

CHAPTER 7

Portfolio Evaluation

Introduction

In the last chapter, we examined how to measure the return and risk of stocks. In an efficient market, investors, however, either individually or through an investment fund, can attain better return-risk opportunities by investing in a portfolio. In this chapter, we analyze portfolios, with the emphasis being on stock portfolios.

Portfolio analysis consists of the evaluation and selection of the financial assets that makeup the portfolio. As with individual security evaluation, stock portfolio evaluation entails measuring the characteristics of the portfolio, with the most important properties being the portfolio expected rate of return and risk. Portfolio selection, in turn, involves finding what proportion of investment funds to allocate to each security to give the portfolio either the maximum expected return for a given risk or the minimum risk given a specified return. In this chapter, we evaluate portfolios of risky stocks in terms of their expected portfolio return and risk, and in Chapter 8, we focus on portfolio selection. We begin by examining the rela-

tionship between portfolio return and risk and the relationship between portfolio risk and number of securities in the portfolio. Next, we introduce a risk-free security and show how investors can obtain different return-risk combinations with different allocations of their investment funds to the risk-free security and a portfolio of risky stocks.

Portfolio Return and Risk

A portfolio can be described by the proportion of investment funds allocated to each security in it. For example, suppose an individual invested \$1,000 in three stocks, denoted X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 . Her stock portfolio would be described by the proportion of investment funds (\$1,000), denoted as w_i , that she allocates to each stock:

$$w_i = \frac{\text{Stock } i \text{ Investment}}{\text{Total Investment}}$$

Thus, if she buys \$200 worth of X_1 , \$300 of X_2 , and \$500 of X_3 , then her portfolio would be described in terms of her proportional allocations of $w_1 = 0.20$, $w_2 = 0.30$, and $w_3 = 0.5$.

In describing a portfolio, two points should be noted. First, the whole must equal the sum of the parts; that is, the proportion of investment funds allocated to each security must sum to one. Thus:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$$

where n = number of stocks in the portfolio.

Second, the allocation or weights, w_i , can take on any value. If $w_i < 0$, then there would be a negative investment in security i . A negative investment is the opposite of investment, which is borrowing or selling

the stock short. In the case of a negative investment in a risky security, such as stock, the negative weight can be interpreted as a short sale in which the investor uses the proceeds from the sale to invest in the other securities in the portfolio. For example, suppose an investor with \$1,000 of investment funds also sells \$500 worth of Stock 1 short (i.e., borrows shares of the stock and sells them in the market for \$500) and uses the proceeds along with his \$1,000 to invest in Stock 2. His portfolio can be described as consisting of two stocks with allocations of $w_1 = -0.5$ and $w_2 = 1.5$:

$$w_1 = \frac{\text{Stock 1 Investment}}{\text{Total Investment}} = \frac{-\$500}{\$1,000} = -0.5$$

$$w_2 = \frac{\text{Stock 2 Investment}}{\text{Total Investment}} = \frac{\$1,500}{\$1,000} = 1.5$$

$$w_1 + w_2 = -0.5 + 1.5 = 1$$

Most stock portfolios constructed by investment companies do not include negative investments or short positions. In our analysis, we will focus on risky stock portfolios with no short positions; that is, all the stocks have positive weights.

Portfolio Expected Return

The portfolio rate of return is the sum of the weighted rates of return of the securities making up the portfolio, with the weights being the proportion of investment funds allocated to each security:

$$R_p = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i r_i = w_1 r_1 + w_2 r_2 + \cdots + w_n r_n \quad (7.1)$$

where:

- R_p = portfolio rate of return

- r_i = rate of return on security i for the period (holding period yield)

Thus, if the above investor who allocated 20 percent, 30 percent, and 50 percent of her \$1,000 in stocks X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 , attained rates of return of 10 percent, 5 percent, and 15 percent, respectively, for holding these stocks for one year, then her portfolio rate of return (or HPY) would be 11 percent:

$$R_p = (0.20)10\% + (0.30)5\% + (0.50)15\% = 11\%$$

Note that in Equation (7.1) the rate of return on the security is defined as a return for the period (total return, TR , or holding period yield, HPY). Using HPY as the measure of return implies an analysis that is static; that is, it applies to only one period in time. The length of time used for portfolio analysis is difficult to determine. Generally, portfolio analysis excludes very short periods (often characterized by speculative trading), and extremely long periods (often subject to greater uncertainty). Static portfolio analysis is therefore restricted to a period between the very short and long run, anywhere between six months and three years. A static analysis of portfolios does not require that the length of time be defined, only that the analysis be constrained to one period instead of multiple periods.

As we noted in our discussion of security return and risk, investors are concerned not with past returns, but with expected returns. The expected portfolio rate of return is the sum of the weighted expected rates of return of the securities making up the portfolio. That is:

$$E(R_p) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i E(r_i) = w_1 E(r_1) + w_2 E(r_2) + \cdots + w_n E(r_n) \quad (7.2)$$

Equation (7.2) is obtained by treating r_i in Equation (7.1) as a random variable and w_i as a constant and then taking the expected value of Equation (7.1) (i.e., apply expected value operator rules).

Portfolio Risk

Investment risk can be measured by the variance or standard deviation in the security's rate of return. This measure of risk is also appropriate in measuring the risk of a portfolio. From our statistics discussion in Chapter 6, we noted that a portfolio's variance (risk) should depend not only on the variances of the individual stocks that make up the portfolio, but also on the correlation between the stocks composing the portfolio. Recall, the correlation between the rates of return of two securities can be measured by the covariance between their rates or by their correlation coefficient. The covariance is a measure of the extent to which one random variable is above or below its mean at the same time or state that another random variable is above or below its mean. If two random variables, on average, are above their means at the same time, and, on average, below at the same time, then the random variables will be positively correlated with each other and their covariance would be positive. In contrast, if one random variable, on average, is above its mean when another is below, and vice versa, then the random variables would move inversely or negatively to each other and their covariance would be negative.

The covariance between two random variables (e.g., security rates of return), r_1 and r_2 , is equal to the expected value of the product of the variables' deviations. Like any expected value, the covariance can be defined as a weighted sum, with the weights being probabilities associated with each possible product of deviation. That is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(r_1 r_2) &= E[r - E(r_1)][r_2 - E(r_2)] \\ \text{Cov}(r_1 r_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^T p_j [r_{1j} - E(r_1)][r_{2j} - E(r_2)] \end{aligned}$$

Recall from Chapter 6, the correlation coefficient between two random variables such as r_1 and r_2 (ρ_{12}) is equal to the covariance between the variables divided by the product of each random variable's standard deviation, σ :

$$\rho_{12} = \frac{\text{Cov}(r_1 r_2)}{\sigma(r_1)\sigma(r_2)} \quad (7.3)$$

The correlation coefficient has the mathematical property that its value must be within the range of minus and plus one. If two random variables have a correlation coefficient equal to one, they are said to be perfectly positively correlated; if their coefficient is equal to a minus one, then they are perfectly negatively correlated; if their correlation coefficient is equal to zero, then they are uncorrelated and statistically independent:

The covariance or correlation coefficient between two security returns can be estimated using historical averages or a regression model similar to the one described in Chapter 6. An average can be calculated using holding period yields over N historical periods:

$$\text{Cov}_{avg} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{t=1}^N [HPY_{1t} - \bar{r}_{1t}][HPY_{2t} - \bar{r}_{2t}]$$

The covariance also can be estimated by using a regression model. If we assume two stocks (1 and 2) that are both related to the market, R^M , such that

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 &= \alpha_1 + \beta_1 R^M + \epsilon_1 \\ r_2 &= \alpha_2 + \beta_2 R^M + \epsilon_2 \end{aligned}$$

and assume the error terms, ϵ , are uncorrelated ($\text{Cov}(\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2) = 0$), then $\text{Cov}(r_1 r_2)$ simplifies to:


$$\text{Cov}(r_1 r_2) = \beta_1 \beta_2 V(R^M)$$

This says that if each stock's unsystematic risk is independent of every other stock's unsystematic risk, then unsystematic risk in the portfolio would average out to zero, and the covariance between any two securities in the portfolio would depend only on each security's systematic risk. A model in which all se-

curities are related just to one factor, such as the market, and their error terms are uncorrelated is referred to as the Single Index Model. It is examined in more detail in the next chapter.

