentially time-varying.

As yet, the research on conditional asset pricing models has focused primarily on the U.S. stock market. However, an important out-of sample check for an asset pricing model is the question whether the results for the U.S. also hold true for other developed capital markets. The purpose of this paper is therefore to evaluate several specifications of the conditional CAPM for a major European market, the German stock market. In this way, our study provides an additional robustness check for conditional asset pricing models. As our test assets, we use 16 portfolios of German stocks sorted by size and book-to-market which are constructed in the

¹See e.g. Banz (1981), Basu (1983), Rosenberg, Reid and Lanstein (1985), DeBondt and Thaler (1985).

²See e.g. Campbell and Shiller (1988), Fama and French (1989) and Lettau and Ludvigson (2001a). Cochrane (2001, ch.20) provides an excellent survey on the predictability of stock returns. For critical views regarding the time-series predictability of returns, see for instance Goyal and Welch (2004) and Ang and Bekaert (2005).

same way as in the seminal paper by Fama and French (1993). For the empirical tests we use the excess returns of these portfolios over the German T-Bill rate equivalent. We also include the gross return of the German T-Bill as an additional test asset, in order to identify the mean of the stochastic discount factor, i.e. we have 17 moment conditions in total. Our estimations are based on monthly data for the time period ranging from 1969:12 to 2002:12.

There are certain criteria for the choice of conditioning variables. It has been suggested in the literature that these variables should capture investors' expectations about future market returns or business cycle conditions. Our set of conditioning variables largely follows the previous literature, in particular Ferson and Harvey (1999). We use the spread between the return on corporate bonds and government bonds (*DEF*), the term spread (*TERM*), short term interest rates (*TB*) as well as dividend yields (*DIV*). In order to see whether a "January-effect" plays a role on the German stock market, we follow Hodrick and Zhang (2001) in considering a January-Dummy as a conditioning variable, which allows for different parameters of the SDF in January and other months.³ Following Hodrick and Zhang (2001) we also use a variable intended to capture the cyclical component of industrial production (*CY*).

Up to now the most prominent model to explain cross-sectional variation in stock returns has been the model by Fama and French (1993). Motivated by the empirical evidence against the CAPM, Fama and French proposed a factor model including two additional risk factors designed to capture risks regarding size (*SMB*) and book-to-market (*HML*). In contrast to the theory-derived conditional CAPM, the Fama-French model is mainly motivated from an empirical perspective. There has been an ongoing debate on what the true risks behind the Fama-French factors actually are.⁴ However, owing to its stunning empirical performance in explain-

³As argued by Daniel and Titman (1997), the fact that value stocks have earned higher risk premia on average than implied by the CAPM ("value" effect) can be largely explained by a "January-effect".

⁴Fama and French (1993, 1995, 1996) interpret their model as a version of Ross's (1976) APT or Merton's (1973) ICAPM. Thus, they provide a risk-based interpretation of the *SMB* and *HML* factors. This view has been corroborated recently by the work of Liew and Vassalou (2000) who provided evidence that *SMB* and *HML* contain news regarding future economic growth suggesting that *SMB* and *HML* are indeed proxies for more fundamental macroeconomic risks.

ing the cross-section of portfolio returns sorted by size and book-to-market, it constitutes the perfect benchmark model for our model comparison tests.

Since the purpose of our paper is to run a horse race among different types of asset pricing models, we estimate the models by the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) using the second moment matrix of returns as the weighting matrix, as proposed by Hansen and Jagannathan (1997). The authors have shown that by doing so, the solution to the GMM problem amounts to minimizing the distance between the set of true stochastic discount factors and the proxy for the SDF implied by the respective asset pricing model. Following Jagannathan and Wang (1996) and Hodrick and Zhang (2001), we test whether this distance is zero. There is another reason for choosing the second moment matrix of returns as our weighting matrix. Optimal GMM by Hansen (1982) uses the inverse of covariance matrix of sample moments as a weighting matrix in order to obtain efficient estimates. This weighting matrix usually differs from model to model. Since the purpose of our paper is to analyze different specifications of asset pricing models and to compare their performance to each other on a common data set, it is essential to use the same weighting matrix for all model specifications. Hence, we prefer the Hansen-Jagannathan (HJ) weighting matrix over optimal GMM in our empirical setup.

We conduct a series of additional robustness checks in order to provide a tough challenge for the different model specifications. Ghysels (1998) has criticized conditional asset pricing models on the grounds that incorporating conditioning information may lead to greater parameter instability. This can be a serious drawback if the model is to be used out-of-sample in corporate finance applications. Therefore, we augment our model comparison tests with the supLM-Test for parameter stability suggested by Andrews (1993). This test has also been used recently in the model comparison tests conducted by Hodrick and Zhang (2001) and Li, Vassalou and Xing (2001). We also investigate the capacity of the different model specifications in capturing the time series predictability of our size and book-to-market

Nevertheless, the model remains controversial.

portfolio returns according to the test by Farnsworth, Ferson, Jackson and Todd (2002). Moreover, we test whether the factors of the conditional asset pricing models are driven out once the Fama-French factors *SMB* and *HML* are included in the SDF.

Prior research on the German stock market has primarily used time series and cross-sectional regression methods in order to evaluate empirical asset pricing models. Earlier studies have investigated for instance the explanatory power of market capitalization, book-to-market ratio and other financial ratios.⁵ In contrast to the model by Fama and French (1993) the additional factors are included as characteristics rather than risk factors. Beiker (1993) finds that the negative relationship between returns and market capitalization which has been found for the U.S. stock market also exists for German stocks but that the strength of this relationship depends on the sample period. The study of Stehle (1997) confirms the results found by Beiker using all stocks listed at the Frankfurt Stock Exchange during the period from 1954 until 1990. Stocks with a low market capitalization exhibited a significantly higher average return compared to blue chip stocks but most of this extra-return was realized in January and February. Thus, the size effect seems to be highly correlated with a January effect. Sattler (1994) and Gehrke (1994) find a significantly positive relationship between average stock returns and the book-to-market ratio. In a more recent study Wallmeier (2000) also considers other financial ratios such as leverage, price-earnings and price-cash-flow ratio. He finds that book-to-market ratio and price-cash-flow ratio have a highly significant impact on German stock returns whereas the size effect is only of minor importance. Ziegler, Schröder, Schulz and Stehle (2005) estimate different multi-factor models including the CAPM and the Fama-French model using portfolios sorted by size and book-to-market as test assets. The main result from their time-series regressions is that the Fama-French multifactor model clearly outperforms the conventional CAPM in terms of explanatory power and pricing errors.

⁵These studies made use of cross-sectional regressions and in most cases the two-step framework of Fama and MacBeth (1973). See for instance Beiker (1993); Gehrke (1994); Sattler (1994); Stehle (1997); Bunke, Sommerfeld and Stehle (1999); Wallmeier (2000); Stock (2002) and Schulz and Stehle (2002).

The empirical results of this paper can be briefly summarized as follows. In line with previous research, we present further evidence regarding the empirical shortcomings of the conventional CAPM in explaining German stock returns. Most importantly, we find that conditioning information leads to substantial improvements of the model's performance. According to our empirical results, the CAPM with *TERM* as the conditioning variable is able to explain the cross-section of returns about as well as the Fama-French model. In contrast to the research by Ghysels (1998) for the U.S., we do not find that the use of conditioning variables necessarily leads to increased parameter instability. By contrast, the null hypothesis of stable parameters is rejected in the case of the three-factor model of Fama and French. Additional test results reveal however, that unconditional model specifications perform quite well in capturing the time-series predictability of the test asset returns.

The organization of this paper is as follows. The next section shows briefly how conditioning information can be incorporated into asset pricing models. In section 3 we provide an overview of our data set. In section 4 we give an overview of the empirical methods applied in this study with particular focus on HJ-GMM. Section 5 presents the results of model estimation and comparison tests and provides a discussion of our empirical results. Section 6 concludes.

