

---

**WORKING PAPER 99/2015**

---

**INFLATION FORECASTING AND  
THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRICE CHANGES**

**Sartaj Rasool Rather  
Sunil Paul  
S. Raja Sethu Durai**



**MADRAS SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS  
Gandhi Mandapam Road  
Chennai 600 025  
India**

**March 2015**

# *Inflation Forecasting and the Distribution of Price Changes*

**Sartaj Rasool Rather**

Lecturer, Madras School of Economics  
[sartajrasool@gmail.com](mailto:sartajrasool@gmail.com)

**Sunil Paul**

Assistant Professor, Madras School of Economics  
[sunilpaul@mse.ac.in](mailto:sunilpaul@mse.ac.in)

**and**

**S. Raja Sethu Durai**

Assistant Professor  
Department of Economics, Pondicherry University, Pondicherry

**WORKING PAPER 99/2015**

**MADRAS SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS  
Gandhi Mandapam Road  
Chennai 600 025  
India**

**February 2015**

**Phone: 2230 0304/2230 0307/2235 2157**

**Fax : 2235 4847/2235 2155**

**Price : Rs. 35**

**Email : [info@mse.ac.in](mailto:info@mse.ac.in)**

**Website: [www.mse.ac.in](http://www.mse.ac.in)**

# Inflation Forecasting and the Distribution of Price Changes

Sartaj Rasool Rather, Sunil Paul and S. Raja Sethu Durai

## Abstract

*This study shows that replacing the traditional measure of asymmetry that is skewness in the inflation forecasting model with an alternative asymmetry measure that captures the joint influence of both skewness and variance on inflation significantly improves the forecast at various horizons. The empirical evidence suggests that it is more appropriate to use such measure of asymmetry in inflation forecast model as it has edge over simple measure of skewness in predicting inflation. These findings are consistent with the prediction of menu cost model that the variance of cross sectional distribution of relative price changes amplifies the impact of skewness on inflation.*

**KEYWORDS:** *skewness, relative price changes, asymmetry, inflation forecasting*

**JEL Codes:** *E30; E31; E52*

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

*We are thankful to the anonymous referees of Economics Bulletin and the participants of 48th Annual Conference of The Indian Econometric Society (TIES) held at Pondicherry University, Pondicherry for their valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper.*

## INTRODUCTION

Large number of empirical studies have provided evidence in favor of positive association between aggregate inflation and the skewness/variance of cross sectional distribution of relative price changes (see, e.g., Ball and Mankiw, 1995; Amano and Macklem, 1997; Aucremanne *et. al.*, 2002; Caraballo and Usabiaga, 2004; Assarsson, 2004; and Pou and Debus, 2008). Theoretically, the link between inflation and skewness is explained by models based on menu cost associated with price adjustments. In this context, Ball and Mankiw (1995) argue that in the presence of menu costs firms adjust prices only in response to large shocks and choose inaction in response to small ones. More specifically, when a firm experiences a shock to its desired price, it changes its actual price only if the required adjustment is large enough to warrant paying the menu cost. As a results, the large shocks have disproportionately a large impact on the changes in average price level. On the other hand, the positive relationship between inflation and variance of cross sectional distribution of relative price changes (commonly called relative price variability) is explained by models based on information asymmetry and misperceptions. Under information asymmetry, firms adjust quantity in response to unanticipated demand shocks if supply is price elastic and adjust prices if supply is price inelastic. Hence, unanticipated demand shocks that generate inflation tend to affect relative price variability (Lucas, 1973; Barro, 1976; Hercowitz, 1981 and Cukierman 1983). Moreover, the menu cost model of Sheshinski and Weiss (1977) also generate positive association between inflation and variance of relative price changes.

