



palgrave▶pivot

A New Model of Capital Asset Prices Theory and Evidence

James W. Kolari
Wei Liu
Jianhua Z. Huang

palgrave
macmillan

A New Model of Capital Asset Prices

James W. Kolari · Wei Liu · Jianhua Z. Huang

A New Model of Capital Asset Prices

Theory and Evidence

palgrave
macmillan

James W. Kolari
Department of Finance
Mays Business School
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX, USA

Wei Liu
USAA Bank
San Antonio, TX, USA

Jianhua Z. Huang
Department of Statistics
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX, USA

ISBN 978-3-030-65196-1 ISBN 978-3-030-65197-8 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65197-8>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer
Nature Switzerland AG 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: © Melisa Hasan

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To my wife Karie and son Wes
—James W. Kolari

To my wife Na and daughters Ashley and Chelsea
—Wei Liu

To my wife Lan and sons Tian-shu and Tian-da
—Jianhua Z. Huang

PREFACE

This book proposes a new capital asset pricing model dubbed the *ZCAPM* that consistently outperforms existing popular models in empirical tests using U.S. stock returns. The ZCAPM's dominance of established multi-factor models in out-of-sample cross-sectional tests—the gold standard in comparative tests—is remarkable. We believe that the ZCAPM represents the next step in the evolution of asset pricing models. Consequently, this book is intended for academics and finance professionals that employ these models in their research activities. Finance Ph.D. students and professors can apply our ZCAPM to asset pricing problems. And, finance professionals, including portfolio managers, securities traders, and quants, can utilize the ZCAPM in their investment activities.

Early chapters in the book establish the theoretical foundation for the ZCAPM by mathematically deriving a special case of Fischer Black's renowned *zero-beta CAPM*. Black's model is a more general form of the famed *Capital Asset Pricing Model* (*CAPM*) by Nobel Laureate William Sharpe. Both models depend heavily on the mean-variance investment parabola of Nobel Laureate Harry Markowitz. In later chapters we document extensive empirical evidence supporting the ZCAPM based on more than 50 years of U.S. stock return data, many different samples of stocks, and comparisons to several popular multifactor models. These substantive tests using stock return data show that the ZCAPM is the premier asset pricing model in terms of surpassing the significance of other models in commonly used cross-sectional tests used to validate models. Also,

we demonstrate practical applications of the ZCAPM in the areas of momentum investing and diversified portfolio formation with superior return/risk performance.

As a backstory, in summers from 2002 to 2017, James Kolari taught a graduate international finance seminar at the Hanken School of Economics in Vaasa, Finland. A long-time puzzle in financial economics is the very small impact of exchange rate movements on stock returns as measured by asset pricing models. After reviewing this vast literature, he began to suspect that problems in asset pricing models may be complicit in the puzzle. In the 1970s, researchers observed that stock return data only weakly supported the lauded CAPM. Motivated by this evidence, Black proposed the zero-beta CAPM to help reconcile CAPM theory and stock return evidence. However, he did not provide empirical proxies for the two efficient and inefficient (zero-beta) portfolios in his model.

In a series of 1990 papers, Eugene Fama and Kenneth French argued that things were worse than previously believed. The beloved CAPM was dead. They accumulated evidence that the CAPM's hypothesized relation between beta risk associated with proxy market portfolio returns and the cross-section of average U.S. stock returns did not hold. Due to this failure, to better fit stock return data, they proposed a three-factor model that augmented the CAPM's market portfolio factor with size and value factors. Responding to the Fama and French studies, Black criticized their three-factor model because: (1) it was developed by means of data snooping, and (2) there was little or no theoretical foundation. He continued to believe that, despite growing evidence to the contrary, the CAPM was valid. What if Black was right?

The biography *Fischer Black and the Revolutionary Idea of Finance* by Perry Mehrling (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.) was published in 2005. As recounted there, after working at the University of Chicago and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Black took a job at Goldman Sachs in 1984 and worked there until he died in 1995. Always in the relentless pursuit of solutions to finance puzzles, as the first quant at Goldman Sachs, he worked one day a week on independent research. Over these years, he likely continued to develop his zero-beta CAPM ideas. Was it possible that he found an alternative form that bridged the gap between pure theory and practical investment in the real world?

