

Fischer, Matthias J.

**Working Paper**

## Are correlations constant over time?: application of the CC-TRIGt-test to return series from different asset classes

SFB 649 Discussion Paper, No. 2007,012

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Collaborative Research Center 649: Economic Risk, Humboldt University Berlin

*Suggested Citation:* Fischer, Matthias J. (2007) : Are correlations constant over time?: application of the CC-TRIGt-test to return series from different asset classes, SFB 649 Discussion Paper, No. 2007,012, Humboldt University of Berlin, Collaborative Research Center 649 - Economic Risk, Berlin

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/25184>

**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.*

SFB 649 Discussion Paper 2007-012

**Are Correlations Constant  
Over Time?  
Application of the  
CC-TRIG<sub>t</sub>-test to Return  
Series from Different  
Asset Classes.**

Matthias Fischer\*



\*University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

This research was supported by the Deutsche  
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>  
ISSN 1860-5664

SFB 649, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin  
Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin



SFB 649 ECONOMIC RISK BERLIN

# ARE CORRELATIONS CONSTANT OVER TIME? APPLICATION OF THE CC-TRIG<sub>t</sub>-TEST TO RETURN SERIES FROM DIFFERENT ASSET CLASSES.

Matthias Fischer

†Department of Statistics and Econometrics

University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, 90419 Nürnberg, Germany

Matthias.Fischer@wiso.uni-erlangen.de

This research was supported by the Deutsche  
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>

ISSN 1860-5664

SFB 649, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin

Key Words: Lagrange multiplier test, constant correlation, trigonometric functions.

JEL Classification: *C22*, *C32*, *G12*.

## ABSTRACT

A new test for constant correlation is proposed. Based on the bivariate Student- $t$  distribution, this test is derived as Lagrange multiplier (LM) test. Whereas most of the traditional tests (e.g. Jennrich, 1970, Tang, 1995 and Goetzmann, Li & Rouwenhorst, 2005) specify the unknown correlations as piecewise constant, our model-setup for the correlation coefficient is based on trigonometric functions. Applying this test to assets from different financial markets (stocks, exchange rates, metals) there is empirical evidence that many of the correlations vary over time.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Realistic models for the dependence structure of financial returns is one of the current issues in financial statistics. Even though there are more powerful measures of dependence (e.g. Drouet-Mari & Kotz, 2001), the focus of this work is solely on correlations as underlying dependence concept. This means that linear dependence is entirely appropriate which in turn is justified if the joint distribution of the data is multivariate normal, or more generally,

multivariate elliptical. Indeed, empirical investigations give reason to assume that the joint distributions of many asset returns are frequently found to being multivariate elliptical (see, e.g. Zhou, 1993).

Agreeing on correlation as adequate dependence measure, it might next be of particular interest whether correlations are constant over time. Stability of correlation is a crucial point: Unstable correlations make it difficult to price and hedge derivatives whose payoffs depends on more than one asset. Similarly, portfolio managers rely on stable correlations in order to reduce or even eliminate their portfolio risk.

This motivated numerous empirical studies trying to shed light on the constancy of correlations of financial return data. Kaplanis (1988), for instance, investigates stock indices of 10 countries from 1967 to 1982 and arrives at the conclusion that correlation structure is stable over time. Considering monthly returns from 1973 to 1989, Meric & Meric (1989) found evidence that that international stock market co-movements are stable in the September-May period, but relatively unstable in the May-September period. Similarly, Koch & Koch (1991) analyzed the stock indices of 8 countries and concluded that the market interdependence within the same geographical region is growing over time. Similarly, Erb, Harvey & Viskanta (1994) found evidence of unstable correlations on the basis of monthly stock indices of G7-countries from 1970 to 1993. Increasing correlations in bear markets but not in bull markets is postulated by Longin & Solnik (1995) for excess returns of stock indices of 7 countries from 1960 to 1990. In contrast, exploring daily stock index returns from 1999 to 2002, Ragea (2002) states that correlation remains stable during volatile periods. Recently, Goetzmann, Li & Rouwenhorst (2005) claim that the correlation structure varies significantly, using worldwide monthly return series from 1872 to 2000.

All of these studies rely on a few statistical tests which assume that correlations of financial returns are piecewise constant over time. Above that, the points of time where regimes (i.e. periods with constant correlation) change are commonly unknown. In contrast, we make use of a test which allows correlations to vary over time according to certain trigonometric functions. Hence, no assumptions on "change points" are necessary and "smooth transitions" between two consecutive regimes are admitted. This allows to detect time-varying dependencies, where "conventional" tests might fail.

The outline of this work is as follows: Section 2 briefly reviews standard tests for constant correlation. A test based on trigonometric functions is introduced in section 3. Section 4 is dedicated to the description of the data set and to the discussion of the empirical results. Finally, section 5 concludes.

