Revised: January, 2001

Volatility Dependence and Contagion in Emerging Equity Markets*

by

Sebastian Edwards
UCLA
Anderson Graduate School of Business
Los Angeles, CA 90095
And
National Bureau of Economic Research
Cambridge, MA 02138
e-mail: sedwards@agsm.ucla.edu

and

Raul Susmel
University of Houston
Department of Finance
C. T. Bauer College of Business
Houston, TX 77204-6282
e-mail: rsusmel@uh.edu

ABSTRACT

In this paper we use weekly stock market data for a group of Latin American countries to analyze the behavior of volatility through time. We are particularly interested in understanding whether periods of high volatility are correlated across countries. The analysis uses both on univariate and bivariate switching volatility models. Our results do not rely on the correlation coefficients, but on the co-dependence of volatility regimes. The results indicate that high-volatility episodes are, in general, short-lived, lasting from two to twelve weeks. We find strong evidence of volatility co-movements across countries, especially among the Mercosur countries.

JEL Nos: F3, G12, G15
KEYWORDS: Stock returns, interdependence, volatility, contagion, emerging markets.

---

*This is a revised version of a paper presented at the IASE Seminar in Buenos Aires, December, 1999. We are indebted to Ilan Goldfjan and Geert Beakert for helpful discussions. We are particularly grateful to a referee for very helpful comments.

I. Introduction

In the aftermath of the East Asian and Russian crises of the 1990s a number of authors have argued that capital mobility has gone too far, creating a highly unstable international financial system. Some analysts have even argued that the emerging countries should implement policies aimed at slowing down capital flows. Specific proposals have included imposing a Tobin tax on foreign exchange transactions, and introducing controls on capital inflows (see Edwards 1999).

In this paper we use data from a group of Latin American and Asian countries to investigate two issues that have been at the center of recent debates on the international financial system: First, we analyze whether the degree of financial instability has indeed increased during the last several years. We do this by analyzing weekly behavior of stock market returns. Second, we investigate whether periods of increased stock market volatility coincide across countries. Understanding these issues has a number of important policy implications. Indeed, supporters of the imposition of capital controls have largely based their views on the notion that periods of financial instability are transmitted across countries.

We address these issues by using both univariate, as well as multivariate techniques. We first follow a variant of Hamilton and Susmel's (1994) SWARCH methodology, to identify breakpoints in an ARCH model of the conditional variance of stock market returns. A particular attractive feature of this approach is that it allows us to date periods of unusually high volatility. We find that, although the degree of volatility does change through time, it has not experienced, in any of our countries, a secular increase. Our results indicate that in most (but not all) countries the "unusually high volatility states" are short-lived. We also find that these periods of "high volatility" tend to roughly coincide across some countries.

Our analysis departs from other work in the area in that we also use a multivariate extension of the SWARCH model to explore whether there are co-movements in stock market volatility across countries. This type of analysis is particularly important in current debates on financial "contagion" across countries. Indeed, the existence of statistically significant comovements in volatility can be interpreted as providing some evidence regarding the presence of contagion. In particular, a simultaneous increase in the (conditional) variance of stock returns would have important implications for the interpretation of traditional models of contagion, based on detecting break-points in simple returns correlations across countries --see Forbes and Rigobon, (1999).

Since multivariate SWARCH models are highly intensive in computing time, in this paper we restrict its application to pairs of countries. The bivariate SWARCH model allows for dependence not only through the correlation coefficient, but also through the Markov matrix, which determines the different volatility states. We find evidence for state-dependent correlations, where the high volatility states tend to be related to international crises. During high volatility periods due to international crisis, correlations among Latin American emerging stock markets increase between two to four times. We find strong evidence of volatility dependence among all Latin American markets. We also find that Hong Kong, which we take as an emblematic representative of the Asian financial crisis of 1997, does not show a non-linear state dependence with most of the Latin American nations.[1]

Our analysis is in a spirit similar to that studies on the effects of 1987 stock market crash on financial volatility across countries --see Bennett and Kelleher (1988), King and Wadhwani (1990). Other papers that deal with cross country volatility include the studies on "meteor showers" by Engle, Ito and Lin (1990, 1992), and Hamano, Ng and Masulis (1990), and the studies on equity markets time-varying correlations by Longin and Solnik (1995), and Ramchand and Susmel (1998). The paper is organized as follows. Section I is the introduction. In Section II we discuss the data used in the analysis. In Section III, we use univariate SWARCH models to analyze interest rate volatility in our five countries. Section IV contains the results for the multivariate case. Finally, section V is the conclusions.

II. Equity Returns in the 1990s: Preliminary Data Analysis

The data used in this article consists of time series of weekly equity indexes, denominated in U.S. dollars, for Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Hong Kong and Mexico. The sample covers the period from the last week of August 1989 to the third week of October 1999. The

---

[1] In a companion paper we use data for all five countries to analyze "volatility comovements" in domestic interest rates. See Edwards and Susmel (2000).

data were taken from the Morgan Stanley Capital International data set. The indexes have been constructed not to double count those stocks multiple-listed on foreign stock exchanges; they are value weighted, and they cover at least 80% of each country's stock-market capitalization. These stock market indexes are transformed into weekly (Thursday to Thursday) rates of returns. In Table 1 we present information on the mean, standard deviation, skewness coefficient, Kurtosis coefficient, the Jarque-Bera Normality test (JB), and Ljung-Box test (LB). All these series show the typical non-normality of financial time series (see the JB test results). The high kurtosis coefficient is also typical of high frequency financial time series, and it is behind the rejection of normality. The Ljung-Box (LB) statistics suggest significant autocorrelation in the levels only for Argentina. The Ljung-Box (LBS) statistics, for the squared levels, are significant, with the exception of Hong Kong. That is, there is significant autocorrelation for the squared returns, which we take as evidence for an ARCH-type process for the conditional variance. In the analysis that follows in Sections III and IV we are interested in understanding in detail the nature of stock market volatility in these five countries. In particular, we are interested in investigating whether there has been a trend towards higher stock market volatility in these markets. We also use our data set to inquire whether high volatility states coincide across countries.

III. Stock Returns Volatility and Breakpoints: Univariate Analysis

III.1 The Model

Most studies on stock returns volatility are based on the estimation of GARCH-type models discussed in Campbell, Lo and MacKinlay (1997). Although standard GARCH models are parsimonious, and are able to capture the time varying nature of volatility, they fail to capture structural shifts in the data that are caused by low probability events, such as the stock market Crash of 1987, the so-called Tequila effect, or other international financial crises, among other. In this paper we use a variant of the model of Hamilton and Susmel (1994) to explicitly model the dynamics of switching variance. Hamilton and Susmel (1994) modify the ARCH specification to account for such structural changes in the data and propose a Switching ARCH (SWARCH) model. The SWARCH (K,q) model used in this paper is:

(1) $\Delta r_t = a_0 + a_1\,\Delta r_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \qquad \varepsilon_t|I_{t-1} \sim N(0,h_t)$

(2) $h_t/\gamma_{st} = \alpha_0 + \Sigma_{i=1}\,\alpha_i\,\varepsilon^2_{t-i}/\gamma_{st-i} \qquad i = 1,2,...,q, \text{ and } s_t=1,2,..,K,$

where r_t is the log of the stock market index, and the γ's are scale parameters that capture the change in regime. One of the γ's is unidentified and, hence, γ_1 is set equal to 1.

