

June 13, 2008

# Time Series Analysis

## The R Software.

The statistical software package that is used for this chapter on Time Series analysis is R. R is a freely downloaded statistical package from the Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) which can be found on the internet at “<http://cran.r-project.org>”. The syntax for R is very similar to the syntax for the commercial statistical package S-plus. In fact, most code written in R will also work in S-plus and vice-versa.

Learning to use R is difficult. The focus of the current chapter is to analyze time series plots and output and not on programming in R. Thus, these notes will provide the R code needed for the discussion.

R is a very nice package for a variety of reasons. The software is maintained by scientists for scientists. Packages are being added to R all the time to reflect current statistical research. Also, R is capable of producing high quality graphics.

In order to install R on a Windows based computer, go to the above web site. Select “R binaries” → “Windows” → “Base”. From here, download the file “R-2.3.0-win32.exe” (or the most current version). You may want to create a file with a name like “rhome” to put this executable file into. Once the executable file is downloaded, just double-click on the RW2010.exe file to install the program. Once the program begins to install, the directions should be self-explanatory. The installation should create a shortcut icon on your desktop. Once the installation is complete, all you need to do to start the software is double-click on the R icon that is now on your desktop screen.

R has many built-in data sets, some of which we will access. Other data sets need to be read into R. There are various ways this can be done. The R code that appears in the text below shows how to read in a data file.

## 8.1 Introduction.

Figure 1 shows a plot of average monthly air temperatures (in Celsius) at Recife, Brazil over the period from 1953 to 1962 (Chatfield 2004). The data in Figure 1 looks like a random scatter of points. However, the data was collected as a *time series*. That is, the data was collected over time, in this case in consecutive months.

If we connect the dots consecutively over time we get the picture shown in Figure 2 and in this plot a very distinctive annual pattern reveals itself.

In order to obtain the plot in Figure 2, open the R software. You will need the `recife.dat` file which contains the data. At the top of the R window, go to “File” → “change dir...”. In the dialog box that opens, go to the directory where you have stored the data file “`recife.dat`”. Then type the following:

```
library(stats)
recife<-as.ts(scan('recife.dat'))
```




Figure 1: Average monthly air temperatures at Recife, Brazil between 1953 and 1962.




Figure 2: Average monthly air temperatures at Recife, Brazil between 1953 and 1962.

```
plot(recife,ylab='Temperature (degree C)',  
      xlab='Month',main='Recife, Brazil Temperature Data')
```

The first line loads a “stats” library that has many built-in statistical functions, including the time series functions we will be using through out this chapter. The “scan” command reads in the data set and the “as.ts” tells R to treat the data set as a time series object. Next, the “plot” command plots the data as seen in Figure 2. the “xlab” and “ylab” stand for the  $x$  and  $y$  axis labels and the “main=” gives a title for the plot.

Another example of a time series with a seasonal pattern as well as an overall increasing trend is shown in Figure 3. This figure shows atmospheric concentrations of  $CO_2$  (ppm) as reported in a 1997 Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO) publication (Keeling et al 1997). The data are given in the following table:

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1959	315.42	316.31	316.50	317.56	318.13	318.00	316.39	314.65	313.68	313.18	314.66	315.43
1960	316.27	316.81	317.42	318.87	319.87	319.43	318.01	315.74	314.00	313.68	314.84	316.03
1961	316.73	317.54	318.38	319.31	320.42	319.61	318.42	316.63	314.83	315.16	315.94	316.85
1962	317.78	318.40	319.53	320.42	320.85	320.45	319.45	317.25	316.11	315.27	316.53	317.53
1963	318.58	318.92	319.70	321.22	322.08	321.31	319.58	317.61	316.05	315.83	316.91	318.20
1964	319.41	320.07	320.74	321.40	322.06	321.73	320.27	318.54	316.54	316.71	317.53	318.55
1965	319.27	320.28	320.73	321.97	322.00	321.71	321.05	318.71	317.66	317.14	318.70	319.25
1966	320.46	321.43	322.23	323.54	323.91	323.59	322.24	320.20	318.48	317.94	319.63	320.87
1967	322.17	322.34	322.88	324.25	324.83	323.93	322.38	320.76	319.10	319.24	320.56	321.80
1968	322.40	322.99	323.73	324.86	325.40	325.20	323.98	321.95	320.18	320.09	321.16	322.74
1969	323.83	324.26	325.47	326.50	327.21	326.54	325.72	323.50	322.22	321.62	322.69	323.95
1970	324.89	325.82	326.77	327.97	327.91	327.50	326.18	324.53	322.93	322.90	323.85	324.96
1971	326.01	326.51	327.01	327.62	328.76	328.40	327.20	325.27	323.20	323.40	324.63	325.85
1972	326.60	327.47	327.58	329.56	329.90	328.92	327.88	326.16	324.68	325.04	326.34	327.39
1973	328.37	329.40	330.14	331.33	332.31	331.90	330.70	329.15	327.35	327.02	327.99	328.48
1974	329.18	330.55	331.32	332.48	332.92	332.08	331.01	329.23	327.27	327.21	328.29	329.41
1975	330.23	331.25	331.87	333.14	333.80	333.43	331.73	329.90	328.40	328.17	329.32	330.59
1976	331.58	332.39	333.33	334.41	334.71	334.17	332.89	330.77	329.14	328.78	330.14	331.52
1977	332.75	333.24	334.53	335.90	336.57	336.10	334.76	332.59	331.42	330.98	332.24	333.68
1978	334.80	335.22	336.47	337.59	337.84	337.72	336.37	334.51	332.60	332.38	333.75	334.78
1979	336.05	336.59	337.79	338.71	339.30	339.12	337.56	335.92	333.75	333.70	335.12	336.56
1980	337.84	338.19	339.91	340.60	341.29	341.00	339.39	337.43	335.72	335.84	336.93	338.04
1981	339.06	340.30	341.21	342.33	342.74	342.08	340.32	338.26	336.52	336.68	338.19	339.44
1982	340.57	341.44	342.53	343.39	343.96	343.18	341.88	339.65	337.81	337.69	339.09	340.32
1983	341.20	342.35	342.93	344.77	345.58	345.14	343.81	342.21	339.69	339.82	340.98	342.82
1984	343.52	344.33	345.11	346.88	347.25	346.62	345.22	343.11	340.90	341.18	342.80	344.04
1985	344.79	345.82	347.25	348.17	348.74	348.07	346.38	344.51	342.92	342.62	344.06	345.38
1986	346.11	346.78	347.68	349.37	350.03	349.37	347.76	345.73	344.68	343.99	345.48	346.72
1987	347.84	348.29	349.23	350.80	351.66	351.07	349.33	347.92	346.27	346.18	347.64	348.78
1988	350.25	351.54	352.05	353.41	354.04	353.62	352.22	350.27	348.55	348.72	349.91	351.18
1989	352.60	352.92	353.53	355.26	355.52	354.97	353.75	351.52	349.64	349.83	351.14	352.37
1990	353.50	354.55	355.23	356.04	357.00	356.07	354.67	352.76	350.82	351.04	352.69	354.07
1991	354.59	355.63	357.03	358.48	359.22	358.12	356.06	353.92	352.05	352.11	353.64	354.89
1992	355.88	356.63	357.72	359.07	359.58	359.17	356.94	354.92	352.94	353.23	354.09	355.33
1993	356.63	357.10	358.32	359.41	360.23	359.55	357.53	355.48	353.67	353.95	355.30	356.78
1994	358.34	358.89	359.95	361.25	361.67	360.94	359.55	357.49	355.84	356.00	357.59	359.05
1995	359.98	361.03	361.66	363.48	363.82	363.30	361.94	359.50	358.11	357.80	359.61	360.74
1996	362.09	363.29	364.06	364.76	365.45	365.01	363.70	361.54	359.51	359.65	360.80	362.38
1997	363.23	364.06	364.61	366.40	366.84	366.68	364.52	362.57	360.24	360.83	362.49	364.34