## 2. TESTS FOR CONSTANT CORRELATION: A SHORT REVIEW

Though all of the following tests for constant correlation are designed for the multivariate case, we restrict discussion to the bivariate case, henceforth. In general, these tests are rooted on Bartlett's (1937) test on equal variances, say  $\sigma_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2$ , of two *iid*-normally distributed random samples with possibly different lengths  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ . Denoting the sample variance of group  $j$  by  $S_j^2$  and defining a pooled sample variance  $S^2 = \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{N_j-1}{N_1+N_2-2} S_j^2$ , Bartlett's test statistic is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{Bartlett} = (N_1 + N_2 - 2) \ln(S^2) - \sum_{j=1}^2 (N_j - 1) \ln(S_j^2) \approx \chi^2(1). \quad (1)$$

Box (1949) extended Bartlett's proposal to a test for homogeneity of covariance matrices, say  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1$  and  $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$ , of two subperiods. Equation (1) generalizes to

$$\mathcal{T}_{Box} = (N_1 + N_2 - 2) \ln(\det(\mathbf{S})) - \sum_{j=1}^2 (N_j - 1) \ln(\det(\mathbf{S}_j)) \text{ with } \mathbf{S} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^2 \frac{N_j - 1}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \mathbf{S}_j,$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_j$  denotes the sample covariance matrix of subperiod  $j$ . Assuming independent and bivariate normally distributed random samples, Box (1949) proposes both a  $\chi^2$ - and an  $F$ -approximation to  $\mathcal{T}_{Box}$ . Finally, Kullback (1967) and Tang (1995) deal with the application of Box's test to correlation matrices rather than covariance matrices (by substituting the covariance matrices by the corresponding correlation matrices in the last formula). In particular, Kullback (1967) asserts that if all populations have the same non-singular correlation matrix, then the distribution of the test statistics is asymptotically chi-squared with certain degrees of freedom. However, Jennrich (1970, p. 905) presented a counterexample where Kullback's assertion fails. Jennrich (1970) himself suggested a test for equality of correlation matrices. Under the assumption of independent samples from two  $k$ -variate normal populations, the vector  $\mathbf{d}$  – which contains all  $k^* = k(k-1)/2$  dissimilar element-by-element differences of the two sample correlation matrices in lexicographic order – is asymptotically normal with mean zero and non-singular covariance matrix  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{T}_{Jennrich} = \frac{N_1 N_2}{N_1 + N_2} \cdot \mathbf{d}' \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}^{-1} \mathbf{d} \stackrel{a}{\sim} \chi^2(k^*),$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$  is a consistent estimator of  $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ . Jennrich's main contribution was to derive a representation for the inverse of  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}$  which also applies to high dimensions in a simple way. In order to get rid off the normality assumption, Goetzmann, Li & Rouwenhorst (2005) utilize the asymptotic distribution of the correlation matrix from Browne & Shapiro (1986) and Neudecker & Wesselman (1990). Their proposal only requires that the observation vectors

are independent and identically distributed according to a multivariate distribution with finite fourth moments, the corresponding test statistic reads

$$\mathcal{T}_{GLR} = \frac{N_1 N_2}{N_1 + N_2} \cdot \mathbf{d}' \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} \mathbf{d} \stackrel{a}{\sim} \chi^2(k^+),$$

with a certain matrix estimator  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$  and suitable degrees of freedom  $k^+$  (For more details see Goetzmann, Li & Rouwenhorst, 2005). Note that all of these tests presume that correlation is piecewise constant over time. In contrast, the  $\text{TC}_t$ -test which is introduced next section allows correlation to vary over time according to certain trigonometric functions. In particular, our model includes smooth transitions between different regimes rather than abrupt changes.

### 3. DERIVATION OF THE CC-TRIG<sub>t</sub> TEST

Undoubtedly, the multivariate Student- $t$  distribution can be considered as one of the most popular models for financial returns (see, e.g., Aas & Haff, 2006). A random variable  $\mathbf{X}$  with mean vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and dispersion matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*$  is said to follow a  $d$ -variate Student- $t$  distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom if its density has the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*, \nu) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+d}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})(\nu\pi)^{d/2}} |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*|^{-1/2} \left[ 1 + \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\nu} \right]^{-(\nu+d)/2}. \quad (2)$$

The corresponding covariance matrix is  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \equiv \text{Cov}(\mathbf{X}) = \frac{\nu}{\nu-2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_* \neq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_*$ ,  $\nu > 2$ . For a better interpretation, we re-scale the Student- $t$  density such that

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+d}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})[(\nu-2)\pi]^{d/2} \sqrt{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|}} \left[ 1 + \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\nu-2} \right]^{-(\nu+d)/2}. \quad (3)$$

Defining the unknown parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* \equiv (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \rho, \nu)$  and the standardized observations  $\bar{x}_i \equiv \frac{x_i - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , equation (3) can be re-written for  $d = 2$  as

$$f(x_1, x_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = \frac{\nu}{(\nu-2)2\pi \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sqrt{1-\rho^2}} \left[ 1 + \frac{\bar{x}_1^2 - 2\bar{x}_1\bar{x}_2\rho + \bar{x}_2^2}{(1-\rho^2)(\nu-2)} \right]^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}}. \quad (4)$$

noting that

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{12} & \sigma_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho = \frac{\sigma_{12}}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}.$$

For a given random sample  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T$  from a bivariate Student- $t$  distribution let us further assume that the correlation coefficient  $\rho_t$  at time  $t$  evolves according to the trigonometric equation

$$\rho_t \equiv \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sin(2f\pi t/T) + \beta_2 \cos(2f\pi t/T), \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad f \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\beta_0, \beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  have to be chosen such that  $\rho \in [-1, 1]$  and  $f$  denotes an appropriate though in general unknown frequency. Possible curves of  $\rho_t$  are plotted in figure 1, below.




Figure 1:  $\beta_0 = 0, \beta_1 = 0.2, \beta_2 = 0.3$  and  $\beta_0 = 0, \beta_1 = -0.1, \beta_2 = 0.6$ .

