

Whitepaper for professional investors

---

# The volatility effect in emerging markets

---



---

April 2013

---

By

**David Blitz**, PhD, Head Quantitative Equity Research,

**Juan Pang**, PhD, Quantitative Researcher and

**Pim van Vliet**, PhD, Senior Portfolio Manager



**David Blitz,**  
PhD, Head Quantitative Equity  
Research



**Juan Pang,**  
PhD, Quantitative Researcher



**Pim van Vliet,**  
PhD, Senior Portfolio Manager

# The volatility effect in emerging markets

**In this paper we examine the empirical relation between risk and return in emerging equity markets and find that this relation is flat, or even negative. This is inconsistent with theoretical models such as the CAPM, which predict a positive relation, but consistent with the results of studies which have previously examined the empirical relation between risk and return in the U.S. and other developed equity markets. We show that our findings are robust to considering a universe of large-cap stocks only, to considering longer holding periods and to controlling for exposures to the size, value and momentum effects. We also observe that the empirical deviation from the theoretical risk-return relation appears to be growing stronger over time, which might be related to the increasing participation of benchmark-driven investors, in line with the 'limits to arbitrage' hypothesis. Finally, we find low correlations between the volatility effects in emerging and developed equity markets, which argues against a common-factor explanation.**

## 1. Introduction

In this paper we examine the empirical relation between risk and return in emerging equity markets. The Nobel-prize winning Sharpe-Lintner Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) postulates that the expected return on a stock is linearly proportional to its market beta. However, the initial empirical tests of the CAPM for the U.S. equity market already indicated that low-beta stocks have higher returns than predicted by the CAPM; see, e.g., Black, Jensen and Scholes (1972), Fama and MacBeth (1973) and Haugen and Heins (1975). Whereas some anomalies tend to weaken or even disappear following their public dissemination, the beta effect only seems to have been growing stronger over time. For instance, the seminal Fama and French (1992) paper documents that the relation between beta and U.S. stock returns is essentially flat over the 1963-1990 period, especially after correcting for size effects. More evidence for a flat, or even negative, relation between risk and return is given by Black (1993), Haugen and Baker (1991, 1996) and Falkenstein (1994), who look at similar or longer sample periods.

More recently, Blitz and van Vliet (2007) provide international evidence, showing that the relation between risk and return is not only negative in the U.S., but also in the European and Japanese equity markets over the 1986 to 2006 period. In addition, they find that the effect is even stronger when risk is measured using simply volatility instead of beta. For the U.S. stock market, Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011) confirm that the volatility effect presents an even bigger anomaly than the related beta effect over the 1968 to 2008 period. In addition, Clarke, de Silva and Thorley (2010) report that the relation between volatility and expected stock returns is flat over the extended 1931 to 2008 period. Ang, Hodrick, Xing and Zhang (2006, 2009) show that also very short-term (past one month daily) idiosyncratic volatility is negatively related to subsequent stock returns in the U.S. and other G7 stock markets, providing further evidence of the robustness of the anomalous empirical relation between risk and return.

In this paper we extend the existing literature by analyzing the empirical relation between risk and return in emerging equity markets. Emerging markets have become increasingly important to investors due to their fast growing economies. This is clearly reflected in the composition of the MSCI All Countries index, in which the weight of emerging markets has grown from roughly 1 percent in 1988 to around 15 percent nowadays. This increase has mostly come from issuance of new shares, and to a smaller extent from higher realized returns. However, emerging markets have also been characterized by a high volatility and multiple crises, such as Mexico 1994, Asia 1997 and Russia 1998. Several studies have examined the cross-section of stock returns in emerging markets, and conclude that the classic size, value and momentum effects are also present in these markets; see, e.g., Fama and French (1998), Patel (1998), Rouwenhorst (1999) and van der Hart, Slagter and van Dijk (2003). However, the empirical relation between risk, in terms of either volatility or beta, and return in emerging markets has not received much attention. One of the few exceptions is Rouwenhorst (1999), who observes that beta is not related to return in emerging markets over the 1982 to 1997 period.

Our analysis of the empirical relation between risk and return in emerging markets is relevant for at least three reasons. First, by considering a fresh dataset with data through 2010 we can test whether conclusions on the empirical relation between risk and return in developed equity markets carry over to emerging equity markets. If the results of our out-of-sample test on emerging markets are similar to previous findings for the U.S. and other developed equity markets, this reduces the probability of a spurious result that might be attributable to

data mining. Moreover, by relating the volatility effect in emerging markets to the volatility effect in developed markets, we can assess if the effects in different markets are driven by a common component. High correlations between the alphas in different markets suggest that the volatility effect may represent a global risk factor, while low correlations are indicative of mispricing occurring independently in different markets.

Second, our new sample enables us to address the main criticisms existing studies have received. For example, Bali and Cakici (2008) argue that the negative empirical relation between risk and return is driven by small-caps, especially the strong negative returns of high (idiosyncratic) volatility stocks. We address this concern by including only constituents of the S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index in our sample, and additionally by conducting a robustness test on the 50% largest stocks within this already liquid universe. Others, such as Scherer (2010), have argued that some of the effect may be due to exposure to the classic value premium. We therefore also adjust for such implicit factor loadings, using both parametric and non-parametric techniques. Yet another critique, by Amenc, Martellini, Goltz and Sahoo (2011), is that the relation between risk and return turns positive over longer holding periods. We therefore also analyze the performance characteristics of portfolios sorted on past risk over holding periods up to 5 years.

Third, emerging markets can shed new light on the different hypotheses which have been proposed in the literature to rationalize the apparently anomalous empirical relation between risk and return. Some, such as Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011) and Frazzini and Pedersen (2010) relate the effect to benchmark-

driven institutional investors, while others, such as Black (1993) and de Giorgi and Post (2011) relate the effect to constraints on leverage or constraints on short-selling. Emerging markets are an interesting test case, as due to their rapid growth and progressive liberalization over the past decades, they have grown from a niche into a mainstream asset class for global institutional investors. For developed markets, Blitz and van Vliet (2007) and Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011) have suggested that the volatility effect has strengthened over time, something which we can now test out-of-sample for dozens of new emerging countries.

Our main finding is that, similar to the results documented previously for the U.S. and other developed equity markets, the empirical relation between risk and return is negative in emerging equity markets, and more strongly so when volatility instead of beta is used to measure risk. Specifically, a monthly rebalanced top-minus-bottom quintile hedge portfolio based on past 3-year volatility exhibits a negative raw return spread of -4.4 percent per annum over our 1989-2010 sample period. Adjusted for differences in market beta this amounts to a statistically significant negative alpha spread of -8.8 percent. The alpha spread remains large and significant after additionally controlling for size, value and momentum effects. In line with other studies on the volatility effect, we observe that the negative alpha of the most volatile stocks is larger than the positive alpha of the least volatile stocks. Robustness tests show that the alpha spread remains significant if the 50% smallest stocks in our sample are excluded from the analysis or if the holding period is extended up to 5 years. We also find that the volatility effect has strengthened over time, again in line with results for developed markets. Specifically,

the alpha spread amounts to 3.1 percent in the first half of our sample period (1989-1999), versus -14.4 percent during the second half of our sample period (2000-2010). Finally, we find low correlations between the volatility effects in emerging and developed equity markets, which argues against a common-factor explanation, i.e. the possibility that the volatility effect might reflect a global systematic risk factor. We conclude that there exists a significant, robust and distinct volatility effect within emerging markets, which appears to be growing stronger over time. Our findings indicate that the relation between risk and return in emerging markets is very similar to developed markets and are consistent with the hypothesis that benchmark-driven institutional investing contributes to the volatility effect.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we first describe our data and methodology, in Section 3 we present our empirical results and in Section 4 we conclude.

