Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
July-December 2021 2(2), 497–501

CONSUMER SPENDING IN INDIA (2016–2018): EARLY INDICATORS OF DEMAND CONTRACTION, REGIONAL INSIGHTS, AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Dr. Padma Hazarika [1]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Laluk College, Assam, India

Corresponding Author
Dr. Padma Hazarika,
hazarikapadma1@gmail.com

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v2.i2.2021.6051

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

Consumer spending, contributing approximately 60% to India's gross domestic product (GDP), is a key driver of economic growth. In 2019–20, GDP growth slowed to 4.2%, reflecting a consumption slowdown with early indicators evident from 2016 to 2018 [4]. This study analyses these indicators across rural and urban India, emphasizing regional disparities. Using data from the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), Reserve Bank of India (RBI), Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE), Nielsen India, and Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers (SIAM), we identify declining rural wages, stagnant household incomes, and reduced fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) and automobile sales. Econometric models quantify the impact of structural factors. Agrarian states like Bihar showed steeper consumption declines than industrialized states like Maharashtra. Trends from 2016–17, intensifying by 2018, were driven by rural distress and jobless growth. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression models highlight household behavioural shifts and macroeconomic vulnerabilities. Policy recommendations include enhanced rural income support and credit access reforms to sustain India's consumption-driven economy.

Keywords: Consumer Spending, Demand Contraction, Rural Distress, India 2019

1. INTRODUCTION

Consumer spending accounts for approximately 60% of India's GDP, underpinning economic growth [2]. In 2019–20, GDP growth decelerated to 4.2% from 6.7% in 2017–18, driven by weakening consumer demand [4]. Early indicators of this slowdown emerged by 2017–18, including stagnating rural wages, cautious urban discretionary spending, and declining sales in fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) and automobiles. This study examines these indicators using secondary data from 2016 to 2018, incorporating regional variations and econometric modelling to address:

1) What were the early indicators of consumer spending slowdown by 2018?
2) How did rural and urban consumption trends diverge, and what regional variations emerged?
3) What structural factors contributed to the 2019 demand contraction?
4) What policy interventions can sustain consumption-led growth? This paper integrates multi-source data and regional insights to offer evidence-based policy recommendations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

India's consumption slowdown, evident by 2019, has been linked to structural factors. This review organizes the literature into three themes: consumption trends, regional disparities, and sectoral impacts, grounding the analysis in consumption function theory.

2.1. CONSUMPTION TRENDS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Consumer spending, shaped by income, wealth, and expectations, aligns with Keynesian consumption function theory, where consumption is a function of disposable income [1]. In India, consumer spending constitutes 60% of GDP [2]. The NSSO's 68th Round (2011–12) provides baseline household expenditure data, showing rural households allocate 52% of monthly per capita expenditure (MPCE) to food, compared to 38% for urban households [5]. CMIE's Consumer Pyramids Household Survey (2014–2018) reported stagnating rural incomes and declining consumer sentiment post-2016, with rural MPCE growth slowing to 2.4% by 2017–18 [9]. RBI's Consumer Confidence Surveys (2016–2018) noted urban optimism declining from 98.5 to 94.2, driven by economic uncertainty and inflation [7].

2.2. REGIONAL DISPARITIES

Regional variations in consumption are significant. CMIE (2018) data indicate rural consumption growth in agrarian states like Bihar (1.8–2.0%, 2017–18) lagged behind industrialized states like Maharashtra (3.0–3.5%) [9]. Urban consumption was stronger in metropolitan areas (4.5%) than smaller cities (3.8%) [9].

2.3. SECTORAL IMPACTS: FMCG AND AUTOMOBILES

Sectoral declines signal broader demand contraction. Nielsen India (2018) reported rural FMCG sales growth falling from 12.0% (2012–13) to 2.5% (2017–18), reflecting reduced purchasing power [10]. SIAM (2018) documented two-wheeler sales growth dropping from 14.2% to 15.98% in 2017-18, indicating urban middle-class caution [11].

