

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Journal of Asset Management. The definitive publisher-authenticated version, Demirovic, A., Kabiri, A., Tuckett, D. *et al.* A common risk factor and the correlation between equity and corporate bond returns. *J Asset Manag* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41260-020-00151-8> is available online at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fs41260-020-00151-8>

# **A common risk factor and the correlation between equity and corporate bond returns**

## **1. Introduction**

In a recent paper, Bollerslev et al. (2018) show that the volatility patterns within and across asset classes are virtually identical. This suggests that the behaviour of investors is strikingly similar across financial markets and in turn, that asset prices can be viewed as being driven by common expectations about future risk and returns, which trigger the collective actions of investors. There are well-documented episodes of both flight-to-quality and flight-to-liquidity effects, which occur when investors' preferences for the highest quality and most liquid assets increases markedly. These episodes provide vivid illustrations of the importance of changes in the common expectations of investors for the pricing of assets during these specific situations.

A growing number of new studies devise measures to capture variations in the common expectations of investors and examine whether they are driven by changes in a common risk premium or alternatively, originate from temporary deviations from rational pricing. The large majority of these studies however, focus exclusively on the equity markets. We contribute to this growing literature by examining how variations in the common expectations of investors affect the correlations between matched firm-level equity and bond returns. The aim of the paper is to refine our ability to identify this common factor using new techniques in computer based algorithmic

text analysis and also to be able to compare our measures to a suite of other potential drivers of the common factor.

In general, asset correlations are a cornerstone of portfolio management. As asset correlations are stochastic, understanding them are important as tools to mitigate portfolio risk. Financial crises, such as the crisis of 2007-08, are characterised by dramatic changes in the correlation of assets and, consequently, the risk of portfolios. In this particular episode, sharp rises in asset correlations in many cases left financial institutions and investors vulnerable to unforeseen risks. Such correlation risk persisted post-crisis and has been linked to several exacerbating factors such as market liquidity changes where the health and stability of the financial system acts to increase asset correlation (IMF, 2015). Whilst market liquidity effects are one potential aggravating factor in the asset correlation changes we test for, we restrict our analysis to the identification of the drivers of the common factor from our expectations based measures from financial news data. The nature of those data currently do not allow us to delineate their exact origins but give impetus to research to test these factors in the future given the nature of our results.

The ability to understand the underlying determinants of the behaviour of these correlations is essential for asset managers and also for the measurement and setting of regulatory capital. The research therefore can inform policymakers towards a more efficient ways of measuring regulatory capital as well as for financial institutions control of risk.

A major impetus for the research is that standard finance models have a relatively poor record in predicting the changes in such correlations and especially in times of extreme outcomes in the financial markets. The relationship between firm-level equity and corporate bond returns is

particularly useful for examining the importance of common pricing factors because of the robust theoretical framework of Merton 1974, which implies the determinants of the correlations as well as the functional relationship between the correlation itself and its determinants. Using this benchmark we are able to isolate the drivers of the correlations in a robust fashion.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine how variations in the common expectations of investors affect the correlation between firm-level equity and bond returns. We add to the literature by showing that changes in the common expectations of investors, which could be captured by an index of expected volatility such as VIX, may also be captured by employing new techniques which use textual analysis of digitised financial and economic news stories. In our study we use a very large database of news in the Thomson-Reuters News Archive database. This database is used in conjunction with a new metric (the Relative Sentiment Shift – RSS) for measuring emotion in text-based articles (Nyman et al. 2018) that has not been previously used in finance studies.

Our study is able to examine the performance of other popular measures of variations in the common expectation of investors (Chicago Board Options Exchange’s Volatility Index - VIX, Baker and Wurgler, 2006 - BW, and Huang et al., 2015 – HJTZ) in order to be able to more clearly differentiate the information in these indexes. These innovative measures have become prominent in explaining changes in asset prices but have not yet been used to analyse the correlation between firm-level equity and bond returns. More importantly, these innovative indexes focus on different aspects of common expectations - BW and HJTZ look at economic indicators reflecting positive/optimistic expectations and in contrast, VIX tends to look at negative/pessimistic

expectations. By comparing their relative performances to the performance of the RSS we also shed new light on the different types of common expectations that may act upon asset prices. Taken collectively, the research offers further insight into the role of these common expectations as a common factor in the pricing of financial assets.

Most Importantly, we show that RSS captures variations in the common risk premium and does so with greater power than previous measures. RSS is strongly correlated with VIX - the one-month option-implied volatility on the S&P500 stock index and conversely, we show that RSS is only weakly correlated with the existing indices of BW and HJTZ. The findings, all told, suggest that the absence of investors' optimism, when the basis on which BW and HJTZ, are constructed are to show the presence of optimism may not necessarily be linked to uncertainty or pessimistic expectations. In other words, when imagining a scale of optimism and pessimism or excitement and anxiety in expectations, the common factor's drivers may not be operating on the same spectrum. Instead, we suggest from our findings that it may be the function of two separate mechanisms. Simply put, the absence of the VIX need not imply optimism in expectations and hence VIX or RSS may better proxy for the expectation of negative outcomes and increased asset correlation. The indices of BW and HJTZ are not significant in explaining the stock-bond correlation.

Our results imply that the collective actions of investors are driven by changes in the common risk premium and we uncover a causal correlation between the common risk premium and the correlation between equity and corporate returns. An increase in RSS causes a weakening of the correlation in the subsequent month. This effect is itself dependent on firms' credit risk

profiles and weakens in a monotonic fashion as firms move away from the default point. The VIX performs similarly overall to RSS but with some noticeable and practically, very important differences. Most prominent of these advantages of RSS is that RSS has strong predictive power over the entire spectrum of credit risk whereas VIX's effect is muted for some levels of credit risk. We are therefore able to offer a more fine-tuned measure to capture the causal links from expectations to correlations across all credit risk grades of firms.

The remainder of this paper is divided into five sections. In the following section, we review the relevant literature. In Section 3, we describe the data and present the methodology for estimating the RSS, the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns, a measure of credit risk, and the empirical model specifications. The results are presented in Section 4, and the robustness of the results is examined in Section 5. The main conclusions are summarized in Section 6.

## **2. Literature review**

According to the structural model of Merton (1974), all securities issued by a firm may be considered as claims on the firm's assets. Consequently, the correlation between equity and debt securities should be primarily determined by the value and volatility of the firm's assets. The structural model implies that factors impacting the value of firm assets have a positive impact on the correlation, whereas factors affecting the volatility of firm assets induce a negative correlation. Furthermore, the model predicts a non-linear relationship between the correlation and the asset value and volatility. Hence, the effect of all explanatory variables is strongest when firms are close

to the default point and weakens as firms move away from the default point or as credit risk improves. The only common variable which is explicitly accounted for is the risk-free rate.

As Anderson and Sundaresan (2000) note, the structural model is attractive on theoretical grounds because it links the valuation of different financial claims on firms' assets with economic fundamentals. Despite its great appeal and precise formulation, the empirical evidence in support of the structural model has been mixed at best. While relationships between key variables of the structural model and credit spread are generally empirically confirmed as predicted by the model (e.g. Campbell and Taksler, 2003), studies usually find that the structural model generates much lower credit spreads than those observed in reality. The inability of the structural model to predict highly realistic credit spreads is generally attributed to the simplifying assumptions used to derive the model and difficulties in estimation of parameters required for implementation. As far as our investigation is concerned, the crucial drawback of the Merton (1974) model stems from the critical assumption that the values of assets evolve as geometric Brownian motions. As a direct result of this assumption, the default probability and hence the credit spread is therefore implied by the volatility of assets and the difference between the asset value and the debt value. This difference, when divided mathematically by the volatility, is usually referred to as the 'distance to default'. Since under the assumptions of a geometric Brownian motion process, the continuously evolving value of assets needs time to change significantly, the default probability over short periods of time is close to zero. The structural model, by relying on this assumption ignores the risk of substantial changes or 'jumps' in the values of assets. This is one of the main reasons why the structural model generates a lower credit spread than those observed.

As large shifts and sudden changes in the values of securities are rare events, and usually confined to crisis and boom periods, it is near impossible to estimate the probability of their occurrence and the magnitude of their effect on asset prices with any high degree of precision. In other words, investors have a limited ability to quantify how likely rare events are ex-ante and the scale of any impact upon asset prices if and when they occur. On this basis, Caballero and Krishnamurthy (2008) argue that these events are more about uncertainty, where outcomes do not occur on a known distribution with probabilities attached, rather than risk. Barro (2006) also emphasises the importance of rare events in asset pricing. He shows that accounting for rare events helps explain the high equity premium and other asset pricing puzzles.

