

Charles University in Prague

Faculty of Social Sciences
Institute of Economic Studies



MASTER THESIS

**Value-at-risk forecasting
with the ARMA-GARCH family of models
during the recent financial crisis**

Author: **Bc. Ivo Jánský**

Supervisor: **PhDr. Milan Rippel**

Academic Year: **2010/2011**

Declaration of Authorship

The author hereby declares that he compiled this thesis independently, using only the listed resources and literature.

The author grants to Charles University permission to reproduce and to distribute copies of this thesis document in whole or in part.

Prague, January 2, 2011

Signature

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful especially to PhDr. Milan Rippel for a successful guidance while writing the master thesis and for valuable comments.

Abstract

The thesis evaluates several hundred one-day-ahead VaR forecasting models in the time period between the years 2004 and 2009 on data from six world stock indices — DJI, GSPC, IXIC, FTSE, GDAXI and N225. The models model mean using the AR and MA processes with up to two lags and variance with one of GARCH, EGARCH or TARCH processes with up to two lags. The models are estimated on the data from the in-sample period and their forecasting accuracy is evaluated on the out-of-sample data, which are more volatile. The main aim of the thesis is to test whether a model estimated on data with lower volatility can be used in periods with higher volatility. The evaluation is based on the conditional coverage test and is performed on each stock index separately. Unlike other works in this field of study, the thesis does not assume the log-returns to be normally distributed and does not explicitly select a particular conditional volatility process. Moreover, the thesis takes advantage of a less known conditional coverage framework for the measurement of forecasting accuracy.

JEL Classification C51, C52, C53, C58, G01, G24

Keywords VaR, risk analysis, financial crisis, conditional volatility, conditional coverage, stock index, garch, egarch, tarch, moving average process, autoregressive process

Author's e-mail Ivo.Jansky@seznam.cz

Supervisor's e-mail milanriettel@seznam.cz

Abstrakt

Diplomová práce vyhodnocuje několik set modelů pro jednodenní předpověď VaR v období mezi roky 2004 až 2009 na datech ze šesti světových akciových indexů — DJI, GSPC, IXIC, FTSE, GDAXI a N225. Modely jsou založené na AR a MA procesech s maximálně dvěma předešlými pozorováními a zároveň modelují podmíněnou volatilitu pomocí jednoho z GARCH, EGARCH a TARCH procesů rovněž s maximálně dvěma předešlými pozorováními. Parametry modelů jsou odhadnuty na datech z prvního období a jejich odhadovací přesnost je otestována na datech z druhého období, které vykazuje podstatně větší volatilitu. Hlavním cílem práce je otestovat, zda modely s parametry odhadnutými v období menší volatility mohou být použity i v období s větší volatilitou. Vyhodnocení je založeno na conditional coverage testu a je provedeno pro každý index zvlášť. Na rozdíl od jiných prací zabývajících se tímto tématem, tato práce nepředpokládá normální rozdělení logaritmovaných výnosů a neomezuje se na jeden předem vybraný proces pro modelování podmíněné volatility. Tato práce navíc využívá méně známý aparát, tzv. conditional coverage, pro vyhodnocení přesnosti odhadu modelů, který oproti standardním metodám nabízí několik výhod.

Klasifikace JEL

C51, C52, C53, C58, G01, G24

Klíčová slova

VaR, analýza rizika, finanční krize, podmíněná volatilita, conditional coverage, odhad modelů, akciový index, garch, egarch, tarch, moving average proces, autoregresivní proces

E-mail autora

Ivo.Jansky@seznam.cz

E-mail vedoucího práce

milanrippel@seznam.cz

Contents

List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	x
Acronyms	xi
Thesis Proposal	xiii
1 Introduction	1
2 Theoretical background	3
2.1 Risk	3
2.1.1 Risk components	4
2.1.2 Value at risk	8
2.2 Conditional mean	10
2.2.1 Autoregressive process	10
2.2.2 Moving-average process	11
2.2.3 Autoregressive moving-average process	12
2.3 Conditional variance	12
2.3.1 GARCH	13
2.3.2 EGARCH	18
2.3.3 TARCH	20
2.4 Back testing	22
2.4.1 Conditional coverage	23
2.4.2 Loss function	26
3 Value-at-risk methods application	29
3.1 Model specification	29
3.1.1 Dynamic models	29
3.1.2 Ranking methodology	31

3.2	Model application	32
3.2.1	Data analysis	32
3.2.2	DJI index	36
3.2.3	GSPC index	40
3.2.4	IXIC index	45
3.2.5	FTSE index	50
3.2.6	GDAXI index	54
3.2.7	N225 index	58
4	Conclusion	63
	Bibliography	70
A	Tables	I
B	Figures	XX
C	In-sample estimates	XXXIII

List of Tables

3.1	Dynamic model composition	30
3.2	Serial autocorrelation tests for the DJI index	37
3.3	Top eight in-sample models for the DJI index	38
3.4	Serial autocorrelation tests for the GSPC index	41
3.5	Top eight in-sample models for the GSPC index	42
3.6	Serial autocorrelation tests for the IXIC index	46
3.7	Top eight in-sample models for the IXIC index	46
3.8	Serial autocorrelation tests for the FTSE index	50
3.9	Top eight in-sample models for the FTSE index	51
3.10	Serial autocorrelation tests for the GDAXI index	55
3.11	Top eight in-sample models for the GDAXI index	56
3.12	Serial autocorrelation tests for the N225 index	59
3.13	Top eight in-sample models for the N225 index	59
A.1	Properties of the in-sample subsets (log-returns)	II
A.2	Properties of the out-of-sample subsets (log-returns)	III
A.3	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for DJI	IV
A.4	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GSPC	IV
A.5	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for IXIC	IV
A.6	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for FTSE	V
A.7	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GDAXI	V
A.8	In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for N225	V
A.9	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for DJI	VI
A.10	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GSPC	VI
A.11	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for IXIC	VI
A.12	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for FTSE	VII
A.13	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GDAXI	VII
A.14	Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for N225	VII

A.15	Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.9$	VIII
A.16	Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.95$	VIII
A.17	Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.99$	IX
A.18	Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.9$	X
A.19	Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.95$	X
A.20	Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.99$	XI
A.21	Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.9$	XII
A.22	Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.95$	XII
A.23	Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.99$	XIII
A.24	Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.9$	XIV
A.25	Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.95$	XIV
A.26	Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.99$	XV
A.27	Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.9$	XVI
A.28	Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.95$	XVI
A.29	Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.99$	XVII
A.30	Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.9$	XVIII
A.31	Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.95$	XVIII
A.32	Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.99$	XIX
C.1	Top AIC value in-sample model for the DJI index	XXXIV
C.2	Top AIC value in-sample model for the GSPC index	XXXV
C.3	Top AIC value in-sample model for the IXIC index	XXXVI
C.4	Top AIC value in-sample model for the FTSE index	XXXVII
C.5	Top AIC value in-sample model for the GDAXI index	XXXVIII
C.6	Top AIC value in-sample model for the N225 index	XXXIX

List of Figures

B.1	Log-returns plots of the indices	XXI
B.2	Volatility of the log-returns	XXII
B.3	In-sample histogram plots of the log-returns	XXIII
B.4	In-sample autocorrelations of residuals	XXIV
B.5	In-sample partial autocorrelations of residuals	XXV
B.6	In-sample autocorrelations of squared residuals	XXVI
B.7	In-sample partial autocorrelations of squared residuals	XXVII
B.8	Out-of-sample histogram plots of the log-returns	XXVIII
B.9	Out-of-sample autocorrelations of residuals	XXIX
B.10	Out-of-sample partial autocorrelations of residuals	XXX
B.11	Out-of-sample autocorrelations of squared residuals	XXXI
B.12	Out-of-sample partial autocorrelations of squared residuals	XXXII

Acronyms

AIC	Akaike Information Criterion
AR	Autoregressive
ARCH	Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
ARIMA	Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average
ARMA	Autoregressive Moving Average
BIC	Bayesian Information Criterion
DJI	Dow Jones Industrial Average
DTARCH	Double Threshold Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
DTB	Deutsche Börse
EGARCH	Exponential Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
EUREX	Eurex
EURONEXT	Euronext
ES	Expected shortfall
FTSE	FTSE 100
GARCH	Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
GBM	Geometric Brownian Motion
GDAXI	German DAX Index
GED	Generalized Error Distribution
GSPC	SPDR S&P 500
HMSE	Heteroskedasticity Adjusted Mean Squared Error
HMAE	Heteroskedasticity Adjusted Mean Absolute Error
HS	Historical Simulation
i.i.d.	independent and identically distributed

ISE	International Securities Exchange
IXIC	NASDAQ Composite
KPSS	Kwiatkowski–Phillips–Schmidt–Shin
LIFFE	NYSE Liffe Futures/Options
LL	Log–Likelihood
LR	Likelihood Ratio
MA	Moving Average
MC	Monte Carlo
MLE	Maximum Likelihood Estimator
MSE	Mean Squared Error
MAE	Mean Absolute Error
N225	NIKKEY 225
NE	NYSE Euronext
NYSE	New York Stock Exchange
QL	Quantile Loss
STGARCH	Tree–Structured Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
TARCH	Threshold Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity
VaR	Value–at–Risk

Master Thesis Proposal

Institute of Economic Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
Charles University in Prague



Author:	Bc. Ivo Jánský	Supervisor:	PhDr. Milan Rippel
E-mail:	ivo.jansky@gmail.com	E-mail:	milanrippel@seznam.cz
Phone:	728846708	Phone:	775127245
Specialization:	FFTaB	Defense Planned:	February 2011

Proposed Topic:

The impact of the financial crisis on the market risk measurement approaches for different asset types and territory.

Topic Characteristics:

While trading with any kind of assets, the market risk must be carefully estimated. There are various methods for calculation the market risk, two of them being “value at risk” and the “expected shortfall”.

Value at risk is one of the most common tools for the measurement of a risk of a loss. Typically, VaR is employed by banks where it is used in the management of a credit risk and by portfolio managers, since it helps them quantify the worst loss that can occur with some given probability. There are several approaches for the calculation of VaR. such as the historical approach, variance/covariance approach, etc., each of them depending on some parameters.

The expected shortfall is an alternative method of calculating the market risk and it is particularly useful when the risk of the most extreme cases must be considered. Some authors even consider it as an excellent replacement of the VaR approach.

The goal of the thesis is to analyze these approaches separately for each asset type as well as a sample portfolio based on the market data and to reveal how much they were influenced by the recent financial crisis. The effects are to be discussed separately for the markets in the USA, the UK and Europe (DAX).

Hypotheses:

1. The appropriate distribution function of market values for the all asset types is the normal distribution function.
2. Based on data prior to the financial crisis, the tested risk measurement approaches for the asset types and the portfolio give the same results or at least the results do not significantly differ.
3. Based on data including the period of the financial crisis, the tested risk measurement approaches for the asset types and the portfolio give the same results or at least the results do not significantly differ.
4. The financial crisis had a significant impact on the values of the tested risk measurement approaches for the asset types and the portfolio in the selected territories.

Methodology:

In order to test the various risk measurement approaches, the dataset consisting of data from the NYSE, LIFFE and Deutsche Börse will be used. Since all of them provide data on a daily basis, the dataset should be large enough to validate the above stated hypotheses. The employed risk measurement approaches will be the expected shortfall and the VaR calculated using “the historical approach”, “the parametric approach” and “the Monte-Carlo simulation using the Brownian motion”.

In order to obtain maximal accuracy, the true distribution function of the dataset will be first discovered using standard econometric tools. If the discovered distribution function differs from the normal distribution function, it will be included in the later on calculations.

Given the confidence intervals of 90%, 95% and 99% the risk measurement values will be calculated and then compared. Since the impact of the financial crisis is to be determined, the risk measurement will be calculated once more, this time including the data during the period of the financial crisis. The values will be compared again. The most appropriate method will be selected employing a method called back-testing.

Finally, extending the basic dataset prior to the financial crisis by data following the Brownian motion or a similar method, the hypothesis that the financial crisis significantly altered the risk measurement values will be tested. The results should suggest the most accurate approach to be employed in the case of a future financial crisis.

Outline:

1. Introduction
2. Theoretical analysis of asset types
3. Risk measurement methods
4. Empirical analysis of the Value at risk method
5. Empirical analysis of the Expected shortfall method
6. Conclusion

Core Bibliography:

JORION, Philippe. Value at Risk : The New Benchmark for Managing Financial Risk. 2 edition. [New York] : McGraw-Hill, 2000. 544 s. ISBN 978-0071355025.

SAUNDERS, Anthony. Credit risk measurement : new approaches to value at risk and other paradigms. New York : John Wiley & Sons, 2002. 319 s. ISBN 047121910X.

HOLTON, Glyn A. Value at Risk : theory and practice. Amsterdam : Academic Press, 2003. 405 s. ISBN 0123540100.

SCHMID, Bernd. Credit risk pricing models : theory and practice. Berlin : Springer, 2004. 383 s. ISBN 354040466X.

ALEXANDER, Carol. Market risk analysis : Volume III, Pricing, hedging and trading financial instruments. Chichester : John Wiley & Sons, 2008. 386 s. ISBN 9780470997895.

Author

Supervisor

Chapter 1

Introduction

The modern financial world knows many types of assets and the vast majority of them can be traded on various exchanges all over the world. The exchanges — *markets* — react very quickly on any new information that enters the price making process and therefore the prices of the traded assets are constantly evolving. The market participants thus need to assess the influence of such information entering the market on the price of the asset that they own — *market risk*. There are several possible ways how to calculate or estimate market risk, one of them being Value-at-Risk (VaR). VaR is a very popular method and it is used by banks mainly for assessment of credit risk and by portfolio managers in order to evaluate the level of loss that can occur with some probability. There exist several approaches for the calculation of VaR such as the historical approach, variance/covariance approach, Monte Carlo simulation, methods based on the GARCH family of conditional volatility processes, and many others.

The objective of the thesis is to analyze VaR forecasting methods based on several conditional mean and conditional variance modeling processes in the context of the recent financial crisis and several most traded stock indices. Moreover, the methods are to be evaluated without any a priori assumptions on the particular parameters of the conditional mean and conditional variance processes as well as the shape of the distribution of the logarithmic returns. The context of the financial crisis means that the thesis will focus on the evaluation of forecasting accuracy of the models in times of increased volatility, commonly observed during the financial crisis. Accuracy in this sense is represented by ability to provide results that closely follow the actual market development.

Such definition of accuracy is especially important in times of market turbulences as it helps the market participants to better asses market risk.

The thesis is structured into four main parts. Chapter 2 provides the reader with a theoretical introduction to the problematic of forecasting VaR, the theory behind conditional mean processes, conditional variance processes, and back-testing methods. After the necessary introduction follows Chapter 3, which applies the selected VaR methods on the data from several market indices and evaluates their accuracy. Finally, Chapter 4 summarizes the obtained results.

Chapter 2

Theoretical background

To measure risk, from the financial point of view, means to try to forecast what are the possible losses that are caused by adverse movements of market prices. Market prices are influenced by many variables such as interest rates and foreign exchange rates. There are several methods, how risk can be measured and translated into real financial figures that are required by the risk managers in companies and banks in order to take appropriate investment decisions. Probably the most popular method is the so-called Value-at-Risk (VaR), which is the main risk measure that this thesis is concerned with. Several VaR forecasting methods are introduced later on in the text together with methods that are used to evaluate their accuracy — *back-testing methods*. The definition of risk, however, has to be tackled first.

2.1 Risk

The main topic of the thesis is the measurement of financial risk on the market and one of the first terms that is to be explained is *risk*. Even though there is no exact definition of what risk actually is, one can find several explanations of this word, such as the following one: “*Risk can be defined as the volatility of unexpected outcomes, which can represent the value of assets, equity, or earnings*” (Jorion 2007, pp. 3). This definition is, however, very broad and for the purpose of this thesis it should be narrowed. Since the thesis is concerned with financial markets, the main category of risk is *financial risk*.

Financial risk comprises all the typical sources of changes in the underlying variables that affect the price of an asset. The most known sources are, for example, interest rate movements that influence a vast majority of as-

sets, and foreign exchange rate changes, which are of particular interest while trading with currency futures. In other words, financial risk represents the possibility of a loss stemming from participation on financial markets.

The importance of financial risks evaluation is easily illustrated on the development of the financial markets during the past 40 years. In the period between the year 1970 and the present day, there have been many significant events that caused the markets to drop in value. Several examples are provided in Jorion (2007, pp. 4-5) and include oil-price shocks, Japanese stock-bubble, the Asian turmoil, the Russian default, the terrorist attacks in 2001, and of course, the most recent financial crisis. Each of these events was unexpected therefore it was not possible to avoid it, when it actually occurred.

2.1.1 Risk components

The sources of risk are also diverse. Most of risk sources are connected with human activities that include running the economy such as inflation, interest rates, innovations, political decisions, wars, and so on. Another source of risk comes from the nature itself. There have always been bad weather, floods, earthquakes, bad crops, etc. Therefore, it is easy to see that the world we live in is full of risk and financial markets are no exception. Since the term *risk* is quite broad, the following groups of risks are typically considered — market risk, liquidity risk, credit risk, and operational risk.

Market risk

Market risk is the main financial risk category that the thesis is concerned with. It represents the losses that result from adverse price movements of assets on the market. As it has already been said, market risk is caused by the movements of interest rates, exchange rates, etc. To get a better grasp at such virtual measure, the market risk value can be looked at from several points of view. Jorion (2007, pp. 22) distinguishes the following:

- absolute risk — the absolute difference between the two prices over time,
- relative risk — the difference of the price of an asset and some arbitrary benchmark index,
- directional risk — represents risk related to the movements of financial variables such as interest rates, foreign exchange rates, etc.,

- non-directional risk — other risk variables not included in directional risk, usually exposures to hedged positions,
- basis risk — represents unexpected “*movements of the relative prices of an asset in a hedged position*”,
- volatility risk — stems from changes of actual volatility.

Market risk is usually being closely monitored and it can be significantly reduced by setting *stop-loss limits*, employing the VaR method, or even by supervising market activities by an independent supervisor.

Liquidity risk

The second type of risk, included in the financial risks category, is liquidity risk. This is a specific type of risk as it is not caused by movements of financial variables. The main sources of liquidity risk are the market itself – *the depth of the market* — and its participants. As well as in the previous discussion of market risk, Jorion (2007) distinguishes two types of liquidity risk:

- market and product liquidity risk,
- cash-flow risk.

Market and product liquidity risk, sometimes called *asset-liquidity risk*, is the case when a market transaction cannot be successfully closed due to some constraints on the size or the price of the transaction. Transaction is considered as either too big or too small for the market, when there is no other entity that has a desire to engage on the other side of the transaction, which usually happens when the transaction size differs from a typical trading lot. This, however, does not seem to be a problem with major currencies or with treasury bonds, as their markets are very deep. Exotic derivatives, on the other hand, face higher liquidity risk.

