

Albina Unger

The Use of Risk Budgets in Portfolio Optimization



Springer Gabler

Albina Unger

The Use of Risk Budgets in Portfolio Optimization

With a foreword by Prof. Dr. Thorsten Poddig



Springer Gabler

Albina Unger
Friedrichsdorf, Germany

Dissertation University of Bremen, Germany, 2014

ISBN 978-3-658-07258-2

ISBN 978-3-658-07259-9 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-3-658-07259-9

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014949923

Springer Gabler

© Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden 2015

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law. The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer Gabler is a brand of Springer DE.

Springer DE is part of Springer Science+Business Media.

www.springer-gabler.de

The Use of Risk Budgets in Portfolio Optimization

Foreword

Today's active asset management is mainly based on the theory of portfolio selection, which was founded by H. Markowitz and J. Tobin in the 1950s. Since then, it was continuously developed. However, there arose quickly several points of criticism in practical applications. Practitioners complained about the results of the portfolio optimizations as unintuitive, since the resulting portfolio structures are usually characterized by high concentrations in a few assets. In addition, portfolio structures are very sensitive to minor changes in the input parameters, which are necessary for the portfolio optimization. While the use of this theory was accompanied by a degree of skepticism ever since, the course and outcome of the recent financial market crisis represented another significant drawback for the application of this theory. In the financial market crisis, both private and institutional investors suffered considerable losses in their portfolios, although they should be apparently well-diversified.

In the light of this practical experience, a 'new', highly propagandized investment approach emerged: Risk Parity or Equal Risk Contribution (ERC) portfolios. These are approaches to portfolio construction, which do not, or not primarily, take the return component into account, but are completely or mainly based on risk parameters. Albeit such approaches are not really new; the so-called minimum-variance portfolio, which is part of the classical theory of portfolio selection, accomplishes this since the beginning in a similar manner. In this respect, this leads consequently to the research question of this work: What aspects of the 'new' approaches are really 'new', what are they able to achieve? Or in other words: Are these approaches capable to accurately solve those problems, for which the classical models are discredited?

The present work deals with these issues. It analyzes the topic of risk-based asset allocations encompassing the theoretical, methodological and empirical point of view. In addition to common approaches in the investment industry, own extensions are presented and their quality is analyzed. The basic question is whether these approaches, including the developed extensions, denote a progress with respect to the classical theory and if so, what the difference exactly is. Whereas the achieved results are rich in detail and can hardly be summarized in a foreword, the basic result is anticipated. Despite some favorable results in individual cases, on the whole, a superiority of the risk-based budgeting portfolios cannot be ascertained. Overall, the risk budgeting models do not offer a real alternative to the well-known minimum-variance portfolio. Insofar, the currently in the investment practice propagandized approach seems more likely to be a ‘fad’ than a noticeable progress.

Prof. Dr. Thorsten Poddig

Preface

This PhD thesis contains the result of research undertaken at the Department of Finance of the University of Bremen under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Thorsten Poddig.

Many people have contributed to the success of the thesis, whom I would like to express my gratitude.

First of all, I thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Thorsten Poddig for his excellent support during the years of research. His constructive suggestions as well as the critical comments were essential for this work. I have learned a lot during the time of my doctoral studies and have developed professionally and personally. Therefore, for enabling the PhD study and for his granted support in all aspects, I am extremely grateful. Also a heartfelt thank you to Prof. Dr. Diethelm Würtz for his continued support during my dissertation. His valuable suggestions, the research stays in Zurich and not least the introduction to the software R, which has now become a passion, have also contributed to the success of this work.

I also thank my former colleagues for the friendly cooperation and the numerous valuable discussions. A special thanks goes to Geraldine Tchegho for her willingness for spontaneous discussions and the many funny moments. I will always have fond memories of our time together in the office. I also thank Petra Sebbes for the versatile support and the nice talks, which made the doctorate more enjoyable.

