Lu, Wenna; Copeland, Laurence S.; Xu, Yongdeng

Working Paper

The pricing of unexpected volatility in the currency market

Cardiff Economics Working Papers, No. E2021/16

Provided in Cooperation with:
Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University

Suggested Citation: Lu, Wenna; Copeland, Laurence S.; Xu, Yongdeng (2021) : The pricing of unexpected volatility in the currency market, Cardiff Economics Working Papers, No. E2021/16, Cardiff University, Cardiff Business School, Cardiff

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/250340

Cardiff Economics Working Papers

Working Paper No. E2021/16

The Pricing of Unexpected Volatility in the Currency Market

Wenna Lu, Laurence Copeland and Yongdeng Xu

July 2021

ISSN 1749-6010

Cardiff Business School
Cardiff University
Colum Drive
Cardiff CF10 3EU
United Kingdom
t: +44 (0)29 2087 4000
f: +44 (0)29 2087 4419
business.cardiff.ac.uk

The Pricing of Unexpected Volatility in the Currency Market

Wenna Lu[a], Laurence Copeland[b], Yongdeng Xu[c]

[a] Cardiff School of Management, Cardiff Metropolitan University, Llandaff Campus, Cardiff, CF5 2YB, United Kingdom. E-mail address: wlu@cardiffmet.com.

[b] Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, CF10 3EU, United Kingdom. E-mail address: laurence.copeland@gmail.com.

[c] Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, CF10 3EU, United Kingdom. E-mail address: xuy16@cardiff.ac.uk.

Abstract

Many recent papers have investigated the role played by volatility in determining the cross-section of currency returns. This paper employs two time-varying factor models: a threshold model and a Markov-switching model to price the excess returns from the currency carry trade. We show that the importance of volatility depends on whether the currency markets are unexpectedly volatile. Volatility innovations during relatively tranquil periods are largely unrewarded in the market, whereas during the volatile period, this risk, has a substantial impact on currency returns. The empirical results show that the two time-varying factor models fit the data better and generate a smaller pricing errors than the linear model, while the Markov-switching model outperforms the threshold factor models not only by generating lower pricing errors but also distinguishing two regimes endogenously and without any predetermined state variables.

Keywords: carry trade; asset pricing; trading strategies; currency portfolios; Markov-switching model

JEL classification: F3, G12, G15

1. Introduction

The carry trade anomaly that exploits the failure of uncovered interest rate parity (Cumby and Obstfeld 1981, Fama,1984) is a long-established fact among market professionals and has attracted a lot of attention in the academic literature in recent years. Fama (1984) suggested that the cause may be a time-varying risk premium, setting off a hunt for plausible factors. In recent years, attention has centred on the role of volatility as the key variable driving returns. In particular, Menkhoff et al. (2012) demonstrated that two factors accounted for a substantial proportion of carry trade returns: a so-called dollar factor acting as the equivalent of the market return in equity market research, and the volatility of exchange rates in general.

More recently, Copeland and Lu (2016) showed that returns to the carry trade depended on whether the currency markets were in a high- or low-volatility state. This indicates that the volatility risk is priced differently in high- and low-volatility states, suggesting an investigation of currency carry trades through the use of conditional factor models: Ang et al. (2006) and Lettau et al. (2014) proposed a model in which the factor loadings in the CAPM are made conditional on the state of the market, specifically whether returns are positive or negative. Atanasov and Nitschka (2014) and Dobrynskaya (2014) use conditional factor models in the currency carry trade context, while all three focus on downside stock market risk.

In this paper, we propose the volatility innovation factor as a new conditional risk factor to model the excess returns from the carry trade portfolios. The approach we take differs insofar as we start from the proposition that volatility innovation, not market return, is the factor that conditions attitudes to risk. In other words, we postulate that markets may well be more sensitive to increases in volatility when the markets are unexpectedly volatile (the volatility innovation is high), whereas when the markets are relatively tranquil, investors are likely to be less concerned about changes in volatility. This proposition is consistent with the extensive literature on asset pricing in crisis and downside risk factor model (e.g., Brunnermeier, Nagel et al., 2008; Farhi and Gabaix, 2008; Atanasov and Nitschka, 2014; Farago and Tédongap 2018).

Notably Farago and Tédongap (2018) argue that the volatility downside factor, as one of the three disappointment-related factors, plays an important role in pricing the

carry trade and other assets, an approach which is closely related to our models. However, our paper differs in several respects from Farago and Tédongap (2018). First and most importantly, we follow Menkhoff et al. (2012) and use the dollar factor as the currency market return and calculate the currency market volatility from daily currency returns, whereas Farago and Tédongap (2018) use the stock market return and volatility as a proxy for currency market return and volatility. Second, Farago and Tédongap (2018) define the downside risk when the stock market return is negative (or below a certain threshold), while we define downside risk (or "abnormal" state) when the currency market volatility is above a certain threshold. As a result, we find that only volatility in the "abnormal" (more volatile) state has explanatory power with respect to cross-sectional currency asset returns, while Farago and Tédongap (2018) show both volatility and downside volatility have explanatory power for currency asset return. This implies that investors only require compensation for taking volatility risk when the market is more volatile than expected. Third, in addition to the threshold model[1], we also propose a Markov-switching model, where the two states, "normal" or "abnormal", are determined endogenously by the data. The Markov-switching model allows the probability in the two states to be different for different portfolios, which is more flexible than the threshold model. Indeed, our results show that the threshold and Markov-switching factor models both outperform the linear factor model of Menkhoff et al. (2012). However, the Markov-switching factor model yields a smaller pricing error than the threshold factor model. Further, we also show that the probability of the "abnormal" state is positively and significantly correlated with high-volatility innovation, which is evidence of the intrinsic link between the threshold and the Markov-switching factor model.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the theoretical setup from which we derive the implied cross-sectional model. Section 3 is the data and empirical methods section. Section 4 contains the empirical analysis with several robustness checks. Section 5 includes more robustness checks and comparisons with results provided in the appendix. Section 6 concludes.

[1]Ang et al. (2006), Lettau et al. (2014), Atanasov and Nitschka (2014) and Dobrynskaya (2014) Farago and Tédongap (2018) all use threshold model to study the downside risk.

