Dynamic Management Journal
Volume 8 No. 1 Tahun 2024
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

EMPIRICAL TESTING OF FAMA-FRENCH ASSET PRICING MODEL IN INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Okta Martua Sitanggang[1], Eko Rizkianto[2]
[1,2)] Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, 10430
Email: okta.martua@ui.ac.id

Artikel History:
Artikel masuk: 28/12/2023
Artikel revisi: 10/01/2024
Artikel diterima: 31/01/2024

Keywords:
Asset Pricing; Structural Break; Fama-French; Excess Return

ABSTRAK

Volatilitas Bursa Efek Indonesia (BEI) meningkat signifikan pada periode pandemi Covid-19. Pada periode ini return predictability dan volatilitas harga pada index saham mengalami single structural break.. Terdapat kekhawatiran pada kalangan investor dan akademisi bahwa model pendekatan dari asset pricing yang selama ini secara empiris diterima, tidak mampu menjelaskan return maupun excess return dari suatu aset atau investasi pada periode pandemi Covid-19. Penelitian ini menguji signifikansi faktor size (market capitalization), profitability, value (book-to-market), investment, dan market risk premium (Rm-Rf) terhadap excess return portofolio saham pada Bursa Efek Indonesia selama periode pandemi Covid-19. Studi awal menunjukkan bahwa Pandemi Covid-19 mempengaruhi sentimen investor, menyebabkan para investor panik serta pesimis terhadap investasinya. Selain itu, terdapat deviasi dari efficient market hypothesis selama beberapa periode pandemi di beberapa negara sehingga harga saham tidak sepenuhnya mencerminkan informasi yang tersedia. Setelah dilakukan pengujian, ditemukan bahwa faktor size (market capitalization), profitability, value (book-to-market), investment, dan market risk premium (Rm-Rf) tidak memiliki pengaruh signifikan terhadap excess return portofolio saham pada Bursa Efek Indonesia selama periode pandemi Covid-19.

ABSTRACT

The volatility of the Indonesian Stock Exchange (BEI) increased significantly during the Covid-19 pandemic period. In this period return predictability and price volatility in the stock index experienced a single structural break. There is concern among investors and academics that the asset pricing approach model that has been empirically accepted so far is unable to explain the return or excess return of an asset or investment during the Covid-19 pandemic period. This research tests the significance of the size (market capitalization), profitability, value (book-to-market), investment, and market risk premium (Rm-Rf) factors on the excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesian Stock Exchange during the Covid-19 pandemic period. Existing studies show that the Covid-19 pandemic has affected investor sentiment, causing investors to panic and be pessimistic about their investments. In addition, there were deviations from the efficient market hypothesis during several pandemic periods in several countries so that stock prices did not fully reflect the available information. After testing, it was found that the factors size (market capitalization), profitability, value (book-to-market), investment, and market risk premium (Rm-Rf) did not have a significant influence on the excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period Covid-19 pandemic.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 ISSN (Online) 2580-2127

INTRODUCTION

The Covid-19 pandemic is dynamic episode with various virus mutations and various market reactions that follow. Investor panic occurred after the emergence of various mutations of the Covid-19 virus, Delta in mid-2021, then Omicron at the end of 2021 to early 2022, as a result investors withdrew their investments on the stock exchange after witnessing an increase in the transmission of Covid-19 cases and deaths. So in 2020 and 2021, volatility in the Indonesian stock market was recorded to be very high.

Rossi & Harjoto (2020) found that previous pandemics such as bird flu, SARS, swine flu, Ebola, and MERS also brought significant increases in volatility in the equity market, but Covid-19 had the strongest impact on the stock market. When comparing Covid-19 with the Great Influenza Pandemic (Spanish Flu) from 1918 to 1920 in 48 countries, it can be concluded that the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic was much greater on Gross Domestic Product (GDP), consumption and the stock market than the previous pandemic.

Salisu & Akanni (2020) predicts stock returns using a fear approach. They compiled a global fear index (GFI) based on cases and deaths due to Covid-19. They find that GFI is an effective predictor of stock returns in OECD and BRICS countries during the pandemic. An increase in the fear index causes a decrease in returns.

Apart from that, Baek et al. (2020) also conducted research on the impact of Covid-19 on stock market volatility and trading volume. They found that there was an increase in total risk and idiosyncratic risk due to deaths caused by Covid-19 on the stock market in the United States, while systematic risk experienced an increase and decrease based on industry. This research shows that there has been a change in stock risk (β) after the Covid-19 pandemic.

Apart from risk (β), the influence of other factors on stock returns also changes. Ramelli & Wagner (2020) examined stock returns in the United States before the pandemic and during the Covid-19 pandemic. They found that there were

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

differences in the coefficients of profitability, book-to-market and market capitalization factors which influenced stock returns.

The changes in the influence of the factors described above are in line with the results of research by Hong et al. (2021). He found that the return predictability and volatility of the S&P 500 and DJIA indexes experienced a single structural break. A single structural break is a sudden change in the parameters of a regression model, which can cause significant forecasting errors so that the existing model is unreliable. Structural breaks can occur in extreme conditions such as the Covid-19 pandemic Cheng et al. (2022).

Based on these studies, it was found that on the United States Stock Exchange there were changes in stock beta (β) and single structural breaks during the Covid-19 period. In other words, an asset pricing model that is able to predict stock portfolio returns and excess stock portfolio returns during the pre-pandemic period, may not be able to predict stock portfolio returns or stock portfolio excess returns during the Covid-19 pandemic period. Likewise, vice versa, an asset pricing model that is weak in predicting stock portfolio returns and stock portfolio excess returns during the pre-pandemic period, might be used to predict stock portfolio returns and stock portfolio excess returns during the Covid-19 pandemic period.

During a financial crisis, such as during the Covid-19 pandemic, investors have a risk aversion investment strategy or a flight toward safe-haven asset classes investment strategy (Coudert & Gex, 2008). So according to A. Singh (2020), investors are paying more attention to company fundamentals in an effort to avoid the risk of falling share prices during periods of economic slowdown.