In summer 2010 Kolari met Wei Liu, at the time a Ph.D. finance student at Texas A&M University. Liu had previously earned a Ph.D. in physics from Texas A&M and published numerous scientific papers.

Together, they set out to rediscover what Fischer Black may have learned about the zero-beta CAPM but did not publish due to proprietary research at Goldman Sachs. Their main goal was to find an alternative form of the zero-beta CAPM that could be readily estimated. Given Black's criticism of Fama and French's three-factor model, they focused on building a model based on the theoretical tenets of the CAPM and related zero-beta CAPM. In this regard, Liu's previous physics training was instrumental in using random matrix theory to better understand the asymptotic behavior of the minimum-variance investment parabola. By 2011 they had derived a special case of Black's zero-beta CAPM dubbed the *ZCAPM* that contained readily available asset pricing factors—namely, average market returns and the cross-sectional return dispersion of all assets' returns.

Excited about this new theoretical model with measurable factors, they began experimenting with different empirical approaches to estimate the theoretical *ZCAPM*. After some initial failures, empirical methods were adapted to take into account positive and negative effects of return dispersion on asset returns. Early tests of these methods corroborated the theoretical *ZCAPM*. However, these empirical tests relied on fitting regression models that use the response variable to define a signal variable indicating the sign of the effect of return dispersion. Soon thereafter, they met with Jianhua Huang, a statistics professor at Texas A&M University, who recommended a reformulation named the *empirical ZCAPM* that treats the unobservable sign as a latent or hidden variable and employs the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm for the estimation of parameters. Importantly, this maximum likelihood approach enables the estimation of the probability that returns are positively versus negatively affected by movements in the return dispersion factor. A major refinement, the EM approach to estimating the empirical *ZCAPM* computes regression parameters, estimates the probability of positive or negative return dispersion effects, substantially boosts the goodness-of-fit of the model, and provides a statistically well-founded empirical methodology.

With both the theoretical and empirical *ZCAPM* in hand, we wrote a research paper using U.S. stock returns and submitted it to finance conferences. In 2012 our paper won the Best Paper in Investments Award at the largest finance conference in the world sponsored by the Financial Management Association. An attendee invited by us to the conference from the Teachers Retirement System of Texas (TRS) proposed that we set up an investment company and work privately with them on research

and development (R&D) for pension fund management. An agreement was made to not publish our work in any manner, including the internet, academic journals, books, etc. From 2012 to 2015 we worked privately with TRS and Texas A&M University, which deepened our applied knowledge of the ZCAPM. During this time, Liu managed the investment company, conducted paper trading experiments, and actively rebalanced an R&D pension fund. Unfortunately, due to changes in management at TRS, our relationship was ended.

After closing our investment firm, we continued to develop the ZCAPM. Our research gradually grew beyond the normal bounds of published papers in academic journals with page length and other restrictions. For this reason, we opted to publish our ZCAPM research in a book. By presenting the theoretical derivation of the ZCAPM from the zero-beta CAPM, a weight of empirical evidence about the ZCAPM and its outperformance compared to other popular models, and useful applications to investment practices, we hope to blunt the natural skepticism that confronts any new and novel model with strong asset pricing claims.

To develop the ZCAPM we benefited greatly from previous work by Black on the zero-beta CAPM. As already mentioned, our ZCAPM is a special case of the zero-beta CAPM that takes on a new functional form with measurable factors. More precisely, the ZCAPM is comprised of *beta risk* associated with average market returns (i.e., CRSP index, S&P 500 index, or other general market indexes) and *zeta risk* related to the cross-sectional standard deviation of all stocks' returns in the market (i.e., return dispersion). Notice that beta risk in the ZCAPM is associated with average market returns rather than the theoretical market portfolio in the CAPM. Together, beta and zeta risks in the ZCAPM serve as a proxy for Sharpe's beta risk as proposed by the CAPM.

Another novel aspect of our ZCAPM model is taking into account positive and negative sensitivity of asset returns to return dispersion movements over time. To estimate the probability of these opposite forces, a mixture model comprised of two factor models is specified. No previous asset pricing models utilize a mixture model to our knowledge. As we will show, return dispersion is a powerful market factor that helps to explain stock returns but must be modeled as in our empirical ZCAPM to fully capture its dual positive and negative nature and be consistent with the theoretical ZCAPM.

