

# Investor Sentiment – Relationship between VIX and Trading Volume<sup>#</sup>

Violet U. T. Lei<sup>a</sup>, Simon M. S. So<sup>a,\*</sup>, Maggie L. J. Zou<sup>a</sup>

(This Version: August 2012)

---

<sup>#</sup> An earlier version of this paper was titled “Investor Sentiment and Trading Volume”.

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Business Administration, University of Macau

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Address: University of Macau, Avenida Padre Tomás Pereira, Taipa, Macau, China; Tel: +853 8397 4715; fax: +853 2883 8320; e-mail: fbasms@umac.mo

# **Investor Sentiment – Relationship between VIX and Trading Volume**

## **Abstract**

As noise traders affect stock market by trading, sentiment, as a signal of noise, may have relationships with trading volume. This paper explores the effect of sentiment on the stock market's trading volume. Increase in Volatility Index (VIX) can explain the percentage increase in trading volume, but only in high VIX period. Besides, higher level of VIX is likely to be associated with greater variability of trading volume. The noise traders add liquidity to the market and provide more chances for investors to time their trade as the volatility of liquidity increases. These two kinds of impact lower rational investors' required return. The noise traders not only drive the price deviating from fundamental value, but also influence the liquidity dimensions.

**JEL Classification:** G12; G14

**Keywords:** *sentiment; trading volume; volatility*

## **1. Introduction**

In the area of modern finance, perfect market and rationality are usually assumed. Underlying logic is then carried out to give insight into how the market works. However, the facts in reality may not be consistent with the assumptions. One major assumption which is always challenged by behavioral finance researchers is rationality of investors. Investors are found to be irrational and subject to various biases (e.g. Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). Traditionally, mispricing from irrational investors is considered to be heterogeneous and can be offset. Even though there is mispricing, it disappears quickly due to arbitrage. However, Kumar and Lee (2006) show that some irrational investors' trades are systematically correlated. Besides, investors could motivate trade among each others, which is known as herd effect. Gleason, Mathur and Peterson (2004) use intraday data and find that herd effect exists in U.S. stock market. Furthermore, arbitrage can be costly and risky. Irrational investors, or noise traders, play an important role in financial market. De Long, Shleifer, Summers and Waldmann (1990) show that the unpredictability of noise traders' belief can create systematic risk and place limit to arbitrage. The magnitude of price deviation from fundamental value is affected by the proportion of noise traders and the level of mispricing. As the noise traders could have positive return from the trend they "created", they may become stronger and lengthen the mispricing period. Arbitrageurs may not be willing to compete with noise traders due to finite horizon because they could lose their wealth before the price goes back to the fundamental value. Shleifer and Summers (1990) have a detail discussion about the possibility and influence of noise traders. Introducing investor sentiment may help to explain various financial market anomalies.

There are a number of papers to investigate the impact of noise traders or investor

sentiment on the stock market. Brown and Cliff (2005) find that sentiment can predict overall market return and the performance of both large and small firms. Neal and Wheatley (1998) compare few sentiment proxies according to their predictive power on return difference between large and small firms. Close-end funds discount and net mutual fund redemptions have such predictive power. Baker and Wurgler (2006) investigate the effect of sentiment on cross-sectional stock returns. They find that small stocks, young stocks and stocks with high volatility are more subject to sentiment than others. During high sentiment period, these stocks are overpriced and thus generate relatively low subsequent return. Glushkov (2006) develops a sentiment beta for individual stocks. It is defined as the change in stock return with respect to the change in sentiment. Consistent with Baker and Wurgler (2006), he finds that stocks with higher sentiment beta are likely to be young, small and comprised of more unique risks than those stocks with low sentiment beta. Cornelli, Goldreich and Ljungqvist (2006) and Dorn (2009) investigate the effect of sentiment on IPO performance. They use grey market price to capture investor sentiment. High grey market price indicates optimism. Stocks that are aggressively bought, or with high price in grey market have high first day return but poor long run performance. Yu and Yuan (2011) find that investors' sentiment affects the risk-return tradeoff. Mean-variance tradeoff is lower during high-sentiment period and becomes higher during low-sentiment period. Lee, Jiang and Indro (2002) find that volatility increases when investors become more bearish and vice versa.