There is much empirical support for the idea that the consequences of changes in the common expectations of investors are statistically and economically significant. Longstaff (2004) estimates that the liquidity premium, which is linked to sharp declines in the investors' expectations, accounts for as much as 15% of the value of risk-free bonds. Nozawa (2017) reports that variations in a common risk factor can explain about 50% of the credit spread. Collin-Dufresne, Goldstein and Martin (2001) show that changes in corporate credit spreads are mostly driven by a single common factor rather than firm-level proxies for the theoretical variables. Demirovic, Guermat and Tucker (2017) find that the relationship between equity and bond returns breaks down during periods of high uncertainty, measured by using the VIX index. They conclude that common factors overshadow the theoretical firm-level factors during financial crises, which is consistent with the flight-to-quality/liquidity phenomenon and associated spikes in correlations between different assets classes. Durand, Lim, and Zumwalt (2011) find that changes in the VIX,



which proxies for investors' expectations of market volatility, affect the Fama-French risk factors (Fama and French, 1993). On a more general note, as highlighted in the introduction, Bollerslev et al. (2018) show that the volatility patterns in equity, bond, commodity and currency markets are virtually identical.

Since variations in the common expectations of investors have been well examined in the literature and appear to have a significant role in asset pricing, it is primarily important to understand what drives them and also how best to take advantage of modern econometric and computer science techniques to measure them accurately.

As already noted, collective actions of investors are triggered by changes in expectations of future returns and risk. If investors' expectations of future market volatility affect risk factors as Durand, Lim, and Zumwalt (2011) argue, these expectations will be relevant in explaining and predicting asset returns and correlations among asset returns. In line with this prediction, Lee, Jiang and Indro (2002) find that excess returns and volatility are contemporaneously correlated with changes in the ratio of 'bullish' to 'bearish' recommendations by investment advisory services. Likewise, Brown and Cliff (2005) find that shifts in the ratio of 'bullish' to 'bearish' recommendations are positively correlated with the pricing errors of models containing Fama-French and other widely used risk factors.

Baker and Wurgler (2006) construct a novel measure of investors' optimism by extracting the common components of six market-based variables (the closed-end fund discount, NYSE share turnover, the number of IPOs, the average first-day returns on IPOs, the equity share in new issues and the dividend premium). They report that the cross-section of future equity returns is

conditional on investors' optimism at the period beginning. When investor optimism is high, securities that are attractive to speculators and unattractive to arbitrageurs tend to earn low returns in subsequent periods. This result implies that investor optimism is a noise driving prices away from their intrinsic values rather than a priced risk factor.

Huang et al. (2015) note that, by design, the principal component analysis used to isolate the common component of the variables used by Baker and Wurgler (2006), is unable to distinguish variations in the investors' optimism relevant for asset pricing from the approximation error of investors' optimism. They filter out the irrelevant approximation error by utilising the two-stage partial least squares estimation method. In line with Baker and Wurgler, they find that the first day returns on IPOs and the equity share in new issues are the most significant proxies for investors' optimism. On the other hand, the number of IPOs and the dividend premium are not statistically significant components of their index.

Another approach to derive measures of investors' expectations is to use a survey of consumer confidence as a proxy or to survey investors directly. Another more recent alternative method infers changes in investors' expectations from the word content of digitized news media articles. One incarnation of this approach can be found in the combination of algorithmic data techniques to scan large samples of digitised news data. An excellent example of this approach is found in Manela and Moreira (2017) who examine the relationship between words appearing in the front page of the Wall Street Journal from 1890-2010 and changes in the VIX. They construct a measure which is significant in predicting equity returns and show that this return predictability can be attributed to changes in investors' concern about rare disasters.

Earlier work in this area has also produced other significant results. Cutler, Poterba and Summers (1989) examine the relationship between news related to fundamental economic values and changes in equity prices. They report that the relevant economic news can not explain a significant portion of variations in equity prices. In other words, a large part of fluctuations in equity prices seems to be driven by news not related to systematic risks. Tetlock (2007) constructs a measure of investors' expectations from the Wall Street Journal's "Abreast of the Market" daily column. He finds that the measure based on the number of words classified as pessimistic or optimistic in the daily column can predict future returns and trading volumes. Negative words are reported to be much more relevant than other words. Tetlock, Saar-Tsechansky and Macskassy (2008) examine the relevance of negative words in stories about S&P 500 firms published in the Wall Street Journal and the Dow Jones News Service. They find that the fraction of negative words forecasts low earnings and that stock prices temporarily underreact to the information embedded in negative words. Garcia (2013) adopts a similar approach and conducts the text analysis of financial columns published in the New York Times. He reports that the predictive power of news' content is concentrated in periods of elevated market uncertainty during recessions. In a similar analysis, Kräussl and Mirgorodskaya (2017) find that a measure based on the text analysis of financial columns predicts market returns and volatilities months in advance.

Da, Engelberg and Gao (2015) use daily Internet search keywords and volume to capture changes in investors' expectations. They report that the number of queries for keywords such as recession and bankruptcy predicts aggregated market returns. Smales (2014) notes that a measure of investors' expectations based on the news for the constituents of the S&P 500 Index is negatively

related to changes in the VIX. In other words, affirmative news coverages are related to a decrease in the VIX. He reports that this relationship is much stronger during the period of market turbulence in 2007-2009. A compelling rejoinder to these papers is that an absence of news coverage may also predict returns in asset markets. Fang and Peress (2009) find that media coverage affects equity returns. Securities with no media coverage significantly outperform securities regularly featured in media after controlling for common risk factors

### **3. Methodology**

This section describes our measure of investors' expectations, the methodology for estimating the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns, control variables and the data set. Lastly, we specify the empirical model.

#### ***3.1. Relative Sentiment Shift (RSS)***

Our approach to deriving the RSS index is similar to the approaches used by Tetlock (2007), Tetlock, Saar-Tsechansky and Macskassy (2008), Garcia (2013) and Kräussl and Mirgorodskaya (2017). Generally, these measures are based on the frequency of words classified as positive or negative. Tetlock (2007) derives his measure by counting words in predetermined categories of the Harvard Psychosocial Dictionary appearing in the Wall Street Journal's daily column. Tetlock, Saar-Tsechansky and Macskassy (2008) consider the frequency of words

appearing in all Wall Street Journal and Dow Jones News Service articles about S&P 500 firms. Garcia (2013) counts positive and negative words in two financial columns appearing in the New York Times. Kräussl and Mirgorodskaya (2017) obtain their measure from Wall Street Journal, Financial Times and New York Times articles classified under the category Banking and Finance in the *LexisNexis* database.

The RSS is based on the frequency of words in news stories from the Thomson-Reuters News Archive Database. Unlike other measures, the RSS is based on the frequency of pre-selected ordinary English emotional words (e.g. unease, perils, distrusted, brilliant, attracts, energising). This potentially makes the RSS orthogonal to any economic news in the text and at least partially mitigates the problem of reverse causality. In other words, the RSS is not directly based on the frequency of words which may be a reaction to the market movements. The approach directs the word search towards just two particular groups of emotion thought to encourage or inhibit action in conditions of uncertainty. Specifically, the emotion groups explored are those associated with excitement about gain (evoking approach) and anxiety about loss (evoking avoidance). A sample of words from both groups of words are presented in Nyman et al. (2018).

Given the word list, we define measures of anxiety and excitement as the sum of relative frequencies of words from the lists, while the RSS is defined as the difference between the measures of excitement and anxiety.

$$RSS_t = \frac{Excitement_t - Anxiety_t}{N_t} \quad (1)$$

where  $Excitement_t$  is the total number of occurrences of words from the excitement list in a period  $t$ ,  $Anxiety_t$  is the total number of incidents of words from the anxiety list, and  $N_t$  is the total number of words.

