School of Finance

University of St.Gallen

MOMENTUM AND CRASH SENSITIVITY

STEFAN RUENZI

FLORIAN WEIGERT

WORKING PAPERS ON FINANCE NO. 2018/1

SWISS INSTITUTE OF BANKING AND FINANCE (S/BF – HSG)

DECEMBER 2017

Momentum and Crash Sensitivity

Stefan Ruenzi and Florian Weigert*

This Version: December 2017

Abstract

This paper proposes a risk-based explanation of the momentum anomaly on equity markets. Regressing the momentum strategy return on the return of a self-financing portfolio going long (short) in stocks with high (low) crash sensitivity in the USA from 1963 to 2012 reduces the momentum effect from a highly statistically significant 11.94% to an insignificant 1.84%. We find additional supportive out-of sample evidence for our risk-based momentum explanation in a sample of 23 international equity markets.

Keywords: Asset pricing, asymmetric dependence, copulas, crash sensitivity, momentum, tail risk

JEL Classification Numbers: C12, G01, G11, G12, G17.

*Stefan Ruenzi is from the Department of Finance at the University of Mannheim; address: L9, 1-2, 68131 Mannheim, Germany; telephone: +49-621-181-1640; e-mail: ruenzi@bwl.uni-mannheim.de. Florian Weigert is from the Swiss Institute of Banking and Finance, University of St. Gallen; address: Unterer Graben 21, 9000 St. Gallen, Switzerland; telephone: ++41-71-224-7014; e-mail: florian.weigert@unisg.ch. All errors are our own.

Momentum and Crash Sensitivity

Abstract

This paper proposes a risk-based explanation of the momentum anomaly on equity markets. Regressing the momentum strategy return on the return of a self-financing portfolio going long (short) in stocks with high (low) crash sensitivity in the USA from 1963 to 2012 reduces the momentum effect from a highly statistically significant 11.94% to an insignificant 1.84%. We find additional supportive out-of sample evidence for our risk-based momentum explanation in a sample of 23 international equity markets.

Keywords: Asset pricing, asymmetric dependence, copulas, crash sensitivity, momentum, tail risk

JEL Classification Numbers: C12, G01, G11, G12, G17.

I Introduction

The cross-sectional momentum effect is an omnipresent anomaly on financial markets. Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) find that a strategy of buying (selling) stocks that have performed well (poorly) over the past 12 months generates high risk-adjusted future returns on the US stock market. The momentum effect is not unique to the US stock market, but also can be found in other equity markets (Rouwenhorst, 1998, Griffin, Ji, and Martin, 2003, and Chui, Titman, and Wei 2010), country equity indices (Asness, Liew, and Stevens, 1997, and Bhojraj and Swaminathan, 2006), currencies (Kho, 1996, LeBaron, 1999, Okunev and White, 2003, and Menkhof, Sarno, Schmeling, and Schrimpf, 2012), commodities (Erb and Harvey, 2006, and Gorton, Hayashi, and Rouwenhorst, 2013), and across asset classes (Asness, Moskowitz, and Pedersen, 2013).

Although momentum is widely documented on financial markets, there is still an active ongoing debate about its main drivers and determinants. While most studies advocate a behavioral explanation for the effect, i.e., momentum is driven by either overreaction or underreaction of investors, recent studies point out the riskiness of momentum strategies.¹ In particular, Barroso and Santa-Clara (2015) find that momentum strategies display large negative skewness and excess kurtosis, i.e., realizations of higher-order moments that are strongly disliked by investors (see, e.g., Kraus and Litzenberger, 1976, and Fang and Lai, 1997). Similarly, Daniel and Moskowitz (2016) show that momentum strategies can experience large, but infrequent crashes.²

