MARCIN CHLEBUS

ONE-DAY PREDICTION OF STATE OF TURBULENCE FOR PORTFOLIO MODELS FOR BINARY DEPENDENT VARIABLE

One-Day Prediction of State of Turbulence for Portfolio.
Models for Binary Dependent Variable.

MARCIN CHLEBUS
Faculty of Economic Sciences
University of Warsaw
e-mail: mchlebus@wne.uw.edu.pl

Abstract

This paper proposes an approach to predict states (states of tranquillity and turbulence) for a current portfolio in a one-day horizon. The prediction is made using 3 different models for a binary variable (LOGIT, PROBIT, CLOGLOG), 4 definitions of a dependent variable (1%, 5%, 10%, 20% of worst realization of returns), 3 sets of independent variables (untransformed data, PCA analysis and factor analysis). Additionally an optimal cut-off point analysis is performed. The evaluation of the models was based on the LR test, Hosmer-Lemeshow test, GINI coefficient analysis and KROC criterion based on the ROC curve.

Six combinations of assumptions have been chosen as appropriate (any model for a binary variable, the dependent variable defined as 5% or 10% of worst realization of returns, untransformed data, 5% or 10% cut-off point respectively). Models built on these assumptions meet all the formal requirements and have a high predictive and discriminant ability.

Keywords:
prediction, state of turbulence, regime switching, risk management, risk measure, market risk.

JEL:
C53, C58, G17

INTRODUCTION

In this study, a family of models to predict the state of turbulence for financial time series data have been proposed. These models may be used in financial institutions in many ways. They can support the risk management process - for example - by generating a trigger that imposes stricter control processes or increases capital to cover extraordinary losses. The state of turbulence models may also be included in the measurement of market risk in a financial institution. The ability to recognize the state of a time series gives an opportunity to measure the level of risk in a state of tranquillity and a state of turbulence independently, which can provide more accurate measurements of the market risk in a financial institution.

The main aim of the proposed models is to predict, based on today's economic situation, the state, in which time series of financial data will be tomorrow.

The rest of the article has been prepared as follows: at the beginning a concept of the proposed models is discussed, then a framework and a testing process is presented, and finally in order to assess the quality of the proposed models, an empirical analysis has been made.

CONCEPT

The concept of the model to predict the state of turbulence for financial time series data comes from the broader issue - forecasting the state of the economy (forecasting a crisis) . Therefore, at the beginning, past studies of the methods used for predicting the state of a crisis have been analysed.

Forecasting the state of the economy is a widely discussed topic among macroeconomists. Prediction of a crisis (a negative state of the economy - a state of turbulence) may help in taking appropriate actions to avoid it. Therefore, many researchers have attempted to build models that can predict upcoming crises. These models are called EWS (Early Warning Systems) models.

EWS models, based on information from before the crisis, predict the probability of crisis occurrence within a specified period of time. These models are built on historical information. They are based on the assumption that the crises, despite their differences, have a common specificity that allows them to be treated as (from modelling point of view) homogenous. This hypothesis is discussed in Kamin(1999)[1]. However, the author compares only three cases, which do not fully reflect the whole scope of the problem. In fact, we can distinguish several types of crises (such as banking crises, currency crises) that are not only different to each other, but also very often are not independent and follow each other. Therefore, researchers usually build the early warning system for one of the crises types (a banking[2] or a currency crisis[3]).

Sometimes, distinction between types of crises is not sufficient enough. In order to obtain greater homogeneity, analysis is limited to certain type of economies (such as emerging

[1] Kamin Steven. *The current international financial crisis: how much is new?* "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System International Finance Working Paper". Working Paper Nr 636, 1999, s. 1-19. On Line. Dostęp 6 grudnia 2013.

[2] Barrell Ray, Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba, Liadze Iana. *Bank regulation, property prices and early warning systems for banking crises in OECD countries*. "Journal of Banking & Finance". Nr 34(9), 2010, s. 2255-2264.

[3] Eichengreen Barry, Rose Andrew, Wyplosz Charles, Dumas Bernard, Weber Axel. *Exchange Market Mayhem: The Antecedents and Aftermath of Speculative Attacks*. "Economic Policy". Nr 10(21), 1995, s. 249-312.

economies[4]). Definitions and classifications of crises do not matter from the perspective of building a model predicting the state of turbulence, since the proposed model is built for a much shorter time horizon. The state of turbulence should be treated as a period of increased risk rather than a period of crisis. Nevertheless, it is important to ensure a proper homogeneity in defining a state of turbulence. Only then, is it possible to effectively predict this period.

Despite the difference in the time horizon between classical EWS models and the proposed models, it is possible to use the methodology from EWS models to build the state of turbulence models. Types of models most commonly used to predict a crisis are: signalling models and logistic regression models. These models are used, *inter alia*, by Kaminsky *et al*.(1998) [5], Beckmann *et al*.(2006) [6], Davis and Karim(2008) [7] and Barrel *et al*.(2010) [8].

Based on the analysis of past studies, there is no conclusion as to which approach is better. Each has its pros and cons, which, depending on the circumstances, makes them more or less useful. It can be assumed that the LOGIT model is better when considering the less specific problems, when the most important thing is to capture the general relation between the occurrence of the crises and the variables under consideration. It means that models of this type are better suited for the analysis of global crises. In contrast, signalling models are better when the problem is considered to be more specific (national crises) [9].

The aim of the proposed model is to provide a universal tool for predicting the state of turbulence, therefore, the more appropriate model would be the logistic regression model (the LOGIT model). The most often mentioned disadvantages of the LOGIT model are its inability to determine the relative quality of a single variable and strength of its impact on the probability of the crisis, as well as, the difficulties in defining precise limits that indicate unusual values for a particular variable[10]. None of these disadvantages are critical for the model of predicting the state of turbulence, as the only information needed is a prediction on the state conditional on a whole data set of independent variables. In addition, the approach based on the LOGIT model is more objective than the signalling approach, since the choice of the significance of each variable is independent from the researcher.

While discussing EWS models based on the LOGIT approach, one of the key problems associated with this type of forecasting models should be described. The results obtained from the LOGIT model are probabilities of the crisis occurrence (obtained from a transformation of the logarithm of the odds ratio). This means that the model does not predict the crisis, but the probability of its occurrence. In order to obtain a crisis prediction from the probability of a crisis (the value from the interval [0,1]) a threshold should be specified, above which it is considered that the model predicts the crisis. The higher the threshold, the less periods of crisis are going to be predicted. It should increase the share of correctly predicted periods of a crisis and at the same

[4] Komulainen Tuomas, Lukkarila Johanna. *What drives financial crises in emerging markets?* "BOFIT Discussion Papers" Nr 5, Bank of Finland 2003, s. 1-26. On Line. Dostęp 6 grudnia 2013.
[5] Kaminsky Graciela, Lizondo Saul, Reinhart Carmen. *Leading indicators of currency crises*. "IMF Staff Papers". Nr 45(1), 1998, s. 1-48. On Line. Dostęp 6 grudnia 2013.
[6] Beckmann Daniela, Menkhoff Lukas, Sawischlewski Katja. *Robust lessons about practical early warning systems*. "Journal of Policy Modeling". Nr 28(2), 2006, s. 163-193.
[7] Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba. *Comparing early warning systems for banking crises*. "Journal of Financial Stability". Nr 4(2), 2008, s. 89-120.
[8] Barrell Ray, Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba, Liadze Iana. *Bank regulation, property prices and early warning systems for banking crises in OECD countries*.
[9] Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba. *Comparing early warning systems for banking crises*.
[10] Kaminsky Graciela, Lizondo Saul, Reinhart Carmen. Leading indicators of currency crises.

time limit the number of periods falsely predicted as a crisis. On the other hand, the higher the threshold, the more periods of crisis will be considered as periods of tranquillity. The choice of the threshold determines, at the same time, the level of the type I and type II errors of the model's predictions. For this reason the choice of the optimal threshold is a very important element in the construction of an EWS model. The level of the threshold should be selected taking into account the high cost of false signals and even higher costs of a crisis. Selecting the optimal cut-off point is a problem[11], which is independent of a time horizon, so it might also be analysed in the model predicting the state of turbulence.

Classical EWS models are designed to predict a crisis, therefore, the most common perspective of the analysis is annual or biennial. The proposed model is built to predict tomorrow's state of a series of financial data using information about today's economic situation. The difference in the time horizon means that variables usually used in EWS models are not appropriate. Data used in EWS models refers to phenomena that are relatively stable. Its values change monthly, quarterly, and sometimes even yearly. The utility of such variables in the model for daily data is very limited, because its volatility is not dynamic enough to distinguish daily states for a financial data series. Although EWS models carry useful information which can be used to build models predicting a turbulent state, the collection of variables describing the economic situation on a yearly basis are not appropriate for the analysis of the problem on a daily basis.

Information about the possible data to use in the model can be taken from the studies described by Kim *et al*. (2004) [12] and Oh *et al*. (2006) [13]. In these studies, authors postulate that modern crises are too dynamic to use quarterly data (or less frequent), so EWS models should be built based on daily data. According to them, the best measure of determining the volatility of the economy is the stock index. Additionally, they propose to take into account short-term interest rates and exchange rates[14]. As well as each variable mentioned, its rates of return, moving averages and moving variances might also be included[15]. The proposed set of data seems to be adequate for modelling the state of turbulence.