2. Theoretical motivation and testable implications

2.1 The ICAPM and the conditional ICAPM

In the setting of the Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model (ICAPM) (Merton1973, Merton 1980 and Chen 2002), apart from market returns, risk-averse investors also want to directly hedge against changes in future market volatility, thus the pricing kernel of the ICAPM takes the form of a two-factor SDF with the market excess return and volatility innovations as risk factors:

$$m_t = 1 - \beta_1 r_t^m - \beta_2 \Delta V_t \quad (1)$$

where r_t^m is the log market excess return at time *t* and ΔV_tdenotes volatility innovations at time *t*. The ICAPM has been found to outperform the traditional CAPM in both stock and exchange rate markets (Ang et al., 2006 and Menkhoff et al., 2012). Note that in the pricing kernel, rather than the level of volatility, it is the unexpected changes in volatility (volatility innovations) which appear as a pricing factor as volatility is usually highly serially autocorrelated. This is consistent with the empirical applications of this model for both stock and exchange rate markets, i.e. Ang et al. (2006) employ changes in the VIX index rather than the level of the VIX to price the cross sectional excess return from the stock market and Menkhoff et al. (2012) use the change in realized volatility to price the cross sectional excess return from the carry trade.

The pricing kernel of the ICAPM takes the form of a two-factor SDF with the market excess return and volatility innovations regardless of all possible different states. This is to assume that the pricing kernel is linear, i.e., the correlations between excess return and risk factors do not change significantly under different states. However, economists have long recognized that investors care differently about downside losses versus upside gains. (Ang et al.,2006). In our case, agents who place greater weight on volatility risk during volatile periods demand additional compensation for holding assets which comove negatively during market turmoil periods. To consider this, we release the assumption and propose an ICAPM model in which we have two different states and we allow the risks to be priced differently under different states. Such a model allows us to measure the changes in correlations between risk and return under different

states. We name it the conditional ICAPM to distinguish it from the unconditional ICAPM.

In the conditional ICAPM, we assume that there are two states: a "normal" state and an "abnormal" state and the *SDF* take the form in (1) only in the "normal" state. In the "abnormal" state, we replace (1) with the conditional *SDF*:

$$m_t = 1 - \beta_1^- r_t^m - \beta_2^- \Delta V_t \tag{2}$$

which implies that each factor loading can take either of two possible values, $\beta_1 = \frac{cov(r^i, r^m)}{var\ (r^m)}$ and $\beta_2 = \frac{cov(r^i, V)}{var\ (r^m)}$ in "normal" times, or $\beta_1^- = \frac{cov(r^i, r^m | abnormal\ state)}{var\ (r^m)}$ and $\beta_2^- = \frac{cov(r^i, V | abnormal\ state)}{var\ (r^m)}$ in "abnormal" times. This allows us to capture the possible changes in correlation in the "abnormal" state. According to Cochrane (2009), the expected return thus is:

$$E[r_t] = \beta_1\lambda_1 + (\beta_1^- - \beta_1)\lambda_1^- + \beta_2\lambda_2 + (\beta_2^- - \beta_2)\lambda_2^- \tag{3}$$

where $\beta_i \ \ i = 1,2$ are the loadings on the two factors in "normal" times, with associated risk prices $\lambda_i \ \ i = 1,2$ and $\beta_i^- \ \ i = 1,2$ are the loadings in "abnormal" times where $\lambda_i^- \ \ i = 1,2$ are the risk prices. In the event, we cannot reject the hypothesis that $\beta_i^- = \beta_i$ for both $i = 1,2$ the conditional ICAPM framework reduces to the unconditional ICAPM framework $E[r_t] = \beta_1\lambda_1 + \beta_2\lambda_2$.

An "abnormal" state is defined as a state when the correlation between risks and returns are significantly different from that in a "normal" state. The intuition is that in such states, investors care differently about risks and hence price them differently. This is inspired by the conditional-CAPM of Ang et al. (2006), and in their model the market return is the only risk factor and thus the "abnormal" state is defined as when the market return is negative. In our conditional-ICAPM, although both market return and market volatility innovation are risk factors, we emphasize the role of volatility and thus the "abnormal" state is defined as when the volatility innovation is higher than a threshold[2]. By doing so, we build a threshold conditional ICAPM. We then release this restriction

[2] The correlations between return and market return risk factor do not change significantly when the "abnormal state" is defined in this way.

and construct a Markov-switching ICAPM, where the "abnormal state" is determined endogenously by the dataset without any pre-determined state variables and threshold. Within a Markov-switching framework, we can also test if the "abnormal state" is determined by market return, volatility innovation, or any other state variables.

2.2 The threshold regime-switching conditional ICAPM implication

In the threshold conditional ICAPM, we assume that the volatility innovation is the state variable. In the event, we cannot reject the hypothesis $\beta_1^- = \beta_1$, in other words that the loadings of the first factor are insignificantly affected by the level of volatility innovations, so imposing this restriction in equation (3), we work with the equation:

$$E\left[r_t^i\right] = \beta_1\lambda_1 + \beta_2\lambda_2 + (\beta_2^- - \beta_2)\lambda_2^- \tag{4}$$

Our econometric approach follows the standard Fama-Macbeth 2-stage procedure[3], starting from time-series estimation of the factor loadings, which are then used as explanatory variables in cross-sectional regressions.

In the first stage, we estimate the time series:

$$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it} \tag{5}$$

on each portfolio $i = 1 \dots 6$ [4], for the whole sample $t = 1,2,\dots,T$, and for $t = 1,2,\dots,T^-$ that is whenever volatility innovation is above a certain threshold[5]:

$$r_t^i = a_i^- + b_{1i}^- DOL_t + b_{2i}^- \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it} \tag{6}$$

In the second stage, we estimate the cross-section:

$$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + \left(\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i}\right)\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i \tag{7}$$

[3] GMM could be used as an alternative estimator to the Fama-Macbeth 2-stage procedure, and the two estimators lead to consistent results as shown in Copeland and Lu (2016). Note that GMM could be used in the threshold model, but not in the Markov-switching model.

[4] The portfolios are defined in the following data section.

[5] The threshold is defined in the empirical results section.

where $\bar{r}^i$ is the average return for portfolio i. $\hat{b}_{1i}$, $\hat{b}_{1i}^-$, $\hat{b}_{2i}$ and $\hat{b}_{2i}^-$ are the point estimates from the first stage. The market risk price λ_1 is restricted to be equal to the sample average of the market excess return as the market has a unit loading of market risk and therefore the risk price is equal to the average of the market return. From the second stage estimation, we can get the volatility risk price λ_2 and the additional volatility risk price λ_2^- for the high volatility state.

