**Testing for Herding using Different Return Definitions: A Comparison between Simple and Logarithmic Returns**

**1. Introduction**

Herding in financial markets occurs when investors are guided by the collective behaviour of other market participants rather than their own beliefs. Numerous studies have empirically investigated herding in many world markets[[1]](#footnote-1). Empirical investigations of herding necessarily need to use measures of the returns on the assets involved. Two common ways to measure returns are used in financial theory and practice: logarithmic and simple returns[[2]](#footnote-2). Herding investigations provide an interesting setting to investigate the possible importance of using different asset return measures. The use of different return measures can sometimes lead to significantly different outcomes (Hudson and Gregoriou, 2015). To our knowledge the effect of using different return measures has not previously been investigated in the context of herding and indeed many papers in the literature do not indicate which measure is used. The return measure used may be particularly important in herding tests for two reasons. Firstly, herding is often proposed to be particularly prevalent when there are large price movements in markets which is when the logarithmic and simple measures have their greatest differences. Secondly, the most common test for herding tests for non-linear relationships between market returns and the dispersion of the returns on the assets in the market. Given there is a non-linear relationship between logarithmic and simple returns, the use of the different return measures is likely to lead to different conclusions from this test.

In this paper we initially outline why the return measure used may affect tests for herding. We then carry out comprehensive empirical tests using different data sets from many of the world’s major financial markets to show that different returns measures can frequently lead to different conclusions about the presence of herding.

## **2. Effect of the Return Measure on Tests for Herding**

Most empirical work on herding uses a test developed by Chang, Cheng and Kohrana (2000) which we subsequently refer to as the CCK test. Due to its popularity, we focus on this test in our investigation. The CCK test is based on the proposition that the cross-sectional absolute deviation of stock returns (CSAD) should be linearly related to overall market returns where:

­ (1)

Given this, the CCK approach for testing for herding is to examine a regression model of the following basic form:

(2)

If is negative and significant that indicates herding as increases less than proportionately to  which is in accordance with market participant imitating one another as market movements become larger. Conversely, if is positive and significant that indicates anti-herding as  increases more than proportionately to as market participant have less tendency to imitate one another as market movements become larger. If is not statistically significant that is taken as evidence of no herding. Theoretically, it is often proposed that herding is more likely in times of market stress so often Equation 2 is used to examine periods of large absolute market movements either by modifying the equation with appropriate dummy variables or by looking at subsets of the data. For example, Chiang, Li and Tan (2010) used quantile regression to estimate herding behaviour in Chinese stock markets, showing that there tends to be more significant herding in the quantiles associated with larger returns. We adopt the approach of looking at appropriate subsets of the data in this paper.

If a study uses log or simple returns throughout there is no theoretical issue preventing from being proportionate to . However, there is not a linear relationship between log and simple returns for a set of price movements. In particular, if we consider the Taylor series expansion of

=

Thus, if there is a precisely proportionate mathematical relation between and for simple (log) returns that cannot also be true for log (simple) returns. Thus, findings regarding the presence of herding will, necessarily, depend on the return measure used. We assess the empirical significance of any differences in the section below.

Table 1 numerically demonstrates this effect and some of its implications. For simple returns, CSADS is a constant precise linear function of so in this case, by definition, there is no herding[[3]](#footnote-3). Without loss of generality, we assume two equally weighted stocks in the market. RS1t = 1.5 RSmt and RS2t = 0.5 RSmt .

In contrast, for log returns, CSADL is not a linear function of  We can observe that for negative market returns CSADL has a convex relationship with which is associated with anti-herding, conversely for positive market returns CSADL has a concave relationship with which is associated with herding. Thus, using different return measures may give different results regarding the presence of herding and these results are also somewhat dependent on market conditions. The relationship between tests for herding using the different measures will depend on whether the overall market is rising or falling and on the magnitude of market movements.

