



The Good? The Bad? The Ugly? Which news
drive (co)variation in Swiss and US bond and stock
excess returns?

Thomas Nitschka

SNB Working Papers

1/2014



Legal Issues

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the Swiss National Bank. Working Papers describe research in progress. Their aim is to elicit comments and to further debate.

COPYRIGHT©

The Swiss National Bank (SNB) respects all third-party rights, in particular rights relating to works protected by copyright (information or data, wordings and depictions, to the extent that these are of an individual character).

SNB publications containing a reference to a copyright (© Swiss National Bank/SNB, Zurich/year, or similar) may, under copyright law, only be used (reproduced, used via the internet, etc.) for non-commercial purposes and provided that the source is mentioned. Their use for commercial purposes is only permitted with the prior express consent of the SNB.

General information and data published without reference to a copyright may be used without mentioning the source. To the extent that the information and data clearly derive from outside sources, the users of such information and data are obliged to respect any existing copyrights and to obtain the right of use from the relevant outside source themselves.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

The SNB accepts no responsibility for any information it provides. Under no circumstances will it accept any liability for losses or damage which may result from the use of such information. This limitation of liability applies, in particular, to the topicality, accuracy, validity and availability of the information.

ISSN 1660-7716 (printed version)
ISSN 1660-7724 (online version)

© 2014 by Swiss National Bank, Börsenstrasse 15,
P.O. Box, CH-8022 Zurich

The Good? The Bad? The Ugly? Which news drive (co)variation in Swiss and US bond and stock excess returns?

Thomas Nitschka¹
Swiss National Bank

13 January 2014

Abstract

Based on a vector autoregressive model, this paper shows that time variation in monthly excess returns on Swiss government bonds and stocks is predominantly driven by news of inflation and dividends, respectively. This finding is in marked contrast to US evidence which points to a more prominent role of excess return news in this respect. The bond market findings for both Switzerland and the US are consistent with the view that market participants put more weight on news of macroeconomic, i.e. long-term inflation, risks in periods of exceptionally low real interest rates and in crisis periods than in normal times.

JEL: E44, G12

Keywords: bond return, news components, stock return, variance decomposition

¹ Postal Address: Swiss National Bank, P.O. Box, Börsenstrasse 15, 8022 Zürich. E-mail: thomas.nitschka@snb.ch.

This paper benefitted from comments and suggestions by Katrin Assenmacher, Alain Gabler, Pierre Monnin, an anonymous referee of the SNB Working Paper Series and participants in the SNB Brown Bag Seminar. The views expressed in this paper are mine and do not represent the view of the Swiss National Bank. Any errors and omissions are my own.

1 Introduction

Variation in asset returns reflects revisions in expectations about cash-flows, real interest rates or risk premia or an arbitrary combination of the three. This is the fundamental insight from the log-linear approximation of the standard present value model that links stock prices, stock returns and dividends proposed by Campbell and Shiller (1988). Hence, seemingly similar asset return fluctuations could reflect very different causes. This is a particularly important topic for all researchers, including monetary policymakers, who monitor asset returns as indicators of financial market participants' expectations. For instance, Campbell et al. (2013) show that the 2000-2002 US stock market bust was largely driven by considerably higher than expected future risk premia while the 2007-2009 US stock market downturn reflected to a good deal worse than expected cash-flow news. High expected risk premia lower the current asset value but also signal better future investment opportunities. By contrast, bad news about the future stream of cash-flows persistently lower the value of an asset and reflect bad news of future (macroeconomic) fundamentals.

Moreover, Kocherlakota (2013) suggests that the past years of very low real interest rates might have led to a situation in which firms and households pay more attention to news about macroeconomic risks, i.e. the fundamentals that underlie the value of assets, than before this period. As a consequence, such news could account for more of the variability of asset returns than in times of "normal" real interest rate levels. In this respect, Switzerland is a particularly interesting case because it does not only experience a long period of low real interest rates since 2009 (see e.g. Swiss National Bank, 2013). It was also directly affected by the banking crisis in 2008/2009 and is still affected by the on-going euro area crisis because Swiss assets (including the exchange rate) are typically perceived as "safe haven" assets by global

investors² (Kugler and Weder, 2005; Grisse and Nitschka, 2013; Hoffmann and Suter, 2010; Ranaldo and Söderlind, 2010).

To provide an empirical account of the relative importance of news of future fundamentals or risk premia, I use the vector autoregression (VAR) framework of Campbell and Ammer (1993) to decompose returns on the Swiss stock market and 10-year government bond returns in excess of a short-term interest rate into news components that reflect future cash-flows, real interest rates and expected risk premia.³ For comparison, I perform similar decompositions for the US.

Variance decompositions show that cash-flow news (dividend news in the case of stocks, inflation news in the case of bonds) are the main driving force of monthly, unexpected stock and bond excess returns in Switzerland in the time period from January 1975 to July 2013. This finding is robust to variation in the sample period. By contrast, variation in excess returns on the US stock and bond markets reflects a considerably higher impact of news of future risk premia on unexpected asset return movements over the same sample period. However, the bond return decompositions suggest that the recent crisis and the low real interest rate period led to a situation in which news about cash-flows, i.e. inflation, are more important for both Swiss and US bond markets than in the more distant past. This evidence could be interpreted as supporting the view of Kocherlakota (2013).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly highlights the basic stock and bond return relationships used to decompose stock and bond returns into three different news components: news about cash-flows, real interest rates and risk premia. Section 3 describes the econometric framework and the data. Section 4 provides the empirical results. Finally, section 5 concludes.

² Habib and Stracca (2012) provide an assessment of country characteristics that determine “safe havens”. According to their criteria, Switzerland is a prime example of a “safe haven” country.

³ Typically, the two markets are studied in isolation (Campbell, 1991; Viceira, 2008) and if both markets are analyzed jointly, the analysis is usually confined to the US and UK (Shiller and Beltratti, 1992; Campbell and Ammer, 1993). A notable exception in this respect is Engsted and Tanggaard (2001) who jointly study the Danish stock and bond market.

2 The basic stock and bond return relationship

The empirical framework of this paper is based on the dynamic accounting identity that links asset returns to expected cash-flows and discount rates derived in Campbell and Shiller (1988) and used by Campbell (1991) to break unexpected returns on stocks into components reflecting news about cash-flows and discount rates (real interest rate plus risk premium). Shiller and Beltratti (1992) and Campbell and Ammer (1993) show that this accounting framework straightforwardly applies to bond returns too. The next two subsections briefly describe these relations.

2.1 The basic stock return relationship

The starting point of Campbell and Shiller (1988) is the two-period present value model that links current stock prices to dividends and returns, i.e.

$$1 + r_{t+1} = \frac{P_{t+1} + D_{t+1}}{P_t} \quad (1)$$

with r , the net return on the stock, P , the stock price excluding dividends, and D , denoting dividends.

Equation (1) implies that if stock prices and dividends are non-stationary, then returns should be stationary. However, stock returns vary and they vary by a lot at business cycle frequencies as risk aversion varies over the business cycle (e.g. Campbell and Cochrane, 1999). To allow for such time-varying returns, Campbell and Shiller (1988) propose a log-linear approximation of equation (1) around the mean dividend-price ratio. This approximation yields

$$r_{t+1} \approx k + \rho p_{t+1} + (1 - \rho)d_{t+1} - p_t \quad (2)$$

where lower-case letters denote logarithms of the variables. The letter k summarizes all constant terms following from the Taylor expansion and $\rho = 1/1 + \exp(d - p)$ is a weight that also follows from the log-linearization. This weight depends on the long-run mean of the log

dividend-price ratio, $d-p$, around which equation (1) is linearized. This weight is slightly lower than unity.

