

## Fiscal rules, fiscal outcomes and financial market behaviour

CHARLOTTE ROMMERSKIRCHEN

University of Edinburgh, UK

**Abstract.** Since the outbreak of the eurozone's sovereign debt crisis, a range of fiscal policy measures have been adopted at the European Union (EU) and national levels that have given rise to claims of a significant reinforcement of fiscal policy constraint. Given the prominence and reinvigorated political appeal of fiscal rules in the EU and beyond, it is disconcerting how little we actually know about the link between fiscal rules, budgetary outcomes and market behaviour. In this research note, the aim is to take stock of the existing literature and challenge its contribution to the current policy debate on the merits of fiscal rules. Specifically it will focus on problems linked to endogeneity, measurements and contextuality.

**Keywords:** fiscal rules; bond markets; fiscal policy; EMU

### Introduction

The European sovereign debt crisis, erupting in 2009, has sparked a host of measures aimed at mitigating the fallout from soaring sovereign bond yields for peripheral eurozone Member States and the risks of contagion across the currency bloc. Key policies range from the establishment of European emergency credit lines to the European Central Bank's (ECB) unconventional policy measures and, ultimately, the forceful statement by Mario Draghi that the ECB would do whatever it takes to save the single currency (and arguably its current membership). Alongside these emergency measures policy makers at the national and European Union (EU) levels, spearheaded by the German government, have lobbied for the reform of fiscal rules to achieve and maintain fiscal sustainability, and thereby calm financial markets. From 2010 to 2012, the German government pressed other Member States to adopt balanced budget laws modelled after its debt brake, the *Schuldenbremse*. With the fiscal compact, participating Member States pledged to create 'German-style' debt brakes by 2014. The promotion of fiscal rules as a cure for the eurozone's woes has not been affected by the growing consensus that neither the financial crisis of 2008 nor the sovereign debt crisis can be cast as a cautionary tale of fiscal intemperance (Buti & Carnot 2012: 903).

Although the reform of existing fiscal rules and the creation of new budgetary constraints are noteworthy, the promotion of rule-based fiscal policy making and coordination in the EU is not a new phenomenon. Kydland and Prescott's (1977) famous dictum 'rules rather than discretion' guided the architectural design of the economic and monetary union (EMU) since the early 1990s. Given the prominence and reinvigorated political appeal of fiscal rules in the EU and beyond, it is disconcerting how little we actually know about the link between fiscal rules, budgetary outcomes and market behaviour. Much of our understanding about possible links is based on empirical work whose data, methods and generalisability are open to question. In this research note we aim to take stock of the existing literature and question

its contribution to the current policy debate. Specifically, we will focus on problems linked to endogeneity, measurements and contextuality. ‘Endogeneity’ concerns the problem that one cannot make conclusions of certain outcomes from fiscal rules, be it balanced budgets or bond yields. ‘Measurement’ concerns the problem that the operationalisation of fiscal rules frequently fails to distinguish between *de jure* and *de facto* fiscal rules. ‘Context-conditional’ concerns the problem in N-country studies or comparisons over time that it is the comparative or evolving context that drives the putative effect of fiscal rules on bond yields, and not the rules as such. Before reviewing these three issues, the next section will take stock of the arguments underpinning the alleged relationship of fiscal rules to budgetary outcomes and also to market reactions.

### *From fiscal rules to financial market behaviour*

A ‘fiscal rule’ can be defined as ‘[a] permanent constraint on fiscal policy, typically defined in terms of an indicator of overall fiscal performance’ (Kopits & Symansky 1998: 2). Within the canon of fiscal rules, none has been subject to as much scrutiny as the stability and growth pact (SGP) – an EU-level obligation that sets deficit and debt level ceilings of 3 and 60 per cent, respectively (Debrun et al. 2008). The weak compliance with the SGP has given rise to calls for increased ‘ownership’ of fiscal rules at the national level (Buti & Carnot 2012) and the incorporation of fiscal restraints into domestic law under the fiscal compact. Domestic fiscal rules, so the underlying assumption goes, are more effective than supranational ones (Marneffe et al. 2011). Empirically, the impact of national fiscal rules has been analysed in several regional contexts: for the United States (e.g., Poterba 1995), for the EU (e.g., Bergman et al. 2013) and for developing countries (e.g., Tapsoba 2012). Overall, this literature is moderately optimistic that fiscal rules lead to an improvement in the budgetary position, although there remains some doubt (Calmfors & Wren-Lewis 2011). A related body of literature takes the whole budgetary procedure into account. Various studies have confirmed the effectiveness of *specific* budgetary procedures in improving fiscal performance (notably Hallerberg et al. 2009). The link between fiscal rules and financial market behaviour (and thus yields on sovereign debt) is based on the assumed impact of fiscal rules on fiscal policy outcomes. Markets react positively to strict fiscal rules, so the argument goes, because they help to resolve deficit and debt biases of contemporary public finances.