## 2. Data and Methodology

In this section we describe the data and methodology used throughout this paper.

### 2.1 Data

We construct our sample by taking, at the end of every month, all stocks included in the S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index at that specific point in time. Our sample covers the period from the inception of this index, at the end of December 1988, until December 2010. The S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index is a subset of the much broader S&P/IFC Global Emerging Markets Index, containing only stocks considered to be accessible and sufficiently liquid for international investors. Our sample covers stocks from 30 different emerging markets. Figure 1 shows that the total

number of stocks in our sample starts off low, but grows progressively over time. During the first two years our sample contains less than 200 stocks, but by the end of 2010 the number of stocks has risen to over 1,800. The average number of stocks is around 1,000.

We note that jumps in the number of index constituents are typically the result of countries entering or leaving the universe. For example, China is included in the index from October 1995 onwards, while Portugal was removed from the index in March 1999.

are distributed uniformly across the various quintile portfolios. We next calculate for each portfolio the total return in U.S. dollars in excess of the one-month Treasury bill rate over the subsequent month.

**Figure 1: Number of Stocks over Time**



This figure plots the number of constituents in the S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index over our sample period from December 1988 to December 2010.

We gather monthly total stocks returns in local currency as well as in U.S. dollars, taking into account dividends, stock splits and other capital adjustments. Our first data source for returns is Interactive Data Exshare. If not available, return data from MSCI are used instead. If also not available, we calculate total returns using data from S&P/IFC. Monthly returns above 500% are truncated at this level. In addition to returns, we gather free-float adjusted market capitalization data from S&P/IFC and accounting data (book-to-price ratios) from, in order of preference, MSCI, Thomson Financial Worldscope and S&P/IFC. Finally, we obtain the one-month

U.S. Treasury bill rate from the data library of Kenneth French.

## 2.2 Methodology

Our methodology consists of creating, at the end of every month, equally-weighted quintile portfolios based on ranking stocks on a past risk measure. The top quintile contains the stocks with the highest risk and the bottom quintile the stocks with the lowest risk. Similar to, for example, Rouwenhorst (1999) and van der Hart, Slagter and van Dijk (2003) we construct the portfolios in a country neutral manner, meaning that the stocks for a given country

The main risk measures used for ranking stocks are past volatility and past beta. Similar to Blitz and van Vliet (2007), we calculate the past volatility of a stock by taking the standard deviation of its monthly total returns in local currency over the preceding three years. The only difference is that we consider return data with a monthly instead of a weekly frequency, due to data limitations for emerging markets. The past beta of a stock is calculated by regressing its monthly total returns in U.S. dollars over the past three years on the total returns in U.S. dollars of the S&P/IFC Investable index for the country to which the stock belongs.

For each quintile portfolio we report the annualized average return, volatility and Sharpe ratio. For the annualized return we report both the arithmetic and the geometric average, but focus on the latter in order to account for compounding effects, which are particularly relevant when comparing portfolios with different volatilities; see, e.g. van Vliet, Blitz and van der Grient (2011). In addition, we report 1-factor, 3-factor and 4-factor alphas and their associated t-statistics for each portfolio. These alphas are obtained by first regressing the monthly portfolio returns on a number of risk factors and next using the estimated betas to adjust the geometric average portfolio returns for these implicit factor exposures. The 1-factor alpha is obtained by regressing the portfolio excess returns on the excess returns of the equally-weighted universe. In order to calculate the

3-factor alpha, we add SMB (size) and HML (value) proxies to the regression, and in order to calculate the 4-factor alpha we additionally add a UMD (momentum) proxy. The SMB, HML and UMD proxies for emerging markets are calculated by ranking stocks, again in a country neutral manner, on their log market capitalization, book-to-market ratio and past 12-1 month total return respectively, and taking the difference in return between the equally-weighted top and bottom quintiles.

### 3. Results

In this section we present our empirical findings. We first describe our main overall results, followed by results for the separate countries. We then investigate if our results are robust to restricting the universe to a sample which only contains large-cap stocks, to controlling for possible loadings on the value effect and to extending the holding period to up to five years. We next examine the evolution of the volatility effect over time by considering subsample results. Finally, we examine if the volatility effects in emerging and developed equity markets are driven by a common component.

#### 3.1 Main results

Our main results are presented in Table 1. Panel A contains the results for quintile portfolios sorted on past 3-year volatility. We begin by noting that past risk is strongly predictive for future risk, as both the realized volatilities and betas of the quintile portfolios are monotonically increasing: the volatilities from roughly 20 to 30 percent annualized, and the betas from 0.79 to 1.15. Turning to the realized returns of the quintile portfolios, we observe that the raw risk-return relation is inverted, as the top (high-volatility) quintile portfolio underperforms the bottom

**Table 1: Emerging Markets Portfolios Sorted on Volatility, Beta and Other Factors**

*At the end of each month between December 1988 and December 2010, all S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index constituent stocks at that point in time are sorted into quintile portfolios based on their past 3-year monthly local return volatility (Panel A), past 3-year beta against their S&P/IFC Investable country index using monthly U.S. dollar returns (Panel B), log U.S. dollar free-float market capitalization (Panel C), book-to-market ratio (Panel D) or past 12-1 month total return (Panel E). All portfolios are equally weighted and constructed in a country neutral manner, with Q1 containing stocks with the lowest scores and Q5 stocks with the highest scores. The universe is defined as the equally-weighted portfolio of all stocks in the S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index. We next calculate portfolios returns in U.S. dollars over the subsequent month and repeat the process. For each portfolio we report the annualized arithmetic (simple) and geometric (compounded) mean returns in excess of the U.S. dollar risk-free return, standard deviation, Sharpe ratio, CAPM beta, CAPM alpha and related t-statistics. For the volatility and beta sorted portfolios we additionally report the annualized 3- and 4-factor alphas and their t-statistics, using the equally-weighted universe as a proxy for the market factor and the top-minus-bottom size, value and momentum quintile portfolios as proxies for the SMB, HML and WML factors.*

**Panel A: Portfolios sorted on volatility**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	15,3%	15,6%	16,0%	16,5%	13,2%	-2,1%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	13,1%	12,9%	12,6%	12,6%	8,7%	-4,4%	12,2%
Standard deviation	20,5%	23,2%	25,6%	27,6%	29,9%	13,5%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,64	0,56	0,49	0,46	0,29	-0,32	0,49
Beta	0,79	0,91	1,00	1,08	1,15	0,37	1,00
1-factor alpha	3,5%	1,7%	0,4%	-0,6%	-5,4%	-8,8%	-
(t-value)	2,79	1,93	0,37	-0,69	-3,26	-4,10	-
3-factor alpha	3,8%	2,1%	0,6%	-0,8%	-4,4%	-8,2%	-
(t-value)	3,10	2,30	0,51	-0,90	-2,76	-3,99	-
4-factor alpha	2,9%	1,7%	0,4%	-0,2%	-2,8%	-5,7%	-
(t-value)	2,19	1,71	0,29	-0,17	-1,63	-2,59	-

