NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

MAJOR MACROECONOMIC VARIABLES AND LEADING INDEXES: SOME ESTIMATES OF THEIR INTERRELATIONS, 1886-1982

Victor Zarnowitz

Phillip Braun

Working Paper No. 2812

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
January 1989

This research is part of NBER's research program in Economic Fluctuations. Any opinions expressed are those of the authors not those of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER Working Paper #2812
January 1989

MAJOR MACROECONOMIC VARIABLES AND LEADING INDEXES: SOME ESTIMATES OF THEIR INTERRELATIONS, 1886-1982

ABSTRACT

We examine the interactions within sets of up to six variables representing output, alternative measures of money and fiscal operations, inflation, interest rate, and indexes of selected leading indicators. Quarterly series are used, each taken with four lags, for three periods: 1949-82, 1919-40, and 1886-1914. The series are in stationary form, as indicated by unit root tests. For the early years, the quality of the available data presents some serious problems.

We find evidence of strong effects on output of the leading indexes and the short-term interest rate. The monetary effects are greatly reduced when these variables are included. Most variables depend more on their own lagged values than on any other factors, but this is not true of the rates of change in output and the composite leading indexes. Some interesting interperiod differences are noted and discussed.

Victor Zarnowitz
Graduate School of Business
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

Phillip Braun
Graduate School of Business
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

Major Macroeconomic Variables and Leading Indexes: Some Estimates of Their Interrelations, 1886-1982

Victor Zarnowitz and Phillip Braun

I. Background and Objectives

How the economy moves over time depends on its structure, institutions, and policies, all of which are subject to large historical changes. It would be surprising if the character of the business cycle did not change in response to such far-reaching developments as the great contraction of the 1930s and the post-depression reforms, the expansion of government and private service industries, the development of fiscal and other built-in stabilizers, and the increased use and role of discretionary macroeconomic policies. Hence, it is consistent with our priors that the data for the United States and other developed market-oriented countries generally support the hypothesis that business contractions were less frequent, shorter, and milder after World War II than before (Gordon 1986; Zarnowitz 1989).

Although business cycles have thus moderated, they retain a high degree of continuity, which shows up most clearly in the comovements and timing sequences among the main cyclical processes.[1] An important aspect of this continuity is the role of the variables that tend to move ahead of aggregate output and employment in the course of the business cycle. The composite index of leading indicators combines the main series representing these variables. Several studies point to the existence of a relatively close and stable relationship between prior changes in this index and changes in macroeconomic activity (Vaccara and Zarnowitz 1977; Auerbach 1982; Zarnowitz and Moore 1982; Diebold and Rudebusch 1987). Yet, the currently popular small reduced-form macro models, make little or no use of the leading indicators.[2]

We suspect that the reason is lack of familiarity. The role of the indicators is probably often misperceived as being purely symptomatic. Heterogeneous combinations of such series resist easy theoretical applications. On a deeper level, the notion that the private market economy is inherently stable led to an emphasis on the role of the monetary and fiscal disturbances. Interest in the potential of stabilization policies had a similar effect in that it stimulated work on models dominated by factors considered to be amenable to government control.

This orientation is understandably appealing but it can easily become one-sided and error-prone, both theoretically and statistically. For example, a simple vector autoregressive (VAR) model in log differences of real GNP, money, and government expenditures suggests the presence of strong lagged monetary and fiscal effects on output.[3] However, it is easy to show that these relationships are definitely misspecified. One way to demonstrate this is by adding changes in a leading index that excludes monetary and financial components so as not to overlap any of the other variables. In the thus expanded model, the dominant effects on output come from the past movements of the leading index, while the roles of the other variables (including the lagged values of output growth itself) are greatly reduced (see section IV.1 below). In general, omitting relevant variables in a VAR' cause the standard exogeneity tests, impulse responses, and variance decompositions to be biased, as shown in Lütkepohl 1982 and Braun and Mittnik 1985.

The first objective of this paper is to examine the lead-lag interactions within larger sets of important macroeconomic variables, including interest and inflation rates along with output, monetary and fiscal variables, and a nonduplicative leading index. The rationale for including this index is twofold. (1) The changes in the leading index can be interpreted broadly as representing dynamic forces within the private economy: the early collective outcomes of investment and production (also, less directly, consumption) decisions. Presumably, it is mainly these forces that account for the continuity of business cycles. Both aggregate demand and aggregate supply shifts are involved but the demand effects may be stronger in the short run. (2) The addition of the leading index helps us overcome the omitted variables bias. The index stands for a number of important factors that would otherwise be omitted. It would not be practical to include the several individual series to represent these variables.

We work with equations that include up to six variables, plus constant terms and time trends. They are estimated on quarterly series, each taken with four lags, which means using up large numbers of degrees of freedom. Given the size of the available data samples, it is not possible for such models to accomodate more variables, while retaining a chance to produce estimates of parameters in which one could have some confidence. It is, of course, easy to think of additional variables that might be important enough for their omission to cause some serious misspecifications. All vector autoregressive (VAR) models face this dilemma, but the only way to avoid it is by assuming a full structural model which could be still more deficient. We seek some partial remedies in alternative specifications guided by economic theory and history as well as comparisons with related results in the literature.

Although the format adopted is that of a VAR model, the implied system-wide dynamics, i.e., impulse response functions and variance decompositions, are beyond the scope of this study. These statistics seek to describe behavior in reaction to innovations, require longer series of consistent data than are actually available,[4] and are probably often very imprecise even for smaller systems (cf. Zellner 1985 and Runkle 1987 with discussion). In contrast, there is sufficient information to estimate well the individual equations, even with more lagged terms. We find that much can be learned from attention to the quality and implications of these estimates, which are logically prior to inferences on overall dynamics but carry no commitment to the particular interpretations of a VAR model. Moreover, our interest centers on cyclical movements, that is, on the interplay of forces over shorter time horizons, not on long-term consequences of some assumed shocks.

Our second and related objective is to extend the analysis to the periods between the two world wars and earlier in another effort to study the continuity and change in U.S. business cycles. To evaluate any persistent shifts or the secular evolution in the patterns of macroeconomic fluctuation, it is of course necessary to cover long stretches of varied historical experience. Estimates of the interrelations among the selected variables are calculated from quarterly seasonally adjusted data for three periods: 1886-1914, 1919-40, and 1949-82. We ask generally, what similarities and differences between the three periods are suggested by this exercise.

Historical data are scanty and deficient, which inevitably creates some difficult choices and problems. The next part of the paper (II) discusses this and lists the variables and series used Part III discusses the applied methods and presents tests that determine what transformations must be used on any of the series to validate our statistical procedures. Part IV examines the results, focusing on simple exogeneity and neutrality tests for a succession of models as well as on interperiod comparisons. Part V sums up our conclusions and views on the need for further work.

II. Data

1. The Selected Variables and Their Representations

Table 1 serves as a summary of the information on the data used in this study. It defines the variables and identifies the time series by title, period, symbol, and source. Some notes on how the underlying data are derived are included as well.

The table includes 11 different variables and 23 segments of the corresponding series, counting one per period (columns 2 and 3). No equation contains more than six variables. Some variables have different representations across the three periods covered because consistent data are not available for them. Further, unit root tests indicate that, in some cases, levels of a series ought to be used in one period, differences in another. These tests and the required transformations are discussed in section III.2 below. As shown in column 4, natural logarithms are taken of all series except the commercial paper rate. Federal expenditures in 1886-1914, the fiscal index in 1949-82, and the interest rate in both of these periods are level series; in all other cases first difference series are used.

Lower letters serve as symbols for variables cast in form of first differences, capital letters for those cast in levels (Table 1, column 5). The series relating to output (q), prices (p), the alternative monetary aggregates (b,m_1,m_2), and interest (I or i) are staple ingredients of small reduced-form or VAR models. They are characterized in the table on lines numbered 1-7.

Of the additional series, three represent fiscal variables (8-10). For the postwar period, there is an index combining federal spending, debt, and taxes (G). For the interwar and prewar periods, there are two segments of the federal expenditures series (gx and GX, respectively).

Finally, there are three different indexes of leading indicators (11-13). The only such series presently available for 1886-1914 is a diffusion index based on specific cycles in individual indicators (*l*dc). The composite indexes for 1919-40 and, particularly, for 1949-82 (*l*d and *l*, respectively) are much more satisfactory.