The second subgroup, cash-flow risk, which is also known as *funding-liquidity risk*, represents actual inability to provide funds. Cash-flow risk is particularly obvious in leveraged portfolios that are “*subject to margin calls from the lender*” (Jorion 2007, pp. 23). Typically, this situation leads to increased losses due to the fact that traders need to make marking-to-market payments and if they fail to do so, they are forced to sell the portfolio, which in turn translates into even higher losses.

Asset–liquidity risk can be effectively minimized by trading standardized amounts of assets on sufficiently liquid markets, however, it might not always be possible to avoid. Cash–flow risk is a bit easier to manage. The easiest way is to engage in proper cash–flow management in combination with portfolio hedging, diversification and setting limits on maximum possible cash–flow differences.

Credit risk

The third major source of risk is credit risk. Credit risk represents losses that stem from inability or unwillingness of a counter–party to meet its liabilities. From the costs point of view, credit risk can be further on divided into two components. The most obvious component is the nominal value that is lost due to credit risk and the second component is the so called *recovery rate*. The recovery rate states, how much from one lost dollar gets returned back to the lender. Naturally, the recovery rate is always smaller than one. As Jorion (2007) argues, credit risk can be caused by the process of marking–to–market of debt, which is often the result of changes in market prices of debt caused by a changed credit rating of the debt.

Two more types of credit risk also belong to the same category. On the contrary to company–specific risk as introduced in the previous paragraph, there is also country–specific risk, *sovereign risk*, which is mainly caused by political bodies that attempt to control the foreign exchange market. The result of such control is inability to meet ones liabilities and therefore increased credit risk.

Last risk belonging to the credit risk group is settlement risk. Settlement risk occurs, as its name suggests, at the time of settling the transaction. Especially when different currencies are being traded and the physical settlement occurs at two different times, settlement risk increases and the trader’s exposure equals the full value of the transaction. Again there is a possibility to manage credit risk. The minimization of credit risk is usually performed by setting “*credit limits on ... exposures, ... requiring collateral or marking to market*” (Jorion 2007, pp. 25).

Operational risk

Finally, the fourth major source of risk is represented by operational risk. This group comprises of several parts that do not fit in any of the previous categories, mainly due to the fact that they arise from internal processes in com-

panies and banks. Typically, one can clearly identify the following sources of operational risk:

- process risk,
- people risk,
- model risk,
- legal risk.

Process risk, as the name suggests, is present in every process connected with the participation on financial markets. A typical example can be found in the banking sector. The process of making a transaction on a financial market, from the perspective of a bank, is a process instrumented by several actors. First, there is a trader who enters the market and creates a deal. Information about the deal is then sent to the back-office where it is entered into banking information systems. It is clear that during the process there can arise a problem due to false information provided and/or received and due to incorrect information entered into banking systems.

People risk is closely related to process risk, as people are parts of processes, but the definition is different. People risk actually represents a possibility that some person intentionally provides false information or, in other words, frauds the other party. This type of risk is often connected with market risk, simply because traders might be tempted to falsely identify their position after incurring a loss of some significant amount. An example could be the fall of the Barings bank in England in 1995.

Third risk – *model risk* — is again partially correlated with process risk, but it is considered as a specific type of operational risk. Model risk is represented by inaccurately valued models that result in wrong decisions about market position and later on incur a loss. Practically any used model can be inaccurately valued. Jorion (2007) gives the option pricing model as an example. This risk can be largely minimized by “*independent evaluation using market prices, when available, or objective out-of-sample evaluations*” (Jorion 2007, pp. 26).

The fourth mentioned source of operational risk is legal risk. Legal risk stems from the legal environment, in which the entity lives and in which it operates. In the modern largely globalized and integrated world, legal environment is very complex as it can include legal environments of many parties

that participate on a particular transaction. Therefore risk of doing something that is against the law or regulation can easily occur. Results of legal risk are “*finer, penalties, or punitive damages resulting from supervisory actions, as well as private settlements*” (Jorion 2007, pp. 26).

Operational risk can be largely minimized by engaging in several activities such as minimizing the number of systems involved, preparing effective internal controlling, and, probably the most important step, requiring a clear separation of responsibilities. Operational risk and its minimization has been widely discussed in the recent years, especially in the banking industry. The BASEL II regulatory framework, for example, clearly identifies operational risk as one of the risks that banks face and it requires them to be prepared for possible losses that might occur due to operational risk.

2.1.2 Value at risk

VaR is a widely used method for the assessment of financial risk. The history of the method dates back to the beginning of the 1990s, when the method was first introduced in response to the recent financial turmoils. At the time VaR was published it was primarily intended to be used as measure of market risk. However, in the past two decades VaR has evolved into a universal risk management tool, which is now used to calculate both credit and operational risk. This is, however, not the complete enumeration. Jorion (2007, pp. ix) provides a transparent list of VaR applications as they evolved over time. It is interesting to observe how a passive tool became an active daily-used method in almost any financial institution in the world.

- *Passive* — At this time, VaR was used mainly for information reporting. Financial operations were assessed by this method and results were presented to the management and shareholders.
- *Defensive* — Later on, as the potential of VaR was better understood, the method began to represent virtual boundaries for traders, while trading on the markets. Position limits calculated by VaR were introduced.
- *Active* — Finally, VaR became an active tool in the risk management industry. Its primary use now is to manage risk and it serves the purpose of allocating capital inside a company or a bank. Another example from this category is the employment of risk adjusted performance mea-

asures that serve the purpose of better assessing risks connected with an investment.

The evolution of VaR clearly shows how a simple statistical method can become one of the mostly used tools in the financial industry. The clear benefits are mainly for shareholders in general, because the management can see the risk impact of some desired investment on the portfolio as a whole, before even carrying out the investment. That is the reason, why VaR is being widely used all over the world. Institutions that use VaR range from financial institutions to non-financial institutions, as it is summarized in the following list introduced by Jorion (2007, pp. x):

- *Financial institutions* — Financial institutions and especially banks are very sensitive to any negative changes in their portfolio, because they usually manage very large portfolios consisting of many types of assets. That is the reason why there is a strong tendency among these institutions to create centralized rules for risk management.
- *Regulators* — Probably the largest growth of the VaR methodology employment can be seen by regulatory offices around the world. As examples can very well serve the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision or securities commissions in the USA and in the European Union. BASEL II requires banks to hold a certain amount of reserves for adverse situations and it also employs VaR in order to calculate credit and operational risk.
- *Non-financial institutions* — It is very common that ordinary companies hold assets in the form of foreign currencies, because they operate on several foreign markets. These companies are also subjects to financial risk that can be evaluated by the VaR method.
- *Asset managers* — Finally, asset managers heavily use VaR, because it gives them the possibility to see a complex picture of risk that they are undertaking, while trading with various assets. As it is described in Jorion (2007), there are even possibilities to show asset managers the breakdown of total risk by markets, asset types and so on.

There are arguments that transparent risk reporting procedures could have prevented financial losses that occurred in the past (Jorion 2007). The application of the VaR method has the advantage that it provides information about

possible losses that could occur as a result of adverse movements of market variables. Another benefit of employing VaR lies in the fact that it changes the way people think about risk. This results in a clear risk management governance in institutions and forces the institutions to consider risk more carefully than before.

Since the risk of a loss actually represents a dichotomy — there is exposure to risk factors and then there are distributions of risky factors — there exist several methods for VaR calculation. First, models that work with the exposure can be divided into two groups — *local valuation* and *full valuation* methods. The main difference between these two groups is in the frequency with which they value the portfolio. The local valuation performs the valuation only once and it is represented by the *delta-normal* method and the *variance-covariance* approach. The second group, the full valuation, performs valuation of the portfolio over a range of possible scenarios. The models that focus on the distribution of risky factors are represented by both *parametric* approaches — such as the normal distribution — and *non-parametric* approaches that work with historical data.

2.2 Conditional mean

While working with time series data, it is quite common that data is timely dependent. In other words, the value of the observed variable at time t might be dependent upon some information that has been observed earlier. Quite common are the lagged values of the observed variable and the lagged values of the error term. Thus the two concepts of conditional mean covered by the thesis are the Autoregressive (AR) process and the Moving Average (MA) process.

2.2.1 Autoregressive process

An AR process is described by the Equation 2.1 below. The order of the AR process is given by the value of the lag parameter p . From the equation it is clear that the value of the random variable y_t at time t depends on the previously realized values of y_t . The other components in the equation are constant mean μ and white noise ϵ_t . The importance of the previously realized value of the random variable y_{t-i} is captured by the parameter ρ_i , where i is the i -th lag of the random variable. For simplicity, the constant μ is usually omitted.

$$y_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i y_{t-i} + \epsilon_t \quad (2.1)$$

A typical constraint on a time series random variable is that the random variable is stationary. The stationarity condition for the AR process is usually described by restrictions on roots of the polynomial $z^p - \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i z^{p-i}$. In order for the AR process to be wide-sense stationary, roots of the polynomial must lie within a unit circle. In other words, for each z_i it must hold that $|z_i| < 1$. Since the task of checking for the stationarity is quite common, there exist several statistical tests, which test for stationarity and can be applied on the time series.

One of the well known tests is the Dickey–Fuller test introduced by Dickey & Fuller (1979), which tests the null-hypothesis that a unit root is present in a time series. This test is available in most statistical software. A derivation of the Dickey–Fuller test for larger datasets is the Augmented Dickey–Fuller test introduced in Said & Dickey (1984). Based on the Dickey–Fuller test is also the Phillips–Perron test. According to Phillips & Perron (1988), the test is able to deal with autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity in the time series in a more robust way. A complement to the unit-root tests described so far is the Kwiatkowski–Phillips–Schmidt–Shin (KPSS) test introduced by Kwiatkowski *et al.* (1992). The null-hypothesis of the KPSS test is a stationarity of the time series and it is typically used together with the three above mentioned tests.

2.2.2 Moving-average process

Another process that is commonly used with univariate time series is the MA process. The mathematical representation of the MA process is provided in the Equation 2.2 below. The order of the MA process is described by the parameter q and it represents the number of lagged errors, on which the current value of the random variable y_t depends. The idea behind the MA process lies in the inclusion of past unexpected shocks or errors ϵ_{t-i} as variables that help to explain the value of the random variable at specific time. Errors are assumed to be white noise and the importance of the lagged error ϵ_{t-i} is captured by the θ_i parameter, the mean is represented by the variable μ and the error term for the current period t is represented by ϵ_t .

$$y_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i \epsilon_{t-i} + \epsilon_t \quad (2.2)$$

2.2.3 Autoregressive moving-average process

The two described processes for modeling the mean of a time series are often combined in order to create an Autoregressive Moving Average (ARMA) process. An ARMA process is able to capture both the autoregressive part of the time series and lagged shocks introduced by the error term. Therefore the ARMA process has two parameters, p and q , which specify orders of the AR process and the MA process respectively. The equation of the ARMA process is provided below in Equation 2.3.

$$y_t = \mu + \sum_{i=1}^p \rho_i y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^q \theta_i \epsilon_{t-i} + \epsilon_t \quad (2.3)$$

An ARMA process is a special case of the Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) process. In addition to the p and q parameters, the ARIMA process has another parameter d that specifies the degree by which the random variable is differenced. Even though, the time series random variable is typically differenced once to become stationary, there might be cases when the first difference is not enough or the model requires a higher order differencing. The ARMA process is thus an ARIMA process with the d parameter equal to zero.

Processes that model the mean of the time series variable are not the only dynamic part in the procedure of identifying an appropriate model for a time series. Many authors, such as Ghahramani & Thavaneswaran (2008) argue that it is quite common with time series random variables that the squared error term is not homoskedastic. In order to improve the predicting capability of the one-day-ahead VaR, conditional variance processes are often used. The conditional process used in the thesis are described in the following section.

2.3 Conditional variance

The calculation methods used for one-day-ahead VaR forecasting range from very simple ones to more advanced models. The first group is represented by the Historical Simulation (HS) method, which is the easiest method to calculate. Then there is the Monte Carlo (MC) method that is a part of the parametric approach family of models. Some authors such as Huang (2010) employ an

advanced modification of the MC method called the optimized MC method, which is supposed to provide more accurate results. Since the MC method is based on a simulation of different outcomes, there is usually a substantial increase in the complexity of the calculation in comparison to the HS method — especially the duration of the calculation. On the other side of the VaR forecasting spectrum lie models based on conditional volatility processes such as the Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) process with all its special cases such as the Exponential Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (EGARCH) and Threshold Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (TARCH). These three mentioned processes will be the main conditional volatility processes used in the thesis.

2.3.1 GARCH

Econometric models dealing with time series usually work under the assumption of homoskedasticity, in other words, constant volatility. However, in the case of financial time series, volatility is rarely a constant, as many authors such as Akgiray (1989) proved. Therefore, volatility can vary at different points in time. One of the models that is able to deal with conditional heteroskedasticity is the Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) model introduced by Bollerslev (1986), which is a generalization of the Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (ARCH) model that was originally developed by Engle (1982).

The ARCH family of models correctly distinguishes between unconditional variance and conditional variance and allows conditional variance to change over time, leaving unconditional variance constant. The ARCH model allows for long lags in conditional variance and the GARCH model extends it in the way that it allows for both long lags in conditional variance and a more flexible lag structure.

Let's start with the definition of the GARCH model, which is described by the equations 2.4 and 2.6. The Equation 2.4 is a general equation for the value of the error term denoted as ε_t . Under the assumption that the distribution of the random variable z_t is normally distributed with mean zero, the Equation 2.4 can be replaced by the Equation 2.5. More details about possible distributions of the random variable z_t are provided later on in this section.

$$\varepsilon_t = z_t \sqrt{h_t} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\varepsilon_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim N(0, h_t) \quad (2.5)$$

$$h_t = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i \varepsilon_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i h_{t-i} \quad (2.6)$$

The Equation 2.5 says that the distribution of the random variable ε_t is normal with mean zero and variance h_t conditional of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} , which is an information set of all information up to time $t-1$. The Equation 2.6 then models conditional variance h_t based on both past realizations of h_t and the square of the past realization of the random variable ε_t . By changing the parameters p and q , the GARCH model can be transformed into other models, some of which are well known.

To show how the GARCH model relates to the ARCH model, let's consider a special case when $p = 0$. The sum of lags of h_t then drops from the equation of conditional variance h_t and the equation is identical to the equation of conditional variance in the ARCH model. Therefore, ARCH model is only a special case of the GARCH model. Another special case takes place when $p = q = 0$. In this case, the GARCH model simply becomes white noise ε_t . It is therefore obvious that parameters p and q are crucial to the model, along with estimates of parameters α and β . There are, however, several restrictions on values of parameters α and β .

$$\begin{aligned} p &\geq 0, & q &> 0 \\ \alpha_0 &> 0, & \alpha_i &\geq 0, & i &= 1, \dots, q \\ \beta_i &\geq 0, & & & i &= 1, \dots, p \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

The interpretation of above written conditions is straightforward. The value of α_0 must be greater than zero, so that conditional variance is also greater than zero. Values of α_i and β_i must as well be greater than zero, in order to achieve overall positive conditional variance. However, α_i and β_i are also allowed to be equal to zero, which is typically the case when parameters are not significant at some i . The last condition, as written in the Equation 2.8, assures that the random process described by ε_t is covariance stationary. The Equation 2.9

simply represents the value of unconditional variance of the GARCH model.

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i < 1 \quad (2.8)$$

$$h_t = \frac{\alpha_0}{\sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i} \quad (2.9)$$

A useful summary of above stated and described conditions and equations is represented by the Theorem 2.1 introduced below. The proof of the theorem can be found in Bollerslev (1986).

Theorem 2.1. *The GARCH(p,q) process as defined in 2.5 and 2.6 is wide-sense stationary with $E(\varepsilon_t) = 0$, $var(\varepsilon_t) = \frac{\alpha_0}{\sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i}$ and $cov(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_s) = 0$ for $t \neq s$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i < 1$.*

Proof. See Bollerslev (1986, Appendix) □

Distributions of z_t

In his original work, Engle (1982) assumed that the distribution of the random variable z_t in the Equation 2.4 is normal. Therefore, this equation could be simply replaced by the Expression 2.5. Normal distribution, however, is not the only possible distribution of the random variable. Bollerslev (1986), for example, suggested to use the standardized Student- t distribution with $v > 2$ degrees of freedom. The density function of the Student- t distribution is in the form described by the Equation 2.10.

$$D(z_t, v) = \frac{\Gamma((v+1)/2)}{\Gamma(v/2)\sqrt{\pi(v-2)}} \left(1 + \frac{z_t^2}{v-2}\right)^{-\frac{v+1}{2}}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\Gamma(v) = \int_0^\infty e^{-x} x^{v-1} dx$ is the gamma function and v represents the so-called tail-thickness parameter of the distribution.

The motivation for the use of the Student- t distribution lies in thick tails of financial time series.¹ The mean of the standardized Student- t distribution is equal to zero and degrees of freedom, controlled by the parameter v , influence the tails-thickness. As the value of v goes to infinity, the shape of the distribution resembles the shape of the normal distribution.

Another popular distribution is the Generalized Error Distribution (GED),

¹The presence of thick tails in financial time series has been reported by many authors such as Bollerslev *et al.* (1994); Ghysels *et al.* (1996).

which has been proposed by Nelson (1991). He suggested that the GED distribution should be used in the EGARCH model. The density function of the GED with zero mean is described by the Equation 2.11.

$$D(z_t, v) = \frac{v \exp(-0.5|z_t/\lambda|^v)}{2^{(1+1/v)}\Gamma(v^{-1})\lambda}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $-\infty < z < \infty$, $0 < v \leq \infty$, $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function and

$$\lambda \equiv [2^{(-2/v)}\Gamma(1/v)/\Gamma(3/v)]^{1/2}. \quad (2.12)$$

The parameter v is the tail-thickness parameter and its value effectively changes the shape of the distribution function. For example, when $v = 2$ then the random variable z is distributed as $z \sim N(0, 1)$. Thicker tails can be achieved by setting $v < 2$ and thinner tails vice versa by setting $v > 2$. In case $v = \infty$, z_t has a uniform distribution on the interval $\langle -\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3} \rangle$. Even though, the three briefly introduced distributions are not the only distributions that can be used in the GARCH family of models, they suffice for the scope of the thesis. More information about other distributions and their use in the GARCH family of models can be found in works of Guermat & Harris (2002) and Lambert & Laurent (2001).

Parameter estimation

One possible procedure, how to obtain parameters of the GARCH model, is to use the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE), which provides an asymptotically efficient estimator.² Under the assumption that innovations z_t that enter the MLE are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) and the density function of innovations is $D(z_t, v)$, the log-likelihood function of $\{y_t(\theta)\}$ is described by the Equation 2.13.

$$\ell(\{y_t\}, \theta) = \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\ln \left[D(z_t(\theta), v) \right] - \frac{1}{2} \ln(h_t(\theta)) \right], \quad (2.13)$$

where T is the number of observations and θ is the vector of parameters that are to be estimated. The likelihood estimator that maximizes the Equation 2.13 is denoted as $\hat{\theta}$. Angelidis *et al.* (2004) in their work provide equations for the three discussed distribution functions. Therefore, the derivation

²See Wooldridge (2008) for introduction to the MLE estimation.

of these equation will not be done step-by-step in this thesis, instead, equations from the referred source will be used.

