

New Exogeneity Tests and Causal Paths: Air Pollution and Monetary Policy Illustrations Using generalCorr Package

Hrishikesh D. Vinod *

January 24, 2018

Abstract

It is shown to be impossible to directly test Engle-Hendry-Richard's 'weak exogeneity,' which relies on 'sequential cuts' of a likelihood function. Hausman-Wu's indirect exogeneity test is akin to medieval-style diagnosis of a disease (endogeneity) by showing that a (dubious) instrumental variables (IV) estimator remedy 'works.' Hence my package 'generalCorr' fills a need for a modern exogeneity test statistic ui or 'unanimity index' based on a Theorem proved here, measuring preponderance of evidence from four orders of stochastic dominance and new generalized partial correlation coefficients. The ui helps determine the direction and strength of causal and exogenous variables. A simulation supports our decision rules. Illustrative examples include air-pollution and variables driving 'excess bond premium,' a known predictor of US recessions, among others.

1 Introduction

This paper provides new tools and tests for determining causal paths and exogeneity using observational data on several variables with potential ap-

*address: H. D. Vinod, Professor of Economics, Fordham University, Bronx, New York, USA 10458. E-mail: vinod@fordham.edu. Tel. 201-568-5976, Fax 718-817-3518, JEL codes C30, C51. I thank Prof. J. Francis for suggesting the 'excess bond premium' application. An earlier version is posted as: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2982128>

plicability in many sciences and implemented in an R package called ‘general Corr’. We illustrate with many examples.

Consider a possibly non-linear nonparametric regression:

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p) + \epsilon_1, \quad (1)$$

where exogeneity of a regressors X_i was first defined by Koopmans (1950) as requiring that X_i should “approximately cause” Y , the endogenous variable. That is, the causal path $X_i \rightarrow Y$ should hold.

An influential lead article in *Econometrica*, Engle et al. (1983) (hereafter “EHR”), was perhaps the first to use flipped models in the present context. Accordingly, a model obtained by flipping Y and X_i is:

$$X_i = f_2(Y, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_p) + \epsilon_2, \quad (2)$$

which specifies the opposite causal path $Y \rightarrow X_i$.

A joint density can be written as a product of a conditional and marginal density (using subscripts ‘jt’, ‘cnd’ and ‘mar’):

$$f_{jt}(Y, X_i, i = 1, \dots, p) = f_{cnd}(Y, X_j, (j \neq i)|X_i) \times f_{mar}(X_i), \quad (3)$$

$$= f'_{cnd}(X_i, (i = 1, \dots, p)|Y) \times f'_{mar}(Y) \quad (4)$$

In addition to Koopmans’ causality, EHR mention (p. 285) Zellner’s predictability-based causality, whereby a causal direction $X_i \rightarrow Y$ requires that X_i in eq. (1) should predict Y better, with a larger R^2 than the flipped eq. (2). EHR focus on flipped ordinary least squares (OLS) estimators for equations (1) and (2), assuming $p = 1$ and f_1, f_2 strictly linear. Now EHR argue that Koopman-Zellner causality is ambiguous, because the R^2 values of flipped regressions are identical.

The computing facilities in 1983 when EHR was published mostly excluded nonparametric (kernel) regressions and bootstraps. In the absence of nonparametric tools, EHR rewrite eq. (3) after conditioning on explicit parameters $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ as:

$$f_{jt}(Y, X_i, i = 1, \dots, p|\lambda) = f_{cnd}(Y, X_j, (j \neq i)|X_i, \lambda_1) \times f_{mar}(X_i|\lambda_2), \quad (5)$$

related to a factoring of the likelihood function, needed for maximum likelihood (ML) estimation. Now EHR’s widely accepted “weak exogeneity” is complicated, because it requires eq. (5) to implement a ‘sequential cut’

extending Barndorff-Nielsen notion of a cut for the exponential family of distributions.

Definition 1.1 (EHR weak exogeneity): X_i is weakly exogenous for parameters of interest, ψ , if there exists a re-parameterization $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ where

- (i) ψ is a function of λ_1 , and
- (ii) $[f_{cnd}(Y, X_j, (j \neq i))|X_i, \lambda_1) \times f_{mar}(X_i|\lambda_2)]$ operates a ‘sequential cut’ defined in eq. (5).

Properties of EHR weak exogeneity:

[WE1] *Parameter Distinctions:* A distinction between parameters of interest, ψ , and other (nuisance) parameters λ_2 is a crucial part of the definition.

[WE2] *Granger Causality Irrelevant:* EHR state (p. 290) that “Granger noncausality is neither necessary nor sufficient for weak exogeneity.”

[WE3] *Invariance:* EHR assume that ψ are invariant to policy changes to avoid the famous Lucas critique.

[WE4] *Inability to test:* EHR flip a two-equation simultaneous equations model (their equations numbered 27 and 28 versus 30 and 31) to argue on page 288 that “the choice of parameters of interest is the sole determinant of weak exogeneity, which is, therefore not directly testable.”

Definition 1.2 (Strict exogeneity): An explanatory variable X_1 is strictly exogenous in a structural equation (1) if X_{1t} is orthogonal to errors ϵ_{1t} , or $X_t \perp \epsilon_{1t}$.

As is well known from textbooks, (Davidson and MacKinnon, 1993, p. 625), strict exogeneity is a restrictive concept.

Definition 1.3 (Stochastic Dominance): Density $f(X)$ dominates another density $f(Y)$ in the first order if their respective empirical cumulative distribution functions (ecdf) satisfy: $F(x) \leq F(y)$.

Stochastic dominance has been developed in Financial Economics for comparing two densities (associated with competing investments). It is surveyed in Levy (1992) and four orders of stochastic dominance are discussed later in Section 3.1. It may seem strange at first sight that the dominating density $f(X)$ with larger magnitudes has smaller cumulative density.

The aim of this paper is to use the insights of strict exogeneity and simplify ‘weak exogeneity’ by using certain inequalities based on nonparametric

kernel regressions quantified by stochastic dominance tools. We overcome the property [WE4] by developing a new computer intensive bootstrap test for exogeneity.

1.1 Intuition behind the new exogeneity test

This section offers a preview of our exogeneity test statistic and its inference without the details. We use 2008 European crime data called ‘EuroCrime’ in my R package ‘generalCorr.’ The flipped variables for these data are ‘violent crime rate (crim)’ and ‘police officer deployment (off) rate’ in 28 European countries measured in comparable units.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between ‘crim’ and ‘off’ is large, $r_{xy} > 0.99$. Elementary statistics teachers use this type of an example to explain that high correlation does not mean police officers cause the crime, or ‘correlation is not causation’. We can turn this unlikely example on its head to show that generalized correlations can indeed have useful information about causal path directions, provided we judiciously use modern computing tools.

Here is the intuition. The data generating process (DGP) for the ‘crim’ variable having the marginal density f_{mar} in eq. (3) is intuitively likely to be self-driven or exogenous, while the DGP of police officer deployment would respond more to crime rates and less likely to be self-driven. Now it becomes an empirically testable proposition which implies that ‘crim’ is ‘Kernel exogenous’ according to our Definition 2.1 below.

With $r_{xy} > 0.99$ statistical independence null is readily rejected. Instead, we focus on asymmetric dependence between ‘crim’ and ‘off’ implying that the regression specification: $off = f_1(crim) + \epsilon_1$, should be superior to $crim = f_2(off) + \epsilon_2$. We propose three criteria Cr1 to Cr3 to quantify three ways of assessing that superiority.

The intuition behind our Cr1 is the OLS consistency requirement $E(crim \epsilon_1) = 0$. This is also ‘strict exogeneity’ of our Definition 1.2. The absolute values of crossproducts between the regressor ‘crim’ and errors ϵ_1 for the superior model should be ‘smaller’ than those between ‘off’ and ϵ_2 . Our Cr2 requires absolute values of residuals of the superior specification to be stochastically ‘smaller’ with a better fit: $|\hat{\epsilon}_1| < |\hat{\epsilon}_2|$. Zellner’s predictability-based causality provides the intuition behind our Cr2 and Cr3. It states that the superior model should have a better predictive ability. Applying kernel regressions to European crime data, what matters for Cr3 is that the superior model’s $R^2 = 0.9972$ exceeds $R^2 = 0.9960$ for the flipped model, even

though they are close. Since it is not safe to rely on any one criterion, we use ‘preponderance of evidence’ using all three.

All three criteria unanimously suggest the sensible causal path: crim→off, yielding a sample unanimity index $ui = 100$. The mode of 999 bootstrap resamples confirms crim→off, with success percent of about 65%, smaller than the traditional 95%. Collective bargaining by unionized police officers in some 35% European countries may have set 2008 officer deployment levels, instead of 2008 crime rates.

We conclude this introductory motivational section with an outline of the remaining paper. Section 2 contains our Theorem 1 and a defines ‘kernel exogeneity.’ Section 3 further explains kernel causality including a proposition on existence of unanimity index (ui) helping to determine from our ‘sum’ criterion incorporating Cr1 to Cr3 based on some digressions needed for comparing the flipped models. The section ends with our decision rules. Section 4 reports a simulation of our decision rules. Section 5 considers statistical inference using the bootstrap. Section 6 considers examples including the famous Klein I model, air pollution data, and a model that considers what macroeconomic variables drive (cause) ‘excess bond premium’ known to be a good predictor of US economic recessions. Our examples include bootstrap inference for the new test. Section 7 contains a summary and final remarks.