2 Conditional Asset Pricing Models

Conditional asset pricing models can be conveniently expressed in their stochastic discount factor representation. Assuming the absence of arbitrage opportunities, asset pricing theory states that there is a stochastic discount factor (or pricing kernel) M_{t+1} , where

$$E[M_{t+1}R_{i,t+1}|\Upsilon_t] = p_i \tag{1}$$

holds for all assets i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) in the economy. Υ_t denotes the information

set of the investor as of time t and $R_{i;t+1}$ is the return of asset i whose price in t is given by p_i . If $R_{i;t+1}$ is an excess return of asset i over a risk-free asset, then p_i in (1) is equal to zero. If $R_{i;t+1}$ denotes the gross return of asset i , then p_i in (1) is equal to one.⁶ In the most basic asset pricing model – the consumption-based asset pricing model – the pricing kernel M_{t+1} is equal to the investor’s marginal rate of substitution.⁷ The focus of this paper, however, is on linear factor models which express the pricing kernel as a linear function of factors:

$$\tilde{M}_{t+1} = b_{0,t} + b'_{1,t}f_{t+1}, \quad (2)$$

where f_{t+1} is a k -dimensional vector of factors. In the case of the CAPM, for instance, there is only a single factor, the excess return of the market portfolio, i.e. $f_{t+1} = R_{m;t+1}$. For the Fama-French model the vector of factors is given by $f_{t+1} = [R_{m;t+1}, SMB_{t+1}, HML_{t+1}]'$. We denote the SDF of an asset pricing model as \tilde{M}_{t+1} , in order to indicate that it is an approximation of the true SDF M_{t+1} . Notice also that equation (2) represents a *conditional linear factor model* since the parameters $b_{0,t}$ and $b_{1,t}$ are time-varying. It can be shown that the parameters of the SDF of linear factor models such as the CAPM can be expressed as functions of expected excess returns.⁸ Empirical evidence from the literature on time series predictability therefore suggests that the parameters of the SDF are potentially time-varying as in (2).

The moment conditions in (1) are not directly testable since they are based on the information set of the investor \mathcal{Y}_t which is not directly observable by an econometrician. As a consequence, asset pricing models are usually tested after transforming (1) into an unconditional moment condition by the law of iterated expectations, which leads to $E[M_{t+1}R_{i;t+1}] = p_i$. Note that this is feasible only when the pa-

⁶The estimation results reported in this paper are based on moment conditions for the excess returns $R_{i;t+1}^e$ for the 16 test portfolios, $E[M_{t+1}R_{i;t+1}^e] = 0$, plus an additional moment condition for the gross return of the German T-Bill equivalent, $E[M_{t+1}R_t^f] = 1$. The purpose of the latter is to identify the mean of the stochastic discount factor.

⁷As yet, empirical tests have not supported the original specification of the consumption-based model. See for instance Hansen and Singleton (1982), Cochrane (1996).

⁸See for instance Lettau and Ludvigson (2001b) or Cochrane (2001, ch.8).

rameters in (2) are assumed to be constant, i.e. $\tilde{M}_{t+1} = b_0 + b_1' f_{t+1}$.⁹ In this way, however, the conditional implications of the model are neglected.

This problem can also be made clear when the model is expressed in its equivalent conditional expected return-beta representation. Combining (1) and (2) we can rewrite the model as

$$E_t(R_{i;t+1}) = R_t^0 p_i + \lambda_t' \beta_{i;t} \quad (3)$$

where $\beta_{i;t} = \text{var}_t(f_{t+1})^{-1} \text{cov}_t(f_{t+1}, R_{i;t+1})$ represents the conditional betas of asset i , the elements of $\lambda_t = -R_t^0 \text{var}_t(f_{t+1})' b_{1,t}$ are also known as the conditional factor risk premia and $R_t^0 = 1/E_t(\tilde{M}_{t+1})$ is the conditional zero-beta rate. When taking unconditional expectations of (3), we obtain according to the law of iterated expectations

$$E(R_{i;t+1}) = E(R_t^0) p_i + E(\lambda_t)' E(\beta_{i;t}) + \text{cov}(\lambda_t, \beta_{i;t}). \quad (4)$$

When the additional covariance term is different from zero, the conditional expected return beta model in (4) cannot be transformed into an unconditional model, $E(R_{i;t+1}) = E(R_t^0) p_i + E(\lambda_t)' E(\beta_{i;t})$. Thus, conventional tests of the CAPM and other multifactor models based on the unconditional model are misspecified when betas and factor risk premia are time-varying and correlated.

A way of incorporating conditioning information into the model is by modelling the parameters $b_{0,t}; b_{1,t}$ in the SDF in equation (2) as linear functions of lagged instruments z_t [See e.g. Cochrane (1996), Hodrick and Zhang (2001)]. In our estimations we only use one conditioning variable at one time, hence z_t is a scalar. In the single factor case, we then obtain the stochastic discount factor of the *scaled factor model*:

⁹See Cochrane (2001, ch.8) for a formal statement.

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{M}_{t+1} &= (b_{0,1} + b_{0,2}z_t) + (b_{1,1} + b_{1,2}z_t)'f_{t+1} \\
&= b_{0,1} + b_{0,2}z_t + b'_{1,1}f_{t+1} + b'_{1,2}(f_{t+1}z_t).
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

According to Hodrick and Zhang (2001), the conditioning variables must fulfill three requirements. First of all, they must belong to the investor's information set Υ_t . Furthermore, they must capture information regarding future excess returns or the business cycle. It is also necessary that conditioning variables should be parsimoniously selected, because otherwise the number of factors of the scaled model quickly explodes. Note that the scaled factor model in (3) is effectively an unconditional multifactor-model, where the factors are given by $\tilde{f}_{t+1} = [z_t, f_{t+1}, f_{t+1}z_t]'$ and the coefficients are now constant. Plugging (5) into (1) and taking unconditional expectations, the following unconditional moment restriction can be obtained by the law of iterated expectations:

$$E[(b_{0,1} + b_{0,2}z_t + b'_{1,1}f_{t+1} + b'_{1,2}f_{t+1}z_t)R_{i;t+1}] = p_i. \tag{6}$$

These moment conditions for the assets i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) can then be exploited for the estimation of the unknown parameters b by the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM). When we estimate the scaled factor model by GMM, we obtain estimates of the parameters $b = [b_{0,1}, b_{0,2}, b'_{1,1}, b'_{1,2}]'$ of the stochastic discount factor. Testing the null whether parameter j of the SDF is zero, we can assess whether the j th factor significantly influences the pricing kernel. When we want to assess, however, if a particular factor j is priced, we test whether the corresponding element of λ is zero [See Cochrane (1996)]. When b is known, the factor risk premia can be readily computed using the sample equivalent of $-E(R_t^0)var(\tilde{f}_{t+1})'b$. We will provide both estimates in our empirical results. The reported standard errors for the estimates of the factor risk premia are calculated by the delta method.

3 The Data

This section gives an overview of the data used for the estimation of the different models. All estimations are based on monthly data ranging from 1969:12 - 2002:12. We first provide details on the construction of our test assets for the German stock market, followed by a discussion of the construction of the risk factors as well as on the conditioning variables for the scaled factor models.

3.1 Portfolio Returns

Ever since the influential work by Fama and French (1993), it has been common practice in the empirical asset pricing literature to test asset pricing models on the cross-section of portfolios sorted by size (market value of equity) and the ratio of book-equity to market-equity. Following this tradition, we construct 16 size and book-to-market portfolios for the German stock market.¹⁰ Our data basis comprises all stocks traded on the Frankfurt stock exchange between December 1969 and December 2002, for which the necessary data on market capitalization and book value of common equity are available. Companies with a negative book value are not taken into account. Banks and insurance companies are also not considered because they differ from other companies in their valuation by the market and are subject to special accounting standards. Our source of the book-value of common equity is the German Finance Database (Deutsche Finanzdatenbank, DFDB). The monthly stock returns and the data necessary to compute the market value of equity are obtained from a database maintained by Richard Stehle.

