

Application of Zhangs Square Root Law and Herding to Financial Markets

Friedrich Wagner

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Kiel, Leibnizstrasse 15, D-24098 Kiel, Germany, e-mail: wagner@theo-physik.uni-kiel.de

Abstract

We apply an asymmetric version of Kirman's herding model to volatile financial markets. In the relation between returns and agent concentration we use the square root law proposed by Zhang. This can be derived by extending the idea of a critical mean field theory suggested by Plerou et al. We show that this model is equivalent to the so called 3/2-model of stochastic volatility. The description of the unconditional distribution for the absolute returns is in good agreement with the DAX independent whether one uses the square root or a conventional linear relation. Only the statistic of extreme events prefers the former. The description of the autocorrelations are in much better agreement for the square root law. The volatility clusters are described by a scaling law for the distribution of returns conditional to the value at the previous day in good agreement with the data.

Key words: Econophysics, Financial Market, Volatility, Stochastic Processes

PACS: 89.90.+n, 02.50.-r, 05.40.+j, 05.45.Tp

1 Introduction

Any model for the price or index of a financial market should account for the following so called stylized facts [1,2]. (i): The sign of the return cannot be predicted. In most models this fact is build in by assuming the return proportional to an iid noise. (ii): The probability for having an absolute return larger than x decays for large x as a power law x^{-n_T} . The tail index n_T seems to be universal [3] in the range 3-4. A precise determination of n_T for daily returns is hampered by the impossibility to reach the asymptotic regime in the data. Therefore one should require a good description of all returns. (iii): Returns are not independent. They form so called volatility cluster. A quantitative measure of this effect may be the distribution of first passage times [4]. In this paper we use the distribution of the returns conditional to the

value of the previous day. (iv): Absolute returns are correlated. In the case of high frequency data a hyperbolic decay of the autocorrelation indicates a long memory process. For daily returns it behaves neither as a power law nor a simple exponential expected from a Markov process.

To achieve these properties one can distinguish two schools. The first are the stochastic volatility models. Here one assumes the return to be an iid noise multiplied with a volatility factor $\sqrt{V_T}$, where V_T typically follows a Markov process. Examples are the GARCH model [6] and its continuous time version [7]. Other possibilities are the CIR-model [8] or the 3/2 model [9] discussed in ref [10]. The multifractal model [11] implements fact (iv) by occurrence of many time scales. Any model for daily returns faces the following difficulty. The quality of data for daily returns does not allow to estimate reliably more than three parameters, for example a scale parameter given by the first moment, a combination of parameters describing the tail index and a rate constant for the time dependence as in GARCH(1,1). Therefore the parsimony principle invoked by Calvet and Fisher [11] is rather a must and not a freedom. For stochastic volatility models a second difficulty arises, that the choice of the free parameters is dictated by mathematical convenience. Their relation to market properties remains obscure. This difficulty is avoided in agent or microscopic models (for a recent review see ref [12] and the references given therein). The behaviour of the agents may be characterized by utility functions [13]. The observed power law (fact (ii)) motivates the use of critical physical models as the application of percolation by Cont-Bouchaud [14]. The percolation cluster are interpreted as herding behaviour of the agents. In the Lux-Marchesi model [15] a herding mechanism appears explicitly in the transition probabilities between chartists and fundamentalistic traders. This leads to an intermittent behaviour of agent numbers and thereby also for the returns. To see whether herding alone can describe the stylized facts a symmetric Kirman model [16] has been studied [17]. Quantitative agreement with the data could be achieved [18] within an asymmetric Kirman model. In the latter agents differ slightly from those in the Lux-Marchesi model that the two types of chartists (optimists and pessimists) are replaced by one sort of agents (noise traders). The difference between optimists and pessimists is described by an iid random number. With this approximation the return behaves similar to a stochastic volatility model, except $\sqrt{V_T}$ follows a Markov process instead of V_T . In this paper we apply the Kirman model with a further simplification. In empirical investigations it has been found [18,19] that fundamentalists are much less affected by herding than noise traders, which implicates a very asymmetric herding model. In the limit of large asymmetry the number of free parameters is reduced from three to two. In the spirit of parsimony we adopt this approach.

For an application to financial markets an equation of state is needed relating the return to ratios of agent numbers. In a Walrasian market [18] the volatility factor $\sqrt{V_T}$ depends linearly on the concentration of agents. The model using the simplified Kirman model and this linear relation has been studied in

[19]. In this paper we adopt another equation of state. In contrast to a Walrasian market the time for an agreement of the agents on a common return ought to be finite. Assuming a random walk Zhang [20,21] concluded that V_t itself should be proportional to the agent concentration. We use this approach in the present paper. It offers two desirable properties. Since in stochastic volatility models V_t and in herding models the concentration proportional to V_t follow simple Markov processes, one might be able to show the equivalence of the latter with one of the stochastic volatility models. Secondly one can use the empirical observation of Plerou et al [22], that the return and the imbalanced volume satisfy the same relation as the order parameter and an external field in a critical mean field theory. In the framework of a universal Φ^4 [23] there ought to be another equation for the return at zero field. We will show that Zhang's law emerges within such a model naturally from risk aversity. Whether the Walrasian linear relation or Zhang's law are correct can be decided at present only empirically. We will compare our model and the results from ref [19] with the probability density function (hereafter abbreviated with pdf) and the autocorrelation function with the empirical returns derived from the DAX.

The paper is organized in the following way. In section 2 we describe our version of the Kirman model and in section 3 a derivation of Zhang's law. The resulting unconditional pdf and the common pdf for two absolute returns at different times are given in section 4. The square root law together with a Gaussian noise allows analytical calculation of various observables. As examples we treat the autocorrelation function and the pdf conditional on the value of the previous day. These predictions we confront with the data in section 5. In section 6 we make some concluding remarks.