The impact of noise traders leaks out in different way. Black (1986) has a detailed discuss about the noise: "Noise makes financial markets possible, but also makes them imperfect. If there is no noise trading, there will be very little trading in individual

assets.” As noise traders should affect the market by trading, the trading volume is expected to have relationship with the noise. According to the traditional CAPM, systematic risk is the only factor for determining price. As market cannot be perfect, some fashionable variables are found to have explanatory power on return. One of such variables is liquidity (e.g. Pástor and Stambaugh, 2003). Generally, stocks with higher level of liquidity should have lower return. Besides, the second moment of liquidity can also affect return. Chordia, Subrahmanyam and Anshuman (2001) find that there is negative relationship between return and variability of liquidity which is measured by dollar trading volume and share turnover. This surprising finding is explained by Pereira and Zhang (2008). Since higher variation of liquidity provides chance for investor to time their trade, required returns are relatively lower.

Odean (1999) demonstrates that investors with discount brokerage account are overconfident and have excessive trading volume. Brown (1999) shows that small investors would like to trade by using close-end fund data when sentiment is extreme. Furthermore, Baker and Stein (2004) argue that liquidity could serve as a sentiment indicator. Noise traders are likely to be retail investors who are subject to short-sales constraint. If noise traders are bullish about the market, they can simply buy shares and these trades thus facilitate liquidity. However, if noise traders are bearish about the market, short-sales constraint keeps them out of the market. Kurov (2008) finds that trend chasing strategy adopted by noise traders is more active during high sentiment period and this increases market liquidity.

To the best of our understanding, no research investigates the effect of sentiment on the variability of liquidity so far. As mentioned before, noise traders affect stock market by trading. Their trading activities, which affect liquidity, can also affect price.

Therefore, it is worth to know the effect of noise traders on both level and variability of trading volume. This paper attempts to investigate this issue and aims to provide a better understanding about the relationship between sentiment and trading volume. Sentiment proxy is developed to capture the noise or irrationality of investors. It can serve as a noise signal which may have some relationships with trading activity. The better understanding on such relationships may help to assess the impact of noise traders. The realized price impact imposed by noise traders may be composed of various parts - price deviation from fundamental value, additional risk they introduce and additional liquidity and variability they provide. The first two parts may increase rational investors' required return whereas the last one could have a contrary impact. Furthermore, this paper uses daily Volatility Index (VIX) to proxy sentiment. Sentiment proxies used in previous studies are usually monthly or yearly measures which may take time to be collected. In contrary, daily VIX can be obtained publicly. It enables practitioners to assess the impact of noise traders more effortlessly and frequently. The following sections are data and methodology and then empirical results. Conclusion follows.

## **2. Data and Methodology**

Volatility Index (VIX) is used as the proxy to capture investor sentiment. VIX is firstly introduced by Whaley (1993) and the Chicago Board Options Exchange (CBOE) publishes VIX index starting from 1993. The calculation method of VIX was changed in 2003. The original VIX represents the 30-day implied volatility of eight S&P 100 index options. In order to be closer to actual industry practices, since September 2003, VIX has been based on S&P 500 rather than S&P 100 index options because S&P 500 is the most widely used benchmark for the equity market in U.S. VIX used in this paper is

downloaded from the CBOE website.<sup>1</sup> It measures the market's expectation of 30-day implied volatility and is often referred to as "investor fear gauge". The higher the VIX, the greater the fear is. Since noise traders are usually overconfident and over optimistic, they can be more aggressive than rational investors. Besides, noise traders are easily affected by various rumors or pseudo-signals. They may increase the volatility and the market expectation on future volatility, thus affect the performance of VIX. Therefore, VIX serves as the measure of noise signal in this paper.