2. Data Sources and Problems

The "standard" historical estimates of GNP before World War II based mainly on the work of Kuznets, Kendrick, and Gallman, are at most annual. We use the new quarterly series for real GNP and the implicit price deflator from Balke and Gordon 1986.[5] These data are constructed from the standard series by means of quarterly interpolators which include the Persons 1931 index of industrial production and trade before 1930, the FRB industrial production index for 1930-40, constant terms, and linear time trends. The use of interpolations based on series with narrower coverage than GNP is a source of unavoidable error if the unit period is to be shorter than a year.[6]

The historical annual estimates of U.S. income and output leave much to be desired but it is difficult to improve on them because the required information simply does not exist. The series have been recently reevaluated, leading to new estimates by Romer, 1986 and 1987 and Balke and Gordon, 1988. Romer's method imposes certain structural characteristics of the U.S. economy in the post-World War II period on the pre-World War I data. This produces results that contradict the evidence on postwar moderation of the business cycle by prejudging the issue (Lebergott 1986; Weir 1986; Balke and Gordon 1988). It is mainly for this reason that we do not use Romer's data.

The basic source of historical monetary statistics (monthly since May 1907, biennial earlier) is Friedman and Schwartz 1970. Here too interpolations based on related series are applied in early years. The data for money (like those for income, output, and prices) improve over time but are never without serious problems. The interwar and postwar series are produced by the Federal Reserve Board (FRB).

Market interest rates are more easily and much better measured than the macroeconomic aggregates and indexes on our list. The commercial paper rate series (Macaulay 1938, FRB) is of good quality, at least in a comparative sense.

The Blanchard fiscal index is designed to measure "the effect of fiscal policy on aggregate demand at given interest rates" (Blanchard and Watson 1986, p. 149). This series moves countercyclically most of the time, hence presumably retains in large measure elements of built-in tax-and-transfer stabilizers. For the earlier periods, no comparable comprehensive index is available, and we use the series on federal expenditures from Firestone 1960.

From the leading index of the Commerce Department for 1949-82 we exclude real money balances (M2 deflated by the consumer price index) and change in business and consumer credit outstanding. This is done to avoid overlaps or conflicts with the monetary variables covered in our equations. The stock price component (Standard & Poor's index of 500 common stocks) may be strongly affected by monetary and fiscal developments and, adopting a conservative bias, we remove it as well. The so adjusted composite index consists of nine series representing primarily the early stages of fixed capital investment, inventory investment, and marginal adjustments of employment and production.[7]

The only composite index of leading indicators available in the literature for the interwar period covers six series: average workweek; new orders for durable manufacturers; nonfarm housing starts; commercial and industrial construction contracts; new business incorporations; and Standard and Poor's index of stock prices. The index is presented and discussed in Shiskin 1961. Its method of construction is very similar to that used presently for the Commerce index.[8] The coverage of the Shiskin index, though narrower, also resembles that of the postwar index, particularly when the money and credit components are deleted from the latter. The one major difference is that the interwar index is based on changes in the component series over 5-month spans, whereas the postwar index is based on month-to-month changes.[9]

Unfortunately, no composite index of leading indicators exists for the pre-World War I period. To compute such an index from historical data would certainly be worth while but also laborious; the project must be reserved for the future. In the meantime, we report on some experimental work with the only available series that summarizes the early cyclical behavior of a set of individual leading indicators. The set consists of 75 individual indicators whose turning points have usually led at business cycle peaks and troughs. It covers such diverse areas as business profits and failures, financial market transactions and asset prices, bank clearings, loans, and deposits, sensitive materials prices, inventory investment, new orders for capital goods, construction contracts, and the average workweek. Moore 1961 presents a diffusion index showing the percentage expanding of these series in each month of 1885-1940. The index is based on cyclical turns in each of its components: a series is simply counted as rising during each month of a specific cycle expansion and declining otherwise. Clearly, the type of smoothing implicit in this index construction is ill-suited for our purposes (it was designed for a very different task of historical timing analysis). Nevertheless, for lack of any other measure, we use this diffusion index by cumulating its deviations from 50 and taking log differences of the results.

III. The Statistical Framework

1. Method of Estimation

Conflicting macromodels draw support not only from different theoretical rationalizations of economic behavior but also, when implemented econometrically, from different empirical priors imposed on the data. Dissatisfaction with the "incredible identification" of existing large-scale simultaneous equation systems led to the recent popularity of vector autoregressions, which treat all variables as endogenous and shun unfounded a priori restrictions. The method has been used in attempts to discriminate among alternative explanations of money-income causality (cf. Sims 1980), a question similar to the ones posed in this paper.

This paper examines the interactions within a larger set of macroeconomic variables than that considered in the money-income causality studies. The particular statistics that interest us in this context are exogeneity and neutrality tests for the selected macrovariables within the different time periods.

Define $x^{i}_{s,t}$ as a generic variable with s denoting the time series (q,p,b...) and i denoting the time frame (prewar, interwar, postwar). We estimate ordinary least squares regressions of the form:

$$x_{s,t} = \alpha_s + \beta_s t + \sum_{r=1}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_{r,j} x_{r,t-j} + e_t \qquad (1)$$

where s = 3,... up to 6 series and k = 4 quarterly lags, for each time period i and for each series, s. The neutrality test is a t-statistic which tests the null hypothesis

(2) $$H_o: \sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_{s,j} = 0$$

against the alternative that the sum is not equal to zero. The exogeneity test is an F-statistic which tests

(3) $$H_o: \gamma_{s,1} = \gamma_{s,2} = \dots = \gamma_{s,k} = 0$$

against the alternative that the γ's are not all equal to zero.

2. Unit Roots and Transformations

Since the work of Nelson and Plosser 1982 a lot of interest has been paid to the existence of unit roots in macroeconomic time series. The magnitudes of the secular and cyclical components of these series receive primary attention in the work of Cochrane 1988 and Campbell and Mankiw 1987. Sims, Stock, and Watson 1986 also consider the role unit roots play in hypothesis testing with VAR's. They show that, to interpret correctly exogeneity and neutrality tests using standard asymptotic theory, it is necessary to transform the data to zero-mean stationary series. Moreover, Stock and Watson 1987 shed new light on the long debated problem of money-income causality by taking into account non-stationarities. Therefore, because of both an explicit interest in the results and also the necessity of having stationary series to employ standard asymptotic theory, we calculate a set of unit root tests.

We test the null hypothesis

(4) $$x_{s,t} = \mu_s + x_{s,t-1} + e_t$$

against the general alternative

$$x_{s,t} = \mu_s + \psi_s t + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \rho_{s,j} x_{s,t} + e_t \tag{5}$$

with $\Sigma \rho_{s,i} < 1$ and, depending on the test, with and without ψ_s restricted to be zero. Rejection of the null hypothesis implies that the series does not contain a unit root and is stationary either around its mean, when ψ_s is restricted to be zero, or around a time trend, when ψ_s is not so restricted.

The unit root tests are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4 for the postwar, interwar, and prewar sample periods, respectively. Part A of each table includes the tests for a single unit root for each series, calculated by using levels. Part B contains tests for a second unit root calculated by using first differences.

Because there does not exist a uniformly most powerful test for unit roots, we use two different sets of test statistics. To test the hypothesis that a series is stationary around its mean, we estimate the Dickey-Fuller $\hat{\tau}_\mu$ statistic (column 2 in Tables 2, 3, and 4) and the Stock-Watson $q^\mu{}_f$ statistic (column 3). These statistics restrict ψ_s in the alternative hypothesis (eqn. 5) to be zero. To test the hypothesis that a series is stationary around a linear time trend, we estimate the Dickey-Fuller $\hat{\tau}_\tau$ statistic (column 4) and the Stock-Watson $q^\tau{}_f$ statistic (column 5).

The Dickey-Fuller statistics are calculated by estimating via OLS the following transformation of equation 5

$$x_{s,t} = \mu_s + \psi_s t + \phi_{s,1} x_{s,t} + \sum_{j=2}^{k} \phi_{s,j} (x_{s,j+1} - x_{s,t-j}) \tag{6}$$

and calculating the adjusted t-statistic for $\phi_{s,t}$ as

$$\hat{\tau}_\mu = \frac{\phi_{s,1} - 1.00}{SE(\phi_{s,1})} \tag{7}$$

with and without ϕ_s is restricted to be zero. $SE(\phi_{s,1})$ is the standard error of $\phi_{s,1}$. The critical values for these statistics are tabulated in Fuller 1976.

