



**Estimating portfolio value-at-risk via dynamic conditional correlation
MGARCH model: An empirical study on foreign exchange rates**

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	AFL-06-9959
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics Letters
JEL Code:	C32 - Time-Series Models < C3 - Econometric Methods: Multiple/Simultaneous Equation Models < C - Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, C53 - Forecasting and Other Model Applications < C5 - Econometric Modeling < C - Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, G11 - Portfolio Choice < G1 - General Financial Markets < G - Financial Economics
Keywords:	Portfolio Value-at-Risk (VaR), DCC model, time-varying correlation

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

Estimating portfolio value-at-risk via dynamic conditional correlation MGARCH model – an empirical study on foreign exchange rates

1. Introduction

As the Basle Committee on Banking Supervision of the Bank for International Settlement begins to adopt Value at Risk (VaR) schemes in its capital accords, applications of VaR have begun to be popular and visible in academic studies and practical implementations. Econometric techniques such as GARCH models can be used in conjunction with VaR to better risk management because their notable capacities for depicting volatility-clustering phenomena as evident in financial dynamics (e.g. Bollerslev et al., 1992, Engle, 1995, Bollerslev, 2001, Li and Lin, 2004, and Cotter, 2005). In particular, co-varying relationships among positions in a portfolio are exceptionally essential because of risk diversification. Thus, we apply Engle's (2002) model which takes dynamic conditional correlation into consideration (the DCC model hereafter) to clarify this viewpoint. The rest of this study is structured as follows: Section 2 explores connections between VaR approaches and GARCH models; empirical results are demonstrated in Section 3; and Section 4 concludes our findings.

2. VaR and GARCH Models

We apply the variance-covariance approach advocated by JP Morgan's RiskMetrics (1996) to work out VaR figures, which can be stated as follows:

$$VaR_{t+1} = \begin{cases} -I_t C_\alpha \sqrt{\mathbf{w}_t' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{w}_t} & \text{for long positions;} \\ I_t C_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\mathbf{w}_t' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{w}_t} & \text{for short positions.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where I_t denotes an agent's invested amount at time t , and we set $I_t = 1$ without loss of generality. C_α and $C_{1-\alpha}$ are the left and right critical values, i.e. the risk

1
2
3 multipliers of a presumed distribution with a given confidence level $1 - \alpha$. JP Morgan
4
5 uses the standard normal distribution and $\alpha = 5\%$ for its risk management. This
6
7 study follows its settings. \mathbf{w}_t is the investment weights vector, i.e.
8
9
10 $\mathbf{w}_t' = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n]$ where w_i denotes the percent invested in i -th asset in this
11
12 portfolio. Σ_t is the estimated variance-covariance matrix of positions in this
13
14 portfolio and can be estimated by various GARCH models. For example, Bollerslev et
15
16 al. (1988) find that the conditional covariances are quite variable over time and are the
17
18 significant determinant of time-varying risk premia for investors in bills, bonds, and
19
20 stock markets. However, the traditional multivariate GARCH model involves
21
22 estimation problems on the tradeoff between their generality and the number of
23
24 parameters to be estimated. In addition, considerable restrictions are needed to
25
26 guarantee the positive definiteness of the covariance matrix. Scholars have devoted
27
28 work to overcoming these drawbacks, including Engle and Kroner (1995), Bollerslev
29
30 (1990), and Engle (2002).
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 The BEKK model is suggested by Baba, Engle, Kraft and Kroner in a preliminary
39
40 version of Engle and Kroner (1995). It guarantees the positive definiteness of the
41
42 covariance matrix. Nevertheless, it is somewhat difficult to implement, and several
43
44 strict constraints are required in its optimization iterations. Moreover, the BEKK
45
46 model focuses on time-varying covariances, while the stochastic correlation
47
48 coefficients are closer to reality (Longin and Solink, 1995, 2001).
49
50

51
52 In order to reduce the number of parameters to be estimated, Bollerslev (1990)
53
54 develops a MGARCH model with constant conditional correlation presumption (the
55
56 CCC model). That is, volatility of each individual series is estimated by a univariate
57
58 GARCH estimation procedure in advance. Then the resulting standardized residuals
59
60 are used to yield the conditional correlation matrix. In addition to the estimation

flexibility, the CCC model endows the covariance matrix with the positive definite property simply by requiring each univariate conditional variance be positive and the constant matrix of conditional correlations be positive definite. Due to its computational simplicity, the CCC model is widely used in empirical applications. Nevertheless, a range of studies such as Tsui and Yu (1999), and Tse (2000) find that the assumption of constant conditional correlation can be too restrictive for realized data.