Readers are encouraged to conduct empirical tests using our Matlab and R computer programs.

- Matlab codes used in our cross-sectional tests of the empirical ZCAPM are provided at the end of this book. Matlab is licensed software that combines a desktop environment with a programming language for matrix and array mathematics.
- R programs for estimating and testing the empirical ZCAPM are available on GitHub (<https://github.com/zcapm>). R is a free software environment for statistical computing and graphics. It compiles and runs on a wide variety of UNIX platforms, Windows, and MacOS. Readers can find our Matlab and Python codes at the GitHub website also.

We should note that our R programs execute at a faster speed than the Matlab and Python programs. We challenge readers to use our software and prove for themselves the superior efficacy of the ZCAPM.

College Station, USA
San Antonio, USA
College Station, USA

James W. Kolari
Wei Liu
Jianhua Z. Huang

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Center for International Studies, Mays Business School, Texas A&M University as well as support from both the Hanken School of Economics and the University of Vaasa in Vaasa, Finland.

Helpful comments about our asset pricing model have been received from participants at the Midwest Finance Association 2012 meetings in New Orleans, Louisiana, the Multinational Finance Society 2012 conference in Krakow, Poland, the Financial Management Association 2012 conference in Atlanta, Georgia, and the Southern Finance Association 2020 conference in Palm Springs, California (virtual format). We are grateful to have been awarded the Best Paper in Investments at the Financial Management Association conference. Also, we are thankful for financial support and real world experience gained from work with the Teachers Retirement System of Texas and Texas A&M University.

Many people at academic institutions and investment firms have shared useful comments with us over the years, including Ali Anari, Will Armstrong, Ihsan Badshah, Geert Bekaert, Grant Birdwell, Saurabh Biswas, Jaap Bos, Yong Chen, Gjergji Cici, Brett Cornwell, Lammertjan Dam, Huaizhang Deng, Bilal Ertuk, Wayne Ferson, Paige Fields, Tristan Fitzgerald, Markus Franke, Wesley Gray, Klaus Grobys, Yao Han, Britt Harris, Tim Jones, Hagen Kim, Johan Knif, Sudhir Krishnamurthi, Anestis Ladas, Scott Lee, Qi Li, Yutong Li, Kelly Newhall, Chris Pann, Francisco Penaranda, Ralitsa Petkova, Mike Pia, Seppo Pynnönen, Liqian

Ren, Kyle Rusconi, Katharina Schüller, William Smith, Mikhail Sokolov, Sorin Sorescu, Ty Sorrel, Jene Tebeaux, Ahmet Tuncez, David Veal, Jack Vogel, Ivo Welch, Mark Westerfield, Jian Yang, Nan Yang, Christopher Yost-Bremm, Jun Zhang, Zhao Xin, Tony van Zijl, Yangru Wu, Zhaodong Zhong, and Yuzhao Zhang.

We are thankful for the assistance of Ph.D. students at Texas A&M University. Yao Han (finance) provided assistance with cross-sectional statistical tests. Zhao Tang Luo (statistics) wrote the initial R codes to conduct replication exercises to check our Matlab codes. Huiling Liao (statistics) further developed R codes, composed the R package, and assisted with additional tests. Jacob Atnip (finance) read through the manuscript and helped with final editing.

Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to Executive Editor Tula Weis at Palgrave Macmillan for her willingness to work with us and make this book possible. Also, Project Coordinator Ashwini Elango was instrumental in manuscript preparation and production. An anonymous referee provided useful comments.

