



**62nd ISI WORLD
STATISTICS
CONGRESS 2019**

18 – 23 August 2019, Kuala Lumpur

Come | Connect | Create

IPS 188

Does Google Search Index Help Track and Predict Inflation Rate? An Exploratory Analysis for India

G. P. Samanta
Reserve Bank of India
21st August 2019, 10.30 am – 12.30 am

Outline/Content

- **Background**
- **Google Search Index**
- **Data and Methodology**
- **Empirical Results**
- **Concluding Remarks**



Background

Introduction (1/2)

- **Forward-looking Assessment** of Inflation is an important input to Monetary Policy, particularly in the era of Inflation Targeting
- **Traditional Approaches**
 - Macro-econometric Model
 - Time Series Modelling and Forecasting
 - Small Economic Models (Output-Gap; P-Star, etc.)
 - Survey-Based Estimation of Market Expectation

Introduction (2/2)

- Emerging Approaches
 - Text Mining (Media Sentiment)
 - Twitter Data/Message Analyses
 - Web-Crawling/Scrapping (Indices-online prices)
 - Online Search Index (i.e. Google Search Index)



Google Search Indicators - Price and Inflation

Google Search Index : Broad Features

- Google search index for specified keywords reflects the volume of search on the given keywords in Google Search Engine.
- **Important features of Google Search Indices**
 - (1) Time series data provide rescaled/relative (not absolute) volume of search on given keywords;
 - (2) Maximum search interest over a set of time points/periods is assigned a value 100 & that in remaining time points are rescaled accordingly;
 - (3) Time series replica of the search index vary depending on the date when the enquiry/search were made.

Google Search Index : Link with Economic Variables

- Many researchers argue that

- (1) People usually gather information on a topic on which they are anxious or concerned with;
- (2) Google search index/volume reflects individuals' *revealed expectations* about the variables/aspects (*represented by the search key words*);
- (3) So, such indices may track or predict corresponding variable/aspect.

Example:

- (a) Before *purchasing consumer goods*, one may be interested in searching for information on the item.
- (b) People may be more *concerned/worried about rising or higher inflation* and their search interest on the keyword 'inflation' may rise.



Data and Methodology

Data – Google Search & Price Indices

- **Data Frequency:** Monthly
- **Data Period:** From Apr 2012 to Mar 2019
- **Data Sources:**

Google Trend Data:

- Search Indexes for Keywords “Inflation” & “Price”

National Statistics Office (NSO):

- Consumer Price Index – Urban (CPI-U)
- Consumer Price Index – Combined (CPI-C)

Data – Google Search Strategy

- **Search Location:** India
- **Data Frequency / Period:** Monthly / Apr 2012 to Mar 2019
- **Enquiry Dates:** Three randomly chosen days in May 2019
- **Two Search Words:** ‘Inflation’ & ‘Price’

Basic Search Indices/Replicas for a Keyword:

- On each enquiry date, a replica of monthly time series of search index was drawn.
- **Denote** the value in t-th day on i-th replica by $\tilde{Y}_t^{(i)}$, $i=1,2,3$.

Data – Google Search Strategy

- **Given**, $\tilde{Y}_t^{(i)} = \frac{\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}}{\delta_i} \times 100$;

where $\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}$ = Unknown absolute volume of search in t-th day on i-th replica;
 δ_i = maximum no of search over t on $\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}$, $i=1,2,3$

- **Overall/Pooled search indicator:**

Y_t = Geometric-Mean (GM) of $\tilde{Y}_t^{(i)}$ s, $i=1,2,3$

∝ GM of $\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}$ s, $i=1,2,3$ (i.e. *GM of actual but unknown search volumes*)

- We call the overall search index as follows

- **Keyword:** “Inflation” → **Overall Search Index:** GM-Infl

- **Keyword:** “Price” → **Overall Search Index:** GM-Price

Data – K-Period Inflation/Change

- **K-period Percentage Change of a Variable X_t**

$$\pi_t = [\log_e(X_t) - \log_e(X_{t-k})] \times 100;$$

$X_t = \text{CPI-C; CPI-U; GM-Price and GM-Infl}$



Empirical Results

Unit-Root Tests - Different Transformations (1/2)

