No. 129 | October 1994 | Discussion Papers

Statistics Norway
Research Department

Søren Johansen and Anders Rygh Swensen

Testing Rational Expectations in Vector Autoregressive Models

Discussion Papers no. 129 • Statistics Norway, October 1994

Søren Johansen and Anders Rygh Swensen

Testing Rational Expectations in Vector Autoregressive Models

Abstract:
Assuming that the solutions of a set of restrictions on the rational expectations of future values can be represented as a vector autoregressive model, we study the implied restrictions on the coefficients. Nonstationary behavior of the variables is allowed, and the restrictions on the cointegration relationships are spelled out. In some interesting special cases it is shown that the likelihood ratio statistic can easily be computed.

Keywords: VAR-models, cointegration, rational expectations.

JEL classification: C32

Acknowledgement: We want to thank Niels Haldrup for drawing our attention to restrictions involving lagged variables and M. Hashem Pesaran for suggesting a simplification of the treatment of present value models.

Address: Anders Rygh Swensen, Statistics Norway, Research Department,
P.O.Box 8131 Dep., N-0033 Oslo. E-mail: asw@ssb.no

Søren Johansen, University of Copenhagen, Institute of Mathematical Statistics
Universitetsparken 5, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø. E-mail: sjo@math.ku.dk

1 Introduction

Expectations play a central role in many economic theories. But the incorporation of this kind of variables in empirical models rises many problems. The variables are in many cases unobserved either because data on expectations are unavailable, or because there may often be reason to suspect that the available data on expectations are unreliable. There are also problems connected with the validity. Economic agents may benefit from not revealing their real expectations. Some sort of proxies must therefore be used.

One possibility when the models contain stochastic elements, is to use conditional expectations in the probabilistic sense given some previous information. When this information is all available past and present information contained in the variables of the model, rational expectation is the usual denomination. Another, perhaps more precise, name is model consistent expectations. Then the aspect that the expectations mean conditional expectations in the model the analysis is based upon, is emphasized. This is an idea originally introduced by Muth [12] and [13]. However, since rational expectation seems to be the common name of this type of expectations, we shall stick to this usage in the following.

It is well known that dynamic models containing rational expectations of future values have a multitude of solutions. In a recent paper Baillie [2] advocated a procedure for testing restrictions between future rational expectations of a set of variables by assuming that the solutions could be described by a vector autoregressive (VAR) model. He then expressed the restrictions implied by the postulated relationships between the expectations as restrictions on the coefficients of the VAR model.

In this paper we shall follow the same approach. However, Baillie also allowed for non-stationary behavior of the variables that could be eliminated by first transforming the variables using known cointegrating relationships. Thus some knowledge about how the variables cointegrate is necessary. At this point we shall pursue another line. Starting out with the VAR model we only assume that the variables are integrated of order one. It turns out, as one can expect, that the restrictions on the expectations entail restrictions on the cointegration relationships. In addition some restrictions on the short run part of the model must be satisfied.

These implications can be tested by invoking the results of Johansen [8] and [9] and of Johansen and Juselius [10] and [11]. In general it seems that a two step procedure must be used, but in an interesting special case it is possible to find the likelihood ratio test. What is also of interest, is that this test is easy to compute involving by now well known reduced rank regression procedures.

The paper is organized as follows: In the next section we state the type of relationships

between the expectations we shall consider, and derive the implications for the VAR model when the expectations are considered to be rational in the sense described earlier. In section 3 we treat the special case where a likelihood ratio test can be developed. Finally, assuming that the variables are integrated of order 1 we discuss the asymptotic distribution of the tests.

2 The form of the restrictions

We assume that the $p \times 1$ vectors of observations are generated according to the vector autoregressive (VAR) model

$$X_t = A_1 X_{t-1} + \cdots + A_k X_{t-k} + \mu + \Phi D_t + \epsilon_t, \quad t = 1, \ldots, T \tag{1}$$

where $X_{-k+1}, \ldots, X_0$ are assumed to be fixed and $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_T$ are independent, identically distributed Gaussian vectors, with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ. The vectors $D_t, t = 1, \ldots, T$ consists of centered seasonal dummies. The model (1) can be reparameterized as

$$\Delta X_t = \Pi X_{t-1} + \Pi_2 \Delta X_{t-1} + \cdots + \Pi_k \Delta X_{t-k+1} + \mu + \Phi D_t + \epsilon_t, \; t = 1, \ldots, T \tag{2}$$

where $\Pi = A_1 + \cdots + A_k - I, \Pi_i = -(A_i + \cdots + A_k), i = 2, \ldots, k.$

To allow for nonstationary behavior of $\{X\}_{t=1,2,\ldots}$ we assume that the matrix Π has reduced rank $0 < r < p$ and thus may be written

$$\Pi = \alpha\beta', \tag{3}$$

where α and β are $p \times r$ matrices of full rank. This model, which we shall use as starting point, has been treated extensively see e.g. Johansen [8] and [9], and Johansen and Juselius [10] and [11]. We remind that the parameters α and β are unidentified because of the multiplicative form in (3).

In our treatment of rational expectations we shall, as explained in the introduction, elaborate upon ideas similar to those exposed by Baillie [2]. The set of restrictions we consider is of the form

$$E_t \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j' X_{t+j} + c_{-1}' X_{t-1} + \cdots + c_{-k+1}' X_{t-k+1} + c = 0. \tag{4}$$

Here E_t denotes conditional expectation in the probabilistic sense taken in model (1) given the variables $X_1, \ldots, X_t$. The $p \times q$ matrices $c_i, i = -k+1, \ldots$ are known matrices, possibly equal to zero. The $q \times 1$ matrix c can contain unknown parameters and is of the form $c = H\omega$ where the $q \times s$ matrix H is known, and ω is an $s \times 1$ vector consisting of unknown parameters, $0 \leq s \leq q$. Note that we allow lagged values of X_t to be included in the restrictions.

There are a number of interesting economic hypotheses that are subsumed in the formulation (4). We only mention three, but refer to the paper by Baillie [2] mentioned above for a more thorough discussion.

