

Question 1 (50 out of 100 points)

Consider the following  $n$ -dimensional vector autoregressive (VAR) process of order 2 for  $t = 3, \dots, T$ :

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \gamma + \Phi_1 y_{t-1} + \Phi_2 y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \\ \varepsilon_t &\sim \text{NID}(0, \Sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{1-2}$$

The values of  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  are known.

- 1. Provide two equivalent formulations of the conditions under which  $\{y_t\}$  in (1)-(2) is weakly stationary. NB: The terms 'weak stationarity' and 'covariance stationarity' are synonymous.
- 2. Derive the log-likelihood function of the sample conditional on  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ . You may use the fact that the density of a multivariate Normal random variable  $z \sim N(\mu, \Gamma)$  is

$$f(z) = (\det(2\pi\Gamma))^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(z-\mu)'\Gamma^{-1}(z-\mu)\right).$$

Assume for simplicity that in (1)-(2) the dimension  $n = 2$  such that, for instance,  $y_t$  is the  $(2 \times 1)$  vector

$$y_t = \begin{pmatrix} y_{1t} \\ y_{2t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

3. Define the concept of Granger-causality, and explain how you would test the null hypothesis that  $y_{2t}$  does not Granger-cause  $y_{1t}$  in the model (1)-(2).

Consider now the full-sample representation of a seemingly unrelated regressions (SUR) model

$$\begin{aligned} y &= X\beta + \varepsilon \\ \varepsilon &\sim N(0, \Omega) \end{aligned} \tag{3-4}$$

where

$$\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & X_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ y_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad \varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_n \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $X_i = (x_{i1} : \dots : x_{iT})'$ ,  $y_i = (y_{i1} : \dots : y_{iT})'$  and similarly for  $\varepsilon_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . While  $y_{it}$  and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  are scalars both  $x_{it}$  and  $\beta_i$  are vectors of dimension  $(k \times 1)$ . Importantly, it is assumed that

$$\begin{aligned} E(\varepsilon_{it}) &= 0 \\ E(\varepsilon_{it}\varepsilon_{js}) &= \begin{cases} \sigma_{ij}, & \text{when } t = s \\ 0, & \text{when } t \neq s. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

4. Argue that the GLS estimator of  $\beta$  in (3), i.e.

$$\hat{\beta} = (X'\Omega^{-1}X)^{-1}X'\Omega^{-1}y,$$

has minimum variance amongst all linear unbiased estimators of  $\beta$  in model (3)-(4).

- 5. Show that the VAR(2) model in (1)-(2) may be written in SUR form (3)-(4) and that it may in fact be efficiently estimated by OLS.

Question 2 (50 out of 100 points)

Consider an autoregressive distributed lag (ADL) model of order  $(1, 1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= \alpha + \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \beta_0 x_t + \beta_1 x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \\ \varepsilon_t &\sim \text{NID}(0, \sigma^2) \end{aligned} \tag{5-6}$$

- 1. Derive the error correction representation of (5)-(6). Interpret the components of the error correction form.

Interest now lies on a stochastic process  $\{x_t\}$  and one suspects that it is a random walk.

- 2. Is a random walk mean-reverting? Are its shocks transient? Justify your answers.

Suppose that the relationship between two stochastic processes  $\{x_t\}$  and  $\{y_t\}$  is investigated, both of which are known to be integrated of order 1, i.e. they are  $I(1)$ .

- 3. Provide intuition behind the concept of cointegration.
- 4. Explain in detail how you would test for cointegration between  $x_t$  and  $y_t$  using the Engle-Granger 2-step procedure.

The following Monte Carlo experiment was conducted: Data of the processes

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= 0.8x_{t-1} + u_t \\ y_t &= 0.8y_{t-1} + v_t \\ \begin{pmatrix} u_t \\ v_t \end{pmatrix} &\sim \text{NID}\left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right] \end{aligned}$$

were generated for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . Subsequently, the model

$$y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim \text{NID}(0, \sigma^2)$$

was estimated by OLS and a t-test for the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \beta_1 = 0 \tag{7}$$

was conducted against the alternative  $H_1 : \beta_1 \neq 0$  at the 5% level. In one setting, the  $t$  statistic was computed using OLS standard errors; in a second setting, heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation consistent (HAC) standard errors were used. The sample sizes  $T$  that were considered are 50, 100, 200, 400, 800, 1600, 3200, 6400. The number of replications in the Monte Carlo experiment was 10000.

$T$	50	100	200	400	800	1600	3200	6400
$t$ statistic w/ OLS SEs	33.94%	34.92%	35.08%	35.75%	35.87%	36.45%	36.50%	35.65%
$t$ statistic w/ HAC SEs	29.74%	20.80%	13.33%	10.36%	7.85%	6.64%	6.31%	5.17%

Table 1: empirical rejection frequencies of the null hypothesis in (7).

- 5. Table 1 displays the empirical rejection frequencies of  $H_0$  for both varieties of the  $t$  statistic and all sample sizes. Explain these findings.