### 3.2. Conditional correlation between equity and bond returns

Equity returns are calculated in the usual manner. Define  $P_{i,t}^E$  as the share price of firm  $i$  at time  $t$ , and  $D_{i,t}$  as dividends paid from time  $t - 1$  to time  $t$ . The rate of return is defined as:

$$R_{i,t}^E = \ln \frac{P_{i,t}^E + D_{i,t}}{P_{i,t-1}^E}. \quad (2)$$

The holding-period returns for bonds are calculated in a similar manner. Define  $P_{i,t}^B$  as the bond price of firm  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $C_{i,t}$  as the coupon payments, and  $AC_{i,t}$  as the accrued interest on bond  $i$  from time  $t - 1$  to time  $t$ . The rate of return is defined as:

$$R_{i,t}^B = \ln \frac{P_{i,t}^B + C_{i,t} + AC_{i,t}}{P_{i,t-1}^B + AC_{i,t-1}}. \quad (3)$$

The conditional correlation between equity and bond returns is obtained from a bivariate Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroscedasticity (GARCH) process. The mean equations are given by:

$$R_t^E = c_1 + \varepsilon_{E,t} \quad \text{and} \quad R_t^B = c_2 + \varepsilon_{B,t}, \quad (4)$$

where  $R_t^E$ ,  $R_t^B$ ,  $\varepsilon_{E,t}$ , and  $\varepsilon_{B,t}$  are equity and bond returns, and the disturbance terms, respectively. One of the most popular models for estimating the conditional covariance is

Bollerslev, Engle, and Wooldridge (1988). We use the parsimonious version referred to as the diagonal VECM (1,1). In order to guarantee that the conditional covariance matrix is positive semi-definite, we follow Engle and Kroner (1995) and Ding and Engle (2001), and restrict the coefficient matrices to rank 1 matrices. This gives the following variance/covariance equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 h_{E,t} &= c_1 + a_1 \varepsilon_{E,t-1}^2 + b_1 h_{E,t-1} \\
 h_{B,t} &= c_2 + a_2 \varepsilon_{B,t-1}^2 + b_2 h_{B,t-1} \\
 h_{EB,t} &= c_1 c_2 + a_1 a_2 \varepsilon_{E,t-1}^2 \varepsilon_{B,t-1}^2 + b_1 b_2 h_{EB,t-1},
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where  $h_{E,t}$ ,  $h_{B,t}$ , and  $h_{EB,t}$  are, respectively, the equity variance, the bond variance, and the equity-bond covariance. This specification is widely utilized in empirical studies (e.g., Bekaert and Wu, 2000; Ang and Chen, 2002; Belke and Gokus, 2011).

### ***3.3 Control variables***

The correlation between equity and bond returns depends on firms' credit risk exposure. The correlation of returns on securities issued by the riskiest firms is expected to be the strongest. Therefore, it is critical to control for credit risk.

The distance to default (DD) is the difference between the market value of the assets and the book value of debt relative to the volatility of the market value of the assets (Merton, 1974). DD follows directly from the Black and Scholes (1973) call option pricing equation:

$$E = A N(d_1) - D e^{-rT} N(d_2), \quad (6)$$

where

$$d_1 = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{A}{D}\right) + \left(r + \frac{\sigma_A^2}{2}\right)T}{\sigma_A \sqrt{T}},$$

$d_2 = d_1 - \sigma_A \sqrt{T}$ ,  $E$ , and  $A$  are the market values of the firm's equity and assets,  $\sigma_A$  is the volatility of the market value of the firm's assets,  $D$  is the book value of the firm's debt,  $r$  is the risk-free rate,  $T$  is the time horizon in years, and  $N(\cdot)$  is the cumulative density of the standard normal distribution.

The market value of the firm's assets is assumed to follow a geometric Brownian motion process. Assuming that the firm's equity value follows the same process, its dynamics under the risk-neutral probability measure can be described by:

$$dE = rE dt + \sigma_E E dX, \quad (7)$$

where  $\sigma_E$  is the volatility of the market value of the firm's equity and  $dX_t$  is the standard Wiener process. Since the equity value is a function of the asset value and time, Itô's lemma can be applied to give:

$$dE = \left[ \frac{\partial E}{\partial t} + rA \frac{\partial E}{\partial A} + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_A A)^2 \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial A^2} \right] dt + \frac{\partial E}{\partial A} \sigma_A A dX. \quad (8)$$

A comparison of the coefficient multiplying the stochastic components in the two preceding equations gives the following identity:



$$\sigma_E E = \frac{\partial E}{\partial A} A \sigma_A. \quad (9)$$

The unobservable market value and volatility of the firm's assets are estimated by simultaneously solving equations (6) and (9). This approach is widely used in empirical studies (e.g., Ronn and Verma, 1986; Hillegeist et al., 2004; Campbell, Hilscher, and Szilagyi, 2008). The equity volatility is estimated using a GARCH(1,1) model (Bollerslev, 1986). Once the asset value and volatility are estimated, the distance to default is calculated as follows:

$$DD = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{A}{D}\right) + \left(r - \frac{\sigma_A^2}{2}\right)T}{\sigma_A \sqrt{T}}. \quad (10)$$

To control for the maturity of bonds, the duration is calculated according to the following formula:

$$d = \frac{1}{B_d} \sum_{t=1}^N \frac{CF_t}{(1+Y)^t} t, \quad (11)$$

where  $B_d$  is the dirty bond price (clean price + accrued interest),  $CF_t$  is the cash flow in period  $t$ ,  $N$  is the number of periods to maturity, and  $Y$  is the per-period yield to maturity. The control variable for the size of the bond issue is the natural logarithm of the bond's market price multiplied by the number of outstanding bonds.

### **3.4. Panel data analysis**

The data set consists of the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns, and a set of independent variables for  $n$  firms over  $T$  consecutive time periods. Because of the possible common factors influencing the correlation, we use a panel data model with period fixed effects:

$$C_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta x_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad \varepsilon_{it} \sim i.i.d. (0, \sigma^2), \quad (12)$$

where  $C_{it}$  is the conditional correlation between the equity and bond returns of firm  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\alpha_i$  is the firm effect,  $\beta$  is a  $k \times 1$  parameter vector,  $x_{it}$  is a vector of explanatory variables, and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is a disturbance term.

We conduct our analysis by regressing the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns,  $C_{it}$ , on measures of the common factor and control variables. The common factor's measures are our index (RSS) and other popular indices (VIX, BW and HJTZ). The control variables are DD, firm's size, bond duration and bond issue size.

As discussed above, the most important control variable is DD which is a measure of credit risk. As implied by the structural model, the impact of a change in DD is expected to depend on the level of credit risk. In other words, a small change in a large DD should have only a limited impact on the correlation between equity and bond returns, while the magnitude of impact should grow as DD falls. To account for this non-linearity, we add the squared DD variable to the model.

Furthermore, to control for a potential discrete form of non-linear impact of changes in credit risk, we include DD dummies, i.e.  $DD_{it}^s = I(\tau_s \leq DD_{it} < \tau_{s+1})$ , where  $I(\cdot)$  is the indicator function and  $\tau_s$  are thresholds. The thresholds are commonly selected arbitrarily. Campbell and Taksler (2003), for example, use five, 10 and 20 as the thresholds for the interest coverage variable, and 10, 25 and 35 per cent as the threshold values for the debt ratio. On the other hand, Cremers et al. (2008) treat financial leverage as a continuous variable. Since controlling for credit risk is

crucial in this study, we select the number and values of thresholds as suggested by Hansen (2000). They are determined by estimating models with different sets of dummies and threshold values and selecting the model on the basis of a minimum Akaike information criterion (AIC). Specifically, for each number of dummies ( $s = 1, \dots, n$ ), we estimate models for all threshold combinations (with discrete increment steps). For the DD variable, we estimated 4,753 models. The lowest AIC is achieved with 15 dummies, but 94% of the improvement in AIC is achieved by a set of four dummies. Therefore, in order to have as parsimonious a model as possible, we use the optimal set of four dummy variables: 0.8, 1.8, 2.8, and 3.8. The coefficient of  $DD_{it}$  then captures the average effect of the DD, while the dummy coefficients capture the additional effect of the DD for predefined risk classes. The threshold selection procedure is described in Appendix.

The common factor may have different effects for different firms. To account for this possibility, we include an interaction between the common factor and firms' credit risk (DD). Overall, the full regression is expressed as follows:

$$C_{it} = \alpha_i + \alpha_1 SENT_t + \sum_{s=1}^4 \delta_s SENT_t DD_{it}^s + \alpha_2 DD_{it} + \alpha_3 DD_{it}^2 + \sum_{s=1}^4 \gamma_s DD_{it}^s + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (13)$$

As emphasized by Petersen (2009), the OLS standard errors in equation (13) may be biased and underestimate the true variability in the estimated coefficients due to the correlation of the residuals across time for a given firm (time series dependence) and/or across different firms (cross-sectional dependence). The standard errors are corrected to account for the cross-section dependence (i.e. common factors affecting all firms at the same time), while the serial

dependence (i.e. firm-specific factors affecting individual firms) is addressed by adding dummy variables.