Example 1. Let X_t denote the vector $(\pi_{1t}, \pi_{2t}, d_t, i_{1,t}, i_{2,t})'$ where $i_{1,t}$ and $i_{2,t}$ denote domestic and foreign interest rate respectively , $\pi_{1,t}$ and $\pi_{2,t}$ are the domestic and foreign inflation rate and d_t is the depreciation of own currency. Two hypotheses of interest are the uncovered interest parity hypothesis which can be formulated as

$$i_{1,t} - i_{2,t} = E_t d_{t+1},$$

and equality of the expected real interest rates

$$i_{1,t} - E_t \pi_{1,t+1} = i_{2,t} - E_t \pi_{2,t+1}.$$

These hypotheses have the form (4) where $c = c_j = 0, j = 2, 3, \ldots$ and where c_0 and c_1 are given by the matrices

$$c_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } c_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad \square$$

Example 2. Campbell and Shiller [4] studied a present value model for two variables Y_t and y_t having the form

$$Y_t = \gamma(1-\delta) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^j E_t y_{t+j} + c,$$

where γ is a coefficient of proportionality, δ a discount factor and c a constant that may be unknown. This relation is of the form (4), which can be seen by taking
$c_j = \delta^{j-1} c_1, j = 2, 3, \ldots.$

In a related paper Campbell [3] treated a system with $X_t = (y_{kt}, y_{lt}, co_t)'$ where y_{kt} and y_{lt} are capital and labor income respectively and co_t is consumption. The permanent income hypothesis he investigated is of form

$$co_t = \gamma[y_{kt} + (1-\delta) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \delta^j E_t y_{l,t+j}].$$

Thus in the case where γ and δ are known, under the hypothesis, these are examples of the hypotheses that can be cast in the form (4). $\square$

Example 3. In a study of money demand Cuthbertson and Taylor [5] considered restrictions of the form

$$(m-p)_t = \lambda(m-p)_{t-1} + (1-\lambda)(1-\lambda D) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\lambda D)^j E_t \gamma' \mathbf{z}_{t+i},$$

where $m - p$ is real money balances, and $\gamma'\mathbf{z}$ are the determinants of the long-run real money demand. The restrictions are deduced from a model where agents minimize the expected discounted present value of an infinite-period cost function measuring both the cost of being away from the long run equilibrium and the cost of adjustment, conditional on information at time t. The constant λ, which satiesfies $0 < \lambda < 1$, depends on the relative importance of the two cost factors.

Taking $X_t = (m_t - p_t, \mathbf{z}_t')'$ and $c_{-1} = (-\lambda, 0, \ldots, 0)'$, $c_0 = (1, -(1-\lambda)(1-\lambda D)\gamma')'$, $c_1 = (0, -\lambda D(1-\lambda)(1-\lambda D)\gamma')'$ and $c_j = (\lambda D)^{j-1}c_1, j = 2, \ldots$ we see that this is a situation covered by the assumption (4) if λ, D and γ are known. A recent application of a similar model to the demand for labor can be found in Engsted and Haldrup [7]. □

The model in (1) can, as is well known, be written on the so-called companion form as

$$Z_t = AZ_{t-1} + e_1 \otimes \mu + e_1 \otimes \Phi D_t + e_1 \otimes \epsilon_t, \tag{5}$$

where $Z_t = (X_t', \ldots, X_{t-k}')$, $e_1 \otimes \epsilon_t$ is the Kronecker product of the $k \times 1$ unit vector $e_1 = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)'$ and ϵ_t, and A is the $pk \times pk$ matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \cdots & A_k \\ I_{p(k-1)} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Denoting the (i_1, i_2) block of the $pk \times pk$ matrix A^j by $A^j_{i_1,i_2}, i_1, i_2 = 1, \ldots, k$, we have the following

Lemma 1 *With the notations defined above*

$$A^j_{11} + \cdots + A^j_{1k} - I = C_j\alpha\beta'.$$

The $p \times p$ matrices C_j, j=1,... are defined recursively by $C_j = (A^{j-1}_{11} + C_{j-1})\alpha\beta'$ with $C_1 = I$ and $A^1_{11} = A_1$.

Proof. By straightforward algebra and the reduced rank condition

$$\begin{aligned} A^j_{11} + \cdots + A^j_{1k} &= (A^{j-1}_{11}A_1 + A^{j-1}_{12}) + (A^{j-1}_{11}A_2 + A^{j-1}_{13}) + \cdots + A^{j-1}_{11}A_k \\ &= A^{j-1}_{11}(A_1 + \cdots + A_k) + A^{j-1}_{12} + \cdots + A^{j-1}_{1k} \\ &= A^{j-1}_{11}(A_1 + \cdots + A_k - I) + A^{j-1}_{11} + \cdots + A^{j-1}_{1k} \\ &= A^{j-1}_{11}\alpha\beta' + A^{j-1}_{11} + \cdots + A^{j-1}_{1k}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the Lemma follows by induction. For $j = 1$ the Lemma is just the reduced rank condition (3). If the lemma is true for j, then by this assumption and the identity above

$$\begin{aligned} A^{j+1}_{11} + \cdots + A^{j+1}_{1k} - I &= A^j_{11}\alpha\beta' + (A^j_{11} + \cdots + A^j_{1k} - I) \\ &= (A^j_{11} + C_j)\alpha\beta'. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$E_t Z_{t+j} = A^j Z_t + \sum_{l=1}^{j} A^{j-l}(e_1 \otimes \mu) + \sum_{l=1}^{j} A^{j-l}(e_1 \otimes \Phi D_{t+l}),$$

it follows that

$$c_j' E_t X_{t+j} = c_j' A_{11}^j X_t + \cdots + c_j' A_{1k}^j X_{t-k} + c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l}\mu + c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l}\Phi D_{t+l},$$

for $j > 0$. Furthermore, $c_0' E_t X_t = c_0' X_t$. Hence by inserting into (4)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' A_{11}^j + c_0' = 0 \quad , \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' A_{1i}^j + c_{-i+1}' = 0, \quad i = 2, \ldots, k$$

$$(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l})\mu + c = 0 \quad , \quad (\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l})\Phi = 0.$$

By Lemma 1,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' A_{11}^j + c_0' = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty}(c_j'(A_{11}^j + \cdots + A_{1k}^j - I) + c_j') + \sum_{i=-k+1}^{0} c_i'$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' C_j \alpha\beta' + \sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j' = 0.$$

Thus we have when $1 \leq q \leq r$,

Proposition 1 . *The restrictions on the coefficients in the reduced rank VAR model implied by the hypothesis (4) are equivalent to*

(6)

$$(i) \qquad \beta\alpha' \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C_j' c_j = -\sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j$$

$$(ii) \qquad \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' A_{1i}^j = -c_{-i+1}', i = 2, \ldots, k,$$

$$\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l}\mu = -H\omega, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j' \sum_{l=1}^{j} A_{11}^{j-l}\Phi = 0,$$

where C_j and $A_{1i}^j, i = 1, \ldots, k, j = 1, 2, \ldots$ are as defined in Lemma 1 and $A_{11}^0 = I$.