Another recent strand of the literature shows that investors dislike (lower) tail sensitive assets (e.g., Kelly and Jiang (2014) and Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert, 2017). Motivated by these recent results, we investigate whether momentum profits are driven by exposure of the momentum strategy to a systematic crash risk factor. Specifically, we regress the momentum portfolio long-short return (UMD) on the return of a self-financing portfolio that buys stocks with high crash sensitivity and sells stocks with low crash sensitivity (CRASH) on the US stock market in the period from 1963 to 2012. The crash sensitivity of individual stocks is measured based on the lower tail dependence of their return time series with the market return time series (see Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert, 2017). Our results indicate that the momentum strategy loads significantly positive on the crash sensitivity factor. While simultaneously controlling for the Fama and French (1993) factors, we show that including

¹Explanation based on underreaction are provided, among others, by Chan, Jegadeesh, and Lakonishok, 1996, Barberis, Shleifer, and Vishny, 1998, Hong and Stein, 1999, and Grinblatt and Han (2005). Overreaction of investors can explain to understand the momentum effect, among others, in De Long, Shleifer, Summers, and Waldmann (1990), and Daniel, Hirshleifer, and Subrahmanyam (1998).

²In 1932, the momentum strategy on the US equity market delivered a -91.54% return in just two months. In 2009, US equity momentum yielded a -73.42% return in a three-months period.

the crash sensitivity factor as an explanatory variable for the momentum return reduces its annualized alpha from a statistically significant 11.94% to an insignificant 1.84%, i.e., a percentage decrease of almost 85%.

As an out-of-sample check we also examine the relationship between the momentum return and the crash sensitivity factor on 23 international equity markets. We find that in 22 countries (i.e., in all countries except of Singapore) momentum loads positively on systematic crash sensitivity with corresponding statistical significance (at least on the 10% level) in 13 countries. Including the crash sensitivity factor as an explanatory variable in the regression setup lowers the alpha of momentum returns in 22 countries and enhances the adjusted R-square in 20 countries of our international sample.

Overall, our findings show that at least a substantial part of U.S. and international momentum profits represents a risk premium for the exposure of the strategy to systematic crash risk.

II Main Variables and Data

We obtain annual data for US stock market momentum (as well as the Fama and French risk factors) from Kenneth French’s webpage.³ We display summary statistics for the annualized US momentum return in the period from 1963 to 2012 on the left side of the first row in Table 1. Consistent with the literature, we document that the momentum factor has a high positive annualized return (8.72%), but also shows significant negative skewness (-2.38) and excess kurtosis (12.91).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Annual data for the US crash sensitivity factor is obtained from Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert (2017). Based on daily return data, the authors estimate an individual stock’s lower tail dependence with the market using copula functions and refer to this measure as a stock’s crash sensitivity. The crash sensitivity factor is then constructed as the equally-weighted average return of the quintile portfolio of stocks with the highest crash sensitivity minus the average return of the quintile portfolio of stocks with the lowest crash sensitivity. For a detailed explanation of the crash sensitivity estimation approach, we refer the reader to Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert (2017). We display summary statistics for the annualized US crash sensitivity factor return in the period from 1963 to 2012 on the right side of the first row in Table 1.

³To construct the momentum factor, six value-weighted portfolios are formed based on firm size and past returns (month $t - 12$ up to $t - 1$). The momentum factor is then computed as the average return on the two high past return portfolios minus the average return on the two low past return portfolios.

Finally, we obtain momentum returns (as well as the Fama and French risk factors) and crash sensitivity factors for 23 international stock markets from Asness, Frazzini, and Pedersen (2017) and Weigert (2016). The construction of the international UMD and CRASH factors is very similar to those constructed for the USA and is detailed in the respective papers. We display summary statistics for the annualized momentum returns and crash sensitivity factors in Table 1 (rows 2 to 24). Consistent with the literature, we find that the UMD and CRASH factors are positive in every country in the sample and also statistically significantly different from zero in the majority of them. The sample period for each country starts with the availability of momentum return data in Asness, Frazzini, and Pedersen (2014) or crash sensitivity factor data in Weigert (2016), respectively. The sample period ends in 2012.

