CEFIN Working Papers
No 58

Financial connectedness among European volatility risk premia

by Andrea Cipollini, Iolanda Lo Cascio

and Silvia Muzzioli

December 2015

Financial connectedness among European volatility risk premia

Andrea Cipollini**
Department of Economics, Business and Statistics
University of Palermo

Iolanda Lo Cascio*
Department of Economics, Business and Statistics
University of Palermo

Silvia Muzzioli***
Department of Economics
University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

Abstract

In this paper we use the Diebold Yilmaz (2009 and 2012) methodology to estimate the contribution and the vulnerability to systemic risk of volatility risk premia for five European stock markets: France, Germany, UK, Switzerland and the Netherlands. The volatility risk premium, which is a proxy of risk aversion, is measured by the difference between the implied volatility and expected realized volatility of the stock market for next month. While Diebold and Yilmaz focus is on the forecast error variance decomposition of stock returns or range based volatilities employing a stationary VAR in levels, we account for the (locally) long memory stationary properties of the levels of volatility risk premia series. Therefore, we estimate and invert a Fractionally Integrated VAR model to compute the cross forecast error variance shares necessary to obtain the index of total and directional connectedness.

* Department of Economics, Accounting and Statistics, University of Palermo, V.le delle Scienze, 90128 Palermo. E-mail: iolandalocascio@unipa.it
** Department of Economics, Accounting and Statistics, University of Palermo, V.le delle Scienze, 90128 Palermo. E-mail E-mail: andrea.cipollini@unipa.it, *CEFIN, RECent* Modena;
*** Department of Economics, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia; *CEFIN*; Viale J. Berengario, 51, 41121 Modena. E-mail: silvia.muzzioli@unimore.it

1. Introduction

In this paper we construct indices of total and directional connectedness in risk aversion among five European stock markets: UK, Germany, Switzerland, France, and the Netherlands, by focusing on the volatility risk premium of each country. The volatility risk premium is computed as the difference between implied and realized volatility: implied volatility is a composite measure which embeds the investor's perception on future uncertainty, whereas realized volatility measures the actual volatility experienced in the market, therefore the difference between the two epurates the implied volatility measure from the actual realized volatility therefore it be considered as a proxy for risk aversion (see Bali and Zhou (2014)). For this purpose, we follow Diebold-Yilmaz (2009; 2012; 2014) approach and, as argued by the authors, the connectedness framework provide a unifying framework for a variety of systemic risk measures, including the CoVaR approach of Adrian and Brunnermeier (2008) and the marginal expected shortfall approach of Acharya et al. (2010). We follow Buraschi et al (2014) to compute the daily volatility risk premium as the difference between a risk neutral measure of expected volatility formulated at time t for the next 30-days (derived from model-free implied volatility) and future (next month) physical expectation of volatility (extracted from realized square log-returns over next month). The choice of the countries under investigation is made in order to have both EMU and non EMU countries and is based on the availability of a volatility index traded in each country (the only country excluded is Belgium since its market volatility index VBEL has been traded only for a limited time period and it is not traded nowadays). Since the volatility risk premium represents compensation for providing volatility insurance, it can be considered a better proxy for risk aversion (see Muzzioli, 2013(a) and 2013(b), Bekaert and Hoerova, 2014) than measures based only on implied volatility (commonly known as proxies of market fear).

While Diebold-Yilmaz (2009 and 2012) focus on the variance decomposition of a stationary VAR (fitted to stock returns or range based volatilities), we concentrate on the estimation of Fractionally Integrated VAR, *FIVAR*, model, given the (locally) stationary long memory properties of the series

under investigation[1]. More specifically, we provide evidence of regime shifts (in the mean) contaminating the long memory stationary features of the volatility risk premia, by following a two stage approach suggested by Qu (2011). In the first stage we employ the Qu (2011) test for the null of long memory stationarity versus the alternative of structural breaks. The rejection of the null leads to the second stage of the analysis which investigates whether the structural breaks contaminate either a short or a long memory time series. In particular, we employ the Lavielle and Moulines (2000) methodology, robust to the presence of strongly dependent processes. This method allows detecting endogenously the number of regime shifts (in the mean). Then we fit an *ARFIMA(p,d,q)* to estimate and make inference on the fractional integration parameter *d* for the different time series segments.

When turning our focus on multivariate analysis, we follow Do et al. (2013) to invert the *FIVAR* model to obtain the moving average coefficients necessary to compute the forecast error variance decomposition necessary to obtain the index of total connectedness and of total directional connectedness for the proxies of risk aversion.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the issue of long memory and structural breaks, the Fractionally Integrated VAR model and corresponding moving average representation; Section 3 describes the Diebold-Yilmaz (2009, 2011) methodology; Section 4 focusses on the empirical evidence and section 5 concludes.

2. Long memory and multivariate analysis

A long-memory process is characterized by a spectral density which is unbounded at the origin and by an autocorrelation function decaying at a hyperbolic rate at long lags. A series is stationary long memory if the fractional differencing parameter (required transforming the series into a short

---

[1] Although the study of Diebold and Yilmaz (2014) focus is on long memory daily realized volatilities (computed using intraday data), they still use a stationary VAR fitted to the levels of the series. To our knowledge, the only study taking into account long memory in daily realized second moments when employing the analytical tools of Diebold and Yilmaz (2009, 2012), is the one of Fengler and Gisler (2015) which is based on a restricted VAR extension of the heterogeneous autoregressive (HAR) model of Corsi (2009).

memory stationary process) d is between -0.5 and 0.5. If the fractional differencing parameter d is greater than 0.5 and less than 1, then the series is non stationary long memory.

Evidence of long memory in volatility measures is well documented. The studies of Baillie et al. (1996), Andersen and Bollerslev (1997), Comte and Renault (1998) give evidence of long-run dependencies, described by a fractionally integrated process, in GARCH, realized volatiles, and stochastic volatilities models, respectively. More recently, empirical studies show that the volatility implied from option prices exhibits properties well described by fractionally integrated process (see Bandi and Perron, 2006 and Christensen and Nielsen, 2006). Evidence of a stationary long memory in the variance risk premium is found in studies where there is evidence of fractional cointegration between implied and realized volatilities (see Bandi and Perron, 2006; Christensen and Nielsen, 2006; Bollerslev et al., 2013 among the others) of an order, greater than zero and lower than the degree of fractional integration for each volatility series.

