

### A two factor model to combine US inflation forecasts

Senra, Eva; Poncela, Pilar

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

[www.peerproject.eu](http://www.peerproject.eu)

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Senra, E., & Poncela, P. (2006). A two factor model to combine US inflation forecasts. *Applied Economics*, 38(18), 2191-2197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840500427296>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

**gesis**  
Leibniz-Institut  
für Sozialwissenschaften

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der  
  
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



### A Two Factor Model to Combine US Inflation Forecasts

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-04-0200.R2
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-May-2005
JEL Code:	C53 - Forecasting and Other Model Applications < C5 - Econometric Modeling < C - Mathematical and Quantitative Methods, E31 - Price Level Inflation Deflation < E3 - Prices, Business Fluctuations, and Cycles < E - Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics, E37 - Forecasting and Simulation < E3 - Prices, Business Fluctuations, and Cycles < E - Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics
Keywords:	inflation variability, factor models, combination of forecasts

powered by ScholarOne  
Manuscript Central™

# A Two Factor Model to Combine US Inflation Forecasts

May 17, 2005

## Abstract

The combination of individual forecasts is often a useful tool to improve forecast accuracy. The most commonly used technique for forecast combination is the mean, and it has frequently proved hard to surpass. This paper considers factor analysis to combine US inflation forecasts showing that just one factor is not enough to beat the mean and that the second one is necessary. The first factor is usually a weighted mean of the variables and it can be interpreted as a consensus forecast, while the second factor generally provides the differences among the variables and, since our observations are forecasts, it may be related with the dispersion in forecasting expectations and, in a sense, with its uncertainty. Within this approach, the paper also revisits Friedman's hypothesis relating the level of inflation with expectations uncertainty at the beginning of the 21st century.

# 1 Introduction

It may be common to have several sources of information that can be used to build different forecasts for the same economic indicator. The combination of such forecasts might be a useful tool to improve forecast accuracy. This paper considers the combination of individual forecasts for US inflation from the Survey of Professional Forecasters, provided since 1990 by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

The combination of individual forecasts is known to improve forecast accuracy since the work of Bates and Granger (1969) and Newbold and Granger (1974), among others. Recent surveys on this topic can be found, for instance, in Clemen (1989), Diebold and Lopez (1996) and Newbold and Harvey (2002). There are a large number of alternatives to combine forecasts. The most commonly used is the equal weights for all the panelists (mean), that has been proved hard to beat by most sophisticated alternatives, like basing the weighting mechanism in the variance-covariance matrix of the forecast errors or ridge regressions, among others, (see, for instance, Stock and Watson, 2004).

One of the most frequently tools used to achieve dimensionality reduction is Factor Analysis. In the context of time series analysis, some references related to this topic are, for instance, Anderson (1963), Priestley *et al.* (1974), Box and Tiao (1977), Geweke and Singleton (1981), Brillinger (1981), Velu *et al.* (1986), Peña and Box (1987), Stock and Watson (2002a), Tiao and Tsay (1989), Reinsel (1993) and Ahn (1997), among others. Some applications using price data are Stock and Watson (1999) and Nath (2004).

As the combination of forecasts can be seen as a dimension reduction problem (from  $I$  panelists forecasts to just a single forecast), we consider the use of factor analysis as a tool to extract the common information to produce a consensus forecast and to reveal the degree of disagreement

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 amongst the different forecasters. The one factor model has previously been used in forecast  
9 combination by Figlewski (1983) and Figlewski and Urich (1983), who focused on forecast errors,  
10 and by Chan et al. (1999) who used an approximated factor model for the forecasts from different  
11 time series approaches. In this paper we compare the forecast accuracy of one and two factor  
12 models to combine forecasts of US inflation. Our endogenous variables in the factor model will be  
13 the predictions provided by different panelists. The first factor is usually a weighted mean of the  
14 observations (in this case, the individual forecasts), so with this factor we expect similar results  
15 to the equal weights approach. The second factor generally provides the differences among the  
16 variables and, since our observations are forecasts, our conjecture is that it may be related with  
17 the dispersion in forecasting expectations. We will analyze the potential usefulness of the second  
18 factor as a proxy of uncertainty in inflation, and check its relationship with the level of inflation  
19 and its ability to improve forecasting performance. In this sense, we would revisit Friedman's  
20 (1977) hypothesis.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we describe the data. In section 3 we present  
35 the factor model and the forecasting combination rule. In section 4 we report the estimation and  
36 initial forecasting results of the one and two factor models. In section 5 we explore the capabilities  
37 of the second factor as a measure of uncertainty and check its forecasting performance with the  
38 previous models. Finally, in section 6 we conclude.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 **2 The data**