**Panel B: Portfolios sorted on beta**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	13,0%	16,6%	15,3%	17,3%	15,5%	2,5%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	10,7%	13,6%	11,5%	13,1%	10,3%	-0,4%	12,2%
Standard deviation	20,5%	23,2%	26,1%	27,3%	30,8%	14,2%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,52	0,58	0,44	0,48	0,33	-0,03	0,49
Beta	0,79	0,90	1,02	1,07	1,20	0,41	1,00
1-factor alpha	1,0%	2,5%	-1,0%	0,0%	-4,4%	-5,4%	-
(t-value)	0,86	2,22	-0,97	-0,01	-3,17	-2,57	-
3-factor alpha	1,3%	2,7%	-0,7%	-0,3%	-4,5%	-5,8%	-
(t-value)	1,12	2,33	-0,65	-0,32	-3,15	-2,68	-
4-factor alpha	0,4%	1,5%	-0,6%	0,2%	-2,7%	-3,1%	-
(t-value)	0,33	1,18	-0,49	0,19	-1,76	-1,33	-

### Panel C: Portfolios sorted on size

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	19,0%	15,6%	14,3%	14,5%	14,2%	-4,8%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	15,1%	12,3%	10,9%	11,3%	11,1%	-3,9%	12,2%
Standard deviation	27,6%	25,1%	25,9%	24,9%	24,5%	11,6%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,54	0,49	0,42	0,45	0,45	-0,34	0,49
Beta	1,07	0,99	1,02	0,98	0,95	-0,12	1,00
1-factor alpha	2,0%	0,3%	-1,6%	-0,7%	-0,4%	-2,4%	-
(t-value)	1,39	0,30	-1,78	-0,83	-0,34	-1,00	-

### Panel D: Portfolios sorted on book-to-market

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	11,6%	12,1%	13,0%	16,9%	23,1%	11,5%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	8,7%	9,0%	9,7%	13,5%	18,9%	10,2%	12,2%
Standard deviation	24,0%	24,7%	25,7%	25,7%	28,3%	12,2%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,36	0,36	0,38	0,53	0,67	0,83	0,49
Beta	0,91	0,95	1,00	0,99	1,08	0,18	1,00
1-factor alpha	-2,4%	-2,6%	-2,5%	1,4%	5,6%	8,0%	-
(t-value)	-1,43	-1,80	-2,02	1,02	3,27	3,26	-

### Panel E: Portfolios sorted on 12-1 month momentum

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	11,1%	15,9%	15,3%	15,2%	19,9%	8,8%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	6,8%	12,5%	12,1%	12,4%	16,6%	9,8%	12,2%
Standard deviation	29,1%	25,7%	25,3%	23,3%	25,0%	14,4%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,23	0,49	0,48	0,53	0,66	0,68	0,49
Beta	1,12	1,01	0,99	0,91	0,95	-0,17	1,00
1-factor alpha	-6,9%	0,1%	0,0%	1,3%	5,0%	11,8%	-
(t-value)	-4,04	0,14	0,03	1,28	3,04	3,98	-

(low-volatility) quintile portfolio by 4.4 percent per annum geometrically and 2.1 percent per annum arithmetically. As a result, the Sharpe ratio of the bottom (low-volatility) quintile portfolio is over double that of the top (high-volatility) quintile portfolio, at 0.64 versus 0.29. Adjusted for differences in market beta, we find economically and statistically significant 1-factor alphas of 5.4 and +3.5 percent per annum for the top and bottom quintile portfolios, resulting in a top-minus-bottom 1-factor alpha spread of -8.8 percent per annum, with an associated t-statistic of 4.10. As in Blitz and van Vliet

(2007), we will refer to this finding as the 'volatility effect'.

For portfolios sorted on past 3-year beta, shown in Panel B, we observe directionally similar, but less strong results. Past risk is again strongly predictive for future risk, as the realized volatilities and betas of the quintile portfolios sorted on beta are very similar to those observed before for quintile portfolios sorted on volatility. The raw relation between risk and return appears to be flat rather than inverted though. The 1-factor alpha spread of

-5.4 percent per annum remains economically and statistically significant (with a t-statistic of -2.57), but is smaller than the corresponding spread for volatility-sorted portfolios. We also observe that the alpha is more asymmetric, as the negative alpha of high-beta stocks is much larger than the positive alpha of low-beta stocks. Our results are consistent with Rouwenhorst (1999), who observes that beta is not related to return in emerging markets over the 1982 to 1997 period. The results are also in line with Blitz and van Vliet (2007) and Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011), who find that, also in developed equity markets, portfolios sorted on volatility exhibit larger alphas than portfolios sorted on beta. For this reason we will focus on volatility-sorted portfolios in the following sections.

In Panels C, D and E of Table 1 we show the performance characteristics of quintile portfolios sorted on size, value and momentum respectively. Consistent with the results of Fama and French (1998), Patel (1998), Rouwenhorst (1999) and van der Hart, Slagter and van Dijk (2003) we find clear evidence of size, value and momentum premiums in emerging markets. Based on the 1-factor alphas we conclude that the low-volatility premium is much larger than the size premium, and comparable in magnitude to the value premium. Only the raw momentum premium is larger, but it should be noted that, due to its high associated turnover, this is the premium which is likely to be eroded most by transaction costs in practical applications.

In order to examine whether systematic exposures to the size, value and momentum effects may explain some, or perhaps even all, of the performance of portfolios sorted on volatility or beta we also report 3- and 4-factor

alphas in Panels A and B of Table 1. As described in the methodology section, we use the top-minus-bottom size, value and momentum quintile portfolios as a proxy for the SMB, HML and WML factors in emerging markets. We observe that the 3-factor alphas are, in fact, very similar to the 1-factor alphas, indicating that systematic size or value exposures do not explain the volatility and beta effects in emerging markets. Only the 4-factor alphas are slightly lower, indicating that some of the alpha may be attributable to implicit loadings on the momentum effect. However, at -5.7 percent the spread remains significant for volatility-sorted portfolios, both economically and statistically. Only the 4-factor alpha of -3.1 percent for beta-sorted portfolios is no longer statistically significant.

### 3.2 Results by country

We continue by examining the results per country. For this analysis we only include country-month observations that are based on at least 25 stocks, and we only report results for countries for which this leaves at least 60 sixty monthly return observations (19 out of 30 countries). An example of a country which is excluded altogether from this analysis is the Czech Republic, which structurally consists of only a small number of stocks. We also note that the period that is effectively considered for each country can be different. In Table 2 we report 1-factor alphas for the top-minus-bottom quintile of volatility-sorted portfolios per country, where the market factor is assumed to be the equally-weighted return of only the stocks in the country under

consideration, instead of the entire emerging markets universe. We observe that 15 out of the 19 1-factor alphas are below 5 percent, 2 are between -5 and 0 percent, and only 2 are (slightly) positive at 1.30 (Mexico) and 3.59 (Russia) percent. Based on this finding we conclude that the volatility effect is generally robust across countries.

### 3.3 Results for large-caps only

Bali and Cakici (2008) argue that the negative empirical relation between risk and return is concentrated in small, illiquid stocks, especially the strong negative returns of high (idiosyncratic) volatility stocks. We already attempt to address this concern by including only constituents of the S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index in our sample, but in this section we go one step further by conducting a robustness test on the 50% largest stocks within this already liquid universe. Specifically, every month we first rank the stocks in our universe on their free-float adjusted market capitalization, and next remove the 50% smallest stocks from that month's sample. The results for volatility-sorted portfolios based on this large-cap only universe are reported in Table 3. The main effect of removing the smaller stocks from our sample appears to be that the average annual returns of all quintile portfolios drop by around 3-4 percent, indicating that large-cap stocks on average exhibited lower returns than small-cap stocks during this particular sample period. The alphas drop accordingly, but the net effect on the top-minus-bottom quintile alpha spreads is small. At -9.1 to -7.1 percent per annum, the 1-, 3- and 4-factor alpha spreads for the large-cap only universe remain both economically and statistically highly significant. Based on this finding we conclude that the volatility effect in emerging markets is not concentrated in less liquid small-cap stocks.