### ***3.5. Data***

We use the Thomson-Reuters News Archive database which contains several million articles on political, financial and economic news. We specifically focus on news articles ‘tagged’ (originating) in Washington DC and New York as those stories are most directly related to the US economy. These data average 10,832 articles per month over the period from 1996-2011. We exclude articles tagged as Sport, Weather and Human Interest. Tetlock (2007) uses a single daily column, and Kräussl and Mirgorodskaya (2017) have 3,135 articles per month which are less than a third of our sample). An extensive database ensures that our algorithm can produce high-quality results due to the volume of matches to our algorithm using a monthly aggregate.

Following Scruggs and Glabadanidis (2003), the correlation between equity and bond is estimated at the monthly level as noise in the returns at higher frequencies makes it challenging to determine the true relation between the returns. We use firm-level equity and bond data. Since bond data are relatively scarce compared to equity data, we start our sample selection with all straight corporate bonds issued by non-financial companies in the U.S. market available in the Thompson Reuters Datastream database. When multiple bonds are available from the same issuer, the bond with the maximum number of observations is used. This is preferred to averaging the data of different bonds with a common issuer as bonds have different characteristics, such as duration and issue size. Bonds with less than 36 monthly observations, asset-backed bonds, bonds

with any sort of collateral, or with an average market value of less than \$10 million are excluded from the sample. Once the bond data are collected, they are matched with the equity data, also obtained from the Datastream database. The matched sample consists of 351 firms and 33,870 firm-month observations.

All other variables (distance to default, firm asset value, bond duration, and bond issue value) are estimated at the daily level and then converted into monthly series by averaging daily observations. The accounting data required for the estimation of DD are obtained from Compustat, and the risk-free interest rate data are obtained from the Datastream database. VIX Index data are obtained from the Chicago Board Options Exchange. Finally, Baker and Wurgler (2006) and Huang et al. (2015) indices data are obtained from Jeffrey Wurgler's and Guofu Zhou's websites. The descriptive statistics for the variables used in the empirical model are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>Skewness</b>	<b>Kurtosis</b>
Equity-Bond Returns Correlation	0.09	1.00	-0.93	0.28	0.25	3.12
RSS	-0.10	-0.01	-0.27	0.05	-0.97	4.25
BW (Baker and Wurgler, 2006, Eq. 2)	0.17	2.84	-0.93	0.77	1.34	4.91
HJTZ (Huang et al. 2015)	-0.04	3.03	-1.03	0.90	1.61	4.93
VIX	22.37	62.64	10.82	8.45	1.73	8.17
Equity Return	0	1.64	-1	0.11	-0.73	16.62
Bond Period Return	0.01	1.19	-0.75	0.04	-0.03	83.62
Distance to Default	5.43	28.05	-2.42	2.73	0.87	4.87
Asset Value	25,449.62	832,438.00	66.69	46,157.04	5.73	61.39
Bond Duration	6.91	18.24	0	3.61	0.19	2.08
Bond Issue Value	238.06	4,567.08	2.12	268.3	5.1	54.3

The RSS is obtained from equation 1. Asset Value and Bond Issue Value are in USD millions. Equity and bond returns are logarithmic as specified in equations (2) and (3); the Distance to default (DD) is the difference between the market value of the assets and the book value of debt relative to the volatility of the market value of the assets (equation (10)); the duration is in years (equation (11)). The indices, equity and bond returns are monthly, while other variables are calculated at the daily frequency and are converted into monthly series as the average of daily observations within the given months.

The sample covers the period from August 1996 to February 2011. Not all series cover the entire sample period, so our panel is unbalanced. It should be noted that the number of observations available at the beginning of the sample period (1996-2000) is much lower than that later in the sample period (2001-2011). However, the earlier dataset is still large (1,519 observations for 33 firms) compared to other studies dealing with bond data.


#### 4. Results

We first examine the relationship between the RSS, VIX, BW (Baker and Wurgler, 2006) and HJTZ (Huang et al., 2015) indices. The RSS and VIX indices are strongly correlated ( $\rho=-$

64%). Similarly, a strong correlation is observed between the BW and the HJTZ. This implies that the RSS/VIX and BW/HJTZ capture different effects. The correlation coefficients are presented in Table 3 while the normalized time series are illustrated in Figure 1.

**Table 2.** The correlation matrix

	<b>RSS</b>	<b>VIX</b>	<b>BW</b>	<b>HJTZ</b>
<b>RSS</b>	1.00			
<b>VIX</b>	-0.64	1.00		
<b>BW</b>	0.05	-0.04	1.00	
<b>HJTZ</b>	-0.11	0.35	0.66	1.00



**Figure 1.** Normalized values of VIX, RSS, BW and HJTZ

To examine the relationships among the RSS, VIX and other indices, we estimate a VAR(2) model. The first lag of RSS is significant at the 5% level in explaining changes in the

VIX, while the second lag of RSS is significant at the 10% level in explaining changes in the BW index. The lags of HJTZ are significant in explaining changes in the RSS and the 5% level and other indices at the 1-% level, while BW's lags explain changes in the HJTZ. The model explains over 95% variations in the BW and HJTZ, 78% of fluctuations in the VIX and only 46% of changes in the RSS.

**Table 3.** VAR model of the indices

	<b>RSS<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>VIX<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>BW<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>HJTZ<sub>t</sub></b>
RSS <sub>t-1</sub>	***0.64	** -0.16	0.01	0.01
RSS <sub>t-2</sub>	0.12	0.06	0.04	-0.02
VIX <sub>t-1</sub>	0.1	***0.87	-0.05	0
VIX <sub>t-2</sub>	-0.03	-0.1	-0.01	-0.02
BW <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.29	-0.01	***0.86	***0.2
BW <sub>t-2</sub>	0.35	-0.01	0.04	***-0.21
HJTZ <sub>t-1</sub>	**0.56	*0.34	*0.15	***1.45
HJTZ <sub>t-2</sub>	** -0.65	-0.25	-0.04	***-0.48
C	0.00	0	-0.01	0
<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>0.46</i>	<i>0.78</i>	<i>0.96</i>	<i>0.97</i>

(-1) and (-2) indicate the first and the second lags of the variables. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10%.

Table 4 depicts an estimate of the model in Equation 13. The model regresses the correlation between equity and bond returns on the investors' expectations and controls for credit risk. The results reveal that the RSS and the three expectation-credit risk interaction variables are significant in explaining the correlation. The relationship is negative. In other words, an increase in the RSS is associated with a decrease in the correlation. The effect is the strongest for the riskiest firms and monotonically weakens as firms move away from the default point. The equation with



the VIX yields similar results, while the model with the BW and HJTZ indices provides mixed results. In the BW model, only one interaction variable is significant, while the index and two interaction coefficients are significant in the HJTZ models.

**Table 4.** Contemporaneous relationship between the indices and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns

<b>Variable</b>	<b>RSS</b>	<b>VIX</b>	<b>BW</b>	<b>HJTZ</b>
DD	** -0.01	*** -0.01	0.00	0.00
DD <sup>2</sup>	*** 0.00	** 0.00	0.00	0.00
I(DD < 0.8)	*** -0.13	** -0.15	** 0.07	0.01
I(DD ≥ 0.8 AND DD < 1.8)	** -0.1	*** -0.15	* 0.03	0.02
I(DD ≥ 1.8 AND DD < 2.8)	** -0.03	** -0.05	* 0.02	** 0.02
I(DD ≥ 2.8 AND DD < 3.8)	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00
INDEX	*** 25.47	*** 0.00	0.00	** -0.01
INDEX*I(DD < 0.8)	** -109.17	*** 0.01	** 0.06	** 0.07
INDEX*I(DD ≥ 0.8 AND DD < 1.8)	*** -88.66	*** 0.01	-0.01	** 0.05
INDEX*I(DD ≥ 1.8 AND DD < 2.8)	*** -35.23	*** 0.00	-0.01	0.01
INDEX*I(DD ≥ 2.8 AND DD < 3.8)	-9.23	0.00	-0.01	0.00
C	*** 0.14	0.16	* 0.09	*** 0.09
<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>61.1%</i>	<i>61.3%</i>	<i>61.0%</i>	<i>61.1%</i>

The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECH (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level.

