


Online Papers

Advertisements



[REPORT THIS AD](#)

■ Interest Rate Risk in a Negative Yielding World

Joel R. Barber, Krishnan Dandapani – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2017 – [Vol 14 N°2, 1-19](#)

■ Components of Economic Policy Uncertainty and Predictability of US Stock Returns and Volatility: Evidence from a Nonparametric Causality-in-Quantile Approach

Nikolaos Antonakakis, Mehmet Balcilar, Rangan Gupta, Clement Kyei – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2017 – [Vol 14 N°2, 20-49](#)

■ Market Integration and Informational Efficiency of Africa's Stock Markets

Godfred M. Aawaar, Devi Datt Tewari, Zhiyong (John) Liu – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2017 – [Vol 14 N°2, 50-84](#)

■ Uncovered Interest Parity, Purchasing Power Parity and the Fisher effect : Evidence from South Africa

Dennis Machobani, Gideon Boako, Paul Alagidede – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2017 – [Vol 14 N°2, 85-131](#)

■ Relative Compensation and Forced CEO Turnover

Shahbaz Sheikh – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2017 – [Vol 14 N°1, 1-28](#)

■ The Dynamics of Market Efficiency: Testing the Random Walk Hypothesis in South Africa

Dr. Yudhvir Seetharam, Prof. Christ Aurret, Prof. Turgay Celik – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2017 – [Vol 14 N°1, 29-69](#)

■ Psychological Barriers at Round Numbers in Single Stock Prices: Evidence from Three Developed Markets

Júlio Lobão, João Fernandes – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2017 – [Vol 14 N°1, 70-111](#)

■ Asymmetries in Yield Curves: Some Empirical Evidence from Ghana

- **Dividends and Stock Prices: A Fresh Look at the Relationship**

- **Transitory and Permanent Volatility Components in the Main US ETF Markets: An Empirical Analysis**

- **Improving Exchange Rate Forecasting with a Kalman Filter: Using Less Information to Obtain Better Forecasts**

- **Predicting South African Equity Premium using Domestic and Global Economic Policy Uncertainty Indices: Evidence from a Bayesian Graphical Model**

- **Military Spending and Economic Growth: Evidence from the Southern African Development Community**

- **Is a Necessary Good Necessarily an Inferior Good? Slutsky Equation is Re-examined**

- **South African Stock Returns Predictability using Domestic and Global Economic Policy Uncertainty: Evidence from a Nonparametric Causality-in-Quantiles Approach**

- **Fiscal Performance, Liberalization and External Debt in Ghana**

- **Firm Organizational Environment and The Effect of Options Based Compensation Incentives on Accrual Earnings Management**

- **Mean-Variance and Stochastic Dominance Analysis of Global Exchange-Traded Funds**

- **Real Estate Market and Uncertainty Shocks :A Novel Variance Causality Approach**

- **Gearing of Chinese Listed Companies**

- **How Does a Firm's Capital Structure Affect Stock Performance ?**

- **Use of Evolutionary Algorithm in the Investment Project Evaluation**

- **Average Tax Rates and Economic Growth : A NonLinear Causality Investigation for the USA**

- **A Quasi-IRR for a Project without IRR**

- **Irrationality of Macroeconomic Forecasts and Behavioral Characteristics of Forecasters**

- **The Study of the Spillover and Leverage Effects of Financial Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs)**

- **GAAP Influence on Bid-Ask Spreads and Share Turnovers**

- **Sources of Momentum Returns: A Decomposition of the Explained and the Unexplained Risk Factors**

- **Quasi Maximum Likelihood Inference for Stochastic Volatility Models**

- **A Mathematical Resurgence of Risk Management: an Extreme Modeling of Expert Opinions**

- **Stock Market Reaction to Debt-Based Securities : Empirical Evidence**

- **Causality between Economic Policy Uncertainty across Countries :Evidence from Linear and Nonlinear Tests**

- **Increase in Cash Holdings: Pervasive or Sector-Specific?**

- **Corporate Debt and Equity: Another Look at their Determinants**

- **Pricing Contingent Claims with an Underlying Asset Driven by an Extreme Value Distribution:**

Options on Dow Jones Industrial Average Index, 2009-2010

- **Monetary Asset Substitution in the Euro Area**

- **The Impact of the Subprime Crisis on Canadian Banks' Stock Returns**

- **High Technology ETF Forecasting: Application of Grey Relational Analysis and Artificial Neural Networks**

- **Revisiting Idiosyncratic Volatility and Stock Returns**

- **What's Wrong with Those Duration Measures? Nothing**

- **Structural Breaks and Predictive Regressions Models of South African Equity Premium**

- **A Three-Stage Labour-Managed Cournot Duopoly with Lifetime Employment as a Strategic Commitment**

- **Exploiting Intraday and Overnight Price Variation for Daily VaR Prediction**

- **A Case for Europe: the Relationship between Sovereign CDS and Stock Indexes**

- **Optimal Hedge Ratio Estimation during the Credit Crisis: An Application of Higher Moments**

- **The Effect of Derivative Instrument Use on Capital Market Risk: Evidence from Banks in Emerging and Recently Developed Countries**

- **Can Credit Risk Be Rated Through-the-Cycle?**

- **A Probit Model for Insolvency Risk among Insurance Companies**

- **Derivatives Use and Analysts' Earnings Forecast Accuracy**

Salma Mefteh-Wali, Sabri Boubaker, Florence Labégorre – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2012 – [Vol 9 N°1, 51 – 86](#)

- **In Search of the “Lost Capital”. A Theory for Valuation, Investment Decisions, Performance Measurement**

Carlo Alberto Magni – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2012 – [Vol 9 N°1, 87 – 147](#)

- **When is Inter-trade Time Informative? A Structural Approach**

Tao Chen – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2012 – [Vol 9 N°1, 148 – 177](#)

- **Fund Performance Robustness – An Evaluation Using European Large-Cap Equity Funds**

Kenneth Högholm, Johan Knif, Seppo Pynnönen – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 1 – 26](#)

- **Giffen Goods in a Transition Economy: Subsistence Consumption in Russia**

Yochanan Shachmurove, Janusz Szyrmer – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 27 – 48](#)

- **Risk in Emerging Stock Markets from Brazil and Mexico: Extreme Value Theory and Alternative Value at Risk Models**

Raúl de Jesús, Edgar Ortiz – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 49 – 88](#)

- **Dynamic Copulas and Long Range Dependence**

Beatriz Vaz de Melo Mendes, Silvia Regina Costa Lopes – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 89 – 111](#)

- **M1, M2, and the U.S. Equity Exchanges**

Ali M. Parhizgari, Duong Nguyen – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 112 – 135](#)

- **Real Interest Rate and Growth Rate: Theory and Empirical Evidence**

Jean-Marie Le Page – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2011 – [Vol 8 N°2, 136 – 152](#)

- **The Association Between Firm Characteristics and the Use of a Comprehensive Corporate Hedging Strategy: An Ordered Probit Analysis**

Hue Hwa Au Yong, Robert Faff, Hoa Nguyen – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2011 – [Vol 8 N°1, 1-16](#)

- **Hedging with Derivatives and Value Creation : an Empirical Examination in the Insurance Industry**

Luis Otero González, Sara Fernández López, Onofre Martorell Cunill – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2011 – [Vol 8 N°1, 17 – 42](#)

- **The Skew Pattern of Implied Volatility in the DAX Index Options Market**

Silvia Muzzioli – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2011 – [Vol 8 N°1, 43 – 68](#)

- **Quantitative vs. Qualitative Criteria for Credit Risk Assessment**

João O. Soares, Joaquim P. Pina, Manuel S. Ribeiro, Margarida Catalão-Lopes – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2011 – [Vol 8 N°1, 69 – 87](#)

- **Models For Moody's Bank Ratings**

Anatoly Peresetsky, Alexander Karminsky – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2011 – [Vol 8 N°1, 88 – 110](#)

- **Should Minimum Portfolio Sizes Be Prescribed for Achieving Sufficiently Well-Diversified Equity Portfolios?**

Lawrence Kryzanowski, Shishir Singh – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 1 – 37](#)

- **Are All Individual Investors Equally Prone to the Disposition Effect All the Time? New Evidence from a Small Market**

Cristiana Cerqueira Leal, Manuel J. Rocha Armada, João L. C. Duque – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 38 – 68](#)

- **Would You Follow MM or a Profitable Trading Strategy?**

Brian Baturevich, Gulnur Muradoglu – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 69 – 89](#)

- **Size, Book-to-Market, Volatility and Stock Returns: Evidence from Amman Stock Exchange (ASE)**

Walid Saleh – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 90 – 124](#)

- **An Examination of Life Insurers' Risk Attitudes**

Yaffa Machnes – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 125 – 137](#)

- **Can Market Actors Help Monitor European Banks?**

Anissa Naouar – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2010 – [Vol 7 N°2, 138 – 182](#)

- **The Two-Parameter Long-Horizon Value-at-Risk**

Guy Kaplanski, Haim Levy – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2010 – [Vol 7 N°1, 1 – 20](#)