The studies on daily EWS models are less useful in defining the state of turbulence. This is due to the difference in specificity of modelling the state of turbulence for the economy and for financial data time series. In daily EWS models, definition of the state of turbulence refers to the general state of the economy. The state of turbulence for financial data should be more specific and relevant to an analysed portfolio (asset). It should identify the periods in which the situation of the economy (described by the independent variables) indicates a state of turbulence for the next day.

From a risk management perspective, the most problematic are periods in which losses are the most severe. A market risk management system should be able to identify those periods to protect banks from their consequences. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the state of

---

[11] Bussiere Matthieu, Fratzscher Marcel. *Low probability, high impact: Policy making and extreme events. „Journal of Policy Modeling"*. Nr 30(1), 2008, s. 111-121.

[12] Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network Trained on the 1997 Crisis*. "Journal of Data Science". Nr 2, 2004, s. 371-381.

[13] Oh Kyong Joo, Kim Tae Yoon, Kim Chiho. *An early warning system for detection of financial crisis using financial market volatility*. "Expert Systems". Nr 23, 2006, s. 83-98.

[14] *Ibidem*; Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural* Network Trained on the 1997 Crisis.

[15] Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network* Trained on the 1997 Crisis.

turbulence for financial data should consist of periods with the highest losses. In this case, it should be possible to predict the periods of most risk and take appropriate steps to protect banks from exceptional losses. For example the state of turbulence forecasting model might be used as a part of Value at Risk model, allowing, in a market risk measurement, to take into account the fact that the some periods are riskier than others.

The above analysis allows to define the basic framework for the state of turbulence forecasting model. Based on the EWS models studies it is possible to choose a possible model to apply (LOGIT) and the set of independent variables. According to it, it is also important to preserve the homogeneity of the analysed phenomenon and the choice of the optimal threshold. In addition, the definition of the dependent variable in the model has been proposed as a group of periods with the most severe losses. Discussed topics do not take into account the whole complexity of the framework, but set a starting point, which will be developed to construct an appropriate model for predicting the state of turbulence.

FRAMEWORK

Dependent variable distribution

According to the conclusions from the previous chapter, the dependent variable should be a binary variable equal to 1 for the periods defined as periods of turbulence, and 0 for the periods defined as periods of tranquillity. For the sake of universality it is suggested in the literature to use the LOGIT model. Models for binary dependent variables assume the existence of an unobserved continuous variable, which comes from a specific distribution (in this case, logistics), but only results which takes one of two values (0 or 1) are observed. On the basis of the observed results the relationship between an unobservable dependent variable and observable independent variables is estimated. The LOGIT model can be defined as follows[16]:

$$y_i^* = \boldsymbol{\beta} * \boldsymbol{X}_i + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if\ y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where:
y_i^* – latent variable,
β – parameter,
X_i – independent variable,
ε – random error from logistic distribution with parameters equal to $(0; 1)$,
y_i – observable result of the phenomenon.

The LOGIT model assumes that a random error (and therefore unobservable dependent variable) comes from the logistic distribution. Another popular assumption is that a random error comes from a normal distribution. The model with the normal distribution assumption is called the PROBIT model. This model can be defined as follows[17]:

[16] Nagler Jonathan. *Scobit: An alternative Estimator to Logit and Probit.* "American Journal of Political Science". Nr 38(1), 1994, s. 230-255.
[17] *Ibidem*.

$$y_i^* = \boldsymbol{\beta} * \boldsymbol{X}_i + \varepsilon \tag{3}$$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if \; y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where:
y_i^* – latent variable,
β – parameter,
X_i – independent variable,
ε – random error from normal distribution with parameters equal to $(0; 1)$,
y_i – observable result of the phenomenon.

The LOGIT and the PROBIT models are the most popular models for binary dependent variables. There are also other models for binary dependent variables, which usually allow to overcome problems which the LOGIT and the PROBIT models are not able to overcome. Frequently, an important issue in binary variable modelling is the lack of a balance between events and non-events. This is because the observed phenomenon is rare in its nature (e.g., wars, crises) . In this case, the LOGIT and the PROBIT models may not be adequate[18]. There are many possible solutions to this problem. The basic model, which takes into account the unbalanced distribution of the dependent variable is the CLOLOG model (Complementary log-log) [19]. The SCOBIT model[20] can also be used or some amendments to the basic models might be performed[21]. Inclusion of these models or corrections is useful in situations where basic models have a poor quality and it is necessary to search for better solutions. In the study, due to the imbalance of dependent variable, it has been decided to take into account the CLOGLOG model. The CLOGLOG model can be defined as the previous two models with the exception that the random error comes from the Gompertz distribution[22]:

$$y_i^* = \boldsymbol{\beta} * \boldsymbol{X}_i + \varepsilon \tag{5}$$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & if \; y_i^* > 0 \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

where:
y_i^* – latent variable,
β – parameter,
X_i – independent variable,
ε – random error from Gompertz distribution,
y_i – observable result of the phenomenon.

The choice of these three options should be sufficient to obtain adequate forecasts of the state of turbulence.

For the above models (LOGIT , PROBIT and CLOGLOG) probability of the state of turbulence is forecast. The purpose of the model is to predict the state of turbulence instead of the probability of its occurrence. Therefore, the expected result is the value of 1 when the model predicts the state of turbulence and 0 when the model predicts the state of tranquillity. To convert a probability (set in the range $[0,1]$) to a binary forecast of the state, a cut-off point must be defined above which the state of turbulence is forecast and below which the state of tranquillity is forecast. The study assumed that the optimal cut-off point will be sought with an accuracy of 0.01. Therefore, the analysis of the optimal cut-off point involves cut-off points belonging to the following set:

[18] King Gary, Langche Zeng. Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data. "Political Analysis" Nr 9, 2001, s. 137–163.
[19] Akkuş Özge. *How to Test the Parametric Fit of the Complementary Log Log Model to the Data?* "Gazi University Journal of Science". Nr 25(3), 2012, s. 665-675.
[20] Nagler Jonathan. *Scobit: An alternative Estimator to Logit and Probit*.
[21] King Gary, Langche Zeng. Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data.
[22] Akkuş Özge. *How to Test the Parametric Fit of the Complementary Log Log Model to the Data?*

$$po_i = 0.01 * i, for\ i = 1, 2, ..., 100 \tag{7}$$

where:
po_i – i-th cut-off point.

Selection of the optimal cut-off point has been carried out on the KROC criterion, which is described later on.

Dependent variable definition

The purpose of the proposed model is to predict the state of turbulence. In order to provide adequate forecasts, first the state of turbulence has to be properly defined. For an analysis of a portfolio (individual asset) the model, as a state of turbulence, should predict the worst cases from the perspective of risk management. The worst case should be connected with the most severe declines in price (returns) of the analysed portfolio. As the change in the price is non-standardized (it depends on the current value of the assets), a more universal variable is the rate of return of a portfolio (asset). In the study, four different binary dependent variables have been considered:

1. The dependent variable is equal to 1 for 1% of the lowest rates of return and 0 otherwise (dependent variable P1);
2. The dependent variable is equal to 1 for 5% of the lowest rates of return and 0 otherwise (dependent variable P5);
3. The dependent variable is equal to 1 for 10% of the lowest rates of return and 0 otherwise (dependent variable P10);
4. The dependent variable is equal to 1 for 20% of the lowest rates of return and 0 otherwise (dependent variable P20);

Independent variable data set

The state of turbulence model is based on the assumption that tomorrow's financial data time series state depends on the present state of the economy. The dependent variable is defined as a certain percentage of the worst realization of the return on a portfolio (asset). In order to describe the above relationship, a set of independent variables should appropriately reflect the current market situation. The set of variables that should properly describe the current state of the economy is proposed in *Oh et al.*(2006)[23] and Kim *et al*. (2008)[24]. According to the studies, the current state of the economy - on a daily basis - can be determined by variables describing the three key elements of the economy:

1. The situation on the stock market - current values of stock indices;
2. The situation on the currency market - current values of exchange rates;
3. The situation on the interest rates market - current values of short - or mid-term interest rates.

Based on the assumptions presented by the authors and by using knowledge of the Polish market characteristics the following variables has been included in the study:

- Stock indices:
  - o The index of companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange Index (WIG);

---

[23] Oh Kyong Joo, Kim Tae Yoon, Kim Chiho. *An early warning system for detection of financial crisis using financial market volatility.*
[24] Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network Trained on the 1997 Crisis*.

- o The index of the 20 largest companies listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange (WIG20).
- Exchange rates:
  - o The Euro to Polish zloty exchange rate (EUR/PLN);
  - o The U.S. dollar to Polish zloty exchange rate (USD/PLN);
  - o The Swiss franc to Polish zloty exchange rate (CHF/PLN).
- Interest rates:
  - o The overnight WIBOR interest rate (ON);
  - o The 3-month WIBOR interest rate (3M).

Application of these variables only in an untransformed form may not represent the full dynamics of the current economic situation. Therefore, the model should take into account transformations of the aforementioned variables. Using the suggestions made by Kim *et al.*(2008)[25], for each of the variables investigated in this study it was decided to include the following values:

1. The rate of return;
2. The 15-day moving average of prices and rates of return;
3. The 15-days moving variances of prices and rates of return.