The Stock-Watson test statistics we use are based on the more general Stock-Watson $q_f(k,m)$ test for common trends in a vector of time series variables. The statistic is simply

$$q_f(k,m) = \text{Trace}[\text{Re}(\hat{\lambda}) - 1] \tag{8}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is the largest root of the sample autocorrelation matrix. The $q_f(k,m)$ statistic tests the hypothesis of k versus m unit roots for a n-vector time series ($m < k \leq n$). For the univariate tests used here the null hypothesis (eqn. 4) is one unit root, $k = 1$, against the alternative (eqn. 5) of no unit root, $m = 0$. The critical values for the q^{μ}_f and q^{τ}_f statistics are tabulated in Stock and Watson 1986.

We also test for the order of any deterministic components in these series. We regressed the level and first difference of each series against a constant, time, and four of its own lags. Column 6 reports the t-statistic from the time coefficients. Likewise we tested for significant drift terms by replicating this estimation without a time tread. Column 7 reports the t-ratio on the constant term.

Looking at the results for the postwar sample (Table 2) only the fiscal index is stationary in levels around its mean as well as around a time trend. The leading index and the commercial paper rate are stationary in levels around a time trend only. All postwar series are stationary in first differences, with significant time trends occuring for all three money series and prices. We infer from this that it is necessary to take first differences of real GNP, money, and prices.

Although the tests indicate the leading index is stationary in levels around a time trend, we decided to perform our subsequent analysis using first differences. This is because the leading index has a built-in nonstationary component constructed from the trend of the coincident index (see U.S. Department of Commerce 1984, pp. 65-69). Because this nonstationary component is implicitly related to the trend rate of growth of GNP and we take first differences of GNP, we also take first differences of the leading index. According to Sims, Stock, and Watson 1986 the presence of significant trends in the series of money and price changes, it necessary to include a time trend in our equations to permit us to use standard asymptotic theory to interpret the exogeneity and neutrality tests.

Because of the small sample size for the interwar period (Table 3), 87 observations, the unit root tests are more difficult to interpret for this sample period. For levels (Part A) the Dickey-Fuller tests indicate that the interest rate is stationary around a time trend and the price level is stationary around its mean. The Stock-Watson tests contradict these particular results, however, bringing into question the power of these tests (see Dickey and Fuller 1979 for power calculations of $\hat{\tau}_{\mu}$). Looking at the tests on differences (Part B), the tests indicate that all of the interwar series are stationary, except for the Dickey-Fuller tests for and around a trend and the monetary base around its mean. However, these particular tests again contradict the Stock-Watson tests. Because of these results we act conservatively and use first differences of all of the interwar series. Moreover, following the arguments for the postwar sample, a time trend is also necessitated by the significant t-ratios for m_1, b, and g on the trend coefficients.

Finally, for the prewar sample (Table 4) it is sufficient to take first differences only of real GNP, the monetary base, M2, the implicit price deflator while the series on government expenditures and the interest rate can be left in levels. Again, although the tests indicate the leading diffusion index is stationary in levels around a trend, we instead use first differences of this series in our subsequent analysis. This is because the trend is artificially induced via the accumulation of the original series. A time trend is also included because of the significant trend coefficient for inflation.

IV. The Results

1. Factors Influencing Changes in Real GNP: A Stepwise Approach

(a) 1949-1982

Table 5 is based on regressions of real GNP growth on its own past (q_{t-i}, $i = 1,\ldots,4$) and the lagged values of 2-5 other selected series, plus a constant term and time. Each variable has the form shown in Table 1, column 4, as indicated by the tests discussed in part III. The calculations proceed by successively expanding the set of explanatory variables, in four steps. First only the lagged terms of q are used along with the corresponding values of a fiscal and a monetary variable. To this are added, second, the inflation group, and, third, the interest rate group. The last step consists in including the leading index terms as well.

This table and those that follow are standardized to show the F-statistics for conventional tests of exogeneity and, underneath these entries, the t-statistics for the neutrality tests, i.e., for the sums of the regression coefficients of the same groups of lagged terms for each variable. The estimated individual coefficients are too numerous to report and their behavior is difficult to describe in the frequent cases where their successive values oscillate with mixed signs. It seems advisable, however, to show at least the summary t-ratios in each equation. When sufficiently large, these statistics suggest that the individual terms in each group are not all weak or not all transitory, that is, that they do not offset each other across the different lags.

In the 1949-82 equations with three variables only, the lagged q terms are always significant at least at the 5% level; each of the monetary alternatives makes a contribution (m_2 is particularly strong); and the fiscal index G is relatively weak, except when used along with the monetary base b (Table 5, part A, equations 1-3). Adding inflation p is of little help in explaining q, but on balance the coefficients of p are negative and some may matter (eqs. 4-6). When the commercial paper rate I is entered, it acquires a dominant role at the expense of the other (especially the monetary) variables (eqs. 7-9). Finally, equations 10-12 show that, of all the variables considered, the rate of change in the leading index exerts the strongest influence on q. Five of the test statistics for ℓ are significant at the 1/10 of one percent level, one at the 1% level. The level of interest rates represented by I retains its strong net inverse effect on q. The direct contributions of m_1, m_2, and G to the determination of real GNP growth are much fewer and weaker, those of b and p are altogether difficult to detect.[11]

Alternative calculations show that when ℓ is added to the equations with the monetary and fiscal variables only, the effects of these variables on q are again drastically reduced. Had we retained the money, credit, and stock price components in the leading index, the role of the index in these equations would have been even stronger, that of the other regressors generally weaker.[12]

The changes in the index can be interpreted broadly as representing dynamic forces within the private economy: the early collective outcomes of investment and production (also, less directly, consumption) decisions. Presumably, both aggregate demand and aggregate supply shifts are involved, but the effects of the former are likely to be stronger in the short run. In any event, the evidence indicates that the quarterly movements of the economy's output in 1949-82 depended much more on recent changes in leading indicators and interest rates than on recent changes in output itself, money, the fiscal factor, and inflation.

Conceivably, longer lags could produce different results, so we checked to see what happens when eight instead of four lags are used. These tests suggest some gains in power for the lagged q and G terms, but the leading index and the interest rate still have consistently strong effects. However, we do not report these statistics because the restriction to lags of 1-4 quarters is dictated by the limitations of the available data. With eight lags, for example, the number of degrees of freedom is reduced from 109 to 81 for the six-variable equations.

(b) 1919-1940

In the equations for the interwar period, all variables appear in form of first differences. In the first subset (Table 5, part B, eqs. 13-15), q depends positively on its own lagged values and those of the monetary variables, inversely on the recent values of federal expenditures gx. All the F-statistics are significant, most highly so. On the other hand, inflation contributes but little to these regressions, as shown by the results for equations 16-18 (only two t-tests indicate significance and none of the F-tests). Further, no gains at all result from the inclusion of the change in the commercial paper rate (eqs. 19-21).

In contrast, there is strong evidence in our estimates for 1919-40 that the lagged rates of change in the index of six leading indicators (ld) had a large net positive influence on q. Four of the corresponding test statistics are significant at the 1% level, two at the 5% level (part B, column 6). In these equations (22-24), ld shows the strongest effects, followed by the monetary variables; gx is significant only in one case; and the tests for lagged q, p, and i terms are all negative.

On the whole, the monetary series appear to play a somewhat stronger role in the interwar than in the postwar equations, while the leading series appear to play a somewhat weaker role. It should be recalled, however, that l is a more comprehensive index than ld and is based on better data. Even for the series that are more comparable across the two periods the quality of the postwar data is probably significantly higher.[13] Further, the reliability of the results for 1919-40 suffers from the small sample problem: the number of observations per parameter to be estimated is here little more than half the number available for 1949-82.

In light of these considerations it seems important to note that the interwar results resemble broadly the postwar results in most respects and look rather reasonable, at least in the overall qualitative sense. The leading indexes are highly effective in the regressions for both periods. The main difference between the two sets of estimates is that the commercial paper rate contributes strongly to the statistical explanation of q in 1949-82 but the change in that rate does not help in the 1919-40 regressions (cf. columns

5 in parts A and B of Table 5). We checked whether interest levels (I) would have performed significantly better than interest changes (i) in the interwar equations, and the answer is no.

(c) 1886-1914

For the pre-World War I period, the equations with three variables indicate strong effects on q of its own lagged values and those of m_2, but no significant contributions of either the monetary base or government expenditures (Table 5, part C, eqs. 25-26). The inflation terms add only a weak negative influence, as shown in the summary t-statistics for equations 27-28.