48  
49  
50 This paper considers the individual forecasts for US inflation from the Survey of Professional  
51 Forecasters, provided since 1990 by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. This Survey gives  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 regular inflation forecasts from private sector economists (Wall Street financial firms, banks,  
9 economic consulting and other private firms). It is distributed free of charge and its forecasts are  
10 widely watched as they are reported in major newspapers like the Wall Street Journal and on  
11 financial newswires. The forecasts are anonymous and do not reflect the ideas of the institutions  
12 they belong to. It is conducted quarterly and, at each moment in time, it provides the last  
13 observed value and forecasts for one to five quarters ahead of the annualized growth rate, that  
14 allows us to have real one period ahead forecasts. Other surveys like the Livingston Survey, the  
15 Blue Chip Economic Indicators, the National Association of Business Economists (NABE) or  
16 the Consensus Forecast do not fill our requirements because of their periodicity or because they  
17 provide the forecasts for the mean of the year and, in that case, the forecasts are updated for the  
18 same time period but with different information sets.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 The Survey of Professional Forecasters was thoroughly analyzed by Zarnowitz and Braun  
31 (1993) who found that the forecast combination of many of these individuals provided a consensus  
32 forecast with lower average errors than most individual forecasts. Also, the survey performed  
33 favorably in forecast accuracy in comparison with a variety of econometric and time series models.  
34 For instance, Batchelor and Dua (1996) analyses a variety of proxies for inflation uncertainty  
35 based on survey and time-series approaches and they find that survey-based proxies for inflation  
36 seem less misleading than the time series proxies. Dutt and Ghosh (2000) have also assessed the  
37 rationality of inflation expectations from this survey, though in a weak form. Engsted (1991)  
38 and Berk (1999) have found the same conclusion using data from surveys in the UK and the  
39 Netherlands, respectively. Most recently, Baghestani (2005) has found that the multiperiod  
40 forecasts of the corporate bond yield spread from the Survey of Professional Forecasters are  
41 generally unbiased and consistently outperform the comparable ARIMA forecasts.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3 The model

Let  $y_{t+1|i,t}$  be the one period ahead forecast, with information up to time  $t$ , given by individual forecaster  $i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ . Let  $\mathbf{y}_{t+1|t} = (y_{t+1|t,1}, \dots, y_{t+1|t,I})'$  be an  $I$ -dimensional vector of inflation forecasts. We use a factor model to separate the common information contained across the  $I$  forecasts, from the specific one to each forecaster. Consider the  $r$ -dimensional vector of common factors  $\mathbf{m}_t = (m_{t,1}, \dots, m_{t,r})'$ ,  $r < I$ . Then, it can be assumed that the forecasts can be generated by a linear combination of the common information plus the specific components or error terms, such that

$$\mathbf{y}_{t+1|t} = \Lambda \mathbf{m}_t + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is an  $I \times r$  factor loading matrix, and  $\mathbf{e}_t = (e_{t,1}, \dots, e_{t,I})'$  is the vector of **specific errors**. Therefore, all the common correlated information comes through the common factors,  $\mathbf{m}_t$ , and the vector  $\mathbf{e}_t$  contains information specific to each time series forecast. The error terms are assumed to have a diagonal variance-covariance matrix, since if there were any information correlated among two terms in  $\mathbf{e}_t$ , it should be captured by the term  $\Lambda \mathbf{m}_t$ . We assume, furthermore, that  $\text{cov}(\mathbf{m}_t, \mathbf{e}_t) = 0$ . As it is explained in Chan et al. (1999), this assumption is not restrictive if joint normality is assumed.

