

Palanska, Tereza

Working Paper

Measurement of volatility spillovers and asymmetric connectedness on commodity and equity markets

IES Working Paper, No. 27/2018

Provided in Cooperation with:

Charles University, Institute of Economic Studies (IES)

Suggested Citation: Palanska, Tereza (2018) : Measurement of volatility spillovers and asymmetric connectedness on commodity and equity markets, IES Working Paper, No. 27/2018, Charles University in Prague, Institute of Economic Studies (IES), Prague

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/203207>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

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

Measurement of Volatility Spillovers and Asymmetric Connectedness on Commodity and Equity Markets

Tereza Palanska

IES Working Paper: 27/2018



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

[UK FSV – IES]

Opletalova 26
CZ-110 00, Prague
E-mail : ies@fsv.cuni.cz
<http://ies.fsv.cuni.cz>

Institut ekonomických studií
Fakulta sociálních věd
Univerzita Karlova v Praze

Opletalova 26
110 00 Praha 1

E-mail : ies@fsv.cuni.cz
<http://ies.fsv.cuni.cz>

Disclaimer: The IES Working Papers is an online paper series for works by the faculty and students of the Institute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic. The papers are peer reviewed. The views expressed in documents served by this site do not reflect the views of the IES or any other Charles University Department. They are the sole property of the respective authors. Additional info at: ies@fsv.cuni.cz

Copyright Notice: Although all documents published by the IES are provided without charge, they are licensed for personal, academic or educational use. All rights are reserved by the authors.

Citations: All references to documents served by this site must be appropriately cited.

Bibliographic information:

Palanska T. (2018): "Measurement of Volatility Spillovers and Asymmetric Connectedness on Commodity and Equity Markets" IES Working Papers 27/2018. IES FSV. Charles University.

This paper can be downloaded at: <http://ies.fsv.cuni.cz>

Measurement of Volatility Spillovers and Asymmetric Connectedness on Commodity and Equity Markets

Tereza Palanska^a

^aInstitute of Economic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University
Opletalova 21, 110 00, Prague, Czech Republic
Email (corresponding author): malirovatereza@gmail.com

October 2018

Abstract:

We study volatility spillovers among commodity and equity markets by employing a recently developed approach based on realized measures and forecast error variance decomposition invariant to the variable ordering from vector-autoregressions. This enables us to measure total, directional and net volatility spillovers as well as the asymmetry of responses to positive and negative shocks. We exploit high-frequency data on the prices of Crude oil, Corn, Cotton and Gold futures, and the S&P 500 Index and use a sample which spans from January 2002 to December 2015 to cover the entire period around the global financial crisis of 2008. Our empirical analysis reveals that on average, the volatility shocks related to other markets account for around one fifth of the volatility forecast error variance. We find that shocks to the stock markets play the most important role as the S&P 500 Index dominates all commodities in terms of general volatility spillover transmission. Our results further suggest that volatility spillovers across the analyzed assets were rather limited before the global financial crisis, which then boosted the connectedness between commodity and stock markets. Furthermore, the volatility due to positive and negative shocks is transmitted between markets at different magnitudes and the prevailing effect has varied. In the pre-crisis period, the positive spillovers dominated the negative ones, however, in several years following the crisis, the negative shocks have had a significantly higher impact on the volatility spillovers across the markets, pointing to an overall increase in uncertainty in the commodity and equity markets following a major crisis. In recent years, the asymmetric measures seem to have returned to their pre-crisis directions and magnitudes.

JEL: C18, C58, G01, G15, Q02

Keywords: Volatility, Spillovers, Relized Semivariance, Asymmetric effects, Commodity markets, Equity markets

Acknowledgements: The author is grateful to Jozef Barunik, Evzen Kocenda, Tomas Krehlik and Miroslav Palansky for their comments and suggestions. The research was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Staff Exchange programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement No 681228.

1 Introduction

In the last decades, individual markets have become interconnected in an unprecedented manner and financial liberalization and internationalization of trade have induced a significant increase in volatility in these markets. With higher integration, commodity and equity markets have become more sensitive to innovations, changing political and economic situation, positive and negative shocks and changes in the investors' expectations. Moreover, as commodity markets become more financialized and the liquidity of commodity futures increases, an increasing number of investors are interested in commodities exclusively as investments. Monitoring, analyzing and understanding time-varying volatility and the transmission mechanism across different asset classes has thus become of fundamental concern for researchers, investors as well as for policy makers.

Most previous studies have focused on volatility spillovers among major stock markets, across one specific industry or between the crude oil market and financial markets. In this paper we model volatility spillovers across widely traded commodity markets, specifically among Crude oil, Gold, Corn and Cotton futures, and one of the main U.S. stock market indices, the S&P 500 Index, to represent the equity market. Each of the included commodities represents an important asset in its class - energy, precious metal, grain and fiber, respectively. We employ high-frequency data for the period from January 2002 to December 2015 which enables us to examine volatility spillovers before, during, and after the global financial crisis of 2008.

Following the approach of Diebold and Yilmaz (2009), we base our methodology on the construction of a simple quantitative measure of interdependence, the so-called spillover index. Specifically, our approach is based directly on the decomposition of the forecast error variance of a vector auto-regressive model, which allows us to distinguish the forecast error variance in one market from the shocks in other markets and thus to estimate the spillover effect. We employ an extension to this approach pioneered by Baruník et al. (2016), who build not only upon the work on spillover indices by Diebold and Yilmaz (2009), but also on the updated methodology introduced by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012), which introduces measures of both total and directional volatility spillovers. The resulting modified indices allow for modeling asymmetric responses to positive and negative shocks.

We find that volatility spillovers across the analyzed assets were rather limited before the 2008 crisis, which then deepened the connectedness between commodity and stock markets and emphasized further financialization of commodities. The shocks to the stock markets play the most important role regarding the transmission of volatility as the S&P 500 Index dominates all commodities in terms of general volatility spillover transmission measures. We analyze asymmetric responses to positive and negative shocks and our results contradict the common perception that the negative shocks impact volatility spillovers more heavily than the positive ones and suggest that except for the times of crises, the attitude of market participants is not as pessimistic as generally assumed. In the pre-crisis period, positive spillovers dominated the negative ones, however, after the Lehman Brothers collapse in September 2008, the negative shocks have had a significantly

higher impact on the volatility spillovers across the analyzed markets. Nevertheless, in recent years, we observe that the asymmetric measures seem to have gradually returned to their pre-crises directions and magnitudes.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The following section provides an overview of the existing literature focusing on inter-market connectedness, transmission of volatility between different markets, measurement of volatility spillovers and asymmetric responses to positive and negative shocks. In Section 3 we describe the theoretical background behind the construction of realized measures and the methodology used to estimate the effects of volatility in commodity and equity markets. We detail the construction and adjustments of the data and provide some descriptive statistics in Section 4. In Section 5 we evaluate the results of a static and dynamic analysis of volatility spillovers between the two asset classes—stocks and commodities—as well as volatility spillovers across different commodities and we further investigate potential asymmetries in the transmission mechanism due to negative and positive shocks. Section 6 concludes and discusses the contribution of our analysis.

2 Literature review

In this section we overview the existing literature focusing on the inter-market connectedness between assets, and in particular those included in our analysis. We then briefly summarize the approaches used in the literature to measure volatility spillovers and the asymmetry of the response to positive and negative shocks.

The majority of the existing studies that analyze volatility transmission focus on the relationships among different key stock markets or between the crude oil market and financial markets. Arouri et al. (2012) investigate the volatility transmission between oil and stock markets in Europe using the VAR-GARCH model, enabling the analysis of spillover effects in both returns and conditional volatility, and document significant volatility spillovers between oil and stock markets in Europe with various intensity of volatility interactions in different sectors. The transmission effect from oil to stock markets shows to be more evident. In order to extract the nature of the relationship between the volatility of stock and oil futures markets, Vo (2011) employs the bivariate VAR(1)-SV model for the joint processes governing the S&P 500 Index and the oil futures returns during the 1999–2009 period. The author finds that there is time-varying correlation between the stock and oil futures markets which tends to grow with increasing volatility in the market, and daily volatility in both markets shows to be very persistent and hence quite predictable. Degiannakis et al. (2013) examine the relationship between the returns of oil prices and industrial sector indices in a time-varying heteroskedastic environment, taking into consideration the origin of the oil prices shocks. The results show that the correlation between industrial sectors' returns and oil price returns is influenced by the origin of the oil price shock as well as by the type of industry. Degiannakis et al. (2014)

follow up with a study showing that oil price changes due to aggregate demand shocks lead to a reduction in stock market volatility in Europe, and that supply-side shocks and oil specific demand shocks do not affect volatility.

In recent years, significant volatility in the U.S. stock market and dramatic fluctuations in the global price of crude oil spurred notable academic interest in studying the relationships of these markets. For example, Kang et al. (2015) use a structural VAR model to study the impact of global oil price shocks on the covariance of U.S. stock market returns and the stock market volatility. The results reveal that after the 2008 crisis, oil-market specific demand shocks predicted a much larger fraction of implied-covariance of stock returns and volatility than in the pre-crisis period. Importantly, the authors find that positive shocks to aggregate demand and to oil-market specific demand are associated with negative effects on the covariance of return and volatility, while oil supply disruptions are associated with positive effects. The spillover index measuring the degree of connectedness for the oil market and the stock market shows to be relatively large and highly statistically significant, suggesting a strong connection between the volatility of oil prices and stock market returns.

Other commodity markets and their inter-connectedness have received relatively less attention, however, there are reasons to think that it plays an important role. First, there has been an extensive increase in the price volatility of non-energy commodities, argued by Tang and Xiong (2012) to be a result of financialization of the markets (Basak and Pavlova, 2016), a process accelerated by the fast growth of commodity index investment and causing increased commodity price correlations. Tang and Xiong (2012) find intensified price co-movements between non-energy commodity futures and oil prices since 2000, contemporaneously with the rapidly increasing index investment in commodity markets. The expanding financialization of commodities in general is documented by other studies as well (Dwyer et al., 2011, Vivian and Wohar, 2012, Mensi et al., 2013, Creti et al., 2013, Basak and Pavlova, 2016).