**Table 2: Volatility Effect for Individual Countries**

	Volatility	
	1-factor alpha	t-statistic
Argentina	-17,6%	-1,54
Brazil	-11,9%	-0,93
Chile	-5,3%	-1,25
China	-21,8%	-2,82
Egypt	-19,3%	-2,31
Greece	-16,4%	-1,57
India	-15,7%	-2,69
Indonesia	-5,9%	-0,79
Israel	-15,7%	-2,62
Korea	-14,4%	-2,71
Malaysia	-11,2%	-1,38
Mexico	1,3%	0,31
Philippines	-6,9%	-0,53
Poland	-9,5%	-1,23
Russia	3,6%	0,33
South Africa	-6,9%	-1,18
Taiwan	-1,4%	-0,29
Thailand	-11,1%	-2,01
Turkey	-3,2%	-0,54

**Table 3: Volatility Effect among the 50% Largest Stocks**

We follow the same methodology as used to construct Table 1, but instead of considering the entire S&P/IFC Investable Emerging Markets Index, we show results based on the 50% largest stocks in this index. Specifically, every month we first rank the stocks in our universe in their free-float adjusted market capitalization, and next remove the 50% smallest stocks from that month's sample.

**Volatility sorted results**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	11,1%	12,1%	12,8%	14,1%	9,2%	-1,9%	11,9%
Mean (compounded)	9,1%	9,6%	9,9%	10,5%	4,8%	-4,3%	9,0%
Standard deviation	20,0%	22,4%	23,7%	26,5%	29,9%	14,0%	24,0%
Sharpe	0,46	0,43	0,42	0,40	0,16	-0,31	0,38
Beta	0,72	0,84	0,89	1,01	1,11	0,39	1,00
1-factor alpha	0,3%	-0,7%	-1,0%	-1,8%	-8,8%	-9,1%	-
(t-value)	0,15	-0,43	-0,60	-1,04	-3,77	-4,20	-
3-factor alpha	0,9%	0,3%	-0,5%	-1,1%	-6,7%	-7,6%	-
(t-value)	0,60	0,24	-0,34	-0,68	-3,03	-3,56	-
4-factor alpha	0,1%	-0,3%	-1,2%	-1,4%	-7,0%	-7,1%	-
(t-value)	0,08	-0,21	-0,70	-0,86	-2,92	-3,06	-

**Table 4: Double Sort on Value and Volatility**

We follow the same methodology as used to construct Table 1, but instead of considering single-sorted portfolios, we consider portfolios that are double sorted on value and volatility. Our double-sort approach consists of first sorting stocks, within each country, into five portfolios on their book-to-market ratio, next sorting the stocks within each of these five portfolios into five subportfolios based on their past 3-year volatility, and finally merging the five lowest volatility subportfolios, the five next lowest volatility portfolios, etc., thereby obtaining five new volatility-sorted portfolios which are designed to be not only country neutral, but also *ex ante* value neutral. All portfolios are equally weighted and constructed in a country neutral manner, with Q1 containing stocks with the lowest scores and Q5 stocks with the highest scores.

**Volatility sorted results**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	16,8%	16,7%	15,8%	17,3%	13,5%	-3,4%	15,5%
Mean (compounded)	14,0%	13,7%	12,6%	13,5%	8,8%	-5,2%	12,2%
Standard deviation	22,9%	23,9%	25,1%	27,2%	30,4%	13,0%	25,1%
Sharpe	0,61	0,57	0,50	0,49	0,29	-0,40	0,49
Beta	0,85	0,92	0,97	1,07	1,16	0,31	1,00
1-factor alpha	3,7%	2,5%	0,7%	0,4%	-5,3%	-9,0%	-
(t-value)	1,97	1,85	0,55	0,38	-2,72	-4,01	-
3-factor alpha	4,3%	2,4%	0,4%	0,2%	-4,9%	-9,2%	-
(t-value)	2,27	1,78	0,33	0,18	-2,53	-4,07	-
4-factor alpha	3,3%	2,1%	0,9%	1,3%	-3,5%	-6,8%	-
(t-value)	1,61	1,45	0,68	1,16	-1,68	-2,81	-

### 3.4 Is the volatility effect a value effect?

Scherer (2010) argues that the alpha of low-versus-high volatility portfolios in the U.S. equity market is mainly a value effect. Our earlier finding that 3-factor alphas are hardly different from 1-factor alphas already indicated that the value (or size) effect does not explain the performance of volatility-sorted portfolios. Specifically, we found a 1-factor alpha of -8,8% with a t-statistic of 4,10 and a 3-factor alpha -8,2% with a t-statistic of -3,99 for the top-minus-bottom quintile hedge portfolio. However, a limitation of this parametric adjustment is that it implicitly assumes that the value exposure of volatility-sorted portfolios is linear and constant over time. This assumption may not be valid though, as value portfolios are known to have a time-varying beta, with risk going up during recessions and down during expansions; see, e.g., Petkova and Zhang (2005). In order to address this concern we consider double-sorted portfolios. This non-parametric technique allows us to adjust for possible loadings on other effects *ex ante*, as opposed to merely adjusting estimated alphas *ex post*.

Our double-sort approach consists of first sorting stocks, within each country, into five portfolios on their value characteristics, next sorting the stocks within each of these five portfolios into five subportfolios based on their past 3-year volatility, and finally merging the five lowest volatility subportfolios, the five next lowest volatility portfolios, etc., thereby obtaining five new volatility-sorted portfolios which are designed to be not only country neutral, but also *ex ante* value neutral.

The results, reported in Table 4, do not differ much from our base-case results. In fact, the 1-, 3- and 4-factor alpha spreads of

**Table 5: Longer Holding Periods**

We follow the same methodology as used to construct Table 1, but instead of showing results based on a 1-month holding period, we show results over  $N$ -month holding periods for  $N = 1, 6, 12, 24, 36, 48$  and  $60$ . We do so by calculating every month the unweighted average return of the portfolios formed in the  $N$  most recent months, as in Jegadeesh and Titman (1993, 2001). The table reports 1-factor alphas and related  $t$ -statistics, using the equally-weighted universe as a proxy for the market factor.

Holding period	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1
1 month	3,5%	1,7%	0,4%	-0,6%	-5,4%	-8,8%
(t-value)	2,79	1,93	0,37	-0,69	-3,26	-4,10
6 months	2,5%	1,4%	-1,5%	-1,5%	-6,0%	-8,5%
(t-value)	1,85	1,14	-0,89	-1,04	-2,98	-4,08
12 months	2,5%	2,1%	-2,0%	-1,0%	-4,7%	-7,3%
(t-value)	1,70	1,48	-1,05	-0,64	-2,26	-3,50
24 months	2,5%	1,7%	-1,3%	-1,6%	-3,8%	-6,4%
(t-value)	1,59	0,95	-0,65	-0,94	-1,76	-3,10
36 months	2,9%	1,7%	-0,7%	-0,8%	-3,4%	-6,3%
(t-value)	1,69	0,91	-0,35	-0,43	-1,54	-3,12
48 months	2,4%	1,7%	-0,2%	-0,1%	-2,7%	-5,1%
(t-value)	1,37	0,92	-0,08	-0,03	-1,24	-2,69
60 months	2,2%	1,3%	-0,3%	0,3%	-2,2%	-4,4%
(t-value)	1,23	0,69	-0,14	0,14	-0,98	-2,38

the portfolios sorted first on value and then on volatility are even slightly larger than the alpha spreads of portfolios sorted only on volatility (-9.0 to -6.8 percent versus -8.8 to -5.7 percent). Also, the alphas of the top quintile portfolio of high-volatility stocks remain consistently negative, the alphas of the bottom quintile portfolio of low-volatility stocks remain consistently positive, and the magnitude of both effects remains statistically and economically significant. We conclude that the volatility effect in emerging markets is a distinct effect, which cannot be explained by either explicit or implicit loadings on the well-known value effect.