We will follow Forni et al. (2000) and Stock and Watson (2002a) who use the principal components to consistently estimate the dynamic factors. In this case, the factor models are known as *approximate factor models* and the procedure consists in estimating the  $r$  common factors through the first  $r$  principal components of the variance-covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{y}_{t+1|t}$ . Approximate factor models have been proven useful in forecasting macroeconomic variables (see Stock and Watson, 2002b and Favero et al., 2004).

Let  $\mathbf{v}_i$  be the eigenvector associated to the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of the variance-covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{y}_{t+1|t}$ . Then, the  $i$ -th principal component (which is a consistent estimate of the  $i$ -th common factor) is estimated as  $\hat{m}_{it} = \mathbf{v}'_i \mathbf{y}_{t+1|t}$ . Let  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_t = (\hat{m}_{1t}, \dots, \hat{m}_{rt})'$  be the first estimated  $r$  principal components.

The factor combining rule to produce a single one step ahead forecast  $\hat{y}_{t+1|t}^*$  from all the sources of information is given by

$$\hat{y}_{t+1|t}^* = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 \hat{m}_{1t} + \dots + \hat{\beta}_r \hat{m}_{rt}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{\beta} = (\hat{\beta}_0, \dots, \hat{\beta}_r)'$  is the ordinary least squares estimate from the regression

$$\pi_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{m}_{1t-1} + \dots + \beta_r \hat{m}_{rt-1} + error_t,$$

with  $\pi_t$  the observed inflation at time  $t$ . Notice that  $\hat{y}_{t+1|t}^*$  are true ex-ante forecasts since the coefficients  $\beta_i$  are estimated only with information up to time  $t$  and do not include any information of the forecasting sample.

## 4 Estimation and initial forecasting results

We consider one period ahead forecasts from the first quarter of 1991 until the last quarter of 2002. The initial number of panelists was approximately 30 but it had to be reduced to 14 as we had to choose those individuals who systematically collaborate, that is, they have been in the panel for a minimum of seven years and did not miss more than four consecutive forecasts. This might introduce some selection bias, but it is done in this way in order to treat the missing data and obtain a balanced panel of forecasts. This has been done previously in the literature since it avoids biases due to changes in panel composition. See, for instance, Batchelor and Dua (1996),



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 who restrict their analysis to the 21, from 60 original respondents, forecasters who contributed  
9 consistently over the sample period they analysed.  
10

11 As regards missing data, in this setup, they are one step ahead inflation forecasts that were  
12 not given by some individuals in a particular period of time. As every individual provides one  
13 to four periods ahead forecasts, we can substitute the missing data by the forecast that the  
14 same individual provided for that period in the previous quarter, that is, the two period ahead  
15 forecast. If this datum were also unavailable, we would consider the three period ahead forecast  
16 and so forth. This is the reason why we can only consider panelists that do not miss more than  
17 four consecutive forecasts. This procedure is intended to preserve the special features of each  
18 forecaster. As an alternative to this option we could take the average of the remaining forecasts at  
19 that point of time. But this would annihilate the panelists own characteristics and would provide  
20 a downwards bias in the estimation of the forecast dispersion. With these considerations in mind,  
21 the final sample considered goes from 1991-III to 2002-IV and for this period both inflation and  
22 one period ahead inflation forecasts might be considered as stationary.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The model is estimated with one and two common factors. It is common practice in the  
37 literature to take as benchmark, for comparison purposes, the average of forecasts (see, for  
38 instance, Batchelor, 2001) and this is the approach we have taken. Our benchmark forecast  
39 will be the average forecast of the 14 panelists. Therefore, the procedure to analyze the different  
40 forecast combinations is as follows:  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 1. We use the data, 1991-III to 1999-IV to fit one and two factor models, as well as the  
47 benchmark forecast.  
48

49 2. Then, the fitted models will be used to generate one-step-ahead forecasts for the years in  
50 our forecasting sample, 2000-I to 2002-IV. In order to obtain one step-ahead forecasts, *models will*  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 *be reestimated* adding one data point at the time, using all previous data prior to each forecast  
9  
10 period.