- **Mitigation of Foreign Direct Investment Risk and Hedging**

Jack E. Wahl, Udo Broll – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2010 – [Vol 7 N°1, 21 – 33](#)

- **Evaluation and Comparison of Market and Rating Based Country Default Risk Assessment**

Alexander Karmann, Dominik Maltritz – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2010 – [Vol 7 N°1, 34 – 59](#)

- **To Outsource or Not To Outsource in North-South Trade**

E. Kwan Choi, Jai-Young Choi – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2010 – [Vol 7 N°1, 60 – 81](#)

- **Financial Deregulation, Private Foreign Borrowing and the Risk of Sovereign Default: A Political-Economic Analysis**

Oya Celasun, Philipp Harms – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2010 – [Vol 7 N°1, 82 – 100](#)

- **Further Evidence on the Impact of Economic News on Interest Rates**

Dominique Guégan, Florian Ielpo – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 1 – 45](#)

- **Private Equity Firms' Behaviours in Western Europe: Does Country Matter?**

Abdesselam Rafik, Bastié Françoise, Cieply Sylvie- *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 46 – 66](#)

- **Money Supply in a Simple Economic Growth Model and Multiple Steady States Equilibria**

Laurent Augier, Jalloul Sghari- *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 67 – 95](#)

- **Consumer Welfare in the Deregulated Swedish Electricity Market**

Jens Lundgren- *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 101 – 119](#)

- **Electricity Traffic over the Barriers of Networks: The Case of Germany and The Netherlands**

Hans Andeweg, André Dorsman, Kees van Montfort – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 120 -139](#)

- **Restructuring the European Energy Market through M&As – An Application of the Model of Economic Dominance**

Wassim Benhassine – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2009 – [Vol 6 N°2, 140 – 180](#)

- **Computational Efficiency and Accuracy in the Valuation of Basket Options**

Pengguo Wang – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 1 – 25](#)

- **Forecasting VaR and Expected Shortfall using Dynamical Systems : A Risk management Strategy**

Dominique Guégan, Cyril Caillault – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 26 – 50](#)

- **A Note on Stakeholder Theory and Risk : Implications for Corporate Cash Holdings and Dividend Policy**

Gerhard Speckbacher, Paul Wentges – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 51 – 72](#)

- **The Mid 1990s Peso Crisis in Mexico: An Application of the Girton-Roper Model**

Edward Ghartey – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 73 – 92](#)

- **Cash Management Routines : Evidence from Spain**

Txomin Iturralde, Amaia Maseda, Leire San José – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 93 – 117](#)

- **Opportunity Cost, Excess Profit, and Counterfactual Conditionals**

Carlo Alberto Magni – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 118 – 154](#)

- **Why Do Monetary Policymakers Lean with the Wind During Asset Price Booms ?**

Wolfram Berger, Friedrich Kissmer – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2009 – [Vol 6 N°1, 155 – 174](#)

- **First Passage and Excursion Time Models for Valuing Defaultable Bonds: a Review with Some Insights**

Martina Nardon – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2008 – [Vol 5 N°2, 1 – 25](#)

- **Using Weekly Empirical Probabilities in Currency Analysis and Forecasting**

Andrew C Pollock, Alex Macaulay, Mary E Thomson, Dilek Önköl – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2008 – [Vol 5 N°2, 26 – 55](#)

- **Financing and Valuation of a Marginal Project by a Firm Facing Various Tax Rates**

Axel Pierru – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2008 – [Vol 5 N°2, 56 – 71](#)

- **Dynamic Copula Modelling for Value at Risk**

Dean Fantazzini – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – October 2008 – [Vol 5 N°2, 72 – 108](#)

- **Fundamental Capital Valuation for IT Companies : A Real Options Approach**

Arun J Prakash, Chung Baek, Bruce Dupoyet – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2008 – [Vol 5 N°1, 1 – 26](#)

- **Statistical Inference of Risk-Adjusted Performance Measures**

Miranda Lam – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2008 – [Vol 5 N°1, 27 – 45](#)

- **Intra-Day Stock Returns and Close-End Price Manipulation in the Istanbul Stock Exchange**

Guray Kuçukkocaoglu – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2008 – [Vol 5 N°1, 46 – 84](#)

- **Relationship between Implied and Realized Volatility of Sand P CNX Nifty Index in India**

Siba Prasda Panda, Nirianjan Swain, D.K. Malhotra – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2008 – [Vol 5 N°1, 85 – 105](#)

- **The Determinants of Commercial Bank Interest Margin and Profitability: Evidence from Tunisia**

Samy Bennaceur, Mohamed Goaied – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – April 2008 – [Vol 5 N°1, 106 – 130](#)

- **Introduction to the European Internal Market – An Abstract of the Present Development of the European Internal Market**

Dr. Wolfgang Berger, DDr. Marian Wakounig, Mag. Caroline Kindl – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 1 – 33](#)

- **The Impact of Value Added Tax on Financial Services and Insurances – the Law of Unintended Consequences?**

Arthur Kerrigan – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 34 – 46](#)

- **Economic Growth and Indirect Financial Taxes, Empirical Evidence from Greece, Spain and Portugal**

Radu Tunaru Athena K. Kaliva – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 47 – 74](#)

- **The Causal Relationship Between Indirect Taxes and Expenditures: a Comparative Investigation of Greece, Spain and Portugal**

Radu Tunaru Athena K. Kaliva – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 75 – 91](#)

- **Corporate Taxation and Futures-Hedging**

Jack E. Wahl Udo Broll – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 92 – 101](#)

- **Comparing Effective Corporate Tax Rates**

Gaëtan Nicodème – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 102 – 131](#)

- **The Impact of EU Law on National Dividend Tax Systems**

Evgenia Chatziioakeimidou – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2007 – [Vol 4 N°2, 132 – 152](#)

- **Marginal Conditional Stochastic Dominance Between Value and Growth**

Victor Chow, Bih-Shuang Huang, Ou Hu K. – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2007 – [Vol 4 N°1, 1 – 34](#)

- **Call and Put Implied Volatilities and the Derivation of Option Implied Trees**

V. Moriggia, S. Muzzioli, C. Torricelli – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2007 – [Vol 4 N°1, 35-64](#)

- **Multicriteria Framework for the Prediction of Corporate Failure in the UK**

Fotios Pasiouras – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2007 – [Vol 4 N°1, 65 – 90](#)

- **The Information Content of Cross-sectional Volatility for Future Market Volatility: Evidence from Australian Equity Returns**

Md. Arifur Rahman – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2007 – [Vol 4 N°1, 91 – 124](#)

- **The Effect of Price Limits on Unconditional Volatility: The Case of CASE**

Eskandar A. Tooma Medhat Hassanein – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2007 – [Vol 4 N°1, 125 – 143](#)

- **Stock Market Reaction to Unexpected Changes in Interest Rates**

Shmuel Hauser Gitit G. Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2, 1 – 17](#)

- **The Long-Run Performance of UK Rights Issuers**

Abdullah Iqbal, Susanne Espenlaub, Norman Strong Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2, 18 – 54](#)

- **Has the Stock Market Integration Between the Asian and OECD Countries Improved After the Asian Crisis?**

Girijasankar Mallik Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2, 55 – 69](#)

- **Are Stock Markets Integrated? Evidence from a Partially Segmented ICAPM with Asymmetric Effects**

Mohamed Arouri Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2, 70 – 94](#)

- **Portfolio Theory and Portfolio Management: a Synthetic View**

Dilip K. Ghosh Dipasri Ghosh Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2](#), 95 – 112

- **Hedging of Exchange Rate Risk: a Note**

Stefan Schubert Gershgoren – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2006 – [Vol 3 N°2](#), 113 – 121

- **Option Pricing with Long-Short Spreads**

Pengguo Wang – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 1 – 28

- **Exchange Rate Determination from Monetary Fundamentals: an Aggregation Theoretic Approach**

William Barnett – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 29 – 48

- **International Portfolio Formation, Skewness & the Role of Gold**

Brian M Lucey, Valerio Poti, Edel Tully – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 49 – 68

- **Interdependence of ASEAN Business Cycles**

Hway-Boon Ong, Chin-Hong Puah, Muzafar Shah Habibullah – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 69 – 78

- **Crisis Anticipation at a Micro-Level: Mexico 1995-1996**

Karen Watkins – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 79 – 102

- **Zelig and the Art of Measuring Excess Profit**

Carlo Alberto Magni – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2006 – [Vol 3 N°1](#), 103 – 129

- **Frontiers of Financially Constrained and Unconstrained Firms: a New Development in Finance**

Julio Pindado – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2005 – [Vol 2 N°2](#), 1 – 32

- **Attitudes with Regard to Risk: Risk Aversion, Prudence and Temperance**

Octave Jokung N. – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2005 – [Vol 2 N°2](#),

- **Additional Panel Data Evidence on the Savings-Investment Relationship and Foreign Aid in LDCs**

James E. Payne Risa Kumazawa – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2005 – [Vol 2 N°2](#), 59 – 66