III Empirical Analysis

In our basic empirical setup, we regress the annual momentum return on the Fama and French (1993) or the Fama and French (2015) risk factors, respectively. We include the crash sensitivity risk factor as an additional explanatory variable to judge whether momentum is related to crash sensitivity. The exact regression setup is based on annual time-series data and can be specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{UMD}_t = & \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot \text{MKT-RF}_t + \beta_2 \cdot \text{SMB}_t + \beta_3 \cdot \text{HML}_t + \\ & \beta_4 \cdot \text{RMW}_t + \beta_5 \cdot \text{CMA}_t + \beta_6 \cdot \text{CRASH}_t + \epsilon_t, \end{aligned}$$

where UMD_t denotes the momentum factor, MKT-RF_t denotes the excess market return, SMB_t denotes the Fama and French (1993) small-minus-big size factor, HML_t denotes the Fama and French (1993) high-minus-low book-to-market factor, RMW_t denotes the Fama and French (2015) robust-minus-weak profitability factor, CMA_t denotes the Fama and French (2015) conservative-minus-aggressive investment factor, and CRASH_t denotes the Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert (2017) crash sensitivity factor. T-statistics of alphas and coefficient estimates are computed using Newey and West (1987) standard errors with 2 lags.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Table 2 displays the results of different specifications of this regression on the US stock market in the period from 1963 to 2012. In specification (1) we regress the momentum

return on the Fama and French (1993) factors. We confirm that the momentum portfolio delivers a significantly positive annualized alpha which amounts to 11.9% with a t-statistic of 4.32. In specification (2), we extend the Fama French (1993) three-factor model by the crash sensitivity factor. Our results indicate that the crash sensitivity factor strongly loads on the momentum portfolio with a coefficient estimate of 0.574 and a t-statistic of 5.73. The inclusion of the crash sensitivity factor in the regression model leads the momentum strategy’s alpha to drop to 1.84% per annum, i.e., correcting strategy returns for systematic crash sensitivity reduces profitability by about 85%. The alpha estimate is not statistically different from zero anymore (t-statistic of 0.52).

In specifications (3) and (4) we repeat the analysis, but use the Fama and French (2015) five-factor model as our baseline model.⁴ As before, we find that the momentum strategy is highly profitable as long as we do not control for its exposure to systematic crash risk. Including the crash sensitivity factor in the regression model decreases the momentum strategy’s alpha from a highly significant 13.2% to an insignificant 2.9% per annum.

To obtain additional robustness for our results, we also investigate the relationship between momentum and crash sensitivity on 23 international equity markets. To do so, we regress the country-specific momentum return on the country-specific Fama and French (1993) factors as well as the crash sensitivity factor for the respective country. Results are displayed in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Column 1 displays the country, while column 2 (4) shows that alpha of the momentum return when controlling for the Fama and French (1993) factors (the Fama and French (1993) factors and the CRASH factor). Column (3) shows the momentum strategy exposure to CRASH. Our results indicate that the crash sensitivity factor loads positively on momentum in 22 out of 23 countries; the coefficient estimate is statistically significant (at least on the 10% level) in 13 of these countries. The inclusion of the crash sensitivity factor as an explanatory variable in the regression setup lowers the momentum strategy’s alpha in 22 countries with an average decrease of -3% per annum (Column 5). Moreover, we find that including crash sensitivity in the regression setup also raises the adjusted R-squared in 20 countries with an average increase of 0.11 (Column 6). Hence, we also find additional out-of sample support that the momentum effect is strongly related to a stock’s crash sensitivity. The quantitative magnitude of the reduction is typically smaller than in the U.S.; however, it

⁴Results are robust if we use a battery of alternative systematic risk factor models suggested in the literature (and also used in Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert, 2017) or if we use value- instead of equally-weighted returns to construct the CRASH factor.

is still substantial particularly among many of the countries where the momentum strategy delivers significant Fama and French (1993) alphas to start with.