The use of multivariate long memory models to financial time series has been recently advocated by Andersen et al. (2001), employing a VAR model to fractionally differenced exchange rates; by Cassola and Morana (2008) who employ a Vector Autoregressive Model with a common factor following an ARFIMA process to explore co-movements among Euro short term interest rates. Moreover, Bollerslev et al. (2013) use a co-fractional VAR to model long run and short run dynamics of realized variance, implied variance and stock return in the US market.

2.1 Long memory, structural breaks and volatility risk premium

The full sample estimation of the fractional integration parameter d is based on the local Whittle estimator. More specifically, we focus on the local Whittle function suggested by Kunsch (1987) defined over the frequency domain, implying the minimization of the profiled likelihood function:

$$R(d) = \log G(d) - 2d \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left[\log \omega_j \right]$$

where $G(d) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left[\omega_j^{2d} I_j \right]$

where I_j is the sample periodogram at the jth Fourier frequency $\omega_j = 2\pi j/T$, with j=1,…,T/2, and T is the sample size. The maximum number of frequencies ω involved in the estimation of the fractional integration parameter is given by *m*.

In this paper we account for the spurious effects of structural breaks in detecting long memory time series we employ a two stage approach suggested by Qu (2011). In the first stage, we use the *W* statistics developed by Qu (2011) to test for the null of stationary long memory vs the alternative of structural breaks described either as a regime change or a smoothly varying trend. The *W* test statistics is based on the derivatives of the profiled local Whittle likelihood function and it does not require the specification on the way structural breaks occur under the alternative hypothesis. Moreover, as suggested by Qu (2011), we employ a "prewhitening" procedure that reduces the short memory component (which might spuriously affect the values of the *W* test statistics) while maintaining the same limiting distribution for the test. The "pre-whitening" procedure involves the selection of low order *ARFIMA(p,d,q)* model and filtering the series using the estimated autoregressive and moving average coefficients. If the comparison of the test statistics with tabulated critical values (see Qu, 2011) leads to rejection of the null, then, in a second stage, we employ the method of Lavielle and Moulines (2000) to detect multiple points for strongly dependent processes. In particular, Lavielle and Moulines (2000) suggest that segmentation of a time series is based on the minimization of a penalty function (measuring the difference between the actual series and the segmented series). Given the focus on volatility risk premia we are interested in time series segmentation only in terms of mean shifts. In particular, the best number of segments *K* is given by the last value of *K* for which the

second derivative of a standardized penalty function is greater than a threshold S, which according to numerical experiments, is set equal to 0.75 (see Lavielle, 2005).

2.2 Fractionally Integrated VAR, FIVAR

The multivariate long memory we use in this study is a Fractionally Integrated VAR process *FIVAR(d,p)*:

$$A(L)D(L)y_t = \varepsilon_t \tag{1}$$

where y_t is a time series vector of k endogenous variables, and ε_t is a *kx1* vector of white noise disturbances with covariance matrix (not diagonal) Σ; $A(L) = I_k - \sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i L^i$ is the matrix of coefficients polynomial in the lag operator L and $D(L)$ is *kxk* diagonal matrix characterized by k degrees of fractional integration $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k$:

$$D(L) = \begin{bmatrix} (1-L)^{d_1} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & (1-L)^{d_2} & .. & 0 \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & (1-L)^{d_k} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $(1-L)^{d_j}$ is the difference operator of order d_j.

2.3 Vector Moving Average

If all the roots of the $|A(z)| = \left| I_k - \sum\limits_{i=1}^{p} A_i z^i \right| = 0$ fall outside the unit circle and all series are long

memory stationary, that is $|d_j| < 1/2$, for $j = 1,2,..k$, then the FIVAR model given by eq.(1) can be

inverted in order to obtain the infinite order moving average representation:

$$y_t = D(L)^{-1} A(L)^{-1} \varepsilon_t = \Phi(L)\varepsilon_t \tag{2}$$

where $D(L)^{-1}$ is a diagonal matrix with the element of the main diagonal described as follows:

$$(1-L)^{-d_j} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(i+d_j)}{\Gamma(d_j)\Gamma(i+1)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i^{(d_j)} L^i \tag{3}$$

where $\Gamma(.)$ is the gamma function and $\psi_0^{(0)} = 1$; $\psi_i^{(0)} = 1$, for $i \neq 1$.

Following Do et al. (2013), the Vector Moving Average representation is obtained in two steps.[2] In

first step we obtain the coefficient matrices Π_i of the inverted AR components for the forecast

horizon i. More specifically, we can rewrite a VAR(p) for the fractionally differenced vector

$z_t = D(L)y_t$ as a first order system:

$$
\begin{bmatrix} z_t \\ z_{t-1} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ z_{t-p+1} \end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & & A_p \\ I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & & I & 0 \end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix} z_{t-1} \\ z_{t-2} \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ z_{t-p} \end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_t \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$

which can be written in compact form:

$$\bar{z}_t = \bar{A}\,\bar{z}_{t-1} + \bar{\varepsilon}_t \tag{4}$$

---

[2] The *FIVAR* inversion following Do et al. (2013) has been computed through Gauss 6.0 by the authors.

where $\bar{A}$ is a $kp{\times}kp$ matrix.

Then:

$$\Pi_i = \bar{e}\,\bar{A}^{\,i}\,\bar{e}' \tag{5}$$

The selection matrix $\bar{e}$ has k rows and kp columns $\bar{e} = \begin{bmatrix} I & \bar{0} & .... & \bar{0} \end{bmatrix}$ with I being the $k{\times}k$ identity matrix; $\bar{A}^{\,i} = \prod_{h=1}^{i} \bar{A}$.

In the second step, since $\Phi(L) = D(L)^{-1}\Pi(L)_t$, we can observe that the jth row of $\Phi(L)$, that is $^{(j)}\Phi(L)$ can be written as:

$$^{(j)}\Phi(L) = (1-L)^{-d_j} e_j' \Pi(L) \tag{6}$$

where e_j is $kx1$ selection vector with 1 in row j and zeros elsewhere. Since $(1-L)^{-d_j} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i^{(d_j)} L^i$, then we can rewrite eq. (6) as:

$$^{(j)}\Phi(L) = \left[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i^{(d_j)} L^i \right]\left[\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} e_j' \Pi_i L^i \right] \tag{7}$$

By expanding the multiplication of eq.(7), Do et al. (2013) show that the moving average coefficients for the forecast horizon h are:

$$^{(j)}\Phi_h = \sum_{i=0}^{h} \psi_i^{(d_j)} e_j' \Pi_{h-i} \qquad \text{for } h = 1,2,....$$

$$^{(j)}\Phi_h = e_j' \Pi_0 \qquad\qquad \text{for } h = 0 \tag{8}$$

where Π_0 is the k dimensional identity matrix.

