

KIER DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

KYOTO INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

Discussion Paper No.720

“How Accurate are Government Forecasts of Economic Fundamentals?
The Case of Taiwan”

Michael McAleer

August 2010



KYOTO UNIVERSITY
KYOTO, JAPAN

How Accurate are Government Forecasts of Economic Fundamentals? The Case of Taiwan*

Chia-Lin Chang

Department of Applied Economics
National Chung Hsing University
Taichung, Taiwan

Philip Hans Franses

Econometric Institute
Erasmus School of Economics
Erasmus University Rotterdam

Michael McAleer

Econometric Institute
Erasmus School of Economics
Erasmus University Rotterdam
and
Tinbergen Institute
The Netherlands
and
Institute of Economic Research
Kyoto University
Japan

Revised: August 2010

* The authors wish to thank the Editor (Michael Clements), an Associate Editor and two reviewers for very helpful comments and suggestions. The first author is most grateful for the financial support of the National Science Council, Taiwan, and the third author acknowledges the Australian Research Council, National Science Council, Taiwan, and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Abstract

A government's ability to forecast key economic fundamentals accurately can affect business confidence, consumer sentiment, and foreign direct investment, among others. A government forecast based on an econometric model is replicable, whereas one that is not fully based on an econometric model is non-replicable. Governments typically provide non-replicable forecasts (or, expert forecasts) of economic fundamentals, such as the inflation rate and real GDP growth rate. In this paper, we develop a methodology to evaluate non-replicable forecasts. We argue that in order to do so, one needs to retrieve from the non-replicable forecast its replicable component, and that it is the difference in accuracy between these two that matters. An empirical example to forecast economic fundamentals for Taiwan shows the relevance of the proposed methodological approach. Our main finding is that it is the undocumented knowledge of the Taiwanese government that reduces forecast errors substantially.

Keywords: Government forecasts, generated regressors, replicable government forecasts, non-replicable government forecasts, initial forecasts, revised forecasts.

JEL classifications: C53, C22, E27, E37.

1. Introduction

Governments typically provide forecasts of economic fundamentals, such as the inflation rate and real GDP growth rate. A government's ability to provide initial and updated forecasts of key economic fundamentals accurately can affect, for example, business confidence, consumer sentiment, and foreign direct investment.

Econometric models are frequently used to provide forecasts in economics and business. Such model-based forecasts can be adjusted by governments for a variety of reasons. A government forecast that is based on an econometric model is replicable, whereas a government forecast that is not based on an econometric model is non-replicable. Governments can, and do, provide both replicable and non-replicable forecasts. In virtually all cases, information on how a model-based forecast is translated into a non-replicable forecast is not recorded (see, for example, Goodwin (2000), Franses (2008)).

The evaluation of model-based, or replicable, forecasts has drawn much attention in the applied econometrics and forecasting literature. When forecasts from two econometric models are compared, many studies rely on criteria like the Diebold- Mariano (1995) test to examine whether one model provides significantly better forecasts than the other. Their original study is based on squared prediction errors, but extensions to absolute or percentage errors are also feasible. More recently, a literature has evolved around the notion that the two models should be treated equally. For example, comparing a time series model forecast with that of a random walk should address that there are no parameters to estimate in the latter case (see, for example, Clark and McCracken (2001) and Clark and West (2007)). At present, there is not a significant literature that examines the situation considered in this paper, namely the evaluation of forecasts which are partly based on an econometric model and partly on judgment. As judgment is typically not based on an observable loss function, appropriate criteria for its evaluation are not easy to establish. Furthermore, it is rarely known which part of the final forecast is based on a model and which part on judgment. There is a large literature on evaluating the merits of manually adjusting model forecasts, but a proper evaluation is in its infancy. Recent studies in Fildes et al. (2009) and Franses and Legerstee (2009, 2010) seem to propose potentially useful avenues, but further work needs to be done. The present study should be seen in the light of this quest for proper methods to evaluate forecasts of national accounts figures, which are usually, and almost everywhere, a combination of model output and human intervention.