2 Kirman's Herding Model

We want to describe the changes of prices in a stock market with different agents which can change their strategy as function of time. Apart from the specification of an agent model a relation between the relative changes (return) of the stock index and the agent numbers is needed which will be treated in the next section. As herding model we use the Kirman model [16] discussed by Alfarano et al [18]. It is defined by the transition probability between two types of behaviour. S denotes the mood of noise traders and F a conservative or fundamentalistic strategy. The probabilities per unit time to change opinion are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(S \rightarrow F) &= (a_2 + b \cdot n_F) \\ \pi(F \rightarrow S) &= (a_1 + b \cdot n_S) \quad .\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

The parameters $a_{1,2}$ correspond to spontaneous changes of mind. The second terms in equ (1) are proportional to the agent numbers $n_{S,F}$ in the new state and therefore describe the herding effect. Despite of the extensive character of π this Markov process leads for a large number of agents to a non trivial equilibrium distribution for intensive ratios as $u \propto n_F/(n_S + n_F)$. As shown in [18] the master equation belonging to (1) leads to a Fokker Planck equation (hereafter abbreviated by FPE) for the pdf $w(u, t)$ and a Langevin equation for $u(t)$. In application of the model it turned out [18,19] that in most cases $a_1 \gg a_2$ holds. This means that fundamentalists are much less influenced by herding than noise traders. Invoking the parsimony principle we consider the limit of large a_1/b . For the ratio

$$u = \frac{a_1}{b} \cdot \frac{n_F}{n_F + n_S} \quad (2)$$

it is shown in appendix A that one obtains the following FPE

$$\frac{\partial w(u, t)}{\partial t} = b \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left[u - \beta - 1 + \frac{\partial}{\partial u} u \right] w(u, t) \quad , \quad (3)$$

with the parameter $\beta = a_2/b - 1$ describing the equilibrium pdf. This implies, that the number of fundamentalists is much smaller than that of the noise traders. If we transform the Langevin equation belonging to (3) to the variable $y = 1/u$

$$\Delta y = b \Delta t y_t (1 + (1 - \beta)y_t) + (2b\Delta t y_t^3)^{1/2} \eta_t \quad , \quad (4)$$

we obtain a well known model of stochastic volatility, the so called 3/2 model [9] provided we identify y_t in the relation between the return r_t and a Gaussian noise η_t

$$r_t = \sqrt{V_t} \cdot \eta_t \quad (5)$$

with the volatility factor V_t . Equ (4) corresponds to a special version of the 3/2 model where drift and diffusion constants are related to ensure existence of an equilibrium pdf for y . From $V_t = u_t$ follows another frequently used model [8].

The limit of large a_1/b affects also the time scales. As shown in the appendix the process (1) should be applied to micro time steps Δt_m , whereas the variable u changes with the observed time scale Δt . Both are related by $\Delta t = a_1 \Delta t_m / b$. Eliminating a_1/b with (2) we get

$$\frac{n_F}{n_F + n_S} = u \cdot \frac{\Delta t_m}{\Delta t} \quad , \quad (6)$$

which shows an explicit dependency of the agent ratio on the time resolution Δt .

As shown in [9] the FPE can be solved analytically for the equilibrium pdf $w_0(u)$

$$w_0(u) = \frac{u^\beta}{\Gamma(\beta + 1)} \exp(-u) \quad (7)$$

and for the conditional pdf $w(u, t + t_0 | \bar{u}, t_0) = A(u | \bar{u}, \exp(-bt))$ with

$$A(u | \bar{u}, z) = w_0(u) \frac{(u\bar{u}z)^{-\beta/2}}{1 - z} \exp\left(-\frac{z(u + \bar{u})}{1 - z}\right) I_\beta\left(\frac{2\sqrt{u\bar{u}z}}{1 - z}\right) \quad (8)$$

I_β denotes the Bessel function with imaginary argument. The kernel A has the following convolution property

$$\int d\bar{u} A(u | \bar{u}, z) A(\bar{u} | u', z') = A(u | u', z \cdot z') \quad (9)$$

and can be used for the time evolution of $w(u, t + t_0)$

$$w(u, t + t_0) = \int d\bar{u} A(u | \bar{u}, \exp(-bt)) w(\bar{u}, t_0) \quad (10)$$

3 Derivation of Zhang's Law

The problem of this section deals with relation of agent ratio to the observable return r_t . The small decay time in the autocorrelation of the returns suggests that the dynamic of the price is much faster than the change of agent numbers. The extreme case of an instantaneous Walrasian market has been assumed in ref [18] to model the behaviour of agents in the Lux-Marchesi model[15]. With the additional assumption that the change between optimistic and pessimistic noise traders occurs also on a fast time scale one gets [18] a linear relation between the return and the agent ratio n_S/n_F . Using u for small values of n_F one gets

$$r_t = \Delta \ln S_t = r_0 \cdot \frac{1}{u_t} \cdot \eta_t \quad (11)$$

The noise η_t incorporates many changes during Δt due to the noise traders. In this Walrasian approach the price change is set instantaneously, a closed order book is assumed and the agents have to accept any new return irrespective of their risk aversity. Considering for example the XETRA market

these assumptions seem to be questionable. Removing the first assumption Zhang [20] assumed the time needed to get the new price is proportional to the demand, which is linear in the agent numbers. Describing the evolution of the price by a random walk the return will be proportional to the square root of the agent numbers. Therefore the linear relation (11) should be replaced by the so called square root law given by

$$r_t = r_0 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{u_t}} \cdot \eta_t \quad (12)$$

It has been applied [21] in context of the percolation model of Cont-Bouchaud [14] in order to obtain a tail index larger than 2. Equ (12) agrees with the return obtained in the 3/2 stochastic model. Therefore the parameters of the latter can be related to the behaviour of agents.