Importance of the Covariance

Period	Stock X_1				Stock X_2			
	Rate of Return, r_1				Rate of Return, r_2			
1	18%				18%			
2	18				18			
3	6				30			
4	18				18			
5	18				18			
6	30				6			
7	18				18			
8	18				18			
<hr/>								
r_{1i}	P_i	$P_i r_{1i}$	$P_i [r_{1i} - E(r_1)]^2$	R_{2i}	P_i	$P_i r_{2i}$	$P_i [r_{2i} - E(r_2)]^2$	
18%	6/8	13.50%	(6/8)(0)	18%	6/8	13.50%	(6/8)(0)	
6%	1/8	0.75	(1/8)(144)	30%	1/8	3.75	(1/8)(144)	
30%	1/8	3.75	(1/8)(144)	6%	1/8	0.75	(1/8)(144)	
		18.00%	$V(r_1) = 36$			18.00%	$V(r_1) = 36$	
			$\sigma(r_1) = 6$				$\sigma(r_1) = 6$	
<hr/>								
P_i	r_1	R_2	$[r_{1i} - E(r_1)]$	$[r_{2i} - E(r_2)]$	$P_i [r_{1i} - E(r_1)] [r_{2i} - E(r_2)]$			
6/8	18%	18%	0	0	(6/8)(0)(0) = 0			
1/8	6%	30%	-12	12	(1/8)(-12)(12) = -18			
1/8	30%	6%	12	-12	(1/8)(12)(-12) = -18			
					Cov($r_1 r_2$) = -36			
					$\rho_{12} = -1$			
<hr/>								






EXHIBIT 7.1 Correlation between Stock X_1 and Stock X_2

The importance of including the covariance between securities' rates of return in measuring portfolio risk can be seen in [Exhibit 7.1](#). The figure is derived from the observations that appear in the exhibit table. The estimated parameters at the bottom of the table are based on the assumption that next period's returns can be obtained from past observations (i.e., on averages). Both the figure and table show the rates of return of two stocks, X_1 and X_2 , over time. Both stocks X_1 and X_2 have an expected rate of return of 18%, a risk factor as measured by their individual variances of 36%, a covariance of -36, and a correlation coefficient of -1.

An examination of the figure in [Exhibit 7.1](#) shows that when X_1 's return (r_1) is above its mean, $E(r_1)$, X_2 's return (r_2) is below its mean, $E(r_2)$, and when r_2 is above $E(r_2)$, r_1 is below $E(r_1)$; r_1 and r_2 in this example are perfectly negatively correlated ($\rho_{12} = -1$). If an investor, holding these securities in equal proportion, computed his portfolio rate of return (R_p) in time period 3, he would have obtained a rate of return of 18 percent. Similarly, if the investor computed the return for time period 6, he would likewise find an 18 percent rate of return; in fact, with equal weights, the investor would find for any time period that his portfolio rate of return always would be 18 percent. Thus, since the investor can always attain an 18 percent rate of return, there is no portfolio risk. This example therefore illustrates what we first broached in Chapter 6, that the measurement of portfolio risk must take into account not only the risk of each secu-

rity in the portfolio, but also the correlations that exist between the securities in the portfolio. If we measure the risk of a portfolio by the variance, then both of these factors explicitly are taken into account.

Derivation of Portfolio Variance Equation

To derive the equation for the variance of portfolio, $V(R_p)$, we start with the definition of $V(R_p)$. That is:

$$V(R_p) = E[R_p - E(R_p)]^2 \quad (7.4)$$

If, for simplicity, we assume a two-security portfolio:

$$R_p = w_1 r_1 + w_2 r_2$$

then the portfolio variance expression (7.4) is

$$V(R_p) = E[w_1 r_1 + w_2 r_2 - w_1 E(r_1) - w_2 E(r_2)]^2 \quad (7.5)$$

Second, we collect the variables in terms of w_1 and w_2 ; this yields:

$$V(R_p) = E[w_1[r_1 - E(r_1)] + w_2[r_2 - E(r_2)]]^2 \quad (7.6)$$

Equation (7.6) is similar to $[ab + cd]^2$, which is equal to $a^2b^2 + c^2d^2 + 2abcd$. As a third step, we take the square of Equation (7.6). Similar to $(ab + cd)^2$, this yields:

$$\begin{aligned} V(R_p) &= E[w_1^2[r_1 - E(r_1)]^2 + w_2^2[r_2 - E(r_2)]^2 \\ &\quad + 2w_1 w_2 [r_1 - E(r_1)][r_2 - E(r_2)]] \end{aligned} \quad (7.7)$$

The fourth step in the derivation is to apply the expected value operator rules. Applying the rules to Equation (7.7) yields:

$$V(R_p) = w_1^2 E[r_1 - E(r_1)]^2 + w_2^2 E[r_2 - E(r_2)]^2 + 2w_1 w_2 E[r_1 - E(r_1)][r_2 - E(r_2)] \quad (7.8)$$

Finally, by definition we know:

$$\begin{aligned} V(r_1) &= E[r_1 - E(r_1)]^2 \\ V(r_2) &= E[r_2 - E(r_2)]^2 \\ Cov(r_1 r_2) &= E[r_1 - E(r_1)][r_2 - E(r_2)] \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these expressions into Equation (7.8) yields the desired two-security portfolio variance equation:

$$V(R_p) = w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + 2w_1 w_2 Cov(r_1 r_2) \quad (7.9)$$

The portfolio standard deviation, $\sigma(R_p)$, also can be used as the measure of risk and is obtained simply by taking the square root of (7.9):

$$\sigma(R_p) = \sqrt{V(R_p)} = \sqrt{w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + 2w_1 w_2 Cov(r_1 r_2)} \quad (7.10)$$

Equations (7.9) and (7.10) measure the risk of a two-security portfolio. Note that the portfolio variance includes both the weighted variances of the individual securities' rates of return and the covariance between the securities' returns; hence, the correlation among securities explicitly is taken into account in the equations for the portfolio variance and standard deviation. Moreover, if we substitute into Equation (7.9) the parameter values in [Exhibit 7.1](#) used in the preceding example, we can confirm our graphical interpretation that the risk of that portfolio is indeed zero

$$V(R_p) = w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + 2w_1 w_2 Cov(r_1 r_2)$$

$$V(R_p) = (0.5)^2(36) + (0.5)^2(36) + 2(0.5)(0.5)(-36) = 0$$

If the securities in the preceding example had not been perfectly negatively correlated, then the portfolio risk would not have been zero. For example, if X_2 had a 6% return in time period 3 and a 30% return in period 6, its expected return and variance would still be 18% and 36%. The covariance between X_1 and X_2 , however, would be a positive 36 instead of a negative 36, and therefore $\rho_{12} = +1$ instead of -1; the two securities therefore would be perfectly positively correlated in this case. Calculating $V(R_p)$ with the $Cov(r_1 r_2) = 36$, we obtain a portfolio variance of 36:

$$V(R_p) = w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + 2w_1 w_2 Cov(r_1 r_2)$$

$$V(R_p) = (0.5)^2(36) + (0.5)^2 + 2(0.5)(0.5)(36) = 36$$

Although Equation (7.9) is only for a two-security portfolio, the variance for a larger portfolio necessarily takes the same form, the only difference being the number of inputs (variances and covariance) included. For example, if we have a three-security portfolio, then our variance expression would consist of three security variances and three covariances; that is, the covariances for all combinations between stock returns:

$$V(R_p) = w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + w_3^2 V(r_3)$$

$$+ 2w_1 w_2 Cov(r_1 r_2)$$

$$+ 2w_1 w_3 Cov(r_1 r_3)$$

$$+ 2w_2 w_3 Cov(r_2 r_3)$$

If we had a four-security portfolio, then there would be four variances and six covariances, and so on. Equation (7.11) gives a general portfolio variance formula for an n -security portfolio.

$$\begin{aligned}
V(R_p) = & w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + \cdots + w_n^2 V(r_n) \\
& + 2w_1 w_2 \text{Cov}(r_1 r_2) + \cdots + 2w_1 w_n \text{Cov}(r_1 r_n) \\
& + 2w_2 w_3 \text{Cov}(r_2 r_3) + \cdots + 2w_2 w_n \text{Cov}(r_2 r_n) \\
& + 2w_3 w_4 \text{Cov}(r_3 r_4) + \cdots + 2w_3 w_n \text{Cov}(r_3 r_n) + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

For large portfolios, the number of inputs and thus the size of the portfolio expression can be quite substantial. For example, if we were to compute the variance of a 100-security portfolio, as inputs we would need to compute 100 variances and 4,950 covariances. In general, the number of inputs for any n -security portfolio variances is:

- n expected returns.
- n variances.
- $[n^2 - n]/2$ covariances.

