BEYOND EQUITY HEDGING

Correlation Regimes, Portfolio Risk, and the Case for Convexity

Wolfgang Landl – March 2026

1. The Misdiagnosis: Risk Is Not Equity Weight

The most common objection to long volatility strategies from conservative allocators is: *"We only have 20–30% in equities — tail hedging isn't for us."* This reflects a widespread but fundamental misunderstanding. It assumes the risk that needs hedging is equity beta. It isn't. ***The risk is the correlation spike itself — the shared sensitivity of all portfolio components to the same underlying macro regime.***

Consider a portfolio allocated 25% equities, 50% bonds, 15% real estate, and 10% private credit. It appears conservative. But in an inflationary or stagflationary regime, every component is exposed to the same driver: rising rates and tightening financial conditions. In 2022, the S&P 500 fell -19.4%, the Bloomberg US Aggregate Bond Index fell -13.0%, US REITs declined -25.1%, and private credit marks lagged but eventually reflected comparable stress. A portfolio with just 25% in equities still lost double digits — because the other 75% was not hedging anything. It was ***repackaging the same exposure through different wrappers.***

The March 2026 episode has intensified this pattern. Bonds are selling off (+43bp in yields), gold is down -14.9%, and equities have declined 5 - 7% — all within sixteen trading days. The stock–bond correlation has surged from +0.13 to +0.42. An allocator with 70% in bonds is not hedged. They are holding 70% in an asset class now positively correlated with equities and negatively correlated with the dominant risk factor. But is this a temporary dislocation, or has the underlying relationship between asset classes fundamentally changed? The answer requires looking at the full history of stock–bond correlations — not just the last two decades.

2. Correlation Regimes: The Hidden Variable in Portfolio Construction

A correlation regime is not a number. It is a *state* — the prevailing pattern of how asset classes move relative to each other over an extended period. A portfolio's risk-return profile is shaped less by the volatility of individual assets than by how those assets co-move. When the co-movement pattern shifts, the portfolio's behaviour changes fundamentally — even if not a single allocation weight has been touched.

The most consequential correlation regime in institutional portfolio construction is the stock–bond relationship. Using 52-week rolling correlations on weekly data from 1970 to 2025, supplemented by daily returns for the 2026 crisis window, three distinct regimes emerge:

Table 1: Stock–Bond Price Correlation by Era

Period	ρ(S,B)	Interpretation
1970–82 (Stagflation)	+0.32	Stocks and bonds fall together. Diversification fails.
1983–99 (Disinflation)	+0.24	Still positive but weakening. Both rise on falling rates.
2000–21 (Negative corr.)	-0.30	Bonds hedge equities. 60/40 works. The regime investors internalised.
2022 (Inflation shock)	+0.17	Regime flips. Bonds amplify losses. S&P –19%, AGG –13%.
2023–24 (Normalisation)	+0.27	Correlation remains positive. Market ignores it.
2026 YTD (daily data)	+0.13	Headline appears benign. Crisis window tells a different story.
Feb–Mar 2026 (daily)	+0.42	Acute crisis: stocks, bonds, and gold fall simultaneously.

Note: Rows through 2023–24 use 52-week rolling correlations on weekly returns. The 2026 rows use daily return data (53 observations YTD; 16 observations for the crisis window Feb 27– Mar 20).

The key observation: the 2000-2021 negative correlation regime was not a permanent feature of markets. It was a *specific macroeconomic state* — characterised by low inflation, central bank support, and falling real rates. The regime that investors internalised as "normal" was, in the context of the full 55-year dataset, the exception rather than the rule. For most of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, the stock–bond correlation was positive.

The Feb–Mar 2026 crisis window reveals a further subtlety. The YTD daily correlation is +0.13 — seemingly benign. But the same data over the acute stress period (sixteen trading days from late February to March 20) shows +0.42. **Correlations shift fastest and furthest precisely when it matters most: during the crisis itself.** The monthly or quarterly average obscures the regime break that occurs in the space of days. **The question this raises is not academic: if the correlation regime can shift this fast, what does that mean for a portfolio that was built on the assumption it would stay negative?**

3. What It Means to Be "Short" Correlation Regime Risk

Every balanced portfolio carries an implicit bet: that the prevailing correlation regime will persist. A 60/40 portfolio is **structurally short correlation regime risk** — it is built on the assumption that stocks and bonds remain negatively correlated. If the correlation turns positive, the portfolio's entire risk management architecture fails. The investor never consciously chose to take this bet, but they carry it in every basis point of their allocation.

