Economic Policy Uncertainty and Financial Market Volatility

Manar Hassan Kamel

Teaching Assistant at The American University in Cairo (AUC)

Supervisor:

Professor. Tarek Eldomiaty

Professor of finance at The American University in Cairo (AUC)

الملخص

أصبحت حالة عدم اليقين المرتبطة بالسياسات الاقتصادية أحد المحددات الأساسية لديناميكيات الأسواق المالية، إلا أن معظم الدراسات السابقة تعاملت معها كظاهرة موحّدة، الأمر الذي قد يحجب التباينات الجوهرية في استجابات الأسواق. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل الأثر التفاضلي لعشرة مكوّنات مختلفة من عدم اليقين في السياسات الاقتصادية على تقلبات الأسواق المالية، وذلك بالاعتماد على مؤشر *عدم اليقين في السياسات الاقتصادية* الذي طوّره بيكر وبلوم وديفيس (٢٠١٦). اعتمد البحث على منهجية المربعات الصغرى المعمّمة (GMM) باستخدام تقنية مبتكرة للضبط الآلي للمعاملات، مستندًا إلى ٢١٤ مشاهدة شهرية لتحديد آليات الانتقال الخاصة بكل مكوّن من مكوّنات السياسة الاقتصادية إلى مؤشر S&P 500.

أظهرت النتائج التجريبية وجود تباينات ملحوظة في تأثيرات عدم اليقين تبعًا لمجال السياسة. فقد تبيّن أنّ عدم اليقين في السياسة التجارية هو الأكثر تأثيرًا سلبًا وبصورة متسقة، حيث ظهر بمعاملات سالبة مخالفة للتوقعات النظرية. في المقابل، أظهرت حالات عدم اليقين في السياسات النقدية والتنظيمية آثارًا إيجابية في الغالب على أسواق الأسهم، وهو ما يتعارض مع الافتراض التقليدي القائل بتأثير سلبي موحّد لعدم اليقين. كما أثبت الإطار المعتمد على GMM قدرة تفسيرية قوية مع قيمة معدلة لمعامل التحديد (R^2) بلغت ٠.٥١٧٤، في حين أكّدت إحصاءات J قوة ومتانة الاختبارات المعتمدة بالأدوات.

تقدم هذه النتائج دليلًا قويًا على أن عدم اليقين في السياسات الاقتصادية يعمل من خلال آليات انتقال مختلفة تتباين منهجيًا بين مجالات السياسة، بما يترتب عليه انعكاسات مهمة في بناء المحافظ الاستثمارية وإدارة المخاطر واستراتيجيات تواصل السياسات.

الكلمات المفتاحية : عدم اليقين في السياسات الاقتصادية؛ الأسواق المالية؛ طريقة المربعات الصغرى المعمّمة؛ آليات انتقال السياسة؛ تقلبات السوق.

Abstract

Economic policy uncertainty has emerged as a critical determinant of financial market dynamics, yet existing research predominantly treats policy uncertainty as a monolithic concept, potentially obscuring important heterogeneities in market responses. This study investigates the differential impacts of ten distinct components of economic policy uncertainty on financial market volatility using the comprehensive Economic Policy Uncertainty index developed by Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016). Employing Generalized Method of Moments estimation with an innovative automated parameter tuning methodology, this research analyzes 214 monthly observations to identify component-specific transmission mechanisms through which policy uncertainty affects the S&P 500 index. The empirical results reveal significant heterogeneity in uncertainty effects across policy domains. Trade policy uncertainty emerges as the most consistently detrimental factor, exhibiting significant negative coefficients contrary to theoretical expectations.

Conversely, monetary policy and regulatory uncertainties demonstrate predominantly positive effects on equity markets, challenging conventional assumptions about uniform negative uncertainty impacts. The automated GMM framework achieves substantial explanatory power with an adjusted R-squared of 0.5174, while instrumental variable validation through J-statistics confirms methodological robustness. These findings provide compelling evidence that policy uncertainty operates through distinct transmission mechanisms that vary systematically across policy domains, with important implications for portfolio construction, risk management, and policy communication strategies.

Keywords: Economic Policy Uncertainty, Financial Markets, Generalized Method of Moments, Policy Transmission Mechanisms, Market Volatility

I. Introduction

The relationship between economic policy uncertainty and financial market behavior has garnered unprecedented attention in contemporary finance and economics research, driven by the recognition that policy decisions increasingly reverberate through global financial markets with profound implications for asset pricing, investment allocation, and market stability. The significance of this relationship became particularly evident during major policy episodes including the 2008 financial crisis,

Brexit referendum, U.S.-China trade tensions, and the extraordinary policy responses to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The foundational work of Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016) revolutionized policy uncertainty research by developing a comprehensive newspaper-based Economic Policy Uncertainty index that can be decomposed into distinct policy categories including monetary policy, taxation, government spending, healthcare, national security, entitlement programs, regulation, financial regulation, trade policy, and sovereign debt concerns. This methodological innovation enables researchers to move beyond aggregate uncertainty measures to examine how specific policy domains affect financial markets through component-specific transmission mechanisms.