### *Empirical literature*

Few studies have built on the budgetary impact of fiscal rules to investigate the relationship between fiscal rules and financial market behaviour. This empirical blind spot comes as a surprise, especially in the context of post-crisis Europe where institutional reform has been welcomed, if not justified, by pointing to its calming effect of market forces. Hallerberg and Wolff (2008) pioneered the study of fiscal institutions and financial markets. Analysing the default risk premia of ten of the original twelve eurozone Member States in the period 1993–2005, the authors show that better fiscal institutions are connected with lower risk premia. The authors built on the fiscal governance literature and argue that markets reward the institutional framework in which budgetary processes are embedded if those processes fit

the expected form of 'ideal' fiscal governance. Using the European Commission's publicly available Fiscal Rules Index (FRI), Iara and Wolff (2010) show that stronger fiscal rules in eurozone Member States reduce sovereign risk using a panel of ten original eurozone Member States in the period 1999–2009. This summary index contains information on the quantitative extent to which a country's fiscal policy is restricted by the numerical rules in addition to qualitative characteristics of the individual rules (legal framework, nature of the bodies in charge of monitoring and enforcement, enforcement mechanisms and media visibility). Iara and Wolff conclude that the stronger the legal basis of the rules and the mechanisms of enforcement, the greater the decrease in risk premia. Heinemann et al. (2014) also rely on the European Commission's FRI in their analysis of the impact of fiscal rules on monthly risk premia for a panel of 16 EU Member States over the 1993–2008 period. The authors show that although fiscal rules generally do not have an impact on bond yields, stronger fiscal rules in high debt countries limit yield increases. In their analysis on fiscal rules at the sub-national level in Switzerland, Feld et al. (2013) create an index of cantonal fiscal rules comprising (1) the connection of budget planning with actual budget execution; (2) the numerical constraint; and (3) the sanctioning mechanism in the form of automatic tax adjustments. Examining 288 tradable Swiss bonds in the period 1981–2007, the authors find that both the presence and the strength of fiscal rules contribute significantly to lower cantonal bond spreads.

These four investigations have their merits, yet, as we argue, they do not present sufficiently strong evidence in order to give empirical support for the promotion of new fiscal rules across Europe. Indeed, the results of all four studies reviewed are questionable on the grounds that they fail to fully consider the three problems discussed in this article: endogeneity, measurement and context-conditionality. To be clear, our critique here does not amount to the reverse argument that markets do not care about, or even dislike fiscal rules. We simply argue that the empirical evidence presented so far does not provide us with strong enough results to inform public policy. The sections that follow will review, in our opinion, the main shortcomings of the existing literature.

### **The endogeneity of fiscal rules**

Empirically modelling the impact of fiscal rules on public finances/sovereign risk throws up the challenge of endogeneity. Put simply, 'endogeneity' concerns the problem that one cannot conclude certain outcomes from fiscal rules, be it budget balances or bond yields. The most frequent form of endogeneity concerns the line of causation, which may run the other way around. A second usual suspect for endogeneity relates to the omission of an important explanatory variable (omitted variable bias). Endogeneity renders estimators inconsistent and is thus a serious challenge to econometric results. For qualitative research investigating causal relationships, the logic of endogeneity applies and is worth considering outside of statistical modelling.

The existing literature supposes that financial market participants reward fiscal rules with better financing conditions for sovereign debt. The allegedly positive effect of a(n improved) fiscal rule has been interpreted as investors' approval of strict fiscal frameworks or even investors' wish for austerity politics. Yet we actually know very little about whether and, if so, how bond investors evaluate fiscal rules. In Mosley's (2003) account of the decisions

of international bond investors, ‘fiscal frameworks/rules’ does not appear as an evaluation category. Not only for academics, but also for policy makers there is a substantial amount of uncertainty: Martin Wolf critically summarised the political situation as ‘giving the markets what we think they may want in future – even though they show little sign of insisting on it now’ (*Financial Times*, 27 May 2010). Austerity politics tend to be presented as the forced policy of a state that has become a residual authority wedged between financial market pressure and the conditionality of EU financial assistance. Yet markets do not necessarily reward austerity measures. As the former IMF Chief Economist Oliver Blanchard (2012) put it, ‘financial investors are schizophrenic ... . They react positively to news of fiscal consolidation, but then react negatively later, when consolidation leads to lower growth.’

