AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
http://ageconsearch.umn.edu
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

CANTER

9112 ✓

Department of Economics

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY

CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND

ISSN 1171-0705

GIANNINI FOUNDATION OF
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
LIBRARY
WITHDRAWN

NOV 1 1991

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF USING THE CHOW TEST IN THE CONTEXT OF AUTOCORRELATED DISTURBANCES

E.A.

David Giles and Murray Scott

Discussion Paper

No. 9112

This paper is circulated for discussion and comments. It should not be quoted without the prior approval of the author. It reflects the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented. Responsibility for the application of material to specific cases, however, lies with any user of the paper and no responsibility in such cases will be attributed to the author or to the University of Canterbury.

Department of Economics, University of Canterbury
Christchurch, New Zealand

Discussion Paper No. 9112

October 1991

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF USING THE CHOW TEST IN THE CONTEXT OF AUTOCORRELATED DISTURBANCES

David Giles and Murray Scott

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF USING THE CHOW TEST

IN THE CONTEXT OF AUTOCORRELATED DISTURBANCES*

David Giles and Murray Scott

Department of Economics
University of Canterbury

October, 1991

Abstract

We consider the true size of the Chow Test for the structural stability of a regression model when the disturbances are autocorrelated. We show that there may be considerable size distortion in the case of either AR(1) or MA(1) errors.

Address for Correspondence:

Professor David Giles, Department of Economics, University of Canterbury, Private Bag, Christchurch, NEW ZEALAND.

1. Introduction

This paper presents preliminary results which show that the Chow (1960) test size is not robust to AR(1) or MA(1) autocorrelation in the regression errors. We provide exact evidence which supports other results in the case of AR(1) errors, and offers new insights in the MA(1) case. The Chow test considers shifts in the relationship generating the data, so it is widely applied with time series data. Ironically, more attention has been paid to the consequences of having heteroscedastic errors than of having autocorrelated errors. For example, see MacKinnon (1989) and the references therein.

The (exact) effects of AR(1) errors on the size of the Chow test have been considered in a limited way by Consigliere (1981) and Kramer (1989). Corsi *et al.* (1982) provide some Monte Carlo evidence and Kiviet's (1980) approach can be used to construct bounds on the test's critical value under ARMA errors. However, there are no exact results based on realistic data sets in the AR(1) case, or on the robustness of the Chow test to MA(1) errors.

2. Notation and Theory

Consider two sub-samples with n_1 and n_2 $(=n-n_1)$ observations, and the models

$$y_i = X_i\beta_i + u_i \; ; \qquad i = 1,2 \tag{1}$$

where y_i and u_i are $(n_i \times 1)$, β_i is a $(k \times 1)$, and X_i is $(n_i \times k)$, of rank k, and non-stochastic. Equations (1) may be written as

$$y \equiv \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & 0 \\ 0 & X_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv X^*\beta^* + u. \tag{2}$$

Under the null hypothesis, H_0: $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$, we have

$$y = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ X_2 \end{pmatrix} \beta \equiv X\beta + u. \tag{3}$$

The Chow test rejects H_0 if $f > c(\alpha)$, where $f = [(e'e - e^{*\prime}e^*)/k] /[e^{*\prime}e^*/(n-2k)]$, e^* and e are the least squares residuals vectors for (2) and (3), and $c(\alpha)$ is the critical value for a (nominal) test size of α. If H_0 is true and $u \sim N(0,\sigma^2 I_n)$, f is F-distributed with k and (n-2k) degrees of freedom, and $c(\alpha)$ is chosen accordingly.

