



AgEcon SEARCH

RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

The Adverse Impact of Gradual Temperature Change on Capital Investment

Ronald Balvers
Division of Economics and Finance
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506
E-mail: rbalvers@wvu.edu
Phone: (304) 293-7880

Ding Du
The W. A. Franke College of Business, PO Box 15066
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
E-mail: ding.du@nau.edu
Phone: (928) 523-7274

Xiaobing Zhao
The W. A. Franke College of Business, PO Box 15066
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
E-mail: Xiaobing.Zhao@nau.edu
Phone: (928) 523-7279

Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association's 2012 AAEA Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington, August 12-14, 2012

*Copyright 2012 by Ronald Balvers, Ding Du, and Xiaobing Zhao. All rights reserved.
Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.*

Abstract

Financial market information can provide an objective assessment of losses anticipated from global warming. In a Merton-type asset pricing model, with asset prices affected by perceived changes in investment opportunities due to global warming, the risk premium is significantly negative and growing over time, loadings for most assets are negative, and asset portfolios in more vulnerable industries have stronger negative loadings on the global warming factor. Average increases in required returns attributed to global warming are 0.11 percent, implying a present value loss of 4.18 percent of wealth. These costs complement previous estimates of the cost of global warming.

JEL Codes: G12, Q54

Key Words: Asset Pricing, Global Warming, Cost of Capital, Tracking Portfolios.

The Adverse Impact of Gradual Temperature Change on Capital Investment

1. Introduction

Evidence in support of the notion of climate change – “global warming” – is accumulating. In a comprehensive and scientific assessment of climate change, the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize recipient Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) concludes that “Warming of the climate system is unequivocal” (IPCC, 2007, Working Group I Report *Summary for Policymakers*, p. 5).

The majority of the research concerning the economic impact of global warming has emphasized the future effect on production or cash flows of an *abrupt* change in climate to occur sometime after the year 2050.¹ Prominent examples are the work of Mendelsohn et al. (2000) and Nordhaus and Boyer (2000) examining and aggregating the output losses by sector, and the work of Horowitz (2001) and Nordhaus (2006) identifying aggregate output losses with a reduced-form cross-sectional approach, occurring once temperatures increase by at least 2.5 to 3.0 degrees Celsius. The highest estimate of the adverse impact of a 3.0 degrees Celsius increase in temperature is a three percent permanent decrease in GDP.

After evaluating various climate-change mitigation strategies, IPCC estimates that stabilizing CO₂ concentrations and limiting the long-term temperature rise may result in a 0.12 percent reduction in the annual growth rate of global GDP. This estimate provides a threshold for climate-change mitigation policies: policies are worth considering only if the negative economic impact of global warming represents a greater cost than the 0.12

¹ The direct impact on production of a rise in mean temperature staying within 2.5 degrees Celsius is usually small and even positive. See Tol (2008) for an excellent review.

percent reduction in GDP growth or a present value loss of 4.56 percent of wealth.² Because the GDP losses due to global warming of up to three percent occur so far in the future, the present value of these losses is usually too small to justify aggressive mitigation policies. Tol (2008, p.5) concisely summarizes the state of research by stating “It is therefore no surprise that cost-benefit analyses of climate change recommend only limited greenhouse gas emission reduction.”

We take a different approach in this paper and focus on the economic and financial impact of *gradual* temperature change. This is motivated by the findings of IPCC. IPCC (2007) points out that gradual global warming can increase the intensity and frequency of extreme events. With gradual climate change, IPCC projects that drought, heavy precipitation, heat waves, extreme sea levels, and intense tropical cyclone activity will likely increase (see also NACC, 2000; Stern, 2007; IPCC, 2012).

Extreme weather events typically adversely affect production and cash flows of firms. Stern (2007) points out that extreme events (such as storms, floods, droughts, and heat waves) could lead to significant infrastructure damage and faster capital depreciation, and that increases in extreme events will be particularly costly for developed economies because they invest a considerable amount in fixed capital each year (a good example is Hurricane Katrina).³ Stern (2007) estimates that the annual losses due to extreme weather events have been around 0.2 percent of world GDP since the 1990s, and that the annual losses could reach 0.5 – 1.0 percent of world GDP by the middle of the century.⁴

² See Section 6 below for details.

³ The 6/30/08 (pre-hurricane-Ike) issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that “Bad weather has cost U.S. property insurers more than \$5 billion so far in second-quarter catastrophe-related claims—equal to about three-quarters of all catastrophe claims during 2007—and could push the industry to an underwriting loss.”

⁴ Aside from extreme events, Quiggin and Horowitz (2003) emphasize adjustment costs to climate change. They argue that costs of adjustment will arise if capital stocks: (i) are dependent on climate for their optimal location; and (ii) depreciate more slowly than is required to permit easy adjustment to a changing

It is well known and potentially important for capital budgeting decisions that impacts of global warming on cash flows could also be highly *uncertain*, which partly stems from considerable uncertainty about the magnitude of global warming, with the range of possible magnitudes involving differences of several hundred percent. This is illustrated by the IPCC's widely-quoted estimates for the possible increase in global mean temperature. Its best estimate for global average surface warming at the end of the 21st century ranges from 1.8°C (with 66 percent confidence interval from 1.1°C to 2.9°C) to 4.0°C (with 66 percent confidence interval from 2.4°C to 6.4°C). Heal and Kriström (2002) and Pindyck (2012) argue that uncertainty is a central feature of climate change.

In brief, global warming (negatively) affects cash flows of firms in an uncertain fashion, acting as a (negative) supply shock. This shock should affect firms and economy not only by its impact on the level of cash flows, but also by its impact on the risk or uncertainty of cash flows and therefore the cost of capital. Global warming (as a supply shock) introduces a new risk factor into the economy. As a result, investors demand higher returns on risky assets such as stocks and corporate bonds. Higher returns represent a higher cost of capital to firms, which can have a profound and adverse impact on capital investment and economic growth. The negative link between the cost of capital and economic growth is well documented in the economics literature (see for instance Henry, 2003). Thus, ignoring global warming's impact on the cost of capital may significantly understate its economic impact. Yet a review of the literature shows that

climate. See also Nordhaus (1991), Cline (1992), Mendelsohn, Nordhaus, and Shaw (1994), Fankhauser (1995), Tol (1995), Rosenthal, Gruenspecht, and Moran (1995), Moore (1998), Mendelsohn and Neumann (1999), Schlenker, Hanemann, and Fisher (2006), Barreca (2011), and IPCC (2007) for the various impact mechanisms of global warming,

there has been no research concerning the impact of global warming on the cost of capital.⁵ We explore here in detail the cost-of-capital link.

A related objective is to provide a detached assessment of possible costs of global warming. Roll (1984) showed that financial markets may be more reliable indicators of future events influencing cash flows than the pronouncements of specialized forecasters: orange juice futures prices have forecasting power for weather conditions (involving frost) beyond the forecasts of the National Weather Service. Since the scientific literature is not definitive concerning the magnitude of the welfare effects of global warming, the observable financial market impact of changes in the likelihood of global warming, likewise, may provide an objective measure of the collective perception of some of the economic damages from global warming.

If global warming is economically important, the risk premium and loadings associated with the global-warming factor should be significantly different from zero. In particular, if climate-change impacts are generally adverse (losses due to extreme events and/or adjustment costs), we expect to see a *negative* premium, because (1) if climate-change impacts are adverse, increases in temperature should for typical firms lead to lower returns, and so the loadings on the global-warming factor should be generally negative; (2) to compensate for the additional risk, the equilibrium return should be

⁵ Kamstra, Kramer and Levi (2003) examine how temperature affects human mood and investor behavior, but not from the climate change perspective. Fankhauser and Tol (2005) study the impact of global warming on capital accumulation, but not from the cost of capital perspective. Brunner (2002) analyzes the effects of the El Niño weather cycle on commodity prices and economic activity but does not consider the cost of capital. Previous finance literature has examined the interaction between weather and financial markets. For instance, Roll (1984) and Fleming et al. (2006) study how weather-related information affects, respectively, mean returns and return variances in particular weather-sensitive markets, and Hirshleifer and Shumway (2003) consider how weather impinges on returns by affecting trader attitudes. These studies focus on higher-frequency (daily) weather events and subsequent return realizations. Our paper focuses on a very different aspect of the interaction between weather and financial markets: the impact of lower-frequency (monthly) weather events, relating to changing expectations about climate change, on systematic risk and the economy-wide cost of capital.

higher, and with negative loadings this can only be achieved by a negative risk premium. In essence we conjecture that global warming is a risk factor that is priced because it affects investment opportunities in the sense of Merton (1973).

