

330 Views | 66 CrossRef citations to date | 0 Altmetric

EQUITY INVESTMENTS

# Value at Risk and Expected Stock Returns

Turan G. Bali & Nusret Cakici

Pages 57-73 | Published online: 02 Jan 2019

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v60.n2.2610>

Sample our Law journals, sign in here to start your FREE access for 14 days

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Share

## Abstract

Stock size, liquidity, and value at risk (VAR) can explain the cross-sectional variation in expected returns, but market beta and total volatility have almost no power to capture

### We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 880 partners store and access personal data, like browsing data or unique identifiers, on your device. Selecting I Accept enables tracking technologies to support the purposes shown under we and our partners process data to provide. Selecting Reject All or withdrawing your consent will disable them. If trackers are disabled, some content and ads you see may not be as relevant to you. You can resurface this menu to change your choices or withdraw consent at any time by clicking the Show Purposes link on the bottom of the webpage. Your choices will have effect within our Website. For more details, refer to our Privacy Policy. [Here](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device

I Accept

Reject All

Show Purpose



Using monthly and annual regressions, we provide evidence that size, liquidity, and VAR could capture the cross-sectional variation in expected returns of NYSE, Amex, and Nasdaq stocks for the period January 1963 to December 2001. Furthermore, we show that market beta and total volatility have almost no power to explain average stock returns at the individual-stock level. We also compared the relative performance of size, beta, and VAR in explaining the cross-sectional variation in portfolio returns. The results show that all the risk factors considered in the article can capture the cross-sectional differences in portfolio returns but that VAR has the best performance in terms of  $R^2$  values. The strong positive relationship between stock (or portfolio) returns and VAR turns out to be robust over various investment horizons and loss-probability levels.

In addition to using cross-sectional regressions in an asset-pricing framework, we also used time-series regressions to evaluate the empirical performance of VAR at the portfolio level. To mimic the risk factor in returns related to VAR, we devised an alternative factor, HVARL, the difference between the simple average of the high-VAR portfolio returns and the low-VAR portfolio returns. Using 25 portfolios, we investigated the relative performance of total volatility, VAR, and liquidity in terms of their ability to capture time-series variation in stock returns. When we regressed monthly returns for a stock portfolio on the returns for portfolios based on market return, company size, the book-to-market ratio, liquidity, and VAR, we found that VAR can capture substantial time-series variation in stock returns and provide additional explanatory power even

after the control factors are included. Our results suggest that liquidity are expected returns are not captured by the control factors, but VAR and liquidity are expected returns or of volatility.

Modern portfolio theory suggests that the expected return of a portfolio is the expected value of the portfolio return, which is the variance of the portfolio return as defined by traditional finance theory. However, about the average return of a portfolio, investors allow separately. The standard deviation of the portfolio returns under normal conditions in financial markets during ordinary periods. Neither the variance nor the standard deviation,



however, can yield an accurate characterization of actual portfolio risk during highly volatile periods. Therefore, the set of mean-variance-efficient portfolios may lead to an inefficient strategy for maximizing expected portfolio return while minimizing risk. Our findings suggest a new approach to optimal portfolio selection in a VAR framework. A mean-VAR approach can be introduced to allocate financial assets by maximizing the expected value of some utility function approximated by the expected return and VAR of the portfolio, as well as the investor's aversion to VAR.

We thank Linda Allen, Archishman Chakraborty, Jay Dahya, Gayle DeLong, Charlotte Hansen, Armen Hovakimian, John Merrick, Rui Yao, and especially Haim Levy for their extremely helpful comments and suggestions. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Baruch College, City College, Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. Financial support from the PSC-CUNY Research Foundation of the City University of New York is also gratefully acknowledged.

Related



Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



Copyright

Accessib

Registered  
5 Howick Pl

or & Francis Group  
orma business