To obtain a less qualitative derivation of (12) and to include the effect of risk aversity and an unbalanced order book we start with an observation made by Plerou et al [22], who showed empirically that the absolute return v increases with the imbalanced volume Ω at small time intervalls Δt and small Ω as

$$v_t = |r_t| \propto \Omega_t^{1/\delta} \quad (13)$$

with an exponent $\delta = 2.9 \pm 0.3$. At large Δt and Ω the return saturates as $v = B_0 \tanh(B_1 \Omega)$. As suggested already in ref [22] this could be interpreted as an equation of state in a critical mean field theory if v corresponds to a scalar order parameter and Ω to an external field. As dynamical fields in such a theory we use the return $\Phi_{k,i}$ expected by agent i of type $k = F, S$. After time Δt equilibrium is reached at a common return $r = E[\Phi_{k,i}]$. A critical mean field theory with a scalar order parameter is described by the universal Φ^4 model [23]. This is defined by the following cost or energy functional

$$S(\Phi) = S_{\text{int}}(\Delta\Phi) + \sum_{k=S,F} \sum_i \left[\frac{\beta_k}{4} \Phi_{k,i}^4 - \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \Phi_{k,i}^2 - \Omega \Phi_{k,i} \right] \quad (14)$$

The first term S_{int} is a positive definite quadratic form in the differences $\Delta\Phi_{ik,jl} = \Phi_{k,i} - \Phi_{j,l}$ describing the interaction between the agents. We assume it strong enough that in equilibrium the mean field value for $\Phi_{i,k}$ is independent of i, k . This means the agents reach a common value v for their expected absolute return. We normalize S_{int} by $S_{\text{int}}(0) = 0$. The Φ^4 terms lead to large cost functions for large Φ . They account for the risk aversity of the agents. We expect that noise traders are much less affected by risk aversity than fundamentalists and can set β_S to zero. Since the disordered phase $E[\Phi] = 0$ is not observed, the coefficients α_k in the quadratic term in (14) must be positive. A negative contribution to the cost function of the noise traders can

be interpreted as 'happy loser' effect [20], that fundamentalists are willing to accept a loss of money restricted by their risk aversity. The analogous term for the fundamentalists can be neglected by setting $\alpha_F = 0$. The last term in (14) corresponds to the coupling of the return to an imbalanced volume. If this coupling is independent of k the coefficient can be set without loss of generality to 1. In the limit of large agent numbers the model is solved by a constant $\Phi_{k,i} = v$ with negligible variance. The value of v is given by the minimum of (14). With the above discussed approximations S reads

$$S(v) = \frac{\beta_F}{4} n_F v^4 - \frac{\alpha_S}{2} n_S v^2 - \Omega v (n_S + n_F) \quad . \quad (15)$$

Introducing the parameter Ω_0 by

$$\Omega_0 = \left[\frac{(n_S \alpha_S)^3}{(n_S + n_F)^2 \beta_F n_F} \right]^{1/2} \quad (16)$$

the value of v making $S(v)$ to a minimum satisfies the following mean field equation

$$\left(\frac{n_S \alpha_S}{(n_S + n_F) \Omega_0} v \right)^3 - \frac{n_S \alpha_S}{(n_S + n_F) \Omega_0} v - \frac{\Omega}{\Omega_0} = 0 \quad (17)$$

The solution of (17) can be written as

$$\frac{v}{\Omega_0} = \frac{n_S + n_F}{\alpha_S n_S} \cdot f \left(\frac{\Omega}{\Omega_0} \right) \quad (18)$$

Equ (18) expresses the scaling property of the critical theory. Ω , Ω_0 and v may be rescaled by the same factor without altering the results. The scaling function f does not depend on any parameter. Its behaviour near $x \sim 0$ and $x \rightarrow \infty$ is given by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{1}{2}x + \dots & \text{for } x \ll 1 \\ (x)^{1/3}(1 + (x)^{-2/3} + \dots) & \text{for } x \gg 1 \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

If only the leading terms are kept, for historical reasons the first form is called the zero field equation of state and the second the critical isotherm. The latter written in v reads as

$$v^3 = \frac{n_S + n_F}{\beta_F n_F} \cdot \Omega \quad , \quad (20)$$

where we recover (13) for $\Omega \gg \Omega_0$. For $\Omega \ll \Omega_0$ we get another equation of state

$$v = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_S}{\beta_F} \cdot \frac{n_S}{n_F}} \quad , \quad (21)$$

which reproduces the square root law of Zhang. The size of Ω_0 depends on the time resolution Δt , if we use the Kirman model of the previous section. Inserting equ (6) for the agent ratios we get

$$\Omega_0 \propto \left(\frac{\Delta t}{u} \right)^{1/2} \quad . \quad (22)$$

Therefore the empirical relation (13) should hold only at small time scales in agreement with the data [22]. For large time scales the Zhang's law ought to be applied. In addition we have the prediction, that the rate factor r_0 in (12) should vary with Δt as

$$r_0 \propto (\Delta t)^{1/2} \quad . \quad (23)$$

This power law is in nice agreement with the observed [30] power of 0.51. There are still two problems within our derivation of the square root law. The application of a critical theory is confined to small values of the fields. At finite values the scaling law (18) may no longer valid. Secondly the return does not saturate as required by the data, but will increase as (20) for large Ω . There exist of course many models which have the same small field expansion as (14). Even if we restrict ourselves to a minimal model of Ising spins which has been used in ref [22] to describe the saturation there will be an extra parameter for the distance from the scaling law (18). As shown in appendix B for a spin model the mean field equation (17) should be replaced by

$$\frac{n_S \alpha_S v}{(n_S + n_F) \Omega_0} = \frac{3}{(3 - y^2) y} \cdot \tanh \left(\frac{n_S \alpha_S v y}{(n_S + n_F) \Omega_0} + \frac{y^3}{3} \cdot \frac{\Omega}{\Omega_0} \right) \quad (24)$$

with a parameter y describing the deviation from the critical region. For $y \rightarrow 0$ we recover the critical mean field equation. Finite y may be adjusted to the observed saturation of the return with the unbalanced volume Ω . Therefore the critical isotherm (20) is very model dependent. On the other side the zero field equation for $\Omega \ll \Omega_0$ is almost unchanged. In the case of (24) we obtain

$$v = a(y) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_S}{\beta_F} \cdot \frac{n_S}{n_F}} \quad (25)$$

with a y -dependent constant $a(y)$ which is the non zero solution of

$$a \cdot y = \frac{3}{3 - y^2} \cdot \tanh(a \cdot y) \quad . \quad (26)$$

Since this constant can be absorbed into the rate constant r_0 , the square root law appears to be robust against deviation from criticality. In appendix B we also replaced the Ising spin model by a compact model, which leads to the same conclusions.

At present stage of research only empirical observations can decide on the possibilities (12) or (11). In the present paper we want to discuss whether there are advantages of the square root law (12) over the linear relation (11).