11  
12 3. Forecast errors will be computed for each forecast period. The root mean squared errors  
13 (RMSEs) by model will be computed to verify the forecasting performance of alternative forecast  
14 combinations.  
15

16  
17  
18 Trying to verify the robustness of our forecasting exercise, a similar procedure is also repeated  
19 later, for different estimation and forecasting samples.  
20

21  
22 To illustrate the estimation results, figure 1 shows the factor loadings for the 1st and 2nd  
23 common factors using the whole sample. It can be seen that the first factor is a weighted mean  
24 of the observations. The interpretation of the second factor is as follows: in figure 1 it is shown  
25 that the second eigenvector gives positive weights to some individuals and negative to others, so  
26 this second factor opposes the expectations in forecasting inflation of the different panelists. As  
27 our observations as forecasts, a measure of the magnitude of this second factor might be related  
28 to the expectations uncertainty on the future of inflation.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 To decide on the number of common factors we follow Stock and Watson (2002b) who con-  
38 sidered factor models until they account for more than 50% of the total variance. In our case,  
39 the first factor accounts for 45% of the variance and the second one adds 13%, so with these two  
40 common factors together more than 50% of the total variance is explained.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 *Figure 1 goes around here.*  
46

47 Table 1 compares the forecasting results in terms of the ratio of the RMSE of the different  
48 factor models over the RMSE of the average forecast (benchmark forecast) for different samples.  
49 So, a ratio less than one means that the factor model improves the benchmark forecast. The  
50 first and second columns show the estimation and forecasting samples while the third and fourth  
51  
52  
53  
54

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 show the RMSE ratios of the 1 and 2 common factors forecast combination methods respectively.

9  
10 The fifth column will be analyzed in the next section.

11  
12 *Table 1 should be around here*

13  
14 These results point out that just one factor is not enough to beat the mean, and that the  
15 second factor seems necessary to improve forecast accuracy. Nevertheless, in the next section we  
16 will explore in more detail the potential contribution of the second factor.  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **5 Uncertainty in inflation expectations**

22  
23 Friedman (1977) remarks the importance of uncertainty in inflation expectations, suggesting a  
24 positive correlation between the level of inflation and inflation uncertainty. Since then, many  
25 articles have attempted to measure inflation uncertainty. Engle (1983), Capporale and McK-  
26 iernan (1997), Belton et al. (2002), or more recently Kontonikas (2004) employ ARCH and  
27 GARCH techniques to estimate this uncertainty with mixed results. Bomberger and Frazer  
28 (1981), Bomberger (1996) and Shoesmith (2000) interpret inflation uncertainty in terms of the  
29 intramarket price variability and Cukierman and Wachtel (1979) and Zarnowitz and Lambros  
30 (1987) take the variance of inflationary expectations from survey data as a proxy for the variance  
31 of the inflationary process. We proceed as in Cukierman and Wachtel (1979) and Zarnowitz and  
32 Lambros (1987) relating the dispersion in the survey data with uncertainty in inflation in the  
33 context of our two factors model.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We have seen that the first factor is a weighted mean of the forecasts. The contemporaneous  
49 correlation between the first factor and the mean of the forecasts is 0.96. Given such a high  
50 correlation between the first factor and the mean it explains why there should not be much  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

gain in using just one factor models. The second factor opposes the expectations in forecasting inflation of different panelists, so a measure of the magnitude of this second factor might be related to the uncertainty in forecasting. The contemporaneous correlation between the squared second factor and the variance of the inflationary expectations forecasts is 0.71 which gives an idea of the strong relationship between both measures; and it is a little smaller between the absolute value of the second factor and the standard deviation of the inflationary expectations.