It is well known that if the covarince matrix of u is non-scalar, then f is *not* F-distributed under H_0. However, the true size of the Chow test can be calculated by noting that[1]

$$\Pr.\left[f>c(\alpha)\right] = 1 - \Pr.\left[u'(dB-M^*c(\alpha))u \le 0\right] \tag{4}$$

where $d = (n-2k)/k$, $B = (M-M^*)$, $M = I - X(X'X)^{-1}X'$, and $M^* = I - X^*(X^{*\prime}X^*)^{-1}X^{*\prime}$. If $u \sim N(0,\Omega)$ then[2]

$$\Pr.\left[f>c(\alpha)|\Omega\right] = 1 - \Pr.\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j z_j^2 \le 0\right] \tag{5}$$

where the λ_j's are the eigenvalues of $\Omega^{1/2}\left(dB - M^*c(\alpha)\right)\Omega^{1/2}$ and the z_j^2 are independent Chi-square variables, each with one degree of freedom. The *true* size of the Chow test, in (5), depends on the regressors and the form[3] of Ω when $\Omega \neq \sigma^2 I$. It is readily calculated using Davies' (1980) algorithm.

3. The Study

If the disturbances are AR(1) then $u_t = \rho u_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, and if they are MA(1) then $u_t = \varepsilon_t + \rho\varepsilon_{t-1}$, where $|\rho| < 1$ and $\varepsilon \sim IN(0,\sigma_\varepsilon^2)$. Values of n = 20, 60 and various sample splits were considered with the following

regressor matrices:[4] X1 comprises the annual "spirits" income and price data of Durbin and Watson (1951); X2 comprises the quarterly Australian Consumers Price Index, and its lag; X3, X4 and X5 each include a linear time trend and (respectively) a Normal (30,4), log-Normal (2.23, 19.58) and Uniform (0,10) regressor; X6 comprises the orthogonal regressors $(a_2 + a_n)/\sqrt{2}$ and $(a_3+a_{n-1})/\sqrt{2}$, where the a_i's are the eigenvectors of the usual "differencing" matrix[5], A. Test sizes of 1%, 5% and 10% were considered.

All computations were undertaken with Davies' routine in the SHAZAM package (White *et al.* (1990)) on a VAX 6340. Our code was verified by replicating Consigliere's (1981, p.130) results for her linear trend model.

4. Results

Our results with AR(1) errors accord with those in earlier studies - the size of the Chow test is distorted when the errors are autocorrelated. Generally, we find that the true size of the test is greater (less) than its nominal size for $\rho > 0$ (< 0), as shown in Figures 1 and 2. As most of our regressors are positively autocorrelated, this is consistent with the analytical results of Corsi *et al.* (1982) for a single regressor model. (An exception[6] is with X6 - in that case the true size exceeds the nominal size regardless of the sign of ρ.) The size distortion can be substantial, especially if $\rho > 0$.

With a nominal test size of 5% for $\rho = 0.9$ the true size ranges from 30% - 60% (50% - 80%) for n=20 (60) with our data. The increase in size distortion as n increases reflects the consistency of the test, even in the presence of model misspecification. Generally, the greater the imbalance in the sample split, the less the size distortion, especially for large n. Similar results are reported by Consigliere (1981) and Corsi *et al.* (1982) in simpler models.

There are no previous results for MA(1) errors. We find that the Chow test is more robust in this case - the degree of size distortion is 30% - 50% as much as with AR(1) errors and the same data. This reflects the non-zero elements off the three leading diagonals of Ω in the AR(1) case. Generally, the patterns noted above apply in the MA(1) case, as in Figures 3 and 4. The only exception is that with MA(1) errors there is far less difference between the size distortions with n=20 and n=60, compared with AR(1) errors. The Chow test is more robust to MA(1) autocorrelation than AR(1) autocorrelation for larger sample sizes.

5. Conclusions

The limited previous evidence on the effects of autocorrelated errors on the Chow test for structural change relates to simple models, artificial data, and AR(1) errors. We show that the size of this test is distorted by such autocorrelation for a range of realistic data sets. A similar distortion arises if the errors follow an MA(1) process, through there is (relatively) greater robustness in this case if the sample size is reasonably large.

In practice, positive autocorrelation of both the errors and the regressors is likely. Then the Chow test is biased towards rejecting the null, and the researcher will "detect" structural change when none has occurred. This will be a severe problem with realistic sample sizes if the errors follow a positive AR(1) process.