In order to demonstrate that correlation curves with these patterns may inherent to real-life data sets, consider the plot of the rolling correlations between two assets (where the correlation coefficient is successively calculated on the basis of the last 150 days over the whole time-period) as a proxy to the time-varying correlation. For the exchange rate pairs Canadian Dollar/US-Dollar versus Japanese Yen/US-Dollar and Japanese Yen/US-Dollar versus British pound/US-Dollar we obtain (for a period of about 10 years) the running correlation curves in figure 2, below. Additionally, the solid lines represent fitted correlation curves of the form

$$\hat{\rho}_t \equiv \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \sin(2\hat{f}\pi t/T) + \hat{\beta}_2 \cos(2\hat{f}\pi t/T),$$

where the unknown parameters have been estimated by means of non-linear least-square methods. More details about that point are provided in the empirical section of this paper.




Figure 2: Left panel:  $\hat{\beta}_0 = 0.14, \hat{\beta}_1 = 0.047, \hat{\beta}_2 = 0.023$  and  $\hat{f} = 1.4$ , right panel:  $\hat{\beta}_0 = 0.54, \hat{\beta}_1 = -0.04, \hat{\beta}_2 = -0.24$  and  $\hat{f} = 1.25$ .

Assuming that the *iid*-sample  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T$  stems from a bivariate Student- $t$  distribution and that the correlation coefficient at time  $t$  evolves according to the extended model in equation (5), we next derive a test whether  $\mathcal{H}_0 : \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$ , i.e. whether correlations are constant over time. On the basis of the log-likelihood function,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\theta) &= \sum_{t=1}^T \log f(x_{1t}, x_{2t}; \theta) \quad \text{with} \quad \theta \equiv (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \nu) \\ &= T \log(\nu) - T \log(\nu - 2) - T \log(2\pi) - T \log(\sigma_1) - T \log(\sigma_2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \log(1 - \rho_t^2) - \left( \frac{\nu + 2}{2} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \log \left[ 1 + \frac{\bar{x}_{1t}^2 - 2\bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t + \bar{x}_{2t}^2}{(1 - \rho_t^2)(\nu - 2)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

one might consider a likelihood ratio (LR) test, where  $\mathcal{LR} = -2[\ell(\hat{\theta}) - \ell(\hat{\theta}_0)]$  has to be calculated. Note that  $\hat{\theta}$  and  $\hat{\theta}_0$ , respectively, denote the maximum likelihood (ML) estimators of  $\theta$  for the unrestricted and the restricted model, respectively. Within this work we make use of the Lagrange multiplier (LM) test (A comprehensive treatment of LM tests can be found, for instance, in Godfrey, 1988) which only requires estimates under the constant-correlation (i.e. under the restricted) model. It is essentially based on the score vector

$$\mathbf{s}(\theta) \equiv \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \mu_1}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \mu_2}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \sigma_1^2}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \sigma_2^2}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \beta_0}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \beta_1}, \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \beta_2} \right)'$$

whose particular elements derive as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \mu_1} &= \frac{\nu + 2}{(\nu - 2)\sigma_1} \frac{\bar{x}_{1t} - \bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t}{(1 - \rho_t^2)A_t}, & \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \mu_2} &= \frac{\nu + 2}{(\nu - 2)\sigma_2} \frac{\bar{x}_{2t} - \bar{x}_{1t}\rho_t}{(1 - \rho_t^2)A_t}, \\ \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \sigma_1} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_1} + \frac{\nu + 2}{(\nu - 2)\sigma_1} \frac{\bar{x}_{1t}^2 - \bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t}{(1 - \rho_t^2)A_t}, & \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \sigma_2} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_2} + \frac{\nu + 2}{(\nu - 2)\sigma_2} \frac{\bar{x}_{2t}^2 - \bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t}{(1 - \rho_t^2)A_t} \\ \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \nu} &= \frac{1}{\nu} - \frac{1}{\nu - 2} - \left[ \frac{1}{2} \log(A_t) - \frac{\nu + 2}{2(\nu - 2)^2} \cdot \frac{\bar{x}_{1t}^2 - 2\bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t + \bar{x}_{2t}^2}{A_t(1 - \rho_t^2)} \right] \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \beta_i} &= \frac{\rho_t}{1 - \rho_t^2} \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial \beta_i} + \frac{\nu + 2}{\nu - 2} \cdot \frac{\bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}(1 - \rho_t^2) - (\bar{x}_{1t}^2 - 2\bar{x}_{1t}\bar{x}_{2t}\rho_t + \bar{x}_{2t}^2)\rho_t}{A_t(1 - \rho_t^2)^2} \cdot \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial \beta_i} \\ \text{noting that } \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial \beta_0} &= 1, & \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial \beta_1} &= \sin(2\pi ft/T), & \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial \beta_2} &= \cos(2\pi ft/T). \end{aligned}$$

In the context of unrestricted estimates the score function is zero by definition. Now if the restricted estimates are close to the unrestricted estimates, the evaluated score should be close to zero. With  $\hat{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s}(\hat{\theta}_0)$  and

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}} \equiv \left\{ \hat{s}_{ti} \equiv \frac{\partial \ell_t}{\partial \theta_i}(\hat{\theta}_0) \right\}_{t=1, \dots, T, i=1, \dots, 7}$$

and under the temporary assumption that the frequency  $f$  is known, the LM-type test statistics reads  $\mathcal{LM}(f) \equiv \hat{\mathbf{s}}' \left( \hat{\mathbf{S}}' \hat{\mathbf{S}} \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{s}}$ . Being the sum of cross products of the first derivatives of  $\ell_t$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}' \hat{\mathbf{S}}$  estimates Fisher's information matrix  $V = E(\partial^2 \ell / \partial \theta \partial \theta')$ .