CONTENTS

Part I Introduction

1	Asset Pricing Evolution	3
1.1	<i>Origins of the CAPM</i>	4
1.2	<i>The CAPM Controversy</i>	7
1.3	<i>The Roll Critique</i>	8
1.4	<i>The Zero-Beta CAPM Alternative</i>	9
1.5	<i>ZCAPM Solution</i>	9
1.6	<i>Summary</i>	18
	<i>Bibliography</i>	19

Part II Theoretical ZCAPM

2	Capital Asset Pricing Models	25
2.1	<i>General Equilibrium Versus Multifactor Models</i>	26
2.2	<i>CAPM</i>	27
	2.2.1 <i>Formal Derivation of the CAPM</i>	28
	2.2.2 <i>CAPM Market Model</i>	30
2.3	<i>Zero-Beta CAPM</i>	33
	2.3.1 <i>Formal Derivation of the Zero-Beta CAPM</i>	35
2.4	<i>Multifactor Models</i>	39
	2.4.1 <i>Three-Factor Model</i>	39

2.4.2	<i>Four-Factor Model</i>	42
2.4.3	<i>Five-Factor Model</i>	42
2.4.4	<i>Other Multifactor Models</i>	44
2.5	<i>Summary</i>	46
	<i>Bibliography</i>	47
3	Theoretical Form of the ZCAPM	53
3.1	<i>Special Case of the Zero-Beta CAPM: The ZCAPM</i>	54
3.1.1	<i>Proof of Equivalence of Geometric Approaches</i>	56
3.1.2	<i>Locating Unique ZCAPM Portfolios I^* and ZI^*</i>	57
3.2	<i>Expected Returns of Portfolios I^* and ZI^*</i>	61
3.2.1	<i>Derivation of Investment Parabola Parameters Based on Random Matrix Theory</i>	62
3.2.2	<i>Random Matrix Approximations of Expected Returns for I^* and ZI^*</i>	64
3.3	<i>Expected Returns of Assets in the ZCAPM</i>	69
3.3.1	<i>No Riskless Asset Exists</i>	69
3.3.2	<i>A Riskless Asset Exists</i>	71
3.4	<i>Summary</i>	74
	<i>Appendix A: Expected Returns for Portfolios I^* and ZI^*</i>	75
	<i>Appendix B: Properties of Matrix C</i>	76
	<i>Bibliography</i>	81
Part III	Empirical ZCAPM	
4	Empirical Form of the ZCAPM	87
4.1	<i>Related Literature</i>	88
4.2	<i>Asymmetric Market Risk</i>	89
4.3	<i>Asymmetric Market Risk and the ZCAPM</i>	91
4.4	<i>Traditional Return Dispersion Models</i>	95
4.5	<i>ZCAPM Approach to Return Dispersion</i>	96
4.6	<i>Expectation-Maximization (EM) Algorithm for Estimating the Empirical ZCAPM</i>	99
4.7	<i>Summary</i>	104
	<i>Bibliography</i>	106

Part IV Empirical Evidence

5	Stock Return Data and Empirical Methods	113
5.1	<i>In-Sample Versus Out-of-Sample Tests</i>	114
5.2	<i>Sample Data</i>	114
5.3	<i>Cross-Sectional Tests</i>	121
5.4	<i>Benchmark Time-Series Multifactor Models</i>	123
5.5	<i>Time-Series and Cross-Sectional Regressions for the ZCAPM</i>	125
5.6	<i>Summary</i>	127
	<i>Bibliography</i>	128
 6	 Empirical Tests of the ZCAPM	 131
6.1	<i>Traditional Model Results</i>	132
6.2	<i>Graphical Evidence for the ZCAPM</i>	135
6.2.1	<i>Excess Returns and Factor Loadings</i>	135
6.2.2	<i>Predicted and Realized Excess Returns</i>	144
6.2.3	<i>Why Do Multifactor Models Do Poorly with Industries?</i>	151
6.3	<i>Summary</i>	152
	<i>Bibliography</i>	156
 7	 Cross-Sectional Tests of the ZCAPM	 159
7.1	<i>Preview of Empirical Evidence</i>	160
7.2	<i>Out-of-Sample Cross-Sectional Tests</i>	163
7.2.1	<i>Overview of the ZCAPM and Cross-Sectional Regression Procedure</i>	163
7.2.2	<i>Empirical Results</i>	165
7.3	<i>Robustness Checks</i>	172
7.3.1	<i>Split Subsample Period Results</i>	173
7.3.2	<i>Size Group Results</i>	178
7.3.3	<i>Profit and Capital Investment Results</i>	180
7.3.4	<i>Individual Stock Results</i>	180
7.3.5	<i>Out-of-Sample Periods Greater Than One Month</i>	182
7.3.6	<i>Other Four-Factor Models</i>	186
7.4	<i>Summary</i>	189
	<i>Bibliography</i>	193

