
Auburn University
Department of Economics
Working Paper Series



Testing the Predictability of Consumption Growth: Evidence from China

Liping Gao and Hyeongwoo Kim

Auburn University

AUWP 2014-11

This paper can be downloaded without charge from:

<http://cla.auburn.edu/econwp/>

<http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/abnwpaper/>

Testing the Predictability of Consumption Growth: Evidence from China

Liping Gao[†] and Hyeonwoo Kim[‡]

July 2014

Abstract

Chow (1985, 2010, 2011) reports indirect evidence for the permanent income hypothesis using time series observations in China. We revisit this issue by addressing direct evidence of the predictability of consumption growth in China during the post-economic reform regime (1978-2009) as well as the postwar US data for comparison. Our in-sample analysis provides strong evidence against the PIH for both countries. Out-of-sample forecast exercises show that consumption changes are highly predictable.

Keywords: Permanent Income Hypothesis; Consumption; Out-of-Sample Predictability; Diebold-Mariano-West Statistic

JEL Classification: E21; E27

[†] School of Forestry & Wildlife Sciences, Auburn University, AL 36849, USA. Tel: 1-334-844-8026. Email: lzg0005@auburn.edu.

[‡] Department of Economics, Auburn University, AL 36849, USA. Tel: 1-334-844-2928. Fax: 1-334-844-4615. Email: gmmkim@gmail.com.

1 Introduction

In his early study, Chow (1985) reported strong evidence in favor of the Permanent Income Hypothesis (PIH) using annual observations in China from 1953 to 1982. Later, Chow (2010) extended his previous model for the data from 1978 to 2006, then provided the same conclusion. Using updated data, Chow (2011) reported weaker but similar supporting evidence for the PIH in China.

We note that his empirical analysis focuses on the coefficient of lagged consumption in an autoregressive model for consumption. Finding that the confidence band of that coefficient includes 1, he suggested that the PIH is consistent with Chinese annual data.

However, his statistical inference may not be valid when consumption obeys an integrated process.¹ Further, his work evaluates the validity of the PIH without addressing the predictability of consumption growth.

This paper fills this gap by directly investigating the in-sample and the out-of-sample predictability of consumption changes in China as well as the postwar US data for comparison. Our findings suggest that consumption changes are highly predictable.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a data description and preliminary test results. In Section 3, we provide our major findings. Section 4 concludes.

2 Data and Preliminary Analysis

We obtained per capita disposable income (y_t) and consumption expenditure (c_t) in China from China Statistical Yearbook (2012) following Chow (1985, 2010, 2011). Observations are annual and span from 1978 to 2012. China began their major economic

¹ For example, conventional t -test is not valid when consumption obeys an $I(1)$ process.

reforms since 1978, so observations prior to 1978 are not used. Following Chow, we deflated all observations using the GDP deflator. All data are log transformed.

The log real per capita disposable income and the log real consumption expenditures of nondurables and services in the US are from the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (FRED). The data is quarterly and covers the period from 1952:Q1 to 2011:Q4.

We first implement the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test for these variables. See Table 1. The ADF test rejects the null of nonstationarity only for differenced series with an exception of y_t in China when time trend is present. Overall, our test results imply that consumption and income are integrated series, which is also consistent with Chow's work.

Table 1

3 Empirical Findings

3.1 In-Sample Analysis

Campbell and Mankiw (1990) test the empirical validity of Hall's (1978) famous claim that consumption follows a random walk process under the PIH. They assume that a constant fraction of consumers (λ) does not obey the PIH, because they are liquidity constrained, therefore are not capable of smoothing consumption over time. Finding non-zero estimates for λ serves evidence against the PIH.

We employ their method for Chinese data. To deal with the Endogeneity bias, we use the iterative efficient Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) estimation method (Hansen, 1982) and report results in Table 2. Results from the US data are reported in Table 3.

The first column provides instrumental variables used in each regression. The second column reports λ estimates along with their robust standard errors. The third

column reports specification test (J -test) results, when applicable, along with corresponding p -values.

All λ estimates are positive and statistically significant at the 5% level, which provides strong empirical evidence against the PIH. Our model specification seems reasonable as the p -value of the J test statistics is greater than 0.05 in all regressions.

We also note that the λ estimates are substantially greater with Chinese data than those from the US. Estimates for λ vary from 0.835 to 0.872 in China, while it ranges from 0.287 to 0.769 in the US. This seems plausible because λ is a fraction of liquidity constrained consumers, and households in China are more likely to be such consumers relative to US counterparts.