More recently, Binner *et. al.* (2010) have shown that the use of skewness of distribution relative price changes improves the inflation forecast whereas the inflation forecast is deteriorated when variance is included in the model. This result contradicts the theoretical prediction of menu cost models that the variance magnifies the effect of skewness on

inflation in presence of skewed distribution of relative price changes (Ball and Mankiw, 1995).<sup>1</sup> Moreover, such results are also inconsistent with the anticipations of misperception models and the related large body of empirical literature which found evidence in favor of positive association between inflation and variance of relative price changes (see, Parks, 1978, Fischer, 1981; Debelle and Lament, 1996; Nath, 2004; Choi, 2010; Nautz and Scharff, 2012; Rather et. al., 2014a).

In this study, we re-estimated the inflation forecast model used by Binner *et. al.*, (2010) by using an alternative measure of asymmetry and examined the predictive power of skewness and variance of distribution of relative price changes. Unlike a simple conventional measure of skewness, the advantage of such alternative asymmetry measure is that it captures the joint influence of both variance and skewness on aggregate inflation. More importantly, the use of such asymmetry measure is motivated by the fact that in menu cost models inflation basically depends on relative density in the tails of the distribution of price changes. As Ball and Mankiw (1995) argue that “it would be more parsimonious to measure the relevant asymmetry with a single variable – one that captures both the direct effect of skewness and the magnifying effect of variance.” Further, this study uses highly disaggregated commodity wise price data for the construction of various measures of asymmetry. As it is quite possible that the use of aggregated price indices may not reflect the various asymmetries in price adjustments and might result in a loss of information about the dynamics of inflation.<sup>2</sup>

The empirical results show that the use of an asymmetry measure that captures the joint influence of both skewness and variance has an edge over simple measure of skewness in forecasting inflation.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Ball and Mankiw (1995)

<sup>2</sup> In this context, Ball and Mankiw (1995) and Balke and Wynne (2000) argue that there is asymmetric/heterogeneous response by firms when they face shocks to their desired prices.

This empirical finding is consistent with the prediction of theoretical models. In the following section 2, we discuss the methodology, in section 3 empirical results are presented and the section 4 of the paper provides concluding remarks.

## METHODOLOGY

Following Parks (1978), the variance of cross-sectional distribution of relative price changes ( $\sigma_t$ ) is measured as:

$$\sigma_t = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i (\pi_{it} - \pi_t)^2$$

where,  $\pi_{it}$  is the  $i^{th}$  commodity inflation rate and  $\omega_i$  denotes the respective weights. Also,  $\pi_t$  represents general inflation and is measured as the weighted average of  $\pi_{it}$ . Similarly, the skewness of cross sectional distribution of relative price changes ( $S_t$ ) is measured as:

$$S_t = \sum_{i=1}^N \omega_i (\pi_{it} - \pi_t)^3$$

Following Ball and Mankiw (1995), we construct two different alternative measures of  $\mu_t^X$  asymmetry. Firstly, we define for some cut off X as:

$$\mu_t^X = \sum_{i=1}^l \omega_i (\pi_{it} - \pi_t) D_i^- + \sum_{i=1}^u \omega_i (\pi_{it} - \pi_t) D_i^+.$$

where,  $D_i^+$  and  $D_i^-$  are dummy variables. The former (latter) takes the value one, when  $i^{th}$  industry's relative price change falls in the upper (lower)  $X$  per cent of the distribution or zero otherwise.  $X$  is the arbitrarily fixed cut off and  $l$  and  $u$  depict the number of price changes falling in upper and lower zone of the distribution. The  $\mu_i^X$  gives a measure of net mass in the tails of distribution.

Note that  $\mu_i^X$  is constructed by giving the full weight to the price changes which are above the cutoff  $X$  and zero weight to the remaining price changes. A variant of  $\mu_i^X$  which increases the weights linearly with the size of price changes can be defined as

$$\theta_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i |\pi_{it} - \pi_t| (\pi_{it} - \pi_t)$$

Here,  $\theta_i$  is defined as the weighted average of product of each relative price change and its own absolute value.  $\theta_i$  is zero for a symmetric distribution and positive (negative) for a positively (negatively) skewed distribution. Also, its value is magnified at higher levels of variance. The advantage such asymmetry measures is that in addition of capturing the direct influence of skewness they also capture the magnifying effect of variance and which makes such measures theoretically more relevant.

