

predictive value provided by historically high or low dividend yields should be stripped away (for example, the correlation should be zero). All of the comments made regarding dividends are true, although indirectly, for earnings and book value. Since dividends ultimately are paid out of cash flow and earnings, buying stocks with historically high earnings yield has led to historically above-average subsequent total returns.

*Correlation is a measure of strength and direction of linear dependence between two variables, and its value may not be sufficient to evaluate that dependence if the assumption of normality of the deviations from linearity is not valid. Therefore, it would be advisable to provide scatter plots of the data to inspect them for linearity, thus attesting the correlation suitableness.*

We agree that it would have been preferable to obtain correlations that are closer to 1.00 in value. In fact, a correlation of 0.68 indicates that 46% of the variability in S&P returns is explained by the dividend/earning factors, so that 54% of the variance is unexplained by our model. (The 46% corresponds to the  $r$ -squared value in a simple linear regression of S&P returns on dividends/earning factors, which is calculated as the square of the correlation.)

While a higher correlation is always desirable, depending on the outcome, it can be difficult to achieve. Given the volatility and difficulty in predicting S&P returns, a model that explains almost half of the variability in these returns may be quite promising. This correlation for a single variable is in line with what other authors have found.

Marco Alves is adding a level of complexity to this analysis that I believe may create a less robust model of market returns than using an empirical observation stripped of any assumptions of either linearity or normal distribution or both.

## MARKETPLACE

ADVISORY SERVICES  
BROKERAGE SERVICES  
COURSES/SEMINARS  
SOFTWARE  
TRADING S

Creating winning traders for over 13 years

The **LAST** Trading Course You'll Ever Need!

Don't take our word for it,  
Listen to our students. Hear their  
stories on our website.

Our award-winning Trading Course will teach you how to make smart trading decisions to help you become a successful trader!

You can place **SMARTER**, more **PROFITABLE** trades, experience smaller draw downs & become **MORE CONSISTENT** with **LESS** effort - **NO MATTER WHAT** time frame or market you trade! **SIMPLE - EASY TO APPLY**

LEARN WITH LIVE  
REAL-TIME TRADING

Voted Top Ranked Futures  
Daytrading Course

Sign up for **FREE** live trading  
demos, CD's & lessons today!

**www.RSofHouston.com**  
**281-286-9736**

**Former Wall Street Insider**

Reveals how you can win at trading  
Must see video.

**NewEraTraders.Blogspot.com**

Then call for my personal guarantee &  
**FREE TRIAL**  
**800-686-0833**

**E-Mini Russell 2000 Trading System**

1,624% return since 1999 (87,089 per contract)  
Avg Win (\$1,260) is 365% larger than Avg Loss.  
Completely Mechanical System - No subjectivity  
**402-964-9042** or **rct0885@cox.net**

**www.investmentresearch.biz**

**OPTIONS "40 IN 4"**

Win ratio consistent near 80% for 13th year.  
Now you can choose "Op40" as a team with:

**"9 TO 1 EDGE FINDER"**

- **Objective:** +40% gain or more, within 4 days
- **Homework:** 10 to 20 minutes after the close
- **Data needed:** S&P 100 index options prices only
- **Signal Logic:** Plain math gives you your next day's Trading Edge value, which controls the profit outlook
- **Special Signals for +90%:** Large Gains  
Module of the "9 to 1 Edge Finder" is able to predetermine extra high potential.

**KVS Inc.**, our 39th year. Modest one-time fee.  
See results by fax, mail or email:  
**op40email@aol.com**

**800-334-0411 ext. 12-S**  
**From outside USA: 828-692-3401**

Two variables can be correlated but in a nonlinear way, for example, age and height. The average six-year-old is taller than the average three-year-old, but this does not mean that the average 60-year-old is taller than the average 30-year-old, or that the ratio between the height of the three-year-old and the six-year-old tells you anything meaningful about the ratio of the height of the 60-year-old to the 30-year-old. In fact, as we age, we may lose height to the forces of osteoporosis, so the average 80-year-old may be shorter than the average 60-year-old. However, it is also incorrect to assume that because this relationship is nonlinear, it is useless. If we construct a table of age versus average height with distributions of height, we can make some determinations of height at some

future date without making any assumptions about linearity, covariance, or correlation.

My attempt in the article was to provide a sort of growth chart for the stock market, dividing the data into buckets by quartile then averaging each of those buckets, making no assumptions about the distributions within or between those buckets.

The scatter plot in Figure 1 shows 12-month returns versus the dividend yield at the start of the period. As with any financial series, it is noisy with some high-return periods following low-dividend yields and some low returns following modest or moderately high-dividend yields, but the following is clear:

*Continued on page 95*