



Working Paper 138/13

(updated version June 2014)

**INSIGHTS ON THE GLOBAL MACRO-FINANCE INTERFACE:
STRUCTURAL SOURCES OF RISK FACTOR FLUCTUATIONS
AND THE CROSS-SECTION OF EXPECTED STOCK RETURNS**

Claudio Morana

Insights on the global macro-finance interface: Structural sources of risk factor fluctuations and the cross-section of expected stock returns

Claudio Morana,^{*†}

Università di Milano Bicocca (Milano, Italy),
CeRP-Collegio Carlo Alberto (Moncalieri, Italy),

First draft May 2013; this draft June, 22, 2014

Abstract

This study contributes to the investigation of the macro-finance interface by assessing the economic content and risk based interpretation of widely employed risk factors in the specification of empirical asset pricing models, i.e., Fama-French size and value, Carhart momentum, as well as the more recent Pastor-Stambaugh liquidity and Adrian-Etula-Muir leverage factors. Strong support for their risk based interpretation, encompassing evidence on cause, persistence and direction of the size, value and momentum effects, and new insights on the specification of systematic risk, are provided.

^{*}Address for correspondence: Claudio Morana, Università di Milano-Bicocca, Dipartimento di Economia, Metodi Quantitativi e Strategie di Impresa, Piazza dell'Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126, Milano, Italy. E-mail: claudio.morana@unimib.it.

[†]A previous version of the paper was presented at the 8th BMRC-QASS Conference on Macro and Financial Economics/Econometrics, Brunel University, the 22nd Annual Symposium of the Society for Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics, Central University of New York, the 10th BMRC-DEMS Conference on Macro and Financial Economics/Econometrics, Brunel University. The author is grateful to conference participants, A. Beltratti, F.C. Bagliano, R.T. Baillie, M. Rockinger and two anonymous referees for constructive comments. This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 3202782013-2015.

Keywords: macro-finance interface; risk factors; size, value, momentum, liquidity, volatility and leverage effects; factor vector autoregressive model.

JEL classification: G1, C3.

1 Introduction

Since the seminal contributions in the late 1980s, empirical evidence of predictability of stock prices by business cycle variables has stimulated the ongoing investigation of the macroeconomic determinants of asset prices (see Chen et al., 1986; Campbell and Shiller, 1988; Fama and French, 1988; Ferson and Harvey, 1991)¹, ensued from the empirical failure of the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM).²

Two different lines of research can be noted in the empirical asset pricing literature, both related to the intertemporal CAPM model (ICAPM). As shown by Merton (1973), once shifts in the investment opportunity set are allowed, the equilibrium equity premium is determined according to a multifactor model, measuring risk in terms of covariance with the market return, as well as with state variables related to unfavorable changes in the investment opportunity set, i.e., downward revisions in expectations of future returns on the market (Campbell, 1993), or in terms of covariance with cash-flow and discount rates news (Campbell and Vuolteenaho, 2004) and news about future risk (Campbell et al., 2012).

The first strand of research augments the market model with additional factors; for instance, Fama and French (FF, 1993) propose a three-factor model considering, in addition to the market excess return (MKT), size (SMB) and value (HML) factors, while Carhart (1997) adds a fourth factor, i.e., momentum (MOM), to the FF specification. Other possible risk factors, proposed in the literature, are related to sector investment growth, human capital, consumption dispersion, stock market liquidity, default risk, gross-profitability, financial leverage (see Goyal (2012) and Nagel (2013) for recent surveys).

In contrast, a second approach proposes conditional reformulations of the CAPM and C-CAPM. This follows findings of Ferson and Harvey (1991) and Ferson and Korajczyk (1995), concerning statistically significant time variation in the market beta and its price. As shown by Jagannathan and Wang (1996), the unconditional version of the conditional CAPM (C-CAPM) model also has a multifactor structure, measuring priced risk in terms of the covariance between the time-varying beta and the time-varying expected market risk premium (consumption growth), in addition to covariance with the market risk premium (consumption growth).

Which of the two multifactor specifications is empirically validated is a controversial issue, as both types of models have been found to show similar

¹See Cochrane (2007) for a survey on the macro-finance interface literature.

²See Fama and French (2004) and Campbell and Vuolteenaho (2004) for an account of the empirical literature.

explanatory power³.

Moreover, once scaling information is included in the specification, the Fama-French factors tend to lose explanatory power for the cross-section of expected returns; for instance, Ferson and Harvey (1999) find that when the market factor (*MKT*) is scaled by business cycle variables, *HML* is not any longer statistically significant; similarly Lettau and Ludvigson (2001), for both *SMB* and *HML*, when the Lettau-Ludvigson consumption, asset wealth and labor income (*cay*) factor is employed for scaling. Moreover, Li et al. (2006) show that the priced information in the Fama-French factors is subsumed in four sector specific investment growth factors. Also, Petkova (2006) and Hahn and Lee (2006) find that both *SMB* and *HML* are superfluous in explaining the size and book-to-market effects once the default and term premia are included in the information set. As the default and term spreads are determined by credit market conditions (asset distress risk) and the stance of monetary policy (asset duration risk), their innovations may measure revisions in market expectations about future credit supply and interest rates (Hahn and Lee, 2006; Petkova, 2006), and therefore business cycle conditions/risk (Campbell and Diebold, 2009). Coherently, Ludvigson and Ng (2007) find *SMB*, *HML* and *MKT* strongly correlated with a common risk factor extracted from a broad cross-section of financial indicators (comprised of valuation ratios, interest rate spreads, industry returns and risk factors); Vassalou (2003) and Kapadia (2011) find the predictive ability of *SMB* and *HML* for the cross-section of expected equity returns determined by their informational content concerning future GDP growth and that component of GDP growth correlated with aggregate distress risk; on the other hand, Abhakorn et al. (2013) relate the predictive ability of *HML* to its informational content concerning the investment growth prospect of firms.

The above results are however consistent with Merton's ICAPM, as *SMB* and *HML* might mimic state variables related to firms' distress, measuring revisions in expectations about the investment opportunity set (Fama and French, 1993, 1996; Davis et al., 2000), i.e., covariance with recession; as recessions are periods when risk and risk aversion are high, (procyclical) small and value stocks should pay a higher premium than (countercyclical) large and growth stocks. Indeed, Bai and Ng (2006) find the information content of innovations in consumption and industrial production growth, inflation, and the corporate and term spreads actually subsumed in *SMB*, *HML* and

³See for instance Fama and French (1993, 1996), Ferson and Harvey (1999), Davis et al. (2000), Lettau and Ludvigson (2001), Campbell and Vuolteenaho (2004), Petkova and Zhang (2005), Lustig and Van Nieuwerburgh (2005), Santos and Veronesi (2005), Kang et al. (2011), Campbell et al. (2012).

MKT.⁴

This paper then contributes to the literature on the macro-finance interface, and the debate concerning the specification of systematic risk, by yielding further insights on the risk-based interpretation of the Fama-French *SMB* and *HML* factors, as well as Carhart momentum (*MOM*), Pastor-Stambaugh stock market liquidity (*PSL*) and Adrian-Etula-Muir financial leverage (*LEV*); moreover, Bagliano-Morana financial fragility (*FRA*), global stock market-wide returns (*F*), and risk aversion/economic uncertainty factors are also assessed.

The originality of the study stems from its global economy perspective, as macro-financial conditions are assessed with reference to a broad cross-section of macroeconomic and financial variables for 50 countries, as well as for the depth of the investigation, yielding insights on *i*) structural determinants of risk factor fluctuations; *ii*) the source, persistence and direction of the size, value and momentum effects; *iii*) the specification of systematic risk. New findings, as well as encompassing evidence, concerning risk factor dynamics over the business cycle, are provided.

To anticipate the main results of the paper, we find strong support for a risk-based interpretation of *SMB* and *HML*, *MOM*, as well as for the other risk factors. Interestingly, different sources of macroeconomic and financial risk are reflected by the various risk factors; in particular, productivity and monetary policy stance shocks for *SMB*; labor market and term structure slope shocks for *HML*; aggregate demand and US terms of trade shocks for *MOM*. Moreover, procyclical size, value and momentum, as well as market-wide, leverage and stock market liquidity effects, appear to be mostly generated by demand-side macroeconomic shocks, largely accounting for business cycle fluctuations; similarly for countercyclical volatility and credit risk. Finally, we find that not all the structural sources of risk factor fluctuations might be priced by the market, and filtering out non-priced components improves the performance of empirical asset pricing models.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the econometric methodology is outlined, while in Section 3 the estimation of the econometric model and the identification of the structural shocks is performed. Then, in Sections 4 and 5 the empirical results concerning macro-financial sources of risk factor fluctuations and their dynamic responses to key structural shocks are presented. Finally, in Section 6 results related to the specification of systematic risk are discussed, while conclusions are drawn in Section 7.

⁴Moreover, the exact factor null hypothesis is not rejected for *SMB*, *HML* and *MKT*, while it is strongly rejected for the innovations in any of the above macroeconomic variables.

2 The econometric model

Consistent with the global economy perspective of the investigation, the econometric model is comprised of two blocks of equations, referring to global and single-country dynamics, respectively.

In particular, the first block refers to *observed* ($\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$) and *unobserved* ($\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$) *global* macro-financial factors and oil market demand and supply side variables (\mathbf{O}_t), at time period t , $t = 1, \dots, T$, collected in a $R \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{F}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \ \mathbf{F}'_{2,t} \ \mathbf{O}'_t]'$; the variables of main interest for the study, i.e., the risk factors, are then collected, among other variables, in the subvector $\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$.

The second block refers to Q macro-financial variables for M countries, collected in a $N \times 1$ vector \mathbf{Z}_t ($N = M \times Q$). Given the aim of the study, the modeling of single-country dynamics is only functional to the extraction of the *unobserved* global macro-financial factors ($\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$), accounting for the international comovement in financial and real variables, which can be accurately performed within the framework proposed in Morana (2014).

The joint dynamics of the *global* and *local* macro-financial blocks are then modelled by means of the following reduced form dynamic factor model

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(L))(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_t \quad (1)$$

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{C}(L))((\mathbf{Z}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa})) = \mathbf{v}_t. \quad (2)$$

The model is cast in a weakly stationary representation, as $(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}), (\mathbf{Z}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim I(0)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ are $N \times 1$ and $R \times 1$ vectors of intercept components, respectively, with $R \leq N$.

Global dynamics are described by the stationary finite order polynomial matrix in the lag operator $\mathbf{P}(L)$, $\mathbf{P}(L) \equiv \mathbf{P}_1 L + \mathbf{P}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{P}_p L^p$, where \mathbf{P}_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$, is a square matrix of coefficients of order R , and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \sim i.i.d.(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta)$ is a $R \times 1$ vector of i.i.d. reduced form shocks driving the \mathbf{F}_t factors. The contemporaneous effects of the global factors on each country's variables in \mathbf{Z}_t are measured by the loading coefficients collected in the $N \times R$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = [\boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_{F_1} \ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_{F_2} \ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_O]'$.

Local dynamics are described by the stationary finite order block (own country) diagonal polynomial matrix in the lag operator $\mathbf{C}(L) \equiv \mathbf{C}_1 L + \mathbf{C}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{C}_c L^c$, where \mathbf{C}_j , $j = 0, \dots, c$, is a square matrix of coefficients of order N , partitioned as

$$\mathbf{C}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{j,11} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ Q \times Q & & & \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{j,22} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ & Q \times Q & & \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{j,MM} \\ & & & Q \times Q \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, $\mathbf{v}_t \sim i.i.d.(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_v)$ is the $N \times 1$ vector of reduced-form idiosyncratic (i.e., country-specific) disturbances, with $E[\eta_{jt}v_{is}] = 0$ for all i, j, t, s .

According to the specification of the model in (1)-(2), then (i) global shocks ($\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$) affect both the global and local economies through the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{P}(L)$ and the factor loading matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$; (ii) country-specific disturbances (\mathbf{v}_t) do not affect the global economy, limiting their impact only to the country of origin ($\mathbf{C}(L)$ is assumed to be block (own-country) diagonal).

By substituting (1) into (2), the reduced form vector autoregressive (VAR) representation of the dynamic factor model can be written as

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(L))(\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{Z}'_t]'$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = [\boldsymbol{\kappa}' \boldsymbol{\mu}']'$,

$$\mathbf{A}(L) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}(L) & \mathbf{0} \\ [\boldsymbol{\Lambda}\mathbf{P}(L) - \mathbf{C}(L)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}] & \mathbf{C}(L) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{1,t} \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \end{bmatrix} [\boldsymbol{\eta}_t] + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{v}_t \end{bmatrix},$$

with variance-covariance matrix

$$E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_t] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta & \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_v \end{pmatrix}.$$

The structural vector moving average representation for the global model in (1) can then be written as

$$(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \mathbf{H}_F(L) \mathbf{K}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t, \quad (6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ is the vector of the R structural shocks driving the common factors in \mathbf{F}_t , i.e., $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t$, \mathbf{K} is a $R \times R$ invertible matrix, and

$$\mathbf{H}(L) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}_F(L) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{H}_{FZ}(L) & \mathbf{H}_Z(L) \end{pmatrix} \equiv (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(L))^{-1}.$$

By assumption, the structural factor shocks are orthogonal and have unit variance, so that $E[\boldsymbol{\xi}_t \boldsymbol{\xi}_t'] = \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \mathbf{K}' = \mathbf{I}_R$. To achieve exact identification of the structural disturbances, additional $R(R - 1)/2$ restrictions need to be imposed. Since $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$, imposing exclusion restrictions on the contemporaneous impact matrix amounts to imposing zero restrictions on the elements of \mathbf{K}^{-1} , for which a lower-triangular structure is assumed. Operationally, \mathbf{K}^{-1} (with the $R(R - 1)/2$ zero restrictions necessary for exact identification imposed) is estimated by the Choleski decomposition of the factor innovation variance-covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta$, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{K}}^{-1} = chol(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\eta)$.

2.1 Estimation

Following Morana (2014), the unobserved global factors and the local model in (2) are estimated by means of an iterative procedure, bearing the interpretation of Quasi-Maximum Likelihood (*QML*) estimation implemented through the Expectation-Maximization (*EM*) algorithm: in the *E*-step the unobserved factors are estimated, given the observed data and the current estimate of model parameters, by means of Principal Components Analysis (*PCA*); in the *M*-step the likelihood function is maximized (OLS estimation of the $\mathbf{C}(L)$ matrix is performed) under the assumption that the unobserved factors are known, conditioning on their *E*-step consistent estimate. Relative to one-step PCA estimation of the unobserved factors, the iterative procedure should yield an efficiency improvement.

Next, the global model in (1) is estimated by means of PC-VAR (Morana, 2012) using $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_t$. In practice, PCA is applied to $\mathbf{x}_t \equiv \hat{\mathbf{F}}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}$ to compute $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t = \hat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}_Q' \mathbf{x}_t$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}_Q$ is the $R \times Q$, $Q < R$, matrix of orthogonal eigenvectors associated with the largest Q eigenvalues of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = E[\mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t']$); then, the stationary dynamic vector regression model $\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{D}(L) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim i.i.d.(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\varepsilon)$, where $\mathbf{D}(L) \equiv \mathbf{D}_1 L + \mathbf{D}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{D}_p L^p$ has all the roots outside the unit circle, is estimated by OLS; finally the (implied) OLS estimate of $\mathbf{P}(L)$ is obtained by solving the set of linear constraints $\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L) = \hat{\mathbf{D}}(L) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Xi}}_Q'$.

By using $\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L)$, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(L)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}$, obtained from (1) and (2), the $\mathbf{A}(L)$ matrix in (5) is then estimated as

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}}(L) = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{P}}(L) & \mathbf{0} \\ [\hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} \hat{\mathbf{P}}(L) - \hat{\mathbf{C}}(L) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}] & \hat{\mathbf{C}}(L) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Following the thick modelling strategy of Granger and Jeon (2004), median estimates of the parameters of interest, impulse responses, forecast error variance and historical decompositions, as well as their confidence intervals,

are obtained by means of Monte Carlo simulation.⁵

3 Estimation of the global model

The global model in (1) counts 33 endogenous variables, collected in the vector $\mathbf{F}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{2,t} \mathbf{O}'_t]'$, and it is estimated using quarterly observations over the period 1985:1 through 2010:3.⁶

$\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ contains 12 unobserved global factors estimated by means of the local country block (2), using a first order own country diagonal dynamic structure, as suggested by the BIC information criterion.⁷ The local block counts over 800 equations and contains macroeconomic and financial data for 50 countries. The unobserved global macro-financial factors, estimated using subsets of homogeneous variables are as follows: *real activity growth* (Y), *excess public consumption growth* (*fiscal stance*), *US\$ exchange rate return index*, *core inflation*, *excess liquidity growth*, *employment growth*, *unemployment rate change*, *real wage growth*, *real stock market returns* (F), *real housing market returns*, *real short term rate* and *term spread*.

$\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$ contains 11 observed global (or US) factors, i.e., the Bagliano and Morana (2012) *financial fragility index* (FRA) in differences, the Fama and French (1993) *size* and *value* factors (SMB , HML), the Carhart (1997) *momentum* factor (MOM), the Pastor and Stambaugh (2003) *stock market liquidity* factor (PSL), the Adrian, Etula and Muir (2012) *leverage* factor (LEV), a *risk aversion index* (FV), *real gold price returns*, *real non-energy commodities returns*, *US fiscal and trade deficit to GDP ratios* in differences.

\mathbf{O}_t contains 10 global oil market variables, i.e., *world oil reserves growth*, *net world oil production changes* (increase and decrease), *OECD oil refineries margins growth*, *world oil consumption growth*, *OECD oil inventories growth*, *real WTI oil price returns*, *nominal WTI oil price volatility* in differences, the *12-month futures basis* and *Working-T index growth rate*.

PC-VAR estimation of the global model in (1) involves the first 12 principal components of \mathbf{F}_t ⁸, jointly accounting for 80% of total variance, and three lags, as selected according to Monte Carlo results (Morana, 2012) and

⁵See Morana (2012, 2014), as well as the WP version of this paper (<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2373542>), for details about the estimation procedure.

⁶See the WP version of the paper for details about the dataset, as well as the estimation of the unobserved global factors.

⁷ $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{1,t}$ has been obtained by conditioning with respect to $\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$ and only a subset of the variables considered in \mathbf{O}_t , i.e., the real oil price and the real non-energy commodities price index, which are available since 1980:1. The other oil market variables are available only since 1986:1.

⁸Net oil production variables excluded.

specification tests. Hence, 36 parameters are estimated for each of the 33 equations in the model. Note that, given the sample size available, the estimation of an unrestricted VAR(3) model would have been infeasible, counting 99 parameters for each equations.

3.1 Identification of the structural shocks

The identification of the structural shocks is based on the Choleski decomposition of the variance-covariance matrix of the global model innovations η_t , grounded on the following rationale concerning global macro-financial interactions:

- the oil market supply side is constrained by geophysical conditions, and therefore relatively exogenous to macro-financial dynamics;
- oil consumption is contemporaneously determined by the state of the world business cycle, while oil inventories by oil market supply-side and (flow and financial) demand-side conditions;
- real oil price and nominal oil price volatility are contemporaneously determined by oil supply and demand interactions.

Moreover, it is assumed that:

- real activity, over the business cycle, is determined by labor market conditions, through a short-run production function;
- the fiscal/trade stance contemporaneously adjust to business cycle conditions;
- aggregate demand feedbacks with delay to aggregate supply, and prices adjust according to their interaction;
- real wages react contemporaneously to prices and aggregate demand/supply developments;
- the liquidity stance, set (by central banks) according to the state of the business cycle, contemporaneously determines the real short-term interest rate, also impacting on asset prices and financial risk;
- liquidity, consistent with a leaning-against-the-wind strategy followed by central banks, may then respond to asset prices and financial risk developments only with (at least one-quarter) delay;
- risk factors react contemporaneously to oil market, macroeconomic/liquidity, real estate and exchange rate market conditions;
- asset prices react contemporaneously to oil market and business cycle conditions, the monetary policy stance and changing expectations on the investment opportunity set (risk factors), assuming housing prices are slower moving than commodities prices, and stock prices faster moving than any other asset.

The recursive ordering implied by the above assumptions is then as follows:

- *oil supply conditions*: reserves, oil production changes, refineries margins;
- *macroeconomic conditions*: employment, unemployment, real activity (Y), fiscal stance, US fiscal and trade deficits, core inflation, real wages;
- *flow oil demand conditions*: oil consumption;
- *monetary policy stance*: excess liquidity, real short term rate and term spread;
- *financial conditions I*: real housing prices, US\$ exchange rate index, risk aversion index (FV), Fama-French size and value factors (SMB , HML), Carhart momentum factor (MOM), Pastor-Stambaugh stock market liquidity factor (PSL), Adrian-Etula-Muir leverage factor (LEV);
- *oil futures and spot market conditions*: Working-T index, futures market basis, oil inventories, oil price, oil price volatility;
- *financial conditions II*: real non-energy commodities, stock (F) and gold prices, Bagliano-Morana fragility index (FRA).

As the implied recursive structural model is exactly identified, the assumed contemporaneous exclusion restrictions cannot be tested. Yet, a joint test, based on the Bonferroni bounds principle, carried out using the 528 possible bivariate tests implied by the recursive structure involving the 33 variables, does not reject, even at the 20% significance level, the weak exogeneity null hypothesis (the value of the test is 0.005 to be compared with a 20% critical value equal to 0.0004). While this result cannot be taken as a validation for the set of restrictions at the system level, it suggests however that the implied pair wise recursive structure is coherent with the data. We then expect the identified shocks be robust to the ordering of the variables.

Three main sets of structural disturbances are then identified by means of the assumed recursive structure, i.e., oil market, macroeconomic and financial shocks. Given the scope of the analysis, insights for selected shocks of interest only are reported below; the latter are those contributing most to risk factor fluctuations (see the forecast error variance decomposition section).⁹

3.1.1 Oil market structural shocks

The *oil market supply-side* structural disturbances (SUP) are: *oil reserves* (OR), *flow oil supply* (positive, OSP ; negative, OSN) and *oil production mix* shocks.

In particular:

⁹Details concerning the congruence of empirical and expected theoretical properties of the identified structural shocks are available in the WP version of this paper.

- A positive *oil reserves* (*OR*) shock (signaling a future downward shift in the flow oil supply schedule) drives the futures and the spot oil prices downward.
- A negative (*OSN*) (positive, *OSP*) flow oil supply shock (upward (downward) shift in the flow oil supply schedule) causes a negative (positive) correlation between oil production and the real oil price.

3.1.2 Macroeconomic structural shocks

The macroeconomic structural disturbances are: *labor market demand and supply* (*LS*), *aggregate demand* (*AD*), *productivity* (*PR*), *core inflation*, and *global imbalance* (*FT*; *global* (*GFI*), *US* (*GDI*) and *ex-US global saving rate*) shocks.

In particular:

- A positive *labor supply* shock (*LS*, downward shift in the labor supply schedule) causes a negative correlation between employment and the real wage. The latter can also be understood in terms of a positive *labor factor share* shock, causing a negative correlation between real stock prices and real wages, as in Lettau and Ludvigson (2011).
- A positive *aggregate demand* shock (*AD*, upward shift in the aggregate demand schedule) induces a positive correlation between output and the price level. *AD* also is the real activity own equation structural disturbance.
- A positive *productivity* shock (*PR*, rightward shift in the long-run aggregate supply schedule) causes a permanent increase in output and contraction in aggregate stock prices (through Shumpeterian's *creative destruction* effects, as in Kogan et al. (2012)¹⁰, or through pricing kernels effects, as in Canova and De Nicolò, 2005), negatively affecting, or without impacting, the price level.
- A positive *global fiscal imbalance* shock is a negative *global saving rate* shock (*GFI*); as predicted by the neoclassical growth model, the shock leads to a downward shift in gross investment and to a contraction in the steady-state real capital and output levels, which decline over the transition process as well.
- Similarly, a positive *US fiscal imbalance* shock is a negative *US saving rate* shock (*GDI*); due to the driving role of the US for the global economy, the contraction in the US steady-state real capital and output levels deter-

¹⁰While shareholder wealth increases at the innovator firm, shareholder wealth destruction occurs at the innovator's competitor firms, which fail to fully adopt the new technology. As the aggregate market return is a weighted average of individual firms stock returns, a positive (negative) linkage between productivity shocks and stock prices can then be posited at the firm (aggregate) level.

mined by *GDI* leads to a contraction in the world steady-state real capital and output levels as well.

3.1.3 Financial structural shocks

The financial structural disturbances are: *monetary policy stance* (*MPS*), *term structure level* (*TL*) and *slope* (*TS*), *US terms of trade* (*TT*) and portfolio allocation/preferences (*stocks* (*PF*), *housing, non-energy commodities and gold*) shocks.

In particular:

- A positive *monetary policy stance/excess liquidity* shock (*MPS*) induces a negative correlation between overall liquidity and interest rates; through interest rate, asset prices, and credit channels, the shock is then transmitted to real activity.

- A positive *term structure level* shock (*TL*) shifts upward the whole term structure of interest rates; moreover, a positive *term structure slope* shock (*TS*) tilts upward the term structure of interest rates.

- A negative *US terms of trade* shock (*TT*) causes a depreciation of the US\$ exchange rate.

- Positive *stocks* (*PF*), *housing, non-energy commodities and gold portfolio allocation/preference* shocks lead to an increase in the demand of the corresponding asset and its price, unrelated to global macro-financial and oil market developments, triggering portfolio reallocation across asset classes and impacting, through wealth, Tobin's *Q* and financial accelerator (Bernanke and Gertler, 1989) effects, on real activity as well. *PF* also is the real stock prices own equation structural disturbance.

