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An investor observes the stock price and forms his subjective opinion about the future evolution.

Figure 1: DAX, 1998 – 2004. Daily observations.
An opinion on the future value $S_t$ can be described by a **subjective density** $p$ (historical or physical density).

Examples:
- Black-Scholes model (Nobel prize 1997): log normal distribution
- GARCH model (Nobel prize 2003, Engle): stochastic volatility
- non-parametric diffusion model (Ait-Sahalia 2000)
Log returns \( \{r_i\} \) are modeled with a GARCH-M (discrete Heston) model:

\[
\begin{align*}
  r_i &= \mu - \frac{1}{2} V_i + \sqrt{V_i} Z_i \\
  V_i &= \omega + \beta V_{i-1} + \alpha (Z_{i-1} - \gamma \sqrt{V_{i-1}})
\end{align*}
\]

From the initial stock price \( S_0 \) the final stock price can be constructed:

\[
S_t = S_0 \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{t} r_i\right).
\]
Figure 2: Subjective historical density with confidence bands on $t=24$ March 2000 for half a year returns, $(t-0.5, t)$, $\tau = 0.5$ (non-parametric kernel estimator)
There is also a **state-price density** (SPD) $q$ implied by the market prices of options.

The SPD (a.k.a. **risk-neutral density**) differs from $p$ because it corresponds to replication strategies (**martingale risk neutral measure**).

A person alone does not use in general a replication strategy but thinks in terms of his $p$ density.
For SPD estimation a Heston continuous stochastic volatility model is used, which is an industry standard for option pricing models:

\[
\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = rd\,dt + \sqrt{V_t}\,dW^1_t
\]

where the volatility process is modelled by a square-root process:

\[
dV_t = \xi(\eta - V_t)\,dt + \theta\sqrt{V_t}\,dW^2_t,
\]

and \(W^1\) and \(W^2\) are Wiener processes with correlation \(\rho\).
Figure 3: SPD on 24 March 2000, $r_{0.5} = 4.06\%$. Using option prices with time-to-maturity between 0.25 and 1 and moneyness between 0.5 and 1.5 we get the estimate for the SPD $\tau = 0.5$ years ahead.
The **pricing kernel** $\mathcal{K}(x)$ is defined as:

$$
\mathcal{K}(x) = \frac{q(x)}{p(x)}
$$

An estimate of the pricing kernel is called **empirical pricing kernel** (EPK). We use the estimate:

$$
\hat{\mathcal{K}}(x) = \frac{\hat{q}(x)}{\hat{p}(x)}
$$

where $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ are the estimated risk-neutral and subjective densities.
Figure 4: Empirical pricing kernel on 24 March 2000 for $\tau = 0.5$ year, $r_{0.5} = 4.06\%$.

EPK and Investor Preferences
Questions

- Is the EPK monotone?
- How to explain the non-monotonicity of the pricing kernel?
- What type of utility functions can generate observed pricing kernels and prices?
- What happens if the hypothesis of the existence of the representative investor is abandoned?
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Utility Maximisation Problem

\[ \max_{\{\xi\}} U(C_0) + \beta \mathbb{E}^P [U(C_T)] \] (1)

s.t. \( C_0 = e_0 - P_0 \xi \)
\[ C_T = e_T + \psi(S_T)\xi \]

where \( \psi(S_T) \) – a pay-off profile contingent on \( S_T \)
\( P_0 \) – the price of the asset at \( t = 0 \)
\( \xi \) – portfolio position
\( \beta \) – subjective discount factor
\( e_0, e_T \) – wages at \( t = 0 \) and \( T \)
\( \mathbb{E}^P \) – expectation w. r. to a historical measure \( P \)
Pricing Equation

If the utility function depends only on state variables and $\beta = \text{const}$, then for any security paying $\psi(S_T)$:

$$P_0 = E^P \left[ \beta \frac{U'(C_T)}{U'(C_0)} \psi(S_T) \right] = E^P \left[ \tilde{m}(C_T) \psi(S_T) \right]$$

(2)

where the stochastic discount factor (SDF) is:

$$\tilde{m}(C_T) = \beta \frac{U'(C_T)}{U'(C_0)} = \text{const} \cdot U'(C_T)$$
Stochastic Discount Factor Projection