Unlike asset pricing, there is no benchmark model for trading volume. Many factors are found to have influence on trading volume. Chordia, Roll and Subrahmanyam (2001) examine the determinants of daily change in trading activity. The determinants include market return related variables, short term interest rate, quality spread, term spread, weekday dummies, holiday dummy and GDP, unemployment rate and CPI announcement date dummies. These variables are included in our regression analysis to see if VIX has any additional explanatory power on trading volume. Trading volume of New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) is obtained from Datastream. Datastream's market return index is used to proxy the market return which defined as the percentage change of the return index. Interest rate related variables are downloaded from Federal Reserve website.<sup>2</sup> The announcement date of GDP and the announcement date of CPI and unemployment rate are obtained from Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of Labor Statistics respectively.<sup>3</sup> All variables are on daily basis. To be included in the sample, data should be available for all variables in a specific trading day with positive trading volume.

The dependent variable of the first time series regression test is the daily

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cboe.com>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.federalreserve.gov/econresdata/releases/statisticsdata.htm>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.bea.gov> and <http://www.bls.gov> respectively

percentage change of trading volume ( $\% \Delta VO$ ) and the explanatory variables are:<sup>4</sup>

**$\Delta VIX$**  : daily change in VIX

**$MKT+$**  : market return at time t and equals to 0 if return is negative

**$MKT-$**  : market return at time t and equals to 0 if return is positive

**$MA5MKT+$**  : average return during t-1 to t-5 and equal to 0 if negative

**$MA5MKT-$**  : average return during t-1 to t-5 and equal to 0 if positive

**$MA5|MKT|$**  : average absolute return during t-1 to t-5

**$ShortRate$**  : difference between Federal Fund Rate at t and t-1

**$TermSpread$**  : daily change in the difference between the yield on 10-year Treasury bond and Federal Fund Rate

**$QualitySpread$**  : daily change in the difference between the yield on Moody's Baa corporate bond and yield on 10-year Treasury bond

**$Holiday$**  : 1 if a specific trading satisfies (1) if Independence Day, Christmas, or New Year's Day falls on a Friday, then the previous Thursday, (2) if any holiday falls on a weekend or on a Monday, then the following Tuesday, (3) if any holiday falls on another weekday, then the preceding and following days, and 0 otherwise.

**$MON, TUE, WED, THU$**  : 1 if trading day is a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday respectively, and 0 otherwise.

**$GDP(1-2), UNP(1-2), CPI(1-2)$**  : 1 on the two trading days prior to a GDP, unemployment or CPI announcement respectively, and 0 otherwise.

---

<sup>4</sup> Except those dummy variables, all other six variables have been examined for stationarity before running time series regression. Both parametric test, Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, and non-parametric test, Phillips-Perron (PP) test, are employed to test the null hypothesis of unit root. The results show that all six time series are stationary. Detailed statistical results are given in Appendix 1.



**GDP(0), UNP(0), CPI(0)** : 1 on the day of a GDP, unemployment , CPI announcement respectively, and 0 otherwise.

In addition to the level of trading volume, this paper also examines the effect of sentiment on its second moment - the variability of trading volume. In literature, there is lack of study to investigate the determinants of the variability in trading volume. In our second test, the explanatory variables are modified based on the assumption that variables that can affect the level of trading volume can also affect the variability of trading volume. Thus, the dependent variable of the second test is the coefficient of variation (**CV(VO)**) which is calculated from trading volumes during  $t$  to  $t-4$ .<sup>5</sup> The explanatory variables are:<sup>6</sup>

**AVG(VIX)** : average VIX during  $t$  to  $t-4$

**AVG(MKT+)** : average market return during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and equal to 0 if negative

**AVG(MKT-)** : average market return during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and equal to 0 if positive

**AVG(ShortRate)** : average ShortRate during  $t$  to  $t-4$

**AVG(TermSpread)** : average TermSpread during  $t$  to  $t-4$

**AVG(QualitySpread)** : average QualitySpread during  $t$  to  $t-4$

**Holiday'** : 1 if there is holiday during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and 0 otherwise

**GDP, UNP, CPI** : 1 if there is GDP, unemployment or CPI announcement during  $t$  to  $t-4$ , respectively

Figure 1 is the time series plot of VIX. VIX is consistently low throughout the period from 1997 to 2007, which includes the Asian crisis, the dot-com bubble and the

---

<sup>5</sup> Coefficient of variation (CV) is the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean or says the ratio of the risk assumed to the expected return.