In this paper, we develop an econometric model to generate replicable government forecasts (called expertise), compare replicable and non-replicable government forecasts using efficient estimation methods, and present a direct test of expertise that is contained in government forecasts. The key motivation to do this is because it allows us to properly evaluate government forecasts. Indeed, before evaluating non-replicable forecasts, one needs to construct the replicable part. An empirical example to forecast economic fundamentals for Taiwan shows the relevance of the methodological approach proposed in the paper. We have chosen Taiwan for three reasons. First, we could obtain rather long time series for the purpose at hand to show that our methodology works well in practice. Second, the Taiwan data have not previously been analyzed as such in any other study, although two studies exist which apply Markov switching models to describe the business cycle in Taiwan, see Chen and Lin (2000) and Huang (1999). Third, we expect it to be likely that in Taiwan model forecasts experience a judgmental touch. To our knowledge, there has not been a study that seeks to estimate and compare replicable and non-replicable forecasts using a variety of updated forecasts, as is done in the paper.

Our empirical analysis shows that replicable and non-replicable government forecasts can lead to markedly different results. Alternative estimation and inferential methods can lead to significantly different outcomes. Initial and revised government forecasts of economic fundamentals can also differ substantially. Taken together this shows that alternative models and methods can, and do, lead to distinct differences in the evaluation of the accuracy of government forecasts.

The plan of the remainder of the paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the econometric model specification, analyses replicable and non-replicable government forecasts, presents the measurement error problem in obtaining initial and revised government forecasts, considers optimal forecasts and efficient estimation methods, and presents a direct test of expertise contained in government forecasts. The data analysis and a relevant empirical example are discussed in Section 3. Some concluding comments are given in Section 4.

2. Model Specification

In this section we present an econometric model for government forecasts. This will enable the generation of replicable government forecasts from non-replicable government forecasts, and permit a comparison to be made with non-replicable government forecasts.

Let an econometric model of the government for initial and revised forecasts for the variable of interest, y , be given as

$$y = Z\gamma + \beta_i X_i^* + u, \quad u \sim (0, \sigma_u^2 I), \quad (1)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, m$, where $m-1$ is the range of updated forecasts. y is a $T \times 1$ vector of observations to be explained (typically, an economic fundamental, such as the inflation rate or the rate of growth of real GDP), Z is a $T \times g$ matrix of T observations on g variables that are publicly available, and X_i^* is the latent (unobserved) expertise of government forecast i . It is also assumed that $E(Zu) = 0$ and $E(X_i^*u) = 0$. The assumptions on the error term in (1) can be relaxed easily.

If X_i^* were to comprise observable data, ordinary least squares [OLS] for (1) would be consistent and efficient, and hence optimal in estimation. Under the assumption of correct specification and a mean squared error (MSE) loss function, the optimal forecast of y , given the information set, is its conditional expectation (see Patton and Timmermann (2007a, 2007b)).

Let the $T \times 1$ vector, X_i , represent the observable (that is, announced) government forecast i , which can partly or fully be based on an econometric model, which is unknown. The relationship between this non-replicable government forecast, X_i , and the expertise contained in government forecast i , is assumed to be given by

$$X_i = X_i^* + \eta_i, \quad \eta_i \sim (0, \sigma_i^2 I) \quad (2)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, m$, and η_i is a $T \times 1$ vector, and it denotes the measurement error in government forecast i . It is assumed that X_i^* and η_i are uncorrelated for all i .

The observed non-replicable government forecast is assumed to be modelled as

$$X_i = W_i \delta_i + \eta_i, \quad \eta_i \sim (0, \sigma_i^2 I) \quad (3)$$

where the $T \times k_i$ matrix W_i is the information set available in obtaining the non-replicable government forecast i at time $t-1$. It is assumed that $E(W_i \eta_i) = 0$ for all i , δ_i is a $k_i \times 1$ vector of unknown parameters, and

$$W_i \subset I_{-1}^i \quad (4)$$

$i = 1, \dots, m$, I_{-1}^i is the information set for the non-replicable government forecast i at time $t-1$. As Z in (1) is common knowledge, it follows from (4) that

$$\{Z, W_i\} \subset I_{-1}^i,$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. The information set I_{-1}^i is used to obtain optimal forecasts of y under a MSE loss function. It should be emphasized that an econometric model enables optimal forecasts to be generated, and hence the absence of an econometric model means that optimal forecasts under a MSE loss function can not be obtained.

