

# Financial development and stock returns: A cross country analysis\*

Harris Dellas\*<sup>†</sup>  
University of Bern  
CEPR, IMOP

Martin K. Hess  
Departamento de Administración  
Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México

## Abstract

We examine stock returns in a cross section of emerging and mature markets (49 countries) over 1980-99. Stock returns are found to be significantly related to the degree of financial development. In general, a deeper and higher quality banking system is associated with lower volatility of stock returns and a greater synchronization in the movements of domestic and world returns. International synchronization is also greater the more liquid the stock market.

JEL Classification: G15, O10

Keywords: Financial development, stock returns

---

\*We are grateful to E. Baltensperger, V. Koubi and C. Wyplosz and, in particular, to an anonymous referee for many valuable comments. We are also grateful to Ecoscientia Stiftung for generous financial support. This project was partly carried out while Hess was associated with the Study Center Gerzensee and the University of Bern.

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author. Gesellschaftsstrasse 49, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland. Tel: (+41) 31-631-3989, Fax: (+41) 31-631-3992. Email: harris.dellas@vwi.unibe.ch, Homepage: <http://www-vwi.unibe.ch/amakro/dellas.htm>

There exists a large literature dealing with the cross country analysis of stock returns (Bekaert and Harvey, 1995, 1997, Erb et al. 1996a, 1996b, Rouwenhorst, 1999). Interestingly, this literature has been exclusively preoccupied with the determinants of cross-country differences in stock return performance *within* a type of market (emerging or mature) rather than across different types. In this paper we pool emerging and mature equity markets together and investigate to what degree the observed cross-country differences in the moments of stock returns can be accounted for by an obvious but so far overlooked candidate, namely the level of financial development<sup>1</sup>.

Our motivation for investigating this relationship is based on the observation that the behavior of assets returns is related to the properties of the financial markets in two distinct ways. First, asset returns directly depend on how well the financial system carries out its main functions: the provision of liquidity, the facilitation of the trading, hedging and diversification of risk, the monitoring of managers and exertion of corporate control, etc. For instance, shortage of liquidity may exaggerate asset price movements. A segregated national capital market may experience smaller comovements with world markets. Surprisingly, these issues have not received any formal attention before. And second, financial markets affect asset prices indirectly through their effects on macroeconomic fundamentals (for instance, on the volatility of economic growth). The relationship between macroeconomic performance and financial development has been the subject of a substantial body of recent research<sup>2</sup>. A presumption seems to have emerged that financial development leads to higher economic growth. But the link between financial development and volatility seems to be ambiguous, both theoretically (Bacchetta and Caminal, 2000) and empirically (Beck et al., 2001).

In this paper, we examine quarterly stock returns in a group of 49 countries over the period 1980-99. We employ standard measures of financial development, pertaining to the size and quality of the banking system as well as the liquidity of the stock market, that have been extensively used in the literature (see e.g. Levine et al., 2000). The value

---

<sup>1</sup>This issue has been partly and indirectly studied in the context of the implications of financial liberalization (see Bekaert and Harvey, 1995, Stulz, 1999)

<sup>2</sup>See King and Levine (1993), Levine and Zervos (1998), Levine et al. (2000), Beck et al. (2000) for the relationship between financial development and growth. And Bernanke and Gertler (1990), Greenwald and Stiglitz (1993), Kiyotaki and Moore (1997), Aghion et al. (1999), Bacchetta and Caminal (2000), Beck et al. (2001), Denizer et al. (2002) for the relationship between financial development and output volatility.

of using several, alternative measures of financial development lies in the fact that as they represent different aspects of the financial system they may help shed light on which elements of under-development are responsible for the observed patterns (e.g. market size, efficiency, restrictions to international capital movements and so on).

The results tend to differ somewhat depending on the indicator of financial development used and the currency of denomination of returns. Nevertheless, irrespective of the currency denomination of the returns, we find that financial development is significantly related to the behavior of the second moments of the distribution of stock returns. In general, "deeper" and more efficient banking systems have been associated with significantly lower stock return volatility as well as a closer comovement with world returns<sup>3</sup>. Stock market liquidity, on the other hand, is only related to the international synchronization of stock returns.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section I outlines some theoretical considerations. Section II describes the empirical methodology and Section III the data. Section IV presents the results.

## **I Theoretical considerations**

The main functions of the financial system are (see Levine, 1997): the provision of liquidity, the facilitation of the trading, hedging and diversification of risk, the monitoring of managers and exertion of corporate control and the matching of savers and investors. We investigate how the distribution of asset returns may depend –directly or indirectly– on how well the financial system carries out these functions. There is a relatively recent literature –reviewed below– that studies how the financial system affects an important determinant of stock market performance, namely, macroeconomic volatility. We call such effects indirect effects. There may also be a direct relationship between the financial system and stock returns, but there exists no formal work addressing this issue. Below we speculate on the nature of this relationship.

### **a) Direct relationship**

---

<sup>3</sup>The closer comovements could reflect either common international shocks or greater susceptibility to foreign shocks. This is investigated by Dellas and Hess (2002), who find that the latter is the key factor, that is, financial development makes a country's financial market more vulnerable to foreign influences even after controlling for the influence of capital controls and international trade.

## I. The monitoring of managers and exertion of corporate control

More efficient monitoring of managers and exertion of corporate control typically imposes tighter constraints on the riskiness of the projects pursued by the firms. Lower risk undertaken then implies a more stable rate of returns of the firm's stock, because of the smoother path of capital gains and dividends.

What is in the heart of this argument is the lessening of the informational problems associated with the financing of investment activities. Note that the banks' contribution is related not only to the amelioration of standard moral hazard and adverse selection problems (the managers having an incentive to take on excessive risk) but also to the fact that there may exist cases where a bank possesses superior information relative to the entrepreneurs concerning the prospects of a particular proposed project. In addition to forcing the borrowing firm to undertake more prudent projects, the bank's exertion of corporate control may also make the firm diversify its activities in order to guarantee a minimum cash flow for debt repayments. More diversified activities mean a smoother stock price path.

Romano (2002) provides a survey of the literature of how shareholder control and activism affects firm performance. There is no discussion of its impact on volatility, though. Hutson and Kearney (2001) use takeovers as a form of control and show that after their announcement stock return volatility tends to fall. Razin et al. (1999) show that markets that lack regulation and disclosure rules face greater moral hazard and adverse selection problems. This lack of monitoring possibilities hinders international investments and lowers international return correlations.

## II. The provision of liquidity

A key function of the banking system is to provide liquidity to the firms to absorb shocks. If temporary shocks cannot be smoothed out, then the firm's output (and stock price) becomes more volatile. In extreme situations of shortage of liquidity temporary shocks may even induce permanent effects (for instance, bankruptcy) in solvent firms.

Kiyotaki and Moore (1997) show that market imperfections such as credit constraints (i.e. illiquidity) amplify the effect of various shocks. Diamond and Rajan (2001) argue that illiquid investments require a higher amount of short-term financing which results in a higher probability of financial crises. Allen and Gale (2003) demonstrate that small

demand shocks for liquidity may lead to large asset price fluctuations if liquidity supply and demand is inelastic, which is a characteristic of underdeveloped markets. Note that both bank and stock market liquidity are important here. A sufficiently liquid banking system allows stock traders to smooth their trades, minimizing price volatility. A thin stock market is more likely to exhibit larger gyrations in prices and, as pointed out by Dellas and Hess (2002), is a less hospitable host to international capital. As a result, it tends to exhibit lower comovement with the rest of the world.

