

Ozel, Ozgur; Ilalan, Deniz

Article

An alternative mean reversion test for interest rates

Central Bank Review (CBR)

Provided in Cooperation with:

Central Bank of The Republic of Turkey, Ankara

Suggested Citation: Ozel, Ozgur; Ilalan, Deniz (2018) : An alternative mean reversion test for interest rates, Central Bank Review (CBR), ISSN 1303-0701, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Vol. 18, Iss. 1, pp. 35-39, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbrev.2017.12.001>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/217312>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:


Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>



An alternative mean reversion test for interest rates

Özgür Özel^a, Deniz Ilalan^{b,*}

^a Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey, TCMB İdare Merkezi Araştırma ve Para Politikası Genel Müdürlüğü İstiklal Cad, No 10, Ulus Altındağ Ankara, Ankara, Turkey

^b Çankaya University, Department of Banking and Finance, Eskişehir Yolu 29.Km, Yukarıyurtçu Mah, Mimar Sinan Cad, No 4, 06530 Etimesgut Çankaya Ankara, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 August 2017

Received in revised form

10 December 2017

Accepted 11 December 2017

Available online 23 December 2017

JEL classification:

B23

E43

Keywords:

Interest rates

Unit root

Mean reversion

ABSTRACT

A number of empirical studies assert that interest rates are governed by unit root processes rejecting any form of reversion to a long term mean by resorting to certain tests, among which the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) is the most widely used one. In this study, we propose an alternative testing methodology that can be applied along with ADF test, in the sense that there are times where it can capture stationarity when the other fails to do so. Moreover, our test has more power than ADF test. As an application to real-data, we consider 10-year US and Turkish T-bond rates.

© 2017 Central Bank of The Republic of Turkey. Production and hosting by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The assertion whether interest rates possess a unit root is a widely explored issue in the literature. Often researchers have come up with the conclusion that interest rates are not stationary. Rose (1988) applied traditional ADF (Dickey and Fuller, 1979) and Philips-Perron (PP) (1988) unit root tests for 18 OECD countries and concluded that the nominal interest rates are not stationary. MacDonald and Murphy (1989) took three-month T-bill rates for Belgium, Canada, United Kingdom and United States between 1955 Q1–1986 Q4 (1957 Q1 to 1986 Q4 for Belgium) and failed to reject the presence of unit root. Siklos and Wohar (1997) considered one, three, six and twelve-month Euro deposit rates for 10 countries and came up with the same result. The conclusions were developed usually through the application of ADF test. Some authors, on the other hand used alternative panel data unit root tests (see for instance Wu and Zhang, 1997; Wu and Chen, 2001) and asserted

that short-term interest rates sometimes exhibit mean reversion. End (2011) considered an extremely long period (two hundred years of interest rate data of the Netherlands, Germany, US and Japan) and could not encounter mean reversion. He only could find traces with some smooth transition autoregressive (STAR) framework.

Once the data in question is not stationary, this problem is usually overcome via differencing the data until stationarity is achieved. However, according to Brooks (2014), differencing a stationary series results in loss of information and observations. In order not to lose any information, it is crucial to detect stationarity, whenever interest rates indeed return to a constant mean. Ours is a humble effort to suggest a mean-reversion test which is applicable to interest rates. The starting point of the work was the observation that in many empirical studies interest rates are differenced, whereas there are good reasons to expect interest rates to revert to a mean, especially in the long run. First of all, nominal

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: ozgur.ozel@tcmb.gov.tr (Ö. Özel), denizilalan@ankaya.edu.tr (D. Ilalan).

Peer review under responsibility of the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey.

interest rates can be decomposed into expected inflation and real interest rates. The latter is composed of risk,¹ term² and liquidity premia.³ When sub-components of nominal interest rates are examined we see that a non-stationary change in price level (inflation or deflation) has many negative implications as mentioned in the booklet “Inflation and Price Stability” by the [Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey \(2014\)](#). As a result, central banks take various actions to stabilize the domestic price level, which in general is a predetermined target equivalently a mean where inflation is desired to return. As to the sub-components of the real interest rate; high risk premium is closely related with debt sustainability issues and at some point, this forces the issuer to take corrective measures such as cutting expenditures or extending debt maturities. High term premium is associated with low investor confidence, and again necessary actions need to be taken to restore confidence in the market. Finally, liquidity premium is a sign of shallow financial markets, and market authorities can modify regulations, or boost domestic savings in order to improve financial depth.