The company fundamentals that investors pay attention to are related to the internal conditions or management of a company. Even though various studies indicate that investors pay more attention to company fundamentals when investing in shares during the financial crisis, research regarding fundamental factors that influence stock portfolio returns on the Indonesian stock exchange

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

during the Covid-19 period is still limited. Research on asset pricing models with company fundamental factors is mostly carried out on stock exchanges in developed countries. The Fama-French Five Factor asset pricing model uses many fundamental company factors.

The Efficient Market Hypothesis, introduced by Bachelier (2011), suggests that all information about an asset is reflected in the asset price so that it is impossible to obtain abnormal returns. Consequently, positive alpha cannot be generated using any type of analysis, neither fundamental analysis nor technical analysis. However, Grossman, S.J., Stiglitz (1980) argue that because obtaining information is expensive, investors are compensated for their efforts to gather information and discover "mispriced" assets, this information cannot be reflected in prices. This paradox is called the "Grossman Stiglitz Paradox" (Dimitrios, n.d.).

Covid-19 is an important cause of market inefficiency (Hong et al., 2021). When the economy is in bad condition, news and information will cause polarization of opinion which creates differences in investor behavior, some investors are over-reactive to news and information while some investors are under-reactive (Cujean & Hasler, 2017). Covid-19 creates better investment opportunities for investors with volatility timing abilities, especially those who have more liquidity than the general public (Hong et al., 2021).

According to Frensidy (2022), although it has more or less the same impact on global finance, the crisis caused by Covid-19 is different from the previous global financial crisis in 2007–2008. During the Covid-19 crisis, the JCI continued to decline for almost three weeks, while in 1998 and 2008 there were not many lower auto rejects (ARBs) compared to 2020, where the four banks with the largest capitalization (BBCA, BBRI, BMRI and BBNI) experienced ARBs. There is no bid volume at the same time. The Covid-19 crisis has had a broad impact, affecting almost all sectors.

Covid-19 has become a symbol of new risks and concerns that are triggering anxiety among investors. However, apart from volatility and panic, stock price

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

movements are still based on expectations of economic conditions (Wagner, 2020). In this way the public can learn about the nature of the challenges faced in these difficult times. The stock price reaction shows that various actions, including fiscal policy interventions, have the effect of avoiding further negative conditions due to the Covid-19 pandemic (Wagner, 2020)

On the other hand, Engelhardt et al. (2021) argues that the amount of market volatility in reaction to Covid-19 differs between countries, depending on public trust, where volatility is lower in high trust countries. Trust in fellow citizens and in the Government are equally important factors.

In the Covid-19 period, return predictability and price volatility in the S&P 500 and DJIA stock indexes experienced a single structural break (Hong et al., 2021). A structural break is a large change at one time in the parameters of a regression model, which can cause a very large projection error so that the model becomes unreliable. When structural break testing is carried out, it is assumed that the existing model (null hypothesis) is correct unless they find evidence to the contrary, so that it can then be concluded that the discrepancy in the results of a model is caused by a structural break (Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2014).

Still in the context of the crisis period, Neves et al. (2021) found that the performance of value stocks and growth stocks was different in each different period of the global financial crisis. In six countries, value stocks outperformed growth stocks in the period before the subprime crisis, and during the subprime crisis this condition continued to occur in three countries. Meanwhile, changes occurred after the crisis period. It was also found that investor sentiment has a strong significance on stock value returns and growth stock returns.

The first important asset pricing model currently used as the basis for financial theory is the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) developed by Sharpe (1964). CAPM is a single factor model, where the only price factor is the market risk premium. This indicates that there is a positive relationship between a stock's beta and the stock's expected return. CAPM helps calculate investment risk and

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

potential return on investment. Empirically, CAPM fails to explain abnormal stock returns, but is still used as a method for assessing the cost of capital and as a portfolio performance evaluation technique. Criticism of the CAPM is usually caused by the simplicity of the model and the linear relationship between systematic risk and the expected return of a stock. Ross (1976) proposed an alternative, The Arbitrage Pricing Theory (APT), through a multi-factor asset pricing model, showing that there is a linear relationship between the expected return of a stock and a number of macroeconomic variables.

Fama & French (1993), tested the CAPM which then produced a new model known as the three-factor model. This model includes two additional market factors that can explain stock excess returns, namely the market capitalization size factor and the company's book-to-market (B/M) ratio. Fama and French found that the three-factor model is a good model for predicting portfolio excess returns.

Daniel & Titman (1997) criticized Fama & French (1993) research and suggested the Characteristics Model. Fama and French show that cross-sectional variations in excess returns can only be explained by size and value factors. Daniel & Titman (1997) found that more characteristics of factor loadings determine excess returns. Their results also show that stock values move because of investors' sensitivity to similar factors and not because of unique factors. The 3-factor model explains the value premium better than Daniel and Titman's (1997) characteristic model, in their 68 year period and there is no evidence to contradict the fact that value loadings determine expected returns. Fama and French believe that the evidence from Daniel & Titman (1997) in favor of the characteristics model is due to the short sample period. If they omitted the period examined by Daniel & Titman (1997), the regression intercept could barely approach the zero intercept.

Carhart (1997) extended Fama and French's (1993) three-factor model to a four-factor model including a momentum factor, in addition to size, value and market factors. It appears that Carhart's model explains more variation in average stock

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

returns than Fama and French's (1993) original three-factor model. Blackburn & Cakici (2017) focused on conducting research on momentum factors and examining returns in various capital markets in developed countries. This then resulted in the discovery that returns were significant using a long strategy for long-term losers and short positions for short-term winners. These results were valid for the entire sample period and most markets.

Griffin (2002) examines different versions of Fama and French's three-factor model in an international data set. He found that no model truly captured variations in average returns. However, he found that research on the three-factor Fama–French model using domestic data produced better performance than the three-factor version of the Fama–French model using international stock market data. In its dataset, Griffin has data on 23 international markets divided into four regions, North America, Asia Pacific, Europe and Japan. Griffin conducted integrated asset pricing model research in these four regions.

