



Dissecting anomalies and dynamic human capital: The global evidence

Rahul Roy, Santhakumar Shijin

► To cite this version:

Rahul Roy, Santhakumar Shijin. Dissecting anomalies and dynamic human capital: The global evidence. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 2018, 18, 1 (1), pp.1-32. 10.1016/j.bir.2017.08.005 . hal-01660135

HAL Id: hal-01660135

<https://hal.science/hal-01660135>

Submitted on 10 Dec 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Borsa İstanbul Review

Borsa İstanbul Review xx (2017) 1–32

<http://www.elsevier.com/journals/borsa-istanbul-review/2214-8450>

Full Length Article

Dissecting anomalies and dynamic human capital: The global evidence

Rahul Roy*, Santhakumar Shijin

Department of Commerce, SOM, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry, 605014, India

Received 27 April 2017; revised 25 July 2017; accepted 17 August 2017

Available online ■ ■ ■

Abstract

We argue that the risk of an asset is measured by the covariance of an asset's return with the return on the aggregate market and human capital. The intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM, along with an extended version of CAPM framework examines the excess return on Fama and French portfolios sorted on size- BE/ME and momentum across the economies. The frequently used priced factors in anomaly literature include, Fama and French factors, momentum, dividend yield, bond market factors, saving, along with aggregate market and human capital component. Using unique panel data sets of emerging and developed economies, the panel regression, IV-GMM with random effects and PCA, finds the aggregate market and human capital are the strongest predictors of asset returns across the economies. Furthermore, the aggregate market and saving are strong predictors of asset return in emerging economies, whereas aggregate market and human capital emerge the best predictors of asset return in developed economies. Interestingly, human capital subsumes the predictive ability of Fama and French factors and becomes redundant along with momentum, dividend yield, and bond market factors.

Copyright © 2017, Borsa İstanbul Anonim Şirketi. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

JEL classification: E21; G12; J24

Keywords: Anomalies; Asset pricing; CCAPM; Human capital; ICAPM; Random effects

1. Introduction

Asset pricing literature in financial economics advocates that the substantial portion of aggregate wealth is non-tradable assets, primarily human capital wealth. The intertemporal models built on time additive utility of consumption functions extensively model the asset return predictability. Rational investors maximize the expected utility of their lifetime consumption to form the optimal portfolio. Owing to the investment opportunities in tradable assets, such as stocks and bonds, part of their wealth is tied in the form of non-tradable assets. Certainly, the human capital component owns the major chunk of wealth for almost entire investors. [Heaton and Lucas \(2000\)](#) and [Lustig, Nieuwerburgh, and Verdelhan \(2013\)](#) found

that the human capital component owes approximately 90% of the aggregate wealth, whereas only 10% consists of capitalized financial assets.

The asset pricing literature has witnessed the series of anomalies posing challenge to the capital asset pricing model (CAPM) to price the variation in return predictability. [Harvey, Liu, and Zhu \(2016\)](#) identified 316 factors and [Hou, Xue, and Zhang \(2015\)](#) traced 80 firm level anomalies are instrumental in explaining the expected stock returns. The role of value and size factors of [Fama and French \(1993\)](#) in asset return predictability is well established in anomalies literature and evident equally in developed and emerging economies. Successively, [Jegadeesh and Titman \(1993\)](#) introduced momentum strategy based on the prediction from three to twelve months past returns. [Griffin, Ji, and Martin \(2003\)](#) extend the momentum strategy across many economies to provide the international evidence. [Carhart \(1997\)](#) argues that the sensitivity towards momentum strategy is priced separately from the risk factors of [Fama and French \(1993\)](#). Lately, [Kim, Kim, and](#)

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: rahulroy819@gmail.com, [\(R. Roy\)](mailto:rroypu.res@pondiuni.edu.in), shijin.s@gmail.com, [\(S. Shijin\)](mailto:shijin.com@pondiuni.edu.in).

Peer review under responsibility of Borsa İstanbul Anonim Şirketi.

Min (2011) opine that the revisions in future labor income dethrone the predictability of FF (Fama and French) value and size factors in U.S. Campbell (1996) attribute that the presence of human capital component along with aggregate market factor enhances the stock return predictability. Moreover, the fact that both the aggregate market and human capital captures the variability in return is economically justifiable in developed economies. However, there exists little empirical evidence in emerging economies, whether the dynamics in aggregate market factor and human capital component perform such a function to measure the variability in return predictability.

Building on the theoretical assumption Campbell (1996), measures the risk of an asset by the covariance of asset's return with the return on the aggregate market and human capital wealth. The present study has the wider scope since primarily it examines the excess returns of the assets by its covariance with the returns on the aggregate market and human capital component in developed and emerging economies. The value weighted index proxies the aggregate market while to proxy the human capital component we construct dual aggregates and one firm-level measure. The labor income growth rate (herewith LBR) and the wealth-to-consumption ratio (herewith WCR) represents aggregate, and Hansson Index (HI) signify firm level measurement of the human capital component. The intertemporal capital asset pricing (ICAPM) framework of Campbell (1993) was built on aggregate market factor along with the innovation in market return which proxies news about the future market return to assess the risk premium. However, we introduce saving in asset pricing framework as the proxy for expected future labor income growth that measures the innovation in the human capital component. By doing so the economic significance is that the representative agents save for the rainy day and thus saving must be the best predictor of declines in labor income (Deaton, 1992). We argue that the representative agents in emerging economies comparatively save today more than the agents do in developed economies to smooth their future consumption. In this regard, it is expected that saving should play an important role to capture the variability in asset return predictability in emerging economies. Primarily, we establish an ICAPM framework, consisting of the time variant component representing the present value of labor income growth, for testing the presumptions developed in the study. Alternatively, we employ the consumption-based CAPM, where the risk premium is measured by the asset's return with the covariance of returns on the aggregate market and wages-to-consumption ratio that proxy human capital component.

The size and value strategies occasionally relate to the human capital component in the asset pricing literature and proclaim that the dynamics in human capital component subsumes the predictive power of size and value effects (Kim et al., 2011). Campbell (1996) proposed adding FF factors in his intertemporal framework would be interesting. With this virtue, we introduce the size and value strategies along with the momentum strategy in an ICAPM and CCAPM framework by controlling the effects of dividend yield, term spread, and

the relative Treasury bill. We employ twelve sets of portfolios formed at the intersection of size-BE/ME and size-momentum return as test assets to examine empirically the proposition developed in the study. We used three sets of panel data of emerging and developed economies and the Aggregate in the ICAPM and CCAPM framework to quantify the presumptions developed in the study. To the best of our knowledge, the present study is first of its kind to quantify the presumptions by employing panel data sets in an intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM framework. Moreover, testing the crafted presumptions of the study in the intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM framework on country-specific data sets requires the country-specific component to be time variant. Thus, we rely on the panel data regression methodology with random and fixed effects. Further to deal with the endogeneity and derive the required parameters of interest in line with the objectivity of the study, we employ the instrumental variable-generalized method of moments (IV-GMM) and principal component analysis.

The Hausman's specification test accepts the null hypothesis that the panel regression with random effect better estimates the parameters of interest and the preliminary result show that ICAPM fits the data better than CCAPM. Further, the result is persistent in most of the FF portfolios across the emerging and developed economies. The estimation results show that both the aggregate market and human capital component are strong predictors of return on FF portfolios in developed economies. Interestingly, on the contrary, the aggregate market along with saving appears strong predictor of return on FF portfolios in the emerging economies. The IV-GMM result reveals that the FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill are instrumental in capturing the variations in return predictability of FF portfolios for both emerging and developed economies. Our major contribution includes the methodological approach we used to fit the country-specific data that handles the statistical issues diligently in the ICAPM and CCAPM framework in line with the economic relationship built in the study. Moreover, it is empirically confirmed that the presence of the human capital component in the asset pricing framework subsequently absorb the predictive ability of FF factors, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill, and becomes redundant. Furthermore, the aggregate market and the human capital priced the risk of FF portfolios in developed economies are well known in the asset pricing literature. Though the most intriguing finding indicates that the aggregate market along with the innovation in the human capital component, i.e., present value of future labor income, price the risk of the FF portfolios in emerging economies. The core findings that, the country-specific dimensions drive the priced factors in determining asset return predictability further deepened our understanding.

2. Data and variable definitions

The study uses three sets of panel data to test the proposition in an intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM

framework. These are the monthly panel datasets of emerging and developed economies, and the monthly data set representing the Aggregate is an aggregation of all the economies. The country classification specification and its groupings reported in Table 1. Table 2 represents the variable definitions and the information related to its construction, which includes aggregate market, FF factors, momentum, term spread, relative Treasury bill and the FF portfolios. Table 1 shows the formation of human capital proxies at an aggregate level whereas the Hansson Index that proxy the firm level human capital component are discussed in successive section.