The infinite sums appearing in the expressions above are all assumed to exist. In case they do not converge, the restriction (6) does not make sense. In many special situations convergence is no problem. The eigenvalues of A then have all modulus less than or equal to 1, and the sum $\sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j$ either consists of a finite sum of nonzero terms or of exponentially decreasing terms.

One can also remark that the conditions of the first part of the proposition may be formulated as $\sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j \in sp(\beta)$, i.e. the vector $\sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j$ must belong to the space spanned by the columns of β. Also by multiplying both sides with the matrix $(\beta'\beta)^{-1}\beta'$, one has the following restrictions on the adjustment parameters α:
$\alpha' \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} C_j' c_j = -(\beta'\beta)^{-1}\beta' \sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j$.

The restrictions on the α parameters and the conditions in the second part of Proposition 1 are in general non-linear in terms of the parameters of the VAR model in (1) or (2). In the particular case where $c_2 = c_3 = \cdots = 0$, the conditions in Proposition 1 simplify since $C_1 = A_{11}^0 = I$ and the terms involving the other $C_j's$ disappear.

Corollary 1 *If $c_i = 0, i = 2, \ldots$, the conditions of Proposition 1 take the form in terms of the model (2):*

$$(7) \qquad \begin{aligned} (i) \qquad & \beta\alpha' c_1 = -\textstyle\sum_{j=-k+1}^{1} c_j \\ (ii) \quad & c_1'\Pi_i = \textstyle\sum_{j=i}^{k} c_{-j+1}', i = 2, \ldots, k, \\ & c_1'\mu = -H\omega \text{ and } c_1'\Phi = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That restrictions like those of example 1 are covered by Corollary 1 is evident. What may not be so obvious, is that the restrictions in the other two examples, where $c_j = \delta^{j-1}c_1, j = 2, \ldots$, are also covered. To see that, write the restrictions (4) as

$$(8) \qquad c_0'X_t + E_t c_1' X_{t+1} + \delta \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \delta^{j-2} E_t c_1' X_{t+j} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} c_{-j}' X_{t-j} + c = 0.$$

Using iterated conditional expectations in a similar expression at time $t+1$, multiplying by δ and subtracting from (8) yields

$$(c_0 - \delta c_{-1})'X_t + (c_1 - \delta c_0)' E_t X_{t+1} +$$
$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-2} (c_{-j} - \delta c_{-(j+1)})' X_{t-j} + c_{-k+1}' X_{t-k+1} + (1-\delta)c = 0,$$

which shows that also restrictions in examples 2 and 3 have a form covered by Corollary 1.

In the next section we shall derive the likelihood ratio test for restrictions of this particular type. To discuss this problem the following result turns out to be useful. We introduce the notation that if a is a $p \times q$ matrix of full rank q, then $a_\perp$ is a $p \times (p-q)$ matrix so that the square matrix $(a, a_\perp)$ is nonsingular. Also let $\overline{a} = a(a'a)^{-1}$. Then the result can be formulated as:

Proposition 2 *The $p \times p$ matrix Π has reduced rank r and satisfies*

$$(9) \qquad \Pi' b = d$$

where b and d are $p \times q$ matrices of full rank if and only if Π has the form

$$(10) \qquad \Pi = \overline{b}d' + \overline{b_\perp}\eta\xi'\overline{d}_\perp' + \overline{b_\perp}\Theta\overline{d}'$$

where η and ξ are matrices of dimension $(p-q) \times (r-q)$ and of full rank $(r-q)$.

Proof. Assuming that (9) is true we consider

$$(b, b_\perp)'\Pi\,(d, d_\perp) = \begin{bmatrix} b'\Pi d & b'\Pi d_\perp \\ b_\perp'\Pi d & b_\perp'\Pi d_\perp \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d'd & 0 \\ b_\perp'\Pi d & b_\perp'\Pi d_\perp \end{bmatrix}.$$

If Π has rank r, then $r \geq q$, which is the rank of $d'd$. Then $b_\perp'\Pi d_\perp$ must have rank $r-q$, and can be written $b_\perp'\Pi d_\perp = \eta\xi'$ for matrices of rank $r-q$. If we define the $(p-q)\times q$ matrix Θ as $\Theta = b_\perp'\Pi d$, we get the representation

$$\Pi = (\overline{b}, \overline{b_\perp}) \begin{bmatrix} d'd & 0 \\ \Theta & \eta\xi' \end{bmatrix} \left(\overline{d}, \overline{d_\perp}\right)' = \overline{b}\overline{d}' + \overline{b_\perp}\Theta\overline{d}' + \overline{b_\perp}\eta\xi'\overline{d_\perp}'.$$

which proves one part of the proposition.

Next assume that Π can be represented as in (10). Then $b'\Pi = d'$. That the rank is reduced can be seen from

$$(b, b_\perp)'\Pi\,(d, d_\perp) = \begin{bmatrix} d'd & 0 \\ \Theta & \eta\xi' \end{bmatrix},$$

which has rank equal to $rank(d'd) + rank(\eta\xi') = q + (r-q) = r$.□

3 Derivation of the maximum likelihood estimators and the likelihood ratio test in a special case

We consider a situation similar to the one covered by Corollary 1, i.e $c_j = 0, j = 2, 3, \ldots,$ and c_0 and c_1 are known $p \times q$ matrices. For simplicity we also assume that $c_{-2} = \cdots = c_{-k} = 0$, so that the restrictions only involve one lagged variable. Also we make the additional assumption that $b = c_1$ and $d = -(c_{-1} + c_0 + c_1)$ are of full rank. Let $a = b_\perp$.

