

University of New Orleans

ScholarWorks@UNO

Department of Economics and Finance Working
Papers, 1991-2006

Department of Economics and Finance

2003

Reexamining the maturity effect using extensive futures data;

Elton Daal

University of New Orleans

Joseph Farhat

The Hashemite University

Peihwang P. Wei

University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uno.edu/econ_wp

Recommended Citation

Daal, Elton; Farhat, Joseph; and Wei, Peihwang P., "Reexamining the maturity effect using extensive futures data;" (2003). *Department of Economics and Finance Working Papers, 1991-2006*. Paper 12. https://scholarworks.uno.edu/econ_wp/12

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Economics and Finance at ScholarWorks@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Economics and Finance Working Papers, 1991-2006 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

Reexamining the Maturity Effect Using Extensive Futures Data

Elton Daal

College of Business Administration
Department of Economics and Finance
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70148

Joseph Farhat

College of Economics and Business Administration
Department of Economics
The Hashemite University
Amman-Jordan

Peihwang P. Wei

College of Business Administration
Department of Economics and Finance
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70148

JEL Classifications: C32, G12, G13, Q14

Key words: futures prices volatility, maturity effect, Samuelson Hypothesis, futures markets

Reexamining the Maturity Effect Using Extensive Futures Data

Abstract

In his seminal article, Samuelson (1965) proposes the maturity effect that volatility of futures prices should increase as futures contract approaches expiration. This study provides new evidence on the maturity effect by examining a more extensive set of futures contracts over longer period than previous studies: 8451 futures contracts drawn from 74 commodities and four International exchanges, (London, Sydney, Tokyo and Winnipeg Futures), in addition to the U.S. markets over the years from 1960 to 2000. Strong support is found for the maturity effect in agricultural and energy commodities, but not for financial futures. Moreover, negative covariance between spot price and net carry cost appears to be able explain the maturity effect fairly well for commodity futures.

I. Introduction

The hypothesis that price variability increases as time-to-maturity nears, first proposed by Samuelson (1965), has important implications on the behavior of futures prices. The relation between volatility and maturity also has implications for margin setting and hedging strategy. The desired margin size is a positive function of futures price volatility. Therefore, if volatility increases as delivery approaches, margins should also increase near maturity. In addition, rising volatility near delivery suggests that correlation between spot and futures prices is weakened. Consequently, hedging strategies should be adjusted as maturity approaches. Finally, since volatility is one of the factors determining the price of an option, a better feel for the maturity effect provides insights for pricing of options on futures.

This study attempts to shed new light on the maturity effect by examining a more extensive set of futures contracts and longer period than previous studies. Specifically, we utilize data of 8451 futures contracts drawn from 74 commodities and from four International exchange markets (London, Sydney, Tokyo and Winnipeg Futures), in addition to the U.S. markets over the years from 1960 to 2000. Furthermore, in contrast to most extant literature that uses constructed time series, we analyze each contract individually, thereby utilizing the full extent of the data. Ma, Mercer and Walker (1992) suggest that aggregating contracts can distort empirical results. In reporting the results, we focus on the percentage of contracts that is consistent with the maturity effect, which has the added advantage that overall conclusions are not affected by extreme estimates. Last but not least importantly, we provide an analysis of the role of covariance between changes in spot prices and carry costs in explaining the maturity effect. Bassembinder, Coughenour, Seguin and Smeller (1996) show that if this covariance is negative, the

maturity effect is likely to exist. Nevertheless, their empirical analysis does not directly link covariance of prices and carry costs with the maturity effect, as in this study. Furthermore, our sample is much greater than theirs.

Our primary results indicate that, on average, 45% of the agricultural contracts confirm the maturity effect, and, more importantly, the maturity effect is present in around 80% of contracts that have negative covariances. For currencies futures contracts, the covariance hypothesis has much less power in explaining the maturity effect.

The paper is organized as the follows. The next section presents a brief review of related literature. This is followed by a discussion of methodology and the data. In the fourth section, the empirical results are reported. The paper ends with a summary and conclusions

II. Related Literature

Samuelson (1965) was the first to suggest that price volatility should increase as futures expiration approaches. However, his analysis gives neither formal proofs nor conditions for what has come to be known as the Samuelson hypothesis. Anderson and Danthine (1983) reinterpret the maturity effect by incorporating time variation in the rate of information flow. They believe that there is no inherent tendency for price volatility to increase as delivery approaches; the underlying reason may be the rate of information flows. Specifically, they hypothesize that the maturity effect reflects more uncertainty resolved or more information flows into the market near maturity.