Later, Engle (2002) proposes a more generalized MGARCH model with dynamic conditional correlation setting (the DCC model). In contrast to the CCC and BEKK models, it simplifies the estimation procedures and allows time variation of the conditional correlation matrix. In terms of a portfolio, the DCC model first fits to each asset return an appropriate univariate GARCH model and estimates the conditional standard deviations to standardize the returns. Then the standardized return vector is used to model the correlation dynamics. The DCC model can be stated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{r}_t &= \boldsymbol{\mu}_t + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, & \boldsymbol{\mu}_t &= E[\mathbf{r}_t | \Omega_{t-1}], \\
 & & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t | \Omega_{t-1} &\sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}_t). \\
 \mathbf{H}_t &= \mathbf{D}_t \mathbf{R}_t \mathbf{D}_t, & \mathbf{D}_t &= \text{diag}\{\sqrt{h_{ii,t}}\}. \\
 \mathbf{z}_t &= \mathbf{D}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{r}_t = (r_{1,t}, \dots, r_{n,t})'$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t = (\mu_{1,t}, \dots, \mu_{n,t})'$, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{n,t})'$ are vectors, $h_{ii,t}$ is the estimated conditional variance from individual univariate GARCH models, \mathbf{D}_t is the diagonal matrix of conditional standard deviations, \mathbf{R}_t is the time-varying conditional correlation matrix of returns, and \mathbf{z}_t is the standardized residuals vector with mean zero and variance one. After the above basic construction, the dynamic correlation matrix of the DCC model can be specified further:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{R}_t &= \left(\text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \mathbf{Q}_t \left(\text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\mathbf{Q}_t &= (q_{ij,t}) \\
\left(\text{diag}(\mathbf{Q}_t) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{q_{11,t}}}, \dots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_{nn,t}}} \right) \\
q_{ij,t} &= \bar{\rho}_{ij} + \alpha (z_{i,t-1} z_{j,t-1} - \bar{\rho}_{ij}) + \beta (q_{ij,t-1} - \bar{\rho}_{ij})
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\bar{\rho}_{ij}$ is the unconditional correlations and the new time-varying conditional

correlation coefficient $\rho_{ij,t} = \frac{q_{ij,t}}{\sqrt{q_{ii,t} q_{jj,t}}}$. Engle (2002) suggests that the conditional

correlation coefficients provide superior performance in a variety of situations.

3. Empirical Studies

In this section, we calculate VaR figures by various GARCH models. The data set includes the U.S. Dollar to British Pound (BP), Japanese Yen (YEN), and Euro Dollar (EU) exchange rates covering 1999–2004. Samples in period 1999–2003 are applied for parameter estimations, and samples in period 2004 are then used to calculate VaR figures under different MGARCH models for later comparisons.

Table 1 shows the basic daily rate-of-return statistics. From the significant ADF statistics, the null hypothesis of a unit root is rejected for all of the three series. Apparent leptokurtic or fat-tailed phenomenon appears in the foreign exchange markets because that the Kurtosis statistics are all larger than 3 and that the Jarque-Bera statistics are all significant. Moreover, obvious heteroskedastic pattern exists in that the Ljung-Box Q statistics are all significant. Thus, it is reasonable to apply GARCH models in the exchange markets.

— Insert Table 1 about here —

Intuitively, a large prediction failure number is uncomfortable in that it implies ill prediction ability or bad risk management. But an insensitive model may produce a

1
2
3 smaller failure number at the price of larger deviation, which costs more resources to
4
5 shelter risky assets. Thus, not only “the actual number of prediction failure” (NF for
6
7 abbreviation hereafter), but also “the average deviation between VaR and realized
8
9 return” (AD for abbreviation hereafter) is calculated. The specification of AD which
10
11 can be used to measure the idle degrees of resources to shelter risk exposure is:

$$AD = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m \left(|VaR_t| - |r_t| \right)^+ \quad (4)$$

12
13
14
15
16
17
18 where m is the number of trading days in the testing period, and the superscripted
19
20 “plus” sign (+) out of the parentheses denotes that only the cases of effective risk
21
22 management are taken into AD calculation, i.e. $|VaR_t| \geq |r_t|$. Perfect risk
23
24 management requests low levels of NF and AD simultaneously.
25
26
27

