

FORECASTING AND ANALYSIS OF CSI 300 DAILY INDEX AND S&P 500 INDEX BASED ON ARMA AND GARCH MODELS

Ningyi Li, Chennan Ju, Dexiang Su, Shuyan Wang and Xing Tong

In this paper, the ARMA(0,6)-GARCH(1,1) and ARMA(2,6)-eGARCH(1,1) models are constructed by applying ARMA and GARCH models to daily data of the CSI 300 and S&P 500 indices from 2018 to 2021, and the forecasts for the next 7 steps and the corresponding VaR and ES are calculated. After testing the sensitivity of the models, the two index stocks are compared and the corresponding conclusions are presented.

Introduction

Time series analysis is a basic technique in quantitative investment. Financial time series analysis considers the theory and practice of the evolution of financial variables (such as investment returns) over time. A time series is a series of values of a variable measured chronologically within a certain period of time. If the variable is the stock price, then its change over time is a time series; Similarly, if the variable is the return rate of the stock, its change over time is also a time series. The time series of financial assets is often viewed as an implementation of the change of the sequence of unknown random variables over time. Any financial time series contains uncertain factors, so the theory and method of statistics are very important in financial time series analysis. Time series analysis is to use statistical means to analyze the past of the series, so as to model the change characteristics of the variable and predict the future.

Time series analysis is widely used in engineering, economics, meteorology, finance and other fields. Classical time series analysis method was proposed in the 1920s and improved constantly. This modeling method does not consider the function of explanatory variables based on economic theory, but describes the changes of time series by extrapolation mechanism according to the change law of variables themselves. The establishment of time series model is based on stationarity.

The three purposes of time series analysis are forecasting, modeling and characterization. The purpose of forecasting is to predict the evolution of the system more accurately; The purpose of modeling is to give a description of the long-term behavior characteristics of the system. The purpose of feature extraction is to determine the basic properties of sequence without prior knowledge. The three purposes of time series are interpenetrating and interdependent. In recent years, the application of time series data mining in the financial field has developed rapidly, involving customer relationship management, credit risk warning, financial market changes and so on. As for the trend forecast, it mainly focuses on the stock price trend and the direction of change, the bond price forecast, the insurance company risk assessment and the bank credit risk forecast^[1].

ARMA model was put forward by Box, an American statistician, and Jenkins, a British statistician, in 1970. It is the most common model used to estimate stable irregular fluctuations or seasonal changes of time series. There are three basic forms : Auto-Regressive; Moving-Average; Hybrid models (ARMA: Auto-Regressive Moving-Average). ARMA model is a definite time series model prediction method, whose prediction accuracy is higher than that of simple model , it suitable for short-term forecasting. To establish the model, it requires the time series to be random and stable, and needs a lot of data, need to write a computer program to identify the model.^[2]

In many practical problems, the conditional variance of the random disturbance term of the sequence also changes with the change of time, that is, the sequence has the characteristic of variable variance. Engel first proposed ARCH model to model the difference in 1982 to describe the clustering and persistence of stock market fluctuations. In 1986, Bollerslev extended ARCH model and developed it into GARCH model. GARCH model is a regression model specially customized for the volume of financial data. Apart from the common regression model, GARCH further modeled the variance of the error. It is especially suitable for the analysis and

prediction of volatility, which can play a very important guiding role in the decision-making of investors, and its significance often exceeds the analysis and prediction of the value itself. GARCH model can describe most financial compensation time series, so it is widely used in volatility research^[1].

In the current research on China's stock market, Yu Qiao found that the characteristics of stock price volatility in Shanghai and Shenzhen can be described by autoregressive heteroscedasticity process^[3]. Ding Hua also pointed out that ARCH phenomenon exists in Shanghai Index^[4]; Wu Qiming, Ji Zhongxian, Yang Xiaorong et al. explained that ARCH phenomenon also exists in Shenzhen Composite Index^[5]; Wang Anxing and Lin Shaogong found that ARCH phenomenon also exists in a single stock^[6]. Yang Qi and Cao Xianbing used Arma-Garch model to analyze and forecast public stock prices, and concluded that ARMA model can better predict short-term prices, while ARCH model can well eliminate the conditional heteroschedasticity of volatility data such as stocks. Combining the two models can make the model more realistic and have better forecasting ability^[7]. Pan Guihao, Hu Nailian et al. pointed out that there is an obvious autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity effect in gold price, and established the ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model which can accurately depict the gold price data dynamically^[8]. Yu Yue made a volatility analysis on the CSI 300 index return series, and concluded that the CSI 300 index return series was relatively fragile on the whole, which was greatly affected when dealing with shocks^[9]. At present, there are few domestic forecasts for the S&P 500 index. Zhang Ruifeng, Zhang Shiyong and Tang Yong pointed out that there is a strong volatility spillover effect between the S&P Index and the Hang Seng, the Straits Index, South Korea and Nikkei in Asian stock markets.^[10]