We construct the 16 portfolios for the German stock market in a fashion similar to the one proposed by Fama and French (1993). For all stocks, we calculate the quartiles of market capitalization at the end of June of year t as well as the quartiles

¹⁰We prefer to use 16 instead of the usual 25 portfolios. Owing to the fact that fewer companies are listed on the German stock exchange compared to the U.S., some of the 25 stock portfolios constructed for the German market contained far fewer companies than those in the original paper by Fama and French. For instance, one portfolio did not even contain a single stock during one year. In order to avoid potential biases, we prefer to use only 16 stock market portfolios instead of the original 25 as in the paper by Fama and French.

of the book-to-market ratio from December of the preceding year $t - 1$. Using the intersections of these quartiles, all stocks are allocated into 16 portfolios based on their individual size and book-to-market ratio. Then value-weighted returns are calculated from July in t to June $t + 1$, when a realignment of the portfolios takes place taking into account the new information on size and book-to-market.

Table 1: Summary Statistics: 16 Test Assets

Excess returns of test assets, 16 stock portfolios				
Mean (standard deviation)				
Size Quartiles	Book-to-market Quartiles			
	$B1$ (Low)	$B2$	$B3$	$B4$ (High)
$S1$ (Small)	-0.329 (4.848)	-0.095 (3.743)	-0.006 (4.036)	0.021 (5.066)
$S2$	0.046 (4.134)	0.143 (4.146)	0.147 (4.432)	0.304 (4.524)
$S3$	0.014 (3.956)	0.145 (4.184)	0.106 (4.576)	0.325 (5.276)
$S4$ (Big)	0.007 (6.209)	0.337 (5.594)	0.417 (5.084)	0.472 (5.291)

Note: The returns are the monthly excess returns on 16 size and book-to-market sorted portfolios of the German stock market. The corresponding standard deviations are reported in brackets. The table is organized as follows: for instance $S1B1$ contains the average (monthly) excess return of the portfolio containing the smallest stocks in terms of market capitalization and the lowest book-to-market ratio. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12.

Table 1 contains descriptive statistics of our test assets. First of all, it is noteworthy that there is a sizeable spread in the average monthly excess returns of the different portfolios which is to be explained by the different asset pricing models. The largest excess return is 0.472% for the stock portfolio containing big value stocks (portfolio $S4B4$), whereas the lowest average excess return is a negative -0.329% (portfolio $S1B1$).

It is striking that in contrast to the pattern documented for the U.S. stock market, no negative relationship between size and average returns can be found for the

German stock market.¹¹ One can even observe a tendency that average returns rise when size increases. The “value effect”, however, holds true on the German stock market: moving from growth stocks (low book-to-market for a given size category) to value stocks (high book-to-market for a given size category), one can see from table 1 that average excess returns tend to rise.

3.2 Factors

For the construction of our proxy for the market portfolio, we use the value-weighted return on all stocks listed on the Frankfurt stock exchange, including the stocks of banks and insurance companies as well as of those companies which have a negative book value at the end of December of the respective year. We compute the market excess return R_m by subtracting the return of the German T-Bill rate equivalent.¹²

The Fama-French factors SMB and HML are designed to mimic risk factors regarding to size and book-to-market. The starting point for the construction of SMB (Small minus Big) and HML (High minus Low) are six portfolios derived in a similar way as the 16 size and book-to-market portfolios. At the end of June of each year t , all stocks are sorted by their market capitalization. Then the size median is used as a breakpoint in order to split the stocks into small stocks (S) and big stocks (B). In a similar way, all stocks are sorted into three categories according to their book-to-market ratio [low (L), medium (M) and high (H)] at the end of December in year $t - 1$. From the intersections of the two size and three book-to-market groups, six portfolios are formed, into which all stocks traded on the Frankfurt stock market are allocated. This procedure results in six portfolios (S/L, S/M, S/H, B/L, B/M, B/H) for which monthly value-weighted returns are calculated. Every year in June, a realignment of the portfolios takes place taking new information on market capitalization and book-to-market into account.

¹¹This finding has been recently reported by Ziegler et al. (2005) who analyzed different types of multifactor models for the German stock market for the period 1968:07-1995:06.

¹²“Einmonatsgeld” obtained from the time series database of Deutsche Bundesbank.

The portfolio *SMB* (Small minus Big) is intended to mimic the risk factor related to size. It is calculated as the average of the returns of the portfolios containing small stocks (S/L, S/M, S/H) minus the average of the returns of the portfolios containing big stocks (B/L, B/M, B/H). As noted by Fama and French (1993), this construction eliminates the influence of book-to-market in *SMB*. The portfolio *HML* (High minus Low) is similarly constructed and designed to capture risk related to book-to-market. It is calculated as the average of the returns of the portfolios containing high BE/ME stocks (S/H, B/H) minus the average of the returns of the portfolios containing low BE/ME stocks (S/L, B/L). Obviously this aims at eliminating the effect of size in *HML*.

3.3 Conditioning Variables

In this paper we use six conditioning variables in total. Our first conditioning variable is the default spread *DEF*, which was constructed using the data for all corporate bonds listed at German security exchanges during the period 1967 until 2002. The German market for corporate bonds was relatively small in the years until the end of the 1980s but has grown rapidly in the past 15 years: the number of listed bonds increased from 14 in 1989 to 43 in 1994 and 171 in 2002. The factor *DEF* is constructed as a long position in a value-weighted portfolio consisting of all corporate bonds and a short position in German government bonds. Due to the fact that the duration of the corporate bond portfolio changes over time, the duration of the government bond portfolio has to be adjusted accordingly. Otherwise *DEF* would not only measure changes in default risk but also changes in duration. Therefore the government bond portfolio is constructed as a weighted average of REXP sub-indexes with different time to maturity.¹³ The weighting scheme changes over time in order to match the duration of the corporate bond portfolio. The *DEF* conditioning variable i.e. the return difference of the two bond portfolios thus measures changes in default risk for the German corporate bond market. The mean of the *DEF* factor of 0.138% (see Table 2) shows that on

¹³The REXP index family consists of 10 sub-indexes each representing a different time to maturity, ranging from 1 year (first sub-index) until 10 years (last sub-index).

average investors in German corporate bonds have been rewarded by an additional return of 1,67% per annum for bearing default risk.

The term spread $TERM$ is defined as the difference between the return on long-term government bonds over the short-term interest rate. For the short-term interest rate we used the German T-Bill rate equivalent mentioned above. The monthly return on long-term government bonds was calculated from the REX-performance index of government bonds with ten years to maturity. Moreover, also aggregate dividend yields DIV have featured prominently in recent tests of conditional asset pricing models. Our time series of aggregate dividend yields is based on the MSCI Index Germany and was made available to us by MSCI. This paper also considers the short-term interest rate TB as a conditioning variable. For this purpose, we use the German T-Bill rate mentioned above. Following Hodrick and Zhang (2001), we explore the effect of using a January-dummy JAN , which takes the value one in January and zero otherwise.

Table 2: Summary Statistics: Conditioning Variables

Size Quartiles		Book-to-market Quartiles			
		$B1$ (Low)	$B2$	$B3$	$B4$ (High)
$S1$ (Small)	$\chi^2_{(5)}$	22.217 (0.001)	5.863 (0.320)	7.380 (0.194)	13.303 (0.021)
$S2$	$\chi^2_{(5)}$	9.499 (0.091)	21.345 (0.001)	17.072 (0.004)	7.558 (0.182)
$S3$	$\chi^2_{(5)}$	13.721 (0.018)	8.394 (0.136)	10.528 (0.062)	11.489 (0.043)
$S4$ (Big)	$\chi^2_{(5)}$	14.356 (0.014)	9.233 (0.100)	9.862 (0.079)	9.530 (0.090)

Note: The table reports tests for the predictive power of our set of conditioning variables. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. The set of conditioning variables is defined as $z_t = (DEF_t, TERM_t, TB_t, DIV_t, CY_t)'$. The table reports the Wald statistic of the null hypothesis $H_0: b = 0$ in the following regression $R_{i;t+1} = a + b'Z_t + \epsilon_{t+1}$. p -values are reported in parantheses.

We also use the cyclical component of industrial production as a conditioning variable as proposed in the paper by Hodrick and Zhang (2001). We construct this

variable for Germany using the filter by Hodrick and Prescott (1997) (HP-filter). Our time series of (log-)industrial production is available from 1960:01-2002:12. The period from 1960:01-1969:11 is used to initialize the series. The smoothing parameter is set to 6,400. Then we apply the HP-filter recursively in order to extract the cyclical component of the series. The recursive application of the filter ensures that only information which is truly available to the investor as of time t appears in the information set.

