JOURNAL OF FINANCIAL AND QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS VOL. 40, NO. 4, DECEMBER 2005
COPYRIGHT 2005, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Volatility Risk Premium Embedded in Currency Options

Buen Sin Low and Shaojun Zhang*

Abstract

This study employs a non-parametric approach to investigate the volatility risk premium in the over-the-counter currency option market. Using a large database of daily delta-neutral straddle quotes in four major currencies—the British pound, the euro, the Japanese yen, and the Swiss franc—we find that volatility risk is priced in all four currencies across different option maturities. We find that the volatility risk premium is negative, with the premium decreasing in maturity. Finally, we also find evidence that jump risk may be priced in the currency option market.

I. Introduction

It is widely documented in the literature that the price volatility of many financial assets follows a stochastic process. This leads to the question of whether volatility risk is priced in financial markets.

Lamoureux and Lastrapes (1993), Coval and Shumway (2001), and Bakshi and Kapadia (2003), among others, present substantial evidence that volatility risk is priced in the equity option market and that the risk premium is negative. However, although foreign currency returns have stochastic volatility (see, e.g., Taylor and Xu (1997)), there is scant evidence on the market price of volatility risk in currency option markets. In this paper, we explore the volatility risk premium in currency options.

Sarwar (2001) studies the historical prices of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange (PHLX) currency options on the U.S. dollar/British pound from 1993 to 1995, and reports that volatility risk is not priced for the currency options in the sample. This finding is in contrast to the overwhelming evidence in support of the existence of a volatility risk premium in the equity options markets. It is also

*Low, abslow@ntu.edu.sg, and Zhang, asjzhang@ntu.edu.sg, Division of Banking and Finance, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798. We thank Phillipe Chen, Robin Grieves, William Lee, Paul Malatesta (the editor), Jun Pan, Yonggan Zhao, and seminar participants at the Nanyang Business School, the 16th Annual Australasian Finance and Banking Conference, and the 2004 China International Conference in Finance for helpful comments and suggestions. We especially thank an anonymous referee for constructive comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors are our own responsibility. We also acknowledge financial support from the Centre for Research in Financial Services at the Nanyang Business School and the Centre for Financial Engineering at the Nanyang Technological University.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inconsistent with other empirical findings in the currency option markets. For example, Melino and Turnbull (1990), (1995) report that stochastic volatility option models, which have a nonzero price of volatility risk, generate less pricing error and better hedging performance for currency options than do constant volatility option models. Furthermore, Black-Scholes implied volatilities for currency options are biased forecasts of actual volatility (see Jorion (1995), Covrig and Low (2003), and Neely (2003)). A possible explanation for the bias is the presence of a volatility risk premium.

Investors are presumably risk averse and dislike volatile states of the world. Within the framework of international asset pricing theory, Dumas and Solnik (1995) and De Santis and Gerard (1998), among others, show that foreign currency securities should compensate investors for bearing currency risk in addition to the traditional risk that arises due to covariance with the market portfolio. Specifically, as the volatility of the currency price is also uncertain, it introduces additional risk that investors have to bear and should be compensated for. Further, assets that lose value when volatility increases, e.g., currency options, are more risky for investors to hold than those that gain value when volatility increases. Hence, while foreign currency securities in the spot market are associated with a positive risk premium for bearing volatility risk, this may not be the case for currency options. Coval and Shumway (2001) formalize this intuition in the context of mainstream asset pricing theory and show that options have greater systematic risk than their underlying securities. They provide evidence that investors are willing to pay a premium to hold options in their portfolio as a hedge against volatile states of the world. Thus, this makes the option price higher than its price would be if volatility risk were not priced. In other words, the volatility risk premium in currency options would be negative if it exists.

In this paper, we investigate the volatility risk premium in the over-the-counter (OTC) currency option market.[1] We extend the new methodology proposed by Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) from equity index options to currency options and apply it to at-the-money delta-neutral straddles traded in the OTC market. An at-the-money delta-neutral straddle is a combination of one European call and one European put with the same maturity and strike price on the same currency. At-the-money delta-neutral straddles are the most liquid option contracts traded on the OTC market. Because their prices are very sensitive to volatility, they are widely used to hedge or speculate on changes in volatility. Therefore, if volatility risk is priced in the currency option market, straddles are the best instruments through which to observe the risk premium.

Our database includes daily OTC average bid and ask implied volatility quotes for European at-the-money delta-neutral straddles. The database covers the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc (against the U.S. dollar) from June 1996 to December 2002, and the euro from January 1999 to December 2002. In the OTC currency option market, option prices are quoted in terms of volatility,

[1]The OTC currency option market is substantially more liquid than the exchange-traded currency option market. The annual turnover of currency options that are traded on organized exchanges was about U.S.$1.3 trillion in 1995 and declined to U.S.$0.36 trillion in 2001 (see Bank for International Settlement (1997), (2003)), whereas the annual turnover on the OTC market was about U.S.$10.25 trillion in 1995 and about U.S.$15 trillion in 2001 (see Bank for International Settlement (1996), (2002)).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which is expressed as a percentage per annum. For example, the option premium of an option quoted at a 10% bid is computed by substituting 10% as the volatility figure into the Garman-Kohlhagen (1983) model, along with the prevailing current spot exchange rate and the domestic and foreign interest rates.[2] One advantage of this data is that the OTC volatility quotes apply to option contracts of the same standard maturity term, regardless of which day the price is quoted. We study at-the-money straddles for maturities of one, three, six, and 12 months. Our approach ensures that our implied volatility series is homogeneous with respect to moneyness and maturity, and that the conclusions we draw from analyzing this database are unlikely to be affected by the mixture of moneyness and maturity.

Our main findings include the following. First, we find that volatility risk is priced in four major currencies—the British pound, euro, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc—across maturity terms between one and 12 months.[3,4] Second, we provide direct evidence that the sign of the volatility risk premium is negative for all four major currencies, which suggests that buyers in the OTC currency option market pay a premium to sellers as compensation for bearing the volatility risk. Third, and more important, we find that the volatility risk premium has a term structure in which the risk premium decreases in maturity. This study is the first to provide empirical evidence of the term structure of the volatility risk premium. While previous studies document that short-term volatility has higher variability than long-term volatility (e.g., Xu and Taylor (1994) and Campa and Chang (1995)), none has investigated the implication on volatility risk premiums. Fourth, we document that jump risk is also priced in the OTC market. However, the observed volatility risk premium is distinct from and not subsumed by the possible jump risk premium.

All of our findings are robust to various sensitivity analyses on risk-free interest rates, subperiods, and empirical model specifications.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II details the methodology we use in the study. Section III explains the unique features of OTC currency option market and the data. Section IV describes the empirical implementation of the methodology. Section V presents our main empirical findings and Section VI reports our robustness studies. Section VII provides a summary and conclusion.

II. Methodology

Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) propose a non-parametric method to investigate volatility risk premiums in equity index option markets. Under a general stochastic option-pricing framework, they prove that if volatility risk is priced in the option market, then the return of a dynamically delta-hedged call option on a stock index is mathematically related to the volatility risk premium. Hence, it is the-

[2] In a study on the term structure of implied volatilities, Campa and Chang (1995) use equivalent OTC option volatility quotes from December 1989 to August 1992.

[3] These results are contrary to the findings of Sarwar (2001). The difference may be because Sarwar (2001) uses data for exchange-traded options, which are mixed in maturity and moneyness, whereas the quotes of the OTC currency options in our study have constant maturity and apply only to at-the-money options.

[4] Evidence of a volatility risk premium is also found in four other currencies against the U.S. dollar and three cross-currencies. The results are reported in Section VI.

oretically sound to infer the sign of the volatility risk premium from returns on dynamically delta-hedged call options. This approach allows for the investigation of the volatility risk premium without imposing strong restrictions on the pricing kernel or assuming a parametric model of the volatility process.

Using this approach, Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) show that volatility risk is priced in the S&P 500 index option market and that the volatility risk premium is negative. We extend their methodology to the currency option market.

A. Theory

Assume that the spot price of a currency at time t, x_t, follows the process,

$$\frac{dx_t}{x_t} = m_t dt + \sigma_t dz_t \tag{1}$$

$$d\sigma_t = \theta_t dt + \delta_t dw_t, \tag{2}$$

where z_t and w_t are standard Wiener processes, the random innovations of which have instantaneous correlation ρ. Parameters m_t and σ_t, respectively, are the instantaneous drift and volatility of the currency spot price process. The instantaneous drift, m_t, can be a function of x_t and σ_t. The instantaneous volatility, σ_t, follows another diffusion process with mean θ_t and standard deviation δ_t as specified in equation (2), where θ_t and δ_t may depend on σ_t but not on x_t.

Let f_t denote the price of a European straddle on the currency. By Ito's lemma, f_t follows the stochastic process characterized by

$$\begin{aligned} df_t = {} & \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial x_t} dx_t + \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial \sigma_t} d\sigma_t \\ & + \left(\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_t^2 x_t^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial x_t^2} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_t^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial \sigma_t^2} + \rho \delta_t \sigma_t x_t \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial x_t \partial \sigma_t} \right) dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The price change, df_t, is properly interpreted mathematically as the stochastic integral equation,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{t+\tau} = {} & f_t + \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} dx_u + \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} d\sigma_u \\ & + \int_t^{t+\tau} \left(\frac{\partial f_u}{\partial u} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_u^2 x_u^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_u}{\partial x_u^2} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_u^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_u}{\partial \sigma_u^2} + \rho \delta_u \sigma_u x_u \frac{\partial^2 f_u}{\partial x_u \partial \sigma_u} \right) du. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Using standard arbitrage arguments (see Cox, Ingersoll, and Ross (1985)), the straddle price, f_t, must satisfy the partial differential equation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}\sigma_t^2 x_t^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial x_t^2} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_t^2 \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial \sigma_t^2} + \rho \delta_t \sigma_t x_t \frac{\partial^2 f_t}{\partial x_t \partial \sigma_t} \\ & + (r - q) x_t \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial x_t} + (\theta_t - \lambda_t) \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial \sigma_t} + \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t} - r f_t = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where r and q denote the domestic and foreign risk-free rates, respectively. The unspecified term, λ_t, represents the market price of the risk associated with dw_t,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which is commonly referred to as the volatility risk premium (see, e.g., Heston (1993)).