Nazlioglu et al. (2013) study volatility transmission between oil and selected agricultural commodity prices—sugar, wheat, soybeans and corn. The time period under research is divided into two, the period before (1986-2005) and after (2006-2011) the food price crisis. By employing a recently developed variance causality test, they show that the risk spills over between oil and agriculture commodity markets (except for sugar) in the post-crisis period while there is no such evidence in the period before the food crisis. Du et al. (2011) also study the relationship between crude oil prices and agricultural markets and the potential transmission of their volatility over the time period from November 1998 to January 2009. They apply stochastic volatility models with parameters estimated by Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods to weekly average settlement prices of crude oil, corn and wheat futures and find that the recent oil price shocks appear to have a substantial impact on agricultural commodity markets. These results confirm their assumption about the volatility spillovers among crude oil, corn, and wheat markets after the fall of 2006 potentially caused by the increasing presence of commodity

investments.

A distinct body of literature studies the links between the commodity markets and the stock markets and the transmission of volatility between them. Creti et al. (2013) study the connectedness between price returns for 25 commodities and stocks. In particular, they cover various sectors such as energy, precious metals, agricultural, non-ferrous metals, food, oleaginous, exotic and livestock, including also an aggregate commodity price index, the Commodity Research Bureau (CRB) index, as well as the S&P 500 Index representing the U.S. equity market. To investigate the time evolution of correlations between the various markets during 11 years spanning from 2001 to 2011, they proxy the volatility by the daily squared returns of prices and employ the dynamic conditional correlation GARCH methodology. The results suggest that the correlations between commodity and stock markets evolve over time and fluctuate substantially, with high volatility being particularly observable in the post-crisis period. On the other hand, the safe-haven role of gold is revealed as the correlation with the stock market is mainly negative and in times of declining stock prices is less considerable. Despite the fact that there are some common features for the commodities included in the analysis, Creti et al. (2013) conclude that they cannot be regarded as a homogeneous asset class. This is in line with results reached by Vivian and Wohar (2012) who argue that commodities are too diverse to be considered as an asset class. Mensi et al. (2013) examine possible correlations and potential volatility spillovers across commodity and stock markets. Specifically, using the VAR-GARCH model, they analyze volatility transmission between the S&P 500 Index returns and BRENT, WTI, WHEAT, GOLD, and BEVERAGE spot prices over the period from 2000 to 2011. Their results suggest a substantial correlation and volatility spillovers across commodity and stock markets revealing that the highest conditional correlations are exhibited between the S&P 500 Index and Gold and the S&P 500 Index and the WTI index. Further emerging empirical literature studying the links between the commodity and equity markets also underlines the usefulness of the analysis of volatility transmission between the two types of markets as volatility plays a crucial role in determining substitution strategies and hedging possibilities (Choi and Hammoudeh, 2010, Dwyer et al., 2011, Silvennoinen and Thorp, 2013).

The vast majority of this research has used multivariate GARCH models, cointegration, structural VAR models or ARCH type models to study volatility spillovers. These models are, however, very limited in the detail in which they are able to quantify spillovers (Baruník et al., 2015). In order to better measure and capture volatility spillovers, Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) introduce a simple and intuitive measure of connectedness between assets based on forecast error variance decompositions from vector autoregressions. Several drawbacks of this approach were solved by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) who provide an improved volatility spillover measure in which forecast-error variance decompositions are invariant to variable ordering. This updated methodology allows us to measure both the total and directional volatility spillovers and reveals the level of intra-market spillovers. Klößner and Wagner (2014) further enhance the volatility spillover index by developing

a new algorithm for the swift calculation of the minimum and maximum of the index over all renumerations. In this paper, we use an approach that builds on these developments and was proposed by Baruník et al. (2016). Combining the volatility spillover index methodology and the concept of positive and negative realized semivariances proposed by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010) allows us to analyze the asymmetric spillovers using high-frequency measures.

Regarding directional spillovers, Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) analyze nineteen global equity markets from the early 1990s and find a strong evidence of divergence in the dynamics of return spillovers and volatility spillovers. Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) measure both the total and directional daily volatility spillovers among four U.S. asset classes—stocks, bonds, foreign exchange rates and commodities—from January 1999 to January 2010. The authors show that the cross-market volatility spillovers proved to have an increasing importance during the global financial crisis of 2008. Until then, the volatility transmissions across assets were quite limited. Specifically, the spillovers from the stock market to the other markets have shown to be significant especially after the collapse of the Lehman Brothers in September 2008. Diebold et al. (2017) study the connectedness among 19 key commodities between 2011 and 2016 and their results show a clear clustering of commodities into groups that match traditional industry groupings, with only a few exceptions. The energy sector turns out to be the most important in terms of transmitting shocks to other markets. Baruník et al. (2016) focus on data covering the most liquid U.S. stocks in several sectors between 2004 and 2011. The results suggest there is asymmetric connectedness in the U.S. stock market. Furthermore, the positive and negative volatility transmissions show to have different volumes which changes over time in different sectors. The authors conclude that the overall intra-market connectedness of the U.S. stocks rose significantly during the recent financial crisis. Baruník et al. (2015) study spillovers from volatility among petroleum commodities during the 1987-2014 period and find evidence for increasing volatility spillovers that substantially change after the 2008 financial crisis. They argue that the observed higher volumes of volatility spillovers are related to the progressive financialization of commodities. Regarding the asymmetric spillovers, the prevalence of spillovers due to negative shocks corresponds to periods of increasing crude oil prices and the asymmetries in spillovers markedly declined after the financial crisis.

In this paper we hypothesize that volatility spillovers exhibit different magnitudes based on whether the shock originates from negative or positive returns. This notion has roots in a broad body of research, represented for example by Barberis (2013), who argue that market agents possess asymmetric attitudes toward good and bad news and related outcomes and that on average, people are more sensitive to losses than to gains of the same volume. To test for these effects, we use return-based measures which has been the standard approach in the literature (Patton and Sheppard, 2015, Feunou et al., 2013). The main innovation presented by this paper is that we estimate directional spillover indices for seemingly unrelated commodity and equity markets.

3 Methodology

In this section, we describe the theoretical background behind the specific hypotheses and methodology used to estimate the effects of volatility and their spillovers in commodity markets. First, we discuss the realized measures—realized variance and its decomposition into positive and negative semi-variances. Then, we present the methodology behind the construction of the spillover index and the measures of spillover asymmetry. We employ the connectedness measurement methodology which was originally developed by Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) and Diebold and Yilmaz (2012), using a generalized vector autoregressive framework. Specifically, we use variance decomposition which helps to demonstrate the amount of information each variable contributes to the other variables in the regression and it shows how much of the forecast error variance of each of the variables can be explained by exogenous shocks to the other variables (Diebold and Yilmaz, 2013). This method allows us to measure both the total and directional volatility spillovers and will reveal the level of intra-market spillovers.

To study the volatility-spillover asymmetries, we will employ the volatility spillover index devised in Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) as modified by Baruník et al. (2016). Based on the concept of realized semi-variances presented by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010), the model allows us to decompose the realized variance into parts corresponding to positive and negative shocks in the market. Focusing on the intra-market spillovers, we estimate the size of the spillovers using these asymmetric spillover indices.

3.1 Realized measures

Let us consider a continuous-time stochastic process for logarithmic prices of an asset, p_t . This price evolves over a given time period $t \in \langle 0, T \rangle$. The price process consists of two components—a continuous component and a pure jump component—and takes the following form:

$$p_t = \int_0^t \mu_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s + J_t, \quad (1)$$

where μ represents a predictable drift process, σ_s a strictly positive volatility process, W a standard Brownian motion and J the pure jump. All variables used in this equation are adapted to a common filtration F . The quadratic variation of the process is then defined as:

$$[p_t, p_t] = \int_0^t \sigma_s^2 ds + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta p_s^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta p_s = p_s - p_{s-}$ represent possible present jumps. The first term on the right-hand side of this equation denotes the integrated variance of the process, which is observed to be equal to zero Andersen et al. (2001).

As proposed by Andersen et al. (2001) and Barndorff-Nielsen (2002), the sum of squared returns, $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2$, can be used as a natural estimator of the quadratic variation.

If we suppose that the intraday logarithmic returns $r_i = p_i - p_{i-1}$ are equally spaced on the interval $[0, t]$, then the sum, denoted RV , converges in probability to the quadratic variation of the underlying price process, or $[p_t, p_t]$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If we use a small-enough interval between observations, we can approximate the quadratic variation using this concept. This simple approach, however, does not differentiate between positive and negative returns. Therefore, we cannot focus individually on positive and negative shocks to prices and the volatility these shocks induce. In reality, the reactions of markets to positive and negative shocks differ, which is why Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010) derived the concept of dividing the realized variances into positive and negative realized semi-variances.

3.2 Realized semi-variances

Since markets may differ in ways they cope with volatility due to general increase and decrease of prices, Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010) define signed returns as follows:

$$RS^- = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2 I_{[r_i < 0]} \quad (3)$$

$$RS^+ = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^2 I_{[r_i > 0]} \quad (4)$$

By definition, $RV = RS^- + RS^+$. RS^- represents a measure of downside risk and captures the variation determined only by falls of the underlying prices; RS^+ , on the other hand, captures the variation determined by increases in the price of the asset. The limiting behavior of RV is transferred to RS^- and RS^+ , with both being equal to exactly one half of the integrated variance and the sum of squared jumps due to negative and positive jumps, respectively.

Moreover, the positive and negative realized semi-variances correspond to the good and bad states of the underlying variable and serve as a proxy for good and bad volatility, respectively. Consequently, we may observe asymmetries in the volatility spillovers due to these different states as they may spread differently across markets (Baruník et al., 2016).

3.3 Spillover index

Next, we introduce a measure of volatility spillovers which will allow for the distinction between negative and positive jumps. Based on the approach of Diebold and Yilmaz (2012), Baruník et al. (2016) propose an extension in the form of including the above-defined concept of realized semi-variances.

