RISK AND RETURN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT BONDS IN INDONESIA

Siti Amaliah, Isni Andriana, Muizzudin Muizzudin
Departement of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia

Abstract

The link between risk and government bond *returns* is needed to determine the risk pressure in influencing government bond returns. This study uncovers the phenomenon of risk-taking behavior on bond returns and examines risk-taking behavior affecting the performance of government bonds in Indonesia. The data used is monthly data, starting from January 2017 to December 2021. The analysis model used is a multifactor model with the GARCH analysis technique. The results showed that risk exposure had a negative and significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia and *Market Factor* had a negative and significant effect on government bond returns. Meanwhile, joint stock performance has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on returns in Indonesia.

1. Introduction

Investment is an important part of developing a country's economy because investment can increase the available capital stock. This increase in capital stock will result in an increase in community production and encourage the pace of national economic growth (Villanueva, 2021) . In this case, the capital market as a forum for trading financial instruments plays a role in national economic development. Investment product choices that can be made in the capital market are stocks, bonds, mutual funds. Government bonds are an important component of many investors' portfolios even more than

other equities. However, the academic literature often neglects the consideration of risk and return on bonds.

Government bonds are simple financial products issued by the government so that the government has an obligation to pay a fixed coupon early and pay the principal when the bond matures. The purpose of issuing these bonds is to finance the state budget deficit, cover short-term cash shortfalls, and manage the state debt portfolio. Bond prices are based on calculating the current value of future cash flow. In the simplest approach, if the future cash flows are fixed and guaranteed, the value of the bond is the present value of those cash flows that have been discounted at a certain rate. The interest rate in financial terms is called the yield. Government bond yields have become a major concern either by the government as issuer or by bond investors.

Several studies link bond returns with risk and macroeconomic variables. According to Li et al., (2020) in his research on the risk of returns on US government bonds using *the Bayesian model* and *the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm* , revealed that there is a close relationship, especially between inflation volatility and interest rate volatility, it is also seen that Macro volatility cannot be ignored to accurately capture the risk-return *trade-off* in the US *Treasury market* . The same was followed by Fan et al., (2021) and Bauer et al., (2017) which revealed that risk based on macroeconomic variables has an influence on bond risk premiums and this has an impact on changes in bond *yields* . However, the study is more focused on corporate bonds than government bonds.

Febi et al., (2018) discusses the impact of liquidity risk on *green bonds* using a regression model. The findings show that LOT liquidity and /bid-ask/ size are positively related to returns. However, for the fixed effects model, only LOT size turns out to be relevant for returns. His research also finds that the LOT effect dissipates over time, indicating that for rates of return, the impact of liquidity risk on returns has been negligible in recent years. Other research conducted by Nitschka (2018) shows that global exchange rate risk has an influence on the returns on government bonds in developed countries. These results support research conducted by Duffee (2018) and FilipoviĆ et al., (2017) , that the level of risk based on exchange rates, inflation and interest rates affects returns from *US Treasury Bonds* . In addition, bond ratings fully mediate the effect of corporate governance and liquidity on bond yields, while for maturity, bond ratings partially mediate the effect of maturity on bond yields (Alinto et al., 2021) .

Some of these studies use the *Markowitz* portfolio selection approach to government bond portfolios. Such as research (Martin & Swanson, 2021) ; (Pasricha et al., 2020) ; (Korn & Koziol, 2006) recently estimated the expected yield , return variance, and covariance of government bonds . An empirical study was conducted on the German bond market. The results suggest that a small number of government bonds are risky enough to achieve a predictably very promising risk-return profile. Creal & Wu (2020) in their research also shows that the time variation in the bond term premium is largely driven by the risk price channel and affects the rate of return *on US Treasury Bonds* .

Another study conducted by Kim et al., (2021) showed that most government bonds outperformed their benchmarks , this indicated that government bonds exhibited a risk character that was different from the benchmarks. Taking risks that have a greater risk exposure than the benchmark drives the difference between index-adjusted and risk-adjusted performance.

Ouyang & Lu (2021) conducted research on the risk evaluation of Chinese government bonds that focused on interest rate and stability risks using the EWMAVaR and SVM models. His research results show that interest rate risk increased rapidly in 2018–2020, while stability risk decreased slightly, and changes in this risk have an influence on the rate of return on government bonds in China.