It follows from (3) that

$$E(X_i | I_{-1}^i) \equiv X_i^* = W_i \delta_i, \quad (5)$$

where $W_i \delta_i$ denotes the observable expertise of the non-replicable government forecast i . The rational expectation in (5) is a replicable government forecast, and its estimate is given as

$$\hat{X}_i^* = \hat{X}_i = W_i \hat{\delta}_i = W_i (W_i' W_i)^{-1} W_i' X_i = P_i X_i \quad (6)$$

where P_i is the standard ‘hat’ matrix. Equation (6) shows that the latent government expertise for forecast i , X_i^* , can be obtained as an estimate of the observable non-replicable government forecast, $\hat{X}_i$. It is well known that the use of rational expectations reduces the number of unknowns in (5) from T to k_i , where $k_i \ll T$ for all i .

Replacing the unobservable X_i^* in (1) with the observable $\hat{X}_i$ gives

$$y = Z\gamma + \beta_i \hat{X}_i + \varepsilon, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= u + \beta_i (X_i^* - \hat{X}_i) \\ &= u + \beta_i (W_i \delta_i - P_i X_i) \\ &= u + \beta_i (W_i \delta_i - P_i (W_i \delta_i + \eta_i)) \\ &= u - \beta_i P_i \eta_i \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which is a composite error term, involving the measurement error, η_i , of the non-replicable government forecast i . If $\beta_i = 0$ for all i , in which case the government uses econometric model (1) including only publicly available information, then it follows that $\varepsilon = u$.

The correlation between $\hat{X}_i$ and ε is $-\beta_i \delta_i^2 (T - k_i)$, but OLS for the parameters in (7) is consistent as $\hat{X}_i$ is asymptotically uncorrelated with ε for all i .

If u and η_i are mutually uncorrelated, then

$$V = E(\varepsilon \varepsilon') = E(uu') + \beta_i^2 P_i E(\eta_i \eta_i') P_i$$

so that

$$V = \sigma_u^2 I + \beta_i^2 \sigma_i^2 P_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (9)$$

It is obvious that serial correlation and heteroskedasticity are present in (9) through the measurement error η_i in X_i in (2). Thus, if OLS is used to estimate (7), the correct covariance matrix in (9), or a consistent estimator such as the Newey-West HAC covariance matrix, should be used.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for OLS to be efficient in the presence of serial correlation and heteroskedasticity are given in Kruskal's theorem, of which a special case is the Gauss-Markov

Theorem (see, for example, McAleer (1992), Fiebig et al. (1992), McAleer and McKenzie (1991), and more recently, Franses et al. (2009)), and are given by

- (i) $VZ = ZA_1$, for some A_1
- (ii) $V\hat{X}_i = \hat{X}_i A_2$, for some A_2

Condition (i) is satisfied if $Z \perp W_i$ or if $Z \subset W_i$, while condition (ii) is satisfied automatically as $\hat{X}_i = P_i X_i$ in (6). In short, generalized least squares [GLS] is equivalent to OLS because the first step of the two step OLS estimator is satisfied as the transformation matrix is proportional to the data matrix.

Defining $G_i = [Z_i : \hat{X}_i]$ and $\phi_i' = (\gamma', \beta_i')$ for all i , (7) may be rewritten as

$$y = G_i \phi_i + \varepsilon. \quad (10)$$

If conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied, OLS is efficient for ϕ_i and the correct OLS covariance matrix is given by

$$\text{var}(\hat{\phi}_i) = (G_i' G_i)^{-1} G_i' V G_i (G_i' G_i)^{-1} \quad (11)$$

where V is given in (9). Substitution for V in (11) gives

$$\text{var}(\hat{\phi}_i) = \sigma_u^2 (G_i' G_i)^{-1} + \beta_i^2 \sigma_i^2 (G_i' G_i)^{-1} G_i' P_i G_i (G_i' G_i)^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

which shows that the standard OLS covariance matrix of $\hat{\phi}_i$, namely $\sigma_u^2 (G_i' G_i)^{-1}$, gives a downward bias in the covariance matrix and an upward bias in the corresponding t-ratios (see Pagan (1984) and Oxley and McAleer (1993) for examples in the case of generated regressors).

An alternative to estimating equation (7) is to substitute from (2) directly into (1) to obtain

$$y = Z\gamma + \beta_i(X_i - \eta_i) + u$$

or

$$y = Z\gamma + \beta_i X_i + (u - \beta_i \eta_i) \quad (13)$$

It is clear that OLS is inconsistent for (13) as X_i is correlated with η_i . Therefore, GMM should be used if the non-replicable government forecast, X_i , is used to explain the variable of interest, y .

