Income smoothing and foreign asset holdings

Balli, Faruk and Jean Louis, Rosmy and Osman, Mohammad

Massey University, Vancover Island University, University of Dubai

2008

Income Smoothing and Foreign Asset Holdings.

Faruk Balli   Rosmy J. Louis   Mohammad Osman

Massey University   Vancouver Island University   University of Dubai

October 10, 2011

Abstract

In this paper we construct a new methodology to measure the international income smoothing and present stronger connection between international asset holding and international income smoothing for OECD countries.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we re-examine the ties between international portfolio allocation and income smoothing. We propose a revised approach of measuring income smoothing via foreign asset holdings that focuses on factor income inflows as opposed to the commonly used net factor income in the literature mainly proposed by Sørensen et al. (2007). A compelling reason for purely concentrating on factor income inflows is mainly that during recession periods wages, interest, and profits tend to be lower and this may entail a reduction in outflows, consequently an overestimation of net foreign factor income and its impact on income smoothing via international asset holdings. Using net factor income in our views carries the potential drawback of producing higher (lower) smoothing than normal during recession (expansion). The factor income inflow by contrast does not suffer from this shortcoming. Its movement or magnitude does not necessarily synchronize with fluctuations in domestic output. Since this paper's primary concern is to construct the strong tie with the international portfolio allocation and international income smoothing, it is less likely to add factor outflows to get a valid estimation of income smoothing via domestic investors' international portfolio allocation.

Macroeconomic models are built on the central assumption that economic agents are either rational or near-rational. Grubel (1968) explains investors' rationale for holding internationally diversified portfolio by looking at the mean-variance of both portfolios with purely domestic assets and portfolios with a combination of domestic and foreign assets. He shows that the mean-variance of the latter is smaller than the former. Lewis (1996 and 1999) substantiates Grubel's main findings by providing both theoretical foundation and empirical evidence. However, Poterba (1991) and Tesar and Werner (1995) have observed that investors in high income countries do not hold foreign financial assets as much as they should optimally. A large portion of their financial assets are from the domestic market, a behavior that is known as "home bias". Nevertheless, over the last decade, capital market integration has grown tremendously leading to higher volumes of international assets trading across borders. This has led to a downward trend in home bias levels, in particular among high-income OECD members. In aggregate level data, Sørensen et al. (2007) have recently shown that there is a strong connection between the volume of cross-border assets holding and income smoothing. More intuitively, this

implies that the more internationally diversified an investor's portfolio is the higher possibility to smooth income as they are able to switch income from the foreign markets to the domestic market to keep their levels of consumption relatively stable over time at home.

2   Methodology

The literature on income smoothing via international asset holding suggests that investors who diversify their portfolio enjoy income smoothing via their holding of international assets. Therefore, foreign assets' holding is equivalent to an insurance against economic downturns at home. It is customary in the literature to use the difference between gross domestic product (GDP) and gross national product (GNP) as a proxy of the amount of net income flows across countries to gauge the extent of risk sharing across countries. That is:

$GNP \approx GDP + R_d * A_d - R_f * A_f$,

where A_f is the stock of domestic assets owned by foreign residents, R_f is the rate of return on these assets, and A_d and R_d are the stock of and the return on domestically-owned foreign assets, respectively.[1]

At the aggregate level, Sørensen and Yosha (1998) applied the following regression to measure income smoothing via cross border asset holdings:

$$\Delta \log \text{GDP}_t^i - \Delta \log \text{GNP}_t^i = \nu_{f,t} + \beta_f \ \Delta \log \text{GDP}_t^i + \epsilon_{i,t} \ , \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta \log \text{GDP}$ is the annual change in GDP per capita in constant prices and $\Delta \log \text{GNP}$ is the annual change in GNP per capita in constant prices. When coefficient of β_f is the coefficient estimate that captures income smoothing from net factor income flows, $\nu_{f,t}$ and $\epsilon_{i,t}$ are fixed effect and error terms, respectively. A positive value of β_f implies that net factor income from abroad is not perfectly correlated with idiosyncratic output shocks; thereby offering some income smoothing for the domestic output shocks. As β_f approaches 1, the country under consideration experiences greater income smoothing from international asset holdings.

---

[1]In fact this is only an approximate relationship between the GDP and GNP. However, we neglect the remittances which is counted in GNP calculation. For detailed the formula you may check the U.N. Statistics Database.

Our approach for excluding the income outflows from the net factor income can be explained by the fact that during recession(expansion) periods wages, interest, and profits tend to be lower(higher) and this may entail a reduction(expansion) in outflows, consequently an overestimation(underestimation) of net foreign factor income and its impact on income smoothing via international asset holdings. Net factor income in our views carries the potential drawback of producing higher(lower) smoothing than normal during recession(expansion). However, factor income inflows are not be effected from those estimation biases. Therefore, we reconstruct this methodology by proposing a measure of income that is reflective of purely international asset holding earnings to capture income smoothing effectively.