Pricing equation using the SDF projection onto asset prices $S_T$ (a state variable alternative to $C_T$):

$$P_0 = E^P [m(S_T)\psi(S_T)] = \int_0^\infty m(s) \psi(s) p(s) ds,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where the projection:

$$m(S_T) = E^P [\tilde{m}(C_T)|S_T]$$

Pricing with $\tilde{m}$ and $m$ is equivalent if the projection is unique. The projection is **linear** if $\psi(S_T) = S_T$ (budget constraint).
Risk-neutral pricing equation:

\[ P_0 = e^{-r\tau} E^Q [\psi(S_T)] = e^{-r\tau} \int_0^\infty \psi(s) q(s) \, ds = \quad (4) \]

\[ = e^{-r\tau} \int_0^\infty \psi(S_T) \frac{q(s)}{p(s)} p(s) \, ds \quad (5) \]

where \( p(s) \) and \( q(s) \) are subjective and risk neutral pdf’s

Since (3) and (5) are equivalent (hold for any \( \psi(S_T) \)), the pricing kernel is:

\[ \mathcal{K}(S_T) = \frac{q(S_T)}{p(S_T)} = \frac{U'(S_T)}{U'(S_0)} \]
The Black-Scholes Model

Geometric Brownian motion process:

\[
\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = \mu dt + \sigma dW_t
\]  

(6)

The historical density \( p \) is log-normal:

\[
p(x) = \frac{1}{x \sqrt{2\pi \tilde{\sigma}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\log x - \tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right)^2 \right\}, \quad x > 0
\]

where \( \tilde{\mu} = (\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})t + \log S_0 \) and \( \tilde{\sigma} = \sigma \sqrt{t} \)
\( p(x) \) and \( q(x) \) are both log-normal and the pricing kernel is

\[
\mathcal{K}(x) = \left( \frac{x}{S_0} \right)^{-\frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2}} \exp \left\{ \frac{(\mu - r)(\mu + r - \sigma^2)T}{2\sigma^2} \right\}
\]

Up to a linear transformation the utility function is a CRRA function:

\[
U(S_T) = \left(1 - \frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2}\right)^{-1} S_T^{(1 - \frac{\mu - r}{\sigma^2})} \tag{7}
\]

In terms of \( R_T = \frac{S_T}{S_0} \):

\[
U(R_T) = a \frac{R_T^{1-\gamma}}{1 - \gamma}
\]
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Estimation of the Pricing Kernel

The empirical pricing kernel is:

\[ \hat{\mathcal{K}}(S_T) = \frac{\hat{q}(S_T)}{\hat{p}(S_T)}, \]

PK estimation:

- the risk neutral density \( q \) from option prices with the Heston model
- the historical subjective density \( p \) from stock prices with the GARCH-M, discrete Heston and non-parametric kernel density models
Estimation of the Subjective Density $\rho$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARCH in mean</td>
<td>2.0y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrete Heston</td>
<td>2.0y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-parametric kernel</td>
<td>1.0y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Models and the time periods used for their calibration.

The GARCH-M and discrete Heston is simulated $\tau = 0.5y$ ahead with 2000 repetitions.
Estimation of the Risk Neutral Density $q$

Risk neutral density $q$ is estimated from DAX option prices using the stochastic volatility Heston model:

$$\frac{dS_t}{S_t} = r dt + \sqrt{V_t} dW_t^1$$

where the volatility process is:

$$dV_t = \xi (\eta - V_t) \, dt + \theta \sqrt{V_t} dW_t^2$$

$W_t^1, W_t^2$ – Wiener processes with correlation $\rho$
The parameters in the Heston model can be interpreted as:

\( \xi \) – mean-reversion speed, \( \xi = 2 \) (Bergomi, 2005)

\( \eta \) – long-term variance

\( V_0 \) – short-term variance

\( \rho \) – correlation

\( \theta \) – volatility of volatility

\( \eta \) and \( V_0 \) control the term structure of the implied volatility surface (i.e. time to maturity direction).

\( \rho \) and \( \theta \) control the smile/skew (i.e. moneyness direction).
Figure 5: Implied volatility surface.
Figure 6: Simulated paths in the Heston model for the parameters $V_0 = 0.1$, $\eta = 0.08$, $\xi = 2$, $\theta = 0.3$, $\rho = -0.7$. $S$ – stock process, $V$ – variance process.
We estimate the parameters of the SPD by minimising the ASE of the implied volatilities:

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (IV_{i}^{\text{model}} - IV_{i}^{\text{market}})^2
\]

where \( IV_{i}^{\text{model}} \) and \( IV_{i}^{\text{market}} \) refer to model and market implied volatilities; \( n \) is the number of observations on the surface.