Moreover, *revisions in expectations* about the state of the investment opportunity set (*size* (*SZ*), *value* (*VL*), *momentum* (*MM*), *stock market liquidity* (*SL*) and *financial leverage* (*LV*)), and *risk aversion* and *appetite* (*RAV*, *RAP*) shocks are identified. The latter disturbances are the own factor equation structural shocks, i.e., *RAV* for *FV*, *SZ* for *SMB*, *VL* for *HML*, *MM* for *MOM*, *SL* for *PSL*, *LV* for *LEV*, and *RAP* for *FRA*; due to ordering, the latter are contemporaneously orthogonal to macroeconomic and oil market conditions.

In particular:

- A positive *size* shock (*SZ*) causes a positive correlation between *SMB* and real activity, revealing expectations of favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.¹¹

¹¹As small firms are more vulnerable than large firms to changing credit conditions, being poorly collateralized and having limited access to external capital markets, improving (worsening) credit/macroeconomic conditions might then be associated with a higher

4 Forecast error variance decomposition

Figure 1 reports the results for the median forecast error variance decomposition (FEVD), computed up to a horizon of ten years (40 quarters), for selected horizons: very short-term (within 2 quarters, VST), short-term (between 1 and 2 years, ST), medium-term (three to five years, MT), and long-term (10-year horizon, LT). The latter exercise is useful to gauge insights on the macro-financial information content of risk factors, measured on average over the period investigated, i.e., 1986:1 through 2010:3.

In particular, results are displayed with reference to the contribution of *oil market supply side* shocks (*SUP*); selected *macroeconomic* and *financial* shocks, i.e., labor supply (*LS*), aggregate demand (*AD*), productivity (*PR*), global imbalance/saving rates (*FT*), monetary policy stance (*MPS*), term structure level (*TL*) and US terms of trade (*TT*) shocks; risk factors and real activity *own/idiosyncratic structural* shocks (*OWN*)¹²

As shown in Figure 1 (top plot # 1), strong endogeneity can be noted for all variables already in the very short-term, as the own (idiosyncratic) shocks account for only 13% to 16% of fluctuations for real stock prices (*F*) and the fragility index (*FRA*) within 2 quarters; 28% for momentum (*MOM*) and leverage (*LEV*); 43% to 49% for size (*SMB*), value (*HML*), stock market volatility (*FV*) and stock market liquidity (*PSL*); 58% for real activity (*Y*).

Figures are even smaller at longer horizons; short-term: 11% to 24% for *F*, *MOM*, *LEV* and *FRA*; 31% to 46% for *Y*, *FV*, *SMB*, *HML* and *PSL*; long-term: 5% to 12% for *Y*, *F*, *SMB*, *MOM* and *FRA*; 21% to 23% for *FV* and *LEV*; 32% to 39% for *HML* and *PSL*.

Moreover, while all categories of structural shocks account for the endogeneity of risk factor fluctuations, in general, macroeconomic shocks contribute most sizably in the very short-term (25% to 35%; not reported), financial shocks in the short-term (8% to 23%; not reported), and oil market supply side shocks in the long-term (12% to 31%; not reported). The contribution of (other) risk factor (own) shocks to risk factor fluctuations is also sizable (23% to 35% ST; not reported) as well as for real activity fluctuations (14% ST, 12% LT; *SZ*: 9% ST; not reported).¹³

(lower) profitability of small rather than large stocks, i.e., with a higher contemporaneous return on *SMB*.

¹²A full set of results is available in the WP version of the paper.

¹³Some exceptions should however be noted. For instance, the contribution of macroeconomic shocks is strongest in the long-term for *SMB* (44% LT; 28% to 31% VST-ST) and *PSL* (20% LT; 12%-19% VST-ST), and in the short-term for *MOM* (38% ST; 24% VST, LT); the contribution of financial shocks is strongest in the long-term for *MOM* (35% LT; 9%-17% VST-ST), while stable across horizons for *HML* (7% to 9% VST to LT); the contribution of (other) risk factor (own) shocks is least sizable for *FV*, *HML*

The contribution of shocks within each category is however not equally relevant; in this respect, the following findings are noteworthy.

Firstly, labor supply (*LS*) and aggregate demand (*AD*), as well as term structure level (*TL*) shocks, are a source of common fluctuations in real activity and stock prices at short horizons.

In particular, *LS* (top plot # 2) accounts for 17%, 7% and 4% of fluctuations in *Y*, *F* and *FV* in the very short-term, as well as for 15% for *HML*. Also sizable is its contribution in the short-term (21%, 7%, 4%, 11%, for *Y*, *F*, *FV* and *HML*, respectively), while weaker in the long-term (5%, 6%, 4%, 1%, for *Y*, *F*, *FV* and *HML*, respectively); *LS* also accounts for 3% to 7% of fluctuations for *PSL*, *LEV*, *FRA* in the short- to long-term.

Moreover, *AD* (top plot # 3) accounts for 58% of fluctuations in *Y* and 7% in *F* and *FV* in the very short-term, as well as for 9% for *FRA*. The contribution of *AD* to common fluctuations at longer horizons is weaker (ST: 14%, 2%, 7% for *Y*, *F*, *FV*, respectively; LT: 5%, 1%, 7%, respectively). Also, *AD* accounts for a sizable proportion of fluctuations for *MOM* in the short-term (8% ST; 4% VST and LT), and for *SMB* and *HML* in the medium- to long-term (5%; 3%-4% ST).

Finally, *TL* (center plot #1) is a source of common short-term fluctuations in *Y* (2% to 6%), *F* (4% to 5%) and *FRA* (3% to 5%).

Secondly, productivity (*PR*), global imbalance/saving rates (*FT*) and monetary policy stance (*MPS*) shocks are sources of common fluctuations in real activity and stock prices in the short- to long-term.

In particular, *PR* (center plot # 2) accounts for 15% to 19%, 7% to 9%, 4% to 2% of medium- to long-term fluctuations in *Y*, *F*, *FV*, as well as for 28% to 32% for *SMB* and 6% for *LEV*. *PR* sizably contributes to fluctuations at shorter horizons as well (VST to ST: 0% to 9%, 8% to 3%, 12% to 8%, 16% to 19%, and 7%, for *Y*, *F*, *FV*, *SMB*, and *LEV*, respectively).

Also, *FT* (center plot # 3) accounts for 17% to 15%, 9% to 8%, and 8% to 7% of fluctuations in *Y*, *F*, *FV*, as well as for 14%, 21% to 17%, 7% to 6% for *LEV*, *MOM* and *HML*, respectively, in the medium- to long-term; 6% to 8% for *FRA*, *SMB* and *PSL* in the very short- to long-term. The contribution of *FT* to common fluctuations is also sizable at shorter horizons (8% to 17%, 13% to 10%, 7%, 16% to 14%, 12% to 23% and 16% to 7% for *Y*, *F*, *FV*, *LEV*, *MOM* and *HML*, respectively).

Moreover, *MPS* (bottom plot # 1) accounts for common fluctuations in *FV* (5% to 9%) and *SMB* (15% to 10%) in the short- to long-term; similarly *TS* (not reported) for *Y* (3% to 4%) and *HML* (3% to 5%).

Thirdly, *TT* (bottom plot # 2) is a source of common fluctuations in *Y* and *SMB* at any horizon (8% to 10% ST; 6% to 7% LT).

(6% to 10%), *SMB* (6% to 7%) and *MOM* (7% to 21%) in the medium-to long-term.

Fourthly, apart from *MOM* (7%; 4% LT) and *SMB* (9%; 7% LT), the contribution of oil market supply side shocks (*SUP*; bottom plot # 3) is larger in the long-term than at any other horizon (short-term): 12% (10%) for *Y*; 23% to 31% (13% to 15%) for *F*, *FV*, *FRA*, and 12% to 18% (11% to 14%) for *PSL*, *LEV* and *HML*.

4.1 Summary of the findings

Overall, the results are clear-cut, providing strong support for a risk-based interpretation of *SMB* and *HML*, as well as for *MOM*, *F*, *FV*, *LEV*, *PSL* and *FRA*. While broadly consistent with available evidence on the linkages between *SMB* and *HML* and business cycle and interest rates shocks (Li et al., 2006; Lettau and Ludvigson, 2001; Ludvigson and Ng, 2007; Petkova, 2006; Hahn and Lee, 2006; Vassalou, 2003; Kapadia, 2011, Abhakorn et al., 2013), as well as between *MOM* and the state of the business cycle (Chordia and Shivakumar, 2002; Cooper et al., 2004; Liu and Zhang, 2008), our findings yield however deeper insights on the structural sources of comovement in real activity and risk factors.

In particular, macroeconomic shocks contribute most sizably in the very short-term, financial shocks in the short-term, and oil market supply side shocks in the long-term. Moreover, different sources of macroeconomic risk appear to be reflected by the various risk factors: labor market (and saving rates) shocks for *HML*, aggregate demand (and saving rates) shocks for *MOM*, productivity shocks for *SMB*, global imbalance shocks for *LEV*; in contrast, *F*, *FV*, *PSL* and *FRA* cannot be associated with a specific source of macroeconomic risk, being affected by all macroeconomic shocks, to various degrees. In this respect, the more detailed decomposition achieved in the current study allows for disentangling other sources of macroeconomic risk, presumably subsumed in the *risk aversion* shock identified by Lettau and Ludvigson (2011).

Similarly concerning the sources of financial risk: monetary policy stance (and US terms of trade) shocks for *SMB*; term structure slope shocks for *HML*; portfolio allocation (and term structure level) shocks for *FRA*; US terms of trade (and portfolio allocation) shocks for *MOM*; monetary policy stance (and portfolio allocation) shocks for *FV*.

In contrast, oil market supply side shocks are a common source of fluctuations for all risk factors, affecting *SMB* and *MOM* to a lower extent.

Finally, the contribution of risk factor shocks, *SZ* in particular, to real activity (9% ST; not reported) and stock prices (23% ST; not reported)

variance is a new and noteworthy finding, consistent with the view that small firms do contribute to business cycle fluctuations, as well as with the relevance of the *financial accelerator* mechanism.¹⁴ Moreover, in so far as *SZ* measures revisions in expectations on the investment opportunity set, changes in expected fundamentals, by impacting on firms' investment, as well as on households' labor supply, might even affect business cycle conditions directly, consistent with news-driven business cycle theories (see Beaudry and Portier, 2013). The latter findings surely invite a further assessment of the signalling properties of risk factors, also from the perspective of constructing an early warning indicator of macro-financial instability.

5 Dynamic response of risk factors to structural shocks

To gain further insights into the risk based interpretation of risk factors, impulse response analysis (IRF) is then employed to assess their dynamic response to structural disturbances yielding favorable/adverse changes in the investment opportunity set.

The empirical results are displayed in Table 1, Panel A-I, over selected time horizons, as for the FEVD. Apart from *LEV* and *PSL*, cumulated impulse response functions are reported in all cases. Details concerning the generation of persistent size, value and momentum effects, as well as market-wide, volatility and credit risk/fragility effects, are reported below, distinguishing between demand- and supply-side shocks. Some details concerning transitory liquidity and leverage effects are also reported.¹⁵

5.1 Procyclical and countercyclical effects of demand-side disturbances

A positive (favorable) *aggregate demand* (*AD*) shock leads to a permanent increase in real activity (0.67% VST; 0.59% ST; 0.29% LT; Panel A) and a procyclical response in stock prices (0.23% VST; 0.13% ST and LT; Panel B). Procyclical size, value and momentum, as well as countercyclical volatility and credit risk/fragility effects are also generated by *AD*, as *SMB* (0.91% VST; 1.08% ST; 1.12% LT; Panel D), *HML* (0.32% VST; 1.65% ST, 1.49%

¹⁴A positive (negative) shock to borrower's creditworthiness turns into a lower (higher) external finance premium and therefore to higher (lower) investment, creating a *financial accelerator* effect (Bernanke and Gertler, 1989).

¹⁵Additional results can be found in the WP version of this article.

LT; Panel E) and *MOM* (1.97% VST; 1.49% ST; 1.26% LT; Panel F) permanently increase, while a permanent contraction in *FV* (-0.27% VST; -0.20% ST and LT; Panel C) and *FRA* (-3 b.p. VST; 2 b.p. ST; -1 b.p. LT; Panel I) can be noted. In contrast, the procyclical response of liquidity and leverage is short-lived, as both *LEV* (0.59% VST; 0.19% ST; Panel H) and *PSL* (0.11% VST, not significant; 0.59% ST; Panel G) only increase temporarily.

Symmetrically, a positive (adverse) global *saving rate* (*GFI*) shock yields a permanent contraction in real activity (-0.25% VST; -0.7% ST; -0.5% LT) and stock prices (-0.29% VST; -0.34% ST; -0.26% LT), as well as in both *SMB* (-0.43% VST; -0.34% ST) and *HML* (-1.51% VST; -0.81% ST; -0.55% LT); procyclical momentum can be noted in the short- to long-term, as profitability of momentum strategies persists in the very short-term only (0.91% VST), *MOM* then turning negative (-1.39% ST; -1.09% LT). A transitory increase in *FV* (0.08% ST) and contraction in both *LEV* (-0.53% VST; -0.16% ST) and *PSL* (-0.79% VST) is also triggered by the shock.¹⁶

Consistent with the impact on real activity, market-wide, size, value and momentum effects are stronger in the short- than in the long-term for both shocks; similarly for volatility, credit risk, leverage and liquidity effects.

Moreover, a positive *monetary policy stance/excess liquidity* shock (*MPS*), coherent with boom-bust cyclical dynamics, leads to a very short-term increase in real activity and stock prices (0.02% and 0.03%, respectively, VST), turning into a contraction in the short- to long-term (*Y*: -0.09% ST; -0.14% LT; *F*: -0.09% ST). Procyclical size effects in the short- to long-term, and procyclical value and momentum effects at any horizon, can then be noted, as *SMB* (-1.69% ST; -1.51% LT; -1.64% VST), *HML* (-0.94% ST; -0.84% LT) and *MOM* (-0.62% within 2 quarters; -1.10% ST; -1.36% LT) contract in the short- to long-term, while *HML* (0.52% VST) and *MOM* (0.39% within 1 quarter) increase in the very short-term. Still consistent with boom-bust dynamics (Borio and Zhu, 2008; Adrian and Shin, 2008), persistent countercyclical credit risk (*FRA*: 2 b.p. ST; 1 b.p. LT) and stock market volatility (*FV*: 0.12% VST; 0.23% ST; 0.28% LT), i.e., higher credit risk and uncertainty, as well as short-lived procyclical leverage (0.24% VST; -0.48% ST) and stock market liquidity (-0.65% ST) responses, are also triggered by *MPS*.

Finally, a negative (adverse) *US terms of trade* shock (*TT*) leads to a short- to long-term contraction in real activity (-0.45% VST; -0.56% LT) and stock prices (-0.09% VST; -0.12% ST). Procyclical value effects (*HML*:

¹⁶Similarly, a positive (adverse) *US saving rate* shock (*GDI*) leads to a permanent contraction in real activity (-0.31% VST, -0.25% ST, -0.43% LT), as well as to a procyclical response in stock prices (-0.31% VST, -0.25% ST, -0.43% LT) and momentum (-1.25% VST; -2.25% ST; -1.48% LT). Countercyclical, yet short-lived, size and value effects (*SMB*: 0.65% ST; *HML*: 1.45% VST; 1.55% ST; 1.06% LT) can also be noted.

-1.38% VST; -0.54% ST) and countercyclical size effects (*SMB*: 0.71% VST; 1.35% ST, LT) can then be noted, consistent with the lower international dimension of small rather than large firms, and therefore the stronger resilience of small firms to contractions in international trade. Moreover, consistent with persistence in fundamentals, countercyclical momentum is generated in the very short-term, as *MOM* increases within 1 quarter (0.64%), turning procyclical already in the short-term (-0.37% within 2 quarters; -3.11 ST; -4.02% LT).

5.2 Procyclical and countercyclical effects of supply-side disturbances

On the other hand, a different macro-financial dynamic pattern is generated by labor supply and productivity shocks.

For instance, a positive (favorable) labor supply (*LS*) shock leads to an increase in real activity (0.43% VST; 0.60% ST; 0.18% MT) and stock prices (0.37% VST; 0.34% ST; 0.47% LT); in contrast, a positive (favorable) *productivity* (*PR*) shock leads to an increase in real activity (0.04% VST; 0.67% ST; 0.85% LT), yet to a contraction in real stock prices (-0.27% VST, ST; -0.63% LT).¹⁷

Coherently, while a contraction in credit risk/fragility (*FRA*) is triggered by both shocks (*LS*: -3 b.p. VST; *PR*: -3 b.p. ST; -2 b.p. LT), countercyclical volatility (*FV*: -0.25% VST; -0.18% ST) and procyclical leverage (*LEV*: 0.98% VST) and liquidity (*PSL*: 1.39% VST) are generated by *LS* only. In fact, a short- to medium-term increase in *FV* (0.39% VST; 0.06% ST; 0.07% MT) and a transitory decrease in both *LEV* (-1.14% VST) and *PSL* (-0.29% VST) can be associated with the contraction in real stock prices triggered by the productivity shock.

Procyclical size and value effects, relatively to stock market-wide movements only, are then generated by *PR* as well, leading to a permanent decrease in *SMB* (-1.91% VST; -2.42% ST) and *HML* (-0.31% VST; -1.46% ST and LT); on the other hand, procyclical value effects (*HML*: 2.39% VST; 0.56% ST), yet countercyclical size effects (*SMB*: -0.18% VST; -0.98% ST; -0.77% LT), are triggered by *LS*. The latter pattern is consistent with growth firms having richer growth opportunities and therefore also stronger investment demand; hence, *PR* shocks, by being embodied in physical capital, have a larger positive impact on the profitability of growth firms, triggering a contraction in *HML* (Kogan and Panikolau, 2014); moreover, consistent with Kogan et al. (2012), showing few large firms being responsible for a

¹⁷See also Kogan et al. (2012) and Chun et al. (2013) for similar findings.

large proportion of the aggregate rate of innovation for the US, *PR* shocks might be expected to enhance more the profitability of large rather than small firms, causing a contraction in *SMB*.

Finally, both *LS* and *PR* generate countercyclical momentum at short-horizons (*LS*, -0.95% VST; *PR*, -1.55% VST, -1.93% ST), turning procyclical at longer horizons (*LS*, 1.01% ST; *PR*, 1.19% LT). The latter finding is consistent with supply-side improvements spreading slowly at the economy-wide level, as the benefits of technical progress are earned by innovative firms only at the outset, while labor intensive firms/sectors benefit most of lower labor costs.

Persistent effects are generated by oil market supply side shocks as well. For instance, a positive (favorable) *oil reserves (OR)* shock leads to a short-to long-term increase in real activity (0.23% ST; 0.44% LT), while stock prices contract (-0.18% VST; -0.23% ST; -0.54% LT).¹⁸ Similarly to *LS*, procyclical value effects (*HML*: 0.40% VST; 1.35% ST and LT), yet countercyclical size (*SMB*: -0.74% VST; -0.33% ST; -1.09% LT) and momentum (-1.04% ST) effects, are then triggered by *OR*.

In contrast, a *negative* (adverse) (*OSN*) *flow oil supply* shock leads to a very short-term contraction in real activity (-0.11% VST) and stock prices (-0.13% VST; -0.45% ST; -0.92% LT); yet, due to lower oil price uncertainty (not reported), real activity increases in the medium- to long-term (0.44% MT; 0.62% LT). Procyclical size, value and momentum effects are generated by *OSN* in the medium- to long-term, as *SMB* (0.68% MT), *HML* (1.84% LT) and *MOM* (1.61% LT) increase. Persistent countercyclical stock market volatility and credit risk/fragility are generated as well, as *FRA* contracts in the short- to long-term (-6b.p.), while *FV* increases in the short-term and contracts in the long-term (0.34% ST; -0.29% LT).¹⁹

¹⁸A decline in the real oil price might favor energy intensive more than energy saving sectors; shareholder wealth would then increase at the energy intensive firms, while declining at energy saving firms. As the aggregate market return is a weighted average of individual firm's stock returns, if wealth destruction dominates wealth creation, a negative linkage between *OR* and aggregate stock returns can be posited.

¹⁹A *positive* (favorable) (*OSP*) *flow oil supply* shock triggers fairly symmetric macro-financial effects. Due to increased oil price uncertainty (not reported), negative effects on real activity can be noted in the long-term (-0.19%), as well as procyclical size, value and momentum (*SMB*: -0.72%; *HML*: -1.43%; *MOM*: -0.79%), and countercyclical volatility (*FV*: 0.16% MT; 0.19% LT) and credit risk/fragility (*FRA*: 1 to 2 b.p.; ST and LT).

5.3 Summary of the findings

According to IRF results, procyclical size, value, momentum and market-wide dynamics, as well as countercyclical volatility and credit risk/fragility, are then persistent features, generated by common structural causes, most notably macroeconomic demand-side shocks, largely accounting for real activity fluctuations at business cycle frequencies, i.e., *aggregate demand (AD)* and *saving rate (GFI, GDI)* shocks, as well as by other demand-side and oil market disturbances, i.e., *monetary policy stance (MPS)*, *US terms of trade (TT)*, *flow oil supply (OSN, OSP)* and *oil reserves (OR)* shocks. Similarly for procyclical liquidity and leverage effects, which are however more short-lived. In contrast, *labor supply (LS)* and *productivity (PR)* disturbances generate persistent countercyclical size, value and momentum, as well as credit risk/fragility effects.

In general, *SMB*, *HML*, *MOM*, *F*, *LEV* and *PSL* might then be expected to be on average larger during expansions and smaller during recessions, and the other way around for *FV* and *FRA*; yet, an opposite scenario may arise if supply-side, rather than demand-side disturbances, generate the bulk of business cycle fluctuations. Relatively to the available literature (Schwert, 1989a,b; Beltratti and Morana, 2006; Bernanke and Gertler, 1989; Adrian et al., 2012; Adrian and Shin, 2010; Pastor and Stambaugh, 2003), our findings are then encompassing, as well as new. To our knowledge, this is in fact the first study to provide a comprehensive account of the structural cause, persistence and direction of the size, value, momentum, leverage and liquidity effects, disentangling the contribution of macroeconomic demand- and supply-side disturbances, as well as oil market shocks.

6 The cross-section of expected equity returns

Through historical decomposition, each risk factor can be dissected in up to 33 components, each one associated with a given structural shock; yet, not all of them might be relevant for asset pricing purposes. As non-priced risk factor components might negatively affect the performance of an empirical asset pricing model, by acting as observational noise, assessing the impact of filtering on the explanation of the cross-section of expected equity returns is thus of interest.

Filtering can be implemented factor by factor by running, for each test asset, a time series regression of risk premia on the 33 risk factor components obtained through historical decomposition, and then reaggregating by retaining only the statistically significant ones.

Hence, considering the (standardized) risk premium for the generic i th test asset ($r_{i,t} - r_{f,t}$) and k th risk factor ($x_{k,t} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{33} x_{k,j,t}$), the OLS time series regression

$$r_{i,t} - r_{f,t} = \sum_{j=1}^{33} \beta_{i,k,j} x_{k,j,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (7)$$

$$\varepsilon_{i,t} \sim mds(0, \sigma^2) \quad (8)$$

is run, where $i, k = 1 \dots; t = 1, \dots, T$; the statistical significance of the various components is then assessed by means of t -ratio tests, and the filtered factor $x_{k,t}^+$ obtained by aggregating the $m \leq 33$ priced/statistically significant components, i.e., $x_{k,t}^+ = \sum_{s=1}^m x_{k,s,t}$.

Alternatively, the selection of the priced components can be implemented by running bivariate regressions

$$r_{i,t} - r_{f,t} = \beta_{i,k,j} x_{k,j,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad (9)$$

involving only one component (j) of the k th risk factor at the time.

Filtered factors are then employed in the place of the actual factors in the estimation of time series and cross-sectional regressions.

In the current application, the Fama and French (1993) 25 size/value ordered portfolios, over the period 1986:3 through 2010:3, are employed as test assets. Despite being short, the sample investigated is highly informative, covering several episodes of economic and financial distress, i.e., the 1987(4) stock market crash, the 1990(4) first Persian Gulf War and associated oil price shock, the 1998(4) East Asia crisis, the 2000(2) burst of the dot-com bubble, the 2003(2) second Persian Gulf War, the 2007-2009 financial crisis and the 2008 (third) oil price shock. Moreover, according to NBER chronology, over the period investigated, three main recessionary episodes have affected the US, as well as the global economy, i.e., 1990:3 through 1991:1, 2001:1 through 2001:4, and 2007:4 through 2009:2.

As the Fama-MacBeth approach is likely to perform better than GMM estimation in small samples, the former is then implemented. In the investigation we compare several specifications, estimated using both filtered and non-filtered factors; in particular, we consider the CAPM (CAPM), the 3-factor Fama-French model (FF), the 4-factor Fama-French model augmented with *MOM* (FF-M), an 8-factor model obtained by augmenting the 3-factor Fama-French model with all the available factors, i.e., *MOM*, *PSL*, *LEV*, *FRA* and *FV* (FF-A). Various 4-factor models are also considered, augmenting the 3-factor Fama-French model with each of the other available factors,

i.e., *PSL* (FF-P), *LEV* (FF-L), *FRA* (FF-F), *FV* (FF-V). Similarly, various augmented CAPM models are considered, by including *MOM* (CAPM-M), *PSL* (CAPM-P), *LEV* (CAPM-L), *FRA* (CAPM-F) and *FV* (CAPM-V).

For each of the above models, either a US or a global market risk factor is considered; while the former is measured by the (nominal) US S&P500 stock market return, the latter is yield by the (real) global stock market return factor F . In both cases the risk premium is computed by subtracting the (nominal/real) 3-month US Treasury bills interest rate.