The choice of the 15-day period for the moving values results from the trade-off between the dynamics of independent variable changes and the stability of the relationship between a dependent and independent variables. Taking into account all the transformations of the aforementioned variables 35 potential independent variables has been considered (5 different values for 7 variables).

It is worth noting that some of them may be highly collinear, which can have a negative impact on the quality of the model. Collinearity may cause the suggested parameters to not properly capture the dependencies between independent variables and the dependent variable. These parameters may additionally reflect (part of) the relationship between the collinear independent variables and the dependent variable. It might be an important issue when the objective of the model is to describe the influence of a single independent variable on the dependent variable. It is less important when the objective of the model is to describe the cumulative effect of a set of independent variables on the dependent variable (forecast the dependent variable). Then, even if individual parameters are biased because of collinearity, the cumulative effect of a set of independent variables on the dependent variable may remain appropriate.

There is no one method of solving the collinearity problem. The simplest approach is to leave all variables in the model and take it into account during the interpretation of the results. There are other, more sophisticated, solutions suggested in other studies. One possibility is to exclude from the set of independent variables those variables that cause the problem of collinearity. This solution may cause a problem with the correct specification of the model. Another possible solution is to use methods of reducing the dimensions of the matrix (the PCA or the factor analysis). These approaches, on the one hand limit the set of independent variables analysed, and on the other hand, solve the problem of collinearity, as calculated components or factors are

---

[25] Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network Trained on the 1997 Crisis.*

orthogonal to each other[26]. In this study it was decided to consider three possible solutions to the problem of collinearity:

1. Leaving all the variables in the model (untransformed data set);
2. Taking the principal components obtained from the PCA as an independent variables data set;
3. Taking factors obtained from factor analysis as an independent variables data set.

It has turned out that variables based on the WIG and the WIG20 indices are almost exactly collinear and for this reason it has been decided to exclude the variables based on the WIG index and leave only the variables based on the WIG20 index. In the final set of independent variables, 30 independent variables has been included.

The proposed set of independent variables has been designed to be universal (to describe the current state of the economy). The opposite assumption has been made in the case of the definition of dependent variable, which is specific to each portfolio (asset). The dependent variable is defined based on the characteristics of a specific portfolio (asset). Therefore, it should be taken into account that the current state of the economy (represented by a set of independent variables) may have a different impact on the state of turbulence forecasts for different portfolios (assets). This should be taken into account by specifying the parameters for each portfolio (asset) separately. This approach caters for(?) the universality arising from the same set of independent variables and the specificity related to the definition of the dependent variable. Both properties are preserved regardless of whether the model is built on untransformed data, the PCA data, or the factor analysis data.

MODEL TESTING

The proposed models for predicting the state of turbulence may differ from each other in four dimensions:

1. Random error and latent variable distribution (LOGIT, PROBIT, CLOGLOG);
2. Definition of the dependent variable (P1, P5, P10, P20);
3. Set of independent variables (untransformed data, the PCA data, the factor analysis data);
4. Cut-off point (100 possible values).

This diversity means that 3600 different combinations of assumptions need to be considered. Therefore, the testing process should be wide enough to find out imperfections of as many combinations of assumptions as possible. For this purpose, the testing process involve four different analyses:

1. The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test;
2. The LR test for independent variables insignificance;
3. GINI coefficient analysis (discriminant ability of the model);
4. KROC criterion (prognostic ability of the model).

The proposed set of analyses is designed to assess appropriateness of assumptions, both from the formal perspective (Hosmer-Lemeshow test, LR test), and from the performance perspective (GINI coefficient, KROC criterion – distance between a point on the ROC curve and the ideal

---

[26] Greene William. *Chapter 4 Finite-Sample Properties of the Least Squares Estimator*. W: Greene William. "Econometric analysis 5th Edition". Prentice Hall 2003, s. 41-64.

point). The Hosmer-Lemeshow and the LR tests are typically used to assess the quality of models for binary variables. The discriminant and predictive ability measures are not always used for such assessments, however, they are gaining in popularity. They are often used (for example) in probability of default models (credit risk models).

The GINI coefficient is used to analyse the discriminant ability of the model. It allows to assess how the model forecasts separate distributions of successes and failures. An effective model should assign a high probability of success for observations, which are in fact successes and low probability of success for observations, which are in fact failures. The GINI coefficient is calculated based on the CAP curve (Cumulative Accuracy Profile), which is a graphical illustration of the distribution of the probability of success conditional on observed success in relation to the unconditional distribution of the probability of success. Examples of CAP curves are shown on Figure 1.


Figure 1. CAP curve.

The figure shows three possible shapes of the CAP curve. The curve for the model with full discrimination (dashed line), the curve for an example model (black line) and the curve for the model with lack of discrimination (dotted line). Assuming that the model is not worse than the model with lack of discrimination[27], its CAP curve may be located between two extreme CAP curves (full and lack of discrimination). The higher discriminant ability that a model has, the closer the CAP curve for the model is to the curve for full discrimination.

The GINI coefficient is calculated based on a relationship between the three CAP curves presented on the Figure 1. It is equal to the ratio of the area between the CAP curves for the analysed model and the model without discrimination, and the area between the CAP curves for the model with full discrimination and the model without discrimination. Which can be written as follows:

---

[27] Otherwise the model has a negative discriminant ability. This means that the model discriminates in the opposite direction. The probability of success is more likely to be low for observed successes. Such a situation is totally undesirable and indicates a very low quality of the model (from the perspective of discriminant analysis the better model is the model with no discrimination).

$$GINI = \frac{a_m}{a_m + a_p} \tag{8}$$

where:
GINI – the GINI coefficient,
a_m – area between a CAP curves for the analysed model and model without discrimination,
a_p – area between a CAP curves for the model with full discrimination and model without discrimination.

Values for the GINI coefficient are in the interval [-1,1] [28]. The closer the coefficient value is to 1, the stronger is the model's discriminant ability[29]. Unfortunately there are no clear critical values (thresholds) for this measure, which would separate high-quality models from low-quality models. Thresholds are determined based on experience and are relative[30]. The necessary minimum is that the value of the GINI coefficient is greater than 0, which means that the discriminant ability of the model is greater than in the case of lack of discrimination.

The KROC criterion based on ROC curve analysis may be used for a predictive ability assessment. The ROC curve illustrates the relationship between two independent distributions. It is determined by the relation between the conditional distributions of the success conditional on observed successes and observed failures. Therefore, the ROC curve consists of a set of points $(F_L(s), F_S(s))$, where s comes from the interval $[0,1]$[31], $F_L(.)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the probability of success conditional on observed failures, and $F_S(.)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the probability of success conditional on observed success. The ROC curve (usually) is described in terms of two measures: the sensitivity and the specificity. The sensitivity measures the ability of the model to correctly predict success. The specificity measures the ability of the model to correctly predict failures. These measures are calculated for binary variables, which means that in order to calculate them, it is necessary to transform probability of success into prediction of success or failure. The sensitivity and the specificity may be calculated for each cut-off point s.

Comparing models using these two measures independently is usually inconclusive because one of the models may be better in terms of sensitivity and the other in terms of specificity. In order to obtain a measure that allows unambiguous comparison of the models weighted indexes are created. Weights for the sensitivity and the specificity are associated with the relative costs of incorrect success and failure forecasts[32]. The most common measure of predictive ability calculated on the basis of the specificity and the sensitivity of a model is the Youden index[33]. It assumes that the trade-off between the sensitivity and the specificity is linear with a scaling factor equal to one. This implies, that at a certain sum of the sensitivity and the specificity, the extreme solutions are equally good (the sensitivity or the specificity is equal to 0) as moderate solutions (the sensitivity and the specificity are different from 0). To involve a preference of moderate solutions over extreme solutions, instead of the Youden index, the KROC criterion may be used. According to this criterion the best model is the one that minimizes the distance between the ideal

[28] W przypadku, gdy krzywa CAP leży poniżej krzywej CAP dla braku dyskryminacji pole powierzchni między tymi krzywymi przemożone jest przez wartość -1.

[29] Tasche Dirk. *Validation of internal rating systems and PD estimates*. W: Christodoulakis George, Satchell Stephen (red.). "The Analytics of Risk Model Validation". Academic press 2008, s. 169-196.

[30] Anderson Raymond. *Module C Stats and maths*. W: Anderson Raymond. "The Credit Scoring Toolkit: Theory and Practice for Retail Credit Risk Management and Decision Automation". Oxford University Press, 2007, s. 159-254.

[31] Tasche Dirk. Validation of internal rating systems and PD estimates.

[32] Steyerberg Ewout, Van Calster Ben, Pencina Michael. *Performance Measures for Prediction Models and Markers: Evaluation of Predictions and Classifications*. "Revista Espanola de Cardiologia (English Edition)". Nr 64(9), 2011, s. 788-794.

[33] Youden William. *Index For Rating Diagnostic Tests*. "Cancer". Nr 3(1), 1950, s. 32–35.

point and a point on the ROC curve (depends on a cut-off point). The ideal point is the point in the upper right corner of the ROC curve graph. At this point, the sensitivity and the specificity are equal to1 (model predicts success for all observed successes and failure for all observed failures). The KROC criterion value can be calculated as follows:

$$KROC = \sqrt{\left(\frac{FN}{TP+FN}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{FP}{TN+FP}\right)^2} \tag{9}$$

TP – true positive rate,
TN – true negative rate,
FP – false positive rate,
FN – false negative rate.