To arrive at a representation of unexpected stock return movements we have to rearrange equation (2) for the stock price, $p_t \approx k + \rho p_{t+1} + (1-\rho)d_{t+1} - r_{t+1}$ and then expand this equation to the infinite horizon imposing the condition that discounted stock prices cannot grow forever, $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \rho^j p_{t+j} = 0$, and take expectations on both sides of the equation such that

$$p_t = \frac{k}{1-\rho} + E_t \left[\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j ((1-\rho)d_{t+1+j} - r_{t+1+j}) \right] \quad (3)$$

with E_t the expectation operator conditional on information at time t . Substituting equation (3) into equation (2), Campbell (1991) shows that unexpected changes of stock returns either reflect news (revisions in expectations) of dividend growth or future discount rates, i.e.

$$r_{t+1} - E_t r_{t+1} = (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j \Delta d_{t+1+j} - (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j r_{t+1+j} \quad (4)$$

Campbell and Ammer (1993) suggest to study excess returns, i.e. stock returns in excess of a short-term debt rate. In addition, they assume that the discount rate, r , is the sum of short-term real interest rates, rr , and a risk premium term, rx , i.e. $r = rr + rx$. Then the discount rate term in equation (4) can be reformulated such that unexpected stock excess returns obey

$$rx_{t+1} - E_t rx_{t+1} = (E_{t+1} - E_t) \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j \Delta d_{t+1+j} - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j rr_{t+1+j} - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \rho^j rx_{t+1+j} \right\} \quad (5)$$

For notational convenience, I follow Campbell (1991) and rewrite equation (5) as

$$NR_{t+1} = NCF_{t+1} - NRR_{t+1} - NRX_{t+1} \quad (6)$$

with $NR_{t+1} \equiv rx_{t+1} - E_t rx_{t+1}$, the unexpected stock market excess return,

$NCF_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j \Delta d_{t+1+j}$, the news of future cash-flows (dividends),

$NRR_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j rr_{t+1+j}$, the news of the real interest rate and finally

$NRX_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \rho^j rx_{t+1+j}$ the news of future excess returns which can be interpreted as proxy of expected risk premia.

Following from this accounting identity a positive surprise movement in the excess stock market return is associated with positive dividend news, lower than expected real interest rates or lower than expected future excess returns or an arbitrary combination.

2.2 The basic bond return relationship

A similar decomposition as the one for stock excess returns applies to bond returns. Define the real, log bond return in excess of the short-term rate as

$$brx_{t+1}^N \equiv b_{t+1}^N - \pi_{t+1} - rr_{t+1} \quad (7)$$

in which $b_{t+1}^N \equiv p_{t+1}^{N-1} - p_t^N$ is the log nominal one-period holding return on a N -period zero-coupon bond with nominal price, p . Inflation is denoted by π and rr represents the short-term real rate. In their Appendix A, Campbell and Ammer (1993) show that the unexpected bond excess return for a bond with maturity N held from t to $t+1$ (at which it becomes a $N-1$ period bond) obeys

$$brx_{t+1}^N - E_t brx_{t+1}^N = (E_{t+1} - E_t) \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \pi_{t+1+i} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} rr_{t+1+i} - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} brx_{t+1+i}^{N-1} \right\} \quad (8)$$

or in more compact notation

$$NBR_{t+1} = -NBCF_{t+1} - NBRR_{t+1} - NBRX_{t+1} \quad (9)$$

with $NBR_{t+1} \equiv brx_{t+1}^N - E_t brx_{t+1}^N$, the unexpected excess return on the n -period, zero-coupon

bond, $NBCF_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \pi_{t+1+i}$ the cash-flow, i.e. inflation, news component,

$NBRR_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} rr_{t+1+i}$, the real interest rate news over the lifetime of the bond and

$NBRX_{t+1} \equiv (E_{t+1} - E_t) \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} brx_{t+1+i}^{N-1}$ the news about bond excess returns.

A positive, unexpected bond excess return hence reflects an unexpected decline in inflation over the maturity of the bond, lower than expected real interest rates or lower than expected bond excess returns. Inflation corresponds to cash-flows because the bond price at the maturity date is fixed in nominal terms. Even when expected real interest rates or excess returns stay constant, the expected real payoff of the bond could vary because of changes in inflation over the lifetime of the bond.

2.3 Variance decompositions with correlated news components

To assess the relative importance of the different news components of stock and bond excess returns, this paper follows Campbell and Ammer (1993) in decomposing the variance of the unexpected stock and bond excess returns. The different news components are correlated with each other such that the variance decomposition of e.g. the stock excess return obeys

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(NR) = & \text{var}(NCF) + \text{var}(NRR) + \text{var}(NRX) \\ & - 2\text{Cov}(NCF, NRR) - 2\text{Cov}(NCF, NRX) + 2\text{Cov}(NRR, NRX) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This decomposition takes explicitly correlations between the different news components into account. This is economically interesting information. For example, the Swiss assets studied in this paper are typically considered to be “safe haven” assets. Investors view these assets as hedge against the materialization of global disaster risks (Kugler and Weder, 2005; Grisse and Nitschka, 2013; Hoffmann and Suter, 2010; Ranaldo and Söderlind, 2010). Does this imply that risk premium news and news about fundamentals move in the same direction reinforcing each other? Or are these news rather uncorrelated meaning that fundamentals and risk premium shocks are clearly distinct?

Again following Campbell and Ammer (1993), I report the statistics of the right-hand side of equation (10) in the empirical part of this paper. These statistics are normalized by the variance of the unexpected asset return, $\text{var}(NR)$ or $\text{var}(NBR)$, such that the sum of the variance and covariance terms of the different news components add up to one.

3 Empirical framework and data

Revisions in expectations of excess returns and their components are not directly observable such that Campbell and Ammer (1993) propose a VAR model to identify the different news components.

3.1 Obtaining news components from a VAR

The VAR for each country is based on a state vector which contains the stock excess return as its first element. Then follows the short-term, ex post measured, real interest rate, the change in the short-term nominal interest rate and the spread between a long-term government bond yield and the short-term interest rate. These four elements are necessary to back out the different stock and bond excess return news components.

To address the criticism of VAR-based return decompositions of Chen and Zhao (2009) and following the recommendations of Engsted et al. (2012), the state vector includes as its fifth element the dividend-price ratio. Engsted et al. (2012) show that including the dividend-price ratio as state variable alleviates concerns about the choice of stock market news component to be obtained as residual from the VAR. This is the case as long as the state variables have the potential to not only signal future returns but also future cash-flows. The dividend-price ratio has to signal dividends or returns by construction. Moreover, following Campbell (1991) and Campbell and Ammer (1993) I include the short-term rate minus its one-year backward moving average as sixth element in the state vector. This variable should capture if short rates are unusually low or high.

Campbell and Shiller (1988) show how to reformulate a p-order VAR into a first-order VAR representation. For notational convenience, I hence present the ways to back out the different news components from the example of a first-order VAR:

$$z_{t+1} = \Gamma z_t + u_{t+1} \quad (11)$$

in which Γ is the matrix of VAR coefficients and u denotes the error terms. Further define the 6x1 vectors e_1 to e_4 to pick out different elements of the state vector. The first element in e_1

is one and all other elements are zero, the second element in e_2 is one and all other elements zero and analogously for the other vectors e_3 and e_4 .

The news of the stock excess return can be directly obtained from equation (11) as $NR_{t+1} = e_1' u_{t+1}$ because the stock excess return is the first element of the state vector. News of the bond excess return can be derived from news of the short-term interest rate and news of the yield spread, i.e. $NBR_{t+1} = -(n-1)(e_3' + e_4') u_{t+1}$, thus exploiting that excess return news can equivalently be written as news of future bond yields. This latter news can again be written as the sum of news of changes in the short-rate⁴ and the term yield spread (Campbell and Ammer, 1993).

The other news components are derived from (11) by using the VAR estimates to compute revisions in (long-horizon) expectations as

$$(E_{t+1} - E_t)z_{t+1+j} = \Gamma^j u_{t+1} \quad (12)$$

In both stock and bond excess return decompositions two of the three different news components can be directly computed from the VAR estimates such that the third component has to be obtained as a residual.