By rearranging equation (5) and substituting it into the last integral of equation (4), we obtain

$$f_{t+\tau} = f_t + \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} dx_u + \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} d\sigma_u + \int_t^{t+\tau} \left(rf_u - (r-q)\, x_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} - (\theta_u - \lambda_u) \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} \right) du. \tag{6}$$

Substituting equation (2) into (6), we can rewrite equation (6) with the straddle price expressed as

$$f_{t+\tau} = f_t + \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} dx_u + \int_t^{t+\tau} \left(rf_u - (r-q)\, x_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} \right) du + \int_t^{t+\tau} \lambda_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} du + \int_t^{t+\tau} \delta_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} dw_u. \tag{7}$$

We now consider a dynamically delta-hedged portfolio that consists of a long straddle position and a spot position in the underlying currency. The spot position is adjusted over the life of the straddle (t to $t+\tau$) to hedge all risks except volatility risk. The outcome of this dynamically delta-hedged portfolio, hereafter referred to as the delta-hedged straddle profit (loss), is given by

$$\Pi_{t,t+\tau} = f_{t+\tau} - f_t - \int_t^{t+\tau} \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} dx_u - \int_t^{t+\tau} \left(rf_u - (r-q)\, x_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial x_u} \right) du. \tag{8}$$

From equation (7), this can also be stated as

$$\Pi_{t,t+\tau} = \int_t^{t+\tau} \lambda_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} du + \int_t^{t+\tau} \delta_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} dw_u. \tag{9}$$

The second integral in equation (9) is the Ito stochastic integral. Hence, the martingale property of the Ito integral implies

$$E(\Pi_{t,t+\tau}) = \int_t^{t+\tau} E\left(\lambda_u \frac{\partial f_u}{\partial \sigma_u} \right) du. \tag{10}$$

The implication of equation (10) is that if the volatility risk is not priced (i.e., $\lambda_u = 0$), then on average the delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) should be zero. If the volatility risk is priced (i.e., $\lambda_u \neq 0$), then the average expected delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) must not be zero. Because the vega of a long straddle, $\partial f_u / \partial \sigma_u$, is positive, the sign of the volatility risk premium, λ_u, determines whether the average delta-hedged straddle profit is positive or negative.

B. Testable Implications

The theory suggests that the return on buying a straddle and dynamically delta-hedging this position until maturity is related to the volatility risk premium.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Although the theory requires the assumption of continuous hedging, in practice rebalancing takes place only at discrete times.[5] Suppose that we rebalance the delta-hedged portfolio at N equally spaced times over the life of the straddle. That is, the hedging position is calculated at time t_n, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N-1$, where $t_0 = t$ and $t_N = t + \tau$. We compute the delta-hedged straddle profit at the maturity date $t + \tau$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (11) \qquad \Pi_{t,t+\tau} &= \text{Max}\left(x_{t+\tau} - k, k - x_{t+\tau}, 0\right) - f_t - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Delta_{t_n}\left(x_{t_n} - x_{t_{n+1}}\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(rf_t - (r-q)\,\Delta_{t_n} x_{t_n}\right)\frac{\tau}{N}, \end{aligned}$$

where f_t is the straddle premium at time t, $x_{t+\tau}$ is the currency price at maturity $t + \tau$, k is the strike price of the straddle, Δ_{t_n} is the delta of the long straddle, and r and q are the domestic and foreign interest rates, respectively. The first term on the right-hand side of the equation is the payoff of the long straddle at maturity $t + \tau$, the second term is the cost of buying the straddle at time t, the third term is the rebalancing cost, and the last term adjusts for the interest expenses on the second and third terms. The delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) allows us to test the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. If, on average, $\Pi_{t,t+\tau}$ is nonzero, then volatility risk is priced in the currency option market.

Hypothesis 2. If, on average, $\Pi_{t,t+\tau}$ is negative (positive), then the volatility risk premium embedded in the currency option is negative (positive).

III. Description of the OTC Currency Option Market and Data

The OTC currency option market has some special features and conventions. First, option prices on the OTC market are quoted in terms of deltas and implied volatilities, instead of strikes and money prices as in the organized option exchanges. At the time of settlement of a given deal, the implied volatility quotes are translated to money prices using the Garman-Kohlhagen formula, which is the equivalent of the Black-Scholes formula for currency options. This arrangement is convenient for option dealers, in that they do not have to change their quotes every time the spot exchange rate moves. However, as Campa and Chang (1998) point out, it is important to note that this does not mean that option dealers necessarily believe that the Black-Scholes assumptions are valid. They use the formula only as a one-to-one nonlinear mapping between the volatility delta space (where

[5] Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) show that the bias in the delta-hedged straddle outcome caused by discrete hedging is small relative to the effect of a volatility risk premium. Melino and Turnbull (1995) provide simulation evidence to show that the discrete delta-hedging error with daily rebalancing is very small. For example, their average hedging errors as a percentage of contract size for a one-year at-the-money currency option are only 0.06% and 0.31% if volatility is assumed to be constant or stochastic, respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the quotes are made) and the strike premium space (in which the final specification of the deal is expressed for the settlement). Second, competing volatility quotes of option contracts are available on the market every day, but only for standard maturity periods such as one week, one, three, or six months, and so on. For example, a three-month option quote on Monday will become an odd period (three months less one day) option quote on Tuesday, and competing quotes for this odd period option will not be available on Tuesday. Third, most transactions on the market involve option combinations. The popular combinations are straddles, risk reversals, and strangles. Among these, the most liquid combination is the standard delta-neutral straddle contract, which is a combination of a call and a put option with the same strike. The strike price is set, together with the quoted implied volatility price, so that the delta of the straddle computed on the basis of the Garman-Kohlhagen formula is zero.

As the standard straddle is by design delta-neutral on the deal date, its price is not sensitive to the market price of the underlying foreign currency. However, it is very sensitive to changes in volatility. Because of its sensitivity to volatility risk, delta-neutral straddles are widely used by participants in the OTC market to hedge and trade volatility risk. If the volatility risk is priced in the OTC market, then delta-neutral straddles are the best instruments through which to observe the risk premium. For this reason, Coval and Shumway (2001) uses delta-neutral straddles in their empirical study of expected returns on equity index options and find that a volatility risk premium is priced in the equity index option market.

Our main option dataset consists of daily average bid and ask implied volatility quotes for the one-, three-, six-, and 12-month delta-neutral straddles on four major currencies—the British pound, the euro, the Japanese yen, and the Swiss franc[6]—at their U.S. dollar prices. Our sample spans a period of approximately 7.5 years, from June 3, 1996 to December 31, 2003. We use the 2003 data to calculate the delta-hedged straddle profit on the straddle bought in 2002. We obtain the data from Bloomberg, which collects observations at 6:00 PM London time from large banks participating in the OTC currency option market. Other data we collect are the synchronized daily average bid and ask spot U.S. dollar prices of each currency, also from Bloomberg. Because the British pound, euro, Japanese yen, Swiss franc, and U.S. dollar Treasury bill yields that exactly match each option period are not available, we use the repurchase agreement interest rates (i.e., repo) for each currency, which match the option maturity period. [7]

Figure 1 uses boxplots to show the distribution of the daily implied volatility quotes on one-, three-, six-, and 12-month delta-neutral straddles for the pound, yen, and franc currencies between June 1996 and December 2002, and for the

[6]We choose to study currency options on these four currencies because they are the most liquid among all currencies. According to the Bank for International Settlement (2002), they accounted for approximately 67% of the total size of the OTC currency options traded in April 2001. As a robustness test, we also study seven other less liquid currency options and the results are reported in Section VI.

[7]The repo rate has a credit quality that is closest to the yield of a Treasury bill. However, to examine the sensitivity of our results to the use of repo rates instead of the true risk-free rates, we adjust for the credit quality spread by subtracting 1% from the repo rates using the reduced rates to rerun the empirical tests. We obtain qualitatively the same results for the British pound, euro, and Swiss franc. We cannot do this for the Japanese yen, however, because its repo rates are very close to zero.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

euro between January 1999 and December 2002. The solid box in the middle of each boxplot represents the middle half of the observations ranging from the first to the third quartile, and the white space at the center indicates the median. Several patterns stand out in Figure 1. First, at all maturities, the British pound has the lowest level of implied volatility and the smallest variation among the four currencies, whereas the Japanese yen has the highest level of implied volatility and the greatest variability. Take, for example, the one-month maturity. At one extreme, the implied volatility of the pound has a median of 8.3% per annum and an inter-quartile range of 2%. At the other extreme, the implied volatility of the yen has a median of 11.2% and an inter-quartile range of 3.6%. In between, the franc and the euro have median implied volatilities of 10.6% and 10.8% and inter-quartile ranges of 2.4% and 3.0%, respectively.

FIGURE 1

Distribution of Implied Volatility Quotes for Entire Sample Period




Figure 1 shows the boxplots of the daily implied volatility quotes for one-, three-, six-, and 12-month at-the-money straddles between June 1996 and December 2002 for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc, and between January 1999 and December 2002 for the euro.

Second, there is a term structure in the variability of the volatility quotes for all four currencies. Specifically, the variability is a decreasing function of the time to maturity as short-dated options have much higher variability than long-dated options. Campa and Chang (1995) observe a similar term structure in their sample of OTC volatility quotes for four major currencies in a different time period. Xu and Taylor (1994) study the term structure of implied volatility embedded in PHLX-traded options on four currencies and report that long-term implied volatility has less variability than short-term implied volatility. The term structure

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in variability of implied volatility is consistent with a mean-reverting stochastic volatility process (see Stein (1989) and Heynen, Kemna, and Vorst (1994)). More importantly, it has an implication for the volatility risk premium. Because the variability of short-term is much higher than that of long-term volatility, if option buyers were to pay a volatility risk premium, they would pay more for short-term options. This means that the volatility risk premium should have a term structure in which the risk premium is a decreasing function of maturity. We report empirical evidence in relation to this hypothesis in Section V.

Third, the boxplots in Figure 1 show the skewness of the implied volatility distribution. In each boxplot, the lower bracket connected by whiskers to the bottom of the middle box indicates the larger value of the minimum or the first quartile less 1.5 times the inter-quartile range, while the upper bracket connected by whiskers to the top of the middle box indicates the lower value of the maximum or the third quartile plus 1.5 times the inter-quartile range. For a right-skewed distribution, the upper bracket is further away from the box than the lower bracket; the pattern reverses for a left-skewed distribution. The lines beyond the lower or upper brackets represent outliers. The four currencies differ in skewness of implied volatility. While the pound and the franc have close to symmetric distributions, the distributions of the euro and the yen are clearly skewed to the right and the yen has far more outliers (i.e., a much fatter tail) than the other three currencies. A close examination shows that a majority of the outliers in the yen occurred during the Asian currency crisis in 1997 and 1998. Figure 2 shows the time-series plot of the implied volatility for the three-month at-the-money straddle for the British pound, the Japanese yen, and the Swiss franc between June 1996 and December 2002. The two vertical dashed lines indicate the start and the end of the Asian currency crisis. The crisis dramatically changed the price process of the yen during that period, but had little effect on the pound and franc. This suggests that we should conduct a robustness analysis for the post-crisis subperiod.