We employ two approaches to estimate the posited risk premium of a global warming factor. The first is the tracking portfolio approach of Lamont (2001). The advantage of this approach is that it does not force us to select an equilibrium asset pricing model and therefore may avoid model specification error. But this approach cannot provide us with an estimate of the loadings on a global warming factor and the impact on the cost of capital. We therefore also employ a second, more structural approach – the two-pass regression methodology proposed by Black, Jensen, and Scholes (1972) and Fama and MacBeth (1973), as amended by Shanken (1992), Lewellen, Nagel and Shanken (2009), and Shanken and Zhou (2007). Consistent with our conjecture, we find evidence suggesting that signals of global warming cause an increase in the cost of capital. Quantitatively this evidence suggests that the impact of global warming may be larger than previously thought.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the theoretical perspective and states three testable hypotheses as well as presenting the appropriate expression for calculating the welfare loss. Section 3 briefly discusses the data. Section 4 presents a non-structural approach – the tracking portfolio approach – that does not involve specification of a particular asset pricing model and allows us to test two of the hypotheses, while Section 5 tests a third hypothesis and provides quantitative results in a structural context – applying the two-pass regression methodology to the standard Fama-French and CAPM asset pricing models. Section 6 investigates

specifically the quantitative impact of climate change on the cost of capital, and Section 7 concludes the paper with a brief summary.

2. Theoretical Perspective and Hypotheses

A general perspective on the factors explaining asset returns is provided by the Merton (1973) model. Merton's model implies that excess returns are determined by the systematic risk of an asset, which in turn depends on the asset's sensitivity to both market returns and aggregate changes in investment opportunities. The application of the model is not straightforward because it provides no specifics about how to characterize aggregate changes in investment opportunities. Of the two most popular asset pricing models, the Sharpe-Lintner CAPM ignores the possibility of investment opportunity shifts, and the Fama-French Three-Factor model empirically captures investment opportunity shifts by means of a value and a size factor.

In a steady state, climate cannot be considered a determinant of changes in investment opportunities. Particular weather realizations affect asset return realizations through standard channels but do not affect future investment opportunities. The nature of a transition period between climate states arising on account of global warming, however, is that potential changes in climate are both uncertain and persistent. Since climate strongly affects production and investment opportunities (see for instance Choinière and Horowitz, 2006), the climate changes associated with global warming would be key determinants of fluctuations in investment opportunities, and should be priced in the context of the Merton model, or as a productivity shock in the context of Balvers and Huang (2007).

We postulate that climate changes represent a priced Merton factor and check empirically if the implications of this view are confirmed by the data. The following hypotheses derive more or less directly from this postulate and will be the target of our empirical analysis in following sections.

HYPOTHESIS 1. *The global warming factor has a significant and negative risk premium.*

If the risk factor is priced, it should have a statistically and economically significant risk premium. Assets with returns that increase with global warming shocks (positive loadings on the global warming factor) constitute a *hedge* against adverse shocks to investment opportunities, thus requiring lower average returns. Since the presumption is that most firms are negatively affected by increased warming (the factor loadings on the global warming factor are generally negative), most assets enhance global warming risk rather than hedge against it. The risk premium must be negative to ensure that riskier assets have higher average returns – a decrease in future investment opportunities is added on top of the initial negative weather shock; and firms whose investment opportunities are affected more are accordingly riskier.⁶

The awareness of the possibility of global warming has increased over the last several decades and this can be taken to imply that changes in weather patterns may be increasingly thought as attributable to global warming and thus more persistent, implying a larger risk premium.

⁶ There is no real significance to the negative sign of the risk premium. If we defined weather shocks with the opposite sign (as an unexpected decrease in temperature), the loadings would be usually positive, and the risk premium would be positive, leading to equivalent cost of capital implications.

HYPOTHESIS 2. *The impact of the global warming factor on the average cost of capital increases over the global warming period starting in 1976.*

We here take as the start of global warming the year 1976 as claimed by IPCC (2007).

One issue with global warming, potentially contributing to its surrounding controversy, is that it may have an uneven impact. In particular, some industries (see IPCC, 2007 and Quiggin and Horowitz, 2003) are more vulnerable: *agriculture and forestry, transportation, retail, commercial services, tourism, insurance, those industries dependent on climate-sensitive inputs (such as food processing), and industries with long-lived capital assets.* If global warming is truly a risk factor, the industries that are more sensitive to climate changes should have higher loadings on the global warming factor and, accordingly, higher required returns and costs of capital.

HYPOTHESIS 3. *The industries that are considered to be more vulnerable to global warming have higher loadings on the global warming factor.*

To address these three hypotheses with some accuracy we ask a rather narrower question than the question of whether global warming affects the cost of capital. For reasons of implementation we ask: *How does news about changes in average U.S. temperatures over the period classified by IPCC as the “global warming period” affect the cost of capital for U.S. equities?* Our belief is that by focusing on a case for which we have accurate data and a clearly defined set of questions, we can begin to obtain insights and ideas that are more generally applicable to the global case.

As an implication, contingent on confirmation of the above hypotheses, we can formulate a measure for the losses stemming from gradual climate change's effect on the cost of equity capital.

PROPOSITION. (A) *The aggregate change in the cost of equity capital due to the global warming factor equals the value-weighted average global warming beta times the global warming risk premium.* (B) *The aggregate losses in average shareholder value can be approximated by the average change in the cost of equity capital times the average price-dividend ratio.*

Part (B) of the proposition follows from a Gordon growth model approximation for equity value and by differentiating with respect to the cost of capital.

3. Data

IPCC (2007) points out that global warming seems to have been taking place in two distinct phases, the first between 1910 and 1945, and the second from 1976. The decrease in the global temperature between 1945 and 1976 may be due to substantial sulphur emissions and changed sunspot activity in this period. Therefore, the post-WWII period offers two distinct periods to examine, the pre-warming of 1946 to 1975 and the global warming of 1976 through 2011. We omit the *pre-1946* period, avoiding the Great Depression and world war periods, to obtain more reliable estimates of the risk premium of global warming.

In terms of location, we limit ourselves to the United States. Whereas global warming is by definition a world-wide phenomenon, there are complicated distribution

issues that we are not prepared to address. Additionally, the required weather and financial-market data are available for the U.S. and are uniformly accurate – in particular, climate measures, macro and risk factor data, and industry-specific equity portfolio returns. The portfolio returns and Fama-French factor data are from Kenneth French’s website.⁷ The macro variables data are from the Federal Reserve Bank St. Louis. The temperature time series is the US average temperature series obtained from the National Climatic Data Center.

4. Economic Tracking Portfolios: A Non-Structural Approach

Asset returns are driven by changing information, “news”, about future cash flows and discount rates. What matters for our purposes is the news concerning future global warming contained in the current observation. We could use a structural model to estimate the news concerning future global warming (and will do so in a later section to check robustness). But doing so results in a joint test of the validity of the model for what constitutes news and the validity of our hypothesis that global warming matters for financial markets. To circumvent this issue, we use the economic tracking portfolio approach proposed by Breeden, Gibbons, and Litzenberger (1989) and Lamont (2001), and previously applied by Vassalou (2003) and Kapadia (2011). Importantly, this statistical approach allows us to estimate the risk premium of global warming without imposing a particular model of asset pricing.

4.1. A Statistical Model of Climate News

⁷ <http://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/>.

For measurement purposes we equate climate change and global warming with a change in average temperatures. The extant temperature modeling literature (see IPCC, 2007) often uses structural atmospheric models. As Campbell and Diebold (2005) point out however, although such an approach may be best for modeling and forecasting for a short horizon, it is not at all obvious that it is best for longer horizons. Successful modeling and forecasting does not necessarily require a structural model, and in the last several decades statisticians and econometricians have made great strides in the nonstructural modeling and forecasting of time series trend, seasonal, cyclical, and noise components.