2.3 The Markov regime-switching conditional ICAPM implication

The threshold model assumes the volatility innovation to be a state variable, which determines if the state is "abnormal" or not. However, the probability of being in an "abnormal state" at any time can either be indicated by market return (Ang et al. 2006, Farago and Tédongap 2018), or volatility innovation (Copeland and Lu 2016), or other state variables. The choice of the state variable, volatility innovation, and the threshold is arbitrary in this model. Although a lot of literature has been arguing that there is a nonlinear relationship between carry trade returns and volatility innovation, that "carry trades go up by the stairs and down by the elevator", it is still not clear which variable(s) is (are) driving the process. To solve this problem, we go on to fit a Markov-switching model to price the returns of the carry trade, which has the advantage that it allows us to estimate the regression with data-determined unobservable state variables. We can also investigate the determinants of the regime probabilities on a selection of related variables that potentially influence the carry trade returns nonlinearly.

The first stage estimation of a Markov-switching model of the ICAPM is shown in eq. 8 below on each portfolio $i = 1 \dots 6$ and for $t = 1,2, \dots, T$.

$$r_t^i = a_i(s_t) + b_{1i}(s_t)DOL_t + b_{2i}(s_t)\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it} \qquad \epsilon_{it} \sim iidN(0, \sigma^2) \tag{8}$$

where s_t is the states (or regimes, s_t=1 or $s_t = 2$) and each state will have distinct values for each of the three parameters, where the first state (s_t=1) is the "abnormal" state and the second (s_t=2) the "normal" state. We expect the loading of volatility innovation b_{2i} to be noticeably greater in absolute terms in the first regime ($s_t = 1$) and relatively smaller in absolute terms, in the second regime ($s_t = 2$). As for the constant term a_i and the loadings of market risk b_{1i} we expect them not to be significantly different between the first regime and the second regime.

The Markov-switching model is then estimated by maximizing the likelihood function as discussed in Hamilton (1994). From the model estimations, we generate the ex-ante probability $p_{1,t} = \Pr(s_t = 1|I_{t-1})$, i.e. the probability of being in the first regime at the time t given the information at time *t-1*.

Note that the two states are identically defined in the model specification. The only way to distinguish the two states is the inputs of the initial parameters in the maximum likelihood estimation. Specifically, the first-state initial parameters $\{\beta_1(s_t = 1), \beta_2(s_t = 1), \sigma^2(s_t = 1)\}$ are taken from the conditional SDF estimates from the periods where volatilities are above the threshold. The second-state initial parameters $\{\beta_1(s_t = 2), \beta_2(s_t = 2), \sigma^2(s_t = 2)\}$ are likewise taken from the unconditional SDF estimates for the periods where volatilities are below the threshold. By doing so, we expect the first state to be the "abnormal" (high volatility) state and the second state to be the "normal" (low volatility) state.

The Markov-switching ICAPM shares the same second stage estimation with the threshold ICAPM model. Similarly, we make use of the high-volatility state estimates in the second-stage estimation.

3. Data

The data covers the period from November 1983 to January 2017, at a monthly frequency. As in Copeland and Lu (2016), our sample consists of the 29 OECD countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Euro Area, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom and the United States.

Following Menkhoff et al. (2012), we take the US dollar as domestic currency and other currencies as foreign currencies. We compute excess returns from the carry trade using the forward premium, on the assumption that covered interest rate parity holds at all times. Hence, we define the (excess) return to the carry trade, rx_{t+1} for the currency (other than the US dollar) as follows:

$$rx_{t+1} = (i_t^* - i_t) - (s_{t+1} - s_t) = (f_t - s_t) - (s_{t+1} - s_t) = f_t - s_{t+1} \qquad (9)$$

where i_t is the one-period risk-free interest rate for US dollar and i_t^* is the one-period risk-free interest rate for foreign currency, and s_t and f_t are logs of the spot and forward exchange rates in foreign currency per unit of the US dollar.

The spot and forward exchange rates are end of month mid-rates obtained from BBI and Reuters (via DataStream). Our spot and forward exchange rates against the US dollar are closing mid-rates. The excess return is calculated by taking the difference between the 1-month forward rate at *t* and the spot rate at *t+1*.

We sort currencies into 6 portfolios according to their risk-free interest rates differentials with US risk-free interest rate, which are equivalent to 1-month forward discounts, providing covered interest rate parity holds. After the sorting, portfolio 1 contains currencies with the lowest interest rate while Portfolio 6 contains currencies with the highest interest rate. For each portfolio, currencies are equally weighted. Portfolios are rebalanced at the beginning of each month. The monthly rebalancing ensures that the portfolios resemble carry trade portfolios, the composition of which changes over time as the forward discounts change.

Descriptive statistics are given in Table 1. As can be seen from Table 1, the excess return on a long position in the highest-carry currencies combined with a short position in the lowest yielded an excess return of 6.65% and a Sharpe Ratio of 0.72, albeit with negative skewness.

Monthly FX market return ($\mathrm{DOL_t}$) is defined as the average return of all portfolios. It is also considered as the dollar risk factor as it is measuring the risk of borrowing one dollar and investing equally weighted in the other 29 currencies.

Monthly exchange rate volatility is defined as in Menkhoff et al. (2012):

$$V_t = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{\tau \in T_t}\left[\sum_{k \in K_\tau} \frac{|\Delta s_\tau^k|}{K_\tau}\right]$$

where K_τ is the number of currencies for which data are available on day τ and there are T_t days in month t. We concentrate on the unexpected change in monthly volatility as Chen (2002) argues that it is the unexpected change[6] in future market volatility rather than the level of volatility itself that risk-averse investors want to hedge and this idea is

[6] Following Menkhoff et al. (2012), we also use the AR (1) residual (the volatility innovation) rather than the first difference to measure unexpected volatility change as volatility is found to have an AR (1) coefficient of 0.65.

empirically supported by Ang et al. (2006) in the stock market and by Menkhoff et al. (2012) in the currency market.

We also consider another sample: a bigger 48-country sample, which was used in Menkhoff et al. (2012), as a robustness check. The details are reported in appendix A4.

4. Empirical Results

4.1 The threshold ICAPM Results

In the setting of the threshold conditional ICAPM, we assume that the volatility innovation is the state variable and in periods when the volatility innovation exceeds the threshold of one standard deviation above the mean (zero) $\Delta V_t > \sigma_{\Delta V}$[7].

Table 2 shows the results of the 1st-stage regressions for the full sample of 399 months (Panel A) and for the 49 high-volatility months (Panel B). All the estimates in both panels are significantly different from zero. The first thing to note is that, in both panels, while the loadings for the dollar (market) factor are all very close to 1.0, the loadings on volatility are diminishing from lowest- (#1) to highest-carry portfolios (#6).

