THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL VARIABLES IN PREDICTING ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

by Raphael Espinoza,
Fabio Fornari and
Marco J. Lombardi

THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL VARIABLES IN PREDICTING ECONOMIC ACTIVITY [1]

by Raphael Espinoza[2], Fabio Fornari[3]
and Marco J. Lombardi[3]

CONTENTS

Abstract

Previous research has shown that the US business cycle leads the European cycle by a few quarters, and can therefore help predicting euro area GDP. We investigate whether financial variables provide additional predictive power. We use a VAR model of the US and the euro area GDPs and extend it to take into account common global shocks and information provided by selected combinations of financial variables. In-sample analysis shows that shocks to financial variables influence real activity with a peak around 4 to 6 quarters after the shock. Out-of-sample Root-Mean- Squared Forecast Error (RMFE) shows that adding financial variables yields smaller errors in forecasting US economic activity, especially at a five-quarter horizon, but the gain is overall tiny in economic terms. This link is even less prominent in the euro area, where financial indicators do not improve short and medium term GDP forecasts even when their timely availability, relative to a given GDP release, is exploited. The same conclusion is reached with a dataset of quarterly industrial production indices, although financial variables marginally improve forecasts of monthly industrial production. We argue that the findings that financial variables have no predictive power for future activity in the euro area relate to the unconditional nature of the RMFE metric. When forecasting ability is assessed *as if* in real time (i.e. conditionally on the information available at the time when forecasts are made), we find that models using financial variables would have been preferred in many episodes, and in particular between 1999 and 2002. Results from the historical decomposition of a VAR model indeed suggest that in that period shocks were predominantly of financial nature.

Keywords: VAR, Financial Variables, International Linkages, Conditional Forecast

JEL Classification: F30, F42, F47

Non-Technical Summary

Real developments in the United States have systematically anticipated those in the euro area, a linkage that has been fruitfully exploited to the aim of forecasting. In this paper we investigate whether financial variables have any role in explaining this stylized fact.

There are at least two potential explanations for a role of financial markets in anticipating business cycles developments. First, tighter financial and credit conditions limit the potential for firms' activity to expand and for households to consume during harsh times. Second, asset prices capture expected firms' profitability, which is linked to the future rate of growth of the economy.

To check whether financial variables help tracking the observed real developments in the United States and in the euro area as well as the linkages between these two areas, we consider Vector Autoregressive models and we look at both in-sample and out-of-sample GDP forecasts. In the former, we find evidence of a relation between financial variables and real activity, both domestically and internationally, a relation that has become stronger since 1985. We also find that the United States have had a leading role in the transmission of shocks since the 70s.

Out-of-sample GDP forecasts show that in the United States financial variables provide statistically non-negligible, but economically not so large, information for future activity, especially five quarters ahead. The picture is however different for the euro area, where adding various combinations of the financial variables leads instead to a worsening in the out-of-sample performance. Also several types of conditional forecasts in which the 'future' values (subsequent 1 or 2 quarters relative to the quarter from which the forecast is made) of financial variables are assumed to be known (and indeed, in real time forecasting, the values of financial variables are known well-ahead of the release of GDP estimates) confirm the conclusion.

However, this is an 'average' result between 1985 and 2007 and may therefore hide periods during which financial variables did play a significant role on future GDP. We investigate this by means of econometric tests designed to identify periods in which a given class of model (those including financial data) would have been preferred to a competing class of models (those including only GDP). Our results show that the information content provided by financial variables would have improved the forecast for the euro area GDP between 1999 and 2002, although there exists a rather wide dispersion in this result across models. Indeed, the historical decomposition obtained from the VAR suggests that in that period financial shocks had a prominent role. In general, one could hypothesize that system-wide financial shocks do not occur very frequently and therefore their predictive power for future GDP can be rather marginal when evaluated on a long out-of-sample period. Alternatively one could think that financial prices affect real activity in a nonlinear way, a channel of transmission which is blurred within a linear framework.

I. INTRODUCTION[1]

Large bank losses and financial turbulences have been the final consequences of the subprime mortgages crisis that erupted in the United States around July 2007 and which required around two years to show its first signs of cooling. The simultaneous occurrence of financial turmoil and a global recession contributed to revive the debate on the intensity of macro-financial linkages and the associated role of financial factors as amplifiers of the international transmission of real shocks. The traditional analysis of the transmission of shocks views the trade channel as the main source of spillovers: a slowdown in the US would decrease its imports, and the associated reduction of European exports would therefore lead Europe to a period of lower growth. However, this direct trade channel can hardly account for the extent of observed spillovers. Looking at the euro area, US imports represent around 15% of its exports, and the euro area exports contribute for only 10% to its GDP growth. The stylized fact that the euro area lags the US business cycles by a few quarters could therefore be hardly justified on account of rather limited trade openness.

Several explanations have been put forward to rationalize the importance of the US-euro area common cycle (e.g. Giannone and Reichlin, 2004, Giannone et al., 2008, and Favero and Giavazzi, 2008). First, the bilateral US-euro area trade statistics could underestimate the actual trade linkages, due to third-country effects (Dees and Vansteenkiste, 2007). Second, transmission of cycles through commodity prices may explain a further amount of the observed linkages, although Bayoumi and Swiston (2007) do not find this channel to be economically relevant. Hence, the literature has concentrated on the financial sector as the possible missing element in the analysis of the channels of transmission. As a result of financial globalization, the financing conditions in a major economy such as the United States can affect other economies because of the required equalization of expected returns, a channel which may have become even more relevant as firms increased the fraction of their operations in foreign areas.[2] Dees, di Mauro, Smith and Pesaran (2005) show indeed, using a Global VAR model, that a 4% fall in US real equity prices not only reduces US output by -0.4% within a year, but also depresses European financial markets by around 4% and euro area GDP growth by 0.4% in the second year after the shock. Bayoumi and Swiston (2007) also argued that global financial conditions are the most relevant channel of transmission, typically

---

[2] Of course due to the presence of currency, country and firm specific risk-premia, returns will not actually equalize instantaneously, but, to the extent that the investors perceive similarities between economies, risk-premia are not expected to diverge too much.

swamping the impact on growth played by the trade channel or the commodity price channel.

There are at least two potential explanations which could account for an active role of financial markets in anticipating turning points in business cycles and more in genral business cycle phases. First, tighter financial and credit conditions limit the potential for firms' activity to expand, constraining their hiring and investment decisions (see Bloom, 2009, and Bloom et al., 2009). Furthermore, they prevent credit-constrained households from borrowing and hence consuming during harsh times. However, the quantification of such effects relies on the proper identification of 'structural' financial shocks, which is a difficult task.

A second explanation, however, requires a less active role: asset prices are determined in markets which are fundamentally forward looking. Equity prices capture expected firms' profitability, which is linked to the future rate of growth of the economy. Hence, the correlation between depressed financial markets today and low growth in the near future could result from the forward-looking nature of financial markets, even in absence of any causal link between financing conditions and growth. This argument is associated with an important branch of the literature analyzing the usefulness of financial data in forecasting GDP cycles. While several authors have argued that financial variables do not consistently help predicting business cycles (Stock and Watson, 2003), Ang et al. (2006), among others, show that expected yields have a non negligible role in forecasting growth.

In this paper we examine such issue with a VAR model including economic activity and combinations of selected financial market indicators. As we use only very basic identification assumptions, the model does not offer the possibility to ascertain whether the predictive power of financial variables, if any, comes from their 'forward-looking role' or instead from a more active role in affecting economic activity, including influence on wealth effects, credit availability, investment decisions, risk aversion.

Overall, the literature evidences a lack of clear-cut results about the role of financial variables in forecasting economic activity. To some extent, this may relate to the variety of indicators available and hence to an inherent difficulty in picking the most favorable combination. Some authors have indeed looked at very specific asset prices: for instance, Liew and Vassalou (2000) show that portfolios which are built as long-short positions in some stock characteristics – typically size and value, the so-called Fama-French factors – can help predict future US GDP. More recently, Gilchrist et al. (2008) look at the predictive ability of credit spreads for future GDP growth and find that credit spreads based on corporate bonds with a 'median' rating convey the most useful information to the aim of predicting real activity. Guichard et al. (2009) look at how the variables included in a financial conditions index for the United States, the euro area, Japan and the United Kingdom are able to affect GDP. These variables, i.e. short and long term real interest rates, bond spreads, stock market capitalization, credit standards and the real effective exchange rate are inserted in a VAR together with GDP, core inflation and the underlying fiscal deficit. They show that some of the variables included in the index do affect GDP over a 4- to 6-quarter horizon, although their results refer to an in-sample analysis and provide therefore no indication about out-of-sample predictability.

Several papers have also emphasized the role of credit quantities or lending standards as

opposed to price-related information. The idea (see Carlson et al., 2008) is that deterioration in the health of a financial institution may raise the cost of intermediation and that the failure of a financial institution, leading to the loss of banking relationships, may limit firms' access to credit and hamper their ability to invest. Within this framework, Goodhart et al. (2006) find that deposit and loan rates rise, while borrowing activity declines, as banks' capital-asset ratios decrease towards their capital adequacy requirement. This channel of transmission completes the channel driven by the financial accelerator (Bernanke and Gertler, 1989). Carlson et al. (2008) find that the health of the financial sector indeed affects US GDP, with a one standard deviation shock to an aggregate index of distance-to-default of financial institutions leading to a cumulative decrease in investments of about 2% over the subsequent two years. However, the above results are again referred to an in-sample analysis. Similarly, Swiston (2008) recovers a financial condition index from a VAR and finds that it represents a powerful anticipator of turning points. Finally, the analysis in IMF (2008) illustrated that a large number of recent phases of slowdown and recessions in a number of industrial countries took place within 6 quarters after turbulence in the banking sector. These episodes were sharper the more leveraged were households and firms – although results are not supported by a formal out-of-sample assessment. Among the papers listed so far, those with empirical applications tend to focus mainly on the United States and only relatively few studies have concentrated on the euro area; a recent analysis by Forni et al. (2003) shows that financial variables can help forecast euro area inflation although they find no predictive power for industrial production.

Taking a different avenue, Junttila (2007) looks at the predictive power of Economic Tracking Portfolios (ETP), a weighted average of asset returns chosen with the aim of maximizing their correlation with economic activity. Using monthly data for industrial production in a number of countries and a rolling estimation based on windows of 60 months, the author shows that the RMSE made in forecasting economic activity through ETP as well as term spreads and dividend yields is much lower than the corresponding figure obtained when a VAR including industrial production, inflation and the short rate is employed. However, as these encouraging results supporting a predictive role of financial indicators for economic activity are referred to the industrial production index sampled at a monthly frequency, it is difficult to single out whether the additional predictability – relative to what can be achieved for GDP – stems from the different measure of economic growth or from the different sample frequency. Also the sample period over which the analysis is conducted (1982-2001 in Junttila against 1970-2007 in our paper) could play a role, as also could the window upon which the out-of-sample results are based (60 months against 48 months in our paper).

Our analysis looks at GDP growth forecasts in both the United States and the euro area and the variables we use as predictors are mainly financial prices, although we also consider some different (quantity-based and risk-based) indicators. Also, we explicitly consider the international environment of the euro area. Overall, we estimate a number of VAR models, constructed around the GDPs of 2 or 3 economic areas (US, euro area and a seven-country aggregate called Rest of the World) and extended to include selected financial variables and look at their performance in predicting real activity at several horizons. The main aim is to understand whether considering financial variables helps improving the forecasts of economic activity with respect to forecasts produced looking at past activity levels only. Among

financial variables we give a prominent role to the slope of the yield curve, the short term rate, the stock market return and its time-varying volatility, the dividend yield of the stock market. We focus attention on these indicators as all of them have been already employed to forecast economic activity. It has to be pointed out, however, that their role can be significantly changing through time. In particular, the presence of risk premiums, which can lead asset prices to deviate from fundamentals, weakens the relationships between asset prices and subsequent changes in fundamentals. As an example, although rising equity prices should signal economic expansions ahead, they could also provoke an economic slowdown if the rise in equity – being unrelated to fundamentals – is suddenly reversed with adverse effects on balance sheets and wealth. The IT-bubble between 1995 and 2000 was an example of such a possibility. To further control for the robustness of our results we also look at some non-price information (bank claims, financial firms' distance-to-default), at indicators of fragility of the banking sector, as measured by the US Ted spread (the gap between the Eurodollar rate and the Treasury bills rate), the gap between the commercial paper and the Treasury bill rate, at indicators of industrial firms' fragility, as proxied by the differential between the yield on 10-year bonds issued by industrial US firms rated Baa and the corresponding 10-year US Government bond yield, and at specific stock returns (the Fama and French factors, 1993, and stocks of listed banks). Other potentially interesting financial series could not be included in the analysis due to i) the long sample period over which we focus (1970-2007) and ii) the possibility of recovering the same indicators for our Rest of the World aggregate. In addition, we address the evidence favoring the predictive power of financial indicators documented in Junttila (2007), by repeating the estimation and the out-of-sample predictability analysis after having replaced GDP with industrial production and considered both the quarterly and the monthly frequency.