We therefore follow Campbell and Diebold (2005) and take a simple time series approach to modeling and forecasting temperature.⁸ Our time-series model is the daily temperature model of Campbell and Diebold (2005) amended to deal with monthly observations. We include a linear time trend and 11 monthly seasonal dummies for our monthly temperature data. That is,

$$T_t = C + A \cdot trend_t + \sum_{i=1}^{11} S_i \cdot seasonal_i + error_t , \quad (1a)$$

with T_t representing the average temperature in month t , and $error_t$ representing the effects of all other variables. Defining $CT_{t+12} = \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{12} T_{t+i}$ as the average temperature over the next year, we have

$$CT_{t+12} = c + a \cdot trend_t + e_{t+12} , \quad (1b)$$

⁸ See also Harvey (1989), Seater (1993), and Visser and Molenaar (1995).

where $c = C + \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{12} iA + \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{11} S_i$, $a = A$, and $e_{t+12} = \frac{1}{12} \sum_{i=1}^{12} error_{t+i}$, captures the effects of

all other variables between $t+1$ and $t+12$. Therefore,

$$E_{t-1}(CT_{t+12}) = c + a \cdot trend_t + E_{t-1}(e_{t+12}) . \quad (1c)$$

Now define $\Delta E_t(CT_{t+12}) = E_t(CT_{t+12}) - E_{t-1}(CT_{t+12})$ as the news component in the temperature observation in month t . Then we have the tautology

$$CT_{t+12} \equiv E_{t-1}(CT_{t+12}) + \Delta E_t(CT_{t+12}) + \omega_{t+12}, \quad (2)$$

which decomposes the annual temperature at the end of the following year in a previously expected component, a news component, and noise, with noise $\omega_{t+12} \equiv e_{t+12} - E_t(e_{t+12})$.

4.2. An Economic Tracking Portfolio for Climate Change

If global warming matters for asset pricing, innovations in excess returns of base assets reflect innovations in expectations about future global warming. That is,

$$\Delta E_t(CT_{t+12}) = b\tilde{R}_t + \eta_t , \quad (3)$$

where \tilde{R}_t represents a column vector of unexpected returns $\tilde{R}_t = R_t - E_{t-1}(R_t)$, with R_t a column vector of excess returns of base assets in month t , and η_t the component of news that is orthogonal to the unexpected returns of the base assets.

Assume that the base asset return in month t is a linear function of Z_{t-1} , a vector of conditioning economic variables known at period $t-1$, and that e_{t+12} is a linear function of Z_{t-1} , and Z'_{t-1} a vector of conditioning climate variables known at period $t-1$. That is, $E_{t-1}(R_t) = d \cdot Z_{t-1}$ and $E_{t-1}(e_{t+12}) = f \cdot Z_{t-1} + g \cdot Z'_{t-1}$. Then we have from equations (1b), (2), and (3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
CT_{t+12} &= E_{t-1}(CT_{t+12}) + \Delta E_t(CT_{t+12}) + \omega_{t+12} \\
&= c + a \cdot trend_t + fZ_{t-1} + gZ'_{t-1} + b(R_t - dZ_{t-1}) + \eta_t + \omega_{t+12}.
\end{aligned}$$

This provides the *Primary Specification*:

$$CT_{t+12} = c + a \cdot trend_t + gZ'_{t-1} + bR_t + eZ_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{t+12}, \quad (4)$$

with $e = -bd + f$, and $\varepsilon_{t+12} = \eta_t + \omega_{t+12}$.

Here CT_{t+12} represents the average annual temperature from t+1 to t+12; the vector $R_t = (SL_t, SM_t, SH_t, BL_t, BM_t, BH_t)'$ represents excess returns: the Fama-French size-BM portfolios net of the one-month T-Bill rate; Vector $Z_{t-1} = (RF_{t-1}, DEF_{t-1}, TERM_{t-1})'$, represents respectively, the lagged one-month T-Bill rate, the lagged default risk premium, and the lagged term premium; Z'_{t-1} here is the lagged average temperature from t-12 to t-1. The global warming factor is the tracking portfolio return $GWF_t = bR_t$.

Tracking portfolio returns are defined here as the “factor mimicking” portfolios of excess returns bR_t . The OLS regression given by equation (4) can be used to estimate the portfolio weights b so as to obtain bR_t . The tracking portfolio returns of changes in expectations about global warming, the global warming factor, is thus $GWF_t = bR_t$.

The unconditional mean of the tracking portfolio returns $bE(R_t)$ represents the factor risk premium (see Lamont, 2001, Vassalou, 2003, and Kapadia, 2011); in our application the factor risk premium of the global warming factor. The intuition is that the estimated coefficients b represent the base asset loadings on the temperature news. The portfolio with weights b on the base assets has a mean excess return $bE(R_t)$ that reflects the risk due to temperature news and can be interpreted as the risk premium on the global warming factor. If global warming is economically important, the risk premium

associated with global warming should be significantly different from zero. Furthermore, if climate-change impacts are generally adverse (losses due to extreme events and/or higher adjustment costs), we expect to see a negative premium: because the loadings on the global-warming factor should be normally negative and to compensate for the additional risk the equilibrium return should be higher, which, with negative loadings, can only be achieved by a negative risk premium.

We focus on news concerning next year's cumulative average temperatures (CT_{t+12}). The implicit assumption is that asset returns are affected by news regarding global warming over the upcoming one-year period. This is a reasonable simplifying assumption because, even if asset returns are affected by global warming news over a longer horizon, we would expect that much of this news pertains also to next year's global warming. In our primary specification we largely follow Vassalou (2003) and use the six Fama-French size/book-to-market portfolios as the base assets.⁹ To obtain the conditioning variables – the Z_{t-1} in equation (4) – we again follow Vassalou (2003) and use macro variables which are known to predict equity returns. They are the risk-free rate (RF), the term premium (TERM), and the default premium (DEF). We use the lagged average temperature over the past one year as the single climate control variable in Z'_{t-1} .

⁹ Although Vassalou (2003) also includes the term premium and the default premium as her base assets in R , we do not do so for two reasons. First, with our monthly data we find strong first-order autocorrelation in these two time series. As a result, including them as base assets introduces strong multicollinearity into Eq. (4). Note that the one-month lagged term and default premium are used as the conditioning variables in Z . The resulting tracking portfolio is dominated by time-series variation in the default premium, and has little value for tracking the variation in temperature. The results are available upon request. Second, in theory, we want to extract the news about future global warming that the stock market perceives and then estimate the risk premium on stocks. Therefore, the bond portfolio returns are not necessary as base assets. They are still useful as conditioning variables because the literature shows that they can predict equity returns (see Fama and French, 1988).

4.3. Tracking Portfolio Properties

The primary specification in Table 1 presents the construction and diagnostic tests of the global warming factor mimicking tracking portfolios based on equations (4) with the six Fama-French size-BM portfolios as the base assets and the macro variables used also by Vassalou (2003) as conditioning variables. The t-ratios are based on Newey-West HAC standard errors with the lag parameter set equal to 12.

The results are for the IPCC global warming period 1976:1-2010:12 (note that we lose the 2011 period as we need it for the final sample point of CT_{t+12}). The coefficient estimates in Panel A indicate that SL and SH have significant tracking ability for future global warming. This seems to be reasonable because small companies are generally more sensitive to global warming or any other risk. Growth firms may potentially benefit from global warming as they do not have their capital in place yet (SL coefficient > 0). Value firms face adjustment costs, as argued by Quiggin and Horowitz (2003), since their capital is already in place (SH coefficient < 0). In the next panel, the chi-square test rejects the hypothesis that the coefficients on the base assets are jointly zero at the 5% level, indicating that the base assets have significant tracking ability.

Panel B provides the mean of the tracking portfolio return, which is -0.02 percent with t-statistic of -4.13 for the 1976:1-2010:12 period. This provides direct support for Hypothesis 1, that the risk premium on global warming is significantly negative. Note that the result is not dependent on the choice of a particular asset pricing model. Figure 1

shows raw average temperatures and the derived global warming factor series (the tracking portfolio returns) from 1976 through 2010.¹⁰

If global warming does not occur in the period before 1976, temperatures for this period ought to be irrelevant to asset pricing – mean asset returns are not driven by temperature news – and the tracking portfolio will have little power to predict future temperature. To test this conjecture, we repeat the above exercise for the IPCC pre-warming period of 1946 to 1975. The results are reported in Table 1 in the columns labeled “1946:1-1975:12”. The tracking portfolio for this period has some ability to track future temperature (but significantly less than for the global warming period). However, the risk premium for this period is an insignificant -0.006 percent as anticipated.

4.4 Alternative Specifications

We consider three alternative approaches to constructing the global warming factor in order to evaluate the robustness of our results. First, we apply the more recent approach of Kapedia (2011) instead of Vassalou (2003) for choosing the basis assets and conditioning variables used in the tracking portfolio approach.