Using the results of Proposition 2 in model (2) with b and d as just defined yields the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X_t &= \overline{b}\overline{d}'X_{t-1} + \overline{a}\eta\xi'\overline{d_\perp}'X_{t-1} + \overline{a}\Theta\overline{d}'X_{t-1} \\ &+ \Pi_2\Delta X_{t-1} + \cdots + \Pi_k\Delta X_{t-k-1} + \mu + \Phi D_t + \epsilon_t. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

By multiplying (11) with a' and b' we get after taking the restrictions in Corollary 1 into account

$$\begin{aligned} a'\Delta X_t &= \eta\xi'\overline{d_\perp}'X_{t-1} + \Theta\overline{d}'X_{t-1} \\ &+ a'\Pi_2\Delta X_{t-1} + \cdots + a'\Pi_k\Delta X_{t-k-1} \\ &+ a'\mu + a'\Phi D_t + a'\epsilon_t \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

$$b'\Delta X_t = d'X_{t-1} + c_{-1}'\Delta X_{t-1} - H\omega + b'\epsilon_t. \tag{13}$$

We thus end up with a model (12)-(13) being equivalent to the reduced rank model (2) satisfying the restrictions (i) and (ii) of Corollary 1. The $(p-q)\times(p-q)$ matrix $\eta\xi'(d_\perp' d_\perp)^{-1}$ in front of $d_\perp' X_{t-1}$ has rank $r-q$ and is therefore of reduced rank. It contains $(p-q)(r-q)+(p-q-r+q)(r-q)=2(p-q)(r-q)-(r-q)^2$ parameters. The matrix $\Theta(d'd)^{-1}$ in front of $d'X_{t-1}$ contains $(p-q)q$ parameters. These correspond to the parameters of Π of (2) taking the restrictions (i) of Corollary 1 into account. Also we see how the restrictions (ii) of Corollary 1 are incorporated, since no parameters except in the constant terms and the covariance matrix are allowed in (13).

The parameters of the VAR model (2) with the restrictions (3) and (4) imposed can thus up to a reparametrization be estimated from the system (12)-(13) where the reduced rank matrix is of rank $(r-q)$.

In order to estimate the parameters of this model we consider the conditional model of $a'\Delta X_t$ given $b'\Delta X_t$ and past information. Using similar results as in Johansen [9], this model may be written

$$
\begin{aligned}
a'\Delta X_t &= \eta\xi'(d_\perp' d_\perp)^{-1} d_\perp' X_{t-1} + \rho(b'\Delta X_t - c_{-1}'\Delta X_{t-1}) \\
&+ (\Theta(d'd)^{-1} - \rho) d' X_{t-1} \\
&+ a'\Pi_2\Delta X_{t-1} + \cdots + a'\Pi_k \Delta X_{t-k-1} \\
&+ (\rho H\omega + a'\mu) + a'\Phi D_t + u_t,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}
$$

where the $(p-q)\times q$ matrix ρ is defined by $\rho = a'\Sigma b(b'\Sigma b)^{-1}$ and the errors are $u_t = (a' - \rho b')\epsilon_t$. Note that they are independent of the errors $b'\epsilon_t$ of (13).

We intend to find the maximum likelihood estimators and the maximal value of the likelihood by considering separately the marginal model given by (13), and the conditional model (14) described above. Due to the independence of the errors the likelihood factorizes. What must furthermore be established, is that the parameters of the two parts are variation free.

The parameters of the marginal model are ω and $b'\Sigma b = \Sigma_{22}$. The parameters of the conditional model are $\eta, \xi, \rho, \gamma = (\Theta(d'd)^{-1} - \rho)$, $\psi_i = a'\Pi_i$, $i = 2, \ldots, k$, $\Phi_0 = a'\Phi$, $\phi = (\rho H\omega + a'\mu)$ and $\Sigma_{11\cdot 2} = a'\Sigma a - a'\Sigma b(b'\Sigma b)^{-1} b'\Sigma a$. It is well known that Σ_{22} is variation free with ρ and $\Sigma_{11\cdot 2}$. What needs some closer attention is the parameter ω which is common to both systems. Writing

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu &= a(a'a)^{-1}a'\mu + b(b'b)^{-1}b'\mu \\
&= a(a'a)^{-1}\mu_1 - b(b'b)^{-1}H\omega,
\end{aligned}
$$

we see that $\mu_1 = a'\mu$ is independent of ω. Since $a'\mu = \phi - \rho H\omega$, any particular value ω may have, will not influence the value μ_1 can take since ϕ will not be restricted in any way.

The estimation of the conditional system is carried out by first regressing the variables $a'\Delta X_t$ and $\overline{d_\perp}' X_{t-1}$ on $b'\Delta X_t - c'_{-1}\Delta X_{t-1}, d'X_{t-1}, \Delta X_{t-1}, \ldots, \Delta X_{t-k+1}, D_t$ and 1, $t = 1, \ldots, T$. In the case where $r = q$ only the variable $a'\Delta X_t$ is used as regressand. Defining the residuals as $R_{1t\cdot 2}$ and $R_{2t\cdot 2}$ the equation (14) takes the form

$$R_{1t\cdot 2} = \eta\xi' R_{2t\cdot 2} + error.$$

Define the $(p-q) \times (p-q)$ matrices $S_{ij\cdot 2}, i, j = 1, 2$ by

$$S_{ij\cdot 2} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} R_{it\cdot 2}R'_{jt\cdot 2}, i, j = 1, 2. \tag{15}$$

By now well known arguments the maximum likelihood estimators of ξ is given by $\tilde{\xi} = (v_1, \ldots, v_{r-q})$ where $v_1, \ldots, v_{p-q}$ are eigenvectors in the eigenvalue problem

$$|\lambda S_{22\cdot 2} - S_{21\cdot 2}S_{11\cdot 2}^{-1}S_{12\cdot 2}| = 0, \tag{16}$$

which has solutions $\tilde{\lambda}_1 > \ldots > \tilde{\lambda}_{p-q}$. Here the normalization $\tilde{\xi}' S_{22\cdot 2}\tilde{\xi} = I_{r-q}$ is used. The estimator of η is given by

$$\tilde{\eta} = S_{12\cdot 2}\tilde{\xi}.$$

We now consider the form of the likelihood ratio test of the restrictions (4) in the VAR model (2) with the reduced rank condition (3) imposed.