Table 2 presents test results for the predictive power of our set of conditioning variables. For this purpose we run the following regression

$$R_{i;t+1} = a + b'z_t + \epsilon_{t+1}. \quad (7)$$

The table reports Wald statistics and the corresponding p -values for the test that the lagged conditioning variables $z_t = (DEF_t, TERM_t, TB_t, DIV_t, CY_t)'$ bear no relation with the portfolio excess returns, i.e. that the coefficients b are jointly zero. For most portfolios, the null hypothesis can be rejected at the 10% level. Further descriptive statistics for the factors and the conditioning variables are provided in table 3.

Table 3: Summary Statistics: Factors and Conditioning Variables

Variable	Cross Correlation									
	Mean	Std.	R^m	SMB	HML	$TERM$	DEF	R^f	DIV	CY
R^m	0.235	5.265	1.000							
SMB	-0.189	2.918	-0.657	1.000						
HML	0.271	2.598	-0.069	0.071	1.000					
$TERM$	0.136	1.282	-0.002	0.015	-0.004	1.000				
DEF	0.115	1.118	0.189	-0.169	0.035	-0.072	1.000			
R^f	0.489	1.118	-0.095	0.043	-0.005	0.015	-0.122	1.000		
DIV	0.296	0.095	-0.100	0.102	-0.039	0.088	-0.079	0.591	1.000	
CY	-0.184	2.119	0.054	0.001	0.092	0.068	-0.054	-0.334	-0.237	1.000

Note: The table reports means and standard deviations in (% , per month) of factors and conditioning variables for the period 1969:12 - 2002:12. Furthermore, correlation coefficients are reported. The set of factors includes the excess return on the market portfolio R^m as well as the Fama-French factors SMB and HML . The set of conditioning variables is defined as $z_t = (DEF_t, TERM_t, TB_t, DIV_t, CY_t)'$, where DEF_t is the default spread, $TERM_t$ represents the term spread, TB_t denotes the short term interest rate, DIV_t are aggregate dividend yields, CY_t denotes the cyclical component of industrial production.

4 Empirical Methods

We estimate the different model specifications using a Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) approach. The appendix also contains empirical results for the traditional cross-sectional regression approach by Fama and MacBeth (1973), mainly for the sake of completeness. Our primary focus, however, is on the variation of the GMM estimation approach proposed by Hansen and Jagannathan (1997), which we briefly outline in the following.

Asset pricing models are characterized by different approximations $\tilde{M}(b)$ of the “true” SDF in equation (1). Hansen and Jagannathan (1997) have proposed a measure to evaluate by how much the pricing kernel proxy of the respective asset pricing model differs from the set of true pricing kernels M .¹⁴ They show that the minimum value of the distance has the following expression

$$\delta = \sqrt{E[\tilde{M}(b)R - p]'E(RR')^{-1}E[\tilde{M}(b)R - p]}. \quad (8)$$

It is straightforward to map the concept of the HJ-distance into the standard GMM framework. GMM estimation is based on minimizing a quadratic form of the pricing errors of the model. The $N \times 1$ vector of pricing errors is equal to $g(b) = E[\tilde{M}(b)R - p]$, whereas the sample analogue is given by

$$g_T(b) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{M}_t(b)R_t - p. \quad (9)$$

Hansen and Jagannathan propose to use the inverse of the second moment matrix of returns $W = E(RR')^{-1}$ as a weighting matrix for GMM estimation. By doing so, it is ensured that the parameters are chosen such that the distance between the pricing kernel proxy and the true pricing kernel is as small as possible. The $k \times 1$ vector of unknown parameters b of the stochastic discount factor are therefore found by solving the following GMM criterion:

¹⁴In this sub-section we suppress time subscripts for simplicity.

$$\min_b \delta_T^2 = \min_b g_T(b)' W_T g_T(b), \quad (10)$$

where W_T is given by the empirical counterpart to the Hansen-Jagannathan weighting matrix, i.e. $W_T = \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T R_t R_t'\right)^{-1}$. Jagannathan and Wang (1996, Appendix C) have derived a test for the null hypothesis that the HJ-distance is equal to zero, as implied by the candidate asset pricing model. They show that the statistic $T\delta_T^2$ is asymptotically distributed as a weighted sum of $\chi_{(1)}^2$ -distributed random variables. We run the simulation suggested by Jagannathan and Wang (1996) 10,000 times in order to determine the p -value for testing the null hypothesis $H_0 : \delta = 0$. This estimation approach is different from the conventional optimal GMM approach by Hansen (1982) who suggests to use an estimate of the variance-covariance matrix of moment conditions as weighting matrix, $W_T = S_T^{-1} = [T\text{var}(g_T)]^{-1}$. He shows that by doing so, asymptotically efficient estimates are obtained. Despite this theoretical statistical advantage, we prefer HJ-GMM over optimal GMM for a number of reasons. Firstly, the GMM objective evaluated at the estimated parameters has an intuitively appealing interpretation as the (squared) distance between the pricing kernel proxy and the set of true discount factors. Most importantly however, the HJ-weighting matrix remains constant from one model to the other. Optimal GMM on the contrary weights the different moment conditions according to statistical considerations and changes from model to model. Since our paper aims at comparing different models on a common data set, the HJ-approach is more suitable in our empirical setup. For completeness, however, we report the J_T -statistic by Hansen (1982) as an additional statistic of model fit. Another possibility to have a “level” playground for model comparisons is by the use of the identity matrix as the weighting matrix for GMM. In this way all assets are treated symmetrically in the GMM optimization. Since this approach leads to very similar results as the Fama-Macbeth procedure (Cochrane 2001), we only report the results of the Fama-MacBeth regressions in the appendix.

An important robustness check for an asset pricing model is whether its parameters are stable over time. Apart from the tests mentioned above, we therefore also

report results from the test for parameter stability derived by Andrews (1993). The null hypothesis states that there is parameter stability, whereas the alternative is that there is a single structural break at an unknown date. We compute the LM-statistic for $\pi_1 = 15\%$ to $\pi_2 = 85\%$ of the sample, which corresponds to the interval recommended by Andrews (1993). Critical values of the maximum of the calculated values (supLM-statistic) have been tabulated by Andrews (1993, Table 1).

5 Results and Discussion

In the following, we discuss the results of our cross-sectional tests of the different asset pricing models. First, we report empirical results for the unconditional models, i.e. the conventional CAPM as well as the Fama-French three-factor model. Then, empirical results are reported for different specifications of conditional factor models. Moreover, the results of additional robustness tests are also presented in this section.

5.1 Unconditional Factor Models

We first discuss the empirical results for the conventional CAPM specification. Table 4 contains the GMM estimation results using the Hansen-Jagannathan weighting matrix and table 8 in the appendix provides the results from the Fama-MacBeth two-stage approach. Panel A in table 4 demonstrates that the market excess return does not influence the pricing kernel significantly. It also does not earn a risk price which is significantly different from zero. In line with previous results in the empirical asset pricing literature, we find that the pricing errors of the CAPM are very large when the model is confronted by size and book-to-market sorted portfolios. The CAPM has clearly the worst empirical performance in explaining the cross-section of German stock returns, which is illustrated by the plots of realized excess returns against the fitted excess returns in figure 1 and 3. This is corroborated by the (adjusted) R^2 of 17.4% in the cross-sectional Fama-MacBeth

regressions, which is the smallest of all models investigated in this paper. The estimated Hansen-Jagannathan distance amounts to 0.209. The corresponding p -value of 28.7% indicates that the model cannot be rejected statistically. The same conclusion is obtained by Hansen’s test of overidentifying restrictions which we calculate on the basis of optimal GMM. In general, we find that both model diagnostics lead to the same conclusions in our study. It should be also pointed out that none of the model specifications investigated in our study can be rejected by the two tests.¹⁵

The finite sample properties of the model specification test based on the HJ-distance have recently been investigated by Ahn and Gadarowski (2004) using simulation techniques. They find that tests of the null $H_0 : \delta = 0$ can exhibit size distortions in finite samples in the sense that a true model is rejected too often. According to their Monte-Carlo experiments, Hansen’s (1982) test of overidentifying restrictions has a slightly better empirical performance with this respect. Table 1 of Ahn and Gadarowski (2004) reveals that this over-rejection problem is particularly severe when the number of observations is small and/or the number of test assets is large.¹⁶ Since none of the model specifications investigated in this paper is rejected neither by the test based on the HJ-distance nor Hansen’s J_T -test, we do not consider this issue further in this paper.

