

Q1

10 Points

The file `IMTSLA.csv` on canvas contains prices of IM and TSLA over a certain period. Compute daily returns for both stocks. Denote IM returns by $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ with mean μ_{IM} . TSLA returns by $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$ with mean μ_{TSLA} . Let $D_i = X_i - Y_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, be the differences of the log returns of the two stocks.

Q1.1

1 Point

Conduct a runs test. At significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, is there strong enough evidence that the returns of IM are not independent? What about D_i ?

Runs Test for log return of IM

data: log_rtn_IM

statistic = 0.04309, runs = 172, n1 = 178, n2 = 178, n = 356, p-value = 0.46376

alternative hypothesis: nonindependence

since $p = 0.46376 > \alpha = 0.05$, we do not reject the H_0 = random (so we remain hypothesized that logreturn of IM is random and independent.)
So, $\alpha = 0.05$ is not strong enough to prove that log return of IM are not independent. Rather, p-value of log return of IM shows a great independency.

Runs Test for D's

data: D

statistic = 0.42946, runs = 169, n1 = 178, n2 = 178, n = 356, p-value = 0.6477

alternative hypothesis: nonindependence

since $p = 0.64771 > \alpha = 0.05$, we do not reject the H_0 = random (so we remain hypothesized that D is random and independent.)
So, $\alpha = 0.05$ is not strong enough to prove that D are not independent. Rather, p-value of D shows a great independency.

Q1.2

1 Point

Conduct a normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk test and Jarque-Bera test. At significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, is there strong enough evidence that the returns of IM are not normal?

Shapiro-Wilk normality test of log return of IM

data: log_rtn_IM

W = 0.98977, p-value = 0.078613

since $p = 0.078613 > \alpha = 0.05$, we reject the hypothesis that logreturn of IM is normal distributed. As a result, $\alpha = 0.05$ is strong enough to say that log return of IM is not normal.

Jarque-Bera Normality Test of log return of IM

data: log_rtn_IM

JB = 0.00613, p-value = 0.26186

alternative hypothesis: greater

since $p = 0.26186 > \alpha = 0.05$, we reject the hypothesis that log return of IM is normal distributed. As a result, $\alpha = 0.05$ is strong enough to say that log return of IM is not normal.

Q1.3

1 Point

Plotting the normality of log return of IM by Shapiro-Wilk normality test.

```
1 #plot
2 #data: logreturn
3 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
4 log_rtn_IM = log(returnsIM)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
5 log_rtn_TSLA = log(returnsTSLA)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
6 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
7 shapiro.test(log_rtn_TSLA)
8 n = log_rtn_IM + log_rtn_TSLA
```

Q1.4

1 Point

Conduct a normal plot for IM's return. Based on question 1.2 and the normal plot, are IM's returns non-normal statistically? or probably? or both?

Statistically, based on the output given on question 1.2, the log return of IM is not normally distributed at all. However, based on the Normal-Q-Q Plot, we can expect that, though it is not completely normal-distributed, log returns of IM is not significantly deviated from normal distribution.

Thus, statistically, log return of IM is not normal. However, practically, I would say it is partly normal.

Q1.5

1 Point

Plotting the normality of log return of IM by Jarque-Bera normality test.

```
1 #plot
2 #data: logreturn
3 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
4 log_rtn_IM = log(returnsIM)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
5 log_rtn_TSLA = log(returnsTSLA)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
6 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
7 shapiro.test(log_rtn_TSLA)
8 n = log_rtn_IM + log_rtn_TSLA
```

Q1.6

1 Point

Plotting the normality of log return of IM by Jarque-Bera normality test.

```
1 #plot
2 #data: logreturn
3 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
4 log_rtn_IM = log(returnsIM)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
5 log_rtn_TSLA = log(returnsTSLA)/series(returns) / series(returns)-1
6 shapiro.test(log_rtn_IM)
7 shapiro.test(log_rtn_TSLA)
8 n = log_rtn_IM + log_rtn_TSLA
```

Q1.7

1 Point

Suppose you want to test whether there is strong enough evidence that $\mu_{IM} < \mu_{TSLA}$. Write down the null hypothesis H_0 and the alternative hypothesis H_1 .