Being short correlation regime risk is like being short an option you never sold: the premium was never collected, but the downside is real. The critical insight for conservative allocators is counterintuitive: **the lower the equity allocation, the greater the dependence on this relationship holding.** A bond-heavy portfolio is not inherently defensive — it is ***conditionally defensive,*** dependent on the macro regime. In a deflationary crisis (2008, 2020), it works: falling rates push bond prices higher. In an inflationary crisis (1973, 1979, 2022, 2026), the same bond-heavy portfolio becomes the most exposed construction possible, because rising yields destroy the largest allocation in the portfolio. When the correlation flips, there is no offset at all.

Table 2: Diversification Benefit by Regime (annualised, weekly data)

Regime	60/40	25/75	Implication
Neg. corr. 2000–21	39.6%	17.3%	Maximum diversification. The regime investors remember.
Stagflation 1970–82	17.5%	14.5%	Benefit halved for 60/40. The regime investors forgot.
2022 Inflation	23.0%	11.1%	25/75 retains barely a tenth. Bond-heavy = most exposed.
2023–24	19.8%	9.6%	Still depressed. Market stopped noticing.
Feb–Mar 2026 (crisis)	See note	See note	ρ = +0.42 (daily). See note.

Note: The Feb–Mar 2026 crisis window uses sixteen daily observations. Short windows illustrate the direction and speed of regime shifts, not their statistical significance. The cross-asset correlation matrix shows an average absolute pairwise correlation of 0.36 across four asset classes (equities, bonds, gold, Brent crude) — higher than the 0.22 observed during the full year of 2022. Gold, which typically offsets equity losses, fell -14.9% over the same period while equities declined 5-7%.

Two patterns stand out. First, the diversification benefit for 60/40 drops from 39.6% in the negative-correlation era to 17.5%-23.0% in inflationary regimes — roughly halved. Second, and more importantly, **the 25/75 portfolio loses proportionally more.** Its benefit drops from 17.3% to 9.6%-11.1%. **A bond-heavy portfolio depends almost entirely on the correlation regime to dampen its volatility. When the regime flips, it has almost no natural offset. The allocator who thinks they are conservatively positioned is, in fact, the most regime-dependent investor at the table.** To understand why the damage can be so severe, it is necessary to look at what happens mechanically when the correlation regime breaks — and why the resulting portfolio volatility is worse than any single asset's behaviour would suggest.

4. Correlation Regimes and Cross-Asset Volatility: Two Sides of One Event

A correlation regime shift and a cross-asset volatility spike are not two separate phenomena that happen to coincide. They are the same event observed from different angles. Portfolio variance for two assets is: $\sigma^2_p = w^2_1\sigma^2_1 + w^2_2\sigma^2_2 + 2w_1w_2\rho\sigma_1\sigma_2$. The third term — the covariance term — is controlled by the correlation ρ. When ρ is negative, it subtracts from total portfolio variance. When ρ turns positive, it adds. The magnitude is amplified by the individual volatilities — and these themselves spike during the same stress events.

This is the mechanism: ***a macro shock triggers two things simultaneously***. First, individual asset volatilities rise. Second, correlations increase because all assets are now responding to the same dominant factor. The two effects multiply each other, producing a portfolio volatility spike far larger than either alone.

Table 3: Realised Volatility and Cross-Asset Correlation by Crisis

	S&P 500	US 10Y	Gold	Avg |Corr|	Interpretation
2008 GFC (weekly)	37-46%	37-53%	36-40%	0.24	High vol, moderate corr.
2022 Inflation (weekly)	21-28%	46-55%	13-15%	0.21	Bond vol dominates.
Feb–Mar 2026 (daily)	13%	19%	32%	0.36	Gold vol surges; correlations spike.

Avg |Corr| = Cross-Asset Correlation

The data reveals that correlation regime shifts and volatility spikes are not always equally weighted. In 2008, individual asset volatilities were extreme (S&P realised vol peaked at 46%), but cross-asset correlation was moderate (0.24) because bonds still provided some offset. In 2022, bond volatility dominated (55%) while equity vol was relatively contained. In February-March 2026, a different pattern emerged: **equity volatility remained moderate at 13%, but gold volatility surged to 32% and the average absolute cross-asset correlation rose to 0.36.** Brent crude oil volatility reached an annualised 85%. The portfolio damage came not from equities alone, but from the simultaneous

breakdown of gold (-14.9%), bonds (+43bp in yields), and equities (-5.4%) — the three assets that are supposed to offset each other.