Finally, Rousseau and Wachtel (2000) argue that the option to exit through a liquid market mechanism increases venture capital and entrepreneurial activity in general. The increase in the latter leads to an expansion of the stock market, making the market more liquid. Hence, through this channel, a liquid stock market can have a multiplier, negative effect on price volatility.

While it is commonly assumed that liquidity reduces stock price volatility, there also seems to exist an informal view that in some circumstances too much of it can prove destabilizing (this seems to be the main factor behind the Tobin tax proposal). Levine and Zervos (1998), Bekaert and Harvey (2000) and Aghion et al. (2001) analyze how liberalizations and the resulting increase in liquidity through foreign investors may lead to enhanced vulnerability. Beck et al. (2001) also show that while more developed intermediaries are able to absorb real shocks they magnify monetary shocks.

## **b) Indirect relationship**

There are two main, indirect routes through which financial development may matter for stock returns: Through its effects on macroeconomic growth and volatility. And through its effects on the structure of production and pattern of international trade. Because the effects on macroeconomic growth have been discussed extensively elsewhere (see, for instance, Levine 1997), we will focus here on macroeconomic volatility only.

### **I. Macroeconomic volatility**

Financial development affects macroeconomic volatility through various channels<sup>4</sup>. First, by allowing an economy to absorb shocks more efficiently. For instance, Aghion et

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that the link between macroeconomic volatility and stock prices (returns) is to be found in the positive relationship between dividend (and interest rate) volatility and macroeconomic volatility as well as in the fact that greater macroeconomic volatility implies greater uncertainty. David and Veronesi (2001) show that greater uncertainty about fundamentals increases stock market volatility.

al. (1999) show that when capital markets are backward, in the sense that individuals have unequal access to investment opportunities, then the demand and supply of credit (and hence the supply of output) is more cyclical. The shocks can also be absorbed more efficiently when there is greater diversification, which is an important function of the banks.

And second, financial development brings about an amelioration of informational asymmetries. When information in the credit markets is asymmetric, Bernanke and Gertler (1990) show that shocks to the net worth of borrowers amplify economic fluctuations (see also Greenwald and Stiglitz, 1993). Similarly, Kiyotaki and Moore (1997) show that capital market imperfections amplify the effects of temporary productivity shocks and make them more persistent, through their effect on the net wealth of credit-constrained borrowers. However, Bacchetta and Caminal (2000) show that this is not always the case and that whether financial imperfections (asymmetric information) exacerbate business cycles or not depends on the impact of the shock on the composition of external and internal funds for credit-constrained firms. Recent empirical work by Beck et al. (2001) confirms the existence of such an ambiguity. Namely, they document the absence of a robust relation between financial intermediary development and growth volatility<sup>5</sup>.

## II. Production structure and trade patterns

International trade is another important route linking the stage of financial development to stock market performance, and in particular to stock return volatility and international stock price comovements. It involves two mechanisms. First, financially advanced countries (the rich) tend to trade more (see e.g., Rodrik, 1995). A larger degree of openness increases the sensitivity to foreign shocks inducing a positive association between financial development and international financial interdependence.

The second mechanism operates through the effects of trade on the structure of production. Helpman and Razin (1978) note that if a country without a well functioning financial market cannot diversify domestic production risks through international asset trade, it may have to do so by selecting a more diversified production structure. Thus,

---

<sup>5</sup>Denizer et al. (2002), though, claim a negative relation between finance and volatility. An important difference between this paper and Beck et al. (2001) is that the former does not condition the effects on individual shocks while the latter does.

financial backwardness implies a domestic production structure that is *more similar* to that in the rest of the world. In the presence of important industry specific shocks, financial backwardness then leads to a positive covariation between domestic and world economic activity but to a lower aggregate volatility (because of the higher production diversification). Financial development, on the other hand, allows for better international risk sharing and allows for greater production specialization. This implies a smaller correlation in movements in economic activity and stock markets across countries but greater domestic macroeconomic volatility.

This argument is based on the traditional theory of trade and ignores economic convergence and the resulting intra-industry trade. In this case one should expect a positive relationship between the stage of economic (financial) development and the degree of susceptibility to foreign shocks (because of similarities in production and trade structure across countries). Intra-industry trade would also imply lower volatility because it is associated with a lower degree of specialization.

A final link between finance and volatility can be claimed based on the findings of Beck (2002). Beck argues that economies with a better-developed financial sector have a comparative advantage in sectors with high scale economies, typically, manufacturing. Given the well established fact that volatility differs systematically across sectors, one may be able to link finance to volatility through the effects of the former on the production structure.

In summary. Financial development (both banking and stock market) seems to have a negative, direct effect on stock market volatility. Banking development also seems to have indirect effects on both volatility and international correlations by influencing output volatility as well as the structure of production and trade. But, these indirect effects seem ambiguous, as different theories generate different patterns. It is then important to turn to the empirical evidence as a mean of determining which effects dominate.

## **II Empirical analysis**

Understanding the sources of differences in the behavior of stock returns across countries is an important theoretical and empirical issue in finance. Aggregate variables are a natural starting point as they appear to exhibit significant variation across countries.

Bekaert and Harvey (1997) examine whether asset concentration, stock market development (market capitalization), economic integration (the degree of trade openness), microstructure (turnover ratios) and the macroeconomy (exchange rate variability, credit ratings) could explain cross sectional differences in stock return volatility in a set of 20 emerging markets. They find that, with the exception of trade openness, nothing else seems to matter. Similarly, Bekaert et al. (2001), address this issue in a group of emerging markets using a broader set of variables. They find that some variables such as market capitalization, inflation and the price earning ratio had some -but limited- success in accounting for the observed cross sectional differences in stock market performance.

Our objective is to extend this literature by studying both emerging and mature markets together. And also, to focus on a tighter set of macroeconomic variables, namely those pertaining to the degree of development of the financial system. In particular, we study cross-country differences in the empirical distribution of stock market returns based on the regression equation

$$y_i = \alpha + \beta f_i + \gamma x_i + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

where  $y_i$  is the moment under consideration (mean, standard deviation, correlation with world stock returns and variability of stock return due to domestic factors),  $f_i$  is the measure of financial development, and  $x_i$  is a control variable.

The choice of the currency of denomination of the returns is not obvious. Under perfect capital mobility, the use of a single currency (say, the US dollar) would seem the most appropriate as it would make cross country comparisons meaningful for the world representative investor. However, in a world where purchasing power does not hold, the real returns associated with a given currency would differ depending on the location of the investor. In addition, there exist two more complications. First, some of the countries included in the sample have had international investment restrictions. And second, for reasons not well understood, there exists a strong home bias in portfolio selection (see e.g., Tesar and Werner, 1995). These two favor the selection of the domestic currency. Using local currency, however, would ignore the importance of international capital flows. We adopt a dual approach. Namely, we compute returns both in terms of the US dollar and the domestic currency. Depending on one's priors on the degree of international segmentation, one may select the set of results to focus on. For the correlation with

the world we measure returns in terms of the currency of a reference G3-country rather than the USD only. The criterion for the selection of the reference country is location: Germany is the reference country for the European and African countries, Japan for the Pacific economies and the US for all American countries. The motivation for this choice is that cross-country economic links tend to have a strong regional component because of strong trade and capital links, common policies and similarities in economic structure.