In searching for a linkage between financial conditions and real activity we look at both in-sample and out-of-sample evidence. We first find that impulse responses support the existence of a relation between financial variables and real activity both domestically and internationally. According to the forecast error variance decomposition, half of the variance of euro area GDP can be explained by US shocks as well as by 'financial' shocks at an eight-quarter ahead horizon. Furthermore, sub-sample analysis suggests that linkages have become stronger since 1985. Counterfactual experiments reinforce this view as we show that considering financial variables in addition to GDP leads to counterfactual GDP values that are much closer to the actual GDP figures than when no financial variables are considered. We also find that the United States have had a leading role in the transmission of shocks since the 70s.

Going to the out-of-sample analysis, we consider 'unconditional' out-of-sample GDP forecasts, i.e. traditional forecasts for time $t+k$ conditional on estimating the VAR models up to time t as well as several types of 'conditional' forecasts in which 'future' values (1 or 2 quarters subsequent to the current estimation quarter t) of financial variables are assumed to be known (and indeed, in real time forecasting, the values of financial variables are known well-ahead of the release of GDP estimates) even though the coefficient estimates are based on current information only.

When looking at 'unconditional' forecasts, we find that in the United States financial

variables provide non negligible information for future activity, especially 5 quarters ahead, although their contribution declines thereafter. The picture is however different for the euro area: here a model which includes the GDPs of the two (United States and euro area) or three (United States, euro area and Rest of the World) economic areas achieves the best performance in terms of forecast Root Mean Squared Forecast Error (RMFE) across the VAR models considered. Adding various combinations of the financial variables leads to a worsening in the out-of-sample performance at short horizons while the gap tends to shrink when forecasting 2 to 3 years ahead. Conditioning the GDP forecasts on information about subsequent (next period) financial data does not change this conclusion. Replacing GDP by *quarterly* values of the industrial production index (as in Junttila,2007) also does not lead to significant changes. However, financial variables do help forecasting *monthly* industrial production over a number of horizons. This gain is nevertheless modest (less than 5% of the RMFE of autoregressive models).

The finding that financial variables have limited relevance in the euro area has to be nuanced. We use a rolling RMFEs and the conditional predictive ability test proposed by Giacomini and White (2006; henceforth GW) to take into account breaks and potential non-linearities that would manifest themselves via coefficient instability. Being designed to detect predictive power of econometric models conditional on the structure of the errors that they produce, the GW test has the potential to identify periods in which a model may perform better than others. Consistently with rolling RMFE, the GW test shows that the information content provided by financial variables would have improved the forecast for the euro area GDP between 1999 and 2002. These results confirm that since VAR models can be unstable over long samples, it is important to run rolling estimations (as required by the GW test) when assessing the relationship between financial conditions and economic activity.

In explaining this result, one could hypothesize that financial shocks do not occur very frequently and therefore their predictive power can be rather marginal when evaluated on a large out-of-sample period. Indeed, the historical decomposition of one of the VAR employed suggests that in the 1999-2002 period financial shocks had a prominent role, although their contribution on average was small (see the forecast error variance decomposition in Section III.B). Alternatively one could think that financial prices affect real activity in a nonlinear way, which blurs their predictive power within a linear framework. The success obtained by financial prices in fitting recessionary periods in out-of-sample experiments both in the United States and in main economic areas (see Fornari and Mele, 2009, and Fornari and Lemke, 2009) as well as results based on threshold VAR models (Balke, 2000) lead some support to this view. All in all, the somewhat conflicting evidence between the RMFE of a linear VAR and the GW tests suggests that the relationships between financial variables and economic activity are changing through time. However, this time variation occurs in a relatively predictable way. This information, which is missed by the VARs, is instead efficiently exploited with rolling estimations and allows us to find some support for the idea that financial indicators help predict real GDP growth.

II. THE VAR MODELS

A. Data

Our measure of real activity in the three economic areas (US, euro area, and Rest of the World) is the seasonally adjusted quarterly real GDP observed between the first quarter of 1970 (1970q1) and the last quarter of 2007 (2007q4). The Rest of the World is an aggregation of seven countries (Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland) that were chosen to represent economies different enough that a shock affecting all of them can indeed be interpreted as 'global', following Bayoumi and Swiston (2007).[3] We build the Rest of the World as a weighted average of the seven countries (with weights being the 1995 GDP expressed in US dollars – the results were similar with un-weighted averages or elimimating Canada from the Rest of the World, on account of its large relative size and tight connections with the United States). For robustness, we also consider the industrial production (IP) index as a measure of economic activity. We use both the German IP index, when dealing with monthly data, as well as a synthetic euro area index built at a quarterly frequency as the weighted average of the industrial production indices in Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Belgium and the Netherlands. The three GDPs are reported in the top panel of Figure 1 and, notwithstanding the higher noise of quarterly GDP growth rate relative to annual growth rates, evidence both the commonality in regional business cycles and episodes of clear anticipation of the United States (e.g. the US leads the euro area after its 1990 recession episode). The industrial production indices are in the lower panel of the Figure and display similar patterns, despite an even higher volatility.

Panel I in Figure 2 shows the cross-correlogram of the United States and the euro area GDP growth rates across different samples. The chart for the 1970-2008 period evidences a strong and prolonged positive spillover of the US GDP on the euro area GDP from quarter t-4 to quarter t-1, in addition to the presence of well-expected contemporaneous movements. The pattern is consistent across sub-samples, although the 1985-2008 period evidences some further spillovers with a peak at quarter t-7 and some limited negative effect of the euro area on the US between quarters t+5 and t+7, more evident for IP indices than for GDP.

Panel II reports the same cross-correlations calculated on the residuals of a regression of the US and the euro area GDP or IP growth rates on the first four lags of the Rest of the World GDP or IP growth rates. This regression is intended to provide, for illustrative purposes, a measure of the amount of spillovers which is driven by common shocks. Overall, the presence of the rest of the world does not remove the linkage between the US and the euro area GDP in the 1985-2008 period. Some stronger spillovers between the two areas at the one-quarter period seems to emerge. The differences with the IP indices are more pronounced in that exercise, justifying our investigation of the properties of that data as well.

---

[3] The euro area GDP series is obtained from the Euro Area Wide Model (see Fagan et al., 2001), the US GDP from the BEA national accounts while the GDP used for the Rest of the World were taken either from the IFS of the IMF, the OECD or Global Financial Data. The GDP series for Canada was taken from the BIS since the IMF and OECD data exhibited an unreasonable jump in 1995. The weights used for the construction of the Rest of the World series are the 1995 nominal GDPs in US dollars. All financial data come from the Global Financial Indicators database.

Figure 1. Growth in the three economic areas (q/o/q rates of change)

Note: The rest of the world GDP and Industrial production are aggregates based on seven small open economies, see Section II. A for details.

Figure 2. Cross-correlogram of US and euro area GDP and IP indices, across sub-samples

Panel I: based on raw q/o/q rates of change

Panel II: based on q/o/q rates of change filtered via lagged Rest of the World changes in GDP or IP

Note: The Chart shows cross-correlograms between the q/o/q rates of growth of the US and the euro area GDP as well as industrial production indices (IP) across two sub-samples, 1970-1984 and 1985-2008, and the full period 1970Q2-2008Q2. Panel I shows the cross correlogram between the raw rates of change of the two GDP and IP. Panel II shows instead the cross correlogram of the residuals of a regression of each GDP or IP growth rates on a constant and the first four lags of the growth rates in the Rest of the World GDP or, respectively, IP. Negative numbers on the x-axis identify cross correlations between lagged US GDP or IP and current euro area GDP or IP The horizontal lines are standard errors computed via Bartlett approximation, assuming no time series dependency in the data, as $1/T^{0.5}$, where T are the observations employed in the calculation of the cross correlogram, and represent therefore an approximation to the true standard error.

We also collect stock market indices and dividend yields as well as 10-year and 3-month yields for all the countries in the sample. The dividend yield is employed to construct a measure of the disequilibrium between the stock market and the bond market, obtained from the cointegrating vector between the dividend yield and the Government bond yield (this relationship is sometimes referred to as the 'Fed' model).[4] We also collect, for the US only, the 3-month commercial paper yield as well as the 3-month eurodollar rate, which we use to create an indicator of tensions in the banking sector, by considering its difference relative to

---

[4] The stock market return is calculated as the quarter on quarter logarithmic change of the stock index but we also consider a 4-quarter backward-looking moving averages of such returns, as smoother return series may help predictability by bringing financial volatility closer to the observed volatility of real GDP changes.

the 3-month commercial paper yield as well as the 3-month eurodollar rate, which we use to create an indicator of tensions in the banking sector, by considering its difference relative to the 3-month T-bill rate. We use stock market returns to generate time-varying stock market volatilities as 4-quarter backward-looking moving averages of their absolute values. The slope of the yield curve is the difference between the 10-year government bond and the 3-month T-Bill rate. The euro area stock market series is reconstructed by Global Financial Data while the slope of the euro area yield curve is proxied by the German slope.[5] For each country, all financial variables have also been collected at a monthly frequency, between March 1970 and March 2008.[6] These monthly financial variables are used primarily to assess the information content of financial data at an intra-quarter level. To check for the robustness of our results we also collect additional variables which are described in Section IV.C. Finally, to keep the size of the VAR within a reasonable limit, and thus reduce parameter uncertainty, we only include two financial variables per economic area in turn (our largest VAR has 10 variables).

B. Specifications

Our results are based on VAR models with four lags.[7] The VARs including GDP variables only are specified in levels with or without cointegration, while the models with financial variables are also estimated in log-difference, so as to limit the potential negative impact of the much higher volatility of financial variables relative to real GDP.[8] Based on the trace statistic (Johansen, 1988) we find evidence of at most one cointegrating vector among the GDPs of the three economic areas. The specifications in level are mainly aimed at checking whether imposing cointegrating restrictions actually improves or worsens forecasting ability. Two VARs include measures of real activity only (GDP) while the remaining models also consider the three combinations of financial variables described before. The cointegration model is:

---

[5] For a robustness check we also used a euro area slope obtained as a difference between a 'synthetic euro' 10-year and 2-year government bond yield, calculated from Global Financial Data (see also Moneta, 2005). Results, available upon request, did not change substantially.

[6] Monthly data are transformed in the same way as quarterly data, with moving averages being based on 12-month windows, matching the choice made for quarterly data.

[7] While standard lag choice tests (AIC, SIC) suggest that one lag captures sufficiently well the dynamics of the variables, these tests are well known to underestimate the true dependence structure ofthe data. Based on the likelihood ratio test, and also considering that we are working with quarterly variables, we decided to fix the lag length at 4. Furthermore, the slope of the yield curve, and the stock market volatility predict business cycles at rather long horizons, typically 12-24 months so that the choice of a short lag would automatically limit the measured predictability.

[8] We do not investigate fully-fledged Vector Error Correction models as we do not want to enter a discussion on the dimension of the cointegration space for financial variables. Furthermore, financial variables are rather synchronized across economic areas (the literature has also evidenced the presence of risks when forcing cointegration in models with nearly integrated variables, such as interest rates, see Mitchell, 2000). To all extent, the major misspecification deriving from not considering cointegration among economic variables will be for the stationary models, as all models in levels will to some extent accommodate the long run relationship among the variables.

$$Y_t = A_0 + A_1 * Y_{t-1} + A_1 * Y_{t-2} + A_3 * Y_{t-3} + A_4 * Y_{t-4} + C * [\lambda * y_{t-1}] + \varepsilon_t$$

where the vector of endogenous variables Y is partitioned into two subsets as $Y = \begin{bmatrix} y & fin \end{bmatrix}'$ where y is a vector that includes the logarithm of the GDPs and *fin* is a vector that collects the selected two financial variables for the different economic areas. The cointegrating vector λ links the dynamics of the two or three GDPs while ε_t is a vector of error terms (whose dimensions goes from a minimum of 2×1 to a maximum of 10×1) normally distributed with covariance matrix Σ.[9] The models estimated can be classified as follows:

1. A 2-country model including the US and euro area log GDP (estimated unconstrained - BiVAR$_L$ and with cointegration - BiVAR$_C$). Together with model 0 (the random walk for the GDP growth rate) this model constitutes the benchmark against which the other specifications are tested.
2. A 3-country model including the US, the euro area and the Rest of the World (ROW) log GDP in levels and with cointegration (TriVar model)
3. A 3-country model for the log GDP plus the stock market volatility and the yield curve slope (FiVAR$_{1D}$ is the model estimated in log-difference, FiVAR$_{1C}$ is the cointegrating VAR, FiVAR$_{1L}$ is the level VAR).
4. A 3-country model including the log GDPs plus the stock market index (level) and the yield curve slope (level) (FiVAR$_{2D}$ is the log-difference model, FiVAR$_{2C}$ is a cointegrating VAR and FiVAR$_{2L}$ is the level VAR).
5. A 3-country model for the log GDP plus the dividend yield, the bond yield and the yield curve slope, in levels (FiVAR$_{3L}$).
6. A 3-country model for the log-difference of the GDP plus the stock market disequilibria and the change in the yield curve slope (FiVAR$_{3D}$).

In addition to these 6 classes of models and mainly to the aims of checking robustness of our results, we also consider:

- Two quarterly models including the GDP as before but considering selected stress indicators: i) an indicator of tensions in the banking sector (represented by the commercial paper – Treasury bill rate differential)[10], an indicator or fragility of industrial US firms, as measured by the Baa-rated – Treasury bond yield differential, and the yield curve slope; ii) developments in the banks' equity index relative to the broad stock market index in both the United States and the euro area as well as the yield curve slope.
- Two quarterly models including the IP indices as well as i) the stock market volatility and the yield curve slope for the three areas and ii) the stock market index and the

---

[9] The matrices A_0, …, A_4, C are estimated through OLS, while the cointegrating vector λ is estimated in a preliminary step and the restrictions that it implies are imposed in the VAR. The VAR with 4 lags in levels can be always re-written as a VAR with 3 lags in first differences.

