

ETC2410 Assignment 2

Alex Wong, Chelaka Paranahewa, Harjot Channa, Jonas Tiong

Question 2 (31 Marks)

2(a) (4 marks)

$$\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = 92.871 - 4.592 \underset{(4.196)}{Jan} - 1.935 \underset{(5.911)}{Feb} + 26.184 \underset{(5.934)}{Mar} \\ + 41.452 \underset{(5.934)}{Apr} + 46.786 \underset{(5.934)}{May} + 46.263 \underset{(5.934)}{Jun} + 40.937 \underset{(5.934)}{Jul} \\ + 38.714 \underset{(5.934)}{Aug} + 32.252 \underset{(5.934)}{Sep} + 36.170 \underset{(5.934)}{Oct} + 15.600 \underset{(5.934)}{Nov}$$
 (1)

The above linear regression estimates the US monthly ‘housing starts’ based on the month that is being modelled. The intercept on its own implies that estimated ‘housing starts’ for the month of December, which means the other values are relative to the ‘housing starts’ of December. The variables in the linear regression are seasonal dummies which mean they only take a binary value (0 or 1). The β values for the seasonal dummies are the average change in the ‘housing starts’ relative to the month December.

2(b) (4 marks)

Steps

In order to formulate the linear regression, first we need to determine the intercept: From equation 1 we can determine the values of each month because of the dummy variables. $92.871 - 4.592 = c \rightarrow c = 88.280$, where the LHS is the month of Jan from calculated from equation 1.

Next we need to determine the β values for Feb - Dec. Since we know the intercept for the

new equation, we can substitute it in.

$$92.871 + 1.935 = 88.280 + \beta_2 \text{ Feb}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_2 = 2.656$$

$$92.871 + 26.184 = 88.280 + \beta_3 \text{ Mar}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_3 = 30.776$$

$$92.871 + 41.452 = 88.280 + \beta_4 \text{ Apr}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_4 = 46.044$$

$$92.871 + 46.786 = 88.280 + \beta_5 \text{ May}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_5 = 51.377$$

$$92.871 + 46.263 = 88.280 + \beta_6 \text{ Jun}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_6 = 50.855$$

$$92.871 + 40.937 = 88.280 + \beta_7 \text{ Jul}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_7 = 45.528$$

$$92.871 + 38.714 = 88.280 + \beta_8 \text{ Aug}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_8 = 43.306$$

$$92.871 + 32.252 = 88.280 + \beta_9 \text{ Sep}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_9 = 36.844$$

$$92.871 + 36.170 = 88.280 + \beta_{10} \text{ Oct}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_{10} = 40.762$$

$$92.871 + 15.600 = 88.280 + \beta_{11} \text{ Nov}$$

$$\rightarrow \beta_{11} = 20.192$$

$$92.871 = 88.280 + \beta_{12} \text{ Dec}$$


$$\rightarrow \beta_{12} = 4.592$$

$$\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = 88.280 + 2.656 \text{ Feb} + 30.776 \text{ Mar} + 46.044 \text{ Apr} \\ + 51.377 \text{ May} + 50.855 \text{ Jun} + 45.528 \text{ Jul} + 43.306 \text{ Aug} \\ + 36.844 \text{ Sep} + 40.762 \text{ Oct} + 20.192 \text{ Nov} + 4.592 \text{ Dec} \quad (2)$$


2(c) (6 marks)

$$\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = 119.3_{(1.377)} \quad (3)$$

Residuals ACF plot




Residuals PACF plot




The residual ACF plot for the linear model $\text{HOUSTNSA} \sim 1$ shows a few things. Firstly, each non seasonal lag ($\text{lag} \neq \{12, 24, 36\}$) have a large positive spike which is the tell tail sign of the existance of a trend. Secondly, the seasonal lags have large positive spikes which indicates that there is also seasonality in the data. So we can attribute the gradual decrease in the lag values is because of trend while the scallop pattern is due to the seasonality. As a result of the trend and seasonality it can safely be said that there is no stationarity in the data and by failing the prerequisite its also not white noise.

Residuals ACF plot



Residuals PACF plot



The residual ACF plot for the linear model EQ(1), shows a significant difference compared to the residual ACF plot for the linear model EQ(3). The linear model EQ(1), has no seasonality in the residual acf plot since the linear model has already captured it. What is remaining is the trend as depicted by decreasing values as the lags increase. Thus showing that the seasonal dummy variables have improved the model. Despite the improvement, there is still a trend which means that there is no stationarity in the data and by failing the prerequisite its also not white noise.