ARMA model is suitable for the study of stationary stochastic processes, and has many shortcomings in measuring the volatility of financial asset prices. Therefore, scholars prefer to use Arma-Garch model which combines ARMA model and GARCH model to analyze financial data. At present, the researches on the application

of ARMA-GARCH model at home and abroad are mainly in the fields of stock index yield prediction, interest rate market risk measurement, exchange rate volatility prediction, listed company system risk measurement, environmental quality index measurement, industrial power measurement and so on. It provides valuable prediction and suggestions for the benign development of various fields. Due to the relevant characteristics of CSI 300 index, this study selects ARMA and GARCH models to predict its development trend, so as to obtain more reliable investment suggestions.

ARIMA Model

1. Consider firstly the daily CSI 300 stock index from Jan.2nd, 2018 to Dec.31st, 2021.




Figure 1 Daily CSI 300 stock index




Figure 2 Daily CSI 300 stock logreturn

Stationarity Check and Autocorrelation Check

For a stock index series, the non-stationarity is mainly due to the fact that there is no fixed level for the stock price. As shown in the Figure 1 above, starting at 4087, the series exhibits a downward trend, and then hits a low of 3000 at the end of 2018, followed by a gradual growth over the next 3 years. The log return of the index, however, is commonly believed to be stationary. As shown in Figure 2, the log return of the stock index seems to vary around a fixed mean level.




Figure 3 ACF and PACF of CSI 300's logreturn

To confirm the observed phenomenon, we apply the ADF unit-root test to the log series. We choose $p = 9$. Other values of p are also used, but they do not alter the conclusion of the test. With $p = 9$, the ADF test statistics is -10.282 with a p-value 0.01, indicating that the unit-root hypothesis is rejected and the log series are stationary. To check whether the log return series have an autocorrelation, We conduct Ljung-Box test with lag 6 and find that the P-value is 0.04458, thus we can reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the series does contain an autocorrelation.

Model Identifying

Since the log series are stationary, we apply ARMA(p,q) model:

$$X_t = c + \varepsilon_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \phi_i X_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$$

To specify the ARMA model, we compute AIC, which suggests an ARMA(0,6) model.

Then we estimate the coefficients and the model turns into:

$$X_t = \varepsilon_t - 0.0625\varepsilon_{t-6}$$

where standard errors of the coefficient estimates is 0.0319.

Model Checking

The Box-Pierce test can be used to check the adequacy of a fitted model. We conduct

the Box-Pierce test on the residuals with lags 6, 12 and 18. As shown in Table 1, all of the P-value are larger than 0.05, thus we cannot reject the null hypothesis and the residuals can be seen as white noise series. Therefore, the model is correctly specified.

Table 1 White Noise Check

| Lag order | Chi-square statistic | P-value |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|
| 6 | 9.0338 | 0.1717 |
| 12 | 11.697 | 0.4703 |
| 18 | 15.326 | 0.6395 |

Forecasting Using ARMA Model

Table2 gives some out-of-sample forecasts of the ARMA(0,6) model for the log return of the daily CSI 300 stock index at the forecast origin $h = 973$ (Dec.31st, 2021). The sample mean and the standard deviations of the estimation sample(total 973 observations) are 0 and 0.0056856, respectively. As expected, the table shows that:

- (a) The 7-step-ahead forecast is the sample mean.
- (b) The standard deviations of the forecast errors converge to the standard deviation of the series as the forecast horizon increases.