Log-likelihood for z_t that is normally distributed:

$$\ell(\{y_t\}, \theta) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[T \ln(2\pi) + \sum_{t=1}^T z_t^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \ln(h_t) \right]. \quad (2.14)$$

Log-likelihood for z_t with Student- t distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\{y_t\}, \theta) = & T \left[\ln \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right) - \ln \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln[\pi(\nu-2)] \right] - \\ & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\ln(h_t) + (1+\nu) \ln\left(1 + \frac{z_t^2}{\nu-2}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Log-likelihood for z_t with GED distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\{y_t\}, \theta) = & \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\ln\left(\frac{\nu}{\lambda}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{z_t}{\lambda} \right|^\nu - \right. \\ & \left. (1+\nu)^{-1} \ln(2) - \ln \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\nu}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(h_t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

The vector of estimated parameters $\hat{\theta}$ of the particular distribution function of the random variable z_t is then obtained by employing a standard maximization method, in which Θ is the parameter space, as captured in the Equation 2.17.

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell(\{y_t\}, \theta) \quad (2.17)$$

Value-at-risk forecast

Once parameters of the random variable z_t with the desired distribution are known, the calculation of the VaR forecast for time $t+1$ conditional on the information up to time t , is straightforward. The general formula for one-day-ahead VaR is in 2.18, where $F(\alpha)$ is the α -quantile of the distribution of innovations and $\hat{h}_{t+1|t}^{1/2}$ is the conditional standard deviation of the innovation process at time $t+1$, based on the information set up to time t , obtained from the Equation 2.19.

$$VaR_{t+1|t} = F(\alpha) \hat{h}_{t+1|t}^{1/2}, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\hat{h}_{t+1|t} = \alpha_0^{(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i^{(t)} \varepsilon_{t-i+1}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i^{(t)} h_{t-i+1} \quad (2.19)$$

Asymmetric models

The advantage of using the GARCH model lies in the fact that the model is able to deal with some characteristics of typical time series. These characteristics include, for example, thick tails and volatility clustering, as pointed out by Mandelbrot (1963) and Mandelbrot (1967). There are, however, some characteristics of financial time series that the GARCH model is not able to deal with. The main disadvantage of the GARCH model is that conditional variance depends on the squared value of ε_t , which in turn means that the model is sensitive only to the absolute magnitude of the variable but not to its sign. This represents a complication as Angelidis *et al.* (2004) point out, since a so called leverage effect introduced by Black (1976) might be present.

The leverage effect represents a negative correlation between asset returns and volatility of returns. In other words, volatility of returns has a tendency to rise as a result of negative news on the market and decrease as a result of positive news on the market, ie. when $\varepsilon_t < 0$ resp. $\varepsilon_t > 0$. Some authors such as Brooks & Persaud (2003) and Rabemananjara & Zakoian (1993) therefore suggest that models that take into consideration asymmetries in volatility of returns should be preferred. Failing to do so might, according to these authors, result in inaccurate forecasts of VaR. The appropriate solution to handle such asymmetry lies in using appropriate extensions of ARCH respectively GARCH models. Two most popular asymmetric models are the EGARCH model of Nelson (1991) and the TARARCH model created by Zakoian (1994).

2.3.2 EGARCH

The introduction of the EGARCH model by Nelson (1991) reacted on the criticism of the popular GARCH model. According to Teräsvirta (2006), Nelson saw a problem especially in restrictions on parameters of the GARCH model, as represented by expressions 2.7 in the preceding section. The source of the criticism was induced by the requirement on positivity of conditional variance at all times. Second problem was the actual ignorance of possible asymmetries

in volatility by the GARCH model.

$$\ln h_t = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i (\theta z_{t-i} + \gamma_i (|z_{t-i}| - E|z_{t-i}|)) + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \ln h_{t-i} \quad (2.20)$$

The EGARCH model is represented by the Equation 2.20. At the first sight, it is clear that the parameter γ_i is the asymmetric effect parameter and its value is a direct determinant of the behavior of the model. In the case when $\gamma_i = 0$, both positive and negative shocks are treated the same way. In general it holds that the component θz_{t-i} determines the sign of the change and the component $\gamma_i (|z_{t-i}| - E|z_{t-i}|)$, on the other hand, the magnitude of the change.

Considering the fact that the Equation 2.20 is a logarithmic transformation, restrictions on values of α_i and β_i parameters, as described by expressions in 2.7, can be levied. Parameters α_i and β_i can therefore attain both positive and negative values. The logarithmic transformation also ensures that the actual value of conditional volatility is always non-negative. Stationarity conditions for the EGARCH model can be found in the original work of Nelson (1991).

Value-at-risk forecast

The parameter estimation of the random variable z_t can be obtained in the same way as in the case of the GARCH model. The calculation of the VaR forecast at time $t + 1$, conditional on the information up to time t , is again based on the one-day-ahead VaR formula described by the Equation 2.18. The calculation of $\hat{h}_{t+1|t}$ differs from the GARCH case though. The conditional standard deviation of the innovation process in the EGARCH model at time $t + 1$ based on the information set up to time t , is obtained from the Equation 2.21.

$$VaR_{t+1|t} = F(\alpha) \hat{h}_{t+1|t}^{1/2} \quad ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \hat{h}_{t+1|t} = & \alpha_0^{(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i^{(t)} (\theta z_{t-i+1} + \gamma_i^{(t)} (|z_{t-i+1}| - E|z_{t-i+1}|)) + \\ & \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i^{(t)} \ln h_{t-i+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

Model discussion

In their work, He *et al.* (2002) suggest that for the popular EGARCH(1,1) model, the decay of autocorrelations of squared residuals is faster at the beginning and it slows down until it begins to decay at an approximately exponential rate. Therefore, they do not recommend to use the EGARCH(1,1) model for such time series where autocorrelations decay slowly. Moreover, Malmsten & Teräsvirta (2004) reported that EGARCH(1,1) model with the assumption of normally distributed errors is not appropriate for time series with slowly decaying autocorrelations and high kurtosis. These findings are in line with the recommendation of Nelson (1991) who suggested that errors should be modeled using the GED. Nelson (1991) in his work considered also the Student- t distribution with finite degrees of freedom, however, he found out that when this distribution is used, infinite unconditional variance might occur. Therefore, the distribution function of errors must be chosen carefully.

Engle & Ng (1993) provide criticism of the EGARCH model that is based on empirical studies. They report that according to their results, the EGARCH model has a tendency to overweight the effect of shocks with greater magnitude on the volatility. As a result the EGARCH model should provide poorer results than the GARCH model. Since the topic of this thesis is to investigate several VaR models in times of increased volatility, own opinion on the criticism will be provided later on.

2.3.3 TARCH

Another model from the family of asymmetric ARCH models is the TARCH model. This model has been introduced by Zakoian (1994) and the idea behind it is based on the work of Davidian & Carroll (1987) who found out that not squared residuals, but absolute residuals provide better variance estimates. It is important to note that Zakoian (1994) estimates conditional standard deviation instead of conditional variance as it is the case with GARCH and EGARCH models. The idea behind the model is to divided innovations ε_t into two intervals that are disjunct and then to estimate parameters in the linear function of conditional standard deviation. The TARCH model is thus described by the Equation 2.22.

$$h_t^{1/2} = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q (\alpha_i^+ \varepsilon_{t-i}^+ - \alpha_i^- \varepsilon_{t-i}^-) + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i h_{t-i}^{1/2} \quad , \quad (2.22)$$

where $\varepsilon_t^+ = \max(\varepsilon_t, 0)$ and $\varepsilon_t^- = \min(\varepsilon_t, 0)$.

Even though, it would be possible to leave out restrictions on values of parameters α_i and β_i , since the modeled conditional standard deviation can attain negative values, Zakoian (1994) restricts these parameters, so they have the same properties as in the standard GARCH model.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 > 0, \quad \alpha_i^+ \geq 0, \quad \alpha_i^- \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, q \\ \beta_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, p \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

From the Equation 2.22 it is obvious that parameters α_i^+ and α_i^- allow to have different values for positive and negative shocks. On the contrary to the EGARCH model, the TARCH model allows for finer control over asymmetry of squared residuals. The reason lies in the fact that various lags might result in opposite contributions to conditional volatility; for example, $\alpha_1^+ - \alpha_1^- < 0$ and $\alpha_2^+ - \alpha_2^- > 0$. Second important difference between the two models stated by Zakoian (1994) is that TARCH employs additive modeling and volatility is a function of (non-normalized) innovations. Last but not least difference is that the $\ln h_t$ process requires an ARMA process and “*it does not provide any linear equation in any function of ε* ” (Zakoian 1994, pp. 935).

Value-at-risk forecast

As well as in the two previous cases, the parameter estimation of the random variable z_t is obtained by employing the MLE method. The calculation of the VaR forecast at time $t + 1$ conditional on the information up to time t , is based on the one-day-ahead VaR formula provided in the Equation 2.18. The calculation of $\hat{h}_{t+1|t}$, as in the case of the EGARCH model, differs from the GARCH case. The conditional standard deviation of the innovation process in the TARCH model at time $t + 1$ based on the information set up to time t , is obtained from the Equation 2.24.

$$VaR_{t+1|t} = F(\alpha)\hat{h}_{t+1|t}^{1/2} \quad ,$$

where

$$\hat{h}_{t+1|t}^{1/2} = \alpha_0^{(t)} + \sum_{i=1}^q \left([\alpha_i^+ \varepsilon_{t-i+1}^+]^{(t)} - [\alpha_i^- \varepsilon_{t-i+1}^-]^{(t)} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i^{(t)} h_{t-i+1}^{1/2}. \quad (2.24)$$

Model discussion

There exist several modifications of the TARCh model, such as the Double Threshold Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (DTARCh) model developed by Li & Li (1996), which is a non-linear threshold model. The TARCh model is, on the contrary, linear in parameters, since it assumes that the value of the threshold parameter is equal to zero. Another example of a nonlinear TARCh model is the Tree-Structured Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (STGARCh) model by Audrino & Buhlmann (2001). This thesis will, however, work solely with the two most popular asymmetric models, namely the EGARCh model and the TARCh model described in this section.

2.4 Back testing

Since the topic of the thesis is to investigate which VaR model is more appropriate in times of increased volatility, evaluation methods shall be discussed. The choice of a particular back-testing method is important decision and one particular problem while evaluating the various VaR models is caused by the fact that it is not possible to directly observe VaR. The back-testing methods should be based on several criteria. Firstly, it should be the number of cases when the actual market loss was greater than the forecasted VaR by a particular model — from now on the number of *violations*. Moreover, methods should also check that violations are i.i.d. i.e. that they are not correlated.

In the literature on VaR methods, several back-testing methods appear very often and can therefore be considered as standard. One of them is the (un)conditional coverage, as introduced by Christoffersen (1998). This method is able to catch both above mentioned types of forecasting errors, therefore, it will be employed in the thesis. Another approach to back-test VaR forecasts that is sometimes used in the literature is the Engle & Manganelli (1999; 2004) model, which tests for correlated VaR violations. This thesis, however, works solely with the (un)conditional coverage. In the case when two or more VaR

methods prove to provide comparable forecasts, the distinction among them will be based on values of loss functions.

2.4.1 Conditional coverage

The first back-testing method described in this section is the conditional coverage approach. The main source of information in this section comes from the work of Christoffersen (1998), where the conditional coverage test was presented for the first time. In order to create a comprehensive test for the accuracy of a VaR model, the unconditional coverage test will first be introduced and the conditional coverage test will follow. Together, these two test form the so-called Christoffersen's framework.

In order to adhere to the naming conventions, let's denote y_t the sequence of realized returns. Forecasted VaR at time $t + 1$, based on the information available at time t , is further on denoted as $VaR_{t+1|t}$ and p is the coverage probability. An indicator function I_{t+1} , which simply indicates whether or not the forecasted VaR value has been violated, has the following form:

$$I_{t+1} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when } y_{t+1} < VaR_{t+1|t} \\ 0, & \text{when } y_{t+1} \geq VaR_{t+1|t} \end{cases}. \quad (2.25)$$

The advantage of the above specified indicator function is clearly the lack of any assumptions on the distribution of the underlying data generating process. Therefore, it is usable even in situations when the actual distribution of the time series in mind is not known. This is particularly advantageous in the case of financial time series due to their non-standard properties as already discussed in previous sections. According to Christoffersen (1998), the series of indicator function values is i.i.d. and has a Bernoulli distribution with parameter p , ie. $\{I_t\} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} Bern(p)$.

However, the variable of interest for back-testing purposes is the total number of violations $N = \sum_{t=1}^T I_t$, which thanks to the properties of I_t follows a Binomial distribution, ie. $N \sim B(T, p)$. The idea of the unconditional coverage test is to test the actual violations ratio $\pi = \frac{N}{T}$ against the hypothetical ratio denoted as p . Therefore the null and alternative hypotheses of the uncondi-

tional coverage test are:

$$H_0 : p = \pi = \frac{N}{T}$$

$$H_A : p \neq \pi = \frac{N}{T}$$

In order to test the hypotheses, likelihood functions for both hypotheses need to be specified as 2.26 and 2.27. The likelihood functions then form the unconditional Likelihood Ratio (LR) test as represented by the Equation 2.28. The test statistics LR_{UC} is asymptotically distributed according to the chi-squared distribution with one degree of freedom, ie. $LR_{UC} \stackrel{asy}{\sim} \chi^2(1)$. Therefore, critical values for particular significance levels can be obtained from this distribution.

$$L(p; I_1, \dots, I_T) = (1 - p)^{T-N} p^N \quad (2.26)$$

$$L(\pi; I_1, \dots, I_T) = (1 - \pi)^{T-N} \pi^N \quad (2.27)$$

$$LR_{UC} = -2 \ln \left[\frac{L(p; I_1, \dots, I_T)}{L(\pi; I_1, \dots, I_T)} \right] = -2 \ln \left[\frac{(1 - p)^{T-N} p^N}{(1 - \pi)^{T-N} \pi^N} \right] \quad (2.28)$$

Even though, the unconditional coverage test provides information about whether or not the violations ratio actually equals the allowed violations ratio, it is not the complete information that is needed in order to decide on the adequacy of a VaR model. The problem is that the LR_{UC} test does not say anything about the time dependency of violations. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the possible effect of clustered violations. Angelidis *et al.* (2004) points out that the unconditional coverage test can rule out VaR models with both too high and too low violations ratio. On the other hand, Kupiec (1995) argues that the power of the test is generally low.

One possible way, how to test for independence is the Ljung–Box test proposed by Ljung & Box (1978) or the conditional coverage test by Christoffersen (1998). In addition to the unconditional coverage test, the conditional coverage test suggests a test for independence and a test for joint independence — *conditional coverage*. The main advantage of the conditional coverage test lies in a separation of a possible violations clustering effect from assumptions on their distribution. To start with the independence test, it should be noted that the test hypothesis of conditional coverage is tested against a binary first-order Markov chain, represented by the indicator function I_t , with a transition

probability matrix Π_1 , as in 2.29.

$$\Pi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \pi_{01} & \pi_{01} \\ 1 - \pi_{11} & \pi_{11} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \pi_{ij} = P(I_t = j | I_{t-1} = i). \quad (2.29)$$

The likelihood function for the independence test of violations has the form presented in the Equation 2.30. The likelihood function is conditional on the first observation. Parameters of the likelihood function can easily be obtained by maximizing the log-likelihood function across its parameters. In this case, maximum log-likelihood estimates of parameters are simple ratios as in the matrix 2.31, where n_{ij} is a number of observations with value i that occur after the observation j ; $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$.

$$L(\Pi_1; I_1, \dots, I_T) = (1 - \pi_{01})^{n_{00}} \pi_{01}^{n_{01}} (1 - \pi_{11})^{n_{10}} \pi_{11}^{n_{11}} \quad (2.30)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{n_{00}}{n_{00}+n_{01}} & \frac{n_{01}}{n_{00}+n_{01}} \\ \frac{n_{10}}{n_{10}+n_{11}} & \frac{n_{11}}{n_{10}+n_{11}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.31)$$

Denoting Π_2 the independence matrix, the first-order Markov chain estimated on violations can be used to test the null-hypothesis that violations are independently distributed. Maximizing the log-likelihood function of Π_2 yields the estimate $\hat{\Pi}_2$.

$$\Pi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \pi_2 & \pi_2 \\ 1 - \pi_2 & \pi_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.32)$$

$$L(\Pi_2; I_1, \dots, I_T) = (1 - \pi_2)^{n_{00}+n_{01}} \pi_2^{n_{10}+n_{11}} \quad (2.33)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}_2 = \hat{\pi}_2 = \frac{n_{01} + n_{11}}{n_{00} + n_{01} + n_{10} + n_{11}} \quad (2.34)$$

As in the case of the unconditional coverage, the LR test denoted LR_{IND} is constructed from the likelihood functions 2.30 and 2.33. As well as LR_{UC} , the test statistics LR_{IND} is asymptotically distributed according to the chi-squared distribution with one degree of freedom, ie. $LR_{IND} \stackrel{asy}{\sim} \chi^2(1)$. Christoffersen (1998) notes that this test is independent of the actual value of p , thus it really tests only the independence of violations.

$$\begin{aligned} LR_{IND} &= -2 \ln \left[\frac{L(\hat{\Pi}_2; I_1, \dots, I_T)}{L(\hat{\Pi}_1; I_1, \dots, I_T)} \right] \\ &= -2 \ln \left[\frac{(1 - \hat{\pi}_2)^{n_{00}+n_{01}} \hat{\pi}_2^{n_{10}+n_{11}}}{(1 - \hat{\pi}_{01})^{n_{00}} \hat{\pi}_{01}^{n_{01}} (1 - \hat{\pi}_{11})^{n_{10}} \hat{\pi}_{11}^{n_{11}}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

On behalf of the LR_{IND} test, Angelidis *et al.* (2004) summarize that the test can rule out models that “generate either too many or too few clustered violations”, however, they also point out that at least several hundred observations should be available for the test to provide accurate results. The derivation of the conditional coverage test, denoted LR_{CC} , is then straightforward. The test is constructed in the way that the null-hypothesis of the unconditional coverage LR_{UC} is tested against the alternative of the independence test LR_{IND} . Since the distribution of both tests is chi-squared with one degree of freedom and the distribution is additive, the distribution of the conditional coverage test statistic is chi-squared with two degrees of freedom, ie. $LR_{CC} \stackrel{asy}{\sim} \chi^2(2)$. The formula for the conditional coverage test can be written in the form specified by the Equation 2.36.

$$\begin{aligned} LR_{CC} &= -2 \ln \left[\frac{L(p; I_1, \dots, I_T)}{L(\hat{\Pi}_1; I_1, \dots, I_T)} \right] \\ &= LR_{UC} + LR_{IND} \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

2.4.2 Loss function

Loss function is a simple tool that serves the purpose of measuring the accuracy of various calculation methods. As it has been already said, back-testing approaches can mark several VaR methods as adequate — capable of forecasting VaR at a given α -quantile. However, they do not say anything about the accuracy of such forecasts. Therefore, measuring the accuracy of VaR methods is the domain of the loss function.