The  $CO_2$  data set is part of the R package and the plot in Figure 3 can be generated in R by typing

```
data(co2)
plot(co2, main = expression("Atmospheric concentration of CO"[2]),
      ylab=expression("CO"[2]), xlab='Year')
```

When data is collected over time, we call the data *time series* data. The goal of time




Figure 3: Atmospheric concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> are expressed in parts per million (ppm) and reported in the preliminary 1997 SIO manometric mole fraction scale.

series analysis is to understand the structure of the series:

- Is there *serial correlation*.
- Is there a *trend* in the data over time?
- Is there *seasonal variation* in the data over time?
- Can we use the data for *forecast* future observations?

The first step in analyzing time series data is to plot the data against time – this is called a **time plot**. The time plot can tell us a lot of information about the time series. Trends and seasonal variation are often evident in time plots. Also, time plots can indicate the presence of *outliers* in the time series which are observations that are not consistent with the rest of the data.

### Stationary Time Series.

The main goal of a time series analysis may be to understand seasonal changes and/or trends over time. However, another goal that is often of primary importance is to understand and model the correlational structure in the time series. This type of analysis is generally done on *stationary* processes. Roughly speaking, a stationary process is one that looks basically the same at any given time point. That is, a stationary time series is one without any systematic change in its mean and variance and does not have periodic variations.

Strictly speaking, we say a time series  $y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots$ , is (strictly) stationary if the joint distribution of any portion of the series of  $(y_{t_1}, y_{t_2}, \dots, y_{t_k})$  is the same as the distribution of any other portion of the series  $(y_{t_1+\tau}, y_{t_2+\tau}, \dots, y_{t_k+\tau})$ , where  $\tau$  can be any integer. That is, if we shift the time series by an amount  $\tau$ , it has no effect on the joint distribution of the responses. This definition holds for any value of  $k$ . A weaker definition of stationarity is *second order stationarity* which does not assume anything about the joint distribution of the random responses  $y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots$  except that the mean is constant:  $E[y_t] = \mu$  and that the *covariance* between two observations  $y_t$  and  $y_{t+k}$  depends only on the lag  $k$  between two observations and not on the point  $t$  in the time series:

$$\gamma(k) = \text{cov}(y_t, y_{t+k}).$$

Recall that the covariance between two random variables, in this case  $y_t$  and  $y_{t+k}$ , is defined to be the average value of the product  $(y_t - \mu_t)(y_{t+k} - \mu_{t+k})$ . For a stationary process and  $k = 0$  it follows that

$$E[y_t] = \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \text{var}[y_t] = \sigma^2,$$

for every value of  $t$ . In other words, the mean and variance of the time series is the same at each time point. If we take  $k = 2$ , then stationarity implies that the joint distribution of  $y_{t_1}$  and  $y_{t_2}$  depends only on the difference  $t_2 - t_1 = \tau$ , which is called the **lag**.

One of the primary interests in studying time series is the extent to which successive terms in the series are correlated. In the temperature data set, it seems reasonable to expect that the average temperature next month will be correlated with the average temperature of the current month. However, will the average temperature five months from now depend in anyway with the current month's temperature? In order to answer questions of this sort, we need to define *serial Correlation* and the *autocorrelation* function.

### Serial Correlation.

If  $y_t$  is the response at time  $t$ , then we can denote the average value of  $y_t$  as  $E[y_t] = \mu_t$  and the variance of  $y_t$  as  $E[(y_t - \mu_t)^2] = \sigma_t^2$ . The *autocovariance* function is defined for any two responses  $y_{t_1}$  and  $y_{t_2}$  as the covariance between these two responses:

**Autocovariance function:** 
$$\gamma(t_1, t_2) = E[(y_{t_1} - \mu_{t_1})(y_{t_2} - \mu_{t_2})].$$

The *autocorrelation* function can be computed from the autocovariance function by dividing by the standard deviations of  $y_{t_1}$  and  $y_{t_2}$  which corresponds to our usual definition of correlation:

**Autocorrelation function:** 
$$r(t_1, t_2) = E[(y_{t_1} - \mu_{t_1})(y_{t_2} - \mu_{t_2})] / (\sigma_{t_1} \sigma_{t_2}).$$

Of course, in practice the autocovariance and autocorrelation functions are unknown and have to be estimated. Recall that if we have bivariate data  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ , the (Pearson) correlation is defined to be

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}.$$

If the time series has  $n$  observations  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$ , then we can form the pairs:

$$(y_1, y_2), (y_2, y_3), (y_3, y_4), \dots, (y_{n-1}, y_n)$$

and treat this as a bivariate data set and compute the correlation as given in the above formula. This will give an estimate of the correlation between successive pairs and is called the *autocorrelation coefficient* or *serial correlation coefficient* at lag 1 denoted by  $r_1$ . The formula obtained by plugging the successive pairs into the correlation formula is usually simplified by using:

$$r_1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i - \bar{y})(y_{i+1} - \bar{y}) / (n-1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 / n}.$$

Similarly, we can define the serial correlation at lag  $k$  by

$$r_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} (y_i - \bar{y})(y_{i+k} - \bar{y}) / (n-k)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 / n}.$$

### Correlogram

One of the most useful descriptive tools in time series analysis is to generate the *correlogram* plot which is simply a plot of the serial correlations  $r_k$  versus the lag  $k$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, M$ , where  $M$  is usually much less than the sample size  $n$ .