Alternative Specification 1

$$CT_{t+12} = c + a \cdot trend_t + gZ'_{t-1} + bR_t + eZ_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{t+12} \quad (4a)$$

CT_{t+12} represents the average annual temperature from $t+1$ to $t+12$; $R_t = (MKT_t, SMB_t, HHL_t, LCMLG, LGMRF)'$ represents the three returns of the Fama-French factors and the excess return of long term corporate bonds over long-term government bonds as well

¹⁰ The results are robust to the somewhat arbitrary choice of conditioning variables. The results presented are for the conditioning variables used in Vassalou (2003). However, the global warming risk premium estimate is nearly identical if we use lagged values of the test assets as conditioning variables, or even if we drop the conditioning variables altogether. These results are available from the authors.

as the excess return of long term government bonds over the risk free rate; $Z_{t-1} = (RF_{t-1}, DEF_{t-1}, TERM_{t-1})'$, represents respectively, the lagged one-month T-Bill rate, the lagged default risk premium, and the lagged term premium; Z'_{t-1} is the lagged average temperature from t-12 to t-1. The global warming factor is the tracking portfolio return $GWF_t = bR_t$.

Second, we avoid the specifics of the climate trend model of Campbell and Diebold (2005) by assuming instead a stochastic trend model of temperature with unknown drift term to identify the tracking portfolio.

Alternative Specification 2

Estimate the following model over the entire sample:

$$CTGRTH_{t+12} = c + gZ'_{t-1} + bR_t + eZ_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{t+12}, \quad (4b)$$

where $CTGRTH_{t+12} = 100 \log(CT_{t+1, t+12}/CT_{t-11, t})$, the log difference in the average annual temperature. As in the benchmark specification $R_t = (SL_t, SM_t, SH_t, BL_t, BM_t, BH_t)'$ represents excess returns: the Fama-French size-BM portfolios net of the one-month T-Bill rate; and $Z_{t-1} = (RF_{t-1}, DEF_{t-1}, TERM_{t-1})'$, represents respectively, the lagged one-month T-Bill rate, the lagged default risk premium, and the lagged term premium; Z'_{t-1} is the lagged growth rate in the average temperature. The global warming factor is the tracking portfolio return $GWF_t = bR_t$.

Third, we avoid the tracking portfolio approach altogether in favor of the two-pass approach with specific risk corrections based on the CAPM and the Fama-French three-factor model, using raw temperature changes as the global warming factor.

Alternative Specification 3

Estimate the following model with the 10 years of data preceding a particular month, say January 1960:

$$T_t = C + A \cdot trend_t + \sum_{i=1}^{11} S_i \cdot seasonal_i + \sum_{i=1}^n L_i T_{t-i} + e_t \quad (4c)$$

where T_t represents the monthly temperature, and the lag length is selected by the Schwartz-Bayes Criterion. Then, calculate the expected temperature in January 1960 based on the estimated parameters. The global warming factor is the unexpected change in the monthly temperature, $GWF_t = e_t$.

The specifics of the tracking portfolios generated by the first and second robustness approaches (ALT1 and ALT2) are in Table 1 (the third approach does not use a tracking portfolio). Panel B in this table illustrates that the mean tracking portfolio return continues to be significantly negative even for the alternative set of basis assets and the different trend specification for temperatures.

5. Standard Asset Pricing Models: Structural Approaches

The tracking portfolio approach of Lamont (2001) in Section 4 estimates the risk premium of the global warming factor without specifying an equilibrium asset pricing model. In this section, we supplement these results by estimating the risk premium of global warming within a multi-factor model. This approach enables us to identify the aggregate quantitative impact on the cost of capital and how the impact changes over time, to address Hypothesis 2, and to obtain the sensitivities to the global warming factor of particular industries, to address Hypothesis 3.

5.1. The Empirical Model

For our asset pricing specifications we take the Fama-French (1996) three-factor model and the Sharpe-Lintner CAPM. These are the most common systematic risk models. Both can be viewed as special cases of the Merton (1973) model. The global warming factor is added to these specifications as an additional factor (the only such factor in the CAPM case) affecting investment opportunities over time.

If climate-change impacts are adverse we expect to find negative loadings for typical firms or portfolios and a negative risk premium (to compensate for the additional risk the equilibrium return should be higher; with negative loadings this can only be achieved with a negative risk premium). The impact of global warming on the average cost of capital can naturally be measured by the product of the premium and the average loading of assets on the global-warming factor.

We use the Black, Jensen, and Scholes (1972) and Fama and MacBeth (1973) two-pass methodology – estimating factor sensitivities in the first pass, and using these to obtain risk premia in the second pass – with standard refinements: the Shanken (1992) correction to obtain errors-in-variables-robust standard errors, accounting for the fact that factor sensitivities are estimated, and the Shanken and Zhou (2007) correction to generate misspecification-robust standard errors.¹¹

Lewellen, Nagel and Shanken (2009) argue that using as test assets only size–BM portfolios, as is common in the literature, can be highly misleading due to the strong factor structure of these portfolios. They propose to expand the set of test assets to include other portfolios, such as industry portfolios. Including industry portfolios also is particularly attractive for our research since the global warming literature has predictions for how different industries should be affected. Lewellen, Nagel and Shanken (2009)

¹¹ See also Kim (1995) and Jagannathan and Wang (1998).

further argue, since the problems are exacerbated by the fact that empirical tests often ignore restrictions on the cross-sectional slopes, that researchers take the predicted magnitudes of the slopes seriously. For example, the risk premium on a factor portfolio should be close to its average excess return.

We take their advice and use 55 size-BM and industry portfolios (25 size-BM portfolios and 30 industry portfolios) instead of just 25 size-BM portfolios.

5.2. Further Empirical Results

Since global warming represents a new systematic risk, adversely affecting investment opportunities in the economy, we expect to see that the global-warming factor is priced and that its premium is negative in the 1976 to 2010 period. The results are reported in Table 2. The first-pass results for each of the four models: CAPM, Fama-French model, the CAPM plus the global warming factor, and the Fama-French model plus the global warming factor are similar. In each case the GRS test rejects the model, although least clearly for the CAPM plus global warming. The second-pass results reveal that the risk premium for the global warming factor is significantly negative as predicted. The model has a higher average cross-sectional R-square than the Fama-French model in the Fama-MacBeth regressions. The premium estimate of -0.01 is in the ballpark of its mean value reported in Table 1 which is -0.02. We confirm Hypothesis 1.

Table 3 shows that the alternative specifications perform similarly as the primary specification: the global warming risk premium is significantly negative, although only

marginally so for ALT3.¹² The table also shows the total value-weighted impact for each of the CAPM plus global warming specifications (the risk premium times the average global warming loading) is economically significant and with the same order of magnitudes. They are a weighted average annual 0.11 percent increase in the cost of capital from global warming in the Primary specification, and 0.14 percent for ALT1, 0.22 percent for ALT2, and 0.20 percent for ALT3.

5.3. Time Path of the Impact

To obtain more information about the *path* of the global warming risk premium over time, we repeat the above exercise with a rolling sample. The risk premium at each time is estimated with 30 years of data to obtain meaningful estimates. Our earliest observation for the term premium is 1953. Consequently the test period starts in 1983. We update estimates monthly by dropping the earliest observation and adding the latest observation.

We want to see if Hypothesis 2 can be confirmed by examining whether the impact of global warming has increased from an early part of the test period to a later part. Table 4 shows the average impact over two evenly divided sub-periods: 1983-1996 and 1997-2010. To properly evaluate the significance of the difference in impact in the two periods we use the approach of Cooper, Gutierrez, and Hameed (2004) which provides appropriate standard errors in this case where we use the rolling 30-year sample.

In the primary specification the average global warming impact in period 1983-1996 is a significantly positive 0.05 percent. The impact in the period 1997-2010 is also

¹² The second-pass results in Tables 2 and 3 are based on OLS. The GLS results are available from the authors. They are different only in that (1) the R-squares are lower; (2) the significance of the risk premia, for global warming in particular, is higher.

significantly positive, but much larger at 0.24 percent. The difference is clearly significantly positive. The results for the three alternative specifications are qualitatively identical, also showing significant impact in both periods that is substantially larger in the second period.