Alternative Portfolio Variance Expressions

The portfolio variance equation also can be expressed in terms of the correlation coefficients by substituting ρ_{ij} σ_i σ_j for $\text{Cov}(r_i, r_j)$ in Equation (7.11):

$$\begin{aligned}
V(R_p) = & w_1^2 V(r_1) + w_2^2 V(r_2) + \cdots + w_n^2 V(r_n) \\
& + 2w_1 w_2 \rho_{12} \sigma(r_1) \sigma(r_2) + \cdots + 2w_1 w_n \rho_{1n} \sigma(r_1) \sigma(r_n) \\
& + 2w_2 w_3 \rho_{23} \sigma(r_2) \sigma(r_3) + \cdots + 2w_2 w_n \rho_{2n} \sigma(r_2) \sigma(r_n) \\
& + 2w_3 w_4 \rho_{34} \sigma(r_3) \sigma(r_4) + \cdots + 2w_3 w_n \rho_{3n} \sigma(r_3) \sigma(r_n) + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

Equation (7.12) highlights the direct relationship between the degree of correlation among securities in the portfolio and the portfolio's risk: the lower the correlation, the lower the portfolio risk.

The portfolio variance expression can be written compactly with summation signs. If we denote the variance of a security's return as its standard deviation squared and represent it as

$$\sigma(r_i)^2 = \sigma_i^2$$

and we denote the covariance of securities i and j as

$$Cov(r_i r_j) = \sigma_{ij} \quad \text{where } i \neq j$$

then $V(R_p)$ can be expressed as

$$V(R_p) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2 \sigma_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n w_i w_j \sigma_{ij} \tag{7.13}$$

Note how the double summation of covariances does yield the two $w_i w_j \sigma_{ij}$ terms. For example, in a three-security case, the double summation term is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^3 w_i w_j \sigma_{ij} &= w_1 w_2 \sigma_{12} + w_1 w_3 \sigma_{13} + w_2 w_1 \sigma_{21} \\ &\quad + w_2 w_3 \sigma_{23} + w_3 w_1 \sigma_{31} + w_3 w_2 \sigma_{32} \end{aligned}$$

Since, $\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ji}$, this expression is

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^3 w_i w_j \sigma_{ij} = 2w_1 w_2 \sigma_{12} + 2w_1 w_3 \sigma_{13} + 2w_2 w_3 \sigma_{23}$$

In summary, the portfolio expected return Equation (7.2) and the portfolio variance Equation (7.11) or Equation (7.12) are the important formulas needed to evaluate portfolios. They allow us to quantify any portfolio in terms of its return and risk. By changing the allocations (w_i), we change the portfolio's return and risk. The return-risk equations also show that an investor constructing a portfolio based on the criteria of return and risk must search not only for securities with high expected returns and low risks, but also for ones that are uncorrelated and ideally negatively correlated with each other.

Example

Consider the case of an investor with two stocks, A and B, with the following characteristics:

$$\text{Stock A} \quad E(r_A) = 10\%$$

$$V(r_A) = 36\%$$

$$\text{Stock B} \quad E(r_B) = 10\%$$

$$V(r_B) = 36\%$$

$$\text{Cov}(r_A r_B) = 18$$

$$\rho_{AB} = 0.5$$

Suppose the investor currently has half of her investment funds allocated to each of the stocks, yielding her a portfolio expected rate of return and variance of

$$E(R_p) = (0.5)(10\%) + (0.5)(10\%) = 10\%$$

$$V(R_p) = (0.5)^2(36) + (0.5)^2(36) + 2(0.5)(0.5)(18) = 27$$

Suppose that the investor, however, would like to add a third stock to her portfolio and is considering either stock C, stock D, or stock E, each with the following characteristics:

Stock C $E(r_C) = 10\%$ $Cov(r_A r_C) = 18$

$V(r_C) = 36\%$ $Cov(r_B r_C) = 18$

Stock D $E(r_D) = 10\%$ $Cov(r_A r_D) = 0$

$V(r_D) = 72$ $Cov(r_B r_D) = 0$

Stock E $E(r_E) = 10\%$ $Cov(r_A r_E) = -36$

$V(r_E) = 144$ $Cov(r_B r_E) = -36$

If she adds stock C to her portfolio and allocates one-third of her investment funds to each stock, her new portfolio expected return and variance would be:

$$E(R_p) = (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) = 10\%$$

$$\begin{aligned}V(R_p) &= (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(36) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(18) + 2(1/3)(1/3)(18) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(18) = 24\end{aligned}$$

If the investor selects stock D instead of stock C, and again allocates one-third of her funds to each stock, then her portfolio expected return and variance would be:

$$E(R_p) = (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) = 10\%$$

$$\begin{aligned}V(R_p) &= (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(72) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(18) + 2(1/3)(1/3)(0) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(0) = 20\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if the investor selects stock E as her third security and again uses an equal allocation strategy, then her expected portfolio return and variance would be:

$$E(R_p) = (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) + (1/3)(10\%) = 10\%$$

$$\begin{aligned}V(R_p) &= (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(36) + (1/3)^2(144) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(18) + 2(1/3)(1/3)(-36) \\&\quad + 2(1/3)(1/3)(-36) = 12\end{aligned}$$

Given the choice of adding only one of the stocks to form an equally allocated portfolio, what stock should she choose? If she bases her selection on a portfolio return-risk criterion, stock E would be her best choice. That is, since the same portfolio expected return of 10 percent is attained whether she adds C, D, or E, stock E must be the best since it gives a lower portfolio variance than C or D. What is interesting, however, is that when we measure individual security risk by the variance, stock E is twice as risky as stock D and four times as risky as stock B, yet when we add stock E to the portfolio, it yields the smallest

portfolio variance. The reason, of course, is the lower correlation stock E has with stocks A and B compared to the correlations stocks D and E have with A and B:

Portfolio A, B, C	Portfolio A, B, D	Portfolio A, B, E
$\rho_{AB} = 0.5$	$\rho_{AB} = 0.5$	$\rho_{AB} = 0.5$
$\rho_{AC} = 0.5$	$\rho_{AD} = 0$	$\rho_{AE} = -0.5$
$\rho_{BC} = 0.5$	$\rho_{BD} = 0$	$\rho_{BE} = -0.5$

The example shows the importance of including the correlation in measuring portfolio risk. In addition, if we compare the different portfolio variances obtained with stocks C, D, and E, we confirm our earlier point that the portfolio risk will be lower, the smaller the correlation.

BLOOMBERG CORRELATION MEASURE SCREENS

- **CORR:** The CORR screen can be used to create and save a number of correlation matrices for securities, indexes, currencies, interest rates, and commodities. As noted in Chapter 6, the matrix also shows a variance-covariance matrix (Cov), correlation coefficient matrix (Correlation), beta, and other correlation and regression parameters.
- **PC:** The PC platform shows correlation and regression parameters of a selected stock with its peers and related indexes: S&P 500, Dow Jones, sector indexes, and others. One can select different peers, indexes, portfolios, and securities from searches from the "Bloomberg Peer" drop-down, select different parameters (correlation, beta, covariance, or *t*-statistics) from the "Calculation" tab, different regression periods, and frequencies (e.g., daily, weekly, or monthly).

The PC screen can be saved to the Correlation Matrix from the red "Save to CORR," where it can be accessed for later study by bringing up the CORR screen (CORR <Enter>).

Portfolio Risk and Size Relation

It can be shown mathematically that as the size of a portfolio increases, the portfolio standard deviation (risk) decreases at a decreasing rate to a point (asymptote) where any additional increase in portfolio size has no impact on portfolio risk. Appendix 7A (text Web site) presents the mathematical derivation of portfolio risk-size relation.