Variable	Augmented Dickey-Fuller					Phillips-Perron				
	Optimal Lag	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend		Bandwidth	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend	
		Test Statistics	p-value	Test Statistics	p-value		Test Statistics	p-value	Test Statistics	p-value
(A) Annual Inflation Rate/Annual Percentage Change										
lnCPI-C	7	<u>-2.8429</u>	0.1869	1.7515	0.0843	3	-2.2117	0.4769	1.3288	0.1876
lnCPI-U	7	<u>-3.7490</u>	0.0247	2.8582	0.0056	3	-2.6516	0.2592	<u>1.9785</u>	0.0512
lnGMPrice	6	<u>-3.9981</u>	0.0125	3.0147	0.0036	1	<u>-3.4091</u>	0.0569	<u>1.8850</u>	0.0629
lnGMInfl	0	<u>-5.8940</u>	0.0000	-5.2213	0.0000	2	<u>-5.8860</u>	0.0000	<u>-5.2213</u>	0.0000
(B) First-Difference Series of Variables at (A) above										
Δ lnCPI-C	6	<u>-7.0514</u>	0.0000	<u>-4.3018</u>	0.0001	0	-5.6672	0.0000	<u>-2.0093</u>	0.0478
Δ lnCPI-U	6	<u>-6.4774</u>	0.0000	<u>-3.4508</u>	0.0010	2	-6.0054	0.0000	<u>-1.7980</u>	0.0759
Δ lnGMPrice	3	<u>-5.9215</u>	0.0000	-0.9223	0.3593	8	-8.1457	0.0000	-0.6333	0.5283
Δ lnGMInfl	1	<u>-9.4089</u>	0.0000	-0.0126	0.9900	13	-20.5903	0.0000	0.1838	0.8546
(C) Second-Difference Series of Variables at (A) above										
Δ^2 lnCPI-C	7	<u>-7.8157</u>	0.0000	0.3484	0.7287	8	<u>-15.7029</u>	0.0000	0.1071	0.9150
Δ^2 lnCPI-U	7	<u>-7.7350</u>	0.0000	0.5843	0.5610	4	<u>-11.9371</u>	0.0000	0.2176	0.8283
Δ^2 lnGMPrice	4	<u>-8.7383</u>	0.0000	-0.0139	0.9889	6	<u>-51.1038</u>	0.0001	0.0135	0.9892
Δ^2 lnGMInfl	4	<u>-7.7786</u>	0.0000	-0.0493	0.9913	6	<u>-51.2341</u>	0.0001	0.0234	0.9852

Unit-Root Tests - Different Transformations (2/2)

Variable	Augmented Dickey-Fuller					Phillips-Perron				
	Optimal Lag	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend		Band-width	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend	
		Test	p-value	Test	p-value		Test	p-value	Test	p-value
		Statistics	value	Statistics	value		Statistic	value	Statistics	value
(D) De-Trending Linear-Time-Trend of Variables at (A) above										
eInCPI-C	7	-2.8428	0.1869	-5.1194	0.0000	1	-5.3040	0.0002	0.0916	0.9273
eInCPI-U	7	-3.7490	0.0247	-4.8328	0.0000	3	-2.6516	0.2592	-2.9244	0.0044
eInGMPrice	6	-3.9981	0.0125	-0.5160	0.6075	1	<u>-3.4091</u>	0.0569	-0.6357	0.5267
eInGMInfl	0	-5.8940	0.0000	0.1911	0.8489	2	-5.8860	0.0000	0.1911	0.8489
(E) De-Trending Quadratic-Time-Trend of Variables at (A) above										
e2InCPI-C	1	-4.4954	0.0027	-0.5439	0.5880	3	<u>-3.2540</u>	0.0811	-0.4989	0.6191
e2InCPI-U	1	-3.6238	0.0336	-0.4053	0.6864	3	-2.8794	0.1743	-0.3621	0.7182
e2InGMPrice	3	-3.6125	0.0348	-0.4351	0.6647	1	-3.5711	0.0384	-0.3378	0.7364
e2InGMInfl	0	-6.0223	0.0000	0.0601	0.9522	1	<u>-6.0519</u>	0.0601	0.0601	0.9522

Unit-Root Tests - Annual Changes & Their Differences

Variable	Augmented Dickey-Fuller					Phillips-Perron				
	Optimal Lag	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend		Band-width	Unit-Root Test		Test for Trend	
		Test Statistics	p-value	Test Statistics	p-value		Test Statistic	p-value	Test Statistics	p-value
(A) Annual Inflation Rate/Annual Percentage Change										
gCPI-C	1	-3.1547	0.1018	-2.1941	0.0316	3	-2.3619	0.3961	-1.4354	0.1556
gCPI-U	4	-1.8559	0.6669	-0.7415	0.4610	5	-1.8075	0.6912	-0.5764	0.5662
gGMPrice	0	-5.3040	0.0002	0.0916	0.9273	1	-5.3040	0.0002	0.0916	0.9273
gGMInfl	0	-2.2835	0.4373	-0.8676	0.3885	4	-2.5811	0.2900	-0.8676	0.3885
(B) First-Difference Series of the Variables at (A) above										
Δ gCPI-C	11	-4.3419	0.0052	1.5623	0.1248	13	-6.2063	0.0000	0.7070	0.4819
Δ gCPI-U	1	-6.6947	0.0000	1.0733	0.2869	13	-5.9064	0.0000	1.0946	0.2774
Δ gGMPrice	1	-9.1522	0.0000	0.1058	0.9161	26	-20.2929	0.0001	-0.1534	0.8785
Δ gGMInfl	0	-7.8708	0.0000	-0.2613	0.7946	2	-7.8397	0.0000	-0.2613	0.7946

