



European Bank
for Reconstruction and Development

Can consumer confidence data predict real variables?

Evidence from Croatia

Marija Kuzmanović and Peter Sanfey

This paper uses monthly data to examine the links between consumer confidence and real economic variables in Croatia, and it tests whether movements in the former contain predictive power for the latter. The results suggest that changes in consumer confidence help to explain retail turnover and imports, while expectations about forthcoming major purchases have particularly strong predictive power for retail turnover. We also find that the inclusion of confidence on the right-hand side improves the fit of simple models of retail turnover, a variable that is highly correlated with quarterly GDP. The results therefore highlight the usefulness of these survey data in helping to explain and forecast the real economy.

Keywords: consumer confidence; Croatia

JEL Classification Number: E2, P3

Contact details: Peter Sanfey, One Exchange Square, London EC2A 2JN, UK.

Phone: +44 20 7338 6227; Fax: +44 20 7338 6110; email: sanfey@ebrd.com.

Peter Sanfey is Deputy Director of Country Strategy and Policy and Marija Kuzmanović is an economic analyst, both within the Office of the Chief Economist at the EBRD.

We are grateful to Cagatay Bircan, Josip Funda, Jonathan Lehne, Franto Ricka and Erwin Tiongson for comments and suggestions on an earlier draft.

The working paper series has been produced to stimulate debate on the economic transformation of central and eastern Europe and the CIS. Views presented are those of the authors and not necessarily of the EBRD.

1. Introduction

Many countries in central and south-eastern Europe suffered a crisis of confidence during and after the major economic downturn in 2009-10. One of the most badly affected economies in this region was Croatia, where real GDP fell by 6 per cent in 2009 and by 1.2 per cent in 2010. No growth occurred in 2011 and (as of late 2012) another year of negative growth seems certain in 2012. In parallel, surveys of consumer and business confidence showed a big drop in 2009 and little sign of recovery since then. But are these real economic trends and psychological expectations linked, and can movements in the latter help us predict trends in the former?

This paper attempts to answer these questions for the case of Croatia. We test whether confidence data can explain subsequent movements in economic variables such as retail sales or industrial production, or whether expectations about the course of economic variables actually follow such outcomes. We also test whether the inclusion of confidence data improves the fit of a simple model of monthly retail sales. In both cases, we find support for these hypotheses. These are potentially important findings, not just for Croatian policy-makers, but perhaps also for those in neighbouring countries where the same forces may be at work but where comparable data to those in Croatia are not yet available.

Many economists have explored, both theoretically and empirically, the ways in which consumer sentiment may influence economic performance. The importance of expectations and “animal spirits” was frequently emphasised by Keynes in his writings, notably in *The General Theory*, and more recently by Akerlof and Shiller (2009). It is not hard to see why business people who are pessimistic about the economic outlook might delay or cancel planned investments. With regard to consumers, low expectations for the future may affect different types of spending in different ways. One would expect, for example, spending on more expensive, durable items to be more sensitive to consumer sentiment, whereas outlays on essential day-to-day goods would fluctuate less in response to expectations.

Our paper adds to a large literature, much of it based on US data, which explores the link between confidence data and real variables. Economists became increasingly interested in the issue once detailed data began to be collected. Okun (1960) is an early example that examines the usefulness of what he and others term “anticipations” data. Ludvigson (2004) is a more recent survey of the main issues surrounding the measurement and reporting of consumer confidence, as well as its relationship with the real economy. He concludes that the most popular surveys do help predict future consumer expenditure, but the extra predictive power beyond that of other economic and financial indicators is modest.

There are very few papers that focus on transition economies and, to the best of our knowledge, only one concerned itself specifically with Croatia. Čižmešija and Sorić (2010) find, on the basis of two Vector Autoregression (VAR) models, that a quarterly economic sentiment indicator does contain some predictive power for quarterly GDP. However, the analysis is inevitably constrained by the short time series. Our approach here concentrates on monthly data instead and uses a related but somewhat different methodology.