The definition of the mean ( $M$ ), the standard deviation ( $SD$ ) and the correlation of the return with the "world" return ( $COR$ ) is straightforward. They are simply the corresponding sample moments for each country. In order to study international co-movements we use an additional variable besides  $COR$ . Namely, the fraction of the variance of stock returns that can be attributed to domestic factors. The decomposition of the total variance has been carried out using a two-variable VAR(1) that includes the domestic and the "world" return. The percentage of the variance of the forecast error in the domestic return that is due to the innovation to the local return is taken to be the measure of the sensitivity of the domestic stock markets to external developments. A high value for this variable indicates low susceptibility to external influences. The variance decomposition has been computed in two distinct ways. The first assumes the existence of only two shocks: the foreign and the local. The second assumes three shocks: the foreign, the domestic and a common shock. More formally, the computation is based on the following specification:

$$r_t = c + \Phi r_{t-1} + B\varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

where vector  $r_t$  contains return data for the country of interest and the world. Under the first specification, the standard recursive identification scheme is used.  $B$  is diagonal,  $\varepsilon_t = (\varepsilon_{1t}, \varepsilon_{2t})'$  with the contemporaneous effect running from the world to the country. Under the second specification, we choose  $B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\varepsilon_t = (\varepsilon_{ct} \quad \varepsilon_{at} \quad \varepsilon_{at}^*)'$  where  $\varepsilon_{ct}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{at}$  and  $\varepsilon_{at}^*$  denote common, domestic and foreign country shocks, respectively. By construction, the contemporaneous correlation between the latter two shocks is zero. In particular, the reduced form disturbances are simply the sum of a common shock and the shock in the respective country  $(\varepsilon_{ct} + \varepsilon_{at} \quad \varepsilon_{ct} + \varepsilon_{at}^*)'$ .

We call  $VD2$  and  $VD3$  the fraction of the variance of stock returns attributed to domestic factors according to the two and three shock decomposition respectively.

### III The data

The key explanatory variable,  $f_i$ , represents the level of financial development. As discussed in the introduction, financial intermediaries' main function is to mitigate the effects of information and transaction costs. They do so by facilitating the trading, hedging and diversification of risk, by providing liquidity and by helping monitor managers and exert corporate control. Unfortunately, it is not possible to construct exact representations of these functions, specially in the context of a large section of countries. As a result, we follow Levine et al. (2000) in using three popular indicators of financial intermediary development<sup>6</sup>: Liquid liabilities (*LLY*), commercial-central bank (*CCB*) and private credit (*PC*).

Liquid liabilities (*LLY*) is currency plus the demand and interest-bearing liabilities of banks and nonbank financial intermediaries divided by GDP. This is a standard measure of "financial depth", that is, of the overall size of the financial intermediary sector. Its main shortcoming is that it may not accurately represent the effectiveness of the financial sector in mitigating the effects of informational asymmetries and transactions costs.

Commercial-central bank (*CCB*) equals the ratio of commercial bank assets divided by commercial bank plus central bank assets. *CCB* measures the degree to which it is the commercial banks rather than the central bank that finance investment. King and Levine (1993) argue that this measure may be useful because private banks are more likely to monitor managers, facilitate risk management, and mobilize savings than central banks. Hence, a higher value of *CCB* may indicate higher financial quality (efficiency). Nevertheless *CCB* does not directly measure the effectiveness of banks in carrying out some of their main functions (such as exerting corporate control, lowering transactions costs) and its ability to capture the quality and quantity of financial services is unknown.

The third indicator, private credit (*PC*), equals the value of credits by financial intermediaries to the private sector divided by GDP. This indicator combines quality and depth and according to Levine et al. (2000) it represents an improvement over other commonly used indicators because it only includes credit issued by the private sector to the private sector (it excludes credit issued to governments, government agencies, and

---

<sup>6</sup>See Levine et al. (2000) for a more detailed discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of these indicators.

public enterprises; and credits issued by the central bank).

Finally, we use a fourth variable to measure financial development, namely, the ratio of the total value of shares traded as a percentage of GDP (*EQV*). *EQV* is a measure of stock market liquidity<sup>7</sup>.

In addition to the financial development variables, we employ a number of control variables that may capture the indirect effects discussed in section I. As discussed in section I, financial development is related to economic volatility. We have thus included in the regressions a measure of output volatility in order to capture the independent effects that output volatility may have on stock returns. Our measure of output volatility (*YVOL*) is the standard deviation of the annual percentage growth rate of GDP computed in constant –local currency– prices. Moreover, in the regressions involving USD based returns, we have included a measure of exchange rate volatility (*FXV*) to check to what extent the volatility of stock returns is driven by exchange rate volatility.

We also include two more variables that relate to international trade. The degree of trade openness (*OP*) is the sum of a country’s exports and imports divided by GDP. Greater trade openness makes domestic firms –and hence domestic stock returns– more susceptible to world economic conditions. The intra-industry trade variable (*IIT*) is the share of intra-industry trade in total trade. We base our measure on the index by Grubel and Lloyd (1975) which represents the share of a bidirectional international trade flows *within* an industrial sector *s* as a percentage of total trade in this sector.

$$IIT_s = \frac{(X_s + M_s) - |X_s - M_s|}{(X_s + M_s)} \quad (3)$$

Our measure is calculated as the weighed sum of *IIT<sub>s</sub>* over 34 manufacturing industry sectors. Export volume in each sector is used as the relevant weight. The sectors are classified by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).

The motivation for including the latter variable is that the trade/production structure influences the distribution of stock returns. A high value for *IIT* means a low degree of country specialization and hence greater synchronization with the rest of the world. Less developed countries tend to be more specialized than more developed ones.

Finally, there is another variable that is of obvious importance for stock returns. It

---

<sup>7</sup>A purer measure of stock market liquidity is the ratio of equity value traded to market capitalization. Using it instead of *EQV*, however, does not change the results.

relates to the existence of official impediments to international financial transactions. Segregated markets are less likely to respond to external shocks than internationally integrated ones. Segregation may also bring about greater or lower volatility depending on the relative importance of domestic and foreign shocks. We use the variable capital controls ( $CC$ ) to capture the effects of official financial restrictions.

The sample consists of 49 countries and covers stock returns over 1980-1999. Almost all of the independent variables are the sample averages of annual observations: 1980-95 for  $LLY$ ,  $CCB$ ,  $PC$  and  $EQV$ ; 1980-99 for  $OP$  and 1980-92 for  $IIT$ . The only exception is the  $CC$  variable which is an index of capital controls in effect in 1996. Due to missing observations the sample size varies depending on the variables included. We present a detailed description of the data, data sources and variable construction in the appendix. The stock return is the quarterly percentage change in stock prices either in domestic currency or adjusted for the change in the exchange rate against the US dollar<sup>8</sup>.

## IV The results

Tables 1–2 report the characteristics of stock returns and the simple correlation coefficients between the variables used in the regression for the quarterly observations<sup>9</sup>. We have also computed the correlations for daily returns in order to gain some insights into the dynamics of the transmission of external shocks to the domestic stock markets. It turns out that there is very little difference between these two sets of correlations. Hence, transmission of external shocks occurs quickly and at the same pace independent of the level of financial development. The results are very similar for  $VD2$  and  $VD3$  so we only report those with the two-shock decomposition.