Predictive Power – Granger's Causality

(1/2)

Google Search Data	Null Hypothesis	Obs	Lag	F-Statistics	P-Value
gGMPrice	gGMPrice does not Granger Cause gCPI-C	66	9	<u>1.9125</u>	0.0732
	gCPI-C does not Granger cause gGMPrice	66	9	<u>2.0230</u>	0.0575
	gGMPrice does not Granger Cause gCPI-U	72	3	0.6434	0.5899
	gCPI-U does not Granger cause gGMPrice	72	3	<u>3.3392</u>	0.0246
Δ gGMPrice	Δ gGMPrice does not Granger Cause Δ gCPI-C	72	2	0.9296	0.3937
	Δ gCPI-C does not Granger cause Δ gGMPrice	72	2	<u>3.4142</u>	0.0387
	Δ gGMPrice does not Granger Cause Δ gCPI-U	72	2	1.7898	0.1749
	Δ gCPI-U does not Granger cause Δ gGMPrice	72	2	<u>3.3384</u>	0.0415
Δ gGMInfl	Δ gGMInfl does not Granger Cause Δ gCPI-C	62	12	1.6213	0.1279
	Δ gCPI-C does not Granger cause Δ gGMInfl	62	12	<u>2.0394</u>	0.0483
	Δ gGMInfl does not Granger Cause Δ gCPI-U	62	12	1.6005	0.1341
	Δ gCPI-U does not Granger cause Δ gGMInfl	62	12	<u>2.8420</u>	0.0073

Predictive Power – Granger's Causality

(2/2)

Google Search Data	Null Hypothesis	Obs	Lag	F-Statistics	P-Value
$\Delta 2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	$\Delta 2\ln\text{GMInfl}$ does not Granger Cause $\Delta 2\ln\text{CPI-C}$	66	7	2.0053	0.0721
	$\Delta 2\ln\text{CPI-C}$ does not Granger cause $\Delta 2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	66	7	2.2713	0.0431
	$\Delta 2\ln\text{GMInfl}$ does not Granger Cause $\Delta 2\ln\text{CPI-U}$	63	10	1.4382	0.1974
	$\Delta 2\ln\text{CPI-U}$ does not Granger cause $\Delta 2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	63	10	2.0800	0.0483
$e2\ln\text{GMPrice}$	$e2\ln\text{GMPrice}$ does not Granger Cause $e2\ln\text{CPI-C}$	78	9	2.7336	0.0098
	$e2\ln\text{CPI-C}$ does not Granger cause $e2\ln\text{GMPrice}$	78	9	2.6099	0.0131
	$e2\ln\text{GMPrice}$ does not Granger Cause $e2\ln\text{CPI-U}$	78	9	2.8349	0.0077
	$e2\ln\text{CPI-U}$ does not Granger cause $e2\ln\text{GMPrice}$	78	9	3.4623	0.0017
$e2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	$e2\ln\text{GMInfl}$ does not Granger Cause $e2\ln\text{CPI-C}$	78	9	1.1596	0.3334
	$e2\ln\text{CPI-C}$ does not Granger cause $e2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	78	9	2.0825	0.0456
	$e2\ln\text{GMInfl}$ does not Granger Cause $e2\ln\text{CPI-U}$	78	9	0.6332	0.7640
	$e2\ln\text{CPI-U}$ does not Granger cause $e2\ln\text{GMInfl}$	78	9	2.2178	0.0332