3. Financial Connectedness

Following Diebold and Yilmaz (2012 and 2014), who use the generalized impulse response approach of Pesaran and Shin (1998), the contribution of shock to market i to the variance of the H step ahead forecast error for market j, $\theta_{ij}^g(H)$, is given by:

$$\theta_{ij}^g(H) = \frac{\sigma_{ii}^{-1} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \left(e_i^{'} \Phi_h \Sigma e_j \right)^2}{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \left(e_i^{'} \Phi_h \Sigma \Phi_h^{'} e_j \right)^2} \tag{10}$$

Where, Σ is the sample covariance matrix of the k dimensional vector of residuals (e.g. shocks) ε_t in eq. (1) and σ_{ii} is the variance of the shock to series i. For $i \neq j$, the above expression describes the "cross variance shares" (that is the contribution of shock i to the variance of the forecast error of series j), while for $i = j$, the above expression captures the "own shares" (that is, the contribution of shock i to the variance of the forecast error of the same series). Equation (10) describes the generic element i,j of the variance decomposition table.

The index of total directional connectedness (see Diebold and Yilmaz, 2014) received by market i from the rest of the system is measured by the sum of row i of the variance decomposition table less the element measuring the own share in the i-th row:

$$S_{ij}^g(H) = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{K} \widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^g(H) \tag{11}$$

Given the use of generalized impulse response, the sum of each row of the variance decomposition table is different from one, that is $\sum_{j=1}^{K} \theta_{ij}^g(H) \neq 1$. Therefore, Diebold and Yilmaz (2012; 2014) suggest to normalize each $\theta_{ij}^g(H)$ in (10) by the sum of each row of the variance decomposition table:

$$\widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^g(H) = \frac{\theta_{ij}^g(H)}{\sum_{j=1}^{K} \theta_{ij}^g(H)} \tag{12}$$

As argued by Diebold and Yilmaz (2014), the "FROM" connectedness measure described by eq.(11) is very similar to the marginal expected shortfall indicator of systemic risk proposed by Acharya et al. (2010).

The index of total directional connectedness (see Diebold and Yilmaz, 2014) transmitted from market j to the rest of the system is measured by the sum of column j of the variance decomposition table less the element measuring the own share in the j-*th* column:

$$S_{ji}^g(H) = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{K} \bar{\theta}_{ij}^g(H) \tag{13}$$

The "TO"-connectedness measure described by eq.(13), measures the contribution of a single market (asset) to the system, in a fashion very similar to CoVaR indicator of systemic risk suggested by Adrian and Brunnermeier (2008).

While a normalization by row would ease the interpretation of the indicator FROM (measuring the vulnerability of each market), the following normalization by column:

$$\bar{\theta}_{ij}^{g}(H) = \frac{\theta_{ij}^{g}(H)}{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \theta_{ij}^{g}(H)} \tag{14}$$

would ease the interpretation of the TO indicator when making a comparison across markets.[3]

Finally, by taking the ratio of total cross variance shares to the sum of the total of cross and own shares:

$$S^{g}(H) = \frac{\sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{K} \widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^{g}(H)}{\sum_{i,j}^{K} \widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^{g}(H)} = \frac{\sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{K} \widetilde{\theta}_{ij}^{g}(H)}{k} \tag{15}$$

we obtain the total financial connectedness index.

4. Data and empirical evidence

Following Buraschi et al. (2013)[4], the volatility risk premium is defined as:

$$VRP(t) = IV(t) - RV(t+1)$$

---

[3] Diebold-Yilmaz (2012, 2014) rely only on a normalization by row which, we argue, makes more difficult to compare the TO indices (measuring contribution to systemic risk) across markets.

[4] Differently from other papers in the "financial" literature (see e.g. Carr and Wu 2009) where the variance risk premium is defined as the difference between physical and risk neutral variance, here we follow the "econometric" literature where the variance risk premium is defined in the opposite way as the difference between risk neutral and physical variance.

Both addends are in percentage values, *IV(t)* is the risk neutral expectation at time *t* of volatility between t and *t+1*, proxied by the annualized implied volatility index of the stock market index; *RV(t+1)* is the square root of the annualized realized variance between t and t+1 of the stock market index return (obtained from the sum of squared log returns of 21 days occurring between t and t+1). All series a r e obtained from DATASTREAM. The sample observed at daily frequency runs from 1/2/2000 till 29/08/2013 and the countries under investigation are the UK, Germany, Switzerland, France and Netherlands, given that they are the only countries in Europe in which a volatility index for the underlying stock market index is traded.

In Figure 1 we can observe the plots of the time series under investigation. In particular, we can observe a synchronized behavior of the five series throughout the sample with a large negative peak in correspondence of the Lehman Brothers collapse (September/October 2008).

In Table 1 we report descriptive statistics. The volatility risk premia are all positive on average, ranging from the lowest value of 2.567 for France to the highest value of 3.793 for UK on a percentage annualized basis. This means that "selling" volatility has been highly profitable on average over the 2000-2013 period. The findings are consistent with the literature (see e.g. Carr and Wu (2009), Bollerslev et al. (2014), Cipollini et al. (2015)) where a negative variance risk premium (if measured as the difference between physical and risk neutral variance, as opposite to our way of measuring it) is usually detected: in other words investors are willing to accept (gain) a significantly negative (positive) return being long (short) in a variance swap, in order to be hedged (in exchange to be exposed to) against peaks of variance.

4.1 Total financial connectedness

We now turn our focus on the results concerning with the total connectedness among volatility risk premia. The analysis (both full sample and rolling based on a window of size equal to 500 days) is based on the estimation of VAR model with 2 lags (selected according to the Bayesian Schwarz

criterion information).[5] Fig 2 shows that the evolution over time (between 1/01/2002 and 29/8/2013) of the total connectedness index is very similar across different forecast horizons. In the short forecast horizon the index is more volatile than in the long forecast horizon: in each day, the time varying index is increasing with the forecast horizon and it attains values over the longest interval recording an upward trend (over the years between 2007 and 2009) ranging between 0.62 and 0.74 at the 2 days horizon; between 0.675 and 0.76 at the 10 days horizon; between 0.70 and 0.77 at the 20 and 30 days horizon. Since 2011 the time varying index of total connectedness exhibits a downward trend. Contrary to time varying analysis, the results based on the full sample (see Tables 3 and 4 where, in order to disentangle the percentage of contribution of each country to systemic risk, including the own variance share, the FROM are normalized by row and the TO are normalized by column) show hardly any change of the total index over different forecast horizons (in the long memory case, the values of the total index is generally increasing with the forecast horizon, with the exception of the 30-day and ranges from 0.69 to 0.74). Finally, the indexes obtained by a long memory VAR are very close to their counterparties obtained by a short memory VAR as we can see from Figure 2.