### 3.5 Results for longer holding periods

Amenc, Martellini, Goltz and Sahoo (2011) argue that the negative relation between risk and return is only present in the short run, and that over longer holding periods the relation does turn positive as predicted by theory. In order to address this concern we analyze the performance characteristics of volatility-sorted portfolios over holding periods up to 5 years. Specifically, if the holding period is assumed to be  $N$  months we calculate the return in month  $t$  by taking the unweighted average return of the portfolios formed in the  $N$  most recent months, as in Jegadeesh and Titman (1993, 2001). The results are summarized in Table 5.

We observe that the 1-factor alphas for the top and bottom quintile portfolio decrease as the holding period increases, but only very gradually. The annualized alpha spread, which starts at -8.8 percent with a 1-month holding period, drops to 7.3 percent with a 1-year holding period and 6.3 percent with a 3-year holding period. Even when the holding period is extended to 5 years the alpha spread remains economically and statistically significant at 4.4 percent per annum. We conclude that the volatility effect is highly persistent and not only present at short investment horizons.

### 3.6 Subsample results

Emerging markets can shed new light on the different hypotheses which have been proposed in the literature to rationalize the apparently anomalous empirical relation between risk and return. Some, such as Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011) and Frazzini and Pedersen (2010) relate the effect to benchmark-driven institutional investors, while others, such as Black (1993) and de Giorgi and Post (2011) relate the effect to constraints on leverage or short-selling. Emerging markets are an interesting test case, as due to their rapid growth and progressive liberalization over the past decades, they have grown from a niche into a mainstream asset class for international institutional investors. For developed markets, Blitz and van Vliet (2007) and Baker, Bradley and Wurgler (2011) have suggested that the volatility effect has strengthened over time, something which we can now test out-of-sample on previously unexplored markets.

In Table 6 we break down the results for volatility-sorted portfolios over the first and second half of our sample. We observe that the raw relation between risk and return

**Table 6: Sub-sample results**

We follow the same methodology as used to construct Table 1, but instead of showing full-sample results, we show results for two subperiods, 1989-1999 and 2000-2010.

**Panel A: 1989-1999**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	14,3%	13,8%	14,6%	17,2%	15,2%	0,8%	15,3%
Mean (compounded)	11,9%	11,0%	11,3%	13,6%	11,4%	-0,5%	12,2%
Standard deviation	21,6%	23,2%	25,2%	26,3%	27,1%	12,0%	24,3%
Sharpe	0,55	0,47	0,45	0,52	0,42	-0,04	0,50
Beta	0,84	0,93	0,99	1,06	1,05	0,21	1,00
1-factor alpha	1,7%	-0,4%	-0,7%	0,7%	-1,4%	-3,1%	-
(t-value)	0,76	-0,22	-0,31	0,41	-0,51	-0,93	-
3-factor alpha	2,5%	0,2%	-0,4%	0,3%	-0,8%	-3,2%	-
(t-value)	1,13	0,09	-0,17	0,19	-0,28	-1,01	-
4-factor alpha	2,8%	0,6%	-0,3%	0,7%	-0,6%	-3,4%	-
(t-value)	1,20	0,37	-0,11	0,41	-0,22	-1,00	-

**Panel B: 2000-2010**

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q5-Q1	Univ
Mean (simple)	16,2%	17,5%	17,4%	15,8%	11,2%	-5,0%	15,6%
Mean (compounded)	14,3%	14,7%	14,0%	11,7%	6,1%	-8,2%	12,3%
Standard deviation	19,5%	23,2%	26,2%	28,8%	32,4%	14,9%	25,9%
Sharpe	0,73	0,64	0,53	0,41	0,19	-0,55	0,47
Beta	0,74	0,89	1,01	1,11	1,24	0,50	1,00
1-factor alpha	5,2%	3,8%	1,6%	-1,9%	-9,2%	-14,4%	-
(t-value)	4,92	4,68	2,46	-2,59	-6,74	-6,45	-
3-factor alpha	4,7%	3,3%	1,1%	-2,0%	-8,2%	-12,9%	-
(t-value)	4,51	4,07	1,60	-2,62	-6,16	-5,99	-
4-factor alpha	2,7%	2,1%	0,3%	-1,3%	-5,8%	-8,5%	-
(t-value)	2,52	2,39	0,38	-1,54	-4,19	-3,87	-

appears to be flat over the first half of our sample (1989-1999), while turning strongly negative over the second half of our sample (2000-2010). This is also reflected in the alpha spreads, which are less than half their full-sample average over the first period, and almost double their full-sample average over the second period. For example, the 1-factor alpha spreads amount to -3.1 and -14.4 percent

respectively. A formal difference-in-means test indicates that this difference is statistically significant (p-value 0.0047). These findings indicate that, similar to developed markets, the volatility effect in emerging markets appears to be growing stronger over time, consistent with the hypothesis that benchmark-driven institutional investing contributes to the volatility effect.

### 3.7 Is there a global volatility effect?

Rouwenhorst (1998) finds that the returns on international and U.S. momentum strategies are correlated, and interprets this as evidence that exposure to a common factor may drive the profitability of such strategies. In this section we examine the correlation between the volatility effect in emerging equity markets, as documented in this paper, and the previously documented volatility effect in developed equity markets. For this analysis we construct volatility-sorted hedge portfolios for the U.S., European and Japanese markets based on a survivorship-bias free sample of FTSE World Developed Index constituent stocks, as in Blitz and van Vliet (2007). The only difference is that instead of calculating past 3-year volatilities using weekly data, we use monthly data, similar to our analysis of the volatility effect for emerging markets.

Table 7 exhibits the estimated correlations between the 1-factor alphas of volatility hedge portfolios in the various regions over the full sample period 1989-2010 and the two subperiods used before, 1989-1999 and 2000-2010. The correlation between the volatility effects in emerging and developed equity markets is moderately positive, at 0.26 with the U.S., 0.19 with Europe and 0.24 with Japan. Correlations are somewhat higher in the more recent subperiod but never exceed 0.36. Only the correlation between the volatility effects within the U.S. and European equity markets has gone up sharply in the more recent subperiod, from 0.27 to 0.73, but the volatility effects in Japan and Emerging markets remain weakly correlated with the other regions. These findings suggest that the volatility effect in emerging markets is largely independent from the volatility effect in developed markets. This argues against a common-factor explanation, i.e. the possibility that the volatility effect

**Table 7: Correlation of 1-factor alphas across regions**

This table reports the correlation coefficients of 1-factor alphas of top-minus-bottom quintile volatility hedge portfolios in the U.S., European, Japanese and Emerging equity markets. The 1-factors alphas for emerging markets are calculated in the same way as described in Table 1. The 1-factor alphas for the U.S., Europe and Japan are calculated in the same fashion as for emerging markets, but based on FTSE World Developed Index constituent stocks instead. Panel A shows full sample correlations (1989-2010) and Panels B and C show correlations over the 1989-1999 and 2000-2010 subperiods.