2.1. Valuation of the firm-based human capital component

We followed Hansson (2004) literature for computing the firm-based measure of the human capital component. The changes in the average wage and salaries weighted against the amount paid by the firm of the respective economy be expressed as

$$R_{jt}^{HC} = \frac{\sum W(i, t) \times \Delta \bar{W}(i, t+1)}{\sum W(i, t)}$$

Where, R_{jt}^{HC} is the return on human capital for the economy j at the month t , $\Delta \bar{W}(i, t+1) = \frac{\bar{W}(t+1) - \bar{W}(t)}{\bar{W}(t)}$, \bar{W} is the total wages paid divided by the number of employees, $\Delta \bar{W}$ is the average wage change in the firm i at the time $(t+1)$ and W is the total wages paid by the firm at the month t . The return on human capital thus changes in individual return ($\Delta \bar{W}$) weighted against the cost of the firm (W). The salaries and wages and the number of employee components retrieved from the firms registered with the stock exchanges of the

Table 1
Economy groupings.¹

Sl. No.	Country Code ²	Emerging economies	Developed economies	Aggregate	Global economies
1	CAN		Canada	Canada	Canada
2	FRA		France	France	France
3	DEU		Germany	Germany	Germany
4	HKG		Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Hong Kong
5	JPN		Japan	Japan	Japan
6	KOR		South Korea	South Korea	South Korea
7	CHE		Switzerland	Switzerland	Switzerland
8	GBR		United Kingdom	United Kingdom	United Kingdom
9	U.S.		United States	United States	United States
10	BRA	Brazil		Brazil	Brazil
11	CHN	China		China	China
12	IND	India		India	India
13	GBL				Global ³

Note: ¹ The economy(s) are grouped into four categories, namely, Emerging, developed, the Aggregate, and global economies, following IMF (2016) Country Data Documentation. ² The Country Code is obtained from IMF (2016) Country Data Documentation. ³ Global economy represents the data pooled from Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, UK, Greece, Hong Kong, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden, Singapore, and the U.S.

respective economy. The Augmented-Dickey-Fuller and Phillips-Perron test of stationarity been performed on all the variables in the framework and subsequently follows IID at levels. However, saving, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill follows IID at first difference.

Table 3 reports the data specifications of the variables that comprise data source, sample period, and data frequency. The data expressed in terms of the country-specific currency unit.

3. Econometric methodology

The primary presumption developed in the study is that the determining factors to measure the risk of an asset are the aggregate market and human capital component. However, the nexus among market risk factor and human capital gain prominence with strong empirical evidence in the U.S. Moreover, little empirical evidence exists in the rest of the developed economies whereas no evidence in the case of emerging economies. The study relies on intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM framework to test the risk and return relationship in the presence of pricing factors, namely, aggregate market, human capital component, and innovations, FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill. The pricing factors in determining the risk of an asset depends on the country-specific dynamicity, thus we expect the better result when the country-specific component is time varying. In line with the objective of the study, we expect the parameter estimates derived from panel regression with random effects incur better result than the parameter estimates from panel regression with fixed effects. We use three broad longitudinal datasets of emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate. McMillan (2013) and Racicot and Rentz (2017) used the country-specific panel regression in an asset-pricing framework to quantify the risk and return relationship. To estimate the parameter of interests the panel regression can take the form

$$y_{it} = X'_{it}\beta + Z'_i\alpha + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

There are K regressors in x_{it} , excluding constant term. The individual effect is $Z'_i\alpha$, where Z'_i contains a constant term and a set of individual or group specific variables either observable or unobservable are assumed to be constant over time t . If z_i is observed for all individuals, the whole model can be expressed as an ordinary linear model through least squares. Alternatively, rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} r_{it}^{FF P/folio} = & (R_m - R_f)_{it}\beta_1 + HC_{it}\beta_2 + \Delta SAV_{it}\beta_3 + HML_{it}\beta_4 \\ & + SMB_{it}\beta_5 + WML_{it}\beta_6 + DIV_{it}\beta_7 + TRM_{it}\beta_8 \\ & + RTB_{it}\beta_9 + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

where $r_{it}^{FF P/folio}$ is the return on FF portfolios, SL, SM, SH, BL, BM, BH, SLo, SNe, SWi, BLo, BNe, and BWi of the economy i at the month t . $R_m - R_f$, HC, HML, SMB, WML, DIV, TRM, and RTB are the excess return, human capital, the return on-value, size, momentum, dividend yield, the term

Table 2
Variable definitions.

Variable code	Variable	Variable definition
Formation of factors		
R _m -R _f	Aggregate market	The excess return on the equity aggregate market over 91 Days Treasury bill rate
SMB	Small Minus Big	Small minus Big, mimic the risk factor related to size
HML	High Minus Low	High minus Low, captures the risk factor related to book-to-market equity
WML	Winners Minus Losers	Winners minus Losers, proxy the risk factor related to momentum returns or known as momentum
DIV	Dividend yield	The dividend yield is measured by taking the one-year moving average of dividends divided by the closing stock price
TRM	Term Spread	Term spread of interest rates is the difference between ten-year and one-year government bonds
RTB	Relative Treasury Bill	Relative Treasury bill is measured as the difference between 91 days Treasury bill and its one-year moving average
LBR	Labor income growth rate	Aggregate of salaries and wages component from earnings report of the firms listed on the stock exchange of the respective economy
WCR	Wealth-to-Consumption Ratio	Dividing wages with the consumption of consumer goods, includes both durables and non-durables. The consumption data are collected from Bloomberg database for the respective economy
HI	Hansson Index	Firm-specific wage growth rate is calculated following Hansson (2004)
Formation of portfolios, FF's factors, and momentum		
SL	Small/Low	The portfolios are the intersections of two portfolios formed on size (Market equity; ME) and three portfolios formed on the book-to-market equity ratio (BE/ME). The ME breakpoint for year (t) is the median of market equity Index for developed economies whereas 10th percentile of market equity Index for emerging economies is at the end of June year (t). BE/ME for year (t) is the BE for the last fiscal year end in t-1 divided by ME for December t-1. The BE/ME breakpoints are the 30th and 70th Equity Index percentiles for developed and emerging economies respectively. Accordingly following Fama and French (1993) for developed and Agarwalla, Jacob, and Varma (2014) for emerging economies, the six portfolios namely, SL, SM, SH, BL, BM, and BH are formed based on the size and BE/ME.
SM	Small/Medium	The portfolios are the intersections of two portfolios formed on size (Market equity; ME) and three portfolios formed on momentum (2-12) return. The ME breakpoint is the median market equity Index for developed economies whereas 10th percentile of market equity Index for emerging economies. The momentum (2-12) return breakpoints are the 30th and 70th Equity Index percentiles for both developed and emerging economies. Following Fama and French (2012) literature the six portfolios namely, SLo, SNe, SWi, BLo, BNe, and BWi are formed based on size and momentum returns for both developed and emerging economies.
SH	Small/High	
BL	Big/Low	
BM	Big/Medium	
BH	Big/High	
SLo	Small/Loser	
SNe	Small/Neutral	
SWi	Small/Winner	
BLo	Big/Loser	
BNe	Big/Neutral	
BWi	Big/Winner	
SMB	Small Minus Big	SMB is the difference between the average returns on the three small-stock portfolios (SL, SM, and SH) and the average returns on the three big-stock portfolios (BL, BM, and BH)
HML	High Minus Low	HML is the difference between the average returns on the two value portfolios (SH and BH) and the average returns on the two growth portfolios (SL and BL)
WML	Winners Minus Losers	WML is the difference between the average returns on the two high momentum return portfolios (SWi and BWi) and the average returns on the two low momentum return portfolios (SLo and BLo)

Notes: ¹ The major stock index of the respective economy is used as the aggregate market proxy. ² The relative stock market indexes of the respective economy used for the construction of FF's portfolios and factors including momentum. ³ The detailed specification relating to the stock index used for aggregate market proxy and FF's portfolio and factors construction made available upon request. ⁴ Human capital denotes with HC.

spread, and the relative Treasury bill respectively, of the economy i at the month t , and ϵ_{it} is the white noise process.

If z_i consists of a constant term, then ordinary least squares (OLS) fetches, consistent and efficient estimates of the common α and the slope vector β .