The effect of measurable government expertise, W_i , on the non-replicable government forecast, X_i , can be tested directly in (3), in which case OLS is efficient given the information set. Moreover, the conditional expectation of X_i is an optimal forecast under a MSE loss function.

An important by-product of this framework is that when $\gamma = 0$, models (7) and (13) reduce to the test regressions to examine forecast unbiasedness. Indeed, (7) becomes

$$y = \gamma_i + \beta_i \hat{X}_i + \varepsilon, \quad (14)$$

and (13) becomes

$$y = \gamma_i + \beta_i X_i + (u - \beta_i \eta_i) \quad (15)$$

and the null hypothesis of no bias corresponds with $\gamma_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 1$.

In summary, what should an analyst do in examining the accuracy of government forecasts? First, the analyst needs to collect data on W_i and, if possible, on Z , and estimate (3) to compute the replicable forecast. The model statistics give an impression as to what extent the government might have used an econometric model to create the overall non-replicable forecast. The analyst can then examine the potential bias in the replicable and non-replicable forecasts. It is known from the literature on forecasting SKU level sales data, where experts frequently adjust (or deviate from) model-based forecasts, that expert forecasts are often biased (Fildes et al., 2009, Franses and Legerstee, 2009). Finally, the analyst can compute forecast error statistics, such as root mean

squared prediction errors [RMSPE] or mean absolute deviation [MAD], for the replicable and non-replicable forecasts to examine how much any undocumented knowledge in the non-replicable forecasts can contribute to forecast accuracy.

3. Government forecasts in Taiwan

In this section we examine the accuracy of government forecasts and we also compare the quality of replicable and non-replicable forecasts. Since 1978, actual data and initial, primary and revised forecasts of economic fundamentals in Taiwan have been released by the government, as follows:

- (i) In Q1 (February), release (initial) forecasts for Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 in the same year; and Q3 (primary value) and Q4 (revised forecast) in the previous year;
- (ii) In Q2 (May), release (initial) forecasts for Q2, Q3 and Q4 in the same year; Q1 and Q2 for the following year; Q4 (primary value) for the previous year; and Q1 (revised forecast) in the same year;
- (iii) In Q3 (August), release (initial) forecasts for Q3 and Q4 in the same year; Q1 (primary value) and Q2 (revised forecast) in the same year;
- (iv) In Q4 (November), release (initial) forecasts for Q4 in the same year; Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 in the following year; and Q2 (primary value) and Q3 (revised forecast) in the same year.

Thus, there are several forecasts for each period, even considering just the one-quarter ahead forecasts, namely the initial forecast made in the same period, the primary forecast that is made available one quarter later, and the revised value that is available two quarters later. Only the initial forecast is a one-quarter forecast, with both the primary and revised forecasts being revisions of the initial forecast. In sum, there are 3 types of forecasts of interest. There is the initial forecast, which is the first forecast for a particular quarter. Then there is the primary forecast, which is the one-quarter lagged update of an initial forecast. The revised forecast is a one-quarter lagged update of a primary forecast. We do not have sufficient data on the revised forecasts, so we do not deal with these in the paper. Finally, there are the actual values, against which we check the initial and primary forecasts.

The data are obtained from the Quarterly National Economic Trends, Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, Taiwan, 1978-2008. The sample period used for the

actual and government forecasts of seasonally unadjusted¹ quarterly inflation rate and real growth rate of GDP is 1978 Q1 to 2008 Q1. Actual data on the inflation rate and real growth rate, as well as the initial and primary forecasts, are used in the empirical analysis. As there are some missing observations in the revised forecasts of both the inflation rate and real growth rate, revised forecasts are not considered in the empirical analysis, as mentioned earlier. So, the initial forecasts are $i = 1$ and the primary forecasts correspond with $i = 2$. We have analyzed the data on unit roots and structural breaks. The diagnostics for unit roots (which are unreported) indicate that we can work with the growth rates data, as in Figures 1 and 2. Visual inspection from the same graphs does not suggest potential structural breaks, and there is also no evidence of structural breaks caused by changing measurement methods at the government agency in Taiwan.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Insert Figure 2 about here

The actual data and the initial and primary forecasts of the inflation rate are given in Figure 1, while the real growth rate counterparts are shown in Figure 2. Both figures show that the actual data, initial forecasts and primary forecasts of the inflation rate and real growth rate are reasonably similar, with most turning points being forecast accurately.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 provides a formal test of the effects of government expertise on non-replicable initial and primary forecasts in equation (3)². Government expertise for the primary forecast in (3) is approximated by one-period lagged real growth, one-period lagged inflation, one period lagged

¹ There is a substantial literature on seasonal adjustment and the numerous associated problems it incurs. However, the data used in our paper are seasonally unadjusted, so we do not have those problems.