Table 2 Out-of-Sample Forecasts

| Step | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|--------|---------|---------|--------|
| Forecast($\times 10^{-4}$) | 1.3931 | 0.3652 | -1.7522 | 3.8762 | -2.1007 | -1.1468 | 0 |
| Std. Error($\times 10^{-3}$) | 5.6779 | 5.6778 | 5.6779 | 5.6779 | 5.6779 | 5.6779 | 5.6890 |
| Actual | 2.447 | 2.542 | 9.237 | -1.713 | 6.026 | 14.999 | 16.565 |

2. Then we consider the daily S&P 500 index from Jan.2nd, 2018 to Dec.31st, 2021.




Figure 4 Daily S&P 500 index




Figure 5 Daily S&P 500 logreturn

ACF and PACF




Figure 6 ACF and PACF of daily S&P 500 logreturn

Stationarity Check and Autocorrelation Check

The stock index is not stationary. As shown in the Figure 4 above, starting at around 2696, the series fluctuate in the first two years, and then hits a low of 2267 in March, 2020, followed by a drastic growth over the next 2 years. The log return of the index is commonly believed to be stationary. As shown in Figure5, the log return of the stock index seems to vary around a fixed mean level.

With $p = 10$, the ADF test statistics is -8.9155 with a p-value 0.01, indicating that the unit-root hypothesis is rejected and the log series are stationary. To check whether the log return series have an autocorrelation, We conduct Ljung-Box test with lag 6, 12, 24,etc and find that all of the P-values are far less than 0.01, thus we can reject the

null hypothesis, indicating that the series does contain an autocorrelation.

Model Identifying

Since the log series are stationary, we apply ARMA(p,q) model:

$$X_t = c + \varepsilon_t + \sum_{i=1}^p \varphi_i X_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \varepsilon_{t-j}$$

To specify the ARMA model, we compute AIC and BIC, which suggests an ARMA(2,6) model. Then we estimate the coefficients and the model turns into:

$$X_t = 0.0004 + \varepsilon_t - 1.6188\varphi_{t-1} - 0.8258\varphi_{t-2} + 1.4818\varepsilon_{t-1} + 0.7209\varepsilon_{t-2} + 0.1090\varepsilon_{t-3} + 0.0688\varepsilon_{t-4} - 0.0754\varepsilon_{t-5} - 0.1396\varepsilon_{t-6}$$

where standard errors of the coefficient estimates are 0.0004, 0.0500, 0.0422, 0.0566, 0.0659, 0.0598, 0.0594, 0.0553 and 0.0364, respectively.

Model Checking

We conduct the Box-Pierce test on the residuals with lags 6, 12 and 18. As shown in Table3, all of the P-value are larger than 0.05, thus we cannot reject the null hypothesis and the residuals can be seen as white noise series. Therefore, the model is correctly specified.

Table 3 White Noise Check

| Lag order | Chi-square statistic | P-value |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|
| 6 | 0.23786 | 0.9997 |
| 12 | 4.8741 | 0.9621 |
| 18 | 9.6335 | 0.9432 |

Forecasting Using ARMA Model

Table 2 gives some out-of-sample forecasts of the ARMA(2,6) model for the log return of the daily CSI 300 stock index at the forecast origin $h = 1008$ (Dec.31st, 2021). The sample mean and the standard deviations of the estimation sample (total 1008 observations) are 0.0002 and 0.005841, respectively.

Table 4 Out-of-Sample Forecasts

| Step | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|--------------------------------|---------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Forecast($\times 10^{-4}$) | -2.5500 | -0.3088 | 7.9282 | -4.4564 | 1.0809 | -2.2490 | 3.1530 |
| Std. Error($\times 10^{-3}$) | 5.3793 | 5.4295 | 5.4686 | 5.4686 | 5.4860 | 5.4882 | 5.5253 |
| Actual | -0.6296 | -19.3928 | -0.9637 | -4.0502 | -1.4411 | 9.1600 | 2.8177 |

GARCH model

1. CSI 300

After building the ARCH model, we will model the residual. According to the Box Pierce test, we found that the residual is not a white noise sequence. According to the analysis of stock market volatility, it is appropriate to select GARCH model for modeling. The basic form of GARCH model is as follows:

$$\sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 u_{t-1}^2 + \alpha_2 u_{t-2}^2 + \dots + \alpha_q u_{t-q}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \beta_p \sigma_{t-p}^2$$

Including GARCH term and ARCH term, it is the volatility. The coefficient shall meet the following conditions:

$$\alpha_0 > 0, \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_q \geq 0, \beta_1 \dots \beta_p \geq 0.$$

Approximate distribution of residuals

In order to find out whether the residual is suitable for GARCH model modeling, we have drawn a residual plot and a QQ plot. The results are as follows:




Figure 7 Residual plot




Figure 8 Histogram of residuals

Figure 9 Q-Q Plot

The results show that there is not much autocorrelation value and autocorrelation in the residual, while the QQ plot shows that the residual is a short tailed distribution.