### *Omitted variable bias*

Fiscal rules and sovereign risk may both respond to other unobserved variables related to other political factors. A positive effect of fiscal rules on sovereign risk is then not necessarily the result of markets yearning for budget cuts or showing an appreciation for strict fiscal frameworks, but is driven by a common underlying factor. For pre-2009 studies, one candidate may be the investor outlook on the probability of a country making it into the eurozone. For the post-2009 studies, particular attention must be given to financial assistance and the political agreement of EU leaders. Bergman et al. (2013) analyse the determinants of changes in credit default swap (CDS) spreads and find that announcements of austerity plans reduced the CDS spreads in Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain. It is, however, not clear whether this reduction is due to markets being in favour of budget cuts or if it simply reflects the fact that for three of these five countries fiscal consolidation was made a condition of EU financial assistance – to which markets were responding. Similarly, the ratification of the fiscal compact might have been welcomed by market participants not because they hope for domestic debt brakes, but because it is a prerequisite for eligibility for future bail-out funding through the newly created European stability mechanism. Market sentiment might also be shaped by perceptions of division among EU (and in particular eurozone) Member States. Therefore, efforts to minimise divisiveness – as with the adoption of similar debt break rules into national legislation – may bring down bond yields.

The current literature fails to pay sufficient attention to the issue of omitted variable bias. Feld et al. (2013) briefly discuss whether the omission of voters’ or legislatures’ preferences creates endogeneity. This concern is brushed aside, pointing at cantonal dummies within the model, which are thought to control for these ‘cultural factors or long-term preferences of the citizens in the cantons’ (Feld et al. 2013: 21). Similarly, Heinemann et al. (2014) are concerned with the impact of ‘fiscal preferences’, which they control for with a host of variables. Hallerberg and Wolff (2008), as well as Heinemann et al. (2014), include a dummy measuring eurozone membership in their models. Yet an ‘in-or-out’ measurement of eurozone membership is unlikely to fully capture correlations between an improvement of fiscal rules and a perceived reduction in sovereign risk by financial market participants linked to monetary integration. Whereas Hallerberg and Wolff (2008) as well as Iara and Wolff (2010) consider a sample of (future) eurozone members only, Heinemann et al. (2014) include three non-EMU Member States (Sweden, United Kingdom and Denmark) in their sample. This is a promising approach to exploring variation and capturing any ‘EMU

effect', yet it is likely that the seemingly arbitrary selection of three outsiders is not ideal. Specifically, the characteristics of these three euro-outsiders are not reasonably comparable, which makes them a potentially problematic counterfactual of the treatment group. Our scepticism is confirmed by their finding that EMU membership leads to an increase in bond yields, which clearly contradicts existing studies on EMU membership and bond yields (Bernoth et al. 2004).

### *Simultaneity*

A second potential source of endogeneity stems from the likelihood that bond yields have an impact on fiscal institutions and not the other way round, raising concerns about reverse causality/simultaneity. Debates on the fiscal compact were clearly driven by the escalating eurozone debt crisis. The Austrian government's endorsement of national debt brakes indicates the reverse causality from fiscal outcomes and the threat of soaring yields to fiscal rules. Josef Pröll, Austria's finance minister, argued that 'considering the high indebtedness in Europe, [the Austrian government is] in favour of a *Schuldenbremse*' (*Die Welt*, 4 May 2010). There is evidence that the majority of EU Member States have, at least on paper, improved their budgetary institutions. According to information provided in the 2009–2010 Stability and Convergence Programme, 21 EU Member States had implemented and/or planned to implement changes in their respective system of fiscal rules (Ayuso-i-Casals 2010). The European Commission's FRI indicates a jump from an average of 0.30 in 2009 to 0.58 in 2010. The phenomenon is not restricted to EU Member States. Schaechter et al. (2012) provide an extensive survey of the adoption of new fiscal rules in 81 developed and developing countries in response to the Great Recession. Whereas in 1990, only five countries had fiscal rules in place, the number of countries with national and/or supranational fiscal rules surged to 76 by March 2012. These developments suggest to us that fiscal rules may well be influenced by pressures from the sovereign bond market, instead of the other way round.