Secondly and most importantly, if we compare the two panels, we can see that the betas for volatility innovation are noticeably greater in absolute terms in the high-volatility state, providing support for the superiority of the conditional over the unconditional model. Indeed, the difference is most marked at the two extremes - portfolios #1 and #6, hinting at a possible nonlinearity which we do not investigate here. In Figure 1, we plot the volatility risk loading β_2 against the realized mean excess returns of 6 portfolios for the unconditional and conditional model in Panel A and B respectively. Clearly, the conditional model in Panel B fits the data better.

The results for the second-stage cross-section regressions are given in Table 3, which provides the risk price for each risk factor. We present the results from the unconditional-ICAPM model in Panel A as a benchmark. Comparing the results in Panel A and Panel B, it is clear that the incremental volatility pricing makes an important contribution to explaining the return. Its coefficient is negative and significantly different from zero, and its inclusion makes the volatility factor price λ_2 insignificant. Note also that the equation adjusted R^2 raises from 0.83 to 0.93, very high

[7] Copeland and Lu (2016) used 75th percentile of volatility innovation as threshold, which is very close to the threshold we defined here.

in the context of monthly currency returns. Figure 2 illustrates graphically the superior fit of the conditional over the unconditional ICAPM for our portfolios.

We also reduce our model to contain only the market risk factor and the extra volatility risk factor (Panel C) and we find that the model provides an even better fit. This suggests that it is the volatility risk during the unexpected volatile period that requires compensation. The excess return of the currency carry trade is mainly compensation for bearing volatility risk during the most volatile periods.

4.2 Markov Switching ICAPM Results

In the previous section, the conditional ICAPM setting can price the carry trade returns better than the unconditional ICAPM. However, the choice of the state variable, volatility innovation, and the threshold is arbitrary. In this session, we employ a Markov-switching model to price the returns of the carry trade, which has the advantage that it allows us to estimate the regression with data-determined unobservable state variables. We can then investigate the determinants of the regime probabilities on a selection of related variables that potentially influence the carry trade returns nonlinearly.

Table 4 shows the results of the 1st-stage regressions for the full sample of 399 months (Panel A) and for the Markov-switching model as in equation (8) (Panel B). Again, all the estimates in both panels are significantly different from zero and the loadings for the market factor are all very close to 1.0, the loadings on volatility are diminishing from lowest- (#1) to highest-carry portfolios (#6).

If we compare the two panels, we can see that the betas for volatility innovation are noticeably greater in absolute terms in the "abnormal" regime, providing support for the superiority of the conditional over the unconditional model. Indeed, the difference is most marked at the two extremes - portfolios #1 and #6.

In Figure 2 Panels A and B, we plot the fitted mean excess returns from 6 portfolios against the realized mean excess returns of the 6 portfolios for all three models. The distance from the points to the 45-degree line shows absolute pricing errors of the model. The conditional models (Threshold ICAPM and Markov-switch ICAPM) outperform the unconditional benchmark model by providing smaller pricing errors. In Panels C and D, we compare the conditional models with different factors – the full three-factor (estimated DOL, VOL and extra VOL) model and the significant two-factor (DOL, and

extra VOL) model. The latter is found to outperform the former and again this finding is consistent with the argument that it is the volatility risk during the unexpected volatile period that requires compensating. Again, we see that the excess return of the currency carry trade is for the most part compensation for bearing volatility risk during the "abnormal" periods.

The results for the second-stage cross-section regressions are given in Table 5, which provides the risk price for each risk factor. Comparing the results in Table 2 Panel A and Panel B, it is clear that the incremental volatility pricing makes an important contribution to explaining the return. Its coefficient is negative and significantly different from zero, and its inclusion makes the volatility factor price λ_2 insignificant. Note also that the equation adjusted R^2 raises from 0.83 to 0.93 in Panel A and even 0.94, when we drop the insignificant factor in Panel B, which is again very high in the context of monthly currency returns. The Markov-switching model provides a better fit and smaller pricing error, confirming the existence of the non-linear relationship between unexpected volatility and the carry trade returns.

4.3 Determinants of "abnormal" regime probabilities

How is the "abnormal" regime probability determined? What is the relationship between the "abnormal" regime and the state variable that has been chosen in the threshold model? To answer these questions, we regress the ex-ante probability $p_{1,t}$ on its lag and a set of possible state variables which were in the threshold models: the volatility innovation, currency market return (DOL), high-minus-low carry return (*HML)*, stock market return and FX-market skewness.

The state variables are defined as the following:

HML_t: is the high minus low currency portfolio return from Lustig et al. (2011) - a proxy for the slope factor from the second principal component.

$Skew_t$: is the skewness of currency market return. We use the same measure as Rafferty (2012) to proxy the global FX skewness. As argued by Rafferty (2012), differences in exposure to the global currency skewness risk factor can explain the systematic variation in average excess currency returns within the carry trade portfolios, the momentum portfolios and portfolios sorted based on the deviation from the PPP

implied exchange rates. The high-interest rate currency portfolio and the carry trade portfolio are more negatively skewed indicating crash risk as argued by Brunnermeier et al. (2008).

SMR_t: is the global stock market return which is computed using the S&P500 index. We also use this factor from the stock market as a robustness check as the two markets are highly correlated and factors in the stock market are used in pricing the excess return from the currency market. (Dobrynskaya, 2014; Farago and Tédongap, 2018).

The ex-ante probability $p_{1,t} = \Pr(s_t = 1|I_{t-1})$, i.e., the probability of being in the first regime (the "abnormal" regime) at the time *t* given the information at time *t-1*, can be obtained after Markov-switching estimation[8].

Figure 3 plots the regime probabilities of being in the first regime (the "abnormal" regime) at time *t* given the information at time *t-1* for each portfolio. The regime probabilities are found to be highly persistent and different across different portfolios. This is, as we mentioned earlier, another advantage of using the Markov-switching model as it allows heterogeneity among different portfolios so we have fewer restrictions to our conditional model compared with the threshold model.

Then we regress the ex-ante probability $p_{1,t}$ on its lag and a set of possible state variables:

$$p_{1,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_{1,t-1} + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t \tag{10}$$

where $p_{1,t-1}$ is the lag of the ex-ante probability, and X_t is the possible state variable.

Table 6 provides estimation results for the determinants of the regime probabilities. We report the results for portfolios 1 and 6. The coefficient for the lagged dependent variable is positive and close to one which is not surprising considering the regime probabilities are highly persistent.