4 Unconditional probability and 2-point function

Suppose one observes a time serie of the absolute returns $H_t = [v_1, \dots, v_t]$. We assume the time t to be an integer by absorbing the time step Δt in the rate factor b . Only the combined process $[H_t, U_t]$ with the history $U_t = [u_0, \dots, u_t]$ of the herding variables is a Markov process. This property is expressed by the following recursion formula for the pdf $f(H, U)$

$$f(H_t, U_t) = g(v_t | u_t) \cdot A(u_t | u_{t-1}, e^{-b}) \cdot f(H_{t-1}, U_{t-1}) \quad . \quad (27)$$

Assuming the square root law (12) with a Gaussian noise the conditional distribution g is given by

$$g(v|u) = N_0 \sqrt{u} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{v^2 u}{2r_0^2}\right) \quad (28)$$

with the normalization constant $N_0 = \sqrt{2/\pi r_0^2}$. To calculate the pdf for the absolute returns H_t the solution of the recursion (27) has to be integrated over all u variables. The square root law leads to an exponential dependence of g as function of u , which matches with the exponentials in A allowing analytical calculations. In principal the recursion (27) can be used to compute $f(H_t)$. The singularity of A for $\exp(-b) \sim 1$ presents a problem, if one encounters a small value of the rate b . For the determination of the parameters β, r_0 and b two simpler cases are sufficient and we defer an approximative solution of the recursion (27) to a future publication [24].

The common pdf $f(v_{t+t_0}, v_t)$ for the absolute returns at t_0 and $t + t_0$ is obtained from the t times iterated recursion (27) by integrating over U_t and all

intermediate $v_{t+1} \cdots v_{t-1+t_0}$. The latter integration eliminates the corresponding g -factors and we can use the convolution property (9) of A to perform the intermediate u integration leading to

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = \int du \, du_{t_0} g(v_{t+t_0}|u) A(u|u_{t_0}, e^{-bt}) \int dH_{t_0-1} dU_{t_0-1} f(H_{t_0}, U_{t_0}) \quad . \quad (29)$$

For large t the operator A converges to the equilibrium distribution $w_0(u)$ independent of u_{t_0} . Therefore $f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0})$ factorizes in the limit of large t as

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = G_0(v_{t+t_0}) \cdot f(v_{t_0}) \quad (30)$$

with the equilibrium pdf

$$G_0(v) = \int du \, g(v|u) w_0(u) = N_0 \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 3/2)}{\Gamma(\beta + 1)} \left(1 + \frac{v^2}{2r_0^2}\right)^{-\beta-3/2} \quad (31)$$

This Pareto like distribution becomes at large v a power law v^{-n_T-1} with a tail index n_T determined by the herding parameter

$$n_T = 2\beta + 2 \quad . \quad (32)$$

From equ (31) all equilibrium moments may be calculated (see equ (D.2) in the appendix). For example the second moment

$$E_0[v^2] = \frac{r_0^2}{\beta} \quad (33)$$

will be used for expressing r_0 in terms of β and the observable second moment in equilibrium ¹.

To derive an explicit form of the two point function $f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0})$ we take in equ (29) large t_0 with finite t . Analogue to the previous case the distribution factorizes and we obtain

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = \int du du' g(v_{t+t_0}|u) A(u|u', e^{-bt}) g(v_{t_0}|u') w_0(u') \quad . \quad (34)$$

The integrations in (34) can be carried out and $f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0})$ is expressed in terms of hypergeometric functions. The exact form is given in appendix C. An interesting property of f is that it depends only on a combination $\zeta(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0})$

¹ Expectation values taken with the equilibrium pdf (31) will be denoted by $E_0[\cdot]$

but not each of the variables v_{t_0} and v_{t+t_0} separately. Such a behaviour implies scaling laws. We demonstrate this scaling law in the simple case of $t = 1$ and neglected terms of order b . As shown in appendix C the conditional pdf $f(v_{t+1}|v_t)$ is given by

$$f(v_{t+1}|v_t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi(2r_0^2 + v_t^2)}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 2)}{\Gamma(\beta + 3/2)} \left(1 + \frac{v_{t+1}^2}{2r_0^2 + v_t^2}\right)^{-\beta-2} . \quad (35)$$

If we eliminate r_0 with equ (33) and introduce the scaling variable x_{t+1} by

$$x_{t+1} = \frac{v_{t+1}}{\sqrt{2\beta E_0[v^2] + v_t^2}} , \quad (36)$$

we get

$$f(x_{t+1}|v_t) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 2)}{\Gamma(\beta + 3/2)} (1 + x_{t+1}^2)^{-\beta-2} . \quad (37)$$

The conditional distribution of x_{t+1} is independent of the previous return v_t . From this we can determine β , since only at the true β the data for x_{t+1} with different v_t will collapse into a single scaling function $f(x_{t+1})$. This function can be compared with the predicted curve (37).

Knowing the two point function the autocorrelation of v^q can be derived (see appendix D). The ratio

$$R = \frac{E[v_{t+t_0}^q v_{t_0}^q]}{E_0^2[v^q]} = F(q/2, q/2; \beta + 1; e^{-bt}) \quad (38)$$

involves again a hypergeometric function. For negative values of $\alpha = q - \beta - 1$ the variance of v^q exists and we find the autocorrelation function $C(t)$

$$C_q(t) = \frac{E_0^2[v^q]}{\text{var}[v^q]} \cdot (F(q/2, q/2; \beta + 1; e^{-bt}) - 1) . \quad (39)$$

If we expand for large t the hypergeometric function we find with the leading term an exponentially decay

$$C_q(t) = \frac{q^2}{4(\beta + 1)} \cdot e^{-bt} . \quad (40)$$

For small b and finite t the deviation from the exponential dependence (40) and the exact expression (39) may be substantial. It is interesting to note that

Intervall	β	$\Delta\beta$	χ^2/point
1/1973-10/1978	4.3	1.4	9/19
11/1978-8/1984	3.3	1.0	31/18
9/1984-7/1990	0.98	0.12	39/25
8/1990-3/1996	1.04	0.15	41/22
4/1996-2/2002	1.86	0.35	21/30
1/1973-2/2002	1.115	0.068	44/43

Table 1

β values and their statistical errors obtained by a fit in four different time intervalls. The last row gives the fit using all data. Column 3 gives the χ^2 value per data point.

for $\alpha > 0$ the ratio R becomes singular at $t = 0$. Applying Eulers relation to the hypergeometric function one observes for the ratio

$$R = \frac{\Gamma(\beta + 1)\Gamma(\alpha)}{\Gamma(q/2)^2} \cdot (bt)^{-\alpha} \quad (41)$$

a power law in t . This does not mean a long memory since neither the variance exists nor it consists in a large t effect. The example given by Lillo et al.[28] shows that Markov processes may lead to power law in t also with existing variance.