A general example of a loss function is presented in the work of Lopez (1998), who suggested a loss function derived from the binomial state loss function of Kupiec (1995). The loss function is based on the squared difference between the forecasted VaR and the actual VaR, which means that not only the actual violation but also the magnitude of the violation is taken into account. The loss function as of Lopez (1998), denoted C_{t+1} , is defined by the Expression 2.37, where y_{t+1} is the actual realized return and $VaR_{t+1|t}$ is the forecasted VaR for time period $t + 1$ based on the information set available at time t .

$$C_{t+1} = \begin{cases} 1 + (y_{t+1} - VaR_{t+1|t})^2, & \text{if } y_{t+1} < VaR_{t+1|t} \\ 0, & \text{if } y_{t+1} \geq VaR_{t+1|t} \end{cases} \quad (2.37)$$

The above presented definition is a definition for a loss at time $t + 1$. In

order to be able to compare the forecast accuracy over the entire sample size, C_{t+1} must be summed as $C = \sum_{t=1}^T C_t$. From the definition it is obvious that a VaR method that systematically underestimates the VaR will yield higher value of the loss function than a more accurate method. However, the defined loss function does not penalize systematic overestimation of the VaR. One possibility how to solve this problem is a so-called Quantile Loss (QL) function suggested by Angelidis *et al.* (2004). Another possibility how to overcome the systematic overestimation is to use loss functions defined below. This is the approach adopted by the thesis.

Loss functions defined by equations 2.38 – 2.43 represent several widely used loss functions, as noted by Wei *et al.* (2010). Decision, which one of the provided loss functions to use, is not simple. More information on the topic of choosing an appropriate loss function can be found in the work of Lopez (2001) or Patton (2006). Selected loss functions could be divided into several groups. First there are the Mean Squared Error (MSE) and the Mean Absolute Error (MAE), which are quite simple. Then there are the Heteroskedasticity Adjusted Mean Squared Error (HMSE) and the Heteroskedasticity Adjusted Mean Absolute Error (HMAE). These two loss functions are adjusted for heteroskedasticity. Another widely used loss function is the QLIKE loss function that is calculated as a loss implied by the Gaussian likelihood. The last mentioned loss function is the R²LOG that “*is similar to the R² of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions*” (Wei *et al.* 2010, pp. 1480) .

$$MSE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sigma_t^2 - \hat{\sigma}_t^2 \right)^2 \quad (2.38)$$

$$MAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| \sigma_t^2 - \hat{\sigma}_t^2 \right| \quad (2.39)$$

$$HMSE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \right)^2 \quad (2.40)$$

$$HMAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left| 1 - \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \right| \quad (2.41)$$

$$QLIKE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\ln \hat{\sigma}_t^2 + \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \right) \quad (2.42)$$

$$R^2LOG = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\ln \left(\frac{\sigma_t^2}{\hat{\sigma}_t^2} \right) \right]^2, \quad (2.43)$$

where $\sigma_t^2 = r_t^2$ represents realized volatility at time t and the term $\hat{\sigma}_t^2$ denotes conditional volatility as predicted by one of the GARCH processes at time t , as suggested by Sadorsky (2006).

In order to be able to compare the loss function of various models, one might use the hypothesis test of Diebold & Mariano (2002), which serves the purpose of evaluating the forecasting ability of various models. The hypothesis test is able to work with various loss functions and violation distributions and its null-hypothesis is no difference in the accuracy of two models. To be able to use the hypothesis test, let's define a sequence $\{d\}_{t=1}^T$ as :

$$d_{t+1} = C_{t+1}^A - C_{t+1}^B, \quad (2.44)$$

where C_{t+1}^A is the loss function of a method A and C_{t+1}^B is the loss function of a method B . Since a lower value of the loss function is better than a higher value, $d_t < 0$ indicates that the model A was able to forecast the VaR more accurately than the model B . The idea of the hypothesis test lies in a regression of d_t on a constant and using its Student- t statistic value as the test statistics.

The theoretical introduction to the problematic of the VaR forecast calculation is now complete and it can be applied on real data. To summarize, VaR will be calculated using methods described in this chapter, namely the family of GARCH models – the GARCH, EGARCH, and TARARCH models. The forecasts adequacy will be measured by a back-testing approach based on the conditional coverage test. In the case that the back-testing approach suggests that several VaR methods are adequate, the final decision on the accuracy of VaR methods will be provided by employing above introduced loss functions and testing them for significance.

Chapter 3

Value-at-risk methods application

In order to test the forecasting accuracy of selected value-at-risk models, a strategy has to be developed first. Models are tested on data from six stock indices that are divided into two groups, as it will be described later in more details. Moreover, models are evaluated first on the in-sample data and then their forecasting capabilities are tested on the out-of-sample data. Since the purpose of the thesis is to find out which models have the best forecasting accuracy, the models are ranked according to the theoretical framework described in the previous section.

3.1 Model specification

Even though the thesis tests several hundred models¹, they can all be considered dynamic models. Static models such as the HS method are not discussed in the thesis. The 648 dynamic models, on the other hand, represent a great number of tested models thanks to the variability of VaR model specification.

3.1.1 Dynamic models

The reason for such a high number of dynamic models that are to be tested in the thesis is that dynamic VaR models allow for great variability thanks to possible combinations of methods that model both mean and variance. Previous sections introduced theoretical frameworks of conditional variance and conditional mean, which are essential parts of dynamic models. The conditional mean is modeled exclusively by the ARMA process and conditional volatility by

¹Precisely 648 models for each stock index.

the GARCH family of processes. The Table 3.1 offers a quick illustration of the dynamic model composition possibilities.

Conditional Mean	Conditional Variance
ARMA	GARCH
	EGARCH
	TARCH

Table 3.1: Dynamic model composition

The decision to employ conditional mean while modeling log-returns was based on the fact that there are no other explanatory variables of the model, except for lagged log-returns. In other words, the mean is modeled as an AR process. The stationarity condition of log-returns is achieved by differencing logarithmic prices in the time series. Since the MA process might also be present in a particular time series, it is included in the mean equation as well. Therefore, modeling the mean using an ARMA process seems to be an optimal choice, since it allows for a great variability in the model selection. The actual choice of ARMA process parameters is subject to the following constraint:

$$(ar, ma) \in \{(0, 1), (0, 2), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}.$$

In the literature,² it is often assumed that the GARCH(1, 1) model is the most appropriate choice for the modeling of conditional variance. This thesis does not consider this assumption as a fact that is always true for every financial time series. Therefore, conditional variance in tested models will be modeled using three GARCH based models — GARCH, EGARCH, and TARCH. Moreover, each model will be subject to changing lagged parameters p and q , which will be drawn from the following set:

$$(p, q) \in \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2)\}.$$

The distribution function that models residuals (error term) represents another aspect in the definition of dynamic models. Most statistical software allow to specify the distribution function for residuals in dynamic models. Typically, the normal distribution function, the Student- t distribution function, and the

²Ghahramani & Thavaneswaran (2008); Drost & Klaassen (1997) and others.

GED are available. Calculations in the thesis are performed using the STATA³ software, which is able to work with all three mentioned distribution functions. Thus all possible combinations of parameters (ar, ma) and (p, q) used for the modeling of conditional mean and conditional variance are extended by the three distribution functions.

3.1.2 Ranking methodology

The theoretical framework in the previous chapter introduced several concepts that are used in the practical part of the thesis. So far only the modeling of conditional mean using the ARMA process and the modeling of conditional volatility using the GARCH family of models were described. The process of estimating and evaluating the various models on selected indices would not be complete without the description of the selection procedure that ranks models based on various criteria.

There are several different ways how to rank estimated models. Since models are first estimated on the in-sample subset, one could calculate the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) or Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) and rank models according to information criteria. Some authors such as Pagan & Schwert (1990), however, discourage from evaluating models using the information criteria, since a superior in-sample performance of a particular model does not necessarily mean a superior out-of-sample performance. Another possibility is to rank models according to the value of their log-likelihood function, but then there is again the problem of the in-sample versus the out-of-sample performance as mentioned with the AIC and the BIC criteria. For this reasons, the evaluation procedure is based on the out-of-sample performance.

The main decision criteria used in the thesis depends on the percentage of failures given a particular confidence interval, which is simply a number of cases when the actual realized log-return $r_{t+1|t}$ is less than the forecasted $\text{VaR}_{t+1|t}$. Since this measure does not address issues described in the section about unconditional and conditional coverage, p-values of the unconditional and conditional coverage are included in the ranking procedure as well. Therefore, the discussion about the ranking procedure lead to the decision to base the ranking on the unconditional and conditional coverage, since it is able to capture both the violations rate and the independence of violations.

³The version of STATA used is 11.1. For more information about the software, visit <http://www.stata.com/>

By ranking models according to above mentioned variables, it is meant to simply sort models with respect to the p-value of the conditional coverage test in an ascending order and incrementally assigning each model a number from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, where N represents the total number of actually estimated models. In the case when several models obtain the same p-value of conditional coverage, values of selected loss functions provide final distinction between such models. The comparison of loss function values is performed according to the Diebold & Mariano (2002) framework described in the previous chapter. After all ranking variables have been used to rank the models, there should be one model left that is the most appropriate for the particular index and confidence interval.

3.2 Model application

The analysis of the selected models is performed on six stock indices, which are listed below. Datasets have been selected with the requirement to grasp indices from different parts of the world and not just one or two usual US stock indices. Therefore, in addition to indices from the US, datasets from Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom have been chosen. The indices are the following:

- Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJI) – US stock based index
- SPDR S&P 500 (GSPC) – US stock based index
- NASDAQ Composite (IXIC) – US stock based index
- FTSE 100 (FTSE) – UK stock based index
- German DAX Index (GDAXI) – German stock based index
- NIKKEY 225 (N225) – Japanese stock based index

3.2.1 Data analysis

Each dataset includes exactly 1500 observations from which the first 1000 represent the in-sample subset and the remaining 500 represent the out-of-sample subset. Observations in all datasets are centered around the end of the year 2007 – more precisely 31st December 2007. The reason is to have an artificial point for the division of each dataset into the in-sample and the out-of-sample subsets. Since the stock indices come from several countries and trading dates

are not internationally standardized, the beginning of the in-sample period and the end of the out-of-sample period vary by several days across the indices. Thanks to the clear division point between the subsets and the exact number of observations for each index, it is possible to evaluate the models on all datasets under equal conditions.

In-sample subset

The descriptive summary of the log-returns in the in-sample subset for each index is presented in the Table A.1. Log-returns are based on daily returns. All indices have kurtosis higher than 3, which is the kurtosis of the normal distribution. Moreover, all indices are characterized with a negative skewness, mostly below -0.3 , which is an indication of fat-tails on the left side of the distribution. Histogram plots of the indices on Figure B.3 also indicate that there are fat-tails on the left side of the distribution. Therefore, log-returns might not be distributed normally. The hypothesis that log-returns are normally distributed is tested using the Jarque-Bera test statistic and the results confirm that the null-hypothesis of normality is rejected at all significance levels for each index, except for the IXIC index, where the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at 1% significance level. Values of the Jarque-Bera test statistic and their corresponding p-values are presented in the Table A.1.

Log-return plots of the indices on Figure B.1 and realized volatility plots on Figure B.2 provide a quick view at the volatility of the indices. The in-sample subset is more or less stable and its volatility does not seem to be very high either, which is in line with the data provided in the Table A.1. According to the figures and the summary table, it seems that the indices behave relatively similarly. Both minimum and maximum values are quite similar and also mean and variance values lie around the same values. Closer look at the Figure B.4 with autocorrelation and the Figure B.5 with partial autocorrelation of residuals⁴ suggests that AR and MA processes are present in all indices. The order of AR and MA processes, however, cannot be clearly determined, since partial autocorrelation graphs do not contain a clear pattern. Therefore, the exact number of lags shall be determined by the log-likelihood maximization procedure of a particular dynamic model in the statistical software.

In order to test for the possibility of GARCH family of processes in the variance, figures with squared residuals plots represent a good starting point.

⁴Residuals were obtained by regressing the log-returns of each index on a constant.

Autocorrelation functions are presented in the Figure B.6 and partial autocorrelation functions in the Figure B.7. The IXIC and N225 indices do not seem to include any GARCH family of processes. On the other hand, figures for the rest of the indices do not reject the possibility of GARCH based processes in the in-sample subset. The presence of a GARCH process in the in-sample subset could be determined by maximizing the log-likelihood function of dynamic models, as in the case of the AR process.

The application of the AR process, the MA process and GARCH family of processes is conditioned by stationarity of the time series. Therefore, each in-sample subset has been tested by the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for the presence of a unit root, which would effectively mean that the particular in-sample subset is not stationary. The application of the mentioned process in the presence of a unit root would not be possible. Tables A.3 – A.8 provide results of the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test together with corresponding critical values at three significance levels. From the tables it is clear that the differenced log-returns are stationary, since the null-hypothesis of a unit root up to the tenth lag has been rejected at all significance levels for each index, with the exception of the N225 index, where the null-hypothesis has been rejected at all significance levels only up to the fifth lag. Since models that are to be applied work with a maximum of two lags, higher order autocorrelations should not cause any problems.

Out-of-sample subset

The descriptive summary of the out-of-sample subset is presented in the Table A.2. The subset contains 500 observations for each index, starting on 1st January 2008. From figures of log-returns and realized volatility, it is clear that the out-of-sample subset has much different characteristics than the in-sample subset. Both minimum and maximum values are more extreme and the mean of the indices has shifted from positive values to negative values for all indices. The skewness has actually improved in the sense that it is closer to the skewness of the normal distribution, which is equal to zero. The reason for that might lie in a lower number of observations and a higher number of both extreme positive and negative realized returns. On the other hand, the kurtosis of the indices in the out-of-sample subset has increased and reached values around 7. For most indices, it is almost twice as much as in the in-sample subset. The kurtosis is obvious from the histogram on the Figure B.8. To test the distribution of the

out-of-sample subset for normality, the Jarque–Bera test statistic is employed. P-values of the test statistics reject the null-hypothesis of normality at all significance levels for each index. Actual values of the Jarque–Bera test statistics and their corresponding p-values are presented in the summary table, as well.

The variance of the out-of-sample has also increased. The increase amounts to approximately 5 to 8 times the variance of the in-sample subset, depending on the particular index. The volatility plot depicted on Figure B.2 provides a better illustration of the increase in the log-returns variance. The out-of-sample subset is therefore quite turbulent, which is very suitable for the purpose of the thesis, since the topic is to evaluate various VaR calculation methods in the period of higher volatility. There are also signs of volatility clustering, as indicated on the figures B.1 and B.2.

The autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation functions of residuals⁵, depicted on figures B.9 and B.10 suggest that there might be AR and MA processes in the subset for each index, since autocorrelation functions are slowly decreasing and partial autocorrelation functions contain spikes at certain lags. As well as in the in-sample subset, the actual order of AR and MA processes varies index by index and it seems that AR and MA processes are of a high order, since there are typically up to ten significant lags. This could be interpreted as a long-time memory of the process, which means that the past realized log-returns might play a significant role in the calculation of the conditional mean.

Graphical analysis of squared residuals, depicted on the autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation function on figures B.11 and B.12, attempts to provide an insight on the behavior of the variance of the indices during the out-of-sample period. As well as in the in-sample subset, the GARCH family of processes seems to be present in the out-of-sample subset for all indices except for the GDAXI index. The highest order GARCH process seems to be present in the FTSE and the N225 indices.

From the analysis of the in-sample and the out-of-sample subsets it is clear that the data have quite different properties. Since the models are estimated on the in-sample data and then applied on the out-of-sample data, it is interesting to observe, whether or not the models are able to use the past realized log-returns at time t in order to provide an appropriate VaR forecast for time $t + 1$. Results of the models application are discussed in following sections. The results are analyzed on per index basis, since every model is estimated separately for each index. The evaluation of the models proceeds with the

⁵Residuals were obtained by regressing the log-returns of each index on a constant.

analysis of the top in-sample estimated models, according to their rank based on AIC and Log-Likelihood (LL) values. Then the top out-of-sample VaR model evaluation, based on the rank of the unconditional and conditional coverage, completes the analysis of the accuracy of the various models for a particular index.

As well as in the case of the in-sample subset, the out-of-sample subset must fulfill the condition of stationarity, when the AR process, the MA process and the GARCH family of processes are to be applied. Stationarity of the indices is tested using the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test and the results of the test for each out-of-sample subset are available in tables A.9 – A.14. From the results it is clear that the null-hypothesis of a unit root up to the tenth lag has been rejected at all significance levels for each out-of-sample subset, with the exception of the N225 index, as it was the case also for the in-sample subset. The unit root of the N225 index has been rejected at all significance levels up to the sixth lag. Since the considered models work with a maximum of two lags, the autocorrelation of squared residuals at higher lags should not represent a problem.

3.2.2 DJI index

In the in-sample subset summary section it is concluded that according to the Jarque-Bera statistic, the DJI timeseries is not normally distributed. The main reason is in the presence of a fat-tail on the left side of the distribution, where negative log-returns are depicted. It is therefore not surprising that when the estimated models are ranked by their AIC and LL values, the top ranking models are the ones that assume either the Student- t or the GED for the distribution of the residuals. The residuals' estimated degrees of freedom parameter of the Student- t distribution lies in most cases between 7 and 8 and the shape parameter for the GED lies between 1.4 and 1.5.

The results of the Portmanteau Q test for serial autocorrelation are presented in the Table 3.2. Even though the test does not reject the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals at 2 lags at 3% significance level, the best in-sample ranking models employ either the TAR(2,2) process or the EGARCH(2,1) for conditional variance. The list of the top eight in-sample models is in the Table 3.3 and the estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.1. From the Table 3.2 it is obvious that the application of the conditional volatility pro-

cess TAR(2,2) has a positive effect on the serial autocorrelation of squared residuals. The null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at the selected lags cannot be rejected at 6.54% significance level in all cases.

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	1.5563	0.2122
Portmanteau Q(2)	6.7867	0.0336
Portmanteau Q(3)	16.7373	0.0008
Portmanteau Q(5)	66.3841	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	164.6121	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.0847	0.7711
Portmanteau Q(2)	0.3818	0.8262
Portmanteau Q(3)	0.5157	0.9154
Portmanteau Q(5)	6.6990	0.2440
Portmanteau Q(10)	17.4277	0.0654

Table 3.2: Serial autocorrelation tests for the DJI index

Quite surprising is the fact that the top ranking in-sample models are dominated by the order of the particular TAR or EGARCH process and the orders of the AR and MA processes seem to play a minor role. In other words, the most dominant factor, while estimating the in-sample models on the DJI index, is the conditional volatility. It might, however, be possible that the process, which models the conditional volatility, is of a higher order than in the estimated models, since the models are estimated only up to $p = q = 2$. To summarize, the in-sample model estimates prove that the distribution of the log-returns is not normally distributed and that the log-returns are not homoskedastic.