As per expectation, the volatility-innovation coefficient is positive and significant, suggesting that a high unexpected volatility period is associated with a high probability of being in the "abnormal" regime in this period. This is consistent with the findings of

[8] See the derivation of the ex-ante probabilities $p_{1,t}$ in Appendix A1.

Kim (2015) where a low volatility regime is more conducive to UIP, and Cenedese, et al. (2014) who report that larger future losses for carry trade positions are associated with high foreign exchange volatility. The results from this regression also link the threshold- and Markov-switching factor model we used, showing that the time-varying property of the ICAPM is driven by the nonlinearity of market volatility.

Notably, Dobrynskaya (2014) and Farago & Tédongap (2018) used global stock market return as a state variable in their threshold models for carry trade returns. From table 6, we can see the stock market return coefficients are insignificant, which suggests that the probabilities of being in an "abnormal" state for portfolios 1 and 6 are not explained by the global stock market return. Other state variables, HML and FX market skewness, are also found insignificant for probabilities of being in "abnormal" states.

Overall, the probabilities of being in an "abnormal" state for portfolios 1 and 6 are more likely to be explained by the carry trade volatility innovation, but not by global stock market return.

4.4 Robustness Check

As robustness checks, we re-estimate our two models using different thresholds and a wider sample of currencies. We also compare our results with existent literature. Our results are found to be consistent.

Different thresholds

We run a robustness check by choosing different thresholds, defining the 75-percentile point and the 90-percentile point as the boundaries for the high unexpected -volatility period and run the 2-stage Fama-Macbeth regression as in Section 4. The results are reported in Appendix A2 and A3, and they are found to be consistent with the threshold we use in the body of the paper.

Different samples

We run another robustness check by choosing a larger sample of 48 countries. We use the same 48 countries as in Menkhoff et al. (2012) from November 1983 to January 2017. Six currency portfolios are sorted and the portfolios are adjusted every month. The threshold and Markov-switching ICAMP are estimated. The results are reported in Appendix A4 and are found to be consistent with our 29 countries sample.

5. Conclusion

As far as currency market behaviour is concerned, the evidence presented in this paper suggests that investors are more concerned with volatility in states when it is unexpectedly high than when it is low, and that these concerns are reflected in the difference in risk premia in the two states. In modelling terms, the implication is that the conditional ICAPM which takes account of this effect fits the facts better than the unconditional ICAPM and that ignoring this conditioning gives misleading results. The most likely behavioural explanation is that our results are a consequence of the sort of patterns observed in the large empirical literature documenting nonlinear adjustment in the exchange rate process (see for example Michael, Nobay and Peel, 1997 and Taylor, Peel and Sarno, 2001). If there is a band of low-amplitude fluctuations around the long-run equilibrium exchange rate, investors may well be quite relaxed about changes in the level of volatility ("noise") within this zone, especially if in this region transaction costs are relatively high compared to the returns to currency trading (Dumas, 1992). It should be noted in this regard that Copeland and Lu (2016) showed that results of estimating the threshold model were largely unaffected by the introduction of bid-ask spreads.

Overall, our contribution can be seen as a partial resolution of the uncovered interest rate puzzle. Knowledge gained from this investigation is useful for all types of participants in the carry trade, including in particular those traders who rely on estimates of day-to-day crash risk probabilities to implement an appropriate currency hedge.

References

Ang A, Chen J and Xing Y (2006) Downside risk, Review of Financial Studies 19(4): 1191-1239

Ang, A., Hodrick, R.J., Xing, Y. and Zhang, X. (2006). The cross-section of volatility and expected returns. The Journal of Finance, 61(1), pp.259-299.

Atanasov, V. and Nitschka, T. (2014). Currency excess returns and global downside market risk. Journal of International Money and Finance, 47, pp.268-285.

Barro R J (2006) Rare Disasters and Asset Markets in the Twentieth Century, Quarterly Journal of Economics, August, 823-866

Brunnermeier, M, Nagel, S and Pedersen, L (2008) Carry trades and currency crashes, NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2008 23, 313-347

Cenedese, G., Sarno, L. and Tsiakas, I. (2014). Foreign exchange risk and the predictability of carry trade returns. Journal of Banking & Finance, 42, pp.302-313.

Chen, J. (2002) Intertemporal CAPM and the cross-section of stock returns. EFA 2002 Berlin Meetings Discussion Paper.

Christiansen, C., Ranaldo, A., & Söderlind, P. (2011). The time-varying systematic risk of carry trade strategies. Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, 46(4), 1107-1125.

Cochrane, J. H. (2009). Asset pricing: Revised edition. Princeton university press.

Copeland, L S and Lu, W (2016) Dodging the Steamroller: Fundamentals versus the Carry Trade, Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money 42, 115-31

Dobrynskaya, V. (2014). Downside market risk of carry trades. Review of Finance, 18(5), 1885-1913

Dumas, B. (1992) Dynamic equilibrium and the real exchange rate in a spatially separated world. Review of financial studies, 5(2), 153-180.

Fama, E F (1984) Forward and spot exchange rates, Journal of Monetary Economics 14(3): 319-338

Farago, A., & Tédongap, R. (2018). Downside risks and the cross-section of asset returns. Journal of Financial Economics, 129(1), 69-86.

Froot, K A and Frankel, J A (1989) Forward Discount Bias: Is It an Exchange Risk Premium? The Quarterly Journal of Economics, MIT Press, vol. 104(1), 139-61

Farhi E and Gabaix X (2016) Rare Disasters and Exchange Rates, Quarterly Journal of Economics 131(1): 1-52

Hamilton, J. D., & Susmel, R. (1994). Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity and changes in regime. Journal of Econometrics, 64(1-2), 307-333.

Kim, S. J. (2015). Australian dollar and Yen carry trade regimes and their determinants. University of Sydney, mimeo.

Lettau, M., Maggiori, M., & Weber, M. (2014). Conditional risk premia in currency markets and other asset classes. Journal of Financial Economics, 114(2), 197-225.

Lustig, H., Roussanov, N. and Verdelhan, A. (2011). Common risk factors in currency markets. The Review of Financial Studies, 24(11), 3731-3777.

Menkhoff, L., Sarno, L, Schmeling, M and Schrimpf, A (2012) Carry trades and global foreign exchange volatility, Journal of Finance 67(2): 681-718

Michael P., Nobay A R. and Peel D.A. (1997) "Adjustment in Real Exchange Rates: An Empirical Investigation", Journal of Political Economy, 105 (4):862-79

Rafferty, B. (2012). Currency returns, skewness and crash risk. Skewness and Crash Risk (March 15, 2012).