3.1. Fixed effects

If z_i is unobserved, conversely correlated with x_{it} , then the least squares estimator of β is biased and inconsistent. However, in this case, the model takes form

$$y_{it} = X'_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha_i = Z'_i\alpha$, represents all the observable effects identified as an estimable conditional mean. This fixed effects method takes α_i to be group specific constant term in the regression model. The term ‘fixed’ used here denotes that the term is time invariant, albeit it is non-stochastic. Concurrently, rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} r_{it}^{FF P/folio} = & (R_m - R_f)_{it}\beta_1 + HC_{it}\beta_2 + \Delta SAV_{it}\beta_3 + HML_{it}\beta_4 \\ & + SMB_{it}\beta_5 + WML_{it}\beta_6 + DIV_{it}\beta_7 + TRM_{it}\beta_8 \\ & + RTB_{it}\beta_9 + \alpha_i + \epsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

whereas, α_i is the country (economy) specific idiosyncratic effect for the economy i .

Table 3
Data specification.

Sl. No.	Economy	FF portfolios SL, SM, SH, BL, BM, BH	Variables				Sample period	Data frequency
			R _m -R _f	SMB	HML	WML		
<i>Data source</i>								
1	CAN	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
2	FRA	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
3	DEU	<i>Siehle (2015)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Siehle (2015)</i>	<i>Siehle (2015)</i>	<i>Siehle (2015)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
4	HKG	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
5	JPN	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
6	KOR	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
7	CHE	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
8	GBR	<i>Gregory, Tharyan, and Christidis (2013)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Gregory et al. (2013)</i>	<i>Gregory et al. (2013)</i>	<i>Gregory et al. (2013)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
9	U.S.	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
10	BRA	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
11	CHN	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Marmi (2012)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
12	IND	<i>Agarwalla et al. (2014)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>Agarwalla et al. (2014)</i>	<i>Agarwalla et al. (2014)</i>	<i>Agarwalla et al. (2014)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>
13	GBL	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>French (2016)</i>	<i>Datasream</i>	<i>Bloomberg</i>

Notes: ¹ Datasream -Thomson Reuters Database, ² Data Source indicates with an Italic face.

3.2. Random effects

If the unobserved idiosyncratic heterogeneity is uncorrelated with the included regressors, then the model may take the form

$$y_{it} = X'_{it}\beta + \alpha + u_i + \varepsilon_{it}. \quad (3)$$

This random effect denotes that u_i is a group-specific random element, identical to ε_{it} . Concurrently rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} r_{it}^{FFP/folio} &= (R_m - R_f)_{it}\beta_1 + HC_{it}\beta_2 + \Delta SAV_{it}\beta_3 + HML_{it}\beta_4 \\ &\quad + SMB_{it}\beta_5 + WML_{it}\beta_6 + DIV_{it}\beta_7 + TRM_{it}\beta_8 \\ &\quad + RTB_{it}\beta_9 + \alpha + u_i + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Hausman's specification test for the random effects model

The specification test coined by [Hausman \(1978\)](#) is employed to test for orthogonality of the random effects and the predictors. The test revolves on the assumption that ordinary least square (OLS) in the least square dummy variable (LSDV) model and generalized least square (GLS) are consistent, but OLS is inefficient, while under the alternative hypothesis, OLS is consistent, but GLS is not. Therefore, under the null hypothesis, the two estimates should not differ systematically, and a test can rely on the difference. Further, the important component of the test is the covariance of the difference vector, $[b - \hat{\beta}]$:

$$Var[b - \hat{\beta}] = Var[b] + Var[\hat{\beta}] - Cov[b, \hat{\beta}] - Cov[b, \hat{\beta}] \quad (4)$$

Hausman test implies

$$Cov[(b, \hat{\beta}), \hat{\beta}] = Cov[b, \hat{\beta}] - Var[\hat{\beta}] = 0$$

or that

$$Cov[b, \hat{\beta}] = Var[\hat{\beta}]$$

Substituting this result in (4) yields the required covariance matrix for the test,

$$Var[b - \hat{\beta}] = Var[b] + Var[\hat{\beta}] = \Psi \quad (5)$$

The χ^2 test is based on the Wald criterion:

$$W = \chi^2[K - 1] = [b - \hat{\beta}]'\Psi^{-1}[b - \hat{\beta}] \quad (6)$$

For $\hat{\Psi}$, the estimated covariance matrices of the slope estimator is used in the LSDV model, excluding the constant term. Under the null hypothesis, W has limiting χ^2 distribution with $K-1$ degrees of freedom.

3.4. IV-GMM (Instrumental Variable-Generalized Method of Moments) estimators

The difference in the viewpoint in the asset pricing literature indicates that the pricing factor determines the risk of an asset varies from country-to-country. The parameter estimators of panel regression with random and fixed effects may cause the error in variables and orthogonality issues (Griliches & Hausman, 1986). Hence, to overcome these issues we further employ generalized methods of moments (GMM) with instrumental variables. Hence, following the presumptions developed in the study that the aggregate market and human capital component priced the risk of an asset in developed economies whereas aggregate market and innovations in human capital component price the risk of an asset in emerging economies. Moreover, we argue that FF factors, momentum, term spread, and relative Treasury bill may be instrumental in enhancing the asset return predictability. With this motivation, we closely follow and modify Griliches and Hausman (1986) so as to derive the parameter of interests. Griliches-Hausman specifies a static linear model,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= \xi_{it}\beta + \alpha_i + \eta_{it}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T; i = 1, \dots, N, \\ X_{it} &= \xi_{it} + v_{it}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where β is a parameter of interest, y_{it} is the t th observed the response from the i th individual, ξ_{it} is an observed covariate associated with y_{it} , η_{it} is a regression error, x_{it} is an observed proxy for ξ_{it} with unobserved measurement error v_{it} and α_i is an unobserved individual fixed effect or random effect that may be correlated with ξ_{it} .

For each i , $y_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iT})'$, $X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{iT})'$, $\xi_i = (\xi_{i1}, \dots, \xi_{iT})'$, $\eta_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iT})'$, and $v_i = (v_{i1}, \dots, v_{iT})'$. The covariance matrix of $(\xi_i', \eta_i', v_i')'$ is a block diagonal matrix with three $T \times T$ diagonal blocks, which are the covariance matrices of ξ_i , η_i , and v_i . Replacing ξ_{it} by $x_i - y_i$ in (7), yield.

$$y_i = X_i\beta + l_T\alpha_i + \epsilon_i \quad (8)$$

where $\epsilon_i = \eta_i - v_i\beta$ and l_T is the $T \times 1$ vector of ones. To yield the consistent estimators, need to identify a set of instrumental variables estimators of the form

$$\widehat{\beta}_P = (w'X)^{-1}w'y, \quad w = (I_N \otimes P)X,$$

whereas I_N is the identity matrix of order N , x is the stacked column vector of all X_i 's, \otimes is the Kronecker product (Abadir & Magnus, 2005), and P is a $T \times T$ deterministically known matrix.

The moment conditions associated with P_1, \dots, P_K are

$$E[X'_i P'_k (y_i - X_i\beta)] = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Because $X'_i P'_k (y_i - X_i\beta) = \text{vec}(P_k)' [X_i \otimes (y_i - X_i\beta)]$ for each k , these equations can be written as

$$HE[X_i \otimes (y_i - X_i\beta)] = 0, \quad (9)$$

Where $H = [\text{vec}(P_1), \dots, \text{vec}(P_K)]'$. Since P_1, \dots, P_K are linearly independent, H is a matrix of full rank and the system of orthogonality conditions in (9). The efficient two-step GMM estimator can yield form (9). Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= H(X_i \otimes y_i), \quad B_i = H[X_i \otimes X_i], \quad \bar{A} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N A_i, \\ \bar{B} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N B_i \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

A typical consistent first-step GMM estimator is the unweighted GMM estimator where W is taken as the identity matrix:

$$\widehat{\beta}_{GMM1} = (\bar{B}' \bar{B})^{-1} \bar{B}' \bar{A}$$

Under assumption A, the matrix

$$\Gamma = E[(A_i - B_i\beta)(A_i - B_i\beta)'] \quad (11)$$

is well-defined and does not depend on i . In terms of the asymptotic variance, $W = \Gamma^{-1}$, if it is known, is the optimal weighting matrix. Since Γ^{-1} is unknown, replace it by a consistent estimator

$$W = \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (A_i - B_i\beta_{GMM1})(A_i - B_i\beta_{GMM1})' \right]^{-1} \quad (12)$$

A two-step GMM estimator is then

$$\widehat{\beta}_{GMM2} = (\bar{B}' W \bar{B})^{-1} \bar{B}' W \bar{A}. \quad (13)$$

Griliches-Hausman stated optimally weighting a complete set of instrumental variable estimates, do not provide an explicit weighting form. By defining the weighted instrumental variable estimator

$$\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) = \lambda_1 \widehat{\beta}P_1 + \dots + \lambda_K \widehat{\beta}P_K. \quad (14)$$

Since $\widehat{\beta}P_1, \dots, \widehat{\beta}P_K$ are consistent for β , $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) = \lambda_1 \widehat{\beta}P_1 + \dots + \lambda_K \widehat{\beta}P_K$ is consistent for β . The following result shows for to find an optimally weighted instrumental estimator.