Re-estimating the model presented in Table 4 with the first lags of the explanatory variables reveals that the RSS is able to predict the correlation. The coefficients imply that an increase in the RSS leads to a decrease in the correlation in a subsequent month. The strength of this effect depends on a firm's credit risk. The first lag of the index coefficient and the first three interaction coefficients are significant while the fourth (i.e. the lowest credit risk) interaction coefficient is not

significant at any of the conventional levels. The VIX model yields similar results. In the HJTZ model, the index and two interaction coefficients are significant, while only one interaction coefficient is significant in the BW model.

**Table 5.** The causal relationship between the indices and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns

<b>Variable</b>	<b>RSS<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>VIX<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>BW<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>HJTZ<sub>t</sub></b>
DD <sub>t-1</sub>	** <i>-0.01</i>	*** <i>-0.01</i>	0.00	-0.004
DD <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	*0.00	**0.00	0.00	*0.000
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> <0.8)	** <i>-0.25</i>	** <i>-0.14</i>	0.03	0.000
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥0.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <1.8)	*** <i>-0.13</i>	*** <i>-0.13</i>	0.02	0.010
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥1.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <2.8)	** <i>-0.05</i>	* <i>-0.04</i>	0.01	0.008
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥2.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <3.8)	** <i>-0.03</i>	<i>-0.02</i>	0.01	0.007
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub>	**18.18	***0.00	0.00	* <i>-0.006</i>
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> <0.8)	** <i>-162.09</i>	**0.00	**0.05	0.032
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥0.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <1.8)	*** <i>-94.71</i>	***0.00	-0.01	*0.031
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥1.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <2.8)	*** <i>-38.52</i>	*0.00	-0.01	0.000
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥2.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <3.8)	** <i>-30.26</i>	0.00	0.00	0.003
Intercept	***0.13	***0.17	***0.10	***0.1
<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>61.1%</i>	<i>61.2%</i>	<i>61.0%</i>	<i>61.0%</i>

The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECH (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from Equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. (t-1) indicates the first lag of the variable. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level.

As depicted by Equation 1, the RSS is the difference between the frequency of words indicating excitement and the frequency of words indicating anxiety. Investors may respond to positive and negative news differently (e.g. Brown, Harlow and Tinic, 1988; Tetlock, 2007). To examine this hypothesis, we replace the RSS with the excitement and anxiety components and estimate the models presented in Table 4 and Table 5. In the contemporaneous model, the coefficients of the RSS components and most of the interaction variables are significant. The

coefficient signs and magnitude are as expected – an increase in excitement lowers the correlation while an increase in anxiety strengthens the correlation. The effect is more substantial for riskier firms. Surprisingly, the magnitude of coefficients implies that a change in excitement is associated with a larger change in the correlation than a change in anxiety. For firms with the distance to default from 0.8 to 1.8, a 0.001 increase in excitement is associated with a decrease in the correlation of 18% while a similar increase in anxiety is associated with an increase in the correlation of 5%.


The statistical significance and magnitude of coefficients in the causal models reveal that the predictive power of the RSS is due to its anxiety component. All anxiety coefficients are statistically significant and show that an increase in excitement causes an increase in the correlation. The effects monotonically decrease as firms' move away from the default point. On the other hand, only two interaction coefficients of the excitement components are significant.

**Table 6.** Contemporaneous and causal relationship between the RSS's components and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns

	<b>Cotemporaneous</b>	<b>Causal</b>
DD	** -0.006	** -0.005
DD <sup>2</sup>	* 0.000	* 0.000
I(DD < 0.8)	0.148	*** -0.62
I(DD ≥ 0.8 AND DD < 1.8)	0.119	0.075
I(DD ≥ 1.8 AND DD < 2.8)	0.093	0.012
I(DD ≥ 2.8 AND DD < 3.8)	-0.024	** -0.111
RSS Anxiety	*** -24.208	** -17.886
RSS Anxiety * I(DD < 0.8)	82.708	*** 198.743
RSS Anxiety * I(DD ≥ 0.8 AND DD < 1.8)	** 72.918	*** 80.342
RSS Anxiety * I(DD ≥ 1.8 AND DD < 2.8)	** 27.465	*** 34.878
RSS Anxiety * I(DD ≥ 2.8 AND DD < 3.8)	10.137	*** 34.933
RSS Excitement	** 36.769	20.026
RSS Excitement * I(DD < 0.8)	* -255.61	33.263
RSS Excitement * I(DD ≥ 0.8 AND DD < 1.8)	*** -215.776	*** -212.409
RSS Excitement * I(DD ≥ 1.8 AND DD < 2.8)	*** -109.679	* -74.027
RSS Excitement * I(DD ≥ 2.8 AND DD < 3.8)	1.147	18.248
Intercept	*** 0.117	*** 0.124
<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>61.2%</i>	<i>61.2%</i>


The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECM (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from Equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. The first lags of the variables are used in the causal model. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level.

As noted above, the effect of changes in the investors' expectations depends on the riskiness of firms. The effect weakens as firms become safer and reverses the sign for the safest group of firms. In other firms, a negative change in the expectations of investors is associated with a steep increase in the correlation between equity and bond returns of the riskiest firms whereas it is related to a decrease in the correlation of the safest firms.



**Figure 2.** The contemporaneous correlation between equity and bond returns conditioned to the maximum, average and minimum RSS value.

A similar dependence on credit risk is present in the causal model too. A decline in the investors' expectations causes a steep increase in the correlation of risky firms. The magnitude of the effect decreases as firms move away from the default point and becomes essentially zero for the safest firms.



**Figure 3.** The causal correlation between equity and bond returns conditioned to the maximum, average and minimum RSS value.

## 5. Robustness checks

Firm size, bond duration, and bond issue size are important characteristics that can potentially influence the correlation between equity and bond returns. Credit risk exposure may be related to firm size. The relation between the duration and the risk inherent in a bond is straightforward: a longer duration indicates higher risk, *ceteris paribus*. Therefore, the returns on long-term bonds should behave more like equity returns than the returns on short-term bonds. The size of a bond issue may affect the correlation through the liquidity mechanism. Large bond issues are more liquid, and therefore their values should react more quickly to shocks in the value of the issuing firm's equity.

To examine whether the results are sensitive to changes in firm size, the maturity and liquidity of bonds in the sample, the models presented in Table 4-6 are augmented with three sets of dummy variables to control for firm size, bond duration, and issue size. The largest firms, the largest issue size, and the longest duration are the benchmarks for which we have no dummies in order to avoid the dummy variable trap. In each case, the number of dummies and their associated thresholds were selected using the approach detailed in Appendix.

The augmented contemporaneous models are presented in Table 7. The coefficients of the bond value and duration control variables are mostly significant, but the results on the effect of changes in the investor's expectations are not altered. The last RSS-credit risk interaction variable, which is insignificant in Table 4, is now significant at the ten per cent level.

**Table 7.** The contemporaneous relationship between the indices and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns – robustness checks

	<b>RSS</b>	<b>VIX</b>	<b>BW</b>	<b>HJTZ</b>
DD	***-0.008	***-0.008	-0.003	-0.004
DD <sup>2</sup>	**0.000	**0.000	0.000	*0.000
I(DD<0.8)	-0.086	*-0.112	***0.088	0.030
I(DD>=0.8 AND DD<1.8)	** -0.095	***-0.141	**0.031	*0.020
I(DD>=1.8 AND DD<2.8)	** -0.036	***-0.045	*0.014	*0.014
I(DD>=2.8 AND DD<3.8)	-0.012	-0.009	0.001	0.001
INDEX	***29.849	***-0.002	-0.001	*-0.005
INDEX*I(DD<0.8)	** -89.841	***0.004	**0.063	**0.058
INDEX*I(DD>=0.8 AND DD<1.8)	*** -84.093	***0.005	-0.009	**0.043
INDEX*I(DD>=1.8 AND DD<2.8)	*** -37.014	***0.002	-0.007	0.004
INDEX*I(DD>=2.8 AND DD<3.8)	* -10.979	0.00	-0.006	-0.002
Intercept	***0.213	***0.223	***0.169	***0.155
Asset Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	***-0.277	***-0.257	***-0.277	***-0.259
Asset Value Dummy 2	*-0.029	-0.015	-0.026	-0.018
Asset Value Dummy 3	*-0.020	-0.010	-0.016	-0.012
Asset Value Dummy 4	0.008	*0.015	0.014	*0.016
Asset Value Dummy 5	0.002	0.007	0.007	0.008
Asset Value Dummy 6	-0.001	0.001	0.003	0.002
Bond Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	***-0.223	***-0.220	***-0.234	***-0.212
Bond Value Dummy 2	***-0.122	***-0.121	***-0.123	***-0.103
Bond Value Dummy 3	-0.051	-0.045	-0.058	-0.040
Bond Value Dummy 4	** -0.073	** -0.068	** -0.081	* -0.066
Bond Value Dummy 5	***-0.094	***-0.092	***-0.1	***-0.086
Bond Value Dummy 6	** -0.075	** -0.074	***-0.08	** -0.067
Bond Value Dummy 7	***-0.099	***-0.097	***-0.104	***-0.09
Bond Value Dummy 8	***-0.078	***-0.073	***-0.085	***-0.074
Bond Duration Dummy 1 (shortest)	***0.063	***0.051	***0.047	***0.049
Bond Duration Dummy 2	***0.048	***0.039	***0.036	***0.038
Bond Duration Dummy 3	***0.016	*0.011	*0.010	*0.010

The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECH (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level.