The SWARCH model requires a formulation of the probability law that causes the economy to switch among regimes. One simple specification is that the state of the economy is the outcome of a K-state Markov chain that is independent of r_t for all t:

(3) $$\text{Prob}\,(s_t = j|s_{t-1} = i, s_{t-2} = k, \ldots, r_t, r_{t-1}, r_{t-2}, \ldots) = \text{Prob}\,(s_t = j|s_{t-1} = i) = p_{ij}.$$

Under this specification, the transition probabilities, the p_{ij}'s, are constant. For example, if the economy was in a high volatility state last period (s_t=2), the probability of changing to the low volatility state (s_t=1) is a fixed constant p_{21}. Maximum likelihood estimation of the model (1)-(3) is straightforward --see Hamilton (1989) for details. For the univariate estimates, each country is estimated independently of the other.

As a byproduct of the maximum likelihood estimation, Hamilton (1989) shows that it is possible to make inferences about the particular state of the market under study, at any date. The "filter probabilities," $p(s_t,s_{t-1}|r_t,r_{t-1},..,r_{-3})$, denote the conditional probability that the state at date t is s_t, and that at date t-1 was s_{t-1}. These probabilities are conditional on the values of r observed through date t. The "smooth probabilities," $p(s_t|r_T,r_{T-1},...,r_{-3})$, on the other hand, are inferences about the state at date t based on data available through some future date T (end of sample). For a two-state specification, for example, the smooth probabilities at time t are represented by a 2x1 vector denoting the probability estimates of the two states. That is, the smooth probabilities represent the ex-post inference made by an analyst/econometrician about the state of the security at time t, based on the entire time series.

II. 2 Results

As a first step in our analysis of stock markets volatility we estimated, for each one of the series, a simple AR(1)-GARCH(1,1) model. The results, reported in Table 2, indicate that there are significant ARCH effects for all the series. The LB statistics for the standardized residuals show no further evidence of autocorrelation in the level of the standardized residuals or in the squared standardized residuals. The size of α_1 tends to be unusually high for high frequency financial time series. Also, for Chile β_1 is unusually low. Moreover, for most countries the sum of α_1 and β_1 is close to one, which makes shocks to the conditional variance highly persistent over time.[2] Lamoureux and Lastrapes (1990) and Hamilton and Susmel (1994) argue that the observed high persistence of shocks to the conditional variance is a sign of structural change in the statistical process generating the variance.

We formally test the null hypothesis of no regime-switch by using the likelihood ratio test proposed by Hansen (1992, 1994). A likelihood ratio test of this null hypothesis does not have the usual limiting chi-squared distribution, because the parameters p_{ij} are unidentified under the null. Hansen (1992) proposes a test, based on empirical theory process, that is able to provide an upper bound to the asymptotic distribution of standardized likelihood ratio statistics, even when conventional regularity conditions (such as unidentified parameters) are violated.[3] We calculate Hansen's test for all the series under the null hypothesis of no regime-switching, using a four-lag Newey-West correction. The standardized likelihood ratio tests and their corresponding p-values are reported in Table 2. As may be seen, the hypothesis of no regime switch is rejected in all cases.

After rejecting the hypothesis of no-regime switch, the next step is to use the (SWARCH) model of Hamilton and Susmel (1994), to identify periods of unusually high volatility. We fit different SWARCH specifications. We estimated models with K=2 to 4 states and q=0 to 3 autoregressive terms. We estimated SWARCH models with asymmetric effects, as proposed by Glosten, Jaganathan and Runkle (1993)[4] and with t-distributed conditional errors. Since we are interested in bivariate switching results, and three states considerably complicate the bivariate estimation, we focus our attention to a two-state system. Our results suggest, however, that for

---

[2] Again, it is usual to observe, in high frequency financial series, the so-called Integrated GARCH model, where $\alpha_1+\beta_1=1$.

[3] To get around the problem of no identified parameters under the null, Hansen (1994) defines a function

$$q_t(\zeta) = L_t[\zeta,\lambda(\zeta)] - L_t[\zeta_0,\lambda(\zeta_0)],$$

where $L_t[\zeta,\lambda(\zeta)]$, represents the conditional log likelihood of the tth observation when evaluated at ζ and $\lambda(\zeta)$. The parameters ζ and λ represent a partition of the parameter space. For the two-state case $\zeta=(p_{11},p_{22},\gamma_2)$. Under the null hypothesis of no regime-switching $\zeta=\zeta_0=(1,0,1)$. We investigated a grid containing 345 possible parameters for ζ under the alternative hypothesis, with Z consisting of these 345 possibilities considered. For any ζ, $\lambda(\zeta)$ is estimated by maximizing the likelihood with respect to λ, given ζ. Hansen (1994) proposes the following standardized test:

$$LR = \max_{\zeta\varepsilon Z}\ T\, mq(\zeta)/[\Sigma_t\,(q_t(\zeta) - mq(\zeta))^2]^{1/2},$$

where mq is the mean of q_t. Hansen shows that, if the null hypothesis of no regime-change is true, then for large samples the probability that LR would exceed a critical value z is less than the probability that a Monte Carlo simulated statistic would exceed the same value z.

[4] We estimated the following SWARCH model, which incorporates an asymmetric effect of negative news: $h_t/\gamma_{st} = \alpha_0 + \Sigma_{i=1}\,\alpha_i\,\varepsilon^2_{t-i}/\gamma_{st-I} + \kappa\, L_{t-1}\,\varepsilon^2_{t-i}/\gamma_{st-I}$ $i = 1,2,...,q$, and $s_t=1,2,..,K$, where $L_{t-1}= 0$ if $\varepsilon_{t-I} <0$ and $L_{t-1}=1$, otherwise.

some countries a three-state SWARCH models may be appropriate[5]. The results obtained are reported in Table 3. Several interesting findings emerge from this table. First, the switching parameters, the γ_i's, are significantly different than one in all series. That is, for each of our five national stock markets it is possible to distinguish a ***"low,"*** and a ***"high"*** volatility state. Second, for all the series we notice that using the SWARCH(2,1) model causes the ARCH effects to be reduced or to disappear. Third, with the exception of Chile, we find no evidence for an asymmetric effect of negative news on conditional volatility. That is, with the exception of Chile, unexpected negative surprises to returns do not have a bigger impact on volatility than positive news.