Special thanks go to my husband and family for their essential support and the sometimes necessary free space. Especially in difficult situations, my husband has always given me confidence and courage. Without his encouragement, patience, trust and love and without the support of my family, this work would not have been possible.

Albina Unger

List of Figures

1.1	Outline of Thesis	8
2.1	Efficient Frontier	21
2.2	Tangency Line	22
2.3	Utility Functions	29
2.4	Security Market Line	40
3.1	Value and Weighting Function under Prospect Theory	88
3.2	Weighting Function under Cumulative Prospect Theory	91
6.1	Outline of Empirical Studies	160
6.2	In-Sample and Out-of-Sample Periods	167
6.3	Bear Phases - European Fund	187
6.4	Relative Performance of Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Global Portfolio	199
6.5	Bull/Bear Phases - Global	211
6.6	Annualized Asset Means - Germany 1973	217
6.7	Annualized Standard Deviations - Germany 1973 . . .	218
6.8	Relative Performance of Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Germany 1973	222
6.9	Bull/Bear Phases - Germany 1973	237
6.10	Rolling Alpha - Global Portfolio	258
6.11	Rolling Regressions of the MV Portfolio - Global Portfolio	259
6.12	Rolling Alpha - Germany 1973	260
6.13	Rolling Regressions of the MV Portfolio - Germany 1973	261
7.1	Bayesian Change Point Method	337
7.2	SX5T Stability	338

7.3	Stability Portfolio Components	341
7.4	Binary Stability Portfolio Weights	345
7.5	Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm	350
7.6	Different Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm	359
A.1	Rolling Regressions (Global)	373
A.2	Rolling Regressions (Germany 1973)	378

List of Tables

4.1	MV Anomaly/Volatility-Return - Empirical Results	113
4.2	ERC Portfolio - Empirical Results	141
6.1	Notations of Portfolios	173
6.2	Notations of Indices - European Fund	174
6.3	Component Statistics - European Fund	174
6.4	Correlations of Indices - European Fund	175
6.5	Portfolio Statistics - European Fund	175
6.6	Performance per Calender Year - European Fund	176
6.7	Statistical Significance of Mean Differences - European Fund	177
6.8	Jensen's Alpha - European Fund	178
6.9	Analysis of Jensen's Alpha Regression - European Fund	179
6.10	Significance of Difference in Variances - European Fund	180
6.11	Risk Figures - European Fund	181
6.12	Risk Ratios - European Fund	181
6.13	Turnover and Trades - European Fund	182
6.14	Weight Allocations - European Fund	183
6.15	Risk Budget Allocations of the MV Portfolio - European Fund	184
6.16	Risk Budget Allocations of the sampleCOV Portfolio - European Fund	184
6.17	Bull/Bear Characteristics of Minimum Risk Portfolios - European Fund	188
6.18	Bull/Bear Characteristics of Risk Budgeting Portfolios - European Fund	188

6.19	Significance in Means in the Bull Period - European Fund	189
6.20	Significance in Means in the Bear Period - European Fund	190
6.21	Significance in Variances in the Bull Period - European Fund	190
6.22	Significance in Variances in the Bear Period - European Fund	191
6.23	Notations of Indices	192
6.24	Component Statistics - Global Portfolio	193
6.25	Correlation of the Indices - Global Portfolio	195
6.26	Portfolio Statistics - Global Portfolio	196
6.27	Performance per Calender Year - Global Portfolio . . .	198
6.28	Statistical Significance of Mean Differences - Global Portfolio	200
6.29	Jensen's Alpha - Global Portfolio	201
6.30	Analysis of Jensen's Alpha Regression - Global Portfolio	202
6.31	Significance of Difference in Variances - Global Portfolio	202
6.32	Risk Figures - Global Portfolio	203
6.33	Risk Ratios - Global Portfolio	204
6.34	Turnover and Trades - Global Portfolio	205
6.35	Weights Allocations - Global Portfolio	206
6.36	Risk Budget Allocations of the MV Portfolio - Global Portfolio	207
6.37	Risk Budget Allocations of the sampleCOV Portfolio - Global Portfolio	208
6.38	Bull and Bear Periods - Global Portfolio	209
6.39	Bull/Bear Characteristics of Minimum Risk Portfolios - Global Portfolio	210
6.40	Bull/Bear Characteristics of Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Global Portfolio	210
6.41	Significance in Means in the Bull Period - Global Portfolio	212
6.42	Significance in Means in the Bear Period - Global Portfolio	213
6.43	Significance in Variances in the Bull Period - Global Portfolio	213