The fundamental problem addressed by this research stems from the recognition that different types of policy uncertainty may have varying effects across asset classes and market segments. Traditional approaches to studying policy uncertainty have predominantly treated it as a monolithic concept, utilizing aggregate uncertainty indices that potentially obscure important heterogeneities in how markets respond to different types of policy changes. This aggregation assumption implies that uncertainty about monetary policy, fiscal policy, regulatory frameworks, and trade policies affects financial markets through identical transmission mechanisms and with similar magnitudes.

However, theoretical considerations suggest that different policy domains may operate through distinct channels, affecting various asset classes and market segments with varying intensity and timing. Despite the growing recognition of policy uncertainty as a fundamental driver of market behavior, several critical gaps remain in the existing literature. Most studies continue to rely on aggregate uncertainty measures that may mask important differences in how specific policy domains affect markets. Limited research has systematically examined how policy uncertainty effects vary across different asset classes within the same analytical framework. Existing methodologies often fail to address potential endogeneity concerns that arise from the possibility that market conditions may influence policy decisions and uncertainty perceptions.

This study addresses these limitations by investigating the differential impacts of economic policy uncertainty components on financial market volatility, specifically examining the S&P 500 index as a measure of broad equity market performance. The empirical methodology employs Generalized Method of Moments estimation with an innovative automated parameter tuning system designed to identify optimal specifications while addressing potential endogeneity concerns through instrumental variables approaches. This methodological framework ensures that the estimated relationships reflect genuine causal effects

rather than spurious correlations induced by reverse causation or omitted variable bias.

The research contributes to the existing literature in several important dimensions. Theoretically, the study provides evidence regarding the component-specific nature of policy uncertainty transmission mechanisms, challenging assumptions about uniform uncertainty effects across policy domains. Methodologically, the research demonstrates the value of disaggregated uncertainty measures and automated specification selection procedures for improving empirical model performance.

II. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

The specialized literature on monetary policy uncertainty provides detailed insights into one of the most important EPU transmission channels. Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016) established the empirical foundation for monetary policy uncertainty research using Vector Autoregressive models with firm-level panel regressions. Their VAR results showed that a 90-point EPU shock generates a 1.2% decline in industrial production and 0.35% employment decline, with highly significant effects at the 1% level. Husted, Rogers, and Sun (2017) provided detailed evidence of MPU transmission mechanisms using multiple identification schemes, revealing that MPU shocks have significant negative effects at both aggregate

and firm levels, with effects comparable in magnitude to conventional monetary policy shocks.

Tax policy uncertainty research has evolved from examining general political uncertainty effects to sophisticated analysis of specific tax policy transmission mechanisms. Julio and Yook (2012) established the empirical link between political uncertainty and corporate investment decisions, demonstrating that firms reduce investment by an average 4.8% during election years relative to non-election years. Gulen and Ion (2016) documented a strong negative relationship between policy uncertainty and corporate investment using firm-level panel regressions, with highly significant negative coefficients ($p<0.01$) that established tax policy uncertainty as a distinct research domain.

Government spending uncertainty research has progressed from theoretical models to sophisticated empirical analysis using instrumental variables and state-dependent approaches. Kim (2019) represented the first comprehensive empirical analysis of government spending policy uncertainty effects using Proxy Structural Vector Autoregression with defense news as instrumental variable, revealing that government spending policy uncertainty has prolonged negative effects on economic activity through external financing premium transmission channels.

Healthcare policy uncertainty research has evolved to sophisticated sector-specific investigations that reveal unique transmission patterns during health crises. Pham, Bannigidadmath, and Powell (2025) represent the current frontier of healthcare policy uncertainty research, demonstrating that healthcare policy uncertainty predicts returns of 25 out of 49 industries during health crisis periods, with pharmaceutical products showing 11.44% annual profits.

Research on national security uncertainty has progressed from simple correlations to advanced network models capturing event-driven spillovers across global markets. Studies reveal that major geopolitical events such as 9/11 and the Gulf Wars cause sharp spikes in uncertainty indices, significantly affecting defense sectors, investment, and employment. The Geopolitical Risk Index further quantified these dynamics, showing measurable declines in industrial production and employment. Recent advances using TENET, EGARCH, and TVP-VAR models demonstrate that geopolitical crises increase network connectedness by 15–25% and amplify tail-risk contagion, particularly in developed markets. Overall, findings confirm that national security uncertainty propagates systematically through international financial systems.

Uncertainty in entitlement programs, particularly Social Security and Medicare, has been analyzed through general

equilibrium and overlapping-generations models. Early theoretical work established that reform uncertainty reduces equity premiums and increases stock market volatility, with significant implications for intergenerational risk-sharing. Empirical studies show that reform-related uncertainty can raise volatility by 12–18% and alter portfolio allocations, with individuals shifting toward safer assets. Evidence further indicates that uncertainty in Social Security reduces stock market participation by up to 15%, while Medicare reform uncertainty has moderate but significant effects. Collectively, findings highlight the complex interactions between demographics, fiscal sustainability, and financial market dynamics.

Research on regulatory uncertainty has shifted from aggregate EPU analysis to sector-specific studies, demonstrating heterogeneous impacts across industries. Early applications using GARCH and HAR models showed that regulatory EPU significantly improves volatility forecasting accuracy. Subsequent work established regulation as a distinct EPU component, strongly linked with reduced investment and increased stock volatility in sensitive sectors such as defense, healthcare, finance, and infrastructure. Macro-level evidence shows regulatory uncertainty accounts for 17.4% of total EPU variation and foreshadows declines in economic activity. Recent sectoral studies confirm non-linear effects, with real estate sub-sectors displaying varying sensitivity across market conditions.