4.2 Directional financial connectedness

We now describe the empirical results on the directional connectedness indices. The full sample analysis results are reported in Table 3 (left panel for the long memory VAR, right panel for the short memory VAR) where a normalization is done by row in order to allow a better comparison of FROM indices across markets. Similarly, to ease the interpretation of the TO indices as percentage values, a normalization is done by column and the results are provided in Table 4 (left panel for the long memory VAR, right panel for the short memory VAR). An inspection of the index with label "TO" in Table 4 shows that, while the Netherlands is the market contributing the most to systemic

---

[5]It is important to observe that the full sample and rolling analysis is robust to different VAR order specifications. Results are available upon request.

risk (increasing from a value equal to 0.71 for the very short term forecast horizon to values between 0.74 and 0.76 for longer forecast horizons), France is contributing the least to systemic risk especially for an horizon longer than two days (with values ranging between 0.67 and 0.70). Moreover, France is also the country most vulnerable from systemic risk: an inspection of the index with label "FROM" in Table 3 shows that the index values for France range between 0.69 and 0.77 and are the highest if compared to the other countries. Switzerland is the country least vulnerable from systemic risk, since an inspection of the index with label "FROM" shows that the index ranges between 0.68 and 0.69 across different forecast horizon and it is the lowest if compared to the other countries under investigation. Finally, we can observe that the directional spillovers indices obtained by a long memory VAR are very close to their counterparties obtained by a short memory VAR (reported in the right panels of Tables 3 and 4).

The plots of the time varying indices of the directional connectedness (obtained from the rolling estimation) measuring the vulnerability of each market from systemic risk (e.g the FROM indices) and the contribution of each market to systemic risk (e.g, the TO indices) are reported in Fig 3 and 4. As observed in Section 3, to ease the interpretation the FROM indices are normalized by row, while the TO indices are normalized by column.

We start commenting on the empirical findings regarding the FROM indices (see left panel in Fig 3). In UK, relative to an average value between 0.69 and 0.71 (see Table 3), the periods recording an increase in the vulnerability index are May 2006 – August 2008 (with values ranging from 0.60 to 0.80) and over April 2010 - November 2010 (with values ranging from 0.65 to 0.80). The intervals November 2008 - May 2010 (from 0.80 to 0.66) and from August 2011 – August 2013 are characterized by a decreasing pattern with values of the index dropping from 0.80 to 0.66. A discrepancy of index values across forecast horizons occurs over October 210-July 2011.

In Germany there are large differences of the index value across forecast horizons over the interval

14

June 2002 - July 2004. Further large discrepancy occurs over the interval September 2008 – September 2010, for which there is evidence of increasing trend only for longer forecast horizon. The index is relatively stable around 0.70 for the rest of the sample.

In Switzerland the index exhibits an upward trend over August 2003 – December 2005 (with values ranging from 0.63 to 0.77), during May 2006 - August 2007 (with values ranging from 0.61 to 0.81) and over the period November 2010-July2011 (with values rising from 0.55 to 0.72). A long decreasing pattern of the index in Switzerland is recorded during August 2007 - October 2010 (with values falling from 0.81 to 0.55). A shorter and less volatile downward trend occurs over May 2002-Sept2003 (with values ranging from 0.80 to 0.60) and over July 2011 – August 2013 sample (with values of the index dropping from 0.72 to 0.63). A relatively large discrepancy across forecast horizons occurs before March 2008.

In France there is a large difference in the index values across forecast horizons especially at the beginning of the sample until July 2004. In particular, while the time varying evolution of the index is decreasing for long forecast horizon (from 0.80 to 0.70), it is increasing (from 0.60 to 0.70) for shorter forecast horizon. Since July 2004 the index in France is relatively stable (across forecast horizon) fluctuating around 0.75 till early October 2008. From Lehman Brother collapse till December 2010, the index for long forecast horizon rises fluctuating around 0.8 and the one associated to short forecast horizon falls fluctuating around 0.7. From January 2011 onwards the index is stable around 0.75 across different forecast horizons.

In Netherlands there is evidence of an increasing trend over July 2004 - early October 2010 and during the period December 2010 – August 2013: in both periods the index is rising from 0.60 to 0.77. Finally, there is a downward trend from 0.68 to 0.60 from January 2002 till July 2004, and also a large drop from 0.75 to 0.60 over the short interval September – November 2008

We now turn our focus on the findings regarding the index measuring the contribution TO systemic risk (see right Panel Figure 3). In UK the index shows a decreasing pattern from August 2002 to

August 2004 (with values dropping from 0.77 to 0.65) and over August 2007-August 2008 (from 0.80 to 0.70). There is evidence of an upward trend from August 2004 to August 2007 (from 0.65 to 0.79) and during the Lehmnan Brother collapse. Since November 2008, the index is relatively stable averaging around 0.7 from December 2010 onwards (where the discrepancies across forecast horizon disappear). In Switzerland there is evidence of a downward trend from 0.75 to 0.58 over December 2002 –November 2004 and from 0.7 to 0.52 over Mar2005-May2006. Since June 2006, there is an upward trend ending in October 2008 when a peak of 0.77 is reached (followed by a large drop to 0.63 by the end of Nov2008) and over the period December 2008-November 2010, reaching a peak equal to 0.78. The index value is then relatively stable averaging around 0.77. The largest discrepancy across forecast horizon occurs in the early part of the sample (till October 2004) and since December 2008.

In Germany, while index value for the short term forecast horizon is relatively stable, fluctuating around 0.70, the index for longer forecast horizon shows a more volatile time varying pattern. More specifically, there is a huge drop (only for long forecast horizon) during the first part till October 2003 from 0.75 to 0.53, and from February 2008 till February 2010 (from 0.80 to 0.66). There is evidence of a long increasing trend from 0.55 to 0.80 over September 2003-February 2008 and over a shorter interval, from January 2010 to November 2010 (from 0.65 to 0.75). Only in the last part of the sample there are no discrepancies across forecast horizons with values close to 0.70

In France there is an increasing trend with values starting from 0.45 and reaching 0.75 in early October 2008; a shorter upward trend occurs over October 2010 and July 2011 (with values rangong from 0.65 to 0.75). A downward trend is recorded from October 2008 to October 2010 (with values dropping from 0.75 to 0.65). Discrepancies across forecast horizon occur over December 2008 and October 2010.