² We analyzed the regression models in Table 1 for the presence of structural breaks and we found no evidence for these. We must remark though that it would also be unlikely to find such breaks, a priori, as these regressions concern forecasts being regressed on observable variables. Only if the forecasters would systematically deviate from reality, like first forecast too high and later on always forecast too low, such breaks could occur. Obviously the graphs in Figures 1 and 2 do not indicate such tendencies. Furthermore, given the very nature of the variables in the regression model, there is also no need to estimate non-linear models like Markov switching models.

initial forecast, and one period lagged primary forecast, while government expertise for the initial forecast replaces the one period lagged primary forecast with its two period lagged counterpart. The lagged inflation rate is significant in both the non-replicable initial and primary forecasts of the inflation rate, and the lagged real growth rate is significant in both the non-replicable initial and primary forecasts of the real growth rate. Overall, the number of individually significant variables is greater for the non-replicable primary forecasts of both the inflation rate and the real growth rate than for their non-replicable initial forecast counterparts. The fit of the models is quite high, and hence the unexplained variance (corresponding to undocumented knowledge of the government forecasters) is somewhere in between 10% and 25%³.

Insert Table 2 about here

The bias in the replicable initial and primary forecasts on the inflation rate and real growth rate in equation (7) is tested in Table 2, using OLS and both the OLS and Newey-West HAC standard errors. For the inflation rate, the replicable initial and primary forecasts are both highly significant, with the estimated coefficients being virtually indistinguishable from unity, especially for the replicable primary forecast. So, there is no bias here. A different qualitative interpretation holds for the replicable initial and primary forecasts of the real growth rate, as the estimated coefficients are significantly greater than unity for both the replicable initial and primary forecasts. Apparently the an analyst can improve on deriving replicable forecasts by including alternative explanatory variables in W_i . The biased OLS standard errors are considerably smaller than their Newey-West HAC counterparts, especially for the inflation rate. The goodness-of-fit of the replicable initial and primary forecasts are very similar as the replicable forecasts use similar information sets.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 3 provides a formal test of bias in the non-replicable initial and primary forecasts in equation (13) using OLS and GMM estimation. The instrument list for GMM for the primary forecast includes one-period lagged real growth, one-period lagged inflation, one-period lagged initial forecast, and one-period lagged primary forecast, while the instrument list for the initial forecast

³ The regressions in Table 1 are selected on the basis of tests of residual autocorrelation, and hence all the test statistics have p-values greater than 0.05. Furthermore, there are no indications of outliers or of extreme non-normality.

replaces the one period lagged primary forecast with its two period lagged counterpart⁴. For GMM, we use the default option as given in EViews version 6. The OLS and GMM estimates are qualitatively the same in all cases, and are numerically quite similar for the non-replicable initial and primary forecasts for the inflation rate, and the non-replicable primary forecast of the real growth rate.

The results in Table 3 suggest that the estimated coefficients of the non-replicable initial and primary forecasts of the inflation rate are indistinguishable from unity, as in Table 2, whereas those of the real growth rate are significantly greater than unity. However, the non-replicable primary forecasts of both the inflation rate and real growth rate would seem to be more accurate than their non-replicable initial forecast counterparts.

Table 3 also shows that, with time, forecast accuracy improves. That is, as the lead time of forecasts becomes shorter, the forecasts improve. .

The results in Tables 2 and 3 also show that forecasts for real growth rates are biased, while the forecasts for inflation are generally unbiased. If we compare the estimated parameters across Tables 2 and 3, then we see that the bias is larger for the replicable forecasts than for the non-replicable forecasts of the growth rates. Apparently, the government experts are able to reduce the model-based bias.