The significant difference for the 2 intervals nominally confirms Hypothesis 2. However, a closer look at the time path of the impacts over time illustrates that the issues are not as simple as hypothesized. The specific time paths of the impact are displayed in Figure 2 and are quite consistent for the various specifications. The evidence further confirms that global warming matters for asset pricing and that its impact is significantly positive and, until recently, growing over time as is consistent with Hypotheses 1 and 2. However, the impact estimate appears to decrease after 2004, which is not consistent with Hypothesis 2. The possible reasons, other than a true abatement in the risk of global warming, are as follows: (1) Sampling error. While temperature shocks indeed have been mostly negative since 2004, the period from 2004 is simply too short to reveal reliable trends. (2) The uncertainty about the extent and the importance of global warming has been decreasing, and/or the ability of firms to handle global warming threats has improved as trading in weather derivatives has taken off dramatically in the early 21st century .

6. Global Warming and the Cost of Capital

6.1. Estimation

To estimate the impact of climate change on the cost of capital, we report the factor loadings in Table 5 for the 1976 to 2010 sample period. The significant factor

loadings (at the 10% level for two-sided tests) are in bold. We discuss the industry portfolio factor loadings to gauge the support for Hypothesis 3.

The literature (see IPCC, 2007, Working Group II Report *Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*, Chapter 7, and Quiggin and Horowitz, 2003) suggests that the most vulnerable industries are Agriculture and Forestry, Transportation, Retail, Commercial Services, Tourism, Insurance, those industries dependent on climate-sensitive inputs (such as Food Processing), and industries with long-lived capital assets. The results in Table 5 seem generally consistent with this classification, confirming Hypothesis 3.¹³ For the size- and value-sorted portfolios it is clear that (1) value firms, which tend to have long-lived capital assets, are far more sensitive to the global warming factor than growth firms, as follows by examining the difference between S_iB5-S_iB1 for all size classes i , and (2) small firms are more sensitive to the global warming factor than larger firms, as follows by the difference $S1Bj-S5Bj$ for all value classes j . In all, 20 out of 30 industry portfolios have statistically significant negative loadings on the global-warming factor. They include Meals, Finance, Transportation, Autos, Retail, and Construction.

The loadings on the global-warming factor are positive for five of the industries only with three of those significant: the Business Equipment, Services and Health industries. Oil and Telecommunications are positive also. The utility industry has a small demand elasticity, and therefore may provide a good hedge against negative supply shocks. The telecommunications and health industries appear also to have small demand

¹³ We only present the loadings on the global warming factor for the primary specification. The loadings for alternative specifications 1 and 2 are very similar, having correlation of 94 percent and 96 percent, respectively, with the loadings for the primary specification. For alternative specification 3 the loadings have lower, but still positive, correlation with those of the primary specification of 29 percent.

elasticities. Services have few long-lived capital assets. Business Equipment benefits from adjustment due to global warming as this increases demand for their product.

The economy-wide average impact on the cost of capital is obtained by multiplying the global warming risk premium by the weighted average loading on this factor. As was shown in Table 3 this produces an average impact of 0.11 percent per year. A convenient means of capitalizing the annual impact to account for the present value costs of global warming is to use the Gordon growth model approximation arising when we equate asset prices with the expected net present value of future dividends, and proxy the latter by setting the dynamic paths of dividends, dividend growth, and costs of capital equal to their averages. Aggregate stock market values can then be expressed as $P = D/(R - G)$, in which P is the current stock market price index, D the end-of-period expected dividends (considered a constant proportion of GDP), G the average anticipated growth rate of dividends, and R is the average cost of capital.

6.2. Implications

We then draw the following conclusions based on the existing literature and our own results:

(1) The estimated cost of global warming in terms of *permanent* future decreases in GDP, as emphasized by previous literature, vary from around 0.2% to 1.0% (Stern, 2007) and below 1% (IPCC, 2007) to 2.0% to 3.5% per 1 degree Celsius increase in temperature (Choinière and Horowitz, 2006) and a maximum of 3.75% (Heal and Kriström, 2002). Even though these estimates deal with permanent changes in GDP the *present value* of the cost, assuming that dividends remain a constant proportion of GDP

and even if the changes occur without delay, is simply the equivalent percent change in stock market value: the Gordon growth equation implies that $\% \Delta P = \% \Delta D$.

(2) Henry (2003) finds an approximate one-to-one relationship between the cost of capital and GDP *growth*. This is consistent with the Gordon growth perspective in which the impact of a change in the cost of capital is equivalent to the impact of an opposite change in the growth rate of dividends or output: $\% \Delta P / \Delta R = -\% \Delta P / \Delta G$. Accordingly, the stock market wealth impact of our 0.11 percent increase in the cost of capital is equivalent to that of a 0.11 percent reduction in the growth rate of dividends or output. Since the IPCC cost of limiting the long-term temperature rise is a 0.12 percent reduction in annual GDP growth, the impact of global warming on the cost of capital alone is of similar magnitude as the total policy cost, which allows room to contemplate more aggressive climate-change mitigation policies.

(3) The Gordon growth approximation also implies that $\% \Delta P = -(P/D)\Delta R$. If we set P/D (the price-dividend ratio) equal to 38, which is its average value over the global warming period, since 1976 (see Robert Shiller's website) then the present value of the cost of global warming is $38 \times 0.11\% = 4.18\%$. This negative impact in isolation is of similar magnitude as the 4.56 percent cost of reducing global warming based on the IPCC estimate.

6.3. Perspectives

To put our estimate of a 4.18 percent loss due to global warming in the perspective of previous estimates, consider the following:

First, the literature has considered mainly the specific present value costs of permanent future losses in GDP due to abrupt climate change, and, more recently, the costs of losses in GDP related to extreme weather due to gradual climate changes. However, the uncertainty about temperatures, extreme weather, and associated regulation adds substantially to the overall costs and shows up in the higher cost of capital which previous studies have ignored in this context. Thus our result amounts to adding an additional present value cost of global warming of larger magnitude to previously identified costs.

Second, our estimate of a 4.18% loss presumes that the change in the cost of capital is permanent. Our rolling regression results for the risk premium show how dangerous this assumption is – clearly the risk premium changes substantially over time and has decreased in recent years. However, we have taken conservatively the *average* risk premium since the start of the global warming period. While it is certainly possible that the cost of capital attributable to global warming may continue to decrease over time, it may also increase over time, and there is no reason to assume that uncertainty about climate change is diminishing in the near future.

Third, an approximate confidence interval of two standard deviations around our annual impact estimate would be an annualized 1.27%, at the upper bound an annualized 6.93%. Thus, estimation uncertainty is substantial.

Fourth, it is not clear how representative the United States stock market values are of the world. Developed economies experience higher losses due to the adjustment costs of capital and so the costs for the United States may overestimate those for the world. A further implicit assumption is that the stock market losses are representative for losses in

the overall economy. It is possible for instance that certain sectors of the economy are over or under represented in the stock market or that there are distribution effects within a sector. For instance, farmers may suffer from global warming but this need not lower profit margins in the food industry.

Fifth, our estimates do not take into consideration time variation in the sensitivities to the global warming factor. Industries with larger increases in the cost of capital may shrink over time as investment in these industry falls, causing the value-weighted loadings to move closer to zero. On the other hand, such reduction in investment lowers growth, an indirect effect that we have not yet incorporated in the cost calculation.

Sixth, the total present value loss of 4.18% is based on the standard discounting paradigm. Other social discounting perspectives, such as zero discounting or Dietz and Asheim's (2012) sustainable discounting, would typically generate a larger loss and motivate stronger abatement efforts.

6.4. Uncertainty about regulation

One potential explanation for the sensitivity of particular industries to our global warming measure is that the global warming indicator has little intrinsic economic importance (either because it is a statistical illusion, has only minor economic impact, or is too remote to affect current present values) but that markets fear the political pressures arising from common perceptions of a global warming threat that may lead to untoward regulation hurting business profits. This "untoward regulation" line of reasoning implies that those industries which are most vulnerable to regulation designed to reduce global

warming would be the most sensitive to the global warming factor. A prospective regulatory impact generally entails rationing or taxation of carbon-dioxide emissions. Hence the prediction is that industries that are the most sensitive to the global warming factor are those industries that have the highest share of carbon dioxide emissions.