IV Conclusion

We find that controlling for the momentum strategy's crash sensitivity reduces its profitability markedly. Our results are in line with the idea that at least a substantial part of the profitability of the momentum effect is a compensation for systematic crash risk exposure. Hence, our results provide a risk-based explanation of the momentum anomaly. This finding does of course not preclude that alternative behavioral explanations also drive a part of the momentum strategy returns.

References

- Asness, C.; Frazzini, A.; Pedersen, L.H. (2017). "Quality minus junk". Working Paper, AQR Capital Management, Copenhagen Business School, and New York University.
- Asness, C.; Liew, J.; Stevens, R. (1997). "Parallels between the cross-sectional predictability of stock and country returns". *Journal of Portfolio Management* 37, 67–75.
- Asness, C.; Moskowitz, T.J.; Pedersen, L. (2013). "Value and momentum everywhere". *Journal of Finance* 58, 929–986.
- Barberis, N.; Shleifer, A.; Vishny, R. (1998). "A model of investor sentiment". *Journal of Financial Economics* 49, 307–343.
- Barroso, P.; Santa-Clara, P. (2015). "Momentum has its moments". *Journal of Financial Economics* 116, 111–120.
- Bhojraj, S.; Swaminathan, B. (2006). "Macromomentum: returns predictability in international equity indices". *Journal of Business* 79, 429–451.
- Chabi-Yo, F.; Ruenzi, S.; Weigert, F. (2017). "Crash sensitivity and the cross-section of expected stock returns". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, forthcoming.
- Chan, L.K.C.; Jegadeesh, N.; Lakonishok, J. (1996). "Momentum strategies". *Journal of Finance* 51, 1681–1713.
- Chui, A.C.W.; Titman, S.; Wei, K.C.J. (2010). "Individualism and momentum around the world". *Journal of Finance* 65, 361–392.
- Daniel, K.; Moskowitz, T.J. (2016). "Momentum crashes". *Journal of Financial Economics* 122, 221–247.
- Daniel, K.; Hirshleifer, D.; Subrahmanyam, A. (1998). "Investor psychology and security market under- and overreactions". *Journal of Finance* 53, 1839–1885.
- DeLong, J.B.; Shleifer, A.; Summers, L.H.; Waldmann, R.J. (1990). "Noise trader risk in financial markets". *Journal of Political Economy* 98, 703–738.
- Erb, C.; Harvey, C. (2006). "The strategic and tactical value of commodity futures". *Financial Analysts Journal* 62, 69–97.
- Fama, E.F.; French, K.R. (1993). "Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds". *Journal of Financial Economics* 33, 3–56.
- Fang, H.; Lai, T-Y. (1997). "Co-kurtosis and capital asset pricing". *Financial Review* 32, 293–307.
- Gorton, G.B.; Hayashi, F.; Rouwenhorst, K. (2013). "The fundamentals of commodity future returns". *Review of Finance* 17, 35–105.