Insert Table 4

The apparent ability of Taiwanese government experts to improve forecast quality is further substantiated by the results in Table 4. In Table 4 we compare the accuracy of the replicable forecasts, obtained using (5), with the available non-replicable forecasts, and express the gain of those non-replicable forecasts over the replicable forecasts as the percentage reduction in forecast errors. For example, using the initial forecasts, the RMSE for the replicable forecasts is 2.55, while that of the original forecasts is 0.95, which gives a $1 - (0.95/2.55) = 0.63$ (or 63%) reduction in error. The non-replicable forecasts show an improvement in accuracy across all variables and

⁴ We experimented with various sets of instruments for GMM estimation, and the overriding impression is that the empirical results are qualitatively similar. In order to reduce the size of the tables, we have reported the results for only one such set. Further details are available from the authors upon request.

criteria, with the improvement being greatest for primary forecasts and, especially, inflation. Upon application of the Diebold and Mariano forecast test, it is found that the substantial differences in forecast accuracy are not found to be significant, which is likely to be due to the limited power of the DM test.

In summary, the empirical results suggest that both the initial and primary forecasts are reasonably accurate measures of the inflation rate and the real growth rate for Taiwan. As the primary forecast is an updated measure of the initial forecast, it is not altogether surprising that it provides a more accurate forecast of both economic fundamentals.

4. Concluding Remarks

A government's ability to provide accurate initial and updated forecasts of key economic fundamentals, such as the inflation rate and real GDP growth rate, can affect, for example, business confidence, consumer sentiment, and foreign direct investment. Econometric models are frequently used to provide initial and updated forecasts in economics and business, and such model-based forecasts can be adjusted by governments for a variety of reasons. A government forecast that is based on an econometric model is replicable, whereas a government forecast that is not based on an econometric model is non-replicable. Many governments can, and do, provide both replicable and non-replicable forecasts. Moreover, government forecasts are regularly updated, as can be seen by the frequent revisions that are made to initial, and even updated, official forecasts.

The empirical analysis for actual and government forecasts of the quarterly inflation rate and real growth rate of GDP for Taiwan from 1978 Q1 to 2008 Q1 showed that replicable and non-replicable government forecasts were distinctly different from each other, that efficient and inefficient estimation methods, as well as consistent and inconsistent covariance matrix estimates, led to significantly different outcomes, that government forecasts of economic fundamentals differed markedly between initial and primary (or updated) forecasts, and that alternative models and methods led to differences in the accuracy of initial and primary government forecasts. The replicable and non-replicable estimated of primary forecasts were generally found to be more accurate than their initial forecast counterparts. Our main finding is that it is the undocumented knowledge of the Taiwanese government that reduces forecast errors substantially.

One interesting issue that follows from our study concerns the potential interaction between those who create the data and those who create the forecasts. In many countries these functions are separated into distinct institutions, but in, for example, Taiwan they may be carried out by overlapping departments. This would amount to further research on forecasting and compiling national accounts data in countries like Taiwan (but also China, Thailand, and perhaps even Greece). In Taiwan, the forecasts and the realizations are generated by the same government institution, although it is our understanding that they are created by different teams. We do not have formal evidence of any political interference, so all we can possibly say would amount to speculation. On the other hand, if forecasts are partly based on preliminary information on the final realizations, one may expect that the undocumented knowledge may indeed reduce forecast errors substantially. This does not affect the validity of the econometric results, but it may, of course, affect the usefulness of the outcomes. In fact, one could then question what the quoted forecasts really mean. This methodological topic is beyond the scope of the present paper. On the other hand, most studies in the relevant literature concern Western countries, where Census bureaus are held separate from forecasting agencies. Then it is often found that forecast errors are quite large, while here, in the case of Taiwan, the forecasts are quite accurate. This also implies an alternative view on government forecasts, which is quite interesting in its own right.

Our main findings are that the government forecasts in Taiwan are much better than a replicable forecast that could have been obtained using lagged variables. This means that government forecasts contain substantial expertise, which is very useful information. Therefore, government forecasts turn out to be quite accurate. However, as was also raised by one of the referees, when the forecasters are in the same team as those who compile the national accounts figures, their improved accuracy does not come as a surprise. On the other hand, at the same time this implies that, for public policy reasons, one may well look very seriously at the government forecasts. This is in contrast to the situation in, for example, the Netherlands, where government forecasts are in an institute that is separate from the Central Bureau of Statistics. In fact, these government forecasts are often found to be quite inaccurate.