The portfolio risk and size relation has also been examined empirically. Evans and Archer were the first to examine this relationship. In their 1968 study, they calculated the average standard deviations of ran-

domly selected portfolios of different sizes. Specifically, they formed a database of the semi-annual returns of 470 NYSE-listed stocks for the period from 1958 to 1967. Securities were then selected using a random number generator and formed into equally weighted portfolios. They first randomly selected 60 two-stock portfolios and calculated the average standard deviation. Evans and Archer then repeated this process: randomly selecting 60 3-security portfolios, 60 4-security portfolios, and so on up to 60 40-security portfolios, then calculating the average standard deviations for each size portfolio:

The result of the Evans and Archer study are shown in [Exhibit 7.2](#). The graph in the exhibit shows the average portfolio standard deviations that Evans and Archer calculated plotted against their size. This empirically generated portfolio risk and size graph, in turn, shows that as the portfolio size increases, the portfolio risk decreases at a decreasing rate to a point where any additional increase in portfolio size has no impact on portfolio risk. In the Evans and Archer study, the maximum risk reduction is realized with a portfolio of approximately 25 stocks, with the portfolio risk being 0.09.




EXHIBIT 7.2 Evans and Archer: Risk-Size Relation

Recall that in Chapter 6 we defined the unsystematic risk of a security or portfolio as the industry and firm risk that could be diversified away, and we defined a security's or portfolio's systematic risk as the market risk that could not be diversified away. In the context of our discussion here, the Evans and Archer study suggests that a portfolio of approximately 25 to 30 stocks would be needed to eliminate unsystematic risk.

Return and Risk of a Portfolio of Risky Stocks and a Risk-Free Security

In Chapter 6, we defined a risk-free security as one whose rate of return is known in advance. If we let R_f be the rate of return on the risk-free security, then by definition the variance of R_f is equal to zero: $V(R_f) = 0$. In addition to a zero variance, the risk-free security also is characterized by having a zero covariance

with the returns of any other security or portfolio. That is, there is no correlation between a random variable and a constant:

Given the opportunity to invest in a risk-free security, investors also want to be able to evaluate a portfolio in which a risk-free security is included with a portfolio of risky stocks. In terms of portfolio evaluation, the inclusion of a risk-free security to a portfolio of risky stocks simply means that we are adding to a stock portfolio a security with a rate of return of R_f , a variance of zero, and a covariance with the other securities in the portfolio of zero. However, to highlight the impact of including a riskless security, let us treat the portfolio as a two-security portfolio, with one of the securities being the risk-free one and the other being the portfolio of risky securities with a return of $E(R_p)$ and risk of $V(R_p)$. Denoting R_I as the rate of return on this two-security portfolio, its expected rate of return would be:

(7.14)

where:

- w_R = proportion of investment funds allocated to the risk-free security
- w_p = proportion of investment funds allocated to the portfolio of risky securities

As with all portfolios, Equation (7.14) is constrained by the condition that the weights sum to one:

Given this constraint, Equation (7.14) can be expressed in terms of just one of the weights, w_p , by substituting $1 - w_p$ for w_R in (7.14):

(7.15)

Using the two-security portfolio variance equation, the variance of a portfolio of risky securities and a risk-free security can be expressed as

Given $V(R_f) = 0$ and $\text{Cov}(R_f R_p) = 0$, this variance expression simplifies to

(7.16)

Finally, taking the square root of (7.16), we obtain the standard deviation of this portfolio:

(7.17)

Equations (7.14) and (7.17) measure the expected return and risk of a portfolio consisting of risky securities and a risk-free security. Note that these equations measure the expected return and standard deviation of returns of the investor's funds. If an investor places all her funds in the portfolio ($w_p = 1$), then her risk would be equal to the portfolio's risk, $\sigma(R_p)$; if she places half of her funds in the risky portfolio and half in the risk-free security, then her investment risk would be equal to half of the portfolio's risk: (0.5) $[\sigma(R_p)]$.

Borrowing and Lending Portfolios

Equations (7.14) and (7.17) can be used to determine the different return-risk opportunities obtainable by changing the allocations of investment funds between the risk-free security and the risky portfolio. For example, suppose an investor is considering investing in a risky stock portfolio with an expected return of $E(R_p) = 10\%$ and a risk (as measured by the standard deviation) of $\sigma(R_p) = 4$. Suppose, however, that the investor is willing to accept a lower expected return for less risk. The investor could change the allocation of the securities in the risky portfolio, with more funds allocated to the less risky stocks. A simpler approach, however, would be to invest only a proportion of funds in the portfolio, the remaining proportion being invested in the risk-free security. For example, suppose the rate on the risk-free security is 5 percent, and the investor decides to place half of his funds in the risk-free security and half in the stock portfolio. Using Equations (7.14) and (7.17), his expected return and risk would be $E(R_I) = 7.5\%$ and $\sigma(R_I) = 2$:

Thus, although the investor's expected return is lower, he has reduced his risk by investing part of his funds in the risk-free security. Moreover, if the investor were still not satisfied with his return-risk opportunity, he could use another allocation strategy. In fact, from a minimum return-risk combination of $E(R_I) = R_f = 5\%$ and $\sigma(R_I) = 0$, in which $w_R = 1$ to a maximum combination of $E(R_I) = E(R_p) = 10\%$, and $\sigma(R_I) = \sigma(R_p) = 4$, in which $w_p = 1$, there are an infinite number of return-risk combinations available to the investor. A portfolio consisting of an investment in a portfolio of risky securities and a risk-free security is referred to as a *lending portfolio*. In a lending portfolio, the allocation to the risk-free security is positive, $w_R > 0$, implying an investment in that security.

Recall from our earlier discussion, that the weights can also be negative. As we noted, a negative weight implies a short position. A short position in a risk-free security ($w_R < 0$) could be implemented by borrowing a risk-free security and selling it in the market at a discount rate of R_f , then at maturity either buying the bond back at its face value and returning it to the security lender so she can collect the principal or simply paying the principal to her. In this case, the short seller of the risk-free security uses the funds from the short sale to invest in the portfolio of risky securities, and she would pay a rate on those proceeds equal to the risk-free rate. A short position can also be implemented by issuing a risk-free security or by borrowing funds from a financial institution at a rate of R_f . In either case, a portfolio of risky securities that is financed in part with funds borrowed at a risk-free rate is referred to as a *borrowing or leveraged portfolio*.

In contrast to a lending portfolio, a leveraged portfolio allows an investor to increase his expected return, but at the expense of assuming a higher risk position. For example, suppose the investor in our preceding case wanted an expected return greater than the 10 percent portfolio return and was willing to assume a risk greater than the risky portfolio's risk of $\sigma(R_p) = 4$. The simplest way to accomplish this would be to leverage the portfolio investment by borrowing additional funds to invest in the portfolio. For example, suppose the investor had \$1,000 of his own funds to invest, plus he borrowed an additional \$1,000 at $R_f = 5\%$ to also invest in the stock portfolio. The proportion of his funds allocated to the stock portfolio would therefore be 2, and the proportion of his funds allocated to the risk-free security would be -1 (i.e., negative investment or borrowing):

Using Equations (7.14) and (7.17), the expected return and risk of this leveraged portfolio would be $E(R_I)$ = 15% and $\sigma(R_I) = 8$:

For the investor to actually attain a 15 percent return, the portfolio expected return of 10 percent would have to be realized. If it is, then the investor would receive \$200 from the \$2,000 invested in the stock portfolio, but he would have to pay \$50 on the borrowed funds. His net return would therefore be \$150, yielding a rate of return of 15 percent from his \$1,000 investment, \$150/\$1,000:

The risk of $\sigma(R_p) = 8\%$ suggests that if the portfolio were to yield a return of only 6 percent (i.e., 4 percent less than its expected return or one standard deviation below its mean: $R_p = E(R_p) - \sigma(R_p) = 10\% - 4\% = 6\%$), the investor's return would be 7 percent (i.e., 8 percent less than its expected return or one standard deviation below its mean: $R_I = E(R_I) - \sigma(R_I) = 15\% - 8\% = 7\%$); that is, he would receive only \$120 from portfolio [(0.06)(\$2,000) = \$120] and would have to pay \$50 on the borrowed funds, for a net return of \$70, and a rate of return of 7 percent (\$70/\$1,000):

Note that the assumption that the portfolio's return distribution is normal (i.e., it depends on only the mean and variance) implies that the actual portfolio return of 6 percent and the leveraged return of 7 percent correspond to one deviation below the standard normal distribution, that is, a z score of -1 (see [Exhibit 7.3](#)). Thus:

<i>z</i>	-2	-1	0	1	2
$R_p = 10 + z4$	2%	6%	10%	14%	18%
$R_I = 15 + z8$	-1%	7%	15%	23%	31%

EXHIBIT 7.3 Return Distributions of Risk Portfolio and Leveraged Portfolio

If the actual portfolio return were two standard deviations below the mean, $z\sigma (R_p) = (2)(4\%) = 8\%$, then

the portfolio return would be 2% (i.e., $R_p = E(R_p) - z\sigma(R_p) = 10\% - (2)(4\%) = 2\%$), and the return on the leveraged investment would be -1%:

On the other hand, if the realized portfolio returns were above the expected return, then the returns on the leveraged portfolio will be even higher: For a $z = +1$, $R_p = 14\%$ and $R_I = 23\%$, and for $z = +2$, $R_p = 18\%$, and $R_I = 31\%$. [Exhibit 7.3](#) summarizes the different returns obtained from the portfolio and the leveraged portfolio given different z scores.