**Panel A: 1989-2010**

	US	Europe	Japan	Emerging
US	1,00			
Europe	0,61	1,00		
Japan	0,17	0,18	1,00	
Emerging	0,26	0,19	0,24	1,00

**Panel B: 1989-1999**

	US	Europe	Japan	Emerging
US	1,00			
Europe	0,27	1,00		
Japan	0,12	0,20	1,00	
Emerging	0,18	0,01	0,25	1,00

**Panel C: 2000-2010**

	US	Europe	Japan	Emerging
US	1,00			
Europe	0,73	1,00		
Japan	0,21	0,18	1,00	
Emerging	0,36	0,33	0,20	1,00

might reflect a global systematic risk factor. For the value and momentum effects in emerging markets, van der Hart, de Zwart and van Dijk (2005) have previously argued against risk-based explanations as well. For investors the practical implication of the low observed correlation levels is that significant diversification benefits may be achieved by exploiting the volatility effect in multiple markets simultaneously.

#### 4. Summary

In this paper we have documented the clear presence of a volatility effect in emerging markets. Contrary to the predictions of theoretical models such as the CAPM, which postulate that the relation between risk and return should be positive, we find that the empirical relation between risk and return in emerging equity markets is flat, or even negative, in particular for portfolios of stocks

sorted on past volatility. Our findings are consistent with studies which have previously established the existence of a volatility effect in the U.S. and other developed equity markets. The volatility effect in emerging markets is found to be robust to considering a universe of large-cap stocks only, to considering longer holding periods and to controlling for exposures to the size, value and momentum effects. The volatility effect also appears to have strengthened over time, which might be related to the increasing participation of benchmark-driven investors, in line with the 'limits to arbitrage' hypothesis. Finally, we find low correlations between the volatility effects in emerging and developed equity markets, which argues against a common-factor explanation.

## References

Amenc, N., Martellini, L., Goltz, F., and Sahoo, D., 2011, Is There a Risk/Return Tradeoff across Stocks? An Answer from a Long-Horizon Perspective, EDHEC-Risk research paper.

Ang, A., Hodrick, R.J., Xing, Y., and Zhang, X., 2006, The Cross-Section of Volatility and Expected Returns, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 259-299.

Ang, A., Hodrick, R.J., Xing, Y., and Zhang, X., 2009, High Idiosyncratic Volatility and Low Returns: International and Further U.S. Evidence, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 91, No. 1, pp. 1-23.

Baker, M.P., Bradley, B., and Wurgler, J.A., 2011, Benchmarks as Limits to Arbitrage: Understanding the Low Volatility Anomaly, *Financial Analysts' Journal*, Vol. 67, No. 1, pp. 40-54.

Bali, T.G., and Cakici, N., 2008, Idiosyncratic Volatility and the Cross Section of Expected Returns, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 29-58.

Black, F., Jensen, M.C., and Scholes, M., 1972, The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Some Empirical Tests, *Studies in the Theory of Capital Markets*, Jensen, M.C. (Ed.), Praeger Black, F., 1993, Beta and Return: Announcements of the 'Death of Beta' seem Premature, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 8-18.

Blitz, D.C., and van Vliet, P., 2007, The Volatility Effect: Lower Risk Without Lower Return, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 102-113.

Clarke, R., de Silva, H., and Thorley, S., 2010, Know Your VMS Exposure, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 52-59.

De Giorgi, E., and Post, T., 2011, Capital Market Equilibrium with Binding Portfolio Restrictions, SSRN working paper no. 1800229.

Fama, E.F., and French, K.R., 1992, The Cross-Section of Expected Stock Returns, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 427-465.

Fama, E.F., and French, K.R., 1998, Value versus Growth: The International Evidence, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 53, No. 6, pp. 1975-1999.

Fama, E.F., and MacBeth, J.D., 1973, Risk, Return and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 43-66.

Falkenstein, E.G., 1994, Mutual Funds, Idiosyncratic Variance, and Asset Returns, PhD thesis, Northwestern University.

Frazzini, A., and Pedersen, L.H., 2010, Betting Against Beta, SSRN working paper no. 1723048

van der Hart, J., Slagter, E., and van Dijk D., 2003, Stock Selection Strategies in Emerging Markets, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, Vol. 10, No. 1-2., pp. 105-132.

van der Hart, J., de Zwart, G., and van Dijk, D., 2005, The Success of Stock Selection Strategies in Emerging Markets: Is it Risk or Behavioral Bias?, *Emerging Markets Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 238-262.

Haugen, R.A., and Heins, A.J., 1975, Risk and the Rate of Return on Financial Assets: Some Old Wine in New Bottles, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 775-784.

Haugen, R.A., and Baker, N.L., 1991, The Efficient Market Inefficiency of Capitalization-Weighted Stock Portfolios, *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 35-40.

Haugen, R.A., and Baker, N.L., 1996, Commonality in the Determinants of Expected Stock Returns, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 401-439.

Jegadeesh, N., and Titman, S., 1993, Returns to Buying Winners and Selling Losers: Implications for Stock Market Efficiency, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 65- 91.

Jegadeesh, N., and Titman, S., 2001, Profitability of Momentum Strategies: An Evaluation of Alternative Explanations, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 699-720.

Patel, S.A., 1998, Cross-sectional Variation in Emerging Markets Equity Returns January 1988 - March 1997, *Emerging Markets Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 57-70.

Petkova, R., and Zhang, L., 2005, Is Value Riskier than Growth?, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 187-202.

Rouwenhorst, K.G., 1998, International Momentum Strategies, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 267-284.

Rouwenhorst, K.G., 1999, Local Return Factors and Turnover in Emerging Stock Markets, *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 1439-1464.

Scherer, B., 2010, A New Look at Minimum Variance Investing, SSRN working paper no. 1681306.

Van Vliet, P., Blitz, D.C., and van der Grient, B., 2011, Is the Relation between Volatility and Expected Stock Returns Positive, Flat or Negative?, SSRN working paper no. 1881503.



## **Important Information**

Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V., hereafter Robeco, has a license as manager of UCITS and AIFs from the Netherlands Authority for the Financial Markets in Amsterdam. This statement is intended for professional investors. Therefore, the information set forth herein is not addressed and must not be made available, in whole or in part, to other parties, such as retail clients. Robeco disclaims all liability arising from users other than those specified herein. Without further explanation this presentation cannot be considered complete. It is intended to provide the professional investor with general information on Robeco's specific capabilities, but does not constitute a recommendation or an advice to buy or sell certain securities or investment products. All rights relating to the information in this presentation are and will remain the property of Robeco. No part of this presentation may be reproduced, saved in an automated data file or published in any form or by any means, either electronically, mechanically, by photocopy, recording or in any other way, without Robeco's prior written permission. The information contained in this publication is not intended for users from other countries, such as US citizens and residents, where the offering of foreign financial services is not permitted, or where Robeco's services are not available. The prospectus and the Key Investor Information Document for the Robeco Funds can all be obtained free of charge at [www.robeco.com](http://www.robeco.com). Investment involves risks. Before investing, please note the initial capital is not guaranteed. The value of the investments may fluctuate. Past performance is no guarantee of future results. Historical returns are provided for illustrative purposes only. The price of units may go down as well as up and the past performance is not indicative of future performance. If the currency in which the past performance is displayed differs from the currency of the country in which you reside, then you should be aware that due to exchange rate fluctuations the performance shown may increase or decrease if converted into your local currency.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in France**

