

SYSTEMATIC RISK IN EARNINGS AND EXPECTED STOCK RETURNS

CHEN, CHEN, AND JIANG (2020)

AAA 2020 DISCUSSION

Tim de Silva
MIT Sloan

August 12th, 2020

OVERVIEW

- **Question:** What are the returns to aggregate earnings risk exposure?
- **Methodology:**

- 1 In each month, estimate β_i^{EA} using past data:

$$ER_{i,t+1} = \alpha_i + (\beta_i + \beta_i^{EA} d_{i,t}^{EA}) ER_{m,t+1}$$

$$d_{i,t}^{EA} = 1, \text{ if firm } i \text{ announces within 1 day of time } t$$

- 2 See whether β_i^{EA} predicts next month returns:

$$R_i = \lambda_a 1(\text{Announcer}) \hat{\beta}_i^{EA} + \lambda_{na} 1(\text{Non-Announcer}) \hat{\beta}_i^{EA} + \text{controls} + \eta_i$$

- **Findings:**

- ▶ Earnings risk “priced” for announcers only: $\hat{\lambda}_a > 0$, $\hat{\lambda}_{na} = 0$
- ▶ FF5 alpha from monthly portfolio sorts on $\hat{\beta}^{EA} \approx 10.2\%$ annualized

OVERVIEW

- **Question:** What are the returns to aggregate earnings risk exposure?
- **Methodology:**

- 1 In each month, estimate β_i^{EA} using past data:

$$ER_{i,t+1} = \alpha_i + (\beta_i + \beta_i^{EA} d_{i,t}^{EA}) ER_{m,t+1}$$

$$d_{i,t}^{EA} = 1, \text{ if firm } i \text{ announces within 1 day of time } t$$

- 2 See whether β_i^{EA} predicts next month returns:

$$R_i = \lambda_a 1(\text{Announcer}) \hat{\beta}_i^{EA} + \lambda_{na} 1(\text{Non-Announcer}) \hat{\beta}_i^{EA} + \text{controls} + \eta_i$$

- **Findings:**

- ▶ Earnings risk “priced” for announcers only: $\hat{\lambda}_a > 0$, $\hat{\lambda}_{na} = 0$
- ▶ FF5 alpha from monthly portfolio sorts on $\hat{\beta}^{EA} \approx 10.2\%$ annualized

- **My focus:** interpretation of findings

COMPENSATION FOR EARNINGS RISK?

- Reformulation of last slide as a conditional model:

$$E_t R_{i,t+1} = \alpha_i + \beta_{it} E_t R_{m,t+1}, \quad \beta_{it} = \beta_i^0 + \beta_i^1 \cdot z_t,$$

$$z_t = \left(1(t = \text{EA date}_1) \quad \dots \quad 1(t = \text{EA date}_j) \quad \dots \right)'$$

COMPENSATION FOR EARNINGS RISK?

- Reformulation of last slide as a conditional model:

$$E_t R_{i,t+1} = \alpha_i + \beta_{it} E_t R_{m,t+1}, \quad \beta_{it} = \beta_i^0 + \beta_i^1 \cdot z_t,$$

$$z_t = \left(1(t = \text{EA date}_1) \quad \dots \quad 1(t = \text{EA date}_j) \quad \dots \right)'$$

- This paper \approx estimate avg. risk price across loadings in β_i^1
 - ▶ = estimate of **time-variation** in market risk premium
 - ▶ $\stackrel{?}{=}$ estimate of systematic earnings risk premia

COMPENSATION FOR EARNINGS RISK?

- Reformulation of last slide as a conditional model:

$$E_t R_{i,t+1} = \alpha_i + \beta_{it} E_t R_{m,t+1}, \quad \beta_{it} = \beta_i^0 + \beta_i^1 \cdot z_t,$$

$$z_t = \left(1(t = \text{EA date}_1) \quad \dots \quad 1(t = \text{EA date}_j) \quad \dots \right)'$$

- This paper \approx estimate avg. risk price across loadings in β_i^1
 - ▶ = estimate of **time-variation** in market risk premium
 - ▶ β_i^0 = estimate of systematic earnings risk premia
- β_i^{QE} is a measure of “systematic earnings risk”
 - ▶ Earnings growth $_{i,t} = \delta_i + \beta_i^{QE}$ Earnings growth $_{m,t} + \epsilon_{i,t}$
 - ▶ But β_i^{QE} doesn't forecast returns \Rightarrow **is it really earnings risk?**

COMMENTS ON EARNINGS BETA

- **Interpretation problem:** β_i^{EA} measured in **event** (not calendar) time
 - ▶ Effectively rules out e.g. Apple having a “beta” to Google’s earnings
 - Why should we rule this out?
 - ▶ Difficult to interpret coefficients in Fama-MacBeth regressions
 - $\lambda_a, \lambda_{na} \neq$ risk prices

COMMENTS ON EARNINGS BETA

- **Interpretation problem:** β_i^{EA} measured in **event** (not calendar) time
 - ▶ Effectively rules out e.g. Apple having a “beta” to Google’s earnings
 - Why should we rule this out?
 - ▶ Difficult to interpret coefficients in Fama-MacBeth regressions
 - $\lambda_a, \lambda_{na} \neq$ risk prices
- **Suggestion:** implement tests using conditional model setup
 - ▶ Everything would be aligned in calendar time
 - ▶ Easy interpretation of risk prices = time variation in MRP
 - ▶ Would directly tell you time variation in MRP over EA cycle