Estimation results for the Fama-French three-factor model that uses SMB and HML as additional factors are reported in panel B of tables 4 and 8. The only factor which is statistically relevant for the pricing kernel is HML . It is also the only factor which earns a significant price of risk as indicated by the t -statistic of 2.202 for the estimated factor risk premium λ_{HML} . It is striking that SMB earns a negative factor risk premium, which is in contrast to the general findings obtained for the U.S. stock market.¹⁷ When looking at the pricing error plots

¹⁵This result differs from the one obtained for the U.S. where usually even the Fama-French model is rejected by formal tests such as the J_T -Test or the test $H_0 : \delta = 0$ when the updated 25 Fama-French portfolios are used as test assets. See e.g. Hodrick and Zhang (2001).

¹⁶With 25 test assets and 330 observations, which comes closest to our empirical setup (16 test assets and 397 observations), the true model is rejected at the 5% level in 8.8% of the cases by the test $H_0 : \delta = 0$ and in 6.9% of the cases by the J_T -test.

¹⁷See for instance Lettau and Ludvigson (2001b) who also find that only HML has a price of risk which is significantly different from zero.


Table 4: Estimation results HJ-GMM : CAPM and Fama-French Model.

Panel A: Non-scaled CAPM				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m		
Estimate	0.997	-0.858		
<i>t</i> -statistic		-0.843		
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m		
Estimate		0.002		
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.843		
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	17.511	0.209	1.226	
<i>p</i> -value	0.289	0.287		
Panel B: Fama-French Model				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{SMB}	b_{HML}
Estimate	1.014	-0.021	2.555	-5.153
<i>t</i> -statistic		-0.015	1.019	-2.290
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{SMB}	λ_{HML}
Estimate		0.002	-0.002	0.003
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.753	-1.238	2.202
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	10.477	0.166	29.248***	
<i>p</i> -value	0.655	0.667		

Note: The table reports the results of GMM estimation for the unconditional CAPM and the Fama-French model. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. We report both estimates of the parameters of the SDF and factor risk premia calculated from these estimates. The standard errors of the latter were calculated using the delta method. *,** and *** means that Andrew's supLM-statistic is significant at the 10, 5 or 1 %.

in 1 and 3, it becomes apparent that the Fama-French three-factor model clearly outperforms the CAPM. This is also reflected by the higher adjusted R^2 of 47.8% in the Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions. Our estimations confirm the earlier results for the German stock market by Ziegler et al. (2005) who found a superior performance of the Fama-French model over the unconditional CAPM based on a time-series OLS approach. Nevertheless, we find that the model has a serious drawback: our tests for parameter stability reveal that the model suffers from unstable parameters as indicated by a significant supLM-statistic.

Figure 1: HJ-GMM: CAPM and Fama-French Model, Fitted versus Actual Mean Excess Returns, in % per month, 16 Fama-French portfolios.



Note: The graphs were generated using the results from the HJ-GMM estimation. The test asset are 16 excess returns of size and book-to-market portfolios as well as the gross return of the German T-Bill equivalent. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. The two graphs show results for the CAPM and the Fama-French-Model.

5.2 Main Empirical Results: Conditional CAPM

We now turn to the main results for the different versions of the conditional CAPM. The results from HJ-GMM are provided in table 5 and the estimation results from the Fama-MacBeth regressions are given in table 9 in the appendix. Pricing error plots are shown in figures 2 and 4 respectively. We consider six model specification in total. We incorporate each conditioning variable separately into the SDF in order to avoid overfitting.

The first specification of the conditional CAPM uses the default spread DEF as scaling variable. According to our empirical findings, this conditioning variable does not help much to improve the performance of the CAPM in explaining cross-sectional returns. None of the factors significantly influences the pricing kernel. The HJ-distance only falls slightly in comparison to the unconditional CAPM. As indicated by the pricing error plots, scaling by DEF only induces a small reduction in pricing errors. The null hypothesis of parameter stability, however, cannot be rejected according to Andrew's supLM-test for this model.

Table 5: Estimation results HJ-GMM: conditional CAPM

Panel A: CAPM scaled by DEF				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{DEF}	b_{DEF*m}
Estimate	0.998	-0.107	-0.353	-4.680
<i>t</i> -statistic		-0.074	-1.102	-1.038
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{DEF}	λ_{DEF*m}
Estimate		0.003	0.333	0.014
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.710	1.051	0.973
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	13.658	0.198	10.087	
<i>p</i> -value	0.398	0.444		
Panel B: CAPM scaled by TERM				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{TERM}	b_{TERM*m}
Estimate	0.966	-2.776	0.708	8.170
<i>t</i> -statistic		-1.494	1.665	1.286
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{TERM}	λ_{TERM*m}
Estimate		0.002	-0.763	-0.026
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.461	-1.781	-1.547
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	4.498	0.139	6.411	
<i>p</i> -value	0.985	0.991		
Panel C: CAPM scaled by TB				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{TB}	b_{TB*m}
Estimate	0.985	-1.668	-0.143	-3.204
<i>t</i> -statistic		-1.264	-0.417	-1.172
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{TB}	λ_{TB*m}
Estimate		0.002	0.123	0.007
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.659	0.358	0.914
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	15.898	0.200	45.266***	
<i>p</i> -value	0.255	0.317		

Note: The table reports the results of GMM estimation for the different specifications of the conditional CAPM. *DEF* is the default spread, *TERM* is the term spread, *DIV* denotes dividend yields and *TB* is the short-term interest rate. *JAN* is a January-Dummy which takes 1 in January and zero otherwise. *CY* is the cyclical component of log-industrial production. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. We report both estimates of the parameters of the SDF and factor risk premia calculated from these estimates. The standard errors of the factor risk premia were calculated using the delta method. *,** and *** means that the supLM-statistic is significant at the 10, 5 or 1 %.

Table 5: cont.

Panel D: CAPM scaled by DIV				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{DIV}	b_{DIV*m}
Estimate	1.020	-3.073	0.348	-6.433
<i>t</i> -statistic		-2.073	1.088	-2.176
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{DIV}	λ_{DIV*m}
Estimate		0.001	-0.339	0.013
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.176	-1.058	2.013
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	12.210	0.178	79.933**	
<i>p</i> -value	0.511	0.548		
Panel E: CAPM scaled by JAN				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{JAN}	b_{JAN*m}
Estimate	1.040	2.298	0.072	-52.003
<i>t</i> -statistic		1.355	0.085	-1.807
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{JAN}	λ_{JAN*m}
Estimate		0.003	0.044	0.009
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.709	0.770	1.911
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	supLM	
Statistic	6.623	0.160	16.274***	
<i>p</i> -value	0.921	0.897		
Panel F: CAPM scaled by CY				
<i>Parameter of the SDF:</i>	const.	b_m	b_{CY}	b_{CY*m}
Estimate	0.989	0.131	-1.082	3.062
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.454	-1.036	0.464
<i>Factor risk price:</i>		λ_m	λ_{CY}	λ_{CY*m}
Estimate		0.003	-0.150	-0.007
<i>t</i> -statistic		0.855	-0.539	-0.551
<i>Model tests:</i>	J_T -Stat.	HJ-Dist.	sup-LM	
Statistic	16.794	0.208	24.749***	
<i>p</i> -value	0.209	0.234		

Note: The table reports the results of GMM estimation for the different specifications of the conditional CAPM. *DEF* is the default spread, *TERM* is the term spread, *DIV* denotes dividend yields and *TB* is the short-term interest rate. *JAN* is a January-Dummy which takes 1 in January and zero otherwise. *CY* is the cyclical component of log-industrial production. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. We report both estimates of the parameters of the SDF and factor risk premia calculated from these estimates. The standard errors of the factor risk premia were calculated using the delta method. *,** and *** means that the supLM-statistic is significant at the 10, 5 or 1 %.