IV. Empirical Implementation

Following the theory discussed in Section II, we now consider portfolios formed by buying delta-neutral straddles and dynamically delta-hedging our positions until maturity. We rebalance the delta-hedged portfolio daily and measure the delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) from the contract date t to the maturity date $t+\tau$, $\Pi_{t,t+\tau}$, by the formula,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{t,t+\tau} &= \text{Max}\left(x_{t+\tau}-k, k-x_{t+\tau}, 0\right) - f_t - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Delta_{t_n}\left(x_{t_n}-x_{t_{n+1}}\right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1}\left(r_t f_t - \left(r_t - q_t\right)\Delta_{t_n} x_{t_n}\right), \frac{\tau}{N},\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FIGURE 2

Time-Series Plot of Implied Volatility Quotes




Figure 2 shows the daily implied volatility for the three-month at-the-money straddle for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc between June 1996 and December 2002. The two vertical dashed lines indicate the start and the end of the Asian currency crisis period.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where k denotes the strike price of the straddle and Δ_{t_n} is the delta of the straddle based on the Garman-Kohlhagen model,

$$\Delta_{t_n} = e^{-q_t(t_n+\tau)}\left[2N\left(d_1\right)-1\right], \tag{12}$$

$$\text{where} \quad d_1 = \frac{\ln\frac{x_{t_n}}{k}+\left(r_t-q_t+\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{t_n}^2\right)\left(t_n+\tau\right)}{\sigma_{t_n}\sqrt{t_n+\tau}}$$

and $N(d_1)$ is the cumulative standard normal distribution evaluated at d_1. The Garman-Kohlhagen model, as an extension of the Black-Scholes model to currency options, is a constant volatility model. Hence, the delta computed from the Garman-Kohlhagen model may differ from the delta computed from a stochastic volatility model. We mitigate this problem by adopting a modified Garman-Kohlhagen model in which the volatility that is employed to compute the delta for daily rebalancing is updated based on the daily average bid and ask implied volatility quotes. Chesney and Scott (1989) conclude that actual prices on foreign currency options conform more closely to this modified Garman-Kohlhagen model than to a stochastic volatility model or to a constant volatility Garman-Kohlhagen model. Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) also provide a simulation exercise that shows using the Black-Scholes delta-hedge ratio instead of the stochastic volatility counterpart has only a negligible effect on delta-hedged results. We report a robustness study in Section VI that examines the impact of potential mismeasurement of the hedge ratio.

More specifically, we take the following two steps to maintain the delta-hedged portfolio until the maturity. First, we need to compute the money price for the straddle. We achieve this by a one-to-one mapping between the volatility delta space and the strike premium space using the Garman-Kohlhagen model. For an observed implied volatility quote on day t, the strike price of the delta-neutral straddle is determined by the formula $k = x_t e^{(r_t-q_t+0.5\sigma_t^2)\tau}$, where x_t denotes the synchronized spot foreign currency price on day t, r_t and q_t are the domestic and foreign interest rates per annum, respectively, τ is the time to maturity expressed in years, and σ_t is the average bid and ask implied volatility quote.[8] This strike price formula is used in the OTC market by convention. The straddle premium is then computed using the Garman-Kohlhagen model, together with the computed strike price, the synchronized spot foreign currency price, and interest rates.

Second, we form and maintain the delta-hedged portfolio until maturity. Suppose that, on day t, we buy a straddle contract at the premium computed above. As the straddle is in itself delta-neutral, the delta-hedged portfolio on day t is composed of only the straddle. However, on the following day $t+1$, the straddle becomes an odd period contract and may no longer be delta-neutral. Hence, to maintain a delta-hedged portfolio, we need to sell the delta amount of the foreign currency against the U.S. dollar at the day $t+1$ spot price. We therefore recompute the delta using equation (12) with the spot price, interest rates, and the estimated volatility of an odd period straddle contract at day $t+1$.[9] We estimate the volatil-

[8] Equation (12) shows that the delta of a straddle is zero only when $d_1 = 0$. The strike price is computed in such a way that $d_1 = 0$.

[9] We cannot use the quoted volatility on day $t+1$ because volatility quotes are valid only for straddles of standard maturities such as one or three months. Thus, volatility has to be estimated for odd period straddles.

ity of an odd period straddle contract using the linear total variance method (see Wilmott (1998)) to interpolate the volatility of standard maturities,

$$\sigma_{T_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_2}}\left[T_1\sigma_{T_1}^2 + \left(\frac{T_2 - T_1}{T_3 - T_1}\right)\left(T_3\sigma_{T_3}^2 - T_1\sigma_{T_1}^2\right)\right]^{1/2}, \tag{13}$$

where $T_1 < T_2 < T_3$, σ_{T_1}, and σ_{T_3}, respectively, denote the average bid and ask implied volatility quotes for the standard maturities T_1 and T_3 available in the market, and σ_{T_2} is the volatility for the non-standard maturity T_2 that we need to estimate by interpolation. We also update the interest rates on a daily basis in rebalancing the delta-hedged portfolio. The foreign currency sold (bought) is borrowed (invested), and the corresponding long (short) U.S dollar cash (net of the straddle premium incurred at time t) is invested (borrowed) at their respective interest rates. We continue to rebalance the delta-hedged portfolio on a daily basis until the straddle maturity date. The net U.S. dollar payoff is the delta-hedged straddle profit (loss).

V. Empirical Results

A. Negative Volatility Risk Premium

In this section, we document our empirical findings. Table 1 reports the statistical properties of the delta-hedged straddle returns on the four currencies at four maturities. The delta-hedged straddle returns are calculated as the U.S. dollar delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) from holding the dynamically delta-hedged portfolio until maturity, divided by the straddle contract size in U.S. dollars. We annualize the returns to make them comparable across maturities. For each combination of currency and maturity, delta-hedged straddle returns comprise a time-series of daily observations. This arises because, for each standard maturity, we buy an at-the-money delta-neutral straddle each trading day and maintain a delta-hedged portfolio of the straddle and underlying currencies until the straddle matures. The first column of Table 1 lists the number of observations in each time-series. The euro has fewer observations than the other three currencies because it only came into existence in January 1999. In the second column, we report the percentage of daily straddle observations that have negative returns when we buy a straddle and maintain the delta-hedged portfolio until maturity. The percentage is much larger than 50% in all cases, and is 85% for the British pound at the 12-month maturity, indicating that most of the time OTC straddle sellers earn positive profits by selling straddles and hedging their exposures. The theory in Section II suggests that such profits are compensation for bearing the risk of volatility changes. The high percentage of negative delta-hedged straddle returns indicates that our results are not biased by outliers.

We now investigate whether delta-hedged straddle returns are statistically significant. The unconditional means and standard deviations of delta-hedged straddle returns are listed in the third and fourth columns of Table 1. The mean

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 1

Summary Statistics of Delta-Hedged Straddle Returns for Entire Sample Period

Maturity	No. of Obs.	% of Negative Return	Sample Mean	Sample Std. Dev.	Autocorrelation Coefficient			Partial Autocorrelation Coefficient			AR(3) Intercept	
					Lag 1	Lag 2	Lag 3	Lag 1	Lag 2	Lag 3	Estimate	*p*-Value
Panel A. British Pound												
1 month	1,705	71%	−0.0239	0.0504	0.863	0.771	0.700	0.863	0.107	0.052	−0.0028	0.0001
3 months	1,705	77%	−0.0179	0.0244	0.953	0.921	0.893	0.953	0.136	0.054	−0.0007	0.0046
6 months	1,705	83%	−0.0152	0.0167	0.957	0.921	0.904	0.957	0.067	0.214	−0.0003	0.0162
12 months	1,705	85%	−0.0130	0.0112	0.948	0.920	0.915	0.948	0.207	0.278	−0.0002	0.0219
Panel B. Euro												
1 month	1,027	58%	−0.0122	0.0626	0.830	0.724	0.638	0.830	0.110	0.037	−0.0018	0.1005
3 months	1,027	67%	−0.0115	0.0259	0.952	0.916	0.888	0.952	0.110	0.074	−0.0005	0.0822
6 months	1,027	64%	−0.0087	0.0191	0.977	0.960	0.942	0.977	0.099	−0.005	−0.0002	0.1542
12 months	1,027	58%	−0.0072	0.0154	0.989	0.979	0.970	0.989	0.042	0.046	−0.0001	0.1966
Panel C. Japanese Yen												
1 month	1,705	59%	−0.0105	0.0974	0.877	0.768	0.699	0.877	−0.006	0.117	−0.0012	0.3507
3 months	1,705	60%	−0.0085	0.0440	0.930	0.876	0.826	0.930	0.083	0.017	−0.0005	0.2502
6 months	1,705	68%	−0.0055	0.0398	0.938	0.902	0.869	0.938	0.183	0.053	−0.0001	0.6671
12 months	1,705	54%	−0.0033	0.0248	0.920	0.879	0.822	0.920	0.214	−0.069	−0.0002	0.3659
Panel D. Swiss Franc												
1 month	1,705	58%	−0.0047	0.0647	0.845	0.732	0.651	0.845	0.063	0.067	−0.0005	0.5344
3 months	1,705	65%	−0.0085	0.0272	0.940	0.899	0.868	0.940	0.130	0.091	−0.0004	0.0747
6 months	1,705	61%	−0.0059	0.0179	0.961	0.932	0.904	0.961	0.107	0.022	−0.0002	0.0696
12 months	1,705	66%	−0.0052	0.0112	0.971	0.955	0.935	0.971	0.212	−0.019	−0.0001	0.0328

The U.S. dollar delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) from holding the dynamically delta-hedged portfolio until maturity is computed by

$$\Pi_{t,t+\tau} = \text{Max}\left(x_{t+\tau} - k, k - x_{t+\tau}, 0\right) - f_t - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Delta_{t_n}\left(x_{t_n} - x_{t_{n+1}}\right) - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(r_t f_t - \left(r_t - q_t\right)\Delta_{t_n} x_{t_n}\right)\frac{\tau}{N},$$

where f_t is the straddle premium at time t, $x_{t+\tau}$ is the currency price at the maturity $t + \tau$, k is the strike price of the straddle, Δ_{t_n} is the delta of the long straddle, and r_t and q_t are the domestic and foreign interest rates, respectively. The delta-hedged straddle return is calculated as $\Pi_{t,t+\tau}$ divided by the straddle contract size in U.S. dollars. We annualize the return to make it comparable across maturities. We report summary statistics on the return for four currencies at four standard maturities. For each combination of currency and maturity, the delta-hedged straddle return comprises a time-series of one observation on each trading day. We fit an AR(3) process to the time-series and test whether the intercept is zero. This is equivalent to a test of whether the mean delta-hedged straddle return is equal to zero. The sample period is from June 1996 to December 2002 for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc, and January 1999 to December 2002 for the euro.

return is negative for all cases,[10] while the high standard deviations of the returns make the means appear insignificantly different from zero. However, it is misleading to use the unconditional standard deviation to test the mean because serial correlation in the time-series of delta-hedged straddle returns can cause the standard deviation to be a biased measure of actual random error. The next three columns of Table 1 show that the first three autocorrelation coefficients are quite large and they decay slowly. This indicates that the time-series may follow an autoregressive process. We calculate the partial autocorrelation coefficients in Table 1. The first-order partial autocorrelation coefficient is large in all cases, while the second- and third-order autocorrelation coefficients become much smaller. The pattern in both autocorrelation coefficients and partial autocorrelation coefficients suggests fitting an autoregressive process of order three (i.e., AR(3)) to the time-

[10]We run the empirical tests using the average bid and ask straddle prices to reduce the impact of bid/ask spread. We also run the empirical tests using both the bid and ask prices. The results are qualitatively similar to those using average straddle bid and ask prices.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

series of the delta-hedged straddle returns.[11] An AR(3) process can be represented by the model, $y_t = \alpha + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_2 y_{t-2} + \beta_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where ε_t is a white noise process. Its unconditional mean is given by the formula,

$$E(y_t) = \frac{\alpha}{1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3},$$

which implies that the null hypothesis of a zero unconditional mean is equivalent to the null hypothesis that the intercept of the AR(3) process is equal to zero.