Robeco is having the freedom to provide services in France. Robeco France has been approved under registry number 10683 by the French prudential control and resolution authority (formerly ACP, now the ACPR) as an investment firm since 28 September 2012. Robeco France is only authorized to offer investment advice service to professional investors.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Germany**

This information is solely intended for professional investors or eligible counterparties in the meaning of the German Securities Trading Act.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Italy**

This document is considered for use solely by qualified investors and private professional clients (as defined in Article 26 (1) (d) of Consob Regulation No. 16190). If made available to Distributors and individuals authorized by Distributors to conduct promotion and marketing activity, it may only be used for the purpose for which it was conceived. Therefore, the information set forth herein is not addressed and must not be made available, in whole or in part, to other parties, such as retail clients. Robeco disclaims all liability arising from uses other than those specified herein.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Spain**

The Spanish branch Robeco Institutional Asset Management BV, Sucursal en España, having its registered office at Paseo de la Castellana 42, 28046 Madrid, is registered with the Spanish Authority for the Financial Markets (CNMV) in Spain under registry number 24.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Switzerland**

This document is exclusively distributed in Switzerland to qualified investors as such terms are defined under the Swiss Collective Investment Schemes Act (CISA). RobecoSAM AG has been authorized by the FINMA as Swiss representative of the Fund(s), and UBS Switzerland AG, Bahnhofstrasse 45, 8001 Zurich, postal address: Badenerstrasse 574, P.O. Box, CH-8098 Zurich, as Swiss paying agent. The prospectus, the key investor information documents (KIDs), the articles of association, the annual and semi-annual reports of the Fund(s), as well as the list of the purchases and sales which the Fund(s) has undertaken during the financial year, may be obtained, on simple request and free of charge, at the head office of the Swiss representative RobecoSAM AG, Josefstrasse 218, CH-8005 Zurich.

If the currency in which the past performance is displayed differs from the currency of the country in which you reside, then you should be aware that due to exchange rate fluctuations the performance shown may increase or decrease if converted into your local currency. The value of the investments may fluctuate. Past performance is no guarantee of future results.

The performance data do not take account of the commissions and costs incurred on the issue and redemption of units.

The prices used for the performance figures of the Luxembourg-based funds are the end-of-month transaction prices net of fees up to 4 August 2010. From 4 August 2010, the transaction prices net of fees will be those of the first business day of the month. Return figures versus the benchmark show the investment management result before management and/or performance fees; the fund returns are with dividends reinvested and based on net asset values with prices and exchange rates of the valuation moment of the benchmark. Please refer to the prospectus of the funds for further details. The prospectus is available at the company's offices or via the [www.robeco.ch](http://www.robeco.ch) website. Performance is quoted net of investment management fees. The ongoing charges mentioned in this publication is the one stated in the fund's latest annual report at closing date of the last calendar year.

The material and information in this document are provided "as is" and without warranties of any kind, either expressed or implied. Robeco and its related, affiliated and subsidiary companies disclaim all warranties, expressed or implied, including, but not limited to, implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

All information contained in this document is distributed with the understanding that the authors, publishers and distributors are not rendering legal, accounting or other professional advice or opinions on specific facts or matters and accordingly assume no liability whatsoever in connection with its use. In no event shall Robeco and its related, affiliated and subsidiary companies be liable for any direct, indirect, special, incidental or consequential damages arising out of the use of any opinion or information expressly or implicitly contained in this document.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in the United Kingdom**

Robeco is subject to limited regulation in the UK by the Financial Conduct Authority. Details about the extent of our regulation by the Financial Conduct Authority are available from us on request.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Hong Kong**

Investment returns not denominated in HKD/USD are exposed to exchange rate fluctuations. Investors should refer to the fund's Hong Kong prospectus before making any investment decision. Investors should ensure that they fully understand the risk associated with the fund. Investors should also consider their own investment objective and risk tolerance level. Any opinions, estimates or forecasts may be changed at any time without prior warning. If in doubt, please seek independent advice. The content of this document is based upon sources of information believed to be reliable. This fund may use derivatives as part of its investment strategy and such investments are inherently volatile and this fund could potentially be exposed to additional risk and cost should the market move against it. Investors should note that the investment strategy and risks inherent to the fund are not typically encountered in traditional equity long only funds. In extreme market conditions, the fund may be faced with theoretically unlimited losses. This document has not been reviewed by the Securities and Futures Commission. This document has been distributed by Robeco Hong Kong Limited ('Robeco'). Robeco is regulated by the Securities and Futures Commission in Hong Kong.

### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Singapore**

This document is not intended as a recommendation or for the purpose of soliciting any action in relation to Robeco Capital Growth Funds or other Robeco Funds (the "Fund") and should not be construed as an offer to sell shares of the Fund (the "Shares") or solicitation by anyone in any jurisdiction in which such an offer or solicitation is not authorised or to any person to whom it is unlawful to make such an offer and solicitation.

Nothing in this document constitutes accounting, legal, regulatory, tax or other advice. Any decision to subscribe for interests in the Fund must be made solely on the basis of information contained in the prospectus (the "Prospectus"), which information may be different from the information contained in this document, and with independent analyses of your investment and financial situation and objectives. The information contained in this document is qualified in its entirety by reference to the Prospectus, and this document should, at all times, be read in conjunction with the Prospectus. Detailed information on the Fund and associated risks is contained in the Prospectus. Any decision to participate in the Fund should be made only after reviewing the sections regarding investment considerations, conflicts of interest, risk factors and the relevant Singapore selling restrictions (as described in the section entitled "Important Information for Singapore Investors") contained in the Prospectus. You should consult your professional adviser if you are in doubt about the stringent restrictions applicable to the use of this document, regulatory status of the Fund, applicable regulatory protection, associated risks and suitability of the Fund to your objectives.

This document is not directed to, or intended for distribution to or use by, any person or entity who is a citizen or resident of or located in any locality, state, country or other jurisdiction where such distribution, publication, availability or use would be contrary to law or regulation or which would subject the Fund and its investment manager to any registration or licensing requirement within such jurisdiction. Investors should note that only the sub-funds listed in the appendix to the section entitled "Important Information for Singapore Investors" of the Prospectus (the "Sub-Funds") are available to Singapore investors. The Sub-Funds are notified as restricted foreign schemes under the Securities and Futures Act,

Chapter 289 of Singapore ("SFA") and are invoking the exemptions from compliance with prospectus registration requirements pursuant to the exemptions under Section 304 and Section 305 of the SFA. The Sub-Funds are not authorised or recognised by the Monetary Authority of Singapore and Shares in the Sub-Funds are not allowed to be offered to the retail public in Singapore. The Prospectus of the Fund is not a prospectus as defined in the SFA. Accordingly, statutory liability under the SFA in relation to the content of prospectuses would not apply. The Sub-Funds may only be promoted exclusively to persons who are sufficiently experienced and sophisticated to understand the risks involved in investing in such schemes, and who satisfy certain other criteria provided under Section 304, Section 305 or any other applicable provision of the SFA and the subsidiary legislation enacted thereunder. You should consider carefully whether the investment is suitable for you.

