

Q1.

```
b=garch.sim(alpha=c(0.7, 0.4), beta=0.5, n = 500)
```

```
d1=b[201:500]
```

(i) These plots show that the data in d1 look random

(ii) These plots show that the data in  $d1^2$  look serially correlated

Q2, Q3 – Repeat Q1

Q4.

(i)

```
garch(d1, order=c(0,1))
```

```
garch(d1, order=c(0,2))
```

```
garch(d1, order=c(1,1))
```

```
garch(d1, order=c(2,1))
```

GARCH(1,1) looks better than the other fits. Your answer may be different as I did not use a seed your result may be different.

(ii)

```
arima(d1^2, order = c(1, 0, 0))
```

```
arima(d1^2, order = c(2, 0, 0))
```

```
arima(d1^2, order = c(1, 0, 1))
```

```
arima(d1^2, order = c(2, 0, 2))
```

ARMA(1,1) looks better than the other fits. Your answer may be different as I did not use a seed your result may be different.

Q5.

(i)  $d = \text{data} - \text{mean}(\text{data})$   
 $\text{ts.plot}(d)$ ,  $\text{acf}(d)$ ,  $\text{pacf}(d)$  show that the data look random.

```
d5=scan()
```

```
m1=garchFit(~garch(1,0),data=d5)
```

Final Estimate of the Negative LLH:

LLH: 332.4596 norm LLH: 1.662298

mu omega alpha1

10.0641054 0.8160422 0.6847046

R-optimhess Difference Approximated Hessian Matrix:

mu omega alpha1

mu -211.5801562 -1.003108 0.3808157

omega -1.0031081 -65.301454 -29.7203763

alpha1 0.3808157 -29.720376 -49.7063042

attr("time")  
Time difference of 0.002166033 secs

--- END OF TRACE ---

Time to Estimate Parameters:  
Time difference of 0.01169991 secs

Title:  
GARCH Modelling

Call:  
garchFit(formula = ~garch(1, 0), data = d5)

Mean and Variance Equation:  
data ~ garch(1, 0)  
<environment: 0x7fa8ee20ad30>  
[data = d5]

Summary(m1)

Title:  
GARCH Modelling

Call:  
garchFit(formula = ~garch(1, 0), data = d5)

Mean and Variance Equation:  
data ~ garch(1, 0)  
<environment: 0x7fa8eeeabd68>  
[data = d5]

Conditional Distribution:  
norm

Coefficient(s):  
mu omega alpha1  
10.06411 0.81604 0.68470

Std. Errors:  
based on Hessian

Error Analysis:  
Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)  
mu 10.06411 0.06875 146.378 < 2e-16 \*\*\*

omega 0.81604 0.14506 5.626 1.85e-08 \*\*\*

alpha1 0.68470 0.16626 4.118 3.82e-05 \*\*\*

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Log Likelihood:

-332.4596 normalized: -1.662298

Description:

Mon May 16 22:20:02 2022 by user:

Standardised Residuals Tests:

Statistic p-Value

Jarque-Bera Test R Chi^2 0.104691 0.9490009

Shapiro-Wilk Test R W 0.9955609 0.828483

Ljung-Box Test R Q(10) 10.2359 0.4200464

Ljung-Box Test R Q(15) 12.72242 0.6237286

Ljung-Box Test R Q(20) 20.09918 0.4517411

Ljung-Box Test R^2 Q(10) 15.95943 0.1007996

Ljung-Box Test R^2 Q(15) 18.60537 0.2321764

Ljung-Box Test R^2 Q(20) 27.20672 0.1295476

LM Arch Test R TR^2 15.93026 0.1944513

Information Criterion Statistics:

AIC BIC SIC HQIC

3.354596 3.404071 3.354155 3.374618

All P-values are large. Thus this fitted model is satisfactory.

Repeat this for other models.

GARCH(1,1) looks the best for this data.

.....  
ALTERNATIVE

g1=garch(d, order=c(0,1))

summary(g1)

Call:

garch(x = a, order = c(0, 1))

Model:

GARCH(0,1)

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.77776	-0.70136	0.09428	0.65142	2.86480

Coefficient(s):

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
a0	0.8337	0.1333	6.255	3.97e-10 ***
a1	0.6812	0.1865	3.653	0.000259 ***

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Diagnostic Tests:

Jarque Bera Test

data: Residuals

X-squared = 0.090302, df = 2, p-value = 0.9559

Box-Ljung test

data: Squared.Residuals

X-squared = 1.8713, df = 1, p-value = 0.1713

.....  
g2=garch(d, order=c(1,1))

summary(g2)

Call:

garch(x = a, order = c(1, 1))

Model:

GARCH(1,1)

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.67015	-0.59961	0.08337	0.56258	2.07003

Coefficient(s):

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
a0	1.779e+00	7.155e-01	2.486	0.0129 *
a1	2.111e-01	9.765e-02	2.162	0.0306 *
b1	7.532e-15	2.754e-01	0.000	1.0000

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Diagnostic Tests:

### Jarque Bera Test

data: Residuals

X-squared = 2.006, df = 2, p-value = 0.3668

### Box-Ljung test

data: Squared.Residuals

X-squared = 7.9246, df = 1, p-value = 0.004877

\*\*\*\*\*

```
g3=garch(d, order=c(1,2))
```

```
summary(g3)
```

Call:

```
garch(x = a, order = c(1, 2))
```

Model:

GARCH(1,2)

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.76431	-0.58835	0.09166	0.55101	1.94566

Coefficient(s):

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
a0	1.683e+00	1.270e+00	1.326	0.185
a1	1.594e-01	1.038e-01	1.537	0.124
a2	1.165e-01	1.958e-01	0.595	0.552
b1	2.275e-15	6.668e-01	0.000	1.000

Diagnostic Tests:

Jarque Bera Test

data: Residuals

X-squared = 2.735, df = 2, p-value = 0.2547

### Box-Ljung test

data: Squared.Residuals

X-squared = 9.8921, df = 1, p-value = 0.00166

\*\*\*\*\*

```
g4=garch(d, order=c(2,1))
```

```
summary(g4)
```

Call:

```
garch(x = a, order = c(2, 1))
```

Model:

```
GARCH(2,1)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.69889	-0.61240	0.09099	0.57946	2.11699

Coefficient(s):

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
a0	1.680e+00	7.701e-01	2.182	0.0291 *
a1	2.114e-01	9.508e-02	2.223	0.0262 *
b1	6.535e-03	2.898e-01	0.023	0.9820
b2	3.034e-15	3.380e-01	0.000	1.0000

---

Signif. codes: 0 '\*\*\*' 0.001 '\*\*' 0.01 '\*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Diagnostic Tests:

Jarque Bera Test

data: Residuals

X-squared = 2.0782, df = 2, p-value = 0.3538

Box-Ljung test

data: Squared.Residuals

X-squared = 7.3499, df = 1, p-value = 0.006707

\*\*\*\*\*

```
g5=garch(d, order=c(2,2))
```

```
summary(g5)
```

Call:

```
garch(x = a, order = c(2, 2))
```

Model:

```
GARCH(2,2)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.79412	-0.59868	0.09417	0.56012	1.98694

Coefficient(s):

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
a0	1.583e+00	1.413e+00	1.120	0.263
a1	1.609e-01	1.045e-01	1.540	0.124
a2	1.176e-01	3.222e-01	0.365	0.715
b1	2.739e-03	1.650e+00	0.002	0.999
b2	9.154e-15	8.984e-01	0.000	1.000

Diagnostic Tests:

Jarque Bera Test

data: Residuals

X-squared = 2.561, df = 2, p-value = 0.2779

Box-Ljung test

data: Squared.Residuals

X-squared = 9.2966, df = 1, p-value = 0.002296

Comment: ARCH(1) looks a better fit than the others.

\*\*\*\*\*

(iii)

```
f1=arima(d^2,order=c(1,0,0))
> f1
```

Call:

```
arima(x = d^2, order = c(1, 0, 0))
```

Coefficients:

ar1	intercept
0.3562	2.0000
s.e. 0.0659	0.3522

sigma^2 estimated as 10.34: log likelihood = -517.49, aic = 1038.97

```
> f2=arima(d^2,order=c(1,0,1))
> f2
```

Call:  
arima(x = d^2, order = c(1, 0, 1))

Coefficients:  
      ar1   ma1 intercept  
      0.8372 -0.5861  1.9755  
s.e. 0.0767  0.1146   0.5513

sigma^2 estimated as 9.749: log likelihood = -511.64, aic = 1029.28

> f3=arima(d^2,order=c(2,0,1))  
> f3

Call:  
arima(x = d^2, order = c(2, 0, 1))

Coefficients:  
      ar1   ar2   ma1 intercept  
      0.8441 -0.0043 -0.5918  1.9734  
s.e. 0.2024  0.1180  0.1897   0.5527

sigma^2 estimated as 9.749: log likelihood = -511.64, aic = 1031.28

> f4=arima(d^2,order=c(2,0,2))  
> f4

Call:  
arima(x = d^2, order = c(2, 0, 2))

Coefficients:  
      ar1   ar2   ma1   ma2 intercept  
      1.2397 -0.3385 -0.9899 0.2402  1.9750  
s.e. 7.3962  6.1931  7.3937 4.3313   0.5494

sigma^2 estimated as 9.749: log likelihood = -511.64, aic = 1033.28

> f5=arima(d^2,order=c(1,0,2))  
> f5

Call:  
arima(x = a^2, order = c(1, 0, 2))

Coefficients:  
      ar1   ma1   ma2 intercept  
      0.8391 -0.5866 -0.0033  1.9754  
s.e. 0.0912  0.1145  0.0886   0.5526



$\sigma^2$  estimated as 9.749: log likelihood = -511.64, aic = 1031.28

Comment: ARMA(1,1) looks like a better fit than the others.

NOTE: The conclusion is slightly different.