If we have a random series of observations that are independent of one another, then the population serial correlations will all be zero. However, in this case, we would not expect the sample serial correlations to be exactly zero since they are all defined in terms  $\bar{y}$  etc. However, if we do have a random series, the serial correlations should be close to zero in value on average. One can show that for a random series,

$$E[r_k] \approx \frac{-1}{(n-1)},$$

and

$$\text{var}(r_k) \approx \frac{1}{n}.$$

In addition, if the sample size is fairly large (say  $n \geq 40$ ), then  $r_k$  is approximately normally distributed (Kendall et al 1983, Chapter 48). The approximate normality of the  $r_k$  can aid in determining if a sample serial correlation is significantly non-zero, for instance by examining if  $r_k$  falls within the confidence limits

$$-1/(n-1) \pm 1.96/\sqrt{n}.$$

Due to the multiplicity problem of estimating many serial correlations, the above confidence limits are used only as a guide instead of a strict statistical inference procedure. If we are observing twenty serial correlations say of a random process, then we would expect to see one of the  $r_k$  fall outside of this confidence limit by chance alone.

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the correlograms for the Recife temperature data and the  $CO_2$  data sets (Figure 5 shows the correlogram for lags up to  $k = 100$  although the horizontal axis is labeled differently). These plots were generated using the R software. These two correlograms show very strong autocorrelations and this is to be expected due to the highly non-stationary nature of these two time series. One of our goals is to explore the nature of the autocorrelations after removing trends and seasonality. The correlogram was generated in R for the Recife Temperature data using the following code:

```
recife<-as.ts(scan('recife.dat'))
racf=acf(recife, lag.max=40,,type = "correlation")
plot(racf, type='l', main='Correlogram for Recife Air Temp. Data')
```

The “acf” function in R computes the autocorrelations.

The correlogram is not a useful tool for a non-stationary process. In the  $CO_2$  example with a strong increasing trend, it is obvious that the serial correlations will be positive. The correlogram is most useful for stationary time series. Thus, when evaluating a non-stationary time series, typically trends and periodicities are removed from the data before investigating the autocorrelational structure in the data.




Figure 4: Correlogram for the Average monthly air temperatures at Recife, Brazil between 1953 and 1962.




Figure 5: Correlogram for Atmospheric concentrations of CO2

## Removing Trends and Periodic Effects in a Time Series.

In order to study a time series in greater detail, it is helpful to remove any trends and seasonal components from the data first. There are a variety of ways this can be done. For the Recife Air Temperature data, there is a clear periodic effect for the different months of the year. The temperatures are highest around January and lowest around July.

### Eliminating a trend when there is no seasonality

We briefly describe three methods of removing a trend from data that does not have any seasonality component. Consider the model

$$y_t = \mu_t + \epsilon_t,$$

where the trend is given by  $\mu_t$ .

1. *Least Squares Estimation of  $\mu_t$ .* The idea here is to simply fit a polynomial regression in  $t$  to the data:

$$\mu_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 t^2 + \cdots + \beta_p t^p.$$

If the time series shows a linear trend, then we take  $p = 1$ . The residuals that result from the fit will yield a time series without the trend.

2. *Smoothing by a Moving Average* (also known as a *linear filter*). This process converts a time series  $\{y_t\}$  into another time series  $\{x_t\}$  by a linear operation:

$$x_t = \frac{1}{2q+1} \sum_{i=-q}^q y_{t+i},$$

where the analyst chooses the value of  $q$  for smoothing. Since averaging is a smoothing process, we can see why the moving average smooths out the noise in a time series and hopefully picks up the overall trend in the data. There exist many variations of the filter described here.

3. *Differencing.* Another way of removing a trend in data is by differencing. The first difference operator  $\nabla$  defined by

$$\nabla y_t = y_t - y_{t-1}.$$

We can define higher powers of the differencing operator such as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 y_t &= \nabla(\nabla y_t) \\ &= \nabla(y_t - y_{t-1}) \\ &= (y_t - y_{t-1}) - (y_{t-1} - y_{t-2}) \\ &= y_t - 2y_{t-1} + y_{t-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and so on. If the differencing operator  $\nabla$  is applied to a time series with a linear trend

$$y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \epsilon_t,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla y_t &= y_t - y_{t-1} \\ &= (\beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \epsilon_t) - (\beta_0 + \beta_1(t-1) + \epsilon_{t-1}) \\ &= \beta_1 + \gamma_t, \end{aligned}$$

which yields a time series with a constant mean and the linear trend is eliminated (here  $\gamma_t = \epsilon_t - \epsilon_{t-1}$  is the error term in the differenced time series). Similarly, we can use  $\nabla^2$  to get rid of a quadratic trend.