<sup>6</sup> Except those dummy variables, all other five variables have been examined for stationarity before running time series regression. Both parametric test, Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, and non-parametric test, Phillips-Perron (PP) test, are employed to test the null hypothesis of unit root. The results show that all five time series are stationary. Detailed statistical results are given in Appendix 2.

SARS event. However, VIX around the 2008 financial crisis is extremely high. The result may be due to the development of online trading in the past few years. Most noise traders are likely to be small traders and retail traders. The popularity of online trading helps them to trade easily and frequently. Thus they are easier to assess the stock market and have greater influence (add higher volatility) on the market comparing to the past years.

**< Insert Figure 1 here >**

In order to test whether there exists asymmetric effect of sentiment on the trading volume, two sub-samples, namely low and high sentiment period are drawn from the whole sample period from January 1997 to December 2010. January 2005 to December 2005 is defined as low VIX period whereas July 2008 to June 2009 is defined as high VIX period.

### **3. Empirical Results**

Figure 2 is the time series plot of change in VIX and percentage change in trading volume. Both series exhibit some extreme large changes during the sample period. Change in VIX is relatively small during low sentiment period and large during high sentiment period. On the other hand, the swing of percentage change in trading volume does not vary much across time. The change in VIX has almost zero average, meaning that changes in VIX from time to time offset each other. The investor sentiment cannot persistently increase in the market. It may appear in the market temporarily. The realized VIX may be the sum of general level of VIX which is caused by market fundamental issues and the additional VIX imposed by noise traders. It is hard to

observe any relationship between the two variables by simply observing the graph. The coefficient of correlation in Table 1 may highlight some ideas. The three coefficients of correlation are all positive. There is positive relationship between VIX and trading volume. Besides, the coefficient of correlation using high VIX period data (+0.2019) is higher than the other two. The positive relationship between VIX and trading volume is stronger during high VIX period.

**< Insert Figure 2 here >**

**< Insert Table 1 here >**

Table 2 shows the first regression results for percentage change in trading volume as the dependent variable. In panel A, the coefficients of  $MKT+$ ,  $MKT-$ ,  $MA5MKT+$ ,  $MA5MKT-$  and  $MA5|MKT|$  are in expected sign.  $MA5|MKT|$  is used to investigate the impact of market volatility on the trading activity. Indeed, it is significant in all the three panels. Volatility is the factor that can significantly affect trading volume regardless the presence of controlled variables. In panel B,  $MKT+$  is positively significant whereas the  $MKT-$  is not significant. Thus it indicates that during high VIX period, the trading volume reacts fast only to the most recent positive market movement. However, the reaction to the negative market movement is relatively slow and reluctant, which is reflected by the significance of  $MA5MKT-$ . When there is a downward trend in the market return, the trading volume starts to decrease. Since noise traders are generally optimistic, they may react fast to the positive market movement and buy shares aggressively. On the other hand, they are reluctant when the market has negative return. They may sell stocks and realize the loss after the market exhibits an obvious decreasing trend. In panel C, both  $MKT+$  and  $MKT-$  are significant while both  $MA5MKT+$  and

MA5MKT– are not significant. As the noise trader becomes the minority during low VIX period, the trading volume reacts fast to the recent market movement.

Comparing panels A and B, the weekday dummies, which are used to capture the systematic seasonal pattern in trading activity (see Chordia, Roll and Subrahmanyam, 2001), become not significant during high VIX period. As the noise traders play a significant role in the high VIX period, VIX is able to capture the trading pattern measured by the week day dummies. Besides, the macroeconomic announcement date dummies also become not significant in panel B. One potential explanation is that the effect of the macroeconomic announcement is grabbed by VIX.