The initial uniform spillover index introduced by Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) was built on the variance decomposition of the forecast errors in a vector autoregressive model (VAR). These measures record how much of the H -step-ahead forecast error variance of some variable i is due to innovations in another variable j and hence provide a simple way

of measuring volatility spillovers (Baruník et al., 2016). However, this methodology has several limitations. A substantial drawback of the original Diebold and Yilmaz framework is that the variance decompositions employ the Cholesky factorization of the covariance matrix of the VAR residuals, which may lead to the dependence of the variance decomposition results on the ordering of variables in the underlying VAR process. Moreover, the initial spillover index allows to measure only the total spillovers (the transmission *from (to)* one market *to (from)* all other markets) while one may be interested also in the directional spillovers, i.e. how the volatility *from* one particular market i is spilled over *to* another specific market j and vice versa. Further limitations concern the application of the methodology only on spillovers across identical asset in different countries whereas many other types of spillovers, such as spillovers across asset classes within one country, may be of interest. These methodological shortcomings were overcome by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012), who develop a generalized vector autoregressive framework which makes forecast error variance decomposition invariant to the variable ordering and enables to measure not only total but also directional volatility spillovers.

3.4 Total spillover index

We further describe the construction of the extended spillover index as developed by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012), which follows directly from the variance decomposition in a generalized VAR framework instead of employing the Cholesky factor orthogonalization. Simply put, the forecast error variance decomposition indicates what percent of the k -step ahead forecast error variance is due to which variable (Cochrane, 2005). First, consider a covariance stationary N -variable VAR (p):

$$x_t = \sum_{i=1}^p \Phi_i x_{t-i} + \epsilon_t, \quad (5)$$

where $x_t = (x_{1t}, x_{2t}, \dots, x_{nt})$ is an N -dimensional vector, Φ_i , with $i = 1, \dots, p$, stands for coefficient matrices and $\epsilon_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_\epsilon)$ is a vector of independently and identically distributed disturbances. In our subsequent empirical work, a vector x will represent realized variances of N assets, more precisely positive or negative realized semivariances. Assuming covariance stationarity, the moving average (MA) representation of the VAR exists and is given by

$$x_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Psi_i \epsilon_{t-i}, \quad (6)$$

where the $N \times N$ coefficient matrices Ψ_i obey the following recursive definition:

$$\Psi_i = \Phi_1 \Psi_{i-1} + \Phi_2 \Psi_{i-2} + \dots + \Phi_p \Psi_{i-p} = \sum_{j=1}^p \Phi_j \Psi_{i-j}, \quad (7)$$

with Ψ_0 being an $N \times N$ identity matrix I_N and with $\Psi_i = 0$ for $i < 0$.

The total spillover index developed by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) is composed of two

parts—own variance shares and cross variance shares. Own variance shares are defined as fractions of the H -step-ahead error variances in forecasting x_i due to shocks to x_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Cross variance shares, or spillovers, are defined as fractions of the H -step-ahead error variances in forecasting x_i due to shocks to x_j , for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ such that $i \neq j$. Following the notation used by Baruník et al. (2016), the H -step-ahead generalized forecast error variance decomposition matrix then looks as follows:

$$\omega_{ij}^H = \frac{\sigma_{jj}^{-1} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} (\mathbf{e}_i' \mathbf{\Psi}_h \mathbf{\Sigma}_\epsilon \mathbf{e}_j)^2}{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} (\mathbf{e}_i' \mathbf{\Psi}_h \mathbf{\Sigma}_\epsilon \mathbf{\Psi}_h' \mathbf{e}_i)}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\epsilon$ is the variance matrix for the error vector, ϵ_t , σ_{jj} is the standard deviation of the error term for the j^{th} equation, \mathbf{e}_i is the selection vector, with one as the i^{th} element and zeros otherwise, and $\mathbf{\Psi}_h$ are moving average coefficients from the forecast at time t . Because the shocks to each variable are not necessarily orthogonalized, the sum of contributions to the variance of forecast error (i.e. the row sum of the elements of the variance decomposition table) is not necessarily equal to one:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_{ij}^H \neq 1 \quad (9)$$

Therefore, to be able to use the information available in the variance decomposition matrix in the calculation of the spillover index, we normalize each entry of the variance decomposition matrix by the row sum:

$$\tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H = \frac{\omega_{ij}^H}{\sum_{j=1}^N \omega_{ij}^H} \quad (10)$$

This step ensures that $\sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H = 1$ and $\sum_{i,j=1}^N \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H = N$ (i.e. the contributions of spillovers from volatility shocks are normalized by the total forecast error variance (Baruník et al., 2016)). Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) then define the spillover index, a measure of the contribution of spillovers from volatility shocks across the variables in the system to the total forecast error variance, as:

$$\mathcal{S}^H = 100 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H \quad (11)$$

3.5 Directional spillovers

The crucial improvement achieved by using the generalized VAR framework lies in the fact that we are now able to identify the directional spillovers, i.e. we can decompose the total spillover to those coming *from* and *to* each observed asset (Diebold and Yilmaz, 2012). The directional spillovers received by asset i from all other assets j are defined as

follows:

$$\mathcal{S}_{i\leftarrow\bullet}^H = 100 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H \quad (12)$$

Similarly, the directional spillovers transmitted by asset i to all other assets j can be measured as:

$$\mathcal{S}_{i\rightarrow\bullet}^H = 100 \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \tilde{\omega}_{ji}^H \quad (13)$$

3.6 Net spillovers and net pairwise spillovers

Once we have obtained the directional spillovers, it is straightforward to derive a simple measure of net spillovers as the difference between gross volatility shocks transmitted to and received from all other assets:

$$\mathcal{S}_i^H = \mathcal{S}_{i\rightarrow\bullet}^H - \mathcal{S}_{i\leftarrow\bullet}^H \quad (14)$$

As explained by Baruník et al. (2016), the above measure tells us how much each asset contributes to the volatility in other assets in net terms. The net pairwise spillovers between two assets, i and j , can then be simply computed as the difference between the gross shocks transmitted from asset i to asset j and those transmitted from asset j to asset i :

$$\mathcal{S}_{ij}^H = 100 \times \frac{1}{N} (\tilde{\omega}_{ji}^H - \tilde{\omega}_{ij}^H) \quad (15)$$

3.7 Bad and good volatility

The innovation brought about by Baruník et al. (2016) lies mainly in fitting the N-variable vector auto regression model to semivariances defined above instead of volatility itself. This combined methodology allows for focusing individually on effects that one asset's volatility has on the other, while also differentiating between negative and positive shocks to the asset price. In particular, using this method, we are able to account for spillovers due to negative returns (\mathcal{S}^-) and positive returns (\mathcal{S}^+) and also directional spillovers from volatility due to negative returns ($\mathcal{S}_{i\leftarrow\bullet}^-, \mathcal{S}_{i\rightarrow\bullet}^-$) and positive returns ($\mathcal{S}_{i\leftarrow\bullet}^+, \mathcal{S}_{i\rightarrow\bullet}^+$).

We are thus able to isolate asymmetric volatility spillovers by replacing the vector of volatilities $\mathbf{RV}_t = (RV_{1t}, \dots, RV_{nt})'$ defined above with the vector of negative semivariances, $\mathbf{RS}_t^- = (RS_{1t}^-, \dots, RS_{nt}^-)'$, or the vector of positive semivariances, $\mathbf{RS}_t^+ = (RS_{1t}^+, \dots, RS_{nt}^+)'$ ¹. This approach allows to distinguish between the effects of positive and negative shocks on volatility spillovers. We are thus able to test which volatility (good or

¹This notation excludes the H index for ease of display, however, it remains a valid parameter for the estimation of spillover indices

bad) matters more for volatility spillover transmission or whether their effects are similar in magnitude.

3.8 Spillover asymmetry measure

Following Barunik et al. (2016), we define the spillover asymmetry measure \mathcal{SAM} as the difference between positive and negative spillovers:

$$\mathcal{SAM} = \mathcal{S}^+ - \mathcal{S}^- \quad (16)$$

where \mathcal{S}^+ and \mathcal{S}^- are volatility spillover indices due to positive and negative semivariances (\mathcal{RS}^+ and \mathcal{RS}^-), respectively, with an H -step-ahead forecast at time t . Defining the measure in this way allows for a straightforward interpretation of the results. In the case when $\mathcal{SAM} \geq 0$, the spillovers from positive realized semivariances are larger in magnitude than those coming from negative realized semivariances and vice versa in the case when $\mathcal{SAM} \leq 0$. When $\mathcal{SAM} = 0$, the spillovers coming from \mathcal{RS}^+ and \mathcal{RS}^- are of the same magnitude.

4 Data

In our analysis, we use five-minute high-frequency data to study volatility spillovers and their asymmetries on the commodity market and how the commodity market's volatility is transmitted to the stock market. From four different commodity classes—energy, precious metal, grain and fiber futures—we select four widely traded commodities (one from each) to represent each sector, namely Crude oil, Gold, Corn and Cotton. As we are also interested in the connectedness between the commodity market and the stock market, we use data for the S&P 500 Index to represent the stock market. The data spans from January 2, 2002 to December 31, 2015. The data were obtained from Tick Data, Inc., one of the leading providers of historical data from stock, futures, options and forex markets.


In order to prevent estimation bias that may be caused by low trading activity on the market, we exclude weekends, U.S. federal holidays and some state holidays. As all five selected futures are traded on different Exchanges, the number of observations per trading day as well as the number of days when the exchange was open varies among the analyzed commodities. For the purposes of this analysis, we exclude all days on which at least one of the Exchanges was closed. Furthermore, we discard days on which, for at least one variable, more than 20% observations is missing as compared to the average trading day.² Such harmonization of data across markets enables us to eliminate days when there are some missing observations due to special opening hours of the Exchanges (e.g. the day before Independence Day) which could lead to a bias in our estimation. These adjustments lead to the final sample which consists of 3,437 trading days.