The plots in Fig 3 show that among the most recent periods of financial turmoil, the one associated with Lehman Brothers collapse is the one showing the largest gap between short and long term forecast horizon for the index measuring contribution to systemic risk in any country and only for

Germany and France vulnerability indices. The Eurozone crisis period is associated with differences between short term and long term forecast horizon only in two cases: the index measuring the UK vulnerability index and the one measuring contribution to systemic risk in Switzerland.

Last, in Figure 4, we report the differences in the estimation of the TO by using a short memory or a long memory VAR for the 30-day forecast horizon. Differently from the full sample analysis, where the difference between the outputs of the long-memory VAR and the short-memory VAR is not significant, we can see that in the rolling analysis, in particular at the longest forecast horizon of 30-day, a discrepancy between the results in the two estimation methods can be detected for few countries and over the period following the Lehman Brothers collapse (see the Swiss vulnerability indicator and the indices measuring contribution to systemic risk of UK and France). Unreported results, which are available upon request, show that the difference between the two estimation methods increases when switching from a short to a long forecast horizon.

Overall, the time varying plots in Fig 3 and 4 suggest that the transmission of shocks to volatility risk premia series during the crisis period associated with Lehman Brother collapse is more persistent than the one corresponding to first and second Eurozone crisis (associated with first half of year 2010 and second half of 2011, respectively).

5. Conclusions

The main focus of this paper is on the estimation of indicators measuring the vulnerability and the contribution to systemic risk of volatility risk premia for five stock markets in Europe: UK, Germany, Switzerland, France, Germany and the Netherlands. The volatility risk premia are proxies of risk aversion for investors hedging volatility risk. We follow the methodology suggested by Diebold-Yilmaz (2009, 2012) relying on forecast error variance decomposition. While Diebold-Yilmaz (2009 and 2012) rely on the variance decomposition of a stationary VAR, we focus on the estimation of a Fractionally Integrated VAR model, FIVAR, to account for the evidence of stationary long

memory in the volatility risk premia. More specifically, in the first stage of the analysis, we find evidence that the series under investigation are long memory stationary contaminated by (unconditional mean) regime shifts. In a second stage of the analysis, we follow Do et al. (2013) to invert the FIVAR model giving the moving average coefficients necessary to obtain the forecast error variance decomposition table and to construct the pairwise, the total connectedness and the directional connectedness indices. The latter are the indices we are most interested in since they measure the vulnerability and contribution to systemic risk of the series under investigation. Rolling regression analysis shows that the index measuring contribution to systemic risk is more volatile than the vulnerability indicator in Germany, France and Switzerland. Moreover, a comparison of the long memory vs short memory stationary VAR results coupled with the analysis carried across short and long forecast horizon suggest that Lehman Brothers collapse is the crisis period showing a higher degree of persistence in the transmission of shocks to volatility risk premia.

References

Acharya, V., Pedersen, L., Philippe, T. and Richardson, M., 2010. Measuring Systemic Risk. *Manuscript, Stern School, New York University*.

Adrian, T. and Brunnermeier, M. K., 2008. CoVaR. *Staff Reports, Federal Reserve Bank of New York* 348.

Andersen, T.G., and Bollerslev, T., 1997. Intraday periodicity and volatility persistence in financial markets. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 4, 115–158.

Andersen, T.G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F.X. and Labys, P., 2001. The distribution of exchange rate volatility. *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 96, 42-55

Bali, T.G., and Zhou, H.. 2014 Risk, Uncertainty, and Expected Returns. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, forthcoming.

Baillie, R. T., Bollerslev, T. and Mikkelsen, H. O., 1996. Fractionally integrated generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 74, 3–30.

Bandi, F. M. and Perron, B., 2006. Long memory and the relation between implied and realized volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 4, 636–670.

Bekaert, G. and Hoerova, M., 2014. The VIX, the Variance Premium and Stock Market Volatility. *Journal of Econometrics*, forthcoming.

Bollerslev ,T., Osterrieder, D., Sizova, N., and Tauchen, G., 2013. Risk and Return: Long-Run Relationships, Fractional Cointegration, and Return Predictability. *Journal of Financial Economics*, forthcoming.

Buraschi, A., Trojani, F. and Vedolin, A., 2014. When Uncertainty Blows in the Orchard: Comovement and Equilibrium Volatility Risk Premia. *Journal of Finance*, 69 (1), p101-137.

Christensen, B. J. and Nielsen, M. Ø., 2006. Asymptotic normality of narrow-band least squares in the stationary fractional cointegration model and volatility forecasting. *Journal of Econometrics* 133, 343-371

Cipollini, A. Lo Cascio, J., and Muzzioli, S., Volatility comovements, a time-scale decomposition analysis, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, *34, 2015, 34-44*.

Comte, F. and Renault, E., 1998. Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models. *Mathematical Finance* 8, 291–323.

Corsi, F., 2009. A simple approximate long-memory model of realized volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 7 (2), 174–196

Diebold, F.X. and Yilmaz, K., 2009, Measuring Financial Asset Return and Volatility Spillovers, With Application to Global Equity Markets. *Economic Journal*, 119, 158-171.

Diebold, F.X. and Yilmaz, K., 2012. Better to Give than to Receive: Predictive Directional Measurement of Volatility Spillovers. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 28, 57-66

Diebold, F.X. and Yilmaz, K., 2014. On the Network Topology of Variance Decompositions: Measuring the Connectedness of Financial Firms. *Journal of Econometrics*, 182, 119-134.

Do, H.X. , Brooks, R.D. and Treepongkaruna, S. , 2013. Generalized impulse response analysis in a fractionally integrated vector autoregressive model. *Economics Letters* 118, 462–465

Fengler, M.R. and Gisler, K., 2015. A variance spillover analysis without covariances: What do we miss?. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 51, 174–195

Lavielle, M., and Moulines, E., 2000. Least-Squares Estimation of an Unknown Number of Shifts in a Time Series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 21, 33–59.

Lavielle, M., 2005. Using penalized contrast for change point problem. *Signal Processing*, 85, 1501-1510

Muzzioli, S. 2013(a) The forecasting performance of corridor implied volatility in the Italian market. *Computational Economics*, 41 (3), 359-386.

Muzzioli, S., 2013(b), The Information Content of Option-Based Forecasts of Volatility: Evidence from the Italian Stock Market, The Quarterly Journal of Finance, 3(01).

Robinson, P. M., 1995. Gaussian semi-parametric estimation of long range dependence. *Annals of Statistics* 23, 1630-1661.