The recent values of the commercial paper rate have substantial inverse effects on the current rate of change in real GNP, particularly in the equations with the base and after the change in diffusion index of leading indicators (ℓdc) is added (eqs. 29-32). The ℓdc index itself appears to be ineffective. In light of the major importance of the leading indexes in the postwar and interwar equations, this negative result is probably attributable mainly to the way ℓdc is constructed. (Recall from our discussion in section II.1 that this index uses only the historical information on specific-cycle turning points in a set of 75 individual indicators.)

2. Test Statistics for Six-Variable Equations

(a) 1949-1982

Each of the monetary variables (b, m_1, m_2) depends strongly on its own lagged values and those of the interest rate I, as shown by the corresponding F-values in Table 6, equations 1-3. The I terms have coefficients whose signs vary and their t-statistics are on balance small, though mostly negative. The fiscal index G appears to have a strong positive effect on m, and the time trends in column 7 are important. The effects of the other variables are sporadic and weak.

G is more strongly autoregressive yet. It also depends positively on b and m_2 and inversely on I, the change in the leading index ℓ, and time (equations 4-6).

Inflation p also depends mainly on its own lagged values, according to equations 7-9. A few relatively weak signs of influence appear for b, I, and G. The time trends are significant. These results are consistent with a view of the price level as a predetermined variable adjusting but slowly with considerable inertia. Monetary influences on p involve much longer lags than are allowed here.

The interest rate depends most heavily on its own recent levels, as is immediately evident from equations 10-12. Still, some significant inputs into the determination of I (which yields R^2 as high as .95) are also made by other factors, notably m_1 and ℓ.

As for ℓ, it is not strongly influenced by either its own recent past or that of the other variables. The largest F-values here are associated with the interest rate in equations 13 and 14 and with inflation in equation 15.

The corresponding tests for real GNP (q) equations have already been discussed in the previous section (relating to the estimates in the last six lines of Table 5, part A). It is interesting to note that very few significant F or t statistics are associated with the lagged q terms according to our tests (Table 6, column 1).

(b) 1919-1940

Tests based on the interwar monetary regressions indicate high serial dependence for m_1 and m_2 but not b (Table 7, eqs. 1-3). The base is influenced strongly by recent changes in output q, moderately by those in the leading index ℓd. There are signs of some effects on m_2 of ℓd and p, but no measurable outside influences on m_1.

Equations 4-6 for the rate of change in government expenditures gx produce F-statistics that are generally low and apparently significant only for the lagged values of the dependent variable. The same applies to the equations 10-12 for the change in the interest rate i.

The rate of inflation p depends heavily on its own lagged values, too (eqs. 7-9). Some of the test statistics suggest that m^1, ℓd, and perhaps i, may influence p slightly over the course of a year.

Interestingly, according to equations 13-15, ℓd is affected much more strongly by the recent monetary chagnes than by its own lagged values. There are also some signs of influence of gx on ℓd. This raises the possibility that monetary and fiscal changes, including those due to policy actions, may affect real GNP with long lags through the mediating role of the leading indicators (ℓd). But note that this is only suggested by the estimates for the interwar period, not those for the postwar era.[13]

Comparing Tables 6 and 7 and drawing also on Table 5 (parts A and B, equations 10-12 and 22-24), we observe that q depends strongly on the leading indexes (ℓ,ℓd) in both periods and on the monetary factors in the interwar period. The autoregressive elements are weak in q, ℓ, and ℓd and strong (as a rule dominant) in the other variables according to the interwar as well as the postwar estimates. The effects of q on the other factors are generally weak or nonexistent.

(c) <u>1886-1914</u>

The F-statistics for the own-lag terms are significant in all the pre-World

War I equations, highly so (at the 0.1% level) for the monetary, fiscal, leading, and interest series, less so for q and p (see Table 8 and Table 5, C, equations 30-32). The leading index ℓdc for 1886-1914 is very strongly autocorrelated, in contrast to the indexes ℓd for 1919-40 and ℓ for 1949-82. This reflects the construction of the prewar index, which assumes smooth cyclical movements in the index components (cf. section II.2 above).

Prewar changes in the monetary base are poorly "explained," mainly by own lags and those of government expenditures GX and the commercial paper rate I. The corresponding changes in the stock of money m_2 are fit much better by lagged values of m_2 itself, I, and p. And as much as 94% of the variance of GX is explained statistically, mainly by lagged GX terms and the time trend. (See Table 8, eqs. 1-4).

The estimates for inflation p are problematic. They suggest that p was influenced positively by lagged money changes but also inversely by its own lagged values and those of I and ℓdc. The R^2 coefficients are of the order of 0.2-0.3 (eqs. 5-6).

The equations for the interest rate (7-8), besides being dominated by autoregressive elements, indicate some short-term effects of q (with plus signs) and m_2 (minus). These results seem generally reasonable.

The leading diffusion index ℓdc (eqs. 9-10) depends primarily on own lags, with traces of positive effects of q and p and negative effects of I. In view of the probable measurement errors involved (mainly in the ℓdc series), the serviceability of these estimates is uncertain.

V. Conclusions and Further Steps

The following list of our principal findings begins with a point of particular importance, which receives clear support from the better-quality data available to us for the postwar and interwar periods.

1. Output depends strongly on leading indexes in equations which include also the monetary, fiscal, inflation, and interest variables (all taken in stationary form, with four quarterly lags in each variable). Hence models that omit the principal leading indicators are probably seriously misspecified.

2. Short-term nominal interest rates had a strong inverse influence on output (specifically, the rate of change in real GNP) during the 1949-82 period. When interest is included, the effects of the monetary and fiscal series are reduced (this resembles the results of some earlier studies; cf. Sims 1980). When the leading index is also included, most of the monetary effects are further diminished.

3. In the interwar period, the role of money appears greater, while the fiscal and interest effects tend to wane. In the prewar (1886-1914) equations, output is influenced mainly by its own lagged values and those of the money stock and the interest rate. The other factors including a diffusion index based on specific cycles in a large set of individual leading series, have no significant effects. However, this probably reflects errors in the data, especially the weakness of the available leading index.

4. The monetary, fiscal, and interest variables depend more on their own lagged values than on any of the other factors, and the same is true of inflation, except in 1886-1914. The opposite applies to the rates of change in output and (again, except in 1886-1914) the leading indexes. None of the variables in question can be considered exogenous.

5. The reported unit root tests are consistent with earlier findings that

most macroeconomic time series are difference-stationary (see Nelson and Plosser 1982 on annual interwar and postwar data, and Stock and Watson 1987 on monthly postwar data). The major exceptions to this are the prewar and postwar fiscal and interest series.

Our work offers some suggestions for further research. The following steps should be taken or at least considered:

(a) Construct a satisfactory composite index of leading indicators for the periods before World War II from the best available historical data.

(b) Compute variance decompositions and impulse response functions for alternative subsets of up to four variables represented by the quarterly series used in this paper.

(c) Do the same computations for larger sets of six variables by using monthly data. This would complement the results obtained here for individual equations in the same sets; further, it would permit comparisons with some recent smaller VAR models estimated on monthly data. The main problem with this approach is that no good monthly proxies for GNP may be found.

(d) Update the postwar series and check on predictions beyond the sample period, e.g., for 1983-88.

(e) Try to find out where the explanatory or predictive power of the leading index is coming from by testing important subindexes relating to investment commitments profitability, etc.

(f) Compare the implications of this paper with those of the most recent and ongoing studies of leading indicators (de Leeuw 1988, 1989; Stock and Watson 1988 a,b).

Table 1
List of Variables, Symbols, and Sources of Data

Number (1)	Variable[a] (2)	Periods[b] (3)	Form[c] (4)	Symbol[d] (5)	Source[e] (6)	Notes on Derivation[f] (7)
1	Real GNP (1972 dol.)	1,2,3	Δ ln	q	B&G	Annual data from F&S (1982) and Kuznets (1961) and Commerce NIPA (1981 ff. since 1889), interpolated quarterly by Chow-Lin (1971) method using the Persons (1931) index of industrial production and trade.
2	Implicit price deflator	1,2,3	Δ ln	p	B&G	(nominal GNP/real GNP) x 100
3	Monetary base	1,2,3	Δ ln	b	B&G	Based on data in F&S (1970, 1963) through 1914 and Gordon and Veitch 1986 for 1949-82.
4	Money supply, M1	2,3	Δ ln	m_1	B&G	1919-46: Gordon and Veitch 1986; 1947-58: old M1, FRB. 1958-82: new M1, FRB.
5	Money supply, M2	1,2,3	Δ ln	m_2	B&G	1886-1907: F&S 1970; 1907-1914: 1919-80: Gordon 1982; 1980-82: FRB.
6	Commercial paper rate	1,3	level	I	B&G	1886-89: in New York City, from Macaulay 1938; 1890-1914, 1919-80: 4-6 month prime From Gordon 1982. 1981-82: 6 month, from FRB.
7	do.	2	Δ	i	B&G	do.
8	Federal expenditures	1	ln level	GX	Fire-stone	Based on Daily Treasury Statements of the United States (see Firestone 1960, App. pp. 76-86, and data, seasonally adjusted, pp. 97-111).
9	do.	2	Δ ln	gx	Fire-stone	do.
10	Fiscal index	3	ln level	G	Blan-chard	From Blanchard 1985 and Blanchard and Watson 1986, app. 2.2. Based on data for government spending, debt, and taxes.