Tables 1 and 2 here

We observe three general patterns. The mean return ( $M$ ) in domestic currency is positively correlated with the standard deviation of returns ( $SD$ ) but negatively linked to the correlation of domestic and world returns ( $COR$  and  $VD2$ ). This implies that

---

<sup>8</sup>Except for the regressions involving comovements with the rest of the world ( $COR$ ) and also external effects ( $VD2$ ,  $VD3$ ) where the rate of return is calculated also in the currency of the reference country.

<sup>9</sup>For completeness sake we also report the correlations with some additional underdevelopment variables which were included in the regression reported in table (8), i.e.,  $TRANS$  and  $LEGAL$ , both described in the appendix.

countries with high stock returns have experienced higher volatility but at the same time they have comoved more closely with world capital markets and have also been subjected to stronger external influences. At least theoretically, a portfolio consisting of stocks from financially developed and underdeveloped countries could be efficient. The correlations are of the opposite sign but nonsignificant for returns measured in US dollars, a pattern that owes much to the effects of currency devaluation.

Second, panel A also shows that the domestic mean returns are negatively associated with all measures of financial development. *SD* is negatively associated and *COR* and *VD2* are positively associated with those measures. The correlations reflect the well-known pattern of volatile and segregated LDC markets. Panel B displays that capital controls (*CC*) tend to increase market volatility and bring about lower synchronization of domestic and world returns. A more diversified production-trade structure (a high *IIT*) is associated with a higher mean return, a lower volatility and a greater synchronization with world equity markets but is unrelated to mean returns. Finally, low transaction costs and a low degree of political uncertainty (high *TRANS* and *LEGAL*, respectively) reduce market fluctuations and increase the comovements with the world as it encourages international capital flows.

Third, panel C shows a tight link between financial development and the control variables such as the high correlation between the indicators of financial development and *TRANS* and *LEGAL*. The correlation between private credit *PC* and *TRANS* is particularly high, an indication that *PC* may capture elements of the quality of the financial system as claimed by Levine et al. (2000). Note, that financially more developed countries have higher production-trade diversification, lower restrictions on international capital movements and more trade openness.

The presentation of the regression results is organized as follows. In each table we combine a single moment of the distribution of stock returns with a single measure of financial development. In the first two data rows we use USD returns while in the third and fourth row we use domestic currency computed returns. The regressors in the equation of the volatility of returns include the volatility of output and, when returns are measured in USD, also the volatility of the exchange rate. When returns are measured in USD, the regressions of the mean also include the average change of the exchange

rate during that period. The inclusion of the foreign exchange variable is done in order to account for the cross country differences in returns that are associated with exchange rate changes. For the sake of space, we only report here results with the volatility and correlation with world returns for *PC* and *EQV*. The regressions involving the other measures of banking development are reported in the appendix. The findings for *VD2* and *VD3* are identical to those obtained when we use *COR* so we have left them out (they are available from the authors).

Tables 3 to 6 here

The results indicate that the relationship between financial development and stock market performance depends somewhat on the moment considered, the financial indicator and the currency denomination of returns. Nevertheless, irrespective of the currency denomination of the returns, we find that financial development is significantly related to the second moments of the distribution of stock returns. In general, "deeper" and more efficient banking systems have been associated with significantly lower stock return volatility as well as a closer comovement with world returns. By comparing table 3 to table 7 it can be seen that it is banking "quality" (*PC*) that seems to matter. The estimated coefficients of *CCB* and *LLY* tend to be not statistically significant at the 5% level. That is, mere banking size is less important than "quality".

Table 4 shows that stock market liquidity cannot account for cross country differences in stock market volatility. On the other hand, stock market liquidity appears to be positively related to international correlations (table 6) but only when returns are denominated in domestic currency. But even in this case, *EQV* does not seem to have strong implications for volatility.

The other variables all seem to have the expected sign (see section I). The results indicate that general macroeconomic instability is a significant contributor to the volatility of stock returns. And the same is true for exchange rate volatility. The fact that the estimated coefficient on *PC* indicator decreases somewhat but remains large and highly significant after including the *GDP* volatility variable as well as the trade variables suggests –to us– that both the direct and indirect effects discussed in section I are empirically relevant.

Official impediments to international capital flows (higher capital controls) mean greater domestic volatility and weaker comovements with world markets. Hence, while capital controls seem to insulate domestic markets from external developments, they prevent the smoothing out of domestic shocks, which contributes to greater domestic volatility. The net effect of capital controls is higher volatility.

Trade openness functions similarly to international capital market integration. It reduces volatility and enhances international stock market comovements. The intra-industrial trade variable (*IIT*) also has the expected sign. Namely, it is associated with stronger international comovements. Nevertheless, it does not seem to matter for volatility<sup>10</sup>. Generally, the overall fit is very high. For instance, in the volatility regression,  $R^2$  is 0.73.

Before concluding, it is important to offer a caveat. Financial development is simply one facet of economic development. In addition to having an underdeveloped financial system, less developed countries also lag behind in several other aspects which may or may not be caused by the factors that are responsible for the lack of financial development. While it is important to identify all these aspects, it is very difficult to do so<sup>11</sup>. Hence, we cannot rule out the possibility that there is some other aspect of underdevelopment, that is strongly correlated with the aspects considered here and which is the fundamental driving force of stock returns.

## Conclusions

Understanding the causes of the observed cross-country differences in stock returns is an important challenge. Part of the recent literature has attempted to address this issue by appealing to cross-country macroeconomic differences. The present paper falls within this approach. The main differences from the existing literature are two: First, we study mature and emerging markets together. And second, instead of examining as broad a set of explanatory variables as possible, we restrict ourselves to a particular, very plausible

---

<sup>10</sup>The *IIT* variable was also included in the volatility regressions. While it was always statistically insignificant, its presence did not have any noticeable effect on any of the other regressors.

<sup>11</sup>In an earlier version of this paper, we tried to deal with this problem by including additional variables capturing economic underdevelopment (per capita income), transactions costs, political risk and so on. Unfortunately, the correlation between these variables and the *FD* variables is very high, so due to multicollinearity, their inclusion makes it impossible to estimate precisely the separate effects of *FD* and of those other variables (see table 8 in the appendix for an example of this).

but so far overlooked variable, namely the level of financial development. There exist good theoretical reasons for this choice, as the recent work on financial development and output growth and volatility has hinted.

We establish that the variance and covariance of country stock returns are closely related to banking development and that this is true irrespective of the currency in which rates of stock returns are measured. Interestingly, stock market development (liquidity) only seems to be related to the covariance of domestic with world returns.

There are two important tasks ahead. The first is to develop theoretical models linking the key functions of the financial system to the properties of asset prices. The existing literature has only indirectly suggested such links, through the effects of financial development on the properties of macroeconomic activity. The second is to produce more appropriate financial development indicators, namely indicators that can be uniquely and precisely associated with specific functions of the financial system. And then relate these indicators to the properties of asset prices.