According to research by Zaremba & Czapkiewicz (2017) which discusses the returns on government bonds in 25 developed and developing countries for 1992 to 2016 using the *Fama-MacBeth cross-sectional model* . The results show that the four-factor model effectively explains various patterns of returns in the international government bond market. Volatility risk, credit risk, value effects and momentum are the main drivers of government bond returns. However, Haddad & Sraer (2020) showed different results in their research, he revealed that liquidity risk does not affect the rate of return on bonds. Pratama et al., (2021) show that the expected return on stocks exceeds the expected market return value. The yield generated from the bond portfolio is also more optimal when compared to the yield of one bond.

Other findings were obtained from research by Carpenter et al (2022) which discussed risk through two components, namely the quantity of risk (volatility) and the value of the risk itself. His research focuses on the rate of return on government bonds in the US and China. Interestingly, these two components support each other positively in the US *Treasury market* . The factor structure of the risk

premium in the Chinese government bond market is similar to that in the US *Treasury market* , despite the fact that it is for the majority of the sample the bond market in China is effectively segregated from the bond market in the US. However, in China, the number and price the two risk factors show a negative unconditional correlation. Moreover, this correlation varies significantly over time. The same results were shown by Daniel et al., (2020) and Feldhütter et al., (2016) which stated that the risk factor for price volatility affects the rate of return on government bonds.

Based on the background and inter-academic debates above, it is important to discuss the relationship between risk and government bond *returns to determine risk pressure in influencing government bond returns.* In addition, this study can analyze the phenomenon of risk-taking behavior on bond returns. This research focuses on the risk and performance analysis of government bonds in Indonesia. The performance of government bonds is measured using the rate of return as research conducted by Kim, Li, & Wang (2021) . Based on the description of the problem, this study will study whether risk exposure is a problem in the Indonesian bond market or not. This study seeks to provide additional information regarding the relationship between risk and bond *returns* in Indonesia. Therefore, this research has two main objectives. First, this study will analyze the risk exposure and yield on government bonds in Indonesia. Second, examining risk-taking behavior affecting the performance of government bonds in Indonesia.

2. Literature review

Signaling theory assumes that company managers or company insiders know more information about the quality of their companies than other people outside the company (Yasar et al., 2020) ; (Puspitaningtyas, 2019) . This theory is often used in the entrepreneurship literature and is one of the important theories for human resource management in carrying out the employee recruitment process. This theory is also frequently used these days in the management literature (Fu et al., 2021) . Signaling theory serves to describe how when the behavior of both individuals and companies has access to different information. This is because different information will affect the decision-making process for individuals, households, businesses, and the government.

The information provided to outsiders itself consists of public information that can be obtained freely and confidential or private information that can be obtained only for certain individuals.

According to Connelly et al (2011) , this confidential information will eventually lead to asymmetric information. Or in other words, asymmetric information arises when individuals who know the confidential information can make decisions that benefit those who have it. However, for more than a century, formal economic models of the decision-making process have been based more and more on the assumption of perfect information, while imperfect information has often been ignored. In fact, many economists assume that companies or markets that have a little imperfect information will still behave the same as markets with perfect information.

Based on the research of Bergh et al (2014) , there are two important players in the *signaling theory* itself, namely those who give signals (*signalers*) and those who receive signals (*receivers*). The signal giver must determine and decide how they must do it to send the signal or information they have to other people. The signal giver in this case is like a manager who has complete information about the resources to the products they have that are not owned by outsiders. The information provided by insiders themselves can be either positive or negative information that is considered useful to outsiders. However, companies should provide positive information as an effort to convince outsiders about the quality of the company.

In short, not all confidential information is useful for passing on signals to outsiders. There are two characteristics so that the signal can be said to be effective (Taj, 2016) . First, the ability to observe signals (*Signal Observability*), which means that insiders who observe outsiders can receive the signals they will give or not. And second, the signal cost *is* meant by a situation where a company realizes that the process of giving signals to outsiders requires greater costs and is not in accordance with the expected benefits. This condition will then cause an incorrect signal to occur, and this condition can return to normal if the signal receiver can ignore the signal. Examples of confidential information provided include specific products or services owned by the company, the discovery or development of new products, the latest reports regarding company receipts, company legal entities, and cooperative organizations established by the company. Later, the signal receiver (receiver*)* needs to know what way to do it to describe the intent of the signal that has been given. The signal receiver is the third element in the signaling process and in this case the signal receiver is an outsider who lacks information about a particular company.

In the latest year, Conterius et al (2023) focuses on understanding how the presence of foreign investors affects the yield and volatility of

the domestic government bond market. The results indicate that an increased involvement of foreign investors leads to a reduction in domestic government bond yields, both in the overall sample and in developing countries, both over the short and long term. A recent study by Shida (2023) highlights that the secondary market yield, issuer's syndication announcements, auction volume, and underpricing in preceding auctions have a notable positive impact on demand. Moreover, it indicates a favorable influence of central bank net purchases in the secondary market, particularly for short-term bonds, but acknowledges adverse effects related to market volatility and the introduction of the leverage ratio for banks from a regulatory perspective.