This is the mechanism that makes traditional hedging fail. A hedge that is directionally dependent — bonds hedging equities, gold hedging inflation, commodities hedging supply shocks — assumes that the hedge asset will move independently of the risk asset. When the correlation regime shifts, that assumption is violated. The hedge becomes correlated with the risk, and the portfolio has no place to hide.

5. What Is Missing: A Different Payoff Shape

What is missing from most portfolios is not a different weight. It is a different **payoff shape** — one that is non-linear, gaining disproportionately when markets move sharply, regardless of the cause or direction. This is what convexity means in practice: not a position in a particular market, but a structural property embedded in the portfolio. A convex allocation does not require the investor to predict whether the next crisis will be deflationary, inflationary, or stagflationary. **It requires only that the crisis is large**. In practice, outcomes depend on implementation and entry conditions, which vary across strategies. The distinction is between adjusting weights on existing exposures and owning a fundamentally different shape — between ***rearranging risk and actually hedging it.***

This is where convexity is distinct from other defensive strategies. Commodities can provide positive returns during supply shocks (Brent crude +46.8% in March 2026), but they do not cushion equity drawdowns — they simply happen to rise at the same time. Trend-following delivers positive skew over extended stress periods but underperforms in sudden crashes. Cash preserves nominal capital but erodes purchasing power; during the 1973–82 stagflation period, short-term Treasury bills netted approximately 0% in real terms. Gold is widely regarded as the canonical inflation hedge, but its effectiveness depends critically on the real rate environment — and in March 2026, gold is down -14.9% as rising yields overwhelm safe-haven demand. Each of these is *regime-conditional.*

The most common convex instruments are long out-of-the-money put options on equity indices, long calls on the VIX, long variance swaps, and actively managed long-volatility funds. Their payoff is tied to the **magnitude of market dislocation,** not to its cause or direction. Bonds require falling rates. Gold requires negative real rates. Commodities require supply shocks. **Convexity requires only one thing: a large move.** *This makes it the most direct hedging mechanism that is structurally indifferent to whether the crisis is deflationary, inflationary, or stagflationary*.

6. Why Convexity Has Not Been Widely Adopted

If the theoretical case is clear, why is convexity chronically under-allocated? The answer is not analytical — it is structural and behavioural.

The primary barrier is negative carry. Most passive convex strategies — systematically rolling out-of-the-money puts on a fixed schedule — are expensive. Equity markets rise on average, and volatility is typically priced at a premium. An investor buying protection continuously pays a compounding cost (the “bleed”) that can erode several percentage points of annual return. This creates three practical problems: return drag in normal markets that is difficult to justify to committees and boards; uncertain holding periods before payoff, which test institutional patience; and behavioural difficulty in maintaining an allocation that compounds negatively for years before delivering its value. These barriers are reinforced by institutional constraints — career risk for the decision-maker, tracking error relative to peers, and benchmark structures that penalise any allocation without a visible near-term return.

The result is that most investors treat convexity tactically — allocating only after risk has already repriced, which is precisely when it is most expensive and least effective. The conditions that make convexity cheapest (low volatility, complacent markets) are those in which it is hardest to justify. And the conditions that prove its value (correlation spikes, multi-asset drawdowns) are those in which buying it is no longer affordable.

Their caution is not entirely misplaced — convexity does underperform in slow, grinding drawdowns and prolonged low-volatility environments where the dislocation never arrives. This is precisely why implementation matters, and why the distinction between passive and active approaches is decisive.

7. From Tactical Hedge to Strategic Allocation

For convexity to function as a **strategic allocation** rather than a situational hedge, the implementation must clear four thresholds:

Carry efficiency: the strategy must avoid persistent negative return in stable markets. The source of carry is not the sale of tail risk, but the exploitation of systematic pricing inefficiencies along the volatility term structure and skew — inefficiencies that persist because of structural demand for short-dated protection and the positioning constraints of institutional hedgers. Active approaches that exploit these dynamics to generate offsetting carry can substantially reduce or eliminate the bleed. This is the decisive distinction between passive insurance products and active volatility trading desks.

Crisis responsiveness: the strategy must deliver positive convexity across different stress types — big crashes (2008), fast crashes (2020), small but fast crashes (2025) and geopolitical shocks (2026) just to mention a few. A strategy that only pays off in a single scenario is not a strategic allocation.