Typically, we observe option prices with time to maturity \( \tau \in [0.25; 1] \) years and moneyness \( K/S_0 \in [0.5; 1.5] \).
Plain vanilla call option prices are calculated by a method of Carr and Madan:

\[ C(K, T) = \exp\{-\alpha \log(K)\} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty \exp\{-iuv \log(K)\}\psi_T(u)\,du \]

for a damping factor \( \alpha > 0 \). The function \( \psi_T \) is given by

\[ \psi_T(u) = \exp(-rT)\phi_T\left\{u - (\alpha + 1)i\right\} \frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha - u^2 + i(2\alpha + 1)v}{\alpha^2 + \alpha - v^2 + i(2\alpha + 1)v} \]

where \( \phi_T \) is the characteristic function of \( \log(S_T) \).
The characteristic function:

\[
\phi_T(z) = \exp\left\{ \frac{-(z^2 + iz)V_0}{\gamma(z) \coth \frac{\gamma(z)T}{2} + \xi - i\rho\theta z} \right\} \\
\times \exp\left\{ \frac{\xi\eta(T(\xi-i\rho\theta z))}{\theta^2} + izTr + iz\log(S_0) \right\} \\
\times \frac{2\xi\eta}{\theta^2} \left( \cosh \frac{\gamma(z)T}{2} + \frac{\xi-i\rho\theta z}{\gamma(z)} \sinh \frac{\gamma(z)T}{2} \right) 
\]

(8)

where \( \gamma(z) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{\theta^2(z^2 + iz) + (\xi - i\rho\theta z)^2} \) see e.g. (Cizek et al., 2005).
The density $f(\log S_T)$ can be recovered with Fourier inversion:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} \phi_T(t) dt,$$

The risk neutral density $q(S_T)$ is given as a transformed density:

$$q(x) = \frac{1}{x} f\{\log(x)\}$$
Estimation of the Subjective Density $\rho$

The log-returns $r_i$ of DAX for 0.5 year are modelled with the GARCH-M model:

\[ r_i = \mu + \sqrt{V_i}Z_i \]
\[ V_i = \omega + \beta V_{i-1} + \alpha r_{i-1}^2 \]

From $S_0$ we can construct $S_t$ as:

\[ S_t = S_0 \exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^{t} r_i \right) \]
Fit the GARCH-M model for DAX returns  
Simulate $N$ time series of the returns ($N=2000$)  
Compute the final $N$ DAX prices  
Evaluate $\hat{p}$ using kernel density estimation  

Other applied models:  
- discrete Heston  
- non-parametric kernel
Figure 7: Empirical historical and risk neutral price densities, 24 March 2000.
Figure 8: Empirical pricing kernels on 24 March 2000.
Figure 9: Empirical pricing kernel on 24 March 2000, 30 July 2002 and 30 June 2004.
Relative risk aversion coefficient:

\[ RRA(S_T) = -S_T \frac{U''(S_T)}{U'(S_T)}. \]

RRA can be estimated directly from the risk neutral and historical densities:

\[ RRA(S_T) = -S_T \frac{q'(S_T)p(S_T) - q(S_T)p'(S_T)}{p^2(S_T)} \frac{q(S_T)}{p(S_T)} = \]

\[ = S_T \left\{ \frac{p'(S_T)}{p(S_T)} - \frac{q'(S_T)}{q(S_T)} \right\}. \]
Figure 10: Relative risk aversion on 24 March 2000, 30 July 2002 and 30 June 2004.
Figure 11: Linear pricing kernel and quadratic utility function (CAPM model). \( U(S_T) = -aS_T^2 + bS_T + c \).
Figure 12: Power pricing kernel and CRRA utility function. \( U(S_T) = a \frac{S_T^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} \).
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Figure 13: Pricing kernel and utility function suggested by Kahneman and Tversky based on behavioural experiments.
Pricing Kernel Monotonicity Test

\{S_i\}_{i=1}^n \sim p, \text{ historical subjective density}

\(q\), risk-neutral density; \(S_{(k)}\) order statistic

\(\mathcal{K}\), pricing kernel

\(\mathcal{K}_k = \mathcal{K}(S_{(k)}) = \frac{q(S_{(k)})}{p(S_{(k)})}\), decreasing \(\forall \ I \text{ and } J, \ I \leq k \leq J\)