A more recent theoretical analysis is introduced by Bassembinder, Coughenour, Seguin and Smeller (1996) (BCSS, thereafter), in which they develop a

framework to predict markets in which the maturity effect should be expected to hold. They show that “neither the clustering of information flows near delivery dates nor the assumption that each futures price is an unbiased forecast of delivery date spot prices is a necessary condition for the success of the hypothesis.” Specifically, they assume the cost of carry model as follows.

$$F_t = S_t e^{c\tau} \quad (1)$$

where F is the futures price, S is the spot price, τ is time-to-maturity, c is the net cost of carry, and $c = r - y$, where r is the risk-free rate and y is the convenience yield. Given Equation (1), they demonstrate that

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(F_t) &= \ln(S_t) + c\tau \\ \sigma_F^2 &= \sigma_S^2 + \tau^2 \sigma_c^2 + 2\tau \text{Cov}(c, \ln(S_t)) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where σ_F^2 is the variance of futures; σ_S^2 is the variance of spot; σ_c^2 is the variance of the net carry cost (which is reflected by futures term structure); and $\text{Cov}(c, \ln(S_t))$ represents the covariance between changes in spot prices and net carry costs. They point out that greater spot volatility near maturity should affect all contracts (including short-term and long-term contracts), thus implying saw-tooth patterns in volatility for longer-term futures. Given that futures prices do not exhibit such a pattern, variation in the spot price volatility is ruled out as an explanation for the maturity hypothesis. If $\sigma_c^2 > 0$ and is constant, reduction in τ^2 over time will cause futures volatility to drop as delivery approaches, which is contrary to the maturity effect. Therefore this is also rejected as a potential explanation for the maturity effect by BCSS. Only the last term can have a positive or negative effect on

futures volatility. They therefore hypothesize that the maturity effect should exist when the covariance between net carry cost and the spot price is sufficiently negative to outweigh the positive effect of $\tau^2\sigma_c^2$. Thus, the BCSS model predicts that maturity effect will tend to hold when the covariance is negative. They also argue that real assets most likely have negative covariance, since covariance between prices and convenience yields of real assets is often positive. For instance, Fama and French (1988) argue that reductions in real asset inventories around business cycles peaks would be associated with both increased convenience yields and spot prices. Positive covariance between prices and yields can also come from seasonality in production or consumption. Similar arguments for financial assets would be weaker, since it is difficult to postulate either substantial time series variation in asset inventory or the importance of convenience yields for financial assets. Therefore, the BCSS model argues that the maturity effect is less likely to hold in financial assets, a prediction seems somewhat supported by the cumulative evidence, as summarized below.

In general, empirical evidence regarding the maturity effect is mixed, but the effect seems to be stronger in non-financial futures than in financial. The remainder of this section provides a brief review of empirical studies on the issue.

Rutledge (1976) studies March 1970 Silver contract, December 1970 cocoa contract, September 1969 wheat contract and May 1971 soybean oil contract. Using daily price observation expressed in logarithms and taking the absolute value of prices differences as a measure of volatility, he employs a goodness of fit test for a three-way contingency table. His results reject the maturity effect for wheat and soybean oil but accept it for silver and cocoa. Dusak-Miller (1979) investigates the maturity effect using June and December live cattle futures contracts for the period 1964-1972. She computes correlation coefficients between volatility and time to maturity and concludes a significant negative relationship, thus supporting the

Samuelson hypothesis. Castelino and Francis (1982) test the maturity effect using daily data from 1960 to 1971 for futures on wheat, corn, soybeans, soybeans meal, soybean oil, and copper. Their methodology standardizes the variance by dividing by the geometric mean of the sample variances of all contracts within the same month of observation. The study employs two tests: the test of equality of the average standardized variances and the significance of the time-to-maturity coefficient in the OLS regression of standardized variance on time-to-maturity; the results largely support the maturity effect. Anderson (1985) uses both nonparametric and parametric tests and indicates significant maturity effects for oats, soybean oil, live cattle, and cocoa but no such effect for wheat, corn, soybeans, or silver, for the sample period of 1966-1980.

Several studies also cover interest-rate sensitive futures. Milonas's (1986) examines wheat, corn, soybeans, soybean meal, soybean oil, GNMA, T-bonds, T-bills, copper, gold, and silver contracts for the period 1972-1983. His empirical evidence is consistent with the maturity effect in 10 out of the 11 futures he analyzes. Grammatikos and Saunders (1986) find no relation between volatility and time-to-maturity for currency futures prices. Barnhill, Jordan, and Seal (1987) document evidence supportive of a maturity effect in the Treasury bond futures market during the period 1977-1984.

The maturity effect in stock index futures is analyzed by Chamberlain (1989), Board and Sutcliffe (1990) and Yang and Brorsen (1993); their results in general are weakly consistent with the maturity effect.

Galloway and Kolb (1996) examine a comprehensive data set, including 45 commodities over the period 1969 to 1992. After controlling for sources of nonstationary other than maturity, the time to maturity variable is found to have a significant negative relationship to monthly return variance for many of the agricultural commodities, for all energy commodities, and for copper. In contrast,

time to maturity is not a significant factor for the precious metals and for all but one of the financials commodities. BCSS (1996) also empirically analyze 11 commodities over roughly a 10-year period. They find that the maturity effect tends to be present in agriculturals but not in financials. Nevertheless, their empirical analysis does not directly link covariance of prices and carry costs with the maturity effect, as in this study. Additionally, the sample here is more extensive than theirs; we include virtually the universe of futures contracts.

III. Data and Methodology

The data in this study consists of daily open, high, low, close, volume and open interest for futures contracts that expired during the years 1960 through 2000. The data is obtained from the R & C Research financial price database, a commercial vendor of futures data. Over 2,300,000 daily prices are available for 8451 futures contracts on 74 commodities, covering the major international exchange markets. Table I provides descriptive information for each commodity, including the beginning year of futures price data, the number of contracts and the expiration months of the futures contract.