Unfortunately, the frequency  $f$  is unknown in practice and has to be estimated from the data set. Following a proposal of Beckers, Ender & Hurn (2004) – who consider functions as in equation (5) in order to detect structural breaks in regression models within a likelihood ratio framework – one might consider a finite set  $\Upsilon$  of  $K$  different frequencies and consider the test statistics

$$\mathcal{LM}_m \equiv \max_{f \in \Upsilon} \mathcal{LM}(f), \quad \mathcal{LM}_a \equiv \sum_{f \in \Upsilon} \frac{\mathcal{LM}(f)}{K} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{LM}_e \equiv \log \sum_{f \in \Upsilon} \frac{\exp(\mathcal{LM}(f)/2)}{K}$$

which arise from the maximum, the average and the exponentially weighted average of the  $\mathcal{LM}(f)$ -statistics. Whereas  $\mathcal{LM}(f)$  is asymptotically chi-squared with 2 degrees of freedom under certain regularity conditions and for known  $f$ ,  $\mathcal{LM}_m$ ,  $\mathcal{LM}_s$  and  $\mathcal{LM}_a$  are no longer. For this reason, critical values are obtained employing parametric bootstrap techniques as follows:

1. For  $i = 1, \dots, J$  repeat the following two steps:
2. Generate *iid*-samples  $\mathbf{X}_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_T^{(i)}$  from a bivariate Student- $t$  with  $\theta = \hat{\theta}_0$ .
3. For a given set  $\Upsilon$ , calculate  $\mathcal{LM}_m^{(i)}$ ,  $\mathcal{LM}_s^{(i)}$  and  $\mathcal{LM}_a^{(i)}$ .
4. The proportion of  $J$  bootstrapped test statistics which exceed the test statistics from the observed data is then an estimate of the  $p$ -values of the test(s).

#### 4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

To cover a broad range of financial assets, we applied the CC-Trig $_t$ -test to foreign exchange rate data from leading currencies (Yen/USD, Swiss Franc/USD, British pound/USD, Canadian Dollar/USD) as well as to exchange rates from Asian emerging markets (Yen/EUR, Singapore Dollar/EUR, Won/EUR, Taiwan Dollar/EUR, Baht/EUR). Above that, emphasis was put on stock returns from the telecommunication market (Telecom Austria, France Telekom, Deutsche Telekom, Telefonica, T.I.M) and from the automobile sector (BMW, VW, DaimlerChrysler, Porsche, Renault, Peugeot). Finally, empirical investigations were performed for assets from the metal market (lead, tin, nickel, zinc). A first impression on the aforementioned data is provided by table 1, below, which summarizes estimated means, estimated variances, empirical skewness and kurtosis coefficients (measured by the third and fourth standardized moments) and the results of the Ljung-Box test on serial correlation and Engle's LM test (for  $p = 10$  lags). Obviously, most of the data sets are highly leptokurtic (in particular the Asian exchange rates) and skew to some extent. Moreover, the results of the Ljung-Box test and of Engle's LM test indicate the presence of minor serial

correlation and of significant (G)ARCH effects. In order to eliminate the possible influence of time-dependencies on the results of our test, we additionally fitted univariate ARMA-GARCH models to each of the series and considered standardized residuals (from now on briefly "GARCH residuals") in addition to the original returns (from now on briefly "plain returns").

Asset	Abbr.	N	$\hat{\mu}$	$\hat{\sigma}$	$\hat{m}_3$	$\hat{m}_4$	$\mathcal{LB}(10)$	$\mathcal{LM}(10)$
Exchange rates, Jan 1973 to Dec 2004 (per US-Dollar)								
Canadian Dollar	CAD	8055	0.002	0.09	-0.004	6.75	12.65	912.18*
Japanese Yen	JPY	8055	-0.015	0.56	-0.002	6.11	12.50	429.24*
Swiss Franc	CHF	8055	0.003	0.36	0.132	6.84	55.79*	485.26*
British Pound	BRP	8055	-0.013	0.44	-0.723	13.33	34.48*	176.20*
Asian exchange rates, Jun 1996 to Aug 2006 (per Euro)								
Japanese Yen	JPY	2642	0.051	4.53	0.818	48.42	72.91*	692.84*
Singapur Dollar	SGD	2642	0.026	0.39	-1.307	68.07	67.42*	48.84*
South Korean Won	KRW	2642	0.004	0.15	-0.991	19.14	40.28*	343.52*
Taiwan Dollar	TWD	2642	0.008	1.46	-2.349	109.27	262.90*	483.05*
Thai Baht	THB	2642	0.007	0.11	0.578	27.51	13.75	266.99*
Stocks: Telecommunication, Nov 2000 to Aug 2006								
Telecom Austria	TA1	1489	-0.006	6.23	-0.081	9.10	27.93*	438.96*
France Telecom	FTE	1489	-0.015	2.07	-0.952	10.50	34.25*	146.04*
Deutsche Telekom	DTE	1489	0.055	3.37	-1.622	24.50	16.90	15.57
Telefonica	TEF	1489	-0.083	4.61	-0.923	11.86	35.10*	129.01*
T.I.M	TQI	1489	-0.082	40.64	1.131	85.56	115.66*	410.27*
Stocks: Automobile, Aug 1989 to Aug 2006								
BMW	BMW	3056	0.039	4.37	0.073	7.24	19.47*	219.93*
VW	VW	3056	0.032	4.32	-0.154	6.66	30.11*	247.29*
DaimlerChrysler	DCX	3056	0.002	3.71	-0.101	6.15	24.13*	413.65*
Porsche	POR	3056	0.103	5.73	-0.021	6.64	10.74	252.84*
Renault	RNL	3056	-0.005	0.41	0.350	5.66	8.88	46.92*
Peugeot	PEU	3056	0.037	5.53	-0.011	5.63	22.81*	352.56*
Metals, Nov 2001 to Aug 2006 (US-Dollar per tonne)								
Lead	LE	1093	0.034	1.22	-0.555	8.72	29.74*	161.56*
Tin	TI	1093	0.084	4.21	-0.368	5.59	30.11*	100.37*
Nickel	NI	1093	0.142	2.38	-0.139	5.13	12.95	127.66*
Zinc	ZI	1093	0.130	4.97	-0.618	7.90	10.72	21.45*

Table 1: Data statistics.