During most of the nineties, US inflation rates have become lower and less variable, but relevant events have occurred in our forecasting sample (years 2000, 2001 and 2002) that could have introduced a higher level of uncertainty in inflation expectations. We propose to test Friedman's hypothesis introducing the absolute value of the second common factor as an additional regressor to explain the level of inflation

$$\pi_{t+1} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{m}_{1t} + \beta_2 \hat{m}_{2t} + \beta_3 |\hat{m}_{2t}| + error_{t+1}. \quad (3)$$

We expect  $\beta_3$  to be positive if the level of inflation is positively correlated with the level of uncertainty.

The fifth column of table 1 shows the ratios of the RMSE of the factor model accounting for uncertainty over the RMSE of the benchmark forecast. The big improvement -the ratio is 0.54- obtained in the last part of the sample might be seen in the context of greater uncertainty of the economy during the period analyzed.

For a better understanding of this improvement in forecasting, we present the estimation results by OLS of the model with the whole sample

$$\hat{\pi}_{t+1} = \underset{(14.18)}{2.32} + \underset{(5.56)}{0.36} \hat{m}_{1t} - \underset{(2.11)}{0.25} \hat{m}_{2t} + \underset{(1.66)}{0.30} |\hat{m}_{2t}|$$

where t-values are given in parenthesis. The highest correlation coefficient between the estimated

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 parameters is negligible (less than 0.1), so  $|\widehat{m}_{2t}|$  adds valuable additional orthogonal information  
9  
10 when trying to explain inflation. The positive value of the coefficient related to  $|m_{2t}|$  might be  
11  
12 interpreted in the sense of Friedman's hypothesis meaning the relationship between uncertainty  
13  
14 and higher inflation rates. The coefficient for  $|m_{2t}|$  is not highly significant, the reduction of  
15  
16 the estimated residual standard error goes from 0.754 to 0.738, and the  $R^2$  increases only from  
17  
18 43% to 47% after its inclusion. However, this might be due to the characteristics of the sample  
19  
20 period analyzed where inflation during the nineties has been most of the time under control,  
21  
22 except perhaps for the last two years, where the forecasting improvement is clear as we have seen  
23  
24 previously.  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **6 Concluding Remarks**

29  
30  
31 Factor analysis seems a reasonable alternative to combine US inflation forecasts, but as it has  
32  
33 been seen just one factor may not be enough to beat the forecasts average. A second factor  
34  
35 seems necessary to improve forecast accuracy, measured in terms of the RMSE. This second  
36  
37 factor is interpreted as a measure of dispersion in inflationary expectations since it gives positive  
38  
39 weights to some panelists and negative to others, pointing out the differences amongst them. The  
40  
41 magnitude of this dispersion, measured as the absolute value of the second factor is also helpful  
42  
43 when forecasting the level of inflation.  
44  
45

46 Inflation during the nineties became lower and more stable with the absence of economic  
47  
48 recessions (except for the one in 1991), but the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century was shocked by  
49  
50 relevant social events, like September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks, that introduced higher levels of  
51  
52 uncertainty in the whole economy and, therefore, in US inflation. In this sense, we revisited  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Friedman's hypothesis to check if the uncertainty in inflation expectations is nowadays still  
9  
10 related to the level of inflation. We have found that including a measure of uncertainty resulted  
11  
12 in more accurate forecasts.  
13

14 Further work should include the extension of our results to forecast other macroeconomic  
15  
16 aggregates and check whether factor analysis still appears as a reasonable alternative to combine  
17  
18 expectations. Also, it would be desirable to analyse deeper the interpretation of the two first  
19  
20 common factors, both, from a theoretical and an empirical points of view.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 7 References