Trade policy uncertainty research has evolved to sophisticated studies of international spillovers, supply chain disruptions, and portfolio effects. Gormsen and Koijen (2020) extended trade policy uncertainty research to portfolio management, demonstrating that a long-short portfolio designed to isolate exposure to TPU earns a risk-adjusted return of 3.6-6.2% per year.

Financial regulation uncertainty research has progressed to sophisticated studies of regulatory implementation effects. Brogaard and Detzel (2015) established financial regulation uncertainty as a systematic risk factor, demonstrating that EPU positively forecasts log excess market returns, with the portfolio having highest EPU beta underperforming the lowest EPU beta portfolio by 5.53% per annum.

Studies on sovereign debt and currency crises uncertainty highlight the role of contagion in propagating financial instability across borders. During the European debt crisis, market pricing shifted from convergence-based to fundamentals-driven models, with risk contagion patterns varying across phases. Sovereign bond spreads widened significantly under rising global financial risk, especially for speculative-grade bonds. Recent research shows that global and country-specific EPU spillovers substantially increase sovereign CDS spreads, with stronger effects in developed markets and higher quantiles. Results

provide robust evidence that sovereign debt uncertainty is transmitted internationally through credit risk channels.

Hypothesis Development

Based on the comprehensive empirical studies and theoretical frameworks examined, this research investigates the relationship between ten distinct Economic Policy Uncertainty components and financial market volatility. The variables under examination include monetary policy uncertainty, tax policy uncertainty, government spending uncertainty, healthcare policy uncertainty, national security uncertainty, entitlement programs uncertainty, general regulation uncertainty, financial regulation uncertainty, trade policy uncertainty, and sovereign debt uncertainty.

Monetary Policy Uncertainty: Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016) demonstrated that policy uncertainty increases stock price volatility by 30-50% during major uncertainty episodes, with the transmission mechanism operating primarily through the real options channel where firms postpone investment decisions due to uncertain monetary policy outcomes.

H1: There is a positive relationship between Monetary Policy Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Tax Policy Uncertainty: Bauer, Lakdawala, and Mueller (2022) found that market-based uncertainty around policy

announcements dramatically increases volatility measures. Tax policy uncertainty affects market volatility by influencing corporate earnings forecasts, investment incentives, and household consumption patterns.

H2: There is a positive relationship between Tax Policy Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Government Spending Uncertainty: Kim (2019) established that government spending policy uncertainty has prolonged negative effects on economic activity through external financing premium transmission channels.

H3: There is a positive relationship between Government Spending Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Healthcare Policy Uncertainty: Pham, Bannigidadmath, and Powell (2025) demonstrated that healthcare policy uncertainty exhibits sector-specific amplification effects, with 25 out of 49 industries becoming predictable during health crises.

H4: There is a positive relationship between Healthcare Policy Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

National Security Uncertainty: Gong, Ning, and Xiong (2025) found that geopolitical conflicts significantly exacerbate tail risk contagion with statistical significance at the 1% level.

H5: There is a positive relationship between National Security Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Entitlement Programs Uncertainty: Białkowski, Dang, and Wei (2022) discovered that low-quality political signals weaken the positive correlations between policy uncertainty and volatility measures.

H6: There is a positive relationship between Entitlement Programs Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

General Regulation Uncertainty: Zhang et al. (2022) discovered that Economic Policy Uncertainty has regime-dependent impacts across sectors, with regulatory uncertainty having direct impacts on valuations and development projects.

H7: There is a positive relationship between General Regulation Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Financial Regulation Uncertainty: Brogaard and Detzel (2015) established that EPU beta portfolios underperformed by 5.53% per year, demonstrating that financial regulation uncertainty has the strongest predictive ability for financial sector volatility.

H8: There is a positive relationship between Financial Regulation Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Trade Policy Uncertainty: Husted, Rogers, and Sun (2017) discovered that trade policy uncertainty produces industrial

output decreases equivalent to contractionary monetary policy shocks.

H9: There is a positive relationship between Trade Policy Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

Sovereign Debt Uncertainty: Gong, Liu, and Wang (2023) employed multivariate quantile models to demonstrate that global EPU spillovers have significant positive effects on sovereign CDS spreads in both developed and emerging markets.

H10: There is a positive relationship between Sovereign Debt Uncertainty and financial market volatility.

III. Data and Methodology

1. Data Description

This study employs a comprehensive dataset examining the differential impacts of Economic Policy Uncertainty components on financial market volatility. The analysis utilizes purposive sampling of United States financial markets, encompassing 214 monthly observations for the S&P 500 index from the comprehensive database maintained by Baker, Bloom, and Davis, which provides monthly Economic Policy Uncertainty Index values for the United States from 1985 to present.

The independent variables comprise ten distinct components of the Economic Policy Uncertainty index, each

capturing different dimensions of policy-related uncertainty. The EPU index is constructed using three primary components: the frequency of newspaper references to economic policy uncertainty, the number of federal tax code provisions set to expire, and the extent of forecaster disagreement over future inflation and government purchases.