Tracking Power – Correlation Coefficient

Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient	Variable Pair	Correlation Coefficient
gGMPrice & gCPI-C	0.1805 (0.1212)	gGMInfl & gCPI-C	0.3591 (0.0016)
gGMPrice & gCPI-U	0.1641 (0.1595)	gGMInfl & gCPI-U	0.3509 (0.0020)
Δ gGMPrice & Δ gCPI-C	0.0150 (0.8985)	Δ gGMInfl & Δ gCPI-C	0.1608 (0.1704)
Δ gGMPrice & Δ gCPI-U	-0.0082 (0.9447)	Δ gGMInfl & Δ gCPI-U	0.1710 (0.1450)
Δ lnGMPrice & Δ lnCPI-C	0.1695 (0.1186)	Δ lnGMInfl & Δ lnCPI-C	0.0373 (0.7333)
Δ lnGMPrice & Δ lnCPI-U	0.1401 (0.1981)	Δ lnGMInfl & Δ lnCPI-U	-0.0280 (0.7977)
e2lnGMPrice & e2lnCPI-C	0.3977 (0.0001)	e2lnGMInfl & e2lnCPI-C	0.2557 (0.0168)
e2lnGMPrice & e2lnCPI-U	0.3701 (0.0013)	e2lnGMInfl & e2lnCPI-U	0.2913 (0.0062)

Figures within () are p-values.



Concluding Remarks

Summary and Conclusions

Time Series Properties

- Annual change of each series is I(1) process.
- Each log-transformed series belongs to I(2) class or TS class (*Quadratic trend*).

Predictive Ability (*Granger's Causality Framework*)

- Bi-directional causal-relationship (*predictive ability*) between CPI-C & GMPrice and CPI-C & GMInfl.
- Bi-directional *predictive ability*: CPI-U and GMPrice.
- GM-Infl is influenced by past CPI-U.

Summary and Conclusions (2/2)

Tracking Ability

- Both GM-Price and GM-Infl have *strong ability to track* inflation based on both CPI-C and CPI-U
- Annual percentage change in GMInfl is strongly correlated with inflation rates based on both CPI-C and CPI-U.

Select References

- Agarwal, Aprrov, Boyi Xie, Ilia Vovsha, Owen Rambow and Rebecca Passonneau (2011), "Sentiment Analysis of Twitter Data", *Proceedings of the Workshop on Language in Social Media (LSM 2011)*, pages 30–38, Portland, Oregon, 23 June 2011.
- Cavallo, Alberto (2013), "Online and Official Price Indexes: Measuring Argentina's Inflation", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 60, pp. 152-65.
- Cavallo, Alberto (2015), "Scraped Data and Sticky Prices", *NBER Working Paper Series*, Working Paper 21490.
- Cavallo, Alberto (2016), "Are Online and Offline Prices Similar? Evidence from Large Multi-Channel Retailers", *NBER Working Paper* 22142, March.
- Cavallo, Alberto (2017), "Are Online and Offline Prices Similar? Evidence from Large Multi-Channel Retailers", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 107, No. 1, pp. 283-303.
- Cavallo, Alberto, Brent Neiman and Roberto Rigobon (2015), "The Price Impact of Joining a Currency Union: Evidence from Latvia", *IMF Economic Review*, Vol 63, No. 2.
- Cavallo, Alberto and Roberto Rigobon (2011), "The Distribution of the Size of Price Changes", *NBER Working Paper Series*, Working Paper 16760.
- Cavallo, Alberto and Roberto Rigobon (2016), "The Billion Prices Project: Using Online Prices for Measurement and Research", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Spring, pp. 151-78.
- Choi, Hyunyoung and Hal Varian (2009a), "Predicting the Present with Google Trends", *Technical Report*, Google Inc. (Website: https://research.google.com/googleblogs/pdfs/google_predicting_the_present.pdf).
- Choi, Hyunyoung and Hal Varian (2009b), "Predicting Initial Claims for Unemployment Insurance Using Google Trends", *Technical Report*, Google Inc. (Website: <https://research.google.com/archive/papers/initialclaimsUS.pdf>).
- Choi, Hyunyoung and Hal Varian (2012), "Predicting the Present with Google Trends", *Economic Record, The Economic Society of Australia*, Vol. 88, Issue S1 (Special Issue), pp 2-9.
- Ettredge, Michael, John Gerdes and Gilbert Karuga (2005), "Using Web-based Search Data to Predict Macroeconomic Statistics", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol 48, No. 11, November, pp. 87-92.
- Ellen Tobback, Stefano Nardelli, David Martens (2017), "Between Hawks and Doves: Measuring Central Bank Communication", *Working Paper Series, European Central Bank*, No. 2086, July.
- Guzmán, Giselle (2011), "Internet Search Behavior as an Economic Forecasting Tool: the Case of Inflation Expectations", *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, Vol. 36, No. 3, IOS Press, pp. 119-167.
- Seabold, Skipper and Andrea Coppola (2015), "Nowcasting Prices Using Google Trends – An Application to Central America", *Policy Research Working Paper 7398, World Bank Group*, August.



THANK YOU