When the signal or information provided earlier is understood by the signal receiver, they can make their own decision regarding whether to buy, register, or invest according to the signal that has been given. For example, like a shareholder who receives a signal from a company that the company can provide greater profits in the future if the shareholder buys the assets that the company owns. The same thing applies to consumers who receive signals that the goods or services they buy will generate large profits if they buy them because the goods or services they buy later are of high quality. Briefly, the process of signaling according to time is explained as follows, the signal giver whether it is a person, the government, or a company owns goods in the form of bonds then gives a signal of information related to government bonds, the signal is then sent to outside parties. The signal receiver then interprets the signal and chooses the product offered.

When associated with government bonds, the signal can be in the form of financial or non-financial information that provides insight to investors. According to Gupta (2021) information about government bonds is an attraction for investors in making decisions to invest because information is an illustration of the prospects for government bonds in the future. Investors will assess the performance of government bonds based on various aspects. This signal is in the form of information regarding the condition of the company to owners or interested parties (Fatima et al., 2021) . The signal that is given can also be done by disclosing government bond data information such as maturity, coupon rate, type of bond, number of bonds that have been issued.

Market risk is caused by investors' reactions to tangible and intangible events. Stock prices fluctuate for many reasons. The frequency of price changes may be high or short in time, or remain

unchanged over a period (de Jong & Fabozzi, 2020) . A general rise in stock prices is referred to as a *bullish trend,* and vice versa. The reverse situation is referred to as a *bearish trend.* An investor can note this change from the stock price index on the stock market. There are various factors that affect market risk ranging from economic to political, entrepreneurial to social. The causes of this phenomenon are manifold. But the magnitude depends on the attitude of investors. The initial reaction signals a fear of loss but following the herd instincts of building a situation where it seems all investors are out for it, the emotional instability of such investors collectively leads to a growing overreaction. Market risk is a major constituent of systematic risk.

Default risk measures the probability that borrowers will fail to repay their loan obligations (Hsu et al., 2015) . Borrowers have a higher risk of default when they have poor credit ratings and limited cash flow. For consumers, the risk of default can influence the rate and terms you will meet if the lender sees you as high risk of default. It can even cause you to be refused a loan. *Default* risk does not only apply to borrowers who want to take out loans. It also relates to the company issuing the bonds, and whether they can make interest payments on these bonds.

Inflation risk refers to the impact of inflation on investment. An increase in the price level of goods and services is generally called inflation. The direct impact of inflation is to delay consumption. In investment management, investment in securities is also considered as consumption. Thus, it means that an increase in the inflation rate reduces the purchasing power of investors, and vice versa. Rational investors should include, in their estimates of expected returns, an allowance for purchasing power risk. Inflation risk impacts debt securities and equity markets in the same direction.

3. Research methods

The data used in this study are 1-year government bond *yield data, government bond index, composite bond index, and composite stock price index. Yield* government bonds with a tenor of 1 year is used to see the performance of bond mutual funds. The *benchmark* is measured using the government bond index and the composite bond index, while the JCI is used as a proxy for stock market performance. The data used is monthly data, starting from January 2017 to December 2021.

multi-factor analysis model commonly used in the bond performance literature, this model is the same as that used by (Blake

et al., 1993) to look at the performance of bonds. The equation model in this study is:

$$r_{i,t} - r_{bench,t} = \alpha_i + \beta_{1,i}\left(Agg_t - r_{f,t}\right) + \beta_{2,i}\,Def_t + \beta_{3,i}\,Term_t + \beta_{4,i}\left(IHSG_t - r_{f,t}\right) + e_{i,t}$$

Information:

$r_{i,t} - r_{bench,t}$: The rate of return on bonds that exceeds the benchmark.

Agg : Aggregate bond market index returns and broad market risk capture.

Def : The difference in returns between the composite bond index and the government bond index index

IHSG : Stock market performance

In this study, a multi-factor model was used to control for risk exposure, and to investigate the risk-adjusted returns on bond funds in a research sample.