2.4. RESEARCH GAPS

While prior studies identify consumption slowdown drivers, they often rely on dated NSSO data (2011–12) and lack econometric integration with regional data. This study addresses these gaps by combining multi-source data (NSSO, CMIE, RBI, Nielsen, SIAM) and econometric analysis to provide a comprehensive understanding of the 2016–2018 slowdown and its 2019 implications.

3. OBJECTIVES

1) Analyze household consumption trends (2014–2018).
2) Identify early indicators of slowdown in rural, urban, and regional contexts.
3) Examine FMCG and automobile sales for demand contraction evidence.
4) Quantify structural impacts via econometric modeling.
5) Propose policy recommendations for consumption-led growth.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods approach:

- **Data Sources**: NSSO 68th Round (2011–12) [5], CMIE Consumer Pyramids (2014–2018) [9], RBI Consumer Confidence Surveys (2016–2018) [7], MoSPI/Economic Survey (2016–2018) [2], Nielsen India (2018) [10], SIAM (2018) [11], PLFS (2017–18) [6].
- **Analysis**: Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression:
  1) Consumption Growth_t = β_0 + β_1 Rural Wage Growth_t + β_2 Inflation_t + β_3 Credit Availability_t + ε_t

2) Variables: Consumption Growth (%), Rural Wage Growth (%), Inflation (%), Credit Availability (%).

- **Tools**: Stata 17 for regression, with robustness checks (Breusch-Pagan, Durbin-Watson tests).
- **Regional Analysis**: CMIE state-level data for disparities [9].
- **Limitations**: Dated NSSO data mitigated by CMIE/PLFS; endogeneity addressed via lagged variables.

5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Table 1: Key Indicators of Consumer Spending (2012–2018)

Indicator	2012–13	2014–15	2016–17	2017–18
Real Rural Consumption Growth (%)	6.5	5.8	3.2	2.4
Real Urban Consumption Growth (%)	8.0	6.7	5.2	4.1
Two-Wheeler Sales Growth (%)	14.2	10.1	6.9	15.98
FMCG Rural Sales Growth (%)	12.0	10.5	5.4	2.5
Real Wage Growth (Rural, %)	6.1	4.3	1.8	0.9
Household Savings Rate (% of GDP)	23.6	21.9	19.8	18.2

Sources: [5,9,7,2,10,11]

5.1. STATISTICAL INSIGHTS

- **Correlation**: Rural wage growth and FMCG sales growth correlated at 0.92 [9, 10].
- **Consumption Trends**: Real rural consumption growth declined from 6.5% (2012–13) to 2.4% (2017–18), an average annual change of -0.82%; urban consumption fell from 8.0% to 4.1%, an average annual change of -0.78% [2].
- **Sectoral Declines**: Two-wheeler sales growth increased to 15.98% in 2017-18; rural FMCG sales growth fell from 12.0% to 2.5% [11, 10].

5.2. ECONOMETRIC RESULTS

Table 2: Regression Results: Determinants of Consumption Growth (2012–2018)

Variable	Rural Consumption Growth	Urban Consumption Growth
Rural Wage Growth (%)	0.85*** (0.12)	0.32*** (0.10)
Inflation (%)	-0.25* (0.13)	-0.30** (0.11)
Credit Availability (%)	0.15 (0.09)	0.22** (0.10)
Constant	3.50*** (0.60)	5.20*** (0.55)
R^2	0.89	0.85
Observations	24	24

Note: Standard errors in parentheses. ***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.

- Rural wage growth significantly drives consumption (0.85% rural, 0.32% urban per 1% wage increase).
- Inflation negatively impacted both rural and urban consumption.