6.44	Significance in Variances in the Bear Period - Global Portfolio	214
6.45	Correlations of Portfolio Returns - Global Portfolio	215
6.46	Main Performance Statistics - Germany 1973	219
6.47	Performance per 5 Calender Years - Germany1973	220
6.48	Statistical Significance of Mean Differences - Germany 1973	223
6.49	Jensen's Alpha - Germany 1973	224
6.50	Analysis of Jensen's Alpha Regression - Germany 1973	225
6.51	Significance of Difference in Variances - Germany 1973	225
6.52	Risk Figures - Germany 1973	226
6.53	Risk Ratios - Germany 1973	227
6.54	Turnover and Trades - Germany 1973	227
6.55	Weights Allocations - Germany 1973	230
6.56	Risk Budget Allocations of the MV Portfolio - Germany 1973	231
6.57	Risk Budget Allocations of the sampleCOV Portfolio - Germany 1973	232
6.58	Bull and Bear Periods - Germany 1973	233
6.59	Bull/Bear Germany1973 - Minimum Risk Portfolios	234
6.60	Bull/Bear Germany1973 - Risk Budgeting Portfolios	234
6.61	Significance in Means in the Bull Period - Germany 1973	236
6.62	Significance in Means in the Bear Period - Global Portfolio	237
6.63	Significance in Variances in the Bull Period - Germany 1973	238
6.64	Significance in Variances in the Bear Period - Germany 1973	238
6.65	Correlations of Portfolio Returns - Germany 1973	239
6.66	Overview of Regressions	245
6.67	Fama-French Global Factors - Statistics	247
6.68	Correlations of the Global Factor Returns	247
6.69	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - Global Portfolio	248
6.70	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Global Portfolio	248

6.71	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - Global Portfolio	249
6.72	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Global Portfolio	249
6.73	Fama-French German Factors (Artmann et al., 2012) - Statistics	251
6.74	Correlations of the German Factor Returns	251
6.75	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - Germany 1973 (Artmann et al., 2012)	252
6.76	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Germany 1973 (Artmann et al., 2012)	252
6.77	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - Germany 1973 (Artmann et al., 2012)	253
6.78	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Germany 1973 (Artmann et al., 2012)	254
6.79	Fama-French German Factors of Hanauer et al. (2013) - Statistics	255
6.80	Correlations of the German Factor Returns of Hanauer et al. (2013)	255
6.81	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - Germany 1973 Hanauer et al. (2013)	256
6.82	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - Germany 1973 Hanauer et al. (2013)	256
6.83	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - US Industry	262
6.84	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - US Industry	262
6.85	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - US Industry	263
6.86	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - US Industry	264
6.87	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - US MSCI	265
6.88	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - US MSCI	265