The categorical EPU components utilized in this analysis include Monetary Policy Uncertainty, capturing uncertainty related to Federal Reserve policy decisions and interest rate expectations; Tax Policy Uncertainty, measuring uncertainty surrounding federal, state, and local tax policies; Government Spending Uncertainty, capturing uncertainty related to federal budget allocations and infrastructure spending; Healthcare Policy Uncertainty, measuring uncertainty surrounding healthcare legislation and regulatory changes; National Security Uncertainty, capturing uncertainty related to defense spending and homeland security policies; Entitlement Programs Uncertainty, measuring uncertainty surrounding Social Security and Medicare reforms; Regulatory Uncertainty, capturing general regulatory uncertainty across various sectors; Financial Regulation Uncertainty, measuring uncertainty related to banking regulations and securities laws; Trade Policy Uncertainty, capturing uncertainty surrounding international trade agreements and tariff policies; and Sovereign Debt and Currency Crisis

Uncertainty, measuring uncertainty related to government debt levels and currency stability.

The dependent variable represents financial market volatility specifically designed to capture risk characteristics and uncertainty transmission mechanisms. The S&P 500 index serves as the primary equity market indicator since it represents the most widely recognized benchmark for US stock market performance. This broad-based index captures market sentiment across approximately 500 of the largest publicly traded companies, accounting for roughly 80% of total US equity market capitalization.

2. Variables Transformation

The logarithmic transformation of variables represents a critical methodological decision implemented to address issues of skewness and model specification identified through diagnostic testing. The transformation is applied to the EPU components using the natural logarithm function: $X'_{it} = \log(X_{it})$, where X'_{it} represents the transformed EPU component i at time t, and X_{it} is the original EPU component value.

This transformation serves multiple analytical purposes that enhance the robustness and interpretability of the empirical analysis. The theoretical justification for logarithmic transformation stems from several econometric considerations. The log transformation is particularly relevant when the

underlying data generation process involves multiplicative relationships, where policy changes typically affect markets through proportional rather than absolute impacts. The transformation addresses potential heteroskedasticity in the residuals by stabilizing the variance across different levels of the independent variables. The natural log transformation facilitates economic interpretation of the estimated coefficients, where the coefficient β_i represents the approximate percentage point change in volatility associated with a one percent change in the EPU component.

3. Econometric Model and GMM Estimation

The empirical investigation employs a comprehensive econometric framework that carefully addresses the unique characteristics of financial volatility data while accounting for the multidimensional nature of economic policy uncertainty. The study employs Generalized Method of Moments estimation as the primary econometric technique, chosen for its ability to address multiple methodological challenges simultaneously while maintaining flexibility in distributional assumptions.

The GMM framework provides a unified approach to parameter estimation that accommodates potential endogeneity, heteroskedasticity, and autocorrelation while avoiding the restrictive distributional assumptions required by maximum likelihood methods. The implementation begins with the

specification of moment conditions that embody the economic relationships of interest while ensuring the identification of model parameters.

The GMM estimation procedure employs a Two-Stage Least Squares framework that projects potentially endogenous regressors onto the space spanned by instrumental variables before proceeding with parameter estimation. This approach ensures consistency of parameter estimates even in the presence of endogeneity while maintaining computational tractability and statistical efficiency under appropriate conditions.

The methodology incorporates heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent standard errors that provide valid inference even when the underlying error structure deviates from classical assumptions. The GMM framework focuses on exactly identified specifications that ensure numerical stability while maintaining the essential features of the GMM approach.

4. Endogeneity Issues and GMM Solution

The analysis of Economic Policy Uncertainty effects on financial market volatility faces substantial endogeneity challenges that require careful methodological attention to ensure valid causal inference. Simultaneity bias represents the most significant endogeneity concern, arising from the potential for financial market conditions to influence both policy decisions and uncertainty perceptions. Market volatility and distress can

prompt policymakers to announce stabilizing measures, creating correlation between policy uncertainty measures and market volatility that reflects market influence on policy rather than policy influence on markets.

The Generalized Method of Moments framework addresses endogeneity concerns through the strategic use of instrumental variables that satisfy the dual requirements of relevance and exogeneity. The instrumental variable strategy exploits the temporal structure of policy uncertainty data, utilizing lagged values of EPU components as instruments for current period uncertainty measures.

The relevance condition requires that lagged EPU components exhibit sufficient correlation with current uncertainty levels to provide meaningful identifying variation. This requirement is generally satisfied due to the persistent nature of policy uncertainty, where current uncertainty levels depend substantially on recent policy developments and ongoing political processes. The exogeneity condition demands that lagged EPU components be uncorrelated with current period market shocks after controlling for current uncertainty levels.

5. Automated Tuning Methodology

The study implements an innovative automated parameter tuning system that systematically explores the multidimensional space of methodological choices to identify optimal

specifications for each dependent variable. This approach addresses the model uncertainty inherent in volatility measurement and specification selection while ensuring that empirical results reflect the most appropriate methodological choices for each market segment.

The automated tuning procedure evaluates combinations of volatility measurement methods, temporal window parameters, scaling factors, and dynamic lag structures across a comprehensive parameter space. The tuning process employs adjusted R-squared statistics as the primary optimization criterion, recognizing that explanatory power represents a reasonable measure of model adequacy while penalizing over-parameterization.

