UNIVERSIDADE FERERAL DE MINAS GERAIS
Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Economia

Luca Capella Klein

DO FISCAL RULES INFLUENCE INCOME
INEQUALITY? EVIDENCE FROM ADVANCED AND
EMERGING ECONOMIES

Belo Horizonte
2024

Luca Capella Klein

DO FISCAL RULES INFLUENCE INCOME INEQUALITY? EVIDENCE FROM ADVANCED AND EMERGING ECONOMIES

Master's Dissertation presented to the Department of Economics of the Faculdade

de Ciências Econômicas of the Universidade

Federal de Minas Gerais as a partial requirement for the degree of Master in Economics.

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Rafael Saulo

Marques Ribeiro

Belo Horizonte

2024

Ficha Catalográfica

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS
FACULDADE DE CIÊNCIAS ECONÔMICAS
CENTRO DE DESENVOLVIMENTO E PLANEJAMENTO REGIONAL
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM ECONOMIA

FOLHA DE APROVAÇÃO

DO FISCAL RULES INFLUENCE INCOME INEQUALITY? EVIDENCE FROM ADVANCED AND EMERGING ECONOMIES

LUCA CAPELLA KLEIN

Dissertação de Mestrado defendida e aprovada, no dia 24 de junho de 2024, pela Banca Examinadora designada pelo Colegiado do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Economia da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais constituída pelos seguintes professores:

Prof. Rafael Saulo Marques Ribeiro (Orientador) (CEDEPLAR/FACE/UFMG)

Profa. Clara Zanon Brenck (CEDEPLAR/FACE/UFMG)

Prof. Hugo Carcanholo Iasco Pereira (Universidade Federal do Paraná/UFPR)

Belo Horizonte, 24 de junho de 2024.

PROF. RAFAEL SAULO MARQUES RIBEIRO

Coordenador do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Economia

Documento assinado eletronicamente por **Clara Zanon Brenck**, **Professora do Magistério Superior**, em 27/06/2024, às 11:09, conforme horário oficial de Brasília, com fundamento no art. 5º do Decreto nº 10.543, de 13 de novembro de 2020.

A autenticidade deste documento pode ser conferida no site https://sei.ufmg.br/sei/controlador_externo.php?acao=documento_conferir&id_orgao_acesso_externo=0, informando o código verificador **3301119** e o código CRC **834307B4**.

Referência: Processo nº 23072.231636/2024-39   SEI nº 3301119

Resumo

A desigualdade de renda é um tema pertinente de estudo devido às suas múltiplas implicações para as economias. As regras fiscais representam uma restrição à política fiscal, uma ferramenta crucial para abordar a desigualdade de renda. A implementação generalizada de regras fiscais tem coincidido com mudanças na dinâmica da desigualdade de renda nas últimas décadas. Este estudo tem como objetivo investigar os impactos da implementação de quatro tipos de regras fiscais (Dívida, Orçamento Equilibrado, Despesas e Receitas) sobre a desigualdade de renda em economias avançadas e emergentes. Através de uma análise empírica utilizando o método de Projeções Locais para o período de 1995 a 2019, este trabalho conclui que todos os quatro tipos de regras fiscais contribuíram para um aumento da desigualdade de renda nas economias avançadas. No entanto, nas economias emergentes, apenas as Regras de Orçamento Equilibrado favoreceram a mitigação da desigualdade de renda, enquanto as regras de Dívida, Despesas e Receitas tiveram efeitos neutros.

Palavras-chave: Desigualdade de renda; Regras Fiscais; Economias avançadas; Economias emergentes.

Abstract

Income inequality is a pertinent subject of study due to its manifold implications for economies. Fiscal rules represent a restriction on fiscal policy, a crucial tool for addressing income inequality. The widespread implementation of fiscal rules has coincided with changes in the dynamics of income inequality in recent decades. This study aims to investigate the differential impacts of the implementation of four types of fiscal rules (Debt, Budget Balance, Expenditures, and Revenues) on income inequality in both advanced and emerging economies. Through empirical analysis using the Local Projections method for the period from 1995 to 2019, this article finds that all four types of fiscal rules contributed to an increase in income inequality in advanced economies. However, in emerging economies, only Budget Balance Rules have favored the mitigation of income inequality, while Debt, Expenditure and Revenue rules have had neutral effects.

Keywords: Income Inequality; Fiscal Rules; Advanced Economies; Emerging Economies.