To test the accuracy of the one-day-ahead VaR forecast, the estimated models are applied to the out-of-sample data. Since the out-of-sample data exhibit higher volatility, it is not surprising that the best performing out-of-sample models are different from the best performing in-sample models. The evaluation of the accuracy of the models is calculated for the following confidence intervals $\alpha = \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$. The top eight performing models for the VaR forecasts for the DJI index are presented in the tables A.15, A.16 and A.17, according to the selected confidence level. It is interesting that even though the TAR and EGARCH models are selected during the in-sample estimation, they exhibit very poor results in the out-of-sample evaluation.

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(2)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7172.359	3598.180
AR(2)-MA(2)-EGARCH(1,2)-GED	-7164.760	3593.380
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7164.157	3595.079
AR(0)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7163.590	3591.795
AR(1)-MA(0)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7163.579	3591.790
AR(1)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-7163.299	3591.649
AR(2)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,1)-GED	-7162.218	3593.109
AR(2)-MA(0)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7161.605	3591.803

Table 3.3: Top eight in-sample models for the DJI index

None of the out-of-sample top performing models uses the TARCH and EGARCH process for the conditional volatility.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

The most accurate forecasts of the one-day-ahead VaR are achieved with models that assume the Student- t distribution with 8 degrees of freedom as the distribution for the error term. The degrees of freedom parameter is estimated using the statistical software while estimating the models. The low number of degrees of freedom corresponds to the presence of fat-tails discovered during the in-sample data analysis. The top eight out-of-sample models are presented in the Table A.15 in the Appendix A. Unlike the in-sample models, the out-of-sample models are dominated by models that model conditional volatility using the GARCH(2,1) process, as it is the case with five out of eight models. The remaining three models use GARCH(1,1) process for modeling the conditional volatility.

All of the top eight models underestimate the VaR by a small amount, as the percentage of cases, when the VaR forecast does not exceed the realized log-return, lies between 12.4% and 12.6%. Since the unconditional coverage measures whether the percentage of failures corresponds to the desired α level and punishes deviations to both sides equally, the p-value of the unconditional coverage, p_{uc} , is quite small. Nevertheless, at the significance level of 5% one cannot reject the null-hypothesis in either of the eight models. Similar situation is with the p-value of the conditional coverage, p_{cc} . When this value is used as the main selection criterion, there are only three models left that cannot be rejected at the 5% significance level and all three of them have the same value of p_{cc} . The differences among them are quite small, however, the priority is

given to the model which performs better in means of the loss function values. Therefore, the most accurate VaR model for the DJI index at confidence interval $\alpha = 0.90$ is the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T model.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

As well as for the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.90$, the most accurate VaR forecasts are achieved with the Student- t distribution with 8 degrees of freedom as the assumed distribution for the error term. The top eight out-of-sample models are listed in the Table A.16. The prevailing process for modeling the conditional volatility at this confidence level is the GARCH(1,1) process, with four out of eight cases. The remaining conditional volatility processes are GARCH(2,1) and GARCH(2,2). The conditional mean process does not seem to follow any particular pattern, as the order of the AR processes varies from 0 to 2. The same situation is with the MA process.

The models at this confidence level also underestimate the VaR. Quick look at the failure rate proves that the failure rate, ranging from 7.0% to 7.4%, is more than the expected rate of 5%. The result of such underestimation is projected to the p-value of the unconditional coverage, which is higher than 5% only in two cases. The value of the conditional coverage p-value is somewhat better, since six out of eight models pass the selection criterion at 5% significance level, however, based on the value of p_{cc} , there are only two superior models. To select a single model with the best performance, the realized values of the loss functions are compared. The best performing VaR model for the DJI index at confidence interval $\alpha = 0.95$ is the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,2)-T model.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

Concerning the distribution of the error term, the evaluation at the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.99$ does not differ from the previous confidence intervals. The top eight performing out-of-sample models are presented in the Table A.17. All of the eight best performing models model the conditional volatility as a GARCH(1,1) process. The AR and MA processes do not seem to follow a specific pattern and their orders range from 0 to 2.

At this confidence level, all eight models achieve the same failure rate of 1%, which is exactly the expected value of the failure rate. The exact performance is projected to the value of the conditional coverage p_{cc} , as well as to the

value of the unconditional coverage, p_{uc} , which is equal to one. Moreover, each model passes the selection criteria of unconditional and conditional coverage at quite high significance levels. Since the models attain the same p -values of the conditional coverage p_{cc} they are compared using the values of the loss functions, which leads to the conclusion that at the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.99$ the model AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T is the best performing one for the DJI index.

Note

There are three models that appear in all three tables (A.15, A.16 and A.17) with the best performing models for the given confidence intervals. These models are the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T model, then the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T model and the AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T model. This could be interpreted as three possibilities how to model the log-returns for the DJI index, when the confidence interval is abstracted from. On the other hand, at two of the three confidence intervals there is at least one model, which outperforms the three mentioned models, in terms of the p_{cc} value. Thus the decision on whether or not to consider one of these models as an appropriate general model for the DJI index, should be considered carefully.

The results prove that in the case of the DJI index it is not optimal to calculate one-day-ahead VaR using models that attain the highest values of either AIC or LL. Even though these models might perform relatively well on the in-sample subset, they do not provide adequate results when applied to the out-of-sample subset. Conditional volatility processes such as EGARCH and TARARCH seem to be adequate in quite stable times in terms of volatility. On the other hand, when a period with higher volatility is expected, the results suggest to use a simple GARCH model, for example the GARCH(1,1) model, since it outperforms the other models in terms of the conditional coverage test, which captures both accuracy of the VaR forecast and the independence of the realized violations of the predicted VaR.

3.2.3 GSPC index

Looking at the GSPC index histogram plot depicted on the Figure B.3, it is clear that the log-returns distribution cannot be considered as the normal distribution. There seems to be a quite high number of extremely negative log-returns, which lie above the line representing the border of the normal

distribution. The hypothesis of normally distributed log-returns is therefore rejected by the Jarque-Bera test, as presented in the in-sample summary table. The value of the test statistic is even higher than for the DJI index. Thus the best performing in-sample models, in terms of AIC and LL values, are the ones working with either the Student- t or the GED as the distribution for the error term. The estimated degrees of freedom parameter for the Student- t distribution lies at 7.5 and the estimated shape parameter for the GED is approximately 1.4. Both values indicate fat-tails in the distribution.

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	4.9255	0.0265
Portmanteau Q(2)	15.5650	0.0004
Portmanteau Q(3)	33.0938	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(5)	100.3342	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	248.9185	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.0001	0.9915
Portmanteau Q(2)	0.0001	0.9999
Portmanteau Q(3)	0.0003	1.0000
Portmanteau Q(5)	5.4464	0.3639
Portmanteau Q(10)	12.6551	0.2436

Table 3.4: Serial autocorrelation tests for the GSPC index

The Table 3.4 with results of the Portmanteau Q test for serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals indicates that a serial autocorrelation process is most likely part of the time series. Since the test for serial autocorrelation of order two and more rejects the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation of the specified order, the best in-sample models should include a conditional volatility modeling process. This is indeed the case, as all the best in-sample models use the EGARCH(2,2) process in order to model conditional volatility, as presented in the Table 3.5 and estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.2. The Table 3.4 provides results of the Portmanteau Q test after the application of the conditional volatility process EGARCH(2,2). The process effectively captures the serial autocorrelation, since the null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at selected lags cannot be rejected even at 24.36% significance level in all cases.

The best in-sample VaR models are dominated by the conditional volatility

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(1)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-7102.982	3562.491
AR(1)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-7102.257	3562.129
AR(2)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-7101.815	3561.907
AR(0)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-7100.620	3561.310
AR(0)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-7100.537	3560.269
AR(2)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-7100.476	3561.238
AR(1)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-7100.182	3562.091
AR(2)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-7100.044	3562.022

Table 3.5: Top eight in-sample models for the GSPC index

part. The conditional mean is modeled with multiple combinations of AR and MA processes with orders ranging from 0 to 2. Therefore, it is obvious that volatility plays the most important role in the prediction of the one-day-ahead VaR. It is possible that orders of the EGARCH process are not the most optimal ones, since the tested models are of a maximum order $p = q = 2$. The presence of the conditional volatility process corresponds with the outcomes of the performed Portmanteau Q tests for serial autocorrelation.

The application of the estimated models on the out-of-sample data is a good stress test, since the out-of-sample subset is more volatile than the in-sample subset. This might be the reason, why the best in-sample models are all outperformed by models with different conditional volatility modeling process. In fact, none of the top eight in-sample models appears in the result tables for the out-of-sample period. All models are calculated for three confidence intervals $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$ and the best performing out-of-sample models are summarized in the tables A.18, A.19 and A.20.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

The best out-of-sample results of the GSPC index at the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.90$ are achieved under the assumption that the error term is distributed according to the Student- t distribution with 7 to 8 degrees of freedom. This is in line with the results of the DJI index, where the distribution and its parameters are very similar. The top eight models for this confidence interval treat the conditional volatility as a GARCH process, five out of them as GARCH(1,1) process, one as a GARCH(1,2) and two as a GARCH(2,2). The top eight models are summarized in the Table A.18.

All eight best performing models underestimate the VaR, since the fail-

ure rate lies between 12.0% and 13.2%, even though the theoretical failure rate should be 10%. The difference between the lowest and the highest values amounts to 1.2%, which is the highest difference among the selected indices and confidence intervals. On the other hand, the p-values of the unconditional coverage test, p_{uc} , indicate that one cannot reject the null-hypothesis of the failure rate being equal to 10% at a significance level 5% for five models. The p-values of the conditional coverage test, however, are not as high. The null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at the significance level of 1% at the most. It seems that violations of the predicted VaR are not randomly distributed and they appear repeatedly one after another. To conclude the evaluation at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval, the most accurate model seems to be the AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T model, since it exhibits the highest values of both conditional and unconditional coverage and the values of its loss functions are the lowest among the compared models.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

Although the best results at this confidence interval are achieved with the Student- t distribution such as in the previous confidence interval, the estimated number of degrees of freedom is closer to 7, for all models. The conditional variance process differs from the process at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval. Even though the conditional variance is still modeled using the GARCH process, as opposed to the in-sample EGARCH process, its parameters are different. Five out of eight models are modeled using the GARCH(2,1) process, two with GARCH(1,1) process and one with GARCH(2,2) process.

The top eight out-of-sample models underestimate the VaR, as the failure rates lie between 7.2% and 8.2%. This fact is reflected in the p-value of the unconditional coverage that suggests, that the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 3.37% significance level only for two models. Even worse numbers attain the p-value of the conditional coverage. The values do not even reach 1%, which indicates that even the best performing models are not very precise. As well as in the previous case, the violations of the log-returns are followed one by another, which worsens the value of the conditional coverage. According to the discussed p-values and the values of the loss functions, the best performing model for the GSPC index at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval is the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T model.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

The results of the evaluation at the highest confidence interval considered are quite similar to the results of the evaluation at the same confidence interval for the DJI index. The error term is assumed to be distributed according to the Student- t distribution with 7 degrees of freedom. This is in line with the presence of a fat-tail on the negative side of the log-returns for this stock index. Six out of eight models take advantage of the conditional variance process modeled as a GARCH(2,1) process. The remaining two models are modeled using the GARCH(1,1) process. The models vary in the orders of the AR and the MA process, as their orders attain values from 0 to 2. The table with the results is presented in the appendix as the Table A.20.

None of the models overestimates the VaR, which means that the failure rates are greater than 1% for all top eight models. Quite interesting is the fact that all models have the same values of both the unconditional and conditional coverage. Thus one cannot reject the null-hypothesis of either test even at the significance level of 66.3%. On the other hand, the p-values of the tests in mind are usually quite high for the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval. The decision to select one model out of the eight as the best one therefore depends only on the values of the loss functions. Surprising is the fact that according to the values of the loss functions, the winning model is using the GARCH(1,1) process for conditional volatility, even though the majority of the top eight models uses GARCH(2,1) process for the conditional volatility. To conclude, the best performing model for the GSPC index at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval is the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T model. One must, however, keep in mind that all eight models exhibit the same values of both the conditional and unconditional volatility.

Note

Unlike as in the case of the DJI index, there is not any particular model that is present in each table with the best scoring models for a given confidence interval. Important fact from the analysis of the GSPC index is that all models at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval are rejected based on the p-values of the conditional coverage, since the p-values are less than 1%.

As well as for the DJI index, the most accurate one-day-ahead VaR forecasts are not achieved with in-sample models that prove to be the best performing ones based on AIC and LL values. The top in-sample models model conditional

volatility exclusively with the EGARCH process; however, the out-of-sample data are quite different from the in-sample data and therefore the conditional volatility process is not the same. Since the best results for the one-day-ahead VaR are achieved using the GARCH process, this process is the recommended conditional volatility process for the GSPC index in period with higher volatility.

3.2.4 IXIC index

The histogram plot of IXIC index log-returns is depicted on the Figure B.3. The histogram indicates kurtosis greater than 3 and a negative skewness. The negative skewness is an indicator of a fat-tail on the left side of the distribution, which means that negative log-returns occur more often than they should appear according to the normal distribution. The summary table of the in-sample subset confirms the information from the figure and provides exact numbers. The normality of the log-returns of the IXIC index is tested using the Jarque-Bera test statistic in the same way as by the previous indices. Interesting result is that the normality test cannot be rejected at the 1% significance level. The 5% significance level, however, already rejects the null-hypothesis. Therefore it could be expected that some of the best performing in-sample models should use normal distribution as the distribution of the error term. This proves to be true, since two out of the eight best performing models actually use normal distribution for the error term. The other six models use the Student- t distribution with 16 to 21 degrees of freedom.

The results of the Portmanteau test for serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals are presented in the Table 3.6. There does not seem to be any serial autocorrelation at lag one, since the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at 50% significance level. The tests for serial autocorrelation at 2 or more lags, however, already reject the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation. Therefore it can be expected that the best performing in-sample models should be the ones that model conditional variance with a process of at least two orders. Indeed, the expectation is confirmed as all of the top eight in-sample models employ an EGARCH process with two lags for the autocorrelation term as the conditional volatility process. The table with the top eight in-sample models is provided in Table 3.7 and the estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.3. The top in-sample model seems to be an appropriate one, considering the application of the conditional volatility process, as presented in the Table 3.6, which provides the results of the Portmanteau Q

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.4496	0.5025
Portmanteau Q(2)	12.6987	0.0017
Portmanteau Q(3)	16.6745	0.0008
Portmanteau Q(5)	41.7432	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	111.6832	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.4185	0.5177
Portmanteau Q(2)	0.4216	0.8100
Portmanteau Q(3)	0.9758	0.8071
Portmanteau Q(5)	1.8497	0.8695
Portmanteau Q(10)	9.4724	0.4879

Table 3.6: Serial autocorrelation tests for the IXIC index

test after the application of the conditional volatility process EGARCH(2,2). The serial autocorrelation is effectively captured, since the null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at the selected lags cannot be rejected even at 48.79% significance level in all cases.

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(0)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-6525.862	3273.931
AR(1)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-N	-6523.866	3271.933
AR(0)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-N	-6523.205	3271.602
AR(0)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6516.296	3267.148
AR(1)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6516.290	3267.145
AR(0)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6515.787	3267.893
AR(2)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6515.675	3267.837
AR(1)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6515.362	3268.681

Table 3.7: Top eight in-sample models for the IXIC index

The top eight in-sample models are all based on the EGARCH(2,1) or the EGARCH(2,2) processes as the conditional volatility modeling part. It is important to mention that the models are estimated for $p = q = 2$ at the most. Thus it might be possible that the actual conditional volatility process is of a higher order than the estimated ones. It has been noted that the Jarque-Bera test did not reject the null-hypothesis of normality of the log-returns at the 1% significance level. Therefore it is not surprising that two out of the eight

models actually consider normal distribution as the distribution for the error term.

Since the out-of-sample subset has greater volatility and kurtosis, the application of the models on the out-of-sample subset might change the order of the best performing models. A likely outcome is that the models that use normal distribution for the error term will not score among the top eight models. The models are evaluated at three confidence intervals $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$ and the best performing out-of-sample models are summarized in the tables A.21, A.22 and A.23.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

The models evaluation results on the out-of-sample subset are quite consistent in terms of the conditional volatility process. Six out of the top eight out-of-sample models are modeled using the GARCH(1,1) process for the conditional volatility with Student- t as the optimal distribution for the error term. The degrees of freedom parameter ranges from 16 to 17. The other two models take advantage of the GARCH(2,2) process with the same distribution function for the error term as the GARCH(1,1) process. The results for the IXIC index at this confidence interval are similar to the results for the two previous indices, when the conditional volatility process is mostly GARCH(1,1).

A quick look at the table with the top eight models at this confidence interval provides an indication that even the best performing models underestimate the VaR. The failure rate is quite high, as it ranges from 13.2% to 14.2%, even though the required failure rate lies at 10%. The underlying conditional volatility process is not able to capture the behavior of the out-of-sample subset very precisely. This is also observable on the p-values of the unconditional and conditional coverage. Ranking the models based on the unconditional coverage, the models cannot be rejected only at the 2.23% significance level, at the highest. The conditional coverage values provide even less convincing information about the predicting accuracy of the models, as the p-values are less than 1%. Even though the results are not as good as expected, the best model among the eight models at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval can still be selected. Based on the values of the conditional coverage and the loss functions, it is the AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T model.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

Among the successful models at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval there are models with two types of the conditional volatility process. There are six models that employ the GARCH(1,1) process for the conditional volatility, such as at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval. Moreover there are two models that take advantage of the GARCH(2,2) process. All of the models use the Student- t distribution for the error term, with 16 to 17 degrees of freedom. Should the number of top performing models be greater than 20, there would also be several models that use the normal distribution for the error term. This observation is in line with the suggestion made in the introductory part of the IXIC index.

As well as at the previous confidence interval, the results of models applications on the out-of-sample subset do not provide satisfactory results. The failure rates range from 7.8% to 8.0%, which is significantly higher than the expected 5% failure rate. Therefore, the p-values of the unconditional coverage lie all below the 1% value. The null-hypothesis of the failure rate being equal to 5% can thus be rejected even at the significance level of 1%. The values of the conditional coverage are even smaller, which means that the null-hypothesis can be rejected at the significance level of 1% for all models. The four models with the highest values of the conditional coverage are then compared based on loss functions values. Based on this criteria, the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T model is selected as a model with the best performance at the confidence interval of $\alpha = 0.95$. It is important to note, however, that based on the values of the conditional coverage, none of the models proves to be an adequate one.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

The top eight performing out-of-sample models at the confidence interval of $\alpha = 0.99$ are the same models as for the confidence interval of $\alpha = 0.99$ in the DJI index, which is an interesting outcome. The distribution of the error term is assumed to be the Student- t with 16 to 17 degrees of freedom. At the first sight, it might seem that the behavior of the IXIC index can be captured with the GARCH(1,1) process for the conditional volatility. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the values of the unconditional and conditional coverage — the main selection criteria — are not very convincing.