As shown in Table I, agricultural commodities represent 47% of the sample contracts, energy and metals commodities represent 22.5%, and financial commodities account for the remaining 30.5% of the sample contracts. Agricultural commodities contracts account for the largest portion of our sample due to the longer history of these contracts. For instance, wheat and soybean futures have been traded since 1960. In contrast, the introduction dates are mid 70's for currency futures, early 80's for energies futures, late 80's for financials futures, and mid 80's for index futures.

In addition to the U.S. futures markets, our data set contains 20 futures contracts drawn from four international exchange markets (London, Sydney, Tokyo and Winnipeg). This data is more comprehensive than previous studies in three manners: longer period of time coverage (almost full coverage from the time prospective), a larger number of futures contracts and coverage of international futures exchanges.

The maturity effect is investigated by performing the following ordinary least square regression, for each individual contract.

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \tau_{j,t} + \varepsilon_t \quad ..(3)$$

where $\sigma_{j,t}^2$ represents price volatility; τ is the number of days until maturity; The main hypothesis and focus is that if the maturity effect exists, the coefficient of τ is negative.

The majority of empirical studies create a time series by linking price changes or returns from separate futures contracts. This requires choosing the time to switch from the nearby contract to the next nearby contract, and adjusting for any differences in price level between the two contracts. Ma, Mercer and Walker (1992) point out that the manner in which the price series are linked can have unpredictable effects on the results of empirical studies. Due to problems and pitfalls of linking price series, methodologies that avoid this are preferable, such as a separate analysis for each contract. Therefore, in this study, we analyze each contract individually. Another reason for this approach is that it will utilize the full information provided by the data. Thousands of contracts need to be analyzed and it is difficult to summarize the results. Therefore, we focus on the percentage of contracts that is consistent with the maturity effect; this has the added advantage that overall conclusions are not affected by extreme regression coefficients.

As in most studies that deal with the maturity effect, the basic unit of observation is the logarithm of daily futures price. The main reason for working with the log differences is that as price level would change we would expect the dispersion of prices to change in the same direction; using percentage changes or log differences corrects for this obvious source of nonstationarity. As a measure of volatility, we employ the classical estimator of price relatives' logarithm. More specifically, the price relative change is calculated as the logarithm of relative daily prices from day t-1 to day t.

$$f_{jt} = \text{Ln}\left(\frac{F_{j,t}}{F_{j,t-1}}\right) \dots (4)$$

where $F_{j,t}$ is the closing price for futures contract j on day t . The volatility of daily price relative for contract j calculated as

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \left(\text{Ln}\left(\frac{F_{j,t}}{F_{j,t-1}}\right)\right)^2 \dots (5)$$

To test BCCS (1996) hypothesis, we follow Bassembinder, Coughenour, Seguin, and Smeller (1995), in which the net carry cost is estimated on a daily basis as the following.

$$c_{j,t} = \frac{\text{Ln}(F_{j,t}) - \text{Ln}(S_{j,t})}{\tau} \dots (6)$$

Then the following regression is run to infer the covariance sign between the spot and net carry cost.

$$c_{j,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln(S_{j,t}) + \varepsilon_t \quad ..(7)$$

where $c_{j,t}$ is the net carry cost for contract j in day t and S_t is the spot price at time t .

If the maturity effect tends to be stronger for contracts that have negative covariance, it would provide support for the BCSS hypothesis.

IV. Empirical Results

Table II presents the summary result of the OLS regression for each commodity. The first column indicates the number of contracts tested. The third column reports the percentage of contracts that is consistent with the maturity effect ($\beta_1 < 0$ at the 95% confidence level) while the fourth column shows the percentage of contracts that contradicts the maturity effect ($\beta_1 > 0$). Examining the percentage of contracts that have significant maturity effect ($\beta_1 < 0$) reveals that, on average, 45.66% of agricultural commodities show significant maturity effect. For example, 63% of the Lean Hogs, 37% of Corn, 44.5% of COBT Wheat, and 54% of Wheat traded in London demonstrate significant maturity effects. For Energy futures, 54.4% of the contracts tested have significant maturity effect; it is the highest for Natural Gasoline, where 89.6% confirm the existence of the maturity effect, and the lowest for Propane Gas, 37%. On average, 32.2% of Metal futures confirm the existence of the maturity effect; the highest percentage is recorded for Copper, where 41.2% of contracts have significant maturity effects. For these commodity futures, few contradict the maturity effect, especially for commodities that are likely to have high convenience yields.