Table 2 reports the results for the Fama-MacBeth second step, i.e., the OLS estimated parameters for the Fama-French 25 size and value portfolios cross-sectional *beta-representation*, with Shanken's standard errors, and actual (R^2) and adjusted (\bar{R}^2) coefficient of determination.²⁰ In particular, Panel A and C report results for the non-filtered specifications, i.e., using actual factors, for US standard models, where the market return is measured by the nominal US S&P 500 return (Panel A), as well as for their global versions, conditioned on the global stock market factor (Panel C). In contrast, in Panel B and D results for the filtered versions of the US and global specifications are reported.²¹

Hence, comparing results reported in Panel A and B (C and D) yields a relative assessment of the impact of filtering for the US (global) specifications. On the other hand, comparing results reported in Panel A and C (B and D) yields a relative assessment of the US and global specifications without (with) filtering.

In the current application both multivariate and univariate filtering has been implemented, using HCSE and OLS standard errors and cut-off significance levels in the range 1% to 10%; the results reported are for the filtered specifications which show the highest explanatory power (R^2 and \bar{R}^2). As shown in Table 2, the following findings are noteworthy.

Firstly, by comparing the R^2 and \bar{R}^2 results reported in Panel A and B (the US non-filtered and filtered models), it can be noted that filtering yields a 15% (20%) average increase (across models) in the R^2 (\bar{R}^2) statistic; the increase in explanatory power is particularly high for the CAPM-P, CAPM-V and FF-P models (30% to 40%); in only two cases out of twelve (CAPM-M and CAPM-L) filtering yields a loss in explanatory power for the US models. For the global models the improvement yield by filtering is even more dramatic, i.e., 90% (R^2 ; 110%, \bar{R}^2) on average across models, apart from FF-A (10%).

²⁰Estimation has been performed also by means of GLS; results are qualitatively similar, not reported for reasons of space, yet available from the author upon request.

²¹The US market factor is not filtered as the latter variable is not included in the global model in (1); hence, its historical decomposition is not available.

Secondly, the 3-factor Fama-French model is not the best specification for the selected sample. In particular, the FF model shows an R^2 (\bar{R}^2) of about 0.52 (0.45) for the US specification, rising up to 0.58 (0.52) when SMB and HML are filtered; the global versions of the model are less performing, showing an R^2 (\bar{R}^2) of 0.36 (0.27) and 0.54 (0.47) for the non-filtered and filtered versions of the model, respectively.

While filtering improves the performance of both US and global FF specifications, a superior performance, in terms of both R^2 and \bar{R}^2 , is yielded by various 4-factor models, obtained by augmenting FF with the other available factors, i.e., MOM , PSL , LEV , FRA , FV . In this respect, the best 4-factor specifications are obtained from the filtered global FF model (Panel D), augmented with LEV (FF-L) or FV (FF-V), showing an R^2 (\bar{R}^2) of about 0.70 (0.63), getting very close to the upper bound attained by the 8-factor model (FF-A: R^2 , 0.78; \bar{R}^2 , 0.67); slightly inferior, yet still noticeable, is the performance of the FF model augmented with FRA , i.e., 0.60 (0.52).

Thirdly, the impact of filtering on the performance of the augmented US CAPM models, yielding R^2 (\bar{R}^2) of about 0.64 (0.60) and 0.55 (0.51) for the FV and FRA augmented models, respectively (Panel B; CAPM-V and CAPM-F), is also impressive.

Finally, in terms of average mispricing errors, filtering in general yields a sizable contraction in the value of the Jensen's alpha (intercept) parameter, larger for the global (30% on average across models) than for the US (13%) models; in only 3 cases out of 26 a larger mispricing error is induced by filtering (global CAPM-M; US and global CAPM-V).

Overall, the results are promising, corroborating the intuition that not all risk factor components might be priced and therefore filtering improves the performance of empirical asset pricing models. Further investigations are clearly demanded, in order to assess the role of scaling and to identify regularities in non priced components, according to size, value and other metrics, by extending the set of test assets to include size/momentum, industry and bond portfolios.

The noteworthy performance of the US CAPM model augmented with the filtered volatility or fragility factors is also a very interesting result, given the highly debated issue concerning the specification of systematic risk. As shown by Merton (1973), when the investment opportunity set is time-varying, systematic risk is not only yielded by covariance with the market-wide return, but also with recession; given the countercyclical behavior of risk aversion and credit risk, the relevance of FV and FRA for the explanation of the cross-section of expected stock returns is then not surprising.

7 Conclusions

This study contributes to the understanding of the macro-finance interface by assessing the economic content of risk factors widely employed in the specification of empirical asset pricing models, i.e., Fama-French size (*SMB*) and value (*HML*), Carhart momentum (*MOM*), as well as other factors more recently proposed in the literature, i.e., Pastor-Stambaugh stock market liquidity (*PSL*) and Adrian-Etula-Muir financial leverage (*LEV*); moreover, the Bagliano-Morana fragility (*FRA*) index, global stock market-wide returns (*F*), and a risk aversion/uncertainty factor (*FV*), as measured by US stock market volatility, are also assessed.

Consistent with Merton's ICAPM, once time-varying risk is allowed for, systematic risk is not only described by covariance with the market return, but also with recession. A risk based interpretation of *SMB*, *HML*, *MOM*, as well as for the other factors, might then be grounded on their mimicking state variables measuring downward revisions in expectations about the investment opportunity set.

Relative to the available literature, we provide novel, as well as encompassing empirical evidence. The investigation is in fact set within the framework of a large scale global dynamic econometric model, where the conditioning macro-financial information set span over 800 variables and 50 countries, including industrialized and emerging economies. The evidence provided thus concerns also the *global economy* information content of US risk factors.

The empirical results are clear-cut. Firstly, macro-financial shocks account for the bulk of risk factor fluctuations, with macroeconomic shocks contributing most sizably in the very short-term, financial shocks in the short-term, and oil market disturbances in the medium- to long-term term. Interestingly, different sources of macroeconomic and financial risk are reflected by the various risk factors; in particular, productivity and monetary policy stance shocks for *SMB*; labor market and term structure slope shocks for *HML*; aggregate demand and US terms of trade shocks for *MOM*.

Secondly, procyclical size, value and momentum, as well as market-wide, leverage and stock market liquidity effects, appear to be mostly generated by macroeconomic demand-side shocks, largely accounting for real activity and stock market fluctuations at business cycle frequencies; similarly for countercyclical volatility and credit risk effects. In contrast, supply-side shocks might generate opposite patterns for all the above effects, apart from credit risk.

Thirdly, concerning the specification of systematic risk, we find that not all the structural sources of risk factor fluctuations might be priced by the market, and filtering out non-priced components improves the performance

of empirical asset pricing models; we also find risk aversion, fragility and leverage factors containing relevant information for the pricing of the Fama-French 25 size and value ordered portfolios, consistent with their business cycle state dependence reflecting covariance with recessions.

In the light of the results of the study, at least two main issues should be considered in future research. Firstly, given the improvement in explanatory power of empirical asset pricing models yield by filtering, further investigation is demanded in order to assess the role of scaling and identify regularities in the non-priced components, according to the size, value and other metrics, by extending the set of test assets to size/momentum, industry and bond portfolios. The noteworthy performance of the US CAPM model, augmented with filtered volatility or fragility factors, is clearly of utmost interest in this respect, given the still open debate concerning the specification of systematic risk, and its implications for testing asset pricing theories.

Secondly, it would be worthwhile investigating the signalling properties of risk factor shocks for macro-financial conditions. As pointed out by the forecast error variance decomposition, risk factor shocks contribute to real activity and stock price fluctuations to various degrees: by accounting for up to 9% and 23% of short- to medium term real activity and stock price fluctuations, the size (*SMB*) shock clearly stands out as a likely indicator of incoming changes in the global economic outlook, also within an early warning system of macro-financial risk.

References

- [1] Abhakorn, P., Smith, P.N., Wickens, M.R., 2013. What do the Fama-French factors add to C-CAPM? *Journal of Empirical Finance* 22, 113-127.
- [2] Adrian, T., Etula, E., Muir, T., 2012. Financial intermediaries and the cross-section of asset returns. Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Report, no. 464, July 2010, revised (*The Journal of Finance*, forthcoming).
- [3] Adrian, T., Shin, H.S., 2008. Liquidity, monetary policy and financial cycles. Federal Reserve of New York: *Current Issues* 14, 1-7.
- [4] Adrian, T., Shin, H.S., 2010. Liquidity and leverage. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 19, 418-437.
- [5] Bai, J., Ng, S., 2006. Evaluating latent and observed factors in macro-economics and finance. *Journal of Econometrics* 131, 507-537.

- [6] Bagliano, F.C., Morana, C., 2012. The Great Recession: US dynamics and spillovers to the world economy. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 36, 1-13.
- [7] Beltratti, A., Morana, C., 2006. Breaks and persistency: Macroeconomic causes of stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics* 131, 151-177.
- [8] Bernanke, B.S., Gertler, M., 1989. Agency costs, net worth, and business fluctuations. *American Economic Review* 79, 14-31.
- [9] Beaudry, P., Portier, F., 2013. News driven business cycles: Insights and Challenges. University of British Columbia. Mimeo.
- [10] Borio, C., Zhu, H., 2008. Capital regulation, risk-taking and monetary policy: A missing link in the transmission mechanism? BIS Working Papers, no. 268.
- [11] Campbell, J.Y., Shiller, R.J, 1988. Stock prices, earnings and expected dividends. *The Journal of Finance* XLIII, 661-676.
- [12] Campbell, J.Y., 1993. Intertemporal asset pricing without consumption data. *American Economic Review* 83, 487-512.
- [13] Campbell, J.Y., Vuolteenaho, T., 2004. Bad beta, good beta. *American Economic Review* 94, 1249-1275.
- [14] Campbell, S.D., Diebold, F.X., 2009. Stock returns and expected business conditions: Half a century of direct evidence. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 27, 266-278.
- [15] Campbell, J.Y., Giglio, S., Polk, C., Turley, R., 2012. An intertemporal CAPM with stochastic volatility. NBER Working Paper Series, no.18411.
- [16] Canova, F., De Nicolò, G., 1995. Stock returns and real activity: A structural approach. *European Economic Review* 39, 981-1015.
- [17] Carhart, M.M., 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance, *The Journal of Finance* 52, 57-82.
- [18] Chen, N.-F., Roll, R., Ross, S.A., 1986, Economic forces and the stock market. *The Journal of Business* 59, 383-403.
- [19] Chordia, T, Shivakumar, L., 2002. Momentum, business cycle and time varying expected returns. *Journal of Finance* 57, 985-1019.

- [20] Chun, H., Kim, J.-W., Morck, R., 2013. Productivity growth and stock returns: Firm- and aggregate-level analyses. NBER Working Paper, no. 19462.
- [21] Cochrane, J.H., 2007. Financial markets and the real economy. In Mehra, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of the Equity Premium*. Elsevier, UK, 237-325.
- [22] Cooper, M.J., Gutierrez JR., R.C., Hamed, A., 2004. Market states and momentum. *The Journal of Finance* 59, 1345-1365.
- [23] Davis, J.L., Fama, E.J. and French, K.R., 2000, Characteristics, covariances and average returns: 1929-1997, *The Journal of Finance*, LV, 389-406.
- [24] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1988. Permanent and temporary components of stock prices. *The Journal of Political Economy* 96, 246-273.
- [25] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1989. Business conditions and expected returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 25, 23-49.
- [26] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1993. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33, 3-56.
- [27] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1996. Multifactor explanations of asset pricing anomalies. *The Journal of Finance* 51, 55-87.
- [28] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 2004. The capital asset pricing model: Theory and evidence. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18, 25-47.
- [29] Ferson, W.E., Harvey, C., 1991. Time variation of economic risk premiums. *Journal of Political Economy* 99, 385-415.
- [30] Ferson, W.E., Harvey, C., 1999. Conditioning variables and the cross-section of stock returns. *The Journal of Finance* 54, 1325-1360.
- [31] Ferson, W.E., Korajczyk, R.A., 1995. Do arbitrage pricing models explain the predictability of stock returns? *The Journal of Business* 68, 309-349.
- [32] Goyal, A., 2012. Empirical cross-sectional asset pricing: A survey, *Financial Markets Portfolio Management* 26, 3-38.
- [33] Granger, C.W., Jeon, Y., 2004. Thick modelling. *Economic Modelling* 21, 323-43.

- [34] Hahn, J., Lee, H., 1996. Yield spreads as alternative risk factors for size and book-to-market. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 41, 245-269.
- [35] Jagannathan, R., Wang, Z., 1996. The conditional CAPM and the cross-section of expected returns. *The Journal of Finance* 51, 3-53.
- [36] Kapadia, N., 2011, Tracking down distress risk. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 102, 167-182.
- [37] Kogan, L., Papanikolaou, D., 2014. Growth opportunities, technology shocks, and asset prices. *The Journal of Finance* 69, 675-718.
- [38] Kogan, L., Papanikolaou, D., Seru, A., Stoffman, N., 2012. Technological innovation, resource allocation, and growth. NBER Working Paper, no. 17769.
- [39] Li, Q., Vassalou, M., Xing, Y., 2006. Sector investments growth rates and the cross-section of expected returns. *The Journal of Business* 79, 1637-1665.
- [40] Liu, X.L., Zhang, L., 2008. Momentum profits, factor pricing, and macroeconomic risk. *The Review of Financial Studies* 21, 2417-2448.
- [41] Lettau, M., Ludvigson, S., 2001. Resurrecting the (C)CAPM: A cross-sectional test when risk premia are time-varying. *Journal of Political Economy* 109, 1238–1287.
- [42] Lettau, M., Ludvigson, S., 2011. Shocks and crashes. NBER Working Paper Series, no. 16966.
- [43] Ludvigson, S.C., Ng, S., 2007. The empirical risk-return relation: A factor analysis approach. *Journal of Financial Economics* 83, 171-222.
- [44] Merton, R., 1973. An Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model. *Econometrica* 41, 867-887.
- [45] Morana, C., 2014. Factor vector autoregressive estimation of heteroskedastic persistent and non persistent processes subject to structural breaks. *Open Journal of Statistics*, forthcoming.
- [46] Morana, C., 2012. PC-VAR estimation of vector autoregressive models. *Open Journal of Statistics* 2, 251-259.

- [47] Nagel, S., 2013. Empirical cross-sectional asset pricing. *Annual Review of Financial Economics* 5, 167-199.
- [48] Pastor, L., Stambaugh, R.F., 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy* 11, 642-685.
- [49] Petkova, R., 2006. Do the Fama-French factors proxy for innovations in predictive variables? *The Journal of Finance* 61, 581-612.
- [50] Schwert, G.W., 1989a. Why does stock market volatility change over time? *The Journal of Finance* 44, 1115-1153.
- [51] Schwert, G.W., 1989b. Business cycles, financial crises and stock volatility. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 31, 83-125.
- [52] Vassalou, M., 2003. News related to future GDP growth as a risk factor in equity returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* 68, 47-73.

Table 1: Cumulated impulse response functions for real activity and risk factors to structural shocks

Panel A: Real activity											Panel B: Real stock prices											Panel C: Stock market volatility										
	OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT
0	-0.03	-0.11	-0.05	0.13	0.41	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.17	-0.01	-0.02	0.09	0.23	-0.15	-0.12	-0.22	0.03	-0.05	0	0.19	0.07	0	-0.09	-0.15	-0.07	0.05	0.2	0.01	-0.04
2	0.01	0	0	0.43	0.67	-0.25	-0.23	0.04	0.02	0.02	2	-0.18	-0.13	0.14	0.37	0.23	-0.29	-0.31	-0.27	0.02	-0.09	2	0.3	0.06	-0.09	-0.25	-0.27	0.06	0.16	0.39	0.12	0
4	0.12	0.04	-0.05	0.62	0.59	-0.49	-0.13	0.26	-0.06	-0.17	4	-0.12	-0.39	0.26	0.32	0.12	-0.34	-0.19	-0.17	-0.09	-0.15	4	0.1	0.34	-0.04	-0.18	-0.23	0.08	-0.03	0.21	0.18	0.01
6	0.22	0.04	0.07	0.64	0.39	-0.63	-0.03	0.56	-0.09	-0.34	6	-0.13	-0.46	0.37	0.35	0.07	-0.33	-0.2	-0.14	-0.04	-0.12	6	-0.11	0.13	-0.08	-0.04	-0.14	0.05	-0.06	0.01	0.25	0.03
8	0.23	0.11	0.1	0.6	0.32	-0.7	0.01	0.67	-0.07	-0.45	8	-0.23	-0.45	0.38	0.34	0.13	-0.34	-0.25	-0.27	-0.03	-0.08	8	-0.06	-0.04	-0.03	0.03	-0.2	0.04	-0.13	0.06	0.23	0.01
12	0.22	0.28	-0.01	0.43	0.29	-0.65	0.08	0.66	-0.11	-0.54	12	-0.34	-0.55	0.34	0.33	0.12	-0.3	-0.28	-0.4	-0.04	-0.08	12	-0.08	-0.12	0.12	0.11	-0.23	0	-0.12	0.07	0.27	0
20	0.29	0.44	-0.13	0.18	0.28	-0.47	0.13	0.7	-0.1	-0.54	20	-0.46	-0.75	0.41	0.37	0.13	-0.22	-0.38	-0.55	0.02	-0.02	20	-0.11	-0.2	0.16	0.18	-0.22	-0.05	-0.14	0.05	0.26	0.02
40	0.44	0.62	-0.19	0.14	0.29	-0.5	0.21	0.85	-0.14	-0.56	40	-0.54	-0.92	0.5	0.47	0.13	-0.26	-0.43	-0.63	0.04	0.02	40	-0.17	-0.29	0.19	0.21	-0.22	-0.04	-0.18	-0.04	0.28	0.04
Panel D: Size factor											Panel E: Value factor											Panel F: Momentum factor										
	OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT
0	-0.74	0.15	-0.42	-0.18	0.42	-0.35	0	-1.64	-1.57	0.49	0	0.25	0.16	-0.63	1.29	-0.04	-1.36	1.45	0	0.3	-1.38	0	0.72	0.63	-0.4	-0.95	-0.01	0.91	-1.07	0.07	0.39	0.64
2	-0.48	0.81	-0.57	-0.08	0.91	-0.43	0.28	-1.91	-1.64	0.71	2	0.4	-0.58	0.18	2.39	0.32	-1.51	0.12	-0.31	0.52	-0.63	2	-0.61	0.66	-1.62	-0.93	1.97	0.54	-1.25	-1.75	-0.62	-0.37
4	0.04	0.41	-0.69	-0.28	0.91	-0.34	0.56	-1.79	-1.79	0.94	4	0.68	-0.07	-0.33	1.06	0.2	-0.97	1.11	-0.84	-0.28	-0.54	4	-1.04	0.83	-1.17	1.39	2.92	-0.81	-2.76	-1.93	-0.22	-1.22
6	0.09	0.88	-0.85	-0.76	0.71	0	0.65	-1.76	-1.66	1.17	6	0.97	1.43	-0.51	0.76	1.58	-0.78	1.04	-1.54	-0.91	-0.18	6	-0.26	-0.33	-0.89	1.01	1.83	-1.21	-2.51	-1.01	-1.07	-2.48
8	-0.33	0.95	-1.16	-0.98	1.08	0.26	0.46	-2.42	-1.69	1.35	8	1.38	1.98	-1.08	0.56	1.65	-0.81	1.55	-1.47	-0.94	-0.07	8	0.23	-0.28	0.04	1.01	1.49	-1.39	-2.25	0.04	-1.1	-3.11
12	-0.63	0.68	-1.31	-0.77	1.17	0.27	0.11	-2.85	-1.69	1.33	12	1.45	2.22	-1.57	0.11	1.41	-0.49	1.34	-1.21	-0.83	0.06	12	0.09	0.14	-0.04	0.61	1.58	-1.54	-2.08	0.19	-1.17	-3.55
20	-0.88	-0.01	-0.89	-0.37	1.18	0.2	-0.15	-3.03	-1.58	1.3	20	1.14	1.86	-1.48	0.3	1.44	-0.52	1.03	-1.52	-0.83	-0.23	20	0.38	0.78	-0.47	-0.48	1.18	-1.06	-1.84	0.63	-1.17	-3.97
40	-1.09	-0.38	-0.72	-0.2	1.12	0.15	-0.26	-3.22	-1.51	1.34	40	1.13	1.84	-1.43	0.34	1.49	-0.55	1.06	-1.46	-0.84	-0.21	40	1.02	1.61	-0.79	-0.77	1.26	-1.03	-1.48	1.19	-1.36	-4.02
Panel G: Stock market liquidity factor											Panel H: Financial leverage factor											Panel I: Financial fragility factor										
	OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT		OR	OSN	OSP	LS	AD	GFI	GDI	PR	MPS	TT
0	-2.13	1.2	-1.02	1.39	0.11	0.4	-1.08	-0.29	-0.39	-1.31	0	-1	-0.17	-0.75	0.98	0.01	0.1	-0.56	-0.94	0.24	0.27	0	0.02	0	0	-0.02	-0.03	0	0.02	0.03	0	-0.01
2	-0.03	-0.63	0.68	0.81	-0.33	-0.79	-0.55	0.67	0.15	-0.73	2	-0.43	0.3	0.95	0.96	0.59	-0.53	-1.44	-1.14	0.24	-0.32	2	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0	0	0	0.01
4	0.54	-0.95	0.41	0.02	-0.38	-0.07	-0.33	0.53	-0.65	-0.15	4	-0.26	-0.48	0.25	0.2	-0.08	0.12	0.05	-0.29	-0.24	-0.06	4	-0.02	-0.03	0	0.02	0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	0.01
6	0.36	0.38	0.2	-0.64	-0.18	0.62	0.3	0.13	0.03	0.09	6	0.66	-0.18	0.53	-0.25	-0.01	-0.02	0.12	0.18	-0.48	-0.3	6	-0.02	-0.04	0	0.03	0.01	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0
8	0.16	0.75	-0.19	-0.37	0.59	0.1	0.06	-0.19	-0.16	0.23	8	0.28	0.31	0.19	-0.01	0.19	-0.16	0.31	0.33	-0.1	0.23	8	-0.01	-0.06	0.01	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0	0.01	-0.02
12	0.21	0.28	-0.16	-0.43	-0.13	0.19	-0.03	0.15	-0.09	0.01	12	-0.02	0.19	-0.22	-0.02	0.01	-0.06	0.08	0.06	-0.03	0.07	12	-0.02	-0.05	0.02	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
20	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02	0	0.03	0.07	-0.02	-0.02	20	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	-0.07	0	0.06	0	-0.04	0	-0.01	20	-0.02	-0.06	0.02	0.02	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
40	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0	0.01	0	0.01	0	0	40	0	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	-0.02	-0.06	0.02	0.02	0	-0.02	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.01

The table reports impulse responses for real activity (Panel A), real stock prices (Panel B), nominal stock market volatility (Panel C), SMB (Panel D), HML (Panel E), MOM (Panel F), PSL (Panel G), LEV (Panel H) and FRA (Panel I) at selected horizons (impact (0) and 2 to 40 quarters), relatively to various identified structural shocks: oil reserves (OR), flow oil supply (positive, OSP; negative, OSN), labor supply (LS), aggregate demand (AD), productivity (PR), global imbalance (GFI, GDI), monetary policy stance (MPS), US terms of trade (TT). Hence, for instance, the column indexed by AD in Panel A reports impulse response for real activity to a 1 standard deviation (positive) aggregate demand disturbance (AD). Apart from LEV and PSL, cumulated impulse response functions are reported in all cases. Figures in bold denote statistical significance at the 5% level.