2 Main Result and Definition of Kernel Exogeneity

Assuming $p = 1$ in eq. (1) for ease of exposition, without loss of generality (wlog), define Model 1 as a nonlinear non-parametric kernel regression:

$$Y_t = G_1(X_t) + \epsilon_{1t}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (6)$$

where errors are no longer Normal and independent. Our nonparametric estimate $g_1(X)$ of the population conditional mean function $G_1(X)$ is:

$$g_1(X) = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T Y_t K\left(\frac{X_t - X}{h}\right)}{\sum_{t=1}^T K\left(\frac{X_t - X}{h}\right)}, \quad (7)$$

where $K(\cdot)$ is the well known Gaussian kernel function and h is the bandwidth parameter often chosen by leave-one-out cross validation, Li and Racine

(2007) and (Vinod, 2008, Sec. 8.4). It is well known that kernel regression fits are superior to OLS.

Proposition 1.1 (Optimality of g_1) Assume that g_1 in eq. (7) belong to \mathcal{G} , a class of Borel measurable functions having finite second moment, then g_1 is an optimal predictor of Y given X , in the sense that it minimizes the mean squared error (MSE) in the class of Borel measurable functions.

This proposition is Theorem 2.1 proved in Li and Racine (2007)

Proposition 1.2 (Kernel Regression is CAN) Assume that

(i) $\{X_t, Y_t\}$ are iid and $g_1(x)$, joint density and error variance functions are twice differentiable.

(ii) K is a bounded second order kernel.

(iii) As $T \rightarrow \infty$, $Th^3 \rightarrow \infty$ and $Th^7 \rightarrow 0$.

Then kernel regression estimate of the conditional expectation function g_1 is consistent and asymptotically Normal (CAN).

Proof: See Theorem 2.7 of Li and Racine (2007) for further details and extensions to multivariate and local polynomial generalizations, including a proof of consistency and asymptotic normality.

The flipped kernel regression Model 2 is obtained by interchanging X and Y in eq. (6):

$$X_t = G_2(Y_t) + \epsilon_{2t}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (8)$$

If X and Y are statistically independent, or $(X \perp Y)$, joint density equals a product of two (unconditional) marginal densities. Hence Theorem 2.1 in Dawid (1979) argues that the independence of X and Y is symmetric by stating that: If $X \perp Y$ then $Y \perp X$ must hold true. Statistical independence can also be expressed in two equivalent ways implying a third equality as:

$$D_{y|x} = f_{cnd}(Y|X) - f_{mar}(Y) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad (9)$$

$$D_{x|y} = f'_{cnd}(X|Y) - f'_{mar}(X) = 0, \quad \text{implying} \quad (10)$$

$$D_{y|x} = D_{x|y}, \quad (11)$$

defining two divergences $D_{(\cdot|.)}$ between two densities.

When X and Y are dependent, eq. (11) fails to hold making for asymmetric divergences: $D_{y|x} \neq D_{x|y}$. Since variables are generally included in a model because the researcher thinks they are related to each other or dependent, a formal test for the null hypothesis: $H_0 : D_{y|x} - D_{x|y} = 0$, will generally

be rejected. Hence we expect that one side of eq. (11) will stochastically dominate the other side by Definition 1.3 above implying asymmetry.

What comes after we establish asymmetry? We propose digging deeper into the relative magnitudes of divergences. Using Radon-Nikodym theorem (Rao, 1973, p. 96) notes that conditional expectations can be defined “without reference to a conditional distribution.” Hence a realization from the divergence density $D_{y|x}$ is provided by the observable residual $\hat{\epsilon}_{1t} = Y_t - g_{1t}$. Similarly a realization from $D_{x|y}$ is $\hat{\epsilon}_{2t} = X_t - g_{2t}$. Since this paper involves comparing their numerical magnitudes, we need following assumptions to force the residuals to have comparable magnitudes and their densities to have a common support.

Assumptions:

- (A1) Assume that flipped kernel regressions of Models 1 and 2 from equations (6) and (8) are well-identified and bandwidth selections use local linear cross validation yielding sample estimates g_{1t}, g_{2t} , respectively.
- (A2) X_t and Y_t data are standardized such that they have zero mean and unit variance, implying that their marginal densities have a common support.

Now the following Lemma uses kernel regression residuals to obtain numerically comparable sample realizations from divergence densities.

Lemma 1: Assuming A1 and A2, sample realizations from $(D_{y|x}, D_{x|y})$ densities forced to have common support are a set of T residuals evaluated at the t -th observation. Let a.e. denote “almost everywhere” in a relevant ‘measure space.’ Now, using the asymmetry we have:

$$|\hat{\epsilon}_{1t}| \neq |\hat{\epsilon}_{2t}|, \quad a.e. \tag{12}$$

Now using the consistency of kernel regression estimates of conditional expectation functions, asymmetry also implies the following:

$$|\hat{\epsilon}_{1t}X_t| \neq |\hat{\epsilon}_{2t}Y_t|, \quad a.e. \tag{13}$$

Proof: Equation (12) is an obvious asymmetric implication of statistical dependence. Since the conditional expectation functions (g_1, g_2) are consistent by Proposition 1.2, the associated errors must be orthogonal to the regressors with probability limit: $\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} (\epsilon_{1t}X_t)/T = 0$. The numerator of the ‘plim’

expression gives the observable left side of eq. (13) upon replacing true errors with their sample estimates.

Lemma 2: Rewrite the inequalities (12) and (13) after replacing (\neq) by ($<$) and interpret them as follows:

(i) Now eq. (12) becomes $|Y_t - g_{1t}(X)| < |X_t - g_{2t}(Y)|$, *a.e.*, which along with Proposition 1.1 mean that X is a better predictor of Y than vice versa.

(ii) Rewritten (13) means that X is closer to being strictly exogenous according to our Definition 1.2, than Y is exogenous in the flipped model.

(iii) Rewritten (12) and (13) together mean that the DGP of X is more likely to be self-driven (exogenous) than the DGP of Y in the flipped model.

Theorem 1: Assume that dependent variables X_t and Y_t satisfy Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 with asymmetric conditioning behavior. Denote by $F(\cdot)$ a generic cumulative distribution function of its argument and write stochastic dominance relations (Definition 1.3)

$$F(|\hat{\epsilon}_{1t}X_t|) > F(|\hat{\epsilon}_{2t}Y_t|), \quad \text{and} \quad (14)$$

$$F(|\hat{\epsilon}_{1t}|) > F(|\hat{\epsilon}_{2t}|), \quad (15)$$

which together imply the following:

(i) Y depends on X relatively more than X depends on Y .

(ii) X is relatively more exogenous than Y is in the flipped models.

(iii) The DGP for X is relatively more self-driven (independent or exogenous) than the DGP for Y .

Proof: Since ‘smaller’ residuals, $|\hat{\epsilon}_{1t}| < |\hat{\epsilon}_{2t}|$, imply a better fit (Model 1 with regressor X) items (i) to (iii) here parallel to those of Lemma 2. Stochastic dominance (Definition 1.3) says that the cumulative density of dominating (larger magnitude) variable is smaller, as seen on the right hand sides of equations (14) and (15).

Remark 1: The main advantage of Theorem 1(ii) is that we can assess exogeneity without any reference to parameters of interest (ψ) or nuisance parameters (λ_2) needed by EHR. We also avoid conceptual complications associated with ‘sufficiency’ mentioned in Dawid (1979). Stochastic dominance relations in Theorem 1 are flexible, allowing residuals of the superior model to be larger for some t values. Our methods are intended for *passively observed*, not controlled experimental data. We assume away applications to estimating functional relations without random components such as Boyle’s

law (pressure *volume = a constant) where all component variables (pressure and volume) can be independently controlled in a laboratory.

Note that Lemmata 1 & 2 and Theorem 1 are readily extended to models with three sets of variables, X, Y, Z , where Z contains control variables not subject to flipping. From now on, it is convenient to let the flipped variables be X_i and Y , where we intend to flip one of $X_i, i = 1, \dots, p$ at a time, while keeping some variables Z in the model without flipping. Webster’s seventh collegiate dictionary defines kernel as “a central or essential part.” Accordingly, let us define the essential part of exogeneity by using Theorem 1 as:

Definition 2.1 (Kernel exogeneity): A variable X_i from the joint density, f_{jt} in eq. (3) after including Z variables, is Kernel exogenous if the data generating process (DGP) for X_i is relatively more self-driven using the evidence based on Theorem 1 than Y is self-driven in a flipped model.

Properties of Kernel exogeneity: Kernel exogeneity properties are:

(KE1) Kernel exogeneity along with Theorem 1 allow us to assess exogeneity by comparing performance of flipped models.

(KE2) Since no parameters are explicitly involved, the concept is applicable to almost any parametric or nonparametric model.

2.1 Indirect Exogeneity Testing

Lacking a direct exogeneity test, Wu (1973) had originally provided an indirect exogeneity test, which was later popularized as the Hausman-Wu test (HWT). It defines a vector of contrasts, $d = b_{OLS} - b_{IV}$, between OLS, an efficient but potentially inconsistent (due to endogeneity) estimator and inefficient but consistent (by assumption) IV estimator. The covariance matrix of d can be shown to be $V_d = V(b_{IV}) - V(b_{OLS})$, and a quadratic form, $d'(V_d)^{-1}d$, is asymptotically a $\chi^2(p)$, with p degrees of freedom. The HWT amounts to medieval diagnosing of a disease (endogeneity) by showing that a cure (b_{IV}) works.