This is true also for the results of the evaluation at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval. Even though the expected failure rate of the one-day-ahead VaR

forecast is equal to 1%, the observed failure rates range from 1.8% to 2.0%. This corresponds to the p-values of the unconditional coverage which indicate that the null-hypothesis of a failure rate equal to 1% cannot be rejected at the significance level of 10% only in two cases. In comparison with the p-values of the unconditional coverage for DJI and GSPC indices, where the same p-values are mostly over 60%, the p-values for the IXIC index are not very convincing. The same situation is with the p-values of the conditional coverage, since only two models reach a value greater than 20%. Based on this information and the loss functions values, the most accurate model for the IXIC index at the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.99$ is the AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T model, even though its p-values of both the unconditional and conditional coverage are not very persuasive.

Note

The distribution of the IXIC index log-returns resembles the normal distribution at the most among the selected indices. On the other hand, the shape of the out-of-sample distribution is not the same, which is the most likely reason why the results of the out-of-sample evaluation do not provide convincing results. The models achieve low p-values of both unconditional and conditional coverage and the failure rates are quite high. The AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T model is selected as the best performing one for the confidence intervals $\alpha = 0.95$ and $\alpha = 0.99$ and the AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T for the $\alpha = 0.90$. It seems that the underlying process for the conditional mean consists of an autoregressive part of order one and that the conditional volatility is at the best modeled using the GARCH(1,1) process. Based on the selection criteria, the decision to employ the winning models should be carefully considered.

The outcome of the analysis is quite similar to the outcomes of the previous two indices. Even though the EGARCH process performs very well for the in-sample subset, which exhibits lower volatility, the one-day-ahead VaR forecasts based on the out-of-sample subset provide different results. The best accuracy is achieved when the conditional volatility process is modeled using the GARCH process. Thus also the results for the IXIC index confirm that the best in-sample models based on the AIC and LL values are not the suggested models for periods with higher volatility.

3.2.5 FTSE index

The properties of the in-sample subset of the FTSE index are provided in the Table A.1. The histogram on Figure B.3 indicates that the FTSE index log-returns exhibit a significant kurtosis and most likely also skewness. This suspicion is confirmed by the properties table referenced above, from which it is obvious that the FTSE index has the highest kurtosis of all selected indices. The same situation is with the skewness, which indicates a fat-tail on the side of the negative log-returns. In order to test the log-returns for normality, the Jarque-Bera test is employed. According to the test statistic, the null-hypothesis of normality is rejected, which is in line with the observed characteristics from the histogram. This is also the reason why the top eight in-sample models, which are ranked according to the values of AIC and LL, work with the assumption that the error term is distributed either according to Student- t distribution with 16 to 22 degrees of freedom or the GED distribution with the shape parameter equal to 1.8. Both parameters indicate fat-tails in the log-returns distribution.

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	78.6563	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(2)	109.4573	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(3)	172.0104	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(5)	329.7434	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	466.1323	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.0609	0.8052
Portmanteau Q(2)	0.2388	0.8874
Portmanteau Q(3)	0.2538	0.9685
Portmanteau Q(5)	0.3649	0.9962
Portmanteau Q(10)	4.1620	0.9397

Table 3.8: Serial autocorrelation tests for the FTSE index

To test for the possibility of serially correlated squared residuals, the Portmanteau Q test is employed. The results of the test, as presented in the Table 3.8, provide an insight on the likely outcome of the top in-sample models. The test at lag one rejects the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation at lag one and the subsequent tests at higher lags also reject the null-hypothesis. It

is therefore expected that the top in-sample models take advantage of a conditional volatility process. The expectation is confirmed, since the top eight in-sample models, as presented in the Table 3.9, all model volatility with either the EGARCH or the TARCH process. The estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.4. The application of the EGARCH(1,1) process while dealing with the serial autocorrelation of squared residuals is able to remove the serial autocorrelation quite well. The Table 3.8 provides the results of the Portmanteau Q test. The serial autocorrelation is effectively captured, since the null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at the selected lags cannot be rejected even at 80.52% significance level in all cases.

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(2)-MA(2)-EGARCH(1,1)-T	-7249.064	3634.532
AR(2)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-T	-7067.065	3545.533
AR(1)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-T	-7067.033	3545.517
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,1)-T	-7066.537	3545.268
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-T	-7066.464	3546.232
AR(2)-MA(1)-TARCH(1,1)-T	-7066.083	3542.042
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-7066.015	3546.007
AR(1)-MA(0)-TARCH(1,1)-T	-7065.887	3539.944

Table 3.9: Top eight in-sample models for the FTSE index

The top eight in-sample models are mostly the ones using the TARCH process for the conditional volatility process, with one exception that is represented by the EGARCH process. The parameters of the conditional volatility processes, p and q , range from one to two, which is in line with the outcomes of the Portmanteau Q test that rejects the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals at lags one and greater. It is, however, possible that the maximum order of $p = q = 2$ is not large enough to capture the underlying volatility process. Seven out of the eight models work under the assumption of the Student- t distribution for the error term and one is taking advantage of the GED distribution. As already mentioned, this is in line with the outcome of the Jarque-Bera test statistic, which rejects normality of the log-returns.

Although the out-of-sample subset of the FTSE index exhibits a value of skewness closer to zero, the kurtosis is higher. The value of the Jarque-Bera test statistic is even higher than in the in-sample subset, which means that the out-of-sample subset is not normally distributed. The variance of the log-returns is also significantly higher. It is therefore expected that the order of the best

performing models might be quite different from order of the in-sample models. The models are evaluated at three confidence intervals $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$ and the best performing out-of-sample models are summarized in the tables A.24, A.25 and A.26.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

The top out-of-sample models for the FTSE index at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval are all working under the assumption of the Student- t distribution with 11 degrees of freedom for the error term. Quite good results achieve also models that assume the normal distribution for the error term, since they account for almost half of the models in the top 50. The conditional volatility process is among the top eight models modeled five times using the GARCH(1,1) process, two models use the GARCH(2,1) process and one model the GARCH(2,2) process.

The failure rates at this confidence interval are similar to the failure rates of the IXIC index, since the failure rates range from 13.0% to 13.4%. According to the p-values of the unconditional coverage, the expected failure rate of 10% for the one-day-ahead VaR forecast cannot be rejected at 3.17% at the highest. This indicates that even the top eight out-of-sample models are not able to capture the behavior of the log-returns very well. The p-values of the conditional coverage select three models with the same p-value $p_{cc} = 0.0979$, which means that the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at the significance level 9.79%. These results are better than the results of the DJI, GSPC and IXIC indices. The values of the loss functions further distinguish the three models. Based on their values, the best performing model for the FTSE index at the confidence interval of $\alpha = 0.90$ is the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T model.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

The results of the models evaluation on the out-of-sample data at this confidence interval provide mixed results. Even though all models assume the Student- t distribution for the error term, the degrees of freedom parameter is estimated to be equal to 12, as opposed to 11 for the previous confidence interval. The models indicate a presence of an autoregressive process in the conditional volatility process and the order of the process ranges from one to two.

Looking at the failure rates, it is obvious that the models are not able to predict the one-day-ahead VaR very accurately. The failure rates range from 7.8% to 8.0%, which is quite large. Therefore the unconditional coverage test rejects the null-hypothesis of the failure rate equal to 5% even at the 1% significance level. It is interesting to note that the p-values are similar to the p-values of the IXIC index at the same confidence interval. On the other hand, the p-values of the conditional coverage test are higher and four models achieve the same value of 2.87%. When the models are further on compared based on the values of their loss functions, there is one model with the lowest achieved value in two of the three selected loss functions. Therefore, the AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T model seems to be the most adequate one for the FTSE index at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

As well as in the previous confidence interval, the top eight models for the confidence interval $\alpha = 0.95$ differ in the orders of the underlying conditional volatility process. The Table A.26 provides a list of these models together with the values of the selection criteria. The best results are achieved using the Student- t distribution for the error term with 11 degrees of freedom. Models assuming the normal distribution begin to appear in the results table starting on the 35th position.

In comparison with the other five indices, the failure rates for the FTSE index at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval are the highest. Even the best performing models are not able to forecast the one-day-ahead VaR with a failure rate lower than 2.6%. To be precise, the failure rates range from 2.6% to 2.8%. This is the reason why none of the models attains the p-value of the unconditional coverage greater than 1%, which means that the null-hypothesis of the failure rate being equal to 1% is rejected for all models at the 1% significance level. The same applies to the values of the conditional coverage, as the highest achieved value is equal to 0.8%. Nevertheless, to continue with the same procedure as with the previous indices, the values of the loss functions provide the final decision on the models performance. The lowest loss functions values are achieved with the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T model, however, the model is still rejected at the significance level of 1%.

Note

The results of the application of the models on the out-of-sample subset do not provide satisfactory results. The reason is the same as for the IXIC index. The in-sample subset is quite different from the out-of-sample subset and the selected models are not able to accurately capture the difference. This is apparent in the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval, where all models are rejected at 1% significance level. The AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T model is present among the top eight models for all three confidence intervals, however, it is selected as the best performing one only for the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval. Selecting this model as a general model for the FTSE index when the confidence interval is abstracted from, is thus discouraged.

The application of the top AIC and LL based models on the FTSE index out-of-sample data is not an optimal choice. None of the in-sample models is able to accurately forecast the one-day-ahead VaR. Interesting observation is that even for the FTSE index it is optimal to employ models that take advantage of a GARCH conditional volatility process, as such models provide the best forecasts. It is important to note, however, that even those models do not provide acceptable forecasts. Thus it is obvious that a simple estimation of a model in an in-sample subset does not ensure an adequate forecasting accuracy on the out-of-sample subset.

3.2.6 GDAXI index

The log-returns histogram of the GDAXI index is presented on the Figure B.3, such as the other indices. From the histogram it is apparent that the distributions suffers from a quite strong fat-tail on the side of the negative log-returns. The kurtosis seems to be well above the kurtosis of the normal distribution. The detailed analysis of the in-sample subset in the Table A.1 confirms that both the kurtosis and skewness deviate from the values of these properties in the normal distribution. The Jarque-Bera test statistic rejects the null-hypothesis of normally distributed log-returns at the 1% significance level. It is therefore not surprising that the top in-sample models are not the ones that assume normal distribution for the error term. The order of the in-sample models is obtained in the same way as for the previous indices — the models are ranked according to their AIC and LL values.

The Table 3.10 provides the results of the Portmanteau Q test for serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals for the GDAXI index. The test cannot

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	3.3375	0.0677
Portmanteau Q(2)	26.4240	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(3)	49.6646	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(5)	72.8182	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	131.1777	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.5895	0.4426
Portmanteau Q(2)	0.6652	0.7170
Portmanteau Q(3)	0.7002	0.8731
Portmanteau Q(5)	1.2781	0.9372
Portmanteau Q(10)	6.7858	0.7455

Table 3.10: Serial autocorrelation tests for the GDAXI index

reject the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation at lag one at 5% significance level. On the other hand, when the test is applied on lags greater than two, the value of the test statistic rejects the null-hypothesis. The interpretation of the test results is that the best in-sample models most likely contain a conditional volatility process with order two. It might be possible that the actual order of the serial autocorrelation is greater than two, however, the thesis works with conditional volatility processes of a maximum order $p = q = 2$, so a higher order serial autocorrelation will not be estimated for. The Table 3.10 provides the results of the Portmanteau Q test after the application of the conditional volatility process TARCH(2,2). The serial autocorrelation is effectively captured, since the null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at the selected lags cannot be rejected even at 44.26% significance level in all cases.

As listed in the Table 3.11, all of the top performing models in terms of their AIC value take advantage of the conditional volatility modeled as a TARCH process. Interesting observation is that the models work exclusively with the GED distribution as the distribution for the error term. The shape parameter of the distribution is estimated to be approximately 1.5. As it is suggested by the Portmanteau Q test, the order of the autoregressive part of the TARCH process is equal to two in seven out of eight cases. There is one model though that models the conditional volatility as a TARCH(1,1) process. The estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.5.

The Table A.2 with the properties of the out-of-sample subset provides an

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6632.773	3329.387
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,1)-GED	-6631.912	3327.956
AR(2)-MA(2)-TARCH(1,1)-GED	-6631.805	3325.902
AR(1)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6630.230	3326.115
AR(1)-MA(0)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6629.695	3324.848
AR(0)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6629.664	3324.832
AR(1)-MA(2)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6628.365	3326.182
AR(2)-MA(1)-TARCH(2,2)-GED	-6628.364	3326.182

Table 3.11: Top eight in-sample models for the GDAXI index

insight on the shape of the out-of-sample log-returns. Both the skewness and kurtosis differ significantly and so does the volatility of the subset. Based on the results of the evaluation of the previous indices, it is expected that the top in-sample models might not score among the top out-of-sample models, simply due to the changed properties of the subset. The models are again evaluated at three confidence intervals $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$ and the best performing out-of-sample models are summarized in the tables A.27, A.28 and A.29.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

The top eight out-of-sample models for the GDAXI index at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval assume the Student- t distribution for the error term. The estimated degrees of freedom parameter lies around 8. There does not seem to be present any specific process for the conditional volatility, as the top eight models employ four different conditional volatility process. On the other hand, the presence of the GARCH process indicates that the decision to model the conditional volatility is not out of question.

The failure rates for this confidence interval range from 12.2% to 13.2%. It is not surprising that the best p-values for the unconditional coverage are achieved by the models with the failure rate equal to 12.2%. Quite interesting is the fact that these three models are outperformed by the models with the highest failure rates in terms of the conditional coverage p-value. The reason lies on less independently distributed failures for the two models. To continue with the evaluation, the values of the loss functions distinguish between the two models with the highest p-values of the conditional coverage and select the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T model as the model with the best performance for the GDAXI index at the $\alpha = 0.90$ confidence interval. It is important to note,

however, that there are models with slightly lower p-values of the conditional coverage, but also with lower values of the loss functions.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

The results of the application of the models at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval are not satisfactory, as it is described further on. The selected models employ the Student- t distribution for the error term with 8 degrees of freedom. The conditional volatility process is modeled by a GARCH processes with multiple orders. None of the EGARCH or TARARCH processes appears among the top eight results for this confidence interval.

The one-day-ahead VaR forecasts are violated approximately in 8.0% to 8.2% cases, which is quite consistent. On the other hand, the rates are still well above the expected failure rate of 5%. Therefore, the unconditional coverage test rejects the null-hypothesis at the 1% significance level for all models. The p-values of the conditional coverage test are also low and the test rejects the null-hypothesis also at the 1% significance level. The values of the loss functions select the AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T model as the one with the lowest realized loss and highest p-value of the conditional coverage test for the GDAXI index at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

The models at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval work with the assumption of the error term distributed according to the Student- t distribution with 8 degrees of freedom. The conditional volatility processes is modeled using the GARCH(1,1) process in seven cases and with the GARCH(2,2) process in the eight case. The other tested conditional volatility process — EGARCH and TARARCH — do not appear among the top eight models. The same outcome is observed at the other indices as well.

An interesting observation at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval is that all models achieve the same failure rate of 1.6%. Considering the expected failure rate of 1%, it is not an unsatisfactory result. This is the reason why the top eight models share the same p-value of the unconditional coverage and even of the conditional coverage. The p-values do not reject the models at 40% significance level. Therefore, the models must be ranked according to the values of the loss functions. The preferred model for the GDAXI index at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval is thus the AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T.

Note

None of the models appears among the top eight performing models for all confidence intervals. Moreover, the evaluation of the models at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval does not provide satisfactory results, since all of the models are rejected by both the unconditional and conditional coverage tests. Therefore it cannot be confirmed that there is a one particular model that is able to capture the behavior of the GDAXI index at the best.

Although the in-sample estimation suggest to use models that take advantage of the TARCH process with GED as the distribution for the error term, the application of these models on the out-of-sample subset provides quite different results. The best relative accuracy is achieved with models that model conditional volatility with the GARCH process and the Student- t distribution. Thus the conclusion is that even the GDAXI index confirms that top in-sample performance does not automatically mean top out-of-sample performance.

3.2.7 N225 index

The Figure B.3 with the histogram of the log-returns of the N225 index indicates that there is a fat-tail on the side of the negative log-returns. This is confirmed by the detailed statistics in the in-sample summary Table A.1. The kurtosis of the log-returns also seems to be above the value of 3, which is the kurtosis of the normal distribution and it is confirmed by the statistics as well. In order to test for the normality of the log-returns, the Jarque-Bera test is employed. The test rejects the null-hypothesis of normality at the 1% significance level. Even though the normality is rejected, two of the top eight in-sample models work with the assumption of normally distributed error term, as listed in the Table 3.13.

The Portmanteau Q test for serial autocorrelation of the squared residuals at lag one rejects the null-hypothesis of no serial autocorrelation at 1% significance level. The results are provided in the Table 3.12. The tests for serial autocorrelation at higher orders also reject the null-hypothesis, which leads to the conclusion that the conditional volatility should be modeled using one of the available conditional volatility processes. The Table 3.13 with the top in-sample models proves that it is the case, since all models take advantage of the EGARCH process for conditional volatility. The estimated parameters of the model with the highest AIC are presented in the Table C.6. The Table 3.12 proves that after the application of the conditional volatility process

	Test statistic value	p-value
<u>In-sample before model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	7.5726	0.0059
Portmanteau Q(2)	21.1184	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(3)	43.3973	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(5)	68.3412	0.0000
Portmanteau Q(10)	93.9835	0.0000
<u>In-sample after model application</u>		
Portmanteau Q(1)	0.0569	0.8115
Portmanteau Q(2)	3.0480	0.2178
Portmanteau Q(3)	3.3156	0.3455
Portmanteau Q(5)	7.8548	0.1644
Portmanteau Q(10)	15.5731	0.1125

Table 3.12: Serial autocorrelation tests for the N225 index

EGARCH(2,1), the serial autocorrelation is effectively captured. The null-hypothesis of the Portmanteau Q test at the selected lags cannot be rejected even at the 11.25% significance level in all cases.

In-sample model	AIC	LL
AR(0)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-35779.33	17898.67
AR(2)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,1)-T	-6470.151	3246.075
AR(1)-MA(1)-EGARCH(2,2)-T	-6396.750	3209.375
AR(1)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-6310.031	3165.015
AR(0)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-GED	-6308.577	3165.288
AR(1)-MA(0)-EGARCH(2,2)-N	-6304.140	3161.070
AR(1)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,2)-N	-6301.853	3161.927
AR(1)-MA(2)-EGARCH(2,1)-GED	-6285.056	3153.528

Table 3.13: Top eight in-sample models for the N225 index

Even though the conditional volatility process, EGARCH, is the same for all top in-sample models, its parameters differ and so does the assumed distribution of the error term. Five models assume the EGARCH(2,2) process, while the other three assume the EGARCH(2,1) process. Quite interesting observation is that there are two models that work with the normal distribution, three models that work with the GED distribution and three with the Student- t distribution. The shape parameter for the GED distribution is approximately 1.6

and the degrees of freedom parameter for the Student- t distribution is greater than 10^{13} .