- spacing method to reduce to exp model
- ML test for monotonicity in \((I, J)\)
- multiple testing to find \(\hat{I}\) and \(\hat{J}\)
**Pyke’s theorem:** Let i.i.d. $U_i \sim U(0, 1)$ and i.i.d. $e_i \sim \text{Exp}(1)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

$$
\mathcal{L} \left( U_{(k+1)} - U_{(k)} \right) = \mathcal{L} \left( \frac{e_k}{\sum_{s=1}^{n} e_s} \right), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n - 1.
$$

Hence:

$$
n \left( U_{(k+1)} - U_{(k)} \right) \approx e_k. \quad (9)
$$
With the cdf $P(x)$:

$$U_{(k+1)} - U_{(k)} = P(S_{(k+1)}) - P(S_{(k)}) \approx p(S_{(k)}) (S_{(k+1)} - S_{(k)})$$

Hence from (9):

$$n (S_{(k+1)} - S_{(k)}) q(S_{(k)}) \approx \frac{q(S_{(k)})}{p(S_{(k)})} e_k = \mathcal{K}(S_{(k)}) e_k = \mathcal{K}_k e_k.$$

Test with observations

$$Z_k = \mathcal{K}_k e_k$$

whether $\mathcal{K}_k$ is monotone.
Maximum Likelihood Ratio Test

\[ \mathcal{M}(I, J) = \{x_k \geq 0 : x_k \geq x_{k+1}, \ I \leq k \leq J\} \]

For \( Z = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) \) define the log-likelihood:

\[
\log\{p(Z, \mathcal{K})\} = -\sum_{k=I}^{J} \frac{Z_k}{\mathcal{K}_k} - \sum_{k=I}^{J} \log \mathcal{K}_k,
\]

Maximum log-likelihood:

\[
\max_{\mathcal{K}} \log\{p(Z, \mathcal{K})\} = -n - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \log(Z_k).
\]
The test statistic:

\[ \xi(I, J) = \log \frac{\max_{K \in M(I,J)} p(Z, K)}{\max_K p(Z, K)} \]

The critical value \((K_k = 1)\):

\[ h_\alpha(I, J) = M(I, J) + t_\alpha V(I, J) \]

where \(M(I, J) = E_0\xi(I, J), V^2(I, J) = E_0\{\xi(I, J) - M(I, J)\}^2\). \(t_\alpha\) is calculated by Monte Carlo as the solution of

\[
P_0 \left[ \max_{I=1,n} \max_{J=I+1,n} \{ \xi(I, J) - M(I, J) - t_\alpha V(I, J) \geq 0 \} \right] = \alpha
\]
ML ratio monotonicity test:

- compute $Z_k = n \left( S_{(k+1)} - S_{(k)} \right) q(S_{(k)})$
- compute test statistic
  \[ \xi(I, J) = \max_{K \in \mathcal{M}(I, J)} \log\{p(Z, K)\} - \max_K \log\{p(Z, K)\} \]
- $H_0$ is rejected if $\xi(I, J) - h_\alpha(I, J) < 0$
Estimation of the Market Utility Function

Utility function is derived from the market data under the representative investor assumption:

\[ U(S_T) = \int_0^{S_T} m(x)dx \]

A cardinal utility function can be defined up to a linear transformation.

\[ U(R_T) = \int_0^{R_T} \frac{q(S_0x)}{p(S_0x)} dx \]
Figure 14: Market utility functions on 24 March 2000, 30 July 2002 and 30 June 2004.
Decomposition of the Market Utility Function

Decomposition of the Utility Function

Observation: the portions of the utility function below $R_T = \frac{S_T}{S_0} = 1$ and above 1.15 are very well approximated with hyperbolic absolute risk aversion (shifted CRRA, Sharpe (2006)) functions:

$$U(x) = a(x - c)^\gamma + b,$$

(10)

The HARA function becomes infinitely negative for $x = c$ and is extended as $U(x) = -\infty$ for $x < c$. HARA($c = 0$)=CRRA.
Figure 15: Decomposition of the utility function, $\tau = 0.5$ years, 30 July 2002.
Individual Utility Functions

Investor \(i\) has utility comprising two HARA components:

\[
U(x, c_{2,i}) = \begin{cases} 
\max \{U(x, \theta_1, c_1); U(x, \theta_2, c_{2,i})\}, & \text{if } x > c_1 \\
-\infty, & \text{if } x \leq c_1 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\theta = (a, b, \gamma)\top\), \(c_{2,i} > c_1\). Investors differ in the parameter \(c_{2,i}\).