The example in Table 1 is deterministic so does not allow for the stochastic deviations from the underlying model that are observed in real stock markets and the returns have been chosen for illustrative purposes. This gives rise to the important practical issue of whether the use of different return measures can produce substantially different conclusions using actual market data. We deal with this question in section 3.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: Numerical demonstration showing how CSADS and CSADL , the cross-sectional absolute deviation of simple and logarithmic stock returns respectively, change in response to changing market returns for a market of two assets. All figures reported are as at time t. Rs and RL  denote the simple and logarithmic returns on assets. | | | | | | |
| Asset | RS | RL | CSADS | CSADL |  |  |
| 1 | -0.75 | -1.38629 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -0.25 | -0.28768 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | -0.5 | -0.83699 | 0.25 | 0.549306 | 0.5 | 0.656289 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | -0.6 | -0.91629 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -0.2 | -0.22314 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | -0.4 | -0.56972 | 0.2 | 0.346574 | 0.5 | 0.608326 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | -0.45 | -0.59784 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -0.15 | -0.16252 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | -0.3 | -0.38018 | 0.15 | 0.217659 | 0.5 | 0.572519 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | -0.3 | -0.35667 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -0.1 | -0.10536 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | -0.2 | -0.23102 | 0.1 | 0.125657 | 0.5 | 0.543929 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | -0.15 | -0.16252 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -0.05 | -0.05129 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | -0.1 | -0.10691 | 0.05 | 0.055613 | 0.5 | 0.520202 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.15 | 0.139762 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.05 | 0.04879 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | 0.1 | 0.094276 | 0.05 | 0.045486 | 0.5 | 0.482476 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.262364 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.1 | 0.09531 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | 0.2 | 0.178837 | 0.1 | 0.083527 | 0.5 | 0.467056 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.45 | 0.371564 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.15 | 0.139762 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | 0.3 | 0.255663 | 0.15 | 0.115901 | 0.5 | 0.453335 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.6 | 0.470004 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.2 | 0.182322 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | 0.4 | 0.326163 | 0.2 | 0.143841 | 0.5 | 0.44101 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.75 | 0.559616 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 0.25 | 0.223144 |  |  |  |  |
| Market | 0.5 | 0.39138 | 0.25 | 0.168236 | 0.5 | 0.429854 |

## **3. Empirical Evidence from Global Markets of the Effect of Using different Return Measures.**

In this section we present the results of herding tests for a number of major world markets based on the traditional CCK using both Logarithmic and Simple returns to see the difference between the measures. Robust regression methods are used throughout.

The data set is constructed from companies in the leading indices of Denmark (OMXC-20), Finland (HEX-25), US Dow Jones Composite, Germany (DAX-30), France (CAC-40), Greece (ATHEX), Italy (FTSE-MIB), Norway (OBX), Portugal (PSI-20), Spain (IBEX-35), Sweden (OMXS-30), Hong Kong Heng SENG as well as the UK market (FTSE-100). The data sample period is collected from Bloomberg over the period from 02/Jan/2002 to 31/May/2018.

Table 2 reports the descriptive statistics for the equally weighted average market return and the CCK measurements for each of the total thirteen different countries using logarithmic and simple returns. We see that, for each country, the difference between the two types of return are quite modest for standard deviation and CSAD whereas they are quite substantial for mean returns and the maximum and minimum returns.

Table 3 reports the results when Equation 2 is applied to the full data and subsets of the data based on absolute return size which are shown in Panels A and B respectively. As discussed above, the key determinant of herding or anti-herding is the sign and significance of the coefficient of so to conserve space this is the coefficient we report. For the countries in the full data set, for both log and simple returns, this coefficient is always positive which is associated with anti-herding. As the size of the data set is reduced by focusing on larger absolute returns, in accordance with theoretical expectations, the coefficient is much more likely to be negative which is associated with herding.

The key purpose of our paper is to compare the results for logarithmic and simple returns. For logarithmic returns on the full data, shown in Panel A, set we see that the coefficient of is significant for 8 countries. For simple returns we see that the statistical significance of the coefficient changes for three countries. Denmark and Norway both become significant when they were not significant previously and the US loses its significance.