In this case, the isocosts curves[34] have the shape of a quarter circle with center at the ideal point. This measure prefers models with a smaller value of a root of a sum of squares of type I and type II errors (incorrect predictions of successes and incorrect predictions of failures). In this case, the best solution, assuming a certain sum of the sensitivity and the specificity, is the middle solution (the sensitivity and the specificity are equal), and the extreme solutions are the least attractive[35].

Both measures have their optimal solutions in the ideal point, with the difference that the optimal value of the Youden index is equal to 1, and the optimal value of the KROC criterion is equal to 0. To assess the predictive ability in the study, the KROC criterion has been selected, the reason is that, with a certain sum of the specificity and the sensitivity, moderate solutions are preferred over extreme solutions. From the state of turbulence predictions perspective a model that predicts only a state of turbulence or only a state of tranquillity should be less attractive than the model which predicts both states. For the KROC criterion, as for the GINI coefficient, no limits are defined which distinguish high-quality from poor-quality models. The KROC criterion is used to provide relative comparisons of the models.

The testing process presented above should allow to choose the best foundation for the state of turbulence predicting model. The test procedure consists of two stages. First, the formal tests should be performed. Then, discrimination and predictive ability should be assessed. Formal tests provide information as to whether the set of assumptions is good enough to be used. The GINI coefficient and the KROC criterion allow to compare models with different assumptions. Finally, based on the results the best possible set of assumptions for the state of turbulence predicting model may be selected.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Individual asset analysis results

The empirical research on the state of turbulence predicting models has been divided into two parts. First, the analysis has been made for a series of rates of return on individual assets, then the analysis has been made on a series of rates of return on portfolios consisting of 10 randomly selected assets. The analysis has been made for shares listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. For the individual assets, in-sample analysis has been performed. For the portfolios, in-sample analysis and out-of-sample analysis has been performed.

---

[34] Isocost are defined as curves defining models of the same quality (which generate the same costs).
[35] Powers David. *Evaluation: From Precision, Recall And F-Measure To ROC, Informedness, Markedness & Correlation*. "Journal Of Machine Learning Technologies". Nr 2(1), 2011, s. 37-63.

Three sets of independent variables have been considered: the untransformed data set, the principal components obtained from the PCA analysis and the factors obtained from the factor analysis. Taking into account that the set of untransformed independent variables, for each of the asset and the portfolio, is the same and all of the models have been constructed based on the same data from the same period, both the untransformed data set itself and the results of the observation matrix reduction methods (the PCA and the factor analysis) are the same for all assets and portfolios.

The PCA analysis and the factor analysis have been performed on all 30 independent variables. The principal components have been selected with respect to the Scree plot and the Kaiser criterion. It has been decided to select six principal components. The factors have been selected based on the Scree plot and the Variance Explanations criterion. According to the results five factors have been selected.

Each of three independent variables data sets (untransformed data, principal components and factors) have been used to estimate the state of turbulence models for each of the assets and for each of the portfolios independently.

Analysis for an individual asset has been conducted for 43 different shares listed on Warsaw Stock Exchange. The shares have been chosen randomly. The only condition imposed has been that shares have to be listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange since at least January 2006. The study covered the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 January 2012 . Companies, whose shares were included in the study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Companies, which shares were included in the study for individual assets.

NR	NAZWA SPÓŁKI	NR	NAZWA SPÓŁKI	NR	NAZWA SPÓŁKI
1	ASSECO POLAND S.A.	16	FERRUM S.A.	31	PROJPRZEM S.A.
2	AMPLI S.A	17	FAMUR S.A.	32	OPAKOWANIA PLAST-BOX S.A.
3	BETACOM S.A.	18	INSTAL KRAKÓW S.A.	33	POLNORD S.A.
4	BRE BANK S.A.	19	KCI S.A.	34	SOPHARMA AD
5	CERAMIKA NOWA GALA S.A.	20	KGHM S.A.	35	STALEXPORT AUTOSTRADY S.A.
6	COGNOR S.A.	21	KOGENERACJA S.A.	36	SWISSMED CENTRUM ZDROWIA S.A.
7	CENTROZAP S.A.	22	LPP S.A.	37	TELL S.A.
8	DOM DEVELOPMENT S.A.	23	MCLOGIC S.A.	38	TRION S.A.
9	ECHO INVESTMENT S.A.	24	MENNICA POLSKA S.A.	39	TELEKOMUNIKACJA POLSKA S.A.
10	EFEKT S.A.	25	MOSTOSTAL PŁOCK S.A.	40	VISTULA GROUP S.A.
11	ELEKTRO BUDOWA S.A.	26	MOSTOSTAL WARSZAWA S.A.	41	WASKO S.A.
12	ELZAB S.A.	27	MOSTOSTAL- EXPORT S.A.	42	WILBO S.A.
13	ENERGOMONTAŻ-POŁUDNIE S.A.	28	MOSTOSTAL ZABRZE - HOLDING S.A.	43	ŻYWIEC S.A.
14	FAM GK S.A.	29	MUZA S.A.		
15	FARMACOL S.A.	30	NORDEA BP S.A.		

The table presents the companies names whose shares have been used in the state of turbulence models for individual assets.
Source: Own.

A wide range of assets have been taken into consideration which should allow detail verification of the correctness of the analysed sets of assumptions. It is worth restating that each set of assumptions for the state of turbulence predicting models has been tested on 43 different dependent variables.

An analysis of the validity of the assumptions made has been performed in accordance with the testing process described above. The results are presented in an aggregated manner – as the average score for all 43 assets. In this study, in-sample analysis has been performed. This analysis is made for the observations, on which the model has been estimated.

Formal tests

The testing process is begun by performing the Hosmer-Lemeshow test. Table 2 presents the percentage of cases for which the null hypothesis in Hosmer-Lemeshow test has not been rejected in models with various theoretical distributions, definitions of the dependent variable and data types.

For all analysed significance levels (10%, 5% and 1%) this test does not significantly prefer any of three theoretical distributions. However, in all cases the best results have been achieved for the PROBIT models. The results for all the theoretical distributions are good enough to consider the possibility of using each of them in the state of turbulence models.

For dependent variables P5, P10, and P20 the best results are obtained from models built on untransformed data (Table 2 omits results for the principal components and the factors for these variables because the results were much worse than for untransformed data and are not worth considering). For the P1 variable all independent variables data sets are of the same quality (actually the untransformed data has the worst results). From analysis of models built on the untransformed data for the different definitions of the dependent variable it may be seen that the models for the P1 variable achieve relatively the worst results. Actually, only for the P1 dependent variable the percentage when the null hypothesis has not been rejected is much smaller than the expected result.

Results for the Hosmer-Lemeshow test indicate that in the state of turbulence models, all considered theoretical distributions of a random error may be used. In addition, for the P5, P10 and P20 variables, models achieve the best results when using the untransformed data. The only exception is the P1 dependent variable, for which slightly better results have been achieved for the models based on the data from the factor analysis. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test does not disqualify any of the dependent variables, although the poorest results have been obtained for the variable P1.

Table 2. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test results for the individual assets analysis.

MODEL	DEP. VAR.	DATA TYPE	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL		
			1%	5%	10%
P1	FA	CLOGLOG	95.2%	95.2%	92.9%
P1	FA	LOGIT	95.2%	95.2%	92.9%
P1	FA	PROBIT	97.6%	95.2%	90.5%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	93.0%	86.0%	83.7%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	90.9%	88.6%	88.6%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	95.5%	95.5%	93.2%
P1	PCA	CLOGLOG	93.0%	93.0%	90.7%
P1	PCA	LOGIT	93.0%	93.0%	88.4%
P1	PCA	PROBIT	95.3%	90.7%	86.0%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	97.7%	93.2%	84.1%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	97.7%	95.5%	84.1%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	100.0%	95.5%	90.9%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	100.0%	97.7%	95.5%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	100.0%	97.7%	97.7%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	100.0%	95.5%	93.2%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	100.0%	95.5%	93.2%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	100.0%	97.7%	95.5%

The table shows the percentage of cases in which there is no reason to reject the null hypothesis in the Hosmer-Lemeshow test for the state of turbulence models with different assumptions about the distribution of a random error, a set of independent variables and the dependent variable definition. The table shows results of the tests for 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: FA - a set of the factors from the factor analysis, UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, PCA - the set of principal components from the PCA analysis, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P20 - the state of turbulence is defined as 20% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

The next step in the testing process is the analysis of the LR test results. The purpose of this test is to test the total irrelevance of the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The table with results of the LR test shows the percentage of cases in which the null hypothesis of the LR test has been rejected. Results obtained for the LR test are presented in Table 3. Presented results are for models estimated on the untransformed data. Results for models estimated on the data from the PCA analysis and the factor analysis were significantly worse and have been omitted.

LR test results for each definition of the dependent variable indicate that independent variables are much more likely to be irrelevant for the P1 dependent variable than for the others. Among the P5, P10 and P20 dependent variables, the P20 variable is relatively the worst. It has also turned out that the significance of the impact in the cases of the P5 and the P10 dependent variables is similar. In addition, the results of the LR test have not shown a significant superiority of one of the random error distributions. All models (LOGIT, PROBIT and CLOGLOG) are equally good with respect to this test.

Table 3. The LR test results for the individual assets analysis.