Figure 3 displays the time series for each of the five markets. To guarantee a better graphical comparison between the series of each market we re-scaled all series to 100 at the starting point of the data collection. This highlights, for instance, the tremendous growth of Porsche compared to other companies from the car industry.




Figure 3: Re-scaled time series for all markets.

One of the crucial points of our test is to determine the set  $\Upsilon$  which contains the frequencies underlying our test. On the one hand, too many frequencies may result in unnecessary computational burden, wrong or too less frequencies may produce misleading results. Against this background we suggest the following procedure to identify the relevant frequencies:

In a first step, the rolling correlations  $rc_t, t - \tau, \dots, T$  between two asset returns (based on the last  $\tau$  observations) are calculated. In a second step, for given frequencies  $0 = f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N = U$ , functions of the form

$$\rho_t \equiv \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sin(2f\pi t/T) + \beta_2 \cos(2f\pi t/T)$$

are fitted to the rolling correlations such that the squared differences

$$K(\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2) = \sum_t (rc_t - \rho_t)^2$$

are minimal. Let  $M(f)$  denote the corresponding minimum which belongs to frequency  $f$ . Plotting  $f$  against  $M(f)$  for all frequencies under consideration can be used as a graphical instrument to determine the interval. Exemplarily, plots for different stock returns are subject to figure 4, below. The minimal frequencies are given by  $f \approx 1.25$  and  $f \approx 2.00$ , respectively.




Figure 4: Choosing the interval for  $f$  ( $U = 6, \tau = 150, N = 60$ ).

The empirical results of our new test are documented in table 2 to 6. Concerning the FX rates in table 2, there seems to be strong evidence for time-varying correlation for both plain returns and GARCH residuals. Critical values are printed in brackets, below.

Asset 1	Asset 2	Plain returns			GARCH-residuals		
		$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$	$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$
CAD	JPY	103.5439 (4.6281)	246.0640 (8.6212)	242.6129 (6.8616)	115.4731 (4.6632)	292.1115 (9.0096)	288.9490 (7.4392)
CAD	CHF	57.0160 (4.2749)	127.9684 (8.9648)	124.6356 (7.1185)	73.3458 (4.4053)	188.0232 (8.6535)	184.6896 (6.9843)
CAD	GPB	75.0485 (4.4398)	170.0469 (8.9023)	166.6209 (7.0615)	85.9070 (4.6617)	219.7406 (8.9784)	216.3305 (7.0360)
JPY	CHF	76.4903 (4.4167)	134.6122 (8.7623)	131.3341 (6.8567)	135.5781 (4.5883)	265.0354 (9.5074)	261.8274 (7.5057)
JPY	GPB	224.8565 (4.7420)	454.8221 (9.5445)	451.1984 (7.6867)	262.6755 (4.3955)	524.5010 (9.1284)	521.1735 (7.2191)
CHF	GPB	126.0475 (4.4918)	212.6770 (9.1534)	209.4634 (7.2703)	160.9184 (4.6560)	316.1506 (9.0342)	312.5655 (7.1173)

Table 2: FX returns.

The situation for the Asian exchange rate returns is quite different. While the null hypothesis is rejected for the plain returns, there is less evidence for correlations to vary over time if the time-serial dependencies are removed. This does not apply to the exchange rates of Korea and Taiwan.

Asset 1	Asset 2	Plain returns			GARCH-residuals		
		$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$	$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$
JPY	SGD	214.6688 (5.3966)	226.2212 (9.8919)	223.8829 (7.9425)	6.8189 (4.4894)	15.3512 (8.8712)	12.9907 (7.0696)
JPY	KRW	97.3095 (5.6687)	115.0183 (9.4488)	113.7123 (7.7439)	16.1599 (4.6384)	24.9849 (9.3952)	23.6628 (7.6126)
JPY	TWD	65.2014 (6.9925)	69.5137 (10.9047)	67.6327 (9.0861)	5.2571 (5.9887)	8.6171 (9.8794)	6.8537 (8.3755)
JPY	THB	125.5002 (5.8615)	131.1136 (10.1463)	129.6513 (8.2883)	7.7395 (4.3946)	16.3925 (8.9015)	14.6583 (6.9980)
SGD	KRW	14.1800 (5.4788)	15.7647 (10.1921)	14.5730 (8.3345)	1.7656 (4.3662)	3.0429 (8.8144)	2.0735 (6.9692)
SGD	TWD	3.9471 (5.6581)	4.8421 (10.1231)	4.0042 (8.0469)	0.2031 (4.5643)	0.3916 (9.0082)	0.2126 (7.1839)
SGD	THB	71.8024 (5.5774)	83.0011 (9.4376)	80.5351 (7.6371)	7.7482 (4.6258)	14.4696 (8.8686)	12.4812 (7.1149)
KRW	TWD	28.2941 (5.8784)	48.9142 (10.3788)	46.2857 (8.5078)	17.2255 (4.5745)	34.1560 (9.0889)	31.6199 (7.3838)
KRW	THB	11.3578 (5.3217)	16.8097 (9.6466)	14.6937 (8.0823)	8.5802 (4.5663)	13.1685 (8.9945)	11.0267 (7.2895)
TWD	THB	2.4646 (4.7045)	6.8926 (9.1225)	4.0968 (7.4439)	3.5768 (4.4779)	11.5692 (8.7159)	7.9922 (6.9577)

Table 3: Exchanges rates: Asian Markets.