²An exception to this rule is Cotton whose numbers of observations per day are, somewhat surprisingly, extremely unstable and their exclusion would lead to the loss of a significant amount of observations. Therefore, we treat Cotton futures with care and use a sample that excludes Cotton entirely as a robustness check.

We calculate the 5-minute return at time t as the change in log price between times $t - 1$ and t . Overnight returns are not computed in order to avoid possible distortion. In order to construct an accurate measure of volatility, we compute the realized variance as a sum of squared intraday logarithmic 5-minute returns for each trading day in our sample. Moreover, as we are also interested in whether the volatility is asymmetric, we further compute positive and negative semivariances as sums of positive and negative intraday returns, respectively.

In Figure 1, the plots of daily realized variances for each observed variable are presented. It can be observed that the highest realized variances are reached during the mid-2008 and 2009 which corresponds to the turbulent periods during the global financial crisis. This pattern is particularly substantial for the S&P 500 Index which is not surprising as the index is based on the market capitalizations of 500 largest companies listed on the U.S. exchange stocks. Prices in markets that are tied more firmly to the financial markets tend to be affected the most by financial crises. Accordingly, the Crude oil and Gold markets were influenced by the financial crisis more as compared to the Cotton and Corn markets.

Figure 1: Daily realized variances



Source: Author's computations.

5 Results

We describe our empirical results in this section. First, we carry out a full-sample static analysis of volatility spillovers between two asset classes—stocks and commodities—as well as volatility spillovers between different commodity markets. As detailed above, this approach can help us detect to what extent expectations in the markets change in reaction to events in other markets and how the connectedness between different class assets evolves. We also provide a number of robustness checks using restricted samples. Second, we track the time variation of the volatility spillovers using 200-day rolling samples and we assess the extent and nature of the development of the total volatility spillover index over time. Furthermore, we focus on the development over the observed time period also for the gross directional and net spillovers. Third, we employ the Spillover Asymmetry Measure (SAM) framework, as described above, to study the differences in the spillovers from bad and good volatility and we quantify the spillover dynamics via rolling window estimation.

5.1 Static analysis

First, we analyze volatility spillovers between four selected commodities traded on U.S. Exchanges and the S&P 500, an American stock market index, using a static VAR model. In order to determine the lag length of the VAR model, we calculate two information criteria, the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian information criterion (BIC). The results reveal that there is no significant difference between the values obtained for each number of lags.³ Therefore, we choose the number of lags to be 2 as it balances the relative simplicity of the model with its good performance. Moreover, using 2 lags is in line with the related literature that has a similar scope of study.⁴

We report below the so-called volatility spillover tables which provide an approximate “input–output” decomposition of the total volatility spillover index. The i^{th} entry represents the estimated contribution to the forecast error variance of market j coming from shocks to market i . Numbers on the diagonal account for the share of own variance and the off-diagonal values represent the cross-variance, i.e. the volatility spillovers between markets. The sum of the off-diagonal columns stands for the contribution *to* others while the sum of rows stands for the contribution *from* others. Furthermore, by subtracting the contributions *to* others from the contributions *from* others, we obtain the

³We do not report these results here, but they are available upon request.

⁴The VAR lag of length 2 was chosen (based on the AIC) by Baruník et al. (2016) when studying asymmetric connectedness on the U.S. stock market as well as by Baruník et al. (2015) when studying volatility spillovers in petroleum markets. In addition, Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) provide a sensitivity analysis of their volatility spillover index employed in this analysis to the VAR lag structure and show that results do not differ substantially for lags of 2 to 6. Baruník et al. (2016) obtained analogous results for lags of 2 to 4. All their results are in support of the assumption that the spillovers are not sensitive to the choice of the order of the VAR model. Furthermore, Baruník et al. (2016) run the residual diagnostics to check whether there is deflection from assumptions on VAR concluding that there is no dependence in the residuals and their estimates are consistent. We also perform this robustness check provided in Appendix and conclude that there are no significant differences and the volatility spillover indices are robust to the choice of the VAR model specification.

net volatility spillovers. In the lower right corner of Table 1 we report the results for the Volatility Spillover Indices for the full sample. The directional spillovers are shown as the off-diagonal values of the matrix represented by Table 1. We conclude that the share of volatility shocks that are spilled over from one market to another substantially differs across the analyzed markets and ranges from 0.6% to 26%. The Cotton futures exhibit the lowest values of volatility transmission among our sample, followed by Corn. On the other hand, the highest spillovers are reported from the S&P 500 Index to Crude Oil and Gold futures—the share of volatility transmitted from the S&P 500 Index to these two markets has been 26.4% and 17.8%, respectively. Regarding the contribution *to* others, we can see that gross directional volatility spillovers to others from each of the five assets span from 6.4% for Cotton to 51.7% for the S&P 500 Index. In other words, the shocks related to Cotton are reflected only slightly in other analyzed markets while more than half of the variance in the S&P 500 Index is transmitted to other markets considered in our analysis. Furthermore, more than 20% of realized variance in the prices of Gold and Crude Oil futures are transmitted to other assets in our sample. In addition, we run a series of robustness checks using restricted samples and report the results in Tables 9 and 11 in the Appendix.

Table 1: Volatility spillover table - full sample

		From					
		CL	CN	CT	GC	SP	Directional from others
To	CL	73.675	2.135	1.183	5.217	17.790	26.325
	CN	2.748	85.679	3.501	4.019	4.053	14.321
	CT	2.749	3.786	88.674	1.297	3.493	11.326
	GC	6.341	2.299	0.583	64.399	26.377	35.601
	SP	8.684	1.450	1.147	13.353	75.366	24.634
	Directional to others	20.523	9.670	6.414	23.888	51.714	112.208
	Directional including own	94.198	95.348	95.088	88.286	127.079	Total Spillover Index 22.44%

Source: Author's computations.

Looking at the directional volatility spillovers from all markets to one specific market (i.e. contributions *from* others in the last column of Table 1), we observe that the range of results is narrower as compared to contributions *to* others, reaching values from 11.3% to 35.6%, for Cotton and Gold, respectively. While significant differences between the results for different markets persist, we may conclude that volatility in all observed assets is at least from one tenth caused by the events taking place in other markets. Gold, as a representative of precious metals, is the one most affected by the shocks in other markets. These results are in line with the economic intuition, since precious metals are often used as a hedge against adverse events in other markets.

Finally, let us consider the total volatility spillovers, which are essentially extracted

from the separated directional spillovers to form one complex index. On average, the volatility shocks related to other markets account for 22.44% of the volatility forecast error variance in our sample. The rest of the volatility can be attributed to the idiosyncratic shocks or to innovations that have taken place in other markets which are not included in our analysis.

To obtain more detailed information about the direction and magnitude of volatility spillovers, we calculate net spillovers and net pairwise spillovers. The results are presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. As described above, the net volatility spillovers are calculated simply as the difference between the contribution *to* others and the contribution *from* all others. Subsequently, when we subtract the gross volatility spillovers from asset j to asset i from the volatility transmitted from asset i to asset j , we obtain the net pairwise spillovers. Therefore, as an example, the notation “CL-CN” stands for the contribution from CL to CN minus the contribution from CN to CL.

Table 2 shows whether the asset acts as a net “receiver” or “giver”, i.e. whether the contribution (in terms of volatility that is spilled over to other markets) from all other markets is greater than the transmission of its own shocks to other markets. We find that the only net giver in our sample is the S&P 500 Index as it transmits more than twice as much volatility than it receives. The results thus suggest that all our selected commodities are more affected by the volatility in the other assets than what they transfer to others. Gold shows to be the biggest receiver of volatility spillovers among the markets in our sample.

Table 2: Net volatility spillovers - full sample

CL	CN	CT	GC	SP
-5.80242	-4.652	-4.912	-11.714	27.079

Source: Author’s computations.

Table 3 provides an overview of the net pairwise spillovers. The S&P 500 Index acts as a net giver of volatility with respect to all commodities which should not be surprising as the index reflects the performance of the stocks of the 500 U.S. leading companies on the two largest⁵ exchanges in the world representing all major industries. Its development is thus largely representative of the overall situation on the market, including the commodity markets. As expected, Crude Oil and Gold are the largest receivers of volatility from the S&P 500 Index. Crude Oil is widely used in nearly all industries, making it largely dependent on the performance of the business sector, while Gold, as explained above, is often used as a hedge against adverse events on the financial and equity markets. Cotton, on the other hand, acts as a net pairwise receiver of volatility with respect to all other examined assets.

⁵In terms of total market capitalization of its listed companies.

Table 3: Net pairwise spillovers - full sample

CL - CN	CL - CT	CL - GC	CL - SP
0.613	1.566	1.124	-9.106
	CN - CT	CN - GC	CN - SP
	0.285	-1.720	-2.603
		CT - GC	CT - SP
		-0.714	-2.347
			GC - SP
			-13.024

Source: Author's computations.

5.2 Conditioning and dynamics


In this section we move from the static analysis towards a dynamic one to analyze volatility spillovers over time. The data used in our analysis spans over 14 years from the beginning of 2002 until the end of 2015. By far the most important event that occurred during the observed time period was the global financial crisis of 2008. While the previous static analysis provides a useful overview of the average volatility spillovers over the period under research, it would be inadequate to assume that the spillover index obtained from matrices above would be appropriately informative for the whole time period. To be able to examine the development of the volatility spillovers over time, as explained above, we estimate our preferred model using 200-day rolling windows, horizon $h = 10^6$, and VAR lag length of 2. Firstly, we examine the dynamics of total spillovers for the full sample and two subsamples constructed by excluding the S&P500 Index and Cotton, respectively. Secondly, we capture the time variation employing the rolling window estimation on the contribution to other markets, from other markets, and net and pairwise volatility spillovers.