DEP. VAR.	DATA TYPE	MODEL	1%	5%	10%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	58.1%	72.1%	79.1%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	54.5%	70.5%	79.5%
P1	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	54.5%	68.2%	79.5%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	72.7%	86.4%	90.9%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	72.7%	88.6%	90.9%
P5	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	72.7%	88.6%	90.9%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	75.0%	84.1%	90.9%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	75.0%	86.4%	90.9%
P10	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	77.3%	88.6%	90.9%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG	68.2%	81.8%	88.6%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGIT	68.2%	77.3%	88.6%
P20	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT	68.2%	77.3%	88.6%

The table shows the percentage of cases in which the null hypothesis is rejected in the LR test for the state of turbulence models with different assumptions about the distribution of a random error, a set of independent variables and the dependent variable definition. The table shows results of the test for 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P20 - the state of turbulence is defined as 20% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Results of the formal tests (the Hosmer-Lemeshow test and the LR test) can be summarized in the following points:

1. The best results are obtained for the state of turbulence models built on a set of untransformed data.
2. On the basis of the formal tests analysed, distributions of random errors are equally good and might be used in the state of turbulence models.
3. Formal tests don't unequivocally reject any of the dependent variables, although for the LR test it can be observed that worst results are obtained for the P1 variable.

The next step is to measure the discriminant and the predictive ability of the model analysis. For this purpose, the GINI coefficient and the KROC criterion have been used.

GINI coefficient analysis

The GINI coefficient is a measure of the discriminant ability of a model. It determines how well the predicted probability of the state of turbulence separates the distribution of rates of return from the state of turbulence from the distribution of rates of return from the state of tranquillity. Results of the GINI coefficient analysis are presented in Table 4. In the table the average values of the GINI coefficient are presented for the state of turbulence models based on the untransformed data. Again, results for the PCA data and for the factor analysis data have been omitted. This is due to the fact that the assessment of the discriminant ability of the models based on different types of data clearly indicates that the discriminant ability of the models based on the untransformed data is significantly higher. On the basis of these results, it may be concluded that the use of principal components or factors instead of untransformed data to build the state of turbulence model worsens its discriminant ability. It can also be stated that, despite the fact that observation matrix reduction methods solve the problem of collinearity, their use may lead to a worsening of the quality of information stored in the data set.

Based on the results shown in the Table 4 it may be concluded that the smaller the area that defines the state of turbulence, the higher the discriminant ability of the model. According to the

15

results obtained, models with the P1dependent variable have the largest discriminant ability, models with the P5 and the P10 dependent variables have moderate discriminant ability and models with P20 dependent variable have definitely the worst discriminant ability. These results might be interpreted as follows: that the more extreme realization of returns are, the situation on the market is more similar and significantly different from those in a defined state of tranquillity. On the basis of the market situation, it is easier to recognize more extreme realizations of returns. It means that the expansion of the definition of the state of turbulence increases the noise. However, it is important to remember about a risk that using too narrow a definition of the state of turbulence may lead to model over-fitting. It means that the GINI coefficient for the P1dependent variable might be so high not due to the actual relationship between today's situation in the economy and tomorrow's financial time series state, but due to specific relationship for a data set. In this case, it may happen that the model, according to in-sample analysis, works correctly, but in fact, when used in reality would perform much worse. In order to verify the over-fitting issue, out-of-sample analysis should be performed. The description of its construction and its effect on the state of turbulence forecasting models will be presented in the portfolios analysis section.

As for formal tests, the GINI coefficient results are similar and good for all three considered assumptions about the distribution of a random error. The similarity is confirmed for each of the definitions of the dependent variable. Again, in all cases, the average value of the GINI coefficient is the highest for the PROBIT model, but the differences are very small and does not appear to be significant.

Table 4. Results for the GINI coefficient analysis for the individual assets analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	DATA TYPE	GINI
P1	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED	0.853
P1	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.859
P1	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.877
P5	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED	0.521
P5	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.526
P5	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.536
P10	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED	0.379
P10	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.384
P10	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.388
P20	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED	0.245
P20	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.248
P20	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED	0.249

The table shows the average value of the GINI coefficient. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: FA - a set of the factors from the factor analysis, UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, PCA - the set of principal component from the PCA analysis, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P20 - the state of turbulence is defined as 20% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Based on the results obtained during the formal testing and the discriminant analysis the following conclusions may be stated:

1. All theoretical distributions of error terms may be used to build the state of turbulence model - the quality of the LOGIT, PROBIT and CLOGLOG models (ceteris paribus) are good enough and do not differ significantly,

2. Models built on the untransformed data achieve significantly better results than the models based on the principal components or the factors. Therefore, for further analysis only the untransformed data will be considered,

3. Models in which the dependent variable is defined as 20% of the worst realisations of rates of return, achieve much worse results than models for other dependent variables. For this reason, the P20 dependent variable will be excluded from a further analysis.

At the end of the testing process the predictive ability of models has been performed by the KROC criterion.

KROC criterion analysis

The primary purpose of the proposed models is to provide high quality state of turbulence forecasts. Therefore, the KROC criterion results are crucial for their evaluation. In this analysis, a set of assumptions has been extended by adding a cut-off point analysis. This is very important, as two identical models which differ only by the cut-off point assumption, may have completely different predictive abilities. For the formal tests and the GINI coefficient, a cut-off point value does not matter. These analyses are prior to the step of determining the cut-off point. The KROC criterion allows to consider an extra dimension of a model, it allows to evaluate which cut-off point for the state of turbulence model achieves the best results.

Results for the KROC criterion analysis are presented in Table 5-Table 7. These tables include the average distance, for different cut-off points, between the point on the ROC curve and the ideal point, for models with differing assumptions. The lower value of the KROC criterion is, the better predictive ability a model has. The tables show results for cut-off points around the optimal cut-off point (the KROC criterion is on average the lowest).

Analysing values presented in the tables, it can be stated that the average values of the KROC criterion for the optimal cut-off points are significantly lower (better) for the dependent variable P1 (0.185-0.203) than the average values for the variable P5 (0.412-0.418) and the variable P10 (0.482-0.487). Results for the P5 and the P10 variables are very similar and equally good.

Again, the results for the various theoretical distributions of a random error do not differ from each other significantly, although at the optimal cut-off points the best results are always achieved for the PROBIT model. Considering the average results for the KROC criterion for different theoretical distributions of a random error, it may be stated that the results for the CLOGLOG, the LOGIT and the PROBIT models are basically indistinguishable.

In the KROC criterion results interesting regularity may be seen. On average, the lowest values of this criterion have been achieved when the cut-off point is equal to the percentage that defines the state of turbulence (dependent variable). It means that, on average, for the P1 dependent variable the optimal cut-off point is equal to 0.01, for the P5 variable is equal to 0.05, and for the P10 variable is equal to 0.1.

Table 5. Selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion. The P1 dependent variable.

DATA TYPE	DEP. VAR.	CUT-OFF POINT	KROC CLOGLOG	KROC LOGIT	KROC PROBIT
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	**0.01**	0.203	0.202	0.185
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.02	0.245	0.236	0.205
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.03	0.307	0.294	0.246
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.04	0.326	0.320	0.293
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.05	0.369	0.363	0.345
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.06	0.404	0.388	0.377
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.07	0.417	0.409	0.413
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.08	0.438	0.426	0.434
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.09	0.469	0.449	0.455
UNTRANSFORMED	P1	0.1	0.490	0.476	0.497

The table shows the selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion for the models with the P1 dependent variable. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, result in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations has been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Table 6. Selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion. The P5 dependent variable.

DATA TYPE	DEP. VAR.	CUT-OFF POINT	KROC CLOGLOG	KROC LOGIT	KROC PROBIT
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.01	0.817	0.809	0.782
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.02	0.639	0.634	0.622
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.03	0.510	0.506	0.503
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.04	0.438	0.433	0.432
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	**0.05**	0.418	0.414	0.412
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.06	0.436	0.432	0.424
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.07	0.468	0.462	0.449
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.08	0.501	0.493	0.486
UNTRANSFORMED	P5	0.09	0.537	0.534	0.530

The table shows the selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion for the models with the P5 dependent variable. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Table 7. Selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion. The P10 dependent variable.

DATA TYPE	DEP. VAR.	CUT-OFF POINT	KROC CLOGLOG	KROC LOGIT	KROC PROBIT
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.06	0.637	0.633	0.631
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.07	0.571	0.569	0.569
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.08	0.523	0.521	0.522
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.09	0.496	0.493	0.493
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	**0.1**	0.487	0.482	0.482
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.11	0.500	0.496	0.492
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.12	0.524	0.519	0.515
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.13	0.547	0.544	0.540
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.14	0.577	0.573	0.567
UNTRANSFORMED	P10	0.15	0.609	0.599	0.599

The table shows the selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion for the models with the P10 dependent variable. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Based on the KROC criterion analysis the conclusions may be summed up in following points:

1. The smaller the area that defines a dependent variable, the better the predictive ability of a model. The best results have been achieved for the P1 dependent variable, results for the P5 and the P10 variables are slightly worse. Nevertheless, the results for the P5 and the P10 dependent variables do not exclude them from a further analysis.

2. The KROC criterion does not materially prefer any one of the family of distributions of a random error.

3. The optimal cut-off point, on average, should be equal to a percentage that defines a dependent variable (the state of turbulence).