The part of the maximized likelihood function stemming from the conditional model is

$$L_{1\cdot 2,max}^{-2/T} = |S_{11\cdot 2}| \prod_{i=1}^{r-q}(1 - \tilde{\lambda}_i)/|a'a|.$$

The part stemming from the marginal model (13) follows from results for standard multivariate Gaussian models, and equals

$$L_{2,max}^{-2/T} = |\tilde{\Sigma}_{22}|/|b'b|,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}_{22} &= \tfrac{1}{T}\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{T}(b'\Delta X_t - d'X_{t-1} - c'_{-1}\Delta X_{t-1} + H\tilde{\omega}) \\ &\quad (b'\Delta X_t - d'X_{t-1} - c'_{-1}\Delta X_{t-1} + H\tilde{\omega})', \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

and $\tilde{\omega}$ is the maximum likelihood estimator for ω. Hence the maximum value of the likelihood function is given by $L_{H,max}^{-2/T} = |\tilde{\Sigma}_{22}S_{11\cdot 2}| \prod_{i=1}^{r-q}(1 - \tilde{\lambda}_i)/|b'b||a'a|$.

In Johansen and Juselius [10] it is shown that the maximum value of the likelihood in the reduced rank model defined by (2) and (3) is given by $L_{max}^{-2/T} = |S_{00}| \prod_{i=1}^{r}(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i)$, where $S_{00}, \hat{\lambda}_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$ arise from maximizing the likelihood in a manner similar to the one described above. In this case only the restriction (3) is taken into account.

Collecting the results above we have:

Proposition 3 *Consider the rational expectation restrictions of the form (4) with c_{-1}, c_0 and c_1 known, and $c_i = 0$ otherwise. Assume that $b = c_1, a = c_{1\perp}$ and $d = -(c_{-1} + c_0 + c_1)$ have full rank. The likelihood ratio statistic of a test for the restrictions (4) in the reduced rank VAR model satisfying (3) against a VAR model satisfying only the reduced rank condition (3), is*

$$\begin{aligned} -2lnQ &= Tln|S_{11\cdot 2}| - \sum_{i=1}^{r} ln(1-\hat{\lambda}_i) + Tln|\tilde{\Sigma_{22}}| \\ &- Tln|S_{00}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-q} ln(1-\tilde{\lambda}_i) - Tln(|b'b||a'a|), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{22}, S_{11\cdot 2}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_i, i = 1, \ldots, r-q$ are given by (15), (16) and (17), and $S_{00}, \hat{\lambda}_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$ are estimates from the VAR model (2) satisfying (3).

It should be fairly clear how to cope with restrictions on further lags than one. The form of such restrictions will have an impact on (13) and (14) which means that one of the regressors must be redefined. Furtermore (17) has to be modified appropriately.

4 The asymptotic distribution of the test statistics

So far no mention has been made of the distribution of the estimators and test statistics. To do so one has to introduce some further conditions. Let $\Pi(z)$ denote the characteristic polynomial of the VAR model (2), i.e.
$\Pi(z) = (1-z) - z\Pi - (1-z)z\Pi_2 - \cdots + (1-z)z^{k-1}\Pi_k$, and let $-\Psi$ equal the derivative of Π evaluated at $z = 1$. Under the condition that $|\Pi(z)| = 0$ implies that $|z| > 1$ or $z = 1$, the restriction (3) and the condition that $\alpha_\perp'\Psi\beta_\perp$ has rank $p - r$, Johansen [8] derived an explicit representation of X_t in terms of the errors. In particular the vector ΔX_t and the rows of $\beta' X_t$ are stationary vectors. Therefore, the columns of β are the cointegrating vectors in the sense of Engle and Granger [6]. Using these results one can find the asymptotic distribution of the estimators of α, β and the other unknown parameters, see Johansen [8] or Ahn and Reinsel [1]. Properly normalized the distribution of the estimators of β converge at the rate T^{-1} towards a mixed Gaussian distribution. The distributions of the estimators of the other parameters converge at a rate $T^{-1/2}$. The asymptotic distribution of these estimators is a multivariate Gaussian distribution, except for the distribution of the estimator for the constant term, which is more complicated. The asymptotic covariance matrix of the estimators of β and of the other parameters is block diagonal.

This has the consequence that a test on the β parameters and the rest may be carried out separately. Since the conditions derived in Proposition 1 separate in conditions on β and

in conditions on the rest of the parameters, it seems natural to proceed in two steps. First we test the restrictions on β ignoring the restrictions on the other parameters, i.e. we test whether $(\sum_{j=-k+1}^{\infty} c_j) \in sp(\beta)$. This can be done by the maximum likelihood procedure developed by Johansen and Juselius [11], and amounts to carrying out a χ^2 test. If this hypothesis is not rejected, one can procede to test the restrictions on the other parameters implied by Proposition 1 treating β as known. This means that the processes involved can be transformed to stationary processes. Hence this part of the testing can be carried out following well known procedures developed for inference in stationary time series. In general the restrictions are nonlinear as pointed out in section 2.

As shown in the previous section there are interesting situations where it is possible to carry out the test in one step. We shall indicate the asymptotic distribution in the case covered by Proposition 3. By the results referred to above the asymptotic distribution is χ^2, and the degrees of freedom is the difference between the number of free parameters in the general case and the number of parameters under the hypothesis. Since there are $pr + (p-r)r + (k-1)p^2 + p + 3p + p(p+1)/2$ in the model (2) satisfying (3) when the seasonal pattern is quarterly, and the formulation (13)-(12) has $(p-q)r + (p-r)(r-q) + (k-1)p(p-q) + s + (p-q) + 3(p-q) + p(p+1)/2$ parameters, the degrees of freedom are $rq + (p-r)q + (k-1)pq - s + 4q$.

References

[1] Ahn, S.K. and Reinsel, G.C. (1990). Estimation for partially non-stationary multivariate autoregressive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **85**, 813-823.

[2] Baillie, R. T. (1989). Econometric tests of rationality and market efficiency. *Econometric Reviews* **8**, 151-186.

[3] Campbell, J. Y. (1986). Does saving anticipate declining labor income? An alternative test of the permanent income hypotheses. *Econometrica* **55**, 1249-1273.

[4] Campbell, J.Y. and R.J. Shiller (1987). Cointegration tests and present value models. *Journal of Political Economy* **95**, 1062-1088.

[5] Cuthbertson, K. and M.P. Taylor (1990). Money demand, expectations, and the forward-lokking model. *Journal of Policy Modelling* **12**, 289-315.

[6] Engle, R.F. and C.W.J. Granger (1987). Co-integration and error correction: Representation, estimation and testing. *Econometrica* **55**, 251-276.