## References

- [1] Aghion, P., Banerjee, A., Piketty, T., 1999. Dualism and macroeconomic volatility. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114, 1359-1397.
- [2] Aghion, P., Bacchetta, P., Banerjee, A., 2001. Currency crises and monetary policy in a credit-constrained economy. *European Economic Review* 45, 1121-1150.
- [3] Allen, F., Gale, D., 2003. Financial fragility, liquidity and asset prices. mimeo.
- [4] Bacchetta, P., Caminal, R., 2000. Do capital market imperfections exacerbate output fluctuations?. *European Economic Review* 44, 449-468.
- [5] Beck T., 2002. Financial development and international trade. Is there a link?. *Journal of International Economics* 57, 107-131.
- [6] Beck, T., Levine R., Loyaza N., 2000. Finance and the sources of growth. *Journal of Financial Economics* 58, 261-300.
- [7] Beck T., Lundberg M., Majnoni G., 2001. Financial development and economic volatility: does finance dampen or magnify shocks?. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 2707.
- [8] Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 1995. Time-varying world market integration. *Journal of Finance* 50, 403-444.
- [9] Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 1997. Emerging equity market volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics* 43, 29-77.
- [10] Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 2000. Foreign speculators and emerging equity markets. *Journal of Finance*, 565-613.
- [11] Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., Lundblad C., 2001. Emerging equity markets and economic growth. *Journal of Development Economics* 66, 465-504.
- [12] Bernanke, B., Gertler, M., 1990. Financial fragility and economic performance. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105, 87-114.

- [13] David, A., Veronesi, P., 2001. Inflation and earnings uncertainty and the volatility of asset prices: an empirical investigation. mimeo.
- [14] Dellas, H., Hess, M.K., 2002. Financial development and the sensitivity of stock markets to external influences. *Review of International Economics* 10, 525-538.
- [15] Denizer, C., Iyigun, M.F., Owen A.L., 2002. Finance and macroeconomic volatility. *Contributions to Macroeconomics* 2(7).
- [16] Diamond, D.W., Rajan, R.G., 2001. Banks, short-term debt and financial crises: theory, policy implications and applications. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 54, 37-71.
- [17] Erb, C.B., Harvey, C.R., Viskanta, T.E., 1996a. Political risk, financial risk and economic risk. *Financial Analysts Journal* 52, 28-46.
- [18] Erb, C.B., Harvey, C.R., Viskanta, T.E., 1996b. Expected returns and volatility in 135 countries. *Journal of Portfolio Management* 32, 46-58.
- [19] Feenstra, R.C., Lipsey, R.E., Bowen, H.P., 1997. World trade flows, 1970-1992, with production and tariff data. NBER 5910.
- [20] Greenwald, B.C., Stiglitz, J.E., 1993. Financial market imperfections and business cycles. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108, 77-114.
- [21] Grubel, H.G., Lloyd, P.J., 1975. *Intra-Industry Trade: The Theory and Measurement of International Trade in Differentiated Products*. Wiley, New York.
- [22] Helpman, E., Razin, A., 1978. *A Theory of International Trade under Uncertainty*. Academic Press, New York.
- [23] Hutson, E., Kearney, C., 2001. Volatility in stocks subject to takeover bids: Australian evidence using daily data. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 8, 273-296.
- [24] Knack, S., Keefer, P., 1995. Institutions and economic performance: Cross-country tests using alternative institutional measures. *Economics and Politics* 7, 207-227.
- [25] King, R.G., Levine, R., 1993. Finance, entrepreneurship, and growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 32, 513-542.

- [26] Kiyotaki, N., Moore, J., 1997. Credit cycles. *Journal of Political Economy* 105, 211-248.
- [27] Levine, R., 1997. Financial development and growth: views and agenda. *Journal of Economic Literature* 35, 688-726.
- [28] Levine, R., Loyaza N., Beck, T., 2000. Financial intermediation and growth: Causality and Causes. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 46, 31-77.
- [29] Levine, R., Zervos, S., 1998. Stock markets, banks, and economic growth. *American Economic Review* 88, 537-558.
- [30] Razin, A., Sadka, E., Yuen, C.-W., 1999. Implications of the home bias: a pecking order of capital inflows and corrective taxation. In: Razin, A., Sadka, E. (Eds.), *The Economics of Globalization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 85-122.
- [31] Rodrik, D., 1995. Getting interventions right. *Economic Policy* 20, 53-97.
- [32] Romano, R., 2002. Less is more: making institutional investor activism a valuable mechanism of corporate governance. In: McCahery, J.A., Moerland, P., Raaijmakers, T., Renneboog, L. (Eds.), *Corporate Governance Regimes*. Oxford University Press, New York, 507-566.
- [33] Rousseau, P.L., Wachtel, P., 2000. Equity markets and growth: cross-country evidence on timing and outcomes, 1980-1995. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 24, 1933-1957.
- [34] Rouwenhorst, K.G., 1999. Local return factors and turnover in emerging stock markets. *Journal of Finance* 54, 1439-1464.
- [35] Stulz, R.M., 1999. International portfolio flows and security markets. In: Feldstein, M. (Ed.), *International Capital Flows*. University Chicago Press, Chicago, 257-293.
- [36] Tamirisa, N.T., 1999. Exchange and capital controls as barriers to trade. *IMF Staff Papers* 46, 69-88.
- [37] Tesar, L., Werner, I.M., 1995. Home Bias and High Turnover. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 14, 467-492.

## V Appendix

### V-A Data Description and Sources

#### Stock Market and Exchange Rates

| Country        | Stock market index | USD ex-change rate | Sample    |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| Argentina      | IFCARGL            | ARGPESO            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Australia      | TOTMKAU            | AUSTDOL            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Austria        | TOTMKOE AS         | AUSTSCH            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Bangladesh     | BDTALSH            | BS..AE.            | 90.2-99.4 |
| Belgium        | TOTMKBG BF         | BELGLUX            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Brazil         | IFCBRAL            | BRACRUZ            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Canada         | TOTMKCN            | CNDDOLLR           | 80.1-99.4 |
| Chile          | IFCHILL            | CHILPES            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Colombia       | IFCOLBL            | COLUPES            | 85.1-99.4 |
| Denmark        | TOTMKDK            | DANISHK            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Finland        | FNOCSPRC           | FINMARK            | 80.1-99.4 |
| France         | TOTMKFR FF         | FRENFRA            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Germany        | TOTMKBD DM         | DMARKER            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Greece         | IFCGREL            | GREDRAC            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Hong Kong      | TOTMKHK            | HKDOLLR            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Hungary        | BUXINDX            | HNL..AE.           | 91.2-99.4 |
| Iceland        | ICEXALL            | ICEKRON            | 93.1-99.4 |
| India          | IFCINDL            | INDRUPE            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Indonesia      | TOTMKID            | INDORUP            | 90.3-99.4 |
| Ireland        | TOTMKIR            | IPUNTER            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Israel         | ISTGNRL            | ISRSHEK            | 84.2-99.4 |
| Italy          | TOTMKIT            | ITALIRE            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Japan          | TOTMKJP            | JAPAYEN            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Jordan         | IFCJORL            | JOL..AE            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Luxembourg     | TOTMKLXLF          | FINLUXF            | 92.2-99.4 |
| Malaysia       | TOTMKMY            | MALADLR            | 86.2-99.4 |
| Mexico         | IFCMEXL            | MEXPESO            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Netherlands    | TOTMKNL FL         | GUILDER            | 80.1-99.4 |
| New Zealand    | TOTMKNZ            | NZDOLLR            | 88.2-99.4 |
| Nigeria        | IFCNIGL            | NGL..AE            | 85.1-99.4 |
| Norway         | TOTMKNW            | NORKRON            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Pakistan       | IFCPAKL            | PAKRUPE            | 85.1-99.4 |
| Peru           | PEGENRL            | PERUSOL            | 91.2-99.4 |
| Philippines    | IFCPHIL            | PHILPES            | 85.1-99.4 |
| Portugal       | POBVLGN PE         | PORTESC            | 88.2-99.4 |
| Singapore      | TOTMKSG            | SINGDOL            | 80.1-99.4 |
| South Africa   | TOTMKSA            | COMRAND            | 80.1-99.4 |
| South Korea    | IFCKORL            | KORSWON            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Spain          | MADRIDI EP         | SPANPES            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Sri Lanka      | SRALLSH            | SRIRUPE            | 85.2-99.4 |
| Sweden         | TOTMKSD            | SWEKRON            | 82.2-99.4 |
| Switzerland    | TOTMKSW            | SWISSFR            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Taiwan         | TAIWGHT            | TAIWDOL            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Thailand       | IFCTHAL            | THABAHT            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Turkey         | IFCTURL            | TKI..AE            | 87.1-99.4 |
| United Kingdom | TOTMKUK            | USDOLLR            | 80.1-99.4 |
| United States  | TOTMKUS            | USDOLLR            | 80.1-99.4 |
| Venezuela      | IFCVENL            | VENEBOL            | 85.1-99.4 |
| Zimbabwe       | IFCZIWS            | ZIMBDOL            | 80.1-99.4 |