COMMENTS ON EARNINGS BETA

- **Interpretation problem:** β_i^{EA} measured in **event** (not calendar) time
 - ▶ Effectively rules out e.g. Apple having a “beta” to Google’s earnings
 - Why should we rule this out?
 - ▶ Difficult to interpret coefficients in Fama-MacBeth regressions
 - $\lambda_a, \lambda_{na} \neq$ risk prices
- **Suggestion:** implement tests using conditional model setup
 - ▶ Everything would be aligned in calendar time
 - ▶ Easy interpretation of risk prices = time variation in MRP
 - ▶ Would directly tell you time variation in MRP over EA cycle
- **Additional comments:**
 - ▶ ERCs are low (e.g Collins et al. (1994)) $\Rightarrow \beta_i^{EA} \perp \text{earnings}_i?$

COMMENTS ON EARNINGS BETA

- **Interpretation problem:** β_i^{EA} measured in **event** (not calendar) time
 - ▶ Effectively rules out e.g. Apple having a “beta” to Google’s earnings
 - Why should we rule this out?
 - ▶ Difficult to interpret coefficients in Fama-MacBeth regressions
 - $\lambda_a, \lambda_{na} \neq$ risk prices
- **Suggestion:** implement tests using conditional model setup
 - ▶ Everything would be aligned in calendar time
 - ▶ Easy interpretation of risk prices = time variation in MRP
 - ▶ Would directly tell you time variation in MRP over EA cycle
- **Additional comments:**
 - ▶ ERCs are low (e.g Collins et al. (1994)) $\stackrel{?}{\Rightarrow} \beta_i^{EA} \perp \text{earnings}_i?$
 - ▶ Could the result be mechanical? (I don’t think so, but one could)
 - Better price discovery at EAs $\stackrel{?}{\Rightarrow}$ “better” betas?

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- How does the size of FF5 alpha compare with arbitrage limits?
 - E.g. high portfolio turnover (100% monthly?)

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- How does the size of FF5 alpha compare with arbitrage limits?
 - E.g. high portfolio turnover (100% monthly?)
- What about intermediary/microstructure-based explanations?
 - Market maker inventory considerations could generate excess comovement around EAs (a la Johnson and So (2018))
 - Could (possibly) generate $\lambda_a > 0$, but $\lambda_{na} = 0$

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- How does the size of FF5 alpha compare with arbitrage limits?
 - ▶ E.g. high portfolio turnover (100% monthly?)
- What about intermediary/microstructure-based explanations?
 - ▶ Market maker inventory considerations could generate excess comovement around EAs (a la Johnson and So (2018))
 - ▶ Could (possibly) generate $\lambda_a > 0$, but $\lambda_{na} = 0$
- More discussion of placing the paper into the literature
 - ▶ How is the objective different from Da and Warachka (2009)?
 - ▶ What's the connection to evidence that CAPM “works better” around macro announcements and days of investor information consumption (Savor and Wilson (2014); Ben-Rephael et al. (2020))?

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- How does the size of FF5 alpha compare with arbitrage limits?
 - ▶ E.g. high portfolio turnover (100% monthly?)
- What about intermediary/microstructure-based explanations?
 - ▶ Market maker inventory considerations could generate excess comovement around EAs (a la Johnson and So (2018))
 - ▶ Could (possibly) generate $\lambda_a > 0$, but $\lambda_{na} = 0$
- More discussion of placing the paper into the literature
 - ▶ How is the objective different from Da and Warachka (2009)?
 - ▶ What's the connection to evidence that CAPM “works better” around macro announcements and days of investor information consumption (Savor and Wilson (2014); Ben-Rephael et al. (2020))?
- How well-identified is β_i^{EA} off of so few observations?
 - ▶ Weak identification \implies non-standard asymptotic distribution for risk premia (Kleibergen (2009))

REFERENCES I

- Ben-Rephael, Azi, Bruce I. Carlin, Zhi Da, and Ryan D. Israelsen (2020), "Information Consumption and Asset Pricing." *Journal of Finance*.
- Collins, Daniel W., S. P. Kothari, Jay Shanken, and Richard G. Sloan (1994), "Lack of timeliness versus noise as explanations for the low contemporaneous return-earnings association." *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 18, 289–324.
- Da, Zhi and Mitchell Craig Warachka (2009), "Cashflow risk, systematic earnings revisions, and the cross-section of stock returns." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 94, 448–468.
- Johnson, Travis L. and Eric C. So (2018), "Asymmetric Trading Costs Prior to Earnings Announcements: Implications for Price Discovery and Returns." *Journal of Accounting Research*, 56, 217–263.
- Kleibergen, Frank (2009), "Tests of risk premia in linear factor models." *Journal of Econometrics*, 149, 149–173.
- Savor, Pavel and Mungo Wilson (2014), "Asset pricing: A tale of two days." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 113, 171–201.