Following Binner *et. al.* (2010), we constructed directly multi-period forecasts based on horizon-specific models. We estimated the following forecast equation to obtain the conditional forecasts of inflation.

$$E_t[\pi_{t+h}] = \alpha_{0ht} + \sum_{l=1}^k \alpha_{lht} \pi_{pt-l+1} + \sum_{l=1}^k \beta'_{lht} Y_{t-l+1}$$

where,  $h$  is the forecast horizon,  $k$  is the number of lags and  $Y_t$  depicts the various measures of asymmetry.


## **DATA AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS**

This study uses monthly data on prices of 418 commodities, which constitutes 96 percent of the commodity basket used in the construction of Wholesale Price Index in India. The sample period ranges from April 1993 to November 2010. The time series data on price indices and the corresponding weights are collected from the website of the Office of the Economic Advisor, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India ([www.eaindustry.nic.in](http://www.eaindustry.nic.in)).


Before proceeding to forecasting analysis, we examined the time series properties of inflation, skewness, variance and various measures of asymmetry using the traditional Augmented Dickey-Fuller and Phillips-Perron unit root tests. The results suggest that the null of unit root is rejected at 1% significance for all the variables (results not presented here).

**Figure1: Inflation, Skewness and Alternative Measures of Asymmetry**


**Panel: (a)**




**Panel: (b)**



**Panel: (c)**



**Panel: (d)**



**Note:** The expressions  $\mu_i^{10}$ ,  $\mu_i^{25}$  denotes that the cut off X for  $\mu_i^X$  is fixed at 10% and 25%, respectively.

In Figure 1, we plotted inflation against the skewness and other alternative asymmetry measures to visualize the relationship between inflation and various moments of distribution of price changes. The plots in Figure 1 display that the basic empirical prediction of the underlying theoretical models is apparent in data. It can be seen from the graph of panel (a) that inflation ( $\pi$ ) closely follows the trajectory of skewness of the cross sectional distribution of relative price changes ( $S_t$ ). However, this association is much clear when inflation is plotted against various alternative measures of asymmetry (see, graphs in panel (b), (c) and (d)). This implies that the variance magnifies the influence of the skewness on inflation.

The forecasting performance of skewness and the alternative asymmetry measures is examined using out-of-sample forecast. The forecasting analysis is carried out by estimating each model recursively, beginning with the period and incorporating successively a new data point to the sample. In the first stage, we obtained inflation forecasts by using a simple AR(1) model, which serves as a bench mark. Then, the inflation forecasts were obtained by augmenting the bench mark model with the simple measure of skewness ( $S_t$ ). In the next stage, we replaced the skewness measure ( $S_t$ ) with the alternative measures of asymmetry (i.e.,  $\theta_t$ ,  $\mu_t^{10}$  and  $\mu_t^{25}$ ) alternatively and re-estimated the model.<sup>3</sup> In order to evaluate the forecasting performance of these models, the  $h$  period ahead forecast made at each stage is compared with the corresponding actual observation. For this purpose, we compared the estimates of mean square error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) obtained from the each model.

---

<sup>3</sup> The expressions  $\mu_t^{10}$  and  $\mu_t^{25}$  denote that the cut off X for  $\mu_t^X$  is fixed at 10% and 25%, respectively.