Source: Datastream. The table contains Datastream mnemonics. The source for the Taiwanese exchange rates before 1985 is <http://www.stat.gov.tw>.

**Financial Development Variables** *PC*: Private credit: the value of credits by financial intermediaries to the private sector divided by GDP.

*CCB*: The ratio of commercial bank assets divided by commercial bank assets plus central bank assets.

*LLY*: Liquid liabilities: currency plus demand and interest-bearing liabilities of banks and nonbank financial intermediaries divided by GDP. These three variables are taken from Levine et al. (2000). They cover the period 1980-1995.

*EQV*: Stock market capitalization: The total value of shares traded as a percentage of GDP. The values are averaged 1980-99. Source: World Development Indicators, The World Bank.

*TOV*: Stock market turnover ratio: The total value of shares traded as a percentage of market capitalization. The values are averaged 1980-99. Source: World Development Indicators, The World Bank.

### **Control Variables**

*CC*: This index measures the degree of capital controls imposed by a country. We use the data definition described by Tamirisa (1999). The data are 1996 values (for 10 countries 1997). Source: *Annual Report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions*, IMF.

*OP*: The openness to trade variable expresses trade (exports plus imports) as a percentage of GDP. Values are averages 1980-98. Source: World Development Indicators, The World Bank.

*IIT*: The intra-industrial trade variable is an export-weighted sum of the intra-industry trade index by Grubel and Lloyd (1975) for 34 manufacturing industries according the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) classification. The data are averages 1980-92 and described in detail by Feenstra et al. (1997). Source: NBER Trade Database: World Trade Flows, 1970-92.

*FXV, FXM*: The standard deviation and the average value of quarterly exchange rate changes (the domestic currency-US dollar rate) respectively. For the correlations with the world, the domestic currency-USD, or DM or JY rate respectively. Source: Datastream (see the Appendix).

*YVOL*: Standard deviation of the annual percentage growth rate of GDP over the entire sample period, based on constant, local currency, prices. WDI, World Bank, 1980-1999

*Y*: Initial per capita income as of 1980. Source: World Development Indicators, The World Bank.

*TRANS*: Sum of the indexes that measure bureaucratic delays and infrastructure quality (i.e. facilities for- and ease of communication between headquarters and the operation and within the country as well as the quality of transportation). High values indicate high efficiency. The data are averages over the period 1982-95 (for 18 countries 1984-95). Source: Business Environmental Risk Intelligence. The components of *LEGAL* and *TRANS* are described in more detail in Knack and Keefer (1995).

*LEGAL*: Sum of the indexes that measure the risk of expropriation (i.e. outright confiscation or forced nationalization) and of the repudiation of contracts by the government due to budget cutbacks, indigenization pressure, a change in government or in its economic and social priorities. The data are averages of the period 1980-95 (Austria: 1992-95). Lower scores indicate higher risk. Source: *International Country Risk Guide*, Political Risk Services.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| country        | $M^{\$}$ | $M^{dom}$ | $SD^{\$}$ | $SD^{dom}$ | $COR^{\$}$ | $COR^{dom}$ | $VD2$  |
|----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|--------|
| Argentina      | 1.494    | 23.868    | 30.465    | 48.504     | 0.175      | 0.490       | 89.105 |
| Australia      | 2.034    | 2.513     | 12.166    | 10.415     | 0.344      | 0.510       | 88.127 |
| Austria        | 2.263    | 2.393     | 13.715    | 13.494     | 0.658      | 0.874       | 58.230 |
| Bangladesh     | -0.333   | 0.675     | 20.772    | 20.822     | 0.117      | 0.079       | 98.136 |
| Belgium        | 2.451    | 2.849     | 10.389    | 9.550      | 0.673      | 0.687       | 55.434 |
| Brazil         | 2.030    | 7.965     | 28.678    | 169.603    | 0.058      | 0.540       | 99.419 |
| Canada         | 2.123    | 2.305     | 9.395     | 8.299      | 0.817      | 0.884       | 33.038 |
| Chile          | 3.442    | 7.124     | 18.048    | 17.759     | 0.272      | 0.308       | 93.999 |
| Colombia       | 3.500    | 8.162     | 19.618    | 18.608     | 0.110      | 0.514       | 96.841 |
| Denmark        | 3.372    | 3.833     | 9.614     | 10.019     | 0.579      | 0.782       | 70.604 |
| Finland        | 4.368    | 4.770     | 11.572    | 11.646     | 0.279      | 0.818       | 63.014 |
| France         | 2.846    | 3.422     | 11.681    | 11.159     | 0.677      | 0.937       | 52.831 |
| Germany        | 2.593    | 2.761     | 10.091    | 9.746      | na         | na          | na     |
| Greece         | 0.893    | 3.522     | 20.514    | 20.196     | 0.249      | 0.374       | 90.909 |
| Hong Kong      | 3.085    | 3.510     | 18.255    | 17.592     | 0.264      | 0.593       | 94.242 |
| Hungary        | 2.029    | 5.729     | 19.331    | 20.442     | 0.637      | 0.698       | 60.485 |
| Iceland        | 4.790    | 4.790     | 8.886     | 8.253      | 0.128      | -0.031      | 94.632 |
| India          | 2.128    | 4.407     | 15.487    | 16.796     | -0.106     | 0.718       | 95.101 |
| Indonesia      | -0.439   | 1.210     | 29.049    | 20.107     | 0.347      | 0.597       | 91.595 |
| Israel         | 2.649    | 8.616     | 11.188    | 15.706     | 0.462      | 0.640       | 78.162 |
| Italy          | 3.116    | 4.244     | 14.097    | 14.045     | 0.537      | 0.702       | 68.790 |
| Japan          | 3.273    | 1.907     | 13.571    | 10.925     | na         | na          | na     |
| Jordan         | 0.898    | 2.025     | 7.401     | 7.676      | 0.264      | 0.070       | 89.361 |
| Korea, Rep. of | 2.438    | 2.616     | 21.921    | 18.022     | 0.401      | 0.559       | 79.372 |
| Luxemburg      | 4.179    | 4.852     | 9.017     | 10.138     | 0.808      | 0.348       | 31.003 |
| Malaysia       | 2.866    | 3.283     | 19.695    | 18.574     | 0.295      | 0.417       | 86.904 |
| Mexico         | 2.553    | 9.344     | 25.453    | 25.638     | 0.436      | 0.626       | 81.134 |
| Netherlands    | 3.370    | 3.578     | 8.500     | 8.483      | 0.773      | 0.927       | 39.000 |
| New Zealand    | 0.946    | 1.300     | 11.264    | 9.928      | 0.356      | 0.492       | 81.855 |
| Nigeria        | 0.836    | 6.959     | 19.701    | 11.588     | 0.218      | 0.348       | 94.824 |
| Norway         | 2.810    | 3.340     | 14.403    | 13.830     | 0.539      | 0.763       | 71.151 |
| Pakistan       | 0.517    | 2.565     | 17.409    | 17.253     | -0.033     | 0.047       | 99.913 |
| Peru           | 5.609    | 12.150    | 19.982    | 25.494     | 0.070      | 0.075       | 94.775 |
| Philippines    | 5.122    | 5.906     | 23.115    | 21.240     | 0.316      | 0.442       | 88.331 |
| Portugal       | 1.155    | 2.010     | 12.612    | 12.714     | 0.553      | 0.711       | 63.421 |
| Singapore      | 2.632    | 2.253     | 14.867    | 14.352     | 0.394      | 0.492       | 82.995 |
| South Africa   | 1.796    | 4.038     | 15.826    | 13.489     | 0.481      | 0.779       | 76.137 |
| Spain          | 2.763    | 3.977     | 13.054    | 13.003     | 0.572      | 0.776       | 67.421 |
| Sri Lanka      | 1.264    | 2.874     | 14.853    | 14.336     | -0.130     | 0.388       | 97.853 |
| Sweden         | 4.071    | 4.825     | 12.784    | 14.260     | 0.723      | 0.949       | 49.105 |
| Switzerland    | 3.064    | 3.066     | 10.674    | 10.093     | 0.771      | 0.833       | 43.936 |
| Taiwan         | 4.393    | 3.432     | 28.687    | 24.684     | 0.272      | 0.443       | 90.401 |
| Thailand       | 1.216    | 1.472     | 22.364    | 20.406     | 0.234      | 0.429       | 94.643 |
| Turkey         | 3.822    | 17.347    | 29.658    | 31.972     | 0.386      | 0.638       | 83.313 |
| United Kingdom | 3.089    | 3.448     | 9.170     | 8.256      | 0.529      | 0.797       | 69.537 |
| USA            | 3.427    | 3.427     | 7.599     | 7.599      | na         | na          | na     |
| Venezuela      | 2.322    | 8.914     | 23.151    | 22.914     | -0.028     | 0.280       | 95.641 |
| Ireland        | 2.941    | 3.656     | 12.003    | 12.158     | 0.595      | 0.577       | 62.482 |
| Zimbabwe       | -0.816   | 3.779     | 24.606    | 21.804     | 0.279      | 0.401       | 92.355 |