In summary, given the opportunity to borrow and lend at a risk-free rate, an investor can attain an unlimited number of return-risk combinations, ranging from a minimum return-risk combination of R_f and zero when $w_R = 1$, to a $E(R_p)$ and $\sigma(R_p)$ combination when $w_p = 1$, to a return-risk combination that is greater than the portfolio's when $w_p > 1$ and $w_R < 0$. Thus, the opportunity to borrow and lend at a risk-free rate, gives the investor a tool for changing his return-risk opportunities without forcing him to change his portfolio's composition of risky securities.

Return-Risk Relation

[Exhibit 7.4](#) summarizes the return-risk combinations from the preceding example. To reiterate, we assumed our investor could hold a risky portfolio yielding an expected return of 10 percent and a risk of $\sigma(R_p) = 4$, and could borrow and lend at the risk-free rate of 5 percent. Given this portfolio, we generated different return-risk combinations the investor could obtain with different allocations in the risk-free se-

curity and the portfolio. Line ABCDE in [Exhibit 7.4](#) is a plot of the return-risk combinations that we obtained. The graph is defined here as the *borrowing-lending line*. The line shows that when the investor places all his funds in the risk-free security, he is on the vertical axis with $\sigma(R_I) = 0$ and $E(R_I) = R_f = 5\%$. By contrast, when the investor places all of his investment funds in the portfolio ($w_p = 1$), he is at point C on the borrowing-lending line where he obtains the portfolio's expected return and risk. Point B lies halfway between points A and C and shows the return-risk combination of $E(R_I) = 7.5\%$ and $\sigma(R_I) = 2$, obtained when the investor places half his investment fund in the portfolio and half in the risk-free security. Finally, point D shows the investor's return-risk combination obtained when he borrows an amount equal to 50 percent above his investment funds ($w_R = -0.5$ and $w_p = 1.5$). The borrowing-lending line, in turn, can be divided into two segments: one segment showing lending portfolios and the other borrowing (or leveraged) portfolios. In particular, the segment to the left of C delineates all the various lending portfolios, whereas the segment to the right of C shows all the borrowing portfolios.

Portfolio	w_R	w_p	$E(R_I)$	$\sigma(R_I)$
A	1	0	$R_f = 5\%$	0
B	0.5	0.5	7.5%	2
C	0	1	$E(R_p) = 10\%$	$\sigma(R_p) = 4$
D	-0.5	1.5	12.5%	6
E	-1	2	15%	8

EXHIBIT 7.4 Borrowing and Lending Line

The equation for the borrowing-lending line is

(7.18)

where:

- R_f = the intercept of the line ABCDE

- $\lambda =$ is the slope of the line ABCDE

Equation (7.18) is obtained by solving Equations (7.15) and (7.17) simultaneously. Specifically, solving Equation (7.17) for w_p yields

(7.19)

and then substituting $\sigma(R_I)/\sigma(R_p)$ for w_p into Equation (7.15), we obtain Equation (7.18).

Substituting the numerical values of our example for R_f , $E(R_p)$, and $\sigma(R_p)$ into Equation (7.18), we obtain the borrowing-lending line equation for ABCDE of

Thus, for a specified risk level (e.g., $\sigma(R_I) = 2$), one can determine the expected return [$E(R_I) = 5\% + 1.25(2) = 7.5\%$]. In addition, using Equation (7.19), one can also determine the allocation needed to attain the specified risk-return combination [$w_p = \sigma(R_I)/\sigma(R_p) = 2\%/4\% = 0.5$, and $w_R = 1 - w_p = 1 - 0.5 = 0.5$]. The allocations needed to attain the return-risk combinations described by ABCDE are shown by the line in the lower quadrant of the figure in [Exhibit 7.4](#). The line comes from Equation (7.19) and shows w_p plotted against $\sigma(R_I)$, with the slope of the line equal to $1/\sigma(R_p) = 1/4$.

Equation (7.18) is the equation for any borrowing-lending line. It shows the different return-risk combinations that are obtainable by varying one's investment funds between a risk-free security and a given portfolio of risky securities. A special borrowing-lending line is the *Capital Market Line (CML)*. The CML is formed with the risk-free security and the market portfolio—the portfolio consisting of all securities in the market. Given the market portfolio's expected rate of $E(R^M)$ and its risk of $\sigma(R^M)$, the equation for the CML is

(7.20)

As shown in [Exhibit 7.5](#), the CML shows the different return-risk combinations investors can obtain from different allocations in the risk-free security and the market portfolio.

EXHIBIT 7.5 Capital Market Line

Before ending our discussion on the return-risk relationship obtained from borrowing and lending portfolios, we should note that throughout the discussion we have assumed that the risk-free rate that applied to borrowing and lending was the same. Obviously, it is more realistic to assume that the borrowing rate, R_B , exceeds the lending rate, R_L . If we assume this to be the case, then our borrowing and lending line will no longer be continuous, but rather will exhibit a kink at the return-risk combination where $w_p = 1$; That is, we basically have two lines as shown in [Exhibit 7.6](#), a steeper lending line segment $R_L E$ with a slope of $\lambda_L = [E(R_p) - R_L]/\sigma(R_p)$, and a borrowing segment EF with a slope of $\lambda_B = [E(R_p) - R_B]/\sigma(R_p)$.

EXHIBIT 7.6 Borrowing and Lending Line with Different Borrowing and Lending Rates

Portfolio Ranking

The return-risk opportunities described by a borrowing-lending line are generated by changing the allocation of investment funds between the risk-free security and the portfolio of risky securities. This return-risk analysis summarized by the borrowing-lending line can be extended to the ranking of different portfolios of risky securities. To see this, suppose the investor in our preceding example was considering an investment in one of two portfolios: portfolio A (the one we just analyzed) or portfolio B. The characteristics of each portfolio are:

Portfolio A $E(R_p) = 10\%$
 $\sigma(R_p) = 4\%$

Portfolio B $E(R_p) = 20\%$
 $\sigma(R_p) = 8\%$

Given the choice of selecting one portfolio, which portfolio should the investor choose?

Because portfolio B yields twice the return and twice the risk as portfolio A, it might appear at first that the investor's decision would depend on his return-risk preference. If he is very risk averse, he would select portfolio A; but if he is less risk averse, then he would select portfolio B. Selecting securities or portfolios based on an investor's risk-return preference is sometimes referred to as the *interior decorator view*. According to this view, an investment advisor would try to match the return-risk characteristic of an investment to the investor's return-risk preferences. In terms of this case, the choice of portfolio would be subjectively based on preference: A timid investor should select portfolio A, and an aggressive investor should select portfolio B.