Our model can be written as follows;

$$\Delta \log \text{GDPin}_t^i - \Delta \log \text{GDP}_t^i = \nu_{f,t} + \beta_{f+} \ \Delta \log \text{GDP}_t^i + \epsilon_{i,t} \ , \tag{2}$$

where GDPin is defined as GDP + factor income inflows. The structure of this equation documents that we only consider the income inflows coming from abroad instead of the net income flows.

3 Data

We use a broad sample of high-income OECD countries to investigate the relationship between international portfolio allocation and income smoothing and test whether our innovation of solely focusing on factor income inflow makes a difference to the existing literature.[2] We obtained a pair-wise volume of cross border equity holdings in US dollars from the International Monetary Fund's Coordinated Portfolio Investment Surveys (CPIS). Total market capitalization of equity markets are obtained from the World Development Indicators Database. To estimate the risk-sharing regressions, we gather national accounts data from OECD National Accounts–Main Aggregates (Volume I) and detailed tables (Volume II) that cover the period 1970–2006.

---

[2]Data set include Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Australia, Canada, Japan, Iceland Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, and US.

We define "home portfolio bias" as the excessive investment in domestic portfolio compared with the optimal amount of allocation of domestic portfolio that international CAPM model. The home equity bias index is calculated as:

$$HOMEBIAS_t^i = \frac{(1 - F_t^i)}{(1 - D_t^i)}.$$ (3)

where F_t^i is the foreign equity ratio in total equity portfolio of country i at time t. Total equity portfolio of country i is equal to stock market capitalization + foreign equity held - amount of country's equity held by foreigners. D_t^i is a ratio of stock market capitalization of country i to stock market capitalization of the world. Figure 1 contains the home bias levels of the sample. We clearly observe gradual decrease in the home equity bias which is consistent with the higher volume of foreign asset trading for the OECD members.

Figure 1 here

4   Empirical Findings

Table 1 shows both our innovation to focus on factor income inflows and the net factor income flows. Both models report higher levels of income smoothing in the very last years which is perfectly consistent with capital market integration. By looking at Figure 1, for the euro members, since home equity bias levels are quite lower than non-EMU OECD members, we shall expect higher level income smoothing via international asset holdings which is further documented in Table 1.

We carry out a sensitivity analysis to determine whether the difference in the methodology stands on firm grounds. We drop Ireland and Netherlands, which have the lowest home equity bias levels among euro members from the sample.[3] The results are reported in Table 2 with 3 panels. Panel A shows the results of the truncated sample defined above. It can be gleaned that the coefficient of smoothing via factor income inflows, β_+, decreases considerably in the last two sub-periods whereas the net factor income smoothing, β_f, does not change that much, though we expected it to decrease also. The coefficients in the Panel A indicates that income

---

[3]Since it has negative level, Ireland's home equity bias levels has not been reported in Figure 1.

smoothing is much higher if we consider Ireland and the Netherlands which are the most "open" countries across the Euro area.

In panel B of Table 2, we drop Greece, the member with the highest home equity bias level among euro members, from the regression equation instead. Expectedly, the income smoothing via factor income inflows increases from 12 % to 17 % and are statistically significant for the last two sub-periods, whereas the former smoothing model does not have that sensitivity, even it reacts in the opposite direction after we drop Greece. In Panel C of Table 3, we performed a similar test for non-EU OECD members, by dropping Switzerland, having the lowest home equity bias level among OECD-EU members, income smoothing through our methodlogy decreases from 3 % to 2 % whereas regressions based up on the net income flows does not show that level of sensitivity after dropping Switzerland.

This simulation demonstrates that a clear relationship between foreign equity holdings and income smoothing via net factor inflows exists but the same cannot be said for net factor income inflows. In light of these facts, and considering the genuine relationship between the foreign asset holdings and income smoothing, we surmise that our approach of using factor income inflows is superior to the existing net factor income approach in the literature to measure income smoothing via capital markets across countries.

This paper has made a practical contribution to the literature in explaining the factors underlying income smoothing. However, we have only considered the equity market and found that it is the most significant factor. Also, considering recent literature to believe that international debt securities' trading does not have such power. This is consistent with recent studies by Pagano (2004), Codogno et al.(2003), and Balli (2008). These authors find that there is a high correlation between bond markets which restrains income smoothing.[4]

---

[4]Adjaout et al.(2002) concluded that since government bond yield differentials across euro region are in very small amount and corporate bond returns are highly correlated, euro bond bias, which is very high across OECD countries, does not create ample opportunity for income smoothing.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we present new empirical evidence on the linkages between international asset trading and income smoothing. We have used factor income inflows instead of net factor income that is common in the literature and found strong correlation between risk sharing and international asset holdings. Our results are more robust compared to the previous literature estimations.