[10] The eurodeposit rate – Treasury bill rate differential was not employed because it is strongly correlated with the commercial paper based spread.

yield curve slope for the three areas;

- Two monthly models including the US and German IP indices, the German index representing a proxy for the euro area, as well as i) the stock market volatility and the yield curve slope for the two countries and ii) the stock market index and the yield curve slope for the two countries.

III. CHARACTERIZING THE MODELS

We assess in this section whether selected models from the above list ove capture the dynamic relationships among the variables in accordance with results in the literature, using standard orthogonalized impulse response functions, over the full sample, and in the two sub-samples 1970-1984 and 1985-2007. The identification procedure[11] isolates the response of slow moving variables (the real ones) from that of the fast moving variables (the financial ones) so that the impulse responses associated to shocks to financial variables can be seen as marginal impacts beyond what is already accounted for by the real variables. This type of identification, which remains a Choleski-type identification based on the 'speed' with which information is released to markets, has been employed for example in Boivin and Giannoni (2007). We also place the euro area GDP first, the rest of the world second and the US last, as the United States have been typically shown to lead the other areas, so that their 'specific' shocks are those that are not shared by the other two economic areas.

A. IRFs and pre-1985 and post-1985 evidence

We present in Figures 3 and 4 the orthogonalized Impulse Response Functions (IRFs) coming from selected models: model 2 (see model classification in six groups in Section II.B) with the three GDPs (with the following causal ordering: euro area, ROW, US); model 3 with cointegration (FiVAR$_{1C}$ above), where the three GDPs are complemented by the stock market volatility and the slope of the yield curve in each geographic area (see end of Section II). Despite some minor differences in the path towards the long-run, the two models provide very similar responses of the real variables to shocks in the real variables themselves.

The impulse responses agree with previous literature in findings that the US GDP adjusts faster to shocks, and thereby leads other economic areas (see Giannone et al., 2008). We find some spillovers between the US and the rest of the world whereas US - euro area spillovers are one-way only – coming from the US.[12] The orthogonalized IRFs from model 3 (Figure 4) suggest that the stock market index (sm) and the slope of the yield curve (sl) do affect the GDP growth. Since financial variables were ordered after real variables, the IRFs provide an estimate of the effects of a financial shock when using simple Choleski decompositions (i.e.,

---

[11] As we estimate reduced form VARs, we need to place restrictions on the A matrix and on the polynomial matrix $B(L)$ in the 'corresponding' structural VAR $y_t = A^{-1}B(L)y_{t-1} + A^{-1}u_t = A^{-1}B(L)y_{t-1} + v_t$, where $v_t = A^{-1}u_t$ are uncorrelated and orthogonal structural shocks with the identity matrix as covariance matrix.
[12] The reported error bands around the estimated impulse functions are based on 500 Monte-Carlo draws from the posterior distributions of the VAR parameters and the covariance matrix.

as mentioned before, financial shocks capture what 'remains' to be explained after the effects of real shocks have been accounted for).

Figure 3. Impulse response functions from a trivariate VAR

Note: The Chart reports the impulse response functions (solid black lines) and the associated 68% confidence bands (dotted blue lines) from a VAR including the GDP of the United States, the euro area and the rest of the world. The lines indicate the responses of the variables listed in the rows to a shock in the variables listed in the columns. The x-axis records the quarters elapsed after the shock. The VAR is estimated between 1970Q1 and 2007Q4 with four lags and all the variables are expressed in log-levels.

Hence, the IRFs point at the presence of some influence of financial variables in affecting real cycles, as also previously reported in the literature, e.g. in Bayoumi and Swiston (2007). Dees et al. (2007) also find that an (8%) increase in the US stock market index translates into a comparable rise in the euro area stock market (this impulse has not been reported given the obvious tight relationships among financial markets) and boosts US and euro area activity (by around 0.2% quarter-on-quarter) during the first year after the shock. The significance of the effect of financial variables is however borderline in most cases and depends on the inclusion of the Great Moderation period (1985-2008) in the estimation sample.

Figure 4. Impulse response function from a 9-variable VAR

Note: The Chart reports the impulse response functions (black lines) and the associated 68% confidence bands (dotted blue lines) from a VAR including the GDP of the United States (us), euro area (ea) and rest of the world (row), as well as their slope of the yield curve (sl) and the stock market index (sm). The lines indicate the responses of the variables listed in the rows to a shock in the variables listed in the columns. The x-axis records the quarters elapsed after the shock. The VAR is estimated between 1970Q1 and 2007Q4 with four lags and all the variables are expressed in levels (in log-levels as concerns GDPs).

The Great Moderation period witnessed a significant drop in US and worldwide macroeconomic volatility, spurring a sizeable amount of research questioning whether this lower volatility came from good luck – i.e. smaller shocks – or from a change in monetary policy or in the transmission mechanism. Our VAR models allow us to investigate whether international spillovers have changed before and after the Great Moderation breakpoint that the literature has almost unanimously identified with 1985 (Dees and Saint-Guilhem, 2008, look at the same issue in the context of a Global VAR). We re-estimate model 2 (3 GDPs) and

model 3 (3 GDPs with slope of the yield curve and stock market volatility) on the sub-samples 1970-1984 and 1985-2007 – see Figure 5.[13] We find that during the Great Moderation the amplitude of the IRFs decreased (shocks were smaller) and that linkages changed. In particular, the response of the euro area and the Rest of the World to US GDP shocks flattened significantly after 1985, although the long term effects were similar. Synchronization between the Rest of the World and the United States also strengthened, although this was not observed for the euro area. Finally, the US responded positively to a GDP shock in the Rest of the World after 1985, possibly as the weight of that region rose in the recent years.

Figure 5. Impulse response function to GDP shocks across sub-samples

Note: The Chart reports the impulse response functions and the associated 68% confidence bands from a VAR including the GDP of the United States, euro area and rest of the world. The lines indicate the responses of the(9h96 T6/GS0 9

of GDPs to a shock in the US slope). The IRF of the Rest of the world GDP to a shock in the US slope is almost always insignificant until the 2-year horizon. This may reflect a very asynchronous business cycle between the United States and the rest of the world in the 80s and 90s.

The lower panel of Figure 6 highlights that US stock market volatility ('var us')- perhaps providing a good proxy for business or consumer confidence (see the arguments in Bloom, 2009) - started to play a very strong role on GDP growth worldwide after 1985: a 1 standard deviation positive volatility shock would have lowered GDP by about 1% annualized in the US and the euro area within 8 quarters. The effect for the rest of the world was half a percentage point at the same horizon. All in all, such in-sample evidence brings some support to the inclusion of financial variables in a VAR model aimed at forecasting economic activity worldwide.

Figure 6. Impulse response functions across sub-samples

Note: The Chart reports a subset of the impulse response functions and the associated 68% confidence bands from a VAR including the GDP of the United States, euro area and rest of the world, as well as the US slope of the yield curve (slope us) and the volatility of the US stock market index (var us). The x-axis records the quarters elapsed after the shock. The VAR is estimated across two sub-samples, from 1970Q1 to 1984Q4 (blue lines) and from 1985Q1 to 2007Q4 (red lines), has four lags in both periods and the variables are included in levels (in log-levels as GDP are concerned).

B. Linkages and the role of financial shocks

To get a deeper understanding of the amount and direction of international spillovers as well as of the role of financial variables in the transmission of shocks we look at the forecast error variance decomposition and at simple counterfactual experiments. The forecast variance

decomposition[14] of euro area GDP builds on a model with the 3 GDPs plus the United States and the euro area slope and stock market index, and is computed at the 1-, 4-, 8-, 12- and 24- quarter horizons. The US GDP and slope (Figure 7) explain the majority of the movements in euro area GDP at the longest horizons. At shorter horizons, domestic variables matter more. Furthermore, as already pointed out in the literature, euro area cycles have little effect on US cycles (see the variance decompositon in Table 1).

Figure 7. Forecast error variance decomposition for the euro area GDP

Note: The VAR includes the 3 GDPs as well as the US and the euro area slope and stock market. All variables are inserted in the VAR in levels (in log-levels as GDP are concerned).

We obtain similar results when we consider counterfactual VARs, i.e. VARs similar to those employed for the out-of-sample predictability assessment in the next Sections but that are estimated with restrictions, so that the real and/or the financial variables of each country, in turn, are the unique drivers of the system. To provide an example, in a VAR that only includes GDPs, we fix to zero the coefficients of the euro area and the rest of the world lags in the US GDP equation; we estimate the VAR with such restrictions; and last we generate 'counterfactual' series of the euro area and Rest of the World assuming that the historical values of the shocks to the European and rest of the world GDP equations are zero. The exercise is repeated by placing each of the remaining two GDPs first in the causal ordering

---

[14] The forecast error variance decomposition relies on the ordering of the variables and uses the same information needed to generate the impulses. Starting from $y_t = X_t \cdot \beta + \Sigma_{s=0}^{\infty} \Phi_s u_{t-s} = X_t \cdot \beta + \Sigma_{s=0}^{\infty} \Phi_s G v_{t-s}$, with $E(u_t u_t') = \Sigma$ and $E(v_t v_t') = I$, the covariance matrix of the K-step ahead forecast error is $\Sigma_{s=0}^{K-1} \Phi_s GG \Phi_s'$ and isolating the effect of one component of v is achieved by re-writing the sum as $\Sigma_{s=0}^{K-1} \Sigma_{i=1}^{N} \Phi_s Ge(i)e(i)G\Phi_s' = \Sigma_{i=1}^{N} \Sigma_{s=0}^{K-1} \Phi_s Ge(i)e(i)G\Phi_s'$ so that the covariance matrix of the forecast errors is decomposed into N terms, each of which is the contribution of a component of v over the K periods.

and placing analogous restrictions, so that each of those countries, in turn, is the only shock propagator in the trivariate system.

Table 1. Variance decomposition of the GDP in the three areas

Euro area GDP	Euro area GDP	ROW GDP	US GDP	Euro area slope	Euro area stock market	US slope	US stock market
Horizon							
1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0
4	75.14	0.55	11.66	0.23	11.05	0.35	1.00
8	47.36	2.11	25.19	5.73	17.66	1.19	0.76
12	31.42	2.21	37.02	9.77	12.72	5.78	1.10
24	13.39	1.16	45.82	10.12	5.52	20.29	3.68
Row GDP horizon							
1	5.63	94.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	3.65	79.91	12.83	0.55	2.35	0.24	0.47
8	1.68	58.28	30.27	1.19	2.86	2.91	2.81
12	2.19	43.83	36.26	2.54	1.79	7.47	5.93
24	3.80	30.82	33.25	3.34	2.97	13.62	12.21
US GDP horizon							
1	2.19	8.34	89.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	3.48	5.57	80.88	1.97	4.18	2.62	1.29
8	1.50	2.24	66.91	8.56	2.30	12.23	6.27
12	1.20	1.56	57.71	9.71	2.59	18.53	8.69
24	0.79	2.81	50.11	9.25	2.19	22.94	11.92

Note: The Table reports the percentage of the total variance of the three GDP attributable to the different variables at various horizons. The VAR includes 7 variables, in the following order: euro area GDP, Row GDP, US GDP, euro area slope and stock market, US slope and stock market.

Table 2, Panel A, reports the R^2 obtained by regressing the actual GDP growth rates on their counterfactual values. Across the whole sample the United States would have explained about 15% of the euro area GDP growth rates and 10% of the rest of the world GDP growth. By contrast, the euro area and the rest of the world are able to explain only a very limited fraction of the US GDP growth. Looking at four sub-samples built across decades (Table 2, Panel B) shows a significant amount of time variation in this pattern. On average, shocks originating from the United States would have explained about 23% of euro area GDP growth between 1970 and 2000, a percentage that has risen to 36% since that year. Extending the exercise to include financial variables, we find that US and ROW real shocks alone would have explained 12 and 8% of euro area GDP growth rates across the whole sample, percentages which rise to 18% and 16% when financial shocks are also considered.

Notwithstanding the inherent difficulty in disentangling common from country-specific shocks, our results favor the conclusion that the United States is the main source of fluctuations – although financial variables seem to have also some influence. The historical

decomposition (see Figure 8)[15] confirms that the role of euro area financial shocks is limited, either because these shocks do not occur frequently enough or because they have a small impact on activity.

Table 2. R^2 of a regression of the first differences in log GDP on its counterfactual values

PANEL I: (full sample)			
common factor	US	euro area	row
US	0.90	0.14	0.21
euro area	0.04	0.80	0.14
row	0.01	0.10	0.61
PANEL II: (across decades)			
	US	euro area	row
US 1970s	0.70	0.23	0.27
US 1980s	0.81	0.21	0.42
US 1990s	0.87	0.25	0.46
US 2000s	0.89	0.36	0.29
	US	euro area	row
euro area 1970s	0.03	0.45	0.01
euro area 1980s	0.00	0.86	0.00
euro area 1990s	0.23	0.89	0.60
euro area 2000s	0.18	0.95	0.31
	US	euro area	row
row 1970s	0.00	0.10	0.55
row 1980s	0.00	0.21	0.22
row 1990s	0.23	0.12	0.51
row 2000s	0.08	0.25	0.80

Note: The VARs are estimated in levels without imposed cointegration between 1970q1 and 2007q4, with four lags. Taking the standpoint of the United States, the three R^2 come from the regression $\Delta \log \text{GDP} = \alpha + \beta \Delta \log \hat{GDP} + \varepsilon_t$, where the superscript denotes the counterfactual values of the GDP in each of the three areas coming from a VAR where shocks other than the US shocks are restricted to zero and the US is therefore the common factor for the other two countries. The same procedure applies when the remaining two countries are considered as the common factor in the VAR.