Hallerberg and Wolff (2008) argue that 'it is unlikely that countries change their institutions because of risk premia in government markets'. Along similar lines, Iara and Wolff (2010: 281) claim that their 'research benefits from the advantage that the fiscal rules can be considered exogenous or predetermined to government bond yields' in the time period of their sample. Yet this may be the case already prior to 2008 – a possibility which none of the four papers reviewed acknowledges. Our assumption corresponds to findings in the literature on fiscal rules and budgetary outcomes where reversed causality is recognised. De Haan et al. (1999), for example, present evidence suggesting that in several European countries, budget rules emerge as a result of fiscal outcomes. There is no reason why market discipline could not have encouraged governments before this date not only to consolidate public finances, but also to reform domestic fiscal institutions. Especially where unfavourable borrowing conditions coincided with a reprimand from the European Commission to improve domestic fiscal frameworks, the change in fiscal rules cannot be considered exogenous. Already in the run-up to the launch of the single currency in 1999, simultaneity may be an issue. One of the five Maastricht criteria related to long-term interest rates. Here candidates, particularly where sovereign risk was considered high by market participants, had a strong incentive to improve their fiscal framework as a means to qualify

for membership. A similar mechanism may have been at work for second- and third-wave eurozone Member States.

### *Addressing endogeneity*

Although endogeneity is a serious problem, there is no shortfall of potentially fruitful remedies. A well-established solution for dealing with endogenous explanatory variables can be found in instrumental variable approaches, which make it relatively straightforward to test for and, if necessary, to control for reversed causality. A related useful avenue for future research would be to explicitly model the bi-directionality of fiscal rules and bond yields using a simultaneous-equation model (Zellner & Theil 1962). Regarding the issue of omitted variable bias, possible solutions require a broadening of model specifications. EU/eurozone membership can be captured with simple country dummies. Defining this dummy, future studies should move beyond official 'joining EMU dates'. Given the convergence of applicant member States' bond yields prior to 1999, it seems likely that market participants had already reacted positively to the prospect of joining EMU (Gray 2013). For research interested in the impact of fiscal rules post 2009, one of the challenges will be to find appropriate measurements to filter the effect of fiscal rules from that of other 'political noise' such as qualifying for a bail-out. Furthermore qualitative research methods, such as process tracing, can yield valuable insight (George & Bennett 2005). In his account of EU budget reform in the late twentieth century, Hallerberg (2004) charts the development of fiscal institutions relying on in-depth interviews and documentary analysis. Although his analysis is concerned with the link between fiscal governance and fiscal outcomes, this type of nuanced process tracing is well suited to addressing both issues of simultaneity and omitted variable bias. Furthermore, interviews with financial market participants, despite its challenges (see McKenzie 2005: 570), can help us to shed light on whether or not investors care about the strength, application and type of fiscal rule that countries adopt. Interviews can also touch upon the contextual nature of fiscal rules: are rules viewed differently in times of financial crises or for countries with a very strong/weak sovereign risk evaluation?

### **Measuring fiscal rules**

Modelling the relationship of bond yields and fiscal rules throws up the challenge of effectively capturing the rules in question. Researchers across the social sciences have undertaken a plethora of efforts to put the measurement of fiscal rules on a firm footing. Yet there is not one final answer as to which approach provides the most appropriate framework for such analyses. Particular attention should be paid to the distinction between rules on paper and in reality. The approach in the fiscal rules literature ranges from binary dummies to a more complex weighted multi-indicator variable. Two of the four studies reviewed rely on the European Commission's FRI. Feld et al. (2013) create a similar index (relying on fewer categories) for sub-state rules in Switzerland. Hallerberg and Wolff (2008) create an index that accounts for the 'institutional fit' of the fiscal governance framework in place, looking at both the strength of the finance minister/parliament and of fiscal targets. In practice, all measures are either, as in a few cases, time-invariant or, in most cases, change little over time. Methodologically all four studies rely on panel fixed effects (see Plümper

et al. 2005). Yet countries where fiscal rules vary little or not at all will not enter the fiscal rules estimates in a specification with fixed country effects that removes all cross-sectional variation. Only Heinemann et al. (2014) address this problem explicitly and use fixed effects vector decomposition (FEVD) estimates (see Plümper & Troeger 2007).