Index and interest-rate futures in general show a weak maturity effect: 13.8% of the contracts tested. It is the lowest for 30-day interest rate futures (0%) and the highest for U.S. Treasury Composite (38.2%). Moreover, the percentage of interest-rate futures that show decreasing variance near maturity is relatively high: 31.1%. Similar results are found for currency futures. Overall, the results in Table II are in agreement with the conclusion from previous studies that the maturity effect tends to be more pronounced in non-financials commodity futures than financials. This conclusion remains qualitatively the same when we pool all contracts and control for the year and month effects, as shown in the appendix.¹

To examine BCCS (1996)'s hypothesis, we estimate covariance between net carry costs and spot prices. Spot prices for currencies are readily available, thus we use currency futures as a representative for financial futures. On the other hand, spot prices are unavailable for most commodities. We use agricultural contracts as representatives for non-financials, where nearby futures prices are employed as proxies for spot prices (Fama and French (1988)). These covariance estimates are displayed in Table III.

The third and fourth columns of Table III report the percentage of contracts showing a negative and positive covariance, respectively. The fifth column shows the percentage of contracts that have negative covariance out of all contracts that exhibit maturity effect. The sixth column reports the percentage of contracts that have positive covariance out of all contracts that demonstrate decreasing volatility. The results in Table III in general suggest that for contracts where convenience

¹ In addition to the maturity effect, several sources of nonstationarity in futures prices have been identified in the literature. As described in Milonas (1986), the year effect refers to year-to-year variability in futures prices due to random shocks, such as weather conditions or political events. The calendar-month effect refers to seasonality within a year of the demand for or supply of the commodity. For example, for many agricultural commodities, price volatility increases during summer months when information on changing weather conditions has the most effect on expectation about crop supply. On the other hand, for energy commodities, production may not be very seasonal, but demand exhibits strong seasonality.

yields are present, covariances between net carry cost and the spot price are negative. On average, 81% of agricultural commodities show negative covariance. Whereas for contracts whose convenience yields are low, such as financial futures, the percentages of negative and positive covariances are roughly the same. For the BCSS hypothesis to hold, the majority of the agricultural contracts should exhibit the maturity effect. Indeed, the results show that on average 45% of the agricultural contracts confirm the maturity effect, and, more importantly, the maturity effect is present in around 80% of contracts that have negative covariances. For currencies futures contracts, the covariance hypothesis has much less power in explaining the maturity effect; only 35% out of all contracts having negative covariance exhibit maturity effect. In summary, Table III suggests that the BCSS model can explain the maturity effect fairly well for agricultural futures but not for currency futures.

V. Summary and Conclusions

This paper re-examines the maturity effect, a source of nonstationarity in futures prices. The data includes 2,300,000 daily prices from the period 1960-2000, for 8451 contracts on 74 commodities and 4 International exchange markets, (London, Sydney, Tokyo and Winnipeg Futures) in addition to the U.S. exchanges. The contracts analyzed are drawn from both physical (agricultural, energy and metals) and financials (stock index, interest rate and currency) commodities.

Our general results are that the maturity effect tends to be stronger for commodity contracts, compared to financial futures. Moreover, (negative) covariance between spot price and net carry cost appears to be able explain the maturity effect fairly well for commodity futures.

References

- Anderson, R. W., (1985) "Some Determinants of the Volatility of Futures Prices," *Journal of Futures Markets* 5, 331-348.
- Anderson, R., and J. Danthine, (1983) "The Time Pattern of Hedging and the Volatility of Futures Prices," *Review of Economic Studies* 50, 249-266.
- Barnhill, T. M., J. V. Jordan, and W. E. Seal, (1987) "Maturity and Refunding Effects on Treasury-Bond Futures Price Variance," *Journal of Financial Research* 10, 121-131.
- Bessembinder, H., J. F. Coughenour, P. J. Seguin, and M. M. Smoller, (1996) "Is There A Term Structure of Futures Volatilities? Reevaluating the Samuelson Hypothesis," *Journal of Derivatives*, 45-58.
- Bessembinder, H., J. F. Coughenour, P. J. Seguin, and M. M. Smoller, (1995) "Mean Reversion in Equilibrium Assets Prices: Evidence from the Futures Term Structure," *Journal of Finance* 50, 361-375.
- Board, J. L. G. and C. M. S. Sutcliffe, (1990) "Information, Volatility, Volume and Maturity: An Investigation of Stock Index Futures," *Review of Futures Markets* 9, 532-549.
- Castelino, M. G., and J. C. Francis, (1982) "Basis Speculation in Commodity Futures: The Maturity Effect," *Journal of Futures Markets* 2, 195-206.
- Chaberbain, T. W., (1989) "Maturity Effects in Futures Markets: Some Evidence from the City of London," *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* , :90-95.
- Dusak-Miller, K., (1979) "The Relation between Volatility and Maturity in Futures Contracts," *Leuthold, R.M (ed.) Commodity Markets and Futures Prices, Chicago Mercantile Exchange*, 25-36.
- Fama, E., and K. French, (1988) "Business Cycles and Behavior of Metals Prices" *Journal of Finance* 43, 1075-1093.
- Galloway, T. M., and R. W. Kolb, (1996) "Futures Prices and the Maturity Effect," *Journal of Futures Markets* 7, 809-828.

Grammatikos, T. and A. Saunders, (1986) "Futures Price Variability: A Test of Maturity and Volume Effects," *Journal of Business* 59, 319-330.

Ma, C. K., Mercer, J. M., and Walker, M. A., (1992) "Rolling over Futures Contracts: A Note," *Journal of Futures Markets* 12, 203-217.