Table 1
Generating Replicable Expertise in Non-Replicable Initial and Primary Forecasts
(standard errors in parentheses)

Included Variables	Inflation		Real Growth Rate	
	Non-Replicable Initial Forecast	Non-Replicable Primary Forecast	Non-Replicable Initial Forecast	Non-Replicable Primary Forecast
Intercept	0.112 (0.283)	-0.351 (0.331)	1.285** (0.283)	1.657** (0.358)
Real Growth (t-1)	0.056 (0.035)	0.084* (0.041)	0.589** (0.081)	0.584** (0.229)
Inflation (t-1)	0.865** (0.125)	0.901** (0.302)	0.012 (0.024)	0.005 (0.030)
Initial Forecast (t-1)	0.018 (0.158)	0.030 (0.189)	0.068 (0.136)	-0.550** (0.155)
Primary Forecast (t-1)		0.006 (0.370)		0.622** (0.300)
Primary Forecast (t-2)	0.019 (0.084)		0.050 (0.081)	
Adjusted R ²	0.916	0.896	0.787	0.740
F test	321.16**	254.69**	110.08**	84.96**

Notes: The regression model (3) correlates the non-replicable forecasts, X_i , and expertise, W_i , in

$$X_i = W_i \delta_i + \eta_i, \quad \eta_i \sim (0, \sigma_i^2 I) \quad (3)$$

where $i = 1$ for the initial forecast and $i = 2$ for the primary forecast. Replicable expertise in (3) for the primary forecast is approximated by one-period lagged real growth, one-period lagged inflation, one period lagged initial forecast, and one period lagged primary forecast. Replicable expertise for the initial forecast replaces the one period lagged primary forecast with its two period lagged counterpart. The F test is a test of replicable expertise.

* and ** denote significance at the 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

Table 2
Testing Bias in Replicable Initial and Primary Forecasts
(standard errors in parentheses)

Estimation Method	Inflation			
	Intercept	Replicable Initial Forecast	Replicable Primary Forecast	Adjusted R ²
OLS	-0.347 (0.188)	1.040 (0.035)		0.884
HAC	[0.176]	[0.090]		
OLS	-0.042 (0.180)		1.001 (0.033)	0.885
HAC	[0.155]		[0.084]	
Estimation Method	Real Growth Rate			
	Intercept	Replicable Initial Forecast	Replicable Primary Forecast	Adjusted R ²
OLS	-0.662 (0.495)	1.223** (0.077)		0.681
HAC	[0.619]	[0.096]		
OLS	-2.694** (0.642)		1.540** (0.101)	0.665
HAC	[0.788]		[0.143]	

Notes: The regression model is

$$y = \gamma_i + \beta_i \hat{X}_i + \varepsilon, \quad (14)$$

where $i = 1$ for the initial forecast and $i = 2$ for the primary forecast. Newey-West HAC standard errors are given in brackets.

** denotes significance at the 1% level. The null hypothesis of no bias corresponds with $\gamma_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 1$.

Table 3
Testing Bias in Non-Replicable Initial and Primary Forecasts
(standard errors in parentheses)

Estimation Method	Inflation			
	Intercept	Non-replicable Initial Forecast	Non-replicable Primary Forecast	Adjusted R ²
OLS	-0.336** (0.110)	1.035 (0.020)		0.958
GMM	-0.463** (0.095)	1.098** (0.027)		0.955
OLS	-0.048 (0.051)		1.003 (0.009)	0.990
GMM	-0.034 (0.035)		1.018 (0.012)	0.990
Estimation Method	Real Growth Rate			
	Intercept	Non-replicable Initial Forecast	Non-replicable Primary Forecast	Adjusted R ²
OLS	-0.484 (0.317)	1.195** (0.048)		0.839
GMM	-1.487** (0.481)	1.329** (0.070)		0.819
OLS	-0.127 (0.128)		1.119** (0.019)	0.968
GMM	-0.150 (0.146)		1.122** (0.022)	0.967

Notes: The regression model is

$$y = \gamma_i + \beta_i X_i + (u - \beta_i \eta_i) \quad (15)$$

where $i = 1$ for the initial forecast and $i = 2$ for the primary forecast. The instrument list for GMM for the primary forecast includes one-period lagged real growth, one-period lagged inflation, one-period lagged initial forecast, and one-period lagged primary forecast. The instrument set for the initial forecast replaces the one period lagged primary forecast with its two period lagged counterpart.