The Asset Value Dummies 1 to 6 take the value of 1 if the log of firm's asset value in millions of US dollars is less than 6 or between the two thresholds of 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (i.e., 403, 1097, 2981, 8103, 22026, 59874 million). The Bond Value Dummies 1 to 8 take the value of 1 if the log of bond issue value in millions of US dollars is less than 3.1 or between the two thresholds of 3.1, 3.6, 4.1, 4.6, 5.1, 5.6, 6.1, and 6.6 (i.e. 22, 37, 60, 99, 164, 270, 446 and 735 million). The Bond Duration Dummies 1 to 3 take the value of 1 if the bond duration is less than 3.7 or between the two thresholds of 3.7, 7.2, and 10.5 years. The selection of dummy variable sets is described in in the Appendix.



The results presented in Tables 8 show that the results on the causal relationship between changes in the investors' expectations and the correlation hold after controlling for the firm size, bond issue size and duration. An improvement in the investors' expectations leads to a weaker correlation between equity and bond returns.

**Table 8.** The causal relationship between the indices and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns – robustness checks

	<b>RSS<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>VIX<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>BW<sub>t</sub></b>	<b>HJZ<sub>t</sub></b>
DD <sub>t-1</sub>	** -0.006	*** -0.009	-0.003	-0.004
DD <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	** 0.000	** 0.000	0.000	* 0.000
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> <0.8)	** -0.231	-0.108	0.045	0.015
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥0.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <1.8)	*** -0.127	*** -0.123	0.016	0.009
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥1.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <2.8)	*** -0.052	* -0.043	0.005	0.005
I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥2.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <3.8)	*** -0.036	-0.026	0.004	0.004
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub>	*** 22.326	*** -0.002	-0.002	* -0.005
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> <0.8)	*** -157.403	** 0.004	** 0.05	0.023
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥0.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <1.8)	*** -93.133	*** 0.004	-0.004	* 0.028
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥1.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <2.8)	*** -40.553	* 0.002	-0.006	0.000
INDEX <sub>t-1</sub> *I(DD <sub>t-1</sub> ≥2.8 AND DD <sub>t-1</sub> <3.8)	*** -31.897	0.001	-0.004	0.003
Intercept	*** 0.182	*** 0.207	*** 0.143	*** 0.14
Asset Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	*** -0.256	*** -0.239	*** -0.249	*** -0.245
Asset Value Dummy 2	-0.017	-0.006	-0.014	-0.012
Asset Value Dummy 3	-0.013	-0.006	-0.011	-0.009
Asset Value Dummy 4	0.013	* 0.017	* 0.016	* 0.017
Asset Value Dummy 5	0.006	0.008	0.009	0.009
Asset Value Dummy 6	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.003
Bond Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	*** -0.193	*** -0.179	*** -0.184	*** -0.18
Bond Value Dummy 2	** -0.096	* -0.083	* -0.08	* -0.079
Bond Value Dummy 3	-0.029	-0.019	-0.023	-0.019
Bond Value Dummy 4	-0.055	-0.048	-0.053	-0.048
Bond Value Dummy 5	** -0.079	** -0.073	** -0.075	** -0.072
Bond Value Dummy 6	** -0.065	* -0.061	* -0.061	* -0.057
Bond Value Dummy 7	*** -0.091	*** -0.088	*** -0.09	*** -0.085
Bond Value Dummy 8	*** -0.074	*** -0.07	*** -0.079	*** -0.074
Bond Duration Dummy 1 (shortest)	*** 0.063	*** 0.058	*** 0.053	*** 0.056
Bond Duration Dummy 2	*** 0.049	*** 0.044	*** 0.04	*** 0.043
Bond Duration Dummy 3	*** 0.016	** 0.014	* 0.012	** 0.013

The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECM (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. (-1) indicates the first lag of the variable. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level. The Asset Value Dummies 1 to 6 take the value of 1 if the log of firm's asset value in millions of US dollars is less than 6 or between the two thresholds of 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (i.e., 403, 1097, 2981, 8103, 22026, 59874 million). The Bond Value Dummies 1 to 8 take the value of 1 if the log of bond issue value in millions of US dollars is less than 3.1 or between the two thresholds of 3.1, 3.6, 4.1, 4.6, 5.1, 5.6, 6.1, and 6.6 (i.e. 22, 37, 60, 99, 164, 270, 446 and 735 million). The Bond Duration Dummies 1 to 3 take the value of 1 if the bond duration is less than 3.7 or between the two thresholds of 3.7, 7.2, and 10.5 years. The selection of dummy variable sets is described in the Appendix.

Finally, the models presented in Table 6 are augmented with the control variables. The first excitement-credit risk interaction variables in the contemporaneous model, which is significant at the ten per cent level in the un-augmented model, is now insignificant, which the last anxiety-credit risk interaction variable become significant at the ten per cent level. However, the obtained results, including the one that changes in the anxiety component cause changes in the correlation, are unaltered.

**Table 9.** Cotemporaneous and causal relationship between the RSS's components and the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns - robustness checks

	<b>Cotemporaneous</b>	<b>Causal</b>
DD	** -0.007	** -0.006
DD <sup>2</sup>	** 0	** 0
I(DD<0.8)	0.131	*** -0.708
I(DD>=0.8 AND DD<1.8)	0.065	0.038
I(DD>=1.8 AND DD<2.8)	0.089	0.006
I(DD>=2.8 AND DD<3.8)	-0.024	** -0.105
RSS Anxiety	*** -29.276	** -22.554
RSS Anxiety*I(DD<0.8)	69.076	*** 203.868
RSS Anxiety*I(DD>=0.8 AND DD<1.8)	** 72.476	*** 81.18
RSS Anxiety*I(DD>=1.8 AND DD<2.8)	*** 29.066	*** 36.864
RSS Anxiety*I(DD>=2.8 AND DD<3.8)	* 11.489	*** 35.875
RSS Excitement	*** 35.815	19.419
RSS Excitement*I(DD<0.8)	-205.182	94.015
RSS Excitement*I(DD>=0.8 AND DD<1.8)	** -177.396	** -189.25
RSS Excitement*I(DD>=1.8 AND DD<2.8)	*** -111.977	* -75.01
RSS Excitement*I(DD>=2.8 AND DD<3.8)	-3.088	10.14
Intercept	*** 0.202	*** 0.186
Asset Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	*** -0.268	*** -0.258
Asset Value Dummy 2	-0.027	-0.017
Asset Value Dummy 3	* -0.02	-0.013
Asset Value Dummy 4	0.008	0.013
Asset Value Dummy 5	0.002	0.006
Asset Value Dummy 6	-0.001	0.001
Bond Value Dummy 1 (smallest)	*** -0.224	*** -0.191
Bond Value Dummy 2	*** -0.122	** -0.093
Bond Value Dummy 3	-0.052	-0.027
Bond Value Dummy 4	** -0.074	-0.055
Bond Value Dummy 5	*** -0.095	** -0.078
Bond Value Dummy 6	** -0.076	** -0.064
Bond Value Dummy 7	*** -0.1	*** -0.09
Bond Value Dummy 8	*** -0.079	*** -0.074
Bond Duration Dummy 1 (shortest)	*** 0.064	*** 0.063
Bond Duration Dummy 2	*** 0.048	*** 0.048
Bond Duration Dummy 3	*** 0.016	*** 0.016

The models are estimated using fixed firm effects with correction for cross-sectional error dependence. The estimated model is Equation (13). The dependent variable,  $C_{it}$ , is the conditional correlation estimated from the VECM (1,1) from Equation (5). The Distance to Default,  $DD_{it}$ , is obtained from equation (10), and  $I(\cdot)$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the argument is true and zero otherwise. The first lags of the variables are used in the causal model. \*\*\*/\*\*/\* indicates significance at the 1%/5%/10% level. The Asset Value Dummies 1 to 6 take the value of 1 if the log of firm's asset value in millions of US dollars is less than 6 or between the two thresholds of 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (i.e., 403, 1097, 2981, 8103, 22026, 59874 million). The Bond Value Dummies 1 to 8 take the value of 1 if the log of bond issue value in millions of US dollars is less than 3.1 or between the two thresholds of 3.1, 3.6, 4.1, 4.6, 5.1, 5.6, 6.1, and 6.6 (i.e. 22, 37, 60, 99, 164, 270, 446 and 735 million). The Bond Duration Dummies 1 to 3 take the value of 1 if the bond duration is less than 3.7 or between the two thresholds of 3.7, 7.2, and 10.5 years. The selection of dummy variable sets is described in the Appendix.