We next consider the term spread $TERM$ as a conditioning variable for the conditional CAPM. Panel B of table 5 shows that b_{TERM} is significant at the 10% level, thus indicating that it is an important component of the pricing kernel. The market excess return and the interaction term between the market excess return and the lagged term spread are not significant.¹⁸ We find that the CAPM scaled by $TERM$ exhibits the best empirical performance of all scaled and non-scaled models in explaining the cross-sectional variation of German stock returns. It has the smallest HJ-distance (0.139) among all models investigated in this study and the p -value for the test $H_0 : \delta = 0$ is equal to 99.1%. This result is also reflected by the small pricing errors (figures 2 and 4), which are smaller than those of the Fama-French three-factor model. As reported in table 9, the adjusted R^2 is about 57%, which is the highest of all models estimated in this paper. Note also that the model passes the test for parameter stability by Andrews (1993) in contrast to the Fama-French three-factor.

We also estimate a specification of the scaled CAPM, using the lagged short-term interest rate as a conditioning variable. Our results suggest that in contrast to the slope of the yield curve, the short term interest rate does not play a big role in explaining the variation in cross-sectional returns. None of the (scaled) factors affects the pricing kernel significantly and the estimate of the HJ-distance is approximately of the same size as the one of the unconditional CAPM. What is more, the model also suffers from parameter instability as suggested by the significant supLM-statistic by Andrews (1993).

The fourth variable considered as conditioning variable for the CAPM are aggregate dividend-yields (DIV). According to the estimation results reported in Panel D of table 5, both the market excess return and the interaction term between the market excess return and DIV are significant components of the pricing kernel and consequently important determinants of the cross-section of returns. The model scaled by DIV is superior to the standard CAPM in terms of pricing errors (smaller HJ-distance). This is also visualized by the pricing error plots in figures 2 and 4.

¹⁸The empirical finding that the interaction term is insignificant can be interpreted as evidence that time-variation in the price of market risk does not significantly affect the pricing kernel.

However, the null hypothesis of stable parameters is rejected by the supLM-Test according to Andrews (1993).


We now turn to the January-Dummy as scaling variable. According to our HJ-GMM estimation results provided in Panel E of table 5, the interaction between the January-Dummy and the market excess return is significant at the 10% level. This can be interpreted as evidence that the market price of risk is different in January than in other periods of the year. The January term taken by itself, however, is not a significant component of the stochastic discount factor. As revealed by the pricing error plots in 2 and 4, the model is clearly better than the CAPM in explaining the cross-section of average returns of our size and book-to-market portfolios. This is a rather interesting result given the fact that the model is only a slight modification of the standard CAPM. The estimate of the HJ-Distance is the second smallest among the scaled factor models. Unfortunately, the model suffers from parameter instability, as indicated by the significant supLM-Test statistic.

Finally, we consider a conditional version CAPM scaled by the cyclical component of industrial production. The model's empirical performance is rather unattractive. Incorporating the conditioning information into the SDF does not lead to a great reduction of pricing errors as visualized by figures 1 and 4. None of the parameters of the SDF are significantly different from zero. Additionally, the CAPM scaled by *CY* suffers from parameter instability.

5.3 Further Investigations

In the following we report the results of additional robustness checks. We consider two further investigations to assess the empirical performance of the different model specifications. First we report the results of the evaluation of dynamic model performance according to Farnsworth et al. (2002). Then, we investigate the empirical performance of the conditional models when the Fama-French factors are added to the SDF. In particular we want to see, whether the factors of the conditional models survive in the presence of the Fama-French factors.

Figure 2: HJ-GMM: conditional CAPM, Fitted versus Actual Mean Excess Returns, in % per month, 16 Fama-French portfolios.



Note: The graphs were generated using the results from the HJ-GMM estimation. The test asset are 16 excess returns of size and book-to-market portfolios as well as the gross return of the German T-Bill equivalent. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. The upper two graphs show results for the CAPM scaled by the default spread *DEF* and the term spread *TERM*. In the middle the pricing error plots of the CAPM scaled by the short-term interest rate *TB* and by dividend yields *DIV* are illustrated. At the bottom plots for the CAPM scaled by the January dummy *JAN* and the cyclical component of industrial production *CY* are presented.

Dynamic Model performance

The main focus of the two previous subsections has been to investigate whether the different specifications of the conditional CAPM are able to explain the cross-sectional variation of average stock returns on the German stock-market. We now turn to an analysis of how well the different models explain the time variation of the test portfolio returns. The central idea of this testing approach, which has been put forth in the paper by Farnsworth et al. (2002), is the following. Assuming that the model does a good job in capturing the time variation of the test portfolios, the model's time series pricing errors, $\hat{\xi}_{t+1} = M_{t+1}(\hat{b})R_{i;t+1}$, should not be predictable using any information available as of t . Note that $R_{i;t+1}$ in this context denotes the return of portfolio i in excess of the short term interest rate. Farnsworth et al. (2002) propose to use a linear projection of the time series of pricing errors $\hat{\xi}_{t+1}$ onto the set of conditioning variables z_t . The standard deviation of the fitted values of this regression then serves as an indicator of how well the model captures the time variation of the respective portfolio return.

We conduct this exercise for our 16 test portfolios. Table 6 reports the average of the standard deviations of the fitted values across the test portfolios. In addition, the minimum and maximum standard deviation are provided. A low average standard deviation indicates that the specific model does a good job in capturing time-series predictability of the excess returns of test portfolios.

The table shows that unconditional models, in particular the "plain vanilla" version of the CAPM apparently do a good job in capturing the time-series predictability of the portfolio excess returns. The unconditional CAPM has the lowest average standard deviation of all investigated models. We do not find that conditional models tend to outperform unconditional ones in this test. It is striking that the different specifications of the conditional CAPM, especially those with a good cross-sectional performance, have a clearly worse performance with regard to time series predictability relative to unconditional specifications such as the unconditional CAPM and the Fama-French model. Our findings are similar to those reported by Farnsworth et al. (2002). The authors find that conditional versions

Table 6: Dynamic Model performance

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Panel A: Unconditional Models</i>			
CAPM	0.805	0.580	1.205
Fama-French	0.810	0.586	1.193
<i>Panel B: Conditional Models</i>			
CAPM scaled by <i>DEF</i>	1.070	0.643	1.630
CAPM scaled by <i>TERM</i>	1.591	1.014	1.877
CAPM scaled by <i>TB</i>	1.071	0.775	1.422
CAPM scaled by <i>DIV</i>	1.068	0.671	1.681
CAPM scaled by <i>JAN</i>	0.839	0.486	1.184
CAPM scaled by <i>CY</i>	0.895	0.643	1.334

Note: The table reports the results of the test for dynamic performance proposed by Farnsworth et al. (2002). The test is based on a regression of the models' pricing errors for the 16 portfolios on the set of conditioning variables $z_t = (DEF_t, TERM_t, TB_t, DIV_t, CY_t)'$. The table reports the mean of the standard deviations of the regressions' fitted values across the 16 portfolios. Moreover the minimum and the maximum standard deviation across the 16 test portfolios are reported. Panel A provides results for the unconditional factor models whereas panel B gives the results of the different versions of the conditional CAPM. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12.

of the CAPM and the Fama-French model perform worse than their unconditional counterparts, whereas other conditional models they consider in their paper tend to do better than unconditional specifications.

Factor Combinations

An additional robustness check for the conditional specifications of the CAPM is to see whether the factors are sufficient for pricing the cross-section of returns or whether they are driven out once other factors are included in the specification of the pricing kernel. For this purpose, we add the Fama-French factors *SMB* and *HML* to the SDF

$$M_{t+1} = b_{0,1} + b_{0,2}z_t + b'_{1,1}f_{t+1} + b'_{1,2}(f_{t+1}z_t) + c_1SMB_{t+1} + c_2HML_{t+1}. \quad (11)$$

To assess whether the Fama-French factors provide explanatory power in addition

to the original set of factors we use a likelihood-ratio test.¹⁹ We first estimate the unrestricted model in (11) by optimal GMM. Then we rerun the estimation imposing $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ as implied by the conditional CAPM. The test-statistic based on the differences of the J_T -statistics is asymptotically distributed χ^2 with two degrees of freedom.