We used Diebold–Mariano (1995) test statistic (DM) to examine whether the estimates of MSE (and MAE) obtained from the competing models with different asymmetry measures are significantly different from the estimates of MSE (MAE) obtained from the benchmark model. The DM statistics based on MSE and the associated p-values are presented in Table 1. The rows of the table provide the lag structure ( $l$ ) and the forecast horizon ( $h$ ) is given in the columns of the table for each model. In the table, corresponding to each lag the first row provides the results from model where  $S_t$  is used and the second row provides the results from the model wherein  $\theta_t$  is used. The results indicate that the estimates of MSE obtained from the models wherein  $\theta_t$  is used are found to be significantly lower than MSE obtained from the benchmark model, for each lag structure. The p-values associated with *bold* DM statistics suggest that we reject the null hypothesis that the inflation forecasts obtained from the given two competing models are equal at the conventional level of significance. However, the estimates of MSE obtained from the model wherein  $S_t$  is used are not found to be significantly different from the MSE obtained from the benchmark model for any lag structure ( $l$ ) or the forecast horizon ( $h$ ). Also, the results obtained from the models wherein alternative asymmetry measures  $\{\mu_t^{10}$  and  $\mu_t^{25}\}$  were used are presented in rows four and five corresponding to each lag. These results indicate that the asymmetry measure  $\mu_t^{25}$  performs better in comparison to the asymmetry measure  $\mu_t^{10}$ ; thereby implying that large shocks have disproportionate impact on aggregate inflation. Overall, these results confirm that the forecasting model, wherein an asymmetry measure ( $\theta_t$ ) is used, outperforms the model where a simple measure of skewness is used.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Moreover, the results suggest that inflation forecasts are worsened when we include the variance and skewness together in the model. This finding is consistent with the theoretical prediction that

Similar inferences can be drawn when we compare the estimates of MAE obtained from the given competing models, as presented in the Table 2. The results indicate that the forecasting performance of the model augmented with  $\theta_t$  improves for the longer forecast horizons.

**Table 1: DM statistics based on MSE**

<i>l / h</i>	Model	1	2	3	4	
<b>1</b>	$\theta_t$	<b>4.67</b> <b>(0.00)</b>	<b>4.84</b> <b>(0.00)</b>	<b>4.05</b> <b>(0.00)</b>	<b>3.57</b> <b>(0.00)</b>	
	$S_t$	1.43 (0.15)	1.29 (0.20)	1.09 (0.27)	0.91 (0.36)	
	<i>AS10</i>	-1.26 (0.20)	-1.40 (0.16)	-0.97 (0.33)	-0.70 (0.48)	
	<i>AS25</i>	<b>2.20</b> <b>(0.03)</b>	<b>2.30</b> <b>(0.02)</b>	<b>2.30</b> <b>(0.02)</b>	<b>2.21</b> <b>(0.03)</b>	
	<b>2</b>	$\theta_t$	<b>2.08</b> <b>(0.04)</b>	<b>1.96</b> <b>(0.05)</b>	1.56 (0.12)	1.42 (0.15)
		$S_t$	1.19 (0.23)	1.06 (0.29)	0.93 (0.35)	0.95 (0.34)
<i>AS10</i>		<b>2.20</b> <b>(0.03)</b>	1.90 (0.06)	1.86 (0.06)	1.23 (0.22)	
<i>AS25</i>		1.78 (0.08)	1.73 (0.08)	1.45 (0.15)	1.32 (0.18)	

Note: In parenthesis are p-values. The bold values indicate that we reject the null hypothesis that the inflation forecasts obtained from the given models are equal at the conventional level of significance using a one-sided Diebold–Mariano test.

**Table 2: DM statistics based on MAE**

<i>l</i> / <i>h</i>	Model	1	2	3	4
<b>1</b>	$\theta_t$	<b>3.36(0.00)</b>	<b>3.68(0.00)</b>	<b>3.58(0.00)</b>	<b>3.24(0.00)</b>
	$S_t$	0.89(0.37)	0.87(0.38)	0.82(0.41)	0.70(0.48)
	<i>AS10</i>	-0.14(0.89)	-0.13(0.90)	0.12(0.90)	0.06(0.95)
	<i>AS25</i>	<b>2.18(0.03)</b>	<b>2.31(0.02)</b>	<b>2.40(0.02)</b>	2.37(0.08)
<b>2</b>	$\theta_t$	<b>2.67(0.01)</b>	<b>2.37(0.02)</b>	<b>2.26(0.02)</b>	<b>2.34(0.02)</b>
	$S_t$	1.55(0.12)	1.48(0.14)	1.44(0.15)	1.44(0.15)
	<i>AS10</i>	1.63(0.10)	1.34(0.18)	1.11(0.27)	0.75(0.45)
	<i>AS25</i>	<b>2.34(0.02)</b>	<b>2.29(0.02)</b>	<b>2.10(0.04)</b>	<b>2.03(0.04)</b>

**Note:** In parenthesis are p-values. Here also, the bold values indicate that we reject the null hypothesis that the inflation forecasts obtained from the given models are equal at the conventional level of significance using a one-sided Diebold–Mariano test.