Table 1. Variable Operational Definition

No	Variable	Definition
1	Government Yields	The level of profit or yield actually obtained by investors with a 5-year tenor bond.
2.	Yield benchmarks	The benchmark for bond yields is the 10-year government bond yield
3	IOPs	Indonesian Government Bond Index
4	ICBI	Indonesia Composite Bond Index
5	JCI	Composite stock price index

4. Results and Discussion

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Means	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Number of Observations
Government Yield tenor of 5 years	6.41	0.85	5.04	8.40	60
Yield Benchmarks	7.03	0.59	5,942	8.60	60
JCI	6101.36	621.08	4538.93	7228.91	60
Government Bond Index	274.51	38.51	212.05	336.52	60
Composite Bond Index	277.41	42.34	209.11	344.06	60

The 5-year government yield is the level of profit or yield obtained by investors with a 5-year tenor bond. Based on the table, the lowest value of the 5-year tenor government yield is 5.04 and the highest value is 8.40, while the average value is 6.41 and has a standard deviation of 0.85. The yield benchmark is used as a benchmark for bond yields, namely the 10-year government bond yield. The average benchmark yield value is 7.03 with the highest value being 8.60 and the lowest being 5.94, while the standard deviation is 0.59.

The performance of the stock market was seen using the JCI, the highest value of the JCI in this study was 7228.91 and the lowest value was 4538.93. The standard deviation of the JCI is 621.08 with an average of 6101.36. The government bond index is used to see the performance of bonds issued by the government. The average value of the government bond index is 274.51, with the highest value being 336.52 and the lowest value being 212.05, while the standard deviation is 38.51.

The performance of corporate bonds is seen from the composite bond index which has the lowest value of 209.11 and the highest of 344.06. The average value of the composite bond index is 277.41 and the standard deviation is 42.34. The unit root test is a test that must be used before estimating the ARDL (Autoregressive Distributed Lag) test. This test is carried out to see whether there is a unit root or not, using the ADF (Augemented Dickey Fuller) test. The criteria that must be shown in this test are the T-test value < ADF Ttes with a level of 5 percent and ADF probability < Significant level with a value of 5 percent so that declared stationary. The ADF stationarity test can be seen in Table 4.2

Table 4.2
Level Unit Root Test

Variable	ADF	Levels	t-statistic	Probability	Information
Government Yield tenor of 5 years	-1.82866	1%	-3.525618	0.3639	Not Stationary
		5%	-2.902953		Not Stationary
		10%	-2.588902		Not Stationary
Yield Benchmarks	-2.27940	1%	-3.525618	0.1814	Not Stationary
		5%	-2.902953		Not Stationary
		10%	-2.588902		Not Stationary
JCI	-8.43003	1%	-3.525618	0.0000	stationary
		5%	-2.902953		stationary
		10%	-2.588902		stationary
Government Bond	0.559457	1%	-3.528515	0.9876	Not Stationary
		5%	-2.904198		Not Stationary

Index		10%	-2.589562		Not Stationary
Composite Bond Index	0.560661	1%	-3.528515	0.9876	Not Stationary
		5%	-2.904198		Not Stationary
		10%	-2.589562		Not Stationary

Source: Data processed with Eviews 10

Based on the results of the unit root test Table 4.2 the GDP variable is stated to be stationary at the level level. The ADF value is greater than the critical value at the level of 1%, 5% or 10%. Likewise with the probability (<0.05), whereas at the first different level all variables are stationary except for the PDB variable, this is evidenced by a probability of 0.3897 (>0.05).

Table 4.3
First Different Level Unit Root Test

Variable	ADF	Levels	t-statistic	Probability	Information
Government Yield tenor of 5 years	-7.23648	1%	-3.527045	0.0000	stationary
		5%	-2.903566		stationary
		10%	-2.589227		stationary
Yield Benchmarks	-8.10265	1%	-3.527045	0.0000	stationary
		5%	-2.903566		stationary
		10%	-2.589227		stationary
JCI	-9.95124	1%	-3.528515	0.0001	stationary
		5%	-2.904198		stationary
		10%	-2.589562		stationary
Government Bond Index	-7.90710	1%	-3.528515	0.0000	stationary
		5%	-2.904198		stationary
		10%	-2.589562		stationary
Composite Bond Index	-7.67537	1%	-3.528515	0.0000	stationary
		5%	-2.904198		stationary
		10%	-2.589562		stationary

Source: Data processed with Eviews 10

The cointegration test is a test used to determine whether there is a long-term balance between variables. The cointegration test in this study uses the *Bound Test approach.* In this approach, cointegration can be seen from the F-statistic value with a critical value. There are two asymptotic limit values for testing cointegration when the independent variables are integrated in I(d) where ($0 \leq d \leq 1$). The lowest value (lower bound) assumes that the regressor is integrated at 1(0) while the highest value (upper bound) assumes that the regressor is integrated at I (1). If the F-statistic value is below the lower bound value, it can be concluded that cointegration does not occur. If the F-statistic value is above the upper bound value 0, it can be concluded that cointegration has occurred. However, if the F-statistic is between

the lower bound and upper bound values, then the result is inconclusive. The results of the cointegration test using the bound test approach can be seen in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4 Cointegration Test Results of *Johansen Trace Statistics*