- **The Kraus and Litzenberger Quadratic Characteristic Line and Event Studies**

Arun Prakash – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2005 – [Vol 2 N°2](#), 67 – 78

- **The Product Life Cycle and the Real Option of Waiting**

Oscar Gutiérrez – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2005 – [Vol 2 N°2](#), 79 – 105

- **Military Spending and Economic Growth in Greece, Portugal and Spain**

Eftychia Nikolaidou – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2005 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 1 – 17

- **Manufacturing Labour Demand, Technological Progress and Military Expenditure**

John Dunne – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2005 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 18 – 30

- **The Evolution of European and US Aerospace and Defence Markets**

Vasilis Zervos – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2005 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 31 – 52

- **Revolution in the Defence Electronics Markets? An Economic Analysis of Sectoral Change**

Paul Dowdall – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2005 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 53 – 67

- **What Lies Beneath? Who Owns British Defence Contractors and Does It Matter?**

Jonathan Bradley Derek Braddon – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2005 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 68 – 81

- **Canadian Mutual Fund Flows and Capital Market Movements**

Jean-Pierre Gueyié Roger B. Atindéhou – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 70 – 84

- **Parametric and Non-Parametric Analysis of Performance Persistence in Spanish Investment Funds**

Luis Ferruz, José L. Sarto, Maria Vargas – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 85 – 100

- **An Empirical Analysis of Kenyan Daily Returns Using EGARCH Models pp. 101-115**

Georges Ogum, Francisca M. Beer, Geneviève Nouyrigat – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 101 – 115

- **Real Options, Uncertainty and Firm Value** pp. 116-140

Manuel Espitia Escuer Gema Pastor Agustin – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 116 – 140

- **Parametric and Non-Parametric Measures of Volatility: Risk Estimation via the Gini Decomposition and Comparison with the Value-at-Risk**

Stéphane Mussard – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – December 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 141 – 156

- **Corporate Governance, Market Valuation and Dividend Policy in Brazil**

Ricardo Leal André Carvalhal-da-Silva – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 1 – 16

- **The Effects of Decision Flexibility in the Hierarchical Investment Decision Process**

Winfried Hallerbach, Haikun Ning, Jaap Spronk – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 17 – 36

- **Random Walk as a Universal Test of Weak-Form Foreign Exchange Market Efficiency: A Proof**

Edward Ghartey – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 37 – 45

- **Credit Exposure & Sovereign Risk Analysis: The Case of South America**

Sotiris K. Staikouras Elena Kalotychou – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 46 – 56

- **Strategic Conduct and Access Discrimination, in the Semi-Liberalized Electricity Sector in Mexico**

Alejandro Ibarra-Yunez – *Frontiers in Finance and Economics* – June 2004 – [Vol 2 N°1](#), 57 – 69

Advertisements

REPORT THIS AD

REPORT THIS AD

Privacy & Cookies: This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this website, you agree to their use.
To find out more, including how to control cookies, see here: [Cookie Policy](#)

Close and accept

The Study of the Spillover and Leverage Effects of Financial Exchange Traded Funds (ETFs)

Jo-Hui, Chen¹

Maya Malinda²

Abstract

This study adopts the Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity-in-Mean Autoregressive Moving Average (GARCH-M-ARMA) and Exponentially Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity-in-Mean Autoregressive Moving Average (EGARCH-M-ARMA) models to analyze the spillover, asymmetric volatility, and leverage effects of financial exchange-traded funds (ETFs). The results show that bilateral relationships exist between financial and non-financial ETFs. Both ETFs have negative asymmetric volatility, suggesting that the value of stock indices and ETFs reveal conditional heteroskedasticity. Financial and non-financial ETFs also have negative leverage effects on benchmark indexes. Bilateral relations in terms of the spillover effects of volatilities and leverage effects exist between financial and non-financial ETFs.

Keywords: Spillover Effect, Asymmetric-Volatility, Leverage Effect, Financial ETFs

JEL Classification: Financial Economics (G1)

¹ Dr. Jo-Hui Chen, Department of Finance, Chung Yuan Christian University, 200 Chung Pei Rd., Chung Li City, Taiwan 32023, R.O.C. [TEL:+886-3-265-5018](tel:+886-3-265-5018)
FAX: +886-3-265-5749
Email: johui@cycu.edu.tw;

² Maya Malinda, student at PhD Program in Business, Chung Yuan Christian University, 200 Chung Pei Rd., Chung Li City, Taiwan 32023, R.O.C. TEL:+886-3-265-9999 FAX: +886-3-265-8888; lecturer at Maranatha Christian University, Bandung, Indonesia.
Email: hmy.malinda@yahoo.com

1 - Introduction

Exchange-traded fund (ETF) was launched for the first time by State Street Global Advisors in 1993, and the ETF market place has grown significantly since then. The global ETF market had grown to \$2.25 trillion assets in 2013 with more than four thousand funds. China's economy, the fourth biggest in the world, has achieved rapid and steady growth over the past 20 years. However, accessing China's capital market remains difficult for global investors. Under these circumstances, ETFs are becoming good investment channels, and for international investors, China ETFs have become a favorite choice for investment [Song (2006)].

Even though many investors are profiting from ETFs, critical issues about risks have caused markets to function in a different way. In particular, some critics have connected with ETFs the large fluctuations in volatility and enhanced correlations in the equity market. Volatility and correlations have indeed increased over the past few years; however, these conditions are consistent with the terms of the macroeconomic uncertainty. Nevertheless, a good advantage of ETFs is that they allow better direction-finding of market environments that display correlations and higher volatility [Mazza (2012)].

Financial giants have been crippled by series of foreclosures and crises. Investors must be competent to recognize potential opportunities and risks. Financial ETFs can help investors to hedge risks, cut losses, or look for better investment opportunities. Financial ETFs can also provide investors some associated advantages, like tax benefits, and allow them to experience more beneficial trading with minimal transactions and lower brokerage costs.

Many empirical studies have proven that ETF indices create spillover and leverage effects. For example, Chen and Huang (2010) revealed that has strong spillover effects from returns for Hong Kong and Singapore. Also, Chen (2011) found significant results on the leverage effects and bilateral spillover effects of index return volatilities for ethical and non-ethical ETFs. Moreover, Chen and Diaz (2012) found a strong negative/positive influence of leverage and inverse leverage ETFs return on stock index returns. To summarize the relevant previous studies, they found significant results on the leverage effects and bilateral spillover effects of ETFs on index return volatilities.

Applying similar methods, some previous studies found spillover and the asymmetric-volatility effects in ETFs using EGARCH-M-ARMA. To illustrate, Chen and Diaz (2012) found that there is a strong positive (negative) influence of lagged leveraged (inversed leverage) ETFs return on current stock index returns. In a relatively new study, Krause and Tse (2013) verified

this results and indicate that return spillovers and asymmetric volatility create a bi-directional volatility response effect of ETFs in the case of the United States and Canada.

Up to this point, however, there were very few studies on financial ETFs for the equities market. ETFs are expanding rapidly, and so are the types of ETFs. There are many types of ETFs, namely, bond, commodity, and equity ETFs, and each type of ETF is further divided into several sub-types. For example, an equity ETF includes industrial, material, and financial ETFs; while financial ETFs has 48 types, which includes bank, insurance, and capital market. We opted to focus on financial ETFs in this study because of the lack of research in this field.

The motivation of this study is to reveal the existence of unilateral and bilateral-return effects of financial ETFs and their benchmark indexes. These findings will help investors to see investment opportunities from financial ETFs of benchmark indices or stock index to predict movements of financial ETFs and vice versa.

This paper analyzes the existing bilateral effects and asymmetric volatility effect of return and volatility between stock indexes and ETF returns for financial and non-financial ETFs utilizing the Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity-in-Mean Autoregressive Moving Average (GARCH-M-ARMA) and Exponentially Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity-in-Mean Autoregressive Moving Average (EGARCH-M-ARMA) models. This paper contributes to the literature on financial and non-financial ETFs using returns and volatilities of underlying stock indexes and to strengthen investing strategies for better portfolio decisions.

This article is organized in sections. Section II presents the literature review. Section III describes the data and explains the GARCH-M-ARMA and EGARCH-M-ARMA models. Section IV presents the empirical results of the ETF spillovers and leverage effects of financial and non-financial ETFs, and Section V provides the conclusion.

2 - Literature review

The global investment market has witnessed a sudden increase in the number and capitalization of ETFs. Gao (2001) earlier explained that the reason for this expansion are diversification, convenience, simplicity, cost-effectiveness, transparency, flexibility, tax-efficiency, and variety. ETFs have certainly caught investors' attention on the many available investment

opportunities that surfaced from their home markets. Schoenfeld (2001) mentioned that ETFs, which can be one or a combination of investment instruments, stands out as a diversification option because they provide varied and flexible options for investors to invest in the global equity markets. In achieving greater coverage in a variety of asset classes, ETFs also offers insights into the recent use of liquid index trackers [Noël (2009)]. Deborah (2009) also examined rankings of ETF providers, index presentation, industry development, and applications.