Novy-Marx (2013) identified profitability factors. They found that shares of companies with high profitability generated significantly higher returns than shares of companies with high profitability. In research, Watanabe et al. (2013) examines whether the value effect in international stock markets is consistent with results in the United States and evaluates possible economic causes of value factors. They found that the value effect existed in international stock markets and that there were large differences in this effect across the countries they studied. The value effect has a stronger impact in markets that have more efficient information.

After successfully finding a five-factor model, which explains size, B/M, profitability, and investment patterns, Fama & French (1997) tried the model internationally and they found that stock returns averaged three of the four regions they used (America North, Europe and Asia Pacific) increases as the B/M ratio and profitability increase. They also find the expected negative relationship between returns and investment. In Japan, the relationship between average

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

investment returns is weak but the relationship between average returns and book-to-market ratio is strong.

In China, this model has also been tested. Journal entitled the five-factor asset pricing model, short-term reversal, and ownership structure – the case of China by Chen et al. (2022). The sample period is from January 2004 to December 2017. The results of the study found that the Fama and French Five-Factor Model overall better explains excess returns than the Fama and French Three-Factor Model.

In India, similar research was also conducted by K. Singh et al. (2023) with the title Testing Factor Models In An Emerging Market: Evidence From India with the conclusion that the five-factor model has better power to explain stock returns than the three-factor model.

Fama & French (2015) tested the five factor model internationally in four regions, namely the United States, Asia Pacific, Europe and Japan in the period July 1990 to September 2014. They found that the average equity return in North America, Asia Pacific , and Europe as profitability and book-to-market increase and are negatively correlated with investment. Meanwhile for the Japanese case, the relationship between average returns and market equity ratios is strong in all size groups, but the relationship between average returns and profitability or investment is weaker.

Meanwhile, Sutrisno & Ekaputra (2016) tested the performance of the five-factor Fama - French model on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period 2000 to 2015. It was found that the Five-Factor Model had a better ability to explain the excess returns of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange than the three-factor model. However, in this study, investment and profitability factors had a weak influence on portfolio excess returns.

From existing research, there are variations in the significance of the influence of independent variables in different geographic regions and this is proven in Fama

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

& French (2017) where the model has different performance from one region to another (Dimitrios, n.d.).

METHOD

For this research period, the object of research is the stock portfolio on the Indonesian Stock Exchange during the Covid-19 pandemic period starting from the first quarter of 2020 to the fourth quarter of 2022. The portfolio used in this research comes from shares listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange (BEI) during the study period. The financial data used in this research is in Rupiah. The data used is panel secondary data taken via Thomson Reuters Datastream.

This research uses the entire population of shares on the IDX for the period first quarter 2020 – fourth quarter 2022. This research follows Fama & French (2015) and Sutrisno & Ekaputra (2016) in terms of data collection criteria. The criteria are: (1) do not include financial stocks, (2) shares of the company under study must have data on operating profit, book-to-market and fixed assets; and (3) does not include shares with negative share capital (equity). Based on these criteria, a sample size of around 667 company shares was obtained. Stock data for each period will be updated every quarter.

This empirical test will examine whether the Fama - French Five Factor Model can explain the average return of portfolios prepared using large spreads on size, value, profitability and investment. The large spread referred to is that the independent variable is divided into three groups based on its size, with the value from group three reducing the value from group one. For example, SMB is arranged based on market cap, where the return from stocks with the largest capitalization (group three) is reduced by the return from stocks with the smallest capitalization (group one).

This research aims to explain the factors that have a significant influence on the excess return of stock portfolios using the Fama - French Five Factor Model.

To see the individual significance of each Rm-Rf, SMB, HML, RMW, and CMA factor, the method used in this research is ordinary least squares (OLS). This

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

study assessed the explanatory power with a t-test of the five-factor model. This research also tested the average adjusted R2 in the model to test the significance of the model in explaining variations in stock portfolio returns on the Indonesian stock exchange during the Covid-19 pandemic. An asset pricing model with a larger average adjusted R2 value indicates that the model is better. The equations tested are as follows:

$$R_{it} - R_{ft} = a_p + b_p (R_{mt} - R_{ft}) + s_p SMB_t + h_p HML_t + r_p RMW_t + c_p CMA_t + e_{pt}$$

Dependent variable, left hand side

In this research, the dependent variable used is excess return (Rit – Rft). In this equation, Rit is the return on security or portfolio i for period t, while Rft is the risk-free return. Where Rit is the closing price of the Indonesian Stock Exchange at the end of each quarter, and Rft is the BI-7 Day Reverse Repo Rate (BI7DRR). Following research conducted by Fama and French (2015) and Ekaputra (2016), the dependent factor calculation in this model uses 5 x 5 portfolio sorting.

Excess return of 25 stock portfolios arranged based on Size - B/M, excess return of 25 stock portfolios arranged based on Size - OP, and excess return of 25 stock portfolios arranged based on Size - Inv. The 25 portfolios formed based on size and B/M are as follows: For each region, the market capitalization size breakpoints are the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th quantiles of the aggregate market capitalization of all shares that was researched. For the book-to-market (B/M), operating profitability (OP), and investment (Inv) factors, use the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th quantiles of the aggregate value of each factor. To build the dependent factor, the excess return variable from period t is used. The book-to-market ratio, operating profitability, and investment values use data at the end of period t-1.

Independent variable, right hand side

In this research, the independent variables used are market factor, size factor, value factor, profitability factor, and investment factor. Market factor is proxied

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

by Rm - Rf, size factor is proxied by SMB, meanwhile value factor is proxied by HML, profitability factor is proxied by RMW, and investment factor is proxied by CMA in this research due to limited research time. Following research conducted by Fama and French (2015) and Ekaputra (2016), the calculation of independent factors in this model uses 2 x 3 portfolio sorting. A more detailed explanation for each independent variable in this research model is explained as follows:

1. The stock data studied is grouped by period, then in each period it is sorted into two capitalization categories, market capitalization size and into three categories for each book-to-market equity (B/M), operating profitability (OP), and investment (Inv).
2. The breakpoint for market capitalization size is the median of the aggregate market capitalization of shares in one period, while the breakpoints for B/M, OP, and Inv are the 30th and 70th percentiles. Stocks with large market capitalization are stocks that are above the median IDX capitalization value in a period, while small stocks are below the median stock.
3. To build independent factors, variables from the fiscal year ending in year t-1 are used. The Rm-Rf, book-to-market ratio, operating profitability, and investment values use data at the end of period t-1, with the following explanation:
    a. Rm-Rf adalah return IHSG dalam satu kuartal dikurangi dengan BI-7 Day Reverse Repo Rate (BI7DRR) untuk satu kuartal yang dinyatakan sebagai Rf.
    b. SMB merupakan proxy dari size, menggunakan data market capitalization suatu saham pada akhir periode sebelumnya (t-1).
    c. HML merupakan proxy dari value perusahaan relatif terhadap jumlah modal yang ditanamkan menggunakan data book to market suatu saham pada akhir periode sebelumnya (t-1). Rasio book-to-market dapat digunakan sebagai indikator apakah suatu perusahaan undervalued atau overvalued.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

d. RMW is a proxy for company profitability calculated using $\frac{Operating\ Profit}{Book\ Value\ of\ Equity}$ at the end of the previous period (t-1).

e. CMA is a proxy for the company's investment factors. The data used is the quarterly increase in total assets, namely the growth in total assets at the end of the previous period (t-1) divided by total assets at the end of the two previous periods (t-2).

The summary of the formula for the independent variables is in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Preparation of Research Variables

Portfolio Type	Breakpoint	Factors and components
Arrangement of 2x3 portfolio based on	Size: Median of IHSG	SMBB/M = (SH + SN + SL)/3 - (BH + BN + BL)/3
Size and B/M		SMBOP = (SR + SN + SW)/3 - (BR + BN + BW)/3
Size and OP		SMBInv = (SC + SN + SA)/3 - (BC + BN + BA)/3
Size and Inv		SMB = (SMBB/M + SMBOP + SMBInv)/3
	B/M: 30th and 70th percentile IHSG	HML = (SH + BH)/2 - (SL + BL)/2 = [(SH - SL) + (BH - BL)]/2
	OP: 30th and 70th percentile IHSG	RMW = (SR + BR)/2 - (SW + BW)/2 = [(SR - SW) + (BR - BW)]/2
	Inv: 30th and 70th percentile IHSG	CMA = (SC + BC)/2 - (SA + BA)/2 = [(SC - SA) + (BC - BA)]/2

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

RESULT

Descriptive Statistics

In Table 2, panel A provides information on the average return for each factor. The average monthly market return is 0.02%. On a monthly basis, the average excess return of the size factor (SMB) was 0.63%, implying an average premium of 0.63% for buying small-cap stocks over large-cap stocks. Meanwhile the average monthly excess return of the book-to-market ratio (HML) factor is 1.23%, implying an average premium of 1.23% for buying large book-to-market stocks over stocks with small book-to-market. Meanwhile, the average monthly return on the profitability factor (RMW) is 1.82%, meaning an average premium of 1.82% for buying shares of companies with strong profitability rather than shares of companies with weak profitability. Meanwhile, the average excess return from

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

investment factors (CMA) is -2.62%, indicating that shares of companies with aggressive investment produce a higher rate of return of 2.26% than shares of companies with conservative investment.

This is in line with the findings of Sutrisno & Ekaputra (2016) where all factors produce positive monthly averages except the investment factor (CMA), where investing in shares of companies that are conservative in investing produces lower returns than investing in companies that are aggressive in investing.

Table 2

Summary Statistics for Monthly Excess Return Factor 2x3

Panel A: Mean, standard deviation, and t-statistics for monthly returns

2x3 Factors									
	Rm-Rf		**SMB**		**HML**		**RMW**		**CMA**
Mean	0,02%		0,63%		1,23%		1,82%		-2,62%
Std dev	4,74%		3,16%		3,57%		3,58%		4,59%
t-Statistic	-1,01		-0,53		0,13		0,75		-3,52

Panel B: Small and Large Factor Components (2x3)

2X3 Factors									
	HMLS	HML B	HMLS-B	RMW S	RMW B	RMW S-B	CMA S	CMA B	CMA S-B
Mean	1,14%	1,32%	-0,18%	1,27%	-2,37%	3,64%	-2,12%	-3,11%	0,99%
Std dev	4,11%	5,36%	6,36%	4,09%	5,50%	7,16%	4,71%	7,55%	8,61%
t-Statistic	0,04	0,19	-1,00	0,16	-2,96	1,79	-3,01	-2,88	-0,07

Panel C: Correlation between different factors

2 x 3 Factor					
	SMB	*HML*	*RMW*	*CMA*	*Rm-Rf*
SMB	1,000				
HML	-0,159	1,000			
RMW	-0,162	0,145	1,000		
CMA	0,107	-0,260	-0,808	1,000	
Rm-Rf	-0,043	-0,030	-0,003	0,026	1,000

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

Panel B divides the small and large components of the 2 x 3 factor. The value premium between large capitalization stocks and small capitalization stocks tends to be the same. Meanwhile, the profitability premium is lower for large shares, RMW B -2.37% compared to RMW S, 1.27% for small shares. Lower investments result in better returns on small caps CMA S= -2.12% compared. CMA B = -3.11 on large stocks. This RMW pattern is the same as the research results of Dimitrios (2020). Meanwhile, the investment premium is negative for

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

both large capitalization stocks and small capitalization stocks. This indicates that the excess return on the portfolio of shares of companies that invest aggressively is higher than the excess return on the portfolio of shares of companies that invest conservatively.

Meanwhile, the t-statistic for HMLS and HMLB is positive. Meanwhile, RMWS is positive and RMWB is negative, indicating differences in the direction of influence. Meanwhile, CMAS and CMAB are negative, meaning they have a negative relationship with the average stock return.

Panel C shows the correlations between the independent variables. There is a positive correlation between RMW and HML, between CMA and SMB, and between Rm-Rf and CMA. Meanwhile there is a negative correlation between SMB and HML, SMB and RMW, SMB with Rm-Rf, HML with CMA, HML with Rm-Rf, RMW with CMA, and RMW with Rm-Rf. The correlation between RMW and CMA -0.8 means that there is a relationship between the profitability premium (RMW) and the investment premium (CMA).