We estimate parameters of the AR(3) process and report the estimated intercept and its *p*-value for the *t*-statistic in the last two columns of Table 1. The intercept is significantly negative in most cases for the pound, euro, and franc, whereas it is negative, although insignificant, for the yen. We suspect that the non-significance of the yen is due to the Asian currency crisis. Hence, in Section VI we report a robustness analysis for the post-crisis subperiod from July 1999 to December 2002.

Relying on the general equilibrium model of Cox, Ingersoll, and Ross (1985), Heston (1993) and Bates (2000) suggest that the volatility risk premium is positively related to the level of volatility. To control for the level of volatility, we consider the following model for the delta-hedged straddle returns,

$$y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_2 y_{t-2} + \beta_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{14}$$

where y_t is the delta-hedged straddle return and σ_t is the implied volatility. We include three lagged variables, y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, and y_{t-3}, to control for serial correlation.

Table 2 reports the results of estimating the above model for the four currencies at four maturities. The coefficient of implied volatility, γ, is negative for all currencies at all maturities. To test its significance, we use the *t*-test statistic based on Newey-West (1987) heteroskedasticity- and autocorrelation-consistent standard errors. The test shows that γ is significantly negative in all cases, again providing evidence that market volatility risk is priced in the OTC currency option market.

B. Effect of Overlapping Periods

We obtain our daily delta-hedged straddle returns by purchasing a straddle and maintaining a delta-neutral portfolio using the spot currency market until the straddle matures. In calculating the delta-hedged return of the one-month straddle bought on a given trading day, say day 0, we use the information of day 1 to 22, assuming that there are 22 trading days before the straddle maturity date. Then, for the delta-hedged return of the one-month straddle bought on day 1, we use information of day 2, day 3, up to day 23. Consequently, the delta-hedged returns of day 0 and day 1 straddles use information from an overlapping period between days 2 and 22. To address the concern that our earlier evidence of a negative risk premium is driven by the common information in the overlapping periods, we adopt two approaches.

[11] In an unreported analysis, we also fit AR(1) and AR(5) processes to the data and observe the same patterns.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 2

Regression of Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on Implied Volatility

Independent Variables	1 Month	3 Months	6 Months	12 Months
Panel A. British Pound				
Intercept	0.018**	0.009**	0.011**	0.009**
Implied volatility	−0.251**	−0.118**	−0.136**	−0.123**
Straddle return–lag 1	0.746**	0.694**	0.577**	0.634**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.064	0.249*	0.048	0.086
Straddle return–lag 3	0.059	−0.006	0.287	0.167
Adj. R^2	0.753	0.897	0.856	0.848
No. of obs.	1,702	1,702	1,702	1,702
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.978	1.958	1.928	1.898
Panel B. Euro				
Intercept	0.018**	0.004**	0.002	0.001
Implied volatility	−0.178**	−0.044**	−0.015	−0.009
Straddle return–lag 1	0.859**	0.869**	0.917**	0.982**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.012	−0.086	0.036	0.008
Straddle return–lag 3	−0.019	0.173	0.037	0.003
Adj. R^2	0.741	0.892	0.963	0.978
No. of obs.	1,024	1,024	1,024	1,024
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.982	1.878	1.991	1.995
Panel C. Japanese Yen				
Intercept	0.171**	0.108**	0.050**	0.024*
Implied volatility	−1.474**	−0.942**	−0.419**	−0.202*
Straddle return–lag 1	0.316**	0.227**	0.371**	0.498**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.136**	0.142**	0.245**	0.252**
Straddle return–lag 3	0.156**	0.091*	0.201**	0.061
Adj. R^2	0.621	0.686	0.741	0.798
No. of obs.	1,702	1,702	1,702	1,702
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.171	0.858	1.428	1.581
Panel D. Swiss Franc				
Intercept	0.029**	0.015**	0.012**	0.006**
Implied volatility	−0.268**	−0.146**	−0.110**	−0.054**
Straddle return–lag 1	0.789**	0.809**	0.886**	0.624**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.041	−0.025	−0.051	0.325**
Straddle return–lag 3	0.051	0.136**	0.079	−0.005
Adj. R^2	0.777	0.879	0.908	0.911
No. of obs.	1,702	1,702	1,702	1,702
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.974	1.973	1.928	1.815

Table 2 presents the estimated results for the regression model, $y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_2 y_{t-2} + \beta_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged straddle return and σ_t is the implied volatility. We include three lagged variables, y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, and y_{t-3}, to control for serial correlation in the time-series of delta-hedged straddle returns. We estimate one model for each combination of currency and maturity. Our objective is to test the null hypothesis that $\gamma = 0$.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

In the first approach, we construct a time-series of non-overlapping delta-hedged straddle returns for each currency. Specifically, for each currency, we construct a monthly series of delta-hedged returns on the one-month straddles bought at the first trading day of each month in our sample period.[12] Because the delta-hedged returns of the beginning-of-month straddle only depend on the information of the trading days in the same month, they are non-overlapping. Panel A of Table 3 reports the summary statistics for the non-overlapping returns for the four major currencies. Consistent with the earlier results in Table 1, the mean delta-hedged returns are negative across all four currencies.

To ascertain whether the volatility risk premium remains negative for non-overlapping series, we run the regression,

$$y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{15}$$

[12] We consider only the one-month maturity because too few non-overlapping delta-hedged returns for longer maturities are available for any meaningful analysis.

TABLE 3
Non-Overlapping Straddle Returns

	British Pound	Euro	Japanese Yen	Swiss Franc
Panel A. Summary Statistics				
No. of obs.	77	48	77	77
Mean	−0.0182	−0.0101	−0.0202	−0.0030
Std. dev.	0.0541	0.0544	0.0835	0.0731
% of negative	66%	58%	63%	60%
Autocorrel. coeff.				
Lag 1	−0.1448	−0.1232	0.0746	−0.0976
Lag 2	−0.1504	−0.1380	0.2390	−0.0321
Lag 3	0.0300	0.0948	−0.0518	0.0517
Panel B. Regression against Implied Volatility				
Intercept	0.0359**	0.0531	0.0360	0.0496*
Implied volatility	−0.4225**	−0.4988*	−0.4073*	−0.5141*
Lag 1	0.8969**	0.6944**	0.7660**	0.8611**
Adj. R^2	0.8514	0.5331	0.7548	0.8584
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.8082	2.1030	1.4851	1.7141

For each currency, we construct a non-overlapping monthly series of delta-hedged straddle returns on the one-month straddles bought the first trading day of every month in the sample period. Panel A shows the summary statistics for the non-overlapping series. Panel B shows the results of estimating this regression, $y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged straddle return and σ_t is the implied volatility quote. If the volatility risk is priced and has a negative premium, we expect γ to be significant and negative. The sample period is from June 1996 to December 2002 for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc, and January 1999 to December 2002 for the euro.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

where y_t is the delta-hedged straddle return and σ_t is the volatility quote. If the volatility risk is priced and has a negative premium, then we expect γ to be significant and negative. Panel B of Table 3 reports the results. The evidence supports the conclusion that volatility risk is priced and has a negative risk premium.

In the second approach, we remove the effect of the common information from the overlapping period by calculating the difference between two consecutive delta-hedged straddle returns. In other words, we study the difference series, $\Delta y_t = y_t - y_{t-1}$, where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t. Since the straddle prices differ between the two days and the straddle return is proportional to the volatility risk premium as in equation (10), we expect to observe the risk premium in the regression of the first difference of the delta-hedged straddle return on the first difference of implied volatility. Therefore, we run the regression for Δy_t,

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha_D + \gamma_D \Delta\sigma_t + \beta_{D1}\Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_{D2}\Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_{D3}\Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (16)$$

where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, σ_t is the volatility quoted for a delta-neutral straddle on date t, and $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}. We include three lags of the dependent variable to control for potential serial autocorrelation in Δy_t. If the volatility risk premium exists and is negative, we expect the coefficient of $\Delta\sigma_t$ to be significant and negative.

Table 4 reports the estimation results of equation (16). The coefficient of implied volatility, γ_D, is negative for all currencies at all maturities. The t-test statistic based on Newey-West (1987) heteroskedasticity- and autocorrelation-consistent standard errors shows that γ is significantly different from zero in all

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cases. This evidence provides further support that market volatility risk is priced in the currency option market.

TABLE 4

Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility

Independent Variables	1 Month	3 Months	6 Months	12 Months
Panel A. British Pound				
Intercept	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.9214**	−1.5621**	−1.0189**	−0.7190**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1852**	−0.2628**	−0.3466**	−0.2696**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1163**	0.0135	−0.2859**	−0.1839
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0796**	0.0336	0.0713	0.0096
No. of obs.	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701
Adj. R^2	0.2110	0.2506	0.2337	0.2084
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.1016	2.1082	2.0589	1.9941
Panel B. Euro				
Intercept	0.0000	−0.0001	−0.0001	−0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.6459**	−1.6170**	−1.1664**	−0.8543**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0633	−0.1109**	−0.0835**	−0.0370
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0360	−0.1930*	−0.0326	0.0001
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.1699*	−0.0833	−0.0082	−0.0457
No. of obs.	1,023	1,023	1,023	1,023
Adj. R^2	0.1427	0.2768	0.3114	0.3137
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0810	1.8912	2.1098	2.0541
Panel C. Japanese Yen				
Intercept	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.4670**	−1.4187**	−0.8722**	−0.4115**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0546*	−0.0225**	−0.0923	−0.1223*
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0527	−0.0099	−0.0799	−0.0315
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0355	−0.0206	−0.0635	−0.0752
No. of obs.	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701
Adj. R^2	0.8831	0.9545	0.8244	0.5919
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.1641	2.3060	2.2903	2.2432
Panel D. Swiss Franc				
Intercept	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.8374**	−1.6060**	−1.1459**	−0.7615**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1513**	−0.1249**	−0.0039	−0.2461**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0952**	−0.1592**	−0.1209	−0.0077
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0208	−0.0883*	−0.0476	0.0851
No. of obs.	1,701	1,701	1,701	1,701
Adj. R^2	0.1477	0.2950	0.3030	0.3392
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0398	2.1151	1.9904	2.0218

Table 4 presents the estimated results for the regression model, $\Delta y_t = \alpha_D + \gamma_D \Delta\sigma_t + \beta_{D1}\Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_{D2}\Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_{D3}\Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, σ_t is the volatility quoted for a delta-neutral straddle on date t, and $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}. We include three lagged dependent variables to control for serial autocorrelation. One regression model is estimated for each combination of currency and maturity. The objective is to test the null hypothesis that $\gamma_D = 0$.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

C. Term Structure of the Volatility Risk Premium

The empirical results so far show that volatility risk is priced in the OTC currency option market and that it has a negative risk premium. However, the results also reveal further information about the term structure of the volatility risk premiums. Previous studies such as those of Campa and Chang (1995) and Xu and Taylor (1994) report that volatility itself is more volatile at short-term rather than at long-term maturities. The pattern is also evident in Figure 1. This means that short-term options carry higher volatility risks than long-term options. Hence, it is reasonable to expect that currency option buyers pay a higher volatility

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

risk premium for shorter maturity options as compensation to option sellers for bearing higher volatility risks. Consistent with this expectation, Table 1 shows that the average delta-hedged straddle return decreases when the option maturity is extended. Tables 2 and 4 show that the coefficients of implied volatility, γ and γ_D, also exhibit a term structure. Because γ is the coefficient of volatility, it can be regarded as the average delta-hedged straddle return per unit of volatility, which we refer to as the unit delta-hedged straddle return. We observe that the magnitude of the unit delta-hedged straddle return decreases with maturity. Because the vega of at-the-money options is an increasing function of maturity (see, e.g., Hull (2003)), the downward-sloping term structure in the magnitude of the unit delta-hedged straddle return is unlikely to be due to vega. This evidence, combined with equation (10), suggests that the magnitude of the volatility risk premium decreases with option maturity, which is consistent with the fact that short-term is more volatile than long-term volatility.