Normal Distribution Test and ARCH Effect Test

In order to establish GARCH model, we need to test whether the residuals are normal distribution and whether there is ARCH effect. Shapiro Wilk normality test is conducted on the residual error, and the test results show that $W=0.96454$, $p\text{-value}=1.243e-14$, so we reject the original hypothesis of normal distribution; At the same time, the ARCH effect test shows that the LM effect is significant no matter how

Table 6 Eacf plot of the squared residuals

| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| 0 | x | o | x | o | x | o | o | o | x | x | o | o | o | o |
| 1 | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 2 | x | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 3 | x | x | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 4 | x | x | x | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 5 | x | x | x | x | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 6 | x | x | x | o | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |
| 7 | x | x | x | o | x | x | x | o | o | o | o | o | o | o |

According to the eacf chart, we can find that it is reasonable to use GARCH (1,1) model to analyze the residual. Therefore, we use GARCH (1,1) model to analyze the volatility of Shanghai Shenzhen 300 Index.

The fitting equation for calculating GARCH model is as follows:

$$\sigma_2^t = 1.695 \times 10^{-6} + 0.1158u_{t-1}^2 + 0.8383\sigma_{t-1}^2$$

Where standard errors of coefficient is: 4.340e-07、 1.245e-02、 1.833e-02, All coefficients of the model are significant.

The Jarque Bera Test and Box Ljung Test are performed on the model. The results of the Jarque Bera Test show that the residual of Garch model is non normal, while the results of the Box Ljung Test show that the square of the residual is a white noise sequence.




Figure 11 gBox-test

The generalized mixed test is performed on the model and the results are shown in the figure above.

It can be seen that there is no correlation between standard residuals. Based on our GARCH (1,1) model, we can draw conditional variance graph and prediction graph:




Figure 12 Conditional variance plot




Figure 13 7-step prediction chart

2. S&P 500

Similarly, Shapiro Wilk normality test is carried out on the residuals, and the test results show that $W=0.87946$, $p\text{-value}<2.2e-16$, so we reject the original hypothesis of normal distribution; The ARCH effect test shows that the sample residual has the ARCH effect, so we continue to use the GARCH model to model. Use each diagram to determine the order of p and q , and get:

$$\sigma_2^t = 1.003 \times 10^{-6} + 0.1625u_{t-1}^2 + 0.7900\sigma_{t-1}^2$$

Where standard errors of coefficient is: $1.600e-07$ 、 $2.128e-02$ 、 $2.560e-02$. The Jarque Bera Test and Box Ljung Test are also conducted. The results of the Jarque Bera Test show that the residual of the Garch model is non normal, while the results of the Box Ljung Test show that the square of the residual is a white noise sequence.

Through the generalized mixed test, we can see that some points fail the test,

indicating that the model fitting is not very good; The conditional variance chart and prediction chart are also drawn according to the model:




Figure 14 gBox-test and Conditional variance plot




Figure 15 7-step prediction chart

For the S&P 500, we also used the eGARCH (1,1) model to model, and the obtained relationship is as follows:

$$\ln h_t = -5.3325 + 0.920106 \ln h_{t-1} - 0.172891 \left| \frac{\varepsilon_{t-1}}{\sqrt{h_{t-1}}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right| + 0.387354 \frac{\varepsilon_{t-1}}{\sqrt{h_{t-1}}}$$

Where standard errors of coefficient is: 0.162690、0.026615、0.014795、0.047607. The four parameters of the model obtained have good significance.

Weighted Ljung Box Test is performed on the square of the residual and the square of the standardized residual. The results show that the residual is a white noise sequence; Weighted ARCH LM Tests were conducted, and it was found that the data after

modeling eliminated the influence of heteroscedasticity; According to Sign Bias Test, standardized residuals have leverage effect, so it is appropriate to model with eGARCH; According to the Adjusted Pearson Goodness of Fit Test, our assumption of standardized residual distribution is also appropriate. The forecast results of eGARCH are as follows:




Figure 16 7-step prediction chart for time series




Figure 17 7-step prediction chart for standard error σ

VaR and ES

VaR, which is short for "Value at Risk", refers to the maximum possible loss of a financial asset (or portfolio of securities) in a specific period of time in the future at a certain confidence level.