The average monthly portfolio excess return pattern of the 25 Size-B/M, 25 Size-OP, and 25 Size-Inv portfolios can be seen in table 2. The excess return in table 2 is the dependent variable in the Fama - French Five Factor Model. In Panel A is a stock portfolio arranged based on size (market capitalization) and value (book-to-market). Vertically from small, 2, 3, 4, big is the order of portfolios with the smallest market capitalization to the largest. Meanwhile, horizontally, low, 2, 3, 4, high is the portfolio sequence from lowest to highest book-to-market. In Panel B is a stock portfolio arranged based on size (market capitalization) and profitability (operating profit). Vertically from small, 2, 3, 4, big is the order of portfolios with the smallest market capitalization to the largest. Meanwhile horizontally, weak, 2, 3, 4, robust is the order of portfolios with the lowest to the highest operating profit. In Panel C is a stock portfolio arranged based on size (market capitalization) and investment. Vertically from small, 2, 3, 4, big is the order of portfolios with the smallest market capitalization to the largest.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

Meanwhile horizontally, conservative, 2, 3, 4, aggressive are the order of portfolios with lowest to highest investment.

Table 3 displays the average monthly excess return (36 observations) for 25 stock portfolios compiled based on Size-B/M, 25 stock portfolios compiled based on Size-OP, and 25 stock portfolios compiled based on 25 Size-Inv from January 2020 until December 2022.

Table 3

Average Monthly Return Percentage for 25 Portfolios

Panel A: Size-B/M portfolio					
	Low	**2**	**3**	**4**	**High**
Small	0,008	0,058	0,031	0,030	0,020
2	-0,005	0,000	0,021	0,022	0,022
3	0,000	0,018	0,017	0,023	0,020
4	0,002	0,014	0,004	0,019	0,022
Big	0,007	0,001	0,016	0,021	0,004
Panel B: Size-OP portfolio					
	Weak	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Robust**
Small	0,014	0,019	0,019	0,026	0,055
2	0,006	0,003	0,018	0,017	0,037
3	-0,003	0,006	0,008	0,025	0,036
4	0,008	-0,002	0,007	0,003	0,025
Big	-0,030	-0,001	0,003	0,010	0,025
Panel C: Size-Inv portfolio					
	Conservative	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Aggressive**
Small	0,029	0,026	0,039	0,018	0,027
2	0,025	0,006	0,016	-0,003	0,013
3	0,021	0,008	0,013	0,018	0,024
4	0,022	0,008	-0,001	-0,002	0,016
Big	0,009	0,030	0,006	-0,001	0,006

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

Regression Results

In the regression results table below it is divided into two parts, on the left there are coefficients of the independent variables indicated by the letters a, s, h, r, c, and b. Meanwhile on the right is the t-statistic of the coefficients of the independent variables.

In this study, a confidence level of 90% was used, so the t-statistic =>|1.697| produces significant regression results. In the table on the right that shows the t-

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

statistic, it is labeled black to indicate a portfolio that is statistically significant. It can be said that in this portfolio the excess return can be explained by the five factor model.

Table 4

Regression for 25 Portfolios based on Size-B/M

BM	Low	2	3	4	High
			a		
Small	0,02	0,02	0,04	0,02	0,02
2	-0,03	-0,01	0,01	0,01	0,01
3	0,01	0,03	0,01	0,01	0,01
4	0,00	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01
Big	0,00	-0,01	0,01	0,01	-0,02
			s		
Small	0,16	3,37	0,02	0,50	0,11
2	0,93	0,47	0,58	0,21	0,80
3	0,18	0,30	0,06	0,01	0,04
4	-0,22	-0,13	-0,05	-0,53	-0,46
Big	-0,43	-0,31	-0,63	-0,35	0,31
			h		
Small	0,11	1,10	-0,38	0,26	0,25
2	0,14	0,54	0,23	0,50	0,65
3	-0,58	0,57	0,39	0,60	0,93
4	0,30	-0,03	0,57	0,73	1,49
Big	-0,15	0,59	0,61	1,39	0,91
			r		
Small	-1,14	0,44	-1,29	-1,18	0,30
2	-0,63	0,30	-0,67	0,13	0,13
3	-0,56	-0,32	-0,18	0,09	-0,20
4	0,20	-0,60	-0,12	-0,77	-0,05
Big	0,33	0,35	-0,16	0,12	-1,10
			c		
Small	-0,13	0,18	-0,58	-0,84	0,18
2	-0,93	0,11	-0,67	-0,06	0,11
3	-0,21	0,48	-0,15	-0,02	-0,19
4	0,21	-0,48	0,12	-0,72	0,03
Big	-0,04	0,19	-0,27	0,07	-1,10
			b		
Small	0,21	1,37	0,16	0,36	0,13
2	0,04	-0,08	0,08	0,00	0,00
3	-0,52	0,29	0,18	-0,12	-0,12
4	-0,11	0,07	-0,02	-0,02	-0,02
Big	0,08	0,08	-0,46	-0,30	-0,30
adj R square: 0,1520874					

BM	Low	2	3	4	High
			t (a)		
Small	-0,86	0,49	2,25	1,34	2,18
2	-0,98	-1,27	0,98	1,26	1,07
3	0,58	1,83	1,12	1,53	0,93
4	0,18	0,96	0,34	0,78	0,72
Big	0,63	-0,56	0,72	0,44	-0,95
			t (s)		
Small	0,23	3,18	0,04	1,11	0,56
2	1,35	1,83	2,30	0,99	3,27
3	0,36	0,74	0,21	0,03	0,23
4	-1,10	-0,35	-0,22	-1,83	-1,45
Big	-2,46	-1,17	-1,97	-1,01	0,61
			t (h)		
Small	-0,18	1,14	-0,81	0,63	1,45
2	0,23	2,34	1,00	2,58	2,96
3	-1,27	1,53	1,58	2,80	5,21
4	1,64	-0,08	2,92	2,75	5,19
Big	-0,91	2,48	2,10	4,47	1,97
			t (r)		
Small	-1,08	0,28	-1,67	-1,76	1,04
2	-0,62	0,80	-1,78	0,40	0,37
3	-0,76	-0,53	-0,43	0,25	-0,70
4	0,66	-1,05	-0,38	-1,77	-0,11
Big	1,25	0,91	-0,34	0,24	-1,45
			t (c)		
Small	-0,16	0,14	-0,95	-1,59	0,79
2	-1,15	0,37	-2,24	-0,24	0,39
3	-0,36	1,00	-0,48	-0,06	-0,82
4	0,89	-1,06	0,46	-2,09	0,07
Big	-0,19	0,62	-0,71	0,17	-1,84
			t (b)		
Small	0,45	1,99	0,48	1,22	1,03
2	0,08	-0,46	0,47	-0,03	1,35
3	-1,59	1,11	1,01	-0,78	0,37
4	-0,87	0,26	-0,12	-0,12	-0,02
Big	0,67	0,49	-2,22	-1,33	1,29