Figure 2 presents the moving-window estimation of total spillovers for the full sample and for the sample including only commodities. We can easily observe the rich dynamics of volatility spillovers between the commodities and the S&P 500 Index over the studied period. The volatility spillover indices for both samples evolve relatively similarly over the studied time period, however, some marked differences can be isolated. The spillovers based on the full sample reach larger magnitudes during the whole time period under research which is in accordance with our findings from the static analysis. Figure 3 depicts the dynamics of the differences between volatility spillover index for the full sample and for the sample that contains only the four selected commodity markets. We can observe that in the years following the crisis the difference between indices is greater than before 2008 which suggests that the impact of the crisis on the commodity market (or at least

⁶We nevertheless check the robustness of our model with respect to the length of the rolling window and also with respect to the forecasting horizon. The results do not substantially change and are robust with respect to the window length and horizon selection as well as with respect to the choice of the model specification. The obtained results are provided in Appendix. The specification of the model is consistent with the approach employed by Baruník et al. (2016) and Diebold and Yilmaz (2012).


regarding the commodities included in our sample) was not as extensive as that on the U.S. stock market (represented by the S&P 500 Index). Table 4 provides some basic summary statistics regarding the differences in the two measures.

Figure 2: Total volatility spillovers - full sample and sample excluding the S&P 500 Index



Source: Author's computations.

Figure 3: Differences in spillover indices with respect to the full sample



Source: Author's computations.

The level of volatility spillovers in both samples is rather low at the beginning of the observed period and fluctuates between 5% to 15% for the first four years. The volatility spillovers index for the full sample hits 20% in the middle of 2006 and then slightly declines during the first half of the year 2007. The same pattern seems to repeat during the following year. The first substantial increase in inter-market connectedness can be detected in September 2008 following the collapse of Lehman Brothers, an investment bank, and the burst of the U.S. sub-prime mortgage crisis which turned into a global

Table 4: Summary statistics - Differences in spillover indices with respect to the full sample

	Mean	Min	Median	Max	St. Dev.
Excluding S&P 500	6.831	-1.722	6.267	17.877	3.556
Excluding CT	1.292	-6.196	1.381	11.234	2.980

Source: Author's computations.

recession and affected the world's economy in a major way over several years that followed. During the fall of 2008, the index for the full sample more than doubled and exceeded the 40% level of volatility spillovers. Concerning only the commodity markets sample, the values of the index increased from 18% before the Lehman Brothers collapse by 15 percentage points, reaching their maximum of 33.37% during November 2008. The high level of volatility spillovers has lasted also throughout the first half of 2009 due to the increased level of uncertainty and instability of the financial markets. At the end of July, the spillover indices hit their second peak and the full-sample index reached its maximum over the studied period, at 43.7%. The probable cause of this peak is the development of the financial crisis which around this time started to impact the economy around the world to its full extent. From mid-2009, the volatility transmissions between markets gradually declined with some minor fluctuations until late 2014 when both indices reached their pre-crisis levels. However, after this point, we can observe again an increase in the transmission of volatility in both samples in the last observed year. To analyze the largest jumps in the volatility spillovers, we calculated their intra-day returns and found that the highest returns correspond to adverse events on the financial market. Table 5 provides an overview of the important events and explains most of the major spikes observable in Figure 2.

To sum up, the overall connectedness of the markets included in our analysis increased substantially following the global financial crisis of 2008. We can distinguish two main periods regarding the behavior of the volatility spillovers over the 14 years under research—before 2008 and after 2008. During the pre-crisis period, the average value of the volatility spillover index was about 15% for the full sample and 10% for the sample including commodities only, whereas in the post-crisis period, the average values of the index for the full and the restricted sample reached 25% and 17%, respectively. Furthermore, regarding the full sample, the highest spikes of spillovers before 2008 do not reach the average level of the index after the global financial crisis. As the period under study covers 7 years after the crisis, we may conclude that the uncertainty and skepticism of stock market participants persist in the market long after the crisis and the traders may change their behavior by diversifying the portfolio more extensively which may lead to higher intra-market connectedness. Our findings reflect the financial situation on the market and are in line with those reached by Baruník et al. (2016), Baruník et al. (2015) and Diebold and Yilmaz (2012).

Table 5: Event study

Date	Volatility Spillover Index	Return	Event
9/17/2008	28.892	10.714	Bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers
9/18/2008	51.234	22.342	Bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers
10/10/2008	64.454	38.617	The great crash of 2008
8/5/2011	64.519	36.548	Asian markets plunge on back of euro fears and U.S. losses, oil and gold both decline as investors race for U.S. Treasuries
10/15/2014	34.569	14.621	U.S. stock market decline
12/17/2014	39.400	15.377	Sharp decline in world stock markets, the tumbling price of oil, and the prospect of another eurozone crisis prompted by political uncertainty in Greece.
8/12/2015	38.351	18.225	Global stock markets plunge on China currency rapid decline
8/24/2015	79.994	49.438	China's Black Monday flash crash

Source: Author.

We also analyze the development of the total volatility index when excluding Cotton from our sample as a type of a robustness check since, as explained above, the observations for Cotton are somewhat inconsistent in the number of observations per day. In Figure 4, we present the development of two total volatility indices—for the full sample and for the sample excluding Cotton. A visual inspection of the figure reveals that both spillovers indices share a largely common path. Somewhat surprisingly, the level of spillovers is even greater at some points of the observed period for the sample that excludes Cotton. These findings indicate that Cotton does not play an important role in the volatility spillovers within our sample and that there is not significant connectedness between Cotton and other commodities included in our analysis. Furthermore, these results suggest that our previous estimates are robust with respect to the selection of assets.


Figure 4: Total volatility spillovers - full sample and sample excluding Cotton



Source: Author's computations.

Note: The black line represents the total volatility spillover index for the full sample, the gray line for the sample excluding Cotton.

Figure 5: Robustness of volatility spillovers to VAR model specification




Source: Author's computations.

Note: The first plot represents the VAR(2)-based spillover index, second depicts the VAR(5)-based index and the third the VAR(4)-based index.

Let us now move to the analysis of directional spillovers. Figure 6 presents directional volatility spillovers from others to each of the five assets over time (corresponding to the “directional from others” column in Table 1). For the full sample, we can observe higher values of gross directional spillovers during the turbulent period of the end of 2008 and the first months of 2009 as compared to those before the crisis. Nevertheless, while the level of volatility transmission from others to Crude oil, the S&P 500, and Gold remains relatively high for a long period after the crisis, the directional contributions from others

to Cotton and Corn return relatively fast to their pre-crisis levels. During the whole analyzed period, the directional transmissions from others to Cotton and Corn are lower than for the other three assets. We can observe a spike in the market for Cotton and Corn in 2013 when, at the same time, the gross directional spillovers to Crude oil, Gold and the S&P 500 have a decreasing trend. These findings further support our previous results that the soft commodities, represented by Cotton and Corn, are the least connected to the rest of the sample.


Figure 6: Directional spillovers from other assets



Source: Author's computations.

Figure 7 depicts the evolution of the gross directional spillovers to others from each of the five observed assets. The directional contributions to others vary greatly over time, however, they seem to reach lower overall volume than the gross directional spillovers from others for all assets except for the S&P 500 Index which exhibits significantly higher transmission to others than any other commodity. This is in line with the results obtained in the “directional to others” row compared to the “directional from others” column in Table 1. An interesting pattern can be observed for Crude oil. While all other assets hit their maximum of gross spillovers to others during the turbulent period corresponding to the global financial crisis, the spillovers from Crude oil to others reach their highest values relatively long after the crisis. This may be the impact of the unstable situation in the oil markets caused by the political problems and rising tensions in the Middle East and North Africa in 2011 when Crude oil prices reached their highest levels since 2008.

Figure 7: Directional spillovers to others




Source: Author's computations.

So far, we focused our analysis on the gross directional spillovers; in what follows, we analyze the net spillovers and the net pairwise spillovers. The former is defined simply as the difference between contribution from others and contribution to others. Therefore, when the values for a specific asset are above zero, the commodity was transmitting more volatility to others than it was receiving from others. In that case, we call that commodity a net spillover giver. The negative domain corresponds to the net spillovers that a commodity receives from the others and therefore the asset acts as a net spillover receiver. Figure 8 shows that the net effects alternate over the sample period as the net spillovers for all assets take both positive and negative values at some point. The net spillovers of all assets except for Crude oil reached their maximum (in absolute value) during the global financial crisis of 2008.

Moreover, the impact of financial instability reflected in the net spillovers is more evident for Cotton, Gold and the S&P 500 Index as their absolute values in the post-crisis period are substantially higher and the increased level of net spillovers is also noticeable in the years following the crisis. Furthermore, the net spillovers of Gold and Cotton take almost exclusively negative values and thus make these two commodities appear as net spillover receivers while the opposite is true for the S&P 500 Index whose net spillovers reach significantly higher volumes compared to the rest of the sample and do not take almost any negative values over the 14-year observed period. These emerged patterns are in accordance with the static analysis and the results obtained in Table 2. Cotton and Crude oil seem to be more balanced in terms of transmitting and receiving net spillovers from other assets, however, it appears that the negative values prevail for both commodities. Furthermore, regarding Crude oil and the S&P 500 Index, we can observe extensive spikes taking the opposite values at the end of the analyzed time period. These

correspond to August 2015, the time of the so-called Black Monday in China, which caused the U.S. stock market to suffer its biggest sell-off in four years and commodity prices have also been hit by worries over China, especially oil which tumbled by 6% (Denyer, 2015).


Figure 8: Net spillovers



Source: Author's computations.

Figure 9 depicts the net pairwise spillovers that show the dynamics and dominance of the net spillovers between two specific commodities. For example, in the plot labeled $cl - cn$, when the values are above zero, the spillovers from Corn (cn) to Crude oil (cl) exceed those from cl to cn . Based on visual inspection, we can determine the dominant position of an asset in almost each pair. The S&P 500 Index appears to be dominant in all pairs. The volatility in Crude oil spills over to Gold more extensively than the other way around, particularly in the post-crisis period. For most of the observed time period, Crude oil also seems to dominate Cotton in terms of spillover transmission. The volatility of Gold impacts considerably more the fluctuation of Cotton than vice versa. The shocks to Gold are also transmitted more heavily to Cotton than in the opposite direction. The transmission of pairwise net spillovers appears quite balanced in $cl - cn$ and $cn - ct$ pairs.