[7] Engsted, T. and N. Haldrup (1994). The linear quadratic adjustment cost model and the demand for labour. Forthcoming *Journal of Applied Econometrics.*

[8] Johansen, S. (1991) Estimation and hypothesis testing of cointegration in Gaussian vector autoregressive models. *Econometrica* **59**, 1551-1580.

[9] Johansen, S. (1992). Cointegration in partial systems and the efficiency of single-equation analysis. *Journal of Econometrics* **52**, 389-402.

[10] Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1990). Maximum likelihood estimation and inference on cointegration - with application to the demand for money. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **52**, 169-210.

[11] Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1992). Testing structural hypotheses in a multivariate cointegration analysis of the PPP and the UIP for UK. *Journal of Econometrics* **53**, 211-244.

[12] Muth, J.F. (1960). Optimal properties of exponentially weighted forecasts. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **55**, 299-306.

[13] Muth, J.F. (1961). Rational expectations and the theory of price movements. *Econometrica* **29**, 315-335.

Issued in the series Discussion Papers

No. 1 *I. Aslaksen and O. Bjerkholt (1985):* Certainty Equivalence Procedures in the Macroeconomic Planning of an Oil Economy

No. 3 *E. Biørn (1985):* On the Prediction of Population Totals from Sample surveys Based on Rotating Panels

No. 4 *P. Frenger (1985):* A Short Run Dynamic Equilibrium Model of the Norwegian Production Sectors

No. 5 *I. Aslaksen and O. Bjerkholt (1985):* Certainty Equivalence Procedures in Decision-Making under Uncertainty: An Empirical Application

No. 6 *E. Biørn (1985):* Depreciation Profiles and the User Cost of Capital

No. 7 *P. Frenger (1985):* A Directional Shadow Elasticity of Substitution

No. 8 *S. Longva, L. Lorentsen and Ø. Olsen (1985):* The Multi-Sectoral Model MSG-4, Formal Structure and Empirical Characteristics

No. 9 *J. Fagerberg and G. Sollie (1985):* The Method of Constant Market Shares Revisited

No. 10 *E. Biørn (1985):* Specification of Consumer Demand Models with Stochastic Elements in the Utility Function and the first Order Conditions

No. 11 *E. Biørn, E. Holmøy and Ø. Olsen (1985):* Gross and Net Capital, Productivity and the form of the Survival Function. Some Norwegian Evidence

No. 12 *J.K. Dagsvik (1985):* Markov Chains Generated by Maximizing Components of Multidimensional Extremal Processes

No. 13 *E. Biørn, M. Jensen and M. Reymert (1985):* KVARTS - A Quarterly Model of the Norwegian Economy

No. 14 *R. Aaberge (1986):* On the Problem of Measuring Inequality

No. 15 *A.-M. Jensen and T. Schweder (1986):* The Engine of Fertility - Influenced by Interbirth Employment

No. 16 *E. Biørn (1986):* Energy Price Changes, and Induced Scrapping and Revaluation of Capital - A Putty-Clay Model

No. 17 *E. Biørn and P. Frenger (1986):* Expectations, Substitution, and Scrapping in a Putty-Clay Model

No. 18 *R. Bergan, Å. Cappelen, S. Longva and N.M. Stølen (1986):* MODAG A - A Medium Term Annual Macroeconomic Model of the Norwegian Economy

No. 19 *E. Biørn and H. Olsen (1986):* A Generalized Single Equation Error Correction Model and its Application to Quarterly Data

No. 20 *K.H. Alfsen, D.A. Hanson and S. Glomsrød (1986):* Direct and Indirect Effects of reducing SO_2 Emissions: Experimental Calculations of the MSG-4E Model

No. 21 *J.K. Dagsvik (1987):* Econometric Analysis of Labor Supply in a Life Cycle Context with Uncertainty

No. 22 *K.A. Brekke, E. Gjelsvik and B.H. Vatne (1987):* A Dynamic Supply Side Game Applied to the European Gas Market

No. 23 *S. Bartlett, J.K. Dagsvik, Ø. Olsen and S. Strøm (1987):* Fuel Choice and the Demand for Natural Gas in Western European Households

No. 24 *J.K. Dagsvik and R. Aaberge (1987):* Stochastic Properties and Functional Forms of Life Cycle Models for Transitions into and out of Employment

No. 25 *T.J. Klette (1987):* Taxing or Subsidising an Exporting Industry

No. 26 *K.J. Berger, O. Bjerkholt and Ø. Olsen (1987):* What are the Options for non-OPEC Countries

No. 27 *A. Aaheim (1987):* Depletion of Large Gas Fields with Thin Oil Layers and Uncertain Stocks

No. 28 *J.K. Dagsvik (1987):* A Modification of Heckman's Two Stage Estimation Procedure that is Applicable when the Budget Set is Convex

No. 29 *K. Berger, Å. Cappelen and I. Svendsen (1988):* Investment Booms in an Oil Economy - The Norwegian Case

No. 30 *A. Rygh Swensen (1988):* Estimating Change in a Proportion by Combining Measurements from a True and a Fallible Classifier

No. 31 *J.K. Dagsvik (1988):* The Continuous Generalized Extreme Value Model with Special Reference to Static Models of Labor Supply

No. 32 *K. Berger, M. Hoel, S. Holden and Ø. Olsen (1988):* The Oil Market as an Oligopoly

No. 33 *I.A.K. Anderson, J.K. Dagsvik, S. Strøm and T. Wennemo (1988):* Non-Convex Budget Set, Hours Restrictions and Labor Supply in Sweden

No. 34 *E. Holmøy and Ø. Olsen (1988):* A Note on Myopic Decision Rules in the Neoclassical Theory of Producer Behaviour, 1988

No. 35 *E. Biørn and H. Olsen (1988):* Production - Demand Adjustment in Norwegian Manufacturing: A Quarterly Error Correction Model, 1988

No. 36 *J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (1988):* A Labor Supply Model for Married Couples with Non-Convex Budget Sets and Latent Rationing, 1988

No. 37 *T. Skoglund and A. Stokka (1988):* Problems of Linking Single-Region and Multiregional Economic Models, 1988

No. 38 *T.J. Klette (1988):* The Norwegian Aluminium Industry, Electricity prices and Welfare, 1988

No. 39 *I. Aslaksen, O. Bjerkholt and K.A. Brekke (1988):* Optimal Sequencing of Hydroelectric and Thermal Power Generation under Energy Price Uncertainty and Demand Fluctuations, 1988