As we investigate the data sets that focus on larger absolute returns, shown in Panel B, we continue to see substantial numbers of countries with the relevant coefficient changing significance as we move from log to simple returns. For the regressions based on the sets of returns within the top 50% of absolute returns or more we see that the coefficients for at least 3 and in most cases 4 of the countries change significance. It is interesting that the changes are not in a systematic direction so that changing from logarithmic to simple returns may either increase or decrease to likelihood of finding evidence of herding.

Thus, the results regarding the presence of herding alter with a change in return calculation for around one quarter of the countries investigated for each of the data sets. We can consider the statistical significance of these numbers. Given conservative methodology we see that 3 out of 13 countries changing significance is of borderline statistical significance and 4 out of 13 countries changing significance is statistically significant[[4]](#footnote-4).

Table 2: Descriptive data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Variable | Mean | sd | Min | Max | Mean CSAD | N |
| Denmark | Log | .044824 | 1.21182 | -10.5563 | 7.99761 | 1.2098 | 4105 |
|  | Simple | .069696 | 1.20643 | -9.93637 | 8.38672 | 1.21065 |  |
| US | Log | .030009 | 1.20649 | -8.06138 | 9.54237 | .908568 | 4132 |
|  | Simple | .047245 | 1.20915 | -7.69683 | 10.0664 | .908986 |  |
| Finland | Log | .029096 | 1.45997 | -8.92102 | 8.93025 | 1.16771 | 4124 |
|  | Simple | .053756 | 1.46356 | -8.46355 | 9.37088 | 1.17074 |  |
| France | Log | .020807 | 1.45872 | -9.31602 | 8.91817 | 1.0055 | 4202 |
|  | Simple | .042586 | 1.45982 | -8.84619 | 9.38817 | 1.00639 |  |
| Germany | Log | .022635 | 1.41664 | -9.02234 | 11.1545 | 1.03381 | 4171 |
|  | Simple | .045037 | 1.41719 | -8.52537 | 11.8836 | 1.03473 |  |
| Greece | Log | -.01962 | 1.66795 | -15.9129 | 12.6811 | 1.82591 | 4063 |
|  | Simple | .032309 | 1.66244 | -14.0175 | 13.8705 | 1.82756 |  |
| HK | Log | .041765 | 1.40087 | -12.413 | 11.4602 | 1.15378 | 4050 |
|  | Simple | .066823 | 1.40287 | -11.5609 | 12.2546 | 1.15651 |  |
| Italy | Log | .004424 | 1.41339 | -8.56588 | 9.27357 | 1.10248 | 4168 |
|  | Simple | .028636 | 1.41354 | -8.14261 | 9.82029 | 1.10372 |  |
| Norway | Log | .026429 | 1.83862 | -12.3905 | 10.4173 | 1.50196 | 4120 |
|  | Simple | .064272 | 1.86264 | -11.9357 | 11.1138 | 1.5208 |  |
| Portugal | Log | .007854 | 1.1991 | -7.98493 | 8.74228 | 1.16989 | 4194 |
|  | Simple | .029709 | 1.19824 | -7.55258 | 9.39527 | 1.17161 |  |
| Spain | Log | .017445 | 1.31686 | -8.06577 | 9.71678 | .977813 | 4174 |
|  | Simple | .036884 | 1.31646 | -7.69075 | 10.3766 | .97829 |  |
| Sweden | Log | .030535 | 1.61524 | -9.30306 | 13.0496 | 1.01083 | 4123 |
|  | Simple | .055766 | 1.61765 | -8.82834 | 14.0028 | 1.01093 |  |
| UK | Log | .020814 | 1.18132 | -9.38468 | 7.88027 | 1.09882 | 4131 |
|  | Simple | .04287 | 1.1798 | -8.79727 | 8.34741 | 1.09861 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3 – Results of herding tests – to conserve space only the coefficients of the term have been reported**  **Panel A – Full set of returns** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
|  | Denmark | US | Finland | France | Germany | Greece | Hong Kong | Italy | Norway | Portugal | Spain | Sweden | UK |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Log | 0.0328 | 0.0116\* | 0.0111\*\* | 0.0179\*\*\* | 0.0204\*\*\* | 0.0160\*\*\* | 0.0101 | 0.0223\*\*\* | 0.00122 | 0.00684 | 0.0175\*\*\* | 0.00721 | 0.0270\*\*\* |
|  | (1.62) | (1.76) | (2.00) | (4.74) | (2.60) | (5.35) | (1.49) | (2.89) | (0.23) | (1.47) | (4.22) | (1.59) | (3.26) |
| Sim | 0.0223\*\*† | 0.0105† | 0.0140\*\* | 0.0185\*\*\* | 0.0195\*\* | 0.0156\*\*\* | 0.0109 | 0.0316\*\* | 0.0351\*\*† | 0.00546 | 0.0171\*\*\* | 0.00613 | 0.0284\*\*\* |
|  | (2.03) | (1.56) | (2.11) | (4.86) | (2.26) | (3.93) | (1.56) | (2.43) | (2.25) | (1.32) | (4.84) | (1.33) | (3.87) |