Figure 9: Pairwise spillovers



Source: Author's computations.

5.3 Asymmetric volatility spillovers

In the previous static and dynamic analysis the presence of volatility spillovers among the selected commodities and the S&P 500 Index has been confirmed. We have also examined the evolution of the volatility transmission over time and the amount of volatility spilled over from each of the studied assets. In this section, we investigate potential asymmetries in the transmission mechanism due to negative and positive shocks.

Based on the methodology proposed by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010) we decompose the realized variance to positive and negative semivariances and use them to derive negative and positive volatility spillovers. Furthermore, in order to quantify the extent of the asymmetric transmission of the volatility within our sample, we calculate the spillover asymmetric measures (SAM) proposed by Baruník et al. (2016).

5.4 Asymmetric volatility spillovers – static and dynamic analysis

First, we analyze the results summarized in the spillover volatility tables based on negative and positive semivariances which provide a useful overview of the average volatility spillovers due to negative and positive shocks. In the low right corners of Tables 6 and 7, we present the total spillover indices for negative and positive returns, respectively. The overall average contribution of positive shocks to volatility spillovers in our sample is only slightly higher compared to the negative ones (17.72% compared to 16.46%). This finding is not in support of our hypothesis that on average, volatility spillovers resulting from negative realized semivariances are of higher magnitude than the ones stemming from the positive ones. For all commodities, the gross directional spillovers to others reach greater values when taking into account good news. However, the S&P 500 Index exhibits higher transmission of bad volatility to others and lower from others as compared to good volatility spillovers. The differences are particularly significant for Gold, Cotton,

and Corn, where the transmission of good volatility to others reaches almost twice the volume of spillovers due to bad volatility. These results indicate that the stock market represented by the S&P 500 Index is more sensitive to bad news corresponding to negative returns than the commodity market. The directional spillovers of good and bad volatilities from others do not vary as considerably, however, the most distinct output is observed again for the S&P 500 Index. When employing the positive realized semivariances in the estimation, the volatility in all commodities included in our analysis is responsible for almost 22% of the fluctuations observed in the S&P 500 Index compared to 15.9% of bad volatility transmitted from others.

Table 6: Volatility spillover table - Negative realized semivariances

		From					Directional from others
		CL	CN	CT	GC	SP	
To	CL	77.698	1.147	0.938	3.863	16.354	22.302
	CN	1.476	93.034	0.917	1.515	3.059	6.966
	CT	2.162	0.859	92.175	1.464	3.339	7.825
	GC	5.872	1.263	0.407	70.643	21.815	29.357
	SP	7.425	0.803	0.734	6.908	84.130	15.869
	Directional to others	16.935	4.072	2.996	13.750	44.568	82.320
	Directional including own	94.633	97.105	95.171	84.393	128.698	Total Spillover Index 16.46%

Source: Author's computations.

Table 7: Volatility spillover table - Positive realized semivariances

		From					Directional from others
		CL	CN	CT	GC	SP	
To	CL	77.249	2.486	1.527	5.068	13.670	22.750
	CN	2.951	89.585	1.308	3.308	2.847	10.415
	CT	2.272	1.502	93.262	0.545	2.418	6.738
	GC	4.539	2.554	0.608	73.260	19.038	26.739
	SP	7.605	1.582	1.499	11.291	78.023	21.977
	Directional to others	17.368	8.125	4.942	20.212	37.973	88.619
	Directional including own	94.617	97.710	98.204	93.472	115.996	Total Spillover Index 17.72%


Source: Author's computations.

Figure 10 depicts the development of two spillover indices based on negative and positive realized semivariances which allows us to observe the differences in volatility transmission that emerge due to negative and positive returns. The black line represents the spillover index from positive RS whereas the gray line depicts the spillover index from negative RS. There are some observable differences in the development of the two

measures, especially in the post-crisis period. The volatility spillover index from positive RS dominates the one from negative RS almost throughout the whole first part of the studied time period, between 2002 and 2005. For years 2005 to 2008, the good and bad volatilities exhibit a more or less common path and reach similar levels. The dominance of volatility transmission due to positive news remains also at the beginning of the crisis in 2008. However, from March 2009 until mid-2011, the volatility index based on negative RS prevails and the differences between the two indices are more excessive. In the period that follows, we can again observe a rather interchangeable development of both indices. At the end of the studied period the impact of positive shocks on the volatility spillover re-dominates.

In Figure 11 we can observe the development of the spillover indices based on negative and positive RS for the sample that includes commodities only. Both indices evolve very similarly to the corresponding ones in Figure 10 which study the whole sample, however, they both reach lower volumes. This is in line with our findings above that the level of volatility transmission is higher for the full sample than for the sample excluding the S&P 500 Index. A closer inspection of different asymmetries in the two samples is provided in Section 5.5 as the differences are better visible using the asymmetry measure. To conclude, we can confirm the presence of certain asymmetries in the impact of positive and negative shocks on the volatility and its transmission. Furthermore, our findings in this section are not in line with the hypothesis that the bad news resulting in negative returns affect the volatility more intensively than good news and related positive shocks. In the following section, we inspect the asymmetries further by employing the Spillover Asymmetry Measure.

Figure 10: Asymmetric volatility spillovers - full sample




Source: Author's computations.

Note: The black line represents the spillover index from positive realized semi-variances (RS^+), the gray line from negative realized semivariances (RS^-).

5.5 Spillover asymmetry measure (SAM)

Finally, we use the Spillover Asymmetry Measure (SAM) proposed by Baruník et al. (2016) and defined in Section 3.7 to quantify the differences in the volatility spillovers due to negative and positive shocks. This approach allows us to study the extent of the asymmetry in the volatility transmission independently of the level of spillovers. Positive values of SAM indicate the dominance of the volatility spillover index based on positive RS while negative values of SAM imply that the transmission of volatility due to negative returns reaches higher volume than that due to positive returns. When $SAM = 0$, the effects of both negative and positive spillovers offset each other, however, as we will see, this situation is very rare on the markets.


Figure 11: Asymmetric volatility spillovers - sample excluding the S&P 500 Index



Source: Author's computations.

Note: The black line represents the spillover index from positive realized semi-variances (RS^+), the gray line from negative realized semivariances (RS^-).

Figure 12: Spillover ssymmetry measure (SAM) - full sample



Source: Author's computations.


Figure 12 presents the SAM for our full sample. Significant fluctuations of the measure are evident over the whole time period under study. We can observe that the extent of asymmetric behavior reflects not only the magnitude but also the duration. Considering the pre-crisis period, we find that the SAM takes predominantly positive values except for several months at the beginning of 2003 which may be associated with the perturbed situation in the oil markets caused by the second Gulf War and unrest in Venezuela (Baruník et al., 2015). The overall dominance of the positive values in this period means that the transmission of volatility due to positive shocks is higher than the bad volatility spillovers which may be related to the optimistic sentiment persisting from the prosperous period before the global financial crisis. Moreover, the asymmetries in spillovers from negative and positive shocks in the pre-crisis period do not take very high values—they range from approximately -5% to +5%.

The most significant asymmetric effect is visible after the crisis starting in March 2009 until September 2011 when we observe a prevalence of negative asymmetries. The clusters of negative spillovers during the years that followed the crisis document the pessimistic mood on the markets, when the negative shocks had a higher impact than the positive ones as the investors were more cautious and more sensitive to bad news. Furthermore, during this period, the extent of negative asymmetries is much higher compared to the pre-crisis period, falling to -14.4% in June 2011, which may point to concerns about uncertainty and stability of the financial markets following the crisis. In the subsequent period, we can observe much less excessive fluctuations of volatility spillovers with a varying dominant position of spillovers based on positive and negative returns. The lower fluctuation with similar range as in the pre-crisis period and the variability of the prevalence of good and bad volatility may be to some extent caused by increasing financialization (Baruník et al., 2015). Similarly, Tang and Xiong (2012) find support for the notion of increasing financialization of commodities by showing that synchronized price movements of major

commodities markets in the U.S. are a consequence of such financialization. Moreover, Baruník et al. (2015) argue that as a further consequence, higher volatility transmission occurs simultaneously with a lower level of asymmetries between volatility spillovers due to positive and negative shocks. At the end of the observed period, good news had a substantially larger influence on the markets than bad news.

Figure 13 depicts the asymmetries induced by positive or negative shocks for the sample that excludes the S&P 500 Index. We notice several differences as compared to the asymmetries presented for the full sample. First, the impact of negative shocks is stronger during the period between 2005 and 2006. This may be caused by uncertainty on the commodity markets associated with the food price crisis which is in line with the findings of Nazlioglu et al. (2013), who examine volatility transmission between oil and selected agricultural commodity prices. They find that oil market volatility spills on the agricultural markets in the post-crisis era while there is no risk transmission between oil and agricultural commodity markets before the food price crisis. Regarding the immediate post-crisis period, the dominance of volatility spillovers based on negative semivariances is also observable for the sample that includes only commodities, however, it does not reach such a high volume as in the case of the full sample.

Figure 13: Spillover asymmetry measure (SAM) - sample excluding the S&P 500 Index



Source: Author's computations.

From mid-2011 till mid-2014, the good volatility transmission prevails. However, in the late 2014 and for several first months of 2015, negative shocks to commodity markets had a substantially larger impact as compared to positive shocks. This negative cluster may be associated with the global commodity price crash when the global commodity prices fell by almost 40% and large drops across many different commodity classes were observable (Saggu and Anukoonwattaka, 2015). Table 8 provides summary statistics for the SAM for both samples. The asymmetries for the full sample reach higher extremes especially regarding the transmission of volatility induced by the negative shocks. How-

ever, the mean for the full sample is slightly above zero while for the sample including only commodities, the mean is -0.215 which means that on average, volatility stemming from the negative semivariances spilled over to the commodity markets fractionally more than the good volatility.