2(d) (9 marks)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{HOUSTNSA} = & -14.042 - 11.014 \text{ Jan} - 20.084 \text{ Feb} + 47.498 \text{ Mar} \\
 & + 40.081 \text{ Apr} + 28.510 \text{ May} + 21.153 \text{ Jun} + 15.297 \text{ Jul} \quad (4) \\
 & + 17.297 \text{ Aug} + 13.490 \text{ Sep} + 22.810 \text{ Oct} + 0.347 \text{ Nov} \\
 & + 0.775 HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + 0.177 HOUSTNSA_{t-2}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$H_0 : \forall_{i \in \{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11\}} \beta_i = 0$$

$$H_1 : \exists_{i \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}} \beta_i \neq 0 \text{ at least one regressor coef is zero}$$

Significance Level : $\alpha = 0.05$

Unresticted Model : $\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = -14.042 - \frac{11.014}{(2.003)} Jan - \frac{20.084}{(2.091)} Feb$

$$+ \frac{47.498}{(2.179)} Mar + \frac{40.081}{(2.652)} Apr + \frac{28.510}{(2.360)} May$$

$$+ \frac{21.153}{(2.198)} Jun + \frac{15.297}{(2.123)} Jul + \frac{17.297}{(2.067)} Aug$$

$$+ \frac{13.490}{(2.095)} Sep + \frac{22.810}{(2.049)} Oct + \frac{0.347}{(2.168)} Nov$$

$$+ \frac{0.775}{(0.036)} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \frac{0.177}{(0.036)} HOUSTNSA_{t-2}$$

Resticted Model : $\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = \frac{14.598}{(1.970)} + \frac{1.110}{(0.035)} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} - \frac{0.232}{(0.035)} HOUSTNSA_{t-2}$

Test stat and null dist : $\frac{(SSR_R - SSR_{UR})}{SSR_{UR}} \frac{(n - k - 1)}{q} \sim F_{(q, n-k-1)} = F_{11,742}$

$$F_{calc} = 74.7468276$$

$$F_{crit} = 2.0101347$$

Decision rule : reject H_0 if $F_{calc} > F_{crit}$

Decision : Since $74.7468276 > 2.0101347$, reject H_0

In conclusion, at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis that the seasonal dummies (Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul, Aug, Sep, Oct) are jointly insignificant in effecting the 'Housing Starts' in favour of the alternative hypothesis that at least one of these variables are significant.

2(e) (8 marks)

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{HOUSTNSA} = & \frac{-1.503}{(2.264)} + \frac{17.299}{(1.590)} Q1 + \frac{16.273}{(1.772)} Q2 + \frac{6.685}{(1.534)} Q3 \\ & + \frac{1.007}{(0.040)} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} - \frac{0.079}{(0.039)} HOUSTNSA_{t-2} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Monthly Model (Unresticted):

$$\begin{aligned} LHS = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Jan + \beta_2 Feb + \beta_3 Mar + \beta_4 Apr + \beta_5 May + \beta_6 Jun + \beta_7 Jul + \beta_8 Aug \\ & + \beta_9 Sep + \beta_{10} Oct + \beta_{11} Nov + \beta_{13} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \beta_{14} HOUSTNSA_{t-2} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Quarterly Model:

$$RHS = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Q1 + \alpha_2 Q2 + \alpha_3 Q3 + \alpha_4 HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \alpha_5 HOUSTNSA_{t-2} \quad (7)$$

LHS == RHS

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{HOUSTNSA} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 Jan + \beta_2 Feb + \beta_3 Mar + \beta_4 Apr + \beta_5 May + \beta_6 Jun \\ &\quad + \beta_7 Jul + \beta_8 Aug + \beta_9 Sep + \beta_{10} Oct + \beta_{11} Nov \\ &\quad + \beta_{13} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \beta_{14} HOUSTNSA_{t-2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\widehat{HOUSTNSA} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Q1 + \alpha_2 Q2 + \alpha_3 Q3 + \alpha_4 HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \alpha_5 HOUSTNSA_{t-2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &= \beta_0 + \beta_{10} + \beta_{11} \\ \alpha_1 &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3 \\ \alpha_2 &= \beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6 \\ \alpha_3 &= \beta_7 + \beta_8 + \beta_9 \\ \alpha_4 &= \beta_{13} \\ \alpha_5 &= \beta_{14} \end{aligned}$$

Quarterly Model (Restricted):

$$\begin{aligned} RHS &= \beta_0 + \beta_{10} + \beta_{11} + (\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) Q1 + (\beta_4 + \beta_5 + \beta_6) Q2 \\ &\quad + (\beta_7 + \beta_8 + \beta_9) Q3 + \beta_{13} HOUSTNSA_{t-1} + \beta_{14} HOUSTNSA_{t-2} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$H_0 : \forall_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} \alpha_i = 0$$

$$H_1 : \exists_{i \in \{0,1,2,3\}} \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ at least one regressor coef is zero}$$

$$\text{Test stat and null dist : } \frac{(SSR_R - SSR_{UR})}{SSR_{UR}} \frac{(n - k - 1)}{q} \sim F_{(q, n-k-1)} = F_{3,752}$$

$$F_{calc} = 189.6544468$$

$$F_{crit} = 3.1334909$$

Decision rule : reject H_0 if $F_{calc} > F_{crit}$

Decision : Since $189.6544468 > 3.1334909$, reject H_0

In conclusion, at 0.05 level of significance, we reject the null hypothesis that there is only quarterly seasonality in the AR(2) model in favour of the alternative hypothesis that there may also be monthly seasonality in the AR(2) model.