From another point of view, due to no-arbitrage conditions, the term structure of interest rates moves in tandem, so that short term interest rate movements are transmitted to longer maturities. Yet, central banks exert regulations on short term rates in order to control inflation, boost growth, reduce unemployment or achieve any other macroeconomic target. Thus, short rates and longer maturities tend to fluctuate around some long-run mean.

In order to get a mathematical idea about mean reversion, we resort to the most analytically tractable and intuitive stochastic interest rate model incorporating mean reversion, which is [Vasicek \(1977\)](#).⁴ Accordingly, the interest rates are governed by Eq. (1):

$$dr_t = \theta(\mu - r_t)dt + \sigma dW_t \quad (1)$$

where μ is the long term mean, θ is the speed of mean reversion, σ is the volatility and W_t is the standard Wiener process. In this model, the interest rates revert to the long term mean μ because the further the interest rate diverges from the mean, the stronger they are pulled down to move towards it according to the magnitude of θ .

Our main contribution is to propose an alternative testing procedure in order to analyze the situations where classical linear tests fail to reject the presence of unit root. We convert the OU process into a linear regression framework, where we can easily compute the t -statistics of the variable pertaining to the mean reversion test and compare it with the critical values we have calculated via Monte Carlo simulation based on the work of [Szimayer and Maller \(2004\)](#), which presents the theoretical asymptotic value of the OU test, under the null hypothesis H_0 , for the case of no mean reversion.

From the discussions above, it is plausible to examine the connection between mean reversion and unit root tests. Any time series with a unit root becomes non-stationary as the effects of shocks are accumulated and build up a stochastic trend. In case of stationary time series, the effects of past shocks will die out. In that sense, unit root tests may also be regarded as a

test of the absence of mean reversion for the underlying time series. However, in practice unit root tests, particularly the ADF test, might fail to reveal the mean-reversion of a time-series, when the data generating process is indeed reverting to mean. When we ran simulations, we observed that both tests make similar number of Type-I errors. However, when the simulated data is generated by an OU process we found out that our test outperforms ADF test in terms of Type-II error which indicates that it has more power.

Rest of the study is as follows: In Section 2 we briefly describe ADF and OU tests together with some derivations and comparisons. Section 3 is devoted to applications. Finally, section 4 concludes.

2. ADF and OU tests

Functional central limit theorem (FCLT) is essential for ADF test statistics. Theorem 1 is by [Donsker \(1951, 1952\)](#):

Theorem 1. Take independent and identically distributed variables ε_t with a zero mean and a variance $\sigma^2 < \infty$. Consider the following partial sum $S_T(r) = \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor rT \rfloor} \varepsilon_t$ where $r \in [0, 1]$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the integer part. Now the scaled version of the partial sum converges in distribution to Brownian motion that is

$$Z_T(r) = S_T(r) / \sigma \sqrt{T} \xrightarrow{d} B(r).$$

Eq. (2) and Eq. (3) are essential for the determination of Dickey-Fuller distribution, where y_t is the data with certain time-series dynamics and ε_t are the shocks:

$$T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{t-1} \varepsilon_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 B(r) dB(r) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 [B(1)^2 - 1] \quad (2)$$

$$T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{t-1}^2 \varepsilon_t \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 B(r)^2 dr = \sigma^2 \int_0^1 B(r)^2 dr \quad (3)$$

Through consideration of an AR (1) process, after some calculations the ADF test distribution can be computed as:

$$F(\hat{\delta}) = \frac{\int_0^1 B(r) dB(r)}{\int_0^1 B(r)^2 dr} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{[B(1)^2 - 1]}{\int_0^1 B(r)^2 dr} \quad (4)$$

For demeaned and de-trended Brownian motions we replace $B(r)$ with

$$B(r)_\mu = B(r) - \int_0^1 B(s) ds \quad (5)$$

$$B(r)_\beta = B(r) - (6r - 4) \int_0^1 B(s) ds - (12r - 6) \int_0^1 sB(s) ds \quad (6)$$

(for detailed proofs and derivations see [Patterson, 2010](#)).

For calculation of the asymptotic distribution of the OU test we follow the methodology proposed by [Szimayer and Maller \(2004\)](#): The OU process is defined by

$$dX_t = \theta(\mu - X_t)dt + \sigma dB_t \quad (7)$$

and it admits a unique solution via integration by parts as:

¹ Risk premium is an additional required rate of return in order to hold a riskier bond than any other reference bond.

² Term premium is an additional required rate of return in order to hold a bond of a longer maturity than any other reference bond.

³ Liquidity premium is an additional required rate of return in order to hold a less liquid bond compared to any other reference bond.