Under Griliches-Hausman's approach, the country specific effect α_i under the model (7) is considered as bothersome effect, albeit under some assumptions its effect can be estimated. For instance, if the α_i 's are IID random effect, which is the matter of interest for the present study, then consistent estimator of $E(\alpha_i)$ (as $N \rightarrow \infty$) is $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \widehat{\alpha}_i$, where $\widehat{\alpha}_i = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (y_{it} - X_{it}\widehat{\beta}_{GMM2})$, $i = 1, \dots, N$.

3.5. Principal component analysis (PCA)

Successively principal component analysis been employed to calibrate the robustness of the priced factors determining

the risk of an asset. It dealt with the orthogonality issue. PCA as a linear combination of principal components, form

$$X_i = w_{i1}p_1 + w_{i2}p_2 + \dots + w_{ik}p_k \quad (15)$$

where X_i is the principal components, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k are the i^{th} variable in the k^{th} month, w_i is the factor loadings, and can be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{aligned} X_i &= w_k(Rm - Rf)_k + w_kHC_k + w_k\Delta SAV_k + w_kHML_k \\ &\quad + w_kSMB_k + w_kWML_k + w_kDIV_k + w_kTRM_k + w_kRTB_k \end{aligned}$$

4. Empirics

Table A1 reports the summary statistics of FF portfolios, aggregate market, FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, relative Treasury bill, and human capital components. The economic relationship that the average returns on value stocks outgrowths the average returns on growth stocks are well established in the asset pricing literature (Hansson, 2004) for developed economies. Identical results are witnessed in **Table A1** for developed economies. Contrarily, the average return on growth stocks (SL and BL) outweighs the average return on value stocks (SH and BH) in emerging economies. **Table A1** reports that the small firms incur higher average return than bigger firms in emerging and developed economies, the Aggregate, and global are consistent with Roll (1981). The notion that the average return on winner portfolio sorted on size and momentum strategies outperform the average return on a loser portfolio (Jegadeesh & Titman, 1993) is consistent with the result in **Table A1**. Hence, it is evident that the average returns on winner stocks (SWi and BWi) outclass the average returns on losers stocks in emerging and developed economies, the Aggregate, and global. **Table A1** indicates that the average return on the aggregate market ($R_m - R_f$) and volatility in emerging economies are relatively higher than the developed economies, the Aggregate, and global. The stocks characterizing value, size, and momentum strategies incur higher average returns in emerging economies than the developed economies, Aggregate, and global evident in **Table A1**. The value, size, and momentum patterns in average returns are highly persistent in emerging economies relative to developed economies, albeit the magnitude of average returns is quite high in emerging economies. Firms operating in the emerging economies announce very low dividends and retains the major portion of earnings to meet the frequent financial requirements because of diversification as shown in **Table A1**. Thus, the firms in emerging economies yield relatively lower average dividend per share than the firms in developed economies, Aggregate, and global.

The average term spread of interest rates (TRM) in government bond is higher in emerging economies because of its vulnerability to default risk than in developed economies (Neumeyer & Perri, 2005) reported in **Table A1**. The average return of relative Treasury bill (RTB) is positive in emerging economies whereas negative in developed economies may be

due to the distinct governing monetary policies of the respective economies to regulate economic operations. The average wage growth (HI) in emerging economies is comparatively lower than the developed economies shown in **Table 4**. The labor force engaged by the firms in developed economies is mostly highly skilled with expertise in their respective fields. Hence, the labor force vested with bargaining power to fix rents on human capital and witness high average wage growth in developed economies. On the contrary, firms in emerging economies are labor-intensive experiencing lower wage increment. Moreover, the greater engagement of labor force tends to witness higher labor income at an aggregate level. **Table A1** shows the similar evidence that the average labor income (LBR) in emerging economies outclasses the average labor income in developed economies at an aggregate level. The similar evidence of LBR are witnessed in the average wages-to-consumption ratio.

Panel A, B, C, and D of **Table A2** reports the result of correlation and covariance coefficients among the variables in emerging and developed, the Aggregate, and global respectively. **Table A2** evidenced approximately an average correlation of 86.283, 80.891, 81.833, and 83.908 between the FF portfolios sorted on size-BE/ME, size-momentum returns and aggregate market, in emerging and developed economies, the Aggregate, and global respectively. Value strategy (HML) negatively correlates with FF portfolios in emerging economies whereas positively in developed economies shown in panel A and B of **Table A2**. The size (SMB) positively correlates with the small and big stocks in emerging economies. Conversely, the size is positively correlated with small stocks and negatively with big stocks in developed economies as in panel A, B, C, and D of **Table A2**. The momentum strategy is positively correlated with the aggressive stocks (SWi and BWi) whereas negatively correlated with the defensive stocks (SNe and BNe) in emerging and developed economies, the Aggregate, and global as is evident in panel A, B, C, and D, respectively of **Table A2**. The dividend yield is positively correlated with FF portfolios in emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate, whereas negatively correlated for global as shown in panel A, B, C, and D of **Table A2**, respectively.

Term spread (positively) and relative Treasury bill (negatively) correlated with FF portfolios. The magnitude of the correlation is very low implying the impact of the bond market in determining the return on FF portfolios are very less. The average wage growth and average return on FF portfolios are negatively correlated in emerging economies whereas positively correlated in developed economies. The WCR negatively correlates with FF portfolios in emerging and developed economies, the Aggregate and global as shown in panel A, B, C, and D of **Table A2**, respectively. The aggregate market witnessed negative correlation with HI and LBR in emerging economies whereas positive in developed economies. Concurrently, the aggregate market is negatively correlated with WCR for all the classifications as reported in panel A, B, C, and D of **Table A2**. The result is consistent with Lustig and Van Nieuwerburgh (2008). The LBR and WCR are positively

correlated whereas HI is negatively correlated with value strategy as reported in panel A, B, C, and D of [Table A2](#). The size strategy is negatively correlated with HI, LBR, and WCR in emerging economies whereas positively correlated in developed economies, the Aggregate, and global economies as evident in panel A, B, C, and D of [Table A2](#). Further, the momentum strategy is positively correlated with human capital proxies for all classifications as reported in panel A, B, C, and D of [Table A2](#).

5. Result

5.1. Dynamics of the factors

Panel A, B, and C of [Table 4](#) summarizes the dynamic behavior of the priced factors. [Table 4](#) reports the coefficients of the panel regression with fixed and random effects estimated monthly. The coefficients are estimated following Equation (3). We report and discuss the results obtained from panel regression with random effect since the Hausman's specification test confirms estimates with random effects generates robust results than the result obtained from fixed effects estimates. Panel A of [Table 4](#) reports the coefficient estimates of the priced factors on FF portfolios sorted on size-BE/ME and size-momentum return with the human capital proxy LBR in the ICAPM framework for emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate. The $R_m - R_f$ (aggregate market), SAV (saving), and SMB (size) significantly priced the small stocks (SL, SM, SH, SLo, SNe, SWi) in emerging economies with the sizeable average R^2 (coefficient of variation) of 86%. Conversely, the $R_m - R_f$, SAV, and HML significantly priced the growth stocks (BL, BM, BH, BLo, BNe, BHi) with the average R^2 of 70%. Moreover, the magnitude of the coefficient estimate on SAV for FF portfolios is comparatively higher (twice) than the coefficient estimate on $R_m - R_f$. Further, the second section in Panel A indicates the $R_m - R_f$, LBR (labor income), and SMB significantly priced the small stocks with the average R^2 of 92% in developed economies. The third section of Panel A reports $R_m - R_f$ and LBR significantly price the utmost of the FF portfolios with the average R^2 of 86% in the Aggregate. The results intuitively indicates that the representative agents in emerging economies comparatively tend to save more today by cutting their current consumption, to smoothen the future consumption, than the representative agents do in developed economies.

Panel B of [Table 4](#) reports the coefficient estimates of panel regression with random effects of FF portfolios with WCR proxy human capital in consumption-based CAPM framework. Panel B shows $R_m - R_f$, SAV, and SMB significantly priced the small stocks with an average R^2 of 86% in emerging economies whereas $R_m - R_f$ and WCR (wealth-to-consumption ratio) significantly priced the utmost FF portfolios with an average R^2 of 84% in developed economies. Further, $R_m - R_f$ and WCR significantly priced FF portfolios with an average R^2 of 53% in the Aggregate. Panel C reports the result of panel

regression estimates with random effects of FF portfolios with HI as an aggregate level proxy of the human capital component. The $R_m - R_f$, SAV, and SMB significantly priced the excess return on small stocks with the average R^2 of 97% in emerging economies whereas $R_m - R_f$ and HI significantly priced the big stocks with an average R^2 of 90% in developed economies. Moreover, $R_m - R_f$ and HI significantly priced the FF portfolios with an average R^2 of 63% in the Aggregate. [Tables A4.1–A4.3](#) in Appendices reports the detailed results of panel regression with fixed and random effects.