The results for the estimated γ_i's are particularly interesting. As Hamilton and Susmel (1994) show, γ_j provides an estimate of the ratio of the conditional variance in state j, relative to the "low volatility" state. That is, in our two-state case, γ_2 provides information on how much higher is high volatility relative to low volatility. For example, in one extreme, for Argentina's stock returns the high volatility state is on average around *ten times* higher than that in the low volatility state. On the other hand, for Hong Kong the high volatility state is on average around *five times* higher than that in the low volatility state.

The basic results obtained from our bivariate analysis are summarized in Figures 1 through 5. Consider first Figure 1. The top panel presents plots the Argentinean weekly stock returns. The second panel plots the smoothed probability that the economy was at state 1 (low volatility) at time t;, the third panel plots the smoothed probability that the economy was at state 2 (high volatility) at time t. The observations are classified following Hamilton's (1989) proposed method for dating regime switches. According to this procedure, an observation belongs to state i if the smoothed probability $Prob(s_t=i|r_T,r_{T-1},...,r_{-3})$ is higher than 0.5. According to Figure 1, stock market returns in Argentina switch between the low volatility state and the high volatility state during the first four years of the sample. Then, starting in 1993 – a time that coincides with the consolidation of Argentina's currency board -- Argentine stock returns tend to have long stays in the low volatility state. Only during the Mexican (late 1994), Asian (late 1997), Russian (August-September 1998) and Brazilian (January 1999) crises, Argentine stock returns switched to the high volatility state.

[5] Standard likelihood ratios reject, with the exception of Mexico, the null hypothesis of a two-state model against the three-state model. Standard likelihood ratio tests, however, cannot be used, because the parameters p_{ij}, for the third state, are unidentified under the null hypothesis of two-states. Precise Hansen (1992) tests are computationally expensive in this case, because of the large number of parameters needed for the grid. Interestingly enough, our analysis on domestic interest rates in these five countries suggests that a three-state representation is more adequate for interest rates.

Figures 2 to 5 present similar graphs for Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Hong Kong. In general, we observe a similar behavior than for the Argentinean case.

An interesting feature of the results in Figures 1 to 5 is that, at a first glance, it appears that since late 1994 the stays of Latin American stock market returns in the high volatility states correspond (roughly) to foreign (exogenous) events. Indeed, the analysis of the figures indicate that after 1994 shifts to the high volatility state tend to coincide with the Mexican crisis, the Asian crisis, the Russian crisis, and the Brazilian crisis, respectively. These results may suggest that indeed emerging markets were subject to some form of "volatility contagion" during these crises upheavals. We analyze this hypothesis in greater detail in the next section, where we use a bivariate switching volatility model to investigate whether we can reject the hypothesis of volatility co-movements and independence in pairs of countries. It is important to notice that the "high volatility" state detected before 1994 cannot be attributed –or at least nor easily– to external events.

In order to investigate this issue further, we estimated, for each of our five countries, a *three-states* SWARCH model. We label the third state as "unusually high volatility." The results from this exercise can be summarized as follows (figures and details available on request):

(1) All four Latin American countries exhibit an "unusually high volatility"spike in late 1994. This corresponds to what has come to be known as the "tequila effect" crisis. As we expected, Mexico – the country where the 1994 currency crisis began– was the first country to experience, at this time, a shift to the "unusually high volatility"state.

(2) Volatility of stock market returns in Hong-Kong did not experience an increase at the time of the "tequila crisis." Interestingly, this contrasts with the behavior of nominal domestic interest rates analyzed by Edwards and Susmel (2000).

(3) In four of the countries in the sample there are "unusually high volatility spikes" in late 1997, at the time the Hong Kong currency board came under attack. The only exception to this is Chile.

(4) Four of the countries experienced a shift to the "unusually high volatility state" in August-September 1998, when Russia devalued the ruble and defaulted on its debt. Chile is, once again, the exception

(5) Finally, Argentina, Brazil and Mexico experienced a shift in volatility to the "unusually high state" in January 1999, when Brazil devalued the real and entered into a (short-lived) crisis.

A particularly interesting result from this exercise is that for Hong Kong and Chile, countries with a history of credible economic policies, the "unusually high" volatility periods are few and do not last more than two weeks. Indeed, the relative long stays in the "unusually high" volatility state and the relative high occurrence of unusual volatility for Argentina, Brazil and Mexico are likely to reflect a low degree of credibility enjoyed by the government economic policies, especially in the period before 1994.[6]

Table 4 contains a summary of our findings on the extent and duration of "unusually high volatility" in the periods surrounding the Mexican, East Asian, Russian and Brazilian currency crises of the 1990s. Each entry, in Table 4, provides, for each of our countries, a starting date for the high volatility state, as well as the number of weeks the economy was in the high volatility state. Although we are reluctant to label these episodes as "volatility contagion," we argue that it is suggestive that our countries experienced a significant increase in volatility in the period ***following*** a major crisis. It is also interesting to note that the crises countries themselves are indeed the first to experience a shift to the high volatility state. The fact that the dates of high volatility states ***roughly coincide***, is indeed suggestive, but does not constitute statistical evidence in favor of either the "volatility co-movement" or the "volatility contagion" hypotheses. In order to investigate this issue formally, it is necessary to extend the SWARCH model used in this section to the multivariate case. This we do in the section that follows.

IV. Cross Country Volatility Co-Movements: Multivariate Results

The results from the preceding section provide some preliminary evidence of (roughly) coincidental stock market volatility switches across countries during the second half of the 1990s. In this section, we explore this issue further by developing a bivariate switching volatility model.[7] We take advantage of the Markov process by the Hamilton (1989) filter to test whether volatility states are *independent* across countries. Generally speaking, there will be *independence*, if national stock markets are segmented. If, however, stock markets are highly integrated, shocks will be transmitted rapidly across countries, and the hypothesis of independence would be rejected.

[6] See Ruge-Murcia (1995) for a "credibility" interpretation of switching states along the lines discussed here.

[7] Edwards (1998) finds evidence of "volatility spillovers" among Mexico, Argentina and Chile. This finding seems to confirm a positive correlation of high variances in international stock markets.

To test the above hypotheses, we estimate a multivariate formulation of the SWARCH model. As it turns out, this multivariate SWARCH model is extremely intensive in computation time. This means that the econometrician has to make some choices in terms of the number of volatility states, and number of countries included in the analysis. In order to keep the number of parameters tractable, in this section we estimate a bivariate SWARCH model – that is, we restrict our analysis to the case of two countries and two volatility states (high volatility and low volatility). In order to organize the discussion, and reduce the dimensionality of the problem, we concentrate on the cases of Mexico and Hong-Kong. More specifically, we investigate whether it is possible to reject the hypotheses that the volatility processes are independent in the following pairs of countries:

(a) Mexico-Argentina, Mexico-Brazil, Mexico-Chile;

(b) Hong Kong-Argentina, Hong Kong-Brazil, Hong Kong-Chile;

(c) Hong Kong-Mexico.