Actually, the IV remedy has been found to be seriously flawed as shown by Bound et al. (1993) with a provocative title “*the cure can be worse than the disease*” and Bound et al. (1995). Of course, there are several applications where IV estimators have proved to be useful. This paper illustrates the use of an R package “generalCorr” to develop a new test which does not use any

IV estimator. We indicate the very few lines of code needed to assess the preponderance of evidence in support of a causal path using macroeconomic examples which can serve as a template in many areas of research.

2.1.1 Avoiding IV estimators and a can-opener joke

Many authors including Bound et al. (1993) and Kiviet and Niemczyk (2007), have warned that in finite samples instrumental variable IV estimators “have systematic estimation errors too, and may even have no finite moments.” Moreover they can be very inefficient (even in large samples) and unnecessarily change the original specification. This paper is motivated by the following disadvantages of the Hausman-Wu test:

1. One must replace X_i with *ad hoc*, potentially weak and/or irrelevant instrumental variable \tilde{Z}_i before testing for exogeneity of X_i .
2. The test needs to be repeated for each potential \tilde{Z}_i replacing each X_i .
3. Davidson and MacKinnon (1993) (p. 241) show that degrees of freedom p for the $\chi^2(p)$ test is too large when a subset of X_i are exogenous.
4. The Chi-square sampling distribution is subject to unverified assumptions of linearity and normality, especially unrealistic in finite samples.

Can-opener joke: A physicist, a chemist and an economist are stranded on an island, with nothing to eat. A can of soup washes ashore. The physicist says, “Let us smash the can open with a rock.” The chemist says, “Let us build a fire and heat the can to pry it open”. The economist says, “Let us assume that we have a can-opener”.

Econometricians’ assumption regarding the use of Instrumental Variables (IV), presumed to be uncorrelated with unobservable errors, is a bit like simply assuming that they have a can-opener. This is only a joke included for comic relief, encouraged by the provocative title of Bound et al. (1993), not intended to criticize all applications of IV models.

2.2 Kernel Regressions and Generalized Correlations

The generalized measures of correlation in Zheng et al. (2012) are:

$$\begin{aligned} GMC(Y|X) &= \left[1 - \frac{E(Y-E(Y|X))^2}{var(Y)}\right], \\ GMC(X|Y) &= \left[1 - \frac{E(X-E(X|Y))^2}{var(X)}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

which are computed simply as the R^2 values of flipped Models 1 and 2. Since they generally do differ from each other, the ambiguity in Koopmans’ method criticized by EHR disappears.

As measures of correlation the non-negative GMC’s in the range $[0,1]$ provide no information regarding the up or down overall direction of the relation between Y and X , revealed by the sign of r_{xy} , the Pearson coefficient. Since a true generalization of r_{xy} should not provide less information, Vinod (2014) and Vinod (2015a) propose the following modification. A general asymmetric correlation coefficient from the $GMC(Y|X)$ is:

$$r_{y|x}^* = \text{sign}(r_{xy})\sqrt{GMC(Y|X)}, \quad (17)$$

where $-1 \leq r_{y|x}^* \leq 1$. A matrix of generalized correlation coefficients denoted by R^* is asymmetric: $r_{x|y}^* \neq r_{y|x}^*$, as desired. A function in the generalCorr package, `gmcmtx0`, provides the R^* matrix from a matrix of data.

Our new test of exogeneity uses the “preponderance of evidence” standard quantified by a comprehensive index, which is a weighted sum of causal direction signs using three criteria: Cr1 to Cr3. Our Cr1 relies on Theorem 1 (iii) using cross products of local residual and regressor. Our Cr2 compares absolute residuals of flipped models justified in Theorem 1. Our Cr3 which compares R^2 of flipped models was mentioned in Vinod (2014).

3 Kernel Causality Explained

Assessing philosophically true causality from non-experimental data is non-trivial, Pearl (2009). Instead, we consider a modified causality called ‘kernel causality,’ based on an empirical comparison of two flipped models guided by our Theorem 1 and ‘kernel exogeneity.’ We warn the reader that the scope of Kernel causality is rather limited and excludes considerable causality literature involving careful studies of differential impacts causal variables on certain outcomes.

Kernel causality simply provides a causal interpretation to Kernel exogeneity. If X_i is Kernel exogenous, we choose the causal path: $X_i \rightarrow Y$ over the opposite path: $Y \rightarrow X_i$. The name Kernel causality acknowledges our reliance on both kernel regressions and ‘Kernel exogeneity.’ Recalling property [WE2] of EHR weak exogeneity, Kernel causality has almost nothing to do with Granger causality.

This section uses Theorem 1 to quantify Kernel exogeneity of Definition 2.1 above. We empirically evaluate three criteria Cr1 to Cr3. If a majority of Cr1 to Cr3 support that X_i is Kernel exogenous (independently generated) it *kernel* causes Y . We begin with two digressions: (D1) stochastic dominance, needed for Cr1 and Cr2, and (D2) partial correlations needed for Cr3.

3.1 Digression D1: Stochastic Dominance of Four Orders

The first order stochastic dominance (SD1) was defined in Definition 1.3 with comments and used in our Lemmata and Theorem 1. It is well known that SD1 provides a comprehensive picture of the ranking between two probability distributions with a focus on locally defined first moment (mean). This subsection attempts to discuss quantification of SD1 to SD4 following the theory and software available in (Vinod, 2008, ch.4).

The underlying computation requires bringing the two densities on a common ‘support,’ requiring ecdf’s to have up to $2T$ possible jumps or steps. Hence there are $2T$ estimates of $F(x) - F(y)$ denoted by a $2T \times 1$ vector (sd1). Anderson (1996) shows how a simple pre-multiplication by a large patterned matrix implements computation of (sd1). Let us use a simple cumulative sum $\text{Av}(\text{sd1})$ whose sign $(+1, 0, -1)$ helps summarize the first order stochastic dominance into only one number.

Second order dominance (SD2) of $f(x)$ over $f(y)$ requires further integrals of ecdf’s to satisfy: $\int F(x) \leq \int F(y)$. One computes the numerical integral by using the trapezoidal rule described in terms of a large patterned matrix whose details are given in (Vinod, 2008, ch.4) and in Anderson (1996). The $2T$ estimates of SD2 denoted by (sd2) are locally defined variances. Their simple cumulative sum is denoted as $\text{Av}(\text{sd2})$, whose sign $(+1, 0, -1)$ summarizes the information regarding second order dominance.

Similarly, SD of order 3 is estimated by a vector (sd3) of $2T$ locally defined skewness values defined from $\int \int F(x) \leq \int \int F(y)$. The sd3 is further summarized by the sign of $\text{Av}(\text{sd3})$. Analogous SD of order 4 for kurtosis requires $\int \int \int F(x) \leq \int \int \int F(y)$ and measures investor ‘prudence’ according to Vinod (2004). Cumulative sum of point-wise kurtosis estimates of SD4 are $\text{Av}(\text{sd4})$, whose sign $(+1, 0, -1)$ summarizes the SD4 dominance information.

Remark 2: By analogy with two streams of investment returns, stochastic dominance allows us to study realistic but fuzzy inequalities (true almost

everywhere, but may not hold for subsets of points). Stochastic dominance of four orders associated with the first four moments yield $2T$ estimates of sd1 to sd4. The signs of their cumulative sums, Av(sd1) to Av(sd4), indicate whether the inequality holds true in an overall sense.

3.2 Digression D2: Generalized Partial Correlations

Note that the partial correlation coefficient between (X_1, X_2) after removing the effect of (X_3) is:

$$r_{12;3} = \frac{r_{12} - r_{13}r_{23}}{\sqrt{(1 - r_{13}^2)}\sqrt{(1 - r_{23}^2)}}. \quad (18)$$

Kendall and Stuart (1977) show that an alternative definition of $r_{12;3}$ is a simple correlation between residuals of the regression: $X_1 = f(X_2, X_3) + error$ and similar residuals of the regression: $X_2 = f(X_1, X_3) + error$. We use this method in our generalization as follows.

We consider the generalized correlations between X_i and X_j after removing the effect of a set of variable(s) in X_k . Let us first define $u_{i,k}$ as the residual of kernel regression of X_i on all control variable(s) X_k . Similarly define $u_{j,k}$ as the residual of kernel regression of X_j on all control variable(s) X_k . Next, we define a symmetric version of generalized partial correlation coefficient in the presence of control variable(s) as:

$$u_{ij;k}^* = \frac{cov(u_{i,k}, u_{j,k})}{\sigma(u_{i,k})\sigma(u_{j,k})}, \quad (19)$$

a symmetric correlation coefficient between two relevant residuals.

Now we recall eq. (17) based on GMC's to obtain asymmetric generalized partial correlation coefficients. Denote the sign of the correlation in eq. (19) as $sign(u_{ij;k}^*)$. Finally we are ready to define an asymmetric matrix of generalized partial correlation coefficients using the R^2 of kernel regression: $u_{i,k} = f((u_{j,k}) + err$ as $GMC(u_{i,k}|u_{j,k})$. Note that the generalized partial correlations will be asymmetric since GMC's are asymmetric.

Thus, we can define:

$$r^*(X_i, X_j; X_k) = sign(u_{ij;k}^*)\sqrt{[GMC(u_{i,k}|u_{j,k})]}. \quad (20)$$

Often, we simplify the notation and write the generalized partial correlations as $r_{i,j;k}^*$. Section 6.5 provides an illustrative example implementing the generalized partial correlation coefficients from data.