Table 7: Combining Factors: Likelihood-ratio Tests

Model	$\chi^2_{(2)}$	p -value
CAPM scaled by <i>DEF</i>	5.191	0.075
CAPM scaled by <i>TERM</i>	1.176	0.555
CAPM scaled by <i>TB</i>	5.839	0.054
CAPM scaled by <i>DIV</i>	3.348	0.188
CAPM scaled by <i>JAN</i>	0.540	0.763
CAPM scaled by <i>CY</i>	12.347	0.002

Note: The table reports the results of the likelihood-ratio test described in the text. First, we estimate an unrestricted model including the factors of the conditional CAPM plus the Fama-French factors *SMB* and *HML* using optimal GMM. Second, we estimate a restricted model which only includes the factors of the conditional CAPM. The test statistic based on the difference of the J_T -statistics of the unrestricted and restricted models is distributed $\chi^2_{(2)}$. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12.

Table 7 contains the results of the likelihood-ratio tests. Adding the Fama-French factors can influence the results considerably for some conditioning variables. As shown in table 7, the likelihood-ratio statistic is significant in the case of the CAPM scaled by *DEF* and *TB* (10% level) and in particular for the CAPM scaled by *CY* (1%). The model scaled by the term spread *TERM* and the CAPM scaled by the January Dummy *JAN* remain largely unaffected by the inclusion of the Fama-French factors, which provides further evidence on their good empirical performance.

¹⁹This test is described for instance in Cochrane (2001, p.258).

6 Conclusion

In this paper we investigated whether conditional versions of the CAPM, allowing for time-variation of the parameters in the stochastic discount factor, are able to explain the cross-section of German stock returns better than unconditional factor models such as the conventional CAPM or the three-factor model by Fama and French (1993). Previous research suggests that scaling the factors with conditioning variables improves the empirical performance of unconditional asset pricing models. Since prior research focused primarily on the U.S. stock market, the aim of this paper was to investigate whether this also holds true for the German stock market.

Using a cross-section of 16 portfolios sorted by size and book-to-market characteristics, we were able to show that, by allowing the parameters of the stochastic discount factor to vary over time through the incorporation of conditioning information, the empirical performance of the CAPM can be enhanced considerably. We focused on several variables, which (according to previous research) are associated with market expectations on future market excess returns or business cycle conditions. The selection of the term spread, default spread, short-term interest rate and aggregate dividend yields as conditioning variables largely followed Ferson and Harvey (1999). In addition, we also considered a January-Dummy and the cyclical component of industrial production as proposed by Hodrick and Zhang (2001). Not all variables however lead to the same degree of improvement. In particular, we find that the CAPM scaled by the term spread *TERM* has the best explanatory power for the German cross-section of stock returns. Its pricing errors are smaller than those of the Fama-French three-factor model. Furthermore, the model has the lowest HJ-distance of all models evaluated in this study. Additional robustness checks demonstrate that the model is robust to an inclusion of the Fama-French factors into the SDF.

We also used the test procedure suggested by Andrews (1993), in order to assess how parameter instability might affect estimation outcomes. Ghysels (1998) criticizes conditional factor models using lagged instruments for having unstable

parameters. Our estimations show that parameter instability is present when the CAPM is scaled by the short-term interest rate TB , dividend yields DIV , the January dummy JAN and the cyclical component of industrial production CY . However, we do not find parameter instability to be important for the CAPM scaled by the term spread $TERM$ or the default spread DEF . Moreover, we find evidence for structural breaks in the case of the Fama-French model. Given this empirical evidence for parameter stability and the small pricing errors, the conditional CAPM using $TERM$ as scaling variable is our preferred specification for explaining the cross-section of German stock returns. However, the model's performance in capturing the time-series predictability of the test asset returns is quite unsatisfactory.

A The Fama-MacBeth Procedure

Beside HJ-GMM we also report results from the two-step cross-sectional regression approach by Fama and MacBeth (1973) (FMB) which has a long tradition in the empirical asset pricing literature. First, a time series regression is carried out by regressing excess returns $R_{i,t}$ on the factors for all assets i .

$$R_{i,t} = a_i + \beta_i' f_t + \epsilon_{i,t}; \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (12)$$

The next step is to use the estimated $\hat{\beta}_i$ as explanatory variables in the cross-sectional regression in order to estimate the factor risk premia. Instead of estimating one cross-sectional regression of average portfolio returns on the betas, however, the following regression is estimated at every point of time $t = 1, \dots, T$.

$$R_{i,t} = \hat{\beta}_i' \lambda_t + \xi_{i,t}. \quad (13)$$

The estimated factor risk premia are calculated as the time series averages of the estimates of each point in time:

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\lambda}_t. \quad (14)$$

Fama and MacBeth (1973) suggest to interpret the estimated $\hat{\lambda}_t$ as a random sample. The standard errors of the estimated parameters are then calculated based on the time series of the estimated $\hat{\lambda}_t$:

$$\text{s.e.}(\hat{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{\lambda}_t - \hat{\lambda})^2 \right]^{1/2}. \quad (15)$$

A well known problem of the FMB approach is the errors-in-variables problem since only estimated betas enter the cross-sectional regression and not the true betas. Shanken (1992) has derived a correction term to alleviate this problem. We report the Shanken-adjusted along with conventional t -statistics. Furthermore, we

report the cross-sectional R^2 as an intuitive measure of model fit.

B Additional Figures and Tables

Table 8: FMB estimation: CAPM and Fama-French Model.

Panel A: CAPM				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m			R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.002			0.174
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.748			
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.748			
Panel A: Fama-French Model				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{SMB}	λ_{HML}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.002	-0.003	0.003	0.478
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.806	-1.853	2.258	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.795	-1.827	2.227	


Note: The table reports the results of Fama-Macbeth estimation for several models. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. We report estimates of the factor risk premia calculated from these estimates. The standard errors of the factor risk premia were calculated using the delta method.

Table 9: FMB estimation: scaled CAPM.

Panel A: CAPM scaled by DEF				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{DEF}	λ_{DEF*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.003	0.567	0.015	0.320
<i>t</i> -statistic	1.042	1.641	1.094	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.876	1.380	0.920	
Panel B: CAPM scaled by TERM				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{TERM}	λ_{TERM*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.003	-0.851	-0.029	0.571
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.939	-2.572	-2.289	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.674	-1.846	-1.643	
Panel C: CAPM scaled by TB				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{TB}	λ_{TB*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.002	0.336	0.003	0.217
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.749	0.913	0.392	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.706	0.860	0.369	
Panel D: CAPM scaled by DIV				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{DIV}	λ_{DIV*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	-0.001	-0.704	0.013	0.419
<i>t</i> -statistic	-0.304	-1.972	2.023	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	-0.241	-1.564	1.604	
Panel E: CAPM scaled by JAN				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{JAN}	λ_{JAN*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.002	0.021	0.012	0.486
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.818	0.343	3.245	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.609	0.255	2.415	
Panel F: CAPM scaled by CY				
<i>Factor risk price:</i>	λ_m	λ_{CY}	λ_{CY*m}	R^2 (adj.)
Estimate	0.002	-0.334	-0.016	0.236
<i>t</i> -statistic	0.744	-1.039	-1.168	
<i>t</i> -statistic (adj.)	0.676	-0.944	-1.062	

Note: The table reports the results of Fama-Macbeth estimation for the different specifications of the scaled CAPM. *DEF* is the default spread, *TERM* is the term spread, *DIV* denotes dividend yields and *TB* is the short-term interest rate. *JAN* is a January-Dummy which takes 1 in January and zero otherwise. *CY* denotes the cyclical component of (log-)industrial production. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. We report estimates of the factor risk premia calculated from these estimates. The standard errors of the factor risk premia were calculated using the delta method.


Figure 3: FMB cross-sectional regression: CAPM and Fama-French Model, Fitted versus Actual Mean Excess Returns, in % per month, 16 Fama-French portfolios.