- Griffin, J.; Ji, X.; Martin, J. (2003). "Momentum investing and business cycle risk: evidence from pole to pole". *Journal of Finance* 53, 2515–2546.
- Grinblatt, M.; Han, B. (2005). "Prospect theory, mental accounting, and momentum". *Journal of Financial Economics* 78, 311–339.
- Hong, H.; Stein, J.C. (1999). "A unified theory of underreaction, momentum trading, and overreaction in asset markets". *Journal of Finance* 54, 2143–2184.
- Jegadeesh, N.; Titman, S. (1993). "Returns to buying winners and selling losers: implications for stock market efficiency". *Journal of Finance* 48, 65–91.
- Kelly, B.; Jiang, H. (2014). "Tail risk and asset prices". *Review of Financial Studies* 27, 2841–2871.
- Kraus, A.; Litzenberger, R.H. (1976). "Skewness preference and the valuation of risk assets". *Journal of Finance* 31, 1085–1100.
- Kho, B.C. (1996). "Time-varying risk premia, volatility, and technical trading rule profits: evidence from foreign currency future markets". *Journal of Financial Economics* 41, 249–290.
- LeBaron, B. (1999). "Technical trading rule profitability and foreign exchange intervention". *Journal of International Economics* 49, 125–143.
- Menkhoff, L.; Sarno, L.; Schmeling, M.; Schrimpf, A. (2012). "Currency momentum strategies". *Journal of Financial Economics* 106, 620–684.
- Newey, W.K.; West, K.D. (1987). "A simple positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix". *Econometrica* 55, 703–708.
- Okunev, J.; White, D. (2003). "Do momentum-based strategies still work in foreign currency markets?". *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 38, 425–447.
- Rouwenhorst, K. (1998). "International momentum strategies". *Journal of Finance* 53, 1439–1464.
- Weigert, F. (2016). "Crash aversion and the cross-section of expected stock returns worldwide". *Review of Asset Pricing Studies* 6, 135–178.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

This table presents summary statistics for annual momentum returns (UMD) and the annual return of the crash sensitivity factor (CRASH) for the USA and 23 international stock markets. We obtain annual data for momentum returns in the USA from Kenneth French's webpage and data for international momentum returns from Asness, Frazzini, and Pedersen (2017). We obtain annual data for the crash sensitivity factor in the USA from Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert (2017) and data for the international crash sensitivity factors from Weigert (2016). For each variable we display the mean, the median (50%-quantile), the standard deviation, the skewness, and the kurtosis. T-statistics for the mean returns are computed using Newey and West (1987) standard errors with 2 lags. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the one, five, and ten percent levels, respectively.

Country	Sample	UMD					CRASH				
		Mean	Median	Std Dev	Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Skewness	Kurtosis
USA	1963 - 2012	8.72%***	10.18%	18.60%	-2.38	12.91	16.62%***	15.82%	15.30%	+1.39	6.04
AUS	1963 - 2012	20.38%***	18.89%	20.06%	-0.23	5.71	13.58%***	13.30%	18.34%	-0.52	2.82
AUT	1963 - 2012	7.83%**	11.39%	25.67%	-1.38	11.89	1.01%	-0.08%	19.83%	+0.38	2.55
BEL	1987 - 2012	11.07%***	13.57%	19.51%	-1.07	9.81	6.05%*	4.03%	15.54%	+1.04	4.61
CAN	1985 - 2012	17.01%***	15.60%	23.97%	-0.82	7.42	9.24%**	11.82%	23.44%	-0.24	4.21
CHE	1985 - 2012	10.09%***	9.63%	17.09%	-0.57	7.96	7.39%*	5.94%	17.98%	-1.02	5.75
DEU	1987 - 2012	13.85%***	12.26%	24.57%	-0.28	8.37	8.89%**	11.45%	22.59%	-0.46	4.11
DNK	1987 - 2012	15.44%***	13.02%	22.46%	-0.81	5.44	1.31%	4.74%	20.48%	-0.60	3.47
ESP	1987 - 2012	7.86%**	10.22%	19.34%	-0.87	6.84	1.03%	-1.02%	24.44%	-0.18	3.49
FIN	1987 - 2012	13.26%***	10.48%	21.25%	-0.34	6.24	13.20%**	9.71%	21.55%	+0.35	4.08
FRA	1987 - 2012	8.40%***	9.60%	19.04%	-0.64	8.46	8.14%**	9.54%	16.67%	-0.41	4.29
GBR	1987 - 2012	13.70%***	14.14%	22.54%	-1.80	14.38	8.97%***	10.33%	14.81%	-0.26	4.07
GRC	1990 - 2012	9.46%*	12.70%	32.73%	-1.43	7.58	5.05%	4.46%	34.62%	+0.55	4.05
HKG	1987 - 2012	3.81%	5.26%	18.35%	-1.14	7.69	4.36%	29.61%	29.61%	-2.32	10.18
IRL	1989 - 2012	12.03%*	5.82%	40.88%	-1.25	10.80	3.49%	1.44%	17.78%	+0.12	3.48
ISR	1997 - 2012	12.09%**	17.11%	22.11%	-0.97	6.00	6.12%	4.90%	22.92%	-0.03	3.81
ITA	1987 - 2012	8.54%***	10.77%	18.45%	-0.31	5.60	8.48%**	10.09%	21.03%	+0.17	3.95
JPN	1987 - 2012	2.13%	0.60%	21.41%	-0.75	6.29	3.54%	1.02%	14.05%	+1.51	6.08
NLD	1987 - 2012	6.54%	5.25%	18.85%	-0.78	7.56	10.49%**	10.09%	18.39%	-0.51	4.49
NOR	1987 - 2012	6.02%**	11.75%	28.66%	-0.19	3.67	13.93%*	8.44%	30.80%	+0.77	4.08
NZL	1987 - 2012	13.69%***	14.23%	21.73%	-0.03	4.39	5.80%**	6.98%	20.27%	-0.42	3.35
PRT	1990 - 2012	11.24%**	10.72%	20.34%	-0.55	5.06	7.61%*	3.54%	21.41%	+0.51	3.24
SGP	1987 - 2012	3.94%	6.97%	20.53%	-3.07	22.21	7.39%**	9.51%	18.45%	-0.26	3.86
SWE	1987 - 2012	8.27%**	8.71%	25.58%	-0.46	5.89	9.58%**	10.91%	19.51%	-0.47	3.92