The power of the test will be similarly distorted. Work in progress considers this, and the effects of "seasonal" autocorrelation in more detail.

FIGURE 1

CHOW TEST SIZE WITH AR(1) ERRORS
X2 DATA , n=60, nominal size=5%



FIGURE 2

CHOW TEST SIZE WITH AR(1) ERRORS
X2 DATA , n=20, nominal size=5%



FIGURE 3

CHOW TEST SIZE WITH MA(1) ERRORS
X3 DATA , n=60, nominal size=5%



FIGURE 4

CHOW TEST SIZE WITH MA(1) ERRORS
X3 DATA , n=20, nominal size=5%



References

Chow, G.C., 1960, Tests of equality between subsets of coefficients in two linear regressions, Econometrica 28, 591-605.

Consigliere, I., 1981, The Chow test with serially correlated errors, Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociale 89, 125-137.

Corsi, P., E. Pollock and S.L. Pracken, 1982, The Chow test in the presence of serially correlated errors, in G.C. Chow and P. Corsi, eds., Evaluating the reliability of macroeconomic models (McGraw-Hill, New York).

Davies, R.B., 1980, The distribution of a linear combination of random χ^2 variables: Algorithm AS 155, Applied Statistics 29, 323-333.

Durbin, J. and G.S. Watson, 1951, Testing for serial correlation in least squares regression II, Biometrika 38, 159-178.

Kiviet, J.F., 1980, Effects of ARMA errors on tests for regression coefficients: comments on Vinod's article; improved and additional results, Journal of the American Statistical Association 75, 353-358.

Koerts, J. and A.P.J. Abrahamse, 1971, On the theory and application of the general linear model (Rotterdam University Press, Rotterdam).

Krämer, W., 1989, The robustness of the Chow test to autocorrelation among disturbances, in P. Hackel, ed., Statistical analysis and forecasting of structural change (Springer-Verlag, Berlin).

MacKinnon, J.G., 1989, Heteroskedasticity-robust tests for structural change, in W. Kramer, ed., Econometrics of structural change (Physica Verlag, Vienna).

Watson, G.S., 1955, Serial correlation in regression analysis I, Biometrika 42, 327-341.

White, K.J., S.D. Wong, D. Whistler and S.A Haun, 1990, SHAZAM user's reference manual: Version 6.2 (McGraw-Hill, New York).

FOONOTES

*We are grateful to Merran Evans for supplying data and to Mark Carrodus, Judith Giles, John Small and Jason Wong for their helpful comments.

1. This probability is being calculated under the null, rather than the alternative, hypothesis, as the same error vector is assumed in (2) and (3).
2. The transformations needed to establish (5) are well known. See Koerts and Abrahamse (1971) for details, and Consigliere (1981) for their application in this context.
3. The size of the test is independent of the scale of the errors. If the error covariance matrix is scalar then the size is also independent of the regressors.
4. In each case, an intercept was included, so k=3. Similar data sets have been used in related studies by various authors.
5. A is an (n x n) tri-diagonal matrix with unit (1,1) and (n,n) elements, 2 elsewhere on the leading diagonal, and -1 as the leading off-diagonal elements. The eigenvectors of A correspond to the eignevectors ordered in terms of increasing size. The first such vector has constant elements.
6. X6 is Watson's (1955) matrix for k=3, and it produces the least efficient least squares parameter estimates in the class of orthogonal regressor matrices. X6 is known to include extreme results in the distribution of the Durbin-Watson statistic, and in other testing situations.

LIST OF DISCUSSION PAPERS*

No. 8701 Stochastic Simulation of the Reserve Bank's Model of the New Zealand Economy, by J. N. Lye.

No. 8702 Urban Expenditure Patterns in New Zealand, by Peter Hampton and David E. A. Giles.

No. 8703 Preliminary-Test Estimation of Mis-Specified Regression Models, by David E. A. Giles.

No. 8704 Instrumental Variables Regression Without an Intercept, by David E. A. Giles and Robin W. Harrison.

No. 8705 Household Expenditure in Sri Lanka: An Engel Curve Analysis, by Mallika Dissanayake and David E. A Giles.