Part V Applications of the ZCAPM

8	The Momentum Mytery: An Application of the ZCAPM	199
8.1	<i>Preview of Momentum Results</i>	200
8.2	<i>Empirical Tests</i>	202
8.2.1	<i>Cross-Sectional Asset Pricing Tests</i>	202
8.2.2	<i>Comparative Returns</i>	203
8.2.3	<i>Regression Tests</i>	205
8.3	<i>Empirical Results</i>	206
8.3.1	<i>Cross-Sectional Test Results</i>	206
8.3.2	<i>Comparative Return Results</i>	213
8.3.3	<i>Regression Test Results</i>	216
8.4	<i>Summary</i>	219
	<i>Bibliography</i>	221
9	Efficient Investment Portfolios: An Application of the ZCAPM	225
9.1	<i>Preview of Portfolio Results</i>	226
9.2	<i>Background Discussion</i>	228
9.3	<i>Building Portfolios Based on Zeta Risk</i>	230
9.4	<i>Empirical Results</i>	234
9.4.1	<i>Zero-Investment Portfolios Sensitive to Return Dispersion</i>	234
9.4.2	<i>Aggregate Portfolios Sensitive to Return Dispersion</i>	239
9.4.3	<i>Long Only Aggregate Portfolios Sensitive to Return Dispersion</i>	245
9.5	<i>Summary</i>	253
	<i>Bibliography</i>	256

Part VI Conclusion

10	Synopsis of Asset Pricing and the ZCAPM	261
10.1	<i>The CAPM Lives</i>	263
10.2	<i>The ZCAPM and Multifactor Models</i>	268
10.3	<i>Future Research</i>	270

<i>10.4 Final Remarks</i>	277
<i>Appendix A: Review of the Empirical ZCAPM and Cross-Sectional Test Methods</i>	279
<i>Bibliography</i>	282
A New Model of Capital Asset Prices: Theory and Evidence	287
Compendium: Matlab Programs	287
Index	305

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Professor James W. Kolari is the JP Morgan Chase Professor of Finance and Academic Director of the Commercial Banking Program in the Department of Finance at Texas A&M University. After earning a Ph.D. in Finance from Arizona State University in 1980, he has taught financial institutions and markets classes and been active in international education, consulting, and executive education. In 1986 he was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Helsinki and Bank of Finland. He has served as a Visiting Scholar at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Senior Research Fellow at the Swedish School of Business and Economics (Hanken), Finland, and Faculty Fellow with the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, in addition to being a consultant to the U.S. Small Business Administration, American Bankers Association, Independent Bankers Association of America, and numerous banks and other organizations. With over 100 articles published in refereed journals, numerous other papers and monographs, and over 15 co-authored books, he ranks in the top 1–2% of finance scholars in the United States. His papers have appeared in domestic and international journals, including the *Journal of Finance*, *Journal of Business*, *Review of Financial Studies*, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, *Journal of Financial Research*, *Real Estate Economics*, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, and *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*. Papers in Russian, Finnish, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Chinese have

appeared outside of the United States. He is a co-author of leading college textbooks in commercial banking, introductory business, and global business courses.

Dr. Wei Liu received his first Ph.D. in Physics in 2004 from Texas A&M University. His research focused on particle physics theory. After working as a postdoc for a few years, he changed his career path and earned a second Ph.D. in Finance in 2013 from Texas A&M University with an emphasis on asset pricing. From 2013 to 2016, he served as the manager and part owner of a small investment company. Developing asset pricing models based on statistical analysis, he created U.S. equity investment strategies to manage \$100 million for the Teachers Retirement System of Texas. Subsequently, in 2017 he joined IberiaBank Corporation in Birmingham, Alabama as a senior analyst building and documenting risk models. Internal risk models for the bank as well analyses for regulatory agencies were implemented. In 2018 he returned to Texas working for USAA Bank in San Antonio as a senior quantitative analyst with duties designing and implementing models for bank stress testing, loss forecasts, allowance for loan and lease losses, and credit risk management analysis. Recently, Dr. Liu has been engaged with various marketing issues at the bank.