Table 2: Fama-French size-value portfolios, cross-sectional regressions

Panel A: Non-filtered factors, US stock market return factor														Panel B: Filtered factors, US stock market return factor														
	CAPM	CAPM-M	CAPM-P	CAPM-L	CAPM-F	CAPM-V	FF	FF-M	FF-P	FF-L	FF-F	FF-V	FF-A		CAPM	CAPM-M	CAPM-P	CAPM-L	CAPM-F	CAPM-V	FF	FF-M	FF-P	FF-L	FF-F	FF-V	FF-A	
C	4.036* (0.834)	3.676* (0.819)	3.261* (0.835)	5.157* (0.635)	3.675* (0.844)	2.630* (0.926)	5.208* (0.581)	4.664* (0.624)	5.199* (0.597)	5.679* (0.692)	5.122* (0.577)	4.480* (0.635)	5.957* (0.691)	C	4.036* (1.828)	3.431* (0.764)	1.923* (0.754)	4.865* (0.639)	3.345* (0.918)	2.845* (0.938)	4.995* (0.580)	3.239* (0.673)	5.142* (0.623)	5.141* (0.555)	4.895* (0.589)	4.223* (0.616)	4.839* (0.653)	
Mkt	-1.606 (0.897)	-1.916* (0.842)	-0.975 (0.900)	-2.666* (0.897)	-1.701 (0.897)	-0.450 (0.901)	3.370* (0.896)	2.271* (0.897)	3.351* (0.897)	3.900* (0.797)	3.281* (0.896)	2.843* (0.896)	3.667* (0.918)	Mkt	-1.606 (0.902)	-1.454 (0.897)	0.584 (0.904)	-2.392* (0.895)	-1.364 (0.898)	-0.309 (0.901)	3.041* (0.896)	-1.058 (0.896)	3.550* (0.778)	3.387* (0.897)	3.019* (0.662)	2.086* (0.673)	2.649* (0.906)	
SMB							0.171 (0.544)	0.223 (0.544)	0.175 (0.544)	-0.124 (0.543)	0.026 (0.543)	0.071 (0.544)	0.079 (0.547)	SMB							0.997* (0.276)	0.536 (0.345)	0.999* (0.351)	0.755 (0.401)	0.968* (0.375)	0.725 (0.401)	1.032* (0.414)	
HML							0.929 (0.730)	0.786 (0.730)	0.924 (0.730)	1.276* (0.556)	0.878 (0.730)	0.673 (0.730)	1.666* (0.737)	HML							0.764 (0.608)	0.473 (0.661)	1.100* (0.389)	0.961 (0.699)	0.665 (0.428)	0.513 (0.390)	0.796 (0.702)	
MOM		-1.817 (1.079)						1.132 (0.899)					-1.163 (0.924)	MOM		-1.739* (0.814)						2.770* (0.687)						-0.405 (0.809)
PSL			5.194* (1.186)										-0.040 (1.163)	PSL			9.351* (1.080)							3.970* (0.843)			2.836* (1.052)	
LEV				-0.030* (0.009)						0.043* (0.018)			0.108* (0.009)	LEV				-2.647* (0.826)						5.625* (0.817)			6.048* (0.826)	
FRA					-0.046* (0.020)						-0.008 (0.020)		0.103* (0.020)	FRA					-0.063* (0.017)							-0.003 (0.022)	0.066* (0.019)	
FV						-0.499* (0.120)							-0.186 (0.119)	FV						-0.729* (0.112)						0.409* (0.154)	0.025 (0.116)	
R ²	0.174	0.324	0.312	0.225	0.438	0.442	0.516	0.520	0.516	0.598	0.541	0.562	0.757	R ²	0.174	0.265	0.421	0.220	0.550	0.635	0.576	0.616	0.672	0.693	0.592	0.660	0.811	
R̄ ²	0.109	0.262	0.249	0.154	0.387	0.391	0.447	0.424	0.455	0.517	0.449	0.465	0.636	R̄ ²	0.109	0.198	0.368	0.149	0.509	0.601	0.515	0.539	0.606	0.632	0.510	0.592	0.717	
Panel C: Non-filtered factors, Global stock market return factor														Panel D: Filtered factors, Global stock market return factor														
	CAPM	CAPM-M	CAPM-P	CAPM-L	CAPM-F	CAPM-V	FF	FF-M	FF-P	FF-L	FF-F	FF-V	FF-A		CAPM	CAPM-M	CAPM-P	CAPM-L	CAPM-F	CAPM-V	FF	FF-M	FF-P	FF-L	FF-F	FF-V	FF-A	
C	2.044* (0.661)	2.031* (0.652)	3.313* (0.723)	1.278 (0.807)	2.613* (0.709)	1.188 (0.769)	1.900* (0.840)	2.959* (0.653)	3.327* (0.553)	4.164* (0.568)	3.884* (0.428)	2.268* (0.765)	4.095* (0.479)	C	1.424* (0.549)	2.342* (0.515)	0.561 (0.648)	1.227 (0.703)	1.851* (0.558)	1.441* (0.571)	1.707* (0.497)	2.403* (0.476)	2.949* (0.782)	2.121* (0.468)	2.442* (0.448)	1.965* (0.512)	2.379* (0.507)	
Mkt	0.044 (0.132)	0.038 (0.133)	0.087 (0.133)	0.225 (0.132)	-0.196 (0.133)	0.222 (0.133)	0.015 (0.133)	0.023 (0.133)	-0.096 (0.132)	0.630* (0.133)	0.695* (0.133)	-0.201 (0.133)	-0.031 (0.136)	Mkt	0.211* (0.098)	0.291* (0.101)	0.094* (0.112)	0.322* (0.114)	-0.047 (0.103)	-0.081 (0.106)	0.046 (0.087)	0.025 (0.087)	0.132 (0.096)	-0.164 (0.087)	0.333* (0.103)	0.388* (0.103)	-0.170 (0.113)	
SMB							0.276 (0.543)	0.326 (0.544)	0.130 (0.543)	0.014 (0.545)	0.136 (0.544)	0.412 (0.544)	0.207 (0.547)	SMB							0.828* (0.276)	0.893* (0.276)	0.793* (0.308)	1.237* (0.277)	1.139* (0.346)	1.187* (0.347)	0.881* (0.412)	
HML							1.409 (0.730)	0.600 (0.730)	1.273 (0.730)	2.094* (0.733)	1.359 (0.731)	0.955 (0.730)	1.703* (0.740)	HML							2.066* (0.608)	0.983 (0.609)	2.029* (0.668)	2.411* (0.611)	1.117 (0.662)	1.463* (0.662)	0.381 (0.701)	
MOM		-0.167 (0.897)						2.336* (0.898)					-0.185 (0.920)	MOM		3.990* (0.730)						1.847* (0.616)					1.812* (0.797)	
PSL			-6.079* (1.154)						5.100* (1.156)				-0.351 (1.175)	PSL			8.266* (1.046)							4.176* (0.839)			2.325* (1.038)	
LEV				0.030* (0.009)						0.077* (0.009)			0.124* (0.010)	LEV				6.292* (0.838)						2.669* (0.746)			2.756* (0.817)	
FRA					-0.077* (0.020)						0.058* (0.020)		0.141* (0.020)	FRA					-0.079* (0.017)							-0.023 (0.017)	0.050* (0.018)	
FV						-0.728* (0.120)						0.535* (0.119)	0.002 (0.125)	FV						-0.743* (0.103)						0.281* (0.103)	-0.150 (0.116)	
R ²	0.005	0.005	0.140	0.073	0.252	0.303	0.357	0.500	0.423	0.504	0.456	0.444	0.752	R ²	0.107	0.449	0.274	0.402	0.505	0.506	0.535	0.659	0.590	0.697	0.598	0.691	0.779	
R̄ ²	-0.038	-0.086	0.062	-0.011	0.183	0.239	0.265	0.400	0.308	0.405	0.347	0.333	0.628	R̄ ²	0.068	0.399	0.208	0.348	0.459	0.461	0.469	0.591	0.508	0.637	0.517	0.629	0.669	

The Table reports the results for the estimation of Fama-MacBeth second-step cross-sectional regressions, using the Fama-French 25 size and value portfolios as test assets. The parameters reported refer to the intercept component (c), the market factor (MKT), and size (SMB), value (HML), momentum (MOM), stock market liquidity (PSL), leverage (LEV), financial fragility (FRA) and stock market volatility (FV) factors; R² is the coefficient of determination and R̄² the adjusted coefficient of determination. The point estimate of the parameters is reported in the table, with Shenken's standard errors in round brackets; "*" denotes statistical significance at the 5% level. The specification employed are the CAPM model (CAPM); the CAPM model augmented with momentum (CAPM-M), stock market liquidity (CAPM-P), leverage (CAPM-L), financial fragility (CAPM-F) and risk aversion (CAPM-V); the Fama-French model (FF); the Fama-French model (FF) augmented with momentum (FF-M), stock market liquidity (FF-P), leverage (FF-L), financial fragility (FF-F), and risk aversion (FF-V); an 8-factor model including all the previous factors jointly (FF-A). In Panel A and C results for the standard case of actual factors, with US (A) and global stock market return factor (C), respectively, are reported. In Panel B and D results for the case of filtered factors, with US (B) and global stock market return factor (D), respectively, are reported.




Figure 1: Forecast error variance decomposition, contribution of the own shocks (OWN), oil market supply side shocks (SUP), and various categories of macroeconomic (LS, AD, FT, PR) and financial (TT, MPS, TL) shocks, to real activity (Y), stock market volatility (FV), stock market returns (F), fragility index (FRA), leverage (LEV), stock market liquidity (PSL), momentum (MOM), value (HML) and size (SMB) factors fluctuations, at various horizons, from (within) 1 quarter (0) to 10 years (40). Due to very different magnitude, results concerning the AD shock are plotted using a different scale for real activity than for the other variables.

Online Appendix
Insights on the global macro-finance
interface: Structural sources of risk factor
fluctuations and the cross-section of expected
stock returns

Claudio Morana*

Università di Milano-Bicocca (Milano, Italy),
CeRP-Collegio Carlo Alberto (Moncalieri, Italy),

June, 22, 2014

Abstract

In this Appendix, details concerning data, estimation and identification of the global structural shocks are reported, as well as for the forecast error variance decomposition analysis.

*Address for correspondence: Claudio Morana, Università di Milano-Bicocca, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Metodi Quantitativi e Strategie d'Impresa, Piazza dell'Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126, Milano, Italy. E-mail: claudio.morana@unimib.it.

1 The data

The dataset contains macroeconomic and financial data for 50 countries, i.e., 31 advanced economies (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, United Kingdom), 5 advanced emerging economies (Brazil, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, South Africa), and 14 secondary emerging economies (Argentina, Chile, China, Colombia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Morocco, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Thailand, Turkey), for a total of 50 countries.

For each of the 50 countries, apart from some exceptions, 17 macroeconomic variables are employed, namely *real GDP*, *private consumption* and *investment* growth, *public expenditure to GDP ratio* growth, *nominal bilateral US\$ exchange rate* (value of 1 US\$ in units of country currency) returns, *CPI inflation rate*, *M2 or M3 to GDP ratio* growth, *nominal M2/M3* growth, *civilian employment* growth, *unemployment rate* changes, *real wages* growth, *real stock prices* returns, *real housing prices* returns, *real short and long term interest rates*, *real effective exchange rate* returns, *bank loans to the private sector to GDP ratio* growth. A total of over 800 equations is then considered in block (2). For OECD countries the macro-financial sample extends from 1980:1 through 2010:3, while for non OECD countries only from 1995:1 through 2010:3; macroeconomic data are seasonally adjusted. The (main) data source is IMF *International Financial Statistics*¹.

Twelve unobserved global macro-financial factors are estimated using (2), from homogeneous subsets of the above variable, i.e., a *real activity growth* factor (Y) is extracted from real GDP, private consumption and investment growth series; an *excess public consumption growth* (G , *fiscal stance*) from the public expenditure to GDP ratio growth series; a *US\$ exchange rate return* index from the various bilateral exchange rates against the US\$ returns (X); a *core inflation* (nominal) factor (N) in differences from the inflation rate and the nominal money growth, short and long term interest rate series; an *excess liquidity growth* index (L) from the M3 (M2) to GDP ratio and the private loans to GDP ratio growth series; an *employment growth* factor (E) from the civilian employment growth series; an *unemployment rate change* factor (U) from the unemployment rate in changes series; a *real wage growth* factor (W) from the real wage growth series; a *real stock market return* factor

¹Other data sources employed are FRED2 (Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis); OECD and BIS (unofficial) house price data sets, and International Energy Agency (IEA-OECD) data sets.

(F) from the real stock market price index return series; a *real housing return* factor (H) from the real housing price index return series; a *real short term rate* factor (SR) in differences from the real short term interest rate series; a *term spread factor* (TS) in differences from the term spread series. This yields the vector of (global) unobserved factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$.

Then, eleven variables are included in the vector of (global) observed factors $\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$, i.e., the Bagliano and Morana (2012) *US economic/financial fragility* index (FRA) in differences², the Fama and French (1993) *size* and *value* factors (SMB , HML), the Carhart (1997) *momentum* factor (MOM)³, the Pastor and Stambaugh (1997) *stock market liquidity* factor (PSL)⁴, the S&P 500 stock return *volatility* in differences (FV), computed from an asymmetric GARCH model, the real *gold* price (GD) return, real IMF *non-energy commodities* price index returns (M), the *US fiscal* (Fd) and *trade deficit* (Td) to *GDP ratios* in differences, the Adrian, Etula and Muir (2011) *leverage* factor (LEV)⁵. The sample for the observed macro-financial factors extends from 1980:1 through 2010:3.

Finally, ten additional variables, concerning global oil demand and supply

²The Bagliano-Morana fragility index is the common component in the TED , *agency* and *corporate* spreads. The TED spread, i.e., the spread between the 3-month LIBOR rate (Euro dollar deposit rate) and the yield on 3-month Treasury bills, being the difference between an unsecured deposit rate and a risk-free rate, yields a measure of credit and liquidity risk; differently, the spread between BAA -rated and AAA -rated corporate bonds ($BAA - AAA$) yields a measure of corporate default risk, as well as a measure of investors' risk-taking attitude, a contraction in the corporate spread signalling an increase in the demand for riskier bonds relative to safer ones; moreover, the agency spread is the spread between the 30-year Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac bonds yield and the 30-year Treasury bonds yield, measuring stress in the mortgage market. The fragility index therefore summarizes overall credit conditions, with reference to corporate, interbank and mortgage markets.

³The size factor is the return differential between small and big size portfolios; the value factor is the return differential between high and low book-to-market-ratio portfolios; the momentum factor is the difference between the returns on the high and low past performance portfolios, measured over the previous four quarters. SMB , HML and MOM data are available at http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html#Developed.

⁴The stocks' liquidity factor is measured by the innovations in aggregate liquidity (non-traded liquidity factor; equation (8) in Pastor and Stambaugh, 2003). Data are available at http://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/lubos.pastor/research/liq_data_1962_2011.txt. The Pastor-Stambaugh liquidity factor is computed as the a cross-sectional weighted average of individual-stock liquidity measures, the latter being the effect of the transaction volume in one month on next month individual return.

⁵The leverage factor is computed as the ratio of total financial assets over the difference between total financial assets and total financial liabilities of security brokers-dealers as reported in Table L.129 of the US Federal Reserve Flow of Funds. It may be considered as a proxy for financial instability, i.e., the higher the ratio, the higher the fragility of the financial sector. The author is grateful to T. Muir for providing the data.

conditions, are included in the vector \mathbf{O}_t , i.e., *world oil reserves growth* (R), *net world oil production changes* (increase: Pp , decrease: Pm)⁶, *OECD oil refineries margins growth* (RM), *world oil consumption growth* (C), *OECD oil inventories growth* (INV), *real WTI oil price return* (OP), *nominal WTI oil price volatility* in differences (OV), computed from a GARCH model, the *12-month futures basis*, i.e., the ratio of the nominal 12-month futures-spot spread over the nominal spot oil price (FB), computed using Crude Oil (Light-Sweet, Cushing, Oklahoma) 12th Contract settle futures prices, and the oil futures market *Working (1960)-T index growth rate* (WT), computed using US Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) Commitment of Trades (COT) data.⁷ The sample for the latter variables extends from 1986:1 through 2010:3.

The global model in (1) then counts 33 endogenous variables, collected in the vector $\mathbf{F}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{2,t} \mathbf{O}'_t]'$, over the period 1985:1 through 2010:3.

2 The econometric model

The econometric model is described by two blocks of equations. The first block refers to the *observed* ($\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$) and *unobserved* ($\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$) *global* macro-financial factors and oil market demand and supply side variables (\mathbf{O}_t), collected in a $R \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{F}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_{1,t} \mathbf{F}'_{2,t} \mathbf{O}'_t]'$; in particular, the size, value, momentum, stock market volatility and liquidity, leverage and fragility factors are collected, among other variables, in the subvector $\mathbf{F}_{2,t}$. The second block refers to Q macro-financial variables for M countries, collected in a $N \times 1$ vector \mathbf{Z}_t ($N = M \times Q$). The joint dynamics of the *global* and *local* macro-financial blocks are then modelled by means of the following reduced form dynamic factor model

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(L))(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_t \quad (1)$$

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{C}(L))((\mathbf{Z}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa})) = \mathbf{v}_t. \quad (2)$$

⁶See Hamilton (1996) for details concerning the construction of the net change variables, albeit for an application to the oil price.

⁷The Working's T index is calculated as the ratio of speculative open interest to total open interest resulting from hedging activity, i.e., as $1+SS/(HS+HL)$ if $HS \geq HL$ and $1+SL/(HS+HL)$ if $HS < HL$, where open interest held by speculators (non-commercials) and hedgers (commercials) is denoted as follows: SS = Speculation, Short; HL = Hedging, Long; SL = Speculation, Long; HS = Hedging, Short.

The model is cast in a weakly stationary representation, as $(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}), (\mathbf{Z}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \sim I(0)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ are $N \times 1$ and $R \times 1$ vectors of intercept components, respectively, with $R \leq N$.

Global dynamics are described by the stationary finite order polynomial matrix in the lag operator $\mathbf{P}(L)$, $\mathbf{P}(L) \equiv \mathbf{P}_1 L + \mathbf{P}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{P}_p L^p$, where \mathbf{P}_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$, is a square matrix of coefficients of order R , and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \sim i.i.d.(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta)$ is a $R \times 1$ vector of i.i.d. reduced form shocks driving the \mathbf{F}_t factors. The contemporaneous effects of the global factors on each country's variables in \mathbf{Z}_t are measured by the loading coefficients collected in the $N \times R$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = [\boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_{F_1} \ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_{F_2} \ \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_O]'$.

Local dynamics are described by the stationary finite order block (own country) diagonal polynomial matrix in the lag operator $\mathbf{C}(L) \equiv \mathbf{C}_1 L + \mathbf{C}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{C}_c L^c$, where \mathbf{C}_j , $j = 0, \dots, c$, is a square matrix of coefficients of order N , partitioned as

$$\mathbf{C}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{j,11} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} & & & \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{C}_{j,22} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} & & \\ \vdots & \dots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{j,MM} \\ & & & \mathbf{Q} \times \mathbf{Q} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, $\mathbf{v}_t \sim i.i.d.(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_v)$ is the $N \times 1$ vector of reduced-form idiosyncratic (i.e., country-specific) disturbances, with $E[\eta_{jt} v_{is}] = 0$ for all i, j, t, s .

The specification of the model in (1)-(2) embeds a set of important assumptions on the structure of global and local linkages: (i) global shocks ($\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$) affect both the global and local economies through the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{P}(L)$ and the factor loading matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$; (ii) country-specific disturbances (\mathbf{v}_t) do not affect the global economy, limiting their impact only to the country of origin ($\mathbf{C}(L)$ is assumed to be block (own-country) diagonal).

By substituting (1) into (2), the reduced form vector autoregressive (VAR) representation of the dynamic factor model can be written as

$$(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(L)) (\mathbf{Y}_t - \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_t = [\mathbf{F}'_t \ \mathbf{Z}'_t]'$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = [\boldsymbol{\kappa}' \ \boldsymbol{\mu}']'$,

$$\mathbf{A}(L) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{P}(L) & \mathbf{0} \\ [\boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{P}(L) - \mathbf{C}(L) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}] & \mathbf{C}(L) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{1,t} \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \end{bmatrix} [\boldsymbol{\eta}_t] + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{v}_t \end{bmatrix},$$

with variance-covariance matrix

$$E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t'] = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' \\ \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta & \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_v \end{pmatrix}.$$

The structural vector moving average representation for the global model in (1) can then be written as

$$(\mathbf{F}_t - \boldsymbol{\kappa}) = \mathbf{H}_F(L) \mathbf{K}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ is the vector of the R structural shocks driving the common factors in \mathbf{F}_t , i.e., $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\eta}_t$, \mathbf{K} is a $R \times R$ invertible matrix, and

$$\mathbf{H}(L) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}_F(L) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{H}_{FZ}(L) & \mathbf{H}_Z(L) \end{pmatrix} \equiv (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}(L))^{-1}.$$

By assumption, the structural factor shocks are orthogonal and have unit variance, so that $E[\boldsymbol{\xi}_t \boldsymbol{\xi}_t'] = \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \mathbf{K}' = \mathbf{I}_R$. To achieve exact identification of the structural disturbances, additional $R(R-1)/2$ restrictions need to be imposed. Since $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$, imposing exclusion restrictions on the contemporaneous impact matrix amounts to imposing zero restrictions on the elements of \mathbf{K}^{-1} , for which a lower-triangular structure is assumed. Operationally, \mathbf{K}^{-1} (with the $R(R-1)/2$ zero restrictions necessary for exact identification imposed) is estimated by the Choleski decomposition of the factor innovation variance-covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta$, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{K}}^{-1} = chol(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\eta)$. Impulse responses, forecast error variance and historical decompositions can then be obtained by means of standard formulas.

2.1 Estimation

Consistent and asymptotically normal estimation of the two-block specification in (1) and (2) is obtained by means of the procedures proposed in Morana (2012, 2014), shown to yield accurate estimation also in small samples (see the Monte Carlo results reported in Morana, 2012, 2014). Following the thick modelling strategy of Granger and Jeon (2004), median estimates of the parameters of interest, impulse responses, forecast error variance and historical decompositions, as well as their confidence intervals, are obtained by means of simulation.

2.1.1 Estimation of the unobserved factors and the local block

Iterative estimation of the unobserved global factors and the local model in (2) is performed through the following steps.

• **Step 1: initialization.**

An initial estimate of the R_1 unobserved common factors in $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ can be obtained through the application of Principal Components Analysis (PCA) to subsets of homogeneous cross-country data $\mathbf{Z}_i = \{\mathbf{Z}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_{i,T}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, R_1$, $R_1 \leq Q$; for instance, a GDP growth global factor can be estimated by means of the first PC extracted from cross-country GDP growth data, a stock return global factor by means of the first PC extracted from cross-country stock return data, and so on.

Then, conditional on the estimate of the unobserved stochastic factors, a preliminary estimate of the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{C}(L)$ and the factor loading matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is obtained by means of OLS estimation of the equation system in (2). This can be performed by first regressing \mathbf{Z}_t on $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and the demeaned factors $(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}})$ to obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}$; then, the gap variables $\mathbf{Z}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}})$ can be constructed and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}(L)$ obtained by means of OLS estimation of the VAR model in (2).

• **Step 2: the iterative procedure.**

Next, a new estimate of the unobserved common factors in $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ can be obtained by means of PCA applied to the filtered variables $\mathbf{Z}_t^* = \mathbf{Z}_t - \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_*(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{*,t} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_*) - \hat{\mathbf{C}}(L) \left[\mathbf{Z}_t - \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_*(\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{*,t} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_*) \right]$, with $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{*,t} = [\mathbf{F}'_{2,t} \ \mathbf{O}'_t]'$, $\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_* = [\hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}'_{F_2} \ \hat{\mathbf{\Lambda}}'_O]'$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}_* = [\hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}'_{F_2} \ \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}'_O]'$. Then, conditional on the new unobserved common factors, a new estimate of the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{C}(L)$ and the factor loading matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is attained as above described. The procedure is then iterated until convergence.

Note that the proposed iterative procedure bears the interpretation of *QML* estimation performed by means of the EM algorithm, using a Gaussian likelihood function. In the *E*-step the unobserved factors are estimated, given the observed data and the current estimate of model parameters, by means of *PCA*; in the *M*-step the likelihood function is maximized (OLS estimation of the $\mathbf{C}(L)$ matrix is performed) under the assumption that the unobserved factors are known, conditioning on their *E*-step consistent estimate. Consistent and asymptotically normal estimation of unobserved I(0) factors by means of PCA is proved in Bai (2003) under general conditions⁸; moreover, as proved by Bai and Ng (2006), when the unobserved factors are estimated

⁸In particular, under some general conditions, given any invertible matrix Ξ and the vector of unobserved I(0) factors f_t , \sqrt{N} consistency and asymptotic normality of PCA for Ξf_t , at each point in time, is established for $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ and the case of I(0) idiosyncratic components, the latter also displaying limited heteroskedasticity in both their time-series and cross-sectional dimensions (Bai, 2003). Moreover, \sqrt{T} consistency and asymptotic normality of PCA for $\Lambda_f \Xi^{-1}$ is established under the same conditions, as

by means of PCA in the E -step, the generated regressors problem is not an issue for consistent estimation in the M -step, due to faster vanishing of the estimation error, provided $\sqrt{T}/N \rightarrow 0$; the factors estimated by means of PCA can then be considered as they were actually observed, therefore not requiring Kalman smoothing at the E -step, i.e., the computation of their conditional expectation. Convergence to the one-step QML estimate is ensured, as the value of the likelihood function is increased at each step. See Morana (2014) for additional details and Monte Carlo results, validating the use of the iterative estimation procedure in small samples.

2.1.2 Estimation of the global model

• **Step 3: restricted estimation of the reduced form VAR model.**

Consistent and asymptotically normal estimation of the polynomial matrix $\mathbf{P}(L)$ in the VAR model in (1), still relying on Bai and Ng (2006), can be obtained by means of OLS (Morana, 2014) or PC-VAR (Morana, 2012) estimation, by holding the latent factors $\mathbf{F}_{1,t}$ as they were observed; then, by employing $\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L)$ and the final estimate of the $\mathbf{C}(L)$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ matrices, the $\Phi^*(L)$ polynomial matrix is estimated as $\hat{\Phi}^*(L) = [\hat{\Lambda}\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L) - \hat{\mathbf{C}}(L)\hat{\Lambda}]$.

PC-VAR estimation Given the $R \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{x}_t \equiv \hat{\mathbf{F}}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}$, consider the vector autoregressive (VAR) model in (1); PC-VAR estimation relies on the following algebraic identity

$$\mathbf{x}_t \equiv \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t, \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t = \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}'\mathbf{x}_t$ is the $R \times 1$ vector of estimated principal components of \mathbf{x}_t , $\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}$ is the $R \times R$ matrix of orthogonal eigenvectors associated with the R (ordered) eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ ($\mathbf{\Sigma} = E[\mathbf{x}_t\mathbf{x}_t']$). This follows from the eigenvalue-eigenvector decomposition of $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}} = \hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{\Gamma}} = \text{diag}(\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_R)$ is the $R \times R$ diagonal matrix containing the (ordered) eigenvalues of $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$.

PC-VAR estimation of $\mathbf{P}(L)$ is then implemented as follows:

- apply PCA to \mathbf{x}_t and compute $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t = \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}'\mathbf{x}_t$;
- obtain $\hat{\mathbf{D}}(L)$ by means of OLS estimation of the stationary dynamic vector regression model

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_t &= \mathbf{D}(L)\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t &\sim i.i.d. (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

well as $\min\{\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T}\}$ consistency and asymptotic normality of PCA for the unobserved common components $\Lambda_f f_t$, at each point in time, for $N, T \rightarrow \infty$.

where $\mathbf{D}(L) \equiv \mathbf{D}_1 L + \mathbf{D}_2 L^2 + \dots + \mathbf{D}_p L^p$ has all the roots outside the unit circle;

- recover the (implied OLS) estimate of the actual parameters yield by the unrestricted VAR model in (1) by solving the linear constraints

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L)_{PCVAR} = \hat{\mathbf{D}}(L)\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}'; \quad (8)$$

in the actual implementation only the first $Q < R$ ordered PCs are employed, yielding

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}(L)_{PCVAR} = \hat{\mathbf{D}}(L)\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}'_Q, \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}_{(R \times R)} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}_Q & \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}_{R-Q} \\ \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}_{(R \times Q)} & \hat{\mathbf{\Xi}}_{(R \times R - Q)} \end{bmatrix}$.