Given that the investor can borrow and lend at a risk-free rate, however, he is not constrained to the specified return-risk characteristics of the portfolios. That is, he can combine portfolio A with a risk-free security to obtain a set of return-risk combinations (depicted by the borrowing-lending line), as well as combine portfolio B with the riskless security to obtain another set of return-risk combinations (depicted by a different borrowing-lending line). [Exhibit 7.7](#) shows the borrowing-lending lines generated for each of the portfolios given a risk-free rate of 5 percent. The equations for each of the lines are

EXHIBIT 7.7 Ranking Portfolios with Borrowing and Lending Lines

Portfolio A:

Portfolio B:

The borrowing-lending line formed with portfolio B is steeper than the line formed with portfolio A; that is, the slope of portfolio B's borrowing-lending line is $\lambda_B = 1.875$, whereas portfolio A's borrowing-lending line slope is $\lambda_A = 1.25$. Given the same intercepts (R_f), portfolio B's steeper slope implies that for any risk level, the investor can obtain a greater expected return from an investment in portfolio B and risk-free security than he can from an investment in portfolio A and a risk-free security. For example, suppose the investor was timid, and following the interior decorator view, placed all of his investment funds in portfolio A with the lower expected return and risk of 10 percent and 4 percent. Alternatively, for the

same risk of 4 percent, the investor could obtain a higher expected return of 12.5 percent by placing half of his funds in portfolio B and half in the risk-free security:

Thus, with the borrowing-lending line formed with B dominating the line formed with A, we can conclude that for any risk, investments formed with portfolio B and the risk-free security yield higher expected returns than those formed with portfolio A and the risk-free security. Portfolio B is therefore the best portfolio.

Mathematically, the only difference between the borrowing-lending lines for portfolio A and B is their slope, λ . The slope coefficient therefore provides a useful index for ranking portfolios: the greater a portfolio's λ , the greater its return-risk opportunities, or equivalently, the greater its risk premium, $E(R_p) - R_f$, per level of risk, $\sigma(R_p)$.

The dominance of portfolio B over A also can be seen by comparing its distribution of returns to A's distribution. As shown in [Exhibit 7.8](#), for all z-scores covering the distribution, portfolio B's returns are always greater than portfolio A's return. When a random variable has a distribution that dominates another random variable's distribution, it is said to be *stochastically dominant*. Thus, another way to rank portfolios would be to compare their distributions to see which one dominates.

z	-2	-1	0	1	2
A: $R_p = 10 + z4$	2%	6%	10%	14%	18%
B: $R_p = 20 + z8$	4%	12%	20%	28%	36%

EXHIBIT 7.8 Stochastic Dominance

Note that the choice of portfolio B over A is based on an objective criterion of comparing return-risk opportunities or distributions, not on the investor's subjective return-risk preference. This, in turn, suggests that an investor in selecting portfolios (or any asset) based on return and risk should separate the investment decision concerning the choice of portfolios (or assets) from her return-risk preference decision. In finance, the separation of the investment decision from the risk-return preference decision is known as the separation theorem. In terms of our example, the *separation theorem* says that the investor should first select the best portfolio (the one with dominant borrowing-lending line or λ), regardless of her return-risk preference. Once the best portfolio is determined, the investor can then combine that portfolio with a risk-free security to obtain her desired risk-return preference (i.e., desired point on the borrowing-lending line).

Portfolio Performance Measures

Sharpe Index

Ranking portfolios by the slopes of their borrowing-lending lines has been a commonly used technique in evaluating the performances of mutual funds, pensions, and other large portfolios. This ranking index is sometimes referred to as the reward-to-variability ratio. The first study to use the slope coefficient to evaluate portfolios was done by William Sharpe. In his study, he evaluated the performance of 34 mutual funds over the decade from 1954 to 1965 using historical return data from *Wiesenberger*. Sharpe calculated each fund's average return and standard deviation and then ranked each in terms of their average risk premium per level of risk using a risk-free rate of 3 percent:

As a standard of comparison, Sharpe also calculated the same ratio for the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA). The data and indexes of the mutual funds are shown in [Exhibit 7.9](#). Sharpe found that the average reward-to-volatility index of the 34 funds was 0.633, which was below the 0.667 index for the DJIA. In fact, of the 34 funds, only 11 had index values higher than the DJIA. Moreover, a study by Lorie and Fisher found that, statistically, the returns from the DJIA were not significantly different from a randomly selected portfolio. Thus, the Sharpe study suggests that many investors during that period would have been better off forming their own portfolios by random selection (e.g., using a random number generator, throwing darts, or having a way for their pets to select stocks) instead of buying mutual fund shares.

Mutual Fund	Average	Standard	Risk Premium*
	Annual	Deviation of	to Standard
	Return, %	Annual Return, %	Deviation Ratio = S_i
Affiliated Fund	14.6	15.3	0.75896
American Business Shares	10.0	9.2	0.75876
Axe-Houghton, Fund A	10.5	13.5	0.55551
Axe-Houghton, Fund B	12.0	16.3	0.55183
Axe-Houghton, Stock Fund	11.9	15.6	0.56991
Boston Fund	12.4	12.1	0.77842
Broad Street Investing	14.8	16.8	0.70329
Bullock Fund	15.7	19.3	0.65845
Commonwealth Investment Co.	10.9	13.7	0.57841
Delaware Fund	14.4	21.4	0.53253

Mutual Fund	Average	Standard	Risk Premium*
	Annual	Deviation of	to Standard
	Return, %	Annual Return, %	Deviation Ratio = S_i
Dividend Shares	14.4	15.9	0.71807
Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA)	16.3	19.9	0.66700
Eaton and Howard, Balanced Funds	11.0	11.9	0.67399
Eaton and Howard, Stock Fund	15.2	19.2	0.63486
Equity Fund	14.6	18.7	0.61902
Fidelity Fund	16.4	23.5	0.57020
Financial Industrial Fund	14.5	23.0	0.49971
Fundamental Investors	16.0	21.7	0.59894
Group Securities, Common Stock Fund	15.1	19.1	0.63316
Group Securities, Fully Administered Fund	11.4	14.1	0.59490

Mutual Fund	Average	Standard	Risk Premium*
	Annual	Deviation of	to Standard
	Return, %	Annual Return, %	Deviation Ratio = S_i
Incorporated Investors	14.0	25.5	0.43116
Investment Company of America	17.4	21.8	0.66169
Investors Mutual	11.3	12.5	0.66451
Loomis-Sales Mutual Fund	10.0	10.4	0.67358
Massachusetts Investors Trust	16.2	20.8	0.63398
Massachusetts Investors - Growth Stock	18.6	22.7	0.68687
National Investors Corporation	18.3	19.9	0.76798
National Securities - Income Series	12.4	17.8	0.52950
New England Fund	10.4	10.2	0.72703
Putnam Fund of Boston	13.1	16.0	0.63222

Mutual Fund	Average	Standard	Risk Premium*
	Annual Return, %	Deviation of Annual Return, %	to Standard Deviation Ratio = S_i
Scudder, Stevens & Clark Balanced Fund	10.7	13.3	0.57893
Selected American Shares	14.4	19.4	0.58788
United Funds - Income Funds	16.1	20.9	0.62698
Wellington Fund	11.3	12.0	0.69057
Wisconsin Fund	13.8	16.9	0.64091

* S_i = (average return – 3 percent)/std. dev. The ratios shown were computed from original data and thus differ slightly from ratios obtained from the rounded data shown in the table.

Source: William F. Sharpe 1966. Mutual fund performances. *Journal of Business* (January, Suppl.): 125.

EXHIBIT 7.9 Sharpe Mutual Fund Ranking

Treynor Index

As an index, the slope of the borrowing-lending line ranks portfolios in terms of their risk premium per unit of risk. A variation on this index is to use the portfolio's beta, β_p , as the measure of risk:

Recall that in Chapter 6 we defined beta as a measure of systematic risk. Thus, a portfolio with a beta of two would have twice the fluctuations as the market and would be considered to have twice the systematic risk as a portfolio with a beta of one. A portfolio's beta can be estimated by regressing the portfolio's return against the market:

Ranking portfolios in terms of their risk premium per level of systematic risk was first introduced by Treynor in a study of how to rate investment funds. Accordingly, the index is often referred to as the Treynor index.

Jensen Index

A third way of ranking portfolios is to estimate a portfolio's risk-adjusted return. This can be done by first regressing a portfolio's risk premium ($R_p - R_f$) against the market risk premium ($R^M - R_f$):

From the regression, the intercept term, α_p , can be used to measure the portfolio's risk-adjusted return. If the intercept is positive, for example, it suggests the portfolio is generating a return in excess of the risk premium. Using the intercept as a portfolio performance measure was first introduced by Jensen and is often referred to as the Jensen index:

Because the intercept measures only a portfolio's risk-adjusted return, to be used as a reward-to-risk ranking measure in evaluating different portfolios, it needs to be divided by the portfolio risk (as measured by either the portfolio beta or standard deviation).