This document may contain projections or other forward looking statements regarding future events or future financial performance of countries, markets or companies and such projection or forecast is not indicative of the future or likely performance of the Fund. Neither the Fund, its investment manager nor any of their associates, nor any director, officer or employee accepts any liability whatsoever for any loss arising directly or indirectly from the use of this document. The information contained in this document, including any data, projections and underlying assumptions are based upon certain assumptions, management forecasts and analysis of information available as at the date of this document and reflects prevailing conditions and our views as of the date of the document, all of which are accordingly subject to change at any time without notice and the Fund and its investment manager are under no obligation to notify you of any of these changes. Prospective investors should not view the past performance of the Fund or its investment manager as indicative of future results.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Shanghai**

This material may not be copied or used with the public. This material is prepared by Robeco Investment Management Advisory (Shanghai) Limited Company (Robeco Shanghai for short) and is only provided to the specific objects under the premise of confidentiality. This material must not be wholly or partially reproduced, distributed, circulated, disseminated, published or disclosed, in any form and for any purpose, to any third party without prior approval from Robeco Shanghai. The information and/or analysis contained in this material have been compiled or arrived at from sources believed to be reliable but Robeco Shanghai does not make any representation as to their accuracy, correctness, usefulness or completeness and does not accept liability for any loss arising from the use hereof or the information and/or analysis contained herein. Neither Robeco Shanghai or its affiliates, nor any of their directors, officers or employees shall assume any liability or responsibility for any direct or indirect loss or damage or any other consequence of any person acting or not acting in reliance on the information contained herein. The information in this material may contain projections or other forward-looking statements regarding future events, targets, management discipline or other expectations which involve assumptions, risks, and uncertainties and is only as current as of the date indicated. Based on this, there is no assurance that such events will occur, and may be significantly different than that shown here, and we cannot guarantee that these statistics and the assumptions derived from the statistics will reflect the market conditions that may be encountered or future performances of Robeco Shanghai. The information in this material is based on current market conditions, which will fluctuate and may be superseded by subsequent market events or for other reasons. The information contained herein may not reflect the latest information on account of the changes and Robeco Shanghai is not responsible for the updating of the material or the correction of inaccurate or missing information contained in the material. Robeco Shanghai has not yet been registered as the private fund manager with the Asset Management Association of China. This material was prepared solely for informational purposes and does not constitute a recommendation, professional advice, an offer, solicitation or an invitation by or on behalf of Robeco Shanghai to any person to buy or sell any product. This material should not be viewed as a recommendation to buy or sell any investment products or to adopt any investment strategies. Nothing in this material constitutes investment, legal, accounting or tax advice, or a representation that any investment or strategy is suitable or appropriate to your individual circumstances, or otherwise constitutes a personal recommendation to you. Robeco Shanghai is a wholly foreign-owned enterprise established in accordance with the PRC laws, which enjoys independent civil rights and civil obligations. The statements of the shareholders or affiliates in the material shall not be deemed to a promise or guarantee of the shareholders or affiliates of Robeco Shanghai, or be deemed to any obligations or liabilities imposed to the shareholders or affiliates of Robeco Shanghai.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Australia**

This document is distributed in Australia by Robeco Hong Kong Limited (ARBN 156 512 659) ('Robeco') which is exempt from the requirement to hold an Australian financial services licence under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) pursuant to ASIC Class Order 03/1103. Robeco is regulated by the Securities and Futures Commission under the laws of Hong Kong and those laws may differ from Australian laws. This document is distributed only to "wholesale clients" as that term is defined under the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth). This document is not for distribution or dissemination, directly or indirectly, to any other class of persons. It is being supplied to you solely for your information and may not be reproduced, forwarded to any other person or published, in whole or in part, for any purpose. In New Zealand, this document is only available to wholesale investors within the meaning of clause 3(2) of Schedule 1 of the Financial Markets Conduct Act 2013 ('FMCA'). This document is not for public distribution in Australia and New Zealand.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC), United Arab Emirates**

Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V. (Dubai Office), Office 209, Level 2, Gate Village Building 7, Dubai International Financial Centre, Dubai, PO Box 482060, UAE. Robeco Institutional Asset Management B.V. (Dubai office) is regulated by the Dubai Financial Services Authority ("DFSA") and only deals with Professional Clients and does not deal with Retail Clients as defined by the DFSA.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Brazil**

The fund may not be offered or sold to the public in Brazil. Accordingly, the fund has not been nor will be registered with the Brazilian Securities Commission - CVM nor have they been submitted to the foregoing agency for approval. Documents relating to the fund, as well as the information contained therein, may not be supplied to the public in Brazil, as the offering of the fund is not a public offering of securities in Brazil, nor used in connection with any offer for subscription or sale of securities to the public in Brazil.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Colombia**

This document does not constitute a public offer in the Republic of Colombia. The offer of the fund is addressed to less than one hundred specifically identified investors. The fund may not be promoted or marketed in Colombia or to Colombian residents, unless such promotion and marketing is made in compliance with Decree 2555 of 2010 and other applicable rules and regulations related to the promotion of foreign funds in Colombia. The distribution of this document and the offering of [Shares] may be restricted in certain jurisdictions. The information contained in this document is for general guidance only, and it is the responsibility of any person or persons in possession of this document and wishing to make application for the fund to inform themselves of, and to observe, all applicable laws and regulations of any relevant jurisdiction. Prospective applicants for the fund should inform themselves of any applicable legal requirements, exchange control regulations and applicable taxes in the countries of their respective citizenship, residence or domicile.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Panama**

The distribution of this fund and the offering of Shares may be restricted in certain jurisdictions. The above information is for general guidance only, and it is the responsibility of any person or persons in possession of the prospectus of the fund and wishing to make application for Shares to inform themselves of, and to observe, all applicable laws and regulations of any relevant jurisdiction. Prospective applicants for Shares should inform themselves as to legal requirements also applying and any applicable exchange control regulations and applicable taxes in the countries of their respective citizenship, residence or domicile. This document does not constitute an offer or solicitation to any person in any jurisdiction in which such offer or solicitation is not authorized or to any person to whom it would be unlawful to make such offer or solicitation.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Peru**

The fund has not been registered before the Superintendencia del Mercado de Valores (SMV) and are being placed by means of a private offer. SMV has not reviewed the information provided to the investor. This document is only for the exclusive use of institutional investors in Peru and is not for public distribution.

#### **Additional Information for investors with residence or seat in Uruguay**

The sale of the fund qualifies as a private placement pursuant to section 2 of Uruguayan law 18,627. The fund must not be offered or sold to the public in Uruguay, except in circumstances which do not constitute a public offering or distribution under Uruguayan laws and regulations. The fund is not and will not be registered with the Financial Services Superintendency of the Central Bank of Uruguay. The fund corresponds to investment funds that are not investment funds regulated by Uruguayan law 16,774 dated September 27, 1996, as amended.

#### **Additional Information for US offshore investors**

The Robeco Capital Growth Funds have not been registered under the United States Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, nor the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended. None of the shares may be offered or sold, directly or indirectly in the United States or to any US Person. A US Person is defined as (a) any individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States for federal income tax purposes; (b) a corporation, partnership or other entity created or organized under the laws of or existing in the United States; (c) an estate or trust the income of which is subject to United States federal income tax regardless of whether such income is effectively connected with a United States trade or business.

---

# Contact

**Robeco (Headquarters)**

P.O. Box 973  
3000 AZ Rotterdam  
The Netherlands  
[www.robeco.com/quant](http://www.robeco.com/quant)

---