To test whether the observed difference between the short-term and the long-term volatility risk premium is statistically significant, we estimate the following model on the combined time-series across the four maturities,

$$\begin{aligned}(17)\qquad \Delta y_t \;=\;& \alpha_1 I_1 + \alpha_3 I_3 + \alpha_6 I_6 + \alpha_{12} I_{12} + \gamma_1 \Delta\sigma_{1,t} * I_1 \\ &+ \gamma_3 \Delta\sigma_{3,t} * I_3 + \gamma_6 \Delta\sigma_{6,t} * I_6 + \gamma_{12} \Delta\sigma_{12,t} * I_{12} \\ &+ \beta_1 \Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_3 \Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t,\end{aligned}$$

where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, $\sigma_{i,t}$ is the date-t quoted volatility for the i-month maturity on date t, $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}, and I_i is the indicator variable for an i-month maturity observation, with $i = 1$, 3, 6, or 12. We use α_i to allow different intercepts at different maturities.

The estimation results are reported in Table 5. The volatility risk premium generates a term structure for all four currencies. We use the Wald statistic to test two null hypotheses, namely, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{12}$ and $\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = \gamma_6 + \gamma_{12}$. The test rejects the two null hypotheses in all cases, which suggests that the difference between short- and long-term volatility risk premiums is significant. This finding implies that the option buyer pays a significantly higher volatility risk premium to the option seller for the shorter maturity option.

VI. Robustness Analysis

A. Other Currency Pairs

To investigate whether our results are a special feature of the four currencies selected or whether they apply more broadly, we examine seven other currency pairs that are selected based on option contract liquidity and data availability. Four of the seven currency pairs are the Australian dollar, Canadian dollar, Norwegian kroner, and New Zealand dollar against the U.S. dollar. The other three are cross-currency pairs and they are the Japanese yen against the British pound, the Japanese yen against the euro, and the euro against the Swiss franc.

TABLE 5

Pooled Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility

Independent Variables	British Pound	Euro	Japanese Yen	Swiss Franc
Dummy–1 month	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0001
Dummy–3 months	0.0001	−0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
Dummy–6 months	0.0001	−0.0001	0.0001	0.0000
Dummy–12 months	0.0000	−0.0001	0.0000	0.0001
ΔImplied volatility–1 month	−2.9198**	−2.6396**	−2.4747**	−2.8370**
ΔImplied volatility–3 months	−1.5518**	−1.6121**	−1.4014**	−1.6082**
ΔImplied volatility–6 months	−1.0541**	−1.1724**	−0.8916**	−1.1115**
ΔImplied volatility–12 months	−0.7349**	−0.8544**	−0.4270**	−0.7804**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.2078**	−0.0654	−0.0495**	−0.1469**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1198**	−0.0423	−0.0439	−0.0994**
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0526	−0.1645*	−0.0334	−0.0253
No. of obs.	6,804	4,092	6,804	6,804
Adj. R^2	0.2079	0.1509	0.8933	0.1624
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0964	2.0786	2.2042	2.0451
Wald test for H_0:$\gamma_1 = \gamma_{12}$				
Statistic	173.8484	81.5774	1703.0080	120.5293
(p-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Wald test for H_0:$\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = \gamma_6 + \gamma_{12}$				
Statistic	188.4576	96.8067	1863.0928	158.5117
(p-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

We pool the delta-hedged straddle returns for four maturities and estimate the following model for each currency,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta y_t \quad = \quad & \alpha_1 I_1 + \alpha_3 I_3 + \alpha_6 I_6 + \alpha_{12} I_{12} \\ & + \gamma_1 \Delta\sigma_{1,t} * I_1 + \gamma_3 \Delta\sigma_{3,t} * I_3 + \gamma_6 \Delta\sigma_{6,t} * I_6 + \gamma_{12} \Delta\sigma_{12,t} * I_{12} \\ & + \beta_1 \Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_3 \Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t,\end{aligned}$$

where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, $\sigma_{i,t}$ is the quoted volatility for the i-month maturity on date t, $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}, and I_i is the indicator variable for the i-month maturity observation with i being 1, 3, 6, or 12. We use α_i to allow for different intercepts at different maturities. Our main focus is on γ_i, which measures the unit delta-hedged straddle return at different maturities. The sample period is from June 1996 to December 2002 for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc, and January 1999 to December 2002 for the euro.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

As these seven currency pairs are less liquid in the OTC option market than the four selected currency pairs analyzed above, Bloomberg does not have complete daily straddle quotes from June 1996 to December 2003. We only include observations before December 2003 that have complete data necessary for our empirical analysis. Table 6 reports the sample size for each currency pair.

We replicate the analysis based on equations (16) and (17) for these seven currency pairs. Table 6 shows that the coefficient of implied volatility in equation (16) is negative and significant. This is consistent with the earlier observations for the four major currency pairs, and demonstrates that volatility risk is also priced in the OTC market for these seven currency pairs.

Table 7 reports the estimation results of equation (17) and provides evidence on the term structure in the volatility risk premium. Consistent with the evidence in the British pound, euro, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc against the U.S. dollar, the volatility risk premium generates a term structure for all seven currencies. The magnitude of the short-term risk premium is greater than its long-term counterpart. The two Wald tests show that the difference is significant.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B. Post-Asian Currency Crisis Period

In this subsection, we report a subperiod analysis that serves to examine the temporal stability of the volatility risk premium, and to rule out the possibility that our main findings may be affected by the Asian currency crisis. We replicate the analysis for the post-crisis period between July 1, 1999 and December 31, 2002. Table 8 reports the results for the post-crisis period. We observe the same properties of the delta-hedged straddle returns as in Table 1. The main difference between Table 8 and Table 1 lies in the results for the Japanese yen. During the post-crisis period, the mean return is significantly negative for the yen, whereas it is not for the whole period. A possible explanation is that the Asian currency crisis affected the yen more than the other three currencies, which would cause the distribution of the yen's implied volatility to differ during and after the crisis. Figure 3 shows that the distribution is less right-skewed for the yen in the post-crisis period than for the whole period.

TABLE 6

Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility for Seven Other Currency Pairs

Independent Variables	1 Month	3 Months	6 Months	12 Months
Panel A. Euro/Swiss Franc				
Intercept	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.6953**	−1.6269**	−1.1451**	−0.8314**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0958	−0.1025*	−0.0747	0.0198
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0207	−0.0930*	−0.0894	−0.0504
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	0.0050	−0.1020*	0.0172	−0.0754
No. of obs.	809	823	881	1,038
Adj. R^2	0.1500	0.4065	0.3519	0.5520
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0743	2.1536	2.0881	1.9810
Panel B. Japanese Yen/British Pound				
Intercept	0.0008	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.5397**	−1.6906**	−1.1327**	−0.6751**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0724	−0.0665	−0.1262*	0.0015
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.2064*	−0.1295**	−0.0189	−0.0178
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.1116**	−0.1262**	−0.1821	−0.0639*
No. of obs.	1,312	1,312	1,312	1,312
Adj. R^2	0.1960	0.3508	0.2825	0.6062
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0067	1.9588	2.1252	2.0230
Panel C. Japanese Yen/Euro				
Intercept	−0.0003	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.6111**	−1.5578**	−1.0682**	−0.7099**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0664	−0.1145*	−0.0619	−0.0488*
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0939*	−0.1176*	−0.0365	0.0023
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0045	−0.0559	−0.0175	0.0413
No. of obs.	1,038	1,038	1,038	1,038
Adj. R^2	0.1721	0.2685	0.7806	0.5378
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0881	2.1016	2.2408	2.1498
Panel D. Australian Dollar				
Intercept	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.5600**	−1.5400**	−1.0200**	−0.9300**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0974**	−0.1463**	−0.1287**	−0.0257*
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0773*	−0.0149	−0.0535	−0.0115
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0269	−0.0663*	−0.0120	−0.0188
No. of obs.	1,679	1,678	1,680	1,713
Adj. R^2	0.0853	0.1358	0.1669	0.9415
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0574	2.0652	2.0914	2.2327

(continued on next page)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 6 (continued)

Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility for Seven Other Currency Pairs

Independent Variables	1 Month	3 Months	6 Months	12 Months
Panel E. Canadian Dollar				
Intercept	−0.0009	−0.0003	−0.0001	−0.0002
ΔImplied volatility	−2.9158**	−2.2620**	−0.8643**	−0.7757**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.2000**	0.0638	−0.2799**	−0.1132
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1590**	−0.0618	−0.1879**	−0.2699
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	0.0005	0.0305	−0.0752	−0.1786
No. of obs.	298	168	137	60
Adj. R^2	0.2663	0.5639	0.5337	0.3782
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.1184	2.2678	2.0147	2.0831
Panel F. Norwegian Kroner				
Intercept	−0.0009	0.0002	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−2.6090**	−1.3140**	−0.9449**	−0.7532**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.2202**	−0.2013**	−0.1969**	−0.1989**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1640**	−0.1552	−0.0545	−0.0650
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0903*	−0.1037	0.0367	−0.0034
No. of obs.	463	409	410	855
Adj. R^2	0.1727	0.3092	0.4749	0.7013
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0961	2.1529	1.9701	2.3951
Panel G. New Zealand Dollar				
Intercept	−0.0013	−0.0001	−0.0001	−0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.6634**	−1.4516**	−0.8526**	−0.6591**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1802**	−0.1473*	−0.1472*	−0.0613
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0549	−0.0690	−0.0786	0.0329
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0318	−0.1491**	−0.1151*	−0.0855
No. of obs.	667	576	504	480
Adj. R^2	0.2093	0.2595	0.3701	0.4521
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0985	2.0498	2.2401	1.9519

Table 6 presents the estimated results of the following regression model for seven other currency pairs, $\Delta y_t = \alpha_D + \gamma_D \Delta\sigma_t + \beta_{D1}\Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_{D2}\Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_{D3}\Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, σ_t is the volatility quoted for a delta-neutral straddle on date t, and $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}. We include three lagged dependent variables to control for serial autocorrelation. One regression model is estimated for each combination of currency and maturity. The objective is to test the null hypothesis $\gamma_D = 0$. Some currency pairs have a smaller number of observations, due to the fact that Bloomberg does not have complete daily straddle quotes from June 1996 to December 2003. We only include observations before December 2003 that have complete data necessary for the empirical analysis.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

Table 9 reports the estimation results of equation (16) for the post-Asian currency crisis period, and shows the same evidence as in Table 4 that the volatility risk premium is significantly negative for the four currencies and the four maturities in our study.