The skewness of out-of-sample subset is very similar to the skewness of the in-sample subset. On the other hand, the kurtosis is significantly higher. Moreover, the volatility on Figure B.2 is a clear indicator that the out-of-sample subset of the N225 index is more turbulent. Therefore the top performing in-sample models might most likely fail to capture the change in the parameters of the subset and it is expected that the normal and GED distributions shall be outperformed by the Student- t distribution, as it is the case with the previously analyzed indices. The models are evaluated at three confidence intervals $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$ and the best performing out-of-sample models are summarized in the tables A.30, A.31 and A.32.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.90$

Neither the N225 index is an exception in the assumed distribution of the error term. The best results at this confidence interval are achieved with the Student- t distribution with estimated 11 degrees of freedom. This is an indication of quite fat-tails of the log-returns. The only conditional volatility process among the top eight out-of-sample models is the GARCH process. The parameters of the process vary and are presented in the Table A.30.

The failure rate ranges from 12.6% to 13.0%. In comparison with the other tested indices, these failure rates are not among the best one, neither are they among the worst ones. According to the p-values of the unconditional coverage, the null-hypothesis of the failure rates being equal to 10% cannot be rejected at 6.14% at the best. The p-values of the conditional coverage are quite similar to the values of the unconditional coverage and according to them, the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected at 4.19%. The values of the loss functions indicate that the model with the lowest achieved values of the loss functions is the AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T model. It is also one of the models with the failure rate closest to the expected value of 10%.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.95$

The top eight out-of-sample models at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval employ the Student- t distribution with estimated 10 degrees of freedom for the error term. The degrees of freedom parameter is estimated using the statistical software during the evaluation of the models. The conditional volatility processes

are modeled using the GARCH process, such as in the previous confidence interval. Interesting observation is that models assuming the normal distribution occupy the last third of the top 50 models.

The failure rates for the one-day-ahead VaR at the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval are the lowest failure rates from the selected indices, as they range from 6.2% to 6.6%. This fact is also transformed to the p-values of the unconditional coverage, since the highest achieved p-value is $p_{uc} = 23.46\%$. Moreover, even the other models in the top eight cannot be rejected even at 10% significance level. The values of the conditional coverage are also quite satisfactory. Based on these values, there is only one model with the highest score, namely the AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T model. This model has also the highest realized p-value of the conditional coverage of all tested models and all indices.

Evaluation at $\alpha = 0.99$

The Student- t distribution with 10 degrees of freedom as the assumed distribution for the error term provides the best results for the N225 index at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval. The conditional volatility process is in all eight models modeled exclusively by the GARCH process. The EGARCH and TARCH processes do not score even among the top 50 models. It is quite interesting that the GARCH process dominates the EGARCH process, when the models are applied on the out-of-sample subset.

The failure rates are equal for all of the top eight models, which is the same situation as with the GDAXI index. The realized failure rate is equal to 1.4% as opposed to the expected rate of 1%. The difference is captured by the p-value of the unconditional coverage test. The p-value of the unconditional coverage test suggest that the null-hypothesis cannot be rejected 39.66% significance level for all models. Since even the p-values of the conditional coverage are the same and attain a value of 64.11%, the decision on which model is the most appropriate one for the N225 index at the $\alpha = 0.99$ confidence interval is based on the realized values of the loss functions. The lowest values were achieved by the AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T model.

Note

None of the models in the top eight models for the particular confidence interval appear among the results for all confidence intervals. Therefore it cannot be suggested to use one model as a general model for the N225 index when the

confidence interval is abstracted from. Interesting observation occurs in the $\alpha = 0.95$ confidence interval, where the closest match to the expected failure rate of 5% is achieved among all indices.

The EGARCH process for conditional volatility is suggested by the in-sample estimation procedure. However, the application of the estimated models on the out-of-sample subset indicates that there are other models that are able to achieve better VaR forecasting accuracy. As well as for the other indices, the best accuracy is achieved when the conditional volatility is modeled using the GARCH process. It is quite interesting that the GARCH process offers the best performance in all indices. The likely reason lies in the fact that the GARCH process treats both positive and negative shocks in the same way and that the situation on the markets during the out-of-sample period probably exhibited this exact behavior.

Chapter 4

Conclusion

The value-at-risk forecasting theory has been applied on six selected stock indices. Even though the most popular choice of stock indices includes either the indices from central and eastern European economies or the US-based indices, the thesis strived to provide a broader picture and based the analysis on other less often used indices. At the same time, these indices (DJI, GSPC, IXIC, FTSE, GDAXI, N225) were chosen as to incorporate indices from the most important world stock exchanges. The data for the one-day-ahead VaR forecast came from the years 2004 – 2007 for the in-sample subset, which serves the purpose of estimating the coefficients of the models, and the years 2008 – 2009 for the out-of-sample subset, which served both as a source of data with higher volatility and as a benchmark.

The decision to divide the dataset into two subsets was a logical step considering the aim of the thesis, which was to estimate various value-at-risk forecasting models in the times of a relative mild volatility and to reevaluate the same models based on data with higher volatility, such as during the recent financial crisis. The methodology used in the thesis was similar to the methodology commonly used by commercial banks with the exception that the models were not periodically re-estimated. Another important aspect of the thesis was that in comparison to the methodology used by commercial banks, the thesis worked with more advanced methods, such as the conditional volatility process.

Even though it is quite common in the literature to work with the assumption of normally distributed log-returns, the thesis did not adhere to such simplification and tested the log-returns for a variety of distributions including the popular Student- t and the GED distributions. The results proved that the log-returns of the selected indices cannot be considered as distributed ac-

according to the normal distribution. In fact, the more appropriate distribution seemed to be the Student- t distribution with 7 to 8 degrees of freedom or the GED with the shape parameter lying between 1.4 – 1.5. Thus the hypothesis of normally distributed log-returns has been rejected at 5% significance level for all selected indices and the decision to reject the null-hypothesis of normality was based on the values of the Jarque-Bera test statistic and checked against the histogram plots. Therefore in addition to the commonly assumed normal distribution, the applied VaR models were parametrized with the Student- t and the GED distribution functions, which proved to result in more accurate estimates.

One of the most significant aspects of the thesis was the variability of employed models, as the thesis attempted to estimate 648 dynamic models. Moreover, all of the models were estimated on the six considered indices and evaluated separately. The large number of tested models was a result of the dynamic approach followed by the thesis, since the models were composed from two components — the conditional mean, which was modeled with the AR and the MA processes with up to two lags, and the conditional variance, which was modeled using one of the GARCH, EGARCH or TARARCH processes with up to two lags. Moreover, each model was estimated for the three afore mentioned distributions. The decision to include conditional volatility process was backed by the results of the Portmanteau Q test statistic at several lags, as it is described in more detail in the thesis.

As already mentioned, the parameters of the models were first estimated on the in-sample subset, which consisted from data observed during the years 2004–2007, and top eight models according to their AIC values were selected. The top AIC value models were mostly EGARCH or TARARCH based with either Student- t or the GED as the most appropriate distribution for the error term. These estimates proved that models that work with conditional volatility modeled as an asymmetric process provided more accurate and significant estimates than the typically used models with a symmetric GARCH process. On the other hand, the orders of the AR and MA processes did not seem to be of a particular importance, as their orders quite varied and seemed to play a minor role in the actual specification of the models. The implication of this result is that the markets treat the volatility of a particular stock index as a dominant factor, rather than the previously realized value of the stock index. For each stock index there were several models that failed to be estimated by the statistical software. The number of failed models, however, was quite small.

Quite interesting outcome of the analysis was the fact that the conditional volatility of the in-sample subsets was best modeled with either the EGARCH or the TARCH process and in the majority of cases the Student- t distribution with approximately 7–8 degrees of freedom. The interpretation of this outcome is that the markets treat positive shocks in a different manner than negative shocks. Considering the fact that the in-sample subsets were less volatile than the out-of-sample subsets, it seems that in periods with relatively stable volatility, asymmetric conditional volatility processes provide better estimates than the symmetric conditional volatility processes. This is, on the other hand, not true in periods with relatively higher volatility, as it is described further on.

All estimated models were then applied on the out-of-sample subset with data from years 2008–2009, in order to test the prediction accuracy of the one-day-ahead VaR. The models were not periodically re-estimated, mainly due to the long computation time. For each estimated model there were 500 forecasts calculated and the models were then compared based on the values of the conditional coverage test. Unlike most works with a similar topic, the thesis applied a less known framework for the evaluation of a one-day-ahead VaR — the conditional coverage framework. The advantage of applying the conditional coverage lies in the fact that it does not only test whether the number of extreme cases corresponds to the selected confidence interval, it also tests whether the violations are clustered or not. This is an important factor in the evaluation of the one-day-ahead VaR, since the occurrence probability of a violation should not depend on the occurrence of previous violations. Therefore the evaluation used in the thesis should have ruled out models with clustered violations.

The evaluation of the models was performed for three most common confidence intervals, namely $\alpha \in \{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$. The results of the application of the models on the out-of-sample subset were quite different from the in-sample results. All of the top scoring models were based on modeling the conditional volatility using the GARCH process. Even though most of the models underestimated the VaR by some amount, as it is described in the summary tables in the appendices, the majority of the models was not rejected based on the p-value of the conditional coverage test.

As it has been mentioned in the thesis, many authors suggest using the GARCH(1,1) process for modeling the conditional volatility of stock indices. Although, the thesis did not work with such apriori assumption and tested a vast number of models, the suggestion of using GARCH(1,1) process for

the conditional volatility process while predicting VaR could not be rejected. Each one of the suggested out-of-sample models took advantage of the GARCH process, however, the parameters of the GARCH process varied. It is therefore an interesting outcome that even though the asymmetric models achieved the best results in terms of the AIC and LL values, the actual forecast capabilities were dominated by a symmetric conditional volatility process. A likely interpretation is that in times of increased volatility, the markets treat both positive and negative shocks in the same way, which is quite interesting. This outcome therefore confirms the hypothesis that an asymmetric EGARCH is outperformed by a GARCH based model when the magnitude of shocks, volatility, is high.

Therefore the suggestion to forecast VaR only with models that have the highest value of the AIC was not backed by the results of the thesis. None of the models with the highest in-sample AIC values was among the top out-of-sample models. The results obtained in the thesis suggest to take advantage of the commonly used GARCH process, which saves a lot of computation time and provides satisfactory results. In order to improve the VaR forecasts, the most obvious step would be to re-estimate the models on a daily basis and to increase the possible lags of the conditional volatility process. The downside of such approach is, however, a significantly higher demand for computational resources, as it takes quite some time to estimate the models.

To conclude, the thesis loosely followed a typical one-day-ahead VaR evaluation procedure with a number of improvements introduced into the procedure. Such improvements included a no apriori assumption on the distribution of the log-returns, which proved to be a step in the right direction. Further on, the thesis estimated a quite large number of models that allowed to compare the models with various conditional mean and conditional volatility processes, as well as with three distribution functions for the error term. The final part of the evaluation took advantage of a less known framework that is used to measure the accuracy of the forecasted models. Thanks to this, the thesis was able to provide a new insight on the topic, which certainly belongs to the most discussed topics in the financial sector.

Bibliography

- AKGIRAY, V. (1989): “Conditional heteroscedasticity in time series of stock returns: Evidence and forecasts.” *The Journal of Business* **62**: pp. 55–80.
- ANGELIDIS, T., A. BENOS, & S. DEGIANNAKIS (2004): “The use of garch models in var estimation.” *Statistical Methodology* **1(1-2)**: pp. 105 – 128.
- AUDRINO, F. & P. BUHLMANN (2001): “Tree-structured generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedastic models.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **63(4)**: pp. 727–744.
- BLACK, F. (1976): “Studies of stock market volatility changes.” *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Business and Economic Statistics Section* pp. 177–181.
- BOLLERSLEV, T. (1986): “Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity.” *Journal of Econometrics* **31**: pp. 307–327.
- BOLLERSLEV, T., R. F. ENGLE, & D. B. NELSON (1994): “Chapter 49 arch models.” volume 4 of *Handbook of Econometrics*, pp. 2959 – 3038. Elsevier.
- BROOKS, C. & G. PERSAUD (2003): “The effect of asymmetries on stock index return value-at-risk estimates.” *The Journal of Risk Finance* **4**: pp. 29–42.
- CHRISTOFFERSEN, P. F. (1998): “Evaluating interval forecasts.” *International Economic Review* **39(4)**: pp. 841–862.
- DAVIDIAN, M. & R. J. CARROLL (1987): “Variance function estimation.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **82(400)**: pp. 1079–1091.
- DICKEY, D. A. & W. A. FULLER (1979): “Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with a unit root.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **74(366)**: pp. pp. 427–431.

- DIEBOLD, F. & R. S. MARIANO (2002): “Comparing predictive accuracy.” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **20(1)**: pp. 134–44.
- DROST, F. C. & C. A. J. KLAASSEN (1997): “Efficient estimation in semiparametric garch models.” *Journal of Econometrics* **81(1)**: pp. 193 – 221.
- ENGLE, R. F. (1982): “Autogressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of united kingdom inflation.” *Econometrica* **50**: pp. 987–1008.
- ENGLE, R. F. & S. MANGANELLI (1999): “Caviar: Conditional value at risk by quantile regression.” *NBER Working Papers 7341*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- ENGLE, R. F. & S. MANGANELLI (2004): “Caviar: Conditional autoregressive value at risk by regression quantiles.” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* **22**: pp. 367–381.
- ENGLE, R. F. & V. K. NG (1993): “Measuring and testing the impact of news on volatility.” *Journal Of Finance* **48**: pp. 1749–1778.
- GHAHRAMANI, M. & A. THAVANESWARAN (2008): “A note on garch model identification.” *Computers & Mathematics with Applications* **55(11)**: pp. 2469 – 2475.
- GHYSELS, E., A. C. HARVEY, & E. RENAULT (1996): “5 stochastic volatility.” In G. MADDALA & C. RAO (editors), “Statistical Methods in Finance,” volume 14 of *Handbook of Statistics*, pp. 119 – 191. Elsevier.
- GUERMAT, C. & R. D. F. HARRIS (2002): “Forecasting value at risk allowing for time variation in the variance and kurtosis of portfolio returns.” *International Journal of Forecasting* **18(3)**: pp. 409 – 419.
- HE, C., T. TERÄSVIRTA, & H. MALMSTEN (2002): “Moment structure of a family of first-order exponential garch models.” *Econometric Theory* **18**: pp. 868–885.
- HUANG, A. Y. (2010): “An optimization process in value-at-risk estimation.” *Review of Financial Economics* **19(3)**: pp. 109–116.
- JORION, P. (2007): *Value at risk: The New Benchmark for Managing Financial Risk*. New York, NY [u.a.]: McGraw-Hill, 3. ed. edition.

- KUPIEC, P. H. (1995): “Techniques for verifying the accuracy of risk measurement models.” *Finance and Economics Discussion Series 95-24*, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- KWIATKOWSKI, D., P. C. B. PHILLIPS, P. SCHMIDT, & Y. SHIN (1992): “Testing the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative of a unit root : How sure are we that economic time series have a unit root?” *Journal of Econometrics* **54(1-3)**: pp. 159 – 178.
- LAMBERT, P. & S. LAURENT (2001): *Modelling financial time series using GARCH-type models and a skewed student density*. Master’s thesis, Université de Liege.
- LI, C. W. & W. K. LI (1996): “On a double-threshold autoregressive heteroscedastic time series model.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **11(3)**: pp. 253–274.
- LJUNG, G. M. & G. E. P. BOX (1978): “On a measure of lack of fit in time series models.” *Biometrika* **65(2)**: pp. 297–303.
- LOPEZ, J. A. (1998): “Methods for evaluating value-at-risk estimates.” *Economic Policy Review* (**Oct**): pp. 119–124.
- LOPEZ, J. A. (2001): “Evaluating the predictive accuracy of volatility models.” *Journal of Forecasting* **20(2)**: pp. 87–109.
- MALMSTEN, H. & T. TERÄSVIRTA (2004): “Stylized facts of financial time series and three popular models of volatility.” *SSE/EFI working Paper Series in Economics and Finance* **563**.
- MANDELBROT, B. (1963): “The variation of certain speculative prices.” *The Journal of Business* **36**: pp. 394–419.
- MANDELBROT, B. (1967): “The variation of some other speculative prices.” *The Journal of Business* **40**: pp. 393–413.
- NELSON, D. B. (1991): “Conditional heteroskedasticity in asset returns: A new approach.” *Econometrica* **59**: pp. 347–370.
- PAGAN, A. R. & G. W. SCHWERT (1990): “Alternative models for conditional stock volatility.” *Journal of Econometrics* **45(1-2)**: pp. 267 – 290.

- PATTON, A. (2006): “Volatility forecast comparison using imperfect volatility proxies.” *Research Paper Series 175*, Quantitative Finance Research Centre, University of Technology, Sydney.
- PHILLIPS, P. C. B. & P. PERRON (1988): “Testing for a unit root in time series regression.” *Biometrika* **75(2)**: pp. pp. 335–346.
- RABEMANANJARA, R. & J.-M. ZAKOÏAN (1993): “Threshold arch models and asymmetries in volatility.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **8**: pp. 31–49.
- SADORSKY, P. (2006): “Modeling and forecasting petroleum futures volatility.” *Energy Economics* **28(4)**: pp. 467 – 488.
- SAID, S. E. & D. A. DICKEY (1984): “Testing for unit roots in autoregressive-moving average models of unknown order.” *Biometrika* **71(3)**: pp. pp. 599–607.
- TERÄSVIRTA, T. (2006): “An introduction to univariate garch models.” *Working papers in Economics and Finance* **646**: p. 30.
- WEI, Y., Y. WANG, & D. HUANG (2010): “Forecasting crude oil market volatility: Further evidence using garch-class models.” *Energy Economics* **32(6)**: pp. 1477 – 1484.
- WOOLDRIDGE, J. (2008): *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach (with Economic Applications, Data Sets, Student Solutions Manual Printed Access Card)*. South-Western College Pub, 4 edition.
- ZAKOÏAN, J.-M. (1994): “Threshold heteroskedastic models.” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **18(5)**: pp. 931 – 955.