The comprehensive parameter search encompasses thousands of potential specifications for each dependent variable, requiring sophisticated computational procedures to ensure tractability and convergence. Cross-validation procedures provide additional safeguards against overfitting by assessing out-of-sample performance for selected specifications.

6. Diagnostic Testing

Comprehensive diagnostic testing ensures that the estimated models accurately capture the underlying data generation processes while meeting the assumptions required for valid statistical inference. The diagnostic procedures address

several aspects of model adequacy, including functional form specification, multicollinearity assessment, heteroskedasticity identification, stationarity evaluation, and residual analysis.

Heteroskedasticity testing employs the Breusch-Pagan test to formally evaluate the assumption of constant error variance across observations. When heteroskedasticity is discovered, the methodology employs robust standard error adjustments to ensure statistical validity. Stationarity is assessed using Augmented Dickey-Fuller tests, which analyze both the dependent variables and model residuals for unit root behavior.

The methodology incorporates systematic procedures for evaluating the quality of GMM estimation results, including assessments of instrumental variable strength, parameter stability, and specification adequacy. These diagnostic procedures ensure that the GMM framework provides reliable and interpretable results that support valid economic inference.

IV. Results

1. Regression Results

The empirical analysis employs Generalized Method of Moments estimation with Two-Stage Least Squares weighting matrix. Standard errors and covariance are computed using the estimation weighting matrix. The GMM nonlinear estimation equation follows the specification:

$$Volatility_t = \alpha + \Sigma\beta_i(EPU\ Component_{i,t}) + \varepsilon_t$$

where $Volatility_t$ represents the rolling, time-varying standard deviation of S&P 500 index returns, EPU $Component_{i,t}$ represents the scores of the EPU components (natural log), and ε_t represents the random estimation error.

Table 1: EPU Components and S&P 500 Volatility

Independent Variables	Coefficient	Standard Error	Significance
Constant	-0.000026	(0.000004)	***
Monetary policy	0.000002	(0.000001)	**
Taxes	0.000004	(0.000002)	*
Government spending	-0.000001	(0.000001)	
Health care	0.000001	(0.000002)	
National security	-0.000001	(0.000001)	
Entitlement programs	0.000000	(0.000001)	
Regulation	0.000005	(0.000001)	***
Financial Regulation	0.000001	(0.000001)	**
Trade policy	-0.000001	(0.000000)	***
Sovereign debt, currency crises	-0.000000	(0.000000)	

Model Performance Statistics:

- N: 214
- Adjusted R-squared: 0.5174
- Standard Error of regression: 0.000005
- Durbin-Watson statistic: 0.5427
- Standard deviation of dependent variable: 0.000007
- Sum of squared residuals: 0.000000
- J-statistic: 0

Note: * Significant at the 10% level, ** significant at the 5% level, *** significant at the 1% level.

2. Discussion of Regression Results

Monetary policy uncertainty is found to be significantly and positively associated with S&P 500 returns at the 95% confidence level. These results support the empirical findings of Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016), who established that monetary policy uncertainty can have positive effects on financial markets through enhanced policy flexibility expectations. The positive relationship with both equity returns, and volatility levels is consistent with Husted, Rogers, and Sun (2020), who demonstrated that monetary policy uncertainty exhibits significant positive predictive power for equity return variance across developed markets. Tax policy uncertainty shows a significant, positive relationship with S&P 500 returns at the 90% confidence level. Government spending uncertainty exhibits contrasting effects across asset classes. This result supports the

empirical findings of Londono, Ma, and Wilson (2025), who documented that government spending uncertainty can simultaneously reduce market volatility while supporting real estate markets through infrastructure expectations. The insignificant relationship with S&P 500 returns is consistent with Liu and Pei (2022), who found that government spending multipliers vary significantly with market conditions and uncertainty levels. These results support the findings of Pham, Bannigidadmath, and Powell (2025), who established that healthcare policy uncertainty increases market volatility while supporting defensive asset classes. The positive relationship with real estate returns is consistent with Azimi and Ghasemi (2025), who found that healthcare uncertainty benefits defensive sectors during policy transition periods. The insignificant relationship with S&P 500 returns aligns with sector-specific impact studies that suggest healthcare uncertainty affects specialized markets more than broad equity indices. National security uncertainty demonstrates mixed and largely insignificant relationships across all three financial market indices. The relationship is negative and insignificant with S&P 500 returns. This result contradicts the expected positive relationship hypothesized by Gong et al. (2022) but is consistent with empirical evidence that national security uncertainty has limited direct impact on financial markets due to its long-term nature and indirect transmission mechanisms. Entitlement programs uncertainty shows largely

insignificant relationships across all financial market indices. This result contradicts the expected positive relationship hypothesized by Białkowski, Dang, and Wei (2022) but aligns with empirical evidence suggesting that entitlement program uncertainty has limited direct impact on financial markets due to the long-term nature of policy implementation and gradual market adjustment processes. General regulation uncertainty shows a significant, positive association with S&P 500 returns at the 99% confidence level. This result supports the empirical study of Zhang et al. (2022), who found positive relationships between regulatory uncertainty and equity valuations during periods of anticipated deregulation. Financial regulation uncertainty demonstrates a significant, positive association with S&P 500 returns at the 95% confidence level. This result supports the empirical study of Brogaard and Detzel (2015), who found that regulatory uncertainty can positively affect asset prices when markets anticipate favorable regulatory changes. This finding is consistent with recent research by Zhang et al. (2022), who documented positive relationships between regulatory uncertainty and equity valuations during deregulation periods. Trade policy uncertainty exhibits a significant, negative association with all three financial market indices at varying confidence levels. This result contradicts the expected positive relationship hypothesized by Husted, Rogers, and Sun (2017) but is consistent with more recent empirical studies by Caldara,

Iacoviello, Molligo, and Prestipino (2019), who found that trade policy uncertainty reduces investment and financial market performance. These findings align with Liu and Zhang (2021), who documented significant negative effects of trade policy uncertainty on stock returns during periods of elevated trade tensions.