Milonas, N. T., (1986) "Price Variability and the Maturity Effect in Futures Markets," *Journal of Futures Markets* 3, 433-460.

Rutledge, D. J. S., (1976) "A Note on the Variability of Futures Prices," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 58, 120-123.

Samuelson, P. A., (1965) "Proof That Properly Anticipated Prices Fluctuate Randomly," *Industrial Management Review* 6, 41-49.

Yang, S., and B. W. Brorsen, (1993) "Nonlinear Dynamics of Daily Futures Prices: Conditional Heteroskedasticity or Chaos?" *Journal of Futures Markets* 13, 175-192.

Appendix

The dependent variable is the daily volatility. The independent variables are the time to maturity and dummies for calendar months and years.

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \beta_1 \tau + \sum_{i=1}^{12} \alpha_i C_{i,j,t} + \sum_{y_0}^{y_t} \lambda_y y_{j,t} + \varepsilon_i$$

Commodity Type	Maturity Effect		Year Effect	Calendar Month Effect	R ²
	β_1	t_B	H ₀ : $\lambda_y = 0 \forall y_i$ F-statistics	H ₀ : $\alpha_i = 0 \forall i$ F-statistics	
Agricultural					
Soybean Oil	-0.0000006174	-6.24**	42.12**	25.63**	.373
Soybeans	-0.0000004350	-5.21**	45.23**	47.50**	.429
Soybean Meal	-0.0000016097	10.69**	62.23**	31.23**	.421
Corn	-0.0000001216	-1.40	23.5**	2415**	.200
Oats	-0.0000009420	-7.43**	21.50**	30.10**	.346
Oats (Winnipeg)	-0.0000000566	-2.38*	2.79*	2.66*	.277
Wheat	-0.0000006231	-5.02**	33.87**	15.70**	.352
Wheat (Kansas City)	-0.0000002791	-1.63	13.95**	10.5**	.178
Wheat (London)	-0.0000005362	-4.41**	5.87**	2.16*	.273
Cocoa	0.0000066075	0.20	2.11*	1.87*	.107
Frozen Orange Juice	-0.0000003421	-12.14**	27.64**	54.23**	.361
Coffee	-0.0000020058	-4.12**	16.25**	1312**	.273
Coffee (London)	-0.0001870604	-1.96*	4.60**	3.56**	.233
Rough Rice	-0.0000004995	-3.68**	22.56**	8.94**	.280
Sugar #14	-0.0000002133	-6.80**	9.31**	3.46**	.223
Cotton #2	-0.0000007663	-6.51**	22.44**	16.56**	.224
Lumber	-0.0000008224	-8.51**	21.58**	17.45**	.298
Barley (London)	-0.0000005130	-2.63*	2.79**	4.60**	.246
Potatoes (London)	-0.0000366158	-4.05**	2.21**	2.25**	.229
Sugar #5 (London)					
Rapeseed (Winnipeg)	-0.0000004401	-4.60**	14.01**	14.59**	.283
Feeder Cattle	-0.0000001004	-7.09**	32.21**	25.41**	.423
Live Cattle	-0.0000003879	-8.12**	41.28**	25.61**	.436
Lean Hogs	-0.0000002973	-16.21**	17.41**	6.32**	.317
Energy					
Crude Oil	-0.0000027685	-5.5**	12.3**	10.2**	0.439
Heating Oil	-0.0000002077	-5.7**	34.1**	29.0**	0.419
Unleaded Gasoline	-0.0000016821	-6.0**	13.0**	17.2**	0.481
Natural Gasoline	-0.0000067570	-19.3**	23.5**	21.5**	0.828
Propane Gas	-0.0000022522	-3.6**	11.3**	21.3**	0.446
Metals					
Gold	-0.000000156	-3.38**	32.27**	51.20**	0.199
High Grade Copper	-0.000000155	-19.75**	21.25**	31.02**	0.225
Palladium	-0.000000116	-1.818	44.32**	32.25**	0.182
Silver	-0.000000071	-2.94**	18.94**	12.53**	0.179

Appendix (continued)