Expected Shortfall (ES), also known as Conditional VaR or Expected Tail Loss (ETL), refers to the average loss (expected value) suffered by an investment portfolio when

the loss exceeds the VaR.

We use the equation:

$$VaR_{1-p} = \mu + Z_{1-p}\sigma$$

To calculate the VaR, For CSI 300, we know that $\mu = 0.0011$, $\sigma = 0.0125$; For S&P 500, we know that $\mu = 0.0033$, $\sigma = 0.0097$. Thus, we can calculate the VaR in different probability. After apply the equation of ES:

$$ES_{1-p} = E[X|X > VaR_{1-p}] = \frac{\int_{VaR_{1-p}}^{\infty} xf(x)dx}{Pr(X > VaR_{1-p})}$$

We can get the results as shown in the following table.

Table 7 VaR and ES of CSI 300

| | prob | VaR | ES |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 0.95 | 0.0217 | 0.0269 |
| 2 | 0.99 | 0.0302 | 0.0344 |
| 3 | 0.999 | 0.0397 | 0.0432 |
| 4 | 0.9999 | 0.0476 | 0.0506 |

Table 8 VaR and ES of S&P 500

| | prob | VaR | ES |
|---|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 0.95 | 0.0192 | 0.0233 |
| 2 | 0.99 | 0.0258 | 0.0291 |
| 3 | 0.999 | 0.0332 | 0.0359 |
| 4 | 0.9999 | 0.0393 | 0.0416 |

Forecast result

The short-term forecast results are as follows:

$$Close_t = 1.132163 * Close_{t-1} - 0.215793 * Open_{t-1} - 0.399326 * High_{t-1} + 0.299041 * Low_{t-1} + 740.468464$$

The predicted closing price in the next 5 days: 3823.56, 3839.06, 3854.89, 3867.33, 3876.90.




Figure 18 The predicted closing price

Granger causality test

Based on variables Open and Close/Last, the significance P value is 0.000***, showing significance. The result indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected and Open can cause Close/Last changes.

Based on variables High and Close/Last, the significance P value is 0.004***, showing significance. The result shows that the null hypothesis is rejected, and High can cause Close/Last change.

Based on variables Low and Close/Last, the significance P value is 0.003***, showing significance. The result indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, and

Low can cause Close/Last changes.

Table 9 Granger causality test

| Pair samples | | F | P |
|--------------|------------|---------|----------|
| Open | Close/Last | 51.515 | 0.000*** |
| Close/Last | Open | 0.145 | 0.708 |
| High | Close/Last | 11.144 | 0.004*** |
| Close/Last | High | 2.035 | 0.172 |
| Low | Close/Last | 11.548 | 0.003*** |
| Close/Last | Low | 0.188 | 0.670 |
| High | Open | 0.155 | 0.699 |
| Open | High | 12, 471 | 0.003*** |
| Low | Open | 0.024 | 0.879 |
| Open | Low | 4.962 | 0.040** |
| Low | High | 1.225 | 0.284 |
| High | Low | 0.571 | 0.460 |

*Note: ***, ** represents significance levels of 1%, 5%, and 10%.*

Model stability test




Figure 19 AR roots in the model

AR roots in the model are all located in the unit circle, which indicates that the VAR system is stable. The model can be further used for impulse response analysis and

variance decomposition.

Impulse response analysis

According to the impulse response diagram on the left, it can be seen that the closing price responds positively when the opening price, the highest price and the lowest price fluctuate by one positive standard deviation. It means that an increase in each of the three prices leads to an increase in the closing price, and that this positive effect diminishes over time.




Figure 20 Impulse response analysis

Variance decomposition result

The impact of the opening price (data fluctuation) has a greater impact on the closing price. 46.6% of the fluctuation in the closing price can be explained by the fluctuation in the opening price. Compared with the opening price, the highest price and the

lowest price have less contribution to the variance of the closing price.