3.3 Criteria Cr1 to Cr3 Details

We determine whether X_i drives Y , with the causal path $X_i \rightarrow Y$, or vice versa, by considering the quantitative evidence from the majority of three criteria Cr1 to Cr3 described in this subsection. Our first criterion Cr1 is based on Theorem 1 eq. (14). Our Cr2 is based on Theorem 1 eq. (15). Our Cr3 requires that the fit (and forecasts) implied by the path $X_i \rightarrow Y$ should have a larger $R^2 = GMC(Y|X, Z)$ than those of reversed path:

$$|r_{(y|x; z)}^*| > |r_{(x|y; z)}^*|, \quad (21)$$

where generalized partial correlation coefficients defined in eq. (20) remove the effect of control variable(s), if any. Let us begin with some definitions.

Definition 3.1: (Evidence Preponderance) According to Legal Information Institute (2017) the preponderance of evidence means a burden to show that greater than 50% of evidence points to something.

Definition 3.2: (Causal Path) We say that X_i is the kernel cause of Y (causal path: $X_i \rightarrow Y$), if at least two of Cr1 to Cr3 criteria satisfying the preponderance of evidence standard support the path.

Definition 3.3: (Bidirectional Path) Bidirectional causality ($X_i \leftrightarrow Y$) or causality marred by the presence of confounding variable(s) occurs if the evidence does not support either ($X_i \rightarrow Y$) or ($Y \rightarrow X_i$).

Koopmans’ “departmental principle” gives practitioners some flexibility in designating certain variables as exogenous, without having to formally test their exogeneity. These can be outside the scope for the current research question, or non-economic variables such as: the weather, geographical areas or distances, demographic facts.

3.4 Weighted sum of Cr1 to Cr3 and unanimity index

It is not practical to keep track of four $Av(sd\ell)$ stochastic dominance indicators arising from each of Cr1 and Cr2 and one indicator for Cr3 separately. For computing ‘preponderance of evidence’ we need to compute their unanimity index (UI) obtained by rescaling their weighted ‘sum’ index.

Proposition 3.1 (UI exist): There exists unanimity index number, UI_1 , quantifying likelihood for the DGP of X_i to be self-driven instead of Y ,

and another index number UI_2 , quantifying the likelihood for the DGP of Y to be self-driven instead of X_i . We define a tolerance constant $\tau = 15$ (say) such that if $|(UI_1 - UI_2)| < \tau$, the two index numbers are “too close” to each other. Then the exogeneity of X_i and Y is indeterminate, implying either bi-directional kernel causality, or that both X_i and Y are jointly dependent, perhaps each needing a separate structural equation.

The proposition is established by explicitly showing how to construct sample unanimity indexes ui as estimators of population UI in the sequel. We first describe a summary index called $sum \in [-3.175, 3.175]$. It is transformed by the relation

$$ui = 100(sum/3.175), \quad ui \in [100, 100]. \quad (22)$$

Applying Remark 2 to quantify (14) for Cr1, and (15) for Cr2 we compute four numbers $Av(sd\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, 4$ each. If $|Av(sd\ell)| < \tau'$, we say that the sign is ambiguous, denoted as zero for the ℓ -th SD. Even when $|Av(sd\ell)| > \tau'$, only the signs of $Av(sd\ell)$, not their magnitudes matter. These signs (sg) from the set $(+1, 0, -1)$, are denoted as $sg_{1\ell}$, where the first subscript 1 refers to the criterion number in Cr1. In practice, the signs sg_{11} to sg_{14} are rarely distinct.

What weights do we choose for combining the signs, $(+1, 0, -1)$, not magnitudes of $Av(sd1)$ to $Av(sd4)$ in the context of Cr1 and Cr2? Statistical theory suggests that weights on magnitudes should be *inversely* proportional to the increasing sampling variances of the first four central moments. $(\sigma^2, 2\sigma^4, 6\sigma^6, 96\sigma^8)$ from a Normal parent (applying central limit theory to $Av(sd\ell)$) according to (Kendall and Stuart, 1977, p. 258). Instead, let us choose the following weakly declining weights: $(1.2/4, 1.1/4, 1.05/4, 1/4)$, found to be reasonable in small simulations, with an option to change them.

Denote a summary sign index based on Cr1 as sC_1 . It is computed as:

$$sC_1 = [1.2 * sg_{11} + 1.1 * sg_{12} + 1.05 * sg_{13} + sg_{14}]/4. \quad (23)$$

When all four ($Av(sd1)$ to $Av(sd4)$) suggest the same sign, ie, all are (± 1) , the largest magnitude of our weighted index of sign by Cr1 is $sC_1 = \pm 1.0875$.

Analogous signs $(+1, 0, -1)$ of $Av(sd1)$ to $Av(sd4)$ representing absolute residuals help define their weighted sum for Cr2 as:

$$sC_2 = [1.2 * sg_{21} + 1.1 * sg_{22} + 1.05 * sg_{23} + sg_{24}]/4. \quad (24)$$

As before, if all four dominance measures suggest the same sign, the largest magnitude of sC_2 is 1.0875. Hence, the sign index based on Cr2 lies in the closed interval: $sC_2 \in [-1.0875, 1.0875]$.

The computation of a Cr3 from the inequality test of (21) states that $X_i \rightarrow Y$ if the sign defined as: $sg_3 = (+1, 0, -1)$ of the absolute difference between flipped partial correlations equals (-1) . We denote the sign index based on Cr3 as:

$$sC_3 = \text{sign}(|r_{(x|y; z)}^*| - |r_{(y|x; z)}^*|) \quad (25)$$

where the largest score, $\max(sg_3) = 1$. When $sg_3 < 0$, the causal path by Cr3 is $X_i \rightarrow Y$. Note that index always lies in the closed interval: $sC_3 \in [-1, 1]$.

So far, we have three sign indexes (sC_1, sC_2, sC_3) for the three criteria, summarizing the evidence supporting the causal path: $X_i \rightarrow Y$. Since our Definition 3.2 of kernel causality requires us to consider all three criteria, we compute their ‘sum’ defined as:

$$\text{sum} = sC_1 + sC_2 + sC_3, \quad (26)$$

from the observed sample data. Let us denote the corresponding true unknown population value with upper case letters as ‘SUM’. When ($SUM < 0$) holds, the causal path is $X_i \rightarrow Y$. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the sign of sum suggests the direction of the path, while its magnitude approximates the strength of sample evidence in support of that causal path.

Combining the three largest possible scores verify that: $\max(\text{sum}) = 3.175$, and $\text{sum} \in [-3.175, 3.175]$, a closed interval. A transformation of sum to our unanimity index ui is in eq. (22), designed to be always in the range $[-100, 100]$. Since the ‘sum’ and ui measure the extent of agreement among the three criteria, its magnitude is a reasonable indicator of the strength (or unanimity) of evidence for a particular causal path. When the population parameter is smaller than a threshold value, ($UI < \tau$, where $\tau = 15$, say,) we can conclude that the causal path is $X_i \rightarrow Y$, making X_i exogenous.

Weighted sum computation in ‘generalCorr’ package

The R command `causeSummary(mtx, ctrl=Z, nam=colnames(mtx))` requires a data matrix with p columns called ‘mtx’ with the first column for the dependent variable and remaining column(s) for regressors. The order of columns is very important. For example, `mtx=cbind(x1,x2,x3)`, where the matrix

‘mtx’ has three columns, denoted as $p = 3$. Our flipped models fix the first column x1 and pair it with either x2 or x3 for flipping. We do not pair x2 with x3. Thus we always have $p - 1$ possible flipped pairs. The code indicates an error if $p < 2$ or if it is not a matrix. Sometimes one needs to use `as.matrix(mtx)`. Note that control variables are a separate argument (not within `mtx`), as in: `causeSummary(mtx, ctrl=0)`, where the default value zero means absence of control variable(s).

The output of ‘causeSummary’ is self-explanatory based on ‘preponderance of evidence’ from a weighted combination of Cr1 to Cr3. Since we have exactly $(p - 1)$ possible causal path pairs, the summary reports each printed to the screen. For each pair it reports the name of the causal variable, then the name of the response variable, the strength index in terms of unanimity of the sign of the reported causal path. It also reports Pearson correlation coefficient and its p-value for testing the null hypothesis: $\rho = 0$. If the unanimity strength index (ui) is close to zero, in the range $[-15, 15]$, one should conclude that $X \leftrightarrow Y$.

The code `su=causeSummary(mtx);xtable(su)` may be used to create a Latex table of results from the output of the function. It is a matrix of $(p-1)$ rows and 5 columns providing summary of pair-wise causal path results. The first column entitled ‘cause’ names the causal variable, while the second column entitled ‘response’ names the response. The third column entitled ‘strength’ has absolute value of summary strength index, printed above but now in the positive range $[0,100]$, summarizing preponderance of evidence from Cr1 to Cr3 from four orders of stochastic dominance and generalized partial correlations. The fourth column entitled ‘corr’ has Pearson correlation coefficient while the fifth column entitled ‘p-value’ is for testing the null of zero Pearson correlation coefficient.

Our notion of causality is not the true philosophical causality, but an approximation where a ‘kernel cause’ is simply the ‘Kernel exogenous’ variable defined above using eq. (3) from a flipped pairs of variables quantified by the unanimity index.