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

Dynamic Management Journal
Volume 8 No. 1 Tahun 2024
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

In each sub table there are 5 x 5 rows and columns which show the regression results for each portfolio. Where for each row the first is the regression result from the smallest size stock portfolio and the fifth row is the regression result from the largest size stock portfolio. Meanwhile, the leftmost column of each sub table is the regression result of the stock portfolio with the lowest book-to-market and the rightmost column is the regression result of the stock portfolio with the highest book-to-market.

Table 5

Regression Results for 25 Portfolios based on Size-OP

OP	Weak	2	3	4	Rob
			a		
Small	0,01	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,04
2	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01
3	0,00	0,02	0,00	0,01	0,02
4	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01
Big	-0,04	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,01
			s		
Small	0,47	0,46	-0,35	0,37	1,35
2	0,09	0,36	1,19	0,24	0,71
3	0,25	-0,11	0,02	0,57	0,08
4	-0,29	-0,06	-0,26	-0,40	-0,19
Big	0,14	-0,15	-0,24	-0,13	-1,41
			h		
Small	0,14	0,18	0,43	0,05	0,35
2	0,21	0,37	0,36	0,25	1,00
3	0,61	0,21	0,80	0,55	0,53
4	0,55	0,66	0,73	0,55	0,56
Big	0,22	0,38	0,85	0,08	0,22
			r		
Small	-0,56	-1,14	0,16	0,00	-0,03
2	-0,34	-0,47	-0,43	-0,21	0,79
3	-0,22	-0,27	-0,40	0,12	0,03
4	0,02	-0,23	-0,78	0,30	-0,29
Big	0,06	-1,47	-0,32	-0,20	0,53
			c		
Small	-0,28	-0,77	0,38	0,04	-0,28
2	-0,14	-0,34	-0,47	-0,31	0,16
3	0,34	0,25	-0,26	-0,05	-0,22
4	0,15	0,03	-0,51	0,22	-0,46
Big	-0,30	-0,74	-0,18	-0,20	-0,38
			b		
Small	0,03	0,07	0,38	0,09	0,89
2	0,11	0,06	0,42	-0,02	-0,02
3	-0,03	0,45	0,01	0,02	0,02
4	-0,39	0,19	0,26	-0,08	-0,08
Big	0,38	0,08	-0,15	-0,22	-0,22
adj R square 0,14722					

OP	Weak	2	3	4	Rob
			t (a)		
Small	-1,07	1,50	1,74	2,18	1,95
2	0,58	-0,51	0,13	0,92	0,64
3	0,08	1,39	-0,15	1,04	1,94
4	0,55	-0,49	0,01	-0,06	1,24
Big	-2,79	0,20	-0,40	0,81	1,00
			t (s)		
Small	1,54	1,79	-1,32	1,25	2,77
2	0,38	1,55	3,13	0,94	1,83
3	1,01	-0,35	0,08	2,00	0,28
4	-0,96	-0,26	-0,72	-2,29	-0,74
Big	0,34	-0,43	-0,82	-0,46	-4,48
			t (h)		
Small	-0,50	0,76	1,48	0,18	0,80
2	0,92	1,77	1,05	1,07	2,84
3	2,74	0,78	3,92	2,12	1,87
4	2,02	3,07	2,18	3,41	2,37
Big	0,58	1,19	3,13	0,32	0,78
			t (r)		
Small	-1,23	-2,96	0,37	0,01	-0,04
2	-0,92	-1,37	-0,76	-0,55	1,36
3	-0,60	-0,61	-1,20	0,28	0,07
4	0,04	-0,66	-1,44	1,13	-0,76
Big	0,10	-2,79	-0,74	-0,50	1,13
			t (c)		
Small	-0,77	-2,53	1,08	0,11	-0,48
2	-0,47	-1,25	-1,04	-1,02	0,34
3	1,18	0,70	-0,98	-0,13	-0,60
4	0,41	0,11	-1,18	1,04	-1,50
Big	-0,61	-1,76	-0,50	-0,62	-1,03
			t (b)		
Small	0,14	0,39	1,82	0,45	2,82
2	0,69	0,41	1,72	-0,12	0,40
3	-0,17	2,29	0,09	0,09	-0,34
4	-2,03	1,20	1,07	-0,70	0,84
Big	1,44	0,35	-0,77	-1,24	1,58

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

Dynamic Management Journal
Volume 8 No. 1 Tahun 2024
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