C. Impact of Jump Risk

Recent studies suggest that option prices account for not only the stochastic volatility in the return distribution of underlying assets, but also the potentially large tail events.[13] Theoretical option pricing models have been developed to incorporate both stochastic volatility and potential jumps in the underlying return process (see Pan (2002) and the references therein). Hence, it is possible that part of the risk premium observed in our empirical results is due to jump risk rather than volatility risk. In this section, we verify whether the volatility risk premium is distinct from the jump risk premium and is, indeed, a portion of the option price.

[13] See, for example, Bakshi, Cao, and Chen (1997), Bates (2000), Duffie, Pan, and Singleton (2000), Eraker, Johannes, and Polson (2000), and Pan (2002) for theoretical analysis and empirical evidence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 7

Pooled Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility for Seven Other Currency Pairs

Panel A.

	Currency		
Independent Variables	Euro/Swiss Franc	Japanese Yen/British Pound	Japanese Yen/Euro
Dummy–1 month	0.0000	0.0008	−0.0003
Dummy–3 months	0.0001	0.0002	0.0000
Dummy–6 months	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000
Dummy–12 months	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility–1 month	−2.6865**	−2.5426**	−2.6094**
ΔImplied volatility–3 months	−1.6384**	−1.6866**	−1.5646**
ΔImplied volatility–6 months	−1.1471**	−1.1307**	−1.0664**
ΔImplied volatility–12 months	−0.8205**	−0.6564**	−0.7170**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0956*	−0.0746	−0.0708*
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0329	−0.1956*	−0.0930*
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0101	−0.1153	−0.0097
No. of obs.	3,551	5,248	4,152
Adj. R^2	0.1899	0.2091	0.2073
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0848	2.0061	2.0905
Wald test for H_0:$\gamma_1 = \gamma_{12}$			
Statistic	14.4969	51.9282	37.6506
(*p*-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Wald test for H_0:$\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = \gamma_6 + \gamma_{12}$			
Statistic	20.0182	65.2485	52.8223
(*p*-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

Panel B.

	Currency			
Independent Variables	Australian Dollar	Canadian Dollar	Norwegian Kroner	New Zealand Dollar
Dummy–1 month	0.0000	−0.0009	−0.0009	−0.0013
Dummy–3 months	0.0000	−0.0003	0.0002	−0.0001
Dummy–6 months	0.0000	−0.0001	0.0000	−0.0001
Dummy–12 months	0.0000	−0.0001	0.0000	−0.0001
ΔImplied volatility–1 month	−2.5600**	−2.9134**	−2.6085**	−2.6600**
ΔImplied volatility–3 months	−1.5400**	−2.1086**	−1.3094**	−1.4761**
ΔImplied volatility–6 months	−1.0300**	−0.8959**	−0.9484**	−0.8506**
ΔImplied volatility–12 months	−0.9000**	−0.7963**	−0.7393**	−0.6393**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1004**	−0.1812**	−0.2191**	−0.1761**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0701*	−0.1504*	−0.1605**	−0.0563
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0307	−0.0016	−0.0875*	−0.0428
No. of obs.	6,750	663	2,137	2,227
Adj. R^2	0.1245	0.2904	0.1985	0.2180
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0621	2.1378	2.0997	2.1005
Statistic	35.6092	15.7488	45.3234	29.1777
(*p*-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Wald test for H_0:$\gamma_1 + \gamma_3 = \gamma_6 + \gamma_{12}$				
Statistic	42.3990	31.1340	46.8289	38.6366
(*p*-value)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

We pool the delta-hedged straddle returns for four maturities and estimate the following model for seven other currency pairs,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta y_t \quad = \quad & \alpha_1 I_1 + \alpha_3 I_3 + \alpha_6 I_6 + \alpha_{12} I_{12} \\ & + \gamma_1 \Delta\sigma_{1,t} * I_1 + \gamma_3 \Delta\sigma_{3,t} * I_3 + \gamma_6 \Delta\sigma_{6,t} * I_6 + \gamma_{12} \Delta\sigma_{12,t} * I_{12} \\ & + \beta_1 \Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_3 \Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t,\end{aligned}$$

where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, $\sigma_{i,t}$ is the quoted volatility for the i-month maturity on date t, $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}, and I_i is the indicator variable for the i-month maturity observation with i being 1, 3, 6, or 12. We use α_i to allow for different intercepts at different maturities. Our main focus is on γ_i, which measures the unit delta-hedged straddle return at different maturities.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

TABLE 8

Summary Statistics of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return for the Post-Asian Currency Crisis Subperiod

Maturity	No. of Obs.	% of Negative Return	Sample Mean	Sample Std. Dev.	Autocorrelation Coefficient			Partial Autocorrelation Coefficient			AR(3) Intercept	
					Lag 1	Lag 2	Lag 3	Lag 1	Lag 2	Lag 3	Estimate	*p*-Value
Panel A. British Pound												
1 month	902	70%	−0.0213	0.0484	0.846	0.750	0.692	0.846	0.123	0.113	−0.0027	0.0065
3 months	902	78%	−0.0185	0.0223	0.943	0.909	0.883	0.943	0.172	0.105	−0.0009	0.0204
6 months	902	82%	−0.0162	0.0165	0.939	0.893	0.881	0.939	0.087	0.289	−0.0003	0.0779
12 months	902	82%	−0.0133	0.0120	0.926	0.885	0.883	0.926	0.193	0.314	−0.0003	0.0666
Panel B. Euro												
1 month	902	59%	−0.0130	0.0642	0.842	0.731	0.647	0.842	0.077	0.048	−0.0018	0.1117
3 months	902	68%	−0.0131	0.0264	0.959	0.927	0.900	0.959	0.091	0.047	−0.0005	0.0674
6 months	902	67%	−0.0106	0.0194	0.976	0.957	0.937	0.976	0.096	−0.012	−0.0003	0.0887
12 months	902	64%	−0.0093	0.0152	0.986	0.973	0.961	0.986	0.038	0.032	−0.0002	0.0317
Panel C. Japanese Yen												
1 month	902	59%	−0.0138	0.0732	0.878	0.781	0.705	0.878	0.044	0.049	−0.0017	0.1653
3 months	902	66%	−0.0147	0.0363	0.886	0.816	0.745	0.886	0.144	−0.007	−0.0014	0.0385
6 months	902	82%	−0.0155	0.0278	0.803	0.711	0.628	0.803	0.186	0.038	−0.0020	0.0814
12 months	902	70%	−0.0096	0.0211	0.820	0.722	0.579	0.820	0.151	−0.145	−0.0017	0.0093
Panel D. Swiss Franc												
1 month	902	55%	−0.0010	0.0660	0.834	0.720	0.656	0.834	0.081	0.119	−0.0002	0.8726
3 months	902	67%	−0.0095	0.0248	0.939	0.902	0.868	0.939	0.172	0.046	−0.0006	0.0376
6 months	902	68%	−0.0098	0.0165	0.950	0.915	0.884	0.950	0.125	0.038	−0.0004	0.0090
12 months	902	75%	−0.0085	0.0118	0.967	0.950	0.927	0.967	0.238	−0.037	−0.0003	0.0034

The U.S. dollar delta-hedged straddle profit (loss) from holding the dynamically delta-hedged portfolio until maturity is computed by

$$\Pi_{t,t+\tau} = \text{Max}\left(x_{t+\tau} - k, k - x_{t+\tau}, 0\right) - f_t - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \Delta_{t_n}\left(x_{t_n} - x_{t_{n+1}}\right) - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left(r_t f_t - (r_t - q_t)\,\Delta_{t_n} x_{t_n}\right)\frac{\tau}{N},$$

where f_t is the straddle premium at time t, $x_{t+\tau}$ is the currency price at the maturity $t + \tau$, k is the strike price of the straddle, Δ_{t_n} is the delta of the long straddle, and r_t and q_t are the domestic and foreign interest rates, respectively. The delta-hedged straddle return is calculated as $\Pi_{t,t+\tau}$ divided by the straddle contract size in U.S. dollars. We annualize the return to make it comparable across maturities. We report summary statistics on the return for four currencies at four standard maturities. For each combination of currency and maturity, the delta-hedged straddle return comprises a time-series of one observation on each trading day. We fit an AR(3) process to the time-series and test whether the intercept is zero. This is equivalent to a test of whether the mean delta-hedged straddle return is equal to zero. The post-Asian currency crisis subperiod is from July 1999 to December 2002.

To isolate the potential effect of jump risk, we need to examine the delta-hedged straddle returns for a sample where jump fears are much less pronounced. We do this by identifying the days on which jump fears are high and exclude them from the sample. We argue that large moves in currency prices cause market participants to revise their expectations of future large moves upward. This is consistent with the fact that GARCH-type models are adequate for the return process of financial assets (see, e.g., Bollerslev, Chou, and Kroner (1992)). Jackwerth and Rubinstein (1996) report that since the October 1987 market crash, the risk-neutral probability of a large decline in the equity market index has been much higher than before the crash. Hence, jump fears are likely to be high after large moves in currency prices. We identify the dates when currency prices experienced large moves so that the daily percentage change is two standard deviations away from the mean daily percentage change in our sample period. The first column of Table 10 reports the number of days that experienced a large move in currency prices. We do not differentiate between negative and positive jumps because the straddle price is equally sensitive to moves in both directions. Take the British

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FIGURE 3

Distribution of Implied Volatility Quotes in the Post-Asian Currency Crisis Subperiod




Figure 3 shows the boxplots of the daily implied volatility quotes for the one-, three-, six-, and 12-month at-the-money straddles between July 1999 and December 2002 for all four currencies.

pound as an example: between June 3, 1996 and December 31, 2002, 103 days (about 6%) experienced large moves in the U.S. dollar price of the British pound in either a positive or a negative direction. The euro has fewer large move days because of its shorter trading history. We find that the average delta-hedged straddle returns remain significantly negative for all currencies after we exclude the delta-hedged straddle returns of those days when large moves occurred and also the days immediately thereafter.