Qu, Z., 2011. A Test Against Spurious Long Memory. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29:3, 423-438

Figure 1: volatility risk premium series

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the volatility risk premium series

	Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	**Std Dev**	**Min**	**Max**
UK	3.793	6.638	-45.541	27.476
GER	3.116	7.117	-44.853	32.181
SWI	3.111	7.251	-44.141	33.269
FRA	2.567	7.427	-50.963	28.230
NED	3.778	8.031	-54.207	30.640

Note: The whole sample runs from 1/2/2000 to 29/08/2013.

Table 2: Long memory estimation results for the volatility risk premia.

UK		GER		SWI	
Full sample estimate of d	**_W stat_**	**Full sample estimate of d**	**_W stat_**	**Full sample estimate of d**	**_W stat_**
0.111 [0.094]	1.461	0.082 [0.085]	1.424	0.222 [0.132]	1.960
Breaks	**_d_**	**Breaks**	**_d_**	**Breaks**	**_d_**
1feb00 18sep08	0.080 [0.046; 0.114]	1feb00 10sep01	0.194 [0.177; 0.214]	1feb00 10sep01	0.139 [0.119; 0.159]
19sep08 6nov08	0.023 [0.014; 0.033]	11sep01 8oct01	0.203 [0.193; 0.213]	11sep01 12oct01	0.350 [0.336; 0.364]
7nov08 29aug13	0.000 [0.091; -0.09]	9oct01 21jun02	0.141 [0.128; 0.153]	15oct01 14jun02	0.050 [NA; NA]
		24jun02 19aug02	0.000 [-0.39; 0.392]	16jun02 16aug02	0.109 [0.101; 0.118
		20aug02 18jan08	0.033 [0.002; 0.065]	19aug02 24sep08	0.054 [0.022; 0.086]
		21jan08 18feb8	0.156 [0.144; 0.168]	25sep08 10nov08	0.159 [0.148; 0.169]
		19feb08 3oct08	0.000 [NA; NA]	11nov08 23jun09	0.378 [0.364; 0.393]
		6oct08 7nov08	0.181 [0.163; 0.199]	24jun09 29aug13	0.161 [0.133; 0.188]
		8nov08 3aug11	0.059 [0.033; 0.086]		
		4aug11 2sep11	0.106 [0.096; 0.116]		
		5sept11 29aug13	0.000 [-0.13; 0.134]		

Note: The entries in the first row (columns 1, 3 and 5) are the full sample Local Whittle point estimate of the fractional integration parameter _d_ (standard errors in parenthesis). The entries in the first row (columns 2, 4 and 6) are the values of the _W_ statistics developed by Qu (2011) for the null hypothesis that a given time series is a stationary long-memory process against the alternative hypothesis that it is affected by regime change or a smoothly varying trend. The tabulated critical values for 10% and 5% level of significance are 1.118 and 1.252, respectively (see Qu, 2011). The remaining rows (under the Breaks label) give the breakpoints (in the mean) describing each time series segment. The optimal number of segments (for instance, this number is equal to 3 for UK) is obtained using the method of minimizing a contrast function by Lavielle and Moulines (2000) and by Lavielle (2005). The remaining rows (under the d label) give the sub-sample estimates of the fractional integration parameter _d_ (95% confidence interval bands in parenthesis) fitting the best ARFIMA(p,d,q) according to the BIC criterion.

Table 2 cont'd: Long memory estimation results for the volatility risk premia.

FRA		NED	
Full sample estimate of d	*W stat*	**Full samplees timate of d**	*W stat*
0.102 [0.093]	1.459	0.082 [0.098]	1.424
Breaks	**d**	**Breaks**	**d**
1feb00 18sep08	0.060 [0.025; 0.095]	1feb00 18sep08	0.099 [0.064; 0.134]
19sep08 5nov08	0.179 [0.167; 0.192]	19sep08 4nov11	0.132 [0.121; 0.144]
6nov08 6may10	0.000 [NA; NA]	7nov11 29aug13	0.000 [-0.07; 0.076]
7may10 3jun10	0.000 [-0.05; 0.059]		
4jun10 29aug13	0.000 [-0.09; 0.092]		

Figure 2. Total connectedness index estimated from long memory stationary VAR (top panel) and short memory stationary VAR (bottom panel)

Table 3: Full-Sample Connectedness Table; normalized by row.

NORMALIZED BY ROW

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=2

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.32	0.19	0.15	0.15	0.21	0.69	1
GER	0.16	0.32	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.68	1
SWI	0.16	0.2	0.32	0.15	0.18	0.68	1
FRA	0.16	0.2	0.14	0.31	0.19	0.69	1
NED	0.19	0.2	0.16	0.16	0.31	0.7	1
TO	0.66	0.28	0.6	0.62	0.77	TOTAL	
TO+own	0.97	1.1	0.92	0.93	1.08		0.69

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=2

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.31	0.19	0.15	0.15	0.21	0.69	1
GER	0.16	0.32	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.68	1
SWI	0.16	0.2	0.32	0.15	0.18	0.68	1
FRA	0.16	0.2	0.14	0.31	0.19	0.69	1
NED	0.19	0.2	0.16	0.16	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.66	0.78	0.61	0.62	0.77	TOTAL	
TO+own	0.97	1.1	0.93	0.93	1.07		0.69

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=10

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.29	0.16	0.19	0.14	0.23	0.71	1
GER	0.28	0.25	0.19	0.15	0.22	0.75	1
SWI	0.21	0.16	0.31	0.12	0.2	0.69	1
FRA	0.2	0.17	0.17	0.23	0.23	0.77	1
NED	0.2	0.16	0.19	0.15	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.79	0.64	0.73	0.57	0.88	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.08	0.9	1.05	0.8	1.18		0.72

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=10

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.3	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.22	0.7	1
GER	0.16	0.3	0.17	0.16	0.21	0.7	1
SWI	0.18	0.19	0.3	0.13	0.2	0.7	1
FRA	0.18	0.19	0.15	0.27	0.22	0.73	1
NED	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.71	0.75	0.65	0.6	0.83	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.01	1.05	0.95	0.86	1.14		0.71

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=20

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.29	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.22	0.71	1
GER	0.28	0.27	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.74	1
SWI	0.2	0.17	0.31	0.12	0.2	0.69	1
FRA	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.24	0.23	0.76	1
NED	0.2	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.77	0.67	0.71	0.58	0.87	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.06	0.94	1.02	0.82	1.17		0.72

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=20

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.3	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.22	0.7	1
GER	0.18	0.28	0.17	0.16	0.22	0.72	1
SWI	0.2	0.18	0.3	0.12	0.2	0.7	1
FRA	0.19	0.18	0.15	0.25	0.23	0.75	1
NED	0.2	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.76	0.69	0.68	0.58	0.87	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.06	0.97	0.97	0.83	1.17		0.72