| 3 Countries change significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \*10% significance, \*\*5% significance, 1% significance, t-stats shown in parentheses.  † Indicates whether the significance of the variable is different when it is calculated used simple rather than logarithmic returns. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3 – Results of herding tests – to conserve space only the coefficients of the term have been reported**  **Panel B – Subsets of returns** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
|  | Denmark | US | Finland | France | Germany | Greece | Hong Kong | Italy | Norway | Portugal | Spain | Sweden | UK |
| **Largest 50% of returns (50% of absolute value (above 25% and 25% below 0))** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Log | 0.0199 | -0.00625 | 0.00745 | 0.00727 | 0.0116 | 0.00806\* | -0.00166 | 0.0114 | -0.0133\* | 0.00522 | 0.0104\*\* | -0.00551 | 0.0151 |
|  | (0.75) | (-0.83) | (0.93) | (1.51) | (1.13) | (1.91) | (-0.27) | (1.07) | (-1.94) | (0.79) | (2.03) | (-1.28) | (1.58) |
| Sim | 0.00178 | -0.00555 | 0.00820 | 0.00813\*† | 0.00961 | 0.00599† | 0.000556 | 0.0225 | 0.0332† | 0.00225 | 0.0105\*\* | -0.00500 | 0.0160\*† |
|  | (0.15) | (-0.72) | (0.91) | (1.68) | (0.90) | (1.32) | (0.08) | (1.31) | (1.49) | (0.38) | (2.24) | (-1.20) | (1.88) |
| 4 Countries change significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Largest 10% (10% of absolute value (above 5% and 5% below 0))** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Log | 0.00816 | -0.0252\* | 0.0116 | -0.0179\* | -0.0154 | 0.00525 | -0.0130\* | -0.00025 | -0.0267\* | 0.0305\*\* | 0.00384 | -0.023\*\*\* | -0.0156 |
|  | (0.19) | (-1.88) | (0.64) | (-1.74) | (-0.89) | (0.62) | (-1.72) | (-0.01) | (-1.65) | (2.24) | (0.32) | (-3.33) | (-1.07) |
| Sim | -0.0298\*† | -0.0227\* | -0.00025 | -0.0134† | -0.0163 | 0.000976 | -0.0129† | 0.0190 | 0.0502† | 0.0254\*\* | 0.00974 | -0.019\*\*\* | -0.0132 |
|  | (-1.96) | (-1.72) | (-0.01) | (-1.28) | (-1.01) | (0.11) | (-1.50) | (0.63) | (1.05) | (2.00) | (1.04) | (-3.27) | (-0.89) |
| 4 Countries change significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Largest 5% (5% of absolute value (above 2.5% and 2.5% below 0))** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Log | -0.0189 | -0.045\*\*\* | -0.0183 | -0.0294\* | -0.0417\*\* | 0.0114 | -0.031\*\*\* | 0.0186 | -0.0257 | 0.0419\*\* | -0.00158 | -0.034\*\*\* | -0.0454\*\* |
|  | (-0.39) | (-2.62) | (-0.69) | (-1.74) | (-2.12) | (1.04) | (-3.62) | (0.44) | (-1.01) | (2.12) | (-0.08) | (-4.18) | (-2.15) |
| Sim | -0.074\*\*\*† | -0.0370\*\* | -0.0436 | -0.0244† | -0.0420\*\* | 0.00179 | -0.026\*\*\* | 0.0114 | 0.0540 | 0.0277† | 0.0134 | -0.030\*\*\* | -0.0566\*\* |
|  | (-3.40) | (-2.20) | (-1.29) | (-1.35) | (-2.49) | (0.14) | (-2.61) | (0.28) | (0.72) | (1.56) | (1.00) | (-4.43) | (-2.42) |
| 3 Countries change significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Largest 2% (2% of absolute value)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Log | -0.0237 | -0.0492\* | -0.0751 | -0.0496\* | -0.0492 | 0.0215 | -0.063\*\*\* | 0.0197 | -0.0816\*\* | -0.00442 | -0.0196 | -0.048\*\*\* | -0.0968\*\* |
|  | (-0.44) | (-1.80) | (-1.23) | (-1.70) | (-1.47) | (1.26) | (-3.85) | (0.28) | (-2.12) | (-0.12) | (-0.58) | (-4.01) | (-2.33) |
| Sim | -0.111\*\*† | -0.0416 | -0.107 | -0.0209† | -0.0403 | 0.0202 | -0.065\*\*\* | -0.125 | -0.0600† | -0.0209 | -0.00842 | -0.041\*\*\* | -0.0992\*\* |
|  | (-2.37) | (-1.65) | (-1.60) | (-0.69) | (-1.49) | (0.86) | (-4.57) | (-1.24) | (-0.37) | (-0.85) | (-0.34) | (-4.19) | (-2.08) |
| 4 Countries change significance | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| \*10% significance, \*\*5% significance, 1% significance, t-stats shown in parentheses.  † Indicates whether the significance of the variable is different when it is calculated used simple rather than logarithmic returns. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**4. Conclusions**