References

Adjaout, K., Laura, B., Danthine, J., Fischer., A., Hamaui, R., and Portes, R. (2002) EMU and portfolio adjustment. CEPR Policy Paper, No:5.

Ahearne, A., Griever, W., and Warnock, F.(2000) Information costs and home bias. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, International Finance Discussion Paper No: 691.

Balli, F. (2008) Spillover effects on government Bond yield spreads in Euro zone. Does perfect integration exist among EMU members? Journal of Economics and Finance Forthcoming.

Codogno, L., Favero, C., and Missale, A. (2003) EMU and government bond spreads, Economic Policy, **18**, 503–532.

French, K., and Poterba, J. (1991) International diversification and international equity markets. American Economic Review, **81**, 222–226.

Grubel, H. L. (1968) Internationally diversified portfolios: welfare gains and capital flows. American Economic Review, **58**, 1299–1314.

Lewis, K. (1996) What explain the apparent lack of international consumption risk sharing?. Journal of Political Economy, **104**, 267–297.

Lewis, K. (1999) Trying to explain home bias in equities and consumption. Journal of Economic Literature 1999, **37**, 571–608.

Pagano, M., and Von-Thadden, E. L. (2004) The European bond markets under EMU, Oxford Review of Economic Policy, **20**, 531-554.

Sørensen, B. E., Yosha, O. (1998) International risk sharing and European monetary unification. Journal of International Economics,**45**, 211–38.

Sørensen, B. E., Wu, Y. T., Yosha, O., Zhu. Y. (2007) Home bias and international risk sharing: Twin puzzles separated at birth. Journal of International Money and Finance, **26**, 587—605.

Tesar, L., and Werner, I. (1995) Home bias and high turnover. Journal of International Money and Finance, **14**, 467–492.

Table 1: **Income Smoothing (percent) via International Factor Income.**

	Panel A: OECD-EU			
	1971–1980	1981–1990	1991–2000	2001–2006
β_{f+}	−1.64	−0.52	2.32	2.96
	(0.95)	(0.94)	(1.47)	(2.66)
β_f	1.41	−2.95	−1.98	2.26
	(0.62)	(1.42)	(1.29)	(2.93)

	Panel B: EMU			
	1971–1980	1981–1990	1991–2000	2001–2006
β_{f+}	0.43	−3.1	6.25	12.13
	(0.91)	(1.52)	(2.06)	(6.06)
β_f	-0.98	−2.01	4.61	9.47
	(0.75)	(1.93)	(2.34)	(2.52)

*Notes.*OECD–EU: Australia, Canada, Japan, Korea Republic, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and US. EMU: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain. We exclude Luxembourg, since it is an outlier with its position. Percentages of shocks absorbed at each level of smoothing. Standard errors in brackets. The table shows, for incoming factor income, the coefficient β_{f+}, the GLS estimate of the slope in the regression of $\Delta \log(\text{GDP}^i + \text{international factor income received}) - \Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$ on $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$. The coefficient β_f, is the GLS estimate of the slope in the regression of $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i - \Delta \log \text{GNP}^i$ on $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$.

Panel A: EMU without Ireland and Netherlands

	1971–1980	1981–1990	1991–2000	2001–2006
β_{f+}	1.14	−4.04	0.57	4.87
	(0.81)	(1.81)	(2.23)	(5.82)
β_f	−1.23	−3.32	−0.3	8.48
	(0.69)	(1.75)	(2.57)	(2.63)

Panel B: EMU without Greece

	1971–1980	1981–1990	1991–2000	2001–2006
β_{f+}	1.34	−2.03	7.31	17.06
	(0.86)	(1.77)	(2.06)	(6.86)
β_f	−1.64	−3.13	4.49	5.33
	(0.77)	(1.93)	(2.41)	(3.17)

Panel C: OECD-EU without Switzerland

	1971–1980	1981–1990	1991–2000	2001–2006
β_{f+}	−2.75	−3.61	1.16	1.63
	(0.88)	(1.42)	(1.79)	(1.94)
β_f	0.83	−3.37	−3.13	2.11
	(0.61)	(0.92)	(1.43)	(3.46)

*Notes.*OECD–EU: Australia, Canada, Japan, Korea Republic, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and US. EMU: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain. Percentages of shocks absorbed at each level of smoothing. Standard errors in brackets. The table shows, for incoming factor income, the coefficient β_{f+}, the GLS estimate of the slope in the regression of $\Delta \log(\text{GDP}^i+$ international factor income received$)-\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$ on $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$. The coefficient β_f, is the GLS estimate of the slope in the regression of $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i - \Delta \log \text{GNP}^i$ on $\Delta \log \text{GDP}^i$.