More specifically, the historical decomposition is consistent with a simple picture of the euro area history: the 1974 recession was worsened by negative US and Rest of the World cycles. Growth was hurt in the early 80s by restrictive monetary policy, especially in the US. The long contraction in 1992 followed the German reunification and was not explained by

---

[15] The historical decomposition of the variance decompose a time series in a projection and the accumulated effects of current and past innovations, basically $y_{T+j} = \Sigma_{s=0}^{j-1} \Phi_s u_{T+j-s} + X_{T+j} \cdot \beta + \Sigma_{s=j}^{\infty} \Phi_s u_{T+j-s}$ with the first sum being the part due to innovations from $T+1$ to $T+j$ and the second being the forecast of y_{T+j} based on information available as of time T. The decomposition does not depend on any Choleski orthogonalization. We base the historical decomposition on a VAR where the 3 GDPs are complemented by the US and euro area stock market indexes and slopes.

international or financial factors. The latter seemed instead to matter in recent times, in particular in the 2002 recession and in the current episode.

Figure 8 shows the log-differences of the euro area GDP together with the revisions, with respect to the baseline GDP forecast (not reported) coming from each of the other five variables included in the VAR. Shocks attributed to the US stock market did not play a major role throughout the US recessions until 2001, when they seem to have significantly affected economic activity. The figure also shows that the role of the slope of the yield curve has been particularly sizeable between 1979 and 1983, but has since then played a rather marginal role. The same story holds for the US GDP. This evidence contrasts with the results from the IRFs. However, the presence of the stock market return in the historical decomposition may to some extent limit the role of the yield curve, so that the two findings are not necessarily mutually incompatible.

Figure 8. Historical decomposition

Note: Shaded areas correspond to US recessions identified by the NBER. The decomposition comes from a VAR including the US, euro area and rest of the world GDP and the US and euro area slopes of the yield curve (ea slope, us slope) as well as the euro area and the US stock markets (ea sm and us sm), The model is estimated between 1970Q1 and 2007Q4 with four lags and all the variables are considered in levels (in log-levels as the GDP are concerned). The actual GDP (black solid line) is reported on the right hand side scale. All remaining histograms refer to the left hand side scale.

IV. OUT-OF-SAMPLE EVIDENCE

The IRFs from the VAR models estimated across sub-samples showed that financial variables have played a stronger and more significant effect on real activity in the post-1985 period,

possibly because the 2001 episode, when the recession was anticipated by a significant drop in the value of equities worldwide, is included in the sample. These in-sample findings need however be complemented by an out-of-sample forecasting exercise.

Our evaluation of predictive ability is based on three main statistics: the Root-Mean-Squared Forecast Error (RMFE) calculated 1 to 12 quarters ahead; rolling RMFEs, calculated over moving windows of 12-quarters, which allows to examine time variation in the predictive ability of the models; and the conditional predictive ability test proposed by Giacomini and White (GW, 2006).[16] The rolling RMFE should be seen as a complement to the results of the GW test, since they can be carried out also on very small windows of data while the GW test requires re-estimating the VAR on windows of fixed length, which cannot be done in practice on windows shorter than 48 quarters. The comparison of the RMFE coming from the fixed estimation windows also allows us to investigate the amount of instability displayed by the data.[17]

A. 'Unconditional' Forecast Evaluation

Table 3a and 3b shows the 'unconditional predictive ability' RMFE (i.e. the RMFE for euro area GDP growth rates between $t+j$ and $t+j+1$, for $j=0,1,\ldots,11$, coming from forecasts conditional on all information – GDP and financial data – as of time t.

Starting from the euro area, we find that model 1, the VAR that includes the two GDPs only, has the best performance over the vast majority of the chosen forecast horizons (with the exception of the 1-step-ahead forecast; see the rows in panel C in Table 3a). Its performance is very close to that of the VAR that includes the three GDPs as well as to the VAR where GDPs are complemented by the stock market volatility and the slope of the yield curve. Considering that these latter two models have many more parameters than the simple bivariate VAR, their performances should be taken as broadly similar. The random walk model is never a winning choice. Adding other combinations of financial variables in the VARs beyond the slope and the stock market volatility worsens the forecasts at horizons shorter than one year, while at longer horizons the forecasts tend to return near the global minimum. Either the implicit cointegration relationships between GDPs that drive co-movements at longer horizons are not affected by the dynamics of financial variables, or noisy information contained in financial variables is smoothed out at long horizons.

---

[16] While the first two tests rely on out-of-sample forecast errors coming from expanding window estimation, the third is built from fixed window recursive estimation of the VAR models.

[17] The GDP forecast which is used to rank the models' performance is the rate of growth of GDP from the beginning of the sample (1970q1) to the actual evaluation point, when using expanding windows, and the rate of growth of GDP in the last k quarters before the actual evaluation point, when a fixed window estimation is considered.

Table 3a. Unconditional out-of-sample RMFE for the euro area GDP

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Panel I												
RW	RANDOM WALK	0.45	0.44	0.45	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
BiVARC	2 gdp cointegrated	0.43	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.43
BiVARL	2 gdp level	0.43	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
TriVARC	3 gdp cointegrated	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.45
TriVARL	3 gdp level	0.44	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.44	0.45	0.46	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.49
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0.49	0.43	0.48	0.47	0.45	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44
FIVAR1L	var slope level	0.56	0.51	0.58	0.60	0.58	0.58	0.56	0.56	0.53	0.53	0.55	0.52
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.63	0.56	0.53	0.60	0.58	0.54	0.53	0.53	0.43	0.51	0.50	0.45
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	0.56	0.55	0.49	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.48	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.50	0.48
FIVAR2L	sm slope level	0.73	0.73	0.65	0.73	0.72	0.72	0.79	0.81	0.77	0.85	0.80	0.82
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.47
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	0.61	0.58	0.68	0.69	0.73	0.72	0.67	0.64	0.62	0.64	0.65	0.64
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0.58	0.48	0.49	0.55	0.59	0.59	0.56	0.53	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
	Panel II												
MDS	median dist, slope	0.50	0.44	0.49	0.54	0.50	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.45
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0.55	0.48	0.51	0.56	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.49	0.46	0.44	0.45	0.44
FF	FF factors, slope	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.45	0.44
C&I	C&I Loans, slope	0.47	0.45	0.48	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans, slope	0.54	0.48	0.52	0.59	0.58	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.60	0.57	0.53	0.49
TB	Cp spread, baa, slope	0.49	0.48	0.52	0.55	0.52	0.54	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.54
Banks	Banks us+ea, slope	0.55	0.50	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.50	0.48
	Panel III												
	minimum all	0.42	0.41	0.41	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.42	0.42	0.43	0.43
	minimum fin	0.47	0.43	0.48	0.47	0.45	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.44	0.44	0.44
	relative gap	0.05	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01
	% gap	12.43	4.34	16.66	16.86	11.88	11.18	12.75	8.87	2.48	3.73	3.67	2.32

Note: The Table shows the out-of-sample RMFE for a number of models between 1 and 12 quarters ahead. The forecast are made as of time *t* conditional on the values of all the variables as of time *t*. Shaded areas identify classes of models. The RMFE are obtained by estimating the models on expanding windows the first of which starts in 1970Q1 and ends in 1986Q4. One observation at the time is added in the rolling procedure. The last four lines of the Table report the minimum RMFE across all models, the minimum RMFE across all models that include also variables other than just GDP, the relative gap between such two minima and the percentage gap. 'var' is the stock market volatility, 'slope' is the slope of the yield curve, 'dy' is the dividend yield of the aggregate stock market index, 'median dist' and 'iqr' are the median and the interquartile range of the distance to default for a set of financial firms (see Carlson et al., 2008), 'C&I Loans' are the US Commercial and Industrial Loans, 'Bank Loans' include Commercial and Industrial Loans, Real Estate Loans and Consumer Credit Loans. 'Cp spread' is the spread between the 3-month US commercial paper yield and the 3-month US T-bill rate, 'baa' is the yield differential between 10-year baa-rate US industrial bonds and the US Treasury bond., Banks'us+ea' is the one-quarter yield differential between the US banking equity index and the US broad stock market index as well as the corresponding series for the euro area.

Table 3b. Unconditional out-of-sample RMFE for the United States GDP

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Panel I												
RW	RANDOM WALK	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.54			

Table 4. Diebold – Mariano tests for unconditional predictive ability at selected horizons

	h=4		h=8		h=12	
	BiVarC vs.	TriVarC vs.	BiVarC vs.	TriVarC vs.	BiVarC vs.	TriVarC vs.
euro area						
BiVarC						
BiVarL	-0.57	-1.69	0.05	-0.72	0.27	-0.21
TriVarC	1.52		0.94		0.59	
TriVarL	1.43	-0.62	1.45	0.16	0.88	0.18
FiVar1C	0.81	-0.20	0.81	0.12	-0.44	-1.12
FiVar1L	0.73	-0.17	0.67	0.19	0.05	-0.17
FiVar1D	2.10	1.62	2.77	2.39	-0.38	-0.69
FiVar2C	0.94	-0.02	1.69	1.38	0.45	-0.15
FiVar2L	0.59	0.22	0.16	0.00	-0.36	-0.43
FiVar2D	2.15	1.79	0.24	0.07	0.12	0.04
FiVar3D	3.47	2.78	3.14	2.90	1.30	1.18
MDS	3.66	3.09	2.31	1.84	0.04	-0.32
MDIS	3.31	2.71	2.46	2.03	0.69	0.36
FF	2.48	1.99	2.64	2.39	-0.27	-0.72
C&I	2.53	1.94	2.31	2.11	0.40	0.16
BL	1.94	1.40	3.13	2.94	0.47	0.27
United States						
BiVarC						
BiVarL	-0.57	-0.25	-0.02	0.10	-0.08	-0.03
TriVarC	-0.33		-0.93		-1.03	
TriVarL	-0.48	-0.27	0.22	0.33	0.59	0.64
FiVar1C	-0.46	'0.36	-0.34	-0.25	-0.89	-0.85
FiVar1L	-0.34	-0.27	-0.70	-0.65	-0.34	-0.31
FiVar1D	0.51	0.57	1.43	1.50	0.00	0.05
FiVar2C	-0.93	-0.85	0.92	1.11	0.36	0.47
FiVar2L	0.48	0.53	0.32	0.34	0.02	0.03
FiVar2D	-0.25	-0.21	0.78	0.81	0.10	0.11
FiVar3D	0.60	0.67	1.52	1.59	2.82	2.85
MDS	-0.58	-0.50	0.47	0.58	1.53	1.62
MDIS	-0.80	-0.74	0.67	0.77	1.48	1.53
FF	0.37	0.46	1.20	1.38	0.27	0.35
C&I	-1.50	1.60	2.19	2.32	0.69	0.77
BL	1.59	1.68	1.66	1.78	0.50	0.58

Note: The Table reports the Diebold-Mariano (1995) tests for unconditional predictive ability between pairs of models. The test is the t-ratio of the constant in a regression of the differential between the absolute values of the forecast errors produced by competing models on the constant. The headings $h = 4$, $h = 8$ and $h = 12$ denote the forecast horizons. Entries larger than 1.96 indicate that the models reported in the second row of the Table (BiVarC and TriVarC) are not overperformed by the corresponding competing model in the first column. For a brief description of the models see, for example, Tables 3a or 3b. 'var' is the stock market volatility, 'slope' is the slope of the yield curve, 'dy' is the dividend yield of the aggregate stock market index, 'median dist' and 'iqr' are the median and the interquartile range of the distance to default for a set of financial firms (see Carlson et al., 2008), 'C&I Loans' are the US Commercial and Industrial Loans, 'Bank Loans' include Commercial and Industrial Loans, Real Estate Loans and Consumer Credit Loans.

The Diebold and Mariano (1995) test also suggests that financial variables provide no help in forecasting real activity. These tests are reported in Table 4 for both the US and the euro area GDP and are obtained as the t-statistics of the constant in a regression of the difference between the absolute values of the forecast errors (made for GDP growth rates) stemming from competing models on the constant itself. Entries in the Table larger than 1.64 indicate that the model in the second row of the Table is not overperformed by the model in the first column. All of the GDP forecasts upon which the tests are based rest on the parameters estimated on the full-sample and are therefore unconditional in a broader sense than implied by the RMFE, which was based on expanding window estimates. By using parameters based on a full-sample estimation in the construction of the Diebold – Mariano test we wish to control for parameter uncertainty, which should be mitigated in the larger 1970-2007 period.[18]

We checked the performance of the BiVarC (model 1) and the TriVarC (model 2) models relative to all remaining models at three horizons, 4, 8 and 12 quarters. For the euro area, at 4 and 8 quarters ahead, the VAR which include financial variables would have never been preferred over the BiVarC and the TriVarC. At the 12-quarter horizon, the test would have been in most cases indifferent between models with and without financial variables. For the US, in many comparisons the test found no major differences in predictive ability.