Schipper (2006, pp. 17-19) provides data on carbon-dioxide emissions in U.S. manufacturing. Manufacturing accounts for around 84 percent of energy-related carbon dioxide emissions. The Petroleum (Oil), Chemicals, and Primary Metals (mostly Steel) industries have the highest carbon dioxide emissions, together generating more than half of these emissions. However, as is apparent from Table 5 *these industries have less than average negative sensitivities to the global warming factor*. Furthermore, many of the industries in Table 5 with strong negative exposures to the global warming factor are non-manufacturing industries such as Finance, Games, Retail, and Meals, with obviously low carbon-dioxide emissions. These observations do not support the “untoward regulation” explanation.

7. Conclusion

The severity of impact and even the existence of global warming are heavily debated. On one end of the debate are the “environmentalists” who care deeply about the negative long-run impact of climate change and may be tempted to under appreciate the economic sacrifices required to combat global warming; on the other end are the “industrialists” who may be owners of capital and overly occupied with the costs necessary to implement policies of fighting global warming. The controversy makes it difficult to obtain an unbiased measure of even the perceived costs of global warming.

Financial markets may be helpful in uncovering true perceptions. When investing in financial assets, individuals – irrespective of their background or political convictions – have an incentive not to “put their money where their mouth is” but to put their money where their mind is. Asset prices provide objective measures of perceived value. We attempt to exploit the information embedded in asset price reactions to news about global warming to infer an objective measure of perceived costs of global warming.

We focus on gradual temperature change, which is motivated by the recent emphasis of Stern (2007) and IPCC (2007) on the ongoing costs of extreme weather events that stem from gradual warming.¹⁴ Our approach ties into the gradual warming perspective and stresses the higher cost of capital that arises from uncertainty about the extent of gradual warming and the increasing prevalence of extreme weather events. The costs of global warming that we derive, therefore, are a complement to the costs found in the earlier work and should be added to previous cost estimates to obtain a more comprehensive cost total.

While we may draw inferences about the broad question of what financial markets in general can tell us about global warming, we obtain a more reliable answer to a narrower question: how do US equity markets react to news about average US temperatures? If we work in the context of (i) the Merton (1973) asset pricing model and (ii) presume that the IPCC (2007) is justified in marking the post-1976 period as one of global warming, then we hypothesize that a significant risk premium exists on a global warming factor, which is rising in the post-1976 period, and that loadings at the industry

¹⁴ In analogy to the terminology used in evolutionary biology distinguishing between the standard gradual Darwinian perspective and Gould’s punctuated equilibrium theory of abrupt evolutionary changes, we may refer to the distinction here as global warming by “creeps” and global warming by “jerks”.

level on this factor are generally negative and more so for industries that are considered to be more sensitive to global warming.

On the whole we are able to confirm the hypotheses and infer, taking the average risk premium for the post-1976 period, that the average cost of capital is 0.11 percentage points higher on an annual basis due to global warming. Thus, markets expect that due to the uncertainty, the costs of adjustment, and the increased incidence of extreme-weather events, each caused by global warming, potential projects will on average have a 0.11 percentage point lower return. The implied costs of global warming amount to a point estimate of a 4.18 percent loss in value – larger than, and adding to, most previous estimates.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank seminar participants at the University of Canterbury, Monash University, the Financial Management Association meetings, and Glenn Boyle, Eric Crampton, Mike Dempsey, Robert Faff, John Fountain, Philip Gharghori, Seamus Hogan, Petko Kalev, and Ed Maberly for helpful comments.

References

- Balvers, R. J., and D. Huang, 2007, Productivity-Based Asset Pricing: Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Financial Economics* 86, 2007, 405-445.
- Barreca, A. I., 2012, Climate Change, Humidity, and Mortality in the United States, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 63, 19-34.
- Black, F., M. C. Jensen, and M. Scholes, 1972, The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Some Empirical Findings; in Michael C. Jensen, ed.: (Praeger, New York). *Studies in the Theory of Capital Markets*
- Breeden, D. T., M. R. Gibbons, and R. H. Litzenberger, 1989, Empirical Test of the Consumption-Oriented CAPM, *Journal of Finance* 44, 231-262.
- Brunner, A. D., 2002, El Niño and World Primary Commodity Prices: Warm Water or Hot Air? *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84, 176-183.
- Campbell, Sean D; Diebold, Francis X, 2005, Weather Forecasting for Weather Derivatives, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 100, 6-16
- Choinière, C. J. and J. K. Horowitz, 2006, A Production Function Approach to the GDP-Temperature Relationship, working paper, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Maryland, Maryland.
- Cline, W.R., 1992. *The Economics of Global Warming*. Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC.
- Cooper, M. J., R. C. Gutierrez, and A. Hameed, 2004, "Market States and Momentum," *Journal of Finance*, 59, 1345-1365.
- Dietz, S. and G. B. Asheim, 2012, Climate Policy under Sustainable Discounted Utilitarianism, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 63, 321-335.
- Fama, E. F., and J. D. MacBeth, 1973, Risk, Return and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests, *Journal of Political Economy* 81, 607-636.
- Fama, E. F., and K. French, 1988, Dividend Yields and Expected Stock Returns, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22, 3-25.
- Fama, E. F., and K. French, 1996, Multifactor Explanations of Asset Pricing Anomalies, *Journal of Finance* 51, 55-84.
- Fankhauser, S., 1995. *Valuing Climate Change*. The Economics of the Greenhouse. Earthscan, London.
- Fankhauser, S. and R. S. J. Tol, 2005, On Climate Change and Economic Growth, *Resource and Energy Economics*, 27, 1-17.
- Fleming, J., C. Kirby, and B. Ostdiek, 2006, Information, Trading, and Volatility: Evidence from Weather-Sensitive Markets, *Journal of Finance*, 61, 2899-2930.

- Harvey, A.C., 1989, *Forecasting, Structural Time Series Models and the Kalman Filter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heal, G., and B. Kriström, 2002, Uncertainty and Climate Change, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 22, 3–39.
- Henry, P. B., 2003, Capital-Account Liberalization, the Cost of Capital, and Economic Growth, *American Economic Review* 93, 91-96.
- Hirshleifer, D., and T. Shumway, 2003, Good Day Sunshine: Stock Returns and the Weather, *Journal of Finance* 58, 1009-1032.
- Horowitz, J. 2001, The Income–Temperature Relationship in a Cross-Section of Countries and Its Implications for Global Warming, working paper, University of Maryland, Maryland.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007, The IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, <http://www.ipcc.ch/>.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2012, Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation, <http://www.ipcc.ch/>.
- Jagannathan, R., and Z. Wang, 1998, An Asymptotic Theory for Estimating Beta-Pricing Models Using Cross-Sectional Regression, *Journal of Finance* 53, 1285-1309.
- Kamstra, M. J., L. A. Kramer, and M. D. Levi, 2003, Winter Blues: A SAD Stock Market Cycle, *American Economic Review* 93, 324-343.
- Kapadia, N., 2011, Tracking Down Distress Risk, *Journal of Financial Economics* 102, 167-182.
- Kim, D., 1995, The Errors in the Variables Problem in the Cross-Section of Expected Stock Returns, *Journal of Finance* 50, 1605-1634.
- Lamont, O. A., 2001, Economic Tracking Portfolios, *Journal of Econometrics* 105, 161-184.
- Lettau, M., and S. Ludvigson, 2001, Consumption, Aggregate Wealth, and Expected Stock Returns, *Journal of Finance* 56, 815-849.
- Lewellen, J. W., S. Nagel, and J. A. Shanken, 2009, A Skeptical Appraisal of Asset Pricing Tests, *Journal of Financial Economics*, forthcoming.
- Mendelsohn, R.O., W.N. Morrison, M.E. Schlesinger, and N.G. Andronova, 2000, Country-Specific Market Impacts of Climate Change, *Climatic Change* 45, 553-569.
- Mendelsohn, R.O., Neumann, J.E. (Eds.), 1999. The Impact of Climate Change on the United States Economy. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mendelsohn, R. O., W. D Nordhaus, and D. Shaw, 1994, The Impact of Global Warming on Agriculture: A Ricardian Analysis, *American Economic Review* 84, 753-71.