3.5 Decision Rules

The ‘preponderance of evidence’ supports one of the three causal paths listed below when the sample unanimity index ‘ui’ is inside one of the three intervals (two half-open and one closed, using $\tau = 15$). If one uses the sample ‘sum’ index, the 15% threshold τ for ui translates to the number

$\tau' = (15/100)3.175 = 0.476$ for ‘sum’. If computational resources are available, one can use the bootstrap described in section 5 below for inference.

R1: $X_{1+j} \rightarrow X_1$ if $(ui \in [-100, -15])$ or $sum \in [-3.175, -0.476]$.

R2: $X_{1+j} \leftarrow X_1$ if $(ui \in (15, 100])$ or $sum \in (0.476, 3.175]$.

R3: $X_{1+j} \leftrightarrow X_1$ if $(ui \in [-15, 15])$ or $sum \in (-0.476, 0.476]$.

4 Simulation for Checking Decision Rules

Following our Definition 2.1 of Kernel exogeneity we generate the X_1 variable independently and then define X_2 to depend on X_1 after adding a noise term, $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$, a the standard normal deviate. Here X_1 is Kernel exogenous by construction, and hence the causal path is known to be $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, by construction. Our sample sizes are $T = 50, 100, 300$.

Let m denote the count for indeterminate signs when we repeat the experiments $N = 1000$ times. Define the success probability (suPr) for each experiment as:

$$(suPr) = \frac{(\text{count of correct signs})}{N - m}. \quad (27)$$

The simulation considers four sets of artificial data where the causal direction is known to be $X_1 \rightarrow X_2$.

1. Time regressor:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \{1, 2, 3, \dots, T\} \\ X_2 &= 3 + 4X_1 + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

2. Unit root Quadratic:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &\text{ has } T \text{ random walk series from cumulative sum or standard normals.} \\ X_2 &= 3 + 4X_1 - 3X_1^2 + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

3. Two Uniforms:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1, Z_1 &\text{ each have } T \text{ uniform random numbers} \\ X_2 &= 3 + 4X_1 + 3Z_1 + \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

4. Three Uniforms:

X_1, Z_1, Z_2 each have T uniform random numbers

$$X_2 = 3 + 4X_1 + 5Z_1 - 6Z_2 + \epsilon$$

The simulation required about 36 hours on a Dell Optiplex Windows 10 desktop running Intel core i5-7500, cpu at 3.40 GHz, RAM 8 GB, R version 3.4.2.

The large success proportions (suPr) reported in row 7 (for $T=50$), row 15 (for $T=100$) and row 23 (for $T=300$) of Table 1 assume the threshold $\tau = 0$. The results for the four experiments in four columns show that our decision rules using a ‘ui’ from Cr1 to Cr3 work well. The effect on success probabilities of the choice of the threshold is studied for the $T = 300$ case by using $\tau = 0, 15, 20, 25$, respectively, along rows 21 to 24.

Moreover since the success probabilities ‘suPr’ for $\tau = 0$ along rows 7, 14 and 21 increase as $T = 50, 100, 300$ increases, this suggest desirable asymptotic convergence-type feature. Thus, our procedure using flipped models to identify independently generated (causal) variables is supported by the simulation.

This simulation uses our newer definition of Cr1 used in the latest versions of ‘generalCorr’ package (ver. $\geq 1.1.0$), which directly implements Theorem 1 (iii) seen in eq. (14) using fitted residuals. An older version of Cr1 involved additional algebra used to replace true errors with its theoretical expression, and finally approximating the expression with the absolute gradient of local linear fit of kernel regression. Unfortunately, newer Cr1 is not unequivocally superior to the older Cr1. For example, when $\tau = 0, T = 100$ the success probabilities using `causeSummary0` command for implementing the older version of Cr1 are: (1.000, 0.905, 0.882, 0.970). These are quite comparable to (1.000, 0.787, 0.892, 0.803) along the row numbered 14 of Table 1.

Hence, both R functions `causeSummary` and its older version `causeSummary0` may be attempted. Any sign disagreement is clearly suggestive of uncertainty in the estimated causal paths. Then one can perhaps postpone if not avoid the computer intensive bootstraps described in the next section to save computational or time resources.

Table 1: Summary statistics for results of using the ‘ui’ measure for correct identification of causal path indicated by its positive sign using N=1000 repetitions, T=50, 100, 300 sample sizes along three horizontal panels. Success probabilities (suPr) show convergence as T increases in the three panels.

Row	stat.	Expm=1	Expm=2	Expm=3	Expm=4
1	Min.T=50	31.496	-100.000	-100.000	-100.000
2	1st Qu.	63.780	31.496	31.496	-31.496
3	Median	100.000	31.496	31.496	37.008
4	Mean	82.395	33.725	24.386	27.622
5	3rd Qu.	100.000	100.000	37.008	37.008
6	Max.	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000
7	suPr	1.000	0.793	0.808	0.712
8	Min.T=100	31.496	-100.000	-100.000	-100.000
9	1st Qu.	63.780	31.496	31.496	31.496
10	Median	81.102	31.496	31.496	37.008
11	Mean	74.691	33.106	32.822	35.879
12	3rd Qu.	100.000	100.000	37.008	37.008
13	Max.	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000
14	suPr	1.000	0.787	0.892	0.803
15	Min.T=300	31.496	-100.000	-31.496	-63.780
16	1st Qu.	81.102	31.496	31.496	37.008
17	Median	81.102	31.496	31.496	37.008
18	Mean	80.357	43.020	42.973	42.117
19	3rd Qu.	100.000	100.000	37.008	37.008
20	Max.	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000
21	suPr, $\tau = 0$	1.000	0.829	0.987	0.963
22	suPr, $\tau = 15$	1.000	0.833	0.988	0.970
23	suPr, $\tau = 20$	1.000	0.835	0.989	0.971
24	suPr, $\tau = 25$	1.000	0.836	0.989	0.971

5 A Bootstrap Exogeneity Test

Statistical inference regarding causal paths and exogeneity uses the ‘sum’ statistic defined in equation (26) for estimating the parameter ‘SUM’ mentioned before. We can transform the ‘sum’ statistic as $ui = 100(sum/3.175)$, with the parameter UI mentioned above.

Bootstrap Percentile Confidence Interval: We suggest a large number J of bootstrap resamples of (X, Y, Z) data to obtain $(sum)_j$ and $(ui)_j$ using any bootstrap algorithm. These $(j = 1, \dots, J)$ values provide an approximation to the sampling distribution of ‘sum’ or ‘ui.’ We can easily sort the J values from the smallest to the largest and obtain the order statistics denoted as $(sum)_{(j)}$ and $(ui)_{(j)}$, with parenthetical subscripts. Now a $(1-\alpha)100$ percent confidence interval is obtained from the quantiles at $\alpha/2$ and $1-\alpha/2$. For example, if $\alpha = 0.05$, $J = 999$, a 95% confidence limits are: $(ui)_{(25)}$ and $(ui)_{(975)}$.

Recalling the decision rules R1 to R3 of Section 3.5, if both confidence limits fall inside one of the two half-open intervals, we have a statistically significant conclusion. For example, R1 states that: $X_{1+\ell} \rightarrow X_1$ if $(ui \in (-100, -15])$. If both confidence limits of ui lie in the half-open interval: $(-100, -15]$ we have a statistically significant conclusion that $X_{1+\ell} \rightarrow X_1$, or equivalently that $X_{1+\ell}$ is exogenous.

This paper uses the maximum entropy bootstrap (meboot) R package described in Vinod and López-de-Lacalle (2009) because it is most familiar to me, retains the dependence structure in the data, and is recently supported by simulations in Yalta (2016), Vinod (2015b) and elsewhere.

Sampling Distribution Summary: The approximate sampling distribution can be usefully summarized by computing bootstrap proportion of significantly positive or negative values. Let m denote the bootstrap count of indeterminate signs when $(ui) \in [-\tau, \tau]$, where the threshold $\tau = 15$ can be changed by the researcher depending on the problem at hand. Now define a bootstrap approximation to the proportion of significantly positive signs as:

$$P^*(+1) = \frac{(\text{count of } ui_j > \tau)}{J - m}. \quad (28)$$

Similarly, a bootstrap approximation to the proportion of significantly negative signs is:

$$P^*(-1) = \frac{(\text{count of } ui_j < -\tau)}{J - m}. \quad (29)$$

6 Application Examples

Let us begin with an example mentioned earlier where the cause is intuitively known to illustrate our statistical inference using the *sum* and *ui* statistics. Vinod (2015a) describes a cross section data example where Y denotes the number of police officers per 1000 population, and X denotes the number of crimes per 1000 population in $T=29$ European countries in 2008.

```
require(generalCorr);require(Hmisc)
attach(EuroCrime)#bring package data into memory
options(np.messages=FALSE)
causeSummary(cbind(crim,off))
bb=bootPairs(mtx, n999=999)
```

Output of above code is illustrated below. The reported k values monitor the progress of simulation numbers 1 to $J = 999$, say, modulo 50.

```
causeSummary(cbind(crim,off))
      cause response strength corr.  p-value
[1,] "crim" "off"      "100"    "0.99" "0"

bb=bootPairs(mtx, n999=999)
[1] "k=" "1"
[1] "k=" "51"
[1] "k=" "101"
.....
[1] "k=" "951"
```

The output of above code `causeSummary` given above shows that crime causes officer deployment with strength 100. It also reports simple correlation coefficient of 0.99 between ‘*crim*’ and ‘*off*’ with a p-value near zero suggesting significantly different from zero.