Taylor M P, Peel D A and Sarno L (2001) Nonlinear mean-reversion in real exchange rates: towards a solution to the purchasing power parity puzzles, International Economic Review, 42, 1015—42

Table 1: Excess Returns from Currency Portfolios

Portfolio	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*DOL*	*HML*
Mean	-1.49	0.30	1.58	1.69	2.75	5.16	1.665	6.65
Std. Dev.	9.56	10.07	9.70	9.56	10.07	10.30	8.89	9.19
Skewness	0.08	-0.14	-0.08	-0.37	-0.78	-0.63	-0.33	-1.08
SR	-0.16	0.03	0.16	0.18	0.27	0.50	0.19	0.72

In this table, 29 currencies have been allocated into 6 portfolios according to the size of the forward discount against the dollar. Portfolios are adjusted monthly.

Table 2: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. For all observations (399-month)					Panel B. For observations when $\Delta V_t >$ **mean+1sd** (49-month)				
$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$					$r_t^i = a_i^- + b_{1i}^- DOL_t + b_{2i}^- \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				
PF	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	R^2	*PF*	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	R^2
1	-0.003	0.968	3.982	0.794	1	-0.017	1.062	11.873	0.894
	[0.001]	[0.044]	[1.052]			[0.004]	[0.065]	[2.099]	
2	-0.001	1.047	1.711	0.844	2	-0.006	1.078	3.953	0.912
	[0.001]	[0.041]	[0.638]			[0.004]	[0.064]	[2.099]	
3	-0.000	1.038	1.706	0.893	3	-0.001	1.020	1.987	0.928
	[0.001]	[0.024]	[0.559]			[0.003]	[0.054]	[1.940]	
4	0.000	0.999	-1.337	0.876	4	-0.005	1.035	0.851	0.944
	[0.000]	[0.028]	[0.608]			[0.003]	[0.050]	[2.165]	
5	0.001	1.016	-2.726	0.835	5	0.010	0.948	-8.022	0.889
	[0.001]	[0.045]	[0.920]			[0.005]	[0.060]	[3.109]	
6	0.003	0.932	-3.336	0.682	6	0.022	0.874	-12.22	0.787
	[0.001]	[0.047]	[1.035]			[0.005]	[0.075]	[2.710]	

This table reports the results from the 1st stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the five carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations are beyond the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets.

Table 3: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. Unconditional ICAPM model

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138***	-0.060***	0.825	3.07e-6
S.E.	[0.036]	[0.014]		

Panel B. Conditional ICAPM model (1)

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	-0.018	-0.023***	0.930	1.1e-6
S.E.		[0.017]	[0.008]		

Panel C. Conditional ICAPM model (2)

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}^-\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.132	-0.021***	0.938	1.09e-6
S.E.	[0.021]	[0.006]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the market return factor, market volatility risk factor and the extra market volatility risk factor. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. R^2 and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 1% level.

Table 4: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Markov-switching Model

Panel A. For all observations (399-month)					Panel B. Markov-switch high regime				
$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$					$r_t^i = a_i^H + b_{1i}^H DOL_t + b_{2i}^H \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				
PF	*Alpha*	*DOL*	ΔV	R^2	*PF*	*Alpha*	*DOL*	ΔV	*LL*
1	-0.003	0.968	3.982	0.794	1	-0.003	1.006	5.267	-1208.76
	[0.001]	[0.044]	[1.052]			[0.001]	[0.025]	[1.148]	
2	-0.001	1.047	1.711	0.844	2	0.000	1.096	1.787	-1265.78
	[0.001]	[0.041]	[0.638]			[0.002]	[0.019]	[1.237]	
3	-0.000	1.038	1.706	0.893	3	0.005	1.033	0.682	-1325.41
	[0.001]	[0.024]	[0.559]			[0.003]	[0.019]	[1.708]	
4	0.000	0.999	-1.337	0.876	4	0.001	0.980	-0.494	-1295.50
	[0.000]	[0.028]	[0.608]			[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.510]	
5	0.001	1.016	-2.726	0.835	5	-0.001	0.996	-4.079	-1227.80
	[0.001]	[0.045]	[0.920]			[0.001]	[0.024]	[1.060]	
6	0.003	0.932	-3.336	0.682	6	-0.002	0.924	-5.908	-1116.87
	[0.001]	[0.047]	[1.035]			[0.005]	[0.031]	[2.793]	

This table reports the results from the 1st stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the five carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation for the Markov-switching high regime. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. LL denotes log-likelihood.

Table 5: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Markov-switching Model

Panel A. Markov-switching Conditional ICAPM model (1)					
$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$					
	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	-0.041	-0.052**	0.930	1.26e-6
S.E.		[0.026]	[0.018]		
Panel B. Markov-switching Conditional ICAPM model (2)					
$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}^-\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$					
		Market Return	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ		0.117	-0.045***	0.941	1.04e-6
S.E.		[0.023]	[0.006]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. Adjusted $R^2$and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 5% level.

Table 6: The relationship between regime probabilities and market volatility innovation

$p_{1,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p_{1,t-1} + \beta_2 X_t + \epsilon_t$							
	β_0	$p_{1,t-1}$	ΔV_t	HML_t	DOL_t	SMR_t	$Skew_t$
P1	0.040***	0.919***	13.792***				
	[0.012]	[0.020]	[7.004]				
P6	0.060***	0.719***	19.249***				
	[0.010]	[0.034]	[6.978]				
P1	0.042***	0.918***		-0.140			
	[0.013]	[0.020]		[0.257]			
P6	0.060***	0.721***		-0.751***			
	[0.010]	[0.035]		[0.255]			
P1	0.041***	0.918***			-0.086		
	[0.012]	[0.020]			[0.264]		
P6	0.060***	0.720***			0.174		
	[0.010]	[0.035]			[0.264]		
P1	0.041***	0.918***				0.022	
	[0.012]	[0.020]				[0.158]	
P6	0.061***	0.723***				-0.201	
	[0.010]	[0.035]				[0.158]	
P1	0.040***	0.919***					0.008
	[0.012]	[0.020]					[0.036]
P6	0.059***	0.721***					0.020
	[0.010]	[0.035]					[0.036]

This table provides estimation results for the determinants of the regime probabilities. $p_{1,t} = \Pr(s_t = 1|I_{t-1})$ is the probability of the observation lies in regime 1 (high volatility regime) at time *t*. Only the results for portfolio 1 and 6 are reported. P1 denotes the portfolio 1. P6 denotes portfolio 2. *** denotes significant at 5% level.