Independence: the strategy must avoid hidden short exposures or reliance on a single market relationship. Many products marketed as “tail hedges” implicitly sell risk in normal markets to fund their protection — and fail precisely when the hedge is needed.

Liquidity: the strategy must be monetisable during periods of stress. A hedge that cannot be realised when it is in profit is not a hedge.

Where these four criteria are met, convexity ceases to be a cost centre and becomes a **source of portfolio resilience with a defined, bounded cost and an unbounded payoff in dislocation.**

8. Convexity Across Portfolio Types

The function of convexity is consistent across portfolio constructions, even though the source of risk differs. A 60/40 portfolio needs convexity because equities dominate its risk. A 25/75 portfolio needs convexity because bonds dominate its risk — and bonds are the asset class most vulnerable to an inflationary regime shift. A portfolio with significant private market exposure needs convexity because illiquidity prevents repositioning once the crisis has begun. In each case, the role is the same: **to provide liquidity and positive returns precisely when every other component of the portfolio is failing simultaneously.**

Convexity complements, rather than replaces, other forms of diversification. It does not argue against holding commodities, trend-following, or short-duration bonds. It argues that none of these, individually or collectively, can hedge the specific risk of correlation breakdown across all regimes — and that a well-implemented convexity allocation fills a gap that no traditional asset class can.

9. Conclusion

The 55-year empirical record is unambiguous. The stock–bond correlation has shifted between positive and negative regimes multiple times, driven by the macroeconomic environment. The negative-correlation era that defined portfolio construction from 2000 to 2021 was not a structural feature of markets — it was a regime, and it has ended. Every balanced portfolio is implicitly short this regime risk. The exposure is largest, counterintuitively, in bond-heavy “conservative” portfolios, which depend almost entirely on the stock–bond correlation remaining negative.

The question facing portfolio construction is not whether equity exposure is high enough to justify hedging. It is whether the portfolio is exposed to **correlation breakdown and systemic repricing.** In a regime where bonds, credit, real estate, and equities draw down together — as they did in 2022, and as they are doing again in March 2026 — this exposure is present in most portfolios with material exposure to duration or growth risk, regardless of equity weight.

The most direct hedge that is structurally indifferent to the direction and cause of the correlation break is convexity. Where it can be delivered without persistent carry drag — through active, price-disciplined volatility trading rather than passive premium outlay — it is not merely a hedge. It is a **structural component of portfolio resilience.**

References

Ang, A. and Chen, J. (2002). “Asymmetric Correlations of Equity Portfolios.” Journal of Financial Economics, 63(3), 443–494.

Campbell, J.Y., Pflueger, C. and Viceira, L.M. (2020). “Macroeconomic Drivers of Bond and Equity Risks.” Journal of Political Economy, 128(8), 3148–3185.

Campbell, J.Y., Sunderam, A. and Viceira, L.M. (2017). “Inflation Bets or Deflation Hedges? The Changing Risks of Nominal Bonds.” Critical Finance Review, 6(2), 263–301.

Dimson, E., Marsh, P. and Staunton, M. (2002). Triumph of the Optimists: 101 Years of Global Investment Returns. Princeton University Press.

Engle, R.F. (1982). “Autoregressive Conditional Heteroscedasticity with Estimates of the Variance of United Kingdom Inflation.” Econometrica, 50(4), 987–1007.

Erb, C.B. and Harvey, C.R. (2013). “The Golden Dilemma.” Financial Analysts Journal, 69(4), 10–42.

Hurst, B., Ooi, Y.H. and Pedersen, L.H. (2017). “A Century of Evidence on Trend-Following Investing.” Journal of Portfolio Management, 44(1), 15–29.

Ilmanen, A. (2011). Expected Returns: An Investor’s Guide to Harvesting Market Rewards. Wiley.

Ilmanen, A. (2022). Investing Amid Low Expected Returns. Wiley.

Investing.com (2026). Historical price data: S&P 500, US 10-Year Treasury Yield, Gold XAU/USD, Brent Crude Oil Futures, Bitcoin, MSCI World. Weekly (1970–2025) and daily (Jan–Mar 2026). Accessed March 2026.

Longin, F. and Solnik, B. (2001). “Extreme Correlation of International Equity Markets.” Journal of Finance, 56(2), 649–676.

Mandelbrot, B. (1963). “The Variation of Certain Speculative Prices.” Journal of Business, 36(4), 394–419.

Markowitz, H. (1952). “Portfolio Selection.” Journal of Finance, 7(1), 77–91.