Hypothesized No.of CE(s)	***Eigenvalue***	***Trace Statistics***	***critical values***	
			5 Percent	***Prob*****
*None**	0.535580	156.6137	125.6154	0.0002
*At most 1**	0.469200	104.4600	95.75366	0.0110
At most 2	0.322150	61.39092	69.81889	0.1951
At most 3	0.242361	34.95051	47.85613	0.4506
At most 4	0.178314	16.07719	29.79707	0.7068
At most 5	0.038932	2.722205	15.49471	0.9780
At most 6	0.000322	0.021922	3.841465	0.8822

Information:
*(**) indicates rejection of the hypothesis at the 5% level of confidence
Trace indicates five cointegration equations at α = 5%
Trend assumption *: Linear deterministic trend*
Series : RRBENCH, DEF, IHSGR, MKTRF, SMB, HML, RF
SC : *Schwarz information criterion*
Interval lag : 1 to 2 *(in first differences)*
When viewed from a trace statistic that is greater than *the critical value* at a confidence level of α = 5%, based on the trace statistic, one form of the cointegration equation is obtained at a confidence level of 95%. Meanwhile, the results of the Johansen cointegration test based on *the max-eigen value statistics* indicate that there is one form of the cointegration equation at the 95% *confidence level.*

Table 4.5 *The Johansen Maximum Eigenvalue Cointegration Test Results*

Hypothesized No.of CE(s)	***Eigenvalue***	***Maximum Eigenvalue***	***critical values***	
			5 Percent	***Prob*****
*None**	0.535580	52.15373	46.23142	0.0104
*At most 1**	0.469200	43.06910	40.07757	0.0224
At most 2	0.322150	26.44041	33.87687	0.2945
At most 3	0.242361	18.87332	27.58434	0.4244
At most 4	0.178314	13.35498	21.13162	0.4201
At most 5	0.038932	2.700283	14.26460	0.9647
At most 6	0.000322	0.021922	3.841465	0.8822

Source: Data processed with Eviews 10
Information:
*(**) indicates rejection of the hypothesis at the 5% level of confidence
Trace indicates five cointegration equations at α = 5%
Trend assumption : *Linear deterministic trend*
Series : RRBENCH, DEF, IHSGR, MKTRF, SMB, HML, RF
SC : *Schwarz information criterion*
Interval lag : 1 to 2 *(in first differences)*

Table 4.5 Estimation Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-statistic	Prob.
Constant	-0.668	-19,673	0.000
DEF	-0.052	-12,219	0.000
IHSGR	4,840	1,773	0.076
MKTRF	-0.018	0.019	0.327
RF	48,658	9,846	0.000
SMB	-0.007	-0.240	0.810
HML	-0.010	-0.535	0.723
Resid (-1)^2	0.586	1,409	0.158
GARCH(-1)	0.297	1,052	0.292
R-squared		0.719	
Adjusted R-Square		1.017	

Source: Eviews 12 data processing

Table 4.5 in this study shows the results of the goodness of fit model test shown in the coefficient of determination which explains the influence of the magnitude of the independent variables, namely: DEF, IHSGR, MKT, SMB, HML and RF on the dependent variable RRbench. The coefficient of determination R2 Square obtained is 0.719, meaning that all independent variables can explain the dependent variable, namely the firm value of 71.9%.
The estimation results of the model are as follows:

- The DEF variable found that the DEF variable has a negative relationship and has a significant effect on the return on bonds. The DEF variable has a coefficient of -0.052 with a probability value of 0.000.
- The IHSGR variable found that IHSGR has a positive relationship and has a significant effect at the 10% level on government bond returns in Indonesia. This is evidenced by the statistical results obtained, namely the coefficient on the IHSGR of 4,840 and a probability value of 0.076.

- The MKTRF variable shows that *Market Factor* has a negative relationship and does not significantly influence government bond returns. The market factor regression coefficient obtained is -0.018 with a probability value of 0.327.
- *Risk Factor* variable has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia. This is because the coefficient value obtained is 48,658 and the probability value is 0.000.
- The SMB variable shows that *small minus big* has a negative relationship and does not significantly influence the return on government bonds in Indonesia. Associated with large capitalization has a relatively smaller level of risk and provides a relatively smaller rate of return as well. This can be seen from the SMB variable which has a coefficient of -0.007 and a probability of 0.810.
- The HML variable shows that *small minus big* has a negative relationship and does not significantly influence government bond returns in Indonesia. The high minus low variable has no effect on government bond returns. Many investors make investments only based on the game and only to gain relatively short profits. This can be seen from the HML variable which has a coefficient of -0.010 and a probability of 0.723.