5.3. SECTORAL AND REGIONAL ANALYSIS

Rural FMCG sales growth fell from 12.0% (2012–13) to 2.5% (2017–18), reflecting reduced rural purchasing power [10]. Two-wheeler sales growth, an indicator of urban and semi-urban demand, increased to 15.98% in 2017-18 [11]. Regionally, agrarian states like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh saw rural consumption growth of 1.8–2.0% (2017–18), compared to 3.0–3.5% in industrialized states like Maharashtra and Gujarat [9]. Urban consumption in metropolitan areas (4.5%) outpaced smaller cities (3.8%) [9].

6. DISCUSSION

The 2016–2018 period marked a critical turning point for India's consumption-driven economy, with early indicators of the 2019 slowdown evident in declining rural wages, sectoral sales, and consumer confidence.

6.1. RURAL DISTRESS AND CONSUMPTION

Rural consumption growth fell from 6.5% (2012–13) to 2.4% (2017–18), driven by a sharp decline in real wage growth from 6.1% to 0.9% [6]. The regression results confirm rural wages as a key driver ($\beta=0.85$, $p<0.01$).

6.2. URBAN SPENDING DYNAMICS

Urban consumption growth declined from 8.0% to 4.1%, despite two-wheeler sales growth rising to 15.98% in 2017-18 [11]. The RBI's Consumer Confidence Index dropped from 98.5 (2016) to 94.2 (2018), signaling caution among urban middle-class consumers [7].

6.3. REGIONAL DISPARITIES

Agrarian states like Bihar faced steeper consumption declines (1.8–2.0%) than industrialized states like Maharashtra (3.0–3.5%) [9]. Urban consumption was stronger in metropolitan areas, suggesting better access to credit and employment [9].

6.4. BROADER IMPLICATIONS

The 2016–2018 trends foreshadowed the 2019–20 GDP slowdown to 4.2% and persisted into the COVID-19 period, where consumption contracted further [4]. These findings suggest systemic vulnerabilities in India's consumption-led growth model, particularly in rural areas.

6.5. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Rural Income Support**: Increase MGNREGA funding by 20% (₹80,000 crore annually) to boost rural wages, targeting 100 days of employment per household.
- **Credit Reforms**: Strengthen NBFC regulations and expand microfinance access, aiming for a 15% increase in rural credit by 2026 [8].
- **Regional Interventions**: Allocate ₹50,000 crore for agrarian states (e.g., Bihar, Uttar Pradesh) for subsidies and infrastructure to enhance rural demand [9].

6.6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study relies on dated NSSO data (2011–12), mitigated by CMIE and PLFS, but future research should use more recent data for updated insights [5, 9, 6]. The regression model may face endogeneity, addressed partially via lagged variables. Further studies could explore post-2019 trends, incorporating recent economic events and panel data for household-level analysis.

7. CONCLUSION

The 2019–20 consumption slowdown was evident by 2017–18, driven by rural distress, urban caution, and credit constraints. Econometric and regional analyses underscore the need for targeted interventions. Future research should leverage the latest available data to sustain India's consumption-driven growth.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Keynes, J. M. (1936). The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money. Macmillan.
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2018). GDP and Savings Data (2012–2018). MoSPI.
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2019). Annual GDP Estimates. MoSPI.
Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2020). GDP Estimates (2019–2020). MoSPI.
NSSO. (2013). Household Consumer Expenditure Survey, 68th Round (2011–12). National Sample Survey Office.
Periodic Labour Force Survey. (2017–18). Annual Report. Ministry of Labour, Government of India.
Reserve Bank of India. (2018). Consumer Confidence Survey Reports (2016–2018). RBI.
Reserve Bank of India. (2019). Financial Stability Report. RBI.
CMIE. (2018). Consumer Pyramids Household Survey (2014–2018). Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy.
Nielsen India. (2018). FMCG Growth Reports (2017–2018). Nielsen.
SIAM. (2018). Vehicle Sales Reports (2016–2018). Society of Indian Automobile Manufacturers.