5 Empirical Comparison with the DAX

In this section we want to estimate the parameters of the model described in the previous section from a time serie of absolute returns of the DAX[25] during 1973-2002. The most efficient method would be using a maximum likelihood fit. The bad analytical properties of A make this task prohibitive unless b is large. As less efficient but tractable method to estimate β and r_0 is to use χ^2 fits to the unconditional pdf given in equ (31). In presence of correlations the sample of length T can be still considered as a representative subset of an infinite time serie if $bT \gg 1$ holds. A small rate parameter b may cause a problem. To see this we divide the data in 5 subsamples of similar statistics. Here and in all subsequent estimates we fix r_0 by equ(33) in terms of β and $E_0[v^2]$. We checked that in each case a free variation of r_0 did not alter the results. The estimates of β in each sample are given in table 1. They behave rather erratic and χ^2 probability is rather low indicating a poor description of the data. This effect is due to the volatility clusters which are by no means equally distributed over the subsamples. Taking all data one obtains a good

χ^2 value and the following value of β

$$\beta = 1.115 \pm 0.068 \quad . \quad (42)$$

In figure 1 we compare the pdf from equ (31) with the empirical data. The agreement is excellent with a χ^2 -probability of 60%. The values in the sub-samples agree with (42) within two standard deviations. The value (42) corresponds to a tail index of $n_T \sim 4$ which is slightly larger than the values obtained in other financial markets [3,26]. As we discuss later on this may be an effect of not having reached the asymptotic regime in the data.

We can compare our model with a model discussed by Alfarano [19] where




Fig. 1. *The pdf from equ (31) for equilibrium (solid line) as function of the absolute return compared with the DAX from 1973-2002. The dashed line gives the result of the linear relation.*

the same herding mechanism is used but the square root law replaced by the linear relation (11). The fit is worse (χ^2 -probability $\sim 1\%$), but in view of possible systematic errors still acceptable. The difference stems mainly from the better description of low returns in our model. On a log scale the fit in the linear model (dashed line in figure 1) can hardly be distinguished from our model, although the tail index $n_T \sim 6$ is 50% larger than in our case. A χ^2 - or maximum likelihood fit is dominated by the many events with low v .

	1985-2002			1973-2002		
x	$N_{sqr t}$	N_{lin}	N_{obs}	$N_{sqr t}$	N_{lin}	N_{obs}
5	8.1	7.6	11	13.8	13.0	24
6	3.9	3.4	6	6.6	5.7	9
7	2.1	1.6	3	3.6	2.8	6
9	0.8	0.5	1	1.3	0.8	1
11	0.3	0.2	0	0.6	0.3	1
15	0.09	0.03	0	0.2	0.06	0

Table 2

Predicted number of events with normalized absolute return larger than x (column 1) for the square root law (column 2 and 5) and the linear law (column 3 and 6) for two time intervalls. The observed number from DAX is given in column 4 and 7.

To judge the description of extreme events we compare the predicted events with $v > x\sqrt{E_0[v^2]}$ in both models with the observed number of events. Since the largest return in figure 1 corresponds to $x \sim 6$ the fits may not be sensible to extreme events with larger x . The values for $x \geq 5$ are given in table 2. Despite of the large difference in the tail index both models agree with the observation reasonably well with a preference for the square root law. Large differences occur only outside the observable region ($x > 15$). We also learn that there is no need for an extra mechanism for crash events as proposed in [27].

Both models can be distinguished if we consider the time dependence. The parameter b can be estimated from the common pdf for pairs $[v_{t+t_0}, v_t]$ given in equ(C.5) of the appendix. We perform maximum likelihood fits by adding the log likelihoods for all pairs with a time lag $t_{0i} = [1, 2, 5, 10, 20]$. Maximizing $\sum_{i,t} \log f(v_{t+t_{0i}}, v_t)$ with respect to b and β we obtain

$$\beta = 1.083 \pm 0.020 \quad (43)$$

$$b = 0.0075 \pm 0.0015 \quad . \quad (44)$$

The value of β is compatibel with the estimate (42) from the equilibrium pdf. The estimate (44) for b implies a large decay time $t_D = 1/b \sim 133[\text{day}]$ in the order of 1/2 year. In the linear model only the autocorrelation function can be computed. This model cannot describe the data over large range of time lags. Adjusting b to describe the autocorrelation for small time lags a value $b \sim 1/37[\text{day}]^{-1}$ is obtained [19]. In figure 2 we compare the autocorrelation function given in (39) (solid line) of our model with the values from DAX. The agreement is good. The leading asymptotic term (40) (dashed line) shows that the data cannot be described by an exponential behaviour. The prediction of [19] (dotted line) should be valid only for small time lags. Therefore the data




Fig. 2. *Correlation function for DAX. Solid line gives the prediction of equ (39), the dashed line the asymptotic term (40) and the dotted line the prediction of the linear relation.*

for the autocorrelation prefer the square root law.

Finally we test the scaling prediction, that the conditional pdf $f(v_{t+1}|v_t)$ is independent of v_t if one uses the scaling variable

$$x_{t+1} = \frac{v_{t+1}}{\sqrt{2\beta E_0[v^2] + v_t^2}} \quad . \quad (45)$$

The assumption of small b is very well satisfied with (44). In figure 3 we show the distribution of x obtained in four intervalls of the normalized absolute return

$$y_t = \frac{v_t}{\sqrt{E_0[v^2]}} \quad (46)$$

at $\beta = 0.4, 0.7, 1.11, 3.0$. For a $\beta \sim 1.1$ the data collapse into a single curve. This curve agrees with the predicted scaling function (37) (solid line). From this agreement we conclude that the model describes the correlation between




Fig. 3. *Conditional pdf for the scaling variable x_{t+1} defined in (45) for various β and v_t intervals. The solid line for $\beta = 1.11$ gives the prediction 37. The intervals of the normalized return y from equ 46 are denoted by stars (diamonds, triangles, squares) for $y \leq 0.35$ ($0.35 \leq y \leq 0.9$, $0.9 \leq y \leq 1.5$, $y \geq 1.5$).*

v_t and v_{t+1} well, which is not obvious from the autocorrelation due to the large fluctuation near $t = 0$ seen in figure 2. A best fit to the scaling curve (37) leads to $\beta = 1.1 \pm 0.2$ which agrees with the previous estimations in (42) and (43). It is very remarkable that three very different methods to determine β lead to the same value.