The above output for bootstrap using `bootPairs` is abridged for brevity. A single bootstrap computation for these data when $J = 999$ on a home PC requires about 20 minutes of CPU time.

```
bootQuantile(bb)
bootSummary(bb)
bootSign(bb)
```

The above code expects to report confidence interval, summary stats and probability of observing the average sign, respectively. We report the confidence interval first.

```
bootQuantile(bb)
      off
2.5% -100
97.5% 100
```

The 95% confidence interval for unanimity index UI is seen to be very wide for the crime data. Since it covers the zero, the causal path $\text{crim} \rightarrow \text{off}$ is not robust to sampling variation at the usual confidence level.

We report the summary stats and $P^*(+1) = 0.647$ next.

```
bootSummary(bb)
      off
Min.   -100.00000
1st Qu. -31.49606
Median   37.00787
Mean     29.73998
3rd Qu.  100.00000
Max.     100.00000
bootSign(bb)
[1] 0.6472362
```

An approximate sampling distribution of ‘ui’ statistic for these data is depicted in Figure 1. We are using a histogram because the sampling distribution is categorical with nonzero frequency counts only at a finite set of points. The mode is clearly seen at 100 in the histogram. suggesting that the path (crime→officer deployment) is not due to random noise, but likely to be present in the population.

The “generalCorr” versions (>1.1.2) have several functions for computing bootstraps. The function `pcause` does all $n_{999}=999$ bootstrap computations and reports the probability of either positive or negative signs and finally reports the max of the two signs. This code resembles similar function in ‘meboot’ package

Using a data matrix called with the argument `mtx=c(crim,off)`, with $p=2$ columns with the understanding that the first column is present in each pair. The functions `bootPairs(mtx)` and `bootPairs0(mtx)` compute the




Figure 1: European Crime Data Approximate Sampling Distribution of the u_i statistic

bootstrap ‘sum’ statistics in the form of a matrix of dimension: $n999 \times (p-1)$ upon calling ‘silentPairs’ or silentPairs0’, respectively. a large number ‘n999’ of times. The results of ‘bootPairs’ are input to various summarizing functions

`bootQuantile` function provides confidence interval with a choice to input any desired proportions instead of default argument `probs=c(0.025, 0.975)` for a 95% interval.

`bootSummary` computes the summary of each column of output of ‘bootPairs’

6.1 Klein I simultaneous equations model

This section reports the results for our three criteria regarding exogeneity of each of the regressors of the three equations of the famous Klein I model. Let us use the following four-character abbreviations using the upper case trailing L for lagged version of a variable: `cons`=consumption, `coPr`=corporate profits, `coPL`= corporate profits with a lag, `wage`=wages, `inve`=investment, `capL`=capital with a lag, `prWg`=private sector wages, `gnpL`=GNP with a

lag, and finally, $tren$ =time trend.

Klein’s specification of the expected consumption equation (stated in terms of fitted coefficients) is:

$$E(\text{cons}) = a_{10} + a_{11} \text{coPr} + a_{12} \text{coPL} + a_{13} \text{wage}. \quad (30)$$

The second (investment) equation of the Klein I model is given by:

$$E(\text{inve}) = a_{20} + a_{21} \text{coPr} + a_{22} \text{coPL} + a_{23} \text{capL}. \quad (31)$$

The third (wage) equation of the Klein I model is given by:

$$E(\text{prWg}) = a_{30} + a_{31} \text{gnp} + a_{32} \text{gnpL} + a_{33} \text{tren}. \quad (32)$$

We report summary statistics for all three criteria combined into the $sum_j, j = 1, \dots, J$ defined in eq. (26) leading to a $J = 999 \times 1$ vector of summary signs, for brevity.

Table 2: Klein I model: Bootstrap summary statistics for ‘sum’ of eq. (26) using 999 resamples to represent the population. A positive mean and median with a large $P^*(+1)$ imply the relevant regressor might not be exogenous.

	cons	inve	prWg
Minimum	-3.1750	-3.1750	-3.1750
1st Quartile, Q1	-1.1750	-1.1750	-1.1750
Median	1.0000	-0.9250	0.0875
Mean	0.4443	-0.1892	0.1874
3rd Quartile, Q3	1.1750	1.1750	1.1750
Maximum	3.1750	3.1750	3.1750
$P^*(+1)$	0.597	0.481	0.504

Three columns of Table 2 are for the three equations of the Klein I model. The rows report descriptive statistics: the minimum, maximum, quartiles Q1 and Q3, mean and median based on $J = 999$ bootstrap realizations. The bottom row of the Table reports the bootstrap probability of a positive result, $P^*(+1)$ defined in eq. (28), which are all close to 0.5. The fact that all equations have the same minimum, maximum, Q1 and Q3 show that the bootstrap variability is considerable in both tails making the causal path subject to sampling variability, implying considerable uncertainty in the estimated ‘sum.’

The signs of means and medians are both positive in columns 1 and 3 for consumption and private wage equations, implying that wage appears to be endogenous in the consumption equation (30), while gnp may be endogenous in the private wage equation (32). The $P^*(+1) = 0.481 < 0.5$, along with the negative sign of the mean and the median in the second column entitled ‘inve’ suggests that coPr appears to be exogenous in the investment equation (31).

6.2 Macro Risk Factors for Excess Bond Premium

US Macroeconomists and Federal Reserve researchers have developed new awareness of their failure to forecast the great recession of 2007-2008. Some have developed new data series. For example, Gilchrist and Zakrajek (2012) have developed excess bond premium (EBP) and shown that it predicts risk of a recession. It is interesting to find what causes the EBP itself, possibly allowing us to understand why EBP predicts recession risk.

Potential causes are: unemployment rate (UnemR), credit creation (CrCrea, not seasonally adjusted), credit destruction (CrDstr, not seasonally adjusted), yield on 10-year treasury bonds (Yld10, not seasonally adjusted), effective federal funds rate (EffFFR), and money stock (M2, seasonally adjusted billions of dollars). Arguments for using separate variables for CrCrea and CrDstr are found in Contessi and Francis (2013) with additional references. We use Federal Reserve’s quarterly data from 1973Q1 to 2012Q4, with some data missing. Our software tools can efficiently handle missing data.

We study endogeneity of variables in the following regression model:

$$\text{EBP} = f(\text{UnemR}, \text{CrCrea}, \text{CrDstr}, \text{Yld10}, \text{EffFFR}, \text{M2}) \quad (33)$$

After getting the data and relevant packages into R memory, we can use the following commands:

```
mtx=cbind(EBP,UnemR,CrCrea, CrDstr,Yld10,EffFFR,M2)
p=NCOL(mtx);print(colnames(mtx)[2:p])
silentPairs(mtx)#newer version of Cr1
silentPairs0(mtx)#zero suggests older version of Cr1
```

The output of this shows that only CrCrea, CrDstr and M2 are negative implying that they are exogenous.

	"UnemR"	"CrCrea"	"CrDstr"	"Yld10"	"EffFFR"	"M2"
NewCr1	3.175	-1.000	-1.000	3.175	3.175	-1.000
OldCr1	1.000	-1.000	-1.000	3.175	1.000	-1.000

The above output of ‘sum’ index is in the range: $[-3.175, 3.175]$. The results in more intuitive translated range: $[-100, 100]$ plus Pearson correlation and its p-values require simple code:

```

su=causeSummary(mtx)
su0=causeSummary0(mtx)#zero suggests older version of Cr1
require(xtable)
xtable(su); xtable(su0)

```

The Latex Table is printed in the following Table 3. Note that only CrCrea, CrDstr and M2 are likely to be independently generated (exogenous) causing the excess bond premium, while the other variables seem to be caused by EBP (endogenous). None of the magnitudes in the column entitled ‘strength’ is less than the threshold 0.476 for ‘sum’ according to our decision rule R3, implying that we do not have bidirectional paths.

Table 3: Excess Bond Premium and possible causes using new Cr1 and old Cr1 indicated by row names

	cause	response	strength	corr.	p-value
1	EBP	UnemR	100	0.1443	0.06875
1.old	EBP	UnemR	31.496	0.1443	0.0688
2	CrCrea	EBP	31.496	-0.087	0.27387
2.old	CrCrea	EBP	31.496	-0.087	0.2739
3	CrDstr	EBP	31.496	0.1998	0.01132
3.old	CrDstr	EBP	31.496	0.1998	0.0113
4	EBP	Yld10	100	0.064	0.42165
4.old	EBP	Yld10	100	0.064	0.4216
5	EBP	Effffr	100	0.0657	0.40915
5.old	EBP	Effffr	31.496	0.0657	0.4091
6	M2	EBP	31.496	-0.0103	0.8976
6.old	M2	EBP	31.496	-0.0103	0.8976

Causal directions in Table 3 for old Cr1 and new Cr1 are identical. The strengths in rows labeled 1 and ‘1.old’ are distinct with $u_i = (100, 31.496)$,

respectively. Same discrepancy holds between rows 5 and ‘5.old.’ Thus the difference between two versions of Cr1 are not found to be significant for this example.