The results obtained from the panel regression with random effects for emerging, and developed economies, and the Aggregate, reflects similar pattern as in the pooled OLS estimates. Further, it quantify the presumption that aggregate market and the human capital component are the strong predictors of FF portfolios. [Tables A3.1–A3.3](#) in appendices report the detailed results of panel regression estimates of FF portfolios in an intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM for all classifications. The priced factors considered are the aggregate market, FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill, and human capital component. [Table A3.1](#) show the comprehensive results of ICAPM framework, where the aggregate market along with saving in emerging economies, and aggregate market and labor income growth in developed economies predominantly price the risk of the FF portfolios. In line with the findings observed in an intertemporal framework, [Table A3.2](#) represents the identical results in emerging and developed economies in the CCAPM framework, where the WCR proxy human capital component. Though the CCAPM results occasionally suffered from the power loss function, hence the ICAPM results comparatively show more persistence in FF portfolio return predictability. [Table A3.3](#) reports the result of the extended version of the CAPM with Hansson Index that proxy the human capital component.

5.2. Expected future labor income and human capital

Owing to the result from the previous section, savings represent the state variable for the expected future labor income along with an aggregate market, predominantly price the risk of the FF portfolios in emerging economies. Although aggregate market and human capital component mostly price the risk of FF portfolios in developed economies. We further test the orthogonality of predominant variable, aggregate market, saving, and human capital component employing IV-GMM. The anomaly literature, evidence that the FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and the relative Treasury bill may be instrumental in enhancing the FF portfolios return predictability. Thus, we used these factors as instrumental variables in panel IV-GMM estimates where the country-specific component is time varying. We implement this framework using the panel data sets of emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate following Equations (7)–(14). Panel A of [Table 5](#) shows the result of IV-GMM

BNe	—	—	—	—	—	1.088*** (19.463)	0.237** (2.383)	0.000	1.000	81.497*** (34.838)	0.956*** (2.665)	0.460*** (2.665)	0.000	1.000	13.519** (22.688***)					
BWi	0.916*** (0.036)	−77.536*** (0.963)	0.036	0.963	16.684*** (−2.969)	−0.390*** (−2.986)	−0.700*** (−2.986)	0.000	1.000	7.035 (19.098)	1.200*** (−4.957)	−1.884*** (−4.957)	0.000	1.000	22.688***					
Panel C: IV-GMM estimates with HI																				
FF Portfolios																				
	Emerging economies				Developed economies				Aggregate				Global economies							
	$R_m - R_f$	SAV	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{C-S}$	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{\text{Idiosyncratic}}$	J-statistics	$R_m - R_f$	HI	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{C-S}$	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{\text{Idiosyncratic}}$	J-statistics	$R_m - R_f$	HI	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{C-S}$	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{\text{Idiosyncratic}}$	J-statistics	$R_m - R_f$	HI	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{C-S}$	$\rho_{\text{random}}^{\text{Idiosyncratic}}$	J-statistics
SL	1.328*** (5.531)	102.247** (2.505)	0.0007	0.999	26.969*** (6.992)	1.246*** (3.774)	1.526*** (3.774)	0.000	1.000	76.212*** (4.281)	2.824*** (−1.544)	−1.251 (−1.544)	0.223	0.776 (1.234)	243.198*** (0.952)	0.544	1.095 (0.952)	0.000	1.000	273.087***
SM	1.235*** (5.121)	5.121*** (2.826)	0.0007	0.999	15.004*** (4.625)	1.083*** (0.531)	2.019*** (0.531)	0.000	1.000	34.936*** (6.229)	3.850*** (−0.600)	−0.336 (−0.600)	0.160	0.839 (2.250)	224.941*** (0.388)	0.859** (0.388)	0.386 (0.388)	0.000	1.000	465.193***
SH	1.076*** (3.693)	154.119*** (3.112)	0.007	0.999	12.766** (2.933)	0.893*** (3.929)	2.715*** (3.929)	0.000	1.000	16.921*** (6.856)	4.042*** (0.302)	0.126 (0.302)	0.120	0.879 (2.393)	197.211*** (0.420)	0.967** (0.420)	0.422 (0.420)	0.000	1.000	414.410***
BL	0.914*** (5.386)	−19.585 (−0.679)	0.0007	0.999	12.762** (17.579)	1.045*** (−0.417)	−0.084 (−0.417)	0.025	0.974	6.065 (5.025)	3.474*** (−3.684)	−0.606*** (−3.684)	0.003	0.996 (10.490)	13.489** (−3.124)	1.094*** (−3.124)	−0.849*** (−3.124)	0.000	1.000	10.044*
BM	1.143*** (11.458)	15.481 (0.913)	0.0007	0.999	7.021 (7.573)	0.955*** (0.409)	0.117 (0.409)	0.000	1.000	99.386*** (5.556)	2.937*** (−4.028)	−0.502*** (−4.028)	0.000	1.000 (15.341)	21.818*** (−3.832)	1.224*** (−3.832)	−0.939*** (−3.832)	0.001	0.998	12.356**
BH	0.963*** (14.370)	10.992 (0.619)	0.0007	0.999	34.817*** (4.775)	0.815*** (0.872)	0.338 (0.872)	0.000	1.000	65.312*** (6.315)	3.751*** (0.450)	−0.450*** (0.450)	0.015	0.984 (13.707)	14.727** (−2.507)	1.253*** (−2.507)	−0.597** (−2.507)	0.000	1.000	15.323***
SLo	1.418*** (3.678)	185.806*** (2.836)	0.0007	0.999	8.604 (4.084)	1.244*** (4.761)	3.408*** (4.761)	0.000	1.000	10.572* (7.691)	6.855*** (−2.292)	−0.514** (−2.292)	0.008	0.991 (5.838)	73.197*** (0.928)	2.515*** (0.928)	1.098 (0.928)	0.000	1.000	107.126***
SNe	—	—	—	—	—	1.120*** (3.559)	2.234*** (3.020)	0.000	1.000	20.594*** (4.787)	3.818*** (−0.553)	−0.180 (−0.553)	0.057	0.943 (3.107)	141.970*** (3.601)	0.905*** (3.601)	3.130*** (3.601)	0.000	1.000	39.887***
SWi	0.929*** (5.110)	69.545** (2.250)	0.0007	0.999	40.060*** (3.674)	1.208*** (3.674)	1.498*** (3.674)	0.000	1.000	66.064*** (−0.201)	−0.141 (−0.476)	−0.163 (−0.476)	0.081	0.918 (−0.874)	202.273*** (2.015)	−0.372 (−0.874)	2.359** (2.015)	0.000	1.000	64.483***
BLo	1.399*** (4.017)	156.604*** (2.645)	0.007	0.999	11.037** (6.383)	1.071*** (5.318)	2.098*** (5.318)	0.000	1.000	4.257 (5.063)	6.593*** (−2.653)	−0.848*** (−2.653)	0.000	1.000 (10.122)	46.768*** (−0.314)	3.599*** (−0.314)	−0.307 (−0.314)	0.000	1.000	4.149
BNe	—	—	—	—	—	1.060*** (9.318)	0.305 (1.140)	0.000	1.000	19.252*** (7.334)	4.159*** (−2.967)	−0.577*** (−2.967)	0.038	0.961 (15.134)	11.949 (−0.901)	1.204*** (−0.901)	−0.049 (−0.901)	0.000	1.000	17.559***
BWi	0.629*** (3.794)	−36.362 (−1.289)	0.0007	0.9993	16.224*** (9.828)	1.164*** (−3.533)	−0.983*** (−3.533)	0.000	1.000	13.829** (−1.825)	−1.055 (0.209)	0.036 (0.209)	0.026	0.973 (−1.592)	30.910*** (3.141)	−0.280 (3.141)	0.862*** (3.141)	0.000	1.000	13.524**

The IV-GMM specifications are tested on the Aggregate market along with Human capital proxies in explaining the variations in returns on FF portfolios. The IV-GMM specifications consist the Random effect dynamics and instrumental variables, namely, SAV, HML, SMB, WML, DIV, TRM, and RTB to estimate the parameters of the vectors in setting the relationship with FF portfolios for Emerging, developed, aggregate, and global economies, respectively. The SNe and BNe portfolios dataset are not available for Emerging economies. The estimates for Global economies are missing due to unavailability of WCR data. *, **, and *** denotes significance at 10, 5 and 1% level, respectively. Standard errors are in parenthesis () .

estimates with LBR. The $R_m - R_f$ and SAV significantly price all the FF portfolio with the exception of BL and BM portfolios, in emerging economies. The $R_m - R_f$ and LBR statistically and significantly capture the variations in all FF portfolios return, except SLo and BLo portfolios, in developed economies. The $R_m - R_f$ and LBR significantly price the risk of all the FF portfolios except SLo, BLo, and BWi portfolios, for the Aggregate.