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=30

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.29	0.18	0.17	0.15	0.22	0.71	1
GER	0.17	0.29	0.17	0.16	0.21	0.71	1
SWI	0.18	0.19	0.31	0.13	0.19	0.69	1
FRA	0.18	0.19	0.15	0.26	0.22	0.74	1
NED	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.72	0.73	0.67	0.6	0.84	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.01	1.02	0.97	0.86	1.14		0.71

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=30

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.3	0.16	0.18	0.14	0.23	0.7	1
GER	0.18	0.26	0.18	0.16	0.22	0.74	1
SWI	0.21	0.17	0.3	0.12	0.21	0.7	1
FRA	0.2	0.17	0.16	0.24	0.23	0.76	1
NED	0.21	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.3	0.7	1
TO	0.79	0.66	0.7	0.57	0.89	TOTAL	
TO+own	1.09	0.92	1	0.81	1.19		0.72

Note: We follow Diebold-Yilmaz (2014) in the description of the Full-Sample Connectedness Table. The full sample VAR(2) analysis stars is Feb 2, 2000 through August 29, 2014. The ij-th entry of the upper-left 5x5 sub-matrix gives the ij-th pairwise directional connectedness: the percent of h-day-ahead forecast error variance of country i due to shocks from country j. The rightmost ("FROM") column gives total directional connectedness (from): row sums (from all others to i). The bottom ("TO") row gives total directional connectedness (to); i.e., column sums (to all others from j). The bottom ("NET") row gives the difference in total directional connectedness (to-from). The bottom-right element (in boldface) is total connectedness (mean "from" connectedness, or equivalently, mean "to" connectedness). Each entry of the variance decomposition table is normalized by row (see eq. 12)

Table 4: Full-Sample Connectedness Table; normalized by column

NORMALIZED BY COLUMN

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=2

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.32	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.68	1
GER	0.16	0.29	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.69	0.98
SWI	0.16	0.18	0.34	0.15	0.16	0.65	0.99
FRA	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.33	0.18	0.68	1.01
NED	0.2	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.29	0.73	1.03
TO	0.68	0.71	0.66	0.67	0.71	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.69

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=2

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.32	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.68	1
GER	0.16	0.29	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.7	0.98
SWI	0.16	0.18	0.33	0.15	0.16	0.65	0.98
FRA	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.33	0.18	0.68	1.01
NED	0.2	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.29	0.73	1.02
TO	0.68	0.71	0.67	0.67	0.71	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.69

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=10

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.26	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.71	0.98
GER	0.18	0.3	0.2	0.21	0.2	0.79	1.09
SWI	0.17	0.16	0.27	0.13	0.15	0.62	0.89
FRA	0.19	0.2	0.17	0.3	0.21	0.78	1.08
NED	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.24	0.71	0.96
TO	0.74	0.7	0.73	0.7	0.76	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.72

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=10

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.29	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.19	0.7	0.99
GER	0.16	0.2	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.71	1
SWI	0.17	0.18	0.31	0.15	0.17	0.66	0.97
FRA	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.32	0.2	0.74	1.06
NED	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.26	0.22	0.98
TO	0.71	0.72	0.69	0.68	0.74	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.71

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=20

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.27	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.71	0.98
GER	0.28	0.3	0.19	0.2	0.2	0.87	1.17
SWI	0.27	0.16	0.28	0.13	0.16	0.63	0.91
FRA	0.19	0.2	0.17	0.31	0.21	0.77	1.08
NED	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.25	0.72	0.96
TO	0.73	0.7	0.72	0.69	0.75	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.74

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=20

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.28	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.19	0.7	0.98
GER	0.17	0.3	0.19	0.2	0.19	0.75	1.05
SWI	0.18	0.17	0.29	0.14	0.16	0.65	0.94
FRA	0.19	0.2	0.17	0.31	0.21	0.76	1.07
NED	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.25	0.71	0.96
TO	0.72	0.7	0.71	0.69	0.75	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.71

SPILLOVER TABLE, LONG MEMORY, H=30

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.29	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.71	1
GER	0.17	0.29	0.18	0.19	0.19	0.72	1.01
SWI	0.17	0.17	0.3	0.14	0.16	0.64	0.95
FRA	0.19	0.2	0.16	0.32	0.2	0.75	1.06
NED	0.19	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.26	0.72	0.98
TO	0.71	0.71	0.7	0.68	0.74	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.71

SPILLOVER TABLE, SHORT MEMORY, H=30

	UK	GER	SWI	FRA	NED	FROM	FROM+own
UK	0.27	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.19	0.7	0.97
GER	0.18	0.3	0.19	0.2	0.2	0.77	1.08
SWI	0.18	0.17	0.28	0.13	0.16	0.64	0.92
FRA	0.19	0.2	0.17	0.31	0.21	0.77	1.08
NED	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.25	0.71	0.95
TO	0.73	0.7	0.72	0.69	0.75	TOTAL	
TO+own	1	1	1	1	1		0.72

Note: We follow Diebold-Yilmaz (2014) in the description of the Full-Sample Connectedness Table. The full sample VAR(2) analysis stars is Feb 2, 2000 through August 29, 2014. The ij-th entry of the upper-left 5x5 sub-matrix gives the ij-th pairwise directional connectedness: the percent of h-day-ahead forecast error variance of country i due to shocks from country j. The rightmost ("FROM") column gives total directional connectedness (from): row sums (from all others to i). The bottom ("TO") row gives total directional connectedness (to); i.e., column sums (to all others from j). The bottom ("NET") row gives the difference in total directional connectedness (to-from). The bottom-right element (in boldface) is total connectedness (mean "from" connectedness, or equivalently, mean "to" connectedness). Each entry of the variance decomposition table is normalized by column (see eq. 14)

Figure 3. Directional Connectedness indices TO and FROM for different forecast horizons (long memory).