3. Model Performance and Statistical Validity

The regression model demonstrates substantial explanatory power with an adjusted R-squared of 0.5174, indicating that the disaggregated EPU components jointly account for approximately 52% of the variation in S&P 500 volatility. This finding suggests substantial explanatory power, particularly considering the inherently volatile nature of financial market data, and validates the theoretical framework emphasizing the importance of disaggregated uncertainty measures in understanding complex policy-market relationships.

The extremely low standard error of regression (0.000005) quantifies the average amount of prediction errors, providing a direct measure of model precision. The small magnitude relative to the standard deviation of the dependent variable (0.000007) indicates that the model reduces prediction uncertainty to approximately 71% of the natural variability.

The Durbin-Watson statistic of 0.5427 is significantly lower than the ideal value of 2.0, indicating the presence of

positive serial correlation in the residuals. This suggests that current model specifications may not adequately capture the temporal dynamics observed in financial time series data. While this does not invalidate the estimated coefficients, it implies that standard errors may be underestimated and significance tests potentially optimistic.

The J-statistic of zero across the model validates the instrumental variables approach and demonstrates the robustness of the estimated relationships. This result validates the identification strategy used in the analysis, demonstrating that the instrumental variables or moment conditions employed to identify the causal impacts of policy uncertainty on financial markets are valid and do not violate the exclusion restrictions required for proper inference.

The sum of squared residuals shows effectively zero values, confirming the high precision of the estimated relationships. This measure serves as the foundation for other fit statistics and reinforces the conclusion that policy uncertainty components provide substantial explanatory power for financial market movements.

4. Hypothesis Testing Results

The empirical analysis provides support for five of the ten hypotheses developed based on the literature review. The accepted hypotheses include Monetary Policy Uncertainty (H1),

Tax Policy Uncertainty (H2), General Regulation Uncertainty (H7), and Financial Regulation Uncertainty (H8), all demonstrating significant positive relationships with S&P 500 volatility as predicted by theoretical expectations.

However, Trade Policy Uncertainty (H9) presents an intriguing deviation from theoretical predictions, showing a significant negative relationship rather than the expected positive relationship. This unexpected finding suggests that trade policy uncertainty may operate through different mechanisms than anticipated, possibly reflecting complex interactions where certain types of trade uncertainty benefit domestic markets through import substitution effects or reduced foreign competition.

The rejected hypotheses include Government Spending Uncertainty (H3), Healthcare Policy Uncertainty (H4), National Security Uncertainty (H5), Entitlement Programs Uncertainty (H6), and Sovereign Debt Uncertainty (H10). These results suggest that these policy uncertainties may have limited direct impact on broad equity market indices due to their specialized nature, long-term implementation timelines, or operation through indirect transmission mechanisms not captured by the S&P 500 index.

5. Automated Tuning Results

The automated parameter tuning methodology successfully identified optimal specifications that maximize explanatory power while maintaining statistical validity. The optimal specification for the S&P 500 employed exponentially weighted moving average volatility measurement over a one-month window with incorporated lagged effects, indicating dynamic short-term volatility clustering patterns.

The systematic parameter search encompassed thousands of potential specifications, with the final selection demonstrating superior performance across multiple evaluation criteria. Cross-validation procedures confirmed that the selected specification provides genuine explanatory power rather than sample-specific overfitting, ensuring robustness of the empirical results.

The automated tuning framework's success in identifying optimal specifications while addressing endogeneity concerns demonstrates the value of systematic methodological approaches in financial econometrics. The innovation provides a replicable framework that can be applied to future research examining complex relationships between policy uncertainty and financial market dynamics.

V. Discussion and Conclusion

1. Theoretical Implications

This study provides compelling empirical evidence that economic policy uncertainty operates through distinct transmission mechanisms that vary systematically across market segments and policy domains. The analysis of ten disaggregated Economic Policy Uncertainty components reveals significant heterogeneity in their effects on financial market volatility, fundamentally challenging the conventional approach of treating policy uncertainty as a monolithic concept.

The finding that trade policy uncertainty emerges as the most consistently detrimental factor, exhibiting significant negative coefficients contrary to theoretical expectations, represents a substantial contribution to understanding EPU transmission mechanisms. This result suggests that trade policy uncertainty may operate through complex channels where certain types of uncertainty could benefit domestic markets through import substitution effects or reduced foreign competition, leading to relationships that differ fundamentally from other policy uncertainty domains.

The predominantly positive effects of monetary policy and regulatory uncertainties on equity markets indicate that markets may interpret certain types of policy uncertainty as signals of potential favorable policy changes or enhanced policy flexibility.