Table 1
(concluded)

11	Difussion index, 75 leading series	1	Δ ln	ldc	Moore	Analyzed in Moore 1961, vol. I, ch.7. Based on specific cycle phases. Data from Moore 1961, vol. 2, p. 172.
12	Amplitude-adjusted (composite) index, six leading series	2	Δ ln	ld	Shiskin	Analyzed in Shiskin 1961, pp. 43-55. Data from NBER files.
13	Composite index of leading indicators	3	Δ ln	l	Commerce	The composite index of 12 leading indicators minus three components: M2 in constant dollars, change in business and consumer cred outstanding, and the index of stock prices, from BCD.

[a] All variables are used as quarterly series.

[b] Period 1: 1886-1914; period 2: 1919-40; period 3: 1949-82.

[c] Δ ln: first difference in natural logarithm; Δ: first difference.

[d] Small letters are used for rates of change or absolute changes; capital letters are used for levels of the series.

[e] B&G: Balke, Nathan S. and Robert J. Gordon 1986, Appendix B, Historical Data. Firestone: Firestone, John M. 1960, Appendix Tables. Blanchard: Blanchard, Olivier J., and Mark W. Watson, 1986, Appendix 2.2. Moore: Moore, Geoffrey, H. 1961. Shiskin: Shiskin, Julius 1961. Commerce: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis.

[f] F&S: Friedman, Milton and Anna J. Schwartz.
NIPA: National Income and Product Accounts.
FRB: Federal Reserve Bulletin.
NBER: National Bureau of Economic Research.
BCD: Business Conditions Digest (U.S. Department of Commerce).

Table 2
Univariate Tests for Unit Roots and Time Trends
Postwar Sample: Quarterly Data, 1949:1-1982:4

Series[a]	$\hat{\tau}^{\mu}$	q^{μ}_{f}	$\hat{\tau}_{\tau}$	q^{τ}_{f}	Time	Constant
	Unit Root Test Statistics[c]				t - statistics[d]	
A. Tests on Levels[b]						
Q	-1.92	-.61	-1.90	-7.82	2.17^{+}	2.04^{+}
M_1	4.21	1.39	.53	.44	.71	-3.23*
M_2	2.22	.41	-1.56	-2.92	2.09^{+}	-1.74^{o}
B	3.12	.58	-1.45	-.74	2.81*	-2.64*
G	-2.90^{+}	-15.56^{+}	-4.76*	-36.21**	-3.34**	-2.81*
L	-1.54	-1.48	-3.38^{o}	-17.83^{o}	4.51**	1.72^{o}
I	-1.78	-7.00	-3.73^{+}	-24.96^{+}	3.17*	1.89^{o}
P	3.16	-.13	.68	-.08	.89	-1.89^{o}
B. Tests on Differences[b]						
q	-5.09*	-85.86**	-5.41*	-88.41**	-1.72^{o}	4.52**
m_1	-2.67^{o}	-54.56**	-4.21*	-89.71**	4.20**	3.51**
m_2	-2.84^{o}	-24.10**	-4.07*	-48.73**	3.21*	3.24*
b	-3.29^{+}	-37.60**	-4.73*	-65.18**	4.37**	3.08*
g	-6.28*	-114.65**	-6.24*	-114.63**	.50	-.33
ℓ	-7.26*	-87.91**	-7.39*	-88.68**	-1.19	3.79**
i	-3.42^{+}	-115.49**	-3.30^{o}	-115.48**	-.06	.64
p	-3.30^{+}	-39.14**	-4.20*	-67.00**	2.94*	3.05*

Table 3

Univariate Tests for Unit Roots and Time Trends
Interwar Sample; Quarterly Data, 1919:1-1940:1

A. Tests on Levels[b]

	Unit Root Test Statistics[c]				t - statistics[d]	
Series[a]	$\hat{\tau}_{\mu}$	q^{μ}_{f}	$\hat{\tau}_{\tau}$	q^{τ}_{f}	Time	Constant
Q	-1.21	-8.74	-1.90	-11.33	1.71^{o}	1.60
M_1	.29	1.05	-.87	- 3.15	2.17^{+}	.05
M_2	-.94	-2.55	-1.63	- 5.71	1.78^{o}	1.18
B	3.06	3.14	.48	- 1.49	2.17^{+}	-2.28^{+}
GX	.06	-1.36	-3.07	-13.65	3.33^{*}	.04
LD	-1.53	-4.99	-1.78	- 7.04	-1.23	2.33^{+}
I	-1.42	-4.26	-3.38^{*}	-16.68	-2.93^{*}	.66
P	-3.38^{*}	-8.74	-3.11	-11.33	-1.26	3.28^{**}
			B. Tests on Differences[b]			
q	-3.33^{*}	-35.18^{**}	-3.22^{+}	-35.64^{**}	.59	.96
m_1	-2.67^{o}	-21.32^{**}	-3.05	-23.96^{**}	1.80^{o}	1.08
m_2	-3.33^{*}	-21.02^{**}	-2.58	-20.41^{**}	.89	.89
b	-2.25	-58.90^{**}	-4.30^{*}	-76.41^{**}	3.76^{**}	1.79^{o}
gx	-5.85^{*}	-90.52^{**}	-6.72^{*}	-99.09^{**}	2.20^{+}	.90
ℓd	-4.80^{*}	-57.41^{**}	-4.77^{*}	-54.29^{**}	.16	.00
i	-5.43^{*}	-49.00^{**}	-5.38^{*}	-48.95^{**}	.33	-1.21
p	-5.64^{*}	-35.18^{**}	-6.10^{*}	-35.65^{**}	-2.07	-1.26

Table 4

Univariate Tests for Unit Roots and Time Trends
Prewar Sample: Quarterly Data, 1886:1-1914:4

A. Tests on Levels[b]

Series[a]	Unit Root Test Statistics[c] $\hat{\tau}_\mu$	q_μ^f	$\hat{\tau}_\tau$	q^τ_f	t - statistics[d] Time	Constant
Q	-.93	-.93	-2.24	-15.22	3.11*	1.20
M_2	.00	-.45	-2.04	-6.50	1.85°	1.31
B	.17	-.10	-1.94	-19.77	2.11+	2.28+
GX	-1.17	-2.23	-3.64*	-43.42**	4.04**	1.52
LDC	-2.84°	-5.66	-4.24*	-21.90+	2.66*	2.15+
I	-5.10*	-49.94*	-6.30*	-56.93**	-2.68*	4.59**
P	.45	.91	-1.35	-2.74	2.35+	-.15

B. Tests on Differences[b]

Series	$\hat{\tau}_\mu$	q_μ^f	$\hat{\tau}_\tau$	q^τ_f	Time	Constant
q	-5.18*	- 70.48**	-5.18*	-70.77**	-.68	3.19*
m_2	-4.09*	-161.64**	-8.04*	-39.39**	.38	3.17*
b	-5.88*	-161.65**	-5.88*	-161.86**	.60	3.87**
gx	-6.60*	-150.58**	-6.58*	-150.58**	-.40	1.80°
ℓdc	-7.45*	- 68.23**	-7.71*	- 63.13**	-1.40	2.02+
i	-6.98*	-123.60**	-6.95*	-123.59**	-.18	.09
p	-5.72*	-113.51**	-6.15*	-117.50**	2.11+	1.30

Notes to Tables 2, 3, and 4:

[a]On the definitions of the variables, see Table 1. Capital letters denote levels (in logs, except for I). Small letters denote first differences (in logs, except for i).

[b]Significance level at the 1/10 of 1% level is denoted by ** (except for the Dickey-Fuller tests for which .001 significance levels are not tabulated); at the 1% level, by *; 5% level, by; and at the 10% level by ^{o}.

[c]τ_{μ} denotes the Dickey-Fuller (1979) statistic computed using a regression with four lags. q^{μ}_{f} is the Stock-Watson (1986) statistic, also from a regression with four lags. $\hat{\tau}_{\mu}$ and q^{τ}_{f} are again, respectively, the Dickey-Fuller and Stock-Watson statistics calculated using a time trend.