Appendix A

Tables

	DJI	GSPC	IXIC	FTSE	GDAXI	N225
Observations	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000
Minimum	-0.0334876	-0.0353427	-0.0393587	-0.0418503	-0.0351624	-0.0556955
Maximum	0.0252232	0.0287896	0.0340557	0.0344408	0.0260508	0.0360312
Median	0.0004412	0.0007385	0.0010444	0.0008293	0.0012235	0.0004349
Mean	0.0002377	0.0002692	0.0002397	0.0003638	0.0006870	0.0003891
Variance	0.0000527	0.0000580	0.0000938	0.0000644	0.0000870	0.0001263
Standard deviation	0.0072608	0.0076173	0.0096851	0.0080266	0.0093260	0.0112390
Skewness	-0.3311214	-0.3099436	-0.1641089	-0.4295073	-0.4018695	-0.3622378
Kurtosis	4.5036750	4.8043270	3.4968970	5.7610460	3.7716550	4.3441480
Jarque–Bera	79.466	121.596	8.261	283.256	12.058	58.351
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.002	0.000

Table A.1: Properties of the in-sample subsets (log-returns)

	DJI	GSPC	IXIC	FTSE	GDAXI	N225
Observations	500	500	500	500	500	500
Minimum	-0.0820051	-0.0946951	0.0958770	-0.0926454	-0.0743346	-0.1211102
Maximum	0.1050835	0.1095720	0.1115944	0.0938424	0.1079747	0.1323459
Median	0.0001969	0.0009805	0.0006197	-0.0002057	0.0000000	0.0004258
Mean	-0.0004739	-0.0005406	-0.0003116	-0.0003972	-0.0006591	-0.0006850
Variance	0.0004043	0.0004873	0.0005005	0.0003932	0.0004489	0.0005737
Standard deviation	0.0201077	0.0220739	0.0223708	0.0198284	0.0211864	0.0239522
Skewness	0.1293708	-0.1143677	-0.0654192	-0.0006206	0.2978910	-0.3142532
Kurtosis	7.5003250	7.2374020	6.3187880	7.1332600	7.4221750	7.9021570
Jarque–Bera	419.003	372.217	228.834	355.043	402.522	493.053
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table A.2: Properties of the out-of-sample subsets (log-returns)

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-8.119	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-8.650	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-9.663	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-10.464	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-10.945	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-12.003	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-12.970	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-14.684	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-16.761	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-21.911	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.3: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for DJI

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-6.482	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-7.028	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-8.030	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-8.890	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-9.491	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-10.488	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-11.702	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-13.692	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-15.798	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-21.321	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.4: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GSPC

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-4.085	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-4.563	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-5.209	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-5.923	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-6.375	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-7.119	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-8.223	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-9.997	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-11.822	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-16.291	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.5: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for IXIC

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-5.807	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-6.359	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-7.140	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-7.782	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-8.502	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-9.373	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-10.684	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-12.501	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-15.001	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-19.301	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.6: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for FTSE

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-8.910	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-9.710	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-10.228	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-10.924	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-11.465	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-12.327	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-14.001	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-15.397	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-17.252	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-20.702	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.7: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GDAXI

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-2.391	-3.480	-2.845	-2.558
9	-2.526	-3.480	-2.846	-2.559
8	-2.796	-3.480	-2.848	-2.560
7	-2.951	-3.480	-2.849	-2.562
6	-3.159	-3.480	-2.850	-2.563
5	-3.560	-3.480	-2.852	-2.564
4	-3.947	-3.480	-2.853	-2.565
3	-4.978	-3.480	-2.854	-2.567
2	-5.951	-3.480	-2.856	-2.568
1	-8.548	-3.480	-2.857	-2.569

Table A.8: In-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for N225

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-4.037	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-4.138	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-4.718	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-5.134	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-6.097	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-6.562	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-7.716	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-8.931	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-10.769	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-16.370	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.9: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for DJI

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-4.805	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-4.826	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-5.488	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-5.899	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-6.898	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-7.415	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-8.682	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-10.004	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-11.870	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-17.421	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.10: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GSPC

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-4.481	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-4.590	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-5.095	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-5.518	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-6.333	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-7.081	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-8.232	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-9.627	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-11.267	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-16.545	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.11: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for IXIC

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-6.049	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-5.916	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-6.652	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-6.991	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-8.066	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-9.643	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-10.204	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-10.418	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-14.991	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-17.316	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.12: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for FTSE

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-4.971	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-5.294	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-6.031	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-6.211	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-6.725	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-7.238	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-8.571	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-9.260	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-12.573	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-15.386	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.13: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for GDAXI

lags	DF-GLS	1% Critical value	5% Critical value	10% Critical value
10	-2.227	-3.480	-2.849	-2.563
9	-2.529	-3.480	-2.852	-2.567
8	-2.926	-3.480	-2.856	-2.570
7	-3.036	-3.480	-2.859	-2.572
6	-3.497	-3.480	-2.862	-2.575
5	-4.240	-3.480	-2.865	-2.578
4	-5.002	-3.480	-2.868	-2.581
3	-5.752	-3.480	-2.871	-2.583
2	-7.754	-3.480	-2.874	-2.586
1	-9.965	-3.480	-2.876	-2.588

Table A.14: Out-of-sample DF-GLS stationarity test for N225

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.386	-7112.772	12.4%	0.0834	0.0626	4.1841	1.2775	-7.2237
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.409	-7112.817	12.4%	0.0834	0.0626	4.1908	1.2781	-7.2234
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.928	-7113.856	12.4%	0.0834	0.0626	4.3819	1.2994	-7.2351
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3562.726	-7113.452	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	4.1958	1.2803	-7.2222
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.285	-7114.571	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	4.3731	1.2991	-7.2351
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.911	-7113.821	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	4.3733	1.2986	-7.2356
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.939	-7111.878	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	4.3946	1.3006	-7.2345
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3564.423	-7114.846	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	4.4387	1.3068	-7.2327

Table A.15: Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3564.402	-7112.804	7.0%	0.0523	0.0855	4.4548	1.3156	-7.2173
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3564.453	-7112.905	7.0%	0.0523	0.0855	4.4573	1.3160	-7.2172
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3562.726	-7113.452	7.2%	0.0337	0.0536	4.1958	1.2803	-7.2222
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3562.785	-7113.571	7.2%	0.0337	0.0536	4.2015	1.2810	-7.2220
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.928	-7113.856	7.2%	0.0337	0.0536	4.3819	1.2994	-7.2351
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3565.939	-7111.878	7.2%	0.0337	0.0536	4.3946	1.3006	-7.2345
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.386	-7112.772	7.4%	0.0211	0.0324	4.1841	1.2775	-7.2237
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.409	-7112.817	7.4%	0.0211	0.0324	4.1908	1.2781	-7.2234

Table A.16: Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.297	-7114.593	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.0868	1.2686	-7.2284
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3563.622	-7113.244	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1526	1.2746	-7.2241
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3563.636	-7113.273	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1632	1.2758	-7.2236
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.386	-7112.772	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1841	1.2775	-7.2237
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.409	-7112.817	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1908	1.2781	-7.2234
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3562.726	-7113.452	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1958	1.2803	-7.2222
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3564.421	-7110.842	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.1986	1.2788	-7.2229
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3562.785	-7113.571	1.0%	1.0000	0.9507	4.2015	1.2810	-7.2220

Table A.17: Best performing models for the DJI index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3533.573	-7049.146	12.0%	0.1471	0.0161	4.5987	1.2918	-7.0449
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3532.033	-7048.066	12.0%	0.1471	0.0161	4.6963	1.2996	-7.0378
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3531.902	-7047.805	12.0%	0.1471	0.0161	4.7054	1.3012	-7.0371
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3537.306	-7056.612	12.6%	0.0614	0.0158	5.4108	1.4039	-7.0287
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3536.429	-7054.857	13.2%	0.0223	0.0107	5.4762	1.4134	-7.0216
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3531.308	-7048.616	12.2%	0.1116	0.0105	4.6663	1.2964	-7.0382
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3536.402	-7056.804	12.2%	0.1116	0.0105	5.7563	1.4316	-7.0002
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3532.643	-7051.286	12.4%	0.0834	0.0067	4.6086	1.2946	-7.0433

Table A.18: Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3531.676	-7049.351	7.2%	0.0337	0.0069	4.9684	1.3413	-7.0450
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3531.980	-7049.960	7.2%	0.0337	0.0069	5.0013	1.3437	-7.0440
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3536.429	-7054.857	8.2%	0.0025	0.0030	5.4762	1.4134	-7.0216
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3529.239	-7046.477	7.6%	0.0129	0.0022	4.6886	1.3046	-7.0364
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3531.902	-7047.805	7.6%	0.0129	0.0022	4.7054	1.3012	-7.0371
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.246	-7052.493	7.6%	0.0129	0.0022	4.8936	1.3284	-7.0489
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.020	-7052.041	7.6%	0.0129	0.0022	4.9215	1.3320	-7.0471
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.672	-7051.345	7.6%	0.0129	0.0022	4.9319	1.3327	-7.0473

Table A.19: Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3528.987	-7045.974	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.6752	1.3038	-7.0368
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3529.239	-7046.477	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.6886	1.3046	-7.0364
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3535.996	-7051.992	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.7781	1.3171	-7.0574
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3535.184	-7054.368	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.8441	1.3244	-7.0540
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.246	-7052.493	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.8936	1.3284	-7.0489
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.020	-7052.041	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.9215	1.3320	-7.0471
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.672	-7051.345	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.9319	1.3327	-7.0473
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3534.537	-7051.073	1.2%	0.6630	0.8454	4.9452	1.3348	-7.0463

Table A.20: Best performing models for the GSPC index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.832	-6489.665	13.2%	0.0223	0.0036	4.5699	1.2338	-6.9376
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.822	-6489.645	13.2%	0.0223	0.0036	4.5971	1.2332	-6.9365
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.951	-6489.902	13.2%	0.0223	0.0036	4.5997	1.2337	-6.9367
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3252.555	-6489.110	13.2%	0.0223	0.0036	4.6106	1.2343	-6.9365
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3252.563	-6489.127	13.2%	0.0223	0.0036	4.6122	1.2345	-6.9366
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3259.344	-6496.688	13.8%	0.0070	0.0022	5.3939	1.3671	-6.8973
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3253.207	-6488.414	13.4%	0.0154	0.0021	4.5797	1.2351	-6.9390
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3254.370	-6492.740	14.2%	0.0030	0.0018	5.6463	1.3124	-6.9053

Table A.21: Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3250.677	-6489.353	7.8%	0.0077	0.0010	4.5522	1.2298	-6.9365
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3250.682	-6489.365	7.8%	0.0077	0.0010	4.5534	1.2299	-6.9365
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3254.370	-6492.740	7.8%	0.0077	0.0010	5.6463	1.3124	-6.9053
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3254.400	-6492.799	7.8%	0.0077	0.0010	5.7314	1.3150	-6.9031
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.832	-6489.665	8.0%	0.0045	0.0005	4.5699	1.2338	-6.9376
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.822	-6489.645	8.0%	0.0045	0.0005	4.5971	1.2332	-6.9365
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.951	-6489.902	8.0%	0.0045	0.0005	4.5997	1.2337	-6.9367
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3252.555	-6489.110	8.0%	0.0045	0.0005	4.6106	1.2343	-6.9365

Table A.22: Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3250.677	-6489.353	1.8%	0.1060	0.2296	4.5522	1.2298	-6.9365
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3250.682	-6489.365	1.8%	0.1060	0.2296	4.5534	1.2299	-6.9365
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.832	-6489.665	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.5699	1.2338	-6.9376
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3253.207	-6488.414	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.5797	1.2351	-6.9390
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.822	-6489.645	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.5971	1.2332	-6.9365
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3251.951	-6489.902	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.5997	1.2337	-6.9367
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3252.555	-6489.110	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.6106	1.2343	-6.9365
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3252.563	-6489.127	2.0%	0.0479	0.1152	4.6122	1.2345	-6.9366

Table A.23: Best performing models for the IXIC index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3530.794	-7045.588	13.0%	0.0317	0.0979	5.9519	1.3747	-7.0856
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3530.817	-7043.635	13.0%	0.0317	0.0979	5.9612	1.3753	-7.0853
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3525.995	-7037.990	13.0%	0.0317	0.0979	6.4857	1.4013	-7.0628
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3526.516	-7037.032	13.2%	0.0223	0.0730	6.5590	1.4187	-7.0589
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3526.504	-7037.009	13.2%	0.0223	0.0730	6.5670	1.4188	-7.0586
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3525.990	-7037.981	13.2%	0.0223	0.0704	6.4919	1.4014	-7.0626
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3526.030	-7036.060	13.2%	0.0223	0.0704	6.4925	1.4008	-7.0627
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3526.715	-7035.430	13.4%	0.0154	0.0532	6.5694	1.4244	-7.0567

Table A.24: Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3526.516	-7037.032	7.8%	0.0077	0.0287	6.5590	1.4187	-7.0589
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3526.504	-7037.009	7.8%	0.0077	0.0287	6.5670	1.4188	-7.0586
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3526.547	-7037.094	7.8%	0.0077	0.0287	6.5882	1.4242	-7.0565
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3526.538	-7039.076	7.8%	0.0077	0.0287	6.5984	1.4246	-7.0559
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3525.995	-7037.990	8.0%	0.0045	0.0175	6.4857	1.4013	-7.0628
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3525.990	-7037.981	8.0%	0.0045	0.0175	6.4919	1.4014	-7.0626
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3526.030	-7036.060	8.0%	0.0045	0.0175	6.4925	1.4008	-7.0627
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3525.929	-7039.858	8.0%	0.0045	0.0175	6.5122	1.4023	-7.0621

Table A.25: Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3531.426	-7044.851	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0272	1.3919	-7.0815
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3531.429	-7042.857	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0290	1.3919	-7.0814
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3531.428	-7044.857	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0301	1.3920	-7.0814
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3531.487	-7042.974	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0324	1.3919	-7.0822
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3531.435	-7044.871	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0587	1.3923	-7.0817
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3531.436	-7042.872	2.6%	0.0027	0.0080	6.0597	1.3924	-7.0816
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3530.794	-7045.588	2.8%	0.0009	0.0027	5.9519	1.3747	-7.0856
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3530.817	-7043.635	2.8%	0.0009	0.0027	5.9612	1.3753	-7.0853

Table A.26: Best performing models for the FTSE index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3300.650	-6581.299	13.2%	0.0223	0.0417	8.3695	1.3811	-6.8956
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3300.644	-6581.289	13.2%	0.0223	0.0417	8.3780	1.3814	-6.8954
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.204	-6584.408	12.2%	0.1116	0.0374	8.1662	1.3620	-6.8950
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.199	-6584.397	12.2%	0.1116	0.0374	8.1750	1.3622	-6.8949
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3301.195	-6582.389	12.2%	0.1116	0.0374	8.4665	1.3857	-6.8896
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3300.645	-6583.290	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	8.3652	1.3784	-6.8965
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3300.562	-6583.124	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	8.3713	1.3863	-6.8908
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3300.640	-6583.279	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	8.3737	1.3787	-6.8964

Table A.27: Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.204	-6584.408	8.0%	0.0045	0.0054	8.1662	1.3620	-6.8950
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.199	-6584.397	8.0%	0.0045	0.0054	8.1750	1.3622	-6.8949
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3301.347	-6580.694	8.0%	0.0045	0.0054	8.4644	1.3799	-6.8956
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.768	-6587.536	8.2%	0.0025	0.0028	8.0758	1.3555	-6.8978
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.770	-6587.540	8.2%	0.0025	0.0028	8.0862	1.3558	-6.8976
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.769	-6585.538	8.2%	0.0025	0.0028	8.0864	1.3558	-6.8976
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.771	-6585.541	8.2%	0.0025	0.0028	8.0963	1.3561	-6.8974
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.773	-6585.545	8.2%	0.0025	0.0028	8.1134	1.3566	-6.8971

Table A.28: Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3302.260	-6588.520	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	7.5561	1.3678	-6.9077
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.768	-6587.536	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.0758	1.3555	-6.8978
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.770	-6587.540	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.0862	1.3558	-6.8976
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.769	-6585.538	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.0864	1.3558	-6.8976
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.771	-6585.541	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.0963	1.3561	-6.8974
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3299.773	-6585.545	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.1134	1.3566	-6.8971
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.204	-6584.408	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.1662	1.3620	-6.8950
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3300.199	-6584.397	1.6%	0.2149	0.4068	8.1750	1.3622	-6.8949

Table A.29: Best performing models for the GDAXI index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3128.610	-6241.220	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	3.5379	1.1337	-6.8480
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3128.556	-6241.112	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	3.5575	1.1362	-6.8454
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3128.679	-6239.357	12.6%	0.0614	0.0419	3.5781	1.1361	-6.8467
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3127.961	-6243.921	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	3.4964	1.1379	-6.8454
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3127.949	-6243.899	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	3.4986	1.1381	-6.8454
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3128.730	-6241.460	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	3.5478	1.1388	-6.8492
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3128.734	-6241.468	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	3.5499	1.1389	-6.8491
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3128.652	-6241.304	13.0%	0.0317	0.0370	3.5672	1.1417	-6.8463

Table A.30: Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.9$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3129.208	-6242.417	6.2%	0.2346	0.3775	3.3440	1.1209	-6.8485
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3129.682	-6241.364	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.4366	1.1256	-6.8505
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3129.626	-6241.251	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.4417	1.1262	-6.8505
AR(0)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3127.961	-6243.921	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.4964	1.1379	-6.8454
AR(1)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3127.949	-6243.899	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.4986	1.1381	-6.8454
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3130.699	-6241.398	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.5496	1.1374	-6.8457
AR(0)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3128.652	-6241.304	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.5672	1.1417	-6.8463
AR(2)-MA(0)-GARCH(1,2)-T	3128.656	-6241.313	6.6%	0.1168	0.2913	3.5698	1.1418	-6.8462

Table A.31: Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.95$

Model	LL	AIC	Failures	p_{uc}	p_{cc}	HMSE	HMAE	QLIKE
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3129.208	-6242.417	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.3440	1.1209	-6.8485
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3129.146	-6242.293	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.3479	1.1215	-6.8484
AR(1)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3129.162	-6238.324	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.3518	1.1212	-6.8481
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3129.346	-6238.693	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.3972	1.1252	-6.8541
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,2)-T	3129.687	-6239.375	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.4204	1.1213	-6.8488
AR(2)-MA(2)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3130.185	-6242.371	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.4248	1.1294	-6.8466
AR(2)-MA(1)-GARCH(2,1)-T	3129.682	-6241.364	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.4366	1.1256	-6.8505
AR(1)-MA(1)-GARCH(1,1)-T	3128.111	-6242.221	1.4%	0.3966	0.6411	3.4399	1.1290	-6.8460

Table A.32: Best performing models for the N225 index at $\alpha = 0.99$

Appendix B

Figures




Figure B.1: Log-returns plots of the indices




Figure B.2: Volatility of the log-returns




Figure B.3: In-sample histogram plots of the log-returns




Figure B.4: In-sample autocorrelations of residuals




Figure B.5: In-sample partial autocorrelations of residuals




Figure B.6: In-sample autocorrelations of squared residuals




Figure B.7: In-sample partial autocorrelations of squared residuals




Figure B.8: Out-of-sample histogram plots of the log-returns




Figure B.9: Out-of-sample autocorrelations of residuals




Figure B.10: Out-of-sample partial autocorrelations of residuals




Figure B.11: Out-of-sample autocorrelations of squared residuals




Figure B.12: Out-of-sample partial autocorrelations of squared residuals

Appendix C

In-sample estimates