Table 10 Variance decomposition result

| Order | Standard deviation | Close/Last% | Open% | High% | Low% |
|-------|--------------------|-------------|--------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 24.027 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 62.323 | 55.494 | 41.637 | 2.286 | 0.584 |
| 3 | 75.076 | 52.821 | 45.02 | 1.656 | 0.504 |
| 4 | 80.071 | 52.02 | 46.029 | 1.463 | 0.488 |
| 5 | 82.09 | 51.719 | 46.405 | 1.393 | 0.484 |
| 6 | 82.908 | 51.6 | 46.551 | 1.366 | 0.483 |
| 7 | 83.238 | 51.553 | 46.61 | 1.355 | 0.482 |
| 8 | 83.372 | 51.533 | 46.634 | 1.351 | 0.482 |
| 9 | 83.426 | 51.526 | 46.643 | 1.349 | 0.482 |
| 10 | 83.448 | 51.523 | 46.647 | 1.348 | 0.482 |

Conclusion

This paper analyzes the price time series of the CSI 300 Index and the S&P 500 index from 2018 to 2021, uses the ARMA-GARCH comprehensive model to predict the development trend of the index, and analyzes and compares the volatility of the two indexes.

In the empirical analysis of CSI 300 index, we find that ARIMA(0,0,6) model can better predict the price of the index without lag. With the increase of the forecast range, the standard deviation of the forecast error is similar to that of the series. At the same time, through the establishment of GARCH(1,1) model, we once again verified the ARCH phenomenon in CSI 300 index. Through the empirical analysis of S&P 500 index, we choose ARIMA(2,0,6) model as the prediction model, and get the ARCH effect of S&P 500 index.

From the forecasting results, the short-term forecasting effect of the model is better

than the long-term forecasting effect. In the short-term forecast, some changes with small effects can be ignored, while in the longer time dimension, the change of the index will be affected by more variable factors, such as macro policies, industry environment, international situation, etc. The compound effect of various factors will bring great interference to the long-term forecast of the original forecast model, making it lose its accuracy and weaken the original forecast effect.

According to the current research, in the stock market with complex and changeable environment and multiple influencing factors, if we want to accurately predict the development trend of future assets, we need to constantly update the mathematical model and consider multiple factors. When the current market conditions change dramatically, the forecast model should be adjusted in time according to the existing conditions, and a variety of environmental factors with significant influence should be taken into account as much as possible in order to obtain reliable forecast results. If some variables with significant influence are missing or omitted, the forecast effect of the model may be greatly reduced, and credible investment recommendations cannot be provided. In the long - term forecast, we should treat the forecast model more carefully and use the forecast results.

Reference

- [1]Wu W, Liu XY, Yang Y & Wang N. (2010). Time series analysis methods and two common models ARMA,GARCH. *Computer Technology and Development*(01),247-249+253.
- [2]Wang, Lina, Xiao, Dongrong. (2004). Forecasting analysis of economic non-smooth time series based on ARMA model. *Journal of Wuhan University of Technology (Transportation Science and Engineering Edition)* (01), 133-136.
- [3]Yu, Qiao. (1994). Market efficiency, cyclical anomalies and stock price volatility - An empirical analysis of the Shanghai and Shenzhen stock markets. *Economic Research* (09), 43-50.
- [4]Ding, H.. (1999). The ARCH phenomenon in stock index fluctuations. *Research in Quantitative Economics and Technology Economics* (09), 22-25.
- [5]Wu, Q. M., Ji, Z. H., Yang, X. R.. (1998). Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (ARCH) Models and Applications. *Forecasting* (04).
- [6]Wang, An-Xing, Lin, Shao-Gong. (1998). Speculative and non-speculative price discovery - An illustration based on ARCH class model. *Research in Quantitative Economics and Technology Economics* (12), 7-9.
- [7]Yang Q & Cao Xianbing. (2016). Stock price analysis and forecasting based on ARMA-GARCH model. *Mathematical Practice and Understanding* (06), 80-86.
- [8]Pan, Guihao, Hu, Nai-Lian, Liu, Huan-Zhong & Li, Guo-Qing. (2010). An empirical analysis of gold prices based on ARMA-GARCH model. *Gold* (01), 5-8.
- [9]Yu Yue. (2022). A study on volatility of CSI 300 index returns based on ARMA-GARCH model. *National Circulation Economy* (28), 153-156. doi:10.16834/j.cnki.issn1009-5292.2022.28.025.
- [10]Zhang, R.F., Zhang, S.Y. & Tang, Y. (2006). (2006). Analysis and empirical study of volatility spillover in financial markets. *Chinese Management Science* (05), 14-22. doi:10.16381/j.cnki.issn1003-207x.2006.05.003.