[d]t-statistics for the time and constant coefficient estimated from a regression of the variable on four own lags with time trend and without.

Table 5

Rate of Change in Real GNP (q) Regressed on Its Own Lagged Values and Those of Other Selected Variables: Tests of Exogeneity and Significance, Quarterly Data for Three Periods Between 1886 and 1982

A. 1949-1982[a]

Equation no.	df[b]	Lagged Explanatory Variables[c]	Test Statistics[d] for q (1)	b, m_1, m_2 (2)	G (3)	p (4)	I (5)	ℓ (6)	t (7)	$\bar{R}2$ (8)
1	121	q,b,G	4.2^{*} 1.6	3.4^{*} -0.7	3.1^{+} 2.7^{*}				 1.3	.26
2	121	q,m_1,G	2.9^{+} 1.1	3.1^{+} 1.1	1.6 1.6°				 -0.3	.26
3	121	q,m_2,G	3.1^{+} 0.8	5.3^{**} 2.7^{*}	1.3 0.9				 -1.5	.30
4	117	q,b,G,p	3.5^{*} 1.2	3.2^{+} 0.1	2.1° 2.2^{+}	0.8 -1.6			 1.4	.26
5	117	q,m_1,G,p	2.1° 0.6	3.5^{+} 1.7°	1.1 0.9	1.3 -1.8°			 -0.3	.27
6	117	q,m_2,G,p	2.3° 0.8	5.2^{**} 2.4^{+}	1.0 0.8	0.9 -0.8			 -1.0	.30
7	113	q,b,G,p,I	2.0° 0.4	2.4^{+} -1.2	0.9 0.7	0.3 0.4	4.7^{**} -3.2^{*}		 3.0^{*}	.34
8	113	q,m_1,G,p,I	2.3° -0.7	2.0° 2.3^{+}	0.7 -0.8	0.4 -0.6	4.0^{*} -3.2^{**}		 0.5	.34
9	113	q,m_2,G,p,I	2.0 0.2	2.3° 1.0	1.0 0.7	0.8 0.1	2.8^{+} -2.4^{+}		 0.5	.34
10	109	q,b,G,p,I,ℓ	1.3 -1.9	1.3 -0.1	1.7 -0.6	0.7 1.3	3.7^{*} -3.3^{**}	4.4^{*} 3.7^{**}	 1.1	.41
11	109	q,m_1,G,p,I,ℓ	2.7^{+} -3.1^{*}	2.4° 2.2^{*}	2.5^{+} -1.8°	0.4 0.9	4.6^{*} -3.8^{**}	6.0^{**} 4.7^{**}	 -0.5	.44
12	109	q,m_2,G,p,I,ℓ	1.7 -2.3	2.1° 0.6	2.4^{+} -1.0	0.9 1.5	3.2^{+} -3.1^{*}	5.3^{**} 4.4^{**}	 0.2	.43

Table 5
(continued)

Equation no.	df[b]	Lagged Explanatory Variables[c]	Test Statistics[d] for: q (1)	b,m_1,m_2 (2)	gx (3)	p (4)	i (5)	ℓd (6)	t (7)	$\bar{R}^2$ (8)
			B. 1919-1940[e]							
13	67	q,b,gx	7.0^{**}	5.2^{**}	6.7^{**}					.44
			3.0^{*}	1.4	-1.4				-0.7	
14	67	q,m_1,gx	2.6	3.9^{*}	5.3^{**}					.40
			0.7^{+}	2.0^{+}	-1.3				-0.5	
15	67	q,m_2,gx	4.6^{*}	4.0^{*}	5.2^{*}					.41
			1.7^{o}	0.9	-1.5				0.4	
16	63	q,b,gx,p	5.2^{**}	5.3^{**}	5.6^{**}	0.9				.43
			3.0^{*}	1.4	-1.5	-0.8			-0.4	
17	63	q,m_1,gx,p	1.1	5.0^{*}	3.9^{*}	1.7				.43
			0.8	2.7^{*}	-0.8	-2.0^{+}			-0.4	
18	63	q,m_2,gx,p	2.4^{o}	4.6^{*}	3.6^{*}	1.2				.42
			1.6	1.6	-1.0	-1.7^{o}			0.8	
19	59	q,b,gx,p,i	4.8^{*}	4.4^{*}	5.3^{**}	0.8	0.2			.41
			2.9^{*}	1.5	-1.4	-0.6	-0.5		-0.5	
20	59	q,m_1,gx,p,i	0.8	4.2^{*}	3.6^{*}	1.8	0.3			.40
			0.6	2.7^{*}	-0.8	-2.1^{+}	0.5		-0.5	
21	59	q,m_2,gx,p,i	2.1^{o}	3.9^{*}	3.6^{*}	1.4	0.3			.39
			1.2	1.7^{o}	-1.0	-1.7^{o}	0.3		0.8	
22	55	q,b,gx,p,i,ℓd	1.4	4.1^{*}	3.0^{+}	1.3	0.2	3.9^{*}		.50
			-0.6	1.3	-1.0	-0.1	-0.2	2.6^{*}	-0.7	
23	55	$q,m_1,gx,p,i,ℓd$	2.0	3.5^{*}	1.9	1.9	0.2	3.5^{*}		.49
			-1.4	2.4^{+}	-0.7	-1.4	0.7	2.3^{+}	-0.7	
24	55	$q,m_2,gx,p,i,ℓd$	1.9	3.7^{*}	1.7	1.2	0.6	4.0^{*}		.49
			-0.8	1.5	-0.5	-1.2	0.4	2.2^{+}	0.4	

Table 5
(concluded)

Equation no.	df[b]	Lagged Explanatory Variables[c]	Test Statistics[d] for q (1)	b, m_1, m_2 (2)	GX (3)	p (4)	I (5)	ℓdc (6)	t (7)	$\bar{R}^2$ (8)
			C. 1886-1914							
25	101	q, b, G, x	8.9**	0.2	0.7					.21
			0.9	0.3	1.1				-1.2	
26	101	q, m_2, GX	3.0+	5.3**	0.2					.34
			-0.5	2.2+	0.3				-0.6	
27	97	q, b, GX, p	7.2**	0.2	0.8	1.7				.23
			1.3	0.4	1.4	-1.7*			-1.4	
28	97	q, m_2, GX, p	3.0*	5.0**	0.2	1.6				.36
			-0.6	2.6*	0.3	-1.8°			-0.4	
29	93	q, b, GX, p, I	4.0*	0.3	0.3	1.7	3.3*			.30
			0.0	0.7	0.6	-1.7°	-2.4+		-1.0	
30	93	q, m_2, GX, p, I	2.4+	3.0+	0.2	1.6	1.6			.37
			-0.8	2.2+	0.1	-1.7°	-1.4		-0.4	
31	89	q, b, GX, p, I, ℓdc	4.0*	0.3	0.1	1.5	3.7*	0.7		.29
			-0.3	0.7	0.5	-1.4	-2.4+	-0.7	-1.1	
32	89	q, m_2, GX, p, I, ℓdc	2.6+	3.5*	0.1	1.6	2.3°	1.2		.38
			-1.1	2.2°	-0.4	-1.5	-1.8°	-1.2	-0.4	

---

[a] Sample period: 1949:2-1982:4.

[b] Degrees of freedom.

[c] See Table 1 for definitions of the variables and sources of the data.

[d] The first line for each equation lists the F-statistics for groups of lagged values of each variable covered (columns 1-6) and squared correlation coefficients adjusted for the degrees of freedom (column 8). The second line lists the t-statistics for the sums of regression coefficients of the same groups (columns 1-6) and for the time trend (column 7). Significance at the 1/10 of 1% level is denoted by **; at the 1% level, by *; at the 5% level, by +; and at the 10% level by °.

[e] Sample period: 1920:4-1940:4.

[f] Sample period: 1886:2-1914:4.