For the data sets from the automobile industry, correlation seems to be non-constant over time, even if GARCH-residuals are considered rather than plain returns.

Asset 1	Asset 2	Plain returns			GARCH-residuals		
		$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$	$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$
BMW	VW	127.6182 (4.7173)	212.4633 (9.4346)	209.4241 (7.5516)	45.4953 (4.8523)	89.0968 (9.3660)	85.8959 (7.6172)
BMW	DCX	200.5955 (4.5666)	335.2793 (9.0758)	331.9755 (7.1477)	72.4488 (4.5597)	129.1108 (9.1869)	125.8327 (7.3543)
BMW	POR	99.6223 (4.5569)	184.6362 (9.4141)	182.3042 (7.4055)	55.6603 (4.5417)	114.3281 (9.1590)	112.0828 (7.3205)
BMW	RNL	14.0591 (4.6057)	42.8074 (9.3431)	40.2622 (7.5654)	15.0432 (4.8690)	44.6061 (9.7535)	42.1099 (7.6944)
BMW	PEU	90.5562 (4.5848)	187.9338 (9.1851)	185.4617 (7.3258)	60.2558 (4.4666)	123.0475 (8.7668)	120.2055 (7.1233)
VW	DCX	88.9277 (4.0545)	162.0190 (8.5025)	158.6811 (6.7604)	37.9808 (4.3566)	77.0180 (8.9752)	73.9289 (7.2113)
VW	POR	71.7736 (4.4712)	136.1786 (8.7086)	134.2285 (7.0186)	46.4044 (4.3115)	95.1935 (8.8574)	93.2933 (7.0191)
VW	RNL	12.7337 (4.2568)	32.7761 (8.6653)	29.8995 (7.0924)	11.5033 (5.1055)	28.7465 (10.164)	26.4179 (8.2904)
VW	PEU	66.5393 (4.7294)	155.6894 (9.5197)	153.6036 (7.5642)	51.5981 (4.6324)	109.1128 (9.4440)	107.0299 (7.4704)
DCX	POR	73.2158 (4.5668)	135.1195 (9.5383)	132.8649 (7.5630)	50.4921 (4.3711)	97.0667 (8.9952)	94.7815 (7.0508)
DCX	RNL	10.3433 (4.7183)	28.3432 (9.1379)	25.1021 (7.4684)	9.5658 (4.5572)	30.9925 (9.3041)	27.6805 (7.4820)
DCX	PEU	82.4998 (4.6203)	177.6023 (8.9406)	175.2209 (7.2553)	62.0517 (4.6370)	127.8215 (9.7432)	125.0783 (7.8390)
POR	RNL	7.7898 (4.3079)	25.7745 (8.7719)	22.9932 (6.9053)	8.2506 (4.1977)	24.9472 (8.1309)	22.3784 (6.2960)
POR	PEU	57.0277 (4.7608)	135.1566 (9.7691)	132.9208 (7.9325)	45.7259 (4.4566)	100.1991 (9.0866)	98.2859 (7.0940)
RNL	PEU	18.4628 (4.4029)	30.8887 (9.0245)	28.3690 (7.1396)	10.9015 (4.6168)	18.3849 (9.4743)	16.3949 (7.4755)

Table 4: Stock returns: Automobiles.

Metal returns, in contrast, are not suspected to feature changes in correlation over time, at least after eliminating GARCH-effects.

Asset 1	Asset 2	Plain returns			GARCH-residuals		
		$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$	$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$
LE	TI	5.7723 (4.4539)	12.1817 (8.9237)	10.3145 (6.9544)	7.2776 (4.5262)	13.7303 (9.6047)	11.7270 (7.7467)
LE	NI	8.9925 (4.6612)	17.7502 (9.2126)	15.4934 (7.3049)	19.2794 (4.8175)	42.4652 (9.3530)	40.7679 (7.5905)
LE	ZI	2.8521 (4.6192)	5.1534 (9.1057)	3.8227 (7.4266)	1.5607 (4.6103)	3.6657 (9.1347)	2.5955 (7.3307)
TI	NI	15.9406 (4.7786)	23.9646 (9.0998)	21.5118 (7.3519)	5.0515 (4.8373)	8.1373 (9.4455)	5.8778 (7.9777)
TI	ZI	12.5654 (4.5835)	16.7924 (9.0724)	14.8412 (7.2402)	4.3095 (4.6448)	5.5260 (9.5511)	4.6571 (7.6388)
NI	ZI	12.3726 (4.4955)	19.4806 (8.9634)	17.9455 (7.1328)	4.8251 (4.8934)	8.4573 (9.9313)	6.9361 (8.1484)

Table 5: Metals.

Surprisingly, the correlations between different stocks from the telecommunication market appear rather stable in the time period which we considered, except for  $TA1/TEF$ ,  $FTE/TEF$  and  $TEF/TQI$ . In particular, the stock returns of Deutsche Telekom and that of its competitors show no time-varying pattern.