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
   & a_i & b_i & \gamma_i & c_i \\
 i = 1 \text{ (bearish market)} & 80.58 & -20.57 & 0.25 & 0.626 \\
 i = 2 \text{ (bullish market)} & -134.75 & 73.91 & 2.00 & - \\
\end{array}
\]

Table 2: \(\theta\) estimated from upper/lower quantiles, 30 July 2002.
Figure 16: Individual and market utility functions with a switching point, $\tau = 0.5$ years, 30 July 2002.
Investor Types

- Switching from bearish to bullish happens at $z = z(c_{2,i})$
- Different investors have different perceptual boundaries between “good” and “bad” states
- Switching points are in $[0.95; 1.1]$, i.e. in the area that corresponds to present unit returns times half-year risk free interest rates
- There is a distribution of switching points (inverse problem)
Naive Utility Aggregation

Specify the observable states of the world in the future by returns $R_T$

Find a weighted average of the utility functions for each state. If the importance of the investors is the same, then the weights are equal

Problem: utility functions of $N$ different investors cannot be summed up since they are incomparable
Investor’s Attitude Aggregation

- Specify \textit{perceived} states of the world given by utility $u$
- Aggregate the outlooks concerning the \textbf{returns} in the future $R_T$ for each perceived state
- Estimate the distribution of switching points
- Aggregation leads to an inverse problem
Figure 17: Inverse market and individual utility functions, $\tau = 0.5$ years, 30 July 2002.
For a subjective state described with utility $u$:

$$u = U^{(1)}(R_T^{(1)}, z_1) = U^{(2)}(R_T^{(2)}, z_2) = \ldots = U^{(N)}(R_T^{(N)}, z_N)$$

The aggregate estimate of the resulting return is

$$R_T^A(u) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} R_T^{(i)}(u) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} U^{-1}(u, z_i)$$

if all investors have the same market power.

**Important property**: the return aggregation procedure is invariant of any monotonic transformation.
Distribution of Switching Points

The aggregate return in the *perceptual* state \( u \) is given by:

\[
R^A(u) = \int U^{-1}(u, z)f(z)dz
\]

(11)

In order to solve (11) for \( f(\cdot) \):

\[
\min_{f(\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}} \int \left\{ R^A_f(u) - U_M^{-1}(u) \right\}^2 \tilde{P}(du),
\]

(12)

where \( U_M^{-1}(u) \) is the inverse of the estimated market utility function, \( \tilde{P} \) is the distribution of utility levels.
Take

\[ f \in \mathcal{F} = \left\{ f = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \theta_j I_{\{z \in B_j\}}, \theta_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{J} \theta_j h_j = 1, h_j = |B_j| \right\}. \]

The problem (12) becomes a quadratic programming problem:

\[
\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ R^A_f(u_i) - R_i \right\}^2 \quad \theta_j \geq 0 \\
\sum_{j=1}^{J} \theta_j h_j = 1
\]
Figure 18: Left panel: the market utility function (red) and the fitted utility function (blue). Right panel: the distribution of the reference points. 24 March 2000, a bearish market.
Figure 19: Left panel: the market utility function (red) and the fitted utility function (blue). Right panel: the distribution of the reference points. 30 July 2002, a stable market.
Figure 20: Left panel: the market utility function (red) and the fitted utility function (blue). Right panel: the distribution of the reference points. 30 June 2004, a bullish market.
Summary

- Representation of individual utility functions as consisting of two parts: for “good” and “bad” states of the world
- Investors behave as risk averse individuals in “good” and “bad” states but become risk seeking when switching occurs
- Utility function aggregation procedure based on subjective states of the world
- Formulation of an inverse problem for the estimation of the switching points distribution
Outlook

- Testing alternative utility function designs
- Refining the technique for estimating the distribution of switching points as an inverse problem
- Study of the dynamics of pricing kernels and individual utility functions (Giacomini et al., 2006)
- Testing the hypothesis of the local utility function non-concavity due to switching in a behavioural experiment
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