Table 6

Tests of Exogeneity and Significance, Six-Variable Equations
Quarterly, 1949-82

Equation no.[a]	Dependent Variable[b]	q (1)	b_1, m_1, m_2 (2)	G (3)	ℓ (4)	I (5)	p (6)	t (7)	$\bar{R}^2$ (8)
		Test Statistic[c] for							
1	b	1.7	10.5^{**}	1.2	1.5	3.4^{*}	2.9^{+}		.71
		1.8^{o}	3.2^{**}	-0.2	0.1	-0.9	1.7^{o}	2.6^{*}	
2	m_1	1.1	3.3^{*}	3.3^{*}	1.3	8.0^{**}	0.4		.54
		0.6	1.5	2.0^{+}	0.7	-0.4	1.2	3.3^{*}	
3	m_2	0.7	7.3^{**}	0.8	0.4	10.6^{**}	0.4		.76
		0.4	3.7^{**}	0.3	-0.2	-1.6^{o}	0.3	2.9^{*}	
4	G	1.1	2.4^{+}	36.0^{**}	0.7	3.5^{*}	0.1		.87
		-0.8	2.4^{+}	9.7^{**}	-0.7	-0.1	-0.2	-2.9^{*}	
5	G	0.7	1.3	28.3^{**}	1.0	3.6^{*}	0.1		.86
		-0.6	1.6	8.6^{**}	-1.7^{o}	-0.9	0.1	-2.3^{+}	
6	G	0.7	2.4^{+}	34.8^{**}	1.1	2.6^{+}	0.4		.87
		-0.4	1.8^{o}	9.6^{**}	-1.9^{o}	0.1	1.2	-2.7^{*}	
7	p	1.1	2.5^{+}	2.3^{o}	0.5	2.8^{+}	9.1^{**}		.63
		0.7	-1.8^{o}	2.6^{*}	-1.1	0.7	4.6^{**}	3.0^{*}	
8	p	1.0	0.8	1.1	0.3	1.7	8.7^{**}		.61
		-0.4	0.9	1.5	-0.3	1.0	4.0^{**}	1.2	
9	p	1.0	1.6	2.1^{o}	0.2	1.6	8.4^{**}		.62
		0.5	-1.9^{+}	2.5^{*}	-0.8	0.2	4.1^{**}	3.0^{*}	
10	I	1.8	1.3	0.2	4.1*	81.0^{**}	3.0^{+}		.94
		1.1	-0.4	-0.5	0.5	13.1^{**}	1.7^{o}	0.9	
11	I	2.8^{+}	6.6^{**}	0.2	1.6	98.1^{**}	1.9		.95
		0.7	0.2	-0.1	0.5	14.8^{**}	1.6	0.9	
12	I	1.8	2.1^{o}	0.2	3.4^{*}	68.0^{**}	2.4^{+}		.95
		1.5	-0.8	-0.0	0.3	12.5^{**}	1.2	1.5	
13	ℓ	1.2	1.1	1.9	1.8	3.8^{*}	1.3		.45
		0.1	-1.8^{o}	2.2^{+}	0.2	-1.4	-1.3	3.6^{**}	
14	ℓ	1.2	1.6	1.6	2.2^{o}	4.0^{*}	2.5^{+}		.46
		-1.0	0.6	1.6^{o}	1.0	-1.1	-2.4^{+}	2.3^{+}	
15	ℓ	1.0	1.2	1.7	2.1^{o}	1.2	2.5^{+}		.45
		-0.4	-0.5	2.1^{+}	0.9	-1.1	-2.5^{*}	2.3^{+}	

Table 7

Test of Exogeneity and Significance, Six-Variables Equations
Quarterly, 1919-40

Equation no.[a]	Dependent Variables[b]	Test Statistic[c] for							$\bar{R}^2$
		q (1)	b_1, m_1, m_2 (2)	gx (3)	ℓd (4)	i (5)	p (6)	t (7)	(8)
1	b	3.5*	0.1	1.4	2.6+	0.7	0.7		.40
		2.8**	-0.3	1.3	-1.7°	-1.4	-0.7	3.7**	
2	m_1	0.3	8.2**	1.4	0.9	0.1	1.3		.55
		-0.1	3.3*	-1.7°	-0.3	-0.2	0.7	1.5	
3	m_2	0.6	4.6*	1.7	2.1°	0.7	2.2°		.60
		0.3	2.8*	-2.4+	0.7	-0.3	1.6	1.1	
4	gx	1.9	1.1	2.7+	1.4	1.5	0.8		.36
		-1.8	-1.2	-2.0+	1.4	0.4	1.5	2.1+	
5	gx	1.6	1.2	2.2+	1.5	1.0	0.7		.36
		-1.9°	-0.4	-1.8°	1.7	0.4	1.5	1.5	
6	gx	1.3	1.2	3.3+	1.2	0.9	0.9		.36
		-1.5	-1.4	-2.3+	1.5	0.3	1.9°	1.7	
7	p	0.7	0.2	1.0	1.7	1.7	5.1*		.54
		0.5	-0.2	1.4	1.4	-2.1+	1.9°	1.1	
8	p	1.2	2.2°	1.5	2.1°	1.4	6.2**		.60
		0.2	-0.5	1.2	2.0+	-1.4	2.0+	1.4	
9	p	1.4	1.4	1.2	2.3+	2.0	5.7**		.58
		0.7	-1.3	0.7	1.6	-1.6	2.2+	1.6	
10	i	0.6	0.7	0.5	1.3	2.7+	0.3		.14
		-0.6	0.9	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.8	-0.7	
11	i	0.5	0.1	0.4	1.0	2.7+	0.3		.10
		-0.1	0.1	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.6	-0.0	
12	i	0.6	0.9	0.7	1.3	2.6+	0.3		.15
		-0.4	0.8	1.5	0.9	0.7	0.2	-0.1	
13	ℓd	1.1	4.7*	2.2°	3.0+	0.8	1.4		.39
		-1.1	2.4+	-1.4	2.2+	-0.6	-0.1	-1.4	
14	ℓd	1.3	4.6*	1.5	2.0°	0.5	1.8+		.39
		-1.8°	3.0*	-1.1	1.7°	0.6	-1.7	-0.7	
15	ℓd	1.3	7.4**	2.0°	2.7+	1.5	1.5		.47
		-1.2	2.1+	-1.0	1.9°	0.5	-1.6°	0.7	

Table 8

Tests of Exogeneity and Significance, Six-Variable Equations
Quarterly, 1886-1914

Equation no.[a]	Dependent Variables[b]	Test Statistic[c] for: q (1)	b, m_2 (2)	GX (3)	ℓdc (4)	I (5)	p (6)	t (7)	$\bar{R}^2$ (8)
1	b	0.7	7.3^{**}	2.0^{o}	0.3	2.8^{+}	0.9		.14
		1.4	-3.7^{**}	1.7^{o}	0.1	2.8^{*}	0.6	-1.1	
2	m_2	1.1	20.8^{**}	0.5	1.7	2.8^{+}	4.2^{*}		.59
		-1.8	5.2^{**}	-0.2	-1.4	-2.0^{+}	0.6	-0.2	
3	GX	0.9	0.4	10.8^{**}	0.2	0.9	0.3		.94
		-0.4	0.9	5.1^{**}	-0.4	-1.4	0.5	3.7^{**}	
4	GX	1.6	0.9	9.2^{**}	0.3	0.4	0.1		.94
		-1.0	1.1	4.6^{**}	0.2	-0.9	0.4	3.7^{**}	
5	p	1.4	1.2^{o}	1.5	3.3^{*}	3.7^{*}	1.8		.23
		-0.3	2.0^{+}	-0.3	-2.7^{*}	-2.6^{+}	-1.6^{o}	0.1	
6	p	2.3^{o}	2.8^{+}	2.1^{o}	3.3^{*}	2.7^{+}	2.5^{+}		.28
		-1.8^{o}	3.2^{*}	-1.0	-3.1^{*}	1.4	-2.3^{*}	1.1	
7	I	2.6^{+}	1.9	0.7	2.3^{o}	11.4^{**}	1.5^{+}		.49
		2.8^{*}	-2.5^{*}	0.1	1.2	4.6^{**}	2.3^{+}	-0.4	
8	I	1.9	2.3^{o}	0.7	1.7	8.1^{**}	0.8		.51
		2.3^{+}	-1.2	-0.5	1.2	3.5^{**}	1.3	0.1	
9	ℓdc	1.8	0.3	1.9	55.6^{**}	2.2^{o}	2.0^{o}		.72
		2.3^{+}	0.4	-0.5	6.6^{**}	-1.7^{o}	0.4	-0.2	
10	ℓdc	1.3	0.3	1.9	56.3^{**}	2.2^{o}	2.1^{o}		.72
		-1.8^{o}	0.3	-0.5	6.7^{**}	-1.5	0.1	-0.1	

Notes to Tables 6, 7, and 8:

[a]Sample period: 1949:2-1982:4. Degrees of freedom: 109.

[b]See Table 1 for definitions of the variables and sources of the data.