Panel B of [Table 5](#) reports the results of IV-GMM estimates with WCR. $R_m - R_f$ and SAV significantly capturing the variations in all FF portfolios return in emerging economies with an exception of BL and BM portfolios. $R_m - R_f$ and WCR significantly price all the FF portfolios except BL, BM, and SLo portfolios in the developed economies. Similarly, $R_m - R_f$ and WCR captures the variations in the FF portfolios return except SH and SNe portfolios.

Panel B of [Table 5](#) reports the results of IV-GMM estimates with HI. The $R_m - R_f$ and SAV price the risk of FF portfolios in emerging economies with the exception of BL, BM, BH, and BWi portfolios. Moreover, The $R_m - R_f$ and HI estimates the variations in the FF portfolios return in developed economies, excluding BL, BM, BH, and BNe portfolios. Similarly, $R_m - R_f$ and HI price the risk of all FF portfolios for the Aggregate, leaving small portfolios.

The result of an IV-GMM estimate satisfies our presumption developed in the study that the asset pricing factors governing the asset return predictability depend on the country-specific risk factor. Our claim been evidenced in the panel datasets of emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate, that the aggregate market is the primary factor along with saving determining the risk of FF portfolios in emerging economies. Conversely, the aggregate market and human capital are the major factors determining the risk of FF portfolios in developed economies. Moreover, the FF factors, momentum, dividend yield and the bond market factors are instrumental in enhancing the portfolio return predictability.

5.3. Alternative specifications

The principal component analysis (PCA) is used to reduce the probability of multicollinearity among the priced factors, including aggregate market, human capital components (LBR, WCR, HI), FF factors, saving, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill. PCA centered on a linear transformation of the factors ensures that they are orthogonal to each other. PCA is appropriate because it maximizes the variance instead of minimizing the least square distance. PCA declassify the components in the system that maximizes component score variance for the cases. Panel A of [Table 6](#) reports the PCA result for emerging economies, where LBR and SAV capture the maximum variation in Component 1 with an eigenvalue of 20.8. Panel B reports LBR captures the maximum variation in Component 1 with an eigenvalue of 1.94 for developed economies. Panel C reports LBR captures

the maximum variation in Component 1 with an eigenvalue of 1.91 for the Aggregate and similarly panel D of [Table 6](#) reports, WCR captures the maximum variation in Component 1 with the eigenvalue of 2.65 for Global.

The PCA results further strengthen our claim that saving and human capital component share the maximum variation among the rest of the components in the system.

6. Summary and discussion

The theoretical assumption that the risk of an asset is measured by the covariance of an asset's return with the return on the aggregate market and the human capital component is being examined in emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate. The study constructs two aggregate and one firm-level measurement of the human capital component. The aggregate labor income growth rate and wealth-to-consumption ratio proxies aggregate measure, whereas Hansson Index proxy firm-level measure of the human capital component. We introduce saving, an innovation in human capital component that proxies expected future labor income. We develop an intertemporal and consumption-based CAPM framework to examine the presumptions across the economies. Alternatively, an extended version of the CAPM is built to widen the scope and for better understanding. We introduce the size and value strategies along with the momentum strategy in an ICAPM and CCAPM framework controlling for the effects of dividend yield, term spread, and the relative Treasury bill. FF portfolios formed at the intersection of size-BE/ME and size-momentum return, are used to the test the proposition developed in the study. Moreover, testing the crafted presumptions of the study in the ICAPM and CCAPM framework on country-specific data sets requires the country-specific component to be time variant. Hence, we rely on the panel data regression methodology with random effects. Further IV-GMM and PCA are used to control the endogeneity, orthogonality, and multicollinearity issues.

Hausman's specification test identifies that the panel regression with random effect yield better estimates of the parameters of interests and the results show that ICAPM fits the data better than the CCAPM and extended version of the CAPM. The results are persistent in utmost FF portfolios across emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate. The results show that both the aggregate market and human capital component are strong predictors of return on FF portfolios in developed economies. Interestingly, on the contrary, aggregate market along with saving appears strong predictor of return on FF portfolios in emerging economies. The results are more persistent in small stocks and the magnitude of coefficient estimates on saving is higher than the coefficient estimates of the aggregate market. Moreover, the pricing factors, value, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill, in the system becomes trivial with the exception of size effect that shows some resistance in FF portfolios return predictability. However, the IV-GMM result

Table 6 (continued)

Panel D: Global economies

Variable	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	Component 5	Component 6	Component 7	Component 8	Component 9	Component 10	Component 11
RTB	0.078	-0.346	-0.425	0.324	0.037	0.156	0.607	0.379	-0.204	-0.092	0.012
Eigen value	2.656	1.526	1.457	1.266	1.003	0.963	0.715	0.643	0.527	0.221	0.024
Variance proportion	0.242	0.139	0.132	0.115	0.091	0.088	0.065	0.058	0.048	0.020	0.002
Cumulative proportion	0.242	0.380	0.513	0.628	0.719	0.806	0.871	0.930	0.978	0.998	1.000

reveals that the FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, term spread, and relative Treasury bill are instrumental in capturing the variations in return predictability of FF portfolios across emerging and developed economies. The core findings of the study that priced factors in the asset return predictability certainly depends on dynamic country-specific dimensions further deepened our understanding about the priced factors in the asset return predictability. Moreover, the study used most sophisticated methodological approach to overcome the issues in fitting the panel data. To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first of its kind where we test the presumptions in an ICAPM and CCAPM framework across the emerging and developed economies.

Human capital component subsumes the predictive ability of FF value and size factors in the asset return predictability, after introducing in an intertemporal framework of [Campbell \(1996\)](#). The findings of the study specify that the common factors in asset return predictability are governed by the dynamicity in the human capital component is in line with [Kim et al. \(2011\)](#). The findings that the aggregate market along with human capital share the risk of an asset across developed economies is in line with the evidence of [Berk and Walden \(2013\)](#) and [Palacios \(2015\)](#). We agree with the asset pricing literature that the aggregate market predominantly priced the risk of an asset across the economies. However, the findings of the present study revealed that human capital and the innovations governing underneath plays crucial roles in modeling the risk and return relationship in the asset-pricing framework. Further, we argue based on the results of the present study that the pricing factors governing the risk of the asset class depends on the country-specific dimensions and hence intensive care and devotion are needed in the investment decision-making process.

7. Conclusion

The study develops the presumption that the risk of an asset is measured by the covariance of an asset's return with the return on the aggregate market and human capital wealth across the economies. Moreover, the anomaly literature augments that there exist factors, that equally price the risk of an asset. Thus, we considered the frequently used factors to assess the risk and return relationship in the asset pricing framework. The priced factors considered in the study are the aggregate market, human capital components, saving, FF factors, momentum, dividend yield, relative Treasury bill, and term spread. We primarily

develop the intertemporal and consumption-based asset pricing framework and an extended version of the CAPM to study the presumption of the study related to risk and return relationship. We rely on the panel data sets pertaining to the emerging and developed economies, and the Aggregate for quantification. The panel regression with random effects, IV-GMM with random effects, and PCA are employed to fit the data with the motivation to dissect the anomalies and human capital components in asset return predictability.

The result indicates that the ICAPM framework yields better result than the CCAPM and extended version of the CAPM. The aggregate market along with saving which proxy the future labor income growth rate, price the risk of utmost FF portfolios across the emerging economies, whereas aggregate market and human capital priced the risk of FF portfolios across the developed economies. Though we found weak evidence for the size effect in FF portfolio return predictability across the emerging and developed economies. The results are more persistent on small stocks relative to the bigger stocks. Interestingly, the human capital component subsumes the predictive power of FF factors and subsequently becomes redundant along with dividend yield and bond market factors in the asset return predictability.

We used three measures of human capital, labor income growth, wealth-to-consumption ratio, and Hansson Index. Though labor income growth and wealth-to-consumption ratio relatively yield better estimates than Hansson Index, however, enhanced human capital proxy is required while examining the risk and relationship in an asset pricing framework. An enhanced human capital proxy may strengthen its share in the asset return predictability and in turn, will develop a better understanding of the patterns in cross-sectional and time-series return. Further, it would be interesting to extend the present framework, including the human capital proxy that closely and explicitly represents the human capital component of aggregate wealth, and study the dynamicity governing risk sharing among aggregate market and human capital component in asset return predictability.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Dr. H Anil Kumar (Librarian, IIM Ahmedabad) the Editor, and the anonymous referees. The work is from doctoral dissertation 'Essays on Capital Asset Pricing of Dynamic Economies: The World Evidence'.