List of Figures

List of Tables

Contents

1 Introduction

Income inequality, defined as the unequal distribution of income among individuals or households within a society, is a pertinent subject of study due to its far-reaching implications on various economic aspects, including growth, productivity and stability (Chancel et al., 2022). In recent decades, a noticeable rise in income inequality has been observed globally, particularly pronounced in advanced economies since the 1980s, with subsequent manifestations in emerging economies (Chancel et al., 2022). This shift in dynamics can be attributed to several factors, including but not limited to globalization, technological changes and institutional reforms (Coady and Gupta, 2012). It is noteworthy that alongside the increase in Income inequality, there has been a growing trend of public support for income redistribution measures aimed at mitigating this disparity (Fund, 2014).

When addressing income distribution, fiscal policy emerges as one of the most effective tools to combat inequality. However, the redistributive function of fiscal policy has been weakening in some countries (Coady and Gupta, 2012). Since the 1990s, Fiscal Rules have been widely adopted in both advanced and emerging markets (Lledó et al., 2017). Essentially, a Fiscal Rule can be defined as a restriction on the use of fiscal policy aimed at promoting sustainability, transparency and signaling of public accounts (Eyraud et al., 2018).

While fiscal rules have been successful in achieving fiscal balance in numerous nations (Dahan and Strawczynski, 2013; Hallerberg et al., 2009; Fabrizio and Mody, 2006; Neyapti, 2013; Bova et al., 2014), their potential side effects remain relatively under explored in the literature (Dahan and Strawczynski, 2013; Bova et al., 2014; Jung and Kim, 2021; Ulloa-Suárez, 2021; Hartwig and Sturm, 2019; Combes et al., 2019). Consequently, this paper aims to address three key gaps in the existing literature regarding Income inequality and Fiscal Rules.

Firstly, it extends the analysis to both advanced and emerging countries, unlike previous studies that often focused on isolated groups such as the Eurozone, the OECD, or Latin America. As noted by previous authors, understanding how structural factors influence both the design of Fiscal Rules and the dynamics of inequality is crucial. Secondly, this study pioneers the application of Local Projections, a method previously unexplored in this literature. Traditional approaches have concentrated on Synthetic Control, Fixed Effects Panel and Propensity Score methodologies. Lastly, the paper examines the effects of Revenue Fiscal Rules, a type of rule that has not been unexplored in previous studies. By addressing these gaps, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of the relationship between Fiscal Rules and Income inequality.

This study is organized into four separate sections. The first section presents a review of the literature on Income inequality and Fiscal Rules. The second section details the database, particular cases of some countries and the methodology used. Then, the

third section thoroughly analyzes the model results.

2 Literature review

2.1 Income Inequality

Inequality is a multidimensional concept appearing in the form of wealth, opportunities, life expectancy, income, gender disparities and among others (Aaberge and Brandolini, 2015). The focus of this study is on Income inequality (II), which pertains to the distribution of individual or household earnings within a population at a given time, reflecting the disparities in income distribution among individuals (**?**).

On a global scale, II has exhibited a gradual decline over history when considering the world average. However, over the past four decades, II has surged in numerous countries and regions, albeit with variations (Chancel et al., 2022). Notably, during the 20th century, income disparities between nations were more pronounced. Presently, these inter-country disparities have somewhat diminished, depending on the regions under analysis. However, there has been a discernible rise in intra-country inequality. Coady and Gupta (2012) attribute this trend to several factors. Globalization, for instance, exerts downward pressure on the wages of low-skilled workers, who constitute a larger share of the workforce, while benefiting more highly skilled labor. Additionally, technological advancements have disproportionately favored highly skilled workers. Furthermore, various institutional and regulatory reforms have fostered a more competitive market environment, diminishing workers' bargaining power. These dynamics initially impacted II in advanced countries during the 1980s and later extended their influence to emerging economies.

The Gini Index is the most commonly used measure of II, ranging from 0 (indicating complete equality) to 1 (indicating complete inequality). An analysis of this indicator reveals that between 1990 and 2010, European economies experienced an increase in II, particularly pronounced between 1990 and 1995, especially in emerging countries within Europe. Similar trends were observed in regions such as Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East and North Africa. Although average inequality in Sub-Saharan Africa decreased during this period, more than a quarter of economies in this region still saw an increase of more than 3 percentage points in II. In Latin America, over a third of economies experienced an increase in II, although there was a slight reduction on average. However, from 2000 onwards, most countries in Latin America began to record a significant decrease in the Gini Index. Interestingly, the global increase in II coincided with a widespread rise in public support for income redistribution, as noted by the **?**.