No. 8706 Preliminary-Test Estimation of the Standard Error of Estimate in Linear Regression, by Judith A. Clarke.

No. 8707 Invariance Results for FIML Estimation of an Integrated Model of Expenditure and Portfolio Behaviour, by P. Dorian Owen.

No. 8708 Social Cost and Benefit as a Basis for Industry Regulation with Special Reference to the Tobacco Industry, by Alan E. Woodfield.

No. 8709 The Estimation of Allocation Models With Autocorrelated Disturbances, by David E. A. Giles.

No. 8710 Aggregate Demand Curves in General-Equilibrium Macroeconomic Models: Comparisons with Partial-Equilibrium Microeconomic Demand Curves, by P. Dorian Owen.

No. 8711 Alternative Aggregate Demand Functions in Macro-economics: A Comment, by P. Dorian Owen.

No. 8712 Evaluation of the Two-Stage Least Squares Distribution Function by Imhof's Procedure by P. Cribbett, J. N. Lye and A. Ullah.

No. 8713 The Size of the Underground Economy: Problems and Evidence, by Michael Carter.

No. 8714 A Computable General Equilibrium Model of a Fisherine Method to Close the Foreign Sector, by Ewen McCann and Keith Mclaren.

No. 8715 Preliminary-Test Estimation of the Scale Parameter in a Mis-Specified Regression Model, by David E. A. Giles and Judith A. Clarke.

No. 8716 A Simple Graphical Proof of Arrow's Impossibility Theorem, by John Fountain.

No. 8717 Rational Choice and Implementation of Social Decision Functions, by Manimay Sen.

No. 8718 Divisia Monetary Aggregates for New Zealand, by Ewen McCann and David E. A. Giles.

No. 8719 Telecommunications in New Zealand: The Case for Reform, by John Fountain.

No. 8801 Workers' Compensation Rates and the Demand for Apprentices and Non-Apprentices in Victoria, by Pasquale M. Sgro and David E. A. Giles.

No. 8802 The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes, the 48% Solution, by Michael Carter.

No. 8803 The Exact Distribution of a Simple Pre-Test Estimator, by David E. A. Giles.

No. 8804 Pre-testing for Linear Restrictions in a Regression Model With Student-t Errors, by Judith A. Clarke.

No. 8805 Divisia Monetary Aggregates and the Real User Cost of Money, by Ewen McCann and David Giles.

No. 8806 The Management of New Zealand's Lobster Fishery, by Alan Woodfield and Pim Borren.

No. 8807 Poverty Measurement: A Generalization of Sen's Result, by Prasanta K. Pattanaik and Manimay Sen.

No. 8808 A Note on Sen's Normalization Axiom for a Poverty Measure, by Prasanta K. Pattanaik and Manimay Sen.

No. 8809 Budget Deficits and Asset Sales, by Ewen McCann.

No. 8810 Unorganized Money Markets and 'Unproductive' Assets in the New Structuralist Critique of Financial Liberalization, by P. Dorian Owen and Otton Solis-Fallas.

No. 8901 Testing for Financial Buffer Stocks in Sectoral Portfolio Models, by P. Dorian Owen.

No. 8902 Provisional Data and Unbiased Prediction of Economic Time Series by Karen Browning and David Giles.

No. 8903 Coefficient Sign Changes When Restricting Regression Models Under Instrumental Variables Estimation, by David E. A. Giles.

(Continued on next page)

No. 8904 Economies of Scale in the New Zealand Electricity Distribution Industry, by David E. A. Giles and Nicolas S. Wyatt.

No. 8905 Some Recent Developments in Econometrics: Lessons for Applied Economists, by David E. A. Giles.

No. 8906 Asymptotic Properties of the Ordinary Least Squares Estimator in Simultaneous Equations Models, by V. K. Srivastava and D. E. A. Giles.

No. 8907 Unbiased Estimation of the Mean Squared Error of the Feasible Generalised Ridge Regression Estimator, by V. K. Srivasatva and D. E. A. Giles.