### *De facto and de jure fiscal rules*

Common measurements, the Commission's index included, predominantly focus only on the *de jure* aspect of fiscal rules, while excluding the reality of fiscal frameworks. An index is usually able to capture which rules exist on paper, but this tells us little about whether fiscal rules are actually respected. Whereas there is empirical research on markets' reaction to the violation of EU-level fiscal rules (Afonso & Strauch 2004), we lack similar evidence for domestic fiscal frameworks. As Iara and Wolff (2010: 10) concede '[the index] only considers if there is a numerical constraint to a budgetary aggregate: it does not take into account however if this constraint is realistically binding in reality'. Yet there is reason to believe that compliance matters (cf. Nelson 2010), particularly as non-compliance is endemic. Recent estimates of 11 EU Member States from 1990–2014 suggest that countries tend to comply with their fiscal rules only in about 50 per cent of the years (Reuter 2015).

As none of the four studies addresses compliance, there is also no distinction between 'justified' and 'unjustified' non-compliance. Specifically, high scores on the fiscal rules index may be relatively meaningless when rules do not fully apply due to escape clauses. The (common) exceptionality provisions of fiscal rules are considered in the Commission's questionnaires, which have 'exclusions from the coverage of the rule' as one criterion. But the random weighting of the rule does not change if escape is sought. The absence of exceptionality clauses does not necessarily mean that policy makers are bound to the (too) restrictive fiscal rules of better times. In the United Kingdom, for example, existing rules were put on hold during the Great Recession. This suspension is reflected in the largest drop in the fiscal rules index since the start of the recording in 1990 for all Member States (from a score of 2.06 in 2008 to –1.02 in 2009). Schick (2010: 3) identifies a broader trend here, noting that in many Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development countries 'fiscal rules have been vitiated, at least temporarily, by the global economic crisis'. In its current form, the Commission's FRI does not account for the political reality of applying, bending or outright violation of fiscal frameworks.

### *Addressing measurement challenges*

Moving forward, more nuanced fiscal rules indicators are needed to test whether bond markets react to the strength of a given budgetary constraint on paper or in reality. Constructing such indices, albeit time-consuming, is feasible. This is evident in the recent literature. Cordes et al. (2015), for instance, create a dummy that measures compliance with expenditure rules in 29 advanced and emerging economies between 1985 and 2013 in their analysis on the link between fiscal rules and fiscal outcomes. Reuter (2015) investigates the effects of (non-)compliance with national numerical fiscal rules on fiscal policy in 11 EU Member States from 1990–2013. Indeed the European Commission's DG ECFIN is planning to work on improving the FRI methodology to better account for the efficacy of national

budgetary frameworks. Proposals are expected to be available at the end of 2015 with a view to implementation in 2016. Indices that are able to consider both *de facto* and *de jure* dimensions of fiscal rules have, furthermore, the advantage of showing greater variation, thus reducing the problems associated with existing composite indices, which are largely time invariant. Where studies continue to rely on fiscal rule indices that are likely to run into the ‘invariant or slow-changing variable’ problem, researchers should address this issue explicitly. Although there is no consensus in the literature as to the appropriate econometric remedy (Breusch et al. 2011), there is no shortage of potential solutions such as fixed-effects vector decomposition, within-between random-effects (Bell & Jones 2015), or a Hausman-Taylor estimator (Hausman & Taylor 1981).

### **Context-conditionality**

The impact of fiscal rules on sovereign risk is inherently context-conditional rather than being of fixed magnitude and fixed content. Complex, context-conditional hypotheses are now the hallmark of empirical comparative politics; the effect of X (fiscal rules) on Y (sovereign risk) *depends on* Z (evaluation practices, liquidity, politics, etc.): formally,  $dY/dX = f(Z)$ . However, current empirical work, such as described above, does not sufficiently reflect the context-conditionality of underlying arguments. We will briefly address three concerns related to the context-conditionality of the study of fiscal rules.