Asset 1	Asset 2	Plain returns			GARCH-residuals		
		$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$	$\mathcal{LM}_a$	$\mathcal{LM}_m$	$\mathcal{LM}_e$
TA1	FTE	21.5897 (4.7944)	51.2293 (9.5541)	48.9153 (7.7627)	14.1013 (4.4825)	25.8216 (8.3040)	23.3035 (6.6872)
TA1	DTE	4.8833 (4.7924)	9.6227 (9.7740)	7.5495 (7.7495)	2.8162 (4.5709)	6.5803 (9.1759)	4.5544 (7.3454)
TA1	TEF	33.6799 (4.6308)	66.6899 (8.9103)	64.7945 (6.7734)	15.5119 (4.7959)	45.2180 (9.4852)	41.4879 (7.9944)
TA1	TQI	27.5244 (5.2854)	36.1989 (9.8352)	34.3343 (8.0526)	7.3520 (4.7042)	10.4698 (9.2295)	9.3944 (7.3093)
FTE	DTE	3.1854 (4.3458)	7.7643 (8.8536)	5.5116 (7.0210)	2.8652 (4.7874)	8.5911 (9.7024)	6.6070 (7.7817)
FTE	TEF	12.2554 (4.5769)	32.4945 (8.8507)	29.7269 (7.1415)	5.8253 (4.4715)	14.2057 (9.0315)	11.8020 (7.0240)
FTE	TQI	10.1478 (5.6197)	13.9656 (9.8894)	12.0456 (8.0794)	5.3928 (4.9305)	8.7289 (9.4033)	7.0345 (7.6470)
DTE	TEF	6.3027 (4.5129)	13.9836 (9.2707)	11.9523 (7.2868)	4.2362 (4.4610)	7.4210 (8.9845)	5.8086 (7.1056)
DTE	TQI	6.1464 (5.6924)	9.3595 (9.9619)	7.7409 (8.3504)	3.5301 (5.2216)	6.0384 (9.4431)	4.4345 (7.7931)
TEF	TQI	23.5632 (5.6456)	35.2809 (9.9207)	32.9010 (8.0327)	8.8052 (4.4004)	14.1831 (9.0969)	12.3405 (7.3630)

Table 6: Stock returns: Telecommunication.

We conclude this section providing the results for the (competitive) tests of section 2. Due to its design for heavy-tailed data, only the test of Goetzmann, Li & Rouwenhorst (2005) for GARCH residuals was taken into account. Table 7 summarizes the empirical results. In many cases, results are identically between the GLR test and the CC-Trig<sub>t</sub> test. However, in some cases (e.g. tin and zinc or nickel and zinc), empirical evidence for time-varying correlation is found using the CC-Trig<sub>t</sub> test while the GLR test fails. This might be due to the construction of the GLR test, where only piecewise constant correlation is allowed.

## 5. SUMMARY

This paper proposes a new test for constant correlation. Based on the bivariate Student- $t$  distribution and correlation coefficients which are allowed to change according to certain trigonometric functions, three Lagrange multiplier-type test statistics are proposed. We approximate the critical values of these statistics by means of bootstrapping. Secondly, the test is applied to asset returns, resp. GARCH residuals from different markets. The results show that stock returns from the automobile industry exhibit time-varying correlations, whereas the correlations observed on the telecommunication market tend to be constant over time. This also applies to Asian exchange rate returns and some of the assets from the commodity market.

Asset 1	Asset 2	<i>GLR</i>	Asset 1	Asset 2	<i>GLR</i>	Asset 1	Asset 2	<i>GLR</i>
BMW	VW	30.5865 (3.8415)	JPY	SGD	1.1555 (3.8415)	TA1	FTE	0.8952 (3.8415)
BMW	DCX	29.3089 (3.8415)	JPY	KRW	0.0031 (3.8415)	TA1	DTE	2.0026 (3.8415)
BMW	POR	37.5042 (3.8415)	JPY	TWD	10.6249 (3.8415)	TA1	TEF	3.9206 (3.8415)
BMW	RNR	0.2552 (3.8415)	JPY	THB	11.1625 (3.8415)	TA1	TQI	7.0756 (3.8415)
BMW	PEU	85.0125 (3.8415)	SGD	KRW	0.2008 (3.8415)	FTE	DTE	0.0877 (3.8415)
VW	DCX	19.7082 (3.8415)	SGD	TWD	0.1168 (3.8415)	FTE	TEF	0.0019 (3.8415)
VW	POR	53.5808 (3.8415)	SGD	THB	6.8121 (3.8415)	FTE	TQI	2.9143 (3.8415)
VW	RNR	1.7018 (3.8415)	KRW	TWD	3.0181 (3.8415)	DTE	TEF	7.9740 (3.8415)
VW	PEU	60.0430 (3.8415)	KRW	THB	25.7978 (3.8415)	DTE	TQI	7.6441 (3.8415)
DCX	POR	34.2926 (3.8415)	TWD	THB	6.2924 (3.8415)	TEF	TQI	6.3126 (3.8415)
DCX	RNR	1.1368 (3.8415)	CAD	JPY	27.4309 (3.8415)			
DCX	PEU	53.2693 (3.8415)	CAD	CHF	10.5284 (3.8415)			
POR	RNR	0.0003 (3.8415)	CAD	BRP	6.7731 (3.8415)			
POR	PEU	48.9124 (3.8415)	JPY	CHF	15.5098 (3.8415)			
RNR	PEU	0.3393 (3.8415)	JPY	BRP	31.5584 (3.8415)			
LE	TI	10.2082 (3.8415)	CHF	BRP	10.2658 (3.8415)			
LE	NI	27.5722 (3.8415)	CAD	JPY	27.4309 (3.8415)			
LE	ZI	9.0261 (3.8415)	CAD	CHF	10.5284 (3.8415)			
TI	NI	0.9648 (3.8415)	CAD	BRP	6.7731 (3.8415)			
TI	ZI	1.5681 (3.8415)	JPY	CHF	15.5098 (3.8415)			
NI	ZI	0.0979 (3.8415)	JPY	BRP	31.5584 (3.8415)			
			CHF	BRP	10.2658 (3.8415)			

Table 7: Results of the GLR test for  $\alpha = 0.05$ .