Portfolio Performance Evaluation Using Bloomberg

The historical returns and risk of a portfolio can be analyzed using Bloomberg's Portfolio Risk & Analytics Screen, PORT. [Exhibit 7.10](#) shows several PORT performance screens for the Xavier Student Investment Fund (XSIF). The top screen in the exhibit shows the total return of the fund relative to the Russell 1000 index (RIY). The Russell 1000 index consists of the largest 1,000 companies of the Russell 3000. For the period from 9/6/2006 to 9/6/2013, the XSIF fund outperformed the Russell with a total return of 68.30 percent compared to 51.17 percent for the index. The lower screen in [Exhibit 7.10](#) also shows for the seven-year period a lower annualized standard deviation of 25.92 for the XSIF fund compared to 27.80 for the Russell (last two columns). With the higher return and lower risk, the XSIF fund has a larger Sharpe index, 0.50, than the index, 0.40. Note, however, that over the more recent periods of six months and YTD, the XSIF underperformed the Russell and had a lower Sharpe index. Over the three-month period, however, the fund rebounded, outperforming the Russell 1000 with higher returns, lower standard deviations, and a higher Sharpe index.

EXHIBIT 7.10 Return Performances of the XSIF Fund and the Russell 1000—Bloomberg PORT Screen

In addition to performance, Bloomberg's PORT screen can also be used to analyze other features of a portfolio, such as the portfolio composition, sector breakdowns, and attributes. Bloomberg portfolio construction using the PRTU screen and portfolio analysis using screens on the PMEN menu and PORT are

described in Chapter 2 and in the Bloomberg exhibit box in this chapter: "Bloomberg Portfolio Screens for Evaluating Portfolios: PRTU and PORT." The box in this chapter and the Bloomberg screens in Bloomberg Web [Exhibit 7.1](#) found on the text Web site show more of the features of the XSIF fund.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we started our analysis of portfolios by examining how to evaluate portfolios of risky securities in terms of their expected returns and risk. In contrast to individual securities, a portfolio's risk characteristics depend on the correlations of the security returns. If two securities are perfectly negatively correlated, a portfolio can be constructed with zero risk. We then introduced a risk-free security and showed how investors can obtain different return-risk opportunities by varying their investment funds between the risk-free security and a portfolio of risky stocks. In the next chapter, we continue our analysis of portfolios by examining Markowitz portfolio selection for determining the allocation of securities making up the portfolio.

BLOOMBERG PORTFOLIO SCREENS FOR EVALUATING PORTFOLIOS: PRTU AND PORT

PRTU

On the Bloomberg PRTU screen, you can set up a stock or fixed-income portfolio. Once loaded, you can analyze the portfolio using screens from the PMEN menu. See Chapter 2 for a description on how to construct portfolios using PRTU.

HISTORICAL PORTFOLIO RETURNS

To analyze the past return performances of a portfolio, a history of portfolio rates of return needs to be created in PRTU. With history, the historical performance of the portfolio can then be analyzed from the performance tab on the PORT screen.

STEPS FOR CREATING HISTORICAL DATA FOR PORTFOLIOS IN PRTU

Bring up the PRTU screen for your portfolio. On the screen, change the date in the amber "Date" box (e.g., Month/Day/2006). Click the "Edit" tab (if it appears) and then the "Actions" tab. From the "Actions" dropdown, select "Import" to bring up the import box. On the import box, select "Portfolio" from the "Source" dropdown, the name of your portfolio from the "Name" dropdown, change the date (e.g., back to the current period), hit the "Import" tab, and then click "Save." You should now have a portfolio with historical data.

PORT

On the Bloomberg "Portfolio Risk & Analytics Screen (PORT)," you can evaluate portfolios in depth. By using the screen tabs (e.g., "Holdings," "Characteristics," "Performance," and "Attributions"), you can evaluate the features, drivers, and historical performances of the portfolio, securities in the portfolio, and the portfolio's index. (Note: Many of these same functions can be accessed directly: PORT HD to access holdings, PORT CH to access characteristics, and PORT PA to access performance attributes.)

PORT Tabs:

1. For portfolio securities: Holdings tab, "by none."
2. For Sector breakdown: Holdings tab, "by GIC Sectors."
3. For Size: Holdings tab, "by Market Cap."
4. For portfolio features: Characteristics tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU), "by GIC Sectors."
5. For performance: Performance tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None."
6. For performance: Performance tab, "Total Return," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom (for Custom, the select time period must be within the period history of the portfolio created in PRTU).
7. For performance: Performance tab, "Statistical Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU).
8. For performance: Performance tab, "Seasonal Analysis."
9. Performance tab, "Period Analysis."
10. For portfolio features: Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
11. For portfolio features: Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
12. For portfolio features: Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
13. For portfolio features: Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.

OTHER PMEN SCREENS FOR PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS

Other screens of note on the PMEN menu screen are Portfolio Display (PDSP), Portfolio News (NPH), Events Calendar (EVTS), Expected Cash Flow (PCF), and Summary Reports (PRTS). (Some of these screens can be found from the PMEN screen by clicking a white heading (e.g., "Performance &

Attributions"). Many of these screens have tabs for accessing different information, sending information to Excel, and downloading information to PDF and Excel reports.

IMPORTING PRTU PORTFOLIOS TO OTHER SCREENS

As noted in Chapter 2, once a portfolio is created, you can export it to other screens or import your portfolio if you are on another screen. For example, if you want to analyze a portfolio created in PRTU using relative valuation, you could select a stock in the portfolio (e.g., Apple), access the stock's menu (AAPL <Equity> <Enter>), and then bring up the stock's RV menu. On the RV menu of the stock, you can then import the portfolio by selecting "Portfolio" from the dropdown "Comp Source" tab and the name of the portfolio from the dropdown "Name" menu. Similarly, you can also import the portfolio from other screens, such as CORR, PC, CACT, MOST, FMAP, EVTS, MRR, and MMAP screens, and also from Excel using the Bloomberg Excel Add-In.

BLOOMBERG SCREENS FOR INVESTMENT FUNDS

The portfolio of an investment fund can be analyzed using PORT, as well as other screens found on the fund's menu. See Bloomberg exhibit box in Chapter 5: Bloomberg Investment Fund Screens.

BLOOMBERG MATERIAL ON FUNDS

- **FSRC:** FSRC generates a list of funds based on specific search criteria. See Chapter 5.
- **PSRT** searches for companies with specific public portfolio/holder information. You can search by keyword and perform advanced searches based on one's criteria.

OTHER SCREENS FOR EVALUATING INVESTMENT FUND PORTFOLIOS

RV: The RV screen on a fund's menu screen (Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter>) can be used to rank a fund relative to its peers using the portfolio ranking indexes of Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen.

FSCO: The FSCO screen scores and ranks funds belonging to the same peer group based on a combination of weighted indicators.

See Bloomberg Web [Exhibit 7.1](#).

Web Site Information

1. For financial information on stocks, see:
 1. <http://seekingalpha.com>
 2. <http://bigcharts.marketwatch.com>
 3. <http://www.morningstar.com>
2. Market Browser: Stock and other security data: Download program for Market Browser:
<http://www.marketbrowser.com>

Selected References

- Brennan, Michael J. 1975. The optimal number of securities in a risky asset portfolio when there are fixed cost of transacting: theory and some empirical results. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 10 (September): 483-496.
- Cahart, Mark M. 1997. On persistence in mutual fund performance. *Journal of Finance* 52 (March): 57-82.
- Francis, Jack C., and S. H. Archer. 1979. *Portfolio Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Goetzman, William, and Roger G. Ibbotson. 1994. Do winners repeat? *Journal of Portfolio Management* 20 (Winter): 9-18.
- Jensen, Michael. 1968. The performance of mutual funds in the period 1945-1964. *Journal of Finance* (May): 389-416.

- Malkiel, Burton G. 1995. Return from investing in equity mutual funds, 1971-1991. *Journal of Finance* 50: 549-572.
- Markowitz, Harry. 1959. *Portfolio Selection: Efficient Diversification of Investments*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sharpe, William F. 1966. Mutual fund performance. *Journal of Business* 39 (January): 118-138.
- Tobin, James. 1958. Liquidity preference and behavior towards risk. *The Review of Economic Studies* 26 (January): 65-86.
- Treynor, Jack L. 1973. How to rate management of investment funds. *Harvard Business Review* 43 (January): 63-75.