⁴ Vasicek's model is an application of [Ornstein and Uhlenbeck \(1930\)](#) process to interest rates.

$$X_t = \mu + (X_0 - \mu)e^{-\theta t} + \sigma \int_0^t e^{-\theta(s-t)} dB_s \tag{8}$$

The null-hypothesis is stated as $H_0 : \theta = 0$ which renders Eq. (8) to follow a random walk (hence unit root). The asymptotic distribution under the null is given by:

$$\frac{\left(\int_0^1 B_t dB_t - B_1 \int_0^1 B_t dt \right)^2}{\int_0^1 B_t^2 dt - \left(\int_0^1 B_t dt \right)^2} + B_1^2 \tag{9}$$

Detailed proofs and derivations can be found in [Szimayer and Maller \(2004\)](#).

Since our alternative hypothesis is $H_A : \theta > 0$ the critical values will be extracted from the right tail of the asymptotic distribution which are given in [Table 1](#). They are computed via Monte-Carlo simulation. The histogram is depicted in [Fig. 1](#).

After finding the asymptotic distribution of the null hypothesis of no mean reversion using the discretized solution of the OU process as given below, our aim now is to determine the corresponding statistics which is to be tested. Here, instead of the solution of the OU process, we directly concentrated on the relevant stochastic differential equation (SDE) and converted it to a finite difference equation in an easy and intuitive manner. We then aligned our results with the OLS regression.

The discretized version of Eq. (7) is

$$X_t - X_{t-1} = \theta(\mu - X_{t-1})\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}B_{t-1} \tag{10}$$

and rearranging yields:

$$X_t - X_{t-1} = \theta\mu\Delta t - \theta X_{t-1}\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}B_{t-1} \tag{11}$$

next step is comparing Eq. (11) with simple regression formula:

$$y = a + bx + \varepsilon \tag{12}$$

now we can equate (11) and (12) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y &= X_t - X_{t-1}, \\ x &= X_{t-1}, \\ a &= \theta\mu\Delta t, \\ b &= -\theta\Delta t, \\ \varepsilon &= \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}B_{t-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\theta = -\frac{b}{\Delta t}, \quad \mu = -\frac{a}{b}$$

For the statistics of the new test, it is sufficient to compute the square of the t statistics of b (detailed explanation can be found in [Buse \(1982\)](#)). The results then should be compared with the critical

Table 1
Asymptotic critical values of OU test

Percentage (%)	Value
90%	6.2103
95%	8.1634
99%	11.1673

values given in [Table 1](#). One important issue is the sign of b . We know that the expected value of Eq. (8) is:

$$E(X_t) = X_0 e^{-\theta t} + \frac{\theta}{\mu} (1 - e^{-\theta t}) \tag{13}$$

When $\theta < 0$, $E(X_t)$ tends to infinity. Thus $b < 0$ must be the case. Therefore, we should rule out positive values, so that the notion of mean reversion is established.

In the literature mean reversion is generally tested via the ADF or Phillips-Perron (PP) (1988) unit root tests. Having understood the differing asymptotic distributions of the above-mentioned and OU tests, we seek for cases where ADF and PP tests fail to detect stationarity, whereas the OU test claims the opposite. Hence, we aim to emphasize the difference between ADF, PP and OU mean reversion tests and try to enhance the methodologies of researchers.

Now, we would like to present the Type-II error analysis of ADF and OU tests. In the analysis we use a grid for the variance and the starting value as 2 to 4 and 8 to 12, respectively. We took the mean to which the simulated paths revert, as 10 with a reversion rate of 0.1. The results are portrayed in [Table 2](#):

Clearly OU test makes less Type II errors compared to ADF test which shows its comparative power.

3. Application to US and Turkish interest rates

In this section we applied our findings to 10-year US and Turkish T-bill data. We intentionally refrained to choose any period containing 2008-09 world financial crisis.




Fig. 1. Histogram of the distribution of null hypothesis of OU test.

	Constant	Trend
ADF (t statistics)	-3.3458**	-3.3011*
PP (t statistics)	-3.2354**	-3.1846**
OU (t statistics)	11.1944***	N/A

***, **, * denote significance levels of 1%, 5%, 10% respectively.

Table 2
Power of OU test

Significance (α)	TYPE-II Error (β)		Power (100- β)	
	ADF Test	OU Test	ADF Test	OU Test
0.1	19.6078	14.7059	80.3922	85.2941
0.05	6.5359	5.6863	93.4641	94.3137
0.01	4.6405	2.8105	95.3595	97.1895

For the data in Fig. 2 although all tests detect stationarity simultaneously, OU test has higher significance.