Table 2: Momentum and Crash Sensitivity: US Evidence

This table shows the results of time-series regressions of the following form:

$$\text{UMD}_t = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot \text{MKT-RF}_t + \beta_2 \cdot \text{SMB}_t + \beta_3 \cdot \text{HML}_t + \beta_4 \cdot \text{RMW}_t + \beta_5 \cdot \text{CMA}_t + \beta_6 \cdot \text{CRASH}_t + \epsilon_t,$$

where UMD_t denotes the momentum factor, MKT-RF_t denotes the excess market return, SMB_t denotes the Fama and French (1993) small-minus-big size factor, HML_t denotes the Fama and French (1993) high-minus-low book-to-market factor, RMW_t denotes the Fama and French (2015) robust-minus-weak profitability factor, CMA_t denotes the Fama and French (2015) conservative-minus-aggressive investment factor, and CRASH_t denotes the Chabi-Yo, Ruenzi, and Weigert (2017) crash sensitivity factor. The sample covers the US stock market and the sample period is from 1963 to 2012. T-statistics are in parentheses and are computed using Newey and West (1987) standard errors with 2 lags. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the one, five, and ten percent levels, respectively.

	(1) UMD	(2) UMD	(3) UMD	(4) UMD
MARKETRF	-0.213 (-1.52)	-0.400** (-2.54)	-0.273 (-1.51)	-0.419** (-2.20)
SMB	-0.102 (-0.65)	-0.144 (-1.20)	-0.109 (-0.75)	-0.138 (-1.09)
HML	-0.289 (-1.64)	0.055 (0.27)	-0.107 (-0.33)	0.123 (0.38)
RMW			-0.102 (-0.40)	-0.062 (-0.27)
CMA			-0.368 (-0.97)	-0.148 (-0.39)
CRASH		0.574*** (5.73)		0.547*** (4.81)
Alpha	0.119*** (4.32)	0.018 (0.52)	0.132*** (5.95)	0.029 (0.91)
Observations	50	50	49	49
R^2	0.08	0.18	0.10	0.18