No. 40 *O. Bjerkholt and K.A. Brekke (1988):* Optimal Starting and Stopping Rules for Resource Depletion when Price is Exogenous and Stochastic, 1988

No. 41 *J. Aasness, E. Biørn and T. Skjerpen (1988):* Engel Functions, Panel Data and Latent Variables, 1988

No. 42 *R. Aaberge, Ø. Kravdal and T. Wennemo (1989):* Unobserved Heterogeneity in Models of Marriage Dissolution, 1989

No. 43 *K.A. Mork, H.T. Mysen and Ø. Olsen (1989):* Business Cycles and Oil Price Fluctuations: Some evidence for six OECD countries. 1989

No. 44 *B. Bye, T. Bye and L. Lorentsen (1989):* SIMEN. Studies of Industry, Environment and Energy towards 2000, 1989

No. 45 *O. Bjerkholt, E. Gjelsvik and Ø. Olsen (1989):* Gas Trade and Demand in Northwest Europe: Regulation, Bargaining and Competition

No. 46 *L.S. Stambøl and K.Ø. Sørensen (1989):* Migration Analysis and Regional Population Projections, 1989

No. 47 *V. Christiansen (1990):* A Note on the Short Run Versus Long Run Welfare Gain from a Tax Reform, 1990

No. 48 *S. Glomsrød, H. Vennemo and T. Johnsen (1990):* Stabilization of Emissions of CO_2: A Computable General Equilibrium Assessment, 1990

No. 49 *J. Aasness (1990):* Properties of Demand Functions for Linear Consumption Aggregates, 1990

No. 50 *J.G. de Leon (1990):* Empirical EDA Models to Fit and Project Time Series of Age-Specific Mortality Rates, 1990

No. 51 *J.G. de Leon (1990):* Recent Developments in Parity Progression Intensities in Norway. An Analysis Based on Population Register Data

No. 52 *R. Aaberge and T. Wennemo (1990):* Non-Stationary Inflow and Duration of Unemployment

No. 53 *R. Aaberge, J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (1990):* Labor Supply, Income Distribution and Excess Burden of Personal Income Taxation in Sweden

No. 54 *R. Aaberge, J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (1990):* Labor Supply, Income Distribution and Excess Burden of Personal Income Taxation in Norway

No. 55 *H. Vennemo (1990):* Optimal Taxation in Applied General Equilibrium Models Adopting the Armington Assumption

No. 56 *N.M. Stølen (1990):* Is there a NAIRU in Norway?

No. 57 *Å. Cappelen (1991):* Macroeconomic Modelling: The Norwegian Experience

No. 58 *J.K. Dagsvik and R. Aaberge (1991):* Household Production, Consumption and Time Allocation in Peru

No. 59 *R. Aaberge and J.K. Dagsvik (1991):* Inequality in Distribution of Hours of Work and Consumption in Peru

No. 60 *T.J. Klette (1991):* On the Importance of R&D and Ownership for Productivity Growth. Evidence from Norwegian Micro-Data 1976-85

No. 61 *K.H. Alfsen (1991):* Use of Macroeconomic Models in Analysis of Environmental Problems in Norway and Consequences for Environmental Statistics

No. 62 *H. Vennemo (1991):* An Applied General Equilibrium Assessment of the Marginal Cost of Public Funds in Norway

No. 63 *H. Vennemo (1991):* The Marginal Cost of Public Funds: A Comment on the Literature

No. 64 *A. Brendemoen and H. Vennemo (1991):* A climate convention and the Norwegian economy: A CGE assessment

No. 65 *K.A. Brekke (1991):* Net National Product as a Welfare Indicator

No. 66 *E. Bowitz and E. Storm (1991):* Will Restrictive Demand Policy Improve Public Sector Balance?

No. 67 *Å. Cappelen (1991):* MODAG. A Medium Term Macroeconomic Model of the Norwegian Economy

No. 68 *B. Bye (1992):* Modelling Consumers' Energy Demand

No. 69 *K.H. Alfsen, A. Brendemoen and S. Glomsrød (1992):* Benefits of Climate Policies: Some Tentative Calculations

No. 70 *R. Aaberge, Xiaojie Chen, Jing Li and Xuezeng Li (1992):* The Structure of Economic Inequality among Households Living in Urban Sichuan and Liaoning, 1990

No. 71 *K.H. Alfsen, K.A. Brekke, F. Brunvoll, H. Lurås, K. Nyborg and H.W. Sæbø (1992):* Environmental Indicators

No. 72 *B. Bye and E. Holmøy (1992):* Dynamic Equilibrium Adjustments to a Terms of Trade Disturbance

No. 73 *O. Aukrust (1992):* The Scandinavian Contribution to National Accounting

No. 74 *J. Aasness, E. Eide and T. Skjerpen (1992):* A Criminometric Study Using Panel Data and Latent Variables

No. 75 *R. Aaberge and Xuezeng Li (1992):* The Trend in Income Inequality in Urban Sichuan and Liaoning, 1986-1990

No. 76 *J.K. Dagsvik and S. Strøm (1992):* Labor Supply with Non-convex Budget Sets, Hours Restriction and Non-pecuniary Job-attributes

No. 77 *J.K. Dagsvik (1992):* Intertemporal Discrete Choice, Random Tastes and Functional Form

No. 78 *H. Vennemo (1993):* Tax Reforms when Utility is Composed of Additive Functions

No. 79 *J.K. Dagsvik (1993):* Discrete and Continuous Choice, Max-stable Processes and Independence from Irrelevant Attributes

No. 80 *J.K. Dagsvik (1993):* How Large is the Class of Generalized Extreme Value Random Utility Models?

No. 81 *H. Birkelund, E. Gjelsvik, M. Aaserud (1993):* Carbon/energy Taxes and the Energy Market in Western Europe

No. 82 *E. Bowitz (1993):* Unemployment and the Growth in the Number of Recipients of Disability Benefits in Norway

No. 83 *L. Andreassen (1993):* Theoretical and Econometric Modeling of Disequilibrium

No. 84 *K.A. Brekke (1993):* Do Cost-Benefit Analyses favour Environmentalists?

