# ECON 337901 FINANCIAL ECONOMICS

Peter Ireland

Boston College

April 26, 2022

These lecture notes by Peter Ireland are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommerical-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/.

Consider an investor who takes the portion of his or her initial wealth that he or she allocates to risky assets and divides it further: using the fraction w to purchase asset j and the remaining fraction 1 - w to buy the market portfolio.

Note that since the market portfolio already includes some of asset j, choosing w > 0 really means that the investor "overweights" asset j in his or her own portfolio. Conversely, choosing w < 0 means that the investor "underweights" asset j in his or her own portfolio.

Based on our previous analysis, we know that this investor's portfolio of risky assets now has random return

$$\tilde{r}_P = w\tilde{r}_j + (1-w)\tilde{r}_M,$$

expected return

$$E(\tilde{r}_P) = wE(\tilde{r}_j) + (1-w)E(\tilde{r}_M),$$

and variance

$$\sigma_P^2 = w^2 \sigma_j^2 + (1 - w)^2 \sigma_M^2 + 2w(1 - w)\sigma_{jM},$$

where  $\sigma_{iM}$  is the covariance between  $\tilde{r}_i$  and  $\tilde{r}_M$ .

$$E(\tilde{r}_P) = wE(\tilde{r}_j) + (1 - w)E(\tilde{r}_M),$$
  
 $\sigma_P^2 = w^2 \sigma_j^2 + (1 - w)^2 \sigma_M^2 + 2w(1 - w)\sigma_{jM},$ 

We can use these formulas to trace out how  $\sigma_P$  and  $E(\tilde{r}_P)$  vary as w changes.



σ

The red curve these traces out how  $\sigma_P$  and  $E(\tilde{r}_P)$  vary as w changes, that is, as asset j gets underweighted or overweighted relative to the market portfolio.

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



The red curve passes through M, since when w = 0 the new portfolio coincides with the market portfolio.

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



For all other values of *w*, however, the red curve must lie below the CML.



Otherwise, a portfolio along the CML would be dominated in mean-variance by the new portfolio. Financial markets would no longer be in equilibrium, since some investors would no longer be willing to hold the market portfolio.

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



Suppose that at W, w > 0. Then asset j is "undervalued" in the sense that overweighting it will yield a portfolio with a higher expected return.

But as all investors buy this undervalued asset, its price will rise.

Given future cash flows (future price from selling the asset plus any dividends earned), a rise the asset's price will lower its expected return.

Buying pressure will continue until the red curve bends back below the CML.

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



Suppose that at W, w < 0. Then asset j is "overvalued" in the sense that underweighting it will yield a portfolio with a higher expected return.

But as all investors sell this overvalued asset, its price will fall.

Given future cash flows, a fall the asset's price will raise its expected return.

Selling pressure will continue until the red curve bends back below the CML.





Together, these observations imply that the red curve must be tangent to the CML at M.

Tangent means equal in slope.

We already know that the slope of the Capital Market Line is

$$\frac{E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f}{\sigma_M}$$

But what is the slope of the red curve?

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



Let  $f(\sigma_P)$  be the function defined by  $E(\tilde{r}_P) = f(\sigma_P)$  and therefore describing the red curve.

Next, define the functions g(w) and h(w) by

$$g(w) = wE( ilde{r}_j) + (1-w)E( ilde{r}_M),$$
  
 $h(w) = [w^2\sigma_j^2 + (1-w)^2\sigma_M^2 + 2w(1-w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2},$  so that

$$E(\tilde{r}_P) = g(w)$$

and

$$\sigma_P = h(w).$$

Substitute

$$E(\tilde{r}_P) = g(w)$$

and

$$\sigma_P = h(w).$$

into

$$E(\tilde{r}_P) = f(\sigma_P)$$

to obtain

$$g(w)=f(h(w))$$

and use the chain rule to compute

$$g'(w) = f'(h(w))h'(w) = f'(\sigma_P)h'(w)$$



σ

Let  $f(\sigma_P)$  be the function defined by  $E(\tilde{r}_P) = f(\sigma_P)$  and therefore describing the red curve. Then  $f'(\sigma_P)$  is the slope of the curve.