3.1.1 Stock market excess return news

The three news components of the stock market excess return are obtained in the following way. News of future expected stock market excess returns can be directly derived from the VAR estimates as

$$NRX_{t+1} = e_1' \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \rho^j \Gamma^j u_{t+1} = e_1' \rho \Gamma (I - \rho \Gamma)^{-1} u_{t+1} \quad (13)$$

and news of future real interest rates obey

$$NRR_{t+1} = e_2' \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho^j \Gamma^j u_{t+1} = e_2' (I - \rho \Gamma)^{-1} u_{t+1} \quad (14)$$

⁴ This is due to the fact that the lagged short rate is known at time t such that innovations in the change of the short rate basically reflect innovations in the level of the short rate.

The news of future cash-flows of the stock market excess return is then obtained as residual, i.e.

$$NCF_{t+1} = NR_{t+1} + NRX_{t+1} + NRR_{t+1} \quad (15)$$

As emphasized in Campbell (1991), modelling the cash-flow news as residual in the context of stock returns helps to avoid potential problems with the measuring of dividends which are highly seasonal.

3.1.2 Bond market excess return news

From the VAR estimates we can directly derive the news about real interest rates over the lifetime of the bond as

$$NBRR_{t+1} = e2' \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Gamma^i u_{t+1} = e2'(I - \Gamma)^{-1} (\Gamma - \Gamma^n) u_{t+1} \quad (16)$$

and cash-flow (inflation news) as

$$NBCF_{t+1} = -NBRR + e3' \left\{ (I - \Gamma)^{-1} \left[(n-1)I + (I - \Gamma)^{-1} (\Gamma^n - \Gamma) \right] \right\} u_{t+1} \quad (17)$$

such that news of future bond excess returns is obtained as the residual.

$$NBRX_{t+1} = -NBR_{t+1} - NBRR_{t+1} - NBCF_{t+1} \quad (18)$$

Since directly estimating the excess return news would require to take the shrinking maturity of the bond into account, we have to obtain that news component as the residual (Campbell and Ammer, 1993; Engsted et al., 2012).

3.2 Data and sample period

I follow Campbell and Ammer (1993) and include the following variables in the state vector: the excess return on the stock market (rx), the short-term, ex post real interest rate (rr), changes in the nominal short-term rate (Δi), the spread between yields on long-term bonds and a short-rate (yield spread, ys), the log dividend-price ratio (dp) and the short-rate relative to a one-year moving average (relative short-rate, $rshort$). The frequency of the data is monthly.

The baseline sample period runs from January 1975 to July 2013. In addition, the paper assesses the news decompositions for two restricted sample periods. Both start in January

1975 but the first restricted sample period ends December 2008 to exclude the period of low real interest rates in recent years. The second restricted sample period excludes the global financial crisis period as well and ends in December 2006.

The source of constant maturity 10-year government bond yields for Switzerland is the Swiss National Bank (SNB). In addition, I use the one-month CHF Libor obtained from Datastream as proxy of the Swiss nominal short-term rate. Following Campbell and Ammer (1993), the yield spread is calculated as difference between the yield on the 10-year zero-coupon government bond and the two-month short rate⁵, here the two-month CHF Libor, in percentage points p.a. For the US I use the constant maturity 10-year treasury bill rate and three-month Treasury bill rate to construct the term yield spread. These series are from the FED Board website. I use the one-month Treasury bill rate to calculate changes in short-rates, the relative short-rate, the ex post real interest and monthly stock excess returns. This series is obtained from Kenneth French's data library.

To calculate monthly, ex post real interest rates, I subtract monthly changes (in % per month) of the seasonally adjusted Swiss consumer price index (CPI) from the nominal short-term interest rate (in % per month). The CPI index excludes oil related products and adjusts for special seasonal patterns in clothing and shoes in Switzerland. The source of the CPI data is the Swiss Federal Statistical Office and the SNB. For the US, I use total personal consumption expenditure (PCE) index data and PCE excluding food and energy prices from the NIPA table 2.3.4 available on the website of the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

To calculate stock returns and dividend-price ratios I use Swiss and US price and total return (assuming that dividend payments are reinvested) stock market index data, denominated in the respective local currency, from MSCI. The MSCI indices have the advantage that they cover a large share of the market capitalization and are constructed using the same

⁵ Usually, the yield spread is measured between the 10-year yield and a one-month yield/rate. This is not possible in the current context as shocks to the one-month rate are explicitly taken into account in the estimation of the VAR.

methodology. They are thus also easily comparable across countries. Following the usual convention in the literature, the monthly log dividend-price ratio is obtained as log of the sum of monthly dividends over the past year minus the log of this month's stock price index. Monthly dividends are obtained as difference between the return on the total return index (including dividend payments) in $t+1$ minus the return on the price index (excluding dividend payments) in $t+1$ times the stock price index in t . Annual dividends are the sum of the monthly dividends. Annualising the dividends helps to avoid seasonal patterns in dividends. Excess returns are expressed in percent per month.

4 Empirical Results

This section presents all of the empirical results. It starts with the estimates from the VAR for the three sample periods under study. Then I report the return decompositions and assess the correlation of the different stock and bond return news components. Finally, this section summarizes some robustness checks.

4.1 VAR estimates

This section presents the estimates of a first-order VAR as in equation (11). The lag of one month is suggested by Akaike and Schwartz information criteria for Swiss and US data. Panel A of table 1 gives the VAR estimates for Switzerland over the baseline sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. The first line of panel A shows that the stock market excess return is only predicted by its own lag. Judged by the Newey-West corrected t-statistics of the VAR estimates, the other one-month lagged variables do not significantly signal future excess returns. The R^2 statistic adjusted for the number of regressors is about 2%. This result is common when assessing one-month ahead time variation in stock market returns. Most empirical studies of stock return predictability find that the forecasting power for stock returns peaks at the business cycle frequency (e.g. Cochrane, 2011). The other lines of panel A of table 1 give the results for the other variables.

Panels B and C of table 1 present the VAR estimates for the restricted sample periods until December 2008 (Panel B) and December 2006 (Panel C). These estimates largely corroborate the evidence for the baseline, full sample period. Judged by the VAR estimates, the recent crisis and low real interest rate periods did not have a major impact on the links between the variables in the VAR system under study.

[about here Table 1]

The US VAR estimates, reported in table 2, provide a similar picture in terms of fit and the observation that the recent crisis period did not significantly affect the links between the VAR state variables.

[about here Table 2]

The two countries' VAR results show that the link between one-month ahead stock market excess returns and predictors such as the term spread is considerably weaker than reported in e.g. Campbell et al. (2013) for the US. The main reason for this difference is the shorter sample period. While e.g. Campbell et al. (2013) estimate their VAR from 1929 to 2010, this paper's sample period starts in 1975. The insignificant VAR coefficients for the term spread are in line with the subsample estimates in e.g. Galsband and Nitschka (2013). Moreover, instead of the dividend-price ratio, the price-earnings ratio is typically used as state variable in studies focused on the US (Campbell and Ammer, 1993; Campbell et al., 2013) which delivers significant estimates in stock return forecast regressions. Since the price-(long-term) earnings ratio for the Swiss MSCI index is not available, I use dividend-price ratios to ensure that cross-country differences in the variance decompositions are not due to the use of different state variables to back out the news components.

Before turning to the variance decompositions, figure 1 depicts the estimated unexpected movements of stock and 10-year government bond excess returns in Switzerland (blue lines) and the US (red lines). The upper panel of the figure presents the unexpected stock excess

return movements while the lower panel gives the unexpected bond excess return movements over time. These series are smoothed as in Campbell et al. (2013).

[about here Figure 1]

The upper panel of figure 1 displays the smoothed unexpected stock market excess return series over the baseline period from February 1975 to July 2013. We observe several pronounced swings that are broadly similar for both Swiss and US data. The 1987 crash is visible as unexpected negative return variation. In the early and mid-1990s we see periods of mostly positive unexpected excess returns. By contrast, the 2000s are mostly characterized by negative news reflecting the downturn after the NASDAQ boom and more recently around the collapse of Lehman Brothers.