Null hypothesis H_0 : $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} - \mu_{D'} = \mu_{D'} - \mu_{D'} = 0$ alternative hypothesis H_1 : $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} - \mu_{D'} < \mu_{D'} - \mu_{D'} = 0$

Q1.8

1 Point

Assume that D_i 's are iid and the sample size is large enough for the central limit theorem to apply. Give the test statistic and the corresponding sampling distribution when H_0 is true.

Since the sample size is large enough to apply CLT, the sampling distribution will be $N(\mu_D, \sigma_D)$ if H_0 is true. Usually, we should use z-test, but unfortunately CLT, we can test as Z.

The test statistics Z0 is equal to $(\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA})/\sqrt{\text{var}(D)}$.for $\mu_{D'}$ is mean of D . $\mu_{D'} = 0$.and $\sqrt{\text{var}(D)}$ is standard error of $\mu_{D'}$.

Q1.9

1 Point

For significance level α , determine the criteria for rejecting H_0 in support of H_1 in terms of \bar{D}_n . (say, for what values of \bar{D}_n will H_0 be rejected?) For the data given, will H_0 be rejected at significance level $\alpha = 0.05$?

The normal Dist that can reject H_0 is $N(0,0.000209871)$.Under significance level of 5%, not reject H_0 .

So, we can hypothesize that, since we not reject that $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} = 0$, there is no significant evidence to show that $\mu_{IM} < \mu_{TSLA}$ under 95% confidence.
(Others and Code shown below)

Q1.10

1 Point

Construct the one-sided confidence interval for $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA}$ corresponding to question 1.8. Is the confidence interval consistent with your conclusion in question 1.8?

The one-side CI of $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} - \mu_{TSLA}$ is roughly $[-0.004763376, \infty)$. $\mu_{D'}$ is in this CI, thus we not reject H_0 .

So, we can hypothesize that, since we not reject that $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} = 0$, there is no significant evidence to show that $\mu_{IM} < \mu_{TSLA}$ under 95% confidence.
(Others and Code shown below)

Q1.11

1 Point

Given the formula for the p-value of the test in question 1.4. Compute the p-value. Does the p-value confirm your conclusion in question 1.8?

P-value = 0.5700208

Since $P > \alpha$, not reject H_0 .

So, we can hypothesize that, since we not reject that $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} = 0$, there is no significant evidence to show that $\mu_{IM} < \mu_{TSLA}$ under 95% confidence.

Q1.12

1 Point

When does the type I error occur in the test in question 1.4? What is the probability of type I error in question 1.8?

When the H_0 actually correct, however, we mistakenly reject it. To be more specific, if μ_{IM} actually equals to μ_{TSLA} , however, under $(1-\alpha)/100\%$ confidence, we mistakenly reject this fact, then it is type I error.

The probability of type I error is $\alpha = 0.05$.

Q1.13

1 Point

If H_0 is rejected, does that mean H_1 is true? If H_0 is not rejected, does that mean H_0 is true?

If we conclude 'do not reject H_0 ', this does not necessarily mean that the null hypothesis is true, it only suggests that there is not sufficient evidence to reject H_0 .

If we reject the null hypothesis, then it suggests that the alternative hypothesis may be true.

Q1.14

1 Point

Given the formula for the p-value of the test in question 1.4. Compute the p-value. Does the p-value confirm your conclusion in question 1.8?

P-value = 0.5700208

Since $P > \alpha$, not reject H_0 .

So, we can hypothesize that, since we not reject that $\mu_{IM} - \mu_{TSLA} = 0$, there is no significant evidence to show that $\mu_{IM} < \mu_{TSLA}$ under 95% confidence.

Q1.15

1 Point

When does the type I error occur in the test in question 1.4? What is the probability of type I error in question 1.8?

When the H_0 actually correct, however, we mistakenly reject it. To be more specific, if μ_{IM} actually equals to μ_{TSLA} , however, under $(1-\alpha)/100\%$ confidence, we mistakenly reject this fact, then it is type I error.

The probability of type I error is $\alpha = 0.05$.