2. Data description

In Croatia, a consumer confidence survey has been carried out regularly by the Croatian National Bank (CNB) since April 1999. Originally carried out quarterly, the survey has been conducted monthly by CNB since May 2005, in cooperation with the statistical arm of the European Commission, Eurostat. The survey is conducted in accordance with the methodology established by the Commission – the Joint Harmonised EU Programme for business and consumer surveys. The survey is conducted each month via face-to-face interviews with 1,000 individuals from all over the country. The individuals are selected via stratified random sampling. The strata are formed based on income, economic activity, education, age and gender.¹

The main goal of the consumer confidence survey is to measure consumer expectations about the financial situation of their households, the general economic situation, unemployment expectations and savings in the next 12 months (see Annex 1 for the full list of questions). In most cases, answers can be on a five-point scale – two positive, two negative and one in-between. For example, in response to the question: “How do you expect the financial situation of your household to change over the next 12 months?”, the answers can be: “get a lot better”, “get a little better”, “stay the same”, “get a little worse” and “get a lot worse”.² The balance of responses to each question – with strongly positive/negative responses (for example, “get a lot better”) weighted double that of weakly positive/negative answers (for example, “get a little better”) – is calculated for each population stratum, and then the answers are weighted by the share of the population stratum in the whole population. Lastly, a confidence indicator is calculated as a simple average of the (seasonally adjusted) responses to four questions: those on the financial situation of the household, the general economic situation, the path of unemployment and the likelihood of saving money – all in relation to the next 12 months.³

Chart 1 shows the time trend of this indicator since monthly sampling began, with the EU average also charted for comparison. Although the time series is relatively short, it covers the distinct periods of robust growth, crisis and subsequent stagnation. Several interesting points emerge. First, consumer confidence in Croatia has been below the EU average throughout the entire time period, even prior to 2009 when growth in the Croatian economy was faster on average than in the European Union. This may reflect the significant gap between the European Union and Croatia in this period, not only in standard of living but also in terms of social safety nets and employment opportunities. Second, the drop in confidence from peak to trough was even bigger in Croatia than in the European Union (nearly 40 points in Croatia compared with 30 points in the European Union), but the lowest point in Croatia came around six months after the trough in the European Union (August versus February 2009). Third, the recovery in confidence has taken place much later in Croatia, compared with the fairly rapid recovery in the European Union in the second half of 2009 and first half of 2010. Lastly, the most recent data suggest significant volatility in Croatia. There was a sharp rise in late 2011/early 2012 at a time of elections, a new government and the signing (and subsequent ratification by parliament and the people) of the European Union treaty. However confidence has fallen away again since then, and as of August 2012 the gap between Croatia and the EU average is once again close to 20 points.


¹ See

http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/euroindicators/business_consumer_surveys/methodology for a description of the sampling methodology. A business confidence survey has also been carried out monthly since May 2008, but the short sample size rules out for now any meaningful econometric testing.

² Another possible response is “Don’t know” – these answers are discarded in the analysis.

³ That is, questions 2, 4, 7 and 11 – see the Annex.


Chart 1. Consumer confidence time trend in Croatia and European Union



Source: European Commission -DG Economic and Financial Affairs, 2012

How well do the confidence data shadow real economic variables? As a first pass at this question, Chart 2 graphs the confidence index against quarterly changes in the real level of (seasonally adjusted) GDP. The shaded areas refer to quarters when GDP growth was negative. Although the two series move fairly closely together, the chart suggests that movements in confidence precede those in GDP. This is the first bit of evidence in favour of the hypothesis that the confidence index may help to predict future movements in real variables.


Chart 2. Consumer confidence and quarterly GDP in Croatia




Note: The quarterly value of the confidence indicator was calculated as the arithmetic average of the monthly indicator values for the three months in each quarter. The shaded areas represent quarters in which seasonally adjusted GDP fell compared with the previous quarter.
Source: Eurostat, 2012.

Although GDP data in Croatia are available on a quarterly basis only, other variables are published monthly. Charts 3(a)-(d) compare confidence with four series: industrial production and retail turnover (both measured as an index), and imports and exports in dollar values.⁴ All series are seasonally adjusted. The correlation with the first two is quite strong; as with GDP, the drop in confidence during the crisis appears to have foreshadowed the fall in industrial output and retail turnover. The link with imports and exports is less clear, as these variables have fluctuated dramatically during the crisis.