What about sampling variability of strength index? The bootstrap inference is computer time intensive. It requires the R function `pcause` as illustrated in the following code.

```
p=NCOL(mtx)
ou2=matrix(NA,nrow=p-1,ncol=2)
for (i in 2:p){
pp=pcause(mtx[,1],mtx[,i],n999=999)
ou2[i-1,1]=colnames(mtx)[i]
ou2[i-1,2]=round(pp,6) }
print(ou2)
colnames(ou2)=c("variable", "P(-1,0,1)")
xtable(ou2)
```

The printed output of the above code is suppressed for brevity. Instead, our Table 4 shows that sampling distribution results provide a distinct piece of information not covered by the results about the strength or p-value in Table 3.

Table 4: Bootstrap success rates for causal direction using 999 resamples

	variable	P(± 1)
1	UnemR	0.801802
2	CrCrea	0.927928
3	CrDstr	0.626627
4	Yld10	0.947948
5	EffFFR	0.600601
6	M2	1

Graphics on Pair-wise Relations

Pretty scatterplots with locally best fitting lines for each pair of data have now become possible with a nice R package called ‘PerformanceAnalytics’ by Carl and Peterson (2010) with the function `chart.Correlation` modified for our purposes in the following code.

```

require(PerformanceAnalytics)
chartCorr2=function(mtx,temp="temp",nam=colnames(mtx)){
p=NCOL(mtx)
#print(c("colnames=",nam))
if (p<2) stop("chartCorr2 has input mtx with <2 columns")
nameoplot=nam[2:p]
print(nameoplot)
for (i in 2:p) {
mypath<-file.path("C:",temp,paste(nameoplot[i-1],".pdf",sep=""))
pdf(file=mypath,width=9,height=7)
chart.Correlation(mtx[,c(1,i)])
dev.off()
}# end i loop
}#end function
chartCorr2(mtx)

```

All figures are analogous. Histograms of the two variables is seen in the diagonal panels. The South West panel has a scatter diagram and locally best fitting free hand curve. The number in the North East panel is the ordinary correlation coefficient whose font size suggests its statistical significance, with stars increasing with 10%, 5% and 1% level. Figures provide visual impressions while the exact correlation coefficients and their p-values are also found in Table 3 with more decimal points.

Our evidence including Figure 2 suggests that the variation in UnemR is endogenous, caused by EBP with a scatterplot having a mildly up-down-up pattern.

Our evidence including Figure 3 suggests that the variation in credit creation is exogenous. Its scatterplot is mostly flat and lots of noise.

Our analysis and Figure 4 suggests that the variation in credit destruction is exogenous. This scatterplot is also mostly flat with lots of noise, similar to credit creation.

Our evidence including Figure 5 suggests that the variation in the yield on 10-year notes is endogenous, caused by EBP with a scatterplot having a mildly up-down pattern.

Our analysis and Figure 6 suggests that the variation in the effective federal funds rate is endogenous, caused by EBP with a scatterplot having a mildly up-down pattern. The non-deterministic variation in Effective Federal Funds rate (EffFFR) is less “original or independent” than the correspond-




Figure 2: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-UnemR




Figure 3: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-CrCrea




Figure 4: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-CrDstr




Figure 5: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-Yld10




Figure 6: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-EffFR

ing variation in EBP. When EBP is negative and rises toward zero EffFR increases, but beyond zero it decreases with increase in EBP. It would be interesting to consider the “surprise” component of the effective FFR and its relationship with the EBP

Our evidence including Figure 7 suggests that the variation in money stock M2 is exogenous with a scatterplot having a mildly down-up pattern. The non-deterministic variation in EBP is less “original or independent” than the corresponding variation in money stock M2.). The graphics reveals that when EBP is negative and rises toward zero as M2 decreases, but beyond the zero EBP M2 increases with increase in EBP.

6.3 Airquality data

Our next example shows how the `causeSummary` function of the package provides reasonable results showing that all meteorological variables are exogenous for Ozone (ppb) air pollution in New York in 1973, using some famous data always available in R.




Figure 7: Scatterplot with nonlinear curve: EBP-M2

```

library(generalCorr)
c1=causeSummary(as.matrix(airquality))
library(xtable)
xtable(c1)

```

Table 5: Ozone pollution and its various known causes using newer Cr1

	cause	response	strength	corr.	p-value
1	Solar.R	Ozone	31.496	0.3483	0.00018
2	Wind	Ozone	100	-0.6015	0
3	Temp	Ozone	31.496	0.6984	0
4	Month	Ozone	100	0.1645	0.0776
5	Day	Ozone	100	-0.0132	0.88794

The results in Table 5 show that solar radiation (Langleys) and temperature (degrees F) have strongly independent variation, influencing Ozone pollution levels with high strength of 100 for both, suggesting unanimity of Cr1 and Cr2 criteria at all four stochastic dominance levels and further confirmed by Cr3. The results in Table 6 using older Cr1 are almost identical.

Table 6: Ozone pollution and its various known causes using older Cr1

	cause	response	strength	corr.	p-value
1	Solar.R	Ozone	100	0.3483	2e-04
2	Wind	Ozone	31.496	-0.6015	0
3	Temp	Ozone	100	0.6984	0
4	Month	Ozone	31.496	0.1645	0.0776
5	Day	Ozone	31.496	-0.0132	0.8879

Other variables: Wind (mph), month number (1:12) and Day number (1:31) also affect Ozone, but the causal direction is not unanimous. Hence the strength index is only 31.496 for them. Not surprisingly, high wind reduces Ozone pollution is indicated by the significantly negative (-0.6015) Pearson correlation coefficient with a near zero p-value. Additional comments about Tables 5 and 6 are omitted for brevity.

We use following code to generate a table of bootstrap results.

```
options(np.messages=FALSE)
bb=bootPairs(airquality, n999=999)
as=bootSummary(bb, per100=FALSE)
ap=bootSign(bb)
ap2=rbind(as,ap)#P(sign) at the bottom of summary table
xtable(ap2,digits=3)
```

The results are summarized in Table 7, where the ‘sum’ index is in the range $[-3.175, 3.175]$. We can focus of the means to obtain the overall effect. The bottom row of Table 7 reports the relative frequency of negative values according to the definition (27) implying a success probability in obtaining a negative sign after removing from the denominator all bootstrap estimates m lying in the bidirectional range $[-\tau', \tau']$. For our example, $m = 0$ for all columns. The bottom line shows that the negative signs in all columns are very reliably estimated. It may be convenient to simply set $m = 0$ in the denominator $(N - m)$, leading to conservative estimates of success rates.

6.4 ‘silentMtx’ illustrated with ‘mtcars’ automobile data

In some engineering applications the causal direction is up to the engineer in the sense that she can change engineered settings for one variable to study its effect on some other variable. We use well known ‘mtcars’ data always

Table 7: Variability of ‘sum’ over 999 bootstrap resamples using airquality data

	Solar.R	Wind	Temp	Month	Day
Min.	-3.175	-3.175	-3.175	-3.175	-3.175
1st Qu.	-3.175	-2.575	-1.500	-1.600	-1.000
Median	-3.175	-1.000	-1.175	-1.000	-1.000
Mean	-2.347	-1.539	-1.520	-1.531	-0.957
3rd Qu.	-1.175	-1.000	-1.175	-1.000	-1.000
Max.	1.975	1.175	1.000	-0.500	2.025
$P^*(-1)$	0.9459	0.9299	0.9710	1.0000	0.9760

available in R to describe the function ‘silentMtx’ which prints a signed matrix of unanimity indexes in the range $[-100, 100]$ for each pair of variables allowing for some variables to be treated as control. Let us use the sixth variable ‘wt’ or weight of the car as the control.

```
require(np);require(generalCorr);options(np.messages=FALSE)
silentMtx(mtcars[,1:4],ctrl=mtcars[,6]) #newer Cr1
silentMtx0(mtcars[,1:4],ctrl=mtcars[,6]) #older Cr1
```

The interpretation of signed unanimity indexes is self-explanatory in the following R output.

```
[1] "Negative index means the column named variable
kernel-causes row named"
[1] "Positive index means the row named variable
kernel-causes column named"
[1] "abs(index)=sign unanimity by weighted sum of
3 signs from Cr1 to Cr3"
#using silentMtx command for newer Cr1 version
      mpg      cyl      disp      hp
mpg  100.000  37.008 -31.496 -100.000
cyl  -37.008 100.000  37.008   18.110
disp  31.496 -37.008 100.000   37.008
hp    100.000 -18.110 -37.008  100.000

#using silentMtx0 command for older Cr1
mpg  100.000 -31.496 -31.496 -100.000
```

```

cyl   31.496 100.000 -31.496  -31.496
disp  31.496  31.496 100.000  -31.496
hp    100.000  31.496  31.496  100.000

```

For example, the negative elements $[1,4] = (-100, -100)$ in the upper and lower parts of the above output matrix suggest that the column 4 ‘horse power variable’ kernel causes the ‘miles per gallon’ or the row 1 variable, or: ‘hp’→‘mpg’. The absolute values of the unanimity index (=100) suggests that the path direction is unanimously supported by Cr1 to Cr3 under both definitions of Cr1.

The elements at the diagonally opposite locations $[4,1]$ in the output matrix have the opposite positive sign, meaning reverse causal path with the same meaning: Column 1 variable is kernel caused by the row 4 variable or ‘mpg’←‘hp’. Both paths are exactly the same even though the signs are opposite, as they should be. Of course, the signs and magnitudes of all pairs do not match for the two distinct definitions of Cr1.

If the argument matrix ‘mtx’ has p rows, ‘silentPairs’ provides a useful summary vector with $(p - 1)$ elements, focused on the first column paired with all other columns in the range $[-3.175, 3.175]$. By contrast, ‘silentMtx’ provides a useful summary matrix of all causal path pairs converted to the intuitive range $[-100, 100]$.