Over all, the results indicate that an asymmetry measure ( $\theta_t$ ), which captures the joint influence of skewness and variance has an edge over simple measure of skewness in predicting inflation. These results corroborate the theoretical prediction of menu cost models that the variance magnifies the impact of skewness on the inflation.

## CONCLUSION

This study examines the performance of skewness and variance of the cross sectional distribution of relative price changes in forecasting inflation. To this end, we constructed the alternative measures of asymmetry that capture the joint influence of both skewness and variance on inflation. The empirical evidence suggest that the inflation forecast models augmented with such asymmetry measures have an edge over the model wherein simple classical measure of skewness is used in predicting the inflation. These empirical findings are consistent with the theoretical predictions of menu cost models.

## REFERENCES

- Amano, R. A. and R. T. Macklem (1997), "Menu Costs, Relative Prices and Inflation: Evidence for Canada", Bank of Canada Working Paper, 97-14.
- Assarsson, B. (2003), "Inflation and Higher Moments of Relative Price Changes in Sweden", Bank for International Settlements Papers No. 19, 383-397.
- Balke, N. and M. Wynne (2000), "An Equilibrium Analysis of Relative Price Changes and Aggregate Inflation", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 45, 269-92.
- Ball, L. and G. Mankiw (1995), "Relative-price Changes as Aggregate Supply Shocks", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110, 161-93.
- Binner, J. M., T. Elger, B. Jones, J. E. Binner and B. Nilsson (2010), "Inflation Forecasting, Relative Price Variability and Skewness", *Applied Economics Letters*, 17 (6), 1-4.
- Choi, C. Y. (2009), "Reconsidering the Relationship between Inflation and Relative Price Variability", *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 42 (5), 769-798.
- Cukierman, A. (1983), "Relative Price Variability and Inflation: A Survey and Further Results", Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, 19, Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Debelle, G. and O. Lament (1996), "Relative Price Variability And Inflation: Evidence from US Cities", National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 5627.
- Diebold, F. and R. Mariano (1995), "Comparing Predictive Accuracy", *Journal of Business and Economics Statistics*, 13, 253-63.
- Fischer, S. (1981), "Relative Shocks, Relative Price-Variability and Inflation", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 381-441.

- Hercowitz, Z. (1981), "Money and the Dispersion of Relative Prices", *Journal of Political Economy*, 89, 328-356.
- Nath, H. K. (2004), "Relative Importance of Sectoral and Aggregate Sources of Price Changes", *Applied Economics*, 36, 1781-97.
- Nautz, D. and J. Scharff (2012), "Inflation and Relative Price Variability in the Euro Area: Evidence from a Panel Threshold Model", *Applied Economics*, 44, 449-460.
- Parks, R. W. (1978), "Inflation and Relative Price Variability", *Journal of Political Economy*, 86, 79-95.
- Pou, M. A. C. and C. Dabus (2008), "Nominal Rigidities, Skewness and Inflation Regimes", *Research in Economics*, 62, 16-33.
- Lucas, R. E. (1973), "Some international evidence on output inflation trade offs", *American Economic Review*, 63, 326-334.
- Rather S. R., S. Raja Sethu Durai and M. Ramachandran (2014) "Inflation and Relative Price Variability: Evidence for India", *Journal of Asian Economics*, 30, 32-41.

