

Reading the tea leaves: Model uncertainty, robust forecasts, and the autocorrelation of analysts' forecast errors

Juhani T. Linnainmaa, Walter Torous, James Yae

PII: S0304-405X(16)30062-9
DOI: [10.1016/j.jfineco.2015.08.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2015.08.020)
Reference: FINEC 2652



To appear in: *Journal of Financial Economics*

Received date: 20 December 2010
Revised date: 11 August 2015
Accepted date: 19 August 2015

Please cite this article as: Juhani T. Linnainmaa, Walter Torous, James Yae, Reading the tea leaves: Model uncertainty, robust forecasts, and the autocorrelation of analysts' forecast errors, *Journal of Financial Economics* (2016), doi: [10.1016/j.jfineco.2015.08.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2015.08.020)

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Reading the tea leaves: Model uncertainty, robust forecasts, and the autocorrelation of analysts' forecast errors*

Juhani T. Linnainmaa^{†a,b}, Walter Torous^c, and James Yae^d

^aUniversity of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089, USA

^bNational Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA 02912, USA

^cMassachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

^dUniversity of Houston, Houston, TX 77004, USA

Abstract

We put forward a model in which analysts are uncertain about a firm's earnings process. Faced with the possibility of using a misspecified model, analysts issue forecasts that are robust to model misspecification. We estimate that this mechanism explains approximately 60% of the autocorrelation in analysts' forecast errors. The remainder stems from the cross-sectional variation in mean forecast errors and in analysts' estimation errors of the persistence of earnings growth shocks. Consistent with our model, we find that analysts learn about some features of the earnings process but not others, and this learning reduces, but does not eliminate, the autocorrelation of forecast errors as firms age. Other potential explanations for the autocorrelation of analyst forecast errors are rejected. Our model of robust forecasting applies not only to analysts' forecasts but also to all model-based forecasts.

JEL classification: G14, G24

Keywords: Model uncertainty; Parameter uncertainty; Forecasting; Robustness; Financial analysts

*We thank Alan Bester, Michael Brennan, Joseph Gerakos, Simon Gervais, Shingo Goto, Bing Han, David Hirshleifer, Matti Keloharju, Ralph Koijen, Christian Leuz, Ľuboš Pástor, Josh Rauh, Bill Schwert (the editor), Doug Skinner, Ross Valkanov, Pietro Veronesi, and the seminar and conference participants at the University of Chicago, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the Western Finance Association meetings for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. We also thank the referee, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh, whose suggestions and comments significantly improved the paper. Micah Allred and Brett Myers provided excellent research assistance. Juhani T. Linnainmaa acknowledges financial support from the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

[†]Corresponding author. Mailing address: Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California, 3670 Trousdale Parkway, Los Angeles, CA 90089, United States. E-mail address: Juhani.Linnainmaa@marshall.usc.edu. Telephone number: +1 (773) 612-5759.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5100509>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5100509>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)