This already gives us seven two-country combinations. We have focused on Mexico and Hong Kong -- which we call (potential) volatility "originators"– because we want to explore the (popular) notion that the crises originated in these countries spread into what was then called the ***"Tequila Effect***" and the ***"Asian Flu,"*** respectively.[8] We refer to the other three countries -- Argentina, Chile and Brazil – as ***"potential recipient countries"***. Testing whether volatility states were (statistically) related across "originator" and "recipient" countries is indeed the purpose of this section.

Suppose then that we have two series (countries), with two volatility states. In this bivariate formulation, the number of states is four. For instance, with Mexico and Argentina in a system, we have the following four primitive states, s_t*:

s_t*=1: Mexico - Low volatility, Argentina- Low volatility.

s_t*=2: Mexico - Low volatility, Argentina- High volatility.

s_t*=3: Mexico - High volatility, Argentina - Low volatility.

s_t*=4: Mexico - High volatility, Argentina - High volatility.

[8] Of course, the Asian crisis could be dated a bit earlier, with the collapse of the Thai Baht. However, as the data in Figures 3 through 7 clearly show, no country in our sample suffered increase instability until the Hong Kong Dollar was attacked by speculators in late October, 1997.

The system can be written as:

(4) $\mathbf{r_t} = A + B\,\mathbf{r_{t-1}} + \mathbf{e_t}$, $\mathbf{e_t}|I_{t-1} \sim N(0,\mathbf{H}_t)$,

where $\mathbf{r_t} = [r^x_t, r^y_t]$ is a 2x1 vector of returns, $\mathbf{e_t} = [e^x_t, e^y_t]$ is a 2x1 vector of disturbances, which follow a bivariate normal distribution, with zero mean and a time varying conditional covariance matrix H_t (for notational convenience, we drop the dependence of H_t on the states of the economy). The conditional covariance matrix $\mathbf{H}_t$ is specified as a constant correlation matrix where the diagonal elements follow a SWARCH process. We allow the correlation coefficient to be state-dependent. We let the correlation coefficient to change with the volatility state of the ***originator*** country.[9] This formulation provides an algebraic model that defines the notion of originator. An originator is a country whose change in the volatility state causes a change in the correlation coefficient with a recipient country. Later, we relax this assumption. The specification set in equation (4) allows the series r^x_t and r^y_t to be related through the non-linearities associated with dependent states. $\mathbf{A} = [a_x, a_y]$ and $B = [b_x, b_y]$ are 2x1 vectors.

As it was assumed for the univariate case, the probability law that causes the economy to switch among states is given by a K*=4 state Markov chain, P*, with a typical element given by $\text{Prob}(s_t^* = j|s_{t-1}^* = i) = p_{ij}^*$. For the four state model, some of the p_{ij}^*'s are close to zero, in order to get convergence, we treat these parameters as given, and equal to zero. This reduces the number of parameters to be estimated. As discussed in Hamilton and Lin (1996), this specification is very general and encompasses different interactions among the volatility states of both countries. That is, the transition probabilities, the p_{ij}^*'s, could be restricted to fit different assumptions about the underlying volatility states. For example, focusing on p_{24}^*, if the volatility states of Mexico and Argentina are independent, $p_{24}^* = p_{12}^{Mex}\, p_{22}^{Arg}$. On the other hand, if the Mexican volatility states are shared by Argentina, then $p_{24}^* = 0$.

Our bivariate analysis is in three steps: (1) We first estimate the unrestricted model, together with the smoothed probabilities for the four states s^*_t=j (j=1,2,3,4) described above. We are interested in finding out whether pairs of countries are jointly in the "high-high" volatility state, and more specifically we are interested in determining whether this happens around the time of the currency crises of the 1990s. (2) In the second step we formally test whether the volatility states are independent across pairs of countries. And (3), for those cases

9 $\mathbf{H_t}$ is a 2x2 covariance matrix. The diagonal elements are given by equation (2), while the off-diagonal (covariance) elements, h^{xy}_t, are give by $h^{xy}_t = \rho_{st}\,[h^x_t, h^y_t]^{1/2}$, where ρ_{st} is the state-dependent correlation

where the null hypothesis of independence is rejected, we test two volatility synchronization hypothesis: (a) In the first one we test whether, when the "originator country" is in a high volatility state, the "recipient country" is ***always*** in the high volatility state. We call the behavior under this hypothesis "*high volatility synchronization*." (b) In our second test we inquire whether when the "originator country" is in a low volatility state, the "recipient country" is always in the low volatility state. We call the behavior under this hypothesis "*low volatility synchronization.*"

To test the null hypothesis of independent states, we first estimate a bivariate SWARCH model, imposing no restriction on the matrix P*. The log likelihood function of the unrestricted model is denoted as $L(H_A)$. We also estimate the model by imposing the restricted transition probability matrix, P*, with elements such as $p_{14}^{*}=p_{12}^{x}\, p_{12}^{y}$. From this estimation, we keep the log likelihood function of the restricted model, $L(H_0)$. Then, we calculate a Likelihood Ratio test, $LR = -2^{*}(L(H_0)-L(H_A))$. Under the null hypothesis, this test has a χ^2 distribution, with k degrees of freedom, where k is given by the number of additional parameters estimated under the alternative hypothesis.

Figure 6 through 14 display the estimated smooth probabilities corresponding to each of the four s_t^{*} states described above. Consider, for example, Figure 6 on Mexico and Argentina. The first panel presents the probability that both countries are jointly in a low probability state. The second panel contains the probability of Mexico being in a low state and Argentina in a high volatility state. Panel 3 corresponds to the probability that Mexico is in a high volatility state, while Argentina is in a low volatility state. Finally, the fourth panel is the probability that both countries are in a high volatility state.

Since we are particularly interested in the transmission of high volatility, in the discussion that follows we focus, mostly, on the fourth panel for each country pair. The results are quite revealing. While there are several instances that Mexico and Argentina are in a high volatility state, this only happens after 1994, and it tends to happen only at the time when there are major international crises . In general, the same behavior is observed for the cases of Mexico and Brazil (Figure 7), and Mexico and Chile (Figure 9). We interpret these joint high-high periods as responding to exogenous events (i.e. the Mexican, Asian, Russian and Brazilian crises) jointly affecting both countries.

---

coefficient.