Based on the research results, the default factor has a negative and significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia. Various previous studies examined bond performance, including Ferson et al (2006) who found that bond market risk factors were sufficient to capture various bond fund risk exposures. In the study, a multi-factor model was used to control for a fund's risk exposure regardless of the bond fund. For a robustness check, we include factors and fundamentals related to economic conditions. The results are qualitatively similar to the results obtained in this study. Based on the model, α in Equation (1) can be interpreted as the part of the index-adjusted return that cannot be explained by this risk factor.

Table 4.5 shows that risk returns are significantly negative over the full sample period. Def is the difference in returns between the high and medium yield indexes, $Term$ is the return spread between the medium- and short-term government bond indexes, and IHSGR is the return on the composite stock price index. Our analysis above shows that the performance of the two mutual funds with different evaluation approaches yields very different results. The index-adjusted returns show significant differences and variations in performance, which are

consistent across fund styles. On the other hand, risk-adjusted returns are stable and consistently negative over time. If we measure the performance of bond funds relative to their benchmarks, many bond funds outperform their benchmarks even after the issuance of funds (Carpenter et al., 2022) . The outstanding performance shown by the fund also varies over time and is correlated with the condition of the bond market. However, if we assess the performance of government bond funds based on the standard multifactor model, bond funds exhibit negative risk-adjusted returns, and negative risk-adjusted returns are mostly stable and persisting over the sample period. The risk exposure of bond funds differs substantially from their benchmarks.

The results of this study found that joint stock performance has a positive relationship and significantly influences government bond returns in Indonesia. Baker and Wurgler (2008) found interesting things about the relationship between bonds and stocks which is associated with changes in investor sentiment.

In addition, this study found that *Market Factor* has a negative relationship and does not significantly influence the return on government bonds in Indonesia. This government bond has a low credit risk because it is backed by full trust and credit from the government. Government bonds do present market risk if sold before maturity, and they also carry some inflation risk in that their relatively lower returns will not offset inflation. While not risk free, government bonds tend to be less risky than equity investments because they are issued by national governments, not corporations or stocks. Government bonds are considered relatively low risk compared to other types of debt securities.

Aside from credit risk, there are a few other potential pitfalls to watch out for with government bonds: including interest rate, inflation, and currency risks. Table 4 shows that the estimated spread yields positively both the realized covariance returns of stocks and bonds, and the normalization afforded by the CAPM of bond betas. The coefficients on the distribution of yields are statistically significant except at the 12-month horizon in the covariance regression, and significant across all horizons in bonds. These results suggest that at least part of the countercyclical variation in expected excess bond returns is driven by the countercyclical variation in bond risk as measured by the movement of bond returns over stock returns.

When the yield differential widens, the real cash flow risk (or inflation) of bonds decreases. This encourages increased aggregate risk and discourages investors from all risky assets. The risk premium

(or risk aversion) more than offsets the cash flow effect, and the bond risk therefore moves cyclically.

Risk Factor found that it has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia. *Small minus big (SMB)* has a negative relationship and has no significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia. This is in accordance with Fama and French (1992), related to large capitalization having a level of risk which is relatively smaller and provides a relatively smaller rate of return. In increasing the capitalization value it has been recognized by some investors to be able to use certain stocks so as to get optimal stock *returns* with minimal risk (Bauer et al., 2017) ; (Kim et al., 2021) . Companies with large capitalization tend to have a level of stability to changes both internally and externally (Nitschka, 2018)

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of the research and the results of the analysis that has been tested in the previous chapters, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The default factor has a negative and significant effect on government bond returns in Indonesia. Bond market risk factors are believed to be sufficient to capture the various risk exposures of bond funds.
- Joint stock performance has a positive relationship and significantly influences government bond returns in Indonesia.
- *Market Factor* has a negative relationship and has no significant effect on government bond returns.
- The results of the study concluded that the risk exposure factor has a positive relationship and has a significant effect on yields on government bond returns in Indonesia.
- The SMB variable shows that *small minus big* has a negative relationship and does not significantly influence the return on government bonds in Indonesia. Associated with large capitalization has a relatively smaller level of risk and provides a relatively smaller rate of return as well.

High minus low has no effect on government bond returns. Many investors make investments only based on the game and only to gain relatively short profits.