II is a crucial topic for study due to its influence across various economic channels. Firstly, it is essential to highlight the negative relationship between II and aggregate demand, which is influenced by income concentration (Jha, 1996; Barro, 2000). Additionally, II can limit access to credit for low-income individuals, thereby constraining their productive potential due to failures in credit and investment markets, which hampers growth(Loury, 1981; Galor and Zeira, 1993; Banerjee and Newman, 1993; Aghion and Bolton, 1997;

Piketty, 1997; Bertola, 2000). Moreover, II can lead to political instability, resulting in inefficiencies in investment levels (Alesina and Perotti, 1996). Lastly, II can impact economic efficiency, fostering rent-seeking activities. High II encourages an inefficient allocation of resources, discouraging investment and hindering economic growth (Rodrik, 1997).

Considering the economic implications surrounding II, it is crucial to understand the factors that influence its dynamics. The literature emphasizes several determinant factors for II. Firstly, education emerges as a crucial instrument in combating II in the medium term (Coady and Dizioli, 2018). Education can play a pivotal role in various ways. For instance, it can stimulate a more robust economic growth process, as suggested by Barro (2013) and Hanushek and Wobmann (2010), or it can disrupt the inter generational transmission of poverty and asymmetry of opportunities, as observed by Corak (2013).

Secondly, the income generation process is considered a significant vector, addressed in various perspectives in the literature. Jha (1996), a pioneer in this discussion, highlighted a nonlinear relationship between economic growth and the Gini Index: initially, economic growth might increase the Gini Index due to income concentration, but later, this relationship could reverse due to factors such as a progressive tax system. On the other hand, the institutional approach suggests that strong institutions promote more balance and distributive growth (Daron and Robinson, 2012; Rodrik, 2000; Stiglitz, 2016).

Globalization has demonstrated significant effects on II since the 1990s, with various studies shedding new light on this relationship Dorn et al. (2018). According to Feenstra and Hanson (1996, 1999), outsourcing low-skilled tasks in advanced economies can negatively impact less skilled workers in these countries. However, within the global value chain, these activities can stimulate demand for higher skills in emerging countries. Thus, heterogeneity between firms within the same sector and wage differentials between firms involved in international trade can contribute to an increase in II. More productive companies tend to offer higher wages to skilled workers, thereby widening the wage gap between workers from different companies (Manasse and Turrini, 2001; Yeaple, 2005; Munch and Skaksen, 2008; Verhoog, 2008; Egger and Kreickemeier, 2009; Frias et al., 2012; Egger et al., 2013; Sampson, 2014).

When addressing income distribution, fiscal policy emerges as the essential tool Fund (2017). On the one hand, studies emphasize that a more progressive tax system has more consistent effects in alleviating II, as shown by Woo et al. (2017). Specifically, direct taxes are more effective in income redistribution, while indirect taxes tend to increase II (Gemmell and Morrissey, 2005; Cubero and Hollar, 2010; Martinez-Vazquez et al., 2012). On the other hand, research highlights that public spending in the form of social benefits is more distributive than taxes (Doumbia and Kinda, 2019; Martinez-Vazquez et al., 2012; Joumard et al., 2012; Paulus et al., 2009; Chu et al., 2012).

Coady and Gupta (2012) suggest that the redistributive function of fiscal policy

in advanced countries was notably efficient, with a reduction in II observed in 25 OECD countries between 1985 and 2005. The authors found that expenditure-focused fiscal policies had a distributive effect twice as large as tax-focused policies. However, starting from the 1990s, the redistributive effects of fiscal policy weakened in these countries.

In contrast, in emerging countries, the effectiveness of fiscal policy in reducing II is more limited due to lower levels of taxes and transfers. Research by Goñi et al. (2008) indicates that by the mid-2000s, the tax and transfer system in six Latin American economies managed to decrease the average Gini Index by only about 2 percentage points, from 0.52 to 0.50. Similar results were reported by Lustig et al. (2011). This decrease stands in stark contrast to the situation in 15 European economies, where inequality dropped by approximately 20 percentage points, from 0.46 to 0.27. As a result, nearly three-quarters of the difference in Gini indices between Latin American and European countries, corresponding to 18 of the 23 points of difference, can be attributed to disparities in fiscal policy approaches.