Table 6

Regression Results for 25 Portfolios based on Size-Inv

Inv	Cons	2	3	4	Aggr
			a		
Small	0,02	0,03	0,01	0,03	0,02
2	0,00	-0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,00
3	0,01	0,00	0,01	0,01	0,02
4	0,01	0,01	-0,01	0,00	0,01
Big	0,00	0,03	0,00	0,00	0,00
			s		
Small	0,45	0,36	1,87	0,18	0,10
2	0,86	0,32	0,27	-0,05	0,59
3	-0,05	0,33	-0,33	0,38	0,11
4	-0,25	-0,16	-0,26	-0,34	-0,27
Big	-0,48	-0,46	-0,14	-0,53	-0,35
			h		
Small	0,27	0,73	0,57	-0,50	0,04
2	0,68	0,44	0,33	0,50	0,50
3	0,56	0,48	0,18	0,54	0,68
4	0,71	0,42	0,14	0,28	0,77
Big	0,58	-0,32	0,12	0,22	0,47
			r		
Small	-0,51	0,32	-0,14	1,58	-0,93
2	-0,24	-0,42	0,05	0,34	0,17
3	-0,10	0,07	-0,51	0,37	-0,17
4	-0,02	-0,14	-0,02	-0,32	-0,70
Big	0,05	0,45	0,17	-0,17	-0,12
			c		
Small	-0,32	0,86	-0,39	1,25	-0,73
2	-0,44	-0,46	-0,01	0,23	0,06
3	-0,19	0,20	-0,50	0,33	0,12
4	-0,06	0,04	-0,22	-0,20	-0,43
Big	-0,26	0,20	-0,02	-0,23	-0,09
			b		
Small	0,43	0,10	0,62	0,08	0,24
2	0,15	0,32	0,11	-0,03	-0,03
3	0,00	-0,06	-0,06	0,02	0,02
4	0,04	0,28	0,20	0,10	0,10
Big	0,10	-0,07	-0,42	-0,18	-0,18
adj R square 0,112996121					

Inv	Cons	2	3	4	Aggr
			t (a)		
Small	-1,79	2,02	0,59	1,55	2,05
2	0,30	-0,50	0,75	-1,06	0,18
3	1,10	0,67	0,90	0,94	1,84
4	1,51	0,62	-0,75	-0,26	0,89
Big	-0,40	2,27	0,25	-0,26	0,26
			t (s)		
Small	1,27	0,88	3,52	0,39	0,32
2	2,69	1,01	0,82	-0,23	2,85
3	-0,16	2,04	-1,26	1,27	0,38
4	-1,08	-0,50	-1,16	-1,47	-0,96
Big	-2,51	-1,16	-0,58	-1,46	-1,31
			t (h)		
Small	-0,84	1,96	1,19	-1,16	0,13
2	2,34	1,55	1,10	2,58	2,63
3	2,20	3,29	0,76	1,99	2,48
4	3,37	1,46	0,69	1,34	2,98
Big	3,36	-0,88	0,54	0,69	1,93
			t (r)		
Small	-0,97	0,52	-0,18	2,24	-2,02
2	-0,49	-0,89	0,11	1,07	0,57
3	-0,24	0,28	-1,31	0,85	-0,37
4	-0,04	-0,31	-0,06	-0,95	-1,64
Big	0,17	0,75	0,46	-0,32	-0,31
			t (c)		
Small	-0,76	1,77	-0,62	2,24	-2,00
2	-1,18	-1,25	-0,03	0,94	0,23
3	-0,59	1,05	-1,63	0,95	0,34
4	-0,21	0,11	-0,83	-0,74	-1,28
Big	-1,16	0,44	-0,07	-0,53	-0,30
			t (b)		
Small	1,86	0,39	1,81	0,27	1,18
2	0,71	1,56	0,54	-0,24	0,19
3	0,02	-0,58	-0,34	0,08	0,74
4	0,28	1,35	1,39	0,70	0,30
Big	0,83	-0,28	-2,61	-0,75	0,40

Source: Results Processed by Researchers (2023)

Panel A shows 25 stock portfolios arranged based on Size-B/M, the shares in this group have an excess return pattern that decreases as the size of market capitalization increases, while the excess return pattern cannot be observed as Book-to-market increases (B/M), in the top two quantiles of market capitalization, excess returns increase as Book-to-market increases while in the first quantile there is no observable pattern. Both market capitalization and book-to-market size patterns are unclear in Panel A. An unclear pattern was also found by Dimitrios (2020) by examining stocks in 19 countries from 1990 to 1990. 2019.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

Panel B shows 25 portfolios arranged based on Size-OP, shares in this group have excess returns which decrease as the size of market capitalization increases. Meanwhile excess return increases along with the increase in operating profit (OP). At the smallest market capitalization quantile, excess return increases from 0.014 to 0.055, and at the largest market capitalization quantile, excess return increases from 0.030 to 0.025 as OP increases. The findings in this research are also in line with Ekaputra (2016) and Dimitrios (2020). In each size quantile, portfolios with high operating profitability show higher excess returns than portfolios with low operating profitability.

Meanwhile, for the 25 portfolios arranged based on Size-Inv in panel C, the shares in this group have an excess return pattern that cannot be observed related to the size of market capitalization and increase in investment (Inv). The findings in this research are also in line with Ekaputra (2016), for 25 portfolios arranged based on Size-Inv, the average excess return for low-capitalization and high-capitalization stocks does not appear to have a clearly captured pattern.

Regression results for 25 portfolios compiled based on Size-BM show that there are three significant intercepts in the Fama-French five-factor asset pricing model. The size factor (SMB) has 7 coefficients which show significant values at the 90% confidence level. But there is no observable pattern for the SMB coefficients. In the HML factor there are 12 coefficients that show significant values. The HML coefficient has a positive correlation with increasing the portfolio's book-to-market ratio. The HML coefficient is statistically significant for portfolios with larger share sizes and those with high profitability. There are 3 significant RMW coefficients and 3 significant CMA coefficients. Based on observations in table 4, no pattern can be found for the RMW and CMA coefficients. Thus, it can be concluded that the RMW and CMA factors have minimal influence on the excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. The market risk premium factor (Rmt – Rft) has 2 coefficients that

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

show significant values. The average adjusted R2 of the 25 Size-B/M portfolios is 0.1521.

The regression results for 25 portfolios arranged based on Size-OP in table 5 show that 5 of the 25 portfolios have significant intercepts at the 90% confidence level. The size factor (SMB) has 7 significant coefficients. No explanatory pattern can be observed for the SMB coefficients. There are 12 significant coefficients of the book-to-market capitalization (HML) factor. The HML coefficient does not have an insignificant influence pattern on portfolios according to size and profitability. Meanwhile, there are only 2 significant RMW coefficients and 2 significant CMA coefficients. From these results, no pattern can be found for the RMW and CMA coefficients. Thus, it can be concluded that the RMW and CMA factors have minimal influence on the excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. The market risk premium factor (Rmt – Rft) has 5 coefficients with significant values. The average adjusted R2 for the 25 Size-OP portfolios is 0.14722.