The lower panel of figure 1 presents the smoothed 10-year bond excess return news series. The correlation between the Swiss and the US series is considerably lower, a correlation coefficient of -0.16, than for the stock news series, a correlation coefficient of more than 0.7. This lower, even slightly negative, correlation between US and Swiss bond return news reflect that we observe more episodes of swings from negative to positive unexpected movements in bond excess returns especially in the 1980s and 1990s and clearly during the Lehman Brothers collapse in the US than in Switzerland.

Compared with the stock excess return news series, news of Swiss bond excess returns do not exhibit so many pronounced swings. There are two episodes that stand out. The first one occurred at the beginning of the sample period around the second oil price shock in the late 1970s and coincides with the introduction of a minimum rate for the Swiss franc against the Deutschmark. The second one occurred around the intensification of the euro area crisis in 2010/2011 which ultimately prompted the SNB to introduce a minimum exchange rate against the euro to fight deflationary pressures. In the course of this crisis, Swiss assets have been perceived as valuable insurance against euro area risks.

At the same time, Swiss inflation rates turned negative and were heavily influenced by extreme exchange rate movements during these periods because Switzerland is a small, open economy. It could be the case that the bond return variation generally reflects the impact of exchange rate movements on Swiss long-term inflation expectations which hence could lead to unexpected variation in bond excess returns.⁶

A priori, it is not clear what effects (Swiss bonds' hedging value against euro area risk or Swiss inflation news potentially triggered by exchange rate fluctuations) led to revisions in expectations of future bond excess returns. The variance decompositions presented in the subsequent sections help to address this question.

4.2 Variance decomposition with correlated components: stock excess return

The results of the variance decomposition of unexpected stock excess returns leave the impression that the variation in Swiss stock excess returns is driven by news about cash-flows. By contrast, news of future risk premia is by far more important to explain variation in US stock market excess returns. This evidence corroborates the earlier evidence by Campbell (1991) and is therefore not discussed in detail in the subsequence.

Table 3 summarizes the results of the variance decompositions. The left panel gives the result for the baseline sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. The middle and the right panel present the corresponding results for the restricted sample periods ending in December 2008 (excluding the low real interest period) and December 2006 (excluding also the crisis period) respectively. Below the variances and covariances, table 2 gives the 95% confidence intervals obtained from bootstrapping these statistics 1000 times. The columns "CH" and "US" report the results for Switzerland and the US respectively.

As the left panel of table 3 shows, the majority of variation in unexpected Swiss stock excess returns is related to news of future fundamentals, i.e. dividends. This finding stands in marked contrast to the US evidence which highlights that news about future excess returns and news

⁶ I thank Alain Gabler for pointing this out to me.

about future cash-flows are about equally important drivers of variation in stock market returns. The US evidence is broadly consistent with earlier evidence but points to a more prominent role of cash-flow news than in studies focused on the 1950s to 1980s (e.g. Campbell, 1991). This increase in the importance of cash-flow news for US stock market return variation is nonetheless in line with recent evidence by Campbell et al. (2013) who show that cash-flow news was particularly important in the 2007 -2009 US stock market bust. The Swiss evidence is consistent with Rey (2004) who examines Swiss stock returns in a similar framework (focused on stock market returns and evaluating various combinations of different state variables) and also finds that cash-flow news are the main driver of Swiss stock market returns in the sample period from 1975 to 2002.

The variance decompositions suggest that the variation in Swiss stock excess returns would be even higher if only news of fundamentals would contribute to it. The share of the cash-flow variance normalized by the total variance is slightly higher than one. The negative co-variation of cash-flow news and news of risk premia lower the total variability of Swiss stock excess returns. De Long and Becht (1992) find similar evidence for the German stock market during the first age of globalization in the pre-World War I period. In that time period German stock returns varied slightly less than suggested by the variability of fundamentals.

It should be noted, however, that cash-flow news is obtained as residual in the VAR-based decomposition and therefore its importance is likely to be overstated.

The Swiss evidence is also backed by a related strand of the literature which assesses the time variation in the dividend-price ratio. Variation in the dividend-price ratio has to reflect future dividend growth or expected returns or both (Cochrane, 2008). Based on US evidence it is conventional wisdom that the variation in dividend-price ratio can be almost exclusively explained by expected returns (e.g. Cochrane, 2008, 2011). However, Chen (2009) shows that dividend growth in the US was predictable by the dividend-price ratio in the pre-World War II period. Van Binswangen and Koijen (2010) use filtering techniques to highlight that

dividend growth is predictable by the dividend-price ratio in the US also in the more recent past. In addition, Engsted and Pedersen (2010) provide evidence for dividend growth predictability in Denmark and Sweden. Rangvid et al. (2013) regard a larger cross-section of countries to show that dividend-price ratios of small countries, e.g. Switzerland, do exhibit some predictive power for dividend growth as dividend smoothing is less pronounced in these countries than in the US.

Comparing the results from the left panel with the other two panels of table 3, it is evident that this result is not the outcome of the recent crisis period. It is a general feature of the data. This outcome is not driven by the latest crisis or low real interest rate period.

[Table 3 about here]

4.3 Variance decomposition with correlated components: bond excess return

As for Swiss stock excess returns, news about cash-flows, here inflation news over the lifetime of the bond, dominates the variation in unexpected bond excess returns. However, the uncertainty around the share of variance explained by inflation news is quite large as reported in table 4. Again we observe the opposite pattern in US data. Here, news of future bond excess returns appear to be relatively more important in explaining bond return variation than the other news components.

In all three sample periods cash-flow (inflation) news is the main driving force of variation in Swiss long-term bond excess returns. As discussed earlier, this finding most likely reflects the fact the Switzerland is a small, open economy for which exchange rate fluctuations have an important impact on inflation rates. Hence the evidence of long-term inflation news as main driver of bond excess return variation could be largely driven by the impact of exchange rate dynamics on inflation expectations. News of future real interest rates play almost no role in this respect. The share of variation in bond excess returns explained by revisions in expectations of future bond excess returns is considerably smaller than the variance share explained by inflation news.

However, it is clearly evident that the importance of inflation news relative to the other news components is particularly pronounced since the onset of the financial crisis. Inflation news seems to have gained importance also in the US in the recent period even though future bond excess return news is still the main explanation of variation in US bond excess returns.

Notice that in the bond return decomposition inflation news is directly estimated in the VAR and news of excess returns is the residual. Hence, it is rather the importance of news of bond excess returns than inflation news that is overstated in these variance decompositions. Against this backdrop, the potential explanation that market participants react more strongly to news about inflation, i.e. fundamentals, when real interest rates are low (Kocherlakota, 2013) or since the crisis hit seems to be supported by the bond market data.

[Table 4 about here]

4.4 Correlation between stock and bond excess return news

An interesting by-product of the return decomposition is the assessment of common movements in revisions of expectations of the different bond and stock excess return news components. In the case of Switzerland, the visual inspection of the bond and stock excess news series in figure (1) suggests that the overall covariation between stock and bond excess return news is low. However, we should expect some components to be closely linked.

4.4.1 Swiss evidence

The correlation coefficients between the three respective news components of Swiss stock and bond excess returns are presented in table 5 separated by the three sample periods examined so far. Panel A gives the correlation coefficients for the baseline sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. Panel B shows the corresponding statistics for the sample period ending in December 2008 and Panel C the corresponding statistics for the sample period ending in December 2006. Bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals of the correlation coefficients appear in parenthesis.

We see high positive correlations between the real interest rate news components irrespective of the sample period. This is a natural observation that follows from the fact the real interest rate news for stock excess returns reflects news over the infinite horizon while the real interest rate news component of the bond excess returns is measured over the life-time of the bond. Hence, these two components should be strongly positively correlated.