After adding those explanatory variables that used in Chordia, Roll and Subrahmanyam (2001), VIX is still significant in panels A and B. If VIX increases, the percentage change in trading volume also increases. The result implies that more trades are associated with higher VIX. In the two sub-samples, the effect of VIX only exists during high sentiment period. As VIX can be viewed as the signal of noise, the result may imply that noise traders increase trading volume. When VIX is low, the noise traders are out of the market, or their role is not significant, VIX has less power in explaining the changing pattern of trading volume.

**< Insert Table 2 here >**

Table 3 shows the second regression results for coefficient of variation of trading volume as the dependent variable. The level of market return appears to be a determinant of the variability of trading volume. Better market performance is associated with larger variation in trading volume. The coefficient of AVG(VIX) is positive and significant as well. If the level of VIX over the successive trading days is

higher, the variability of trading volume over the successive trading days also tends to be larger. Noise traders are usually uninformed. Their trade is based on noise or sentimental belief and is likely to be affected by various news or rumors. During high VIX period, the noise traders share a significant portion of investors. The induced trades are noise trading. The volatility of trading activity is likely to be induced by those noise trading. Their variable trading behavior may also affect the volatility in stock returns. Lee et al. (2002) find that stock market return volatility increases when investors become more bearish.

< Insert Table 3 here >

#### **4. Conclusion**

Level and variability of liquidity are found to significantly affect market return. Trading volume, as a proxy of liquidity, may be worth to be investigated. Noise traders could impose risks on price by deriving it from the fundamental value. Besides, as noise traders should affect price by trading, their trading behavior, captured by level and variability of trading volume, may also have effect on return. The change in VIX significantly explains the percentage change in trading volume, but such effect only exists in high sentiment period. Their correlation coefficient is positive, meaning that when VIX increases, trading volume also increases. The volatility of trading volume is also found to be positively related to the level of VIX. When the level of VIX during successive trading days is higher, the variability of trading volume during the same period is also higher.

On one hand, noise traders drive price deviation from fundamental value. Arbitrageurs or rational investors may require higher return for compensating the

mispricing risk. On the other hand, noise traders also add liquidity and induce the variability of liquidity. Previous researches show that the increase in the level and/or variability in liquidity lower the required return. Therefore, the realized price impact of noise trader may be a combination of different kinds of impact. This consideration may help in explaining different findings among researches and provide an alternative approach to assess the impact of noise traders.

## Reference

Baker, Malcolm and Stein, Jeremy C., 2004, "Market liquidity as a sentiment indicator", *Journal of Financial Markets* V.7(3), pp.271-299.

Baker, Malcolm and Wurgler, Jeffrey, 2006, "Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock return", *Journal of Finance* V.61(4), pp.1645-1680.

Black, Fischer, 1986, "Noise", *Journal of Finance* V.41(3), pp.529-543.

Brown, Gregory W., 1999, "Volatility, sentiment, and noise Traders", *Financial Analysts Journal* V.55(2), pp.82-90.

Brown, Gregory W. and Cliff, Michael T., 2005, "Investor sentiment and asset valuation", *Journal of Business* V.78(2), pp.405-440.

Chordia, Tarun, Roll, Richard and Subrahmanyam, Avanidhar, 2001, "Market liquidity and trading activity", *Journal of Finance* V.56(2), pp.501-530.

Chordia, Tarun, Subrahmanyam, Avanidhar and Anshuman, V. Ravi, 2001, "Trading activity and expected stock returns", *Journal of Financial Economics* V.59(1), pp.3-32.

Cornelli, Francesca, Goldreich, David and Ljungqvist, Alexander, 2006, "Investor sentiment and pre-IPO markets", *Journal of Finance* V.61(3), pp.1187-1216.