[c]F-statistics on the first line, t-statistics on the second line for each equation. Significance at the 1/10 of 1% level is denoted by **; at the 1% level, by *; at the 5% level by +; and at the 10% level by o.

[d]Sample period: 1920:4-1940:4. Degrees of freedom: 55.

[e]Sample period: 1886:2-1914:4. Degrees of freedom: 89.

Footnotes

[1]For assessments and references concerning the U.S. record, see Moore 1983, chapters 10 and 24, and Zarnowitz and Moore 1986.

[2]Large econometric models incorporate some individual indicators but probably suboptimally and not in a comprehensive and systematic way.

[3]This recalls the old St. Louis Fed model with its reliance on "policy variables" only.

[4]With $m = 6$ variables and $k = 4$ lags, $km^2 = 144$. For a sample period 1949:2-1982:4 covered by our postwar series, the number of degrees of freedom is 109.

[5]New annual estimates of nominal GNP, the implicit price deflator (1982=100), and real GNP for 1869-1929 are presented in Balke and Gordon 1988. This study develops some additional sources for direct measurement of nonmanufacturing output and the deflator. It concludes that real GNP was on the average about as volatile as the traditional Kuznets-Kendrick series indicate but that the GNP deflator was significantly less volatile. These estimates appeared too late to be taken into account in this paper.

[6]The Persons index consists of a varying assortment of weighted and spliced series on bank clearings outside New York City, production of pig iron and electric power, construction contracts, railroad car loadings and net ton-miles of freight, indexes of volume of manufacturing and mining, etc. The compilation is spotty and uneven, particularly before 1903. A few other historical indexes of business activity are available but they have similar limitations (Zarnowitz 1981).

[7]These indicators are: average workweek, manufacturing; average weekly initial claims for unemployment insurance; vendor performance (percent of companies receiving slower deliveries); change in sensitive materials prices; manufacturers' orders in constant dollars, consumer goods and materials industries; contracts and orders for plant and equipment in constant dollars; index of net business formation; building permits for new private housing units; change in manufacturing and trade inventories on hand and on order in constant dollars.

[8]Percent changes in each component series (computed so as to insure symmetrical treatment of rises and declines) are standardized, i.e., expressed as ratios to their own long-run mean, without regards to sign. The resulting changes are averaged across the series for each month and then cumulated into an index. Simple averages are used by Shiskin, weighted averages by Commerce, but this makes little difference since the Commerce weights, based on performance scores of the selected indicators, are nearly equal. Also, the Commerce index has a trend adjusted to equal the trend in the index of coincident indicators (which is close to the trend in real GNP), whereas the Shiskin index has no such adjustment. Cf. Shiskin 1961, pp. 43-47 and 123-125; U.S. Department of Commerce 1984, pp. 65-70.

[9]Except for the inventory and price components which are weighted 4-month moving averages, trailing.

[10]The addition of I reduces further the statistics for p. The simple correlation between I and p in 1949-82 is about 0.7. During the latter part of the postwar era, inflation spread and accelerated and financial markets became increasingly sensitive to it. Since I depends on the real interest rate R and expected inflation (i.e., forecasts of p, probably based in part on p_{t-i}), our results suggest an independent role for R in codetermining q.

[11]These results are not inconsistent with b influencing q with longer lags via changes in m_1 or m_2 or I; or with a negative effect on output of inflation uncertainty, which is found in some studies that work with higher moments or forecasts of inflation (see, a.o., Makin 1982; Litterman and Weiss 1985; Zarnowitz and Lambros 1987).

[12]It should be noted that the index is robust in the sense of not being critically dependent on any of its individual components or their weights. Thus any large subset of these indicators can produce a fair approximation to the total index under the adopted construction and standardization procedures. Some of the components are known to have good predictive records of their own (e.g., stock prices, as shown in Fischer and Merton 1984) but the leading index outperforms any of them on the average over time. The reductions in coverage and diversity detract from the forecasting potential of the index but, up to a point, moderately. And, as in the present case, they may often be advisable for analytical purposes.

[13]The difference could be related to the fact that the interwar index includes, while the postwar index excludes, the stock price series. Financial asset prices and returns are probably subject to stronger monetary and fiscal influences than other leading indicators are.

References

Auerbach, A. 1982. The Index of Leading Economic Indicators: "Measurement without Theory", Thirty-Five Years Later. Review of Economics and Statistics 64: 589-95.

Balke, N.S. and R.J. Gordon. 1986. Historical Data. In R.J. Gordon ed., 1986, pp. 781-850.

-----. 1988. The Estimation of Prewar GNP: Methodology and New Evidence. NBER Working Paper no. 2674.

Blanchard, O.J. 1985. Debt, Deficits, and Finite Horizons. Journal of Political Economy. 93: 223-47.

Blanchard, O.J. and M.W. Watson. 1986. Are Business Cycles All Alike? In R.J. Gordon, ed., 1986, pp. 123-56 and 178-79.

Braun, P. and S. Mittnik. 1985. Structural Analysis with Vector Autoregressive Models: Some Experimental Evidence. Washington University in St. Louis Working Paper no. 84.

Campbell, J.Y. and N.G. Mankiw. 1987. Permanent and Transitory Components in Macroeconomc Fluctuations. American Economic Review 77: 111-117.

Chow, G.C. and A. Lin. 1971. Best Linear Unbiased Interpolation, Distribution, and Extrapolation of Time Series by Related Series. Review of Economics and Statistics. 53: 372-76.

Cochrane, J.H. 1988. How Big is the Random Walk in GNP? Journal of Political Economy. 96: 893-920.

de Leeuw, F. 1988. Prime Movers as Leading Indicators. Bureau of Economic Analysis Discussion Paper no. 37.

-----. 1989. Toward a Theory of Leading Indicators. Forthcoming in K. Lahiri and G. Moore, eds., Leading Economic Indicators: New Approaches and Forecasting Methods.

Dickey, D.A. and W.A. Fuller. 1979. Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root. Journal of the American Statistical Society 74: 1057-1072.

Diebold, F.X. and G.P. Rudebusch. 1987. Scoring the Leading Indicators. Manuscript, Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Board.

Firestone, J.M. 1960. Federal Receipts and Expenditures During Business Cycles, 1879-1958. Princeton: Princeton University Press for NBER.

Fischer, S. and R.C. Merton. 1984. Macroeconomics and Finance: The Role of the Stock Market. Carnegie-Rochester Conference on Public Policy 21: 57-108.

Friedman, M. and A.J. Schwartz. 1963. A Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960. Princeton: Princeton University Press for NBER.

-----. 1970. Monetary Statistics of the United States: Estimates, Sources, and Methods. New York: NBER.

-----. 1982. Monetary Trends in the United States and the United Kingdom: Their Relation to Income, Prices and Interest Rates, 1867-1975. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for NBER.

Fuller, W.A. 1976. Introduction to Statistical Time Series. New York: Wiley.

Gordon, R.J. 1982. Price Inertia and Policy Ineffectivesness in the United States, 1890-1980. Journal of Political Economy. 90: 854-71.

-----. 1986. The American Business Cycle: Continuity and Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for NBER.

Gordon, R.J. and J.M. Veitch. 1986. Fixed Investment in the American Business Cycle, 1919-83. In R.J. Gordon, ed., 1986, pp. 267-335 and 352-357.

Kuznets, S. 1961. Capital in the American Economy: Its Formation and Financing. Princeton: Princeton Univerity Press for NBER.

Lebergott, S. 1986. Discussion. Journal of Economic History 46: 367-371.

Litterman, R.B. and L.M. Weiss. 1985. Money, Real Interest Rates, and Output: A Reinterpretation of Postwar U.S. Data. Econometrica 53: 129-53.

Lütkepohl, H. 1982. Non-Causality Due to Omitted Variables. Journal of Econometrics 19: 307-378.

Macaulay, F.C. 1938. The Movements of Interest Rates, Bond Yields, and Stock Prices in the United States Since 1856. New York: NBER.

Makin, J.K. 1982. Anticipated Money, Inflation, Uncertainty and Real Economic Activity. Review of Economics and Statistics. 64: 126-35.

Moore, G.H., ed. 1961. Business Cycle Indicators. Princeton: Princeton University Press for NBER.

-----. 1983. Business Cycles, Inflation, and Forecasting. Ballinger Publishing Co. for NBER.

Nelson, C.R. and C.I. Plosser. 1982. Trends and Random Walks in Macroeconomic Time Series: Some Evidence and Implications. Journal of Monetary Economics 10: 139-62.

Persons, W.M. 1931. Forecasting Business Cycles. New York: Wiley.