The testing process has consisted of four elements: the Hosmer-Lemeshow test, the LR test, the discriminant ability analysis based on the GINI coefficient and the predictive ability analysis based on the KROC criterion. Results obtained during the testing process have enabled to reduce 3600 different combinations of assumptions to 9 possible combinations, which provide relatively the best state of turbulence models. The best combinations of the assumptions have been presented in the Table 8.

Table 8. The best combinations of the state of turbulence models assumptions. Individual assets analysis.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	CUT-OFF POINT	MODEL	DATA TYPE
P10	10%	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P10	10%	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P10	10%	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED
P5	5%	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P5	5%	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P5	5%	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED
P1	1%	LOGIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P1	1%	PROBIT	UNTRANSFORMED
P1	1%	CLOGLOG	UNTRANSFORMED

The table shows the nine combinations of assumptions, which (based on the results obtained) should define high-quality state of turbulence models.
Source: Own.

The results obtained during individual assets analysis have pointed out the 9 sets of assumptions that should define high quality models. The correctness of these conclusions has been verified in the portfolio analysis. The results of the portfolios analysis are presented below.

Portfolio analysis results

In portfolios analysis five portfolios have been examined. Each of them consists of 10 randomly selected assets listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. Portfolios are built on the assumption that at any time the share of each asset in the portfolio is fixed and equal to 1/10 of the portfolio value. This is a simplifying assumption, which should not affect the result of the analysis. Same as for the analysis of individual assets, the assets in the portfolios are listed at least 6 years on the Warsaw Stock Exchange. The study has been conducted for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 January 2012 . Table 9 shows the composition of each of the portfolios.

Table 9. Companies, which shares were included in the study for portfolios.

LP	PORTFOLIO 1	PORTFOLIO 2	PORTFOLIO 3	PORTFOLIO 4	PORTFOLIO 5
1	ATLANTIS S.A.	AMPLI S.A.	ATLANTA S.A.	ASSECO POLAND S.A.	ATM GROUP S.A.
2	BBI ZENERIS NFI S.A.	FORTE S.A.	AWBUD S.A.	BIOTON S.A.	ZO BYTOM S.A.
3	BIOTON S.A.	INTER GROCLIN AUTO S.A.	DUDA S.A.	ELZAB S.A.	CEZ A.S.
4	ECHO INVESTMENT S.A.	HYDROTOR S.A.	EUROCASH S.A.	GLOBE TRADE CENTRE S.A.	IMPEXMETAL S.A.
5	ENERGOPOL-POŁUDNIE S.A.	KGHM S.A.	DM IDM S.A.	IMPEXMETAL S.A.	IZOLACJA JAROCIN S.A.
6	GLOBE TRADE CENTRE S.A.	MOSTOSTAL PŁOCK S.A.	PEPEES S.A.	LPP S.A.	NORDEA BP S.A.
7	PKO BP S.A.	POLICE S.A.	PRÓCHNIK S.A.	NOVITA S.A.	ORCO PROPERTY GROUP S.A.
8	TRAVELPLANET.PL S.A.	PULAWY S.A.	REDAN S.A.	PBS FINANSE S.A.	TRAVELPLANET.PL S.A.
9	WISTIL S.A.	SYGNITY S.A.	STOMIL SANOK S.A.	POLCOLORIT S.A.	ULMA S.A.
10	ŻYWIEC S.A.	ZETKAMA S.A.	SUWARY S.A.	SOPHARMA AD	ZELMER S.A.

The table presents the names of companies whose shares have been used in the state of turbulence models for portfolios.
Source: Own.

In the study, in order to verify the results obtained during the analysis for individual assets, in-sample and out-of-sample analysis has been performed. The out-of-sample analysis enables to check the stability of the results obtained during the in-sample analysis. The out-of-sample analysis is made for observations, which have not been taken into account during estimation. A significant reduction of the forecast quality implies an over-fitting issue which generates a high risk that the model may perform significantly more weakly in reality than it is expected to according to in-sample results. In this case, the state of turbulence model instead of describing a universal relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables, describes the relationship between them resulting from the specificity of the analysed data set.

The out-of-sample analysis has been performed in accordance with the recursive window approach. The analysis has been carried out for the period between 1 January 2010 and 31 January 2012. The process to obtain prediction samples for the out-of-sample analysis is illustrated in the Figure 2. It consists of the following steps:

1. A division of the entire analysed sample (01.01.2006-31.01.2012) into a training sample (01.01.2006-31.12.2009) and a prediction sample (01.01.2010-31.01.2012);
2. An estimation of the state of turbulence model based on the training sample;
3. A forecast of a state for the first period from the prediction sample;
4. A comparison of the forecast with the observed state on the first period from the prediction sample;
5. An extension of the training sample and a reduction of the prediction sample by the observation from the day the comparison in the point 4 has been made.
6. The execution of points 2-5 until all observations would move from the prediction sample to the training sample.

20

Figure 2. An illustration of the out-of-sample analysis approach.

Source: Own.

The initial training sample consisted of 1004 observations and the prediction sample consisted of 525 observations. This means that the out-of-sample analysis has been made on a sample of 525 forecasts.

The test procedure, as in models for individual assets, has consisted of four components: the Hosmer-Lemeshow test, the LR test, the GINI coefficient and the KROC criterion analyses. Formal tests, due to their specificity (assess the goodness of fit and form of the model) have been carried out only during the in-sample analysis. The GINI coefficient and the KROC criterion analyses have been carried out both for the in- and out-of-sample analysis.

At the beginning, the Hosmer-Lemeshow test (Table 10) has been performed. Results of the test have confirmed the conclusions drawn from the analysis for individual assets. For all analysed portfolios, in most cases, there is no reason to reject the null hypothesis because of the correctness of the assumed theoretical distribution of a random error (for the significance level equal to 5%). The worst results have been obtained by the CLOGLOG model with the P1dependent variable. For this model for 3 out of 5 portfolios the percentage of cases in which there was no reason to reject the null hypothesis is lower than the expected 95%. For the PROBIT model with the P10 dependent variable the same results have been obtained for two portfolios. It can also be noted that for portfolio 1 and dependent variable P5 none of the considered theoretical distributions reach the expected percentage of cases in which there is no reason to reject the null hypothesis. However, for all described cases results are as expected. Therefore, despite the imperfections, it is difficult to reject any combination of the assumptions for the state of turbulence models.

21

Table 10. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test results for the portfolio analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	100%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
P10	PROBIT	92%	100%	100%	93%	98%	97%
P10	LOGIT	98%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%
P5	CLOGLOG	88%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%
P5	PROBIT	88%	97%	97%	100%	100%	96%
P5	LOGIT	76%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%
P1	CLOGLOG	100%	84%	84%	100%	100%	93%
P1	PROBIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P1	LOGIT	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%

The table shows the percentage of the cases in which there is no basis to reject the null hypothesis in the Hosmer-Lemeshow test for the state of turbulence models with different assumptions about the distribution of a random error, a set of independent variables and the dependent variable definition. The table shows the results of the test for a 5% significance level. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Then the LR test has been performed (Table 11). It may be concluded that for the assumed level of significance equal to 5%, untransformed independent variables always have significant combined impact on a dependent variable. All combinations of analysed assumptions, from the perspective of this test, are equally good.

Table 11. The LR test results for the portfolio analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P10	PROBIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P10	LOGIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P5	CLOGLOG	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P5	PROBIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P5	LOGIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P1	CLOGLOG	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P1	PROBIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
P1	LOGIT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The table shows the percentage of the cases in which the null hypothesis is reject in the LR test for the state of turbulence models with different assumptions about the distribution of a random error, a set of independent variables and the dependent variable definition. The table shows the results of the test for a 5% significance level. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

The next stage of the evaluation has been the GINI coefficient analysis. This coefficient has been calculated both during the in-sample and the out-of-sample analysis. The GINI coefficient values for the in-sample analysis (Table 12) confirm the results obtained during the individual assets analysis. Again, the smaller the area that defines the dependent variable, the greater the discriminant ability of the model. In addition, for each dependent variable the LOGIT, the PROBIT and the CLOGLOG model have a very similar discriminant ability.

Key results have been obtained during the out-of-sample analysis (Table 13). These results indicate that models built on the P10 and the P5 dependent variables not lost much oftheir discriminant ability when out-of-sample analysis is performed. In contrast, models with the

P1dependent variable have lost their discriminant ability very significantly. Extremely bad results have been reached for the portfolio number 1, where the GINI coefficient is smaller than 0. This means that the model has a negative discriminant ability. Obtaining such a result suggests a very high instability for the P1 dependent variable.