Commodity Type	Maturity Effect		Year Effect	Calendar Month Effect	R ²
	β_1	t_B	H ₀ : $\lambda_y = 0$ V _{y_i}	H ₀ : $\alpha_i = 0$ V _i	
			F-statistics	F-statistics	
Stock Index					
Eurotop-100 Index	0.0002758593	1.44	1.99*	1.65	0.081
Municipal Bonds	0.0000001086	3.75**	18.01**	1.83	0.095
S&P 400 Mid Cap Index	-0.00000 0282	-0.18	6.69**	1.75	0.075
3-Month Can. Bankers Acc	0.0000000053	2.49	6.25**	1.77	0.055
Nikkei 225 Stock Index	-0.0000000209	-0.375	4.02**	2.30	0.099
Russell 2000	-0.0000000108	-0.70	10.05**	1.80	0.045
S&P 500 Index	0.0000007314	0.23	14.12**	4.63**	0.089
NY Stock Composite Index	0.0000015558	2.75**	2.94**	1.74	0.097
All Ordinary Index	0.0000013461	2.28*	1.64	0.88	0.057
Tokyo Stock Price Index	0.0000013410	3.76**	6.23**	0.78	0.065
FTSE 100 Index	0.0000002789	0.96	3.22**	0.90	0.045
Interest Rate					
Eurodollar	0.000000032	0.57	5.25**	1.40	0.091
Libor (1 Month)	0.000000006	1.95	7.50**	3.90**	0.102
30-day Interest Rate	0.000000002	0.23	3.25**	1.42	0.062
Five Year Treasury Note	0.000000044	0.70	2.40**	0.60	0.022
Three Month T-Bills	0.000001812	0.40	1.13	1.50	0.070
Ten Year Treasury Note	0.000000163	0.97	11.45**	1.25	0.046
US Treasury Composite	0.000000175	0.46	22.5**	6.21**	0.048
Australian 10 Year Bond	-0.000000007	-0.58	6.12**	1.05	0.133
Australian 3 Year Bond	-0.000000004	-0.27	7.50**	1.78	0.073
Japanese 10 Yr Gov. Bond	0.000000045	0.31	9.18**	1.68	0.148
Currencies					
Australian Dollar	0.0000000402	1.02	12.2*	1.7	0.400
British Pound	0.0000001327	4.27*	21.0*	1.1	0.450
Canadian Dollar	0.0000000143	2.13*	11.1*	10.4**	0.420
German Mark	-0.0000000044	-0.22	12.5*	4.5*	0.460
Dollar Index	-0.0000000068	-0.33	11.2*	3.7*	0.470
French Franc	-0.0000000078	-0.71	9.3*	4.3*	0.440
Japanese Yen	0.0000000068	0.71	14.2*	6.2*	0.360
Swiss Franc	0.0000000055	0.81	22.5*	21.1**	0.480

Table I
Descriptive Information on Sample
(Data goes to Dec 2000)

Ticker	Commodity	Starting Date	Number of Contracts	Contracts Months
Currencies				
AD	Australian Dollar	1987	56	3,6,9,12
BP	British Pound	1975	104	3,6,9,12
CD	Canadian Dollar	1977	96	3,6,9,12
DM	German Mark	1975	104	3,6,9,12
DX	Dollar Index	1986	60	3,6,9,12
FR	French Franc	1993	32	3,6,9,12
JY	Japanese Yen	1977	96	3,6,9,12
SF	Swiss Franc	1975	104	3,6,9,12
Energies				
CL	Crude Oil	1983	216	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
HO	Heating Oil	1979	264	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
HU	Unleaded Gasoline	1985	192	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
NG	Natural Gasoline	1990	132	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
PN	Propane Gas	1987	168	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
Financials				
ED	Eurodollar	1982	76	3,6,9,12
EM	Libor (1 Month)	1990	132	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
FF	30-day Interest Rate	1988	52	3,6,9,12
FV	Five Year Treasury Note	1988	52	3,6,9,12
TB	Three Month T-Bills	1976	100	3,6,9,12
TY	Ten Year Treasury Note	1982	76	3,6,9,12
US	US Treasury Composite	1977	96	3,6,9,12
Foods				
CC	Cocoa	1960	205	3,5,7,9,12
JO	Frozen Orange Juice	1967	204	1,3,5,7,9,11
KC	Coffee	1973	168	3,5,7,9,11,12
NR	Rough Rice	1986	90	1,3,5,7,9,11
SB	Sugar #11	1961	240	1,3,5,7,9,10
SBF	Sugar #14	1993	48	1,3,5,7,9,11
Grains				
BO	Soybean Oil	1960	369	1,3,5,7,8,9,10,11,12
C	Corn	1960	205	3,5,7,9,12
KW	Wheat (Kansas City)	1976	125	3,5,7,9,12
O	Oats	1960	205	3,5,7,9,12
S	Soybeans	1960	287	1,3,5,7,8,9,11
SM	Soybean Meal	1960	369	1,3,5,7,8,9,10,11,12
W	Wheat	1960	205	3,5,7,9,12

Table I (continued)

Ticker	Commodity	Starting Date	Number of Contracts	Contracts Months
Metals/Fiber				
CT	Cotton #2	1960	205	3,5,7,10,12
GC	Gold	1975	156	1,2,3,4,6,8,10,12
HG	High Grade Copper	1960	205	1,3,5,7,9,10,12
LB	Lumber	1973	168	1,3,5,7,9,11
PA	Palladium	1977	96	3,6,9,12
PL	Platinum	1968	132	1,4,7,10
SI	Silver	1964	185	1,3,5,7,9,12
Index Based Items				
CR	CRB Index	1986	90	1,2,4,6,8,11
ET	Eurotop-100 Index	1992	36	3,6,9,12
GSCI	GS Comm Index	1992	108	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
MB	Municipal Bonds	1985	64	3,6,9,12
MD	S&P 400 Mid Cap Index	1992	36	3,6,9,12
BAX	3-Month Can. Bankers Acc	1994	28	3,6,9,12
NK	Nikkei 225 Stock Index	1990	44	3,6,9,12
RU	Russell 2000 (day)	1993	32	3,6,9,12
SP	S&P 500 Index	1982	76	3,6,9,12
YX	NY Stock Composite Index	1983	72	3,6,9,12
Meats				
FC	Feeder Cattle	1974	216	1,3,4,5,8,9,10,11
LC	Live Cattle	1965	216	2,4,6,8,10,12
LH	Lean Hogs	1970	217	2,4,6,7,8,10,13
PB	Pork Bellies	1966	175	2,3,5,7,8
International Markets				
London Markets				
LBR	Barley	1994	35	1,3,5,9,11
LKC	Coffee - Metric	1993	48	1,3,5,7,9,11
LES	Euro/Swiss Franc	1992	36	3,6,9,12
LFX	FTSE 100 Index	1984	68	3,6,9,12
LCC	London Metric Cocoa	1993	40	3,5,7,9,12
LFG	Long Gilt (20 Year)	1990	44	3,6,9,12
LPO	Potatoes	1994	35	3,4,5,6,11
LFL	Short Sterling (3 Month)	1984	68	3,6,9,12
LSB	Sugar #5	1993	40	3,5,8,10,12
LW	Wheat	1994	42	1,3,5,7,9,11
LEC	Three Month Euro Curr Unit	1991	40	3,6,9,12