28
29 However, no significant distinction of the EWMA, i.e. IGARCH (1, 1, $\lambda = 0.94$)
30
31 and the GARCH (1, 1) models can be found on the criteria NF and AD for the three
32
33 exchange rates data in Table 2. The two univariate GARCH models perform better
34
35 and worse than each other at different criteria and different exchange rates data. For
36
37 example, IGARCH has less prediction failures than GARCH in the BP case ($33 < 41$),
38
39 but the opposite results exist in the EU and YEN cases ($32 > 27$ and $33 > 27$). It may
40
41 be the case that models from the univariate GARCH family exhibit equivalent ability
42
43 to capture the volatility-clustering dynamics of exchange markets in terms of VaR
44
45 backtesting.
46
47
48

49
50 — Insert Table 2 about here —
51

52
53 Next, the econometric structures and parameter estimates of the DCC, CCC, and
54
55 BEKK MGARCH models are listed in Table 3. We then use the three exchange rates
56
57 to formulate a hypothetical equally-weighted portfolio to examine the performance of
58
59 the three MGARCH models to clarify whether the time-varying correlation setting is
60
important for portfolio risk management. According to Table 4, none of the three

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

models performs best on the two criteria simultaneously. The BEKK model performs best at the AD criterion and the DCC model performs best at the NF criterion. Nevertheless, their AD figures are rather close because each of them differs less than 2.11% ($= (0.4244 - 0.4157) / 0.4157$) with each other. In contrast, the NF criterion reveals a strong ranking order in which the DCC model performs notably 42.11% ($= (27 - 19) / 19$) better than the CCC model and notably 57.89% ($= (30 - 19) / 19$) better than the BEKK model. In other words, the DCC model seems to be the best choice for portfolio VaR calculation because it offers great improvement of prediction accuracy at the lesser cost of sheltering resource. We can reasonably infer that the superiority of the DCC model results from the consideration of time-varying correlation among different exchange rate series, which is more consistent with reality.

— Insert Table 3 about here —

— Insert Table 4 about here —

4. Conclusions

This study uses exchange rates data to examine performance of GARCH models in terms of VaR backtesting on prediction failures and average deviations. We find that univariate GARCH models seem to be equipped with equivalent ability to capture the volatility-clustering dynamics of financial assets. In contrast, the multivariate GARCH model developed by Engle (2002) performs much better on the criterion of prediction failures than other multivariate GARCH models developed by Bollerslev (1990) and Engle and Kroner (1995) in estimating portfolio VaR series. Consequently, it is reasonable to infer that the superiority results from the consideration of time-varying correlation and cannot be ignored when dealing with portfolio risk management.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Bollerslev, T. (1990) Modeling the coherence in short-run nominal exchange rates: a
6
7 multivariate generalized ARCH approach, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **72**,
8
9 498–505.
10
11
12 Bollerslev, T. (2001) Financial econometrics: Past developments and future challenges,
13
14 *Journal of Econometrics*, **100**, 41-51.
15
16 Bollerslev, T., Engle, R. and J. Wooldridge (1988) A capital asset pricing model with
17
18 time varying covariance, *Journal of Political Economy*, **96**, 116-131.
19
20
21 Bollerslev, T., Chou, R., and K. Kroner (1992) ARCH modeling in finance: a review of
22
23 the theory and empirical evidence, *Journal of Econometrics*, **52**, 5-59.
24
25
26 Cotter, J. (2005) Extreme risk in futures contracts, *Applied Economics Letters*, **12**,
27
28 489-492.
29
30
31 Engle, R. (1982) Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity with estimates of the
32
33 variance of united kingdom inflation, *Econometrica*, **50**, 987-1008.
34
35
36 Engle, R. (1995) ARCH: Selected readings (Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK).
37
38
39 Engle, R. (2002) Dynamic conditional correlation: a simple class of multivariate
40
41 generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity models, *Journal of Business
42
43 and Economic Statistics*, **20**, 339–350.
44
45
46 Engle, R., Ito, T. and W. Lin (1990) Meteor showers or heat waves? heteroskedastic
47
48 intra-daily volatility in the foreign exchange market, *Econometrica*, **58**, 525–542.
49
50
51 Engle, R. and K. Kroner (1995) Multivariate simultaneous GARCH, *Econometric Theory*,
52
53 **11**, 122-150.
54
55
56 J. P. Morgan (1996) RiskMetrics: Technical document (Morgan Guaranty Trust Company,
57
58 New York, 4th edition).
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 1960-1990, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, **14**, 3-26.