Chart 3. Consumer confidence and other high-frequency series




(a) Consumer confidence and industrial production



(b) Consumer confidence and retail trade turnover



(c) Consumer confidence and imports



(d) Consumer confidence and exports

Source: Eurostat; European Commission - DG Economic and Financial Affairs, 2012.

⁴ Taking quarterly averages, the simple correlation coefficients between each of these variables and GDP is quite strong – at least 0.7 – in all cases except between GDP and exports, where the correlation coefficient is only 0.06.

3. Econometric tests

3.1 Stationarity, cointegration and causality

While the charts above are suggestive, it is not possible to say anything definitive about the predictive power of the confidence index without econometric analysis of the series.

Therefore, we examined the direction of causality between confidence and the four high-frequency time series depicted above.⁵ We followed the standard methodology for testing causality in time series, according to the steps below.⁶

First, we tested each series for stationarity using the Augmented Dickey Fuller (ADF) test. We applied the ADF test for each of the following three specifications: models with an intercept and trend; models with an intercept but no trend; and models with no intercept and no trend (see Table 1). The number of lags used in the ADF regressions was determined using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC). We found that under all three specifications, the level series are non-stationary (that is, they failed to reject the null hypothesis of a unit root). We also found that the first-differenced series for our four variables are stationary under all three specifications. Table 1 also reports ADF tests for three other series: unemployment; expected unemployment (question 7 in the survey – see Annex); and expected purchases (question 9 in the survey) – the rationale for including these variables is discussed below.

Table 1. Stationarity test results

	Trend, constant		Constant, no trend		No trend, No constant	
	Level	First difference	Level	First difference	Level	First difference
Consumer confidence	-2.006 (1) -3.464	-9.349 (0) -3.464	-1.473 (1) -2.901	-9.406 (0) -2.901	0.059 (1) -1.950	-9.240 (0) -1.950
Industrial production	-1.856 (2) -3.467	-5.384 (4) -3.470	-0.415 (2) -2.904	-4.799 (4) -2.906	-0.744 (2) -1.950	-4.216 (4) -1.950
Retail trade turnover	-2.275 (2) -3.467	-8.335 (1) -3.467	0.018 (2) -2.904	-7.894 (1) -2.904	-0.555 (2) -1.950	-7.869 (1) -1.950
Imports	-2.009(4) -3.466	-6.910 (1) -4.082	-1.755 (4) -2.903	-6.898 (0) -2.904	-0.087 (1) -1.950	-6.937 (0) -1.950
Exports	-2.223 (3) -3.468	-7.759 (2) -3.468	-2.268 (3) -2.904	-7.771 (2) -2.904	-0.320 (3) -1.950	-7.788 (2) -1.950
Unemployment	-1.345 (1) -3.465	-6.079(1) -3.466	-0.031 (1) -2.902	-5.320 (1) -2.903	0.618(1) -1.950	-5.317(1) -1.950
Expected purchases	-1.947(4) -3.467	-5.549 (3) -3.467	-0.728(4) -2.904	-5.582 (3) -2.904	-1.061 (4) -1.950	-5.423 (3) -1.950
Expected unemployment	-2.021(1) -3.464	-10.007 (0) -3.464	-1.426 (1) -2.901	-10.065 (0) -2.901	-0.303 (1) -1.950	-10.104(0) -1.950

Note: For each series, the first statistic is the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) statistic. The number of lags used in the ADF regressions is indicated in the parentheses. The second statistic is the 95 per cent critical

⁵ We experimented with taking logs, instead of levels, of exports and imports but the results are broadly unchanged.

⁶ Enders (1995) is a useful textbook guide to these methods.

value associated with the test. If the test statistic is more negative than the critical value, the null hypothesis of a unit root is rejected at the 95 per cent confidence level.

Source: Eurostat, 2012.