Table I (continued)

Ticker	Commodity	Starting Date	Number of Contracts	Contracts Months
Sydney Futures				
AAO	All Ordinary Index	1991	40	3,6,9,12
ASX	Australian 10 Year Bond	1992	36	3,6,9,12
ASY	Australian 3 Year Bod	1992	36	3,6,9,12
Tokyo Futures				
BT	Japanese 10 Yr Govt Bond	1992	36	3,6,9,12
IT	Three Month Euro yen	1992	36	3,6,9,12
TTX	Tokyo Stock Price Index	1992	36	3,6,9,12
Winnipeg				
WO	Oats	1992	45	3,5,7,10,12
WR	Canola Rapeseed	1981	100	1,3,6,9,11
WW	Wheat	1980	105	3,5,7,10,12

Futures months Symbols

1=F, 2=G, 3=H, 4=J, 5=K, 6=M, 7=N, 8=Q, 9=U, 10=V, 11=X, 12=Z

Table II
Percentage of Contracts consistent with the Maturity Effect

The dependent variable is daily volatility. The independent variable is the time to maturity. The third column reports the percentage of contracts with significant maturity effect at 95% confidence. The fourth column reported the percentage of contracts that contradict the maturity effect.

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \tau_{j,t} + \varepsilon_t$$

Commodity	Number of Contracts	$\beta_1 < 0$	$\beta_1 > 0$
Agricultural			
Soybean Oil	319	39.50%	8.46%
Soybeans	278	43.17%	15.07%
Soybean Meal	320	48.13%	13.75%
Corn	195	36.92%	17.43%
Oats	230	42.61%	12.60%
Oats (Winnipeg)	37	21.62%	21.62%
Wheat	200	44.50%	10.00%
Wheat (Kansas City)	115	35.65%	14.78%
Wheat (London)	33	54.54%	6.06%
Cocoa	200	42.50%	14.00%
Frozen Orange Juice	195	36.41%	12.82%
Coffee	132	46.21%	15.09%
Coffee (London)	39	17.94%	15.38%
Rough Rice	77	42.86%	11.68%
Sugar #14	37	54.05%	10.81%
Cotton #2	198	52.52%	13.63%
Lumber	156	64.74%	0.641%
Barley (London)	27	37.07%	3.70%
Potatoes (London)	25	32.00%	4.00%
Rapeseed (Winnipeg)	103	42.71%	16.50%
Feeder Cattle	202	42.57%	6.93%
Live Cattle	184	62.50%	2.17%
Lean Hogs	209	63.16%	4.78%
Total	3511	45.66%	11.10%
Energy			
Crude Oil	199	52.26%	15.57%
Heating Oil	240	50.00%	15.83%
Unleaded Gasoline	179	54.19%	11.17%
Natural Gasoline	115	89.57%	1.74%
Propane Gas	145	37.24%	21.37%
Total	865	54.44%	12.90%
Metals			
Gold	173	27.17%	22.54%
High Grade Copper	286	41.26%	4.19%
Palladium	91	24.18%	36.26%
Silver	210	27.62%	22.38%
Total	760	32.24%	17.23%

Table II (continued)