The EGARCH approach and the ARMA model for ETF and stock index returns were also adopted to analyze asymmetric volatility or leverage effects that released non-negativity constraints in the linear GARCH approach [Koutmos and Booth (1995); Nelson, (1991)]. In the application of GARCH-ARMA and EGARCH-ARMA models to evaluate spillover effects of ETFs, Chen and Huang (2010) analyzed the effect of the spillover and the leverage effects on returns and volatilities of stock indexes and ETFs for emerging markets and developed countries. The result shows that the spillover effects of returns are excellent for Hong Kong, followed by Singapore. The study found that spillover effects on stock index and ETF volatilities have bilateral relationship. The study of Chen (2011) applied leverage effects on ethical ETFs based on GARCH-ARMA and EGARCH-ARMA models. The research analyzed ethical and non-ethical ETFs against benchmark indexes; the results found that there are no differences in the spillover of returns from volatilities and leverage effects.

Chen and Diaz (2012) established the strong positive (negative) influence of lagged leverage (inverse leveraged) ETF returns on current stock index returns. Lagged stock index returns have a negative (positive) effect on leveraged (inverse leveraged) ETF returns as a result of the addition (reduction) of total return swap exposure. Spillover effects of returns also showed a negative bilateral relationship. A bilateral relationship in the spillover effects of volatilities was also observed from the results. The findings provided evidence on the higher volatility caused by leveraged ETFs. The correlation between risks and returns is negative for both inverse leveraged ETF returns and stock indexes, and the positive correlation for leveraged ETFs was minor but still significant.

Krause and Tse (2013) used the EGARCH model, and found that price discovery flows consistently from the United States to Canada and also discovered volatility spillovers and bi-directional feedback effects. On the other hand, Chen, et. al (2014) used ARMA and Seasonal Autoregressive Moving Average (SARMA) revealed that Real Estate Investment Trust-Exchange-Traded Funds have bilateral-return influences with their

tracked indices, demonstrated a robust positive connection.

3 - Data and methodology

This study uses daily closing prices of financial and non-financial ETFs, and their corresponding stock indexes from the Yahoo! Finance website. The study period involves various ETF inception dates until the 12th of May 2012. Only financial ETFs from the Broad Financial List, especially those in the insurance and financial services, were selected. The other selected five international financial ETFs are from Brazil, China, Canada, Europe, Emerging market and financial ETFs, and two U.S. financial ETFs. Non-financial ETFs came from the industrial sector, consumer, industrial, and material ETFs such as Brazil Consumer ETFs, China Industrial ETFs, and Capped Material Index from Canada, Emerging Market Metal Mining, Europe ETFs, Down Jones U.S. Industrial, and Select Sector SPDR USA were also selected for comparison. The New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) Composite Index, S&PTSX Composite Index Toronto, and NASDAQ Composite were included as benchmark stock indexes.

The spillover and leverage effects of ETFs and stock index returns and their volatilities were estimated. Returns were measured as the logarithm of returns. The difference between the logarithm of price at time $t-1$ for ETFs and the difference between the logarithm of index (I) at time t and time $t-1$ for stock index were calculated with the equations below.

$$R_{i,t}^m = \ln\left(\frac{I_t}{I_{t-1}}\right) * 100, \quad (1)$$

$$R_{i,t}^e = \ln\left(\frac{P_{i,t}}{P_{i,t-1}}\right) * 100, \quad (2)$$

where $R_{i,t}^m$ and $R_{i,t}^e$ represent stock index returns and the i,t financial or non-financial ETFs returns at time t , respectively, I is stock index, and P is ETF price.

Previous research revealed using the GARCH model like that of Chan et al. (1991) using the bivariate GARCH model, proved that stock and futures market can be used to predict the future volatility in other markets. Liu and Pan (1997), on the other hand, found that volatility spillover and the leverage effect in the United States influenced the Asia financial market. In a more recent set of studies, Steeley (2006) found that bond market volatility

influenced both stock and bond markets in utilizing a GARCH model. Morales (2008) used GARCH and EGARCH models and indicated clear confirmation of volatility determination among valuable metals returns. There is also an evidence of bidirectional volatility spillovers in the majority of studied cases. Furthermore, asymmetric spillover effects discovered that pessimistic information has a stronger impact in these markets than optimistic news. Using a bivariate GARCH approach, Dean et al. (2010) found that there is asymmetry in return and volatility spillover among bond and stock markets in Australia.

The advantage of this study, using the GARCH-M-ARMA and EGARCH-M-ARMA models is that both models reveal a more accurate prediction of financial ETFs and vice versa. This study mainly focuses on financial ETFs because of the lack of research in this field, and to further strengthened the determination of spillover and leverage effects.

The GARCH-ARMA models were adopted to determine if GARCH effects exist between stock index returns and ETF returns and to verify if the data have conditional heteroskedasticity [Chen and Huang (2010)]. The EGARCH model proposed by Nelson (1991) and the ARMA specification for stock index and ETF returns were also adopted to analyze asymmetric volatility or leverage effects with non-negativity constraints in the linear GARCH model. The components of the combination of GARCH (p, q) -ARMA (g, s) and EGARCH (p, q) - ARMA (g, s) models were illustrated [Niarchos et al. (1999); Huang and Yang (2002); Xu and Fung (2005)].

The interdependence between stock index and ETF returns is affected by market shocks. The spillover and leverage effects are illustrated as follows:

$$R_{i,t}^e = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^g \alpha_i R_{i,t-i}^e + wR_{i,t-1}^m + \varepsilon_{i,t}^e + \sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i \varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e + z\sqrt{h_{i,t}^e}, \quad (3)$$

$$\log(h_{i,t}^{e^2}) = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q \left(a_i \left| \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e}{h_{i,t-i}^e} \right| + \delta_i \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e}{h_{i,t-i}^e} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^p \psi_i \cdot \log(h_{i,t-i}^{e^2}) + v\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{m^2},$$

for EGARCH-M

$$\varepsilon_{i,t}^e \mid \psi_{t-1} \sim N(0, h_{i,t}^e),$$

$$R_{i,t}^m = \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^g \beta_i R_{i,t-i}^m + dR_{i,t-1}^e + \varepsilon_{i,t}^m + \sum_{i=1}^s \gamma_i \varepsilon_{i,t-i}^m + k\sqrt{h_{i,t}^m}, \quad (5)$$

$$\log(h_{i,t}^{m^2}) = b_0 + \sum_{i=1}^q \left(b_i \left| \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^m}{h_{i,t-i}^m} \right| + \delta_i \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^m}{h_{i,t-i}^m} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_i \cdot \log(h_{i,t-i}^{m^2}) + l\varepsilon_{i,t-1}^{e^2},$$

for EGARCH-M, (6)

$$\varepsilon_{i,t}^m \mid \psi_{t-1} \sim N(0, h_{i,t}^m),$$

where $R_{i,t}^e$ and $R_{i,t}^m$ are financial (or non-financial) ETF returns and stock index return at time t ; $h_{i,t}^{e^2}$ is conditional variance; $\sum_{i=1}^g \alpha_i R_{i,t-i}^e$ is the higher order of the autoregressive AR (g) for ETF returns; $\varepsilon_{i,t}^e$ represents residual ETF returns at period t ; and $\sum_{i=1}^s \theta_i \varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e$ is the higher order of the autoregressive MA(s) for ETF returns at period t . $\sum_{i=1}^p \psi_i h_{i,t-i}^{e^2}$ is the p order conditional heteroskedasticity of GARCH term for ETF returns at period t ; $\sum_{i=1}^q a_i \varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e$ is the q order of the ARCH term for ETF returns at time t ; δ_i is leverage term; $t-l$ is information set at period $t-l$; and θ_i is for the unknown parameter. $\sum_{i=1}^p \psi_i \log(h_{i,t-i}^{e^2})$ is the notation for the ETF returns associated with p order of qualified heteroscedasticity of GARCH at time t ; $\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_i \cdot \log(h_{i,t-i}^{m^2})$ is the notation for the stock index returns associated with p order of qualified heteroscedasticity of GARCH at time t ;

$$\sum_{i=1}^q \left(a_i \left| \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e}{h_{i,t-i}^e} \right| + \delta_i \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^e}{h_{i,t-i}^e} \right) \text{ is the notation for the ETF returns associated with } q$$

order of qualified heteroscedasticity of ARCH; $\sum_{i=1}^q \left(b_i \left| \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^m}{h_{i,t-i}^m} \right| + \delta_i \frac{\varepsilon_{i,t-i}^m}{h_{i,t-i}^m} \right)$ is the notation for the stock index returns associated with q order of qualified heteroscedasticity of ARCH.

The null hypothesis, H_0 , means no spillover effects of volatility ($v=0$; $l=0$), against the alternative hypothesis, H_1 , related to having spillover effects of volatility, ($v \neq 0$; $l \neq 0$). If v is significantly higher than zero, then lagged residual stock index will affect ETF volatility. If l is significantly unequal to zero, then lagged residual ETF will influence stock index volatility. Possible

volatility spillover effects were considered to verify cross-market dynamics for stock indexes and ETFs returns.