No. 85 *L. Andreassen (1993):* Demographic Forecasting with a Dynamic Stochastic Microsimulation Model

No. 86 *G.B. Asheim and K.A. Brekke (1993):* Sustainability when Resource Management has Stochastic Consequences

No. 87 *O. Bjerkholt and Yu Zhu (1993):* Living Conditions of Urban Chinese Households around 1990

No. 88 *R. Aaberge (1993):* Theoretical Foundations of Lorenz Curve Orderings

No. 89 *J. Aasness, E. Biørn and T. Skjerpen (1993):* Engel Functions, Panel Data, and Latent Variables - with Detailed Results

No. 90 *I. Svendsen (1993):* Testing the Rational Expectations Hypothesis Using Norwegian Microeconomic DataTesting the REH. Using Norwegian Micro-economic Data

No. 91 *E. Bowitz, A. Rødseth and E. Storm (1993):* Fiscal Expansion, the Budget Deficit and the Economy: Norway 1988-91

No. 92 *R. Aaberge, U. Colombino and S. Strøm (1993):* Labor Supply in Italy

No. 93 *T.J. Klette (1993):* Is Price Equal to Marginal Costs? An Integrated Study of Price-Cost Margins and Scale Economies among Norwegian Manufacturing Establishments 1975-90

No. 94 *J.K. Dagsvik (1993):* Choice Probabilities and Equilibrium Conditions in a Matching Market with Flexible Contracts

No. 95 *T. Kornstad (1993):* Empirical Approaches for Analysing Consumption and Labour Supply in a Life Cycle Perspective

No. 96 *T. Kornstad (1993):* An Empirical Life Cycle Model of Savings, Labour Supply and Consumption without Intertemporal Separability

No. 97 *S. Kverndokk (1993):* Coalitions and Side Payments in International CO_2 Treaties

No. 98 *T. Eika (1993):* Wage Equations in Macro Models. Phillips Curve versus Error Correction Model Determination of Wages in Large-Scale UK Macro Models

No. 99 *A. Brendemoen and H. Vennemo (1993):* The Marginal Cost of Funds in the Presence of External Effects

No. 100 *K.-G. Lindquist (1993):* Empirical Modelling of Norwegian Exports: A Disaggregated Approach

No. 101 *A.S. Jore, T. Skjerpen and A. Rygh Swensen (1993):* Testing for Purchasing Power Parity and Interest Rate Parities on Norwegian Data

No. 102 *R. Nesbakken and S. Strøm (1993):* The Choice of Space Heating System and Energy Consumption in Norwegian Households (Will be issued later)

No. 103 *A. Aaheim and K. Nyborg (1993):* "Green National Product": Good Intentions, Poor Device?

No. 104 *K.H. Alfsen, H. Birkelund and M. Aaserud (1993):* Secondary benefits of the EC Carbon/ Energy Tax

No. 105 *J. Aasness and B. Holtsmark (1993):* Consumer Demand in a General Equilibrium Model for Environmental Analysis

No. 106 *K.-G. Lindquist (1993):* The Existence of Factor Substitution in the Primary Aluminium Industry: A Multivariate Error Correction Approach on Norwegian Panel Data

No. 107 *S. Kverndokk (1994):* Depletion of Fossil Fuels and the Impacts of Global Warming

No. 108 *K.A. Magnussen (1994):* Precautionary Saving and Old-Age Pensions

No. 109 *F. Johansen (1994):* Investment and Financial Constraints: An Empirical Analysis of Norwegian Firms

No. 110 *K.A. Brekke and P. Børing (1994):* The Volatility of Oil Wealth under Uncertainty about Parameter Values

No. 111 *M.J. Simpson (1994):* Foreign Control and Norwegian Manufacturing Performance

No .112 *Y. Willassen and T.J. Klette (1994):* Correlated Measurement Errors, Bound on Parameters, and a Model of Producer Behavior

No. 113 *D. Wetterwald (1994):* Car ownership and private car use. A microeconometric analysis based on Norwegian data

No. 114 *K.E. Rosendahl (1994):* Does Improved Environmental Policy Enhance Economic Growth? Endogenous Growth Theory Applied to Developing Countries

No. 115 *L. Andreassen, D. Fredriksen and O. Ljones (1994):* The Future Burden of Public Pension Benefits. A Microsimulation Study

No. 116 *A. Brendemoen (1994):* Car Ownership Decisions in Norwegian Households.

No. 117 *A. Langørgen (1994):* A Macromodel of Local Government Spending Behaviour in Norway

No. 118 *K.A. Brekke (1994):* Utilitarism, Equivalence Scales and Logarithmic Utility

No. 119 *K.A. Brekke, H. Lurås og K. Nyborg (1994):* Sufficient Welfare Indicators: Allowing Disagreement in Evaluations of Social Welfare

No. 120 *T.J. Klette (1994):* R&D, Scope Economies and Company Structure: A "Not-so-Fixed Effect" Model of Plant Performance

No. 121 *Y. Willassen (1994):* A Generalization of Hall's Specification of the Consumption function

No. 122 *E. Holmøy, T. Hægeland and Ø. Olsen (1994):* Effective Rates of Assistance for Norwegian Industries

No. 123 *K. Mohn (1994):* On Equity and Public Pricing in Developing Countries

No. 124 *J. Aasness, E. Eide and T. Skjerpen (1994):* Criminometrics, Latent Variables, Panel Data, and Different Types of Crime

No. 125 *E. Biørn and T.J. Klette (1994):* Errors in Variables and Panel Data: The Labour Demand Response to Permanent Changes in Output

No. 126 *I. Svendsen (1994):* Do Norwegian Firms Form Exptrapolative Expectations?

No. 127 *T.J. Klette and Z. Griliches (1994):* The Inconsistency of Common Scale Estimators when Output Prices are Unobserved and Endogenous

No. 128 *E. Bowitz, N. Ø. Mæhle, V. S. Sasmitawidjaja and S. B. Widayono (1994):* MEMLI – The Indonesian Model for Environmental Analysis. Version 1. Tecnical Documentation (in print)

No. 129 *S. Johansen and A. Rygh Swensen (1994):* Testing Rational Expectations in Vector Autoregressive Models

Nr. 130 *T.J. Klette (1994):* Estimating Price-Cost Margins and Scale Economies from a Panel of Microdata

Statistics Norway
Research Department
P.O.B. 8131 Dep.
N-0033 Oslo

Tel.: + 47 - 22 86 45 00
Fax: + 47 - 22 11 12 38

Statistics Norway
Research Department