The variances of stock and bond excess returns, however, are dominated by their cash-flow news components. These components are only weakly correlated. In the baseline sample period, the correlation is not distinguishable from zero. It is weakly negative in the restricted sample periods suggesting that the Swiss stock market delivered limited hedging value against long-term inflation risk.

Notice also the strong negative correlation between stock risk premium news and news of real interest rates (stocks and bonds). This correlation reflects that real interest rates fall during a recession. At the same time expected risk premia on stocks have to be high in recessions in order to induce investors to hold stocks (e.g. Campbell and Cochrane, 1999).

The final noteworthy observation across all subsamples is the positive and significant correlation between risk premia news and the respective other market's cash-flow news. The correlation between dividend news and risk premia news on the Swiss bond market varies between 0.54 and 0.65. This finding suggests that positive news of fundamentals (dividends) are associated with positive expected returns on government bonds. A potential explanation of this association is the possibility that positive news of fundamentals coincide with restrictive monetary policy, potentially an increase in the policy rate, which tends to lower the current value of bonds but at the same time signals higher future excess returns.

A similar reasoning potentially applies to explain the positive correlation (0.47 – 0.62) between long-term inflation news and risk premia news on the Swiss stock market: Positive surprises of long-term inflation rates might prompt the central bank to react with an interest

hike or other restrictive policy measures which temporarily lower current asset values and lead to higher than expected excess returns in the future.

[Table 5 about here]

4.4.2 US evidence

Table 6 presents the corresponding correlation coefficients between the different news components for the US. In contrast to the Campbell and Ammer (1993) evidence from the 1950s to 1980s, there is virtually no correlation between future stock and bond excess returns in the sample under study. This difference can be explained by the lack of predictive power of the term yield spread for excess returns in the baseline sample period as presented in table 2. Typically, the term spread predicts both stock and bond excess returns such that mechanically some positive correlation between risk premium news on the two asset markets is the result. In the setting of this paper, the US term spread exhibits no predictive power.

Also noteworthy is the negative correlation between bond cash-flow, i.e. long-term inflation, news and news of stock excess returns. This finding suggests that long-term inflation news is bad for US stock markets and in line with the Campbell and Ammer (1993) evidence.

[Table 6 about here]

4.5 Summary of robustness checks of VAR-based return decomposition

This section summarizes robustness checks of the main results of this paper. Detailed results are available upon request. These robustness checks show that the main results are qualitatively robust to various changes in the empirical setup.

First, one might argue that financial market participants do care about oil prices. Instead of using a CPI that excludes oil related products one should take this explicitly into account when calculating the ex post real interest rate. It turns out that the qualitative results remain unaffected by the particular choice of the CPI to calculate inflation rates.

Second, I used growth rates of monetary aggregates as additional proxies of monetary policy in the VAR for Switzerland. It should be noted, that the short-term market rate is already

closely related to Swiss monetary policy since 2000. The Swiss National Bank (SNB) uses the three-month Libor as policy rate since its current policy framework became effective in 2000. In any case, the inclusion of monetary aggregates does not change any of the results neither for Switzerland nor for the US.

Third, I included changes in effective (nominal and real, trade-weighted) Swiss franc exchange rates as explicit state variable in the VARs to take into account that Switzerland is a small open economy such that exchange rate movements could directly influence revisions in expectations of Swiss bond and stock returns. None of the results presented in this paper is affected by the inclusion of the effective Swiss franc exchange rate changes. This does not mean, however, that they do not have an indirect effect through revisions in Swiss long-term inflation expectations as discussed earlier.

Finally, I assessed a VAR excluding the relative short-term rate as it does not predict stock excess returns significantly and, in contrast to the other five VAR variables, it is not necessary to ensure that the VAR reflects the theoretical underpinnings (Engsted, et al., 2012). Including or excluding this variable from the VAR state vector does not change any of the results. This is true for both Switzerland and the US.

5 Conclusions

This paper has evaluated the relative importance of news about cash-flows, real interest rates and risk premia in explaining time variation in Swiss stock and bond excess returns. It additionally compares these results with US evidence for the same sample period. The main findings of this paper suggest that variation in Swiss asset returns mainly reflects revisions in expectations about their underlying economic fundamentals, i.e. dividends in the case of stocks and inflation in the case of bonds. This observation stands in marked contrast to the evidence for the US.

The relative importance of long-term inflation news for the overall variation in Swiss bond excess returns is stronger in sample periods including the recent period of low real interest

rates and the global financial crisis. This pattern is also visible in US data. The evidence is consistent with the view that a prolonged period of low real interest rates induces agents to place more weight on expectations of macroeconomic risk, i.e. the dynamics of the economic fundamentals underlying asset prices, than in periods of “normal” real interest rate levels (Kocherlakota, 2013).

References

- Campbell, John Y. (1991). A variance decomposition for stock returns. *Economic Journal* 101, 157-179.
- Campbell, John Y. and John Ammer (1993). What moves the Stock and Bond Markets? A Variance Decomposition for Long-Term Asset Returns. *Journal of Finance* 48, 3-37.
- Campbell, John Y. and John H. Cochrane (1999). By force of habit: A consumption-based explanation of aggregate stock market behaviour. *Journal of Political Economy* 107, 205-251.
- Campbell, John Y., Stefano Giglio and Christopher Polk (2013). Hard Times. *Review of Asset Pricing Studies* 3, 95-132.
- Campbell, John Y. and Robert J. Shiller (1988). The dividend-price ratio and expectations of future dividends and discount factors. *Review of Financial Studies* 1, 195-228.
- Chen, Long (2009). On the Reversal of Dividend and Return Predictability: A Tale of Two Periods. *Journal of Financial Economics* 92, 128-151.
- Chen, Long and Xinlei Zhao (2009). Return Decomposition. *Review of Financial Studies* 22, 5213-5249.
- Cochrane, John H. (2008). The Dog That Did Not Bark: A Defense of Return Predictability. *Review of Financial Studies* 21, 1533-1575.
- Cochrane, John H. (2011). Presidential Address: Discount Rates. *Journal of Finance* 66, 1046-1108.
- De Long, J. Bradford and Marco Becht (1992). 'Excess' Volatility and the German Stock Market: 1876-1990. NBER working paper 4054.
- Engsted, Tom, Thomas Q. Pedersen and Carsten Tanggaard (2012). Pitfalls in VAR based return decompositions: A clarification. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 36, 1255-1265.
- Engsted, Tom and Thomas Q. Pedersen (2010). The dividend-price ratio does predict dividend growth: international evidence. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 17, 585-605.
- Engsted, Tom and Carsten Tanggaard (2001). The Danish stock and bond markets: comovement, return predictability and variance decomposition. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 8, 243-271.
- Galsband, Victoria and Thomas Nitschka (2013), Foreign Currency Returns and Systematic Risks. Forthcoming *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*.
- Grise, Christian and Thomas Nitschka (2013), On financial risk and the safe haven characteristics of Swiss franc exchange rates. SNB Working Paper 2013-04.
- Habib, Maurizio M and Livio Stracca (2012), Getting Beyond Carry Trade. What Makes a Safe Haven Currency? *Journal of International Economics* 87, 50-64.

Hoffmann, Mathias and Rahel Suter (2010). The Swiss Franc Exchange Rate and Deviations From Uncovered Interest Rate Parity: Global vs Domestic Factors. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics* 146, 349-371.

Kocherlakota, Narayana (2013). Low Real Interest Rates. Speech given at the 22nd Annual Hyman P. Minsky Conference, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, New York on April 18, 2013. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.

Kugler, Peter and Beatrice Weder (2005). Why are Returns on Swiss Franc Assets so Low? *Applied Economics Quarterly* 51, 231-246.

Ranaldo, Angelo and Paul Söderlind (2010). Safe Haven Currencies. *Review of Finance* 14, 385-407.

Rangvid, Jesper, Maik Schmeling and Andreas Schrimpf (2013). Dividend predictability around the world. *Forthcoming Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*.