Looking at RMFEs, (cf. Tables 3a and 3b), the results are different for the US and the euro area. First, the RMFE is higher for the US GDP than for the euro area GDP, by around 20% on average. Because the US GDP seems to come first in the causal link,[19] it is more difficult to predict than the other variables and particularly so when compared to the euro area GDP. Second, the difference in RMFE between models that only look at past GDP and models that include financial variables is negligible for the US beyond the 4-quarter horizon, whereas for the euro area models with financial variables lead to a worse RMFE, by as much as 15-20%.

B. Conditional forecast evaluation

GDP numbers (even taking into account flash and preliminary estimates) are often made public with a substantial delay. As a result, the literature dedicated to short-run forecasting often makes use of financial data as leading indicators, in addition to surveys data (on retail sales, labor markets and so on) to complement the flow of information used for current quarter forecasting (nowcasting) and next quarter forecasting. For instance, Giannone et al. (2005) analyze the information content of around 200 macroeconomic releases for the US economy and find that interest rates, among a number of macroeconomic releases, improve the nowcasting of GDP.

---

[18] The random walk model has been eliminated from these comparisons as, unconditionally, we would have had the same GDP forecast for all the sample period (the average GDP growth rate).

[19] See again the counterfactual calculations in Table 2.

In this section, we put ourselves in the position of a short-term forecaster. We use our VAR models to forecast GDP as of period $t+1$ and beyond using financial data up to period $t+1$, while the most recent GDP release 'known' by the model refers to period t only. The forecasts are generated as conditional forecasts, i.e. we condition the VAR forecasts between $t+1$ and $t+12$ on financial data as of time $t+1$ and GDP as of time t.[20]

The results are presented in Tables 5a and 5b, panels I and II. The third-to-last row in each panel reports the minimum RMFE achieved by the models in Table 3, i.e. the lowest RMFE of the unconditional forecasting exercise. Conditional forecasts are worth being employed if the RMFE that they produce is lower than the RMFE coming from unconditional forecasts.

In the case of the United States (Table 5b) financial variables produce a statistically sizeable gain in predicting GDP. The gain peaks at the 5-quarter horizon and thereafter remains slightly positive. Another less sizeable gain is reached at the 11th step ahead. This pattern is reproduced with most combinations of financial variables. The predictability pattern in terms of gain/loss in RMFE relative to models including GDPs only has been reported also in Figure 9, in addition to Tables 3 to 5.

Coming to the euro area (Table 5a) and looking at panel I, up to the 8th step ahead, forecasting performance deteriorates for all models with financial variables, by between 15 and 35%. Between the 2- and the 3-year ahead horizon, the RMFE gets close to the overall minimum in Table 3. Panel II reports the same information when knowledge about GDP is further restricted to time $t-1$ while financial variables are known as of times t and $t+1$. The picture does not change too much with respect to panel I. Hence, it seems that the optimal forecast need not use the most recent quarterly financial data.

Relying on the most recent monthly financial data would not help either. We present in the three panels of Table 6 the results obtained for a similar exercise, conditioning on GDP as of time t and monthly financial variables dated $t+1/3$, $t+2/3$ and $t+3/3$ of a quarter[21]. For models m_4 to m_6, including financial data drastically deteriorates forecasting ability. For model 3 (the three GDPs plus stock market volatility and slope) 'unconditional forecast' and conditional forecast errors are similar at long horizons. The main improvements are for model 7 at horizons $h = 8, 9, 10$ (conditioning on first month and second month data) and at $h = 9$ (conditioning on third month data).

---

[20] Conditional forecasts amount to placing restrictions on the forecast errors of the VAR model $\Sigma_{s=0}^{K-1}\Theta_s u_{t-s}$.

The errors are orthogonalized so that the forecast errors becomes $\Sigma_{s=0}^{K-1}\Theta_s G v_{t-s}$, where G is a factor of the covariance matrix. Stacking the orthogonalized innovations in the forecast period, the constraints can now be written as $RV = r$, where R holds the restriction in V. In this way one first computes the vector which minimizes $V'V$ subject to the constraint, i.e. $V = R'(RR')^{-1}R$. The shocks are then translated into non-orthogonalized shocks and the model is used with these added shocks.

[21] Notice that the financial variables in $t+3/3$ differ from the quarterly variables in $t+1$ as rates of changes have a month-on-month reference period, rather than a quarter-on-quarter reference period.

Table 5a. Out-of-sample RMFE for the euro area, conditional on quarterly inforrmation.

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Panel I: estimation up to t, forecasts conditional on time t+1 information													
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0.51	0.49	0.54	0.61	0.70	0.68	0.63	0.64	0.57	0.60	0.60	0.57
FIVAR1L	var slope in level	0.62	0.54	0.54	0.62	0.59	0.61	0.60	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.55	0.57
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.58	0.51	0.57	0.58	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.48	0.50	0.46
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	0.60	0.59	0.57	0.55	0.53	0.52	0.50	0.49	0.47	0.45	0.48	0.47
FIVAR2L	sm slope in level	0.81	0.77	0.72	0.84	0.72	0.76	0.77	0.82	0.78	0.79	0.82	0.78
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.51	0.47	0.47	0.57	0.59	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.49	0.47	0.48	0.47
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	0.72	0.61	0.60	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.67	0.72	0.63	0.68	0.71	0.68
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0.60	0.50	0.48	0.53	0.58	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.51
MDS	median dist, slope	0.54	0.49	0.45	0.53	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.46	0.45
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0.60	0.54	0.49	0.57	0.58	0.55	0.51	0.52	0.47	0.44	0.45	0.44
FF	FF factors, slope	0.55	0.53	0.52	0.58	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.48	0.45	0.44	0.44
C&I	C&I Loans, slope	0.49	0.47	0.46	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.54	0.51	0.48	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans, slope	0.57	0.54	0.49	0.56	0.60	0.61	0.60	0.62	0.61	0.57	0.56	0.51
	minimum	0.49	0.47	0.45	0.53	0.53	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.47	0.44	0.44	0.44
	gain/loss over unco	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.10	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.00
	% gap	17.1	13.2	11.6	32.2	33.1	28.0	25.4	18.0	12.9	4.9	1.6	1.1

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Panel II: estimation up to t-1, forecasts conditional on time t and t+1 information													
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegarted	0.81	0.80	0.89	0.93	1.08	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.12	1.14	1.04
FIVAR1L	var slope in level	1.00	0.58	0.62	0.62	0.66	0.60	0.59	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.59	0.64
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.53	0.52	0.54	0.50	0.51	0.46	0.45
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	0.96	0.62	0.65	0.58	0.59	0.53	0.53	0.50	0.44	0.48	0.44	0.46
FIVAR2L	sm slope in level	1.33	0.81	0.92	0.90	0.78	0.79	0.85	0.83	0.85	0.83	0.78	0.80
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.52	0.48	0.53	0.60	0.59	0.55	0.55	0.52	0.49	0.48	0.48	0.47
FIVAR3L	dy slope in level	1.09	0.67	0.69	0.88	0.86	0.75	0.80	0.82	0.69	0.77	0.79	0.72
FIVAR3D	dy slope in delta	0.54	0.49	0.54	0.55	0.57	0.56	0.56	0.53	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.52
MDS	Median dist, slope	0.54	0.51	0.50	0.54	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.48	0.47	0.45	0.46
MDIS	Median dist, iqr, slope	0.61	0.55	0.56	0.59	0.60	0.54	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.46	0.43	0.44
FF	FF factors, slope	0.58	0.54	0.58	0.58	0.56	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.44	0.43	0.44
C&I	C&I Loans, slope	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans, slope	0.57	0.54	0.53	0.58	0.63	0.61	0.60	0.62	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.49
	Minimum	0.50	0.48	0.50	0.54	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.44
	gain/loss over unco	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.14	0.15	0.11	0.11	0.09	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
	% gap	17.6	17.4	23.0	34.2	37.5	27.9	27.4	21.5	6.5	5.3	0.6	1.1

Note: The two panels of the Table show the out-of-sample RMFE for a number of models between 1 and 12 quarters ahead. In Panel I, the forecast are made as of time *t* conditional on the values of the GDP as of time *t* and on the financial variables as of *t*+1. In Panel II, the forecast are made as of time *t*-1 conditional on the values of the GDP as of time *t*-1 and on the financial variables as of *t* and *t*+1 Shaded areas identify classes of models. The RMFE are obtained by estimating the models on expanding windows the first of which starts in 1970Q1 and ends in 1986Q4. One observation at the time is added to the previous sample in the rolling procedure. The last four lines of the Table report the minimum RMFE across all models, the minimum RMFE across all models that include also variables other than just GDP, the relative gap between such two minima and their percentage gap. 'var' is the stock market volatility, 'slope' is the slope of the yield curve, 'dy' is the dividend yield of the aggregate stock market index, 'median dist' and 'iqr' are the median and the interquartile range of the distance to default for a set of financial firms (see Carlson et al., 2008), 'C&I Loans' are the US Commercial and Industrial Loans, 'Bank Loans' include Commercial and Industrial Loans, Real Estate Loans and Consumer Credit Loans.

Table 5b. Out-of-sample RMFE for the United States, conditional on quarterly information.

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Panel I: estimation up to t, forecasts conditional on time t+1 information													
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0,92	0,89	0,91	0,99	0,92	0,89	0,81	0,74	0,66	0,66	0,65	0,59
FIVAR1L	var slope in level	1,19	0,98	0,98	0,93	0,77	0,77	0,70	0,72	0,84	0,90	0,89	0,91
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0,81	0,77	0,64	0,59	0,59	0,63	0,62	0,63	0,61	0,54	0,51	0,51
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	1,08	0,88	0,82	0,81	0,76	0,70	0,68	0,61	0,76	0,65	0,57	0,79
FIVAR2L	sm slope in level	1,63	1,26	1,22	1,17	1,19	1,13	1,10	1,16	1,33	1,18	1,23	1,39
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0,78	0,72	0,73	0,59	0,53	0,53	0,55	0,55	0,59	0,60	0,59	0,56
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	1,06	0,87	0,96	1,18	1,09	0,94	1,22	1,01	1,06	1,12	1,06	1,06
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0,77	0,73	0,74	0,67	0,67	0,64	0,59	0,57	0,59	0,64	0,66	0,64
MDS	median dist, slope	0,70	0,71	0,71	0,61	0,57	0,57	0,55	0,53	0,56	0,55	0,55	0,54
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0,85	0,77	0,73	0,65	0,60	0,57	0,54	0,54	0,55	0,53	0,56	0,54
FF	Fama French factors	0,76	0,79	0,68	0,62	0,56	0,58	0,59	0,57	0,56	0,54	0,56	0,55
C&I	C&I Loans	0,71	0,69	0,70	0,66	0,62	0,58	0,57	0,54	0,54	0,55	0,56	0,55
BL	Bank loans	0,85	0,86	0,93	0,77	0,77	0,73	0,69	0,64	0,62	0,58	0,57	0,58
	minimum	0,70	0,69	0,64	0,59	0,53	0,53	0,54	0,53	0,54	0,53	0,51	0,51
	gain/loss over unco	0,19	0,20	0,13	0,08	0,01	0,02	0,02	0,01	0,01	-0,01	-0,02	-0,01
	% gap	36,74	39,60	24,62	15,47	2,00	3,89	2,96	1,09	2,34	-1,45	-4,30	-1,09

Forecast horizon		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Panel II: estimation up to t-1, forecasts conditional on time t and t+1 information													
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	1,50	1,60	1,66	1,70	1,66	1,75	1,54	1,40	1,30	1,28	1,23	1,18
FIVAR1L	var slope in level	2,03	0,99	1,02	0,99	0,86	0,72	0,72	0,93	1,03	1,00	1,00	0,99
FIVARD	var slope in delta	1,01	0,71	0,76	0,70	0,62	0,65	0,65	0,68	0,62	0,54	0,55	0,53
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	1,67	0,91	0,90	0,88	0,71	0,70	0,68	0,61	0,67	0,64	0,62	0,63
FIVAR2L	sm slope in level	2,68	1,44	1,23	1,22	1,16	1,09	1,18	1,16	1,27	1,23	1,32	1,44
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0,80	0,71	0,74	0,59	0,53	0,58	0,56	0,59	0,60	0,60	0,58	0,55
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	1,49	0,87	1,11	1,38	1,21	1,18	1,30	1,22	1,22	1,12	1,17	1,13
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0,75	0,73	0,75	0,72	0,66	0,66	0,59	0,57	0,60	0,67	0,68	0,62
MDS	median dist, slope	0,73	0,76	0,72	0,62	0,56	0,60	0,55	0,56	0,53	0,54	0,55	0,55
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0,89	0,81	0,75	0,68	0,58	0,61	0,55	0,55	0,52	0,53	0,56	0,55
FF	Fama French factors	0,89	0,81	0,75	0,68	0,58	0,61	0,55	0,55	0,52	0,53	0,56	0,55
C&I	C&I Loans	0,73	0,70	0,70	0,67	0,62	0,60	0,57	0,57	0,55	0,55	0,56	0,57
BL	Bank loans	0,85	0,92	0,93	0,78	0,77	0,72	0,75	0,78	0,60	0,58	0,57	0,56
	minimum	0,73	0,70	0,70	0,59	0,53	0,58	0,55	0,55	0,52	0,53	0,55	0,53
	gain/loss over unco	0,22	0,20	0,19	0,08	0,01	0,07	0,02	0,03	-0,01	-0,01	0,01	0,01
	% gap	43,05	41,01	36,04	16,10	2,31	13,96	3,35	5,01	-1,28	-1,08	1,40	2,23

Note: The two panels of the Table show the out-of-sample RMFE for a number of models between 1 and 12 quarters ahead. In Panel I, the forecast are made as of time *t* conditional on the values of the GDP as of time *t* and on the financial variables as of *t*+1. In Panel II, the forecast are made as of time *t*-1 conditional on the values of the GDP as of time *t*-1 and on the financial variables as of *t* and *t*+1 Shaded areas identify classes of models. The RMFE are obtained by estimating the models on expanding windows the first of which starts in 1970Q1 and ends in 1986Q4. One observation at the time is added to the previous sample in the rolling procedure. The last four lines of the Table report the minimum RMFE across all models, the minimum RMFE across all models that include also variables other than just GDP, the relative gap between such two minima and their percentage gap. 'var' is the stock market volatility, 'slope' is the slope of the yield curve, 'dy' is the dividend yield of the aggregate stock market index, 'median dist' and 'iqr' are the median and the interquartile range of the distance to default for a set of financial firms (see Carlson et al., 2008), 'C&I Loans' are the US Commercial and Industrial Loans, 'Bank Loans' include Commercial and Industrial Loans, Real Estate Loans and Consumer Credit Loans.