The unilateral effect of lagged ETF returns on stock index returns and vice versa, or the bilateral return influence and asymmetric volatility effects between financial or non-financial ETFs and the stock indexes that are being tracked were identified. Risk and return relationships in standard deviation are denoted by z and k coefficients; and in that order, a positive relationship exists in accordance with other previous studies that utilized the GARCH-M model [Chou (1987); French, et al.(1987)]. Therefore, this study can determine whether a positive or negative connection exists between risks and returns of stock indexes and financial or non-financial ETFs. Given the significance of these results, this research provides a different direction from that of previous studies that only considered the spillover and leverage effects of non-financial ETFs.

This study tested the null hypothesis, H_0 , (which states that the sequence has no spillover effects of returns ($w = 0$; $d = 0$)) against the alternative hypothesis, H_1 , (which states that the sequence has the spillover effect of returns ($w \neq 0$; $d \neq 0$)). The coefficients w and d represent the spillover effect of ETFs and stock index returns, respectively. If w is significantly different from zero, the lagged stock index returns will affect ETF. If d is significantly unequal to zero, the lagged ETF returns will affect the stock index returns. The use of GARCH models that incorporate the possibility of spillover enabled us to determine whether ETF and stock index returns in different markets are interdependent or whether they respond to domestic market shocks.

4 - Results

Table 1 shows that the average returns for the majority of the samples are positive, except for three financial ETFs, namely, Global X Brazil Financial (BRAf), Global X China Financial ETF (CHIX), and MSCI Europe Financial Index (EUFN); and for one non-financial ETFs, the Global China Industrials ETF (CHII). Generally, we can say that financial and non-financial ETFs are an investment for diversification because average returns positive, and standard deviations for both are relatively small. However, the majority of the financial data under study, including some of stock returns have negatively skewed,

Table 1. The Sample Size and Period of financial and non-financial ETFs and Stock Indexes

ETFs	Market	Index	Code	Type	Period	Obs	Mean	SD	Skew	Kurt	J-B
Financial ETFs	BRAZIL	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Global X Brazil Financials ETF (BRAQ)-NYSEArca	NYA BRAQ	Stock ETF	2010/7/29- 2012/5/12	374	0.001 0.013 -0.59 7.24 301.58***				
	CHINA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Global X China Financials ETF (CHIX)-NYSEArca	NYA CHIX	Stock ETF	2010/1/22- 2012/5/12	571	0.000 0.022 0.06 6.94 242.09***				
	CANADA	S&PTX Composite index (Interi (^GSPTSE)-Toronto iShares S&PTX Capped Financials Index (XFN.TO)-Toronto	GSP XFN	Stock ETF	2001/3/30- 2012/5/12	2631	0.000 0.020 0.20 6.76 340.06***				
	EMERGING	NASDAQ Composite (^IXIC)-Nasdaq iShares MSCI Emerg Mkts Financials Idx (EMFN)-Nasdaq	NAS EMFN	Stock ETF	2010/2/11- 2012/5/12	421	0.000 0.013 0.18 13.12 11244.1***				
	EUROPE	NASDAQ Composite (^IXIC)-Nasdaq iShares MSCI Europe Financials Index (EUFN)-Nasdaq	NAS EUFN	Stock ETF	2010/2/3- 2012/5/12	527	0.001 0.014 -0.34 6.03 169.34***				
	USA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE iShares Dow Jones US Insurance (IAK)-NYSEArca	NYA IAK	Stock ETF	2006/5/5- 2012/5/12	1487	0.000 0.017 -0.12 10.21 3225.34***				
	USA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE iShares Dow Jones US Financial Services (IYG)-NYSEArca	NYA IYG	Stock ETF	2010/6/21- 2012/5/12	2963	0.000 0.023 0.29 11.43 4420.76***				
	BRAZIL	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Global X Brazil Consumer ETF (BRAQ)-NYSEArca	NYA BRAQ	Stock ETF	2010/8/7- 2012/5/12	457	0.000 0.013 -0.46 6.44 241.168***				
	CHINA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Global X China Industrials ETF (CHII)-NYSEArca	NYA CHII	Stock ETF	2009/12/1- 2012/5/12	587	0.000 0.018 -0.39 4.47 53.1617***				
	CANADA	S&PTX Composite index (Interi (^GSPTSE)-Toronto iShares S&PTX Capped Materials Index (XMA.TO)-Toronto	GSP XMA	Stock ETF	2005/12/28- 2012/5/12	1554	0.000 0.013 -0.37 6.10 248.705***				
	EMERGING	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE EGShares Emerging Markets MetalsMining (EMT)-NYSEArca	NYA EMT	Stock ETF	2009/6/2- 2012/5/12	724	-0.001 0.021 0.16 5.28 130.062***				
	EUROPE	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Vanguard MSCI Europe ETF (VGGK)-NYSEArca	NYA VGGK	Stock ETF	2005/3/10- 2012/5/12	1793	0.000 0.014 -0.39 10.53 3714.20***				
	USA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE iShares Dow Jones US Industrial (IYJ)-NYSEArca	NYA IYJ	Stock ETF	2000/7/14- 2012/5/12	2909	0.001 0.023 0.06 10.41 3557.67***				
	USA	NYSE COMPOSITE INDEX (NEW METHO (^NYA)-NYSE Industrial Select Sector SPDR (XLI)-NYSEArca	NYA XLI	Stock ETF	1998/12/22- 2012/5/12	3322	0.001 0.013 -0.37 5.53 209.923***				
Non-financial ETFs							0.000 0.022 0.45 14.22 15643.4***				

Source: Yahoo Finance, various years, Finance.yahoo.com.

which means that perhaps the future data will be smaller than mean.

The result for financial ETFs and non-financial ETFs kurtosis are leptokurtic, which means that the stock will have a quite low quantity of variance, because returns are usually closer to the mean. Kurtosis also helps us to recognize the level of risk in the stock. Leptokurtic distribution is preferred by investors who wish to keep away from large and inconsistent swings in portfolio returns, which may negatively affect the volatility structures of their investments. All Jarque-Bera statistics are significant for all samples showing that the assumption of normal distribution of the residual cannot be accepted.

Table 2 indicates that the results of the Augmented Dickey Fuller test are all significant, showing that the observed time series for ETFs returns and stock indexes returns are stationary. This paper uses the minimum Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) for getting the best model for the ARMA, GARCH, and EGARCH models [Engle and Ng (1991)]. Test for serial correlation applies the Breusch-Godfrey LM test, and shows that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for all of ETFs and stock Index returns, which means no serial correlation. The use of the ARCH-LM test illustrates that the null hypothesis of no ARCH effects for all samples can be rejected. The results of the ARCH-LM test again shows that the GARCH-ARMA and EGARCH-ARMA models have the capability to eliminate ARCH errors in the residuals. Leverage effect is verified through EGARCH-ARMA estimations by checking significant autocorrelation, and by examining the volatility of stock index and ETF returns that exhibit conditional heteroskedasticity [Chen and Diaz (2012)]. The results of EGARCH- ARMA models for the leverage effect (δ) indicate that all financial and non-financial ETFs and stock index returns are significant in Table 3, which is consistent with the results obtained by [Chen (2004), Balaban (2005), Li (2007), and Chen and Huang (2010)]. All ETFs produce negative asymmetric volatility effects. Two financial instruments converged in their values. The empirical result of EGARCH-M-ARMA for ETF risk (z) shows that based on the ARCH-M model, the expected risk and return is positive for EMFN and EMT ETFs and negative for IYG and VGK ETFs. The result also indicates that the expected risk and return for stock index risk (k) is positive for BRAF/NYA ETFs and negative for EMFN/NAS and IYJ/NYA ETFs. The spillover effect of return (w) in relation to lagged stock index returns has a negative effect on EUFN financial ETF and BRAQ non-financial ETF. According to EGARCH-M-ARMA models, the spillover effect of returns (d) has a positive effect on the returns of

Table 2. Summary statistics of Unit Root, of financial and non-financial ETFs and Stock Indexes