After introducing the discussion on II, this study aims to understand how the implementation of Fiscal Rules can affect the dynamics of this variable. Recent literature has emphasized the success of incorporating rules in promoting fiscal sustainability, but there is still a lack of investigation into their effects on socioeconomic variables Dahan and Strawczynski (2013); Hartwig and Sturm (2019); Bonasia et al. (2020).

In this context, it is important to consider that each country's structural factors may result in different effects for each Fiscal Rules, such as in emerging and advanced economies. In other words, the process of economic and redistributive growth, along with each country's fiscal situation, may lead to different interpretations of the impacts of fiscal constraints. For example, one rule may lead to a reduction in II in one country and an increase in another.

This study aims to fill a gap in the literature by investigating how Fiscal Rules affect II in both emerging and advanced economies. This is particularly relevant since previous studies have focused on groups of economies with similar characteristics, such as the Eurozone, the OECD, and Latin America. Additionally, Appendix B contains surveys of empirical work on the determinants of income inequality and the relationship between fiscal rules and income inequality.

2.2 Fiscal Rules

Fiscal Rules (FR) can be defined as constraints on the use of fiscal policy, aimed at promoting fiscal sustainability, transparency and signaling of the conduct of public accounts (Eyraud et al., 2018). Essentially, FR are designed to contain excessive government debt.

This practice is grounded in three key principles. Firstly, as Alesina and Tabellini (1990) explain, FR serves as a commitment device, acting as a restraint on fiscal discretion.

Secondly, Debrun and Kumar (2007) emphasize the role of FR in reducing informational asymmetry in economic policy, functioning as a signaling instrument. Finally, as observed by Eyraud et al. (2018), FR also possesses a political dimension, facilitating coordination and coalition-building among political parties.

Well-designed FR plays a crucial role in preserving fiscal space to promote policies of interest, contributing to economic stabilization, balance growth and inclusive social policies. Blanchard et al. (2010) and Delong and Summers (2012) emphasize that better-shaped FR enhances the performance of automatic stabilizers, mechanisms that act during economic fluctuations without government intervention. Consequently, the fiscal space generated can help alleviate II or enhance the efficiency of countercyclical fiscal policies. The increased maneuvering room provided by well-designed FR favors stimulating aggregate demand without compromising fiscal sustainability.

Conversely, poorly designed FR can incur costs (Eyraud et al., 2018). For instance, limits on nominal deficits can lead to pro-cyclical dynamics, where spending cuts or tax increases occur during economic slowdowns and vice versa. Certain FR may also be inconsistent and generate composition bias, as demonstrated by Peletier et al. (1999), resulting in misallocated spending hindering the fight against II. Additionally, FR introduced without proper political adherence can lead to cases of creative accounting, reducing the transparency of fiscal policy (Milesi-Ferretti, 2003).

FR can have different properties and objectives. Among the various specifications of FR, this study relies on the IMF dataset (Schachter et al., 2012), focusing specifically on rules related to restrictions on budget aggregates Kumar et al. (2009). Therefore, the research only encompasses four types of rules:

- **Debt Rule:** The establishment of a limit or target for public debt, expressed as a ratio of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), is a common practice aimed at ensuring fiscal discipline and promoting convergence to a specific level of indebtedness, with ease of communication and monitoring.

  However, this rule is not without its limitations. One notable limitation is the lagged effects that budgetary measures may have on debt, making it challenging to implement short-term and stabilization policies. This can result in pro-cyclical dynamics, where fiscal policy exacerbates economic fluctuations rather than mitigating them.

  Additionally, adhering strictly to a debt rule may complicate the response to monetary shocks, as adjustments to fiscal policy may need to be larger than expected to maintain compliance with the debt target. This can introduce additional volatility into the economy and hinder efforts to stabilize economic conditions.

  Furthermore, when the level of indebtedness is below the maximum limit established by the rule, it may offer little guidance on fiscal policy decisions. In such cases,

policymakers may lack clear direction on whether to pursue further debt reduction or to reallocate resources towards other policy objectives.

Overall, while Debt Rule can provide a useful framework for fiscal discipline, policymakers must be mindful of these limitations and consider them when designing and implementing fiscal policy. Balancing the need for debt sustainability with the flexibility to respond effectively to economic shocks is essential for achieving macroeconomic stability and promoting long-term economic growth.