- Moore, T. G., 1998, Health and Amenity Effects of Global Warming, *Economic Inquiry* 36, 471-88
- Merton, R. C., 1973, An Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model, *Econometrica* 41, 867-887.
- NACC, 2000: Climate Change Impacts on the United States: The Potential Consequences of Climate Variability and Change. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, District of Columbia.
- Nordhaus, W.D., 1991. To Slow or Not to Slow: The Economics of the Greenhouse Effect. *Economic Journal* 101, 920-937.
- Nordhaus, W.D. and J. G. Boyer (2000), *Warming the World: Economic Models of Global Warming*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Nordhaus, W.D., 2006, Geography and Macroeconomics: New Data and New Findings. Inaugural Article, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103, 3510-3517.
- Perron, P., 1997, Further Evidence from Breaking Trend Functions in Macroeconomic Variables, *Journal of Econometrics* 80, 355-385.
- Pindyck, R. S., 2012, Uncertain Outcomes and Climate Change Policy, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 63, 289-303.
- Quiggin, J., and J. Horowitz, 2003, Costs of Adjustment to Climate Change, *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 47, 429-446.
- Roll, R., 1984, Orange Juice and the Weather, *American Economic Review* 74, 861-80.
- Rosenthal, D. H., H. K. Gruenspecht, and E. A. Moran, 1995, Effects of Global Warming on Energy Use for Space Heating and Cooling in the United States, *Energy Journal* 16, 77-96.
- Schipper, M., 2006, Energy-Related Carbon Dioxide Emissions in U.S. Manufacturing, DOE Report EIA-0573 (2005).
- Schlenker, W., W. M. Hanemann, and A. C. Fisher, 2006, The Impact of Global Warming on U.S. Agriculture: An Econometric Analysis of Optimal Growing Conditions, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88, 113-25.
- Seater, J.J. (1993), World Temperature-Trend Uncertainties and Their Implications for Economic Policy, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 11, 265-277.
- Shanken, J., 1992, On the Estimation of Beta-Pricing Models, *Review of Financial Studies* 5, 1-33.
- Shanken, J., and G. Zhou, 2007, Estimating and Testing Beta Pricing Models: Alternative Methods and Their Performance in Simulations, *Journal of Financial Economics* 84, 40-86.
- Stern, N., 2007, *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.

- Tol, R.S.J., 1995. The Damage Costs of Climate Change: Toward More Comprehensive Calculations. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 5, 353–374.
- Tol, R.S.J., 2008, The Economic Impact of Climate Change. Working Paper No. 255, Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, Ireland.
- Vassalou, M., 2003, News Related to Future GDP Growth as a Risk Factor in Equity Returns, *Journal of Financial Economics* 68, 47-73.
- Visser, H. and Molenaar, J., 1995, Trend Estimation and Regression Analysis in Climatological Time Series: An Application of Structural Time Series Models and the Kalman Filter, *Journal of Climate* 8, 969-979.

Figure 1a. Annual Average Raw Temperatures, CT_{t+12}




Figure 1b. Global Warming Tracking Portfolio Returns, bR_t




Figure 1. Descriptive Statistics for Temperatures and the Global Warming Factor. The average raw temperatures over the next one year, are shown in degrees Fahrenheit for $t = 1953:5$ to $2010:12$. Figure 2b displays the global-warming factor series, the global-warming factor mimicking portfolio returns, for $t = 1953:5$ to $2010:12$.




Figure 2. Rolling Impact Estimates of the Global-Warming Factor. The impact is estimated for the entire 1953:5 – 2010:12 sample using 30 years of data for each estimate. Accordingly, the first period starts in 1983:4. We update the estimates each month by dropping the earliest observation and adding the latest observation.

PRIMARY represents our main specification given the base asset and conditioning variables choices of Vassalou (2003); ALT1 represents an alternative specification given the base asset and conditioning variables choices of Kapedia (2011); ALT2 represents our alternative specification with the temperature growth rate as the global warming factor; ALT3 directly uses the temperature surprise as the global warming factor.

Table 1. Tracking Portfolios and Diagnostic Tests

The results for the regression of eq. (4), $CT_{t+12} = c + a \cdot trend_t + gZ'_{t-1} + bR_t + eZ_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{t+12}$, are in Panel A, where CT_{t+12} represents the average annual temperature from t+1 to t+12; $R_t = (SL_t, SM_t, SH_t, BL_t, BM_t, BH_t)'$ and $(MKT_t, SMB_t, HML_t, LCMLG_t, LGMRF_t)'$ represents excess returns: the Fama-French size-BM portfolios net of the one-month T-Bill rate, and the three Fama-French factors, the corporate bond rate minus the long-term government bond rate, and the long-term government bond rate minus the T-Bill rate; $Z_{t-1} = (RF_{t-1}, DEF_{t-1}, TERM_{t-1})'$, represents, respectively, the lagged one-month T-Bill rate, the lagged default risk premium, and the lagged term premium; Z'_{t-1} is the lagged average temperature from t-12 to t-1, CT_{t-12} or the lagged temperature growth rate, $CTGRTH_{t-12}$. Primary represents our main specification given the base asset and conditioning variables choices of Vassalou (2003); ALT1 represents an alternative specification given the base asset and conditioning variables choices of Kapedia (2011); ALT2 represents our alternative specification with the temperature growth rate as the global warming factor. Panel B presents for each specification the average return on the zero-investment portfolio R_t , with the weights given by the coefficient estimates in Panel A.

Panel A. Tracking Portfolio Regressions									
	PRIMARY			ALT1			ALT2		
	Coeff	t-ratio		Coeff	t-ratio		Coeff	t-ratio	
SL _t	0.03	2.02	MKT _t	0.00	0.55	SL _t	0.09	2.80	
SM _t	0.00	-0.09	SMB _t	-0.02	-1.51	SM _t	-0.11	-1.74	
SH _t	-0.04	-2.10	HML _t	-0.03	-2.49	SH _t	-0.02	-0.45	
BL _t	0.00	0.13	LCMLG _t	0.02	1.36	BL _t	-0.02	-0.69	
BM _t	0.01	0.61	LGMRF _t	0.01	0.75	BM _t	0.09	2.12	
BH _t	0.01	0.69				BH _t	-0.03	-0.93	
Constant	43.15	8.83	Constant	43.22	8.94	Constant	-0.06	-0.16	
RF _t	-0.67	-1.45	RF _t	-0.68	-1.46	RF _t	0.68	0.82	
DEF _{t-1}	-0.08	-0.39	DEF _{t-1}	-0.09	-0.41	DEF _{t-1}	-0.17	-0.47	
TERM _{t-1}	-0.15	-1.40	TERM _{t-1}	-0.15	-1.49	TERM _{t-1}	0.02	0.07	
Trend	0.00	4.61	Trend	0.00	4.66	CTGRTH _{t-12}	-0.40	-6.07	
CT _{t-12}	0.17	1.77	CT _{t-12}	0.17	1.77				
Adj-R ²	0.37		Adj-R ²	0.37		Adj-R ²	0.16		
χ ² p-value	0.04		χ ² p-value	0.06		χ ² p-value	0.03		
Panel B. The means of the Tracking Portfolio Returns									
Mean	-0.02	-4.13	Mean	-0.01	-2.56	Mean	-0.06	-5.38	

Table 2. Summary statistics of time-series and cross-sectional regressions for 55 size-BM and industry portfolios: 1953:5 – 2010:12

Panel A summarizes time-series regressions to explain monthly excess returns on 55 size-BM and industry portfolios. Panel A shows the average absolute value of the intercepts ($|\text{Alpha}|$), the average adjusted R^2 (AVG R^2), and the GRS F-test statistic (GRS). Panel B reports the Fama and MacBeth (1973) two-pass OLS regressions with 55 size-BM and industry portfolios as the test assets. γ is the estimated risk premium associated with each factor. t_{EIV} and t_{MIS} are the Shanken (1992) errors-in-variables robust t-ratio and the Shanken and Zhou (2007) misspecification robust t-ratio, respectively. We also report the OLS cross-sectional adjusted R^2 . The three models are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CAPM:} \quad & r_{it} = \alpha_i + m_i \text{MKT}_t + \varepsilon_{it} \\ \text{FF:} \quad & r_{it} = \alpha_i + m_i \text{MKT}_t + s_i \text{SMB}_t + h_i \text{HML}_t + \varepsilon_{it} \\ \text{CAPM+GW:} \quad & r_{it} = \alpha_i + m_i \text{MKT}_t + f_i \text{GWF}_t + \varepsilon_{it} \\ \text{FF+GW:} \quad & r_{it} = \alpha_i + m_i \text{MKT}_t + s_i \text{SMB}_t + h_i \text{HML}_t + f_i \text{GWF}_t + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned}$$