Appendices

Table A1

Descriptive statistics.

Sl. No	Variables	Emerging economies				Developed economies				Aggregate				Global economies			
		Moments															
		μ	σ	Skew	Kurt	μ	σ	Skew	Kurt	μ	σ	Skew	Kurt	μ	σ	Skew	Kurt
1	SL	2.631	11.410	0.537	4.285	0.734	6.274	0.020	7.134	1.088	7.536	0.540	7.365	1.011	7.371	0.497	7.434
2	SM	2.220	9.882	0.157	4.506	0.803	5.464	-0.083	7.736	1.068	6.540	0.218	7.592	1.029	6.386	0.184	7.678
3	SH	1.912	9.583	0.128	4.719	0.771	5.838	-0.003	9.710	0.984	6.709	0.167	8.262	0.976	6.518	0.139	8.444
4	BL	1.597	13.222	1.127	8.621	0.763	5.722	-0.147	7.414	0.918	7.699	1.131	16.171	0.880	7.441	1.118	16.726
5	BM	1.749	9.527	0.237	4.195	0.747	5.114	-0.394	5.438	0.934	6.188	0.104	6.588	0.908	6.030	0.077	6.702
6	BH	1.418	8.144	-0.231	4.390	0.755	5.109	-0.471	5.771	0.879	5.800	-0.319	5.993	0.855	5.728	-0.342	5.983
7	SLo	1.415	11.673	0.752	6.459	0.317	7.385	0.344	8.304	0.525	8.375	0.645	8.837	0.501	8.179	0.626	8.947
8	SNe	2.496	9.820	0.152	4.512	0.882	5.508	-0.204	9.486	1.023	6.025	0.033	8.963	0.999	5.840	0.003	9.161
9	SWi	2.416	9.753	-0.061	4.157	1.362	6.169	0.083	7.532	1.562	6.999	0.096	6.655	1.524	6.835	0.063	6.727
10	BLo	1.189	11.529	0.322	5.398	0.501	7.484	0.356	9.070	0.631	8.402	0.402	8.277	0.604	8.173	0.391	8.440
11	BNe	1.313	9.102	-0.275	3.897	0.686	5.004	-0.306	6.295	0.741	5.487	-0.269	6.514	0.729	5.348	-0.294	6.587
12	BWi	1.626	8.983	0.021	5.174	0.867	5.402	-0.380	5.730	1.010	6.244	-0.114	6.829	0.991	6.121	-0.133	6.812
13	R_m - R_f	0.978	8.224	-0.082	4.500	0.490	4.939	-0.509	5.598	0.581	5.698	-0.263	6.215	0.565	5.585	-0.286	6.234
14	HML	0.754	5.973	1.118	6.571	0.441	3.088	0.512	6.895	0.499	3.796	1.101	10.152	0.482	3.683	1.105	10.463
15	SMB	0.530	4.987	0.043	3.654	0.014	3.377	0.566	8.103	0.111	3.734	0.420	6.567	0.102	3.604	0.422	6.872
16	WML	0.922	7.147	0.068	6.240	0.635	4.953	-1.045	11.351	0.689	5.429	-0.595	9.911	0.687	5.322	-0.616	10.004
17	DIV	0.014	0.015	0.615	1.978	0.343	0.835	2.469	7.889	0.271	0.750	2.926	10.513	0.257	0.730	3.044	11.268
18	TRM	0.986	0.911	0.483	3.536	1.273	0.910	0.349	2.492	1.216	0.917	0.363	2.682	1.075	1.013	0.114	2.796
19	RTB	0.025	1.192	-0.061	5.538	-0.075	0.546	-1.195	7.880	-0.055	0.720	-0.333	10.255	-0.059	0.728	-0.400	9.564
20	HI	0.101	0.450	6.250	46.287	2.132	62.387	1721.417	2.206	1.738	56.002	2136	46.045	1.575	53.288	48.394	2360.387
21	LBR	20.140	1.214	-0.157	2.053	18.081	5.694	-3.359	14.903	18.496	5.183	-3.772	18.519	18.087	5.088	-3.419	16.907
22	WCR	11.908	4.035	-0.663	2.179	8.434	5.914	-0.103	1.964	9.107	5.765	-0.271	2.026	9.107	5.765	-0.271	2.026

Notes: ¹ μ - Mean, σ - Standard deviation, Skew - Skewness, Kurt - Kurtosis.

Table A2 (continued)

Panel D: Global economies

cov	SL	SM	SH	BL	BM	BH	SLo	SNe	SWi	BLo	BNe	BWi	R _m -R _f	HML	SMB	WML	DIV	TRM	RTB	HI	LBK	WCR
corr																						
SL	—	41.501	40.038	35.477	30.333	27.321	49.346	39.324	41.612	39.116	28.960	28.425	31.266	-1.230	12.738	-6.950	-0.121	0.708	-0.120	-11.268	2.091	0.339
SM	0.931	—	39.029	31.910	29.073	27.248	45.357	37.041	37.794	36.708	27.895	26.270	28.804	0.543	10.726	-7.603	-0.068	0.648	-0.145	-11.062	1.657	-0.609
SH	0.858	0.935	—	30.840	28.901	27.798	46.094	37.619	38.211	36.277	27.641	25.794	28.235	0.554	11.733	-8.577	-0.007	0.689	-0.124	-11.990	1.192	-0.531
BL	0.792	0.796	0.735	—	31.169	27.798	38.420	30.574	30.428	39.908	30.494	27.459	31.357	2.673	-0.350	-9.288	-0.102	0.382	0.109	-2.608	1.385	-0.393
BM	0.749	0.802	0.762	0.855	—	28.142	33.964	27.917	27.364	36.885	29.531	27.184	29.728	2.260	-1.321	-7.946	-0.065	0.351	0.039	-5.489	1.132	-0.319
BH	0.694	0.773	0.754	0.784	0.878	—	31.412	26.151	25.607	34.485	27.678	24.821	28.309	1.808	-1.575	-7.865	-0.106	0.257	0.066	-4.587	1.084	-0.371
SLo	0.861	0.885	0.859	0.745	0.729	0.693	—	47.311	44.830	51.152	34.137	28.861	33.771	0.354	12.333	-17.979	-0.013	1.136	-0.369	-10.450	1.276	0.192
SNe	0.870	0.916	0.889	0.752	0.759	0.732	0.910	—	39.612	37.357	27.889	26.022	27.418	1.647	9.781	-7.781	-0.105	0.747	-0.146	-8.224	1.975	0.020
SWi	0.848	0.860	0.831	0.689	0.685	0.660	0.794	0.889	—	32.924	27.058	29.647	27.935	-0.226	11.406	0.485	-0.115	0.557	0.057	-10.575	2.123	-0.281
BLo	0.703	0.737	0.696	0.797	0.815	0.784	0.799	0.740	0.600	—	36.440	27.282	35.816	1.622	0.273	-23.358	-0.053	0.698	-0.151	-0.462	0.762	-0.645
BNe	0.735	0.791	0.749	0.861	0.922	0.889	0.753	0.780	0.697	0.828	—	25.355	28.553	1.488	-1.069	-8.464	-0.018	0.284	0.046	-2.891	1.030	-0.447
BWi	0.691	0.714	0.669	0.742	0.812	0.763	0.610	0.697	0.731	0.593	0.779	—	26.497	-0.466	0.342	3.834	0.024	0.165	0.209	-6.293	1.066	-0.705
R _m -R _f	0.809	0.833	0.781	0.902	0.946	0.927	0.760	0.782	0.734	0.830	0.935	0.830	—	-0.088	-0.363	-6.966	-0.049	0.397	0.041	-4.231	0.895	0.109
HML	-0.056	0.028	0.027	0.135	0.126	0.104	0.014	0.082	-0.010	0.066	0.085	-0.026	-0.005	—	-2.291	-2.659	-0.072	0.148	0.066	-2.387	0.893	0.507
SMB	0.504	0.474	0.496	-0.015	-0.064	-0.079	0.424	0.427	0.458	0.010	-0.054	0.016	-0.019	-0.205	—	0.657	0.025	0.352	-0.201	-7.205	0.446	0.094
WML	-0.200	-0.245	-0.264	-0.297	-0.281	-0.286	-0.450	-0.247	0.014	-0.602	-0.308	0.134	-0.259	-0.173	0.037	—	-0.080	-0.528	0.365	-3.064	0.635	-0.435
DIV	-0.022	-0.014	-0.001	-0.021	-0.015	-0.025	-0.002	-0.021	-0.021	-0.009	-0.004	0.005	-0.012	-0.030	0.009	-0.021	—	0.047	-0.012	-0.087	-0.131	0.570
TRM	0.102	0.105	0.106	0.061	0.062	0.047	0.143	0.119	0.082	0.090	0.052	0.029	0.074	0.048	0.100	-0.109	0.062	—	-0.274	-0.992	-0.160	0.059
RTB	-0.024	-0.033	-0.027	0.024	0.010	0.017	-0.065	-0.032	0.012	-0.027	0.012	0.051	0.011	0.030	-0.080	0.105	-0.022	-0.397	—	2.118	0.303	-0.032
HI	-0.023	-0.025	-0.026	-0.006	-0.014	-0.012	-0.018	-0.018	-0.022	-0.001	-0.007	-0.015	-0.011	-0.011	-0.028	-0.009	-0.002	-0.014	0.043	—	1.949	-10.444
LBK	0.048	0.043	0.029	0.035	0.032	0.032	0.026	0.050	0.050	0.016	0.030	0.030	0.027	0.047	0.020	0.021	-0.027	-0.026	0.070	0.004	—	-9.932
WCR	0.009	-0.018	-0.015	-0.012	-0.010	-0.013	0.004	0.001	-0.008	-0.015	-0.015	-0.023	0.004	0.031	0.005	-0.017	0.139	0.011	-0.009	-0.028	-0.303	—

Note: ¹ Correlations are in bold face, corr - Correlation, cov - Covariance.