Professor Jianhua Z. Huang is Professor of Statistics and Arseven/Mitchell Chair in Astronomical Statistics in the Department of Statistics at Texas A&M University. He received his B.A. in Probability and Statistics (1989) at Beijing University, M.A. in Probability and Statistics (1992) at Beijing University, and Ph.D. in Statistics (1997) at University of California at Berkeley. His areas of expertise are in statistical machine learning, computational statistics, statistical methods for big data sets, nonparametric and semi-parametric statistical modeling and inference, functional data analysis, spatial data analysis, application of statistics in business, social and natural sciences and engineering. He has supervised 21 Ph.D. students and published over 100 refereed papers. He is a Fellow of American Statistical Association, Fellow of Institute of Mathematical Statistics, and Elected Member of International Statistical Institute. Additionally, he has served on the editorial board of *Chemo-metrics and Intelligent Laboratory System*, *Journal of American Statistical Association*, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, and *STAT*.

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1	The Markowitz mean-variance investment parabola showing the relationship between the returns and risks of assets	5
Fig. 1.2	The Capital Market Line (CML) locates risky market portfolio M as the tangent point on the ray from the riskless asset to the investment parabola	6
Fig. 2.1	The Security Market Line (SML) of the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) shows the relationship between asset returns and beta risk	30
Fig. 2.2	The geometry of the zero-beta CAPM using Roll's approach locates pairs of efficient frontier and inefficient zero-beta portfolios	37
Fig. 3.1	New geometric approach to identify orthogonal zero-beta CAPM portfolios ZI and ZI' with respect to efficient portfolios I and I' , respectively, on the mean-variance investment parabola	55
Fig. 3.2	Roll and new geometric approaches are shown to locate two unique ZCAPM orthogonal portfolios I^* and ZI^* on the mean-variance investment parabola with equal return variance or total risk	59
Fig. 3.3	The level and width of the investment parabola changes over time. The individual i th asset's return is affected by changes in both the level (average market returns) and width (cross-sectional market return dispersion) of the investment parabola	68

Fig. 3.4	Dual opposing market volatility effects are taken into account by the ZCAPM. Expected returns above and below beta-adjusted expected returns occur due to zeta risk related to positive and negative sensitivity to cross-sectional return dispersion (σ_a), respectively	72
Fig. 4.1	Cross-sectional return variance (denoted σ_{CS}^2) directly affects the width of the mean-variance investment parabola	93
Fig. 4.2	Increasing return dispersion from time $t = 1$ to $t = 2$ ($\sigma_{m2} > \sigma_{m1}$) has asymmetric positive and negative effects on asset returns, as shown by increasing the return of asset A but decreasing the return of asset B	94
Fig. 5.1	Average out-of-sample, value-weighted monthly returns are shown for 25 beta-zeta portfolios. Zeta risk portfolios are sorted into quintiles from low to high within each beta risk quintile portfolio. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	120
Fig. 5.2	Average out-of-sample, equal-weighted monthly returns are shown for 25 beta-zeta risk portfolios. Zeta risk portfolios are sorted into quintiles from low to high within each beta risk quintile portfolio. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	120
Fig. 6.1	Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). Results are shown for 97 portfolios consisting of 25 size-B/M sorted plus 47 industry plus 25 beta-zeta sorted portfolios. These portfolios are sorted into beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintiles and then zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles within each $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	138
Fig. 6.2	Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). Results are shown for 97 portfolios consisting of 25 size-B/M sorted plus 47 industry plus 25 beta-zeta sorted portfolios. These portfolios are sorted into zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles and then beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintiles within each $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	139

- Fig. 6.3 Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). Results are shown for 25 size-B/M portfolios often-used in the Fama and French (1992, 1993, 1995, 2015, 2018) studies. These portfolios are sorted into beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintiles and then zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles within each $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018 140
- Fig. 6.4 Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). Results are shown for 25 size-B/M portfolios often-used in the Fama and French (1992, 1993, 1995, 2015, 2018) studies. These portfolios are sorted into zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles and then beta risk $\hat{\beta}_{i,a}$ quintiles within each $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018 141
- Fig. 6.5 Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). A total of 25 size-B/M portfolios are sorted into size quintiles and then zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles within each size quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018 142
- Fig. 6.6 Out-of-sample cross-sectional ZCAPM relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ in the previous 12-month estimation period (X-axis). A total of 25 size-B/M portfolios are sorted into B/M quintiles and then zeta risk $\hat{Z}_{i,a}^*$ quintiles within each B/M quintile. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018 143