- **Budget Balance Rules:** These rules may encompass general balance, structural balance, cyclically adjusted balance and "above the cycle"balance, aiming to ensure that the debt-to-GDP ratio converges to a finite level. Among these, the cyclically adjusted balance rule is the most sensitive to political decisions.

  Favorable characteristics of these rules include their ability to ensure debt sustainability with clear objectives, as well as ease of communication and monitoring. However, they are not without limitations, which vary depending on their specific design.

  Rules focused on cyclically adjusted balance may be complex to calculate, making communication difficult. Conversely, the "above the cycle"balance rule may weaken corrective measures. Additionally, some designs may not incorporate economic stabilization characteristics, leading to pro-cyclical dynamics.

  Lastly, the Golden Rule, a peculiarity of this type of control, stipulates that capital expenditures are not restricted. However, this characteristic is not directly related to debt sustainability.

  In summary, while these rules offer advantages in ensuring fiscal discipline and debt sustainability, policymakers must carefully consider their design and implementation to mitigate potential limitations and avoid unintended consequences.

- **Expenditure Rules:** These types of rules establish limits for total public spending, primary spending (excluding debt interest payments), or current spending (regular government expenses). These limits are typically defined in various ways, including absolute values, growth rates, or as a percentage of GDP and typically extend over three to five years.

  It's important to note that these rules do not primarily aim to ensure the sustainability of public debt and do not restrict government revenue collection. However, they can complement rules that directly address public debt or budget balance. They serve as an operational tool to encourage fiscal consolidation, controlling the budget consistently with sustainability when used alongside other rules.

  Additionally, expenditure rules can prevent excessive spending during periods of unexpected economic growth when government revenues are temporarily high and

meeting budget deficit limits is easy. However, they may not be suitable for allowing automatic fiscal responses to adverse economic shocks, as they do not require automatic adjustments of fiscal revenues in times of recession. Certain categories of spending, such as those aimed at unemployment support, may exhibit greater counter-cyclicality, which can increase the gap from sustainability targets.

In summary, these rules set limits for government spending and are relatively easy to communicate and monitor. However, they are not sufficient on their own to ensure the sustainability of public finances and are not compatible with discretionary fiscal stimulus. To ensure sustainability and economic stability, they generally need to be combined with other rules and fiscal policies.

- **Revenue Rules:** These rules are guidelines that establish maximum or minimum limits for government revenues, aiming to increase revenue collection or avoid excessive taxation. However, most of these rules are not directly related to controlling public debt since they do not limit government spending.

  Setting limits on revenues can be challenging, as revenue collection can vary considerably due to economic fluctuations, following the business cycle. An exception is rules that prohibit the use of "unexpected" revenues for additional expenses, helping prevent the government from spending unplanned money.

  On their own, revenue rules can contribute to pro-cyclical fiscal policies. Minimum limits often do not consider how revenues may automatically decrease in a recession or how they may grow beyond maximum limits during an economic recovery.

  However, like expenditure rules, revenue rules can be used to directly target the size of government, meaning they can be used to control the level of government activities. This aspect provides policymakers with a tool to manage the overall scope and scale of government operations.

Advanced economies led the way in adopting FR in the 1990s, with several emerging economies following suit from the 2000s onwards. By the end of 2021, 105 countries had incorporated at least one FR into their fiscal regimes, either at the national or supranational level. The impetus for advanced economies to implement FR came primarily from the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, which mandated members of the European Economic and Monetary Union to adopt measures to achieve debt and public deficit targets (Davoodi et al., 2022).

During the early 2000s, emerging countries began implementing national FR, while low-income economies adopted supranational FR. Among emerging countries, some implemented FR to make fiscal adjustments after crisis periods, such as Brazil and Colombia. Others, like Mexico and Poland, aimed to achieve gains from fiscal reforms.

Additionally, countries like Chile, Russia and Mongolia utilized FR to mitigate larger pro-cyclical spending amidst fluctuations in natural resource prices.

The prevalence of FR increased over time, with the average number of FR per nation rising from 2 in the early 2000s to 3. This trend towards multiple constraints was primarily driven by the desire to promote greater fiscal discipline, as observed by Davoodi et al. (2022) and Schachter et al. (2012). Analysis of FR dynamics reveals that Debt Rule were commonly combined with Budget Balance Rules. Subsequently, many countries introduced Expenditure Rules, while Revenue Rules were less adopted, partly due to governments having less control over revenue.