- Ahn, S.K. (1997) Inference of vector autoregressive models with cointegration and scalar components, *J. Am. Statist. Ass.*, 437, 350-356.
- Anderson, T.W. (1963) The use of factor analysis in the statistical analysis of multiple time series, *Psychometrika*, 28, 1-25.
- Baghestani, H. (2005) On the rationality of professional forecasts of corporate bond yield spreads, *Applied Economics Letters*, 4, 213-216.
- Bates, J.M. and C.W.J. Granger (1969) The combination of forecasts, *Operations Research Quarterly*, 20, 451-468.
- Batchelor, R. (2001) How useful are the forecasts of intergovernmental agencies? The IMF and OECD versus the consensus, *Applied Economics*, 33, 225-335.
- Batchelor, R. and P. Dua (1996) Empirical measures of inflation uncertainty: a cautionary note, *Applied Economics*, 28, 333-341.
- Benton, W.J.Jr, R. J. Cebula and U. Nair-Reichert (2002) Money and the dispersion of relative prices revisited, *Applied Economics*, 34, 1765-1773.
- Berk, J.M. (1999) Measuring inflation expectations: a survey data approach, *Applied Economics*, 31, 1467-1480.
- Bomberger, W.A. (1996) Disagreement as a Measure of Uncertainty, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 28, 381-392.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Bomberger, W.A. and W.J. Frazer Jr. (1981) Interest Rates, Uncertainty and the Livingston  
9  
10 Data, *The Journal of Finance*, XXXVI, 661-675.  
11  
12  
13 Box, G., Tiao, G. (1977) A canonical analysis of multiple time series, *Biometrika*, 64, 355-65.  
14  
15  
16 Brillinger, D.R. (1981) *Time series Data Analysis and Theory*, expanded edition. Holden-Day,  
17  
18 San Francisco.  
19  
20 Caporale, T. and B. McKiernan (1997) High and variable inflation: Further evidence on the  
21  
22 Friedman Hypothesis, *Economics Letters*, 54, 65-68.  
23  
24  
25 Chan, Y.L., J. Stock, and M. Watson (1999) A dynamic factor model framework for forecast  
26  
27 combination, *Spanish Economic Review*, 1, 91-121.  
28  
29  
30 Clemen, R.T. (1989) Combining forecasts: A review and annotated bibliography, *International*  
31  
32 *Journal of Forecasting*, 5, 559-583.  
33  
34  
35 Cukierman, A. and P. Wachtel (1979) Differential Inflationary Expectations and the Variability  
36  
37 of the Rate of Inflation: Theory and Evidence, *The American Economic Review*, 69, 595-  
38  
39 609.  
40  
41  
42 Diebold, F.X. and J.A. López (1996) Forecast Evaluation and Combination, *Handbook of Statis-*  
43  
44 *tics*, vol. 14, 241-268 (North-Holland, Amsterdam).  
45  
46  
47 Dutt, S.D. and D. Ghosh (2000) Inflation expectations: are they rational? An empirical exam-  
48  
49 ination, *Applied Economic Letters*, 7, 103-106.  
50  
51  
52 Engle, R.F. (1983) Estimates of the variance of US inflation based upon the ARCH model,  
53  
54 *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 15, 286-301.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Engsted, T. (1991) A note on the rationality of survey inflation expectations in the United  
9  
10 Kingdom, *Applied Economics*, 23, 1269-1276.  
11  
12 Favero, C., Marcellino, M, and Neglia, F. (2004) Principal components at work: the empir-  
13 ical analysis of monetary policy with large data sets, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*,  
14  
15 forthcoming.  
16  
17 Figlewski, S. (1983) Optimal Price Forecasting Using Survey Data, *The Review of Economics*  
18  
19 *and Statistics*, 65, 13-21.  
20  
21 Figlewski, S. and T. Urich (1983) Optimal Aggregation of Money Supply Forecasts: Accuracy,  
22  
23 Profitability and Market Efficiency, *The Journal of Finance*, 28, 695-710.  
24  
25 Forni, M., M. Hallin, M. Lippi and L. Reichlin (2000) The generalized factor model: Identifica-  
26  
27 tion and estimation, *Review of Economic and Statistics*, 82, 540-554.  