This table displays values of the mean ( $M$ ), standard deviation ( $SD$ ), correlation with the world return ( $COR$ ) and the domestic influence on stock returns ( $VD2$ ) as measured by a variance decomposition from VARs (see equation (2)) with two shocks. Subscripts  $\$$  and  $dom$  denote the moments are calculated from return series in US dollars and domestic currency, respectively. The data sources are described in the appendix.

Table 2: Variable Correlations

| Panel A: Stock Return Moments with FD |          |           |           |            |            |             |          |          |          |          |       |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
|                                       | $M^{\$}$ | $M^{dom}$ | $SD^{\$}$ | $SD^{dom}$ | $COR^{\$}$ | $COR^{dom}$ | $VD2$    | $LLY$    | $PC$     | $CCB$    | $EQV$ |
| $M^{\$}$                              | 1        |           |           |            |            |             |          |          |          |          |       |
| $M^{dom}$                             | 0.219    | 1         |           |            |            |             |          |          |          |          |       |
| $SD^{\$}$                             | -0.212   | 0.508***  | 1         |            |            |             |          |          |          |          |       |
| $SD^{dom}$                            | -0.066   | 0.346**   | 0.523***  | 1          |            |             |          |          |          |          |       |
| $COR^{\$}$                            | 0.213    | -0.257*   | -0.479*** | -0.293*    | 1          |             |          |          |          |          |       |
| $COR^{dom}$                           | 0.153    | -0.088    | -0.257*   | -0.079     | 0.680***   | 1           |          |          |          |          |       |
| $VD2$                                 | 0.278*   | -0.228    | -0.583*** | -0.286*    | 0.911***   | 0.676***    | 1        |          |          |          |       |
| $LLY$                                 | 0.099    | -0.475*** | -0.445*** | -0.315**   | 0.549***   | 0.270*      | 0.564*** | 1        |          |          |       |
| $PC$                                  | 0.211    | -0.404*** | -0.459*** | -0.284*    | 0.588***   | 0.549***    | 0.566*** | 0.755*** | 1        |          |       |
| $CCB$                                 | 0.240    | -0.432*** | -0.476*** | -0.411***  | 0.557***   | 0.323**     | 0.527*** | 0.499*** | 0.614*** | 1        |       |
| $EQV$                                 | 0.210    | -0.261*   | -0.246*   | -0.139     | 0.298**    | 0.299**     | 0.231    | 0.571*** | 0.772*** | 0.428*** | 1     |

  

| Panel B: Stock Return Moments with Control Variables |           |           |           |            |            |             |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------|
|  | $M^{\$}$  | $M^{dom}$ | $SD^{\$}$ | $SD^{dom}$ | $COR^{\$}$ | $COR^{dom}$ | $VD2$     |
| $Y$  | 0.157     | -0.131    | -0.269*   | -0.065     | 0.336**    | 0.512***    | 0.340**   |
| $YVOL$   | 0.013     | 0.353**   | 0.481***  | 0.229      | -0.058     | -0.046      | -0.121    |
| $IIT$  | 0.140     | -0.221    | -0.361*** | -0.207     | 0.568***   | 0.603***    | 0.565***  |
| $CC$   | -0.404*** | 0.045     | 0.474***  | 0.207      | -0.580***  | -0.510***   | -0.535*** |
| $LEGAL$  | 0.521***  | -0.370**  | -0.611*** | -0.246*    | 0.729***   | 0.692***    | 0.737***  |
| $OP$   | 0.115     | -0.256    | -0.234    | -0.177     | 0.233      | -0.013      | 0.182     |
| $TRANS$  | 0.424***  | -0.373**  | -0.638*** | -0.291*    | 0.723***   | 0.597***    | 0.722***  |

  

| Panel C: FD with Control Variables |          |           |           |          |          |           |           |           |          |        |         |
|------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|--------|---------|
|                                    | $LLY$    | $PC$      | $CCB$     | $EQV$    | $Y$      | $YVOL$    | $IIT$     | $CC$      | $LEGAL$  | $OP$   | $TRANS$ |
| $Y$                                | 0.364**  | 0.550***  | 0.226     | 0.298*   | 1        |           |           |           |          |        |         |
| $YVOL$                             | -0.359** | -0.305**  | -0.236    | -0.102   | -0.285*  | 1         |           |           |          |        |         |
| $IIT$                              | 0.251    | 0.278*    | 0.306**   | 0.345**  | 0.130    | -0.202    | 1         |           |          |        |         |
| $CC$                               | -0.322   | -0.399*** | -0.477*** | -0.263** | -0.275*  | 0.275*    | -0.404*** | 1         |          |        |         |
| $LEGAL$                            | 0.538*** | 0.650***  | 0.631***  | 0.452*** | 0.323**  | -0.290*   | 0.486***  | -0.683*** | 1        |        |         |
| $OP$                               | 0.377**  | 0.066     | 0.339**   | 0.410*** | -0.224   | 0.030     | 0.346**   | -0.175    | 0.253    | 1      |         |
| $TRANS$                            | 0.582*** | 0.812***  | 0.613***  | 0.568*** | 0.408*** | -0.441*** | 0.494***  | -0.612*** | 0.829*** | 0.303* | 1       |

This table displays values of the mean ( $M$ ), standard deviation ( $SD$ ), correlation with the world return ( $COR$ ) and the domestic influence on stock returns ( $VD2$ ) as measured by a variance decomposition from VARs (see equation (2)) with two shocks. The superscripts  $\$$  and  $^{dom}$  denote that the moments are calculated in US dollars and domestic currency, respectively. See appendix for variable description. \*\*\*, \*\* and \* denote significance at a 99%, 95% and 90% level, respectively.