As of 2021, the adoption of Expenditure Rules prevails, with advanced economies leading the way. Approximately 75% of advanced economies have instituted this type of rule. However, less than half of emerging and developing economies have adopted this type of restriction. This reflects, in part, the need to increase spending in response to revenue growth, according to the findings of the same authors.

Figure 1 – Distribution of FR in Advanced Economies

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schaechter et al. (2012).

Figure 2 – Distribution of FR in Emerging Economies

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schaechter et al. (2012).

The connection between FR and macroeconomic aggregates has been extensively studied in the literature. Notable findings include the positive effect of these rules on reducing economic volatility (Fatás and Mihov, 2006) and their influence on interest rates (Iara and Wolff, 2014). Additionally, research shows that FR can have significant implications for fiscal sustainability (Dahan and Strawczynski, 2013; Hallerberg et al., 2009; Fabrizio and Mody, 2006; Neyapti, 2013; Bova et al., 2014).

However, it is important to note that the side effects of FR have not been widely explored, especially concerning social variables such as inequality and poverty.

Overall, FR are not explicitly designed to combat inequality and poverty. However, they have direct effects on fiscal policy, which consequently tends to have a more pronounced impact on II. The dynamics between II and FR can occur through at least three transmission channels.

Firstly, as argued by Debrun and Kumar (2007),Taps (2012) and Combes et al. (2018), the most direct channel through which FR influences II is the fiscal balance. The fiscal balance directly impacts the dynamics between government revenues and expenditures, making the composition of these variables relevant for reducing II. The progressiveness of spending and taxes is a determining factor for aggregate demand and, therefore, for II.

Next, fiscal consolidation programs play a significant role, with the implementation of FR being key in the pursuit of fiscal sustainability (Guichard et al., 2007). Studies suggest that the type of fiscal consolidation matters for II. Programs focused on expenditure cuts have been associated with an increase in II (Ball et al., 2011; Woo et al., 2017; Agnello

and Sousa, 2014), while those based on tax increases have reduced II (Ciminelli et al., 2019).

Thirdly, the cyclicality of fiscal policy and borrowing costs also influence how fiscal policy varies over time in response to economic cycles and government borrowing costs. The results generated in these processes can impact the dynamics of public debt and the credibility of fiscal policy, which in turn affect various determinants of II. Capital flows (Figini and Gorg, 2011), trade (UNCTAD, 2019), globalization factors, education (Goldin and Katz, 2009) and the labor market (Berg, 2015) are highlighted as factors influenced by fiscal policy credibility that can impact II.

Based on the findings from the Appendix B survey, there is a notable shortage of studies on the effects of FR on II. This research aims to address this gap by conducting a comprehensive analysis covering both emerging and advanced countries. Furthermore, this research advocates for the adoption of the Local Projections analytical technique, a novel approach within this literature. This technique is designed to quantify effects over time stemming from the implementation of FR on II. Finally, this research offers novel estimations for Revenue Rules.

2.3 Particular Cases

To briefly illustrate the relationship between FR (Schachter et al., 2012) and II (Solt, 2020), we surveyed selected cases where the dynamics of the chosen economies broadly reflect the pattern of their respective groups. We delve into the evolution of the Gini Index over time, focusing on the implementation (not revision or suspension) of certain types of FR. The date in parentheses indicates the duration of the rules or if they were revised; if there is only one date, it means the rule is currently in effect.

2.3.1 Advanced Economies

- **Finland**

  Finland implemented three types of FR without enforcement mechanisms. The first one is the Debt Rule (1995-2006; since 2011), aiming to keep the Central Government deficit below 1% of GDP. The second one is the Budget Balanced Rules (since 1999, revised in 2011), aiming to achieve surpluses of 1% of potential GDP during 2007-2011, with a tolerance band for short-term deviations. Since 2011, the target has been adjusted to 1% of nominal GDP. The third rule is the Expenditure Rule (since 2003), which sets annual limits in real terms for non-cyclical primary spending.

  Among other factors that influenced the dynamics of II in Finland, we can mention the crisis of the 1990s that led to a long-term increase in unemployment until the early 2000s (Paukkeri et al., 2023). After these periods, changes in II tended to be more related to cyclical fluctuations (Blomgren et al., 2014). Furthermore, there has

been a notable slowdown in average growth in hourly wages and annual earnings since 2008.