Let us return to the *CO2* example and use the least-squares approach to remove the clear upward trend in the data. From Figure 3, it looks as if there is a linear trend in *CO2* over time. Thus, in R, we could fit the following model

$$y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \epsilon_t,$$

and then look at the residuals from the fit. To do this in R, we use the following code:

```
t=1:length(co2)
ft=lm(co2~t)
summary(ft)
r=ft$residuals # get the residuals from the fit
plot.ts(r,ylab='residuals', main='Residuals from CO2 Data From a Linear Fit')
```

The plot of residuals from the linear fit versus time is shown in Figure 6 and clearly the linear fit did not remove the entire trend in the data. There appears to be some nonlinearity to the trend. This plot suggests that we probably need to include a quadratic term  $t^2$  to the least-squares fit. However, the residual plot from the quadratic fit (not shown here) still showed some structure. Thus a cubic model was fit to the data using the following R code:

```
ft3=lm(co2~t+I(t^2)+I(t^3))
summary(ft3)
plot.ts(ft3$residuals,ylab='residuals', main='Residuals from CO2 Data From a Cubic Fit')
```

The output from fitting a cubic trend is provided by the “summary(ft3)” as:

Call:

```
lm(formula = co2 ~ t + I(t^2) + I(t^3))
```

Residuals:

```
Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max
```




Figure 6: Residuals from the linear fit to the  $CO_2$  data

-4.5786 -1.7299 0.2279 1.8073 4.4318

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )	
(Intercept)	3.163e+02	3.934e-01	804.008	< 2e-16	***
t	2.905e-02	7.256e-03	4.004	7.25e-05	***
I(t <sup>2</sup> )	2.928e-04	3.593e-05	8.149	3.44e-15	***
I(t <sup>3</sup> )	-2.902e-07	5.036e-08	-5.763	1.51e-08	***

---

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

Residual standard error: 2.11 on 464 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-Squared: 0.9802, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9801

F-statistic: 7674 on 3 and 464 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

From the  $p$ -values, it's clear that the estimated coefficients of the cubic fit appear very stable. The residuals from the cubic fit plotted against time are shown in Figure 7. There no longer appears to be any trend in this residual plot. However, there is still clearly a seasonal pattern remaining in this residual plot. Examining the raw data, one can see that the  $CO_2$  level rises from January to mid-summer and then decreases again. The next section describes methods of eliminating a seasonal or periodic effect.

### Eliminating a Seasonal or Periodic Effect.




Figure 7: Residuals from the cubic fit to the  $CO_2$  data

The differencing method just described can be used to eliminate a seasonal effect in a time series as well. For the Recife average temperature data, there is clearly a 12 month seasonal effect for the different seasons of the year. We can eliminate this effect by using a **seasonal differencing** such as  $\nabla_{12}$  where

$$\nabla_{12}(y_t) = y_t - y_{t-12}.$$

One way to remove the periodic effect is to fit a linear model with indicator variables for the different months:

$$y_t = \beta_1 m_{1t} + \beta_2 m_{2t} + \cdots + \beta_{12} m_{12t} + \epsilon_t, \quad (1)$$

where  $y_t$  is the temperature at time (month)  $t$  and  $m_{kt}$  is the 0-1 indicator for month  $k$ . To fit this model in R, we write:

```
fac = gl(12,1,length=120,
label=c("jan","feb","march","april","may","june","july","aug","sept","oct","nov","dec"))
recifefit=lm(reccdat~fac)
summary(recifefit)
```

The “fac” defines the month factor. The R function “gl” generates factors by specifying the pattern of their levels. The first number in the “gl” command gives the number of levels (12 for 12 months in this example). The second number gives the

number of replications (1 in our case since we have only a single average for a given month). “length = 120” tells R that the time series has  $n = 120$  observations. The “labels” statement is optional and we use it here to give labels for the different months. Fitting this linear model is done in R by the “lm” function which stands for “linear model.” Here, the raw data is called “recdat” and is treated as the response and the “fac” are the factors. This linear model fit has the simple effect of computing the 12 monthly averages and subtracting them from each of the corresponding terms in the data set. We have called the fit of the model “recifefit”. To see the results of the fit, in R type

```
summary(recifefit)
```

The output is given as:

Call:

```
lm(formula = recdat ~ fac)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-1.0700	-0.2700	-0.0200	0.2325	1.8300

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )
(Intercept)	26.8200	0.1502	178.521	< 2e-16 ***
facfeb	0.2600	0.2125	1.224	0.2237
facmarch	-0.0500	0.2125	-0.235	0.8144
facapril	-0.4500	0.2125	-2.118	0.0365 *
facmay	-1.2400	0.2125	-5.836	5.67e-08 ***
facjune	-2.1800	0.2125	-10.261	< 2e-16 ***
facjuly	-2.8600	0.2125	-13.461	< 2e-16 ***
facaug	-2.8500	0.2125	-13.414	< 2e-16 ***
facsept	-1.8400	0.2125	-8.660	5.07e-14 ***
facoct	-0.9800	0.2125	-4.613	1.10e-05 ***
facnov	-0.5400	0.2125	-2.542	0.0125 *
facdec	-0.0900	0.2125	-0.424	0.6727

---

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

Residual standard error: 0.4751 on 108 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-Squared: 0.85, Adjusted R-squared: 0.8347

F-statistic: 55.64 on 11 and 108 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

Most of the factor effects are highly stable indicated by small  $p$ -values. The top frame of Figure 8 shows the residuals versus time for the seasonally adjusted data and we see that the strong seasonal effect is now gone. The bottom frame of Figure 8 shows the correlogram for the seasonally adjusted data. This correlogram indicates that the first three serial correlations appear to differ significantly from zero (they lay




Figure 8: Seasonally adjusted data (top frame) and the correlogram (bottom frame) for the Average monthly air temperatures at Recife, Brazil between 1953 and 1962.

outside the 95% confidence band) and they are positive. This indicates that if a given month has an above average temperature, then the following two months will also tend to have above average temperatures. Also, if a given month has a below average temperature, then the following two months will also tend to be below average.

**Fitting a Periodic Function.** The model (1) is defined by twelve indicator variables for the 12 months which is a lot of parameters. A simpler way of modeling the Recife temperature data is to fit a regression model that is periodic. Since the period is 12, we can fit the following model:

$$y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \sin((2\pi/12)t) + \beta_2 \cos((2\pi/12)t) + \epsilon_t. \quad (2)$$

One can readily check that the regression function in (2) is a periodic function with period equal to 12. If one wanted to fit a model with a different period, say  $m$ , then simply replace the 12 by  $m$  in (2).

The necessary code in R is given by:

```
t=1:length(reccdat)
x1=sin(t*2*pi/12)
x2=cos(t*2*pi/12)
recperiodic = lm(reccdat~x1+x2)
summary(recperiodic)
```

The “summary” statement tells R to print out the results of fitting the periodic fit (2) and the output is as follows:

```
Call:
lm(formula = recdat ~ x1 + x2)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-1.0553887 -0.3402542  0.0001944  0.2464723  2.1176721

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept) 25.75167    0.04808   535.62  <2e-16 ***
x1           1.00372    0.06799   14.76  <2e-16 ***
x2           1.07718    0.06799   15.84  <2e-16 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 0.5267 on 117 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-Squared:  0.8003,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.7969
F-statistic: 234.5 on 2 and 117 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

The regression coefficient estimates of  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are both highly significant. Figure 9 shows the raw temperature data along with the fitted values from (1) in the top frame and (2) in the bottom frame. Also, Figure 10 shows a time plot of the residuals from the periodic fit in the top frame and the correlogram for the residuals in the bottom frame. The plots in Figure 10 looks very similar to the plot Figure 8 using the model (1).