See Morana (2012) for further details on PC-VAR estimation, its asymptotic properties and Monte Carlo results.

3 Identification of structural shocks and selected impulse responses

Three main sets of structural disturbances are identified by means of the assumed recursive structure, i.e., oil market, macroeconomic and financial shocks. Details for each category of shocks are reported below, where theoretical predictions are contrasted with the empirical evidence provided by impulse response analysis. For exposition purposes we refer to selected time horizons, i.e., very short-term (VST; within 2 quarters), short-term (ST; between 1 and 2 years), medium-term (MT; 3 to 5 years), and long-term (LT; 10-year horizon).

Impulse responses for various variables and shocks are reported in Table A1-A3. Results in each Panel and Table correspond to impulse responses of relevant variables to a given shock. For instance, Panel A in Table A1, reports impulse responses of oil reserves (R), future basis (FB), real oil price (OP), nominal oil price volatility (OV), real activity (Y) and the price level (N) to a 1 standard deviation oil reserves shocks (OR).

3.1 Oil market shocks

The oil market structural disturbances are: oil market supply side shocks (*oil reserves* (OR), *flow oil supply* (positive, OSP ; negative, OSN), *oil production mix* (OX)); oil market demand side shocks (*oil consumption* and

inventories preferences (OC , OI)); oil futures market speculative shocks (*oil futures market-pressure* (OFP), *residual oil futures market* (OFR)); other oil price shocks (*other real oil price* (ORP) and *nominal oil price volatility* (ONV)). Results are reported in Table A1, Panel A-L.

3.1.1 Oil market supply side shocks

A positive *oil reserves* (OR) shock (signaling a future downward shift in the flow oil supply schedule) drives the futures, and through a price discovery mechanism, the spot oil prices downward; empirically, OR leads to a permanent increase in oil reserves (0.39% VST; 1.29% ST; 1.66%), and to a very short-term contraction in the futures (-1.90%, futures basis) and spot real oil price (-1.03%), as well as in nominal oil price volatility (-0.13% VST; -0.55% ST; -0.75% LT). Consistent with lower oil price uncertainty and weaker user costs, precautionary savings and discretionary income effects, a short-to long-term positive effect on real activity can be noted (0.23% ST; 0.44% LT).

A negative (OSN) (positive, OSP) flow oil supply shock (upward (downward) shift in the flow oil supply schedule) causes a negative (positive) correlation between oil production and the real oil price.

Empirically, OSN leads to a permanent contraction in oil production (-0.21% VST; -0.15% ST; -0.13% LT), increasing the real oil price (3.26%) and nominal oil price volatility (0.74%) in the very short-term. Consistent with higher user costs, precautionary savings and discretionary income effects, a stagflationary impact can be noted in the very short-term (-0.11%, real activity; 0.03% price level), yet not in the medium- to long-term (0.62% and 0.03%, respectively), due to the contraction in nominal oil price uncertainty (-0.65% ST; -1.02% LT).

Conversely, OSP leads to a permanent increase in oil production (0.41% VST; 0.42% ST; 0.36% LT) and a transitory contraction in the real oil price (-0.96% VST; 1.85% ST), increasing nominal oil price volatility (0.82% VST; 1% ST; 1.26% LT). While the impact on real activity is mostly not significant over the horizon investigated, consistent with increased nominal oil price uncertainty, some negative effects can be noted, particularly in the long-term (-0.19% LT; -0.05% VST).

A positive *oil production mix* shock (OX) leads to a negative correlation between refineries output and the real oil price, consistent with a shift in the production mix favoring (relatively less expensive) medium and heavy sour crudes; empirically, OX leads to a permanent increase in refineries output (0.43% VST; 0.50% ST; 0.68% LT) and contraction in the real oil price (-2.07% VST; -1.25% ST; -1.42% LT). Due to increased nominal oil price

uncertainty (0.65% VST; 0.58% ST; 0.52% LT), real activity contracts (-0.07% VST; -0.21% ST and MT).

3.1.2 Oil market demand side shocks

Positive *oil consumption (OC)* and *inventories (OI) preferences* shocks, unrelated to macro-financial fundamentals, cause an upward (downward) shift in the flow (financial) oil demand function and therefore a positive (negative) correlation between oil consumption (inventories) and the real oil price.

Empirically, *OC* leads to a permanent increase in global oil consumption (0.54% VST; 0.59% ST 0.55% LT) and the real oil price (2.79% VST; 3.54% ST; 3.27% LT), dampening nominal oil price volatility (-0.42 VST; -0.37% ST; -0.39% LT). Due to lower oil price uncertainty, the shock then leads to an increase in real activity (0.14% VST; 0.27% ST; 0.22% LT).

Differently, *OI* leads to a permanent increase in global oil inventories (0.50% VST; 0.39% ST; 0.44% LT) and contraction in the real oil price (-0.98% VST; -0.66% ST; -0.93% LT), also dampening nominal oil price volatility (-0.61% VST; -0.50% ST; -0.56% LT). Through reduced oil price uncertainty, as well as lower user costs and precautionary savings, and higher discretionary income effects, the shock then leads to a permanent increase in real activity (0.07% VST; 0.32% ST; 0.29% LT).

3.1.3 Oil futures market speculative shocks

Two *oil futures market speculative* shocks, unrelated to macro-financial, as well as physical oil market conditions, can be identified, i.e., an *oil futures market-pressure* shock (*OFP*) and a *residual oil futures market* shock (*OFR*).

Consistent with the Theory of Normal Backwardation and Market Pressure Theory, a positive *oil futures market-pressure* shock (*OFP*) causes a positive correlation between the excess supply for long (speculative) traders positions and the demand for short (hedging) positions (Working's T index, *WT*) and the oil futures prices; as price discovery occurs first in the futures market, to spill over to the spot market, a positive correlation with the spot oil price is also imparted by *OFP*; empirically, *OFP* leads to a contemporaneous increase in the Working's T index (0.72%; 0.73% LT), the futures basis (0.24%; 0.10% MT) and the real oil price (0.36%; 0.59% LT), dampening nominal oil price volatility (-0.43% VST; -0.27% ST; -0.20% LT). Consistent with higher user costs, precautionary savings and discretionary income effects, a contraction in real activity can be noted (-0.03% VST; -0.15% ST and LT);

To the *residual oil futures market* shock (*OFR*), which is net of the contemporaneous effect of traders positions (Working-T index) as well, we do not provide an economic interpretation; empirically, *OFR* leads to a contemporaneous increase in the futures basis (4.36%) and the real oil price (0.30%; 2.67% ST; 2.39% LT), dampening nominal oil price volatility (-0.21% VST; -0.13% ST; -0.11% LT). Due to lower oil price uncertainty, *OFR* then leads to an increase in real activity (0.08% VST; 0.13% ST; 0.09% LT).

3.1.4 Other oil price shocks

To the *other real oil price* (*ORP*) and *nominal oil price volatility* (*ONV*) shocks, unrelated to macro-financial, as well as physical and futures oil market conditions, we do not attach an economic interpretation. Consistent with various mechanisms explaining the transmission of oil price shocks to the macroeconomy, i.e., discretionary income, precautionary savings, operating costs and uncertainty effects, the latter disturbances exercise recessionary effects, i.e., cause a negative correlation between oil price fluctuations and real activity.

Empirically, a positive *other real oil price* shock (*ORP*) leads to a permanent increase in the real oil price (3.73% VST; 2.64% ST; 2.95%, LT) and nominal oil price volatility (0.22% VST; 0.18% ST; 0.21% LT), and a contraction in real activity (-0.05% VST; -0.21% ST and LT); similarly for a positive *other nominal oil price volatility* shock (*ONV*), yielding a permanent increase in nominal oil price volatility (1.28% VST; 1.14% ST; 1.19% LT) and the real oil price (1.79% ST; 1.05% LT), and a medium to long-term contraction in real activity (-0.14%).

3.2 Macroeconomic structural shocks

The macroeconomic structural disturbances are labor market shocks (*labor demand* (*LD*) and *supply* (*LS*)); *aggregate demand* shocks (*AD*); *productivity* shocks (*PR*); *core inflation* shocks (*CI*); global imbalance shocks (*global* (*GFI*), *US* (*GDI*) and *ex-US global* (*GTI*) *saving rate*). Results are reported in Table A 2, Panel A-H.

3.2.1 Labor market shocks

A positive *labor supply* shock (*LS*, downward shift in the labor supply schedule) induces a negative correlation between employment and the real wage; empirically, *LS* has an opposite contemporaneous impact on employment

(0.24%) and the real wage (-0.16%), building up monotonically as the horizon increases (1.33% and -0.70% ST; 1.31% and -1.30% LT), leading to a contraction in the unemployment rate as well (-0.41% VST; -0.92% ST; -0.58% LT); through the short-run production function, a positive impact on real activity (0.43% VST; 0.60% ST; 0.18% MT) can then be noted. *LS* might also be understood in terms of a positive *factor shares* shock, as in Lettau and Ludvigson (2011), boosting stock prices (0.37% VST; 0.34% ST; 0.47% LT), while depressing real wages.

A negative *labor demand* shock (*LD*, downward shift in the labor demand schedule) causes a positive correlation between employment and the real wage; empirically, *LD* leads to a -0.10% contraction in employment in the very short-term (-0.08% ST), a 0.28% contemporaneous increase in the unemployment rate (0.32% ST; 0.35% LT) and to a delayed contraction in the real wage (-0.10 ST; -0.33% LT); through the short-run production function, a negative impact on real activity is found as well (-0.14% VST; -0.08% ST; -0.17% LT).

3.2.2 Aggregate demand and productivity shocks

A positive *aggregate demand* shock (*AD*, upward shift in the aggregate demand schedule) induces a positive correlation between output and the price level; empirically, *AD* has a positive contemporaneous impact on real activity (0.41%) and the price level (0.02%), the former effect being strongest in the very short- (0.67%) than in the short- to long-term (0.59% to 0.28%). A positive impact can also be noted on housing (0.02% VST) and stock prices (0.23% VST; 0.13% MT and LT).

A positive *productivity* shock (*PR*, rightward shift in the long-run aggregate supply schedule) causes a permanent increase in output, negatively affecting or without impacting on the price level; empirically, *PR* yields a negative correlation between real activity (0.04%) and the price level (-0.01%) in the very short-term; the effect of the shock on real activity builds up over time, being strongest in the long- (0.85%) than in the short-term (0.67%). *PR* also causes a negative correlation between aggregate output and stock prices. The latter effect is consistent with a Shumpeterian view of innovation as a process of *creative destruction* (Kogan et al., 2012); while shareholder wealth increases at the innovator firm, due to booming profits determined by the adoption of the new technology, shareholder wealth destruction occurs at the innovator's competitor firms, which fail to fully adopt the new technology: hence, a positive linkage between productivity shocks and stock prices can be posited at the firm level, yet a negative linkage at the aggregate market level, as the aggregate market return is a weighted average of het-

erogeneous and mostly negatively correlated individual firm's stock returns. The countercyclical impact may also follow the opposite effect PR exercises on future cashflows (increasing) and the pricing kernel, i.e., consumption and hours worked (decreasing); if PR is sufficiently persistent, the pricing kernel effect dominates the cash flow effect, depressing asset prices (Canova and De Nicolò, 1995). Empirically, the negative impact on real stock prices builds up over time, being strongest in the long- (-0.63%) than in the short-term (-0.27%). PR also leads to an increase in (housing) wealth (0.28%, VST; 0.63%, ST; 0.96%, LT) and in real wages (0.66%, VST; 0.86%, ST; 1.58%, LT), consistent with Lettau and Ludvigson (2011).

3.2.3 Core inflation shock

A positive *core inflation* shock (CI , upward shift in the short-term Phillips curve) induces a positive correlation between the price level and the unemployment rate in the short-term, being neutral in the long-term; empirically, CI yields a positive permanent impact on the price level (0.07% VST; 0.05% ST and LT); consistent with a vertical long-run Phillips curve, the shock is long-run output (real activity) neutral, positively affecting the unemployment rate in the short- to medium-term only (0.19% ST; 0.15% MT).

3.2.4 Global imbalance shocks

A positive *global fiscal imbalance* shock is a negative *global saving rate* shock (GFI); as predicted by the neoclassical growth model, this leads to a downward shift in gross investment and to a contraction in the steady-state real capital and output levels; the latter also decline over the transition process; empirically, GFI yields a permanent increase in the global public consumption to GDP ratio (0.59% VST; 0.86% ST; 0.59% LT), as well as a permanent contraction in real stock prices (-0.29% VST; -0.34% ST; -0.26% LT), i.e., in the market valuation of installed capital, and real activity (-0.25% VST; -0.7% ST; -0.5% LT). An increase in the short-term rate can also be noted (4 b.p. VST).

Similarly, a positive *US fiscal imbalance* shock is a negative *US saving rate* shock (GDI); due to the driving role of the US for the global economy, the contraction in the US steady-state real capital and output levels determined by GDI is then expected to lead to a contraction in world steady-state real capital and output levels. Empirically, GDI yields a permanent increases in the US fiscal deficit to GDP ratio (0.40% VST; 0.18% ST; 0.15% LT) and the short-term rate (6 b.p. VST; 4 b.p. LT), and contraction in real stock prices (-0.31% VST; -0.25% ST; -0.43% LT), as well in global real activity in

the short-term (-0.23% VST; -0.13% ST; 0.21% LT).

A positive *US trade imbalance shock* (*GTI*) is a positive *saving glut shock*, which can be associated with the ongoing capital flows from emerging countries to the US, since early 1980s.⁹ Consistent with Bernanke (2005)¹⁰, the shock leads to the diversion of savings from countries with relative higher productivity (fast growing emerging countries) to the US, driving down the global real interest rate; empirically, *GTI* leads to a permanent increase in the US trade deficit to GDP ratio (0.23% VST; 0.27% ST; 0.29% LT), appreciation of the US\$ (-0.05% VST; -0.22% ST; -0.19% LT), and contraction in the real short-term interest rate (-11 b.p. VST; -5 b.p. ST and LT); real stock prices decline in the short-term (-0.05% VST, -0.13% ST, 0.15% LT), as well as real activity also in the long-term (-0.03% VST, -0.30% ST, -0.37% LT).

3.3 Financial structural shocks

The financial structural disturbances are *monetary policy stance* shocks (*MPS*); *term structure level* (*TL*) and *slope* (*TS*) shocks; *US terms of trade* shocks (*TT*); portfolio allocation/preferences shocks (*stocks* (*PF*), *housing* (*PH*), *non-energy commodities* (*PM*) and *gold* (*PG*)); *revisions in expectations* about the state of the investment opportunity set (*size* (*SZ*), *value* (*VL*), *momentum* (*MM*), *stock market liquidity* (*SL*) and *financial leverage* (*LV*)), *risk aversion* and *risk appetite* (*RAV*, *RAP*) shocks. Results are reported in Table A3, Panel A-Q.

3.3.1 Monetary policy shocks

A positive *monetary policy stance/excess liquidity* shock (*MPS*) induces a negative correlation between overall liquidity and interest rates; through various channels, i.e., interest rate, asset prices, credit, the shock is then transmitted to real activity; empirically, *MPS* yields a liquidity effect, causing a permanent increase in excess liquidity (0.33% VST; 0.50% ST; 0.62% LT)

⁹Japan in the 1980s and early 1990s, oil producer and emerging Asia economies since the mid 1990s, and China more recently.

¹⁰Higher ex-US global savings, servicing the growing US trade deficit, can be explained on the basis of increased savings and reserves accumulation in emerging Asia economies, following the 1997-1998 financial crisis, also determined by their export-led growth policies cum undervaluation; aging population in industrialized countries, requiring higher savings to provide to the needs of a growing retired population; the increase in oil prices, leading to trade balance surpluses in oil exporting countries. According to Caballero et al. (2008), the saving glut is also compatible with the shortage of stores of values affecting less developed economies.

and contraction in the real short-term interest rate (-4 b.p. VST; -6 b.p. ST; -7 b.p. LT). Consistent with the expectation hypothesis of the term structure of interest rates a contraction in the long-term interest rate can also be noted (-9 b.p. VST; -2 b.p. ST; -3 b.p. LT)¹¹. The dynamic response of real activity and asset prices is consistent with a boom-bust cycle: in fact, *MPS* triggers an increase in real activity (0.02%, not significant), the price level (0.01%), real stock prices (0.03%) and financial leverage (0.24%) in the very short-term turning into a contraction in the short-term (real activity: -0.09%; -0.14% LT; real stock prices: -0.09%; financial leverage: -0.48%); an increase in stock market uncertainty is however triggered at any horizon.

3.3.2 Term structure shocks

A positive *term structure level* shock (*TL*) upward shifts the whole term structure of interest rates; empirically, *TL* leads to a permanent increase in the real short- and long-term interest rates (17 b.p. and 16 b.p. VST, respectively; 13 b.p. and 9 b.p. LT). Due to the smaller increase in the long- than in the short-term rate, the term spread contracts (-1 b.p. VST; -4 b.p. ST and LT); as the term spread tends to be lower near business cycle peaks (Fama and French, 1989), its contraction is then consistent with the increase in real activity (0.06% VST; 0.51% ST; 0.37% LT) triggered/signalled by the shock. Also consistent with a current/expected improved macroeconomic outlook is the increase in real stock (0.12% VST; 0.31% ST; 0.21% LT) and housing (0.04% VST; 0.52% ST; 0.40% LT) prices, as well as the contraction in real gold prices (-0.65% VST; -0.51% MT).

A positive *term structure slope* shock (*TS*) tilts upward the term structure of interest rates; empirically, *TS* leads to a permanent increase in the long-term interest rate (23 b.p. VST; 18 b.p. ST; 19 b.p. LT), leaving (mostly) unaffected the real short-term rate (1 b.p. LT), therefore increasing the term spread (26 b.p. VST; 18 b.p. ST and LT). As the increase in the term spread is not associated with a contraction in the real short-term rate, the increase in real activity (0.07% VST; 0.36% ST; 0.31% LT) triggered/signalled by the shock is consistent with current/expected improved macroeconomic conditions, as well as with perceived inflation risk (the price level increases 0.01% VST-ST; 0.02% MT-LT); similarly the increase in real stock (0.04% VST; 0.16% ST; 0.12% LT) and housing (0.04% VST; 0.26% ST; 0.16% LT) prices, as well as the contraction in real gold prices (-0.42% VST; -0.85% ST; -0.87% LT) caused by the shock.

¹¹The responses for the real long-term interest rate (*LR*) are obtained from the responses of the real term spread (*TS*) and short-term interest rate (*SR*), as $TS = LR - SR$, i.e., $LR = TS + SR$.

3.3.3 US terms of trade shock

A negative *US terms of trade* shock (TT) causes a depreciation of the US\$ exchange rate; empirically, TT leads to a permanent depreciation of the US\$ exchange rate index (0.47% VST; 0.72% ST; 0.84% LT) and a short- to long-term contraction in the US trade deficit to GDP ratio (-0.10%); a negative short- to long-term impact on real activity (-0.45% ST; -0.56% LT) can also be noted, consistent with the contraction in US import and its negative impact on aggregate demand.

3.3.4 Portfolio allocation shocks

Positive *stocks* (PF), *housing* (PH), *non-energy commodities* (PM) and *gold* (PG) *portfolio allocation/preference* shocks lead to an increase in the demand of the corresponding asset and in its price, unrelated to global macro-financial and oil market developments, triggering portfolio reallocation across assets classes and impacting, through wealth/Tobin's Q effects, on real activity as well.

Empirically, a positive *stocks preference* shock (PF) leads to a permanent increase in real stock prices (0.23% VST; 0.13% ST and LT), as well as a transitory short-term increase in housing (0.06%; -0.11 LT) and Treasury bill and bond prices (the short- and long-term real interest rates contracts -1 b.p. (VST) and -3 b.p., respectively). PF also leads to a permanent increase in non energy commodities (0.25% VST; 0.29% ST; 0.38% LT), oil (0.61% VST; 0.98% ST; 1.14% LT) and gold (0.37% ST; 1.05% LT) prices.

Similarly, a positive *housing preference* shock (PH) leads to a permanent increase in real housing prices (0.40% VST; 0.74% ST; 0.47% LT), a transitory short-term increase in Treasury bill and bond prices (the real short- and long-term rates contract -4 b.p. and -7 b.p, respectively), as well as in real stock prices (0.12% VST; 0.17% ST; 0.08% MT); a permanent increase in oil (2.32% ST and LT), non energy commodities (1.12% VST; 1.01% ST; 0.95% LT) and gold (1.69% VST; 1.56% ST; 1.94% LT) prices.

Differently, a positive *non-energy commodities preference* shock (PM) leads to a permanent increase in real non-energy commodities prices (1.64% VST; 2.14% ST; 2.09% LT), as well as in stock (0.06% VST), gold (0.75% VST; 1.27% ST and LT) and oil (0.79% VST; 0.34% ST 0.32% LT) prices, yet depressing housing (-0.04% VST; 0.09% ST; -0.13% LT) and Treasury bills and bonds (the real short- and long-term rates increase 3 b.p. ST) prices.

Moreover, a positive *gold preference* shock (PG) leads to a permanent increase in real gold prices (2.47% VST; 3.61% ST; 3.93% LT), as well as in non-energy commodities (0.75% VST; 0.92% ST and LT) and oil (0.97%

VST; 1.52% ST; 1.34% LT) prices, yet depressing stock (-0.06% ST), housing (-0.04% VST; 0.12% ST; -0.26% LT) and Treasury bills and bonds (the real short- and long-term rates increase 1 b.p. VST; 2 b.p. and 4 b.p. ST, respectively; 5 b.p. LT, long-term rate only) markets.

Overall the findings show that a shift in investors preferences toward stocks and/or housing also leads to increased demand and prices for any other asset class; differently, a shift in investors preferences toward commodities tend to depress other asset classes, particularly less risky assets, i.e., housing and Treasury bills and bonds, as well as stocks (*PG* only). Finally, through wealth, Tobin's q and financial accelerator mechanics¹², *PF* and *PH* only trigger a short to long-term increase in real activity (0.08% and 0.19% VST, respectively; 0.12% and 0.39% ST; 0.21% *PH*, LT); a positive effect on real activity is also yield by *PM* and *PG*, yet in the very short-term only (0.06%).

3.3.5 Revisions in expectations and risk aversion/risk appetite shocks

Size and value shocks A positive *size* shock (*SZ*) causes a positive correlation between *SMB* and real activity. As small firms are more vulnerable than large firms to changing credit conditions, being poorly collateralized and having limited access to external capital markets (Gertler and Gilchrist, 1994), improving (worsening) credit/macroeconomic conditions might be associated with higher (lower) profitability of small than large stocks, i.e., with a higher contemporaneous return on *SMB*. A positive (negative) *SMB* can be expected during expansions (recessions) (Hahn and Lee, 2006; Petkova, 2006), a positive *size* shock (*SZ*) then revealing expectations of favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.

Similarly, a positive *value* shock (*VL*) causes a positive correlation between *HML* and real activity. As firms with high book-to-market ratios are likely to suffer from a higher debt burden than low book-to-market firms, and therefore more vulnerable to changes in the monetary policy stance and interest rates, value stocks are more strongly exposed to cyclical news on future economic activity than growth stocks (Kojien et al., 2012); moreover, value stocks are more strongly correlated with consumption growth during recessions (Lettau and Ludvigson, 2001) and do worse when the expected aggregate stock market return declines (Campbell and al., 2012). Improv-

¹²Financial accelerator effects may be generated through both firms and households spending decision; households and firms can borrow posting their equities as collateral; changes in asset prices then affect net worth and therefore spending, not only through wealth or Tobin's Q effects, but also, by changing their external finance premium, i.e., their cost of credit.

ing (worsening) economic conditions might then be associated with higher (lower) profitability of value than growth stocks, i.e., with a higher contemporaneous return on *HML* on average. A positive (negative) *HML* can be expected during expansions (recessions) (Hahn and Lee, 2006; Petkova, 2006; Kojien et al., 2012), a positive *value* shock (*VL*) then revealing expectations about favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.

Empirically, *SZ* leads to a permanent increase in *SMB* (3.08% VST; 1.36% ST; 1.74% LT), while *VL* in *HML* (3.81% VST; 4.16% ST; 3.87% LT), pointing to larger profitability of small than large stocks and value than growth stocks, respectively; both shocks (trigger) signal an expansion in real activity (*SMB*: 0.19% VST and MT; 0.49% ST; *HML*: 0.18% ST; 0.41% LT).¹³

Coherently, a tightening in the monetary policy stance can be noted, as excess liquidity contracts (*SZ*: -0.18% VST; *VL*: -0.07% VST; -0.27% ST; -0.49% LT), the real short-term rate increases (*SZ*: 5 b.p. ST; 3 b.p. MT; *VL*: 1 b.p. MT; 2 b.p. LT), while the term spread falls (*SZ*: -3 b.p. VST; -12 b.p. ST; -9 b.p. LT; *VL*: -4 b.p. VST and ST; -8 b.p. LT).