Tables 2 and 3

3.2 Out-of-Sample Predictability

We next implement a more direct test for the PIH via out-of-sample forecast tests proposed by Diebold and Mariano (1995) and West (1996). We evaluate predictability of lagged variables for consumption changes relative to that of the random walk model, which is consistent with the PIH (Hall, 1978), serving as a benchmark.

We carry out forecasting recursively by sequentially adding one additional observation from $P\%$ initial observations toward the end of observations. We re-estimate coefficients in the prediction model $\Delta c_{t+1} = \beta' \Delta x_t + u_t$ for each recursive sample, then re-formulate forecasts. The ratio of the root mean square prediction error ($RRMSPE$) is defined as the root mean square error of the random walk model relative to that of the competing model. Therefore, a greater value of $RRMSPE$ than one implies some evidence against the PIH, because the explanatory variables have predictive power. Since the random walk model ($\beta = 0$) is nested by the alternative one, we evaluate the DMW statistics with McCracken's (2007) critical values to prevent size distortion problems.

We report out-of-sample forecast exercise results in Tables 4 and 5 for China and the US, respectively. All *RRMSPE* values exceed one for both countries. Further, the DMW test rejects the null of equal predictability at any conventional significance level. Our results are quite robust to alternative initial split ratios.² Again, we obtain strong empirical evidence against the PIH via more direct out-of-sample forecast analysis.

Tables 4 and 5

4 Concluding Remarks

This paper revisits the empirical inconsistency of the Permanent Income Hypothesis using household data in China along with the postwar US data as a benchmark.

We present strong evidence against the PIH in the sense that consumption growth is highly predictable, which is in contrast to the work by Chow (1985, 2010, 2011) who reported favorable indirect evidence using conventional normal approximation based tests.

Our in-sample analysis based on the specification of Campbell and Mankiw (1990) implies a lot weaker evidence of the PIH for Chinese data than the US data. The λ point estimates varied in the vicinity of 0.85 for China, while much smaller values were obtained when we use the US data, which seems reasonable because λ is a fraction of consumers who are liquidity constrained.

Our out-of-sample forecasting exercises directly address the predictability issue from the PIH. We obtain very strong results against the PIH for both countries in the sense that explanatory variables have substantial predictive contents for consumption growth, which is robust to the choice of sample split ratio.

² The forecast performance may depend of the size of initial number of observations used in the estimation relative to the remaining observations for evaluations.

References

- [1] J.Y. Campbell, N.G. Mankiw, Permanent income, current income, and consumption, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*. 8(3) (1990), pp. 265–279.
- [2] G. Chow, A model of Chinese national income determination, *Journal of Political Economy*. 93(4) (1985), pp. 782–792.
- [3] G. Chow, Note on a model of Chinese national income determination, *Economics Letters*. 106 (2010), pp. 195–196.
- [3] G. Chow, Lessons from studying a simple macroeconomic model for China, *Economics Letters*. 112 (2011), pp. 233–235.
- [5] F.X. Diebold, R.S. Mariano, Comparing predictive accuracy, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*. 13 (1995), pp. 253–263.
- [6] R.E. Hall, Stochastic implications of the life cycle-Permanent Income Hypothesis: theory and evidence, *Journal of Political Economy*. 86(6) (1978), pp. 971–987.
- [7] L.P. Hansen, Large sample properties of Generalized Method of Moments estimators, *Econometrica*. 50(4) (1982), pp. 1029–1054.
- [8] M.W. McCracken, Asymptotics for out of sample tests of Granger causality, *Journal of Econometrics*. 140 (2) (2007), pp. 719–752.
- [9] K.D. West, Asymptotic inference about predictive ability. *Econometrica*, 64 (1996), pp. 1067–1084.

Table 1. ADF Test Results

<i>China</i>		
Variable	ADF_c	ADF_t
c_t	-0.889	-2.693
y_t	0.044	-4.641*
Δc_t	-3.885*	-3.907 [†]
Δy_t	-4.263*	-4.163 [†]

<i>US</i>		
Variable	ADF_c	ADF_t
c_t	-1.839	-0.688
y_t	-2.093	-0.503
Δc_t	-4.966*	-5.280*
Δy_t	-9.416*	-14.62*

Note: ADF_c and ADF_t denote the ADF t -statistic with an intercept and with an intercept and time trend, respectively. We chose the number of lags by the Akaike Information Criteria with a maximum 8 lags for quarterly US data, while a maximum 2 lags were used for annual Chinese data.