The estimated smooth probabilities when Honk Kong is the “originator country” are in Figure 9 through 12 and are also quite interesting. First, and surprisingly perhaps, they show that Argentina and Honk Kong stock markets jointly experienced a high volatility state –i.e., prob(s_t*=4)>0.5– during a number of periods, *going back to 1991*. These figures also show that in the latter part of 1997 –at the time when the East Asian currency crisis was in full swing – Hong Kong and Argentina were jointly in the high volatility state. Second, these figures also show that after the attack on the Hong Kong currency board in late October, 1997, Brazil and Hong Kong experienced short periods of joint high volatility. Throughout 1998, both countries also experienced joint high-high periods. In contrast, Figures 10 and 11, on Hong-Kong and Brazil, and Hong Kong and Chile respectively, show that some of the joint states are not very well defined. These results might indicate that these two pairs might have some structure in the Markov matrix, which is not well captured by the unconstrained model.

Our bivariate technique can be used to investigate the extent to which Brazil’s currency crisis of January 1999 spilled-over to its MERCOSUR trading bloc partners, Argentina and Chile.[10] This is an important exercise, since a number of authors have argued that financial contagion is mostly regional, and is particularly strong across countries that have a close trade ties. The estimated smooth probabilities for Argentina and Chile, when Brazil is considered to be the “originator,” are shown in Figure 13 and 14, respectively. These figures show that during all international crises Brazil, Argentina and Chile share the same high volatility-state. Interestingly enough, the second state (Brazil low volatility and the other country high volatility) is not very well defined and does not show persistence.

Tables 5 to 7 summarize the results obtained from the actual estimation of the bivariate SWARCH models. These tables contain the estimated SWARCH parameters for each country, state-dependent correlation coefficients, as well as the Likelihood Ratio test for the null hypothesis that the volatility states are independent across each pair of countries. In Tables 5 and 6, we present the results for Mexico and Brazil, taken as “originator” countries. We find strong evidence for state dependent correlations with the originator country, especially with Mexico. In general, our correlation estimates are very close to the ones obtained in the very recent literature on contagion, see Forbes and Rigobon (1999). The correlation coefficient between Mexico and the other Latin American markets jumps between two and four times when

[10] Argentina is a full member of MERCOSUR; Chile is an associate member.

Mexico is in the high volatility state. Forbes and Rigobon (1999) argue that under heteroscedastic conditions, the estimates of the correlation coefficient in the high volatility state are biased. The SWARCH model, however, explicitly models heteroscedasticity, and if this is the correct model, our estimators are maximum likelihood estimates. An important difference between our analysis and more traditional results, is that we do not use correlation coefficients to test dependence. Instead our dependence tests are based on the Markov structure of the Hamilton process, as described above.

According to our results the independence state hypothesis can be rejected for all Latin American stock markets. For these Latin American cases, we then tested the two null hypotheses of *volatility synchronization* discussed above. In Tables 5 and 6, we report these tests. We reject *the "high volatility synchronization"* hypothesis, which states that when the "originator country" is in a high volatility state, the "recipient country" *is always* in the high volatility state. With the exception of the Brazil-Argentina pair, we also reject the *"low volatility synchronization"* hypothesis. That is, for Argentina and Brazil, we find that when Brazil is in a stable, low volatility period, Argentina is also in the low volatility period. That is, the second state is not well defined. This result is consistent with the findings in Figure 13, where the second state smoothed probabilities do not have a clear economic interpretation. A natural interpretation of this result is that no-news in Brazil, is good news in Argentina. Overall, taking into account the economic linkages of Latin American economies, these results point out to a non-linear interdependence of their stock markets.

In Table 7, we present the results when we take Hong Kong as the "originator country." Overall these results suggest low correlations. Notice, however, that the correlations between Hong Kong and the Latin American countries increase during the periods of high volatility in Hong Kong. But as argued in Edwards and Susmel (2000) low or zero correlations do not imply independence. After all, contagion is a non-linear event, difficult to be captured by a standard correlation coefficient. We find dependence between Hong Kong-Argentina, and Hong Kong-Mexico. We cannot reject the independence hypothesis between Hong Kong-Brazil, and Hong Kong and Chile. This result might reflect the existence of capital controls in both Brazil and Chile during much of the period covered by our analysis. The independence of the volatility processes of these two pairs might also explain the findings in Figures 10 and 11, where some of the states where not clearly defined. For Hong Kong-Argentina, and Hong Kong-Mexico, however, we also reject both versions of the synchronization hypothesis. [11]

In Table 8, we relax the assumption that correlations change only when the "originator country" changes its volatility state. We estimate the four-state SWARCH model allowing for correlations to change across each state. The pattern of increased correlations during high volatility periods of an originator country, implied by typical contagion stories, is only observed when Mexico is the originator. When Brazil or Hong Kong are taken as originators countries, the pattern is not clear. For example, the correlation coefficient between Argentina and Brazil is significantly (twice or more) higher when both countries are in the low volatility state. Hong Kong and Chile also have unusual correlation patterns. The correlation coefficients are the highest when Chile is in the high volatility state. A similar pattern is observed for Hong Kong and Mexico. These results point out the shortcomings of arbitrarily splitting the sample and then using the correlation coefficients in the arbitrarily partitioned data set as a measure of contagion.

V. Concluding Remarks

In this paper we use weekly stock return data for a group of Latin American and Asian countries to analyze the behavior of volatility through time. For this purpose, we use univariate and bivariate switching ARCH models. We find strong evidence for state-varying volatility during the 1990s in Latin American stock markets. The univariate results indicate that high-volatility episodes are, in general, short-lived and tend to be associated with common international crisis. We then examined the joint behavior of Latin American and Hong Kong stock returns. We find that Latin American markets have interdependent volatility processes. When Hong Kong, taken as a representative Asian market, is included in the analysis, Chile and Brazil show no volatility dependence with that Asian market. In general, we observe strong dependence among regional lines, especially among the Mercosur countries. With the exception of Mexico, the correlation coefficients do not show the typical behavior under the contagion hypothesis. Overall, we interpret our results as being more supportive of interdependence than of contagion stories.

[11] We also tested an even stronger version of the high volatility synchronization hypothesis, the common states hypothesis. Under this null hypothesis, both countries share the same volatility states. The common states null hypothesis was rejected in all the cases, with a p-value lower than .0001

References

Ball, C. and W. Torous (1995), “ Regime Shifts in short term riskless interest rates” Working Paper, #15-95, unpublished manuscript, The Anderson School, UCLA.

Bennet, P. and J. Kelleher (1988), `The International Transmission of Stock Price Disruption in October 1987,' Federal Reserve Bank of New York Quarterly Review, Summer 1988, 13: 17-33.

Edwards, S. (1998), "Interest rate Volatility, Contagion and Convergence: An Empirical Investigation of the Cases of Argentina, Chile and Mexico," Journal of Applied Economics, 1,1.