Figure 1: Risk-return relations for Unconditional and Conditional ICAPM Models



Plotted are risk-return relations for six currency portfolios monthly re-sampled based on the interest rate differential with the US. Panel A plots the realized mean excess return versus the ICAPM betas. Panel B plots the realized mean excess return versus the threshold conditional relative betas. Panel C plots the realized mean excess return versus the Markov-switching conditional relative betas.

Figure 2: Pricing Error Plots for Unconditional and Conditional ICAPM Models



This figure plots the fitted mean excess returns from 6 portfolios against the realized mean excess returns of the 6 portfolios for both the unconditional ICAPM model and conditional ICAPM model (both threshold and Markov-switch). The distance from the points to the 45-degree line shows absolute pricing errors of the model. The sample period is 12/1983 to 01/2017. ICAMP 1 denotes the full three-factor (DOL, VOL and extra VOL) model, which is from the estimates of Penal A in table 4 and 5. ICAMP 2 denotes the two-factor (DOL and extra VOL) model, which is from the estimates of Penal B in table 4 and 5.

Figure 3: Regime probabilities



This figure plots the regime probabilities of being in the first regime (the "abnormal" regime) at time *t* given the information at time *t-1* for each portfolio.

Appendix

Appendix A1: The ex-ante probability and Log-likelihood function of the Markov switching model

The unobservable state variable s_t is assumed to evolve according to the following time-varying transition probabilities. The first-order Markov Chain, with transition probability

$$\Pr(s_t = j | s_{t-1} = i) = P_{ij,t} \tag{10}$$

That indicates the probability of switching from state *i* at time *t−1* into state *j* at *t*. These probabilities are grouped into the transition matrix

$$\mathrm{P} = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{21} \\ p_{12} & p_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} p & (1-q) \\ 1-p & q \end{bmatrix} \tag{11}$$

where $P_{ij,t}$ are the probabilities of moving from state i in period $t-1$ to state j in period t.

An essential ingredient is an ex-ante probability $p_{1,t} = \Pr(s_t = 1 | I_{t-1})$, i.e. the probability of being in the first regime at the time t given the information at time *t*, whose specification is

$$p_{1,t} = \Pr(s_t = 1 | I_{t-1}) = (1q)\left[\frac{f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=2)(1-p_{1,t-1})}{f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=1)p_{1,t-1}+f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=2)(1-p_{1.t-1})}\right] + p\left[\frac{f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=1)p_{1,t-1}}{f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=1)p_{1,t-1}+f(y_{t-1}|s_{t-1}=2)(1-p_{1.t-1})}\right] \tag{12}$$

where the ergodic probability (that is the unconditional probability (Hamilton, 1994) of being in the state $s_t = 1$ is given by $\pi_1 = (1-p)/(2-p-q)$. So ex-ante probability $p_{i,t}$ can be calculated recursively. Thus, the log-likelihood function can be written as

$$l = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \log\left[p_{1,t} f(y_t | s_t = 1, I_{t-1}) + \left(1 - p_{1,t}\right) f(y_t | s_t = 2, I_{t-1})\right] \tag{13}$$

where $f(.|s_t = i)$ is the conditional distribution given that regime *i* occurs at time *t*.

Appendix A2: Robustness check with 75 percentile as the boundary

Table A2.1: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

	Panel B. For observations when $\Delta V_t >$ **75 percentile**				Panel C. Markov-switch high regime			
	$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				$r_t^i = a_i^- + b_{1i}^- DOL_t + b_{2i}^- \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$			
PF	*Alpha*	*DOL*	ΔV	R^2	*Alpha*	*DOL*	ΔV	*LL*
1	-0.008	0.967	7.414	0.848	-0.003	1.006	5.267	-1208
	[0.003]	[0.042]	[1.669]		[0.001]	[0.025]	[1.148]	
2	0.000	1.073	1.752	0.913	0.000	1.096	1.787	-1265
	[0.002]	[0.035]	[1.385]		[0.002]	[0.019]	[1.237]	
3	0.001	1.000	1.742	0.929	0.005	1.033	0.682	-1325
	[0.002]	[0.029]	[1.160]		[0.003]	[0.019]	[1.708]	
4	-0.001	1.016	-1.271	0.907	0.001	0.980	-0.494	-1295
	[0.002]	[0.035]	[1.395]		[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.510]	
5	0.002	0.991	-3.901	0.875	-0.001	0.996	-4.079	-1227
	[0.002]	[0.041]	[1.640]		[0.001]	[0.024]	[1.060]	
6	0.007	0.952	-5.737	0.769	-0.002	0.924	-5.908	-1116
	[0.004]	[0.059]	[2.335]		[0.005]	[0.031]	[2.793]	

Table A2.2: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. Unconditional ICAPM model

$$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + \epsilon_i$$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138***	-0.060***	0.825	3.07e-6
S.E.	[0.036]	[0.014]		

Panel B. Threshold ICAPM model (1)

$$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	0.029	-0.053**	0.880	1.52e-6
S.E.		[0.047]	[0.028]		

Panel C. Markov-switching ICAPM model (2)

$$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	0.024	-0.060***	0.944	1.01e-6
S.E.		[0.025]	[0.017]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) fact or, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations exceed the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. $R^2$and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 5% level.

Appendix A3: Robustness check with 90 percentile as the boundary

Table A3.1: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

	Panel B. For observations when $\Delta V_t >$ 90 percentile				Panel C. Markov-switch high regime			
	$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				$r_t^i = a_i^- + b_{1i}^- DOL_t + b_{2i}^- \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$			
PF	Alpha	DOL	ΔV	R^2	Alpha	DOL	ΔV	LL
1	-0.017	1.053	11.334	0.873	-0.003	1.006	5.267	-1208
	[0.006]	[0.066]	[2.780]		[0.001]	[0.025]	[1.148]	
2	-0.002	1.057	2.601	0.900	0.000	1.096	1.787	-1265
	[0.006]	[0.061]	[2.557]		[0.002]	[0.019]	[1.237]	
3	-0.003	1.032	3.675	0.939	0.005	1.033	0.682	-1325
	[0.004]	[0.045]	[1.899]		[0.003]	[0.019]	[1.708]	
4	-0.004	1.053	0.319	0.933	0.001	0.980	-0.494	-1295
	[0.005]	[0.050]	[2.083]		[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.510]	
5	0.010	0.937	-7.235	0.885	-0.001	0.996	-4.079	-1227
	[0.006]	[0.064]	[2.698]		[0.001]	[0.024]	[1.060]	
6	0.017	0.868	-10.694	0.774	-0.002	0.924	-5.908	-1116
	[0.009]	[0.094]	[3.958]		[0.005]	[0.031]	[2.793]	

Table A3.2: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. Unconditional ICAPM model

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138***	-0.060***	0.825	3.07e-6
S.E.	[0.036]	[0.014]		

Panel B. Threshold ICAPM model (1)

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\hat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	-0.010	-0.026***	0.894	1.31e-6
S.E.		[0.035]	[0.013]		

Panel C. Markov-switching ICAPM model (2)

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\hat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.138	0.021	-0.058***	0.937	1.12e-6
S.E.		[0.026]	[0.018]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, or and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations exceed the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. R^2 and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 5% level.