Favorable revisions in expectations about the investment opportunity set are also revealed by the portfolio shift toward riskier assets triggered by both shocks. For instance, both shocks lead to higher housing (*SZ*: 0.22% VST; 0.54% ST; 0.43% MT; *VL*: 0.03% VST; 0.31% ST; 0.58% LT), non-energy commodities (*SZ*: 1.35% VST; 1.96% ST; 2.08% LT; *VL*: 1.15% VST; 1.61% ST; 1.33% LT), and Treasury bond prices (long-term rate: -5 b.p. VST; -10 b.p. ST; -9 b.p. LT, following *SZ*; -4 b.p. VST and ST; -7 b.p. LT, following *VL*), while Treasury bill prices contract (short-term rate: 5 b.p. ST, following *SZ*; 2 b.p. LT, following *VL*).

Also, while *SZ* leads to higher stock (0.54% VST; 0.61% ST; 0.71% LT) and gold (1.28% VST; 1.37% ST; 2.72% LT) prices, *VL* triggers a contraction in the price of both assets (*F*: -0.17% VST; -0.31% ST; -0.49% LT; *G*: -0.40% VST; -0.64% MT; -1.59% LT). Moreover, *SZ* leads to higher oil prices in the medium- to long-term (0.93% LT; -1.98% ST) and *VL* in the very short-term (1.03% VST; -1.18% ST).

Momentum shocks A positive *momentum* shock (*MM*) may cause both a positive or negative correlation between *MOM* and real activity. As the return on momentum strategies might be related to the state of the business

¹³The finding is consistent with the evidence of forecasting power of *SMB* and *HML* for US GDP growth, as well as for other industrialized countries (Liew and Vassalou, 2000; Lettau and Ludvigson, 2001), as well with the view that investors hold large and growth stocks when the economy is in a bad state, shifting to small and value stocks when expectations of future economic growth improve (Liew and Vassalou, 2000).

cycle, being positive (negative) during expansionary (contractionary) phases (Chordia and Shivakumar, 2002; Liu and Zhang, 2008) and following periods of upward (downward) market-wide movements (Cooper et al., 2004), when also financial leverage (Adrian et al., 2012)¹⁴ and stock market liquidity increase (decrease) (Pastor and Stambaugh, 2003), a positive (negative) *MOM* can be expected during expansions (recessions). A positive *momentum* shock (*MM*) might then reveal expectations of favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.

Yet, firms with stronger fundamentals may be expected to outperform firms with weaker fundamentals during economic downturn; if fundamentals are persistent and reflected in stock returns, positive momentum should be observed also during recessions. A positive *momentum* shock (*MM*) might then also induce a negative correlation between *MOM* and real activity, revealing expectations of unfavorable changes in the investment opportunity set. Empirically, the latter pattern is found to be relevant.¹⁵

Empirically, a positive *momentum* shock (*MM*), leading to a permanent increase in *MOM* (3.50 VST; 2.36% ST; 2.31% LT), might be associated with a negative outlook on the investment opportunity set, signalling an incoming contraction in real activity (-0.07% VST; -0.23% ST and LT) and the ensuing expansion in the monetary policy stance, as excess liquidity increases (0.09% VST; 0.14% ST) and the real short-term rate contracts in the short- to long-term (-1 b.p.). Due to the contraction in Treasury bond prices (the long-term rate increases 5 b.p. VST; 7 b.p. ST and LT), the term spread also increases (4 b.p. VST; 7 b.p. ST; 8 b.p. LT).

Consistent with the expectations of unfavorable changes in the investment opportunity set, *MM* triggers portfolio rebalancing favoring Treasury bills (*flight to safety*), as real stock (-0.12% VST; -0.16% ST; -0.08% LT), housing (-0.06% VST; -0.29% ST; -0.27% LT), non-energy commodities (-0.21% VST; -0.99% ST; -0.90% LT), and Treasury bond prices contract (long-term rate: 5 b.p. VST; 7 b.p. ST and LT), while Treasury bill (short-term rate: -1 b.p. ST and LT) and gold prices (0.17% VST; not reported) increase; an increase in the real oil price can however be noted (1.04% VST; 0.89% ST; 0.55% LT; not reported).

¹⁴According to Adrian et al. (2012) momentum is procyclical, being eroded when falling asset prices and worsening credit conditions force financial institutions into deleveraging.

¹⁵Chordia and Shivakumar (2002), based on NBER chronology, find that, over the period 1926-1994, the return on momentum strategies is positive in each of the ten expansionary phases, albeit statistically significant only in four cases; positive in six out of the nine recessionary episodes, yet statistically significant in only one case.

Stock market liquidity shocks A positive *stock market liquidity* shock (SL) causes a positive correlation between PSL and real activity. As improving economic conditions lead to a reduction in investors' risk aversion and to portfolio rebalancing towards riskier assets, higher stock market liquidity, pointing to increased investment in stocks (risky assets), signals an expected improvement in the economic outlook. Hence, a high (low) PSL can be expected during expansions (recessions), a positive *stock market liquidity* shock (SL) revealing expectations of favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.

Empirically, a positive *stock market liquidity* shock (SL) leads to a transitory increase in PSL (6.3% VST), signaling an incoming short-term increase in real activity (0.07% VST; 0.11% ST) and tightening in the monetary policy stance, as excess liquidity contracts (-0.06% VST; -0.09% ST) and the real short-term rate increases (1 b.p. VST; 2 b.p. ST), while the term spread contracts (-2 b.p. ST).

Consistent with the improved macroeconomic outlook, as well as with increased stock market participation, SL leads to portfolio rebalancing favoring stocks over other risky and safe assets; in fact, real stock prices increases (0.11% VST; 0.15% ST; 0.19% LT), while Treasury bills and bonds prices contract (short- and long-term rates: 1 b.p. VST; 2 b.p. ST); similarly housing (-0.07% VST; -0.30% ST, LT), non-energy commodities (-0.70% VST; -1.03% ST; -0.82% LT) and gold (-0.59% VST; -1.14% ST; -0.77% LT; not reported) prices; differently an increase in the real oil price can be noted (1.48% VST; 0.87% ST; 0.65% LT; not reported).

Leverage shocks A positive *leverage* shock (LV) may cause both a positive and negative correlation between LEV and real activity. As leverage of financial intermediaries is procyclical, i.e., increasing in boom phases and contracting during recessions (Adrian and Shin, 2010; Adrian et al., 2012), it is negatively related to risk aversion; then, LEV can be expected to be high during expansions and low during recessions. Hence, an unexpected increase in leverage might reveal favorable changes to the investment opportunity set.

Yet, consistent with recent events, excessive leverage may enhance financial fragility, leading to financial crises, credit crunches and deep real effects. A positive *leverage* shock (LV) might then also reveal expectations of unfavorable changes in the investment opportunity set. As shown below, the latter pattern is found empirically relevant.

Empirically, a positive *leverage* shock (LV), leading to a contemporaneous increase in LEV (3.78%), might be associated with a negative outlook on the investment opportunity set, signalling an incoming contraction in real ac-

tivity (-0.10% ST; -0.34%, ST; -0.19% LT) and credit supply (excess liquidity contracts -0.09% ST; -0.31% LT).

Consistent with bust dynamics and the expectation of unfavorable changes in the investment opportunity set, a generalized decline in asset prices is triggered by LV , as real stock (-0.19% VST; -0.29% ST; -0.26% LT), housing (-0.09% VST; -0.29% ST; -0.40% LT), non-energy commodities (-0.45% VST; -0.75% ST; -0.49% LT), oil (-1.84% VST; -2.0% ST; -2.16% LT; not reported), Treasury bond (long-term rate: 5 b.p. VST; 10 b.p. ST; 8 b.p. LT) and gold (-0.49% VST; -0.61% ST; -0.58% LT; not reported) prices contract; while also Treasury bill prices contract in the short-term (short-term rate: 3 b.p.), portfolio rebalancing favoring Treasury bills (*flight to safety*) occurs in the medium-term (short-term rate: -1 b.p. MT).

Risk aversion and appetite shocks A positive *risk aversion* shock (RAV), i.e., an increase in risk aversion, causes a negative correlation between FV and real activity. As higher (lower) economic uncertainty may be expected during recessions, higher (lower) volatility in future fundamentals and discount rates, and therefore higher (lower) stock market uncertainty can be expected during economic downturn (Schwert, 1989a,b; Hamilton and Susmel, 1994; Hamilton and Lin, 1996; Beltratti and Morana, 2006). Moreover, worsening (improving) economic conditions lead to an increase (decrease) in risk aversion by investors (Fama and French, 1989; Cochrane, 2007). Then, FV can be expected to be low (high) during expansions (recessions), a positive *risk aversion* shock (RAV) signaling unfavorable revisions in expectations in the investment opportunity set.

Empirically, RAV leads to a permanent increase in stock market volatility (0.60% VST; 0.36% ST; 0.28% LT), signaling an incoming contraction in real activity (-0.08% VST) and loosening in the monetary policy stance, as excess liquidity increases (0.12% VST; 0.30% LT), while the real short-term rate contracts (-5 b.p. ST); similarly the term spread, due to the contraction in the real long-term rate as well (-15 b.p. ST; -10 b.p. LT).

The latter pattern can also be understood in the light of an unexpected *uncertainty* increase, as higher uncertainty, by negatively affecting investment and aggregate demand, exercises recessionary effects, which might be lessened/sterilized through an expansionary monetary policy.

Moreover, consistent with worsening macroeconomic conditions, RAV causes portfolio rebalancing, favoring safer over riskier assets, in the very short-term; in fact, stock prices (-0.26% VST), oil (-0.97% VST; not reported) and non-energy commodity prices contract (-0.35% VST), while Treasury bills and bonds prices (short-term rate: -5 b.p. ST; long-term rate: -15 b.p.

ST; -10 b.p. LT), as well as housing (0.04% VST; 0.56% ST; 0.45% LT) and gold (0.35% VST; not reported) prices increase.

Conversely, a positive *risk appetite* shock (*RAP*) causes a positive correlation between *FRA* and real activity. As credit risk is countercyclical, when the economic outlook improves (worsens) the cost of external financing for borrowers decrease (increase) (Bernanke and Gertler, 1989). Moreover, as raising (falling) asset prices during economic upturn (downturn) drive up (down) financial institutions' balance sheets and leverage, and the value of the collateral borrowers can post, leading to higher (lower) lending and borrowing ability, credit is procyclical over the business cycle (Bernanke, 1983).

The Bagliano-Morana fragility/credit risk index (*FRA*) might then be expected to be low (high) during expansions (recessions). Yet, a positive *risk appetite* shock (*RAP*), by pointing to increased willingness of investors to bear credit risk, signals the expectations of favorable changes in the investment opportunity set.¹⁶

Empirically, *RAP* leads to a permanent increase in *FRA* (4 b.p. VST, ST and LT), signaling an incoming short- to medium-term increase in real activity (0.06% ST; 0.04% MT) and stronger credit flow to the economy (excess liquidity: 0.03% ST; 0.11% LT); a temporary increase in the term spread (1 b.p. VST), determined by the increase in the long-term rate at an unchanged short-term rate, is also found.¹⁷

Moreover, consistent with the improved macroeconomic outlook, a generalized increase in asset prices is triggered by *RAP*, as stock (0.03% VST; 0.07% ST; 0.08% LT), housing (0.01% VST; 0.05% ST and MT), oil (0.22% ST; not reported), non-energy commodities (0.06% VST) and Treasury bill and bond prices (short- and long-term rate: -1 b.p. ST) increase, while gold prices fall (-0.12% VST; -0.28% ST; -0.32% MT; not reported).

References

- [1] Adrian, T., Etula, E., Muir, T., 2012. Financial intermediaries and the cross-section of asset returns. Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff

¹⁶Due to ordering, the idiosyncratic fragility index shock is contemporaneously orthogonal to oil market, macro and financial conditions, as well as to the information contained in the other risk factors; it therefore contains residual information about credit risk conditions unrelated to contemporaneous signals provided by all the other variables in the system.

¹⁷The latter finding is broadly consistent with the evidence of forecasting power of the default spread, one of the components of *FRA*, for future GDP growth over short horizons (Lettau and Ludvigson, 2001).

- Report, no. 464, July 2010, revised (The Journal of Finance, forthcoming).
- [2] Adrian, T., Shin, H.S., 2010. Liquidity and leverage. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 19, 418-437.
 - [3] Bagliano, F.C., Morana, C., 2012. The Great Recession: US dynamics and spillovers to the world economy. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 36, 1-13.
 - [4] Bai, J., 2003. Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica* 71, 135-171.
 - [5] Bai, J. and S. Ng, 2006. Confidence intervals for diffusion index forecasts and inference with factor-augmented regressions. *Econometrica* 74, 1133-1150.
 - [6] Beltratti, A., Morana, C., 2006. Breaks and persistency: Macroeconomic causes of stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics* 131, 151-177.
 - [7] Bernanke, B.S., 1983. Nonmonetary effects of the financial crises in the propagation of the Great Depression. *American Economic Review* 73, 256-277.
 - [8] Bernanke, B.S., Gertler, M., 1989. Agency costs, net worth, and business fluctuations. *American Economic Review* 79, 14-31.
 - [9] Bernanke, B.S., 2005. The global saving glut and the U.S. current account deficit. Remarks by Governor Ben S. Bernanke at the Sandridge Lecture, Virginia Association of Economists, Richmond, Virginia, March, 10, 2005.
 - [10] Caballero, R.J., Farhi, E., Gourinchas, P.O., 2008. An equilibrium model of global imbalances and low interest rates. *American Economic Review* 98, 358-393.
 - [11] Campbell, J.Y., Giglio, S., Polk, C., Turley, R., 2012. An intertemporal CAPM with stochastic volatility. NBER Working Paper Series, no.18411.
 - [12] Canova, F., De Nicolò, G., 1995. Stock returns and real activity: A structural approach. *European Economic Review* 39, 981-1015.
 - [13] Carhart, M.M., 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance, *The Journal of Finance* 52, 57-82.

- [14] Chordia, T, Shivakumar, L., 2002. Momentum, business cycle and time varying expected returns. *Journal of Finance* 57, 985-1019.
- [15] Cochrane, J.H., 2007. Financial markets and the real economy. In Mehra, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of the Equity Premium*. Elsevier, UK, 237-325.
- [16] Cooper, M.J., Gutierrez JR., R.C., Hamed, A., 2004. Market states and momentum. *The Journal of Finance* LIX, 1345-1365.
- [17] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1989. Business conditions and expected returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 25, 23-49.
- [18] Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1993. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33, 3-56
- [19] Gertler, M., Gilchrist, S., 1994, Monetary policy, business cycle, and the behavior of small manufacturing firms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109, 309-340.
- [20] Granger, C.W., Jeon, Y., 2004. Thick modelling. *Economic Modelling* 21, 323-43.
- [21] Hamilton, J.D., Susmel, R., 1994. Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity and changes in regime. *Journal of Econometrics* 64, 307-333.
- [22] Hamilton, J.D., Lin, 1996. Stock market volatility and the business cycle. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 11, 573-593.
- [23] Hamilton, J., 1996. This is what happened to the oil price-macroeconomy relationship. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 38, 215-20.
- [24] Hahn, J., Lee, H., 1996. Yield spreads as alternative risk factors for size and book-to-market. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 41, 245-269.
- [25] Kogan, L., Papanikolaou, D., Seru, A., Stoffman, N., 2012. Technological innovation, resource allocation, and growth. NBER Working Paper, no. 17769.
- [26] Koijen, R.S.J, Lustig, H., Van Nieuwerburgh, S., 2012. The cross-section and time series of stock and bond returns. CEPR Discussion Papers no. 9024.

- [27] Liew, J., Vassalou, M., 2000. Can book-to-market, size and momentum be risk factors that predict economic growth. *Journal of Financial Economics* 57, 221-245.
- [28] Liu, X.L., Zhang, L., 2008. Momentum profits, factor pricing, and macroeconomic risk. *The Review of Financial Studies* 21, 2417-2448.
- [29] Lettau, M., Ludvigson, S., 2001. Resurrecting the (C)CAPM: A cross-sectional test when risk premia are time-varying. *Journal of Political Economy* 109, 1238–1287.
- [30] Lettau, M., Ludvigson, S., 2011. Shocks and crashes. NBER Working Paper Series, no. 16966.
- [31] Morana, C., 2014. Factor vector autoregressive estimation of heteroskedastic persistent and non persistent processes subject to structural breaks. *Open Journal of Statistics* 4, 292-312.
- [32] Morana, C., 2012. PC-VAR estimation of vector autoregressive models. *Open Journal of Statistics* 2, 251-259.
- [33] Pastor, L., Stambaugh, R.F., 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy* 11, 642-685.
- [34] Petkova, R., 2006. Do the Fama-French factors proxy for innovations in predictive variables? *Journal of Finance* 61, 581-612.
- [35] Schwert, G.W., 1989a. Why does stock market volatility change over time? *The Journal of Finance* XLIV, 1115-1153.
- [36] Schwert, G.W., 1989b. Business cycles, financial crises and stock volatility. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 31, 83-125.
- [37] Working, H., 1960. Speculation on hedging markets. *Stanford University Food Research Institute Studies* 1, 185-220.

Table A1: Identification of oil market structural shocks: Empirical responses of selected variable for congruence evaluation with theoretical effects of structural shocks

Panel A: Oil reserve shock (OR)								Panel B: Negative flow oil supply shock (OSN)							
	R	FB	OP	OV	Y	N			P	OP	OV	Y	N		
0	0.39	0.65	-0.92	-0.13	-0.03	-0.01			0	-0.21	1.59	0.74	-0.11	0.00	
2	0.79	-1.90	-1.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.02			2	-0.17	3.26	0.14	0.00	0.03	
4	1.00	-0.59	-0.05	-0.39	0.12	-0.01			4	-0.15	0.73	-0.40	0.04	0.00	
6	1.20	-1.03	0.73	-0.65	0.22	0.00			6	-0.15	-0.04	-0.52	0.04	0.01	
8	1.29	-0.15	-0.61	-0.55	0.23	0.00			8	-0.15	0.80	-0.65	0.11	0.01	
12	1.43	0.31	-0.74	-0.52	0.22	0.01			12	-0.13	0.38	-0.79	0.28	0.02	
20	1.53	-0.05	-0.91	-0.64	0.29	0.01			20	-0.14	0.38	-0.85	0.44	0.03	
40	1.66	-0.01	-0.98	-0.75	0.44	0.01			40	-0.13	-0.01	-1.02	0.62	0.03	
Panel C: Positive flow oil supply shock (OSP)								Panel D: Oil production mix shock (OX)							
	P	OP	OV	Y	N				RM	OP	OV	Y	N		
0	0.40	-0.96	0.32	-0.05	0.00				0	0.32	-1.44	0.16	-0.07	-0.01	
2	0.41	0.34	0.82	0.00	0.00				2	0.43	-2.07	0.65	-0.06	-0.01	
4	0.42	-1.85	1.18	-0.05	0.00				4	0.40	-0.25	0.48	-0.11	0.00	
6	0.41	0.00	1.05	0.07	0.01				6	0.46	-0.55	0.51	-0.13	0.00	
8	0.42	0.26	1.00	0.10	0.02				8	0.50	-1.25	0.58	-0.20	0.00	
12	0.36	-0.16	1.24	-0.01	0.01				12	0.54	-1.39	0.55	-0.21	0.00	
20	0.35	-0.23	1.18	-0.13	0.00				20	0.64	-1.36	0.59	-0.08	0.00	
40	0.36	0.03	1.26	-0.19	0.00				40	0.68	-1.42	0.52	-0.01	0.00	
Panel E: Oil consumption preferences shock (OC)								Panel F: Oil inventories preferences shock (OI)							
	C	OP	OV	Y	N				I	OP	OV	Y	N		
0	0.54	0.16	-0.39	0.00	0.00				0	0.50	-1.35	-0.44	0.00	0.00	
2	0.45	2.79	-0.42	0.14	0.01				2	0.58	-1.98	-0.61	0.07	0.00	
4	0.53	3.12	-0.29	0.25	0.01				4	0.51	-2.32	-0.46	0.13	0.00	
6	0.58	2.91	-0.29	0.24	0.01				6	0.45	-1.56	-0.42	0.24	0.00	
8	0.59	3.54	-0.37	0.27	0.01				8	0.39	-0.66	-0.50	0.32	0.01	
12	0.57	3.24	-0.35	0.25	0.02				12	0.42	-0.71	-0.50	0.35	0.01	
20	0.53	3.33	-0.38	0.16	0.02				20	0.45	-0.93	-0.56	0.28	0.01	
40	0.55	3.27	-0.39	0.22	0.02				40	0.44	-0.93	-0.56	0.29	0.01	
Panel G: Oil futures market pressure shock (OFP)								Panel H: Residual oil futures market shock (OFR)							
	WT	FB	OP	OV	Y	N			FB	WT	OP	OV	Y	N	
0	0.72	0.24	0.36	-0.43	0.00	0.00			0	4.36	0.00	0.30	-0.15	0.00	0.00
2	0.68	0.24	-0.22	-0.31	-0.03	0.00			2	-0.06	0.08	2.60	-0.21	0.08	0.01
4	0.68	-0.04	0.78	-0.25	-0.07	0.00			4	0.19	-0.01	2.00	-0.10	0.10	0.00
6	0.71	0.01	0.75	-0.26	-0.11	0.00			6	0.35	0.00	2.05	-0.05	0.10	0.00
8	0.72	-0.05	0.73	-0.27	-0.14	0.00			8	-0.26	0.00	2.67	-0.13	0.13	0.01
12	0.72	0.10	0.48	-0.23	-0.18	0.00			12	0.00	-0.01	2.34	-0.10	0.13	0.01
20	0.73	-0.02	0.59	-0.20	-0.15	0.00			20	0.03	-0.01	2.42	-0.12	0.10	0.01
40	0.73	0.00	0.59	-0.20	-0.15	0.00			40	0.00	0.00	2.39	-0.11	0.09	0.01
Panel I: Other real oil price shock (ORP)								Panel L: Other nominal oil price volatility shock (ONV)							
	OP	OV	Y	N					OV	OP	Y	N			
0	3.73	0.22	0.00	0.00					0	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2	3.69	0.18	-0.05	0.00					2	1.28	0.21	-0.02	0.01		
4	3.63	0.10	-0.08	0.00					4	1.00	1.79	0.07	0.01		
6	3.24	0.12	-0.15	0.00					6	0.95	1.75	0.08	0.02		
8	2.64	0.18	-0.21	-0.01					8	1.14	0.83	0.02	0.01		
12	2.86	0.15	-0.23	-0.01					12	1.17	1.06	-0.08	0.01		
20	2.92	0.19	-0.19	-0.01					20	1.17	0.92	-0.12	0.01		
40	2.95	0.21	-0.21	-0.01					40	1.19	1.05	-0.14	0.01		

Each Panel in the Table reports cumulative impulse responses of selected variables to a given oil market shock, i.e., oil reserves (OR, Panel A), flow oil supply (positive, OSP, Panel B; negative, OSN, Panel C), oil production mix (OX, Panel D), oil consumption and inventories preferences (OC, Panel E; OI, Panel F), oil futures market-pressure (OFP, Panel G), residual oil futures market (OFR, Panel H), other real oil price (ORP, Panel I) and nominal oil price volatility (ONV, Panel L). The variables of interest are oil reserves (R), oil production (P), refineries margins (RF), oil consumption and inventories (C, I), Working-T index (WT), oil futures market basis (FB), real oil price (OP), nominal oil price volatility (OV), real activity (Y), core inflation (N). Figures in bold denote statistical significance at the 5% level. Cumulative impulse responses are reported in all cases, apart from the oil future market basis.