Table 6. Out of sample RMFE for the euro area, conditional on monthly information.

Panel I: estimation up to t, forecasts conditional on month t+1/3 information

	Forecast horizon	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
FIVAR1L	var slope in level	0.61	0.55	0.55	0.63	0.57	0.61	0.59	0.57	0.54	0.53	0.55	0.59
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.62	0.53	0.52	0.56	0.55	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.46
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	1.07	0.71	0.60	1.02	0.85	0.81	0.83	0.74	0.89	0.53	0.61	0.50
FIVAR2L	sm slope in level	1.60	0.88	0.76	1.90	1.15	1.04	1.12	1.08	1.14	0.96	1.13	0.93
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.51	0.46	0.47	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.47	0.46	0.47	0.47
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	0.73	0.59	0.61	0.75	0.76	0.76	0.65	0.65	0.62	0.64	0.70	0.68
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0.60	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.57	0.56	0.53	0.52	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.50
MDS	median dist, slope	0.55	0.46	0.47	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.45
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0.60	0.50	0.51	0.58	0.56	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.45	0.44
FF	Fama French factors	0.60	0.50	0.51	0.58	0.56	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.45	0.44
C&I	C&I Loans	0.50	0.46	0.48	0.53	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans	0.59	0.51	0.50	0.56	0.60	0.60	0.56	0.59	0.57	0.54	0.53	0.49
	minimum	0.50	0.46	0.47	0.47	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
	gain/loss over unco	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01
	% gap	18.2	11.2	14.8	17.3	12.5	5.6	8.2	8.0	1.2	2.4	3.0	2.3

Panel II: estimation up to t, forecasts conditional on month t+2/3 information

	Forecast horizon	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.48	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
FIVAR1L	var slope level	0.61	0.55	0.56	0.64	0.57	0.61	0.61	0.56	0.55	0.53	0.55	0.59
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.50	0.50	0.46	0.48	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	1.07	0.74	0.69	1.05	0.86	0.81	0.84	0.74	0.89	0.53	0.60	0.50
FIVAR2L	sm slope level	1.60	0.93	0.82	1.95	1.17	1.09	1.15	1.09	1.13	0.96	1.12	0.92
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.56	0.57	0.54	0.53	0.51	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	0.71	0.61	0.60	0.75	0.78	0.78	0.67	0.68	0.62	0.67	0.70	0.68
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0.56	0.54	0.51	0.54	0.55	0.56	0.53	0.53	0.49	0.48	0.49	0.51
MDS	median dist, slope	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.46	0.45	0.45
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0.58	0.52	0.51	0.57	0.55	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.44	0.44
FF	Fama French factors	0.58	0.52	0.51	0.57	0.55	0.54	0.51	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.44	0.44
C&I	C&I Loans	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.53	0.52	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans	0.58	0.52	0.48	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.56	0.58	0.57	0.53	0.53	0.49
	minimum	0.47	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.45	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.44
	gain/loss over cond Q	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
	% gap	11.9	12.5	12.7	19.5	13.7	4.7	8.0	7.0	1.7	2.8	3.1	1.7

Panel III: estimation up to t, forecasts conditional on month t+3/3 information

	Forecast horizon	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FIVAR1C	var slope cointegrated	0.51	0.51	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.44
FIVAR1L	var slope level	0.62	0.56	0.54	0.64	0.57	0.62	0.62	0.57	0.55	0.53	0.55	0.59
FIVARD	var slope in delta	0.59	0.54	0.51	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.53	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.47
FIVAR2C	sm slope cointegrated	1.07	0.72	0.70	1.10	0.87	0.82	0.87	0.75	0.90	0.53	0.60	0.51
FIVAR2L	sm slope level	1.58	0.93	0.82	2.01	1.15	1.09	1.18	1.10	1.15	0.94	1.15	0.94
FIVAR2D	sm slope in delta	0.51	0.47	0.46	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.52	0.52	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.47
FIVAR3D	dy slope in level	0.72	0.61	0.60	0.75	0.78	0.80	0.67	0.72	0.63	0.68	0.71	0.68
FIVAR3L	dy slope in delta	0.57	0.53	0.49	0.54	0.55	0.56	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.49	0.49	0.50
MDS	median dist, slope	0.52	0.48	0.44	0.52	0.52	0.51	0.50	0.52	0.49	0.46	0.45	0.45
MDIS	median dist, iqr, slope	0.58	0.53	0.48	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.52	0.52	0.47	0.44	0.45	0.43
FF	Fama French factors	0.58	0.53	0.48	0.57	0.56	0.54	0.52	0.52	0.47	0.44	0.45	0.43
C&I	C&I Loans	0.47	0.45	0.44	0.52	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.54	0.51	0.48	0.47	0.46
BL	Bank loans	0.59	0.50	0.47	0.57	0.60	0.59	0.57	0.60	0.58	0.53	0.53	0.49
	minimum	0.47	0.45	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.42	0.44	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.43
	gain/loss over cond Q	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00
	% gap	12.6	10.0	8.1	20.4	15.2	5.3	8.8	7.9	2.7	1.9	2.6	0.5

Note: The three panels of the Table show the out-of-sample RMFE for a number of models between 1 and 12 quarters ahead. In the three panels the forecast are made as of time *t* conditional on the values of the GDP as of time *t* and on the financial variables as of, respectively, quarter *t* + 1 month, 2 months and 3 months. Shaded areas identify classes of models. The RMFE are obtained by estimating the models on expanding windows the first of which starts in 1970Q1 and ends in 1986Q4. One observation at the time is added to the previous sample in the rolling procedure. The last four lines of the Table report the minimum RMFE across all models, the minimum RMFE across all models that include also variables other than just GDP, the relative gap between such two minima and their percentage gap. For the definition of some variables see note to Table 3 and 5.

Overall, our forecasting exercise shows that the more general 'GDP models' consistently beat the random walk over all the considered horizons for the euro area. In particular, models with 2 or 3 GDPs, also including stock market volatility and the slope of the yield curve, consistently improve the GDP forecast. Adding other combinations of financial variables tends to worsen the quality of the predictions (a result in line with the US literature, e.g. Stock and Watson, 2003) but the losses are small especially at very long horizons (between 1.5 and 3 years ahead) despite the increased uncertainty brought by the larger number of parameters to be estimated. However, it is rather surprising that predictions worsen significantly in our conditional forecast exercise.[22] The 2-GDP model performs the best, although the performance of the model with 3 GDP is only slightly worse, which suggests that there are indeed gains to take into account the activity of the small open economies, in order to capture global shocks in addition to idiosyncratic US shocks.[23]

Monthly information about financial variables prevailing one or two quarters after the latest GDP has been observed does not seem to provide a boost to models' predictive ability (cf. Table 6), although the losses in forecasting power are small. Furthermore the forecast paths for both model 1 (the two GDPs) and model 2 (the three GDPs) are extremely flat throughout the sample (not reported), and therefore provide little policy relevant information. On the contrary, the GDP forecasts from the models that include financial variables are much more time varying and in particular episodes track well the actual (ex-post) fluctuations of GDP. This observation will motivate further investigation on the time-varying forecasting ability of the models (see section V).

C. Additional explanatory factors and prediction of industrial production indices

In this sub-section we briefly consider whether non-price financial information or price-related information associated with specific characteristics of the firms has the potential of changing our findings so far in terms of GDP predictability. We also look at the behavior of the models in forecasting industrial production indices sampled at two frequencies, quarterly and monthly.

As we discussed earlier, according to recent research (see Liew and Vassalou, 2000, Gilchrist et al., 2008, and Carlson et al., 2008) non-price financial information and equity price information with a narrower coverage than the broad market index seem to improve predictions of real activity. Building on these findings, we repeated our forecasting exercises using i) the Fama and French (1993) factors (high-minus-low, so-called 'hml' factor, and small-minus-big, so-called 'smb' factor), ii) the distance-to-default measure employed in

---

[22] The worsening occurs especially at short horizons and therefore does not seem to be due to a poor forecasting of the financial variables, which for 3 quarters ahead mostly coincide with actual data.

[23] The situation changes somewhat when one considers models that are specified in levels rather than in cointegration, always keeping the models in difference in the forecasting exercise. As in previous exercise, 4 lags are allowed for the variables. In this case, however, model 7 has 12 variables, as we have to leave unrestricted the relations between the dividend yield and the long rate (valuation of the stock market relative to the bond market) and the relationship between the long rate and the short rate (slope of the yield curve).

Carlson et al. (2008) and relative to a set of US financial firms, either alone and iii) together with its cross-sectional dispersion, measured by the interquartile range, iv) the Consumer and Industrial bank loans alone and v) together with consumer credit loans and real estate loans, vi) the 3-month US commercial paper spread, the difference between the US Baa industrial yield and the 10-year US Government bond yield, vii) the difference between the US and euro area banking sector stock market indices and the corresponding broad equity market indices.[24]

The out-of-sample RMFE from some of these additional models (from i) to v)) are reported in Tables 3 to 5, Panels II, (those for specifications vi) and vii) are reported as concerns our 'unconditional forecasts' only in Table 3 – lines identified by 'TB' and 'banks'), overall showing that while some of such financial variables lead to some improvement in out-of-sample GDP forecasting ability relative to the benchmark models with financial indicators described in Panels I of the same Tables, they lead nonetheless to a worsening of predictions relative to VAR models which consider only the 2 or the 3 GDPs as endogenous variables.

Motivated by the analysis of Junttila (2007)[25], we also used quarterly and monthly industrial production indices to investigate the information content of two combinations of financial variables. The results are presented in Table 7. The quarterly IP models include: i) the US and euro area IP indices, ii) the three IP indices (i.e. United States, euro area and Rest of the World), iii) the three IP indices, the three yield curve slopes and the three stock market volatilities, iv) the three IP indices, the three yield curve slopes and the three stock market indices. The models with financial variables are evaluated estimating the models up to time t conditional on financial variables at $t+1$ (superscript a) or estimating the models up to time t-1 conditional on financial variables at t and $t+1$ (superscript b). When considering the monthly frequency we used German IP data rather than the aggregated euro area variable since the latter was not available for the whole sample. We estimated models including i) the US and German IP monthly indices, ii) the two IP monthly indices, the two yield curve slopes and the two stock market volatilities, iv) the two IP monthly indices, the two yield curve slopes and the two stock market indices. The lines identified by 'a' and 'b' have the same meaning as before.

---

[24] The Fama and French factors are stationary variables (they are stock market returns). The distance to default and interquartile range were found to be stationary using a Dickey - Fuller augmented test with 4 lags. The same test suggests that the three types of bank loans are integrated of order one and they have therefore been considered in first differences. As all the financial variables have been made stationary – or were already stationary – we only employed VARs where GDPs are considered in first logarithmic differences. The Fama and French factors are computed as zero investment portfolios, i.e. long – short positions in firms with specific characteristics (size and value).

[25] Junttila (2007) showed for several countries that specific portfolios of financial variables can beat, out-of-sample, AR models of industrial production.