Rey, David (2004). A Variance Decomposition for Swiss Stock Market Returns. University of Basel, WWZ/Department of Finance, Working Paper No. 7/04.

Shiller, Robert J. and Andrea E. Beltratti (1992). Stock prices and bond yields. Can their comovements be explained in terms of present value models? *Journal of Monetary Economics* 30, 25-46.

Swiss National Bank, Quarterly Bulletin 2/2013 June.

Van Binsbergen, Jules H. and Ralph S.J. Koijen (2010). Predictive Regressions: A Present-Value Approach. *Journal of Finance* 65, 1439-1471.

Viceira, Luis M. (2008). Bond risk, bond return volatility, and the term structure of interest rates. *International Journal of Forecasting* 28, 97-117.

Tables

Table 1: VAR estimates (Switzerland)

Panel A: VAR estimates; baseline sample period January 1975 to July 2013							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	0.16 * (3.47)	0.27 (0.21)	-0.05 (-0.11)	0.23 (1.36)	0.72 (1.11)	1.02 (0.41)	0.02
rr_t	-0.00 (-0.72)	0.04 (0.98)	-0.01 (-0.61)	-0.04 * (-7.08)	-0.10 * (-4.27)	0.08 (0.83)	0.19
Δi_t	0.01 (1.63)	-0.27 * (-1.96)	0.06 (1.26)	0.03 (1.59)	0.05 (0.74)	0.05 (0.18)	0.02
ys_t	-0.01 (-1.43)	0.49 * (3.64)	0.06 (1.38)	0.97 * (53.60)	0.01 (0.18)	-0.32 (-1.18)	0.91
dp_t	-0.00 * (-2.65)	0.00 (0.10)	0.00 (0.18)	-0.00 (-0.64)	0.97 * (93.91)	0.02 (0.49)	0.96
$rshort_t$	0.00 * (2.08)	-0.04 * (-3.08)	-0.01 (-1.59)	0.00 (1.53)	-0.00 (-0.24)	0.91 * (35.86)	0.79
Panel B: VAR estimates; restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2008							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	0.15 * (3.06)	0.51 (0.39)	-0.34 (-0.59)	0.26 (1.43)	0.69 (0.91)	1.42 (0.53)	0.01
rr_t	-0.00 (0.43)	0.04 (0.85)	0.01 (0.47)	-0.05 * (-6.87)	-0.12 * (-4.19)	0.05 (0.45)	0.18
Δi_t	0.01 (1.24)	-0.23 * (-1.97)	0.05 (0.93)	0.04 * (2.73)	0.14 * (2.02)	0.13 (0.56)	0.05
ys_t	-0.01 (-1.58)	0.54 * (3.74)	0.08 (1.31)	0.97 * (48.52)	-0.00 (-0.02)	-0.36 (-1.21)	0.91
dp_t	-0.00 * (-2.48)	-0.01 (-0.30)	0.00 (0.39)	-0.00 (-0.96)	0.97 * (87.86)	0.01 (0.33)	0.96
$rshort_t$	0.00 * (2.07)	-0.04 * (-3.02)	-0.01 (-1.88)	0.00 (1.55)	0.00 (0.05)	0.92 * (32.78)	0.79

Table 1 continued

Panel C: VAR estimates; restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2006							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	0.13 * (2.59)	0.17 (0.13)	-0.53 (-0.91)	0.27 (1.50)	0.93 (1.22)	1.52 (0.56)	0.01
rr_t	-0.00 (0.40)	0.04 (0.84)	0.01 (0.34)	-0.05 * (-6.62)	-0.12 * (-3.91)	0.05 (0.46)	0.18
Δi_t	0.00 (0.74)	-0.24 * (-2.02)	0.04 (0.67)	0.04 * (2.74)	0.15 * (2.23)	0.13 (0.54)	0.05
ys_t	-0.01 (-1.25)	0.56 * (3.73)	0.09 (1.42)	0.96 * (47.25)	-0.01 (-0.16)	-0.35 (-1.15)	0.91
dp_t	-0.00 * (-2.28)	-0.01 (-0.08)	0.01 (0.60)	-0.00 (-0.96)	0.97 * (87.35)	0.01 (0.27)	0.96
$rshort_t$	0.00 (1.64)	-0.04 * (-3.02)	-0.01 (-1.94)	0.00 (1.55)	0.00 (0.23)	0.92 * (31.94)	0.79

Notes: This table presents estimates from a vector autoregression (VAR) with lag length of one month of the following variables: the excess return on the Swiss stock market (rx), the short-term real interest rate (rr), changes in the nominal short-term rate (Δi), the spread between yields on long-term bonds and a short-rate (yield spread, ys), the log dividend-price ratio (dp) and the short-rate relative to a one-year moving average (relative short-rate, $rshort$). Panel A gives the estimates for the sample period from January 1975 to July 2013 Panel B gives the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 while the estimates reported in panel C are based on the sample period ending in December 2006. Newey-West corrected t-statistics appear below the estimates in parenthesis. The measure of fit, R^2 , is corrected for the number of regressors.

Table 2: VAR estimates (USA)

Panel A: VAR estimates; baseline sample period January 1975 to July 2013							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	0.06 (1.29)	0.60 (0.54)	0.33 (0.45)	-0.03 (-0.14)	0.48 (1.05)	-1.51 (-0.67)	0.00
rr_t	-0.00 (-1.28)	0.67 * (18.24)	0.05 * (2.09)	-0.01 (-1.78)	0.02 (1.69)	0.27 (3.64)	0.55
Δi_t	-0.00 (-0.76)	-0.13 (-1.79)	-0.16 * (-3.40)	0.01 (0.81)	0.02 (0.50)	-0.06 (-0.39)	0.03
ys_t	0.01 * (2.29)	0.09 (0.71)	-0.07 (-0.88)	0.85 * (36.32)	0.03 (0.61)	-1.57 (-6.11)	0.84
dp_t	-0.00 * (-2.87)	-0.02 (-1.46)	-0.00 (-0.62)	-0.00 (-0.17)	0.99 * (213.88)	0.03 (1.14)	0.99
$rshort_t$	-0.00 (-0.51)	-0.05 * (-2.97)	-0.03 * (-2.32)	0.00 (1.49)	0.00 (0.41)	0.84 * (25.18)	0.63
Panel B: VAR estimates; restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2008							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	0.05 (1.04)	1.32 (1.12)	1.48 (0.81)	-0.10 (-0.45)	0.56 (1.22)	-2.99 (-1.20)	0.00
rr_t	-0.00 (-1.26)	0.65 * (16.84)	0.22 * (3.74)	-0.01 * (-1.98)	0.02 (1.18)	0.17 * (2.05)	0.53
Δi_t	-0.00 (-0.06)	-0.10 * (-2.24)	-0.40 * (-5.90)	0.02 * (2.12)	0.01 (0.33)	0.17 (1.80)	0.09
ys_t	0.01 * (2.01)	0.08 (0.58)	-0.70 (-3.21)	0.85 * (32.98)	0.05 (0.82)	-1.28 (-4.22)	0.84
dp_t	-0.00 * (-2.46)	-0.02 (-1.81)	-0.02 (-0.82)	0.00 (0.44)	0.99 * (212.97)	0.04 (1.66)	0.99
$rshort_t$	-0.00 (-0.40)	-0.06 * (-3.18)	-0.08 * (-2.81)	0.01 * (1.98)	0.00 * (0.02)	0.88 * (22.68)	0.64