## 6. Conclusions

It is well documented that investors' preference for assets of the highest quality and liquidity sharply increase when the markets are unstable, such as crises periods like the one witnessed in 2008. At these times, shifts in the common expectations about risk and returns are the primary drivers of asset prices. Moreover, a recent study by Bollerslev et al. (2018) shows that volatility patterns across the markets are highly similar most of the time. This implies that the importance of changes in the common expectations of investors extends beyond the relatively short and infrequent episodes of flights to quality and liquidity.

In line with other studies, authors examining the pricing of corporate debt find that the firm-level variables implied by the structural model of Merton (1974) cannot explain a large portion of the credit spread. Consequently, they emphasise the importance of a common factor. We contribute to the literature by examining how changes in the common expectations of investors affect the correlation between equity and corporate bond returns. We use a measure of investor's expectations, termed the Relative Sentiment Shift (RSS), not previously used in financial research. The RSS is defined as the difference in relative frequencies of words signalling excitement and anxiety. We also consider alternative measures of the investors' expectations, namely the VIX, BW (Baker and Wurgler, 2006) and HJTZ (Huang et al., 2015) indices.

The RSS is strongly correlated with VIX ( $\rho = -64\%$ ) and weakly correlated with the BW and HJTZ indices. This implies that the RSS and VIX capture the same effect, whereas the other two indices proxy for another effect. In a VAR(2) model of all four indices, the RSS equation has the lowest explanatory power ( $R^2 = 48\%$ ) which suggests that the largest portion of changes

in the RSS is due to orthogonal factors. The first lag of RSS is significant in explaining VIX while past changes in VIX do not explain variations in RSS.

After controlling for credit risk, we find that the RSS and VIX perform similarly in explaining the contemporaneous correlation between equity and bond returns. An improvement in the investors' expectations is associated with a weaker correlation. The magnitude of the effect decreases as firms' move away from the default point. In other words, a change in the investors' expectations will have an outsized impact on the correlation between equity and bond returns of the riskiest firms and little or no impact on the correlation of the safest firms.

Moreover, shifts in the investors' expectations, proxied by the RSS and VIX indices, are significant in predicting changes the correlation between equity and bond returns.. An improvement in the investors' expectations causes a weaker correlation. Here we also discover that RSS is much more effective than VIX at predicting correlation across the credit risk spectrum. The effect is stronger for the riskiest firms and flattens as firms' credit risk improves. As we are able to decompose RSS into the excitement/optimism and anxiety/pessimism components, we find that this predictive power stems primarily from changes to the anxiety components. In other words, shifts in investors' anxiety lead to changes in the correlation between equity and bond returns of risky firms across the full credit spectrum.

## References

- Anderson, R., & Sundaresan, S. (2000). 'A comparative study of structural models of corporate bond yields: An exploratory investigation'. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 24(1/2), 255.
- Ang, A. and Chen, J. (2002), 'Asymmetric Correlations of Equity Portfolios', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 443-494.
- Baker, M. and Wurgler, J. (2006), 'Investor Sentiment and the Cross-section of Stock Returns', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 1645-1680.
- Barro R. J. (2006), 'Rare Disasters and Asset Markets in the Twentieth Century', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 121, No. 3, pp. 823–866.
- Beber, A., Brandt, M. W. and Kavajecz, K. A. (2009), 'Flight-to-Quality or Flight-to-Liquidity? Evidence from the Euro-Area Bond Market', *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 925-957.
- Bekaert, G. and Wu, G. (2000), 'Asymmetric Volatility and Risk in Equity Markets', *The Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 1-42.
- Belke, A. and Gokus, C. (2011), 'Volatility Patterns of CDS, Bond and Stock Markets Before and During the Financial Crisis: Evidence From Major Financial Institutions', Working Paper (German Institute for Economic Research, Berlin).
- Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973), 'The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities', *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 637-654.
- Bollerslev et al. (2018), 'Risk Everywhere: Modeling and Managing Volatility', *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 7, pp. 2729-773.
- Bollerslev, T. (1986), 'Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity', *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 307-327.

- Bollerslev, T., Engle, R. and Wooldridge, J. (1988), 'A Capital Asset Pricing Model with Time-Varying Covariances', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 96, No. 1, pp. 116-131.
- Brown, G. W. and Cliff, M. T. (2005), 'Investor Sentiment and Asset Valuation', *The Journal of Business*, Vol. 78, No. 2, pp. 405-440.
- Brown, K. C., Harlow, W. V., and Tinic, M.C. (1988), 'Risk Aversion, Uncertain Information, and Market Efficiency', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 22, No. 2., pp. 355-385.
- Caballero, L. J. and Krishnamurthy, A. (2008), 'Collective Risk Management in a Flight to Quality Episode', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 63, No. 5, pp. 2195-2230.
- Campbell, J.Y. and Taksler, G. (2003), 'Equity Volatility and Corporate Bond Yields', *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 58, No. 6, pp. 2321-2350.
- Campbell, J. Y., Hilscher, J. and Szilagyi, J. (2008), 'In Search of Distress Risk', *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 63, No. 6, pp. 2899-2939.
- Collin-Dufresne, P., Goldstein, R. S., & Martin, S. J. (2001). 'The Determinants of Credit Spread Changes', *Journal of Finance*, Vol., 56, No. 6, 2177-2207.
- Cremers, M., Driessen, J., Maenhout, P. and Weinbaum, D. (2008), 'Individual Stock-Option Prices and Credit Spreads', *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol. 32, No. 12, pp. 2706-2715.
- Cutler, D. M., Poterba, J. M. and Summers, L. H. (1989), 'What Moves Stock Prices?', *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 4-12.
- Da, Z., Engelberg, J., and Gao, P. (2015), 'The Sum of all FEARS: Investor Sentiment and Asset Prices', *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1-32.
- Demirovic, A., Guermat, C and Tucker, J. (2017), 'The Relationship between Equity and Bond Returns: An Empirical Investigation', *Journal of Financial Markets*, Vol. 35, No. C, 47-64.



- Ding, Z. and Engle, R. (2001), 'Large Scale Conditional Covariance Matrix Modeling, Estimation and Testing', *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 83-106.
- Durand, R. B., Lim, D. and Zumwalt, J. K. (2011) 'Fear and the Fama-French Factors', *Financial Management*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 409–426.
- Elton, E., Gruber, M. J., Agrawal, D., and Mann, C. (2001), 'Explaining the Rate Spread on Corporate Bonds'. *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 247-277.
- Engle, R. and Kroner, K. (1995), 'Multivariate Simultaneous Generalized ARCH', *Econometric Theory*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 122-150.
- Fama, E. F. (1970), 'Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 383-417.
- Fama, E. F., and French, K. R. (1993), 'Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds'. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 3-56.
- Fang, L., and Peress, J. (2009) 'Media Coverage and the Cross-section of Stock Returns', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 64, No. 5, pp. 2023–2052.
- García, D (2013), 'Sentiment During Recessions', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 1267–1300.
- Hansen, B. E. (2000), 'Sample Splitting and Threshold Estimation', *Econometrica*, Vol. 68, No. 3, pp. 575-603.
- Hillegeist, S. A., Keating, E. K., Cram, D. P., and Lundstedt, K. G. (2004), 'Assessing the Probability of Bankruptcy', *Review of Accounting Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 5-34.
- Huang, D., Jiang, F., Tu, J. and Zhou, G. (2015), 'Investor Sentiment Aligned: A Powerful Predictor of Stock Returns', *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 791-837.
- Kräussl, R. and Mirgorodskaya, E. (2017) 'Media, Sentiment and Market Performance in the Long Run', *European Journal of Finance*, Vol. 23, No. 11, 1059–1082.