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aas, K., Haff, I. H. (2006). The Generalized Hyperbolic Skew Students t-Distribution. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 4(2):275-309.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1937). Properties of Sufficiency and Statistical Tests. *Proceeding of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A* 160, 268-282.
- Becker, R., Enders, W., Hurn, S. (2004). A General Test for Time Dependence in Parameters. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 19:899-906.
- Box, G. E. P. (1949). A General Distribution Theory for a Class of Likelihood Criteria. *Biometrika* 36(3/4):317-346.
- Browne, M. W., Shapiro, A. (1986). The Asymptotic Covariance Matrix of Sample Correlation Coefficients under General Conditions. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 82:589-599.
- Drouet-Mari, D. D., Kotz, S. (2001). *Correlation and Dependence*. Imperial College Press, Singapore.
- Erb, C. B., Harvey, C. R., Viskanta, T. E. (1994). Forecasting international equity correlations. *Financial Analysts Journal* 50(6):32-45.
- Fisher, R. A. (1915). Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an infinitely large population. *Biometrika* 10:507-521.
- Godfrey, L. G. (1988). *Misspecification Tests in Econometrics: The Lagrange multiplier principle and other approaches*. Econometric Monographs No. 16, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Goetzmann, W. N., Li, L., Rouwenhorst, K. G. (2005). Long-Term Global Market Correlations. *Journal of Business* 78(1):1-38.
- Jennrich, R. I. (1970). An asymptotic chi-square test for the equality of two correlation matrices. *JASA* 65:904-912.
- Kaplanis, E. C. (1988). Stability and forecasting of the comovement measures of international stock market returns. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 7(1):63-75.
- Kullback, S. (1967). On testing correlation matrices. *Applied Statistics* 16:80-85.
- Koch, P. D., Koch, T. W. (1991). Evolution in dynamic linkage across daily national stock indexes. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 10(2):231-251.
- Longin, F., Solnik, B. (1995). Is the correlation in international equity returns constant: 1960-1990? *International Money and Finance* 14(1):3-26.

- Meric, I., Meric, G. (1989). Potential gains from international portfolio diversification and the intertemporal stability of international stock market relationships. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 13(4/5):627-640.
- Neudecker, H., Wesselman, A. M. (1990). The Asymptotic Variance Matrix of the Sample Correlation Matrix. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 127:589-599.
- Ragea, V. (2003). Testing correlation stability during hectic financial markets. *Journal Financial Markets and Portfolio Management* 17(3):289-308.
- Tang, G. Y. N. (1995). Intertemporal Stability in International Stock Markets Relationships: A Revisit. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 35:579-593.
- Zhou, G. (1993). Asset-Pricing Tests Under Alternative Distributions. *The Journal of Finance* 48(5):1927-1942.

## SFB 649 Discussion Paper Series 2007

For a complete list of Discussion Papers published by the SFB 649, please visit <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>.

- 001 "Trade Liberalisation, Process and Product Innovation, and Relative Skill Demand" by Sebastian Braun, January 2007.
- 002 "Robust Risk Management. Accounting for Nonstationarity and Heavy Tails" by Ying Chen and Vladimir Spokoiny, January 2007.
- 003 "Explaining Asset Prices with External Habits and Wage Rigidities in a DSGE Model." by Harald Uhlig, January 2007.
- 004 "Volatility and Causality in Asia Pacific Financial Markets" by Enzo Weber, January 2007.
- 005 "Quantile Sieve Estimates For Time Series" by Jürgen Franke, Jean-Pierre Stockis and Joseph Tadjuidje, February 2007.
- 006 "Real Origins of the Great Depression: Monopolistic Competition, Union Power, and the American Business Cycle in the 1920s" by Monique Ebell and Albrecht Ritschl, February 2007.
- 007 "Rules, Discretion or Reputation? Monetary Policies and the Efficiency of Financial Markets in Germany, 14th to 16th Centuries" by Oliver Volckart, February 2007.
- 008 "Sectoral Transformation, Turbulence, and Labour Market Dynamics in Germany" by Ronald Bachmann and Michael C. Burda, February 2007.
- 009 "Union Wage Compression in a Right-to-Manage Model" by Thorsten Vogel, February 2007.
- 010 "On  $\sigma$ -additive robust representation of convex risk measures for unbounded financial positions in the presence of uncertainty about the market model" by Volker Krätschmer, March 2007.
- 011 "Media Coverage and Macroeconomic Information Processing" by Alexandra Niessen, March 2007.
- 012 "Are Correlations Constant Over Time? Application of the CC-TRIG<sub>t</sub>-test to Return Series from Different Asset Classes." by Matthias Fischer, March 2007.

**SFB 649, Spandauer Straße 1, D-10178 Berlin**  
**<http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de>**

This research was supported by the Deutsche  
Forschungsgemeinschaft through the SFB 649 "Economic Risk".