Hence, to compute  $f'(\sigma_P)$ , we can rearrange

$$g'(w) = f'(\sigma_P)h'(w)$$

to obtain

$$f'(\sigma_P) = rac{g'(w)}{h'(w)}$$

and compute g'(w) and h'(w) from the formulas we know.

$$g(w) = wE(\tilde{r}_j) + (1-w)E(\tilde{r}_M),$$

implies

$$g'(w) = E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)$$

$$h(w) = [w^2 \sigma_j^2 + (1-w)^2 \sigma_M^2 + 2w(1-w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2},$$

implies

$$h'(w) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{2w\sigma_j^2 - 2(1-w)\sigma_M^2 + 2(1-2w)\sigma_{jM}}{[w^2\sigma_j^2 + (1-w)^2\sigma_M^2 + 2w(1-w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2}} \right\}$$

or, a bit more simply,

$$h'(w) = \frac{w\sigma_j^2 - (1-w)\sigma_M^2 + (1-2w)\sigma_{jM}}{[w^2\sigma_j^2 + (1-w)^2\sigma_M^2 + 2w(1-w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2}}$$

$$f'(\sigma_P) = g'(w)/h'(w)$$
$$g'(w) = E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)$$
$$h'(w) = \frac{w\sigma_j^2 - (1 - w)\sigma_M^2 + (1 - 2w)\sigma_{jM}}{[w^2\sigma_j^2 + (1 - w)^2\sigma_M^2 + 2w(1 - w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2}}$$

imply

$$f'(\sigma_P) = [E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)] \\ \times \frac{[w^2 \sigma_j^2 + (1-w)^2 \sigma_M^2 + 2w(1-w)\sigma_{jM}]^{1/2}}{w \sigma_j^2 - (1-w) \sigma_M^2 + (1-2w)\sigma_{jM}}$$

```
Deriving the CAPM
```



The red curve is tangent to the CML at M. Hence,  $f'(\sigma_P)$  equals the slope of the CML when w=0.

When w = 0,

$$f'(\sigma_P) = [E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)] \\ \times \frac{[w^2 \sigma_j^2 + (1 - w)^2 \sigma_M^2 + 2w(1 - w) \sigma_{jM}]^{1/2}}{w \sigma_j^2 - (1 - w) \sigma_M^2 + (1 - 2w) \sigma_{jM}}$$

implies

$$f'(\sigma_P) = \frac{[E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)]\sigma_M}{\sigma_{jM} - \sigma_M^2}$$

Meanwhile, we know that the slope of the CML is

$$\frac{E(\tilde{r}_M)-r_f}{\sigma_M}$$

The tangency of the red curve with the CML at M therefore requires

$$\frac{[E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M)]\sigma_M}{\sigma_{jM} - \sigma_M^2} = \frac{E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f}{\sigma_M}$$
$$E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M) = \frac{[E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f][\sigma_{jM} - \sigma_M^2]}{\sigma_M^2}$$
$$E(\tilde{r}_j) - E(\tilde{r}_M) = \left(\frac{\sigma_{jM}}{\sigma_M^2}\right) [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f] - [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f]$$
$$E(\tilde{r}_j) = r_f + \left(\frac{\sigma_{jM}}{\sigma_M^2}\right) [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f]$$

$$E(\tilde{r}_j) = r_f + \left(\frac{\sigma_{jM}}{\sigma_M^2}\right) [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f]$$

Let

$$\beta_j = \frac{\sigma_{jM}}{\sigma_M^2}$$

so that this key equation of the CAPM can be written as

$$E(\tilde{r}_j) = r_f + \beta_j [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f]$$

where  $\beta_j$ , the "beta" for asset j, depends on the covariance between the returns on asset j and the market portfolio.

$$E(\tilde{r}_j) = r_f + \beta_j [E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f]$$

This equation summarizes a very strong restriction.

It implies that if we rank individual stocks or portfolios of stocks according to their betas, their expected returns should all lie along a single security market line with slope  $E(\tilde{r}_M) - r_f$ .





According to the CAPM, all assets and portfolios of assets lie along a single security market line. Those with higher betas have higher expected returns.

An enormous literature is devoted to empirically testing the CAPM's implications.

Although results are mixed, studies have shown that when individual portfolios are ranked according to their betas, expected returns tend to line up as suggested by the theory.

A famous article that presents results along these lines is by Eugene Fama (Nobel Prize 2013) and James MacBeth, "Risk, Return, and Equilibrium," *Journal of Political Economy* Vol.81 (May-June 1973), pp.607-636.

Early work on the MPT, the CAPM, and econometric tests of the efficient markets hypothesis and the CAPM is discussed extensively in Eugene Fama's 1976 textbook, *Foundations of Finance*.

More recent evidence against the CAPM's implications is presented by Eugene Fama and Kenneth French, "Common Risk Factors in the Returns on Stocks and Bonds," *Journal of Financial Economics* Vol.33 (February 1993): pp.3-56.

This paper shows that equity shares in small firms and in firms with high book (accounting) to market value have expected returns that differ strongly from what is predicted by the CAPM alone.

Quite a bit of recent research has been directed towards understanding the source of these "anomalies."

See, for example, David McLean and Jeffrey Pontiff, "Does Academic Research Destroy Stock Return Predictability?" *Journal of Finance* Vol.71 (February 2016): pp.5-31