Edwards, S. (1999), “How Effective are Capital Controls?” Journal of Economic Perspectives, Fall,

Edwards, S. (2000), “Contagion,” The World Economy,

Edwards, S. and R. Susmel (2000), “Interest Rate Volatility in Emerging Markets: Evidence from the 1990s,” NBER Working Paper 7813.

Engle, R.F. (1982), "Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity with Estimates of the Variance of U.K," Econometrica, 50, 987-1008.

Engle, R.F. and V.K. Ng (1993), "Measuring and Testing the impact of news on Volatility," Journal of Finance, 48, 1749-1778.

Engle, R. F., T. Ito, and W-L Lin (1990), `Meteor Shower or Heat Waves. Heteroskedastic Intra-Daily Volatility in the Foreign Exchange-Market,' Econometrica, May 1990, 55: 525-542.

Forbes, K. and R. Rigobon (1999), “No Contagion, Only Interdependece: Measuring Stock Market Co-Movements,” NBER Working Paper n. 7267.

Glosten, L.R., R. Jaganathan and D. Runkle (1993), "Relationship between the Expected Value and the Volatility of the Nominal Excess Return on Stocks," Journal of Finance, 48, 1779-1801.

Goodwin, T.H. (1993), "Business-Cycle Analysis with a Markov-Switching Model," Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 11, 331-339.

Hamao, Y., R. Masulis, and V. Ng (1990), `Correlations in Price Changes and Volatility across International Stock Markets,' Review of Financial Studies, 1990, 3: 281-308.

Hamilton, James D. (1989), "A New Approach to the Economic Analysis of Nonstationary Time Series and the Business Cycle," Econometrica, 57, 357-384.

Hamilton, James D. (1996), "Specification Testing in Markov-Switching Time Series Models," Journal of Econometrics, 70, 127-157.

Hamilton, James D. and R. Susmel (1994), "Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity and Changes in Regime," Journal of Econometrics, 64, 307-333.

Hansen, B.E. (1992), "The Likelihood Ratio Test under Non-standard Conditions: Testing the Markov Trend Model of GNP," Journal of Applied Econometrics, 7, S61-S82.

Hansen, B.E. (1994), "Erratum: The Likelihood Ratio Test under Non-standard Conditions: Testing the Markov Trend Model of GNP," working paper, Boston College.

King, M. and S. Wadhwani (1990), `Transmission of Volatility Between Stock Markets,' Review of Financial Studies, 1990, 3: 5-33.

Lamoureux, C.G. and W. D. Lastrapes (1990), "Persistence in Variance, Structural Change and the GARCH Model," Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 5, 121-129.

Longin, F. and B. Solnik (1995), “Is the correlation in international equity returns constant: 1960-1990?” Journal of International Money and Finance, 14, 3-23.

Ljung, G. and G. Box (1978), “On a Measure of Lack of Fit in Time Series Models,” Biometrika, March 1978, 65: 297-303.

Ruge-Murcia, F. (1995), "Credibility and Changes in Policy Regime," Journal of Political Economy,

Susmel, R. (2000), "Switching Volatility in International Equity Markets," International Journal of Economics and Finance.

TABLE 1: Univariate Statistics for Stock Returns (USD) in Latin American Interest Rates

Series	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Mexico	Hong Kong
Mean	0.225	0.179	0.290	0.247	0.243
SD	7.741	8.279	4.137	4.893	3.895
Skewness	-0.417	-1.239	-0.152	-0.982	-1.030
Kurtosis	11.916	8.372	17.477	6.458	6.047
JB-Normality test	3127.3*	1670.8*	6696.7*	998.56*	894.43*
LB(6)	23.26*	3.24	3.98	12.45	5.88
LBS(6)	88.58*	79.08*	125.73*	55.53*	12.11

Notes:
SD: Standard Deviation
JB-Normality test: Jarque-Bera test, which is distributed χ^2_2.
LB(6): Ljung-Box test for returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.
LBS(6): Ljung-Box test for squared returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.

TABLE 2. ESTIMATION OF AR(1)-GARCH(1,1):

$\Delta r_t = a_0 + a_1 \Delta r_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t|I_{t-1} \sim N(0,h_t)$

$h_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon^2_{t-1} + \beta_1 h_{t-1}$

	Argentina	Brazil	Chile
a_o	0.282 (0.23)	0.245 (0.22)	0.178 (0.15)*
a_1	0.073 (0.05)	0.074 (0.05)	0.271 (0.06)*
α_0	3.899 (1.09)*	1.179 (0.72)	3.504 (1.77)*
α_1	0.310 (0.09)*	0.290 (0.05)*	0.460 (0.11)*
β_1	0.656 (0.07)*	0.762 (0.04)*	0.402 (0.17)*
Likelihood	-1710.49	-1781.57	-1413.22
LB(6)	2.91	3.79	3.19
LBS(6)	0.87	0.86	2.46
Hansen-Standardized LR test (simulated 1% critical value)	5.62 (3.11)	6.17 (2.98)	3.07 (2.88)

	Mexico	Hong Kong
a_o	0.700 (0.19)*	0.437 (0.65)*
a_1	0.074 (0.05)	-0.033 (0.05)
α_0	3.313 (1.22)*	0.705 (0.34)*
α_1	0.283 (0.08)*	0.157 (0.05)*
β_1	0.614 (0.10)*	0.816 (0.05)*
Likelihood	-1539.72	-1421.93
LB(6)	1.74	5.50
LBS(6)	7.27	11.32
Hansen-Standardized LR test (simulated 1% critical value)	3.65 (3.03)	4.18 (3.23)

Notes:
Likelihood: GARCH(1,1) likelihood function.
Hansen-Standardized LR test: Hansen (1994) test. Null hypothesis is no switching.
LB(6): Ljung-Box test for returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.
LBS(6): Ljung-Box test for squared returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.