Table 2. GMM Estimation Results: Chinese Data (Annual)

Instruments	λ (s.e)	J (p -value)
None (OLS)	0.872 (0.018)	<i>n.a</i>
Δy_{t-1}	0.864 (0.015)	<i>n.a</i>
Δc_{t-1}	0.868 (0.015)	<i>n.a</i>
$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-1}$	0.835 (0.013)	3.637 (0.057)
$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}$	0.862 (0.013)	1.619 (0.203)
$\Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	0.868 (0.014)	0.081 (0.776)
$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	0.844 (0.008)	4.836 (0.184)

Note: Annual observations span from 1978 to 2009. This table reports iterative efficient GMM estimates of $\Delta c_t = \lambda y_t + u_t$, using an array of instrumental variables. Numbers in parentheses in column 2 are standard errors for the λ estimate. p -values for the J -test statistic are from the chi-square distribution.

Table 3. GMM Estimation: US Data (Quarterly)

Instruments	λ (s.e.)	J (p -value)
None (OLS)	0.287 (0.045)	<i>n.a</i>
$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}$	0.769 (0.282)	1.240 (0.538)
$\Delta y_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta y_{t-6}$	0.447 (0.157)	4.989 (0.288)
$\Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	0.628 (0.137)	5.885 (0.053)
$\Delta c_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta c_{t-6}$	0.664 (0.132)	8.291 (0.082)
$\Delta y_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta y_{t-4}, \Delta c_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta c_{t-4}$	0.487 (0.112)	9.902 (0.078)
$\Delta y_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta y_{t-6}, \Delta c_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta c_{t-6}$	0.505 (0.094)	13.06 (0.160)

Note: Following Campbell and Mankiw (1990), we use consumption expenditures for nondurable goods and services, and we excluded the first lagged variables from the set of instruments. Observations are quarterly and span from 1952:Q1 to 2011:Q4. This table reports iterative efficient GMM estimates of $\Delta c_t = \lambda y_t + u_t$, using an array of instrumental variables. Numbers in parentheses in column 2 are standard errors for the λ estimate. p -values for the J -test statistic are from the chi-square distribution.

Table 4. Out-of-Sample Forecast: China

Split Ratio	Explanatory Variables	<i>RRMSPE</i>	<i>DMW</i>
0.51	Δy_t	3.5999	6.6756*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}$	3.4202	7.3507*
	$\Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	3.3188	7.2628*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	3.3204	7.1548*
0.66	Δy_t	3.6606	6.8638*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}$	3.3623	7.6711*
	$\Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	3.7080	8.3429*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	3.6638	8.5777*
0.81	Δy_t	4.1636	5.0213*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}$	5.3395	6.0435*
	$\Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	7.0499	6.5777*
	$\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-1}, \Delta c_{t-2}$	5.5285	6.5049*

Note: Out-of-sample forecasting was recursively implemented by sequentially adding one additional observation from $P\%$ initial observations toward the end of observations. Split ratio denotes the number for P . *RRMSPE* denotes the ratio of the root mean squared prediction error of the random walk hypothesis to the competing model. *DMW* denotes the test statistics of Diebold and Mariano (1995) and West (1996). * denotes rejection of the null hypothesis of equal predictability at the 1% significance levels.

Table 5. Out-of-Sample Forecast Analysis: US

Split Ratio	Explanatory Variables	<i>RRMSPE</i>	<i>DMW</i>
0.50	Δy_t	1.8411	10.322*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}$	1.9177	10.602*
	$\Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	2.0158	10.806*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}, \Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	2.0068	10.642*
0.65	Δy_t	1.7986	9.8501*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}$	1.8993	9.9372*
	$\Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	2.0615	10.660*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}, \Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	2.0824	10.892*
0.81	Δy_t	1.4856	5.4806*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}$	1.5825	5.9971*
	$\Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	1.7480	6.9882*
	$\Delta y_{t-2}, \Delta y_{t-3}, \Delta y_{t-4}, \Delta c_{t-2}, \Delta c_{t-3}, \Delta c_{t-4}$	1.7572	7.1435*

Note: Out-of-sample forecasting was recursively implemented by sequentially adding one additional observation from $P\%$ initial observations toward the end of observations. Split ratio denotes the number for P . *RRMSPE* denotes the ratio of the root mean squared prediction error of the random walk hypothesis to the competing model. *DMW* denotes the test statistics of Diebold and Mariano (1995) and West (1996). * denotes rejection of the null hypothesis of equal predictability at the 1% significance levels.