Table A2: Identification of macroeconomic structural shocks: Empirical responses of selected variable for congruence evaluation with theoretical effects of structural shocks

Panel A: Labor supply shock (LS)								Panel B: (Negative) Labor demand shock (LD)								
	E	W	U	Y	F	H	N			U	W	E	Y	F	H	N
0	0.24	-0.16	-0.10	0.13	0.09	0.13	-0.02		0	0.28	0.03	0.00	-0.07	0.11	-0.07	-0.04
2	0.57	-0.40	-0.41	0.43	0.37	0.35	0.01		2	0.40	0.04	-0.10	-0.14	0.19	0.01	-0.03
4	0.94	-0.52	-0.74	0.62	0.32	0.48	0.00		4	0.37	-0.01	-0.08	-0.08	0.30	-0.03	-0.03
6	1.17	-0.60	-0.85	0.64	0.35	0.54	0.01		6	0.31	-0.09	-0.04	-0.06	0.29	-0.12	-0.03
8	1.33	-0.70	-0.92	0.60	0.34	0.53	0.01		8	0.32	-0.10	-0.01	-0.08	0.28	-0.16	-0.04
12	1.38	-0.90	-0.84	0.43	0.33	0.36	0.02		12	0.34	-0.15	-0.01	-0.12	0.34	-0.14	-0.04
20	1.23	-1.10	-0.58	0.18	0.37	0.09	0.01		20	0.31	-0.24	0.06	-0.12	0.39	-0.08	-0.04
40	1.31	-1.30	-0.58	0.14	0.47	0.04	0.01		40	0.35	-0.33	0.07	-0.17	0.42	-0.15	-0.04
Panel C: Aggregate demand shock (AD)								Panel D: Productivity shock (PR)								
	Y	N	F	H	W					Y	N	F	H	W		
0	0.41	0.02	0.23	0.02	-0.10			0	0.00	0.00	-0.22	0.14	0.40			
2	0.67	0.02	0.23	-0.02	-0.31			2	0.04	-0.01	-0.27	0.28	0.66			
4	0.59	0.02	0.12	-0.01	-0.31			4	0.26	0.00	-0.17	0.48	0.77			
6	0.39	0.01	0.07	0.05	-0.22			6	0.56	0.01	-0.14	0.58	0.77			
8	0.32	0.02	0.13	0.10	-0.21			8	0.67	0.02	-0.27	0.63	0.86			
12	0.29	0.02	0.12	0.01	-0.25			12	0.66	0.02	-0.40	0.80	1.12			
20	0.28	0.02	0.13	-0.05	-0.23			20	0.70	0.02	-0.55	0.79	1.33			
40	0.29	0.02	0.13	-0.04	-0.22			40	0.85	0.02	-0.63	0.96	1.58			
Panel E: Core inflation shock (CI)								Panel F: (Negative) Global saving rate shock (GFI)								
	N	U	Y	E					G	F	Y	SR				
0	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00				0	0.34	-0.15	0.00	0.04				
2	0.06	-0.01	-0.08	-0.04				2	0.59	-0.29	-0.25	0.04				
4	0.05	0.05	-0.16	-0.10				4	0.80	-0.34	-0.49	0.03				
6	0.05	0.15	-0.23	-0.21				6	0.88	-0.33	-0.63	0.01				
8	0.05	0.19	-0.24	-0.30				8	0.86	-0.34	-0.70	0.00				
12	0.04	0.15	-0.15	-0.34				12	0.70	-0.30	-0.65	-0.01				
20	0.05	0.04	-0.01	-0.28				20	0.54	-0.22	-0.47	-0.01				
40	0.05	0.02	0.01	-0.30				40	0.59	-0.26	-0.50	0.00				
Panel G: (Negative) US saving rate shock (GDI)								Panel H: Saving glut shock (GTI)								
	Fd	F	Y	SR					Td	F	Y	SR				
0	0.40	-0.12	0.00	0.04				0	0.16	-0.05	0.00	-0.11				
2	0.18	-0.31	-0.23	0.06				2	0.23	-0.06	-0.03	0.00				
4	0.20	-0.19	-0.13	0.01				4	0.22	-0.13	-0.17	-0.01				
6	0.17	-0.20	-0.03	0.02				6	0.22	-0.09	-0.30	-0.04				
8	0.18	-0.25	0.01	0.04				8	0.27	0.01	-0.30	-0.05				
12	0.16	-0.28	0.08	0.04				12	0.29	0.05	-0.32	-0.05				
20	0.16	-0.38	0.13	0.04				20	0.29	0.12	-0.29	-0.04				
40	0.15	-0.43	0.21	0.04				40	0.29	0.15	-0.37	-0.04				

Each Panel in the Table reports cumulative impulse responses of selected variables to a given macroeconomic shock, i.e., labor supply (LS; Panel A) and demand (LD, Panel B), aggregate demand (AD, Panel C), productivity (PR, Panel D), core inflation (CI, Panel E), global saving rate (GFI, Panel F), US saving rate (GDI, Panel G) and ex-US global saving rate (GTI, Panel H). The variables of interest are real activity (Y), excess public consumption (G), US\$ exchange rate return index (X), core inflation (N), excess liquidity (L), employment (E), unemployment rate (U), real wage (W), real stock prices (F), real short term rate (SR). Figures in bold denote statistical significance at the 5% level.

Table A3: Identification of financial structural shocks: Empirical responses of selected variable for congruence evaluation with theoretical effects of structural shocks

Panel A: Monetary policy stance shock (MPS)										Panel B: Term structure level shock (TL)							
	L	SR	TS	Y	N	F	LEV	FV		SR	TS	Y	N	F	H	GD	FV
0	0.29	-0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.24	0.01	0	0.17	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.04	-0.65	0.03
2	0.33	-0.04	-0.05	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.24	0.12	2	0.11	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.23	0.23	-0.14	-0.04
4	0.51	-0.03	0.01	-0.06	0.00	-0.09	-0.24	0.18	4	0.11	-0.02	0.28	0.01	0.30	0.38	0.10	-0.02
6	0.54	-0.07	0.04	-0.09	0.00	-0.04	-0.48	0.25	6	0.12	-0.02	0.44	0.01	0.31	0.47	0.15	-0.04
8	0.50	-0.06	0.04	-0.07	0.00	-0.03	-0.10	0.23	8	0.13	-0.04	0.51	0.02	0.28	0.52	0.01	0.00
12	0.53	-0.06	0.04	-0.11	0.00	-0.04	-0.03	0.27	12	0.14	-0.06	0.49	0.03	0.24	0.54	-0.51	0.04
20	0.56	-0.06	0.04	-0.10	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.26	20	0.14	-0.04	0.34	0.02	0.19	0.39	-0.24	0.08
40	0.62	-0.07	0.04	-0.14	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.28	40	0.13	-0.04	0.37	0.02	0.21	0.40	-0.18	0.07
Panel C: Term structure slope shock (TS)										Panel D: US terms of trade shock (TT)							
	TS	SR	Y	N	F	H	GD	FV		X	Td	Y					
0	0.23	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.03	-0.42	0.04	0	0.47	0.00	0.00					
2	0.26	0.11	0.07	0.01	0.04	0.04	-0.15	0.00	2	0.59	0.01	0.02					
4	0.22	0.11	0.22	0.01	0.18	0.10	-0.07	-0.09	4	0.61	-0.04	-0.17					
6	0.18	0.12	0.34	0.01	0.14	0.15	-0.59	-0.06	6	0.67	-0.08	-0.34					
8	0.18	0.13	0.36	0.01	0.16	0.21	-0.85	-0.05	8	0.72	-0.10	-0.45					
12	0.17	0.14	0.40	0.02	0.16	0.26	-1.05	-0.02	12	0.78	-0.11	-0.54					
20	0.18	0.14	0.30	0.02	0.10	0.16	-0.97	0.02	20	0.84	-0.10	-0.54					
40	0.18	0.13	0.31	0.02	0.12	0.16	-0.87	0.02	40	0.84	-0.10	-0.56					
Panel E: Stocks preferences shock (PF)										Panel F: Housing preferences shock (PH)							
	F	H	SR	TS	M	OP	GD	Y		H	F	SR	TS	M	OP	GD	Y
0	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.15	0.00	0	0.40	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.21	-0.87	1.26	0.00
2	0.43	0.06	-0.01	-0.02	0.25	0.61	0.15	0.08	2	0.57	0.12	-0.04	0.00	1.12	0.73	1.69	0.19
4	0.44	0.07	0.00	-0.03	0.43	0.82	0.31	0.15	4	0.68	0.16	-0.03	-0.02	1.32	1.89	1.98	0.34
6	0.43	0.07	0.01	-0.03	0.34	0.75	0.31	0.13	6	0.73	0.17	-0.01	-0.04	1.29	2.40	1.72	0.40
8	0.44	0.06	0.00	-0.02	0.29	0.98	0.37	0.12	8	0.74	0.14	0.01	-0.06	1.01	2.32	1.56	0.39
12	0.45	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.29	1.27	0.50	0.08	12	0.66	0.08	0.01	-0.05	0.80	2.61	1.53	0.29
20	0.48	-0.08	0.00	-0.01	0.33	1.07	0.82	-0.01	20	0.44	0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.91	2.24	2.00	0.16
40	0.51	-0.11	0.00	-0.01	0.38	1.14	1.05	-0.03	40	0.47	0.07	-0.01	-0.02	0.95	2.32	1.94	0.21
Panel G: Non-energy commodities preferences shock (PM)										Panel H: Gold preference shock (PG)							
	M	F	H	SR	TS	OP	GD	Y		GD	F	H	SR	TS	M	OP	Y
0	1.64	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.00	0	2.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	2.14	0.03	-0.04	0.01	-0.03	0.79	0.75	0.06	2	2.80	0.00	-0.04	0.01	0.00	0.75	0.97	0.06
4	2.04	-0.04	-0.08	0.03	-0.01	-0.13	1.01	0.01	4	3.26	-0.06	-0.09	0.02	0.02	0.77	0.51	0.00
6	1.98	-0.06	-0.08	0.02	0.01	-0.13	1.11	-0.04	6	3.44	-0.03	-0.09	0.01	0.04	0.76	0.78	0.00
8	2.09	-0.03	-0.09	0.01	0.02	0.34	1.27	-0.03	8	3.61	0.01	-0.12	0.00	0.04	0.92	1.52	0.02
12	2.16	-0.04	-0.13	0.01	0.01	0.36	1.33	-0.02	12	3.58	0.00	-0.17	0.01	0.03	0.86	1.28	0.01
20	2.16	-0.03	-0.13	0.01	0.01	0.37	1.31	-0.01	20	3.80	0.01	-0.23	0.01	0.04	0.89	1.33	-0.04
40	2.14	-0.04	-0.13	0.01	0.01	0.32	1.27	-0.01	40	3.93	0.04	-0.26	0.00	0.05	0.92	1.34	-0.06
Panel I: Size shock (SZ)										Panel L: Value shock (VL)							
	SMB	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M		HML	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M
0	3.08	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.44	0	3.81	0.00	0.00	-0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.74
2	2.71	0.19	-0.18	0.54	0.22	-0.02	-0.03	1.35	2	3.57	-0.03	-0.07	-0.17	0.03	0.01	-0.04	1.15
4	2.01	0.45	-0.25	0.65	0.36	-0.01	-0.13	2.60	4	4.38	0.03	-0.15	-0.25	0.14	0.01	-0.05	1.18
6	1.43	0.49	0.03	0.56	0.45	0.05	-0.15	2.11	6	3.99	0.07	-0.20	-0.31	0.23	0.00	-0.04	1.43
8	1.36	0.47	0.27	0.61	0.54	0.02	-0.12	1.96	8	4.16	0.18	-0.27	-0.31	0.31	0.00	-0.04	1.61
12	1.40	0.48	0.44	0.65	0.43	0.03	-0.13	2.03	12	3.88	0.32	-0.34	-0.34	0.43	0.01	-0.06	1.61
20	1.60	0.19	0.65	0.63	0.16	0.02	-0.10	1.92	20	3.90	0.36	-0.36	-0.43	0.53	0.01	-0.08	1.34
40	1.74	0.15	0.72	0.71	0.09	0.02	-0.09	2.08	40	3.87	0.41	-0.49	-0.49	0.58	0.02	-0.08	1.33
Panel M: Momentum shock (MM)										Panel N: Stock market liquidity shock (SL)							
	MOM	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M		PSL	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M
0	3.50	0.00	0.00	-0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.21	0	6.34	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.09
2	2.51	-0.07	0.09	-0.16	-0.06	0.01	0.04	-0.66	2	-0.18	0.07	-0.06	0.10	-0.07	0.01	0.00	-0.70
4	2.42	-0.17	0.14	-0.16	-0.14	0.00	0.07	-1.04	4	-0.39	0.11	-0.09	0.15	-0.18	0.02	-0.02	-0.60
6	2.15	-0.19	0.06	-0.11	-0.22	-0.01	0.07	-0.93	6	-0.19	0.04	-0.05	0.09	-0.27	0.02	-0.01	-0.86
8	2.36	-0.23	0.03	-0.13	-0.29	0.00	0.07	-0.99	8	0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.08	-0.31	0.02	0.00	-1.03
12	2.17	-0.30	0.00	-0.12	-0.31	-0.01	0.08	-1.02	12	0.01	-0.04	-0.06	0.13	-0.35	0.00	0.02	-0.83
20	2.29	-0.22	-0.06	-0.09	-0.27	-0.01	0.08	-0.87	20	0.01	-0.01	-0.06	0.18	-0.27	0.00	0.01	-0.80
40	2.31	-0.23	-0.03	-0.08	-0.27	-0.01	0.08	-0.90	40	0.00	-0.05	0.01	0.19	-0.30	0.00	0.01	-0.82

Table A3 (ctd): Identification of financial structural shocks: Empirical responses of selected variable for congruence evaluation with theoretical effects of structural shocks

Panel O: Leverage shock (LV)									Panel P: Risk aversion shock (RAV)								
	LEV	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M		FV	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M
0	3.78	0.00	0.00	-0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.03	0	0.57	0.00	0.00	-0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.35
2	-0.26	-0.10	0.02	-0.19	-0.09	0.02	0.03	-0.45	2	0.60	-0.08	0.12	-0.18	0.04	-0.01	0.01	-0.05
4	0.11	-0.24	0.06	-0.28	-0.23	0.03	0.05	-0.75	4	0.42	0.00	0.04	-0.03	0.25	-0.05	-0.01	-0.06
6	-0.23	-0.31	0.00	-0.27	-0.32	0.00	0.09	-0.72	6	0.31	0.14	-0.02	0.07	0.44	-0.02	-0.08	0.07
8	-0.01	-0.34	-0.09	-0.29	-0.40	0.00	0.10	-0.63	8	0.26	0.18	0.02	0.09	0.56	-0.01	-0.13	0.04
12	0.01	-0.31	-0.24	-0.27	-0.41	-0.01	0.11	-0.42	12	0.34	0.13	0.25	0.03	0.66	0.01	-0.14	-0.35
20	0.05	-0.17	-0.32	-0.23	-0.25	0.00	0.08	-0.39	20	0.40	0.00	0.34	-0.04	0.44	0.00	-0.10	-0.34
40	0.00	-0.19	-0.31	-0.26	-0.24	0.00	0.08	-0.49	40	0.38	0.03	0.30	0.00	0.45	0.00	-0.10	-0.23
Panel Q: Risk appetite shock (RAP)																	
	FRA	Y	L	F	H	SR	TS	M									
0	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00									
2	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.06									
4	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.05	0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.04									
6	0.04	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.05	-0.01	-0.01	0.07									
8	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.00	-0.01	0.03									
12	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.00	-0.01	-0.05									
20	0.04	0.01	0.10	0.06	0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.03									
40	0.04	0.01	0.11	0.08	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00									

Each Panel in the Table reports cumulative impulse responses of selected variables to a given financial shock, i.e., monetary policy stance (MPS, Panel A), term structure level (TL, Panel B) and slope (TS, Panel C), US terms of trade shocks (TT, Panel D), stocks (PF, Panel E), housing (PH, Panel F), non-energy commodities (PM, Panel G) and gold (PG, Panel H) preferences, size (SZ, Panel I), value (VL, Panel L), momentum (MM, Panel M), stock market liquidity (SL, Panel N) and financial leverage (LV, Panel O), risk aversion and risk appetite (RAV, Panel P; RAP, Panel Q). The variables of interest are excess liquidity (L), real short term rate (SR) and term spread (TS), real housing prices (H), real stock prices (F), US\$ exchange rate index (X), real activity (Y), core inflation (N), real oil prices (OP), real non-energy commodities prices (M), real gold prices (GD), stock market volatility (FV), Fama-French size and value factors (SMB, HML), Carhart momentum factor (MOM), Pastor-Stambaugh stock market liquidity factor (PSL), Adrian-Etula-Muir leverage factor (LEV), Bagliano-Morana fragility index (FRA). Figures in bold denote statistical significance at the 5% level. Apart from LEV and PSL, cumulated impulse responses are reported in all cases.

Table A4: Forecast error variance decomposition, contributions of each structural shock

Real activity (Y)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	0.3	5.8	1.0	2.5	8.5	2.1	79.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.8	17.2	2.9	58.4	4.5	3.8	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.2	0.3	2.6	0.2	0.4	2.2	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.0
4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.8	20.7	1.4	35.4	9.3	2.4	0.7	0.9	1.8	2.4	0.1	2.3	1.4	4.5	0.8	0.3	7.4	0.1	1.0	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.0
6	1.1	0.3	0.2	0.8	18.3	0.8	21.4	12.1	1.3	1.9	1.4	5.8	2.3	0.3	4.3	2.8	5.2	2.4	0.5	8.8	0.1	1.2	0.3	2.9	0.3	0.4	1.2	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.1
8	1.4	0.3	0.3	1.0	16.2	0.6	14.4	13.4	0.8	2.3	1.5	9.0	2.3	0.2	5.7	3.2	5.1	3.8	0.7	8.1	0.5	1.4	0.2	3.1	0.4	0.4	1.9	0.7	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.1
12	1.4	0.9	0.2	1.3	12.5	0.5	9.4	13.8	0.6	2.7	1.3	10.9	2.2	0.2	6.7	3.9	4.3	5.9	0.8	8	1.4	1.9	0.2	3.2	0.6	0.5	2.8	1.1	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.1
20	1.9	2.9	0.3	1.1	8.9	0.5	6.7	13.1	0.6	2.9	0.9	14.5	1.7	0.3	6.5	4.1	3.2	8.6	0.6	6.2	2.9	2.1	0.1	2.8	0.8	0.5	3.2	1.4	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1
40	3.8	7.1	0.7	0.6	4.8	0.6	4.8	11.1	0.8	3.5	0.4	19.1	1.5	0.4	5.7	3.7	2.4	9.8	0.3	3.5	4.4	2	0.1	2.1	0.8	0.4	3.1	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
Real stock prices (F)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	5.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	1.3	2.2	9.1	3.9	2.6	0.5	0.1	8.4	0.7	0.1	2.5	0.2	0.2	0.4	11.2	19.1	1.9	2.3	2.1	1.7	0.5	0.1	0.4	1.4	0.1	0.5	20.9	0.0	0.0
2	3.6	0.8	0.9	0.3	6.7	2.0	6.6	5.5	6.6	0.5	0.7	6.4	0.6	0.1	3.5	0.2	0.8	0.4	5.7	21.6	2.5	2.0	1.5	2.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.3	15.9	0.0	0.0
4	2.3	4.3	1.8	0.2	7.0	3.8	3.9	6.0	4.6	0.6	1.4	4.3	0.7	0.2	4.3	0.7	1.2	0.8	3.0	22.9	2.9	1.8	1.5	3.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.2	14.0	0.1	0.1
6	1.8	6.5	3.8	0.2	6.7	4.3	2.7	6.2	3.7	0.6	2.0	3.2	0.7	0.3	4.8	1.0	1.3	0.9	2.1	21.8	3.9	1.4	1.2	3.6	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.2	12.8	0.1	0.1
8	2.0	7.6	4.9	0.2	6.7	4.3	2.1	6.3	3.4	0.5	2.4	3.2	0.8	0.2	4.7	1.0	1.2	0.8	1.6	21.1	4.2	1.3	0.9	3.8	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.2	12.1	0.1	0.2
12	3.1	9.4	5.1	0.3	6.3	4.5	1.6	5.7	3.4	0.3	2.7	4.3	0.7	0.2	4.2	1.0	0.9	0.6	1.1	20.8	4.6	1.1	0.8	3.7	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.7	0.1	11.2	0.1	0.2
20	4.9	13.7	5.4	0.4	5.6	5.2	1.0	4.2	3.9	0.4	2.7	6.7	0.4	0.1	3.1	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.6	18.2	5.2	0.8	0.9	2.9	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.1	10.0	0.0	0.2
40	6.3	18.4	5.9	0.5	5.7	5.1	0.6	2.7	4.4	0.4	2.6	8.6	0.2	0.1	2.0	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.3	15.3	5.9	0.4	1.0	2.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.7	0.8	0.1	8.3	0.0	0.1
Stock market volatility (FV)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	6.2	1.0	0.0	2.6	1.2	3.2	4.2	0.8	0.4	8.9	1.1	7.4	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	3.4	0.3	57.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2	9.1	0.4	0.5	1.5	3.5	1.8	6.8	0.4	1.9	5.8	0.4	12.2	1.2	0.8	0.1	0.2	2.6	0.1	42.7	5.9	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
4	6.6	5.0	0.4	1.5	4.1	2.4	7.0	0.4	1.7	5.2	0.3	10.9	1.1	1.5	0.1	0.3	3.5	0.1	36.8	7.2	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0
6	5.5	5.1	0.5	3.4	3.4	3.0	6.5	0.6	1.5	4.5	0.3	8.8	1.6	3.9	0.1	0.4	4.8	0.2	33.4	6.7	0.4	0.8	0.4	1.3	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.0
8	4.9	4.4	0.5	4.1	3.0	3.1	6.5	0.5	1.7	4.9	0.2	7.7	3.1	5.0	0.1	0.4	5.2	0.2	31.4	5.9	0.5	0.8	0.7	1.6	0.1	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.7	0.0
12	3.9	3.9	0.8	5.8	2.6	2.6	7.5	0.4	2.0	5.3	0.2	6.1	4.7	6.7	0.2	0.3	5.2	0.2	28.4	4.5	0.8	0.7	1.3	1.6	0.1	1.4	0.7	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.0
20	3.0	4.4	1.7	8.2	3.1	2.1	7.2	0.4	2.4	5.3	0.5	4.0	5.6	8.2	0.4	0.2	4.1	0.2	26.0	3.0	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.2	0.1	1.7	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.8	1.1	0.0
40	3.1	6.6	2.9	10.5	3.7	1.4	6.9	0.3	3.0	4.4	0.8	2.0	6.1	9.0	0.5	0.1	2.9	0.2	22.5	1.8	2.3	0.4	1.7	0.7	0.0	1.9	1.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.2	1.4	0.1
Size factor (SMB)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	3.0	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.2	1.2	1.0	0.7	0.0	5.4	0.0	15.4	0.2	14.0	1.3	0.4	0.6	1.3	0.1	53.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2	1.7	1.4	1.5	0.4	0.2	3.2	2.9	0.7	0.6	4.3	0.1	16.0	1.4	14.7	0.5	0.3	0.7	3.0	0.6	43.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
4	1.1	1.7	2.3	0.3	0.2	2.6	3.6	0.9	1.4	2.6	0.4	17.2	1.5	15.0	0.6	0.2	0.5	3.7	2.1	36.7	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.9	1.4	0.6	0.8	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0
6	0.9	2.4	2.7	0.3	1.0	2.1	3.5	0.7	1.7	2.2	0.5	17.4	1.1	15.3	0.7	0.3	0.4	4.6	4.2	29.9	0.2	0.9	1.1	0.1	0.1	1.0	2.2	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.0
8	0.7	2.8	3.4	0.3	1.9	1.8	3.6	0.6	1.6	2.3	0.4	19.0	0.9	14.8	1.2	0.4	0.4	5.2	4.8	24.2	0.1	1.2	1.3	0.1	0.2	1.0	3.0	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.0
12	0.9	2.9	4.6	0.3	2.1	1.4	4.3	0.5	1.1	3.0	0.3	23.0	0.7	13.2	2.1	0.6	0.6	6.1	4.2	17.8	0.2	1.4	1.1	0.1	0.2	0.9	3.8	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.0
20	1.4	1.9	4.5	0.2	1.7	0.8	4.7	0.4	0.7	3.9	0.3	27.5	0.8	11.7	2.7	0.9	0.7	6.4	3.5	13.7	0.4	1.7	0.7	0.1	0.3	0.9	4.4	1.4	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.0
40	2.4	1.1	3.4	0.2	1.0	0.4	4.7	0.3	0.4	4.6	0.5	31.7	0.9	10.3	2.7	1.0	0.7	6.5	3.1	11.9	0.8	1.8	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.8	4.6	1.7	0.7	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.0
Value factor (HML)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	0.3	0.1	1.5	3.9	6.5	0.2	0.0	7.1	8.2	0.2	0.4	0.0	3.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	7.4	2.4	1.3	56.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2	0.9	0.5	0.6	4.0	14.5	0.5	0.4	7.5	2.7	0.3	0.9	0.4	3.6	0.5	0.2	2.2	0.7	4.6	2.2	1.0	49.4	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	
4	0.9	0.6	0.5	4.8	10.8	1.3	0.3	5.6	2.6	0.5	0.7	0.7	2.3	0.4	0.3	3.1	0.6	3.0	1.5	1.4	50.8	0.1	4.1	0.1	0.1	1.0	0.4	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0
6	1.7	1.7	0.5	4.2	7.9	2.1	1.8	4.4	2.5	0.5	0.5	2.2	1.6	1.0	0.3	2.8	0.4	2.1	1.4	2.3	49.6	0.3	4.4	0.1	0.1	1.7	0.4	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	
8	2.2	3.7	1.0	3.8	6.0	2.7	3.2	3.5	3.3	0.6	0.4	3.1	1.2	1.2	0.5	2.8	0.3	1.5	1.8	1.8	46.3	0.2	4.5	0.1	0.1	2.0	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0
12	3.5	5.9	2.2	2.9	3.9	2.6	3.8	2.6	3.9	0.8	0.3	3.1	1.1	1.5	0.9	3.2	0.2	1.0	2.8	1.3	41.7	0.2	5.0	0.1	0.2	2.3	1.5	0.2	0.8	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0
20	3.3	7.5	3.7	2.4	2.5	2.4	4.6	1.8	3.4	1.3	0.2	4.4	0.8	1.5	1.3	4.0	0.3	0.7	2.4	0.8	39.3	0.1	4.8	0.1	0.3	2.3	1.8	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0
40	3.3	8.0	4.4	2.2	1.4	2.2	5.2	1.3	3.0	1.7	0.1	5.1	0.6	1.5	1.6	4.6	0.4	0.5	2.2	0.5	38.6	0.1	4.6	0.1	0.3	2.5	2.1	0.3	1.0	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.0

The table reports the forecast error decomposition for selected variables at various horizons

Table A5: Forecast error variance decomposition, contributions of each structural shock