**CO2 Example revisited ...** We saw in the previous section how to remove the trend in the CO2 data by fitting a cubic polynomial to the data. However, the residuals from that model still show a strong periodic effect. We can fit a model to the data to account for the periodic effect and to account for the trend by combining models (1) with the cubic fit. In R, we can use the code:

```
fac = gl(12,1,length=468,
label=c("jan","feb","march","april","may","june","july","aug","sept","oct","nov","dec"))
ftper = lm(co2~fac+t+I(t^2)+I(t^3))
summary(ftper)
co2acfper=acf(ftper$residuals, lag.max=100, type="correlation")
par(mfrow=c(2,1))
plot.ts(ftper$residuals,ylab='residuals', main='CO2 Residuals from a Cubic & Periodic Fit')
plot(co2acfper$acf, type='l',
     main='Correlogram for CO2 Data with Trend & Period Removed',xlab='Lag',ylab='corr')
abline(h=0)
abline(h=1.96/sqrt(length(co2)))
abline(h=-1.96/sqrt(length(co2)))
```




Figure 9: Recife Monthly Temperature Data with the seasonality fitted by the model with indicator variables (1) in the top frame and fitted using the periodic regression function (2) in the bottom frame.




Figure 10: **Periodic Fit:** Seasonally adjusted data (top frame) and the correlogram (bottom frame) for the Average monthly air temperatures at Recife, Brazil between 1953 and 1962.




Figure 11: **Top Frame:** Residuals for  $CO_2$  data versus time from a fit that extracts the seasonal component as well as the cubic trend. **Bottom Frame:** Shows the corresponding correlogram from the residuals.

This R code produces the plots shown in Figure 11. From the correlogram it appears that the autocorrelations for the  $CO_2$  are positive for successive months up to about 16 months apart.

### Tests for Randomness.

With many time series, a trend or seasonal pattern may be evident from the time plot indicating that the series is not random. The lack of randomness may be evident by noting short term autocorrelation. For instance, if the time series alternates up and down about the mean in successive values, then  $r_1$ , the first autocorrelation will be negative. On the other hand, if an observation above the mean tends to be followed by several other observations that are above the mean, then the autocorrelations for lags  $k$  where  $k$  is small tend to be positive (or, vice-versa, if an observation below the mean tends to be followed by successive observations that are also below the mean is an indication of positive autocorrelations for small number of lags). If a time series exhibits these type of correlations, then the series is not completely random. One of the goals of time series analysis is to model this sort of autocorrelation. However, before pursuing this more complicated modeling, it would be useful to know if the series is completely random or not. In other words, are the observations independent with the same distribution?




Figure 12: Time plots of four random time series with a standard normal distribution.

**Definition:** A time series is *random* if it consists of independent values from the same distribution.

Figure 12 shows four examples of random time series that were simulated in R using the code:

```
# Plot 4 random time series of white noise
layout(mat=matrix(1:4, 2, 2, byrow=FALSE))
plot(1:100,rnorm(100,0,1),type='l',ylab='',xlab='t')
plot(1:100,rnorm(100,0,1),type='l',ylab='',xlab='t')
plot(1:100,rnorm(100,0,1),type='l',ylab='',xlab='t')
plot(1:100,rnorm(100,0,1),type='l',ylab='',xlab='t')
```

This R code generates random time series from a standard normal distribution.

There exist some well-known nonparametric tests for randomness in a time series:

1. *Runs Test:* This is an intuitively simple nonparametric test. First compute the median of the time series. Next, replace each numerical value in the series by a 1 if it is above the median and a 0 if it is below the median. If the data is truly random, then the sequence of zeros and ones will be random. Next, count the “runs”. A run is simply a sequence of all one’s or all zeros in the series. For instance, the series

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

has median equal to 5.5. If we replace the data by ones and zeros as described above we get

$$0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1,$$

and this sequence has  $M = 2$  runs. In this case our test statistic is  $M = 2$  which happens to be the smallest possible value such a test statistic can obtain. On the other hand, the series

$$1\ 10\ 2\ 9\ 3\ 8\ 4\ 7\ 5\ 6$$

also has median equal to 5.5 and replacing the data by zeros and ones gives

$$0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1\ 0\ 1.$$

This series has  $M = 10$  runs which is the maximum number possible for a sample size of  $n = 10$ . The exact distribution of  $M$  under the hypothesis of randomness has been computed and exact  $p$ -values can be computed. For large samples sizes ( $n > 20$ ), the sampling distribution of  $M$  under the null hypothesis of randomness is approximately normal with mean

$$\mu_M = 2r(n - r)/n + 1,$$

and variance

$$\sigma_M^2 = 2r(n - r)\{2r(n - r) - n\}/\{n^2(n - 1)\},$$

where  $r$  is the number of zeros. Thus, for large  $n$ , the hypothesis of randomness can be conducted by comparing a standardized value of  $M$  with the standard normal distribution.

2. The *Sign Test*. From the raw data  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n$ , compute the differences  $y_2 - y_1, y_3 - y_2$  and so on. Let  $P$  be the number of positive differences. For large  $n$  ( $n > 20$ ), the distribution of  $P$  under the null hypothesis of randomness is approximately normal with mean  $\mu_p = m/2$  and  $\sigma_p^2 = m/12$  where  $m$  is the number of differences. Thus, if the observed value of  $P$  from your data is too extreme to be expected from this normal distribution, then the hypothesis of randomness is rejected.