** denotes significance at the 1% level. The null hypothesis of no bias corresponds with $\gamma_i = 0$ and $\beta_i = 1$.

Table 4**Accuracy of Replicable (R) and Non-Replicable (NR) Initial and Primary Forecasts**

Forecasts	Inflation		Real Growth Rate	
	RMSE	MAD	RMSE	MAD
Initial	R: 2.55	R: 1.11	R: 4.16	R: 1.49
	NR: 0.95	NR: 0.69	NR: 2.53	NR: 1.19
	Reduction: 63%	Reduction: 38%	Reduction 39%	Reduction: 20%
Primary	R: 2.44	R: 1.07	R: 4.91	R: 1.60
	NR: 0.21	NR: 0.14	NR: 0.86	NR: 0.72
	Reduction: 91%	Reduction: 87%	Reduction: 82%	Reduction: 55%

Notes: RMSE and MAD denote root mean square error and mean absolute deviation, respectively. The sample period is 1978 Q1 to 2008 Q1.

Data source: Quarterly National Economic Trends, Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, Taiwan, 1978-2008.

Figure 1

Inflation Rate, Initial Forecasts and Primary Forecasts
(Data set is from 1978 Q1 to 2008 Q1)





Figure 2

Real Growth Rate, Initial Forecasts and Primary Forecasts
(Data set is from 1978 Q1 to 2008 Q1)



References

- Chen, S.-W. and J.-L. Lin (2000), Modelling business cycles in Taiwan with time-varying Markov-switching models, *Academia Economic Papers*, 28(1), 17-42.
- Clark, T.E. and M.W. McCracken (2001), Tests of equal forecast accuracy and encompassing of nested models, *Journal of Econometrics*, 105, 85-110.
- Clark, T.E. and K.D. West (2007), Approximately normal tests for equal predictive accuracy in nested models, *Journal of Econometrics*, 138, 291-311.
- Diebold, F.X. and R.S. Mariano (1995), Comparing predictive accuracy, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 13, 253-263.
- Fiebig, D.G., M. McAleer and R. Bartels (1992), Properties of ordinary least squares estimators in regression models with non-spherical disturbances, *Journal of Econometrics*, 54, 321-334.
- Fildes, R., P. Goodwin, M. Lawrence and K. Nikopoulos (2009), Effective forecasting and judgmental adjustments: an empirical evaluation and strategies for improvement in supply-chain planning, *International Journal of Forecasting*, 25, 3-23.
- Franses, P.H. (2008), Merging models and experts, *International Journal of Forecasting*, 24(1), 31-33.
- Franses, P.H. and R. Legerstee (2009), Properties of expert adjustments on model-based SKU-level forecasts, *International Journal of Forecasting*, 25, 35-47.
- Franses, P.H. and R. Legerstee (2010), Do experts' adjustments on model-based SKU-level forecasts improve forecast quality?, *Journal of Forecasting*, in print.
- Franses, P.H., M. McAleer and R. Legerstee (2009), Expert opinion versus expertise in forecasting, *Statistica Neerlandica*, 63, 334-346.
- Goodwin, P. (2000), Improving the voluntary integration of statistical forecasts and judgement, *International Journal of Forecasting*, 16, 85-99.
- Huang, C.-H. (1999), Phases and characteristics of Taiwan business cycles: A Markov switching analysis, *Taiwan Economic Review*, 27(2), 185-214.
- McAleer, M. (1992), Efficient estimation: the Rao-Zyskind condition, Kruskal's theorem and ordinary least squares, *Economic Record*, 68, 65-72.
- McAleer, M. and C. McKenzie (1991), When are two step estimators efficient?, *Econometric Reviews*, 10, 235-252.

- Oxley, L. and M. McAleer (1993), Econometric issues in macroeconomic models with generated regressors, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 7, 1-40.
- Pagan, A.R. (1984), Econometric issues in the analysis of regressions with generated regressors, *International Economic Review*, 25, 221-247.
- Patton, A.J. and A. Timmermann (2007a), Properties of optimal forecasts under asymmetric loss and nonlinearity, *Journal of Econometrics*, 140, 884-918.
- Patton, A.J. and A. Timmermann (2007b), Testing forecast optimality under unknown loss, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 1172-1184.
- Smith, J. and M. McAleer (1994), Newey-West covariance matrix estimates for models with generated regressors, *Applied Economics*, 26, 635-640.