Fig. 2. US 10-year daily T-bill rate between June 2000 and November 2007.

	Constant	Trend
ADF (t statistics)	-2.4976	-2.5327
PP (t statistics)	-2.4653	-2.4725
OU (t statistics)	6.3766*	N/A

***, **, * denote significance levels of 1%, 5%, 10% respectively.

For the data in Fig. 3 ADF and PP tests fail to reject mean reversion where OU test captures it with 10% significance level.



Fig. 3. US 10-year daily T-bill rate between June 2012 and November 2017.

	Constant	Trend
ADF (t statistics)	-2.4976	-2.7522
PP (t statistics)	-2.5224	-2.7615
OU (t statistics)	6.2380*	N/A

***, **, * denote significance levels of 1%, 5%, 10% respectively.

TURKEY 10 YEAR YIELD (01.2010-08.2017)



Fig. 4. Turkey 10-year daily T-bill rate between June 2012 and November 2017.

For the data in Fig. 4 again OU test detects stationarity with 10% significance level while others fail to do so.

4. Conclusion

In this study, we tried to point out the differences between mean reversion and traditional unit root testing methodologies (particularly the ADF test) through concentrating on interest rate data. The analysis revealed that our test outperforms ADF test in terms of power. The theoretical results are applied on US and Turkish 10-year T-bond data. We particularly concentrated on cases where there is no visible time trend and the process seems to revert to a constant mean. We saw that OU test claims stationarity where ADF and PP tests fail to do so or indicates a higher significance level where all tests simultaneously detect stationarity. This is quite important in the sense that, if the series is not mean reverting differencing or co-integration techniques are implemented as a remedy in the literature. However, these remedies inherit some well-known drawbacks. Hence researchers can use the proposed OU test along with the ADF test (and PP test) for detection of mean reversion particularly for interest rates. We have not addressed the issues of break points, heteroscedasticity, and non-normality together with the asymptotic distribution of the null hypothesis in the presence of a deterministic time trend which are envisaged as future research topics.

References

Brooks, C., 2014. *Introductory Econometrics for Finance 3rd Edition*. Cambridge University Press.

Buse, A., 1982. The likelihood ratio, wald and lagrange multiplier tests: an expository note. *Am. Statistician* 36 (3) (Part 1).

Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey, Inflation and Price Stability Report, (2014) URL: http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/22dbefd0-b9db-48ff-9f9f-68835b673f8a/Enflasyon_FiyatIstikrari.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE-22dbefd0-b9db-48ff-9f9f-68835b673f8a-ksqwWxp.

Dickey, D.A., Fuller, W.A., 1979. Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with a unit root. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* 74 (366), 427–431.

Donsker, M.D., 1951. An invariance principle for certain probability limit theorems. *Memoir. Am. Math. Soc.* 1951 (6).

Donsker, M.D., 1952. Justification and extension of Doob's heuristic approach to the Kolmogorov–Smirnov theorems. *Ann. Math. Stat.* 23, 277–281.

End, J.W., 2011. *Statistical Evidence on the Mean Reversion of Interest Rates*. DNB Working PaperNo. 284.

MacDonald, R., Murphy, P., 1989. Testing for the long-run relationship between nominal interest rates and inflation using cointegration techniques. *Appl. Econ.* 21 (4), 439–447.

Ornstein, L., Uhlenbeck, G., 1930. On the theory of the Brownian motion. *Phys. Rev.* 36, 823–841.

- Patterson, K., 2010. *A Primer for Unit Root Testing*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Phillips, P.C., Perron, P., 1988. Testing for a unit root in time series regression. *Biometrika* 75 (2), 335–346.
- Rose, A.K., 1988. Is the real interest rate stable? *J. Finance* 43, 1095–1112.
- Siklos, P.L., Wohar, M.E., 1997. Convergence of interest rates and inflation rates across countries and over time. *Rev. Int. Econ.* 5, 129–141.
- Szimayer, A., Maller, R., 2004. Testing for Mean Reversion in Processes of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Type Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes, vol. 7, pp. 95–113.
- Vasicek, O., 1977. An equilibrium characterization of the term structure. *J. Financ. Econ.* 2 (5), 177–188.
- Wu, J.L., Chen, S.L., 2001. Mean reversion of interest rates in the eurocurrency market. *Oxf. Bull. Econ. Stat.* 63 (4), 459–473.
- Wu, Y., Zhang, H., 1997. Do interest rates follow unit-root Processes? Evidence from cross-maturity treasury bill yields. *Rev. Quant. Finance Account.* 8, 69–81.