Note that when using a normal approximation for the above test statistics, one can obtain more accurate results using a *continuity correction*. The continuity correction is helpful because the sampling distributions of the above test statistics is discrete (e.g. the number of runs) but the normal distribution is continuous.

## Time Series Models.

Time series fall into the general field of *Stochastic Processes* which can be described as statistical phenomenon that evolve over time. One example we have already discussed is the purely random process which consists of a sequence of random variables  $z_1, z_2, \dots$  that are independent and have the same distribution.

**The Random Walk.** Another type of process is the *Random Walk*. Suppose  $z_1, z_2, \dots$ , is a random process with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then we can define a new process

$$y_t = y_{t-1} + z_t, \text{ for } t > 1,$$

and  $y_1 = z_1$ . This is a non-stationary process since the mean  $E[y_t] = t\mu$  changes with  $t$ . A random walk is a stochastic process where the next observation depends on the current value plus a random error. One can consider a simple example of a random walk literally in terms of a walk: suppose a person begins at zero and will step to the right or left with probability  $p$  or  $1-p$ . Then for the second step, the person will once again step to the right or left with probability  $p$  or  $1-p$ . Then, after  $n$  steps, where the person ends up at the next step depends on where they are currently standing plus the random left or right step. Note that if we form the first difference

$$\nabla y_t = y_t - y_{t-1} = z_t$$

gives a purely random process.

### Moving Average Processes.

Once again, let  $z_1, z_2, \dots$ , denote a purely random process with mean zero and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then we can define what is known as a *Moving Average* process of order  $q$  by

$$y_t = \beta_0 z_t + \beta_1 z_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_q z_{t-q}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_q$  are constants. The moving average process of order  $q$  is denoted by  $MA(q)$ . One can show that the moving average process is a stationary process and that the serial correlation at lags greater than  $q$  are zero. For a  $MA(1)$  process with  $\beta_0 = 1$ , the autocorrelation function at lag  $k$  can be shown to be

$$\rho(k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \beta_1 / (1 + \beta_1^2) & \text{if } k = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moving average processes can be useful for modeling series that are affected by a variety of unpredictable events where the effect of these events have an immediate effect as well as possible longer term effects.

Note that the mean of a moving average series is zero since the  $z_t$  in (3) have mean zero. We can add a constant  $\mu$  to (3) to make it a mean  $\mu$  series which will not change the autocorrelation function.

### Autoregressive Processes.

Once again, let  $z_1, z_2, \dots$ , be a purely random process with mean zero and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then we can define an *autoregression process*  $y_t$  of order  $p$ , written  $AR(p)$ , if

$$y_t = \alpha_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + \alpha_p y_{t-p} + z_t. \quad (4)$$

This looks just like a multiple regression model, except that the regressors are just the past values of the series. Autoregressive series are stationary processes provided

the variance of the terms are finite and this will depend on the value of the  $\alpha$ 's. Autoregressive processes have been used to model time series where the present value depends linearly on the immediate past values as well as a random error.

The special case of  $p = 1$ , the first-order process, is also known as a *Markov process*. For  $p = 1$ , we can write the process as

$$y_t = \alpha y_{t-1} + z_t.$$

By successive substitution, one can easily show that the first-order process can be written

$$y_t = z_t + \alpha z_{t-1} + \alpha^2 z_{t-2} + \dots,$$

provided  $-1 < \alpha < 1$ . Writing the AR(1) process in this form indicates that it is a special case of an infinite-order moving average process.

The autocorrelation function for the first order process is

$$\rho(k) = \alpha^k, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

The thing to note here is that terms in the AR(1) series are all correlated with each other, but the correlation drops off as the lag  $k$  increases. The correlation will drop off faster the larger the value of  $k$ .

For autoregressive series of high order  $p$ , determining the autocorrelation function is difficult. One must simultaneously solve a system of equations called the *Yule-Walker* equations.

### ARMA Models.

We can combine the moving average (MA) and the autoregressive models (AR) processes to form a mixed autoregressive/moving average process as follows:

$$y_t = \alpha_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + \alpha_p y_{t-p} + z_t + \beta_1 z_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_q z_{t-q}, \quad (5)$$

which is formed by a MA( $q$ ) and an AR( $p$ ) process. The term used for such processes is an ARMA process of order  $(p, q)$ . An advantage of using an ARMA process to model time series data is that an ARMA may adequately model a time series with fewer parameters than using only an MA process or an AR process. One of the fundamental goals of statistical modeling is to use the simplest model possible that still explains the data – this is known as the *principal of parsimony*.

### ARIMA Processes.

Most time series in their raw form are not stationary. If the time series exhibits a trend, then, as we have seen, we can eliminate the trend using differencing  $\nabla^k y_t$ . If the differenced model is stationary, then we can fit an ARMA model to it instead of the original non-stationary model. We simply replace  $y_t$  in (5) by  $\nabla^k y_t$ . Such a model is then called an *autoregressive integrated moving average* (ARIMA) model. The word “integrated” comes from the fact that the stationary model that was fitted

based on the differenced data has to be summed (or “integrated”) to provide a model for the data in its original form. Often, a single difference  $k = 1$  will suffice to yield a stationary series. The notation for an ARIMA process of order  $p$  for the AR part, order  $q$  for the MA part and differences  $d$  is denoted  $\text{ARIMA}(p, d, q)$ .

### Fitting Times Series Models

Now that we have introduced the  $\text{MA}(q)$ , the  $\text{AR}(p)$ , and  $\text{ARMA}(p, q)$ , processes, we now turn to statistical issues of estimating these models. The correlogram that we introduced earlier can greatly aid in determining the appropriate type of model for time series data. For instance, recall that for an  $\text{MA}(q)$  process, the correlations drop off to zero for lags bigger than  $q$ . Thus, if the correlogram shows a value of  $r_1$  significantly larger than zero but that the subsequent values of  $r_k, k > 1$  are “close” to zero, then this indicates an  $\text{MA}(1)$  process. If, on the other hand, the values of  $r_1, r_2, r_3, \dots$ , are decreasing exponentially, then that is suggestive of an  $\text{AR}(1)$  process. Sample data will not yield correlograms that fit neatly into either of these two cases and hence it is very difficult to interpret correlograms.