Table 8: SAM - Summary statistics

	Mean	Min	Median	Max	St. Dev.
Full sample	0.156	-14.438	0.550	8.462	3.132
Commodities only	-0.215	-10.102	0.091	7.278	3.074

Source: Author's computations.

Overall we find some asymmetric behavior in volatility transmission for both samples. In particular, in the years following the crisis, the negative shocks have had a higher impact on the volatility spillovers across the markets included in our analysis. Nevertheless, the level of the asymmetry measure does not take very high values compared to the results obtained by Baruník et al. (2015) who find the asymmetric effects in spillovers on the petroleum market rather substantial. Similarly, Dohunová (2014) finds stronger evidence of asymmetric volatility transmission also for the stock markets in Central and Eastern Europe. Despite the fact that the asymmetric connectedness of markets included in our analysis is not as substantial, the good and bad volatility is transmitted at different magnitudes and the dominant position changes over the studied time period. While negative spillovers reach higher extremes, they do not strictly dominate the transmission of volatility based on positive returns. These findings are in line with those of Baruník et al. (2016) and suggest that risk transmission is not driven by pessimism as much as generally assumed.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we study volatility spillovers using a recently developed approach based on the volatility spillover index, as introduced by Diebold and Yilmaz (2009) and further developed by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012). The approach uses a generalized vector autoregressive framework in which forecast-error variance decompositions are invariant to the variable ordering which enables us to measure total, directional and net volatility spillovers. We employ an extension to this approach introduced by Baruník et al. (2016) who build upon the volatility spillover index proposed by Diebold and Yilmaz (2012) and combine it with the concept of positive and negative realized semivariances developed by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2010). The realized measures allow not only to better estimate the total volatility but most importantly, the resulting modified indices allow for modeling asymmetric responses to positive and negative shocks.

We apply the methodology proposed by Baruník et al. (2016) to quantify the volatility spillovers and the asymmetric response to positive and negative shocks in high-frequency data within two datasets. First, we model the volatility transmission between four se-

lected widely traded commodities and one of the main U.S. stock market indices, the S&P 500 Index, as a representative of the equity market. The second dataset includes commodities only, specifically Crude oil, Gold, Corn and Cotton futures. Each of the included commodities represents a specific branch of the commodity market—energy, precious metals, grains and fiber markets, respectively. The importance of each of these commodities within their markets is sufficient to consider them as a proxy for each sector. In order to provide accurate estimates, five-minute returns are used for the construction of realized measures. Our sample covers a 14-year period from January 2002 to December 2015, which allows us to analyze the development long before the global financial crisis of 2008 as well as quite long after the turbulent period fades away and we can thus evaluate the impact of the global crisis on the commodity and equity markets.

The results are divided into several categories. First, we provide a static analysis of the full sample and samples that exclude first the S&P 500 Index and then Cotton futures. The decomposition of the total volatility spillover index allows us to estimate the directional spillovers, i.e. how much the shocks to one asset are transmitted to another asset, as well as the net and the pairwise spillovers. Second, in order to capture the development of spillovers over time, we employ the rolling window estimation. Third and last, we investigate potential asymmetries in the transmission mechanism due to negative and positive shocks.

The static analysis reveals that the volatility transmission within the sample including the S&P 500 Index is substantially higher than the volatility spillovers only between commodities. On average, the volatility shocks related to other markets account for 22.44% of the volatility forecast error variance in our full sample while only for 12.64% in the sample that includes commodities only. The S&P 500 Index turns out to be a net giver of volatility when compared to all commodities under research, i.e. the transmission of shocks from the stock index to others exceeds the volatility spillovers from others to the stock index. Our findings thus show that the shocks to stock markets play a rather important role in the volatility in commodities while commodities do not influence each others' volatility to such an extent. Especially, the soft commodities such as Cotton and Corn exhibit the lowest contribution of spillovers to other markets.

The dynamic analysis shows the development of volatility spillovers between markets over time and provides strong evidence that the connectedness between markets has become much more significant after the global financial crisis of 2008. The uncertainty and skepticism of market participants persist in the markets long after the crisis as the volatility spillovers reach higher volumes than in the pre-crisis period. The recent global financial crisis has thus played an important role for volatility spillovers, emphasizing the connectedness between commodity and stock markets and inducing further financialization of commodities. Furthermore, by applying the rolling window estimation also on the net, pairwise and directional spillovers, we reveal that the S&P 500 Index exhibits significantly higher volatility transmission to commodities than any other commodity and also the S&P 500 appears to be dominant in all pairs over the whole period. The stock

markets turn out to play a crucial role in the volatility transmission on the commodity market.

Finally, we investigate asymmetries in the response to negative and positive shocks. Despite the fact that the level of the asymmetry measure is not very substantial, the good and bad volatility is transmitted at different magnitudes and the dominant position changes over the studied time period. We find that in the years following the crisis, the negative shocks have had a higher impact on the volatility spillovers across the markets included in our analysis. However, while negative spillovers reach higher extremes, they do not strictly dominate the transmission of volatility based on positive returns. Moreover, an inspection of volatility spillover tables reveals that for all the observed commodities, the gross directional spillovers to others based on positive semivariances reach greater values than the directional spillovers due to negative shocks. Nevertheless, the S&P 500 Index exhibits a higher transmission of bad volatility to others and lower from others compared to good volatility spillovers which indicates that the stock market is more sensitive to bad news than the commodity market.

This paper provides further corroboration of the increased importance of intra-market connectedness following the global financial crisis of 2008. While most previous studies focus on the volatility transmission among different stock markets or between the crude oil market and financial markets, we provide a complex analysis of the connectedness between seemingly unrelated widely traded commodities, representing different sectors, and the S&P 500 Index. The increasing financialization on the commodity market and the fast growth in the liquidity of commodity futures are of particularly high interest. Moreover, our results from the analysis of the asymmetric responses to positive and negative shocks defy the common notion that the negative shocks impact the volatility spillovers more heavily than the positive ones and indicate that the attitude of market participants has not been as pessimistic as generally assumed, except for the period of a few years following the global financial crisis. We thus provide a fresh look at the speed of the healing process of the markets following a major financial crisis.

We see several possible extensions of the present research. First, the inclusion of more commodities representing each sector would enable a more precise analysis of how the individual markets are related and one might want to inspect also the connectedness at the disaggregate sectoral level. Similarly, the connectedness between our selected commodities and the bond market could lead to interesting findings. Furthermore, a more detailed event analysis would further clarify the volatility transmission mechanism following major events in the commodity and equity markets. Last but not least, a directional spillover asymmetry measure would allow to study the source of asymmetry among assets and to identify the extent to which volatility from one specific asset transmits to other assets asymmetrically.

References

- Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F. X., and Labys, P. 2001. The distribution of realized exchange rate volatility. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 96 (453):42–55.
- Arouri, M. E. H., Jouini, J., and Nguyen, D. K. 2012. On the impacts of oil price fluctuations on european equity markets: Volatility spillover and hedging effectiveness. *Energy Economics*, 34(2):611–617.
- Barberis, N. C. 2013. Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: A review and assessment. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(1):173–195.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O., Kinnebrock, S., and Shephard, N. *Volatility and Time Series Econometrics: Essays in Honor of Robert F. Engle, Chapter Measuring Downside Risk-Realised Semivariance*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. 2002. Econometric analysis of realized volatility and its use in estimating stochastic volatility models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 64(2):253–280.
- Baruník, J., Kočenda, E., and Vácha, L. 2015. Volatility spillovers across petroleum markets. *The Energy Journal*, 36(3).
- Baruník, J., Kočenda, E., and Vácha, L. 2016. Asymmetric connectedness on the us stock market: Bad and good volatility spillovers. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 27:55–78.
- Basak, S. and Pavlova, A. 2016. A model of financialization of commodities. *The Journal of Finance*, 71(4):1511–1556.
- Choi, K. and Hammoudeh, S. 2010. Volatility behavior of oil, industrial commodity and stock markets in a regime-switching environment. *Energy Policy*, 38(8):4388–4399.
- Cochrane, J. H. 2005. Time series for macroeconomics and finance. *Manuscript, University of Chicago*.
- Creti, A., Joëts, M., and Mignon, V. 2013. On the links between stock and commodity markets’ volatility. *Energy Economics*, 37:16–28.
- Degiannakis, S., Filis, G., and Floros, C. 2013. Oil and stock returns: Evidence from european industrial sector indices in a time-varying environment. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 26:175–191.
- Degiannakis, S., Filis, G., Kizys, R., et al. 2014. The effects of oil price shocks on stock market volatility: Evidence from european data. *The Energy Journal*, 35(1):35–56.

- Denyer, S. 2015. China's 'black monday' spreads stock market fears worldwide. *Washington Post*. Available online: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/worldmarkets-lose-ground-amid-black-monday-for-shanghai-index/2015/08/24/a1c88a48-0161-404ca48b-6cee7d04f864_story.html.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. 2009. Measuring financial asset return and volatility spillovers, with application to global equity markets*. *The Economic Journal*, 119 (534):158–171.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. 2012. Better to give than to receive: Predictive directional measurement of volatility spillovers. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 28(1):57–66.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. 2013. Measuring the dynamics of global business cycle connectedness. *PIER Working Paper*.
- Diebold, F. X., Liu, L., and Yilmaz, K. 2017. Commodity connectedness. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Dovhunová, V. Volatility spillovers and response asymmetry: Empirical evidence from the cee stock markets. Master's thesis, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Social Sciencis, Institute of Economic Studies, 2014.
- Du, X., Cindy, L. Y., and Hayes, D. J. 2011. Speculation and volatility spillover in the crude oil and agricultural commodity markets: A bayesian analysis. *Energy Economics*, 33(3):497–503.
- Dwyer, A., Gardner, G., Williams, T., et al. 2011. Global commodity markets—price volatility and financialisation. *RBA Bulletin*, June, pages 49–57.
- Feunou, B., Jahan-Parvar, M., and Tédongap, R. 2013. Modeling market downside volatility. *Review of Finance*, 17(1):443–481.
- Kang, W., Ratti, R. A., and Yoon, K. H. 2015. The impact of oil price shocks on the stock market return and volatility relationship. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 34:41–54.
- Klößner, S. and Wagner, S. 2014. Exploring all var orderings for calculating spillovers? yes, we can!—a note on diebold and yilmaz (2009). *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 29(1):172–179.
- Mensi, W., Beljid, M., Boubaker, A., and Managi, S. 2013. Correlations and volatility spillovers across commodity and stock markets: Linking energies, food, and gold. *Economic Modelling*, 32:15–22.
- Nazlioglu, S., Erdem, C., and Soytas, U. 2013. Volatility spillover between oil and agricultural commodity markets. *Energy Economics*, 36:658–665.