Furthermore, we compare the mean and the median of delta-hedged straddle returns the day before large moves and the day after. The results are reported in Table 10. The *t*- and Wilcoxon tests show that both the mean and median of the delta-hedged straddle returns are significantly negative in most cases both before and after large moves.[14] However, the most salient feature is that, for all currencies and across all maturities, the delta-hedged straddle return is significantly more negative the day after rather than the day before the large move. To control for the effect of variability between the days on the before vs. after comparison, we calculate the return difference between before and after for each large move day and compute the mean and median of the differences. The results are reported

[14] A close look at the dates of large moves shows that the dates are set widely apart, which makes it safe to assume independence in the sample of delta-hedged straddle returns and to therefore use *t*- and Wilcoxon tests. This also suggests that although large moves cause market participants to raise their expectations of future jumps, few large moves of the same magnitude happen consecutively because of the mean-reverting nature of the return process.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 9

Regression of the First Difference of the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return on the First Difference of Implied Volatility for the Post-Asian Currency Crisis Subperiod

Independent Variables	1 Month	3 Months	6 Months	12 Months
Panel A. British Pound				
Intercept	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.7502**	−1.5195**	−0.8710**	−0.6980**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.2161**	−0.3202**	−0.4009**	−0.2796**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1601**	0.0299	−0.3309*	−0.1999
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0977*	0.0690	0.0624	0.0143
No. of obs.	898	898	898	898
Adj. R^2	0.2299	0.2488	0.2444	0.1878
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0820	2.1123	2.0313	1.9780
Panel B. Euro				
Intercept	0.0000	−0.0001	−0.0001	−0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.5395**	−1.6108**	−1.1657**	−0.8574**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.0462	−0.0832	−0.0807*	−0.0389
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0393	−0.1986	−0.0329	−0.0010
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.1793*	−0.0992	−0.0041	−0.0477
No. of obs.	898	898	898	898
Adj. R^2	0.0958	0.2812	0.3035	0.3020
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0775	1.8289	2.1121	2.0527
Panel C. Japanese Yen				
Intercept	−0.0002	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000
ΔImplied volatility	−3.1096**	−1.5436**	−1.1213**	−1.0263**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1177**	−0.1973*	−0.3172**	−0.2011**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.0715*	−0.0437	−0.2103*	0.0399
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0987*	−0.1229	−0.2037*	−0.1415
No. of obs.	898	898	898	898
Adj. R^2	0.2816	0.1660	0.1522	0.1056
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0697	2.0326	2.0549	2.0502
Panel D. Swiss Franc				
Intercept	−0.0001	−0.0001	0.0000	0.0001
ΔImplied volatility	−2.5901**	−1.6449**	−1.1455**	−0.7238**
ΔStraddle return–lag 1	−0.1819**	−0.1715**	0.0063	−0.3168**
ΔStraddle return–lag 2	−0.1494**	−0.2061*	−0.1747	−0.0144
ΔStraddle return–lag 3	−0.0301	−0.1700*	−0.0274	0.1205
No. of obs.	898	898	898	898
Adj. R^2	0.1438	0.3324	0.2505	0.2891
Durbin-Watson stat.	2.0286	2.0904	1.9849	1.9902

Table 9 presents the estimated results for the regression model, $\Delta y_t = \alpha_D + \gamma_D \Delta\sigma_t + \beta_{D1}\Delta y_{t-1} + \beta_{D2}\Delta y_{t-2} + \beta_{D3}\Delta y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged return on a delta-neutral straddle bought on date t, Δy_t is the difference between y_t and y_{t-1}, σ_t is the volatility quoted for a delta-neutral straddle on date t, and $\Delta\sigma_t$ is the difference between σ_t and σ_{t-1}. We include three lagged dependent variables to control for serial autocorrelation. One regression model is estimated for each combination of currency and maturity. The objective is to test the null hypothesis, $\gamma_D = 0$. The post-Asian currency crisis subperiod is from July 1999 to December 2002.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

in the last two columns of Table 10. The within-day difference clearly shows that the magnitudes of delta-hedged straddle returns are significantly larger the day after rather than the day before jumps. It is likely that after price jumps, the market perceives a high risk of jumps and thus option buyers pay an additional premium to option sellers for bearing jump risk on top of the volatility risk. This finding provides evidence that jump risk is priced in the currency option market. However, the result that the delta-hedged straddle returns are negative at most times even on the days before jumps, when jump risk is much less pronounced, indicates that the volatility risk premium is distinct from and not subsumed by the jump risk premium.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 10

Effect of Jumps on the Delta-Hedged Straddle Return

Maturity	No. of Jumps	Before Jumps: Mean (*p*-value of *t*-test)	Before Jumps: Median (*p*-value of Wilcoxon test)	After Jumps: Mean (*p*-value of *t*-test)	After Jumps: Median (*p*-value of Wilcoxon test)	Before vs. After: Mean (*p*-value of *t*-test)	Before vs. After: Median (*p*-value of Wilcoxon test)
Panel A. British Pound							
1 month	103	−0.0009 (0.88)	0.0031 (0.89)	−0.0354 (0.00)	−0.0357 (0.00)	0.0345 (0.00)	0.0307 (0.00)
3 months	103	−0.0167 (0.00)	−0.0199 (0.00)	−0.0257 (0.00)	−0.0275 (0.00)	0.0090 (0.00)	0.0078 (0.00)
6 months	103	−0.0155 (0.00)	−0.0150 (0.00)	−0.0188 (0.00)	−0.0194 (0.00)	0.0033 (0.00)	0.0025 (0.00)
12 months	103	−0.0149 (0.00)	−0.0177 (0.00)	−0.0166 (0.00)	−0.0188 (0.00)	0.0017 (0.10)	0.0010 (0.00)
Panel B. Euro							
1 month	53	0.0242 (0.03)	0.0265 (0.01)	−0.0251 (0.01)	−0.0116 (0.05)	0.0493 (0.00)	0.0442 (0.00)
3 months	53	−0.0102 (0.00)	−0.0071 (0.01)	−0.0206 (0.00)	−0.0201 (0.00)	0.0104 (0.00)	0.0095 (0.00)
6 months	53	−0.0094 (0.00)	−0.0103 (0.00)	−0.0136 (0.00)	−0.0115 (0.00)	0.0042 (0.00)	0.0053 (0.00)
12 months	53	−0.0117 (0.00)	−0.0157 (0.00)	−0.0125 (0.00)	−0.0147 (0.00)	0.0008 (0.30)	0.0014 (0.24)
Panel C. Japanese Yen							
1 month	82	0.0257 (0.20)	0.0367 (0.06)	−0.0444 (0.01)	−0.0474 (0.00)	0.0701 (0.00)	0.0607 (0.00)
3 months	82	0.0023 (0.73)	−0.0051 (0.84)	−0.0237 (0.07)	−0.0163 (0.01)	0.0259 (0.03)	0.0134 (0.00)
6 months	82	−0.0010 (0.87)	−0.0059 (0.26)	−0.0078 (0.17)	−0.0155 (0.02)	0.0068 (0.00)	0.0071 (0.00)
12 months	82	−0.0079 (0.01)	−0.0108 (0.00)	−0.0109 (0.00)	−0.0121 (0.00)	0.0030 (0.10)	0.0033 (0.00)
Panel D. Swiss Franc							
1 month	100	0.0353 (0.00)	0.0235 (0.00)	0.0004 (0.95)	−0.0017 (0.66)	0.0349 (0.00)	0.0309 (0.00)
3 months	100	0.0005 (0.87)	0.0003 (0.91)	−0.0067 (0.02)	−0.0112 (0.01)	0.0072 (0.00)	0.0052 (0.00)
6 months	100	−0.0058 (0.00)	−0.0101 (0.00)	−0.0087 (0.00)	−0.0130 (0.00)	0.0030 (0.00)	0.0023 (0.00)
12 months	100	−0.0066 (0.00)	−0.0058 (0.00)	−0.0076 (0.00)	−0.0072 (0.00)	0.0009 (0.08)	0.0006 (0.07)

We identify the day on which the daily percentage change in the currency price is two standard deviations away from the mean daily percentage change in our sample period. We examine the delta-hedged straddle returns on the day immediately before or after these price jumps. We do not differentiate between negative and positive jumps because the straddle price is equally sensitive to moves in both directions. The first column reports the number of days when the price jumped. Take the British pound as an example. Between June 3, 1996 and December 31, 2002, 103 days (about 6%) experienced large moves in the U.S. dollar price of the British pound in either a positive or a negative direction.

D. Effect of Mismeasurement in the Delta-Hedge Ratio

Extant theory (e.g., Hull and White (1987), (1988), Heston (1993)) suggests that using a delta-hedge ratio computed on the basis of a constant volatility model such as the Garman-Kohlhagen model may cause bias in hedging performance when the volatility process is actually stochastic. The bias depends on the correlation between the volatility process and the underlying asset return process. To mitigate the potential bias in the delta-hedge ratio, we use the modified Garman-Kohlhagen model in computing the hedge ratio, that is, we update the volatility

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

daily. Since this modified Garman-Kohlhagen model may not fully correct the misspecification, we estimate the following model for the delta-hedged straddle returns,

$$y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + \Omega R_{t,t+\tau} + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_2 y_{t-2} + \beta_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (18)$$

where the additional variable, $R_{t,t+\tau}$, is the return in spot currency prices over the straddle maturity period from t to $t+\tau$. We use $R_{t,t+\tau}$ to capture the potential effect of a systematic hedging bias. We construct two time-series of at-the-money straddles for each currency for the one- and the three-month maturity periods, where one series represents positive $R_{t,t+\tau}$ and the other series represents negative $R_{t,t+\tau}$. The first series is designed to capture a sample for which the spot market is upward trending. The second series represents a sample for which there is a downward-trending spot market.[15] If the modified Garman-Kohlhagen model systematically underhedges (overhedges), we expect Ω to be positive (negative) for an upward-trending spot market and Ω to be negative (positive) for a downward-trending spot market.[16]

The regression results are reported in Table 11. All the Ω coefficients are positive for upward-trending markets and the majority is negative for downward-trending markets. However, not all of the Ω coefficients are significantly different from zero, particularly for downward-trending markets. This suggests that the modified Garman-Kohlhagen model we use does not fully correct for the misspecification in all cases. Rather, it tends to underhedge, so that the delta-hedged straddle return is upward biased. However, the important thing to note is that in all regressions, after we explicitly account for the possible bias in the hedge ratio, the γ coefficient of implied volatility is significantly different from zero and is negative. The only exception is the γ coefficient of the euro currency in the upward-trending market. This provides further support for the negative volatility risk premium in the OTC currency option market.

We conduct a further test to assess the reasonableness of the estimated delta-hedge ratio. In this test, we compute two daily delta-neutral straddle returns: i) the first day price changes of a new delta-neutral straddle price and the estimated second day price (R1), and ii) the first day price changes of successive new delta-neutral straddle prices (R2). We compute the two price changes for one-, three-, and six-month, and one-year straddles for the pound, franc, yen, and euro.

The daily returns of a delta-neutral straddle on average should give an expected return less than the risk-free rate in the presence of a negative volatility risk premium. We also expect that on average R1 is less than R2. Since a long position in a delta-neutral straddle earns a large profit when there are jumps in the spot price, we exclude those days when there are jumps in the spot price. We define a jump as the daily percentage change in the spot price that is two standard deviations away from the mean daily percentage change in our sample period. This definition is consistent with the definition we use in Section VI.C. Our empirical results show that the means of R1 are negative and statistically significant

[15]Time-series for straddles with a six- and 12-month maturity are not used in this robustness test because the use of the $R_{t,t+\tau}$ criteria cannot fully capture the spot market trend during the option life.