Table 12. Results for the GINI coefficient analysis for the portfolios. In-sample analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	0.43	0.48	0.48	0.46	0.41	0.45
P10	PROBIT	0.44	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.42	0.47
P10	LOGIT	0.43	0.49	0.49	0.47	0.41	0.46
P5	CLOGLOG	0.54	0.59	0.59	0.57	0.59	0.58
P5	PROBIT	0.56	0.61	0.61	0.59	0.61	0.60
P5	LOGIT	0.55	0.60	0.60	0.58	0.60	0.59
P1	CLOGLOG	0.88	0.85	0.85	0.90	0.90	0.88
P1	PROBIT	0.90	0.87	0.87	0.92	0.91	0.89
P1	LOGIT	0.89	0.86	0.86	0.91	0.90	0.88

The table shows the average value of the GINI coefficient for the in-sample analysis. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

Table 13. Results for the GINI coefficient analysis for the portfolios. Out-of-sample analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	0.39	0.34	0.34	0.38	0.33	0.36
P10	PROBIT	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.33	0.40
P10	LOGIT	0.39	0.37	0.37	0.40	0.33	0.37
P5	CLOGLOG	0.32	0.45	0.45	0.51	0.46	0.44
P5	PROBIT	0.36	0.46	0.46	0.57	0.52	0.48
P5	LOGIT	0.34	0.46	0.46	0.54	0.47	0.45
P1	CLOGLOG	- 0.89	0.44	0.44	0.30	0.40	0.14
P1	PROBIT	- 0.57	0.49	0.49	0.31	0.43	0.23
P1	LOGIT	- 0.86	0.46	0.46	0.29	0.41	0.15

The table shows the average value of the GINI coefficient for out-of-sample analysis. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.

The final step of the testing process has been the KROC criterion analysis. It has been performed during the in-sample and the out-of-sample analyses. All values presented below have been calculated with the assumption that the cut-off point is equal to the percentile defining the dependent variable. This means that the cut-off point for the P1variable is equal to 0.01, the cut-off point for the P5 variable is equal to 0.05 and for the P10 variable equal to 0.1.

The KROC criterion results for the in-sample analysis (Table 14) confirm the results obtained for individual assets. The KROC criterion values are significantly lower for the P1dependent variable than for the P5 and the P10 variables. Again, the KROC criterion values for the P5 and the P10 variables are similar and low enough to assume that models with those dependent variables have high predictive quality. For each of the portfolios under consideration it is possible to find cut-off points with a lower value of the KROC criterion than for cut-off points equal to the

percentile which defines the dependent variable. However, the results for the so- defined cut-off points are close to optimal, and each time provide a model with a high predictive ability.

As for the GINI coefficient, the KROC criterion out-of-sample analysis (Table 15) has provided key results. It has turned out that during the out-of-sample analysis, models built on the P5 and the P10 dependent variables have lost much less from their predictive ability in comparison to models built on the P1 variable. Models with the P1variable have a very poor prognostic ability. For portfolios 1, 2 and 3 the binary models (LOGIT, PROBIT and CLOGLOG) have not once predicted the state of turbulence correctly. This result confirms the conclusions of the GINI coefficient out-of-sample analysis. Models based on the P1 dependent variable are characterized by high instability. This means that models based on the P1variable, although they work well for the sample on which the model has been estimated, its usefulness in the predicting process is much smaller.

Table 14. Results for the KROC criterion analysis for the portfolios. In-sample analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	0.47	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.48	0.44
P10	PROBIT	0.47	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.46	0.44
P10	LOGIT	0.47	0.41	0.41	0.43	0.47	0.44
P5	CLOGLOG	0.42	0.35	0.35	0.41	0.38	0.38
P5	PROBIT	0.41	0.34	0.34	0.39	0.36	0.37
P5	LOGIT	0.41	0.35	0.35	0.41	0.35	0.38
P1	CLOGLOG	0.16	0.22	0.22	0.15	0.16	0.18
P1	PROBIT	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.15	0.18
P1	LOGIT	0.16	0.21	0.21	0.15	0.16	0.18

The table shows the selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion for the in-sample analysis. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, results in red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.   .

Table 15. Results for the KROC criterion analysis for the portfolios. Out-of-sample analysis.

DEP. VAR.	MODEL	PORT. 1	PORT. 2	PORT. 3	PORT. 4	PORT. 5	AVERAGE
P10	CLOGLOG	0.61	0.64	0.64	0.82	0.61	0.66
P10	PROBIT	0.64	0.58	0.58	0.71	0.59	0.62
P10	LOGIT	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.82	0.61	0.65
P5	CLOGLOG	0.76	0.49	0.49	0.73	0.78	0.65
P5	PROBIT	0.77	0.49	0.49	0.55	0.78	0.62
P5	LOGIT	0.76	0.49	0.49	0.64	0.78	0.63
P1	CLOGLOG	1	1	1	0.67	0.51	0.84
P1	PROBIT	1	1	1	0.67	0.5	0.84
P1	LOGIT	1	1	1	0.67	0.51	0.84

The table shows the selection of the optimal cut-off point based on the KROC criterion for out-of-sample analysis. In the table a three-color scale has been used. Results in green cells are relatively the best, in results red cells are relatively the worst and results in yellow cells are moderate. The following abbreviations have been used: UNTRANSFORMED - the untransformed independent variables data set, DEP. VAR. - the dependent variable, P1 – the state of turbulence is defined as 1% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P5 - the state of turbulence is defined as 5% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period, P10 - the state of turbulence is defined as 10% of the worst realisation of rates of return for an asset during the analysed period.
Source: Own.   .   .

SUMMARY

During the empirical results analysis a number of possible combinations of assumptions for the state of turbulence models have been examined. It has been studied how different assumptions affect the quality of the model. The assumptions about the theoretical distribution of a random error, the definition of the dependent variable, the types of the independent variables data set and the choice of the cut-off point that defines the state of turbulence have been taken into consideration.

Based on the results of the in-sample analysis for individual assets, it may be stated that the choice of the theoretical distribution of a random error from the normal, the logistic and the Gompertz distribution is irrelevant to the quality of the model (all assumptions are equally good). The results have shown that models with the P20 dependent variable or ones built on the principal component or the factors have much lower quality than the others. It might also be noted that on average, the optimal cut-off point is equal to the percentage of observations that defines the state of turbulence.

The in-sample analysis of the portfolios has confirmed previously obtained results. Additionally, the out-of-sample analysis implies that models built on the P1 dependent variable are characterized by a very high instability in its discriminant and predictive ability.

Finally, the six combinations of assumptions, which meet all formal requirements and have a high predictive and discriminant ability, both for the in-sample and the out-of-sample analyses, have been selected. Table 16 shows the possible groups of assumptions which should allow to build a high quality state of turbulence model.

Table 16. Six the best combinations of the state of turbulence models assumptions.

ASSUMPTIONS	DEPENDENT VARIABLE	CUT-OFF POINT	DATA TYPE	MODEL
GROUP 1	P10	10%	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT
GROUP 2	P10	10%	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGTI
GROUP 3	P10	10%	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG
GROUP 4	P5	5%	UNTRANSFORMED	PROBIT
GROUP 5	P5	5%	UNTRANSFORMED	LOGTI
GROUP 6	P5	5%	UNTRANSFORMED	CLOGLOG

The table shows the six combinations of assumptions, which (based on the all results obtained) should define high-quality state of turbulence models.
Source: Own.

Due to the differences in the horizon of the analysis and significantly different specificity of the state of turbulence model and the EWS models developed by the authors of the studies discussed above, it is difficult to directly compare the obtained results. Nevertheless, it is worth referencing the general conclusions obtained in the study with the conclusions from the EWS model studies.

Firstly, it is worth noting that the results of the study confirm the findings from studies such as Eichengreen *et al.*(1995) [36], Kaminsky *et al.*(1998) [37], Beckmann *et al.*(2006) [38], Davis and

---

[36] Eichengreen Barry, Rose Andrew, Wyplosz Charles, Dumas Bernard, Weber Axel. *Exchange Market Mayhem: The Antecedents and Aftermath of Speculative Attacks*.
[37] Kaminsky Graciela, Lizondo Saul, Reinhart Carmen. Leading indicators of currency crises.
[38] Beckmann Daniela, Menkhoff Lukas, Sawischlewski Katja. *Robust lessons about practical early warning systems*.

Dilurby(2008)[39], Bussiere and Fratzscher(2008)[40] and Barrel *et al*. (2010)[41], in which models for binary dependent variable are regarded as adequate to predict the state of turbulence (the state of the crisis). The choice of the optimal cut-off point has also turned out to be very important as in the study of Fratzscher and Bussiere(2008)[42].

Secondly, results obtained have also confirmed the conclusions from Oh *et al*. (2006)[43] and Kim *et al*. (2008)[44] about the set of independent variables that can be used to predict the state of turbulence. The inclusion of variables describing the situation on the stock exchange, the foreign exchange and the interest rates markets should provide effective forecasts of the state of turbulence.

It seems that the state of turbulence models constructed in accordance with the scheme described in the study, with one of the six combinations of assumptions selected, can provide high quality forecasts and thus be very useful in risk management in a financial institution. The groups of assumptions specified in the Table 16, not only meet the formal requirements, but are also characterized by a high and stable predictive and discriminant ability. The high forecasts quality leads to the conclusion that the proposed model may be an effective tool for generating signals that trigger stricter control processes or increases in a capital buffer with respect to extraordinary loss expectation. It seems that these models may also be effectively used in measuring market risk in a financial institution. In this case, its usefulness should be verified on the basis of quality of the risk level forecasts provided by the models used to measure market risk, which would take into account the state of turbulence models. The possibility of using forecasts of the state of turbulence in the measurement of the market risk is an important issue because it could potentially lead to improved estimates of the regulatory capital held for market risk by a financial institution, which may translate into a greater stability of the entire sector. Construction and evaluation of the effectiveness of the market risk measurement models using state of turbulence models is a direction worth developing for the proposed models.

---

[39] Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba. *Comparing early warning systems for banking crises*.