Bibliography

Alinto, A., Isnurhadi, & Widiyanti, M. (2021). CORPORATE

GOVERNANCE, LIQUIDITY AND MATURITY ANALYSIS ON BONDS YIELD WITH BOND RATINGS AS INTERVENING VARIABLES IN COMPANIES LISTED ON IDX. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences* . https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2021-10.22

Amaliawiati, L., Minda Utami, E., Komariah, S., & Mawarnie Puspitasari, D. (2021). Effect of Macroeconomic Variables on Jakarta Composite Index before and the Time of Covid19. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education , 12* (8), 1420–1430.

Aryani, DN, & Maupula, SW (2021). Covid-19, Inflation, and Interest Rate: Their Influences on the Jakarta Composite Index. *Journal of Minds: Management of Ideas and Inspiration , 8* (2), 339. https://doi.org/10.24252/minds.v8i2.22942

Bauer, MD, Hamilton, JD, Le, A., Priebsch, M., Ng, S., Greenwood, R., Priestley, R., & Cieslak, A. (2017). *Robust Bond Risk Premium* .

Bergh, DD, Connelly, BL, Ketchen, DJ, & Shannon, LM (2014). Signaling theory and equilibrium in strategic management research: An assessment and a research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies* . https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12097

Blake, CR, Elton, EJ, & Gruber, MJ (1993). The Performance of Bond Mutual Funds. *The Journal of Business , 66* (3), 371. https://doi.org/10.1086/296609

Carpenter, JN, Lu, F., & Whitelaw, RF (2022). *Government Bond Risk and Return in the US and China* .

Chari, MDR, David, P., Duru, A., & Zhao, Y. (2019). Bowman's risk-return paradox: An agency theory perspective. *Journal of Business Research* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.08.010

Chukwunonso, NJ, Ebuka, AA, Ezinne, KM, & Chinyelu, ON (2021). Social Capital as a Panacea for the Competitive Advantage of Brewing Firms in South-South Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting* . https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2021/v21i430366

Connelly, BL, Certo, ST, Ireland, RD, & Reutzel, CR (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. In *Journal of Management* . https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419

Conterius, S., Akimov, A., Su, JJ., & Roca, E. (2023). Do foreign investors have a positive impact on the domestic government bonds market? A panel pooled mean group approach. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 77,863-875, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2022.12.031

Creal, DD, & Wu, JC (2020). Bond Risk Premia in Consumption-Based Models. *Quantitative Economics* , *11* (4), 1461–1484. https://doi.org/10.3982/qe887

Daniel, K., Mota, L., Rottke, S., & Santos, T. (2020). The Cross-Section of Risk and Returns. *Review of Financial Studies* , *33* (5), 1927–1979. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhaa021

de Jong, M., & Fabozzi, FJ (2020). The market risk of corporate bonds. *Journal of Portfolio Management* . https://doi.org/10.3905/jpm.2019.1.120

Duffee, GR (2018). Expected Inflation and Other Determinants of Treasury Yields. *Journal of Finance* , *73* (5), 2139–2180. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12700

Evans, RB (2021). Risk, Return, and Modern Portfolio Theory. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3942607

Fan, J., Ke, Y., & Liao, Y. (2021). Augmented Factor Models with Applications to Validate Market Risk Factors and Forecasting Bond Risk Premia. *Journal of Econometrics* , *222* (1), 269–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.07.002

Fatima, S., Desouza, KC, Denford, JS, & Dawson, GS (2021). What explains governments interest in artificial intelligence? A signaling theory approach. *Economic Analysis and Policy* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2021.05.001

Febi, W., Schäfer, D., Stephan, A., & Sun, C. (2018). The Impact of Liquidity Risk on the Yield Spread of Green Bonds. *Finance Research Letters* , *27* , 53–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2018.02.025

Feldhütter, P., Heyerdahl-Larsen, C., & Illeditsch, P. (2016). Risk Premia and Volatilities in a Nonlinear Term Structure Model. *Review of Finance* , rfw052. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfw052

Ferson, W., Henry, TR, & Kisgen, DJ (2006). Evaluating government bond fund performance with stochastic discount factors. *Review of Financial Studies* , *19* (2), 423–455. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhj015

FilipoviĆ, D., Larsson, M., & Trolle, AB (2017). Linear-Rational Term Structure Models. *Journal of Finance* , *72* (2), 655–704. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12488

Fu, L., Boehe, DM, & Orlitzky, MO (2021). Broad or Narrow Stakeholder Management? A Signaling Theory Perspective. *Business and Society* . https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503211053018

Gupta, AK (2021). Innovation dimensions and firm performance synergy in the emerging market: A perspective from Dynamic

Capability Theory & Signaling Theory. *Technology in Society* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101512