No. 8908 An Unbiased Estimator of the Covariance Matrix of the Mixed Regression Estimator, by D. E. A. Giles and V. K. Srivastava.

No. 8909 Pre-testing for Linear Restrictions in a Regression Model with Spherically Symmetric Disturbances, by Judith A. Giles.

No. 9001 The Durbin-Watson Test for Autocorrelation in Nonlinear Models, by Kenneth J. White.

No. 9002 Determinants of Aggregate Demand for Cigarettes in New Zealand, by Robin Harrison and Jane Chetwyd.

No. 9003 Unemployment Duration and the Measurement of Unemployment, by Manimay Sengupta.

No. 9004 Estimation of the Error Variance After a Preliminary-Test of Homogeneity in a Regression Model with Spherically Symmetric Disturbances, by Judith A. Giles.

No. 9005 An Expository Note on the Composite Commodity Theorem, by Michael Carter.

No. 9006 The Optimal Size of a Preliminary Test of Linear Restrictions in a Mis-specified Regression Model, by David E. A. Giles, Offer Lieberman, and Judith A. Giles.

No. 9007 Inflation, Unemployment and Macroeconomic Policy in New Zealand: A Public Choice Analysis, by David J. Smyth and Alan E. Woodfield.

No. 9008 Inflation – Unemployment Choices in New Zealand and the Median Voter Theorem, by David J. Smyth and Alan E. Woodfield.

No. 9009 The Power of the Durbin-Watson Test when the Errors are Heteroscedastic, by David E. A. Giles and John P. Small.

No. 9010 The Exact Distribution of a Least Squares Regression Coefficient Estimator After a Preliminary t-Test, by David E. A. Giles and Virendra K. Srivastava.

No. 9011 Testing Linear Restrictions on Coefficients in a Linear Regression Model with Proxy variables and Spherically Symmetric Disturbances, by Kazuhiro Ohtani and Judith A. Giles.

No. 9012 Some Consequences of Applying the Goldfeld-Quandt Test to Mis-Specified Regression Models, by David E. A. Giles and Guy N. Saxton.

No. 9013 Pre-testing in a Mis-specified Regression Model, by Judith A. Giles.

No. 9014 Two Results in Balanced-Growth Educational Policy, by Alan E. Woodfield.

No. 9101 Bounds on the Effect of Heteroscedasticity on the Chow Test for Structural Change, by David Giles and Offer Lieberman.

No. 9102 The Optimal Size of a Preliminary Test for Linear Restrictions when Estimating the Regression Scale Parameter, by Judith A. Giles and Offer Lieberman.

No. 9103 Some Properties of the Durbin-Watson Test After a Preliminary t-Test, by David Giles and Offer Lieberman.

No. 9104 Preliminary-Test Estimation of the Regression Scale Parameter when the Loss Function is Asymmetric, by Judith A. Giles and David E. A. Giles.

No. 9105 On an Index of Poverty, by Manimay Sengupta and Prasanta K. Pattanaik.

No. 9106 Cartels May Be Good For You, by Michael Carter and Julian Wright.

No. 9107 Lp-Norm Consistencies of Nonparametric Estimates of Regression, Heteroskedasticity and Variance of Regression Estimate when Distribution of Regression is Known, by Radhey S. Singh.

No. 9108 Optimal Telecommunications Tariffs and the CCITT, by Michael Carter and Julian Wright.

No. 9109 Price Indices : Systems Estimation and Tests, by David Giles and Ewen McCann.

No. 9110 The Limiting Power of Point Optimal Autocorrelation Tests, by John P. Small.

No. 9111 The Exact Power of Some Autocorrelation Tests When the Disturbances are Heteroscedastic, by John P. Small.

No. 9112 Some Consequences of Using the Chow Test in the Context of Autocorrelated Disturbances, by David Giles and Murray Scott.

* Copies of these Discussion Papers may be obtained for $4 (including postage, price changes occasionally) each by writing to the Secretary, Department of Economics, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. A list of the Discussion Papers prior to 1987 is available on request.