#### *One rule to bind them?*

Prior to the outbreak of the global financial crisis, there was a diversity of fiscal rules and debate among both policy-making officials and academics as to which kind of rules (if any) were most effective in achieving results (fiscal consolidation and the reduction of sovereign debt yields). Hallerberg et al. (2009) argue that the suitability of fiscal frameworks hinges on the prevailing type of government in a given country. Single majority governments should have a different type of fiscal framework than coalition governments. Hallerberg and Wolff (2008) present supporting evidence for this argument and show that fiscal rules lead to lower risk premia, but only if those rules ‘fit’ the political system of a country. The other three studies reviewed rely on composite indicators that take neither the ‘institutional level of fit’ into account nor distinguish between different types of rules such as budget balance rules, expenditure rules and debt rules which are likely to have dissimilar effects (cf. Tapsoba 2012). The push for sterner fiscal frameworks in the aftermath of the Great Recession has singled-out the German debt brake as a model to emulate. We lack empirical evidence as to whether debt brakes are actually superior instruments in achieving fiscal consolidation and/or improving borrowing conditions. Without further analysis, it would be unfounded to cite Germany’s post-crisis fiscal position and low sovereign risk as clear evidence for the success of debt brakes in bringing about either outcome.

#### *Sample selection*

All studies reviewed involve the setting of, at least, two parameters: time and space. Which country to include in the empirical analysis, which country to exclude? What is the



appropriate time-span of the analysis? The first question is often not adequately addressed. Heinemann et al. (2014), for example, pick 16 EU Member States without discussing their selection criteria. Yet it is likely that the effects of fiscal rules on sovereign risk are contextual and may well differ across countries. Further analysis is needed that disentangles the characteristics of different country groups, such as EU/EMU membership or credit groups used by financial market investors to analyse the contextual features of fiscal rules (see Brooks et al. 2014). On a related note, the generalisability of findings so far can be put into question. What does the alleged impact of fiscal rules in nine or 16 E(M)U Member States tell us about the need for reformed fiscal frameworks in the EU-28, as pushed by the fiscal compact, to bring down sovereign bond yields? In their analysis of the impact of fiscal rules on cantonal bond yields, Feld et al. (2013: 2) argue that the ‘Swiss system serves as a perfect laboratory’ due to its system of fiscal federalism. If that is the case, then it still remains that the Swiss experience (a country with a unique sovereign risk structure) is hardly relatable to EU Member States. More attention should also be paid to the role of potential outliers. Outliers in datasets can have large effects, especially in small samples. Greece, for instance, was the only country of the nine Member States examined by Iara and Wolff (2010) that, according to the European Commission, had no domestic fiscal rule in place. With only nine countries under scrutiny, it is unclear if and how the inclusion of Greece impacts on the results.

The second issue relates to the question of whether the alleged fiscal rules – market behaviour link holds in crisis and non-crisis times alike. Generally speaking, the fiscal rules literature analysing fiscal outcomes is aware of problems linked to identifying a suitable timeframe for empirical analyses (although see Bergman et al. 2013). Recent studies clearly identify a major structural break in both the determinants of fiscal policy outcomes and the drivers of yield spreads with the eruption of the global financial crisis in 2008 (Bernoth & Erdogan 2012). Of all four studies on fiscal rules and financial markets discussed, only Iara and Wolff (2010) include the Great Recession year 2009 in their analysis. As a robustness check, the authors estimated their model with 2009 observations excluded. Even though this leads to a drop to only ten observations ( $N = 97$  versus  $N = 107$ ), the results are different.

Beyond the problem of appropriate time samples, the crisis-induced structural break further points to a so-far unresolved question: how much does the impact of fiscal rules pre-crisis tell us about the impact of fiscal rules during a crisis, in its immediate aftermath and beyond? We know that sovereign bond yields are influenced by both pull (domestic) and push (global) factors (De Grauwe & Ji 2012). This suggests that the impact of fiscal rules on sovereign risk premia, if it exists, is not constant but contingent on, *inter alia*, the financial risk climate. Iara and Wolff (2010) indeed present evidence that fiscal rules become relevant with a rise in investors’ risk aversion. Politics, be it the perceived politics of bail-out prior to 2009 or the ECB’s non-standard monetary policy measures, have shaped and continue to shape market behaviour. Further analysis is needed to account for non-linear, context-conditional effects.