4
5 Longin, F., and B. Solnik (2001) Extreme correlation of international equity markets,
6
7 *Journal of Finance*, **56**, 649-676.

8
9
10 Tse, Y. K. (2000) A test for constant correlations in a multivariate GARCH model,
11
12 *Journal of Econometrics*, **98**, 107-127.

13
14 Tsui, A. K., and Q. Yu (1999) Constant conditional correlation in a bivariate GARCH
15
16 model: evidence from the stock market in china, *Mathematics and Computers in*
17
18 *Simulation*, **48**, 503-509.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**Table 1 Basic Statistics of Three Series
of Daily Proportional Changes in Exchange Rates**

	BP	EU	YEN
Basic Statistics			
Number of sample	1249	1249	1249
Mean	-0.0061	-0.0054	-0.003
Maximum	1.504	2.3842	4.9073
Minimum	-2.006	-2.3177	-3.4033
Variance	0.2409	0.4375	0.4119
Standard deviation	0.4908	0.6614	0.6418
Skewness	-0.0039	-0.022	0.2291
Kurtosis	3.6369	3.6058	6.8525
Test Statistics			
Jarque-Bera	21.7322*	19.5668*	792.5033*
ADF	-15.0679*	-14.6651*	-15.223*
Q(20)	12.815	19.735	11.282
Q ² (20)	46.949*	53.877*	48.811*

* denotes significance at the 5% level.

**Table 2 Numbers of Prediction Failure and Levels of Average Deviations
for Year 2004 — EWMA vs. GARCH VaR**

EWMA					
	Numbers of Prediction Failure (NF)			Average Deviations (AD%)	
	Long positions	Short Positions	Total		
BP	14	19	33	0.6167	
EU	17	15	32	0.6915	
YEN	18	15	33	0.5972	
GARCH					
	Numbers of Prediction Failure (NF)			Average Deviations (AD%)	
	Long positions	Short Positions	Total		
BP	19	22	41	0.5346	
EU	15	12	27	0.6928	
YEN	14	13	27	0.6299	

**Table 3 Econometric structures and parameter estimates
of DCC, CCC, and BEKK MGARCH Models**

The unified mean equation of the three models:

$$r_{i,t} = \mu_i + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad \varepsilon_i | \Omega_{t-1} \sim N(0, H_t), \quad H_t \equiv \begin{bmatrix} h_{1,t} & h_{12,t} & h_{13,t} \\ h_{21,t} & h_{2,t} & h_{23,t} \\ h_{31,t} & h_{32,t} & h_{3,t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The variance equation of the DCC model ($i, j = 1 \equiv \text{EU}$, $i, j = 2 \equiv \text{YEN}$, $i, j = 3 \equiv \text{BP}$):

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,t} &= C_{11} + a_{11}\varepsilon_{1,t-1}^2 + b_{11}h_{1,t-1} & h_{2,t} &= C_{22} + a_{22}\varepsilon_{2,t-1}^2 + b_{22}h_{2,t-1} \\ h_{3,t} &= C_{33} + a_{33}\varepsilon_{3,t-1}^2 + b_{33}h_{3,t-1} & q_{ij,t} &= \bar{\rho}_{ij} + \alpha(z_{i,t-1}z_{j,t-1} - \bar{\rho}_{ij}) + \beta(q_{ij,t-1} - \bar{\rho}_{ij}) \\ \rho_{ij,t} &= \frac{q_{ij,t}}{\sqrt{q_{ii,t}q_{jj,t}}} & h_{ij,t} &= \rho_{ij,t}\sqrt{h_{i,t}h_{j,t}} \end{aligned}$$

The variance equation of the CCC model ($i, j = 1 \equiv \text{EU}$, $i, j = 2 \equiv \text{YEN}$, $i, j = 3 \equiv \text{BP}$):

$$h_{i,t} = C_{ii} + a_{ii}\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^2 + b_{ii}h_{i,t}, \quad h_{ij,t} = \rho_{ij}\sqrt{h_{i,t}h_{j,t}}, \quad \text{where } \rho_{ij} \text{ is constant unconditional correlation.}$$