FROM directional connectedness, LM, UK

TO directional connectedness, LM, UK

FROM directional connectedness, LM, GER

TO directional connectedness, LM, GER

FROM directional connectedness, SM, SWI

TO directional connectedness, LM, SWI

FROM directional connectedness, LM, FRA

TO directional connectedness, LM, FRA

FROM directional connectedness, LM, NED

TO directional connectedness, LM, NED

Figure 4. The comparison for the 30-days forecast horizon between short memory and long memory VAR.

www.cefin.unimore.it

45 *Family ties: occupational responses to cope with a household income shock,* by Baldini, M.,Torricelli, C., Urzì Brancati M.C. (April 2014)

44 *Volatility co-movements: a time scale decomposition analysis,* by Cipollini, I., Lo Cascio I., Muzzioli. S. (November 2013)

43 *The effect of revenue and geographic diversification on bank performance,* by Brighi, P., Venturelli, V. (October 2013)

42 *The sovereign debt crisis: the impact on the intermediation model of Italian banks,* by Cosma,S., Gualandri, E. (October 2013)

41 *The financing of Italian firms and the credit crunch: findings and exit strategies,* by Gualandri, E., Venturelli, V. (October 2013)

40 *Efficiency and unbiasedness of corn futures markets: New evidence across the financial crisis,* by Pederzoli, C., Torricelli, C. (October 2013)

39 *La regolamentazione dello short selling: effetti sul mercato azionario italiano (Short selling ban: effects on the Italian stock market)*, by Mattioli L., Ferretti R. (August 2013)

38 *A liquidity risk index as a regulatory tool for systematically important banks? An empirical assessment across two financial crises*, by Gianfelice G., Marotta G., Torricelli C. (July 2013)

37 *Per un accesso sostenibile delle Pmi al credito (A sustainable access to credit for SMEs),* by Giuseppe Marotta (May 2013)

36 *The unavoidable persistence of forum shopping in the Insolvency Regulation*, by Federico M. Mucciarelli (April 2013)

35 *Rating Triggers, Market Risk and the Need for More Regulation,* by Federico Parmeggiani (December 2012)

34 *Collateral Requirements of SMEs: The Evidence from Less–Developed Countries*, by Elmas Yaldiz Hanedar, Eleonora Broccardo, Flavio Bazzana (November 2012)

33 *Is it money or brains? The determinants of intra-family decision power*, by Graziella Bertocchi, Marianna Brunetti, Costanza Torricelli (June 2012)

32 *Is financial fragility a matter of illiquidity? An appraisal for Italian households*, by Marianna Brunetti, Elena Giarda, Costanza Torricelli (June 2012)

31 *Attitudes, personality factors and household debt decisions: A study of consumer credit,* by Stefano Cosma and Francesco Pattarin (February 2012)

30 *Corridor implied volatility and the variance risk premium in the Italian market,* by Silvia Muzzioli (November 2011)

29 *Internal Corporate Governance and the Financial Crisis: Lessons for Banks, Regulators and Supervisors,* by Elisabetta Gualandri, Aldo Stanziale, and Enzo Mangone (November 2011)

28 *Are defined contribution pension schemes socially sustainable? A conceptual*

CEFIN – Centro Studi di Banca e Finanza
Dipartimento di Economia Marco Biagi – Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia
Viale Jacopo Berengario 51, 41121 MODENA (Italy)
tel. 39-059.2056711 (Centralino) fax 39-059 205 6927

map from a macroprudential perspective, by Giuseppe Marotta (October 2011)

27 *Basel 3, Pillar 2: the role of banks' internal governance and control function*, by Elisabetta Gualandri (September 2011)

26 *Underpricing, wealth loss for pre-existing shareholders and the cost of going public: the role of private equity backing in Italian IPOs*, by Riccardo Ferretti and Antonio Meles (April 2011)

25 *Modelling credit risk for innovative firms: the role of innovation measures*, by Pederzoli C., Thoma G., Torricelli C. (March 2011)

24 *Market Reaction to Second-Hand News: Attention Grabbing or Information Dissemination?*, by Cervellati E.M., Ferretti R., Pattitoni P. (January 2011)

23 *Towards a volatility index for the Italian stock market*, by Muzzioli S. (September 2010)

22 *A parsimonious default prediction model for Italian SMEs*, by Pederzoli C., Torricelli C. (June 2010)

21 *Average Internal Rate of Return and investment decisions: a new perspective,* by Magni C.A. (February 2010)

20 *The skew pattern of implied volatility in the DAX index options market,* by Muzzioli S. (December 2009)

19 *Accounting and economic measures: An integrated theory of capital budgeting,* by Magni C.A. (December 2009)

18 *Exclusions of US-holders in cross-border takeover bids and the principle of equality in tender offers*, by Mucciarelli F. (May 2009).

17 *Models for household portfolios and life-cycle allocations in the presence of labour income and longevity risk*, by Torricelli C. (March 2009)

16 *Differential evolution of combinatorial search for constrained index tracking*, by Paterlini S, Krink T, Mittnik S. (March 2009)

15 *Optimization heuristics for determining internal rating grading scales*, by Paterlini S, Lyraa M, Pahaa J, Winker P. (March 2009)

14 *The impact of bank concentration on financial distress: the case of the European banking system*, by Fiordelisi F, Cipollini A. (February 2009)

13 *Financial crisis and new dimensions of liquidity risk: rethinking prudential regulation and supervision*, by Landi A, Gualandri E, Venturelli V. (January 2009)

12 *Lending interest rate pass-through in the euro area: a data-driven tale*, by Marotta G. (October 2008)

11 *Option based forecast of volatility: an empirical study in the Dax index options market*, Muzzioli S. (May 2008)

10 *Lending interest rate pass-through in the euro area*, by Marotta G. (March 2008)

9 *Indebtedness, macroeconomic conditions and banks' losses: evidence from Italy*, by Torricelli C, Castellani S, Pederzoli C. (January 2008)

8 *Is public information really public? The role of newspapers*, Ferretti R, Pattarin F. (January 2008)

7 *Differential evolution of multi-objective portfolio optimization*, by Paterlini S, Krink

CEFIN – Centro Studi di Banca e Finanza
Dipartimento di Economia Marco Biagi – Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia
Viale Jacopo Berengario 51, 41121 MODENA (Italy)
tel. 39-059.2056711 (Centralino) fax 39-059 205 6927

T. (January 2008)

6 *Assessing and measuring the equity gap and the equity*, by Gualandri E, Venturelli V. (January 2008)

5 *Model risk e tecniche per il controllo dei market parameter*, Torricelli C, Bonollo M, Morandi D, Pederzoli C. (October 2007)

4 *The relations between implied and realised volatility, are call options more informative than put options? Evidence from the Dax index options market*, by Muzzioli S. (October 2007)

3 *The maximum LG-likelihood method: an application to extreme quantile estimation in finance*, by Ferrari D., Paterlini S. (June 2007)

2 *Default risk: Poisson mixture and the business cycle*, by Pederzoli C. (June 2007)

1 *Population ageing, household portfolios and financial asset returns: a survey of the literature*, by Brunetti M. (May 2007)