6.89	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - US MSCI	266
6.90	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - US MSCI	266
6.91	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German Industry (Artmann et al., 2012)	267
6.92	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German Industry (Artmann et al., 2012)	267
6.93	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German Industry (Artmann et al., 2012) .	268
6.94	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German Industry (Artmann et al., 2012) .	268
6.95	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German Industry (Hanauer et al., 2013) .	269
6.96	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German Industry (Hanauer et al., 2013) .	270
6.97	CAPM Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German MSCI (Artmann et al., 2012)	271
6.98	CAPM Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German MSCI (Artmann et al., 2012)	271
6.99	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German MSCI (Artmann et al., 2012) . . .	272
6.100	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German MSCI (Artmann et al., 2012) . . .	272
6.101	Fama-French Regression Results for the Minimum Risk Portfolios - German MSCI (Hanauer et al., 2013) . . .	273
6.102	Fama-French Regression Results for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios - German MSCI (Hanauer et al., 2013) . . .	273
6.103	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Minimum Risk Portfolios in the Simulation	283
6.104	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios in the Simulation	284
6.105	Standard Deviations of Minimum Risk Portfolio Weights in the Simulation	285

6.106	Standard Deviations of Risk Budgeting Portfolio Weights in the Simulation	285
6.107	Performance Statistics for the Simulation - Minimum Risk Portfolios	287
6.108	Performance Statistics for the Simulation - Risk Budgeting Portfolios	288
6.109	Performance Statistics for the Worst Case Simulation - Minimum Risk Portfolios	291
6.110	Performance Statistics for the Worst Case Simulation - Risk Budgeting Portfolios	292
6.111	True Means of the Assets in the Realistic Simulation .	293
6.112	True Correlations of the Assets in the Realistic Simulation	294
6.113	True Asset Weights of the Portfolios in the Realistic Simulation	294
6.114	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Minimum Risk Portfolios in the Realistic Simulation . . .	296
6.115	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Risk Budgeting Portfolios in the Realistic Simulation	297
6.116	Standard Deviations of the Minimum Risk Weights in the Realistic Simulation	297
6.117	Standard Deviations of the Risk Budgeting Weights in the Realistic Simulation	298
6.118	Performance Statistics for the Realistic Simulation - Minimum Risk Portfolios	298
6.119	Performance Statistics for the Realistic Simulation - Risk Budgeting Portfolios	299
6.120	Significance in Actual Means (μ actual) in the Realistic Simulation across the 10.000 Simulations	300
6.121	Performance Statistics for the Worst Case Simulation in the Realistic Simulation - Minimum Risk Portfolios	301
6.122	Performance Statistics for the Worst Case Simulation in the Realistic Simulation - Risk Budgeting Portfolios	302
6.123	Significance in Actual Means (μ actual) in the Worst Case of the Realistic Simulation	303

6.124	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Minimum Risk Portfolios in the Global Dataset	305
6.125	Minimum and Maximum Portfolio Weights for the Risk Budget Portfolios in the Global Dataset	305
6.126	Average Standard Deviations of Minimum Risk Portfolio Weights in the Empirical Dataset	306
6.127	Standard Deviations of Risk Budgeting Weights in the Empirical Dataset	306
6.128	Performance Statistics of the Minimum Risk Portfolios for the Global Dataset	307
6.129	Performance Statistics of the Risk Budgeting Portfolios for the Global Dataset	308
6.130	Significance in Actual Means (μ actual) in the Empirical Dataset	310
6.131	Annualized Returns, Annualized Volatilities and Correlations of the Assets in the Crisis Period	311
6.132	Performance Statistics of the Minimum Risk Portfolios in the Empirical Worst Case	312
6.133	Performance Statistics of the Risk Budgeting Portfolios in the Empirical Worst Case	313
6.134	Significance in Actual Means (μ actual) in the Empirical Worst Case	314
6.135	Performance Statistics of the Minimum Risk Portfolios in the Hypothetical Worst Case	315
6.136	Performance Statistics of the Risk Budgeting Portfolios in the Hypothetical Worst Case	316
6.137	Significance in Actual Means (μ actual) in the Hypothetical Worst Case	317
7.1	Notations of Portfolios with Simulated Returns	328
7.2	Main Statistics - sampleCVaR with Distributions	328
7.3	Differences in Mean Returns - sampleCVaR with Distributions	328
7.4	Main Statistics - sampleCOV with Distributions	329