[40] Bussiere Matthieu, Fratzscher Marcel. *Low probability, high impact: Policy making and extreme events*

[41] Barrell Ray, Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba, Liadze Iana. *Bank regulation, property prices and early warning systems for banking crises in OECD countries*.

[42] Bussiere Matthieu, Fratzscher Marcel. *Low probability, high impact: Policy making and extreme events*

[43] Oh Kyong Joo, Kim Tae Yoon, Kim Chiho. *An early warning system for detection of financial crisis using financial market volatility*.

[44] Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network Trained on the 1997 Crisis*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdi Hervé, Williams Lynne. *Principal component analysipages* "Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics". Nr 2(4), 2010, pages 433–459.

Akkuş Özge. *How to Test the Parametric Fit of the Complementary Log Log Model to the Data?* "Gazi University Journal of Science". Nr 25(3), 2012, pages 665-675.

Anderson Raymond. *Module C Stats and mathpages* W: Anderson Raymond. "The Credit Scoring Toolkit: Theory and Practice for Retail Credit Risk Management and Decision Automation". Oxford University Press, 2007, pages 159-254.

Barrell Ray, Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba, Liadze Iana. *Bank regulation, property prices and early warning systems for banking crises in OECD countriepages* "Journal of Banking & Finance". Nr 34(9), 2010, pages 2255-2264.

Beckmann Daniela, Menkhoff Lukas, Sawischlewski Katja. *Robust lessons about practical early warning systempages* "Journal of Policy Modeling". Nr 28(2), 2006, pages 163-193.

Berg Andrew, Borensztein Eduardo, Pattillo Catherine. *Assessing Early Warning Systems: How Have They Worked in Practice?* "IMF Staff Papers". Nr 52(3), 2005, pages 463-502. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/staffp/2005/04/pdf/berg.pdf

Berg Andrew, Pattillo Catherine. *Are Currency Crises Predictable? A Test*. "IMF Staff Papers". Nr 46(2), 1999, pages 107-138. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. https://www.imf.org/external/Pubs/FT/staffp/1999/06-99/pdf/berg.pdf

Burkart Olivier, Coudert VirGINIe. *Leading Indicators of Currency Crises in Emerging Economiepages* NER #74, Banque de France 2000. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://www.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/banque_de_france/Working_papers/ner74.pdf

Bussiere Matthieu, Fratzscher Marcel. *Low probability, high impact: Policy making and extreme events.*"Journal of Policy Modeling". Nr 30(1), 2008, pages 111-121.

Bussiere Matthieu, Fratzscher Marcel. *Towards a new early warning system of financial crisepages* "Journal of International Money and Finance". Nr 25(6), 2006, pages 953–973.

Cooper John. *Factor Analysis: An Overview*. "The American Statistician". Nr 37(2), 1983, pages 141-147.

Davis Philip, Karim Dilruba. *Comparing early warning systems for banking crisepages* "Journal of Financial Stability". Nr 4(2), 2008, pages 89-120.

Demirguc-Kunt Asli, Detragiache Enrica. *The Determinants of Banking Crises in Developing and Developed Countriepages* "IMF Staff Papers". Nr 45(1), 1998, pages 81-109. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://policydialogue.org/files/publications/Determinants_of_Banking_Crises.pdf

Demirguc-Kunt Asli, Detragiache Enrica. *Monitoring Banking Sector Fragility: A Multivariate Logit Approach*. "World Bank Economic Review". Nr 14(2), 2000, pages 287-307.

Edison Hali. *Do indicators of financial crises work? An evaluation of an early warning system*. "International Journal of Finance & Economics". Nr 8(1), 2003, pages 11-53.

Eichengreen Barry, Rose Andrew, Wyplosz Charles, Dumas Bernard, Weber Axel. *Exchange Market Mayhem: The Antecedents and Aftermath of Speculative Attackpages* "Economic Policy". Nr 10(21), 1995, pages 249-312.

Engle Robert. *Chapter 13. Wald, likelihood ratio, and Lagrange multiplier tests in econometricpages* W: Griliches Zvi, Intriligator Michael (red.). "Handbook of Econometricpages Volume 2". Elsevier 1984, pages 775-826. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1573441284020055

Fawcett Tom. *An introduction to ROC analysipages* "Pattern Recognition Letters". Nr 27(8), 2006, pages 861-874.

Frankel Jeffrey, Rose Andrew. *Currency crashes in emerging markets: An empirical treatment.*" Journal of International Economics". Nr 41(3-4), 1996, pages 351-366.

Greene William. *Chapter 4 Finite-Sample Properties of the Least Squares Estimator*. W: Greene William. "Econometric analysis 5th Edition". Prentice Hall 2003, pages 41-64.

Hosmer D., Hosmer T., Le Cessie S., Lemeshow S.. *A Comparison Of Goodness-Of-Fit Tests For The Logistic Regression Model*. "Statistics in Medicine". Nr 16(9), 1997, pages 965–980.

Hosmer David, Lemeshow Stanley. *Chapter 5. Assessing the Fit of the Model*. W: Hosmer David, Lemeshow Stanley. "Applied Logistic Regression. Second Edition". John Wiley & Sons 2000, pages 143-202.

Jackman Simon. *An Introduction to Factor Analysis* 2005. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://jackman.stanford.edu/classes/350c/old/factanal.pdf

Kaiser Henry. *A Second Generation Little Jiffy*. "Psychometrika". Nr 35(4), 1970, pages 401-415.

Kamal1Asifa, Khalid Pervaiz Muhammad. *Factors Affecting the Family Size in Pakistan: Clog-log Regression Model Analysipages* "Journal of Statistics". Nr18, 2011, pages 29-53.

Kamin Steven. *The current international financial crisis: how much is new?* "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System International Finance Working Paper". Working Paper Nr 636, 1999. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=171714

Kaminsky Graciela, Lizondo Saul, Reinhart Carmen. *Leading indicators of currency crisepages* "IMF Staff Papers". Nr 45(1), 1998, pages 1-48. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. https://www.imf.org/external/Pubs/FT/staffp/1998/03-98/pdf/kaminsky.pdf

Kaminsky Graciela. 1998. *Currency and banking crises: the early warnings of distrespages* "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System International Finance Working Paper". Working Paper Nr 629, 1998. http://www.federalreserve.gov/pubs/ifdp/1998/629/ifdp629.pdf

Kim Hee-Ju. *Common Factor Analysis Versus Principal Component Analysis: Choice for Symptom Cluster Research*. "Asian Nursing Research". Nr 2(1), 2008, pages 17–24.

Kim Tae Yoon, Hwang Changha, Lee Jongkyu. *Korean Economic Condition Indicator Using a Neural Network Trained on the 1997 Crisipages* "Journal of Data Science". Nr 2, 2004, pages 371-381.

King Gary, Langche Zeng. *Logistic Regression in Rare Events Data*. "Political Analysis" Nr 9, 2001, pages 137–163.

Komulainen Tuomas, Lukkarila Johanna. *What drives financial crises in emerging markets*? "BOFIT Discussion Papers" Nr 5, Bank of Finland 2003. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1015459

Metz Charlepages *Receiver Operating Characteristic Analysis: A Tool for the Quantitative Evaluation of Observer Performance and Imaging Systempages* "Journal of the American College of Radiology". Nr 3(6), 2006, pages 413-422.

Nagler Jonathan. *Scobit: An alternative Estimator to Logit and Probit.* "American Journal of Political Science". Nr 38(1), 1994, pages 230-255.

Oh Kyong Joo, Kim Tae Yoon, Kim Chiho. *An early warning system for detection of financial crisis using financial market volatility*. "Expert Systems". Nr 23, 2006, pages 83-98.

Powers David. *Evaluation: From Precision, Recall And F-Measure To Roc, Informedness, Markedness & Correlation*. "Journal Of Machine Learning Technologies". Nr 2(1), 2011, pages 37-63.

Qiao Li-fang, Zhang Yi-chuan. Qi An-guo. *Evaluation and classification of residential greenbelt quality based on factor analysis & clustering analysis: An example of Xinxiang City*. "China Journal of Forestry Research". Nr 19(4), 2008, pages 311−314.

Reinhart Carmen, Kaminsky Graciela. *The Twin Crises: The Causes of Banking and Balance-of-Payments Problempages* "American Economic Review". Nr 89(3), 1999, pages 473-500.

Steyerberg Ewout, Van Calster Ben, Pencina Michael. *Performance Measures for Prediction Models and Markers: Evaluation of Predictions and Classificationpages* "Revista Espanola de Cardiologia (English Edition)". Nr 64(9), 2011, pages 788-794.

Studies on the Validation of Internal Rating Systempages Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Basel 2005. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs_wp14.pdf

Suhr Diana. *Principal Component Analysis vpages Exploratory Factor Analysipages* Materiały konferencyjne: SAS® Users Group International Conference (SUGI 30). Paper 203-30, Philadelphia 2005. On Line. Access 6 December 2013. http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi30/203-30.pdf

Tasche Dirk. *Validation of internal rating systems and PD estimatepages* W: Christodoulakis George, Satchell Stephen (red.). "The Analytics of Risk Model Validation". Academic press 2008, 169-196.

Vincent Douglapages *The Orgin and Development of Factor Analysipages* "Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)". Nr 2(2), 1953, pages 107-117.

Youden William. *Index For Rating Diagnostic Testpages* "Cancer". Nr 3(1), 1950, pages 32-35.