#### *Addressing context-conditionality*

Common to most studies on fiscal rules and financial markets is a lack of rigorous empirical testing, which makes it hard to assess the explanatory validity of each of the models

presented. At a minimum, future studies need to discuss the justification of sampling both regarding space and time. Particularly for analyses over a longer period of time, researchers are not in a position to confidently predict the incidence of structural breaks beyond established (crisis) points. It is useful and straightforward to test for these with a modified Chow test also known as ‘Quandt likelihood ratio statistic’. Given larger data availability as years go by, future research will be in a better position to compare the effects of fiscal rules post and pre debt crisis. In addition, the context-conditionality of fiscal rules can be tested with interaction terms similar to those used in Iara and Wolff (2010), whereby the fiscal rule measurement is interacted with a measure of domestic (e.g., sovereign debt) or international (e.g., the VIX<sup>1</sup>) risk. Regarding the country selection, more attention needs to be given to the role of potential outliers. It should be standard practice to, at least informally, identify outliers and to re-estimate models with the suspected outliers excluded. Data availability should not be an issue. The European Commission’s FRI is available for *all* 28 EU Member States from 1990–2013. Furthermore, the International Monetary Fund’s Fiscal Rules Dataset<sup>2</sup> provides information on the use and design of fiscal rules covering 89 countries from 1985–2014. The scope of the IMF’s dataset has the advantage of providing potential control groups to formally test how, for example, EU/eurozone membership conditions the impact of fiscal rules on sovereign bonds. Undertaking a large(r)-N project would allow us to better judge the extent to which the findings reported in these comparably small-N studies are representative. Within large(r)-N studies difference-in-difference analysis, which is widely used in econometric and experimental analyses, would also be a fruitful avenue to tease out context-conditional effects.

## Conclusion

Within the current academic and political debate on fiscal rules much is assumed, whereas little is known. The alleged preference of financial market participants for stricter fiscal rules is based on a handful of articles whose generalisability and validity can be questioned. Moving forward, this review of the literature suggests an emerging research agenda. The fiscal rules literature can be strengthened by paying greater attention to: the endogeneity of fiscal rules; the distinction of *de jure* and *de facto* fiscal rules; and the context-conditionality of fiscal rules. Methodological triangulation (i.e., the combination of different methods) may resolve problems that cannot be tackled in studies that rely on only one method. As argued above, social scientists have a rich methodological toolkit at their disposal to advance the literature. Given the pressing challenges of debt sustainability in the developed and developing world, more and better empirical evidence on the relationship between fiscal rules and financial market behaviour is wanted.

## Acknowledgements

My thanks go to David Howarth who encouraged me to write this piece, as well as three anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. The research leading to this article has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ ERC grant agreement 291733.

## Notes

1. The VIX is the Chicago Board Options Exchange Market Volatility Index. It is one of the most prominent measurements for international investors' appetite for risk.
2. [www.imf.org/external/datamapper/fiscalrules/map/map.htm](http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/fiscalrules/map/map.htm)

## References

- Afonso, A. & Strauch, R. (2004). Fiscal Policy Events and Interest Rate Swap Spreads: Evidence from the EU. ECB Working Paper 303. Frankfurt: European Central Bank.
- Ayuso-i-Casals, J. (2010). National expenditure rules: Why, how and when. *European Commission Economic Papers* 473: 1–64.
- Bell, A. & Jones, K. (2015). Explaining fixed effects: Random effects modeling of time-series cross-sectional and panel data. *Political Science Research and Methods* 3(1): 133–153.
- Bergman, M., Hutchison, M. & Hougaard Jensen, S. (2013). Do sound public finances require fiscal rules or is market pressure enough? *European Commission Economic Papers* 489(1): 1–58.
- Bernoth, K. & Erdogan, B. (2012). Sovereign bond yield spreads: A time-varying coefficient approach. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 31(3): 639–656.
- Bernoth, K., Hagen, J. von & Schuknecht, L. (2004). Sovereign Risk Premia in the European Government Bond Market. ECB Working Paper 369. Frankfurt: European Central Bank.
- Blanchard, O. (2012). 2011 in Review: Four Hard Truths. IMF direct blog. Available online at: <http://blog-imfdirect.imf.org/2011/12/21/2011-in-review-four-hard-truths/>
- Breusch, T. et al. (2011). On the fixed-effects vector decomposition. *Political Analysis* 19(2): 123–134.
- Brooks, S., Cunha, R. & Mosley, L. (2014). Categories, creditworthiness and contagion: How investors' shortcuts affect sovereign debt markets. *International Studies Quarterly*, first published online. DOI: 10.1111/isqu.12173.
- Buti, M. & Carnot, N. (2012). The EMU debt crisis: Early lessons and reforms. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(6): 899–911.
- Calmfors, L. & Wren-Lewis, S. (2011). What should fiscal councils do? *Economic Policy* 26: 649–695.
- Cordes, T. et al. (2015). Expenditure Rules: Effective Tools for Sound Fiscal Policy? IMF Working Paper WP/15/29. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Debrun, X. et al. (2008). Tied to the mast? National fiscal rules in the European Union. *Economic Policy* 54(1): 297–362.
- De Grauwe, P. & Ji, Y. (2012). Mispricing of sovereign risk and macroeconomic stability in the eurozone. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50(6): 866–880.
- De Haan, J., Sturm, J.E. & Beekhuis, G. (1999). The weak government thesis: Some new evidence. *Public Choice* 101(3–4): 163–176.
- Feld, L.P. et al. (2013). Sovereign bond market reactions to fiscal rules and no-bailout clauses: The Swiss experience. *Center for European Economic Research Discussion Papers* 13(34): 1–29.
- George, A. & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gray, J. (2013). *The company states keep: International economic organization and sovereign risk in emerging markets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallerberg, M. (2004). *Domestic budgets in a united Europe: Fiscal governance from the end of Bretton Woods to EMU*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hallerberg, M. & Wolff, G. (2008). Fiscal institutions, fiscal policy and sovereign risk premia in EMU. *Public Choice* 136(3): 379–396.
- Hallerberg, M., Strauch, R. & Hagen, J. von (2009). *Fiscal governance in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hausman, J. & Taylor, W. (1981). Panel data and unobservable individual effects. *Econometrica* 49(2): 1377–1398.