De Long, J. Bradford, Shleifer, Andrei, Summers, Lawrence H. and Waldmann, Robert J., 1990, "Noise trader risk in financial markets", *Journal of Political Economy* V.98(4), pp.703-738.

Dorn, Daniel, 2009, "Does sentiment drive the retail demand for IPOs?", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* V.44(1), pp.85-108.

Gleason, Kimberly C., Mathur, Ike, and Peterson, Mark A., 2004, "Analysis of intraday herding behavior among the sector ETFs", *Journal of Empirical Finance* V.11(5), pp.681-694.

Glushkvo, Denys, 2006, "Sentiment beta", SSRN working paper.

Kahneman, Daniel and Tversky, Amos, 1979, "Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk", *Econometrica* V.47(2), pp.263-291.

Kumar, Alok and Lee, Charles M.C., 2006, "Retail investor sentiment and return comovements", *Journal of Finance* V.61(5), pp.2451-2486.

Kurov, Alexander, 2008, "Investor sentiment, trading behavior and informational efficiency in index futures markets", *Financial Review* V.43(1), pp.107-127.

Lee, Wayne Y., Jiang, Christine X., Indro, Daniel C., 2002, "Stock market volatility, excess returns, and the role of investor sentiment", *Journal of Banking and Finance* V.26(2), pp.2277-2299.

Neal, Robert and Wheatley, Simon M., 1998, "Do measures of investor sentiment predict returns?", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* V.33(4), pp.523-547.

Odean, Terrance, 1999, "Do investors trade too much?", *American Economic Review* V.89(5), pp.1279-1298.

Pástor, Ľuboš and Stambaugh, Robert F., 2003, "Liquidity risk and expected stock returns", *Journal of Political Economy* V.111(3), pp.642-685.

Pereira, João Pedro and Zhang, Harold H., 2008, "Stock returns and the volatility of liquidity", *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* V.45(4), pp.1077-1110.


Shleifer, Andrei and Summers, Lawrence H., 1990, "The noise trader approach to finance", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* V.4(2), pp.19-33.

Whaley, Robert E., 1993, "Derivatives on market volatility: hedging tools long overdue", *Journal of Derivatives* V.1(Fall), pp.71-84.


Yu, Jianfeng and Yuan, Yu, 2011, "Investor sentiment and the mean-variance relation", *Journal of Financial Economics* V.100(2), pp.367-381.



**Figure 1 Time Series Plot of Volatility Index (VIX), 1997 - 2010**



**Figure 2 Time Series Plot of Change in VIX and Percentage Change of Trading Volume, 1997 - 2010**



**Table 1** Summary statistic of % $\Delta$ VO and  $\Delta$ VIX

	Mean	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Std. Dev.
% $\Delta$ VO	0.0185	0.0005	2.1552	-0.7604	0.2081
$\Delta$ VIX	0.0001	-0.0800	16.5400	-17.3600	1.7080
Coefficient of Correlation ( $\Delta$ VIX & % $\Delta$ VO)					
Whole Period <u>(1997/01 - 2010/12)</u>		High VIX Period <u>(2008/07 - 2009/06)</u>		Low VIX Period <u>(2005/01 - 2005/12)</u>	
0.1107		0.2019		0.1263	