[16]Bakshi and Kapadia (2003) employ a similar robustness test in their study of the equity index option market.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 11

Effect of Mismeasurement in the Delta-Hedge Ratio

Independent Variables	Upward-Trending Spot Market				Downward-Trending Spot Market			
	British Pound	Euro	Japanese Yen	Swiss Franc	British Pound	Euro	Japanese Yen	Swiss Franc
Panel A. One-Month Maturity								
Intercept	0.009*	0.015*	0.120*	0.023**	0.019**	0.018	0.183**	0.028**
Implied volatility	−0.262**	−0.223**	−1.366**	−0.304**	−0.368**	−0.226*	−1.747**	−0.262**
Return in spot market	0.429**	0.314**	1.449**	0.337**	−0.541**	−0.287**	−0.394	−0.031
Straddle return–lag 1	0.678**	0.710**	0.310*	0.794**	0.713**	0.915**	0.209*	0.071**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.073	0.069	0.029	0.064	0.068	−0.026	0.114**	0.013
Straddle return–lag 3	0.061	0.053	0.232**	0.026	0.048	−0.043	0.066*	0.749
No. of obs.	849	438	742	708	836	575	947	981
Adj. R^2	0.761	0.687	0.642	0.806	0.773	0.770	0.712	0.712
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.889	1.930	1.393	1.989	1.968	1.935	0.894	1.895
Panel B. Three-Month Maturity								
Intercept	0.006**	−0.001	0.013	0.013**	0.015**	0.007*	0.126**	0.014**
Implied volatility	−0.081**	−0.027	−0.178*	−0.136**	−0.223**	−0.082**	−1.166**	−0.129**
Return in spot market	0.015	0.049**	0.151*	0.030*	−0.117**	−0.041*	0.024	0.001
Straddle return–lag 1	0.809**	0.818**	0.419*	0.799**	0.730**	0.790**	0.084*	0.099**
Straddle return–lag 2	0.070	−0.014	0.262**	0.052	0.099*	0.080	0.053*	0.053
Straddle return–lag 3	0.060	0.120*	0.054	0.072	0.073	0.087	0.051**	0.771*
No. of obs.	751	373	642	672	895	600	1,006	974
Adj. R^2	0.937	0.901	0.772	0.905	0.901	0.917	0.824	0.888
Durbin-Watson stat.	1.919	1.701	0.963	1.937	1.833	1.766	0.455	1.833

Table 11 shows the estimation results for the regression model, $y_t = \alpha + \gamma\sigma_t + \Omega R_{t,t+\tau} + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_2 y_{t-2} + \beta_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$, where y_t is the delta-hedged straddle return, σ_t is the implied volatility, and $R_{t,t+\tau}$, is the return in spot currency prices over the maturity period from t to $t + \tau$. We use $R_{t,t+\tau}$ to capture the potential systematic hedging bias. If the modified Garman-Kohlhagen model systematically underhedges (overhedges), we expect Ω to be positive (negative) for an upward-trending spot market and Ω to be negative (positive) for a downward-trending spot market. We include three lagged variables, y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, and y_{t-3}, to control for serial correlation in the time-series of delta-hedged straddle returns. We estimate one model for each currency for both the one- and three-month maturities. The sample period is from June 1996 to December 2002 for the British pound, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc, and January 1999 to December 2002 for the euro.

** and * indicate significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

for all cases, except one-year pound straddles. Moreover, the means of R2 are higher than the means of R1 for all cases. The results provide support for the reasonableness of our delta estimates.[17]

E. Potential Biases during Periods of Increasing or Decreasing Volatility

As a final robustness check, we investigate whether the trend in the volatility process affects our conclusions. We identify two trending periods for both the pound and the yen; one with an increasing trend in observed volatility quotes and the other with a decreasing trend. For the pound, the decreasing trend occurred between June 6, 1998 and August 14, 1998, while the increasing trend occurred between June 25, 1999 and September 17, 1999. For the yen, the decreasing and increasing trends extend from February 19, 1999 to June 25, 1999, and from November 10, 2000 to March 30, 2001, respectively. We replicate the empirical analysis based on regressions (14) and (16) for the one- and three-month delta-hedged straddle returns in these four trending periods and obtain similar evidence that supports the existence of a negative volatility risk premium.[18]

[17] We thank the referee for suggesting this robustness test. The empirical results are available upon request.

[18] The empirical results are available upon request.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

VII. Conclusion

Substantial evidence documents that volatility in both the equity market and the currency market is stochastic. This exposes investors to the risk of changing volatility. Although several studies show that volatility risk is priced in the equity index option market and that the volatility risk premium is negative, a few studies examine these issues for the currency option market. This paper contributes to the literature in this direction.

Using a large database of daily ask volatility quotes on at-the-money delta-neutral straddles in the OTC currency option market, we first find that the volatility risk is priced in four major currencies—the British pound, euro, Japanese yen, and Swiss franc—across a wide range of maturity terms between one and 12 months. Second, we provide direct evidence of the sign of the volatility risk premium. The risk premium is negative for all four major currencies, suggesting that buyers in the OTC currency option market pay a premium to sellers as compensation for bearing the volatility risk. Third, we find that the volatility risk premium has a term structure where the magnitude of the volatility risk premium decreases in maturity. This study is the first to provide empirical evidence of the term structure of the volatility risk premium. Although previous studies document that short-term volatility has higher variability than long-term volatility (e.g., Campa and Chang (1995) and Xu and Taylor (1994)), no study has investigated its implication on the volatility risk premium. Fourth, there is some evidence that jump risk is also priced in the OTC market. However, the observed volatility risk premium is distinct from and not subsumed by the possible jump risk premium. These findings are robust to various sensitivity analyses on the risk-free interest rate, option delta computation, and empirical model specification.

References

Bakshi, G.; C. Cao; and Z. Chen. "Empirical Performance of Alternative Option Pricing Models." *Journal of Finance*, 52 (1997), 2003–2049.

Bakshi, G., and N. Kapadia. "Delta-Hedged Gains and the Negative Market Volatility Risk Premium." *Review of Financial Studies*, 16 (2003), 527–566.

Bank for International Settlement. *Central Bank Survey of Foreign Exchange and Derivatives Market Activity 1995.* Basel (1996).

Bank for International Settlement. *BIS Quarterly Review–International Banking and Financial Market Developments.* Basel (1997).

Bank for International Settlement. *Central Bank Survey of Foreign Exchange and Derivatives Market Activity 2001.* Basel (2002).

Bank for International Settlement. *BIS Quarterly Review–International Banking and Financial Market Developments.* Basel (2003).

Bates, D. "Post-'87 Crash Fears in S&P 500 Futures Options." *Journal of Econometrics*, 94 (2000), 181–238.

Bollerslev, T.; R. Y. Chou; and K. F. Kroner. "ARCH Modeling in Finance." *Journal of Econometrics*, 52 (1992), 5–59.

Campa, J., and K. H. Chang. "Testing the Expectations Hypothesis on the Term Structure of Volatilities." *Journal of Finance*, 50 (1995), 529–547.

Campa, J., and K. H. Chang. "The Forecasting Ability Of Correlations Implied In Foreign Exchange Options." *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 17 (1998), 855–880.

Chesney, M., and L. Scott. "Pricing European Currency Options: A Comparison of the Modified Black-Scholes Model and a Random Variance Model." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 24 (1989), 267–284.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Coval, J., and T. Shumway. "Expected Option Returns." *Journal of Finance,* 56 (2001), 983–1009.
Covrig, V., and B. S. Low. "The Quality of Volatility Traded on the Over-the-Counter Currency Market: A Multiple Horizons Study." *Journal of Futures Markets,* 23 (2003), 261–285.
Cox, J.; J. Ingersoll; and S. Ross. "An Intertemporal General Equilibrium Model of Asset Prices." *Econometrica,* 53 (1985), 363–384.
De Santis, G., and B. Gerard. "How Big Is The Premium For Currency Risk?" *Journal of Financial Economics,* 49 (1998), 375–412.
Duffie, D.; J. Pan; and K. Singleton. "Transform Analysis and Asset Pricing for Affine Jump-Diffusions." *Econometrica,* 68 (2000), 1343–1376.
Dumas, B., and B. Solnik. "The World Price of Foreign Exchange Risk." *Journal of Finance,* 50 (1995), 445–479.
Eraker, B.; M. S. Johannes; and N. G. Polson. "The Impact of Jumps in Returns and Volatility." Working Paper, Univ. of Chicago, (2000).
Garman, B., and S. Kohlhagen. "Foreign Currency Option Values." *Journal of International Money and Finance,* 2 (1983), 231–237.
Heston, S. "A Closed Form Solution for Options with Stochastic Volatility with Applications to Bond and Currency Options." *Review of Financial Studies,* 6 (1993), 327–343.
Heynen, R.; A. Kemna; and T. Vorst. "Analysis of the Term Structure of Implied Volatilities." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis,* 29 (1994), 31–56.
Hull, J., and A. White. "The Pricing of Options on Assets with Stochastic Volatilities." *Journal of Finance,* 42 (1987), 281–300.
Hull, J., and A. White. "An Analysis of the Bias in Option Pricing Caused by Stochastic Volatility." *Advances in Futures and Options Research,* 3 (1988), 29–61.
Hull, J. *Options, Futures, and Other Derivatives,* 5th ed. New York: Prentice Hall (2003).
Jackwerth, J., and M. Rubinstein. "Recovering Probability Distributions from Option Prices." *Journal of Finance,* 51 (1996), 1611–1631.
Jorion, P. "Predicting Volatility in the Foreign Exchange Market." *Journal of Finance,* 50 (1995), 507–528.
Lamoureux, G., and W. Lastrapes. "Forecasting Stock-Return Variance: Toward an Understanding of Stochastic Implied Volatilities." *Review of Financial Studies,* 6 (1993), 293–326.
Melino, A., and S. Turnbull. "Pricing Foreign Currency Options with Stochastic Volatility." *Journal of Econometrics,* 45 (1990), 239–265.
Melino, A., and S. Turnbull. "Misspecification and the Pricing and Hedging of Long-Term Foreign Currency Options." *Journal of International Money and Finance,* 14 (1995), 373–393.
Neely, C. "Forecasting Foreign Exchange Volatility: Is Implied Volatility the Best We Can Do?" Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (2003).
Newey, W. K., and K. D. West. "A Simple Positive Semi-Definite, Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix." *Econometrica,* 55 (1987), 702–708.
Pan, J. "The Jump-Risk Premia Implicit in Options: Evidence from an Integrated Time Series Study." *Journal of Financial Economics,* 63 (2002), 3–50.
Sarwar, G. "Is Volatility Risk for the British Pound Priced in the U.S. Options Markets?" *Financial Review,* 36 (2001), 55–70.
Stein, J. "Overreactions in the Options Market." *Journal of Finance,* 44 (1989), 1011–1024.
Taylor, S., and X. Xu. "The Incremental Volatility Information in One Million Foreign Exchange Quotations." *Journal of Empirical Finance,* 4 (1997), 317–340.
Wilmott, P. *Derivatives.* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons (1998).
Xu, X., and S. Taylor. "The Term Structure of Volatility Implied by Foreign Exchange Options." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis,* 29 (1994), 57–74.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022109000001988 Published online by Cambridge University Press