Table 3: Standard deviation of returns and  $PC$

|            | <b>PC</b>        | <b>FXV</b>      | <b>YVOL</b>     | <b>CC</b>       | <b>OP</b>         | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|
| $SD^{\$}$  | -6.81<br>(0.003) | 0.049<br>(0.27) |                 |                 |                   | 0.25                 | 44       |
| $SD^{\$}$  | -4.02<br>(0.034) | 0.12<br>(0.001) | 1.60<br>(0.000) | 7.25<br>(0.045) | -0.057<br>(0.011) | 0.73                 | 39       |
| $SD^{dom}$ | -17.5<br>(0.046) |                 |                 |                 |                   | 0.08                 | 44       |
| $SD^{dom}$ | -12.8<br>(0.06)  |                 | 2.94<br>(0.012) | 7.65<br>(0.61)  | -0.19<br>(0.15)   | 0.18                 | 39       |

Cross-country regression of the standard deviation of stock returns -in USD and domestic currency- on the variables in row 1. The numbers in parenthesis are  $p$ -values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.

Table 4: Standard deviation of returns and  $EQV$

|            | <b>EQV</b>       | <b>FXV</b>      | <b>YVOL</b>     | <b>CC</b>       | <b>OP</b>        | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------|
| $SD^{\$}$  | -4.30<br>(0.15)  | 0.07<br>(0.13)  |                 |                 |                  | 0.16                 | 47       |
| $SD^{\$}$  | -1.13<br>(0.65)  | 0.16<br>(0.000) | 1.70<br>(0.000) | 9.17<br>(0.003) | -0.006<br>(0.65) | 0.60                 | 43       |
| $SD^{dom}$ | -12.55<br>(0.07) |                 |                 |                 |                  | 0.02                 | 47       |
| $SD^{dom}$ | -3.69<br>(0.32)  |                 | 3.58<br>(0.014) | 14.1<br>(0.40)  | -0.05<br>(0.002) | 0.10                 | 43       |

Cross-country regression of the standard deviation of stock returns -in USD and domestic currency- on the variables in row 1. The numbers in parenthesis are  $p$ -values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.

Table 5: Correlation with world returns and *PC*

|                           | <b>PC</b>       | <b>CC</b>        | <b>OP</b>         | <b>IIT</b>      | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| <i>COR</i> <sup>G3</sup>  | 0.44<br>(0.000) |                  |                   |                 | 0.35                 | 41       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>G3</sup>  | 0.22<br>(0.001) | -0.58<br>(0.020) | 0.002<br>(0.002)  | 0.27<br>(0.03)  | 0.71                 | 36       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>dom</sup> | 0.42<br>(0.000) |                  |                   |                 | 0.30                 | 41       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>dom</sup> | 0.26<br>(0.004) | -0.36<br>(0.017) | -0.001<br>(0.034) | 0.46<br>(0.003) | 0.18                 | 36       |

Cross-country regression of the correlation of stock returns -in the currency of the G3-reference country and in domestic currency- with "world" returns. The numbers below in parenthesis are *p*-values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.

Table 6: Correlation with world returns and *EQV*

|                           | <b>EQV</b>       | <b>CC</b>        | <b>OP</b>         | <b>IIT</b>      | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| <i>COR</i> <sup>G3</sup>  | 0.28<br>(0.053)  |                  |                   |                 | 0.09                 | 44       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>G3</sup>  | 0.045<br>(0.751) | -0.64<br>(0.012) | 0.00<br>(0.85)    | 0.45<br>(0.003) | 0.49                 | 40       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>dom</sup> | 0.29<br>(0.025)  |                  |                   |                 | 0.09                 | 44       |
| <i>COR</i> <sup>dom</sup> | 0.15<br>(0.024)  | -0.47<br>(0.003) | -0.001<br>(0.000) | 0.53<br>(0.000) | 0.52                 | 40       |

Cross-country regression of the correlation of stock returns -in the currency of the G3-reference country and in domestic currency- with "world" returns. The numbers below in parenthesis are *p*-values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.

Table 7: Standard deviation of returns and *CCB* and *LLY*

|                          | <b>CCB</b>        | <b>LLY</b>       | <b>FXV</b>      | <b>YVOL</b>     | <b>CC</b>       | <b>OP</b>         | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------|
| <i>SD</i> <sup>\$</sup>  | -13.78<br>(0.034) |                  | 0.13<br>(0.001) | 1.58<br>(0.000) | 7.16<br>(0.045) | -0.04<br>(0.011)  | 0.72                 | 41       |
| <i>SD</i> <sup>dom</sup> | -74.13<br>(0.15)  |                  |                 | 2.73<br>(0.016) | -0.86<br>(0.94) | -0.10<br>(0.18)   | 0.23                 | 41       |
| <i>SD</i> <sup>\$</sup>  |                   | -3.05<br>(0.13)  | 0.14<br>(0.000) | 1.60<br>(0.000) | 9.33<br>(0.006) | -0.048<br>(0.015) | 0.70                 | 39       |
| <i>SD</i> <sup>dom</sup> |                   | -14.34<br>(0.15) |                 | 2.83<br>(0.016) | 18.73<br>(0.94) | -0.15<br>(0.18)   | 0.17                 | 39       |

Cross-country regression of the standard deviation of stock returns -in USD and domestic currency- on the variables in row 1. The numbers in parenthesis are *p*-values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.

Table 8: Standard deviation of returns and measures of underdevelopment

|                          | <b>PC</b>       | <b>TRANS</b>     | <b>LEGAL</b>    | <b>Y</b>        | <b>FXV</b>      | <b>YVOL</b>     | <b>R<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>N</b> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|
| <i>SD</i> <sup>\$</sup>  | .75<br>(0.79)   | -1.85<br>(0.34)  | -.139<br>(0.79) | -.000<br>(0.54) | .182<br>(0.000) | .925<br>(0.095) | 0.72                 | 34       |
| <i>SD</i> <sup>dom</sup> | -8.74<br>(0.44) | -5.71<br>(0.098) | -1.50<br>(0.15) | .001<br>(0.025) |                 | 2.41<br>(0.094) | 0.12                 | 34       |

Cross-country regression of the standard deviation of stock returns -in USD and domestic currency- on the variables in row 1. The numbers in parenthesis are *p*-values based on robust standard errors. See appendix for variable description.