- Heinemann, F., Osterloh, S. & Kalb, A. (2014). Sovereign risk premia: The link between fiscal rules and stability culture. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 41(1): 110–127.
- Iara, A. & Wolff, G. (2010). Rules and risk in the euro area: Does rules-based national fiscal governance contain sovereign bond spreads? *European Economy Economic Papers* 433: 1–28.
- Kopits, G. & Symansky, S. (1998). Fiscal policy rules. *IMF Occasional Papers* 162: 1–45.
- Kydland, F. & Prescott, E. (1977). Rules rather than discretion: The inconsistency of optimal plans. *Journal of Political Economy* 85(3): 473–492.
- Marneffe, W. et al. (2011). The impact of fiscal rules on public finances in the euro area. *CESifo DICE Report* 3: 18–25.
- McKenzie, D. (2005). Opening the black boxes of global finance. *Review of International Political Economy* 12(4): 555–576.
- Mosley, L. (2003). *Global capital and national governments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, S. (2010). Does compliance matter? Assessing the relationship between sovereign risk and compliance with international monetary law. *Review of International Organizations* 5(2): 107–139.
- Plümper, T. & Troeger, V. (2007). Efficient estimation of time-invariant and rarely changing variables in finite sample panel analyses with unit fixed effects. *Political Analysis* 15(2): 124–139.
- Plümper, T., Troeger, V.E. & Manow, P. (2005). Panel data analysis in comparative politics: Linking method to theory. *European Journal of Political Research* 44(2): 327–354.
- Poterba, J. (1995). State Responses to Fiscal Crisis: the Effects of Budgetary Institutions and Politics. NBER Working Paper 4375. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau for Economic Research.
- Reuter, W. (2015). National numerical fiscal rules: Not complied with, but still effective? *European Journal of Political Economy* 39(3): 67–81.
- Schaechter, A. et al. (2012). Fiscal Rules in Response to the Crisis toward the Next-Generation Rules: A New Dataset. IMF Working Paper WP/12/187. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Schick, A. (2010). Postcrisis Fiscal Rules: Stabilizing Public Finance While Responding to Economic Aftershocks. OECD GOV/PGC/SBO(2010)2.
- Tapsoba, R. (2012). Do national numerical fiscal rules really shape fiscal behaviours in developing countries? A treatment effect evaluation. *Economic Modeling* 29(4): 1356–1369.
- Zellner, A. & Theil, H. (1962). Three-stage least squares: Simultaneous estimation of simultaneous equations. *Econometrica* 30(1): 54–78.

*Address for correspondence:* Charlotte Rommerskirchen, School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh, Chrystal Macmillan Building, 15a George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9LL, UK. E-mail: charlotte.rommerskirchen@ed.ac.uk