ETFs	Market	Code	Type	ADF	ARMA	AIC	LM	ARCH-LM	GARCH	AIC	ARMA-LM	EGARCH	AIC	ARCH-L
Financial ETFs	BRAZIL	NYA Stock		-18.52947***	(3,3)	-5.851	0.392	88.4210***	(3,1)	-6.144	0.722	(2,1)	-6.187	2.234
		BRAF ETF		-18.2365***	(1,2)	-4.833	0.272	10.02260***	(2,1)	-5.056	0.745	(2,2)	-5.052	0.587
	CHINA	NYA Stock		-25.47335***	(1,1)	-5.787	3.492	48.6436***	(3,3)	-6.064	1.136	(2,2)	-6.112	0.442
		CHIX ETF		-22.80675***	(2,2)	-4.988	1.810	35.3196***	(3,2)	-5.200	2.245	(3,2)	-5.222	1.939
	CANADA	GSP Stock		-52.78048***	(2,2)	-5.990	0.610	425.3316***	(3,3)	-6.464	0.603	(1,3)	-6.482	0.390
		XFN ETF		-38.42727***	(1,2)	-5.829	2.325	328.1506***	(2,3)	-6.435	0.331	(2,1)	-6.443	2.392
	EMERGING	NAS Stock		-21.48991***	(0,3)	-5.689	0.281	67.7654***	(3,2)	-5.972	0.722	(1,2)	-6.021	1.024
		EMFN ETF		-21.78522***	(1,1)	-4.831	0.247	9.5351***	(3,2)	-4.929	0.810	(3,0)	-4.982	0.619
	EUROPE	NAS Stock		-23.18567*RS*	(3,3)	-5.727	2.282	67.5660***	(3,3)	-5.969	0.688	(3,3)	-6.049	0.374
		EUFN ETF		-23.24754***	(3,0)	-4.533	0.732	29.7358***	(3,3)	-4.692	0.710	(2,3)	-4.726	3.771
Non-Financial ETFs	USA	NYA Stock		-30.85679***	(3,3)	-5.376	1.749	296.6376***	(3,2)	-5.923	1.407	(3,3)	-5.966	0.648
		IAK ETF		-42.23498***	(1,1)	-4.694	0.126	294.3146***	(1,3)	-5.503	0.235	(3,2)	-5.526	0.369
	USA	NYA Stock		-42.20152***	(3,3)	-5.757	1.629	569.9392***	(3,2)	-6.278	0.586	(2,3)	-6.313	0.105
		IYG ETF		-59.03104***	(3,2)	-4.792	4.761	336.8734***	(3,3)	-5.574	0.299	(3,3)	-5.601	5.241
	BRAZIL	NYA Stock		-23.01554***	(3,3)	-5.853	1.273	49.7363***	(2,3)	-6.117	1.677	(2,2)	-6.176	0.018
		BRAQ ETF		-20.20459***	(2,2)	-5.229	0.706	42.9210***	(1,1)	-5.360	2.602	(1,3)	-5.389	0.105
	CHINA	NYA Stock		-25.70534***	(2,2)	-5.822	1.260	51.5469***	(1,2)	-6.081	0.523	(2,3)	-6.144	0.931
		CHII ETF		-22.10892***	(2,2)	-4.875	3.707	51.5404***	(2,2)	-5.086	2.065	(1,1)	-5.085	2.306
	CANADA	GSP Stock		-41.77709***	(3,3)	-5.689	0.303	235.6174***	(3,1)	-6.184	1.157	(2,2)	-6.209	1.068
		XMA ETF		-39.93016***	(3,3)	-4.721	1.831	99.4856***	(3,3)	-5.065	0.685	(1,1)	-5.080	1.032
Non-Financial ETFs	EMERGING	NYA Stock		-28.06256***	(3,3)	-5.818	0.022	71.5624***	(3,3)	-6.045	2.101	(2,2)	-6.086	0.965
		EMT ETF		-25.06849***	(2,2)	-4.842	0.261	26.1289***	(1,3)	-4.939	0.254	(1,2)	-4.966	2.901
	EUROPE	NYA Stock		-33.81221***	(3,3)	-5.533	1.503	355.3070***	(1,3)	-6.136	0.391	(2,3)	-6.179	0.452
		VGK ETF		-47.9706***	(3,3)	-5.110	2.245	290.7812***	(2,2)	-5.572	0.085	(1,2)	-5.589	0.487
	USA	NYA Stock		-41.91756***	(3,3)	-5.743	1.620	564.3177***	(1,2)	-6.260	0.722	(3,3)	-6.297	0.189
		IYJ ETF		-56.39291***	(3,3)	-5.522	1.097	297.3291***	(1,2)	-5.931	1.040	(3,3)	-5.966	2.448
	USA	NYA Stock		-44.92324***	(3,3)	-5.798	0.504	610.1103***	(3,2)	-6.258	0.129	(1,2)	-6.293	0.493
		XLI ETF		-58.98298***	(2,1)	-5.584	0.125	359.8646***	(1,3)	-5.929	0.092	(1,2)	-5.957	0.616

Note: ADF is the t-statistic for the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test with a constant and trend at the level. LM is Breusch-Godfrey serial correlation test and we use Lag(4) to be the best period. AIC is Akaike Info Criterion. *, **, and *** denote significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% or less, respectively. The p-Values are shown in brackets.

Table 3: Spillover effects of return and volatilities for stock and ETF returns

ETFs & Indices	Code	Returns				Volatilities				Risk				Leverage Effect	
		Stock		ETF		Stock		ETF		Stock		ETF		Stock	
		1 (d)	2 (w)	3 (l)	4 (v)	5 (k)	6 (z)	7 (d)	8 (d)	9 (d)	10 (d)	11 (d)	12 (d)	13 (d)	14 (d)
Financial ETFs	BRAF/NYA	-0.029	-0.123	17.167	297.477	0.0046***	0.131	0.253	-0.063	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	CHIX/NYA	0.041	-0.029	149.463	84.509	-0.063	0.063	-0.306	-0.069	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	XFN/GSP	0.0711*	0.660	0.158	0.0988*	0.563	0.691	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		-0.012	0.143	49.949	33.999	-0.063	-0.067	-0.098	-0.084	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.572	0.178	0.0021**	0.0117**	0.248	0.143	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	EMFN/NAS	0.063	0.049	99.800	91.168	-0.247	1.332	-0.198	-0.209	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.051**	0.539	0.332	0.0155**	0.0412***	0.003***	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	EUFN/NAS	0.026	-0.128	78.427	103.903	0.196	-0.172	-0.356	-0.055	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.234	0.0714*	0.152	0.169	0.371	0.143	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	IAG/NYA	-0.033	0.015	-47.547	2.258	-0.057	-0.057	-0.236	-0.151	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
Non- Financial ETFs	IYG/NYA	0.226	0.728	0.0001***	0.906	0.330	0.223	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		-0.036	0.005	38.181	-0.472	-0.062	-0.057	-0.161	-0.151	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.0037***	0.905	0.0135**	0.971	0.168	0.0011***	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	BRAQ/NYA	0.059	-0.214	279.676	106.671	-0.065	-0.158	-0.287	-0.087	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.0149**	0.0198**	0.0116**	0.160	0.575	0.408	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	CHII/NYA	0.053	-0.054	122.561	51.110	-0.076	0.044	-0.327	-0.095	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.0238**	0.526	0.268	0.438	0.484	0.781	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	XMA/GSP	0.009	0.027	62.576	82.742	0.073	0.108	-0.096	-0.084	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.574	0.595	0.004***	0.000***	0.362	0.195	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	EMT/NYA	0.054	-0.031	141.640	31.858	0.031	0.776	-0.318	-0.145	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
Non- Financial ETFs		0.047**	0.691	0.157	0.144	0.767	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	VGK/NYA	0.047	-0.098	33.302	24.414	-0.063	-0.206	-0.187	-0.110	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.198	0.158	0.0803*	0.0156**	0.221	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	IYJ/NYA	-0.022	0.019	-42.090	23.192	-0.072	-0.004	-0.162	-0.528	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
		0.151	0.628	0.0016***	0.0911*	0.0935*	0.934	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
Non- Financial ETFs		0.028	0.003	32.737	17.690	-0.027	-0.030	-0.124	-0.091	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**
	XL/NYA	0.182	0.928	0.0038***	0.051*	0.549	0.465	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**

Note: *, **, and *** are significance at 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively. The p-Values are shown in brackets.

stock indexes for CHIX/NYA, EMFN/NAS, BRAQ/NYA, CHII/NYA and EMT/NYA ETFs and negative effects on returns of stock index for IYG/NYA ETFs. The spillover effects of volatilities with EGARCH-M-ARMA models show that six ETFs and stock indexes have positive effects on the volatility of the ETFs, and vice versa in terms of lagged stock index volatility. Bilateral connections such as BRAF/NYA, XFN/GSP, XMA/GSP, VGK/NYA, IYJ/NYA, and XLI/NYA ETFs also exist. Lagged stock index volatility has a positive effect on EMFN/NYA and CHIX/NYA ETFs. Lagged ETF volatility has a positive effect on the volatility of the stock index for IYG/NYA and BRAQ/NYA, whereas lagged ETF volatility has a negative effect on the volatility of the stock index for IAK/NYA ETFs. Lagged stock index volatility has significant and positive effects on the volatility of CHIX and EMFN ETFs.