Momentum factor (MOM)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	1.5	1.1	0.5	0.3	2.5	0.4	0.0	2.4	3.3	4.1	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.5	1.2	4.8	0.2	1.2	0.7	22.0	16.7	35.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
2	1.1	1.9	4.0	0.4	3.7	0.2	4.4	1.5	3.5	7.0	0.5	3.6	0.4	0.8	2.3	3.1	2.0	0.6	2.2	11.4	14.0	27.5	2.1	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1
4	1.3	1.6	3.1	0.3	2.8	0.1	9.7	1.0	9.0	9.0	0.3	5.7	1.4	0.5	2.6	2.6	1.9	1.2	5.3	5.7	8.4	18.0	5.0	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.1
6	1.0	1.2	2.8	0.2	2.8	0.6	9.3	1.4	10.1	9.9	0.3	4.9	2.1	0.8	2.2	2.3	1.9	3.6	5.7	4.0	6.7	15.2	6.7	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.6	1.5	0.0
8	0.8	1.0	2.1	0.2	2.6	1.1	8.0	1.9	10.4	9.5	0.2	3.7	2.7	1.2	1.8	1.9	1.9	7.0	5.1	3.1	5.9	14.0	7.8	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.6	2.5	0.0
12	0.6	0.7	1.5	0.3	2.1	1.3	6.9	2.7	9.9	10.1	0.2	2.5	3.2	1.6	1.4	1.4	2.3	12.0	4.1	2.5	4.5	12.3	8.6	0.1	2.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	3.4	0.0
20	0.5	0.8	0.9	0.2	1.4	1.5	5.0	2.8	8.2	9.7	0.2	1.8	4.5	1.9	1.1	0.9	3.3	17.7	3.7	2.6	3.0	10.4	9.2	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.4	4.4	0.0
40	0.8	1.8	0.8	0.2	1.0	1.4	3.5	2.1	6.2	8.3	0.4	1.6	5.1	2.1	1.2	0.6	4.0	20.9	4.2	4.1	1.5	9.3	9.3	0.1	2.8	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.2	5.2	0.0
Stock market liquidity factor (PSL)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	5.6	1.9	1.2	0.0	2.4	0.6	0.0	0.2	1.4	2.4	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.2	2.6	0.3	3.0	2.2	9.4	11.8	0.5	2.2	51.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	5.1	3.8	2.3	0.2	3.0	0.9	1.2	1.0	1.7	2.2	0.2	1.4	1.1	0.2	2.6	0.4	2.6	2.7	8.6	10.5	1.5	2.0	43.9	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	4.7	5.9	2.2	0.4	3.7	0.9	1.5	1.4	2.6	2.6	0.8	1.8	1.7	1.4	2.5	0.5	2.5	2.3	7.8	9.3	2.3	1.7	37.8	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
6	4.7	5.6	2.2	0.6	4.7	1.1	1.9	1.7	2.5	2.9	1.2	2.0	1.8	1.5	2.4	0.5	2.3	2.2	8.0	8.6	2.3	1.6	35.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
8	4.6	6.3	2.1	0.6	4.6	1.2	2.3	1.6	2.9	3.0	1.2	2.2	1.9	1.6	2.5	0.6	2.3	2.2	7.8	8.3	2.5	1.6	33.8	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
12	4.6	6.4	2.4	0.8	4.8	1.3	2.3	1.6	3.0	3.0	1.2	2.3	1.9	1.6	2.6	0.6	2.3	2.2	7.6	8.4	2.4	1.6	32.7	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
20	4.6	6.4	2.5	0.8	4.8	1.3	2.3	1.7	3.0	3.0	1.2	2.3	1.9	1.6	2.6	0.6	2.3	2.2	7.6	8.5	2.4	1.6	32.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0
40	4.6	6.4	2.5	0.8	4.8	1.3	2.3	1.7	3.0	3.0	1.2	2.3	1.9	1.6	2.6	0.6	2.3	2.2	7.6	8.5	2.4	1.6	32.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0
Leverage factor (LEV)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	3.7	0.1	2.2	0.4	3.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.0	2.2	3.4	3.9	0.2	0.9	0.5	2.0	0.3	12.1	2.2	0.2	0.7	0.5	53.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	4.3	0.3	4.0	0.4	4.7	1.9	1.2	0.6	10.5	5.2	1.6	7.4	4.5	0.7	1.3	1.7	1.4	0.4	13.4	3.2	1.1	1.0	1.0	26.8	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.2
4	4.0	1.9	3.8	0.4	5.5	1.8	1.3	0.6	9.7	4.6	1.7	6.9	4.3	0.8	1.3	2.1	1.3	0.6	14.2	3.3	1.3	0.9	1.4	24.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2
6	4.6	2.2	4.1	0.6	5.3	1.9	1.2	0.6	9.3	4.3	1.7	6.5	4.1	1.6	1.3	2.2	1.2	0.8	14.1	3.3	1.3	0.9	1.3	22.3	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.2
8	4.8	2.3	4.1	0.7	5.1	1.9	1.3	0.6	9.1	4.2	1.7	6.5	4.1	1.6	1.3	2.1	1.2	0.9	14.1	3.6	1.4	1.0	1.3	21.3	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2
12	4.8	2.6	4.1	0.7	5.1	2.0	1.4	0.6	9.0	4.2	1.7	6.4	4.2	1.6	1.3	2.1	1.2	0.9	14.0	3.6	1.4	1.0	1.4	20.9	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2
20	4.8	2.7	4.2	0.7	5.1	2.0	1.4	0.7	8.9	4.2	1.7	6.4	4.2	1.6	1.3	2.1	1.2	0.9	14.0	3.6	1.4	1.0	1.4	20.7	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2
40	4.8	2.7	4.2	0.7	5.1	2.0	1.4	0.7	8.9	4.2	1.7	6.3	4.2	1.6	1.3	2.1	1.2	0.9	13.9	3.7	1.4	1.0	1.4	20.7	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.2
Financial fragility index (FRA)																																	
	OR	OSN	OSP	OX	LS	LD	AD	GFI	GDI	GTI	CI	PR	OC	MPS	TL	TS	PH	TT	RAV	SZ	VL	MM	SL	LV	OFP	OFR	OI	ORP	ONV	PM	PF	PG	RAP
0	4.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	8.0	0.1	3.2	1.4	1.2	6.1	1.6	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.6	0.8	15.8	0.1	13.9	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	5.0	0.9	0.1	2.7	10.6	0.2	0.6	15.0
2	3.6	0.7	0.5	1.7	5.7	1.4	5.4	0.9	4.0	0.9	0.8	2.4	3.7	0.2	3.4	0.2	1.1	0.4	6.4	0.5	16.2	2.3	2.2	0.3	0.1	5.3	0.5	0.9	4.8	9.7	0.1	1.1	12.7
4	3.1	1.9	0.5	1.3	4.9	1.1	5.2	0.8	4.0	1.7	0.8	3.2	3.8	1.5	5.0	0.3	1.7	0.7	4.8	0.5	15.7	1.9	3.2	0.3	0.1	4.1	0.8	0.8	3.7	7.9	0.3	0.8	13.5
6	3.2	5.3	0.4	1.1	6.0	1.0	4.1	1.9	4.9	1.3	0.6	3.4	3.1	1.8	3.7	0.4	2.9	0.6	4.2	4.0	12.8	1.3	4.2	0.3	0.1	2.9	1.4	0.6	3.0	6.0	0.9	0.6	12.2
8	2.5	9.6	0.5	0.8	6.3	1.1	2.9	2.7	4.2	1.2	0.5	2.5	3.0	1.3	2.6	0.6	3.9	0.7	3.1	7.3	11.1	1.0	4.3	0.4	0.2	2.4	1.8	0.5	3.0	5.4	1.2	0.4	11.2
12	1.9	13.1	1.4	0.9	6.2	1.1	2.1	3.8	3.5	0.9	0.5	1.7	3.0	1.2	1.8	0.8	4.3	0.9	2.1	8.8	9.2	0.7	4.1	0.5	0.3	1.9	2.3	0.4	3.0	5.0	1.3	0.3	11.0
20	2.0	16.4	1.6	0.9	5.2	1.2	1.4	3.9	2.9	0.6	0.4	1.4	3.4	1.0	1.3	1.0	4.1	1.0	1.4	9.8	8.5	0.5	4.3	0.5	0.3	1.5	2.6	0.3	2.9	4.9	1.3	0.2	11.2
40	2.2	20.2	1.8	0.7	4.5	1.3	0.8	3.3	2.8	0.3	0.2	1.5	4.1	1.0	0.9	0.9	3.8	0.7	0.8	9.9	8.4	0.3	4.6	0.4	0.3	1.3	2.5	0.3	2.9	4.6	1.3	0.1	11.1

The table reports the forecast error decomposition for selected variables at various horizons (impact (0) and 2 to 40 quarters), relatively to the various identified structural shocks: oil reserves (OR), flow oil supply (positive, OSP; negative, OSN), oil production mix (OX), oil consumption (OC) and inventories (OI) preferences, labor supply (LS) and demand (LD), aggregate demand (AD), productivity (PR), core inflation (CI) and global imbalance (GFI, GDI, GTI), monetary policy stance (MPS), term structure level (TL) and slope (TS), US terms of trade (TT), stocks (PF), housing (PH), non-energy commodities (PM), gold (PG) portfolio allocation/preferences, oil futures market-pressure (OFP), residual oil futures market (OFR), other real oil price (ORP) and nominal oil price volatility (ONV), size (SZ), value (VL), momentum (MM), stocks' liquidity (SL), leverage (LV), risk aversion (RAV), risk appetite (RAP). The selected variables are the Carhart momentum (MOM), Pastor-Stambaugh stocks' liquidity (PSL), Adrian-Etula-Muir leverage (LEV) and Bagliano-Morana fragility (FRA) factors.

Our papers can be downloaded at:

<http://cerp.unito.it/index.php/en/publications>

CeRP Working Paper Series

N° 138/13	Claudio Morana	Insights on the global macro-finance interface: Structural sources of risk factors fluctuations and the cross-section of expected stock returns
N° 137/13	Claudio Morana	New Insights on the US OIS Spreads Term Structure During the Recent Financial Turmoil
N° 136/13	Anna Lo Prete	Inequality and the finance you know: does economic literacy matter?
N° 135/13	Rik Dillingh Henriette Prast Mariacristina Rossi Cesira Urzi Brancati	The psychology and economics of reverse mortgage attitudes: evidence from the Netherlands
N° 134/13	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	The Economic Importance of Financial Literacy: Theory and Evidence
N° 133/13	Annamaria Lusardi Pierre-Carl Michaud Olivia S. Mitchell	Optimal Financial Knowledge and Wealth Inequality
N° 132/13	Riccardo Calcagno Sonia Falconieri	Competition and dynamics of takeover contests
N° 131/13	Riccardo Calcagno Cesira Urzi Brancati	Do more financially literate households invest less in housing? Evidence from Italy
N° 130/12	Maela Giofrè	Financial Education, Investor Protection and International Portfolio Diversification
N° 129/12	Michele Belloni Rob Alessie Adriaan Kalwij Chiara Marinacci	Lifetime Income and Old Age Mortality Risk in Italy over Two Decades
N° 128/12	Fabio Cesare Bagliano Claudio Morana	Determinants of US Financial Fragility Conditions
N° 127/12	Mariacristina Rossi Serena Trucchi	Liquidity Constraints and Labor Supply
N° 126/11	Margherita Borella Flavia Coda Moscarola Mariacristina Rossi	(Un)expected retirement and the consumption puzzle
N°125/11	Carolina Fugazza	Tracking the Italian employees' TFR over their working life careers
N°124/11	Agnese Romiti Mariacristina Rossi	Should we Retire Earlier in order to Look After our Parents? The Role of immigrants

N°123/11	Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi Maria Cesire Urzi Brancati	Explaining why, right or wrong, (Italian) households do not like reverse mortgages
N°122/11	Serena Trucchi	How credit markets affect homeownership: an explanation based on differences between Italian regions
N° 121/11	Elsa Fornero Chiara Monticone Serena Trucchi	The effect of financial literacy on mortgage choices
N° 120/11	Giovanni Mastrobuoni Filippo Taddei	Age Before Beauty? Productivity and Work vs. Seniority and Early Retirement
N° 119/11	Maarten van Rooij Annamaria Lusardi Rob Alessie	Financial Literacy, Retirement Planning, and Household Wealth
N° 118/11	Luca Beltrametti Matteo Della Valle	Does the implicit pension debt mean anything after all?
N° 117/11	Riccardo Calcagno Chiara Monticone	Financial Literacy and the Demand for Financial Advice
N° 116/11	Annamaria Lusardi Daniel Schneider Peter Tufano	Financially Fragile Households: Evidence and Implications
N° 115/11	Adele Atkinson Flore-Anne Messy	Assessing financial literacy in 12 countries: an OECD Pilot Exercise
N° 114/11	Leora Klapper Georgios A. Panos	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in View of a Growing Youth Demographic: The Russian Case
N° 113/11	Diana Crossan David Feslier Roger Hurnard	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in New Zealand
N° 112/11	Johan Almenberg Jenny Säve-Söderbergh	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in Sweden
N° 111/11	Elsa Fornero Chiara Monticone	Financial Literacy and Pension Plan Participation in Italy
N° 110/11	Rob Alessie Maarten Van Rooij Annamaria Lusardi	Financial Literacy, Retirement Preparation and Pension Expectations in the Netherlands
N° 109/11	Tabea Bucher-Koenen Annamaria Lusardi	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in Germany
N° 108/11	Shizuka Sekita	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in Japan
N° 107/11	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Financial Literacy and Retirement Planning in the United States
N° 106/11	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Financial Literacy Around the World: An Overview
N° 105/11	Agnese Romiti	Immigrants-natives complementarities in production: evidence from Italy
N° 104/11	Ambrogio Rinaldi	Pension awareness and nation-wide auto-enrolment: the Italian experience
N° 103/10	Fabio Bagliano Claudio Morana	The Great Recession: US dynamics and spillovers to the world economy

N° 102/10	Nuno Cassola Claudio Morana	The 2007-? financial crisis: a money market perspective
N° 101/10	Tetyana Dubovyk	Macroeconomic Aspects of Italian Pension Reforms of 1990s
N° 100/10	Laura Piatti Giuseppe Rocco	L'educazione e la comunicazione previdenziale - Il caso italiano
N° 99/10	Fabio Bagliano Claudio Morana	The effects of US economic and financial crises on euro area convergence
N° 98/10	Annamaria Lusardi Daniel Schneider Peter Tufano	The Economic Crisis and Medical Care Usage
N° 97/10	Carlo Maccheroni Tiziana Barugola	E se l'aspettativa di vita continuasse la sua crescita? Alcune ipotesi per le generazioni italiane 1950-2005
N° 96/10	Riccardo Calcagno Mariacristina Rossi	Portfolio Choice and Precautionary Savings
N° 95/10	Flavia Coda Moscarola Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	Parents/children "deals": Inter-Vivos Transfers and Living Proximity
N° 94/10	John A. List Sally Sadoff Mathis Wagner	So you want to run an experiment, now what? Some Simple Rules of Thumb for Optimal Experimental Design
N° 93/10	Mathis Wagner	The Heterogeneous Labor Market Effects of Immigration
N° 92/10	Rob Alessie Michele Belloni	Retirement choices in Italy: what an option value model tells us
N° 91/09	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell Vilsa Curto	Financial Literacy among the Young: Evidence and Implications for Consumer Policy
N° 90/09	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	How Ordinary Consumers Make Complex Economic Decisions: Financial Literacy and Retirement Readiness
N° 89/09	Elena Vigna	Mean-variance inefficiency of CRRA and CARA utility functions for portfolio selection in defined contribution pension schemes
N° 88/09	Maela Giofré	Convergence of EMU Equity Portfolios
N° 87/09	Elsa Fornero Annamaria Lusardi Chiara Monticone	Adequacy of Saving for Old Age in Europe
N° 86/09	Margherita Borella Flavia Coda Moscarola	Microsimulation of Pension Reforms: Behavioural versus Nonbehavioural Approach
N° 85/09	Cathal O'Donoghue John Lennon Stephen Hynes	The Life-Cycle Income Analysis Model (LIAM): A Study of a Flexible Dynamic Microsimulation Modelling Computing Framework
N° 84/09	Luca Spataro	Il sistema previdenziale italiano dallo shock petrolifero del 1973 al Trattato di Maastricht del 1993
N° 83/09	Annamaria Lusardi Peter Tufano	Debt Literacy, Financial Experiences, and Overindebtedness

N° 82/09	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Time and Risk Diversification in Real Estate Investments: Assessing the Ex Post Economic Value
N° 81/09	Fabio Bagliano Claudio Morana	Permanent and Transitory Dynamics in House Prices and Consumption: Cross-Country Evidence
N° 80/08	Claudio Campanale	Learning, Ambiguity and Life-Cycle Portfolio Allocation
N° 79/08	Annamaria Lusardi	Increasing the Effectiveness of Financial Education in the Workplace
N° 78/08	Margherita Borella Giovanna Segre	Le pensioni dei lavoratori parasubordinati: prospettive dopo un decennio di gestione separata
N° 77/08	Giovanni Guazzarotti Pietro Tommasino	The Annuity Market in an Evolving Pension System: Lessons from Italy
N° 76/08	Riccardo Calcagno Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	The Effect of House Prices on Household Saving: The Case of Italy
N° 75/08	Harold Alderman Johannes Hooegeven Mariacristina Rossi	Preschool Nutrition and Subsequent Schooling Attainment: Longitudinal Evidence from Tanzania
N° 74/08	Maela Giofré	Information Asymmetries and Foreign Equity Portfolios: Households versus Financial Investors
N° 73/08	Michele Belloni Rob Alessie	The Importance of Financial Incentives on Retirement Choices: New Evidence for Italy
N° 72/08	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia Mitchell	Planning and Financial Literacy: How Do Women Fare?
N° 71/07	Flavia Coda Moscarola	Women participation and caring decisions: do different institutional frameworks matter? A comparison between Italy and The Netherlands
N° 70/07	Radha Iyengar Giovanni Mastrobuoni	The Political Economy of the Disability Insurance. Theory and Evidence of Gubernatorial Learning from Social Security Administration Monitoring
N° 69/07	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Investing in Mixed Asset Portfolios: the Ex-Post Performance
N° 68/07	Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Small Caps in International Diversified Portfolios
N° 67/07	Carolina Fugazza Maela Giofré Giovanna Nicodano	International Diversification and Labor Income Risk
N° 66/07	Maarten van Rooij Annamaria Lusardi Rob Alessie	Financial Literacy and Stock Market Participation
N° 65/07	Annamaria Lusardi	Household Saving Behavior: The Role of Literacy, Information and Financial Education Programs (Updated version June 08: "Financial Literacy: An Essential Tool for Informed Consumer Choice?")
N° 64/07	Carlo Casarosa Luca Spataro	Rate of Growth of Population, Saving and Wealth in the Basic Life-cycle Model when the Household is the Decision Unit

N° 63/07	Claudio Campanale	Life-Cycle Portfolio Choice: The Role of Heterogeneous Under-Diversification
N° 62/07	Margherita Borella Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	Does Consumption Respond to Predicted Increases in Cash-on-hand Availability? Evidence from the Italian “Severance Pay”
N° 61/07	Irina Kovrova	Effects of the Introduction of a Funded Pillar on the Russian Household Savings: Evidence from the 2002 Pension Reform
N° 60/07	Riccardo Cesari Giuseppe Grande Fabio Panetta	La Previdenza Complementare in Italia: Caratteristiche, Sviluppo e Opportunità per i Lavoratori
N° 59/07	Riccardo Calcagno Roman Kraeussl Chiara Monticone	An Analysis of the Effects of the Severance Pay Reform on Credit to Italian SMEs
N° 58/07	Elisa Luciano Jaap Spreeuw Elena Vigna	Modelling Stochastic Mortality for Dependent Lives
N° 57/07	Giovanni Mastrobuoni Matthew Weinberg	Heterogeneity in Intra-Monthly Consumption. Patterns, Self-Control, and Savings at Retirement
N° 56/07	John A. Turner Satyendra Verma	Why Some Workers Don’t Take 401(k) Plan Offers: Inertia versus Economics
N° 55/06	Antonio Abatemarco	On the Measurement of Intra-Generational Lifetime Redistribution in Pension Systems
N° 54/06	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Baby Boomer Retirement Security: The Roles of Planning, Financial Literacy, and Housing Wealth
N° 53/06	Giovanni Mastrobuoni	Labor Supply Effects of the Recent Social Security Benefit Cuts: Empirical Estimates Using Cohort Discontinuities
N° 52/06	Luigi Guiso Tullio Jappelli	Information Acquisition and Portfolio Performance
N° 51/06	Giovanni Mastrobuoni	The Social Security Earnings Test Removal. Money Saved or Money Spent by the Trust Fund?
N° 50/06	Andrea Buffa Chiara Monticone	Do European Pension Reforms Improve the Adequacy of Saving?
N° 49/06	Mariacristina Rossi	Examining the Interaction between Saving and Contributions to Personal Pension Plans. Evidence from the BHPS
N° 48/06	Onorato Castellino Elsa Fornero	Public Policy and the Transition to Private Pension Provision in the United States and Europe
N° 47/06	Michele Belloni Carlo Maccheroni	Actuarial Neutrality when Longevity Increases: An Application to the Italian Pension System
N° 46/05	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Financial Literacy and Planning: Implications for Retirement Wellbeing
N° 45/05	Claudio Campanale	Increasing Returns to Savings and Wealth Inequality
N° 44/05	Henrik Cronqvist	Advertising and Portfolio Choice
N° 43/05	John Beshears James J. Choi David Laibson Brigitte C. Madrian	The Importance of Default Options for Retirement Saving Outcomes: Evidence from the United States
N° 42/05	Margherita Borella Flavia Coda Moscarola	Distributive Properties of Pensions Systems: a Simulation of the Italian Transition from Defined Benefit to Defined Contribution

N° 41/05	Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Small Caps in International Equity Portfolios: The Effects of Variance Risk.
N° 40/05	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Investing for the Long-Run in European Real Estate. Does Predictability Matter?
N° 39/05	Anna Rita Bacinello	Modelling the Surrender Conditions in Equity-Linked Life Insurance
N° 38/05	Carolina Fugazza Federica Teppa	An Empirical Assessment of the Italian Severance Payment (TFR)
N° 37/04	Jay Ginn	Actuarial Fairness or Social Justice? A Gender Perspective on Redistribution in Pension Systems
N° 36/04	Laurence J. Kotlikoff	Pensions Systems and the Intergenerational Distribution of Resources
N° 35/04	Monika Bütler Olivia Huguenin Federica Teppa	What Triggers Early Retirement. Results from Swiss Pension Funds
N° 34/04	Chourouk Houssi	Le Vieillessement Démographique : Problématique des Régimes de Pension en Tunisie
N° 33/04	Elsa Fornero Carolina Fugazza Giacomo Ponzetto	A Comparative Analysis of the Costs of Italian Individual Pension Plans
N° 32/04	Angelo Marano Paolo Sestito	Older Workers and Pensioners: the Challenge of Ageing on the Italian Public Pension System and Labour Market
N° 31/03	Giacomo Ponzetto	Risk Aversion and the Utility of Annuities
N° 30/03	Bas Arts Elena Vigna	A Switch Criterion for Defined Contribution Pension Schemes
N° 29/02	Marco Taboga	The Realized Equity Premium has been Higher than Expected: Further Evidence
N° 28/02	Luca Spataro	New Tools in Micromodeling Retirement Decisions: Overview and Applications to the Italian Case
N° 27/02	Reinhold Schnabel	Annuities in Germany before and after the Pension Reform of 2001
N° 26/02	E. Philip Davis	Issues in the Regulation of Annuities Markets
N° 25/02	Edmund Cannon Ian Tonks	The Behaviour of UK Annuity Prices from 1972 to the Present
N° 24/02	Laura Ballotta Steven Haberman	Valuation of Guaranteed Annuity Conversion Options
N° 23/02	Ermanno Pitacco	Longevity Risk in Living Benefits
N° 22/02	Chris Soares Mark Warshawsky	Annuity Risk: Volatility and Inflation Exposure in Payments from Immediate Life Annuities
N° 21/02	Olivia S. Mitchell David McCarthy	Annuities for an Ageing World
N° 20/02	Mauro Mastrogiacomo	Dual Retirement in Italy and Expectations

N° 19/02	Paolo Battocchio Francesco Menoncin	Optimal Portfolio Strategies with Stochastic Wage Income and Inflation: The Case of a Defined Contribution Pension Plan
N° 18/02	Francesco Daveri	Labor Taxes and Unemployment: a Survey of the Aggregate Evidence
N° 17/02	Richard Disney and Sarah Smith	The Labour Supply Effect of the Abolition of the Earnings Rule for Older Workers in the United Kingdom
N° 16/01	Estelle James and Xue Song	Annuities Markets Around the World: Money's Worth and Risk Intermediation
N° 15/01	Estelle James	How Can China Solve its Old Age Security Problem? The Interaction Between Pension, SOE and Financial Market Reform
N° 14/01	Thomas H. Noe	Investor Activism and Financial Market Structure
N° 13/01	Michela Scatigna	Institutional Investors, Corporate Governance and Pension Funds
N° 12/01	Roberta Romano	Less is More: Making Shareholder Activism a Valuable Mechanism of Corporate Governance
N° 11/01	Mara Faccio and Ameziane Lasfer	Institutional Shareholders and Corporate Governance: The Case of UK Pension Funds
N° 10/01	Vincenzo Andrietti and Vincent Hildebrand	Pension Portability and Labour Mobility in the United States. New Evidence from the SIPP Data
N° 9/01	Hans Blommestein	Ageing, Pension Reform, and Financial Market Implications in the OECD Area
N° 8/01	Margherita Borella	Social Security Systems and the Distribution of Income: an Application to the Italian Case
N° 7/01	Margherita Borella	The Error Structure of Earnings: an Analysis on Italian Longitudinal Data
N° 6/01	Flavia Coda Moscarola	The Effects of Immigration Inflows on the Sustainability of the Italian Welfare State
N° 5/01	Vincenzo Andrietti	Occupational Pensions and Interfirm Job Mobility in the European Union. Evidence from the ECHP Survey
N° 4/01	Peter Diamond	Towards an Optimal Social Security Design
N° 3/00	Emanuele Baldacci Luca Inglese	Le caratteristiche socio economiche dei pensionati in Italia. Analisi della distribuzione dei redditi da pensione (only available in the Italian version)
N° 2/00	Pier Marco Ferraresi Elsa Fornero	Social Security Transition in Italy: Costs, Distorsions and (some) Possible Correction
N° 1/00	Guido Menzio	Opting Out of Social Security over the Life Cycle