Table 7: Out of sample RMFE for the IP indices

	Forecast horizon	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Panel I: euro area: QUARTERLY FREQUENCY													
RW	Random walk	0.709	0.939	0.952	0.991	0.999	0.994	0.999	1.003	1.008	1.009	1.014	1.022
BiVARC	2 gdp coint.	0.970	1.112	1.167	1.118	1.017	0.983	1.010	1.006	1.007	1.001	1.017	1.022
TriVARC	3 gdp coint.	0.970	1.112	1.167	1.137	1.039	1.004	1.035	1.030	1.035	1.031	1.048	1.052
FIVAR1C	var slope coint.	0.970	1.112	1.160	1.123	1.026	0.991	1.022	1.017	1.022	1.018	1.034	1.037
FIVAR2C	sm slope coint.	1.074	1.165	1.266	1.226	1.224	1.227	1.197	1.107	1.123	1.111	1.085	1.063
FIVAR1C[a]	var slope coint.	1.102	1.018	1.120	1.192	1.188	1.076	1.003	1.021	1.029	1.022	1.014	1.026
FIVAR1C[b]	var slope coint.	1.975	1.246	1.260	1.175	1.063	1.011	1.013	1.023	1.015	1.021	1.018	1.032
FIVAR2C[a]	sm slope coint.	2.122	1.199	1.292	1.340	1.335	1.287	1.274	1.230	1.155	1.118	1.118	1.088
FIVAR2C[b]	sm slope coint.	2.271	1.394	1.331	1.391	1.337	1.260	1.169	1.129	1.097	1.103	1.035	1.080
Panel II: United States													
RW	RANDOM WALK	1.014	1.025	1.034	1.062	1.064	1.072	1.080	1.088	1.095	1.098	1.098	1.107
BiVARC	2 gdp coint.	1.481	1.355	1.227	1.085	1.174	1.244	1.242	1.230	1.155	1.151	1.082	1.073
TriVARC	3 gdp coint.	1.481	1.355	1.232	1.120	1.208	1.282	1.284	1.267	1.195	1.193	1.128	1.117
FIVAR1C	var slope coint.	1.481	1.355	1.225	1.107	1.193	1.266	1.268	1.251	1.179	1.178	1.113	1.102
FIVAR2C	sm slope coint.	2.039	1.829	1.678	1.723	1.557	1.700	1.845	1.559	1.796	1.649	1.482	2.122
FIVAR1C[a]	var slope coint.	1.535	1.414	1.276	1.221	1.204	1.266	1.266	1.294	1.224	1.164	1.140	1.090
FIVAR1C[b]	var slope coint.	2.496	1.496	1.271	1.322	1.288	1.242	1.300	1.268	1.244	1.121	1.107	1.093
FIVAR2C[a]	sm slope coint.	2.086	1.924	1.844	1.844	1.701	1.683	1.765	1.677	1.835	1.599	1.416	1.933
FIVAR2C[b]	sm slope coint.	3.067	2.007	2.072	1.813	1.659	1.630	1.727	1.508	1.510	1.451	1.320	1.597
Panel I: Germany, MONTHLY FREQUENCY													
RW	Random walk	1.321	1.328	1.329	1.331	1.333	1.335	1.335	1.333	1.335	1.338	1.339	1.339
BiVARC	2 gdp coint.	1.272	1.326	1.333	1.344	1.337	1.341	1.336	1.333	1.334	1.336	1.335	1.335
FIVAR1C	var slope coint.	1.265	1.290	1.291	1.298	1.293	1.293	1.290	1.291	1.292	1.296	1.292	1.285
FIVAR2C	sm slope coint.	1.292	1.323	1.303	1.295	1.295	1.297	1.291	1.292	1.293	1.294	1.291	1.285
FIVAR1C[a]	var slope coint.	1.971	1.276	1.299	1.292	1.308	1.295	1.294	1.290	1.290	1.292	1.297	1.292
FIVAR1C[b]	var slope coint.	1.542	1.302	1.306	1.303	1.294	1.289	1.288	1.289	1.294	1.294	1.291	1.284
FIVAR2C[a]	sm slope coint.	1.974	1.313	1.345	1.327	1.318	1.285	1.297	1.294	1.290	1.294	1.295	1.290
FIVAR2C[b]	sm slope coint.	1.593	1.346	1.334	1.308	1.280	1.292	1.293	1.289	1.294	1.293	1.290	1.283
Panel II: United States													
RW	Random walk	2.022	2.032	2.029	2.033	2.037	2.036	2.029	2.027	2.030	2.033	2.037	2.041
BiVARC	2 gdp coint.	1.808	2.079	2.044	2.059	2.044	2.042	2.032	2.028	2.027	2.033	2.036	2.036
FIVAR1C	var slope coint.	1.773	2.042	1.999	2.011	1.986	1.991	1.983	1.986	1.980	1.985	1.982	1.971
FIVAR2C	sm slope coint.	1.809	2.092	2.029	2.026	1.986	1.987	1.981	1.986	1.982	1.987	1.985	1.974
FIVAR1C[a]	var slope coint.	1.764	2.061	2.009	2.017	1.987	1.987	1.983	1.985	1.980	1.986	1.983	1.971
FIVAR1C[b]	var slope coint.	1.830	2.018	2.023	1.990	1.985	1.976	1.981	1.977	1.983	1.985	1.980	1.990
FIVAR2C[a]	sm slope coint.	1.816	2.128	2.071	2.051	2.011	1.986	1.979	1.984	1.982	1.987	1.985	1.974
FIVAR2C[b]	sm slope coint.	1.795	2.106	2.093	2.039	2.010	1.975	1.979	1.979	1.983	1.986	1.982	1.990

Note: Panel I of the Table shows the out-of-sample RMFE made in forecasting the euro area and the US quarterly IP index, via a number of models, between 1 and 12 quarters ahead. All models except BiVARC include three economic areas. Panel II shows the same results as Panel I but all models include two economic areas only, Germany and the United States, and are based on monthly data. In the rows labeled with a superscript 'a', forecasts are made as of time t conditional on the values of the IP Indices as of time t and on the financial variables as of $t+1$. In the lines characterized by the superscript 'b', the forecast are made as of time t-1 conditional on the values of the IP Indices as of time t-1 and on the financial variables as of t and $t+1$. Shaded areas identify classes of models. The RMFE are obtained by estimating the models on expanding windows the first of which starts in 1970Q1 or in 1970M1 and ends in 1986Q4 or in 1986M12. One observation at the time is added to the previous sample in the rolling procedure. 'var' is the stock market volatility, 'slope' is the slope of the yield curve.

The quarterly IP models confirm what found using GDP series, i.e. the results based on the bivariate or the trivariate models that only include past GDPs cannot be improved when one considers financial variables (Table 7, panel I). However, the findings of Junttila (2007) are also confirmed when looking at monthly activity: nearly all of the models including financial variables, conditional on information about industrial production indices dated t or t-1, fare better than the VAR for the two IP indices or than the random walk. The decrease in the RMFE is however rather small, around 2 to 4% relative to either the bivariate VAR or the random walk.

V. CONDITIONAL EVALUATION

A. Rolling RMFEs

This section analyses the conditional predictive ability of our models using rolling RMFEs as well as the test due to Giacomini and White (2006). Rolling RMFEs, calculated over 12-quarter windows, are reported in Figure 9 for some selected models and are referred to 4- and 8-quarters ahead errors. The rolling RMFEs mitigate our previous results: between March 1996 and March 1999 and between 2002 and 2005 monthly financial information (i.e. monthly values of the financial variables within quarter t+1) would have improved the forecasting performance over the 'unconditional' forecast (the forecast being made in quarter t). Figure 10 suggests that there is a dramatic loss in forecasting ability when one uses quarterly financial variables but there are substantial gains when using monthly financial data. Improvements in forecasting ability are due to second month information (i.e. the second month in quarter t+1 when GDP information is limited up to quarter t) for the 4-step ahead horizon and due to information coming from the first month in quarter t+1 for the 8-step horizon (see the first two panels of Figure 10). The VAR models that include the slope of the yield curve and the stock market volatility, as well as the distance to default (itself a function of the volatility of a number of individual equities) seem to be the most successful specifications (last two panels of Figure 10).

B. Conditional Predictive Ability Test

We complement the informal findings obtained through the rolling RMFEs above with the GW test. The latter, which allows to analyze out-of-sample predictive ability in realistic situations, generalizes the widely employed Diebold and Mariano (1995) test along two dimensions, namely the limiting properties and the conditional evaluation of the predictive ability. This latter feature allows us to answer the question "can we predict whether two forecasts will be different and if so which model should be chosen at a given point in time?"[26]

For horizons $\tau = 1$, 4 and 8 quarters we test the null hypothesis that the expectation, as of time t, of the difference in forecast performance (using the loss function L, in our case the absolute value) for the two competing models '*ma*' and '*mb*' is zero

---

[26] The test is valid for both nested and non-nested models. For the computation of the GW test all the models are re-estimated over fixed intervals of 60 quarters since the test applies to rolling windows of fixed size only

$$H_0 \; : \; E\Big[\big|GDP_{t+\tau} - \hat{GDP}^{\tau}_{t,ma}\big| - \big|GDP_{t+\tau} - \hat{GDP}^{\tau}_{t,mb}\big| \, | \, G_t\Big] = E[\Delta L_{t+\tau} \, | \, G_t] = 0.$$

Giacomini and White (2006) show that the test can be computed from the R^2 of a regression of the difference in the absolute value of the forecast errors on its lag and a constant, [27] with the forecast performance estimated on fixed length windows by rolling estimations. When the information set upon which the test is built is limited to current quarter, i.e. it is G_t, then the test that two forecasts are different is a conditional test, whereas when G_t coincides with the full sample, i.e. it is G_T, then it is an unconditional test and as such equivalent to the Diebold-Mariano test. The conditional test is a powerful tool in fine-tuning the choice of a predictive model depending on the underlying environment.

Figure 9. Gain/losses (in %) in terms of RMFE achieved by models with financial variables with respect to bivariate or trivariate models of the GDPs only, at various horizons.

Note: The two panels in the Chart report the gain or the loss in terms of RMFE of models with financial variables relative to the minimum RMFE achieved by a bivariate or a trivariate VAR model including GDPs only, at various horizons, expressed in quarters. The gain and the losses are expressed in percentages. "unco" refers to the model with financial variables, with forecast estimated without any conditioning. "quarters t and $t+1$" refers to the model estimated up to $t-1$, and the forecast is conditional on financial data at time t and $t+1$. "quarter $t+1$" refers to a model estimated up to t, with the forecast conditional on financial variables at time $t+1$. "m_1", "m_2" and "m_3" refer to the model forecast when conditioning on current GDP and 1.2 and 3 months ahead financial data. "$m_{1,t-1}$", "$m_{2,t-1}$" and "$m_{3,t-1}$" refer to the model forecast when conditioning on last quarter GDP and 1, 2 and 3 months ahead financial data.

---

[27] The test statistics can be computed as $n \cdot R^2 m$ where R^2 is the uncentered squared multiple correlation coefficient for the artificial regression of the constant unity on $(h_t . \Delta L_{m,t+1})$ where $h_t = (1, \Delta L_{m,t})$. In addition, if $\Delta L_{m,t}$ is assumed to be homoskedastic the test can be based on the $n \cdot R^2$ of the regression of $\Delta L_{m,t+1}$ on h_t.

Figure 10. RMFE from competing classes of models and from individual models

Panel I: 4-step ahead


Panel II: 8-step ahead

Note: In these first two panels of the Figure, "unco" refers to the model with financial variables, with forecast estimated without any conditioning. "quarters *t* and *t*+1" refers to the model estimated up to *t*-1, and the forecast is conditional on financial data at time *t* and *t*+1. "quarter *t*+1" refers to a model estimated up to *t*, with the forecast conditional on financial variables at time *t*+1. "m_1", "m_2" and "m_3" refer to the model forecast when conditioning on current GDP and 1.2 and 3 months ahead financial data. "$m_{1, t-1}$", "$m_{2, t-1}$" and "$m_{3, t-1}$" refer to the model forecast when conditioning on last quarter GDP and 1, 2 and 3 months ahead financial data.

Figure 10. RMFE from competing classes of models (ctd.)

Panel A: 4-step ahead

Panel B: 8-step ahead

Note: In these last two panels of the Figure, rw is the random walk model (model 0), 2gdp and 3gdp are the bivariate and trivariate models including GDPs only (model 1 and model 2), 3gdp+vol+slope is model 3l while 3gdp+svar+slope in delta is model 4, 3gdp+sr+slope cointegrated is model 5, 3gdp+sr+slope in delta is model 6 and 3gdp+dy+slope in delta is model 7. Finally DTD (distance to default) is model 8 and DTD, IQR (the distance to default together with its interquartile range) is model 9.

The choice of model '*a*' over model '*b*' is based on regressing $\Delta L_{t+\tau}$ (defined above) on a constant and its first lag ($\Delta L_{t+\tau} = \alpha + \beta \cdot \Delta L_{t-1+\tau} + \eta_{t+\tau}$) and then preferring model '*a*' to model '*b*' if the predicted value of the error gap between the two models, i.e. $\alpha + \beta \cdot \Delta L_{t-1+\tau}$ is below a given threshold. Figures 11 to 13 report the time series of the pairwise conditional GW test applied, respectively, to comparing the random walk model as well as the VAR with 2 and 3 GDPs against all the remaining VARs, i.e. those including information from financial variables. All pairwise comparisons refer to the 4-step ahead predictive ability only, for the period 1999-2007, but results are common to the other horizons and to further preserve space results are only presented for what we call the 'unconditional' forecasts (i.e. forecast from the VARs made as of time *t* conditional on the knowledge of all variables as of time *t*).