The variance equation of the BEKK model ($i, j = 1 \equiv \text{EU}$, $i, j = 2 \equiv \text{YEN}$, $i, j = 3 \equiv \text{BP}$):

$$\begin{aligned} H_t &= \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} \\ 0 & C_{22} & C_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & C_{33} \end{pmatrix}' \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} \\ 0 & C_{22} & C_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & C_{33} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{pmatrix}' H_{t-1} \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} & b_{13} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} & b_{23} \\ b_{31} & b_{32} & b_{33} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}' \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,t-1}^2 & \varepsilon_{1,t-1}\varepsilon_{2,t-1} & \varepsilon_{1,t-1}\varepsilon_{3,t-1} \\ \varepsilon_{2,t-1}\varepsilon_{1,t-1} & \varepsilon_{2,t-1}^2 & \varepsilon_{2,t-1}\varepsilon_{3,t-1} \\ \varepsilon_{3,t-1}\varepsilon_{1,t-1} & \varepsilon_{3,t-1}\varepsilon_{2,t-1} & \varepsilon_{3,t-1}^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

	DCC			CCC		BEKK	
Mean equation							
μ_1	0.02765907	(2.25023)**	-0.0299103	(-2.15303)**	-0.0097799	(-0.6581)	
μ_2	0.00953727	(2.71413)***	-0.0010481	(-0.07172)	-0.0002405	(-0.01557)	
μ_3	0.01259293	(2.83825)***	-0.0295238	(-2.95291)***	-0.0112213	(-0.97876)	
Conditional variance							
C_{11}	0.01606457	(192.4624)***	0.17600768	(9.02761)***	0.09229813	(3.83916)***	
C_{12}	-		-		0.07781377	(2.23269)**	
C_{13}	-		-		0.04356409	(1.86766)*	
C_{22}	0.03058556	(5.73953)***	0.02570124	(4.63947)***	0.10208315	(2.66283)***	
C_{23}	-		-		0.00123405	(0.05179)	
C_{33}	0.01168708	(39.8515)***	0.02216984	(24.3383)***	0.04081853	(2.53676)**	
a_{11}	0.00631243	(3.59173)***	0.02806241	(3.73930)***	-0.1150398	(-4.46604)***	
a_{12}	-		-		-0.1223074	(-3.39018)***	
a_{13}	-		-		0.06154895	(3.02410)***	
a_{21}	-		-		-0.0429973	(-1.82635)*	
a_{22}	0.06889311	(5.20071)***	0.09400469	(11.9998)***	-0.1999086	(-6.77908)***	
a_{23}	-		-		-0.0115973	(-0.67717)	
a_{31}	-		-		-0.0528492	(-1.44721)	
a_{32}	-		-		0.14470230	(3.50212)***	
a_{33}	0.03410842	(9.51350)***	0.04728167	(16.2726)***	-0.1964761	(-7.11189)***	
b_{11}	0.95997063	(9.8556)***	0.58474087	(14.6191)***	0.99576367	(139.0897)***	
b_{12}	-		-		-0.02993147	(-2.71481)***	

(Continued on next page)

	DCC		CCC		BEKK	
b_{13}	-		-		0.02395819	(4.39177)***
b_{21}	-		-		-0.02027279	(-2.01272)**
b_{22}	0.85821571	(36.7895)***	0.85042075	(83.4550)***	0.95217287	(76.19464)***
b_{23}	-		-		-0.01416988	(-2.20495)**
b_{31}	-		-		-0.03306931	(-2.81989)***
b_{32}	-		-		0.04528157	(3.29903)***
b_{33}	0.92228510	(24.5844)***	0.87422945	(146.966)***	0.96183429	(128.9099)***
Conditional correlation						
α	0.03399787	(4.59058)***	-		-	
β	0.91940272	(39.7378)***	-		-	
Unconditional correlation						
ρ_{12}	-		0.11251262	(5.53328)***	-	
ρ_{13}	-		0.65578882	(61.2153)***	-	
ρ_{23}	-		0.11648389	(6.07363)***	-	

***, **, and * represent significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. The parameters of α and β are the coefficients of dynamic conditional correlation. The CCC-MGARCH model contains all equations in DCC-MGARCH, except for $\alpha = \beta = 0$. Figures in parentheses denote corresponding t -statistics.

Table 4 Numbers of Prediction Failures and Levels of Average Deviations for Year 2004 — CCC vs. BEKK vs. DCC VaR

	Numbers of Prediction Failure (NF)			Average Deviations (AD%)
	Long positions	Short Positions	Total	
DCC	10	9	19	0.4244
CCC	15	12	27	0.4218
BEKK	16	14	30	0.4157