Three of the 25 portfolios arranged based on Size-Inv in table 6 have significant intercepts at the 90% confidence level. Meanwhile, 5 of the 25 portfolios arranged based on size factors (SMB) were categorized as statistically significant. The SMB coefficient decreases with size (market capitalization). The HML factor has 12 coefficients which are categorized as significant at the 90% confidence level. Observing the pattern of significant HML coefficients shows that there is no clear pattern. Meanwhile, RMW only has 2 significant coefficients, and CMA only has 3 significant coefficients. The influence of the RMW and CMA factors on the excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange is weak.

CONCLUSION

The results of descriptive statistics conclude that the average excess return of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange increases with the increase in operating profit and the excess return decreases with the increase in market

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

capitalization size. This is in line with the findings of Fama & French (2015), that stocks with small capitalization produce higher returns compared to stocks with large capitalization. Meanwhile, in this research, the pattern of book-to-market and investment variables cannot yet be observed.

The regression results show that the independent variables of the Fama and French Five Factor Models have a weak influence on the excess returns of stock portfolios on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the Covid-19 period. Compared with previous research, the significant coefficient in the Covid-19 period in Indonesia is lower compared to research in Indonesia in the pre-Covid-19 period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bachelier, L. (2011). Louis Bachelier's theory of speculation: The origins of modern finance. In *Louis Bachelier's Theory of Speculation: The Origins of Modern Finance*.

Baek, S., Mohanty, S. K., & Glambosky, M. (2020). COVID-19 and stock market volatility: An industry level analysis. *Finance Research Letters*, *37*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101748

Blackburn, D. W., & Cakici, N. (2017). Overreaction and the cross-section of returns: International evidence. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, *42*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jempfin.2017.02.001

Carhart, M. M. (1997). On persistence in mutual fund performance. *Journal of Finance*, *52*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb03808.x

Cheng, Y., Yi, J., Yang, X., Lai, K. K., & Seco, L. (2022). A CEEMD-ARIMA-SVM model with structural breaks to forecast the crude oil prices linked with extreme events. *Soft Computing*, *26*(17). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-022-07276-5

Chen, J. L., Glabadanidis, P., & Sun, M. (2022). The five-factor asset pricing model, short-term reversal, and ownership structure – the case of China. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, *82*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102147

Coudert, V., & Gex, M. (2008). Does risk aversion drive financial crises? Testing the predictive power of empirical indicators. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jempfin.2007.06.001

Cujean, J., & Hasler, M. (2017). Why Does Return Predictability Concentrate in Bad Times? *Journal of Finance*, *72*(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12544

Daniel, K., & Titman, S. (1997). Evidence on the characteristics of cross sectional variation in stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, *52*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1997.tb03806.x

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

Dimitrios, S. (n.d.). *"Fama-French 5-factor model: The performance in Developed markets excluding the U.S."*

Engelhardt, N., Krause, M., Neukirchen, D., & Posch, P. N. (2021). Trust and stock market volatility during the COVID-19 crisis. *Finance Research Letters*, *38*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101873

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (1993). Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *33*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(93)90023-5

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (1997). Industry costs of equity. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *43*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(96)00896-3

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2015). A five-factor asset pricing model. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *116*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.10.010

Fama, E. F., & French, K. R. (2017). International tests of a five-factor asset pricing model. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *123*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2016.11.004

Griffin, J. M. (2002). Are the Fama and French Factors Global or Country Specific? In *Review of Financial Studies* (Vol. 15, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/15.3.783

Grossman, S.J., Stiglitz, J. E. (1980). On the Impossibility of Informationally Efficient Markets. In *The American Economic Review* (Vol. 70, Issue 3).

Hong, H., Bian, Z., & Lee, C. C. (2021). COVID-19 and instability of stock market performance: evidence from the U.S. *Financial Innovation*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-021-00229-1

Hyndman, R. J., & Athanasopoulos, G. (2014). Measuring forecast accuracy. In *www.otexts.org/fpp/2/5*.

Neves, M. E., Abreu Pinto, M., Assunção Fernandes, C. M. de, & Simões Vieira, E. F. (2021). Value and growth stock returns: international evidence (JES). *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, *29*(5). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-05-2021-0097

Novy-Marx, R. (2013). The other side of value: The gross profitability premium. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *108*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.01.003

Ramelli, S., & Wagner, A. F. (2020). Feverish stock price reactions to COVID-19. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies*, *9*(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/rcfs/cfaa012

Rossi, F., & Harjoto, M. A. (2020). Corporate non-financial disclosure, firm value, risk, and agency costs: evidence from Italian listed companies. *Review of Managerial Science*, *14*(5). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-019-00358-z

Ross, S. A. (1976). The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(76)90046-6

Salisu, A. A., & Akanni, L. O. (2020). Constructing a Global Fear Index for the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *56*(10). https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X.2020.1785424

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31000/dmj.v8i1 **ISSN (Online) 2580-2127**

Sharpe, W. F. (1964). CAPITAL ASSET PRICES: A THEORY OF MARKET EQUILIBRIUM UNDER CONDITIONS OF RISK. *The Journal of Finance*, *19*(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1964.tb02865.x

Singh, A. (2020). COVID-19 and safer investment bets. *Finance Research Letters*, *36*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101729

Singh, K., Singh, A., & Prakash, P. (2023). Testing factor models in an emerging market: evidence from India. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-05-2021-0245

Sutrisno, B., & Ekaputra, I. A. (2016). UJI EMPIRIS MODEL ASSET PRICING LIMA FAKTOR FAMA-FRENCH DI INDONESIA. *Jurnal Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *20*(3). https://doi.org/10.26905/jkdp.v20i3.287

Wagner, A. F. (2020). What the stock market tells us about the post-COVID-19 world. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(5). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0869-y

Watanabe, A., Xu, Y., Yao, T., & Yu, T. (2013). The asset growth effect: Insights from international equity markets. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *108*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2012.12.002