In this paper we show both theoretically and empirically that different returns measures can lead to different conclusions about the presence of herding. In tests on many of the world’s major financial markets we show that a change in research measure may lead to a different conclusion about the presence of herding in the region of a quarter of cases. Thus, in this area of finance research, we suggest that the choice of return measure to use in investigations is an important decision and should be carefully considered given the purpose of the study. Additionally, the return measure used should be reported as a matter of course to facilitate comparisons with other similar studies.
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1. See, for example, Christie and Huang (1995) and Clements, Hurn and Shi (2017) for the US market, Economou, Kostakis and Philippas (2011) and Galariotis, Krokida and Spyrou (2016) for European financial markets and Demirer and Kutan (2006) and Arjoon, Bhatnagar and Ramlakhan (2020) for Asian markets. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The log return is defined by . The simple return is defined by ( where is the stock price at time t. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To show that CSADS is a constant precise linear function of consider a market consisting of two equally weighted stocks S1 and S2. Without loss of generality, we assume RS1t = 1.5 RSmt and RS2t = 0.5 RSmt Then

   From Eqn 1:

   We have

   Then:

   In our example, RS1 = 1.5 RSm

   So that  = i.e. is a constant precise linear function of . [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. We can conceptualize the situation as having done tests for herding/anti-herding on 13 counties using logarithmic returns with the conclusion for each country being correct with 90% probability (assuming 10% significance level). Given this, if we repeat the tests using simple returns we can assess if the results are statistically significant by assuming the number of changes follow a binomial distribution with a 10% probably of each country changing significance. The probability of three or more changes is 13.39% and the probability of four or more changes is 3.42%. These conclusions are conservative as many of the initial logarithmic results are significant at over the 10% level. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)