Table 3: Momentum and Crash Sensitivity: International Evidence

This table presents results of the relationship between momentum (UMD) and crash sensitivity (CRASH) on 23 international equity markets. We regress the country-specific momentum return on the country-specific Fama and French (1993) factors as well as the crash sensitivity factor for the respective country. Column 1 displays the country, while column 2 (4) shows that alpha of the momentum return when controlling for the Fama and French (1993) factors (the Fama and French (1993) factors and the CRASH factor). Column (3) shows the momentum strategy exposure to CRASH. Column (5) displays the change in the momentum strategy's alphas when controlling for the CRASH factor. Column (6) denotes the number of annual returns in the respective regression. Column (7) reports the change in the adjusted R-squared when controlling for the CRASH factor in the regression. T-statistics are in parentheses and are computed using Newey and West (1987) standard errors with 2 lags. ***, **, and * indicate significance at the one, five, and ten percent levels, respectively.

Country	3-Factor Alpha Alpha	CRASH	4-Factor Alpha with CRASH	Change in Alphas	Observations	Change in Adjusted R-squares
AUS	0.179** (2.74)	0.331* (1.82)	0.124* (1.78)	-0.055	26	+0.064
AUT	0.092* (1.75)	0.739** (2.82)	0.049 (1.07)	-0.043	26	+0.307
BEL	0.176*** (6.12)	0.276 (0.97)	0.162*** (4.49)	-0.014	26	+0.031
CAN	0.141*** (3.89)	0.514** (2.53)	0.073 (1.15)	-0.068	28	+0.202
CHE	0.095*** (3.02)	0.163 (0.64)	0.082** (2.03)	-0.013	26	+0.028
DEU	0.134** (2.53)	0.408* (1.75)	0.094** (2.11)	-0.040	26	+0.140
DNK	0.203*** (4.89)	0.090 (0.22)	0.202*** (4.80)	-0.001	26	-0.047
ESP	0.087 (1.58)	0.278 (1.26)	0.078 (1.43)	-0.009	26	+0.075
FIN	0.073 (1.35)	0.535*** (3.48)	0.036 (0.90)	-0.037	26	+0.183
FRA	0.126*** (3.40)	0.656*** (3.72)	0.091** (2.43)	-0.035	26	+0.292
GBR	0.160*** (3.92)	0.540** (2.03)	0.119* (2.00)	-0.041	26	+0.067
GRC	0.113 (1.30)	0.398 (0.85)	0.110 (1.23)	-0.003	23	+0.032
HKG	0.034 (0.95)	0.087 (1.23)	0.029 (0.90)	-0.005	26	+0.021
IRL	0.194** (2.54)	0.553* (1.75)	0.152* (2.01)	-0.042	24	+0.040
ISR	0.166*** (4.18)	0.228 (0.81)	0.137** (2.20)	-0.029	16	+0.000
ITA	0.102*** (2.94)	0.509*** (4.42)	0.046* (1.79)	-0.056	26	+0.344
JPN	0.083* (1.86)	0.123 (0.57)	0.084* (1.97)	+0.001	26	-0.043
NLD	0.089* (1.93)	0.443*** (3.18)	0.028 (0.65)	-0.061	26	+0.146
NOR	0.140** (2.54)	0.312* (1.99)	0.112* (1.84)	-0.028	26	+0.088
NZL	0.175*** (4.73)	0.651*** (3.02)	0.136*** (3.86)	-0.039	26	+0.372
PRT	0.082** (2.14)	0.248 (1.29)	0.080* (1.78)	-0.002	23	+0.009
SGP	0.005 (0.08)	-0.059 (-0.26)	0.004 (0.07)	-0.001	26	-0.043
SWE	0.013 (0.28)	0.662*** (3.77)	-0.052 (-1.20)	-0.065	26	+0.132
Average	0.116	0.378	0.086	-0.030	25.30	+0.110