Table A3.1

Pooled OLS estimates with LBR.

Panel	Group	FF portfolios	$y_{it}^{FF\ T.A.} = \alpha_0 + R_m - R_f \beta_1 + LBR_{it} \beta_2 + \Delta SAV_{it} \beta_3 + HML_{it} \beta_4 + SMB_{it} \beta_5 + WML_{it} \beta_6 + DIV_{it} \beta_7 + TRM_{it} \beta_8 + RTB_{it} \beta_9 + u_{it}$	α_0	$R_m - R_f$	LB.R	ΔSAV	HML	SMB	WML	DIV	TRM	RTB	R^2	F-statistics
A	Emerging economies	SL	-4.089	4.419***	0.172	12.887**	0.723***	0.901***	0.014	-6.022	0.152	-0.131	0.898	71.141***	
		SM	-3.928	4.901***	0.177	12.003**	0.217***	0.727***	-0.010	11.403	0.041	-0.035	0.795	31.716***	
		SH	-6.525	4.305***	0.315	14.457***	-0.089	0.795***	0.034	-0.358	-0.765	-0.123	0.790	30.691***	
		BL	-18.800	5.639***	0.877	9.699	0.571***	-0.473***	0.062	16.076	0.690	0.688	0.519	9.512***	
		BM	-10.439	5.805***	0.462	15.074**	0.417***	-0.202	-0.030	27.555	0.737	0.014	0.648	15.572***	
		BH	4.591	3.359***	-0.223	11.721**	-0.156**	0.023	0.029	-27.705**	-0.678	-0.114	0.719	21.221***	
		SLo	-10.537	5.074***	0.479	7.203	0.209**	0.792***	-0.485***	15.659	-0.207	-0.355	0.821	37.292***	
		SNe	-11.707	5.326***	0.490	16.676**	0.141	0.975***	0.195	-9.874	-0.972	-0.250	0.884	21.214***	
		SWi	-5.920	4.595***	0.293	11.007**	0.152**	0.828***	0.240***	3.220	-0.686	-0.480	0.831	40.005***	
		BLo	-4.759	3.809***	0.272	12.314	0.005	0.008	-0.760***	-9.685	-0.586	-0.264	0.655	16.018***	
		BNe	4.574	5.027***	-0.298	10.186	-0.061	0.266**	0.174	-16.439	0.552	-0.077	0.798	15.568***	
		BWi	-9.131	4.101***	0.433	12.701*	0.100	-0.048	0.559***	1.895	-0.776	-0.427	0.545	10.485***	
B	Developed economies	SL	7.957***	1.133***	-0.276**	16.918	0.937**	1.324***	0.191	0.526	-2.750	-0.305	0.693	15.360***	
		SM	7.174***	1.132***	-0.264***	-1.891	0.569**	1.006***	0.470	0.866	-2.215**	-0.046	0.852	37.606***	
		SH	1.167***	-0.267***	1.446***	0.518	1.347***	-0.022	8.210	-4.244***	0.294	7.105	0.755	20.566***	
		BL	-0.019	1.086***	0.045	15.125*	0.542**	0.161	-0.561	-4.825	-0.374	-0.287	0.827	31.472***	
		BM	1.349**	0.937***	-0.055*	9.938***	0.276***	-0.060	0.269**	-2.918	0.049	-0.020	0.957	144.439***	
		BH	1.016	0.001***	-16.538	0.006***	-0.055	-0.021	3.866	-0.593	0.079	0.317	0.930	86.318***	
		SLo	4.420	1.474***	-0.162	3.203	0.075	1.221***	-0.456	24.948	-1.927	0.449	0.669	13.172***	
		SNe	6.616***	0.922***	-0.191	10.270	0.486	0.978***	0.519	-8.073	-1.497	-0.358	0.632	11.342***	
		SWi	10.341***	1.199***	-0.363*	1.214	0.196	1.601***	1.303	1.545	-4.688**	-0.112	0.540	8.051***	
		BLo	-3.346***	0.978***	0.158**	7.236	-0.337	-0.076	-0.579	-7.143	-1.541	-0.219	0.844	33.538***	
		BNe	0.777	0.842***	-0.024	6.861	0.002	0.069	0.310	-11.099**	0.311	-0.234	0.884	47.143***	
		BWi	5.143***	0.840***	-0.202**	12.868	0.066	0.183	1.585***	-13.741	2.581**	-0.278	0.751	19.165***	
C	Aggregate	SL	7.479***	1.135***	-0.251***	5.61E-09***	0.988***	1.768***	-0.196	5.238	-0.576	-0.016	0.838	131.790***	
		SM	5.881***	1.014***	-0.181***	9.23E-10	0.447***	1.269***	0.019	3.104	-0.358	-0.190	0.893	210.634***	
		SH	5.806***	0.939***	-0.187***	3.68E-09**	0.340***	1.398***	-0.129	1.181	-1.375***	-0.578	0.870	169.179***	
		BL	0.812	1.150	0.002	4.57E-09	0.901**	-0.135	-0.111	2.789	-0.646	0.427	0.529	29.282***	
		BM	2.058***	1.045***	-0.085**	9.30E-10	0.696***	-0.058	0.004	-0.963	-0.084	-0.553	0.891	205.577***	
		BH	0.155	0.940***	0.007	-1.56E-09*	-0.043	-0.112	0.047	1.683	-0.278	-0.532	0.929	331.524***	
		SLo	3.656***	1.112***	-0.116**	0.103	0.212	1.638***	-0.876***	6.744	-0.675	-2.097***	0.848	125.675***	
		SNe	4.765***	0.967***	-0.115**	-0.331	0.190	1.105***	0.144	-5.256	-0.843	0.532	0.836	93.886***	
		SWi	9.376***	1.031***	-0.306***	2.714	0.482**	1.734***	0.608**	0.823	-1.293	-0.175	0.768	75.014***	
		BLo	-4.367***	1.059***	0.189***	1.619	-0.250	0.148	-1.331***	0.927	-0.546	0.959	0.848	125.642***	

(continued on next page)

- Lustig, H., & Van Nieuwerburgh, S. G. (2008). The returns on human capital: Good news on wall street is bad news on main street. *Review of Financial Studies*, 21(5), 2097–2137. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhl035>.
- Lustig, H., Van Nieuwerburgh, S. G., & Verdelhan, A. (2013). The wealth-consumption ratio. *Review of Asset Pricing Studies*, 3(1), 38–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rapstu/rat002>.
- Marmi, S. (2012). *Stefano Marmi - data library*. Retrieved from: http://homepage.sns.it/marmi/Data_Library.html#datalibrary.
- McMillan, D. G. (2013). Consumption and stock prices: Evidence from a small international panel. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 36, 76–88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmacro.2013.01.007>.
- Neumeyer, P. A., & Perri, F. (2005). Business cycles in emerging economies: The role of interest rates. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 52(2), 345–380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2004.04.011>.
- Palacios, M. (2015). Human capital as an asset class implications from a general equilibrium model. *Review of Financial Studies*, 28(4), 978–1023. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhu073>.
- Racicot, F.-E., & Rentz, W. F. (2017). A panel data robust instrumental variable approach: A test of the new Fama-French five-factor model. *Applied Economics Letters*, 24(6), 410–416. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2016.1197361>.
- Roll, R. (1981). A possible explanation of the small firm effect. *The Journal of Finance*, 36(4), 879–888. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2327553>.
- Stehle, R. (2015). *Richard Stehle - data library*. Retrieved from: <http://www.wiwi.hu-berlin.de/professuren/bwl/bb/data/fama-french-factors-germany>.