- Patton, A. J. and Sheppard, K. 2015. Good volatility, bad volatility: Signed jumps and the persistence of volatility. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(3):683–697.
- Saggu, A. and Anukoonwattaka, W. 2015. Commodity price crash: Risks to exports and economic growth in asia-pacific ldes and lldcs. *Trade Insights, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*.
- Silvennoinen, A. and Thorp, S. 2013. Financialization, crisis and commodity correlation dynamics. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 24: 42–65.
- Tang, K. and Xiong, W. 2012. Index investment and the financialization of commodities. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 68(5):54–74.
- Vivian, A. and Wohar, M. E. 2012. Commodity volatility breaks. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 22(2):395–422.
- Vo, M. 2011. Oil and stock market volatility: A multivariate stochastic volatility perspective. *Energy Economics*, 33(5):956–965.

7 Appendix

Static analysis for adjusted samples

We conduct a similar static analysis in Section 5.1 but for samples modified by excluding one of the assets. First, we eliminate the S&P 500 Index from our sample as we are also interested in the interconnectedness exclusively among the commodity markets. Table 9 reveals unconditional patterns of volatility transmission among the examined commodities. The total volatility spillover index is substantially lower than the one we obtained for the full sample—the overall transmission of volatility within this sample only slightly exceeds 12%. Thus, almost 88% of the total variance of forecast errors can be attributed to the idiosyncratic volatility shocks and to events that have taken place in other markets not included in our sample.

Table 9: Volatility spillover table - sample excluding the S&P 500 Index

		From				
		CL	CN	CT	GC	Directional from others
To	CL	86.718	2.864	1.738	8.679	13.282
	CN	3.431	87.729	3.796	5.044	12.271
	CT	3.565	4.069	90.242	2.123	9.758
	GC	10.616	3.471	1.149	84.764	15.236
	Directional to others	17.612	10.405	6.683	15.846	50.547
	Directional including own	104.330	98.134	96.926	100.610	Total Spillover Index 12.64%

Source: Author's computations.

Comparing the gross directional spillovers with the results from the volatility spillover table for the full sample, we may conclude that while the values for Cotton and Corn do not exhibit significant changes neither regarding the directional transmission to others nor the contribution from others, the figures for Crude oil and Gold vary rather extensively. The gross directional spillovers to Gold are twice as small as for the full sample which includes the S&P 500 Index, and for Crude oil, the difference is even more substantial, decreasing from 35% to 15%. The same applies for the directional effects to others, although the difference is less significant. It follows from the above that the U.S. stock market represented by the S&P 500 Index plays an eminent role in the transfer of volatility to hard commodities, represented by Gold and Crude Oil, but does not play such an important role for soft commodities, represented by Corn and Cotton. These results are in line with the notion that while the production process in many industries relies heavily on hard commodities, soft commodities are more often consumed directly (Creti et al., 2013). Taking into account the results from Table 10 which summarizes the net spillovers, we can conclude that the volatility shocks to Crude Oil and Gold spill over to other commodities the most. On the other hand, the shocks related to volatility in the Cotton futures are the least influential in both samples. To summarize the results shown

in Table 9, we can say that both the total as well as the directional spillovers over the studied period were rather low among the commodity markets themselves.

Table 10: Net spillovers - sample excluding the S&P 500 Index

CL	CN	CT	GC
4.330	-1.866	-3.074	0.610

Source: Author's computations.

As the number of observations per trading day for Cotton futures was relatively unstable over time, we did not harmonize the data for CT as we did for all other assets to prevent unnecessary loss of too many observations (see Section ?? for more details). For this reason, we perform the same analysis as above but for a sample excluding Cotton in order to reveal some possible hidden patterns due to its inconsistency in observations. Table 11 reports the volatility spillovers for the sample that excludes Cotton. The total volatility spillover index is slightly higher than the one obtained for the full sample, at 23.9%.

Table 11: Volatility spillover table - sample excluding Cotton

		From				
		CL	CN	GC	SP	Directional from others
To	CL	74.536	2.146	5.258	18.059	25.464
	CN	2.853	88.768	4.158	4.220	11.231
	GC	6.383	2.307	64.792	26.518	35.208
	SP	8.829	1.451	13.423	76.296	23.704
	Directional to others	18.065	5.905	22.839	48.798	95.607
	Directional including own	92.601	94.674	87.631	125.094	Total Spillover Index 23.90%

Source: Author's computations.

Concerning the off-diagonal figures representing directional spillovers as well as the diagonal figures standing for idiosyncratic volatility shocks, the results do not exhibit significant differences as compared to the volatility spillover table for the full sample. Inspecting the cumulative contribution to and from other markets, the figures do not change excessively compared to the results from the full sample (Table 1). An exception to this is Corn, the results for which change relatively significantly after the exclusion of Cotton from the sample—contribution to other markets as well as the transmission from other markets declines markedly in absolute numbers, from 9.7% to 5.9% and from 14.3% to 11.2%, respectively. Table 12 reports the net volatility spillovers and underlines our conclusion that by the exclusion of the Cotton market from our sample, we do not observe


significant variation from results obtained from the full sample analysis. The impact of the change of the sample affects almost exclusively the Corn market results and we may conclude that the connectedness between the two markets (Corn and Cotton) is more intense than the connection between the Cotton market and other assets included in our sample. These results suggest that regarding volatility spillovers, the connectedness is higher among soft commodities than between soft and hard commodities.

Table 12: Net spillovers - sample excluding CT

CL	CN	GC	SP
-7.399	-5.326	-12.369	25.094

Source: Author's computations.

Figure 14: Robustness check with respect to the window width, w , and forecasting horizon $H = 5$, $H = 10$ and $H = 15$



Source: Author's computations.

IES Working Paper Series

2018

1. Karel Janda, Martin Strobl: *Smoking Czechs: Modeling Tobacco Consumption and Taxation*
2. Karel Janda, Michaela Koscova: *Photovoltaics and the Slovak Electricity Market*
3. Simona Malovana, Dominika Kolcunova, Vaclav Broz: *Does Monetary Policy Influence Banks' Perception of Risks?*
4. Karolina Vozkova: *Why Did EU Banks Change Their Business Models in Last Years and What Was the Impact of Net Fee and Commission Income on Their Performance?*
5. Jan Malek, Lukas Recka, Karel Janda: *Impact of German Energiewende on Transmission Lines in the Central European Region*
6. David Svacina: *Devaluation with Exchange rate Floor in a Small Open Economy*
7. Ladislav Kristoufek: *Are the Crude Oil Markets Really Becoming More Efficient over Time? Some New Evidence*
8. Karel Janda, Zuzana Lajksnerova, Jakub Mikolasek: *A General Equilibrium Model of Optimal Alcohol Taxation in the Czech Republic*
9. Nicholas Tyack, Milan Scasny: *Estimating the Value of Crop Diversity Conservation Services Provided by the Czech National Programme for Agrobiodiversity*
10. Laure de Batz: *Financial Impact of Regulatory Sanctions on French Listed Companies*
11. Matej Opatrny: *Extent of Irrationality of the Consumer: Combining the Critical Cost Efficiency and Houtman Maks Indices*
12. Mojmir Hampl, Tomas Havranek: *Foreign Capital and Domestic Productivity in the Czech Republic*
13. Miroslav Palansky: *The Value of Political Connections in the Post-Transition Period: Evidence from the Czech Republic*
14. Karel Janda: *Earnings Stability and Peer Selection for Indirect Valuation*
15. Ondrej Tobek, Martin Hronec: *Does the Source of Fundamental Data Matter?*
16. Stefan Schmelzer, Michael Miess, Milan Scasny, Vedunka Kopečna: *Modelling Electric Vehicles as an Abatement Technology in a Hybrid CGE Model*
17. Barbora Malinska, Jozef Barunik: *Volatility Term Structure Modeling Using Nelson-Siegel Model*
18. Lubomir Cingl, Vaclav Korbel: *Underlying Motivations For Rule-Violation Among Juvenile Delinquents: A Lab-in-the-Field Experiment*
19. Petr Jansky, Marek Sedivy: *Estimating the Revenue Costs of Tax Treaties in Developing Countries*
20. Yao Wang, Zdenek Drabek, Zhengwei Wang: *The Predicting Power of Soft Information on Defaults in the Chinese P2P Lending Market*
21. Matej Kuc: *Cost Efficiency of European Cooperative Banks*

22. Dominika Kolcunova, Tomas Havranek: *Estimating the Effective Lower Bound for the Czech National Bank's Policy Rate*
23. Petr Jansky, Markus Meinzer, Miroslav Palansky: *Is Panama Really Your Tax Haven? Secrecy Jurisdictions and the Countries They Harm*
24. Petr Jansky, Marek Sedivy: *How Do Regional Price Levels Affect Income Inequality? Household-Level Evidence from 21 Countries*
25. Mojmir Hampl, Tomas Havranek: *Central Bank Capital as an Instrument of Monetary Policy*
26. Petr Pleticha: *Entrepreneurship in the Information Age: An Empirical Analysis of the European Regions*
27. Tereza Palanska: *Measurement of Volatility Spillovers and Asymmetric Connectedness on Commodity and Equity Markets*

All papers can be downloaded at: <http://ies.fsv.cuni.cz>



Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Fakulta sociálních věd

Institut ekonomických studií [UK FSV – IES] Praha 1, Opletalova 26

E-mail : ies@fsv.cuni.cz

<http://ies.fsv.cuni.cz>