TABLE 3. ESTIMATION OF AR(1)-SWARCH(2,1)

$\Delta r_t = a_0 + a_1 \Delta r_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\varepsilon_t|I_{t-1} \sim N(0,h_t)$
$h_t/\gamma_{st} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \varepsilon^2_{t-1}/\gamma_{st-1}$

	Argentina	Brazil	Chile
a_o	0.274 (0.20)	0.421 (0.24)	0.191 (0.14)
a_1	0.044 (0.05)	0.057 (0.05)	0.205 (0.05)*
α_0	11.478 (1.31)*	12.581 (2.35)*	5.495 (0.83)*
α_1	0.266 (0.07)*	0.234 (0.07)*	0.185 (0.08)
γ_2	10.177 (1.63)+	7.530 (1.18)+	7.831 (2.34)+
Likelihood	-1673.5	-1757.2	-1374.6
Likelihood SWARCH(3,1)	-1665.6	-1739.8	-1362.8
LB(6)	6.48	10.90	9.48
LBS(6)	2.44	4.55	7.36
Likelihood SWARCH(2,1)-L	-1673.4	-1755.9	-1368.9
Likelihood SWARCH(2,2)	-1673.4	-1755.1	-1374.6

	Mexico	Hong Kong
a_o	0.474 (0.17)*	0.469 (0.14)*
a_1	0.096 (0.05)	-0.017(0.04)
α_0	11.179 (1.03)*	6.858 (2.54)*
α_1	...	...
γ_2	6.915 (1.24)+	5.179 (1.10)+
Likelihood	-1513.1	-1405.0
Likelihood SWARCH(3,1)	-1509.2	-1399.1
LB(6)	8.73	9.78
LBS(6)	0.65	1.19
Likelihood SWARCH(2,1)-L	-1512.4	-1404.0
Likelihood SWARCH(2,2)	-1513.1	-1404.2

Notes:
Likelihood: SWARCH(2,1) likelihood function.
Likelihood SWARCH(K,q): SWARCH(K,q) likelihood function.
Likelihood SWARCH(2,1): SWARCH(2,1) with asymmetric effects likelihood function.
LB(6): Ljung-Box test for returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.
LBS(6): Ljung-Box test for squared returns with 6 lags, which is distributed χ^2_6.

TABLE 4: IDENTIFYING HIGH VOLATILITY EPISODES AROUND MAJOR CURRENCY CRISES: December 1994-April 1999

	MEX CRISIS 12/22/94	ASIAN CRISIS 10/23/97	RUS CRISIS 9/03/98	BRAZ CRISIS 1/14/94
ARGENTINA	2/09/95 (7)	10/30/97 (2)	8/06/98 (9)	xxx
BRAZIL	2/16/95 (5)	10/30/97 (3)	8/06/98 (9)	1/14/99 (2)
CHILE	3/09/95 (2)	xxx	xxx	xxx
MEXICO	12/15/94 (17)	10/23/97 (4)	8/06/98 (12)	1/14/99 (3)
HONG KONG	xxx	10/23/97 (1)	xxx	xxx

Notes:
Each entry provides a starting date for the high volatility state (3rd state) and the number of weeks the economy was in the high volatility state during each crisis. xxx means the economy was not in the 3rd state during the given crisis.

TABLE 5: MEXICO ORIGINATOR: SWARCH(2,1) BIVARIATE SYSTEM

	Coefficients (Standard errors)		
	Receptor Argentina	Receptor Brazil	Receptor Chile
$a_{M,o}$	0.569 (0.17)*	0.462 (0.17)*	0.491 (0.17)*
$a_{M,1}$	0.053 (0.06)	0.073 (0.13)	0.057 (0.04)
$\alpha_{M,0}$	9.956 (1.20)*	10.606 (1.05)*	11.202 (1.01)*
$\alpha_{M,1}$	0.152 (0.13)	0.071 (0.05)	.001 (0.13)
$\gamma_{M,2}$	6.182 (1.24)+	4.526 (0.71)+	6.850 (1.23)+
$a_{Rec,o}$	0.455 (0.19)*	0.326 (0.22)	0.194 (0.13)
$a_{Rec,1}$	0.010 (0.04)	0.049 (0.05)	0.214 (0.05)*
$\alpha_{Rec,0}$	10.302 (1.37)*	10.795 (0.15)*	5.175 (0.63)*
$\alpha_{Rec,1}$	0.256 (0.07)*	0.140 (0.06)*	0.223 (0.07)*
$\gamma_{Rec,2}$	9.193 (1.41)+	8.072 (1.20)+	6.031 (1.13)+
$\rho_{M\text{-}LV}$	0.305 (0.06)*	0.200 (0.06)*	0.210 (0.05)*
$\rho_{M\text{-}HV}$	0.878 (0.03)*++	0.803 (0.03)*++	0.644 (0.07)*++
Likelihood SWARCH	-3102.6	-3202.5	-2850.2
Likelihood constant correlation	-3120.7	-3221.2	-2859.2
Likelihood 4 correlation coeff.	-3091.0	-3193.4	-2845.5
Likelihood-independent states	-3119.5	-3201.1	-2850.5
LR-independent states (p-value)	(>0.001)	(0.001)	(0.040)
Likelihood-common state	-3148.9	-3242.2	-2871.0
LR-common states (p-value)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)
Likelihood-HV synchronization	-3111.7	-3215.1	-2859.1
LR-HV synchronization (p-value)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)
Likelihood-LV synchronization	-3156.4	-3233.5	-2861.7
LR-LV synchronization (p-value)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)

Notes:

$\rho_{M\text{-}LV}$: correlation coefficient between Mexico and recipient country when Mexico is in the low volatility state.

$\rho_{M\text{-}HV}$: correlation coefficient between Mexico and recipient country when Mexico is in the high volatility state.

Likelihood SWARCH: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1).

Likelihood constant correlation: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) imposing a constant correlation across states.

Likelihood 4 correlation coefficient: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) four correlation coefficients.
Likelihood-independent states: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing independence states between the two series. (LR-independent states represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-HV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the high volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-HV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-LV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the low volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-LV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
* significant at the 5% level
+ significantly different than 1 (null hypothesis under no-switching)
++ significantly different state-dependent correlation coefficients (null hypothesis both correlation coefficients are equal)

TABLE 6: BRAZIL ORIGINATOR: SWARCH(2,1) BIVARIATE SYSTEM

	Coefficients (Standard errors)	
	Receptor Argentina	Receptor Chile
$a_{M,o}$	0.394 (0.24)*	0.507 (0.25)*
$a_{M,1}$	0.033 (0.05)	0.026 (0.05)
$\alpha_{M,0}$	15.054 (1.90)*	16.352 (2.66)*
$\alpha_{M,1}$	0.289 (0.08)*	0.224 (0.08)*
$\gamma_{M,2}$	5.960 (0.89)+	8.073 (1.36)+
$a_{Rec,o}$	0.320 (0.20)	0.173 (0.13)
$a_{Rec,1}$	0.022 (0.04)	0.199 (0.04)*
$\alpha_{Rec,0}$	11.341 (1.33)*	5.046 (0.73)*
$\alpha_{Rec,1}$	0.221 (0.07)*	0.226 (0.09)*
$\gamma_{Rec,2}$	9.344 (1.48)+	7.107 (1.67)+
$\rho_{B\text{-}LV}$	0.561 (0.05)*	0.321 (0.06)*
$\rho_{B\text{-}HV}$	0.199 (0.06)*++	0.271 (0.08)*
Likelihood SWARCH	-3376.0	-3101.8
Likelihood constant correlation	-3382.3	-3101.9
Likelihood 4 correlation coeff.	-3375.4	-3097.9
Likelihood-independent state	-3394.8	3112.1
LR-independent states (p-value)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)
Likelihood-common state	-3394.5	3106.0
LR-common states (p-value)	(>0.001)	(0.009)
Likelihood-HV synchronization	-3394.2	-3109.2
LR-HV synchronization (p-value)	(>0.001)	(>0.001)
Likelihood-LV synchronization	-3381.4	-3105.6
LR-HV synchronization (p-value)	(0.062)	(0.027)

Notes:
$\rho_{B\text{-}LV}$: correlation coefficient between Brazil and recipient country when Brazil is in the low volatility state.
$\rho_{B\text{-}HV}$: correlation coefficient between Brazil and recipient country when Brazil is in the high volatility state.
Likelihood SWARCH: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1).
Likelihood constant correlation: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) imposing a constant correlation across states.
Likelihood 4 correlation coefficient: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) four correlation coefficients.