6 Conclusions

The herding model of Kirman has been considered in the limit that fundamentalists are much less affected by herding than noise traders. As a consequence the market consists of many noise traders and few fundamentalists reflecting the conditions in a real market. Volatility cluster occur if the fundamentalists disappear from the market. This is in contradiction to the results of the Lux-Marchesi model, where fundamentalists dominate and volatility clusters appear if chartists rise beyond 30%. Augmenting the herding model with Zhang's square root law between price changes and agent ratios the model

turns out to equivalent to the 3/2 model of statistical volatility. This coincidence allows an interpretation of the parameters in the latter model in terms of agent behaviour. Due to the simplicity of our model various observables can be calculated analytically. This is important in χ^2 or maximum likelihood estimations, where numerically accurate and computationally easy accessible expressions are required.

Comparing our model with empirical data we find good agreement with the stylized facts derived from the DAX. The tail index of 4 is in harmony with universality. Replacing the square root law by a linear relation one gets a worse but still acceptable value of χ^2 , however the tail index increases to 6. This shows that the index depends strongly whether one uses a Pareto law in the squared return v^2 (as in our model) or in v . Universality of the tail index and the behaviour of extreme events favor the square root law. The autocorrelation of the absolute return will decay exponentially at large time lags. The very small rate constant b ensures that this asymptotic behaviour is reached outside the region of timelags where the data can be trusted. The reasonable agreement of the autocorrelation function of our model with the data is much better than in the linear model. A quantitative measure of the volatility cluster is expressed by a new scaling law for the pdf conditional on the value of the previous day, which is again in good agreement with the data.

The predictions based on a recursive solution of the combined Markov process of return and agent ratios will be presented in a future publication.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Thomas Lux and Simone Alfarano for stimulating discussions and valuable hints.

A Asymmetric Kirman Model

In this section we give the changes of the formulae of [18] in the case if one of the parameters describing the spontaneous change of opinion becomes large. As pointed out in [18] the macroscopic time scale Δt during the returns are observed does not need to coincide with the microscopic time scale Δt_m over which the agents change opinion. On the latter scale we have the FPE for $z = n_S/(n_S + n_F)$ derived in [18] from the transition probabilities (1)

$$\frac{\Delta w(z, t)}{\Delta t_m} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[z a_2 - (1 - z) a_1 + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} b z (1 - z) \right] w(z, t) \quad . \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For large a_1 z will be close to 1. Therefore we introduce the variable u by

$$u = \frac{a_1}{b} (1 - z) = \frac{a_1}{b} \frac{n_F}{n_S + n_F} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which remains finite. Transforming (A.1) into u and neglecting terms of the order b/a_1 we find

$$\frac{\Delta w(u, t)}{\Delta t_m} = a_1 \cdot D_u w(u, t) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with the differential operator

$$D_u = \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \left[u - \frac{a_2}{b} + \frac{\partial}{\partial u} u \right] \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The real time scale Δt (f.e. days) is related to Δt_m by

$$\Delta t = \frac{a_1}{b} \cdot \Delta t_m \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The limit of large a_1 leads to small average values of the number of fundamentalists. By the identification (A.5) the agent ratio can be expressed in terms of the time scale

$$\frac{n_F}{n_S + n_F} = \frac{\Delta t_m}{\Delta t} u \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Inserting (A.5) into equ. (A.3) leads to

$$\frac{\Delta w(u, t)}{\Delta t} = b \cdot D_u w(u, t) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which is equivalent to equ. (7) replacing $\Delta w(u, t)/\Delta t$ by $\partial w(u, t)/\partial t$ and a_2/b by $\beta + 1$. The FPE (3) (see [9]) can be solved by expanding $w(u, t)$ in terms of Laguerre polynomials $L_n^\beta(u)$:

$$w(u, t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n(t) L_n^\beta(u) w_0(u) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with the equilibrium pdf $w_0(u)$ from equ. (7). The functions $L_n^\beta(u) \cdot w_0(u)$ are right eigen functions of D_u

$$D_u \cdot L_n^\beta(u) w_0(u) = -n \cdot L_n^\beta(u) w_0(u) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

The conditional pdf $A(u|\bar{u}, z)$ follows from the generating function of the Laguerre polynomials (see [29]). The convolution property (9) is proven by the orthogonality of L_n^β

$$E_0[L_n^\beta(u) L_{n'}^\beta(u)] = \delta_{n, n'} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

with $E_0[.]$ the expectation value with respect to w_0 .

B Models Outside the Critical Region

A general class of models can be characterized by the following cost functional

$$S(\Phi) = -\frac{g+g_0}{N\sigma_0^2} \sum_{i<j} \Phi_i \Phi_j - \frac{\mu_0 \Omega}{\sigma_0} \sum_i \Phi_i \quad . \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The minimum coupling g_0 ensures that the system is never in the disordered state. σ_0 and μ_0 set the scales for Φ and Ω . A suitable dynamic (Langevin equation, heat bath or Metropolis algorithm) will bring the system into equilibrium, which is a Boltzmann distribution. Expectation values are given by derivatives of the partition sum Z :

$$Z = \prod_i \int d\mu(\Phi_i) \exp(-S(\Phi)) \quad . \quad (\text{B.2})$$

For the measure $d\mu(\Phi)$ we can use either a spin or a compact model. μ reads in these cases

$$\int d\mu(\Phi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\Phi=\pm\sigma_0} & \text{for} & \text{for the Ising model} \\ \frac{1}{2\sigma_0} \int d\Phi & \text{for} & \text{for the compact model} \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