Commodity	Number of Contracts	$\beta_1 < 0$	$\beta_1 > 0$
Stock Index			
Eurotop-100 Index	28	21.43%	25.00%
Municipal Bonds	58	8.62%	36.32%
S&P 400 Mid Cap Index	32	15.63%	21.87%
3-Month Can. Bankers Acc	23	0.00%	56.52%
Nikkei 225 Stock Index	36	22.22%	36.11%
Russell 2000 (day)	28	17.86%	21.42%
S&P 500 Index	71	19.72%	25.35%
NY Stock Composite Index	67	8.96%	22.38%
All Ordinary Index	34	14.71%	26.47%
Tokyo Stock Price Index	30	3.33%	26.66%
FTSE 100 Index	63	15.87%	30.16%
Total	470	13.8%	28.90%
Interest Rate			
Eurodollar	68	23.80%	36.47%
Libor (1 Month)	116	2.59%	58.62%
30-day Interest Rate	45	0.00%	62.22%
Five Year Treasury Note	47	10.64%	17.02%
Ten Year Treasury Note	71	12.68%	11.26%
US Treasury Composite	89	38.20%	28.71%
Australian 10 Year Bond	32	12.50%	6.25%
Australian 3 Year Bond	32	15.63%	6.25%
Japanese 10 Yr Gov. Bond	30	10.00%	23.33%
Long Gilt (20 Year)	38	10.52%	21.12%
Total	638	13.80%	31.10%
Currency			
Australian Dollar	40	20.00%	12.50%
British Pound	98	14.29%	21.43%
Canadian Dollar	91	18.68%	32.97%
German Mark	98	18.37%	16.33%
Dollar Index	20	20.00%	10.00%
French Franc	24	12.50%	12.50%
Japanese Yen	92	16.30%	16.30%
Swiss Franc	98	15.31%	19.39%
Total	561	16.75%	19.78%

Table III
The relationship between the maturity effect and
covariance between spot price and net carry cost

The third and fourth columns report the percentage of contracts showing negative and positive covariance of net carry cost and spot price, respectively. The fifth column shows the percentage of contracts that have negative covariance and maturity effect out of all contracts that exhibit maturity effect. The sixth column reports the percentage of contracts that have positive covariance out of all contracts that demonstrate decreasing volatility. The last two columns report the percentage of contracts that support and contradict the maturity effect.

$$\sigma_{j,t}^2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \tau_{j,t} + \varepsilon_t$$

$$c_{j,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln(S_{j,t}) + \varepsilon_t$$

Commodity	Number of Contracts	$\alpha_1 < 0$	$\alpha_1 > 0$	$\alpha_1 < 0$	$\alpha_1 > 0$	$\beta_1 < 0$	$\beta_1 > 0$
				$\beta_1 < 0$	$\beta_1 > 0$		
Agricultural							
Soybean Oil	319	87.46%	6.58%	86.51%	3.70%	39.50%	8.46%
Soybeans	278	70.86%	18.35%	71.67%	21.43%	43.17%	15.07%
Soybean Meal	320	87.50%	4.69%	93.51%	11.36%	48.13%	13.75%
Corn	195	81.54%	10.26%	80.56%	17.65%	36.92%	17.43%
Oats	230	83.91%	2.61%	83.67%	3.45%	42.61%	12.60%
Oats (Winnipeg)	37	75.68%	5.41%	62.50%	0.00%	21.62%	21.62%
Wheat	200	81.00%	9.50%	80.90%	15.00%	44.50%	10.00%
Wheat (Kansas City)	115	75.65%	15.65%	82.93%	23.53%	35.65%	14.78%
Wheat (London)	33	90.91%	3.03%	94.44%	0.00%	54.54%	6.06%
Cocoa	200	83.50%	7.50%	85.88%	3.57%	42.50%	14.00%
Frozen Orange Juice	195	69.74%	15.38%	64.79%	12.00%	36.41%	12.82%
Coffee	132	72.73%	15.91%	62.30%	0.00%	46.21%	15.09%
Coffee (London)	39	51.28%	28.21%	9.38%	16.67%	17.94%	15.38%
Rough Rice	77	75.32%	9.09%	59.09%	0.00%	42.86%	11.68%
Sugar #14	37	94.59%	0.00%	95.00%	0.00%	54.05%	10.81%
Cotton #2	198	80.81%	10.10%	87.50%	11.11%	52.52%	13.63%
Lumber	156	91.03%	3.85%	62.82%	0.00%	64.74%	0.641%
Barley (London)	27	70.37%	3.70%	50.00%	0.00%	37.07%	3.70%
Potatoes (London)	25	68.75%	3.13%	87.50%	0.00%	32.00%	4.00%
Rapeseed (Winnipeg)	103	75.73%	14.56%	68.18%	5.88%	42.71%	16.50%
Feeder Cattle	202	75.25%	13.86%	69.77%	7.14%	42.57%	6.93%
Live Cattle	184	94.57%	1.63%	96.52%	0.00%	62.50%	2.17%
Lean Hogs	209	83.25%	9.09%	85.61%	10.00%	63.16%	4.78%
Total	3511	80.97%	9.39%	79.97%	11.28%	45.66%	11.10%
Currency							
Australian Dollar	40	27.50%	12.50%	42.86%	0.00%	20.00%	12.50%
British Pound	73	28.77%	23.29%	22.22%	12.50%	14.29%	21.43%
Canadian Dollar	90	27.78%	40.00%	23.53%	32.26%	18.68%	32.97%
German Mark	98	27.55%	18.37%	27.27%	17.86%	18.37%	16.33%
Dollar Index	20	65.00%	10.00%	100.00%	0.00%	20.00%	10.00%
French Franc	24	41.67%	8.33%	66.67%	0.00%	12.50%	12.50%
Japanese Yen	92	25.00%	38.04%	25.00%	34.78%	16.30%	16.30%
Swiss Franc	98	27.55%	26.53%	28.57%	28.57%	15.31%	19.39%
Total	561	29.3%	26.36%	35.51%	25.92%	16.75%	19.78%