6.5 ‘parcorMany’ illustrated with ‘mtcars’ data

The R function `parcorMany` creates a matrix of generalized partial correlation coefficients between all pairs of variables after removing the effect of remaining variables and also after removing the effect of control variables if any, when the dependencies are computed from kernel regressions.

```
parcorMany(mtcars[,1:4], ctrl=mtcars[,6])
```

Since we have four basic variables and one control variable, we have `choose(4, 2)` or six pairs or three flipped pairs. In the following output column entitled `nami` and `namj` provide names of X_i and X_j while `partij` and `partji` provide the partial correlations. The column entitled ‘rijMrji’ reports the difference between their absolute values useful for our third criterion Cr3: $(\text{abs}(\text{partij}) - \text{abs}(\text{partji}))$.

```
> parcorMany(mtcars[,1:4],ctrl=mtcars[,6])
      nami    namj   partij   partji   rijMrji
[1,] "mpg"    "cyl"  "-0.0033" "-0.3428" "-0.3395"
[2,] "mpg"    "disp" "0.0634"  "0.0421"  "0.0213"
[3,] "mpg"    "hp"   "-0.0845" "-0.0883" "-0.0037"
```

This function is included at the request of a package user.

If the reader wishes to check additional bootstrap functions on automobile data, we provide the following code.

```
bb=bootPairs(mtx=mtcars[,1:4],ctrl=mtcars[,6],n999=999)
# Make n999=9 for quick check
bootQuantile(bb)
bootSummary(bb)
bootSign(bb)
bootQuantile(bb, per100=FALSE)
bootSummary(bb, per100=FALSE)
```

The output is mostly omitted for brevity. The option ‘per100=FALSE’ gives results for the ‘sum’ statistic in the range $[-3.175, 3.175]$ instead of ui . We include the short output for quantiles with $n999=9$ for illustration.

```
bootQuantile(bb)
      cyl      disp      hp
2.5% -37.00787  31.49606 -87.40157
97.5%  31.49606 100.00000  31.49606
```

7 Summary and Final Remarks

We show that Engle et al. (1983) or EHR’s “weak exogeneity” is not directly testable as it involves arbitrarily defined parameters of interest (ψ) and nuisance parameters (λ_2). Hausman-Wu indirect exogeneity tests use IV estimators which can “do more harm than good” (Bound et al., 1995, p. 449), and are criticized as being “very inefficient” by Kiviet and Niemczyk (2007), Dufour, and others. Medicine has long rejected medieval-style diagnoses of diseases by simply showing that a cure works. Hence there is a long-standing need for a practical exogeneity test which avoids IV. A joke in subsection

2.1.1 on IV is for comic relief, since there are many valid applications of IV in the literature.

The definition of statistical independence leads to our Lemmata for studying asymmetry of a flipped pair of variables in a model. Our Theorem helps define “Kernel exogeneity” of a variable when it has independently generated DGP with self-driven innovations. Modern computing tools allow us to use newly defined asymmetric generalized partial correlation coefficients from Vinod (2014) and stochastic dominance of four orders (SD1 to SD4) first suggested in Finance for comparing portfolios to quantify the asymmetry of flipped model variables (Y and X_i) using three criteria, Cr1 to Cr3. Their unanimity index ($ui \in [-100, 100]$) measures the preponderant sign to identify the Kernel exogenous variable and its strength. If, for example, X_i is Kernel exogenous, we say that the Kernel cause is X_i with the causal path: $X_i \rightarrow Y$.

Our decision rules based on ui are simulated in section 4 with high success rate. Our new bootstrap test for exogeneity in section 5 can do statistical inference for ui using about a thousand estimates. Descriptive statistics of these estimates, illustrated in Table 2, provide a view of the sampling distribution of ui to assess the preponderant sign and hence the causal direction, as well as, unanimity strength. We include tools for bootstrap confidence interval construction.

Our Kernel causality is not true philosophical causality and literature dealing with extractions of causal relations with careful studies of relations with and without certain conditions are outside the scope of this paper. If X_i is relatively more exogenous than Y , based on preponderance of evidence using ui , we have the Kernel causal path $X_i \rightarrow Y$. If the causal path is reversed or bidirectional, researchers may well need an extra equation in a simultaneous equations model.

We illustrate the new bootstrap exogeneity test and causal path determination with several examples. Illustrative data sets from various R packages studied here include Klein I simultaneous equations model, Ozone pollution, European crime and automobile design. Our Section 6.2 considers a novel macroeconomic model explaining the ‘excess bond premium’ (EBP) known to be a good predictor of US recessions. We study detailed relation between EBP and six variables including various criteria and graphics, providing software tools for implementation based on the R package ‘generalCorr.’ Our evidence in Table 3 suggests that US investors worried about an impending recession should pay attention to innovations in three key variables: credit

creation (CrCrea), credit destruction (CrDstr) and money stock (M2), which are found to be Kernel exogenous.

Clearly, practitioners can use our unanimity index implemented with very few lines of code. The ability to treat potentially confounding variables as control may be particularly valuable. There are several potential applications in all scientific areas including exploratory hypothesis formulation, Big Data and artificial intelligence. It is straightforward to extend and modify our tools, if indicated by future research, since they are open source.

References

- Anderson, G., 1996. Nonparametric tests of stochastic dominance in income distributions. *Econometrica* 64(5), 1183–1193.
- Bound, J., Jaeger, D. A., Baker, R., 1993. The Cure Can Be Worse than the Disease: A Cautionary Tale Regarding Instrumental Variables. NBER Working Paper No. 137.
URL <http://ssrn.com/paper=240089>
- Bound, J., Jaeger, D. A., Baker, R., 1995. Problems with instrumental variables estimation when the correlation between the instruments and the endogenous explanatory variables is weak. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90, 443–450.
- Carl, P., Peterson, B. G., 2010. PerformanceAnalytics: Econometric tools for performance and risk analysis.
URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=PerformanceAnalytics>
- Contessi, S., Francis, J., 2013. u.s. commercial bank lending through 2008:q4: new evidence from gross credit flows. *Economic Inquiry* 51(1), 428–444.
- Davidson, R., MacKinnon, J. G., 1993. *Estimation and Inference in Econometrics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Dawid, A. P., 1979. Conditional independence in statistical theory. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 41, 1–31.
- Engle, R. F., Hendry, D. F., Richard, J.-F., 1983. Exogeneity. *Econometrica* 51, 277–304.

- Gilchrist, S., Zakrajek, E., 2012. Credit spreads and business cycle fluctuations. *American Economic Review* 102(4), 1692–1720.
- Kendall, M., Stuart, A., 1977. *The Advanced Theory of Statistics*, 4th Edition. Vol. 1. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Kiviet, J. F., Niemczyk, J., 2007. The asymptotic and finite-sample distributions of OLS and simple IV in simultaneous equations. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 51, 3296–3318.
- Koopmans, T. C., 1950. When is an equation system complete for statistical purposes. Tech. rep., Yale University.
URL <http://cowles.econ.yale.edu/P/cm/m10/m10-17.pdf>
- Legal Information Institute, 2017. *Wex Legal Dictionary*. Cornell Law School, Ithaca, NY.
URL https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/preponderance_of_the_evidence
- Levy, H., 1992. Stochastic dominance and expected utility: Survey and analysis. *Management Science* 38(4), 555–593.
- Li, Q., Racine, J. S., 2007. *Nonparametric Econometrics*. Princeton University Press.
- Pearl, J., 2009. *Causality: Models, Reasoning and Inference*. New York: Wiley.
- Rao, C. R., 1973. *Linear Statistical Inference And Its Applications*, 2nd Edition. J. Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Vinod, H. D., 2004. Ranking mutual funds using unconventional utility theory and stochastic dominance. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 11(3), 353–377.
- Vinod, H. D., 2008. *Hands-on Intermediate Econometrics Using R: Templates for Extending Dozens of Practical Examples*. World Scientific, Hackensack, NJ, ISBN 10-981-281-885-5.
URL <http://www.worldscibooks.com/economics/6895.html>

- Vinod, H. D., 2014. Matrix algebra topics in statistics and economics using R. In: Rao, M. B., Rao, C. R. (Eds.), Handbook of Statistics: Computational Statistics with R. Vol. 34. North Holland, Elsevier Science, New York, Ch. 4, pp. 143–176.
- Vinod, H. D., 2015a. Generalized correlation and kernel causality with applications in development economics. Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation Accepted Nov. 10, 2015.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2015.1122048>
- Vinod, H. D., 2015b. New bootstrap inference for spurious regression problems. Journal of Applied Statistics.
URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02664763.2015.1049939>
- Vinod, H. D., López-de-Lacalle, J., 2009. Maximum entropy bootstrap for time series: The meboot R package. Journal of Statistical Software 29 (5), 1–19.
URL <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v29/i05/>
- Wu, D.-M., 1973. Alternative tests of independence between stochastic regressors and disturbances. Econometrica 77(5), 733–750.
- Yalta, A. T., 2016. Bootstrap inference of level relationships in the presence of serially correlated errors: A large scale simulation study and an application in energy demand. Computational Economics 48, 339–366.
- Zheng, S., Shi, N.-Z., Zhang, Z., 2012. Generalized measures of correlation for asymmetry, nonlinearity, and beyond. Journal of the American Statistical Association 107, 1239–1252.