The expectation value of the return is given by

$$v = E \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \Phi_i \right] = \frac{\sigma_0}{N\mu_0} \frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial \Omega} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

To evaluate Z we use the Gaus trick for large agent number N :

$$\exp\left(\frac{g+g_0}{N\sigma_0^2} \sum_{i<j} \Phi_i \Phi_j\right) = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2\pi(g+g_0)}} \int d\omega \exp\left(-\frac{N\omega^2}{2(g+g_0)} + \frac{\omega}{\sigma_0} \sum_i \Phi_i\right) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Inserting equ (B.5) into Z the integration over Φ_i can be carried out with the result

$$Z = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2\pi(g+g_0)}} \cdot \int d\omega \exp \left(-N \left[\frac{\omega^2}{2(g+g_0)} - \ln C(\omega + \mu_0\Omega) \right] \right) . \quad (\text{B.6})$$

For the spin model we set $g_0 = 1$ and C is given by

$$C(x) = \cosh(x) \quad , \quad (\text{B.7})$$

whereas in the compact model we use $g_0 = 3$ and the function C as

$$C(x) = \frac{1}{x} \cdot \tanh(x) \quad . \quad (\text{B.8})$$

In the large N -limit Z is given by the maximum of the integrand at ω_0 . For the spin model we get

$$\omega_0 = (g+1) \tanh(\omega_0 + \mu_0\Omega) \quad . \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Replacing ω_0 by the expectation value $v = E[\Phi_i] = \omega_0\sigma_0/(g+1)$ we find the equation of state

$$v = \sigma_0 \tanh \left((g+1) \frac{v}{\sigma_0} + \mu_0\Omega \right) \quad (\text{B.10})$$

To get the relation with the parameters of the critical model discussed in section 3 we expand equ (B.10) around small g and μ_0

$$\frac{1}{3\mu_0} \left(\frac{g+1}{\sigma_0} \right)^3 \cdot v^3 - \frac{g}{\sigma_0\mu_0} \cdot v - \Omega = 0 \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Comparing coefficients with the equation of state (18) we get two equations for the three parameters g , σ_0 and μ_0 . For example the scale parameter μ_0 for Ω can be chosen arbitrarily. Measuring μ_0 in units of Ω_0 we set

$$\mu_0 = \frac{1}{(6g_0 - 3)\Omega_0} \cdot y^3 \quad (\text{B.12})$$

and express g and σ_0 in terms of the previous parameters Ω_0 and α_S

$$g = \frac{y^2}{3 - y^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_0 = \frac{\Omega_0}{\alpha_S} \frac{3}{y(3 - y^2)} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Inserting these parameters into equ (B.10) we obtain the equation of state valid also outside the critical region

$$\frac{\alpha_S}{\Omega_0} \cdot v = \frac{3}{(3 - y^2)y} \cdot \tanh(\xi) \quad (\text{B.14})$$

with

$$\xi = \frac{\alpha_S}{\Omega_0} \cdot v + \frac{y^3}{6g_0 - 3} \cdot \frac{\Omega}{\Omega_0} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

The parameter y with $0 < y < \sqrt{3}$ describes the distance from the critical behaviour obtained for $y \rightarrow 0$. The saturation of the return as function of Ω determines the value of y . The exact form is model dependent. The analogous calculation for the compact model leads instead of (B.14) to

$$\frac{\alpha_S}{\Omega_0} \cdot v = \frac{45}{(15 - y^2)y} \cdot \left(\coth(\xi) - \frac{1}{\xi} \right) \quad (\text{B.16})$$

It has the same behaviour for $y \rightarrow 0$, but extrapolates hyperbolically for small $1/\Omega$ to a constant instead of the exponential behaviour obtained from (B.14).

C Two Point Function of the Probability Density

From the expansion of the Bessel function in (8) we obtain the following representation for A with $z = \exp(-bt)$

$$A(u|u', z) = \frac{u^\beta}{(1 - z)^{\beta+1}} \exp\left(-\frac{u}{1 - z} - \frac{zu'}{1 - z}\right) \cdot \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{uu'z}{(1 - z)^2}\right)^m \frac{1}{m!} \frac{1}{(\beta + m)!} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Inserting (C.1) and the noise distribution (28) into equ(34) we obtain after integration over u and u'

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = \frac{N_0^2}{\beta!} (1 - z)^{\beta+2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{((\beta + m + 1/2)!)^2}{m!(\beta + m)!} z^m \cdot \left[(1 + (1 - z) \frac{v_{t+t_0}^2}{2r_0^2}) \cdot (1 + (1 - z) \frac{v_{t_0}^2}{2r_0^2}) \right]^{-(\beta+m+3/2)} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The sum corresponds to the serie expansion of the hypergeometric function

$$F(a, b; c; x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a+m-1)!}{(a-1)!} \frac{(b+m-1)!}{(b-1)!} \frac{(c-1)!}{(c+m-1)!} \frac{x^m}{m!} \quad . \quad (\text{C.3})$$

At special arguments $F(a, b; c; 0) = 1$ and $F(a, b; c+1; 1) = c!(c-a-b)!/((c-a)!(c-b)!)$ holds. Using the scaling variable

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{2r_0^2} \left(v_{t+t_0}^2 + v_{t_0}^2 + (1-z) \frac{v_{t+t_0}^2 v_{t_0}^2}{2r_0^2} \right) \quad (\text{C.4})$$

we get

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = \left(\frac{N_0(\beta+1/2)!}{\beta!} \right)^2 \frac{(1-z)^{\beta+2}}{(1+(1-z)\zeta)^{\beta+3/2}} \cdot F\left(\beta+3/2, \beta+3/2; \beta+1; \frac{z}{(1+(1-z)\zeta)}\right) \quad . \quad (\text{C.5})$$

With Euler's relation $F(a, b; c; x) = (1-x)^{c-a-b} F(c-a, c-b; c; x)$ equ(C.5) can be rewritten as

$$f(v_{t+t_0}, v_{t_0}) = \left(\frac{N_0(\beta+1/2)!}{\beta!} \right)^2 \frac{\sqrt{1+(1-z)\zeta}}{(1+\zeta)^{\beta+2}} \cdot F\left(-1/2, -1/2; \beta+1; \frac{z}{(1+(1-z)\zeta)}\right) \quad . \quad (\text{C.6})$$

If terms of order $1-z$ are negligible and $t=1$ ζ agrees with the scaling variable x_{t+1}^2 from equ (36). Setting in F the argument to 1 leads to

$$f(v_{t+1}, v_t) = \frac{2(\beta+1)}{\pi r_0^2} \left(1 + x_{t+1}^2 \right)^{-\beta-2} \quad . \quad (\text{C.7})$$

This equation is equivalent to (35) if we use

$$f(x_{t+1}|v_t) = \frac{dv_{t+1}}{dx_{t+1}} \frac{f(v_{t+1}, v_t)}{G_0(v_t)} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

with the equilibrium pdf (31) for v_t .