**Table 2 Time Series Regression for Percentage Change in Trading Volume**

The dependent variable is the daily percentage change of trading volume,  $\% \Delta VO$ . The explanatory variables are:  $\Delta VIX$  : daily change in VIX;  $MKT+$  : market return at time  $t$  and equals to 0 if return is negative;  $MKT-$  : market return at time  $t$  and equals to 0 if return is positive;  $MA5MKT+$  : average return during  $t-1$  to  $t-5$  and equal to 0 if negative;  $MA5MKT-$  : average return during  $t-1$  to  $t-5$  and equal to 0 if positive;  $MA5|MKT|$  : average absolute return during  $t-1$  to  $t-5$ ; **ShortRate** : difference between Federal Fund Rate at  $t$  and  $t-1$ ; **TermSpread** : daily change in the difference between the yield on 10-year Treasury bond and Federal Fund Rate; **QualitySpread** : daily change in the difference between the yield on Moody's Baa corporate bond and yield on 10-year Treasury bond; **Holiday** : 1 if a specific trading satisfies (1) if Independence Day, Christmas, or New Year's Day falls on a Friday, then the previous Thursday, (2) if any holiday falls on a weekend or on a Monday, then the following Tuesday, (3) if any holiday falls on another weekday, then the preceding and following days, and 0 otherwise; **MON**, **TUE**, **WED**, **THU** : 1 if trading day is a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday respectively, and 0 otherwise; **GDP(1-2)**, **UNP(1-2)**, **CPI(1-2)** : 1 on the two trading days prior to a GDP, unemployment or CPI announcement respectively, and 0 otherwise; **GDP(0)**, **UNP(0)**, **CPI(0)** : 1 on the day of a GDP, unemployment, CPI announcement respectively, and 0 otherwise.

Dependent Variable : $\% \Delta VO$								
Explanatory Variables	Panel A			Panel B			Panel C	
	Whole Period <sup>(a)</sup> (1997/01 - 2010/12) 3443 Observations			High VIX Period <sup>(b)</sup> (2008/07 - 2009/06) 250 Observations			Low VIX Period <sup>(c)</sup> (2005/01 - 2005/12) 250 Observations	
	Coefficients		<i>p</i> -value	Coefficients		<i>p</i> -value	Coefficients	<i>p</i> -value
$\Delta VIX$	0.0279 ***		0.0000	0.0269 ***		0.0007	-0.0199	0.5123
$MKT+$	6.9513 ***		0.0000	5.7601 ***		0.0012	11.0057 **	0.0023
$MKT-$	-1.9560 *		0.0516	-0.0525		0.9799	-20.9593 **	0.0188
$MA5MKT+$	1.4763		0.3999	8.8393		0.1460	3.4678	0.7138
$MA5MKT-$	-0.8218		0.4282	-6.5810 ***		0.0015	6.7781	0.2811
$MA5 MKT $	-4.9120 ***		0.0000	-5.6677 ***		0.0001	-13.9890 **	0.0147
<b>MON</b>	-0.0419 **		0.0124	-0.1141		0.1681	0.0068	0.9208
<b>TUE</b>	0.1056 ***		0.0000	-0.0465		0.4614	0.1040 ***	0.0093
<b>WED</b>	0.0376 ***		0.0004	-0.0707		0.2902	0.0294	0.4065
<b>THU</b>	-0.0021		0.8473	-0.0536		0.3425	-0.0104	0.7814
<b>Holiday</b>	-0.1214 ***		0.0000	-0.1287		0.1433	-0.0664	0.3772
<b>ShortRate</b>	0.0031		0.9721	-0.6226 ***		0.0016	0.2305	0.4662
<b>TermSpread</b>	-0.0968		0.1802	-0.6039 ***		0.0004	-0.0926	0.6763
<b>QualitySpread</b>	0.1780		0.2408	0.0371		0.8812	0.4923	0.3754
<b>GDP(1-2)</b>	0.0163		0.2148	0.0161		0.6830	0.0905	0.2736
<b>GDP(0)</b>	0.0087		0.5289	0.0409		0.5237	-0.0471	0.1965
<b>UNP(1-2)</b>	0.0054		0.5636	-0.0334		0.3543	0.0162	0.4750
<b>UNP(0)</b>	-0.0371 ***		0.0060	-0.1084		0.1055	-0.0680 *	0.0877
<b>CPI(1-2)</b>	-0.0086		0.2423	-0.0410		0.3447	-0.0363	0.2486
<b>CPI(0)</b>	0.0603 ***		0.0000	0.0043		0.9227	0.0074	0.8444
<b>Intercept</b>	-0.0009		0.9401	0.0989		0.1452	-0.0197	0.6675
<i>F</i> -statistic	26.0096 ***		0.0000	3.3657 ***		0.0000	3.1180 ***	0.0000
<i>R</i> -squared	0.1320			0.2272			0.2140	
Adj. <i>R</i> -squared	0.1269			0.1597			0.1454	

\*\*\*, \*\* & \* denote coefficients significantly different from zero at 1%, 5% & 10%, respectively.