Table 2 continued

Panel C: VAR estimates; restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2006							
	rx_{t-1}	rr_{t-1}	Δi_{t-1}	ys_{t-1}	dp_{t-1}	$rshort_{t-1}$	R^2
rx_t	-0.00 (-0.08)	0.75 (0.64)	1.03 (0.53)	-0.18 (-0.79)	0.45 (0.98)	-4.42 (-1.73)	0.00
rr_t	-0.00 (-1.03)	0.65 * (16.20)	0.23 * (3.51)	-0.01 * (-1.96)	0.02 (1.06)	0.16 (1.79)	0.52
Δi_t	-0.00 (-1.02)	-0.10 * (-2.76)	-0.27 * (-4.81)	0.01 (1.68)	0.00 (0.01)	0.08 (1.04)	0.08
ys_t	0.01 (1.77)	0.06 (0.40)	-0.98 * (-4.08)	0.85 * (31.10)	0.04 (0.65)	-1.17 * (-3.67)	0.83
dp_t	-0.00 (-1.28)	-0.02 (-1.29)	-0.01 (-0.64)	0.00 (0.95)	0.99 * (215.32)	0.06 (2.31)	0.99
$rshort_t$	-0.00 (-1.08)	-0.06 * (-3.38)	-0.09 * (-2.87)	0.01 (1.58)	-0.00 (-0.09)	0.87 * (21.12)	0.63

Notes: This table presents estimates from a vector autoregression (VAR) with lag length of one month of the following variables: the excess return on the US stock market (rx), the short-term real interest rate (rr), changes in the nominal short-term rate (Δi), the spread between yields on long-term bonds and a short-rate (yield spread, ys), the log dividend-price ratio (dp) and the short-rate relative to a one-year moving average (relative short-rate, $rshort$). Panel A gives the estimates for the sample period from January 1975 to July 2013 Panel B gives the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 while the estimates reported in panel C are based on the sample period ending in December 2006. Newey-West corrected t-statistics appear below the estimates in parenthesis. The measure of fit, R^2 , is corrected for the number of regressors.

Table 3: Stock excess return news:**variance decomposition with correlated components**

	Jan 1975 – July 2013		Jan 1975 – Dec 2008		Jan 1975 – Dec 2006	
	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>
Var(NCF)	1.04	0.23	1.17	0.18	1.01	0.21
(95% CI)	(0.77,1.40)	(0.18,0.31)	(0.87,1.60)	(0.13,0.25)	(0.73,1.44)	(0.16,0.29)
Var(NRR)	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
(95% CI)	(0.01,0.01)	(0.01,0.02)	(0.01,0.01)	(0.01,0.01)	(0.01,0.01)	(0.01,0.02)
Var(NRX)	0.20	0.22	0.18	0.32	0.22	0.28
(95% CI)	(0.15,0.27)	(0.17,0.29)	(0.13,0.24)	(0.24,0.43)	(0.16,0.30)	(0.21,0.38)
-2*Cov(NCF,NRR)	-0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02
(95% CI)	(-0.04,0.01)	(0.04,0.07)	(-0.05,0.00)	(0.01,0.03)	(-0.02,0.03)	(0.01,0.04)
-2*Cov(NCF,NRX)	-0.17	0.40	-0.28	0.41	-0.17	0.42
(95% CI)	(-0.26,-0.08)	(0.32,0.49)	(-0.37,-0.18)	(0.33,0.52)	(-0.29,-0.05)	(0.34,0.50)
2*Cov(NRR,NRX)	-0.07	0.07	-0.06	0.06	-0.07	0.05
(95% CI)	(-0.08,-0.05)	(0.06,0.09)	(-0.07,-0.05)	(0.04,0.07)	(-0.08,-0.05)	(0.04,0.07)

Notes: This table gives the variance decomposition of unexpected excess returns on the Swiss and US stock market into variances and covariances of the three news components: News about cash-flows, real interest rates and future excess returns. These statistics are normalized by the variance of the total stock market return news such that they sum to one. In addition, the table gives the 95% confidence interval of the statistics after 1000 bootstrap simulations. The left panel gives the results for the baseline sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. The middle panel provides the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 and finally the right panel gives the results for the sample period ending in December 2006.

Table 4: Bond excess return news:**variance decomposition with correlated components**

	Jan 1975 – July 2013		Jan 1975 – Dec 2008		Jan 1975 – Dec 2006	
	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>CH</u>	<u>US</u>
Var(NBCF)	1.08	0.19	1.76	0.06	1.73	0.02
(95% CI)	(0.58,1.88)	(0.09,0.39)	(1.19,2.79)	(0.03,0.09)	(1.14,2.63)	(0.02,0.04)
Var(NBRR)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
(95% CI)	(0.00,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)
Var(NBRX)	0.20	0.68	0.93	0.83	0.90	0.92
(95% CI)	(0.13,0.32)	(0.43,1.10)	(0.63,1.43)	(0.50,1.32)	(0.62,1.35)	(0.55,1.06)
2*Cov(NBCF,NBRR)	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.01
(95% CI)	(-0.01,-0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(-0.02,-0.01)	(0.00,0.00)	(-0.01,-0.01)	(-0.01,-0.01)
2*Cov(NBCF,NBRX)	-0.28	0.13	-1.68	0.12	-1.63	0.06
(95% CI)	(-0.43,-0.15)	(0.06,0.22)	(-2.11,-1.28)	(0.06,0.20)	(-2.05,-1.22)	(0.02,0.11)
2*Cov(NBRR,NBRX)	0.00	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.00	-0.00
(95% CI)	(-0.00,0.00)	(-0.01,-0.00)	(0.00,0.01)	(-0.01,0.00)	(0.00,0.00)	(-0.01,-0.00)

Notes: This table gives the variance decomposition of unexpected excess returns on the Swiss bond market into variances and covariances of the three components: News about cash-flows, real interest rates and future excess returns. These statistics are normalized by the variance of the total stock market return news such that they sum to one. In addition, the table gives the 95% confidence interval of the statistics after 1000 bootstrap simulations. The left panel gives the results for the baseline sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. The middle panel provides the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 and finally the right panel gives the results for the sample period ending in December 2006.

Table 5: Correlations of Swiss stock and bond excess return components

Panel A: Baseline sample period January 1975 to July 2013						
	Stock	Stock	Stock	Bond	Bond	Bond
	(cash-flow)	(risk premium)	(real rate)	(cash-flow)	(risk premium)	(real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	0.19	0.07	-0.03	0.54	0.05
		(0.10,0.27)	(-0.02,0.16)	(-0.12,0.06)	(0.48,0.60)	(-0.04,0.14)
Stock (risk premium)		1	-0.85	0.47	-0.12	-0.94
			(-0.87,-0.82)	(0.40,0.54)	(-0.21,-0.03)	(-0.95,-0.93)
Stock (real rate)			1	-0.46	0.08	0.91
				(-0.53,-0.39)	(-0.01,0.17)	(0.90,0.93)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	-0.30	-0.48
					(-0.38,-0.21)	(-0.55,-0.40)
Bond (risk premium)					1	0.12
						(0.03,0.21)
Bond (real rate)						1

Panel B: Restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2008						
	Stock	Stock	Stock	Bond	Bond	Bond
	(cash-flow)	(risk premium)	(real rate)	(cash-flow)	(risk premium)	(real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	0.30	0.12	-0.31	0.67	0.09
		(0.21,0.39)	(0.02,0.21)	(-0.40,-0.22)	(0.61,0.72)	(-0.01,0.18)
Stock (risk premium)		1	-0.79	0.51	-0.07	-0.91
			(-0.82,-0.75)	(0.43,0.58)	(-0.17,0.02)	(-0.92,-0.89)
Stock (real rate)			1	-0.62	0.30	0.91
				(-0.67,-0.55)	(0.21,0.38)	(0.89,0.92)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	-0.66	-0.66
					(-0.71,-0.60)	(-0.71,-0.60)
Bond (risk premium)					1	0.35
						(0.26,0.43)
Bond (real rate)						1

Table 5 continued

Panel C: Restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2006

	Stock (cash-flow)	Stock (risk premium)	Stock (real rate)	Bond (cash-flow)	Bond (risk premium)	Bond (real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	0.18 (0.08,0.27)	-0.02 (-0.12,0.08)	-0.26 (-0.35,-0.16)	0.60 (0.54,0.66)	-0.06 (-0.16,0.04)
Stock (risk premium)		1	-0.84 (-0.87,-0.81)	0.62 (0.55,0.68)	-0.30 (-0.38,-0.20)	-0.95 (-0.96,-0.94)
Stock (real rate)			1	-0.58 (-0.64,-0.50)	0.19 (0.09,0.28)	0.90 (0.88,0.92)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	-0.65 (-0.70,-0.59)	-0.61 (-0.67,-0.55)
Bond (risk premium)					1	0.23 (0.14,0.33)
Bond (real rate)						1

Notes: This table presents correlation coefficients between cash-flow, real interest rate and excess return news components of Swiss stock and bond excess returns obtained from a VAR with a one month lag. Below the correlation coefficients in parenthesis are the 95% confidence intervals of the statistics obtained from bootstrap simulations. Panel A gives the correlation coefficients for the sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. Panel B provides the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 and finally panel C gives the results for the sample period ending in December 2006.