D Autocorrelation

The easiest way to derive $E[v_{t+t_0}^q \cdot v_{t_0}^q]$ is to perform in equ(34) first the v integrations using

$$\int_0^\infty g(v|u) v^q dv = E_0[v^q] \frac{\beta!}{(\beta - q/2)!} u^{-q/2} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

with the equilibrium moments

$$E_0[v^q] = \sqrt{\frac{2^q}{\pi}} r_0^q \cdot \frac{(\beta - q/2)!((q - 1)/2)!}{\beta!} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Inserting as in the previous section the expansion (C.1) and performing the integrations over u and u' we obtain for the ratio

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \frac{E[v_{t+t_0}^q v_{t_0}^q]}{E_0[v^q]^2} \\ &= (1 - e^{-bt})^{\beta+1-q} \cdot \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(\beta + m - q/2)!}{(\beta - q/2)!} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{\beta! \cdot e^{-btm}}{m!(\beta + m)!} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Again the sum is a hypergeometric function leading to

$$R = (1 - e^{-bt})^{\beta+1-q} \cdot F\left(\beta + 1 - q/2, \beta + 1 - q/2; \beta + 1; e^{-bt}\right) \quad (\text{D.4})$$

With the help of Euler's relation we get finally

$$R = F\left(q/2, q/2; \beta + 1; e^{-bt}\right) \quad (\text{D.5})$$

For large bt expansion of F up to linear terms leads to

$$R = 1 + \frac{q^2}{4(\beta + 1)} \cdot e^{-bt} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

For $bt \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta + 1 - q < 0$ the expectation value R becomes singular. Replacing in equ(D.4) the function F by its value at argument 1 we find the power law given in equ (41)

References

- [1] C. G. de Vries The handbook of International Macroeconomics, Blackwell, Oxford 1994, p. 348.
- [2] A. Pagan Journal of Empirical Finance **3** (1996) 15
- [3] T. Lux and M. Ausloos in A. Bunde et al.(ed.) Theory of Disaster, Berlin 2002, p.373
- [4] F. Wagner Physica A **322** (2003) 607
- [5] Y. Liu, P. Gopikrishnan, P. Cizeau, M. Meyer, C. K. Peng and H. E. Stanley Phys.Rev E **60** (1999) 1390
P. Gopikrishnan, V. Plerou, L. A. Nunes Amaral, M. Meyer and H. E. Stanley Phys.Rev E **60** (1999) 5305
- [6] R. F. Engle and T. Bollerslev Econometric Reviews **5** (1986) 1
- [7] D. B. Nelson Journ. of Econometrics **45** (1990) 7
- [8] J. C. Cox, J. e. Ingersoll and S. A. Ross Econometrica **53** (1985) 385
- [9] D. Ahn and B. Gao Rev.Fin.Studies **12** (1999) 721
- [10] A. l. Lewis Option Valuation under Stochastic Volatility, Finance Press, Newportbeach 2000
- [11] L. Calvet and A. Fisher Review of Economics & Statistics **84** (2002) 381
- [12] E. Samanidou, E. Zschischang, D. Stauffer and T. Lux in F. Schweitzer (ed.)Microscopic models for Economic Dynamics, Lecture notes in Physics, Springer, Berlin 2002.
- [13] G. Kim and H.M. Markowitz Journ. Portfolio Management **16** (1989) 45
M. Levy, H. Levy and S. Solomon Journal de Physique I **5** (1995) 1087 and Physica A **242** (1997) 90
S. Solomon and R. Richmond, Physica A **299** (2001) 188 O. Biham, Z. F. Huang, O. Malcai and S. Solomon Phys. Rev. E **64** (2001) 101
- [14] R. Cont and J. P. Bouchaud Macroeconomic Dynamics **4** (2000) 170
- [15] T. Lux and M. Marchesi Nature **397** (1999) 397 and Int. Journ. Theor. Appl. Finance **3** (2000) 67
- [16] A. Kirman Quart. Journal Econ. **108** (1993) 137
- [17] S. Alfarano and T. Lux in A. Kirman and G. Teyssi re, eds., Long Memory in Economics and Econometrics, Springer, Berlin 2004
- [18] S. Alfarano, F. Wagner and T. Lux to be published in Computational Economics 2005
- [19] S. Alfarano Thesis, Kiel 2005

- [20] Y.C. Zhang Physica A **269** (1999) 30
- [21] D. Stauffer and D. Sornette Physica A **271** (1999) 496
- [22] V. Plerou, P. Gopikrishnan, X. Gabaix and H. E. Stanley Phys.Rev E **66** (2002) 027104
- [23] J. J. Binney, N. J. Darwick, A. J. Fisher and M. E. J. Newman The Theory of Critical Phenomena, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1992
- [24] S. Alfarano and F. Wagner, to be published
- [25] Data basis of Institut für Weltwirtschaft, Kiel
- [26] M. M.Dacarogna, R. Gençay and U. Müller An Introduction to High-Frequency Finance, Academic Press, Oxford 2001
- [27] A. Johansen, O. Ledoit and D. Sornette Int. Journ. of Theor. and Applied Fin. **3** (2000) 219
- [28] F. Lillo, S. Micciche and R. N. Mantegna arXiv:cond-mat/0203442 (2002)
- [29] A. Erdely Higher Transcendental Functions Volume 2, p.189 McGraw-Hill Inc., New York 1953
- [30] P. Gopikrishnan, V. Plerou, L. A. Nunes Amaral, M. Meyer and H. E. Stanley Phys.Rev E **60** (1999) 5305