(a), (b) & (c) use 8-lag, 4-lag & 4-lag Newey-West standard errors, respectively.

**Table 3 Time Series Regression for Coefficient of Variation of Trading Volume**

The dependent variable is the coefficient of variation calculated using trading volume during  $t$  to  $t-4$ , **CV(VO)**. The explanatory variables are : **AVG(VIX)** : average VIX during  $t$  to  $t-4$ ; **AVG(MKT+)** : average market return during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and equal to 0 if negative; **AVG(MKT-)** : average market return during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and equal to 0 if positive; **AVG(ShortRate)** : average ShortRate during  $t$  to  $t-4$ ; **AVG(TermSpread)** : average TermSpread during  $t$  to  $t-4$ ; **AVG(QualitySpread)** : average QualitySpread during  $t$  to  $t-4$ ; **Holiday'** : 1 if there is holiday during  $t$  to  $t-4$  and 0 otherwise; **GDP, UNP, CPI** : 1 if there is GDP, unemployment or CPI announcement during  $t$  to  $t-4$ , respectively.

Dependent variables : CV(VO) <sup>(d)</sup>		
Explanatory variables	Coefficient	<i>p</i> -value
AVG(VIX)	0.0010 ***	0.0048
AVG(MKT+)	1.2671 **	0.0370
AVG(MKT-)	-1.0086 *	0.0753
Holiday'	0.0556 ***	0.0000
AVG(ShortRate)	-0.2264 **	0.0170
AVG(TermSpread)	0.1286	0.1725
AVG(QualitySpred)	0.1469	0.3197
GDP	0.0111 **	0.0317
UNP	-0.0166 ***	0.0000
CPI	-0.0059	0.2108
Intercept	0.0885 ***	0.0000
F-statistic	44.0587 ***	0.0000
<i>R</i> -squared	0.1138	
Adj. <i>R</i> -squared	0.1112	

\*\*\*, \*\* & \* denote coefficients significantly different from zero at 1%, 5% & 10%, respectively.

(d) use 8-lag Newey-West standard errors.

## Appendix 1 Unit Root Tests for Percentage Change in Trading Volume and Other Explanatory Variables

	$H_0 : \rho = 1$ (unit root) vs. $H_a : \rho < 1$ (stationary)			
	Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF)		Phillips Perron (PP)	
Variables	$t$ -statistic	$p$ -value	adj. $t$ -statistic	$p$ -value
% $\Delta$ VO	-40.03685	0.0000	-103.0135	0.0001
$\Delta$ VIX	-27.09572	0.0000	-73.99451	0.0001
MA5 MKT	-4.974289	0.0000	-9.714263	0.0000
ShortRate	-29.84085	0.0000	-73.67275	0.0001
TermSpread	-22.57799	0.0000	-82.81058	0.0001
QualitySpread	-23.33128	0.0000	-61.80139	0.0001

## Appendix 2 Unit Root Tests for Coefficient of Variation of Trading Volume and Other Explanatory Variables

	$H_0 : \rho = 1$ (unit root) vs. $H_a : \rho < 1$ (stationary)			
	Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF)		Phillips Perron (PP)	
Variables	$t$ -statistic	$p$ -value	adj. $t$ -statistic	$p$ -value
CV(VO)	-16.56809	0.0000	-18.41725	0.0000
AVG(VIX)	-4.265633	0.0005	-3.681708	0.0044
AVG(ShortRate)	-9.247656	0.0000	-35.39464	0.0000
AVG(TermSpread)	-10.69019	0.0000	-23.56933	0.0000
AVG(QualitySpread)	-7.546654	0.0000	-15.42974	0.0000