Fig. 6.7	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 size-B/M sorted portfolios: Fama and French three-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	146
Fig. 6.8	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 size-B/M sorted plus 47 industry portfolios: Fama and French Fama and French three-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	147
Fig. 6.9	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 profit-investment sorted portfolios: Fama and French five-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	148
Fig. 6.10	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 profit-investment sorted plus 47 industry portfolios: Fama and French Fama and French five-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	149
Fig. 6.11	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 profit-investment sorted portfolios: Fama and French six-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	150

Fig. 6.12	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent (Y-axis) and average one-month-ahead predicted (fitted) excess returns in percent (X-axis) for 25 profit-investment sorted plus 47 industry portfolios: Fama and French Fama and French six-factor model in Panel A and empirical ZCAPM in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	151
Fig. 8.1	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent and average one-month-ahead predicted excess returns in percent for 25 size-momentum, 25 momentum, and 25 zeta risk portfolios: empirical ZCAPM in Panel A and Fama and French three-factor model in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2017	212
Fig. 8.2	Out-of-sample cross-sectional relationship between average one-month-ahead realized excess returns in percent and average one-month-ahead predicted excess returns in percent for 25 size-momentum, 25 momentum, and 25 zeta risk portfolios: Carhart four-factor model in Panel A and Fama and French five-factor model in Panel B. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2017	213
Fig. 9.1	A positive, linear relation is shown between average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns for 12 long/short zeta risk portfolios formed based on zeta coefficient estimates in the previous year. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	238
Fig. 9.2	A positive, linear relation is shown between average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for 12 long/short zeta risk portfolios. Visual comparisons can be made to the CRSP index as well as popular long/short multifactors size (<i>SMB</i>), value (<i>HML</i>), profit (<i>RMW</i>), capital investment (<i>CMA</i>), and momentum (<i>MOM</i>) from Kenneth French's website. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	239

Fig. 9.3	Frontier estimates are shown based on average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for aggregate portfolios with different levels of zeta risk. Aggregate portfolios are constructed by adding either the CRSP market index (denoted α) or the proxy minimum variance portfolio g to 12 long/short zeta risk portfolios. Visual comparisons can be made to the CRSP market index, portfolio g , and aggregate portfolios combining either the CRSP index or portfolio g with popular long/short multifactors size (SMB), value (HML), profit (RMW), capital investment (CMA), and momentum (MOM) from Kenneth French's website. The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2015	241
Fig. 9.4	Frontier estimates are shown based on average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for 24 long only zeta risk portfolios. Visual comparisons can be made to the CRSP market index and proxy minimum variance portfolio g . The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	246
Fig. 9.5	Frontier estimates are shown based on average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for 24 long only aggregate portfolios. These long aggregate portfolios are formed by investing 50% of funds in the CRSP market index and 50% of funds in 24 long zeta risk portfolios. Visual comparisons can be made to the CRSP market index and proxy minimum variance portfolio g . The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	247
Fig. 9.6	Frontier estimates are shown based on average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for 24 long only aggregate portfolios. These long aggregate portfolios are formed by investing 50% of funds in the proxy minimum variance portfolio g and 50% of funds in 24 long zeta risk portfolios. Visual comparisons can be made to the CRSP market index and proxy minimum variance portfolio g . The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018	250