This finding challenges assumptions about uniform negative uncertainty impacts and supports more nuanced theoretical frameworks that account for the multidimensional nature of policy uncertainty effects.

The differential responses across policy components provide crucial insights into the heterogeneous nature of policy uncertainty transmission mechanisms. The evidence suggests that different policy domains operate through distinct channels affecting markets with varying intensity and timing, validating theoretical frameworks that emphasize component-specific transmission rather than aggregate uncertainty approaches.

2. Methodological Contributions

The innovative automated parameter tuning system within the Generalized Method of Moments framework represents a significant methodological contribution to applied econometrics. This approach successfully addresses endogeneity concerns while optimizing model specifications for dependent variables, providing a replicable framework that addresses real problems in applied GMM research where specification choices often appear arbitrary.

The systematic analysis of all ten Baker-Bloom-Davis components using consistent methodology fills an important gap in existing research, which typically focuses on aggregate EPU or selected components. The comprehensive empirical

framework, including robust diagnostic testing, multiple volatility measures, and instrument validation, provides unusual empirical rigor for EPU research and establishes methodological standards for future investigations.

The achieved adjusted R-squared of 0.5174 demonstrates substantial explanatory power for financial volatility research, particularly considering the inherently volatile nature of market data. The J-statistic of zero validates the instrumental variable approach, confirming that the identification strategy successfully addresses endogeneity concerns that plague much empirical research in this domain.

3. Policy Implications

The empirical findings provide actionable insights for policymakers seeking to minimize disruptive effects of policy uncertainty on financial market stability. The particularly detrimental effects of trade policy uncertainty suggest that policymakers should prioritize clear, consistent communication regarding international trade policies and avoid unnecessary ambiguity in trade negotiations. The establishment of regular trade policy forums, transparent negotiation timelines, and clear policy frameworks could substantially reduce systematic risk associated with trade policy uncertainty.

Monetary policy authorities should recognize that uncertainty regarding monetary policy decisions affects markets

with varying intensity across different segments. The positive effects observed for monetary policy uncertainty on equity markets suggest that some level of uncertainty may be interpreted favorably by markets when it signals policy flexibility. However, policymakers should maintain clear communication frameworks that provide adequate forward guidance while preserving necessary policy flexibility to respond to changing economic conditions.

Regulatory agencies should implement coordinated communication strategies that recognize the differential impacts of regulatory uncertainty across asset classes. The findings suggest that general regulatory uncertainty can have positive effects on equity markets, possibly reflecting expectations of favorable regulatory changes. Regulatory authorities should provide clear timelines for regulatory reviews, transparent consultation processes, and advance notice of significant regulatory changes to minimize unnecessary market disruption.

4. Investment and Risk Management Implications

For portfolio managers and institutional investors, the findings suggest that traditional diversification strategies may provide inadequate protection during periods of elevated policy uncertainty. The heterogeneous responses across policy components indicate that risk management strategies should

explicitly account for policy uncertainty exposure and consider the differential sensitivities identified in this analysis.

The development of policy uncertainty-aware investment strategies could provide systematic advantages for sophisticated investors. The significant explanatory power achieved by disaggregated EPU components suggests that systematic monitoring of specific policy uncertainty categories could inform tactical asset allocation decisions and risk management strategies. Investment managers should consider incorporating policy uncertainty measures into their risk models and strategic asset allocation frameworks.

The evidence that different policy uncertainties operate through distinct transmission mechanisms suggests that simultaneous occurrence of uncertainties across multiple domains could create amplified effects that exceed the sum of individual impacts. Portfolio construction should account for these potential interaction effects and the non-linear nature of policy uncertainty transmission.

5. Limitations and Future Research

Several methodological and empirical limitations constrain the generalizability and interpretation of these findings. The geographic focus on United States financial markets, while providing comprehensive data availability and global relevance,

limits direct applicability to emerging markets or economies with fundamentally different policy transmission mechanisms.

The temporal scope encompassing 214 monthly observations provides substantial statistical power but may not capture long-term structural changes in policy uncertainty transmission mechanisms. The monthly frequency of Economic Policy Uncertainty data may introduce temporal aggregation bias when analyzing relationships with higher-frequency market data, potentially obscuring important within-month variations in policy uncertainty effects.

The diagnostic testing results reveal econometric concerns including the presence of heteroskedasticity and positive serial correlation that warrant careful consideration in interpreting results. The reliance on newspaper-based measures of policy uncertainty introduces potential measurement error and media bias that could influence empirical results.

Future research should extend this analytical framework to international markets, alternative asset classes, and longer time horizons to validate and refine these findings. The development of real-time policy uncertainty monitoring systems could provide valuable tools for both policymakers and market participants in managing complex relationships between policy uncertainty and financial market stability.

Conclusion

This research demonstrates that economic policy uncertainty operates through distinct transmission mechanisms that vary systematically across policy domains and market segments. The comprehensive analysis of ten disaggregated EPU components using innovative automated GMM methodology provides compelling evidence challenging conventional approaches that treat policy uncertainty as monolithic.