Tables 4 and 5 show the results for the GARCH-M-ARMA model, which determine the stable convergence of GARCH. The sum of all coefficients, namely, $\alpha_i, \psi_i, \beta_i, \gamma$ and ζ_i , is constrained to be lesser or equal than 1, which is consistent with the result of [Baillie and DeGennaro (1990) and Chen and Huang (2010)]. The estimated values for ψ_i and ζ_i are not equal with those of α_i and β_i in terms of the volatility of financial and non-financial ETFs. This finding implies the existence of the volatility clustering phenomenon. Table 4 presents empirical evidence showing that the previous unexpected return (θ_1) for XFN and IAK is significant at the 1% level and has greater negative impact on financial ETF returns compared to that of non-financial returns XMA and VGK ETFs, which indicated that previous unexpected returns have a negative influence on Canada and USA markets for financial ETFs returns and Canada and Europe market for non-financial ETFs returns. On the other hand, the study finds positive impact of CHIX financial ETFs and IYJ non-financial ETFs returns. The coefficient θ_2 is significant at the 1% level and has positive lagged innovations result for CHIX, BRAQ, CHII, and IYJ ETFs, but negative lagged innovations for XFN and EMT; while the coefficient θ_3 for XMA ETFs have a negative lagged innovation result. Table 4 also shows the impact of lagged innovations on current conditional variance, almost all a_1 coefficients have positive and significant results except for the EUFN ETF. The results for a_2 coefficients of CHIX, XFN, EMFN, IAK and XMA ETFs have negative significant values, while

Table 4. GARCH-M-ARMA of financial and non-financial ETFs return

ETFs	Code	Model	Mean Equation			Conditional Variance Equation										
			a0	a1	a2	a3	θ1	θ2	θ3	a0	a1	a2	a3	ψ1	ψ2	ψ3
Financial ETFs	BRAF	GARCH (2,1)	-0.004	-0.776			0.834	0.055		0.000	-0.005	0.856		0.120		
		ARMA (1,2)	0.254	0.488			0.455	0.403		0.056*	0.917	0.000***		0.000***		
	CHIX	GARCH(3,2)	-0.001	-0.855	-0.961		0.890	0.990		0.000	1.309	-1.276	0.849	0.083	0.016	
		ARMA (2,2)	0.639	0.000***	0.000***		0.000***	0.000***		0.038*	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.543	
	XFN	GARCH (2,3)	0.001	0.785			-0.752	-0.071		0.000	1.743	-0.752		0.109	-0.092	-0.00
		ARMA (1,2)	0.194	0.000***			0.000***	0.002***		0.000***	0.000***	0.000***		0.000***	0.036**	0.71
	EMFN	GARCH (3,2)	-0.005	-0.264			0.149			0.000	0.265	-0.354	0.942	0.090	0.035	
		ARMA (1,1)	0.0548*	0.431			0.669			0.139	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.069*		
	EUFN	GARCH (3,3)	0.002	0.008	-0.065	-0.063				0.000	-0.594	0.759	0.507	-0.019	0.084	0.19
		ARMA (3,0)	0.535	0.832	0.144	0.137				0.006***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.464	0.000***	0.000*
Non- Financial ETFs	IAG	GARCH (1,3)	0.000	0.743			-0.802			0.000	0.152	-0.076	0.893	0.029		
		ARMA (1,1)	0.535	0.000***			0.000***			0.000***	0.000***	0.007***	0.000***	0.117		
	IYG	GARCH (3,3)	0.000	0.283	0.421	-0.003	-0.339	-0.432		0.000	1.298	0.056	-0.364	0.027	0.134	-0.15
		ARMA (3,2)	0.850	0.715	0.472	0.901	0.662	0.494		0.025**	0.000***	0.805	0.001***	0.056*	0.000***	0.000*
	BRAQ	GARCH (1,1)	0.001	-1.681	-0.937		1.725	0.987		0.000		0.876		0.096		
		ARMA (2,2)	0.744	0.000***	0.000***		0.000***	0.000***		0.031**		0.000***		0.000***		
	CHII	GARCH (2,2)	-0.003	-1.151	-0.583		1.229	0.649		0.000	0.285	0.531		0.028	0.118	
		ARMA (2,2)	0.343	0.000***	0.0237**		0.000***	0.007***		0.0129**	0.484	0.154		0.396	0.002***	
	XMA	GARCH (3,3)	0.000	1.866	-1.582	0.650	-1.866	1.576	-0.668	0.000	1.394	-1.373	0.860	0.050	-0.031	0.07
		ARMA (3,3)	0.801	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.001***	0.092*	0.000*
Non- Financial ETFs	EMT	GARCH (1,3)	-0.005	0.024	0.763		0.028	-0.820		0.000	0.944			-0.030	0.206	-0.15
		ARMA (2,2)	0.126	0.872	0.000***		0.848	0.000***		0.092*	0.000***			0.070*	0.000***	0.000*
	VGK	GARCH (2,2)	0.001	1.307	-0.174	-0.251	-1.416	0.308	0.200	0.000	0.546	0.309		-0.008	0.142	
		ARMA (3,3)	0.529	0.000***	0.562	0.116	0.000***	0.325	0.242	0.000***	0.007***	0.099*		0.650	0.000***	
	IYJ	GARCH (1,2)	0.000	-1.181	-1.281	-0.481	1.168	1.260	0.458	0.000	0.891			0.009	0.091	
		ARMA (3,3)	0.863	0.000***	0.000***	0.107	0.000***	0.000***	0.127	0.000***	0.000***			0.532	0.000***	
	XLI	GARCH (1,3)	0.000	-0.277	-0.040		0.260			0.000	0.915			0.049	0.098	-0.00
		ARMA (2,1)	0.904	0.503	0.041**		0.530			0.000***	0.000***			0.000***	0.000***	0.000*

Note: *, **, and *** are significance at 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively. The p-Values are shown in brackets.

Table 5. GARCH-M-ARMA of financial and non-financial Stock index return

ETFs	STOCK	Model	Mean Equation					Conditional Variance Equation									
			β_0	β_1	β_2	β_3	γ_1	γ_2	γ_3	β_0	β_1	β_2	β_3	ζ_1	ζ_2	ζ_3	
Financial ETFs	NYA/ BRA	GARCH (3,1)	0.003	-0.579	-0.756	-0.730	0.649	0.782	0.881	0.000	1.710	-1.691	0.870	0.070			
	NYA/ BRA	ARMA (3,3)	0.005***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.001***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***			
	NYA/ CHIX	GARCH (3,3)	0.001	0.805	-0.863					0.000	-0.625	0.569	0.544	-0.026	0.231	0.26	
	NYA/ CHIX	ARMA (1,1)	0.399	0.000***	0.000***					0.015**	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.299	0.000***	0.000*	
	GSP/ XFN	GARCH (3,3)	0.001	-1.178	-0.813		1.205	0.842		0.000	0.518	-0.625	0.863	0.076	0.047	0.08	
	XFN ARMA (2,2)	0.289	0.000***	0.000***						0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000*	
	Financial NAS/ EMFN	GARCH (3,2)	0.002				-0.012	-0.036	-0.034	0.000	1.028	-0.674	0.398	0.004	0.197		
	EMFN ARMA (0,3)	0.328				0.803	0.525	0.540	0.007***	0.000***	0.0254**	0.002***	0.931	0.001***			
	NAS/ EUFN	GARCH (3,3)	0.004	-0.055	0.069	0.915	0.049	-0.045	-0.991	0.000***	0.490	0.105	0.179	0.097	0.079	0.01	
	EUFN ARMA (3,3)	0.042**	0.005***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.800	0.902	0.955	0.923	0.011**	0.840	0.97	
Non-Financial ETFs	NYA/ IAK	GARCH (3,2)	0.001	-0.037	0.043	0.040	-0.043	-0.094	-0.078	0.000	0.567	0.209	0.046	-0.025	0.188		
	IAK ARMA (3,3)	0.273	0.975	0.935	0.936	0.971	0.861	0.890	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.208	0.734	0.000***	0.000***		
	NYA/ IYG	GARCH (3,2)	0.000	0.344	0.237	0.125	-0.391	-0.252	-0.118	0.000	0.780	0.146	-0.064	-0.020	0.142		
	IYG ARMA (3,3)	0.353	0.703	0.832	0.775	0.665	0.828	0.797	0.000***	0.000***	0.517	0.612	0.040**	0.000***			
	NYA/ BRAQ	GARCH (2,3)	0.001	-0.715	0.313	0.759	0.679	-0.376	-0.851	0.000	0.322	0.451		0.013	0.226	-0.04	
	BRAQ ARMA (3,3)	0.589	0.000***	0.182	0.000***	0.000***	0.060	0.000***	0.126	0.362	0.0997*		0.696	0.000***	0.67		
	NYA/ CHII	GARCH (1,2)	0.001	0.041	0.746		-0.093	-0.757		0.000	0.796			-0.055	0.229		
	CHII ARMA (2,2)	0.372	0.890	0.001***		0.761	0.002***		0.003***	0.000***			0.009***	0.000***			
	GSP/ XMA	GARCH (3,1)	0.000	0.172	0.483	0.115	-0.180	-0.513	-0.150	0.000	2.021	-1.432	0.371	0.032			
	XMA ARMA (3,3)	0.654	0.834	0.244	0.824	0.826	0.225	0.781	0.014**	0.000***	0.028**	0.190	0.009***				
Non-Financial ETFs	NYA/ EMT	GARCH (3,3)	0.001	-0.057	-0.169	0.855	0.016	0.143	-0.902	0.000	-0.605	0.460	0.621	-0.007	0.266	0.21	
	EMT ARMA (3,3)	0.482	0.486	0.0258**	0.000***	0.817	0.025**	0.000***	0.006***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.726	0.000***	0.000*	
	NYA/ VKG	GARCH (1,3)	0.001	0.038	0.167	0.358	-0.105	-0.212	-0.388	0.000	0.847			-0.021	0.172	-0.01	
	VKG ARMA (3,3)	0.0606*	0.962	0.769	0.310	0.897	0.729	0.295	0.000***	0.000***			0.000***	0.000***	0.70		
	NYA/ IYJ	GARCH (1,2)	-0.001	-0.712	-0.228	0.458	0.648	0.174	-0.506	0.000	0.864			0.000***	0.133		
	IYJ ARMA (3,3)	0.162	0.000***	0.142	0.000***	0.000***	0.232	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***			0.000***	0.000***		
	NYA/ XLI	GARCH (3,2)	0.000	0.036	-0.346	0.747	-0.060	0.297	-0.779	0.000	1.330	-1.083	0.628	0.037	0.074		
XLI ARMA (3,3)	0.920	0.728	0.000***	0.000***	0.536	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***		

Note: *, **, and *** are significance at 10%, 5%, 1% levels, respectively. The p-Values are shown in brackets.