- Fig. 9.7 The graph compares average one-month-ahead (out-of-sample) returns and the time-series standard deviation of these returns for: (1) aggregate portfolios comprised of the CRSP market index (denoted α) plus 12 long/short zeta risk portfolios, and (2) aggregate portfolios comprised of the CRSP market index (denoted α) plus 12 long/short beta risk portfolios based on sensitivity to the popular multifactors size (SMB), value (HML), and momentum (MOM). The analysis period is January 1965 to December 2018 252
- Fig. 10.1 This graph shows the average beta risk, zeta risk, and one-month-ahead returns for 25 beta-zeta sorted portfolios. These long only portfolios approximate the shape of an investment parabola. In each one-year estimation window, the empirical ZCAPM is estimated using daily returns for proxy g minimum variance portfolio in place of the CRSP market index. The analysis period is from January 1965 to December 2018 272
- Fig. 10.2 This graph illustrates the effects of beta and zeta risks in the theoretical ZCAPM on the investment parabola with short positions allowed. Here we assume that minimum variance portfolio G is used as the market index. Beta risk and zeta risk are based on expected G returns and the total return dispersion of individual stock returns in portfolio G , respectively. Zeta risk curves share a common vertex at portfolio G and plot from left to right in the graph. Zeta risk increases from the lower to upper boundaries of the parabola. Beta risk curves plot vertically and intersect zeta risk curves. Beta risk imparts an upward or downward slope to each zeta risk curve depending on if beta is greater or less than one. The latticework of interlocking beta risk and zeta risk curves determine the expected returns of stocks within the parabola. The CAPM market portfolio M can be reached via a tangent ray from the riskless rate R_f (only if the location of the parabola is known) or the combination of moving horizontally along the axis of symmetry of the parabola at the expected return R_G and then upward based on zeta risk associated with market return dispersion (which shapes the width of the parabola) as well as beta risk related to portfolio G 274

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1	Descriptive statistics for the analysis period January 1965 to December 2018	116
Table 5.2	Average out-of-sample, value-weighted monthly returns for 25 beta-zeta risk sorted portfolios in the period January 1965 to December 2018	118
Table 5.3	Average out-of-sample, equal-weighted monthly returns for 25 beta-zeta risk sorted portfolios in the period January 1965 to December 2018	119
Table 6.1	Out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional tests of the traditional model based on market and return dispersion (<i>RD</i>) factors in the period January 1965 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	134
Table 6.2	Time-series regression results for the CAPM and multifactor models in the period January 1965 to December 2018	153
Table 7.1	Out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional tests for ZCAPM regression factor loadings compared to other asset pricing models in the period January 1965 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	166
Table 7.2	Split subsample period results for out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional tests from January 1965 to December 1989: 12-month rolling windows	174
Table 7.3	Split subsample period results for out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional tests from January 1990 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	176

Table 7.4	Size group results for different asset pricing models using out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions in the period January 1965 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	178
Table 7.5	Profit and capital investment sorted results for different asset pricing models using out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions in the period January 1965 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	181
Table 7.6	Largest 500 common stocks' results by market capitalization for different asset pricing models using out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions in the period January 1965 to December 2018: 12-month rolling windows	183
Table 7.7	Comparisons of different asset pricing models based on out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions in the period January 1965 to December 2018: Robustness tests using out-of-sample rolling windows greater than one month	184
Table 7.8	Out-of-sample Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regressions for four-factor models proposed by Hou, Xue, and Zhang and Stambaugh and Yuan: 12-month rolling windows	187
Table 8.1	Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regression tests of momentum portfolios: January 1965 to December 2017	207
Table 8.2	Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regression tests of zeta risk portfolios: January 1965 to December 2017	210
Table 8.3	Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional regression tests of momentum and zeta risk portfolios: January 1965 to December 2017	211
Table 8.4	Descriptive return statistics for zero-investment momentum and return-dispersion portfolios	215
Table 8.5	Hybrid zero-investment portfolios formed by combining momentum and zeta risk strategies	216
Table 8.6	Risk-managed hybrid zero-investment portfolios formed by combining momentum and zeta risk strategies	217
Table 8.7	Time series OLS regression tests	218
Table 9.1	Construction details for long/short zeta risk portfolios	235
Table 9.2	Construction details for aggregate portfolios composed of the CRSP index plus long/short zeta risk portfolios	242
Table 9.3	Construction details for aggregate portfolios composed of the proxy minimum variance portfolio g plus long/short zeta risk portfolios	243

Table 9.4	Construction details for long only aggregate portfolios composed of the CRSP index plus long only zeta risk portfolios	248
Table 9.5	Construction details for long only aggregate portfolios composed of the proxy minimum variance portfolio g plus long only zeta risk portfolio	249

PART I

Introduction