Haddad, V., & Sraer, D. (2020). The Banking View of Bond Risk Premium. *Journal of Finance* , *75* (5), 2465–2502. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12949

Hsu, PH, Lee, HH, Liu, AZ, & Zhang, Z. (2015). Corporate innovation, default risk, and bond pricing. *Journal of Corporate Finance* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2015.09.005

Juliana Pratiwi, C., & H. Mustafa, M. (2021). The Analysis of the Effect of Macroeconomic Factors on Indonesia 10-Year Government Bond Yield. *Dynasty International Journal of Digital Business Management* , *2* (3), 471–481. https://doi.org/10.31933/dijdbm.v2i3.697

Kim, D., Li, C., & Wang, X. (2021). Risk-Taking and Performance of Government Bond Mutual Funds. *International Review of Financial Analysis* , *76* , 101780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2021.101780

Korn, O., & Koziol, C. (2006). Bond Portfolio Optimization A Risk: Return Approach. *Journal of Fixed Income* .

Lebelle, M., Lajili Jarjir, S., & Sassi, S. (2020). Corporate Green Bond Issues: An International Evidence. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* . https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13020025

Li, J., Sarno, L., & Zinna, G. (2020). Risks and Risk Premium in the US Treasury Market. In *SSRN Electronic Journal* . https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3640341

Martin, B., & Swanson, A. (2021). A Markowitz-based alternative model: Hedging market shocks under endowment constraints*. *Review of Financial Economics* . https://doi.org/10.1002/rfe.1147

Nitschka, T. (2018). Bond Market Ride of Time Variation in Exposures to Global Risk Factors and The Role of US Monetary Policy. *Journal of International Money and Finance* , *83* , 44–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2018.02.002

Ouyang, T., & Lu, X. (2021). Risk Evaluation on China Government Bonds with EWMAVaR and SVM Methods. *Security and Communication Networks* . https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/9617933

Pasricha, P., Selvamuthu, D., D'Amico, G., & Manca, R. (2020). Portfolio optimization of credit risky bonds: a semi-Markov process approach. *Financial Innovation* . https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-020-00186-1

Permanasari, I., & Kurniasih, A. (2021). Factors Affecting the Yield of Indonesian Government Bonds 10 Years. *European Journal of*

Business and Management Research , *6* (1), 243–248. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.1.753

Pratama, YY, Andriana, I., & Umrie, HMARH (2021). The Analysis of Optimal Stock-Bond Portfolio Strategy: Empirical Study in LQ 45 Index Companies and Government Bonds Listed on Indonesia Stock Exchange. *SRIWIJAYA JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS* . https://doi.org/10.29259/jmbs.v18i3.12642

Puspitaningtyas, Z. (2019). Empirical evidence of market reactions based on signaling theory in the Indonesia Stock Exchange. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations* . https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.16(2).2019.06

Putro, TR, Sumantyo, R., Jati NS, HS, Prasetyo, A., & Gumilar, MG (2022). Macroeconomic Stability and Yield on Government Bonds in ASEAN-5 Countries. *Journal of Economics-Qu* , *12* (2), 275. https://doi.org/10.35448/jequ.v12i2.17505

Rahmatika, N., & Fachmi, MN (2020). Macroeconomics: Liquidity, Solvency, and External Factor as a Determinant of Government Bond Index Yield (INDOBEXGB) with The Vector Error Correction Model (VECM). *Journal of Economic, Accounting and Business Applications* , *2* (2), 326–340. https://doi.org/10.35212/research.v2i2.50

Siddiq, MHN, Hasnawati, S., & Huzaimah, RAF (2020). Fama-French Three Factor Model : A Study on LQ 45 Companies In Indonesia Stock Exchange. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSR-JEF)* .

Shida, J (2023). Primary market demand for German government bonds. *Journal of International Money and Finance.* 137, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2023.102909

Taj, SA (2016). Application of signaling theory in management research: Addressing major gaps in theory. *European ManagementJournal* . https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.02.001

Villanueva, DS (2021). Capital and growth. *Monetary Economics and Banking Bulletin* . https://doi.org/10.21098/BEMP.V24I2.1437

Yasar, B., Martin, T., & Kiessling, T. (2020). An empirical test of signaling theory. *Management Research Reviews* . https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2019-0338

Zaremba, A., & Czapkiewicz, A. (2017). The Cross Section of International Government Bond Returns. *Economic Modeling* , *66* , 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2017.06.011

Zulfa, M., & Nahar, A. (2020). Determinants of Corporate Bond Yield. *KRISNA Journal: Collection of Accounting Research* , *11*

(2), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.22225/kr.11.2.1418.117-128