Likelihood-independent states: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing independence states between the two series. (LR-independent states represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-HV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the high volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-HV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-LV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the low volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-LV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
* significant at the 5% level
+ significantly different than 1 (null hypothesis under no-switching)
++ significantly different state-dependent correlation coefficients (null hypothesis both correlation coefficients are equal)

TABLE 7: HONG KONG ORIGINATOR: SWARCH(2,1) BIVARIATE SYSTEM

	Coefficients (Standard errors)			
	Receptor Argentina	Receptor Brazil	Receptor Chile	Receptor Mexico
$a_{HK,o}$	0.479 (0.14)*	0.500 (0.14)*	0.476 (0.14)*	0.511 (0.15)*
$a_{HK,1}$	-0.038 (0.04)	-0.032 (0.04)	-0.033 (0.04)	-0.025 (0.04)
$\alpha_{HK,0}$	6.854 (0.76)*	6.898 (0.61)*	6.969 (0.63)*	7.167 (1.45)*
$\alpha_{HK,1}$	0.001 (0.11)	...	....	0.002 (0.20)
$\gamma_{HK,2}$	5.319 (0.78)+	5.141 (0.74)+	5.312 (0.79)+	5.357 (0.87)*+
$a_{Rec,o}$	0.403 (0.14)*	0.492 (0.23)*	0.226 (0.14)	0.546 (0.17)*
$a_{Rec,1}$	0.025 (0.04)	0.053 (0.05)	0.185 (0.04)*	0.086 (0.04)
$\alpha_{Rec,0}$	10.164 (1.37)*	12.200 (2.20)*	7.332 (0.74)*	10.860 (1.09)*
$\alpha_{Rec,1}$	0.241 (0.07)*	0.232 (0.07)*	0.223 (0.08)*	0.046 (0.06)
$\gamma_{Rec,2}$	10.684 (1.41)+	8.169 (1.32)+	6.031 (2.07)+	8.217 (1.71)*
$\rho_{HK\text{-}LV}$	0.123 (0.05)*	0.081 (0.06)	0.127 (0.02)*	0.236 (0.05)*
$\rho_{HK\text{-}HV}$	0.349 (0.08)*++	0.340 (0.08)*++	0.234 (0.06)*	0.400 (0.08)*
Likelihood SWARCH	-3061.6	-3149.1	-2770.5	-2887.1
Likelihood const. correl	-3064.0	-3151.9	-2770.9	-2888.2
Likelihood 4 correl coeff.	-3056.8	-3146.6	-2769.3	-2882.1
Likelihood-indep. state	-3064.7	-3152.4	-2773.4	-2891.7
LR-indep. states (p-value)	(0.045)	(0.159)	(0.056)	(0.032)
Likelihood-com. states	-3110.8			-2898.5
LR-com. states (p-value)	(>.001)			(.011)
Likelihood-HV synchr.	-3075.9			-2894.5
LR-HV synchr. (p-value)	(>.001)			(>.001)
Likelihood-LV synchr.	-3091.1			-2893.0
LR-LV synchr. (p-value)	(>.001)			(.001)

Notes:

$\rho_{HK\text{-}LV}$: correlation coefficient between Hong Kong and recipient country when Hong Kong is in the low volatility state.

$\rho_{HK\text{-}HV}$: correlation coefficient between Hong Kong and recipient country when Hong Kong is in the high volatility state.

Likelihood SWARCH: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1).

Likelihood constant correlation: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) imposing a constant correlation across states.

Likelihood 4 correlation coefficient: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) four correlation coefficients.

Likelihood-independent states: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing independence states between the two series. (LR-independent states represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-HV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the high volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-HV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
Likelihood-LV synchronization: likelihood function for the bivariate SWARCH(2,1) model estimated imposing the low volatility synchronization restriction. (LR-LV synchronization represents the likelihood ratio test, with its p-value in parenthesis).
* significant at the 5% level.
+ significantly different than 1 (null hypothesis under no-switching).
++ significantly different state-dependent correlation coefficients (null hypothesis both correlation coefficients are equal).

TABLE 8: SWARCH(2,1,2) STATE DEPENDENT CORRELATIONS

	correlation coefficient			
	LV_{OR} - LV_{REP}	LV_{OR} - HV_{REP}	HV_{OR} - LV_{REP}	HV_{OR} -HV_{REP}
Originator : Mexico				
Argentina	0.506 (0.06)	0.055 (0.08)	0.649 (0.13)	0.891 (0.03)
Brazil	0.503 (0.06)	0.089 (0.07)	0.859 (0.04)	0.715 (0.07)
Chile	0.225 (0.06)	0.161 (0.13)	0.424 (0.12)	0.776 (0.05)
Originator: Brazil				
Argentina	0.574 (0.05)	>0.001 (0.01)	0.197 (0.13)	0.254 (0.08)
Chile	0.290 (0.06)	0.949 (0.04)	0.013 (0.11)	0.422 (0.10)
Originator: Hong Kong				
Argentina	0.159 (0.07)	0.062 (0.09)	0.539 (0.09)	0.036 (0.14)
Brazil	0.231 (0.10)	>0.001 (0.01)	0.523 (0.12)	0.226 (0.10)
Chile	0.072 (0.07)	0.375 (0.15)	0.201 (0.11)	0.333 (0.21)
Mexico	0.234 (0.06)	0.672 (0.15)	0.617 (0.10)	0.155 (0.11)

FIGURE 1. Argentina:SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 2. Brazil: SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 3. Chile: SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 4. Mexico: SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 5. Hong Kong: SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 6. Mexico-Argentina: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 7. Mexico-Brazil: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 8. Mexico-Chile: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 9. Hong Kong-Argentina: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 10. Hong Kong-Brazil: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 11. Hong Kong-Chile: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 12. Hong Kong-Mexico: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 13. Brazil-Argentina: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States



FIGURE 14. Brazil-Chile: Bivariate SWARCH(2,1) Volatility States