Where r_{it} is the excess return on asset i in period t , and MKT_t is the excess market return, SMB_t is the difference between the returns on diversified portfolios of small stocks and big stocks, HML_t is the difference between the returns on diversified portfolios of high book-to-market (value) stocks and low book-to-market (growth) stocks, and GWF_t is the The tracking portfolio returns of changes in expectations about global warming

Panel A: Time-series regression summary statistics

	$ \text{Alpha} $	AVG R^2	GRS
CAPM	0.19	0.66	3.47*
FF	0.16	0.75	3.07*
CAPM+GWF	0.17	0.69	2.60*
FF+GWF	0.16	0.75	3.07*

Panel B: cross-sectional regression summary statistics

		γ	t_{EIV}	t_{MIS}
CAPM	MKT	-0.08	-0.29	-0.28
	R^2	-0.01		
FF	Constant	0.90	4.05	3.93
	MKT	-0.27	-0.99	-0.97
	SMB	0.13	1.12	1.12
	HML	0.20	1.75	1.74
	R^2	0.20		
CAPM+GWF	Constant	0.72	3.09	3.07
	MKT	-0.09	-0.31	-0.31
	GWF	-0.01	-2.61	-2.58
	R^2	0.25		
FF+GWF	Constant	0.85	3.81	3.66
	MKT	-0.22	-0.78	-0.76
	SMB	0.15	1.30	1.29
	HML	0.20	1.75	1.74
	GWF	-0.01	-2.97	-2.85
	R^2	0.27		

Table 3. Summary statistics of time-series and cross-sectional regressions for 55 size-BM and industry portfolios: 1953:5 – 2010:12

Panel A summarizes time-series regressions to explain monthly excess returns on 55 size-BM and industry portfolios. Panel A shows the average absolute value of the intercepts ($|\text{Alpha}|$), the average adjusted R^2 (AVG R^2), and the GRS F-test statistic (GRS). Panel B reports the Fama and MacBeth (1973) two-pass OLS regressions with 55 size-BM and industry portfolios as the test assets. γ is the estimated risk premium associated with each factor. t_{EIV} and t_{MIS} are the Shanken (1992) errors-in-variables robust t-ratio and the Shanken and Zhou (2007) misspecification robust t-ratio, respectively. We also report the OLS cross-sectional adjusted R^2 . Panel C reports the value-weighted annual Impact (%) estimates for each of the alternative specifications.

Panel A: Time-series regression summary statistics				
		$ \text{Alpha} $	AVG R^2	GRS
ALT1		0.16	0.70	3.04*
ALT2		0.16	0.69	2.77*

Panel B: Cross-sectional regression summary statistics				
		γ	t_{EIV}	t_{MIS}
ALT1	Constant	0.75	3.27	3.25
	MKT	-0.12	-0.43	-0.43
	GWF	-0.01	-2.26	-2.24
	R^2	0.19		
ALT2	Constant	0.64	2.75	2.72
	MKT	0.00	-0.01	-0.01
	GWF	-0.03	-2.35	-2.32
	R^2	0.19		
ALT3	Constant	0.65	2.66	2.55
	MKT	0.04	0.12	0.12
	GWF	-0.77	-1.84	-1.26
	R^2	0.04		

Panel C: Value-weighted annual Impact (%) estimates				
	Primary	ALT1	ALT2	ALT3
Impact	0.11	0.14	0.22	0.20

Table 4 The Impact of the global warming factor in two sub-sample periods

Following Cooper, Gutierrez and Hameed (2004), we estimate the impact of the global warming factor in two sub-sample periods with the following regression:

$$IMPACT_t = i_{83-96}D_{83-96} + i_{97-10}D_{97-10} + e_t$$

where $IMPACT_t$ is the impact in month t estimated based on 30-year rolling samples, D_{83-96} is equal to 1 for the period 1983-1996 and zero otherwise, and D_{97-10} is equal to 1 for 1997-2010 and zero otherwise. The mean impact in 1983-1996 is i_{83-96} , while that in 1997-2010 is i_{97-10} . To test whether the mean impacts are equal, we run the following regression:

$$IMPACT_t = a + i_{Difference}D_{97-10} + e_t$$

The impact difference is $i_{Difference}$. Such regressions, implied by Cooper, Gutierrez and Hameed (2004), can preserve full time-series of impacts and allow researchers to reliably estimate the standard errors. The t-ratios are based on Newey-West HAC standard errors with the lag parameter set equal to 12.

		Primary		ALT 1		ALT 2		ALT 3	
		Coeff	t-ratio	Coeff	t-ratio	Coeff	t-ratio	Coeff	t-ratio
IMPACT	i_{83-96}	0.05	11.96	0.02	2.72	0.10	23.83	0.02	4.20
	i_{97-10}	0.24	6.44	0.18	6.26	0.25	8.47	0.14	5.17
	$i_{Difference}$	0.19	4.97	0.15	5.10	0.15	4.96	0.11	4.23

Table 5. Factor Loadings of the Industry Portfolios: 1953:5 – 2010:12

The factor loadings of the industry portfolios over the sample period 1976-2006 are inferred from:

$$r_{it} = \alpha_i + m_iMKT_t + f_iGWF_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where r_{it} is the excess return on asset i in period t , M_t , GWF_t are the excess returns on the market and the global warming factor. The β 's are the associated factor loadings, and ε_{it} is the disturbance. To save space, we do not report the associated HAC-robust (Newey-West) t-statistics. The significant factor loadings (at the 5% level of significance) are in bold.

	Alpha	MKT	GWF	R ²		Alpha	MKT	GWF	R ²
S1B1	-0.57	1.43	-4.79	0.60	Food	0.22	0.75	-3.63	0.55
S1B2	-0.14	1.30	-12.32	0.65	Beer	0.18	0.81	-5.17	0.45
S1B3	-0.15	1.19	-17.61	0.72	Smoke	0.45	0.72	-5.91	0.25
S1B4	-0.02	1.16	-21.79	0.77	Games	-0.18	1.37	-10.02	0.66
S1B5	-0.11	1.29	-29.36	0.82	Books	-0.18	1.12	-8.56	0.69
S2B1	-0.23	1.33	2.98	0.73	Hshld	0.14	0.85	-1.38	0.59
S2B2	-0.09	1.22	-9.54	0.78	Clths	-0.33	1.19	-14.97	0.63
S2B3	0.01	1.15	-15.39	0.82	Hlth	0.43	0.81	6.15	0.58
S2B4	-0.08	1.16	-20.53	0.86	Chems	-0.12	1.07	-4.75	0.72
S2B5	-0.19	1.32	-28.00	0.87	Txtls	-0.63	1.31	-26.22	0.61
S3B1	-0.07	1.26	4.26	0.79	Cnstr	-0.33	1.26	-12.37	0.80
S3B2	0.00	1.14	-7.84	0.84	Steel	-0.44	1.37	-9.02	0.65
S3B3	-0.03	1.09	-12.89	0.85	FabPr	-0.15	1.24	-5.47	0.79
S3B4	0.00	1.08	-16.92	0.85	ElcEq	0.13	1.22	-1.54	0.73
S3B5	-0.07	1.20	-23.90	0.85	Autos	-0.37	1.21	-13.71	0.59
S4B1	0.10	1.15	6.50	0.86	Carry	-0.03	1.17	-8.40	0.59
S4B2	-0.07	1.10	-4.88	0.88	Mines	-0.06	1.00	-6.70	0.34
S4B3	0.01	1.09	-9.93	0.86	Coal	0.40	1.18	-3.22	0.30
S4B4	0.01	1.06	-13.52	0.84	Oil	0.34	0.79	2.66	0.46
S4B5	-0.15	1.18	-17.99	0.79	Util	0.11	0.58	-3.58	0.39
S5B1	0.11	0.95	6.98	0.90	Telcm	0.15	0.73	2.67	0.53
S5B2	0.05	0.93	0.60	0.87	Servs	0.25	1.20	7.27	0.72
S5B3	0.08	0.88	-1.42	0.79	BusEq	0.23	1.23	7.69	0.70
S5B4	-0.06	0.90	-7.59	0.74	Paper	-0.08	1.01	-5.60	0.71
S5B5	-0.09	0.98	-10.90	0.67	Trans	-0.26	1.15	-10.19	0.69
					Whlsl	-0.12	1.11	-6.73	0.71
					Rtail	0.01	1.01	-4.84	0.66
					Meals	0.01	1.12	-8.26	0.58
					Fin	-0.16	1.10	-7.81	0.77
					Other	-0.22	1.08	-3.05	0.68