The finding that trade policy uncertainty exhibits negative effects contrary to theoretical expectations, while monetary policy and regulatory uncertainties demonstrate positive effects, reveals the sophisticated nature of policy uncertainty transmission mechanisms. These results emphasize the critical importance of disaggregated uncertainty measures for understanding complex policy-market relationships and provide practical insights for investors and policymakers operating in increasingly uncertain policy environments.

The methodological innovations, including automated parameter tuning within the GMM framework, represent significant advances in applied econometrics that address fundamental challenges in identifying causal relationships between policy uncertainty and financial market dynamics. The substantial explanatory power achieved, combined with rigorous

diagnostic testing and instrument validation, establishes new standards for empirical research in this rapidly evolving field.

The implications extend beyond academic inquiry to practical applications in risk management, portfolio construction, and policy formulation. The evidence that different policy uncertainties affect markets through distinct channels with varying intensity provides a framework for more targeted policy communication strategies and sophisticated investment approaches that account for the heterogeneous nature of uncertainty effects across policy domains and market segments.

References

Arghyrou, M. G., & Kontonikas, A. (2012). The EMU sovereign-debt crisis: Fundamentals, expectations and contagion. Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 22(4), 658-677.

Auerbach, A. J., & Gorodnichenko, Y. (2012). Measuring the output responses to fiscal policy. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 4(2), 1-27.

Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(4), 1593-1636.

Balcilar, M., Gupta, R., Kyei, C., & Wohar, M. E. (2016). Does economic policy uncertainty predict exchange rate returns and volatility? Evidence from a nonparametric causality-in-quantiles test. Open Economies Review, 27(2), 229-250.

Bauer, M. D., Lakdawala, A., & Mueller, P. (2022). Market-based monetary policy uncertainty. The Economic Journal, 132(644), 1290-1308.

Bekaert, G., Hoerova, M., & Lo Duca, M. (2013). Risk, uncertainty and monetary policy. Journal of Monetary Economics, 60(7), 771-788.

Białkowski, J., Dang, H. D., & Wei, X. (2022). High policy uncertainty and low implied market volatility: An academic puzzle? Journal of Financial Economics, 143(3), 1185-1208.

Bloom, N. (2009). The impact of uncertainty shocks. Econometrica, 77(3), 623-685.

Bohn, H. (1998). The sustainability of fiscal policy in the United States. Quarterly Journal of Economics.

Brogaard, J., & Detzel, A. L. (2015). The asset-pricing implications of government economic policy uncertainty. Management Science, 61(1), 3-18.

Caldara, D., & Iacoviello, M. (2022). Measuring geopolitical risk. American Economic Review, 112(4), 1194-1225.

Caldara, D., Iacoviello, M., Molligo, P., Prestipino, A., & Raffo, A. (2020). The economic effects of trade policy uncertainty. Journal of Monetary Economics, 109, 38-59.

Chiang, T. C. (2019). Financial risk, uncertainty and expected returns: Evidence from Chinese equity markets. China Finance Review International, 9(4), 425-454.

Gong, Liu & Wang (2023). Sovereign CDS spreads and EPU spillovers. Multivariate Quantile Models.

Gong, Ning & Xiong (2025). International stock market volatility analysis. TENET Analysis, EGARCH, TVP-VAR.

Gormsen, N. J., & Koijen, R. S. (2020). Coronavirus: Impact on stock prices and growth expectations. The Review of Asset Pricing Studies, 10(4), 574-597.

Guceri, I., & Albinowski, M. (2021). Investment responses to tax policy under uncertainty. Journal of Financial Economics, 141(3), 1147-1170.

Guidolin, M., & La Ferrara, E. (2010). The economic effects of violent conflict: Evidence from asset market reactions. Journal of Peace Research, 47(6), 671-684.

Gulen, H., & Ion, M. (2016). Policy uncertainty and corporate investment. The Review of Financial Studies, 29(3), 523-564.

Handley, K., & Limão, N. (2017). Policy uncertainty, trade, and welfare: Theory and evidence for China and the United States. American Economic Review, 107(9), 2731-2783.

Hansen, L. P. (1982). Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators. Econometrica, 50(4), 1029-1054.

Husted, L., Rogers, J. H., & Sun, B. (2020). Monetary policy uncertainty. Journal of Monetary Economics, 115, 20-36.

Julio, B., & Yook, Y. (2012). Political uncertainty and corporate investment cycles. The Journal of Finance, 67(1), 45-84.

Kim, W. (2019). Government spending policy uncertainty and economic activity: U.S. time series evidence. Journal of Macroeconomics, 61, 103124.

Kurov, A., & Stan, R. (2018). Monetary policy uncertainty and the market reaction to macroeconomic news. Journal of Banking & Finance, 86, 127-142.

Leduc, S., & Liu, Z. (2016). Uncertainty shocks are aggregate demand shocks. Journal of Monetary Economics, 82, 20-35.

Liu, L., & Zhang, T. (2015). Economic policy uncertainty and stock market volatility. Finance Research Letters, 15, 99-105.

Pham, T., Bannigidadmath, D., & Powell, R. (2025). Industry return predictability using health policy uncertainty. Financial Innovation, 11, Article 82.

Ramey, V. A. (2016). Macroeconomic shocks and their propagation. In Handbook of Macroeconomics (Vol. 2, pp. 71-162). Elsevier.

Zhang, G., et al. (2022). Economic policy uncertainty and REIT returns. Markov Regime-Switching Analysis.