Table 6: Correlations of US stock and bond excess return components

Panel A: Baseline sample period January 1975 to July 2013						
	Stock (cash-flow)	Stock (risk premium)	Stock (real rate)	Bond (cash-flow)	Bond (risk premium)	Bond (real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	-0.88 (-0.90,-0.85)	-0.44 (-0.51,-0.36)	-0.30 (-0.38,-0.21)	0.02 (-0.07,0.11)	-0.48 (-0.55,-0.41)
Stock (risk premium)		1	0.62 (0.56,0.68)	0.28 (0.20,0.36)	-0.20 (-0.28,-0.11)	0.68 (0.63,0.73)
Stock (real rate)			1	0.14 (0.05,0.23)	-0.34 (-0.41,-0.25)	0.97 (0.97,0.98)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	0.18 (0.09,0.27)	0.21 (0.12,0.30)
Bond (risk premium)					1	-0.34 (-0.42,-0.26)
Bond (real rate)						1
Panel B: Restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2008						
	Stock (cash-flow)	Stock (risk premium)	Stock (real rate)	Bond (cash-flow)	Bond (risk premium)	Bond (real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	-0.86 (-0.88,-0.83)	-0.21 (-0.30,-0.11)	-0.45 (-0.52,-0.37)	-0.04 (-0.14,0.05)	-0.28 (-0.36,-0.18)
Stock (risk premium)		1	0.49 (0.41,0.56)	0.50 (0.42,0.57)	-0.14 (-0.24,-0.05)	0.54 (0.47,0.61)
Stock (real rate)			1	0.19 (0.10,0.28)	-0.34 (-0.42,-0.25)	0.96 (0.95,0.96)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	0.28 (0.19,0.36)	0.36 (0.27,0.44)
Bond (risk premium)					1	-0.36 (-0.44,-0.27)
Bond (real rate)						1

Table 6 continued


Panel C: Restricted sample period January 1975 to December 2006

	Stock (cash-flow)	Stock (risk premium)	Stock (real rate)	Bond (cash-flow)	Bond (risk premium)	Bond (real rate)
Stock (cash-flow)	1	-0.87 (-0.89,-0.84)	-0.23 (-0.33,-0.14)	-0.10 (-0.20,-0.00)	-0.21 (-0.31,-0.11)	-0.29 (-0.38,-0.19)
Stock (risk premium)		1	0.46 (0.38,0.54)	0.06 (-0.04,0.16)	-0.04 (-0.14,0.06)	0.48 (0.47,0.61)
Stock (real rate)			1	0.12 (0.02,0.22)	-0.31 (-0.40,-0.22)	0.96 (0.95,0.97)
Bond (cash-flow)				1	0.21 (0.12,0.31)	0.29 (0.20,0.38)
Bond (risk premium)					1	-0.35 (-0.43,-0.26)
Bond (real rate)						1

Notes: This table presents correlation coefficients between cash-flow, real interest rate and excess return news components of US stock and bond excess returns obtained from a VAR with a one month lag. Below the correlation coefficients in parenthesis are the 95% confidence intervals of the statistics obtained from bootstrap simulations. Panel A gives the correlation coefficients for the sample period from January 1975 to July 2013. Panel B provides the corresponding results for the sample period ending in December 2008 and finally panel C gives the results for the sample period ending in December 2006.

Figures

Figure 1: Time series of smoothed stock and bond excess return news.



Notes: This figure presents smoothed time series of stock (upper panel) and bond (lower panel) excess return news over the time period from February 1975 to July 2013. The news series are obtained from VAR estimates over that sample period. The smoothing follows Campbell et al. (2013) in smoothing with a trailing exponentially-weighted moving average. The smoothing of the news series (N) obeys $MA_t(N) = 0.08N_t + (1 - 0.08)MA_{t-1}(N)$. The blue line gives the Swiss news series. The red line depicts the US news series.


Recent SNB Working Papers

- | | | | |
|---------|---|---------|---|
| 2014-1 | Thomas Nitschka: The Good? The Bad? The Ugly? Which news drive (co)variation in Swiss and US bond and stock excess returns? | 2013-2 | Nicole Aregger, Martin Brown and Enzo Rossi: Transaction Taxes, Capital Gains Taxes and House Prices. |
| 2013-11 | Linda S. Goldberg and Christian Grisse: Time variation in asset price responses to macro announcements. | 2013-1 | Andreas Kettemann and Signe Krogstrup: Portfolio balance effects of the SNB's bond purchase program. |
| 2013-10 | Robert Oleschak and Thomas Nellen: Does SIC need a heart pacemaker? | 2012-16 | Katja Drechsel and Rolf Scheufele: Bottom-up or Direct? Forecasting German GDP in a Data-rich Environment. |
| 2013-9 | Gregor Bäurle and Elizabeth Steiner: How do individual sectors respond to macroeconomic shocks? A structural dynamic factor approach applied to Swiss data. | 2012-15 | Raphael A. Auer: What Drives Target2 Balances? Evidence From a Panel Analysis. |
| 2013-8 | Nikolay Markov and Thomas Nitschka: Estimating Taylor Rules for Switzerland: Evidence from 2000 to 2012. | 2012-14 | Raphael A. Auer and Raphael S. Schoenle: Market Structure and Exchange Rate Pass-Through. |
| 2013-7 | Victoria Galsband and Thomas Nitschka: Currency excess returns and global downside market risk. | 2012-13 | Andreas Kropf and Philip Sauré: Fixed Costs per Shipment. |
| 2013-6 | Elisabeth Beusch, Barbara Döbeli, Andreas Fischer and Pınar Yeşin: Merchanting and Current Account Balances | 2012-12 | Sébastien Kraenzlin and Thomas Nellen: Access policy and money market segmentation. |
| 2013-5 | Matthias Gubler and Matthias S. Hertweck: Commodity Price Shocks and the Business Cycle: Structural Evidence for the U.S. | 2012-11 | Raphael A. Auer, Thomas Chaney and Philip Sauré: Quality Pricing-to-Market. |
| 2013-4 | Christian Grisse and Thomas Nitschka: On financial risk and the safe haven characteristics of Swiss franc exchange rates. | 2012-10 | Thomas Nitschka: Global and country-specific business cycle risk in time-varying excess returns on asset markets. |
| 2013-3 | Simone Meier: Financial Globalization and Monetary Transmission. | 2012-9 | Bo E. Honoré, Daniel Kaufmann and Sarah Lein: Asymmetries in Price-Setting Behavior: New Microeconomic Evidence from Switzerland. |

From 2014, this publication series will be renamed *SNB Working Papers*.

All SNB Working Papers are available for download at: www.snb.ch, Research

Subscriptions or individual issues can be ordered at:
Swiss National Bank
Library
P.O. Box
CH-8022 Zurich
Phone: +41 44 631 32 84
Fax: +41 44 631 81 14
E-mail: library@snb.ch



SCHWEIZERISCHE NATIONALBANK
BANQUE NATIONALE SUISSE
BANCA NAZIONALE SVIZZERA
BANCA NAZIUNALA SVIZRA
SWISS NATIONAL BANK