28  
29 Friedman, M. (1977) Inflation and Unemployment, *Journal of Political Economy*, 85, 451-472.  
30  
31 Geweke, J.F., Singleton K.J. (1981) Maximum Likelihood Confirmatory Analysis of Economic  
32  
33 Time Series, *International Economic Review*, 22, 37-54.  
34  
35 Kontonikas, A. (2004) Inflation and inflation uncertainty in the United Kingdom, evidence from  
36  
37 GARCH modelling, *Economic Modelling*, 21, 525-543.  
38  
39 Nath, H.K. (2004) Relative importance of sectoral and aggregate sources of price changes, *Ap-  
40  
41 plied Economics*, 36, 1781-1796.  
42  
43 Newbold, P. and C.W.J. Granger (1974) Experience with forecasting univariate time series and  
44  
45 the combination of forecasts, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 137, 131-146.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Newbold, P. and D.I. Harvey (2002) Forecasting combination and encompassing in *A companion*  
9  
10 *to economic forecasting* (Eds.) M. Clements and D. Hendry, Blackwells, Oxford, pp. 268-  
11  
12 283.
- 13  
14  
15 Peña, D., Box, G. (1987). Identifying a simplifying structure in time series, *J. Am. Statist.*  
16  
17 *Ass.*, 82, 836-43.
- 18  
19  
20 Priestley, M.B., Rao, T.S., Tong, J. (1974) Applications of principal component analysis and  
21  
22 factor analysis in the identification of multivariable systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*,  
23  
24 19, 703-4.
- 25  
26  
27 Reinsel, G.C. (1993) *Elements of Multivariate Time Series Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New  
28  
29 York.
- 30  
31  
32 Shoemith, G.L. (2000) A further interpretation of Friedman's hypothesis: the cointegration of  
33  
34 component CPI indexes, *Economics Letters*, 67, 49-52.
- 35  
36  
37 Stock, J.H., M. Watson (1999) Forecasting inflation, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 44, 293-  
38  
39 335.
- 40  
41  
42 Stock, J.H., M. Watson (2002a) Forecasting using principal components from a large number of  
43  
44 predictors, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97, 1167-1179.
- 45  
46  
47 Stock, J.H., M. Watson (2002b) Macroeconomic Forecasting Using Diffusion Indexes, *Journal*  
48  
49 *of Business & Economic Statistics*, 20, 147-163
- 50  
51  
52 Stock, J.H., M. Watson (2004) Combination forecasts of output growth in a seven-country data  
53  
54 set, *Journal of Forecasting*, 23, 405-430.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Tiao, G.C., Tsay, R.S. (1989) Model specification in multivariate time series, *J. R. Statist. Soc.*  
9  
10 *B*, 51, 157-213.
- 11  
12 Velu, R.P., Reinsel, G.C., Wichern, D.W. (1986) Reduced rank models for multiple time series,  
13  
14 *Biometrika*, 73, 105-18.
- 15  
16  
17 Zarnowitz, V. and P. Braun (1993) Twenty-two years of the NBER-ASA quarterly economic  
18  
19 Outlook Survey: Aspects and Comparisons of Forecasting Performance, in *Business Cycles,*  
20  
21 *Indicators and Forecasting* (Eds.) J. Stock and M. Watson, The University of Chicago Press,  
22  
23 Chicago, pp. 11-93.
- 24  
25  
26 Zarnowitz, V. And L.A. Lambros (1987) Consensus and Uncertainty in Economic Prediction,  
27  
28 *Journal of Political Economy*, 95, 3, 591-621.
- 29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 8 Table

Table 1

Ratios of the RMSE of the different factor models over the RMSE of the average forecast (benchmark forecast).

Initial Estimation Sample	Forecasting Sample	1 Factor	2 Factor	2 Factor + Uncert.
1991-III to 1999-IV	2000-I to 2002-IV	1.00	1.00	0.99
1991-III to 2000-IV	2001-I to 2002-IV	0.96	0.94	0.92
1991-III to 2001-IV	2002-I to 2002-IV	1.28	0.89	0.54

## 9 Figures




Figure 1: Factor loadings for the 1st and 2nd common factors (left and right panels respectively).