We then proceeded to test if the confidence indicator is cointegrated with each of the macroeconomic series (see Table 2). Cointegration means that a linear combination of two (or more) non-stationary series is stationary, implying a long-run equilibrium relationship among these variables. We used the Engle-Granger method to test for cointegration between the variables. That is, we regressed the confidence index on each of the macro variables, using least squares. We then tested for stationarity of the residuals using the Dickey-Fuller test. In each case but one (expected purchases and retail trade turnover at zero lags), the residuals were non-stationary, suggesting that no cointegrating relationship exists between confidence and the other macro series. We therefore cannot identify a long-term causal relationship in the data.

Table 2. Cointegration test results

	No trend			Trend		
	Lag 0	Lag 1	Lag 2	Lag 0	Lag 1	Lag 2
Industrial production and consumer confidence	-2.658 (-2.896)	-2.089 (-2.896)	-1.821 (-2.896)	-2.339 (-3.463)	-2.059 (-3.463)	-1.790 (-3.463)
Retail trade turnover and consumer confidence	-2.339 (-2.896)	-2.251 (-2.896)	-1.859 (-2.896)	-2.248 (-3.463)	-2.148 (-3.463)	-1.747 (-3.463)
Imports and consumer confidence	-2.855 (-2.896)	-2.743 (-2.896)	-2.525 (-2.896)	-3.129 (-3.463)	-3.267 (-3.463)	-2.861 (-3.463)
Exports and consumer confidence	-1.754 (-2.896)	-1.516 (-2.896)	-1.340 (-2.896)	-3.930 (-3.463)	-2.798 (-3.463)	-2.876 (-3.463)
Expected purchases and retail turnover	-3.878 (-2.896)	-2.801 (-2.869)	-2.504 (-2.869)	-4.808 (-3.463)	-3.232 (-3.463)	-2.539 (-3.463)
Expected unemployment and unemployment	-1.842 (-2.896)	-1.742 (-2.869)	-1.567 (-2.869)	-2.194 (-3.463)	-2.019 (-3.463)	-1.889 (-3.463)

Note. The first statistic is the Engle Granger test statistic. The 95 per cent confidence critical value for each test is included in parentheses. If the test statistic is more negative than the critical value, we reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration.

Source: Eurostat, 2012.

Notwithstanding the last result, we can still test for short-term causality, using the standard Granger causality test. That is, confidence Granger causes a macro variable if and only if the macro variable is better predicted using past changes in the confidence variable in addition to past changes in the macro variable itself. We tested for Granger causality using the VAR model, as applied to the stationary (first-differenced) series. The optimum number of lags is difficult to determine *a priori* and different diagnostic tests sometimes yield different results for the optimum number. Table 3 reports the results for three lags.

Table 3. Granger causality test results

Model	Null hypothesis	Lags	P value
VAR (CCI, Industrial production)	CCI does not cause industrial production Industrial production does not cause CCI	3 3	0.811 0.059
VAR (CCI, Retail trade turnover)	CCI does not cause retail trade Retail trade does not cause CCI	3 3	0.077 0.846
VAR (CCI, Imports)	CCI does not cause imports Imports do not cause CCI	3 3	0.005 0.782
VAR (CCI, Exports)	CCI does not cause exports Exports do not cause CCI	3 3	0.453 0.239
VAR (CCI Q9 - Expected purchases, Retail trade turnover)	Expected purchases do not cause retail trade Retail trade does not cause expected purchases	3 3	0.015 0.190
VAR (CCI Q7 - Expected unemployment, Unemployment)	Expected unemployment does not cause unemployment Unemployment does not cause expected unemployment	3 3	0.595 0.318

Note: The test statistic reported in this table is the p-value associated with each test. If the p-value is less than 0.05, the associated null hypothesis is rejected at the 95 per cent confidence level.

Source: Eurostat, 2012.

There are two main results in Table 3. First, consumer confidence Granger causes both retail turnover and imports, but not vice versa. This result is relatively robust to different lag length and the addition of new months of data, although the result for retail turnover is significant only at the 10 per cent level. The link with imports is unsurprising because Croatia imports most of its durable goods and, as argued in the introduction, this category of spending may be particularly vulnerable to changes in confidence. Second, the component of the consumer confidence index that reflects consumer expectations of major purchases in the coming 12 months (question 9 in the survey – see Annex) has stronger predictive power with respect to retail turnover compared with the overall confidence index. This is an important finding because it highlights the potential value of analysing different parts of the confidence index rather than simply taking the aggregate value.