Appendix A4: Robustness check with 48-country sample

Table A4.1: Excess Returns from 48-country Currency Portfolios

Portfolio	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*DOL*	*HML*
Mean	-1.45	0.35	1.63	1.51	2.56	5.15	1.63	6.60
Std. Dev.	9.12	10.08	9.79	9.21	9.87	10.11	8.97	9.01
Skewness	0.07	-0.12	-0.15	-0.46	-0.19	-0.71	-0.31	-1.02
SR	-0.16	0.03	0.17	0.16	0.26	0.51	0.18	0.73

In this table, 48 currencies have been allocated into 6 portfolios according to the size of the forward discount. Portfolios are adjusted monthly.

Table A4.2: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. For all observations [399-month)					Panel B. For observations when $\Delta V_t >$ **mean+1sd** [49-month)				
$r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$					$r_t^i = a_i^- + b_{1i}^- DOL_t + b_{2i}^- \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				
PF	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	R^2	*PF*	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	R^2
1	-0.003	0.975	3.666	0.799	1	-0.016	1.061	11.137	0.890
	[0.001]	[0.024]	[0.655]			[0.005]	[0.055]	[2.367]	
2	-0.001	1.040	1.776	0.843	2	-0.004	1.069	3.148	0.911
	[0.001]	[0.023]	[0.601]			[0.004]	[0.052]	[2.204]	
3	-0.000	1.030	1.810	0.895	3	-0.003	0.997	3.344	0.936
	[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.473]			[0.003]	[0.040]	[1.714]	
4	-0.000	1.003	-1.555	0.872	4	-0.005	1.047	0.503	0.944
	[0.001]	[0.020]	[0.524]			[0.004]	[0.042]	[1.802]	
5	0.001	1.006	-2.461	0.840	5	0.010	0.929	-6.854	0.890
	[0.001]	[0.023]	[0.603]			[0.005]	[0.056]	[2.378]	
6	0.003	0.944	-3.236	0.690	6	0.020	0.898	-11.28	0.798
	[0.001]	[0.033]	[0.878]			[0.007]	[0.082]	[3.491]	

This table reports the results from the 1st stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the five carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations are beyond the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets.

Table A4.3: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Threshold Model

Panel A. Unconditional ICAPM model				
$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + \epsilon_i$				
	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.135***	-0.059***	0.769	3.92e-6
S.E.	[0.040]	[0.016]		

Panel B. Conditional ICAPM model [1]					
$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + (\hat{b}_{2i}^- - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$					
	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.135	-0.013	-0.027**	0.917	1.43e-6
S.E.		[0.020]	[0.010]		

Panel C. Conditional ICAPM model [2]				
$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}^-\lambda_2^- + \epsilon_i$				
	Market Return	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.135***	-0.022***	0.911	1.51e-6
S.E.	[0.025]	[0.006]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (ΔV) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations exceed the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. R^2 and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 5% level.

Table A4.4: The 1st Stage of FMB Regression for the Markov-switching Model

Panel A. For all observations $r_t^i = a_i + b_{1i}DOL_t + b_{2i}\Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$					Panel B. Markov-switch high regime $r_t^i = a_i^H + b_{1i}^H DOL_t + b_{2i}^H \Delta V_t + \epsilon_{it}$				
PF	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	R^2	*PF*	*Alpha*	*DOL*	*ΔV*	*LL*
1	-0.003	0.975	3.666	0.799	1	-0.003	1.006	5.317	624.61
	[0.001]	[0.024]	[0.655]			[0.001]	[0.024]	[1.153]	
2	-0.001	1.040	1.776	0.843	2	-0.000	1.095	1.769	567.16
	[0.001]	[0.023]	[0.601]			[0.002]	[0.019]	[1.237]	
3	-0.000	1.030	1.810	0.895	3	0.005	1.030	0.804	508.17
	[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.473]			[0.003]	[0.019]	[1.769]	
4	-0.000	1.003	-1.555	0.872	4	0.001	0.980	-0.534	537.22
	[0.001]	[0.020]	[0.524]			[0.000]	[0.018]	[0.511]	
5	0.001	1.006	-2.461	0.840	5	-0.001	0.996	-3.998	605.37
	[0.001]	[0.023]	[0.603]			[0.001]	[0.024]	[1.075]	
6	0.003	0.944	-3.236	0.690	6	-0.003	0.925	-6.041	716.36
	[0.001]	[0.033]	[0.878]			[0.005]	[0.031]	[3.082]	

This table reports the results from the 1st stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the five carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (*ΔV*) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations are beyond the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets.

Table A4.5: The 2nd Stage of FMB Regression for the Markov-switching Model

Panel A. Markov-switching Conditional ICAPM model [1]

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\widehat{\lambda_1} + \hat{b}_{2i}\lambda_2 + [\hat{b}_{2i}^H - \hat{b}_{2i})\lambda_2^H + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Market Volatility risk	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.135	-0.038***	-0.054**	0.922	1.36e-6
S.E.		[0.012]	[0.020]		

Panel B. Markov-switching Conditional ICAPM model [2]

$\bar{r}^i = \hat{b}_{1i}\lambda_1 + \hat{b}_{2i}^H\lambda_2^H + \epsilon_i$

	Market Return	Extra Market Volatility risk	R^2	MAE
λ	0.115***	-0.044***	0.928	1.23e-6
S.E.	[0.023]	[0.006]		

This table reports the results from the 2nd stage time series FMB regression. The test assets are excess returns to the six carry trade portfolios. Factors are the dollar risk (*DOL*) factor, and the volatility risk (*ΔV*) factor. Panel A provides estimation for the full sample while Panel B provides estimation when the volatility innovations exceed the threshold. Newey-West standard errors are reported in the brackets. Adjusted $R^2$and mean absolute errors (MAE) are provided. *** denotes significant at 5% level.