# ***MSE Monographs***

- \* Monograph 18/2012  
Performance of Flagship Programmes in Tamil Nadu  
*K. R. Shanmugam, Swarna S Vepa and Savita Bhat*
- \* Monograph 19/2012  
State Finances of Tamil Nadu: Review and Projections A Study for the Fourth State Finance Commission of Tamil Nadu  
*D.K. Srivastava and K. R. Shanmugam*
- \* Monograph 20/2012  
Globalization and India's Fiscal Federalism Finance Commission's Adaptation to New Challenges  
*Baldev Raj Nayar*
- \* Monograph 21/2012  
On the Relevance of the Wholesale Price Index as a Measure of Inflation in India  
*D.K. Srivastava and K. R. Shanmugam*
- \* Monograph 22/2012  
A Macro-Fiscal Modeling Framework for forecasting and Policy Simulations  
*D.K. Srivastava, K. R. Shanmugam and C.Bhujanga Rao*
- \* Monograph 23/2012  
Green Economy – Indian Perspective  
*K.S. Kavikumar, Ramprasad Sengupta, Maria Saleth, K.R.Ashok and R.Balasubramanian*
- \* Monograph 24/2013  
Estimation and Forecast of Wood Demand and Supply in Tamilnadu  
*K.S. Kavi Kumar, Brinda Viswanathan and Zareena Begum I*
- \* Monograph 25/2013  
Enumeration of Crafts Persons in India  
*Brinda Viswanathan*
- \* Monograph 26/2013  
Medical Tourism in India: Progress, Opportunities and Challenges  
*K.R.Shanmugam*
- \* Monograph 27/2014  
Appraisal of Priority Sector Lending by Commercial Banks in India  
*C. Bhujanga Rao*
- \* Monograph 28/2014  
Fiscal Instruments for Climate Friendly Industrial Development in Tamil Nadu  
*D.K. Srivastava, K.R. Shanmugam, K.S. Kavi Kumar and Madhuri Saripalle*
- \* Monograph 29/2014  
Prevalence of Undernutrition and Evidence on Interventions: Challenges for India  
*Brinda Viswanathan.*
- \* Monograph 30/2014  
Counting The Poor: Measurement And Other Issues  
*C. Rangarajan and S. Mahendra Dev*

# ***MSE Working Papers***

## **Recent Issues**

- \* Working Paper 89/2014  
Testing the Expectations Trap Hypothesis: A Time-Varying Parameter Approach  
*Naveen Srinivasan*
- \* Working Paper 90/2014  
Analyzing the Pathway to Improve Tiger Conservation in India  
*Zareena Begum. I and Amanat K. Gill*
- \* Working Paper 91/2014  
A New Approach to Construct Core Inflation  
*Sartaj Rasool Rather; S. Raja Sethu Durai and M. Ramachandran*
- \* Working Paper 92/2014  
Energy Use Patterns And Firm Performance: Evidence From Indian Industries  
*Santosh Kumar Sahu*
- \* Working Paper 93/2014  
Women's Malnutrition In India: The Role Of Economic And Social Status  
*Shikha Dahiya and Brinda Viswanathan*
- \* Working Paper 94/2014  
Asymmetric Price Adjustment - Evidence For India  
*Sartaj Rasool Rather; S. Raja Sethu Durai and M. Ramachandran*
- \* Working Paper 95/2014  
Volatility Spillover Between Oil And Stock Market Returns  
*B. Anand , Sunil Paul and M. Ramachandran*
- \* Working Paper 96/2015  
A Dynamic Economic Model of Soil Conservation Involving Genetically Modified Crop  
*Amrita Chatterjee*
- \* Working Paper 97/2015  
Entrepreneurial Choice of Investment Capital For House-Based Industries: A Case Study in West Bengal  
*Shrabani Mukherjee*
- \* Working Paper 98/2015  
Technology Import, R & D Spillover And Export: A Study of Automobile Sector in India  
*Santosh K. Sahu and K. Narayanan*

---

\* Working papers are downloadable from MSE website <http://www.mse.ac.in>

\$ Restricted circulation