The three figures report the choice function, which equals one when the second model in the pairwise comparison would have been preferred over the first model at each quarter *t*.[28] The random walk model would have been preferred in a significant fraction of the quarters only to model 1 (the two GDPs) and less frequently to model 2 (the 3 GDPs) but it would have been by far surpassed by nearly all the models with financial variables, both price- and non-price related (Figure 11). The model with the 2 GDPs only, which performs extremely well based on the in-sample and out-of-sample RMFE criterion, would have instead been frequently over-performed by a VAR including the stock market volatility and the yield curve slope (Figure 12). The same occurs when the model with 3 GDPs only is evaluated against this richer VAR model with stock market volatility and yield curve slope (Figure 13). It is interesting to note that models with financial variables performed best in 1999 and between 2001 and 2003, periods in which the historical decomposition attributed the largest revisions to the baseline forecast to shocks in financial variables (see Figure 8).

In a nutshell, although on average financial variables may not contribute to improving forecasts according to the RMFE metric, they seem to have conveyed useful information for the euro area GDP forecast in several episodes in the past. The evidence is however more favorable as concerns the predictability of the United States GDP.

---

[28] The test is based on the information set spanning [0,*t-k*] where *k* is the horizon over which the predictive ability is tested (*k*=4 in Figures 11-13).

Figure 11. GW test for conditional predictive ability vis-à-vis the random walk model

Conditional choice: model 0 (random walk) vs. selected competing models (4-step ahead)


Note: The panels in the Figure show the results of the conditional model choice test proposed by Giacomini and White (2006). The test is presented as a series of zeros and ones, with one indicating that model 0 (the random walk assumption for GDP growth) would be chosen over the alternative model. The test builds on a regression of the differences between absolute out-of-sample forecast errors (4 quarters ahead) on their first four lags. The mean of the forecast errors is used a threshold for model's choice. The out-of-sample estimation is based on a moving window of 48 quarters. Model 1 is a bivariate VAR for US and euro area GDPs, Model 2 adds the GDP of the rest of the world, Model 3, Model 4 and Model 3l add the stock market volatility and the slope of the yield curve, Model 5, Model 5l and Model 6 add instead the stock market return and the slope of the yield curve, Model 7 and Model 7l add the dividend yield, the long term nominal rate and the slope of the yield curve. Models 8 to 12 add to the three GDPs respectively: the slope and the distance to default of a set of financial firms, the slope, the distance to default and its interquartile range for a set of financial firms, the Fama and French factors, the C&I loans, the C&I, real estate and consumer credit bank loans.

Figure 12. GW test for conditional predictive ability - 2 GDP VAR
Conditional choice: model 1 vs. selected competing models (4-step ahead)

Note: see Figure 11.

Figure 13. GW test for conditional predictive ability - 3 GDP VAR
Conditional choice: model 2 (3GDPs) vs. selected competing models (4-step ahead)

Note: see Figure 11.

VI. Conclusions

Against the background of the recent financial turmoil originated by a declining US housing market and a concurrent synchronized recession in the United States and in the main economic areas, this paper attempts to shed further light on the role of financial variables in predicting economic growth. In-sample evidence suggests that 'financial shocks' do matter for euro area and US real activity. However, when out-of-sample forecasts are judged under a RMFE metric, we share the Stock and Watson (2003) conclusion that financial variables do not help forecasting real activity in the euro area, even when taking into account their timeliness. In the United States the evidence is more favourable to a role of the financial variables in predicting real activity but the gain is concentrated at a few forecast horizons (5 and 11 quarters) and the loss in predictive power at the shortest horizons is remarkable. Also employing industrial production indices, either observed at a quarterly and a monthly frequency, does not change conclusions. The picture changes instead when conditional predictive ability tests are considered, with financial variables playing a role in the prediction of the euro area GDP especially in 1999 and between 2001 and 2003, in agreement with our results based on historical decomposition, showing that financial shocks were indeed prominent in these periods.

A caveat which also entails some directions for future research relates to the linear framework employed throughout the paper. Indeed, our results are derived in the setting of linear models, and therefore our findings and statements about the forecasting power of financial variables should be interpreted within that framework. As a consequence, it could indeed be the case that financial variables have a nonlinear impact on macroeconomic variables. For example, Fornari and Lemke (2009) show that financial variables, domestic and global, do help forecast business cycle phases in the United States, euro area and Japan. In addition, many other ways can be postulated through which financial developments can affect nonlinearly the predictability of GDP. For example, the forecasting power coming from financial variables may be larger when their movements are more synchronised both across countries and type of indicator, as economic activity could be more severely hit when the majority of financial variables are providing consistent signals. This is certainly an interesting avenue for future research.

References

Ang, A., M. Piazzesi and M. Wei (2006), "What does the yield curve tell us about GDP growth?", Journal of Econometrics, 131, 359-403.

Balke, N. S. (2000), Credit and Economic Activity: Credit Regimes and Nonlinear Propagation of Shocks, Review of Economics and Statistics, 82, 344-49.

Bayoumi, T. and A.J. Swiston (2007), "Foreign Entanglements: Estimating the Source and Size of Spillovers Across Industrial Countries", IMF Working Paper No. 07/182.

Bernanke, B.S. and M. Gertler (1989), "Agency Costs, Net Worth, and Business Fluctuations", American Economic Review, 79, 14-31.

Bloom, N. (2009), "The Impact of Uncertainty Shocks", Econometrica, 77, 623-85.

Bloom N., M. Floetotto and N. Jaimovich (2009), Really Uncertain Business Cycles, Stanford

University, mimeo.

Boivin, J. and M. Giannoni (2007), Global Forces and Monetary Policy Effectiveness, in J. Galì and M. Gertler (eds.) International Dimensions of Monetary Policy, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, forthcoming.

Carlson, M.A, T. B. King and K. F. Lewis (2008), Distress in the Financial Sector and Economic Activity, Federal Reserve Board Working Paper, No. 2008-43.

Dees S., di Mauro F. Pesaran M.H. and Smith L.V. (2007), "Exploring the international linkages of the euro area: a global VAR analysis", Journal of Applied Econometrics, 22, 1-38.

Dees, S. and Saint-Guilhem A. (2008), The Role of the United States in the Global Economy and its Evolution Over Time, ECB Working Paper, forthcoming.

Dees, S. and I. Vansteenkiste (2007), "The Transmission of US Cyclical Developments to the Rest of the World", ECB Working Paper No. 798.

Diebold, F.X. and R.S. Mariano (1995), "Comparing Predictive Accuracy", Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 13, 253-263.

Fagan, G., J. Henry and R. Mestre (2001), "An Area-wide Model (AWM) for the euro area" ECB working paper No. 42.

Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (1993), "Common Risk Factors in the Returns of Stocks and Bonds", Journal of Financial Economics, 33, 3-56.

Favero, C. and F. Giavazzi (2008), "Should the Euro Area Be Run as a Closed Economy?", American Economic Review, 98, 138-145.

Fornari, F. and A. Mele (2009), "Financial Volatility and Economic Activity", London School of Economics, mimeo.

Fornari, F. and W. Lemke (2009), "Financial Variables and Recession Probabilities", ECB Working Paper, forthcoming.

Forni, M., M. Lippi, M. Hallin and L. Reichlin (2003), "Do financial variables help forecasting inflation and real activity in the euro area?", Journal of Monetary Economics, 50, 1243-55.

Giacomini, R. and H. White (2006), "Tests of Conditional Predictive Ability", Econometrica, 74, 1545-78.

Giannone, D. and L. Reichlin (2004), "Euro area and US recessions: 1970-2003", in L. Reichlin (editor) The euro area business cycle: stylized facts and Measurement Issues, CEPR, 83-93.

Giannone, D., L. Reichlin and D. Small (2005), "Nowcasting GDP and Inflation: The Real Time Informational Content of Macroeconomic Data Releases", CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5178.

Giannone, D. M. Lenza and L. Reichlin (2008), "Business Cycles in the Euro Area", in A. Alesina and F. Giavazzi (editors), Europe and the Euro, forthcoming.

Goodhart, C, P. Sunirand and D. Tsomocos (2006), "A time series analysis of financial fragility in the UK banking system", Annals of Finance, 1, 197-224.

Guichard, S., D. Haugh and D. Turner (2009), "Quantifying the Effects of Financial Conditions in the Euro Area, Japan, United Kingdom and United States", OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 677, OECD Publishing.

IMF (2008), Financial Stress and Economic Downturns, Chapter 4, World Economic Outlook.

Junttila, J. (2007), "Forecasting the macroeconomy with contemporaneous financial market information: Europe and the United States", Review of Financial Economics 16, 149-75.

Johansen,S. (1988), "Statistical Analysis of Cointegrating Vectors", Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control 12, 231-254

Liew, J. and M. Vassalou (2000), "Can book-to-market size and momentum be risk factors that predict economic growth?", Journal of Financial Economics 57, 221-245.

Moneta, F. (2005), "Does the Yield Spread Predict Recessions in the Euro Area?", International Finance, 8, 263-301.

Stock, J.H. and M.W. Watson (2003), "Forecasting output and inflation: the role of asset prices", Journal of Economic Literature, 41, 788-829.

Swiston, A. (2008), "A US Financial Condition Index: Putting Credit where Credit Needs is Due", IMF Working Paper, WP/08/61.

European Central Bank Working Paper Series

For a complete list of Working Papers published by the ECB, please visit the ECB's website (http://www.ecb.europa.eu).

1077 "The reception of public signals in financial markets – what if central bank communication becomes stale?" by M. Ehrmann and D. Sondermann, August 2009.

1078 "On the real effects of private equity investment: evidence from new business creation" by A. Popov and P. Roosenboom, August 2009.

1079 "EMU and European government bond market integration" by P. Abad and H. Chuliá, and M. Gómez-Puig, August 2009.

1080 "Productivity and job flows: heterogeneity of new hires and continuing jobs in the business cycle" by J. Kilponen and J. Vanhala, August 2009.

1081 "Liquidity premia in German government bonds" by J. W. Ejsing and J. Sihvonen, August 2009.

1082 "Disagreement among forecasters in G7 countries" by J. Dovern, U. Fritsche and J. Slacalek, August 2009.

1083 "Evaluating microfoundations for aggregate price rigidities: evidence from matched firm-level data on product prices and unit labor cost" by M. Carlsson and O. Nordström Skans, August 2009.

1084 "How are firms' wages and prices linked: survey evidence in Europe" by M. Druant, S. Fabiani, G. Kezdi, A. Lamo, F. Martins and R. Sabbatini, August 2009.

1085 "An empirical study on the decoupling movements between corporate bond and CDS spreads" by I. Alexopoulou, M. Andersson and O. M. Georgescu, August 2009.

1086 "Euro area money demand: empirical evidence on the role of equity and labour markets" by G. J. de Bondt, September 2009.

1087 "Modelling global trade flows: results from a GVAR model" by M. Bussière, A. Chudik and G. Sestieri, September 2009.

1088 "Inflation perceptions and expectations in the euro area: the role of news" by C. Badarinza and M. Buchmann, September 2009.

1089 "The effects of monetary policy on unemployment dynamics under model uncertainty: evidence from the US and the euro area" by C. Altavilla and M. Ciccarelli, September 2009.

1090 "New Keynesian versus old Keynesian government spending multipliers" by J. F. Cogan, T. Cwik, J. B. Taylor and V. Wieland, September 2009.

1091 "Money talks" by M. Hoerova, C. Monnet and T. Temzelides, September 2009.

1092 "Inflation and output volatility under asymmetric incomplete information" by G. Carboni and M. Ellison, September 2009.

1093 "Determinants of government bond spreads in new EU countries" by I. Alexopoulou, I. Bunda and A. Ferrando, September 2009.

1094 "Signals from housing and lending booms" by I. Bunda and M. Ca'Zorzi, September 2009.

1095 "Memories of high inflation" by M. Ehrmann and P. Tzamourani, September 2009.

1096 "The determinants of bank capital structure" by R. Gropp and F. Heider, September 2009.

1097 "Monetary and fiscal policy aspects of indirect tax changes in a monetary union" by A. Lipińska and L. von Thadden, October 2009.

1098 "Gauging the effectiveness of quantitative forward guidance: evidence from three inflation targeters" by M. Andersson and B. Hofmann, October 2009.

1099 "Public and private sector wages interactions in a general equilibrium model" by G. Fernàndez de Córdoba, J.J. Pérez and J. L. Torres, October 2009.

1100 "Weak and strong cross section dependence and estimation of large panels" by A. Chudik, M. Hashem Pesaran and E. Tosetti, October 2009.

1101 "Fiscal variables and bond spreads – evidence from eastern European countries and Turkey" by C. Nickel, P. C. Rother and J. C. Rülke, October 2009.

1102 "Wage-setting behaviour in France: additional evidence from an ad-hoc survey" by J. Montornés and J.-B. Sauner-Leroy, October 2009.

1103 "Inter-industry wage differentials: how much does rent sharing matter?" by P. Du Caju, F. Rycx and I. Tojerow, October 2009.

1104 "Pass-through of external shocks along the pricing chain: a panel estimation approach for the euro area" by B. Landau and F. Skudelny, November 2009.

1105 "Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: survey evidence from European firms" by J. Babecký, P. Du Caju, T. Kosma, M. Lawless, J. Messina and T. Rõõm, November 2009.

1106 "The margins of labour cost adjustment: survey evidence from European firms" by J. Babecký, P. Du Caju, T. Kosma, M. Lawless, J. Messina and T. Rõõm, November 2009.

1107 "Interbank lending, credit risk premia and collateral" by F. Heider and M. Hoerova, November 2009.

1108 "The role of financial variables in predicting economic activity" by R. Espinoza, F. Fornari and M. J. Lombardi, November 2009.