The other main findings are as follows. There is no identifiable causal relationship in either direction between confidence on the one hand and exports on the other, which is perhaps not surprising. However, there is tentative evidence (at the 10 per cent level) of a feedback effect from industrial production to confidence. We also tested whether there might be a relationship between the component of the indicator that reflects expectations of future unemployment (question 7 in the survey) and actual unemployment figures. However, the results suggest no such link in either direction.

3.2 Goodness of fit

In addition to these results, we carried out a couple of further experiments with the data. We wanted to test whether consumer confidence adds any predictive power to a model of household consumption for Croatia. In line with some of the existing literature, we estimated several simple models of household consumption and we measured whether adding consumer confidence to each model enhances its predictive power.⁷

⁷ See, for example, Dees and Soares Brinca (2011) for a cross-country analysis of the US and the euro area.

The models can be represented by the following equation, where C_t represents consumption at time t and Z^K represents the different explanatory variables in each model.

$$\Delta C_t = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^3 \gamma_i \Delta Z_{t-i}^k + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta C_t = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^3 \beta_i \Delta conf_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \gamma_i \Delta Z_{t-i}^k + \varepsilon_i. \quad (2)$$

In the first model (without a confidence measure), we initially included as explanatory variables only past changes in real disposable income. We then added changes in household wealth, and subsequently we also added changes in short-term interest rates and changes in unemployment. For this model we used changes in net real wages as a measure of changes in real disposable income and we proxied for household wealth by using the value of the Zagreb Stock Exchange Index. We experimented with quarterly data but the results were rather inconclusive, unsurprisingly given the small number of observations. Therefore, we decided to stick to monthly data, where retail trade turnover is used as a proxy for household consumption. The monthly series are also relatively short – they are available since May 2005 for all the required variables. However, because of the higher frequency, they provide more data points.

Table 4 shows the goodness of fit of each model, as measured by the adjusted R-squared. In each case the model fit improves, usually by about three percentage points (0.03) when lagged changes of consumer confidence were added as explanatory variables.⁸ It should be noted that the overall adjusted R-squared remains relatively low even under the best model and many individual coefficients (not reported) were insignificant. The best model is actually one which excludes real wages and unemployment. Nevertheless, the results at least suggest that any model of consumer behaviour, however sophisticated, may benefit from the inclusion of confidence indicators on the right-hand side.

Table 4. Consumption model regression results

Explanatory variables consumption model	Adj. R^2 without consumer confidence	Adj. R^2 with consumer confidence
Real wage	0.0186	0.0534
Real wage, stock market index	0.0050	0.0378
Real wage, stock market index, unemployment, interest rates	.0395	.0669
Stock market index, interest rates	0.0586	0.0847

Source: Eurostat 2012.

⁸ In each regression, the level of lag length was chosen to maximise explanatory power.

4. Conclusion

This paper provides support for the view that confidence data in Croatia are useful and important. We conclude that the Croatian consumer confidence index has predictive power for retail turnover, which in turn is closely linked to GDP movements, and for imports. We also showed that one element of this index – that relating to expected purchases – is particularly closely related with subsequent retail developments. Lastly, we found that including confidence in a model of retail turnover can help improve the statistical fit. These are important results for policy-makers and business owners, who have to plan ahead and anticipate market trends. Unfortunately, the present depressed state of confidence in Croatia suggests that no economic recovery is in sight, at least in the short term.

There are various ways in which our preliminary analysis could be extended. First, it is unclear how robust the results are to further tests and inclusion of other variables. These can be the topics of future investigation as extra months and years of data become available. It will also be interesting to see how well the business confidence indicator – available on a monthly basis since May 2008 only – performs in similar tests, once there are sufficient data to make such tests statistically meaningful. An even more interesting avenue to pursue will be to carry out a multi-country analysis for those countries in the transition region, in particular among those that joined the European Union in the past decade, where comparable data are available. It is hoped that neighbouring countries, including in former Yugoslavia, where good-quality confidence data are not available, will accelerate efforts to gather such data. Lastly, we hope that the paper will contribute to shaping a broader debate about how confidence can be boosted because, without an upturn in consumer sentiment, it is hard to see how sustainable growth in Croatia can be restored.