### Estimating the Mean of a Time Series.

In usual statistical practice, one of the fundamental problems is to estimate the mean of a distribution. In time series analysis, the problem of estimating the mean of the series is complicated due to the serial correlations. First of all, if we have not removed the systematic parts of a time series, then the mean can be misleading.

Of course, the natural estimate of the mean is simply the sample mean:

$$\bar{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i/n.$$

For independent observations, the variance of the sample mean is  $\sigma^2/n$ , but for time series data, we do not generally have independent data. For instance, for an  $\text{AR}(1)$  process with parameter  $\alpha$ , the variance of  $\bar{y}$  is approximately

$$\text{var}(\bar{y}) = \frac{\sigma^2 (1 + \alpha)}{n (1 - \alpha)}.$$

Thus, for  $\alpha > 0$ , the variance of  $\bar{y}$  is larger than that of independent observations. Nonetheless, one can show that under fairly normal circumstances that the sample mean will take value closer to the true population mean as the sample size increases provided the serial correlations go to zero as the lags increase.

### Fitting an Autoregressive Model.

For autoregressive time series, the two main questions of interest are what is the order  $p$  of the process and how can we estimate the parameters of the process? An  $\text{AR}(p)$  process with mean  $\mu$  can be written

$$y_t - \mu = \alpha_1(y_{t-1} - \mu) + \dots + \alpha_p(y_{t-p} - \mu) + z_t.$$

Least-squares estimation of the parameters are found by minimizing

$$\sum_{t=p+1}^n [y_t - \mu - \alpha_1(y_{t-1} - \mu) - \cdots - \alpha_p(y_{t-p} - \mu)]^2$$

with respect to the parameters  $\mu$  and the  $\alpha$ 's. If the  $z_t$  are normal, then the least square estimators coincide with the maximum likelihood estimators.

For a first-order AR(1) process, it turns out that the first serial correlation  $r_1$  is approximately equal to the least-squares estimator of  $\alpha$ :

$$\hat{\alpha}_1 \approx r_1.$$

Furthermore, we can use  $\bar{y}$  to estimate  $\mu$ , the mean of the process.

There are various methods for determining the least-squares estimators for higher order AR( $p$ ) models. A simple approximate method is to estimate  $\mu$  by  $\bar{y}$  and then treat the data as if it were a multiple regression model

$$y_t - \bar{y} = \alpha_1(y_{t-1} - \bar{y}) + \cdots + \alpha_p(y_{t-p} - \bar{y}).$$

**Partial Autocorrelation Function.** Determining the order  $p$  of an AR process is difficult. Part of the difficulty is that the correlogram for AR( $p$ ) processes for higher orders  $p$  can have complicated behaviors (e.g. a mixture of damped exponential and sinusoidal functions). A common tool for this problem is to estimate what is known as the *partial autocorrelation function* (PACF). The last coefficient  $\alpha_p$  in an AR( $p$ ) model measures the excess correlation at lag  $p$  that is not accounted for by an AR( $p - 1$ ) model.

In order to get a plot for the PACF, one fits AR( $k$ ) models for  $k = 1, 2$ , etc. The highest order coefficients in each of these models are plotted against  $k$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and this constitutes the PACF plot. Partial autocorrelations outside the range  $\pm 2/\sqrt{n}$  are deemed significant at the 5% significance level. If the time series data is from an AR( $p$ ) model, then the autocorrelations should drop to zero at lag  $p$ ; for a given sample, the partial autocorrelations should fail to be significant for values beyond  $p$ .

We now illustrate with an example.

**Example.** Annual measurements of the level, in feet, of Lake Huron 1875-1972 were measured. The raw data for this data set are plotted in the top frame of Figure 13. This plot does not show any evident periodic behavior, nor does it indicate a notable trend. The second frame of Figure 13 shows the correlogram for the data showing significant autocorrelations up to lag 10. The bottom plot in Figure 13 is a partial autocorrelation plot for the Lake Huron data. In R, the partial autocorrelation plot can be generated using the function “pacf”. Note that the first two partial autocorrelations appear to be statistically significant which is indicative of an autoregressive model of order 2, AR(2). The R code for generating Figure 13 is as follows:

```
data(LakeHuron)
n = length(LakeHuron)
```




Figure 13: Lake Huron water level data. Top frame is the raw data, second frame is the correlogram, and the bottom frame is the partial autocorrelation function.

```
lhacf = acf(LakeHuron,lag.max=25, type='correlation')
layout(mat=matrix(1:3, 3, 1, byrow=FALSE))
plot(LakeHuron, ylab = "Feet", xlab="Year",las = 1)
      title(main = "Lake Huron Water Level Data")
# Plot correlogram
plot(lhacf$acf,type='l',main='Correlogram for Lake Huron Data',xlab='Lag',ylab='ACF')
abline(h=0)
abline(h=1.96/sqrt(n),lty='dotted')
abline(h=-1.96/sqrt(n),lty='dotted')
# Now plot the partial auto-correlation function.
pacf(LakeHuron)
```

We can use R to fit the AR(2) model using the function “ARIMA” using the following R command:

```
fit = arima(LakeHuron, order = c(2,0,0))
```

The type of ARIMA model fit by R is determined by the “order” part of the command. In general, the syntax is “order = c( $p, d, q$ ),” where  $p$  is the order of the AR process,  $d$  is the number of differences, and  $q$  is the order of the MA process. Note that if  $d = 0$  (as in the current example), then an ARMA process is fit to the data. To see the output from the ARIMA fit, simply type “fit” at the command prompt since “fit” is the name we have given to the ARIMA fit. The following output was generated in R:

Call:

```
arima(x = LakeHuron, order = c(2, 0, 0))
```

Coefficients:

	ar1	ar2	intercept
	1.0436	-0.2495	579.0473
s.e.	0.0983	0.1008	0.3319

```
sigma^2 estimated as 0.4788: log likelihood = -103.63, aic = 215.27
```

From this fit, the AR(2) model

$$y_t - \mu = \alpha_1(y_{t-1} - \mu) + \alpha_2(y_{t-2} - \mu) + z_t,$$

was fit yielding  $\hat{\alpha}_1 = 1.0436$  and  $\hat{\alpha}_2 = -0.2495$  and  $\hat{\mu} = 579.0473$ .

**Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).** In order to choose a model from several competing other models, a popular criterion for making the decision is to use AIC. The AIC is used in a wide variety of settings, not just time series analysis. For a fitted ARMA time series of length  $n$ , the AIC is defined to be:

$$\text{AIC} = \ln(\hat{\sigma}_{p,q}^2) + 2(p + q)/n,$$




Figure 14: Lake Huron water level data. Top frame is the residual plot from fitting an AR(2) model and the second frame is a timeplot of the raw data along with the fitted values.

where  $\hat{\sigma}_{p,q}^2$  is the residual error variance from the fitted model. The idea is to choose the model with the smallest AIC value. Note that the AIC penalizes for additional model complexity with the addition of  $2(p+q)/n$ . In the R output above, the AR(2) fitted model has an AIC of 215.27. Note that the AIC for fitting an AR(1) is 219.2, larger than the AIC for the AR(2) fit indicating that the AR(2) model is preferable in terms of AIC.

A plot of the residuals from the AR(2) is shown in Figure 14 in the top frame and the raw data (solid curve) and the fitted values from the AR(2) (dashed curve) are shown in the bottom frame of Figure 14.

### Fitting a Moving Average Process.

As with an autoregressive process, with a moving average process we would like to estimate the order  $q$  of the process as well as the parameters for the process. The simple method of regression used for AR processes will not work for MA processes. The least-squares estimators do not yield closed form solutions. Instead, iterative algorithms are needed. One possibility is to guess at some initial values for the parameters and compute the residual sum of squares. For instance, in a MA(1) model

$$y_t = \mu + z_t + \beta_1 z_{t-1},$$

the residuals are

$$z_t = y_t - \mu - \beta_1 z_{t-1}.$$

Note that this  $t$ th residual depends on the  $t - 1$  residual. After plugging in initial guesses for  $\mu$  and  $\beta_1$  (for instance, guess the value  $\bar{y}$  for  $\mu$ ), compute the residual sum of squares  $\sum z_t^2$ . Next, do a grid search for values of  $\mu$  and  $\beta_1$  and find the values that minimize the residual sum of squares. There exist algorithms in many time series software that are more efficient than the grid search.

The period of an MA process can be estimated fairly easily by simply inspecting the autocorrelation function – simply find the lag  $q$  after which the serial correlations do not differ significantly from zero.

### Fitting an ARMA Process.

Like MA processes, ARMA processes require iterative techniques to estimate the parameters. Exact maximum likelihood estimation is used primarily in practice. This requires more computation than the least-squares search procedure alluded to for the MA processes above, but this is no problem with current computing power.

### Residual Analysis.

Once a model (AR, MA, ARMA) is fit to the raw data (or the differenced data), one should check that the “correct” model has been specified. This is typically done using residual analysis as was the case for regression problems. If we have fit an AR(1) model  $y_t = \alpha y_{t-1} + z_t$ , obtaining an estimate  $\hat{\alpha}$ , then the residual for an observation is

$$e_t = y_t - \hat{y}_t = y_t - \hat{\alpha} y_{t-1}.$$

Perhaps the best way to evaluate the model via the residuals is to simply plot the residuals in a time plot and in a correlogram. Note that if the correct model has been fit, then the residual time plot should not show any structure nor should any of the serial correlations be significant different from zero.

There exists tests to determine if the residuals correspond to estimates of the random error in a time series model. One such test is the *portmanteau lack-of-fit* test:

$$Q = n \sum_{i=1}^K e_i^2,$$

for some value of  $K$  usually taken to be in the range of 15 to 30. If the model is correctly specified, then  $Q$  follows a chi-squared distribution approximately with  $(K - p - q)$  degrees of freedom where  $p$  and  $q$  are the orders of the fitted ARMA process respectively. The chi-squared approximation is not very good for  $n < 100$ . There exist alternatives to this test (e.g. *the Ljung-Box-Pierce statistic*) in the hope of providing a better approximation.

Another popular test for residuals is the *Durbin-Watson* test statistic which is defined as

$$V = \sum_{i=2}^n (e_i - e_{i-1}) / \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2.$$

One can show that  $V \approx 2(1 - r_1)$ , where  $r_1$  is the lag one autocorrelation. If the true model has been specified and fit, then  $r_1 \approx 0$  and in which case  $V \approx 2$ . Thus, the Durbin-Watson test is asymptotically equivalent to a test on the value of the lag-one autocorrelation  $r_1$  being zero.

As a general guide to the practice residual analysis in time series modeling (Chatfield 2004, page 69), it is recommended that one simply look at the first few residuals and the first seasonal residual (e.g.  $r_{12}$  for a monthly time series) to see if any are significantly different from zero. Remember, if one is inspecting a correlogram with many serial correlations (say 20-40), it is not unusual to find one or two significant correlations by chance alone.

If the residual analysis indicates a problem with the fitted time series model, then alternative models should be considered. The model building process, as in multiple regression, often turns into an iterative process. One typically specifies a model. Then a software program is used to fit the model and produce residual plots (and tests). If there appear to be problems with the model, then the original model needs to be reformulated. In the process of model building, it is possible to arrive at several competing models. In such cases, a model choice can be aided by the use of *model-selection statistics* such as *Akaike's Information Criterion* (AIC). The idea of these statistics is to balance a good fitting model and a parsimonious model.

### Frequency Domain Analysis.

We have been discussing the *time domain* analysis of time series data which is basically the analysis of the raw data. Another approach to time series analysis is the *frequency domain*. The analogue to the autocovariance function in the frequency domain is the *spectral density function* which is a natural way of studying the frequency properties of a time series. The frequency domain analysis has been found to be particularly useful in fields such as geophysics and meteorology.

The spectral approach to time series is useful in determining how much of the variability in the time series is due to cycles of different lengths. The idea is to represent the time series in terms of the trigonometric sine and cosine functions which are periodic. A time series can be expressed as a sum of trigonometric functions with differing frequencies. One of the primary theoretical results for the frequency domain analysis shows a one-to-one correspondence between an autocovariance function and the spectral density function.

### References.

Chatfield, C. (2004), *The Analysis of Time Series*, Chapman & Hall.

Keeling, C. D. and Whorf, T. P., Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California, La Jolla, California USA 92093-0220.

Kendall, M. G., Stuart, A. and Ord, J. K. (1983), *The Advanced Theory of Statistics*, Volume 3, 4th Edition, London: Griffin.