- IMF Global Financial Stability Report (2015) : ‘Vulnerabilities, Legacies, and Policy Challenges-Risks Rotating to Emerging Markets’
- Lee, W. Y., Jiang C. X. and Indro, D.C. (2002), ‘Stock Market Volatility, Excess Returns, and the Role of Investor Sentiment’, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 26, No. 12, pp. 2277-2299.
- Longstaff, F. A. (2004), ‘The Flight-to-Liquidity Premium in U.S. Treasury Bond Prices’, *Journal of Business*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 511-526.
- Manela and Moreira (2017), ‘News Implied Volatility and Disaster Concerns’, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 123, No. 1, pp. 137-162.
- Merton, R. (1974), ‘On the Pricing of Corporate Debt: The Risk Structure of Interest Rates’, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 449-470.
- Nozawa, Y. (2017), ‘What Drives the Cross-Section of Credit Spreads?: A Variance Decomposition Approach’, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 72, No. 5, pp. 2045-2072.
- Nyman, R., Kapadia, S., Tuckett, D., Gregory, D., Ormerod, P. and Smith, R. (2018), ‘News and narratives in financial systems: exploiting big data for systemic risk assessment’ *Bank of England Staff Working Paper* No. 704.
- Petersen, M. (2009), ‘Estimating Standard Errors in Finance Panel Data Sets: Comparing Approaches’, *The Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 435-480.
- Ronn, E. I., and Verma, A. K. (1986), ‘Pricing Risk-Adjusted Deposit Insurance: An Option-Based Model’, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 871-895.
- Scruggs, J. and Glabadanidis, P. (2003), ‘Risk Premia and the Dynamic Covariance Between Stock and Bond Returns’, *The Journal of Financial & Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 295-316.

Smales, L. A. (2014), 'News Sentiment and the Investor Fear Gauge', *Finance Research Letters*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 122-130.

Tetlock, P. C. (2007). 'Giving Content to Investor Sentiment: The Role of Media in the Stock Market.' *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 1139–1168.

Tetlock, P. C., Saar-Tsechansky, M., and Macskassy, S. (2008), 'More than Words: Quantifying Language to Measure Firms' Fundamentals.' *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 1437–1467.

## Appendix

The threshold values for the dummy variables are determined in the spirit of Hansen (2000). We basically regress the conditional correlation between equity and bond returns on all potential combinations of models using predetermined threshold increments and select the optimal model based on the Akaike information criterion (AIC).

We assign  $D_{it}^k = I(\tau_{k-1} \leq X_{it} < \tau_k)$  as the dummy variables, where  $X_{it}$  is the value of a variable for firm  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\tau_k$  are thresholds, and  $I(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.  $\tau_0$  is equal to the variable's sample minimum, the first threshold,  $\tau_1$ , is equal to the lower limit  $K_L$ , and the last threshold,  $\tau_n$ , is equal to the upper limit  $K_U$ . The difference between the lower and upper limits covers the large majority of observations. The first threshold,  $\tau_1$ , increases by an increment of 0.1, and the difference between two thresholds,  $s$ , starts at 0.5 and increases by an increment of 0.5, i.e.  $\delta = 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, \dots$ . The threshold selection procedure involves estimation of models with all possible combinations of the number of thresholds ( $n$ ), the starting value of  $\tau_1$ , and the differences between two thresholds ( $\delta$ ), which covers the range from  $K_L$  to  $K_U$ .

In the case of one threshold, the procedure simplifies to estimating the models with one dummy variable  $D_{it}^1 = I(X_{it} < \tau_1)$  with  $\tau_1 = K_L, K_L + 0.1, K_L + 0.2, \dots, K_U$ .

In the case of two thresholds,  $D_{it}^1 = I(X_{it} < \tau_1)$  and  $D_{it}^2 = I(\tau_1 \leq X_{it} < \tau_2)$ , where  $\tau_1 = K_L, K_L + 0.1, K_L + 0.2, \dots, K_U - \delta$ , and  $\tau_2 = \tau_1 + \delta$ .

In the case of  $n$  thresholds,  $D_{it}^1 = I(X_{it} < \tau_1)$  and  $D_{it}^k = I(\tau_{k-1} \leq X_{it} < \tau_k)$ , where  $\tau_1 = K_L, K_L + 0.1, K_L + 0.2, \dots, K_U - (n - 1)\delta$ , and  $\tau_k = \tau_1 + (k - 1)\delta$ .

Performing the above procedure on the distance to default variable requires estimation of 4,753 models with all combinations of the number of dummies (1 to 26), the starting value of  $\tau_1 = 0.5$ , and the differences between two thresholds  $\delta = 0.5, 1, 1.5 \dots$ , which cover the range from  $K_L = 0.5$  to  $K_U = 13$ . The values between these limits cover 98% of the observations. The lowest AIC gives a model with 15 dummy variables or thresholds, and the lowest SSE gives a model with 26 dummy variables. The greatest improvement in AIC (94%) and SSE (90%) is achieved by the best performing model with four dummies. Therefore, we use the best performing four-dummy model in order to present a model that is as parsimonious as possible. Thus, the optimal thresholds for the distance to default dummies are 0.8, 1.8, 2.8, and 3.8. The threshold values for the robustness variables are selected in the same manner.

-----Original Message-----

From: [em.jase.0.68e0d6.30af00ec@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.jase.0.68e0d6.30af00ec@editorialmanager.com)

<[em.jase.0.68e0d6.30af00ec@editorialmanager.com](mailto:em.jase.0.68e0d6.30af00ec@editorialmanager.com)> On Behalf Of Journal of Asset Management

Sent: 27 January 2020 01:32

To: Dr Amer Demirovic <[amer.demirovic@utb.edu.bn](mailto:amer.demirovic@utb.edu.bn)>

Subject: [Newsletter] Your Submission JASE-D-19-00097

Dear Dr. Demirovic,

I am delighted to inform you that the editor of Journal of Asset Management has confirmed that your paper, "A common risk factor and the correlation between equity and corporate bond returns", has been accepted for publication. I cannot yet confirm in which issue of the journal your paper will publish, but we will be in touch once allocated to an issue.

Please can I ask you to take this opportunity to check that all references include the required information and are in the correct format. Please also ensure that tables and figures are in an editable Doc/Excel format. This will prevent delays during the production process.

Once your manuscript has been copy edited and typeset, you will receive an email directing you to our e.Proofing system, where you will be able to check the text of your article and make any corrections to it prior to final publication. You be able to answer any queries from our typesetters at the same time. Please remember that the e.Proof will be your last chance to check the article before it is published, so it is important that you review it carefully.

You have the opportunity to have your accepted manuscript published Open Access as part of the Palgrave Open initiative. On payment of an Article Processing Charge, your article would be made available to non-subscribers immediately upon publication. Palgrave Open articles are made freely available online and can be freely redistributed under a Creative Commons license. Full details about Palgrave Open are available at <http://www.palgrave.com/gp/rights-permissions/open>.

If you want to consider this option the publisher will need to know as soon as possible and ideally within 2 working days of receipt of this message. Please contact [forms@palgrave.com](mailto:forms@palgrave.com) for more information.

If you are not requesting that your article is published Open Access you will need to sign a standard author Copyright Assignment Form instead, before it can be published. You will be sent a copy of the form from our production team in due course and you should return the form to them.

You will also be provided with details of how to order offprints of your individual article and the associated costs. Please bear in mind that if you request copies of your article after publication (i.e. reprints) these will be significantly more expensive.

Your paper should publish online ahead of allocation to a full print/online issue via our Online First service. The Online First version will be fully typeset, definitive and it will have a Digital Object Identifier (DOI), making it fully citable. For further information about Online First please visit the JAM Online First page at <http://link.springer.com/journal/41260/onlineFirst/page/1>.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us at [jam@palgrave.com](mailto:jam@palgrave.com).

With kind regards,  
Marielle de Jong, Ph.D.  
Editor in Chief  
Journal of Asset Management

Comments to the author (if any):  
Reviewer #2: See attached file.

Recipients of this email are registered users within the Editorial Manager database for this journal. We will keep your information on file to use in the process of submitting, evaluating and publishing a manuscript. For more information on how we use your personal details please see our privacy policy at <https://www.springernature.com/production-privacy-policy>. If you no longer wish to receive messages from this journal or you have questions regarding database management, please contact the Publication Office at the link below.

---

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jase/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.