IYG ETF has the only negative significant result for a_3 . Meanwhile, the ψ_1 coefficients are significant except for the EMT ETF, revealing that the lagged conditional variance of ETF returns has a positive impact on the current conditional variance except for the for ψ_2 coefficients of XFN and XMA ETFs which showed a negative influence. The last column of Table 4 shows that the ψ_3 coefficients show that EUFN and XMA ETFs have positive significant results, but negative significant results are observed in IYG, EMT and XLI ETFs. The authors observed that NYA/BRAF, GSP/XFN, and NAS/EMFN for financial ETFs and NYA/BRAQ and NYA/IYJ for non-financial ETFs have positive and have strong significance at the 1% level of the lagged innovation (1), indicating that these stock index returns have a positive influence, as shown in Table 5. For γ_2 coefficients, the findings show positive results for NYA/BRAF, GSP/XFN, NYA/EMT, and NYA/XLI; and negative results for the γ_3 coefficients of NAS/EUFN, NYA/BRAQ, NYA/EMT, NYA/IYJ, and NYA/XLI except for NYA/BRAF which has a positive result. The conditional variance equation represented by ζ_1 also shows a significant positive effect on stock index returns associated with financial ETFs for NYA/BRAF, GSP/XFN, and NAS/EUFN and non-financial ETFs for GSP/XMA and NYA/XLI. The result for ζ_2 and ζ_3 coefficients have shown positive significant results for financial and non-financial ETFs, which means that lagged innovations and lagged conditional stock index return variance generate the current conditional variance. The authors also found in the volatility of the stock index return that the coefficient of b_1 are almost positive, except for NYA/CHIX financial ETFs and NYA/EMT non-financial ETFs. The positive result means that lagged innovations and lagged conditional stock index return variance generate a positive impact on the current conditional variance. For b_3 coefficients all financial and non-financial ETFs have positive significant results, and for b_2 coefficients, just NYA/CHIX financial ETFs; and only NYA/BRAQ and, NYA/EMT for non-financial ETFs have positive results.

5 - Conclusions

This research documented the results of the GARCH-M-ARMA and EGARCH-M-ARMA models to analyze the spillover of returns and volatilities and the leverage effects of financial and non-financial ETFs.

Findings show that a bilateral connection exists between financial and non-financial ETFs, which affects the benchmark indexes. The spillover

effects of volatilities in non-financial ETFs have a strong positive influence on stocks; however, stock indexes have several negative effects on non-financial ETFs. Another finding provides evidence that non-financial ETFs and stock indexes have more spillover effects of volatility than financial ETFs and stocks as exhibited by XMA/GSP, VGK/NYA, and XLI/NYA. These findings indicate that the spillover effects of volatilities have positive bilateral effects on stock indexes and non-financial ETFs in Canada, Europe, and the USA. Financial ETFs in Brazil and Canada have positive spillover effects of volatility.

The spillover effects of ETF return also have a positive effect on a stock index. Tests with EGARCH-M-ARMA reveal that all ETF (financial and non-financial) and stock index returns are strongly negative for leverage effect (δ).

Risk and return relationships are denoted by the z and k coefficients showed that expected risk and return on ETF risk (z) is negative for the USA and European market and positive for emerging market. The result also indicates the expected risk and return for stock index risk (k) is negative for emerging market but positive for Brazil. This study can help fund managers and investors establish appropriate strategies for portfolio investment, especially for financial ETFs in the international finance market. Investors can also evaluate stock and benchmark indexes before investing in ETFs, and vice versa.

References

- Baillie, R. and R. DeGennaro, 1990. Stock return and volatility. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 25 (2), 203-214.
- Balaban, E. A, 2005. Stock returns and volatility: Empirical evidence from fourteen countries. *Applied Economics Letter*, 1 (10), 603-611.
- Chan, K, K. C. Chan, and G. A. Karolyi, 1991. Intraday volatility in the stock index and stock index futures markets. *Review of Financial Studies*, 4 (4), 657-684.
- Chen, J. H, 2011. The spillover and leverage effects of ethical exchange traded funds. *Applied Economics Letter*, 18 (10), 983-987.
- Chen, J. H. and J. F. Diaz, 2012. Spillover and asymmetric volatility effects of leverage and inverse leverage exchange traded funds. *Journal of Business and Policy Research*, 7 (3), 1-10.
- Chen, J. H. J. F. Diaz. and C. S. Chen, 2014. The seasonal and spillover effects

- of real estate investment trusts (REIT) exchange- traded funds (ETFs). *International Journal of Research in Finance and Marketing*, 4 (9), 1-13.
- Chen, J. H. and C. Huang, 2010. An analysis of the spillover effects of exchange traded fund. *Applied Economics*, 42 (9), 1115-1168.
- Chen, T., 2004. Forecasting the information content derived from volatility of exchange traded funds. Dissertation, Tamkang University, Taiwan, R.O.C.
- Chou, R, 1987. Volatility persistence and stock valuations; Some empirical evidence using GARCH. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 3 (4), 279-294.
- Dean, W. G., R. W. Faff, and G. F. Loudon, 2010. Asymmetry in return and volatility spillover between equity and bond markets in Australia. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal*, 18 (3), 272-289.
- Deborah, F. S. K, 2009. Emerging-market ETFs industry review. *ETFs and Indexing*, 1, 77-95.
- Engle, R. F. and V. K. Ng, 1991. Measuring and testing the impact of news on volatility. *Journal of Finance*, 48 (5), 1749-1778.
- French, K, G. Schwert. and R. Stambaugh, 1987. Expected stock returns and volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics*, (19), 3-29.
- Gao, S., 2001. ETFs, The new generation of investment funds. *ETFs and Indexing*, 1, 101-105.
- Huang, B. and C. W. Yang, 2002. Volatility of changes in G-5 exchange rates and its market transmission mechanism, *International Journal of Finance and Economics*, 7, 37-50.
- Koutmos, G. and G. G. Booth, 1995. Asymmetric volatility transmission in international stock markets. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 14 (6), 747-762.
- Krause, T. and Y. Tse, 2013. Volatility and return spillovers in Canadian and U.S. industry ETFs. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, (25), 244–259.
- Li, M., 2007. Wealth, volume and stock market volatility: Case of Hong Kong (1993-2001). *Applied Economics*, (39), 1937-1953.
- Liu, Y. A. and M. S. Pan, 1997. Mean and volatility spillover effects in the U.S. and Pacific-Basin stock markets. *Multinational Finance Journal*, 1, 47-62.
- Mazza, D. B., 2012. Do ETFs increase correlations? *The Journal of Index Investing*, 3 (1), 45-51.
- Morales. L., 2008. Volatility spillovers on precious metals markets: The

- effects of the Asian Crisis, *Proceedings of the European Applied Business Research Conference (EABR)*, Salzburg, Austria, 23rd.-25th. June, 2008.
- Nelson, B, 1991. Conditional heteroskedasticity in asset returns: A new approach. *Econometrica*, 59 (2), 347–370.
- Noël. A. F. G., 2009. The way ahead for exchange-traded funds: Results from a European survey. *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, 12 (1), 50-54.
- Niarchos, N, Y. Tse, C. Wu.and A. Young, 1999. International transmission of information: A study of the relationship between the U.S. and Greek Stock Markets, *Multinational Finance Journal*,3 (1), 19-40.
- Schoenfeld, S. A., 2001. ETFs offer the world to investors. *ETFs and Indexing*, 1, 111-117.
- Song, L. J., 2006. The development of Chinese ETFs. *ETFs and Indexing*, 1, 139-149.
- Steeley, J. M, 2006. Volatility transmission between stock and bond markets. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 16 (1), 71-86.
- Xu, X. E. and H. Fung, 2005. Cross-market linkages between U.S. and Japanese precious metals futures trading. *International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*,15, 107-124.