Bloomberg Exercises

1. Select an equity investment fund of interest (use SECF and click Funds tab) and examine its price and volatility for different periods and frequencies using the GV screen. Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter> and then click GV and select the following:
 1. Historical volatility and price from "Type" dropdown.
 2. Statistics check box to show Histogram window.
2. Select a stock of interest and compare its correlation with the market, systematic risk (use R^2), alpha, and beta with its peers using the PC screen: Stock ticker <Equity> <Enter>; PC.
3. Study the historical correlation over different periods of the top 10 stocks by market cap making up the S&P 500 using the CORR screen. CORR <Enter>; click the red "Create New" tab; click "Add from Source"; select Equity Index under "Source" tab and SPX under "Name" tab; Select "All," and click "Add."
4. Use EQS to find stocks making up the S&P 500 or the Russell 3000 with a market cap greater than \$15 billion and then import your stocks into PRTU to form a portfolio.

1. EQS <Enter>; select Standard and Poor's 500 or Russell 3000 from the Indexes tab; in the yellow ribbon box, type Market Cap and enter \$15B; save your screen.
2. PRTU <Enter>; click red "Create;" click "Actions" tab and then import stocks (on the settings screen, enable history; see Bloomberg exhibit box: Bloomberg Portfolio Screens for Evaluating Portfolios: PRTU and PORT).
 1. Examine the betas, alphas, systematic risk (R^2) of the stocks in your portfolio using the PC screen: Bring up the equity screen for one of the stocks in the portfolio (Stock Ticker <Equity> <Enter>); type in PC; on the PC screen, import your portfolio from the "Peer Source" yellow dropdown tab. On the PC screen, choose a time period for your analysis and then select alpha, beta, and R^2 from the Calculation dropdown tab.
 2. Evaluate your portfolio's past performance relative to an index (e.g., Dow Jones (INDU)) using the PORT screen over different time periods: Performance tab, "Total Return," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom (for Custom, the select time period must be within the period history of the portfolio created in PRTU).
 3. Evaluate your portfolio's performance relative to your index using PORT: Performance tab, "Statistical Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU).
 4. Examine the top news related to the stocks in your portfolio using the "Portfolio News Screen" (NPH) to see if there is any news to explain a stock's performance.
 5. Examine the top movers and laggars in your portfolio for different periods using the MRR screen: MRR <Enter>; select "Portfolio" from "Source" tab and select time period.
 6. Check current prices and news for the stock in your portfolio using MOST: MOST <Enter>; load the stocks of your portfolio from the amber tab (left side of screen).
 7. Using MMAP, study some of the features of the stocks in your portfolio such as P/e, eps growth, beta, and total returns for different periods: MMAP <Enter>; select Portfolio from "Source" dropdown, the name of your portfolio from "Name" dropdown, and characteristic from "Analyze" dropdown.

8. Use CACT and EVTS screen to see if there were any corporate actions and events that could explain the performances of some of the stocks in your portfolio: CACT <Enter>, select Portfolio from "Source" dropdown, the name of your portfolio from "Name" dropdown, and select time period.
5. The performances of funds by type can be found on the Bloomberg Fund Heat Map Screen, FMAP.

 1. Use the screen to identify several equity funds: FMAP <Enter>, click "Objective" in "View By" dropdown and United States in "Region" dropdown, and then click "Equity" and type (e.g., Growth). Select one of the funds and study it (the fund's ticker can be found on the description page) using the functions on the fund's menus screen (Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter>). Functions to include: DES, historical fund analysis (HFA), and price graph (GP).
 2. Evaluate the fund using the Holdings, Performance, and Characteristics tabs on the fund's PORT screen.
 3. Examine the fund's total returns for different periods and frequencies relative to the S&P 500, Russell 3000, other indexes, and other funds using the COMP screen: Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter> and then click COMP.
 4. Using the HRA or Beta screen, determine the fund's characteristic line with the S&P 500, its systematic risk (R^2), and unsystematic risk.
 5. Using your selected fund's RV screen, compare the fund with other similar funds in terms of Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen ranking indexes. On the RV screen, type in Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen in the amber box to find those indexes or select Return/Risk from the Theme dropdown.
 6. The FSCO screen scores and ranks funds belonging to the same peer group based on a combination of weighted indicators. Select a fund style using FSCO, select a fund style and category (e.g., open-end, growth, large cap fund domiciled in the United States), and then score them in terms of indexes (e.g., Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen indexes).
 7. Select one of the top-ranked funds you identified in Exercise 6 (or another fund of interest) and evaluate it using PORT. In your evaluation, use some of the following PORT tabs:

1. Holdings tab, "by none."
 2. Holdings tab, "by GIC Sectors."
 3. Holdings tab, "by Market Cap."
 4. Characteristics tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), "by GIC Sectors."
 5. Characteristics tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), "by GIC Sectors."
 6. Performance tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None."
 7. Performance tab, "Total Return," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., INDU), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
 8. Performance tab, "Statistical Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)).
 9. Performance tab, "Seasonal Analysis."
 10. Performance tab, "Period Analysis."
 11. Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
 12. Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
 13. Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
 14. Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
8. Use the Bloomberg fund search screen, FSRC, to search for the following open-end equity fund: Fund Type: Open-End; Classification/Fund Asset Class Focus: Equity; Classification/General Attribute: Index Fund; Country of Domicile: United States; Screening Criteria (enter in amber box): total return for one year of greater than X% (e.g., 20%). You may want to save the search. To do so, go to the "Action" tab and click "Save As."
1. Using this screen, examine several of the funds. Select one of the funds and study it using the functions on the fund's menus screen (Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter>). Functions to include are DES, fund holdings (MHD), Beta or HRA, relative valuation (RV), and price graph (GP).
 2. Examine the fund's total returns for different periods and frequencies relative to the S&P 500 using the COMP screen: Fund Ticker <Equity> <Enter> and then click COMP.

3. Evaluate the fund's performance using PORT: Performance tab, "Total Return," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom; Performance tab, "Statistical Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)).
4. Using your selected fund's RV screen, compare the fund with other similar funds in terms of Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen ranking indexes. On the RV screen, type in Sharpe, Treynor, and Jensen in the amber box to find those indexes.
9. Use the Bloomberg advanced PSRT screen to search for an equity mutual fund in a particular area (country or city) and then analyze the fund using PORT: PSRT <Enter>; Mutual Funds (Source); Click "Metro Area"; click fund's name; click portfolio analytics to bring up the PORT screen.
10. Construct your own equity portfolio and then analyze it using PORT. In constructing you own portfolio, consider using the equity search screen (EQS), FMAP to identify stocks that make up different types of funds, or the stocks making up indexes. In your PORT analysis, include some of the following tabs:
 1. Holdings tab, "by none."
 2. Holdings tab, "by GIC Sectors."
 3. Holdings tab, "by Market Cap."
 4. Characteristics tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), "by GIC Sectors."
 5. Characteristics tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), "by GIC Sectors."
 6. Performance tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None."
 7. Performance tab, "Total Return," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom (for Custom, the select time period must be within the period history of the portfolio created in PRTU).
 8. Performance tab, "Statistical Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)).
 9. Performance tab, "Seasonal Analysis."
 10. Performance tab, "Period Analysis."
 11. Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.

12. Attribution tab, "Main View," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
13. Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs None," Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.
14. Attribution tab, "Attribution Summary," "Portfolio vs Index" (e.g., Dow (INDU)), Time = MTD, YTD, and Custom.

Create a Launchpad view with pages for one of the portfolios you created in this chapter or for a fund or index. See Chapter 2 for a guide in setting up a Launchpad.

1. BLP <Enter>.
2. On Launchpad toolbar, click "View" to bring up the toolbar showing the tabs with Views, Pages, Setting, and Tools.
3. To import a portfolio, index, or search: Click the "Browser" tab, "Monitor," and the "Launch Component" to bring up a stock monitor screen. This will bring up a box where you can select from a source: portfolios (PRTU), equity searches (EQS), equity indexes, fund screens (FSCR), Bloomberg peers, and other sources.