Note: The graphs were generated using the results from the Fama-Macbeth estimation. The test asset are 16 excess returns of size and book-to-market portfolios as well as the gross return of the German T-Bill equivalent. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. The two graphs show results for the CAPM and the Fama-French-Model.

Figure 4: FMB cross-sectional regression: Scaled CAPM, Fitted versus Actual Mean

Excess Returns, in % per month, 16 Fama-French portfolios.



Note: The graphs were generated using the results from the Fama-Macbeth estimation. The test asset are 16 excess returns of size and book-to-market portfolios as well as the gross return of the German T-Bill equivalent. The sample period is 1969:12 - 2002:12. The upper two graphs show results for the CAPM scaled by the default spread *DEF* and the term spread *TERM*. In the middle the pricing error plots of the CAPM scaled by the short-term interest rate *TB* and by dividend yields *DIV* are illustrated. At the bottom plots for the CAPM scaled by the January dummy *JAN* and the cyclical component of industrial production *CY* are presented.

References

- Ahn, S. C. and Gadarowski, C.: 2004, Small sample properties of the GMM specification test based on the Hansen-Jagannathan distance, *Journal of Empirical Finance* **11**, 109–132.
- Andrews, D.: 1993, Tests for parameter instability and structural change with unknown change point, *Econometrica* **61**, 821–856.
- Ang, A. and Bekaert, G.: 2005, Stock return predictability: Is it there? Working paper, Columbia University.
- Banz, R. W.: 1981, The relationship between return and market value of common stocks, *Journal of Financial Economics* **9**, 3–18.
- Basu, S.: 1983, The relationship between earnings yield, market value and return for NYSE common stock: further evidence, *Journal of Financial Economics* **12**, 129–156.
- Beiker, H.: 1993, *Überrenditen und Risiken kleiner Aktiengesellschaften. Eine theoretische und empirische Analyse des deutschen Kapitalmarktes von 1966 bis 1989.*, Müller Botermann, Aachen.
- Black, F.: 1972, Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing, *Journal of Business* **45**, 444–455.
- Bunke, O., Sommerfeld, V. and Stehle, R.: 1999, Semiparametric modelling of the cross-section of expected returns in the German stock market. Humboldt Universität Berlin.
- Campbell, J. Y. and Shiller, R. J.: 1988, The dividend-price ratio and expectations of future dividends and discount factors, *Review of Financial Studies* **1**(3), 195–228.
- Cochrane, J. H.: 1996, A cross-sectional test of an investment-based asset pricing model, *Journal of Political Economy* **104**(3), 572–621.

- Cochrane, J. H.: 2001, *Asset Pricing*, Princeton University Press, NJ.
- Daniel, K. and Titman, S.: 1997, Evidence on the characteristics of cross sectional variation in stock returns, *Journal of Finance* **52**, 1–33.
- DeBondt, W. F. M. and Thaler, R.: 1985, Does the stock market overreact?, *Journal of Finance* **55**, 793–805.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R.: 1989, Business conditions and expected returns on stocks and bonds, *Journal of Financial Economics* **25**(1), 23–49.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R.: 1992, The cross-section of expected stock returns, *Journal of Finance* **47**(2), 427–465.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R.: 1993, Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds, *Journal of Financial Economics* **33**, 3–56.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R.: 1995, Size and book-to-market factors in earnings and returns, *Journal of Finance* **50**, 131–156.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R.: 1996, Multifactor explanations of asset pricing anomalies, *Journal of Finance* **51**(1), 55–84.
- Fama, E. F. and MacBeth, J.: 1973, Risk, return and equilibrium: Empirical tests, *Journal of Political Economy* **81**, 607–636.
- Farnsworth, H., Ferson, W., Jackson, D. and Todd, S.: 2002, Performance evaluation with stochastic discount factors, *Journal of Business* **75**, 473–503.
- Ferson, W. E. and Harvey, C. R.: 1991, The variation of economic risk premiums, *Journal of Political Economy* **99**, 385–415.
- Ferson, W. E. and Harvey, C. R.: 1999, Conditioning variables and the cross section of stock returns, *Journal of Finance* **54**(4), 1325–1360.
- Gehrke, N.: 1994, *Tobin's q - Die Beziehung zwischen Buch- und Marktwerten deutscher Aktiengesellschaften*, Gabler Edition Wissenschaft, Wiesbaden.

- Ghysels, E.: 1998, On stable factor structures in the pricing of risk: Do time-varying betas help or hurt?, *Journal of Finance* **53**, 549–573.
- Goyal, A. and Welch, I.: 2004, A comprehensive look at the empirical performance of equity premium prediction. Working paper, NBER.
- Hansen, L. P.: 1982, Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators, *Econometrica* **50**(4), 1029–1054.
- Hansen, L. P. and Jagannathan, R.: 1997, Assessing specification errors in stochastic discount factor models, *Journal of Finance* **52**(2), 557–590.
- Hansen, L. P. and Singleton, K. J.: 1982, Generalized instrumental variables estimation of nonlinear rational expectations models, *Econometrica* **50**(2), 1296–1286.
- Harvey, C. R.: 1989, Time-varying conditional covariances in tests of asset pricing models, *Journal of Financial Economics* **24**, 289–318.
- Hodrick, R. J. and Prescott, E.: 1997, Postwar U.S. business cycles: an empirical investigation, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **29**, 1–16.
- Hodrick, R. J. and Zhang, X.: 2001, Evaluating the specification errors of asset pricing models, *Journal of Financial Economics* **62**, 327–376.
- Jagannathan, R. and Wang, Z.: 1996, The conditional CAPM and the cross-section of expected returns, *Journal of Finance* **51**(1), 3–53.
- Lettau, M. and Ludvigson, S.: 2001a, Consumption, aggregate wealth, and expected stock returns, *Journal of Finance* **56**(3), 815–849.
- Lettau, M. and Ludvigson, S.: 2001b, Resurrecting the (C)CAPM: A cross-sectional test when risk premia are time-varying, *Journal of Political Economy* **109**, 1238–1287.
- Li, Q., Vassalou, M. and Xing, Y.: 2001, An investment-growth asset pricing model. CEPR working paper.

- Liew, J. and Vassalou, M.: 2000, Can book-to-market, size and momentum be risk factors that predict economic growth?, *Journal of Financial Economics* **57**, 221–245.
- Lintner, J.: 1965, The valuation of risky assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets, *Review of Economics and Statistics* **47**, 13–37.
- Merton, R. C.: 1973, An intertemporal capital asset pricing model, *Econometrica* **41**(5), 867–887.
- Rosenberg, B., Reid, K. and Lanstein, R.: 1985, Persuasive evidence on market inefficiency, *Journal of Portfolio Management* **11**, 9–17.
- Ross, S. A.: 1976, The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing, *Journal of Economic Theory* **13**, 341–360.
- Sattler, R. R.: 1994, *Renditeanomalien am deutschen Aktienmarkt*, Aachen.
- Schulz, A. and Stehle, R.: 2002, Buchwert-Marktwert-Verhältnis, Size und Beta als Erklärungsvariable für die Renditen deutscher Aktien. Humboldt Universität Berlin.
- Shanken, J.: 1992, On the estimation of beta pricing models, *Review of Financial Studies* **5**, 1–34.
- Sharpe, W. F.: 1964, Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk, *Journal of Finance* **19**, 425–442.
- Stehle, R.: 1997, Der Size-effekt am deutschen Aktienmarkt, *Zeitschrift für Bankrecht und Bankwirtschaft* **9**, 237–260.
- Stock, D.: 2002, *Zur Relevanz von Marktmodell-Anomalien für den deutschen Aktienmarkt*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Wallmeier, M.: 2000, Determinanten erwarteter Renditen am deutschen Aktienmarkt - Eine empirische Untersuchung anhand ausgewählter Kennzahlen, *Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung* **52**, 27–57.

Ziegler, A., Schröder, M., Schulz, A. and Stehle, R.: 2005, Multifaktormodelle zur Erklärung deutscher Aktienrenditen: Eine empirische Analyse. ZEW Working paper, No. 03-45.