References

- T. Afshar, G. Arabian and R. Zomorrodian (2007), "Stock return, consumer confidence, purchasing manager's index and economic fluctuations", *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, Vol. 5(8), pp. 97-106.
- G.A. Akerlof and R. J. Shiller (2009), *Animal spirits: how human psychology drives the economy, and why it matters for global capitalism*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- K. Bodnar (2010), "Household consumption expenditures and the consumer confidence index", MNB Bulletin, March 2010, pp. 6-18.
- M. Čižmešija and P. Sorić (2010), "Assessing Croatian GDP components via economic sentiment indicator", *Ekonomika Istraživanja*, Vol. 23(4), pp. 1-10.
- S. Dees and P. Soares Brinca (2011), "Consumer confidence as a predictor of consumption spending: evidence for the United States and the euro area", European Central Bank Working Paper No. 1349.
- W. Enders (1995), *Applied econometric time series*, Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics, New York.
- O. Kuziakiv (2010), "Do the managers' expectations predict main tendency before and during recession of Ukrainian economy?", paper presented at 30th CIRET conference, New York, October 2010.
- S.C Ludvigson (2004), "Consumer confidence and consumer spending", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 18(2), pp. 29-50.
- A.M Okun (1960), "The value of anticipations data in forecasting national product", Chapter 17 of *The Quality and Economic Significance of Anticipations Data*. A conference of the Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research; Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Annex: The consumer confidence questionnaire

The consumer confidence survey includes the following questions:

1) How has the financial situation of your household changed over the last 12 months? It has...

- ++ got a lot better
- + got a little better
- = stayed the same
- got a little worse
- got a lot worse
- N don't know

2) How do you expect the financial situation of your household to change over the next 12 months? It will...

- ++ get a lot better
- + get a little better
- = stay the same
- get a little worse
- get a lot worse
- N don't know

3) How do you think the general economic situation in the country has changed over the last 12 months? It has....

- ++ got a lot better
- + got a little better
- = stayed the same
- got a little worse
- got a lot worse
- N don't know

4) How do you expect the general economic situation to develop over the next 12 months? It will...

- ++ get a lot better
- + get a little better
- = stay the same
- get a little worse
- get a lot worse

N don't know

5) How do you think consumer prices have developed over the last 12 months? They have...

++ risen a lot

+ risen moderately

= risen slightly

- stayed about the same

-- fallen

N don't know

6) In comparison with the past 12 months, how do you expect that consumer prices will develop in the next 12 months? They will...

++ increase more rapidly

+ increase at the same rate

= increase at a slower rate

- stay about the same

-- fall

N don't know

7) How do you expect the number of people unemployed in this country to change over the next 12 months? The number will....

++ increase sharply

+ increase slightly

= remain the same

- fall slightly

-- fall sharply

N don't know

8) In view of the general economic situation, do you think that now is the right moment for people to make major purchases such as furniture, electrical/electronic devices, etc?

++ yes, it is the right moment now

= it is neither the right moment nor the wrong moment

-- no, it is not the right moment now

N don't know

9) Compared with the past 12 months, do you expect to spend more or less money on major purchases (furniture, electrical/electronic devices, etc)? I will spend....

- ++ much more
- + a little more
- = about the same
- a little less
- a lot less
- N don't know

10) In view of the general economic situation, do you think that now is...?

- ++ a very good moment to save
- + a fairly good moment to save
- not a good moment to save
- a very bad moment to save
- N don't know

11) Over the next 12 months, how likely is it that you will save any money?

- ++ very likely
- + fairly likely
- not likely
- not at all likely
- N don't know

12) Which of these statements best describes the current financial situation of your household?

- ++ we are saving a lot
- + we are saving a little
- = we are just managing to make ends meet on our income
- we are having to draw on our savings
- we are running into debt
- N don't know