Figure 3 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in Finland

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

- **Spain**

  Spain implemented two fiscal rules with enforcement mechanisms. The first one is the Budget Balanced Rules (2003-05; 2006-11; revised in 2011). Initially, the deficit target was adjusted according to economic stability. During the period from 2006 to 2011, the rule considered the economic cycle, requiring the deficit not to exceed a certain percentage of GDP in times of low growth, and seeking surpluses in times of strong expansion. Since 2011, the rule also aims to limit public debt to 60% of GDP from 2020 onwards and allows additional spending of 0.5% of GDP on public investment, provided it is justified. Exceptional deficits must be followed by a medium-term adjustment plan. The second rule is the Expenditure Rule (since 2011), which limits the nominal spending of central and local governments to the nominal growth of GDP in the medium term.

  Among the events that changed II, we highlight that the Spanish labor market is affected by structural issues that contribute to rising II, as unemployment is often high and highly sensitive to cyclical fluctuations. Additionally, II was considered highly countercyclical in a period in the country, a phenomenon evidenced by the economic boom that occurred until 2007 (Anghel et al., 2023; Ayala and Cantó, 2018). Since the 2008 crisis, unemployment has been identified as one of the main

drivers of increasing II, along with rising wage disparity. Another point to note is the limited redistributive capacity of the country's fiscal system, whose weakness became more evident after 2008 (Ayala and Cantó, 2018).

Figure 4 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in Spain

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

- **France**

  France has implemented three fiscal rules with enforcement mechanisms only for the Budget Balanced Rules. The Expenditure Rule (since 1998) aims to increase real or nominal expenditures, excluding interest and pensions. The Revenue Rule (since 2006; revised in 2011) initially allowed central and local governments to set revenues higher than projected, but later established mandatory minimum targets for the net impact of new revenue measures. The Budget Balanced Rule (2012) requires the country to follow a plan for structural balance.

  Among the characteristics that influenced the dynamics of II in France, we highlight the increase in youth unemployment from 1997 to 2002, followed by stability. Another factor contributing to the rise in II was the growth of self-employed workers since 2003 (Bozio et al., 2023). Additionally, wage inequality began to intensify in the mid-90s (Godechot, 2012). Besides the weaknesses in the labor market, the French social protection system faces challenges in directing expenditures efficiently, largely due to the weight of pension and healthcare expenses (OECD, 2007).

Figure 5 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in France

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

2.3.2 Emerging Economies

- **Argentina**

  Argentina adopted enforcement mechanisms for FR. The Expenditure Rules (since 2000; revised in 2017), in general, limited the growth of primary expenditures concerning nominal GDP or in real terms during periods of economic recession. After being suspended between 2009 and 2017, new rules were established, where current primary expenditures cannot grow more than inflation; while for those that reached primary balance, the limit is nominal GDP. Additionally, public employment growth cannot exceed population growth.

  The Budget Balanced Rule (2000-2017) required central and local governments to maintain balanced accounts, except for investments in basic social and economic infrastructure and projects financed by international financial institutions. This rule was suspended between 2009 and 2017 and later abolished. However, the Fiscal Responsibility Law (FRL) encouraged local governments to establish countercyclical funds and imposed limits on entity indebtedness, aligned with revenue dynamics.

  Diverging from the trend of the '90s, Argentina experienced in the 2000s a process of formalization and flexibilization of the labor market across all categories of workers, while simultaneously reducing wage disparities (Maurizio, 2015). During this period, the government took a more proactive approach, ensuring a more equitable social

protection system for low-skilled workers, as well as strengthening labor institutions (Gasparini and Cruces, 2010; Lustig et al., 2013).

Figure 6 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in Argentina

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

- **Panama**

  Panama adopted two FR with no enforcement mechanisms. The Budget Balanced Rules (2002-07; since 2009; revised in 2012) was implemented as part of the FRL, limiting the deficit of the non-financial public sector to 1% of GDP, adjustable to 3% during periods of weak economic growth. In 2008, the FRL was replaced by the Social and Fiscal Responsibility Law, which set new deficit limits and public debt goals. Safeguard clauses were included for situations of natural disasters, national emergencies, and economic recessions. In 2012, the concept of "adjusted balance"of the non-financial public sector was introduced, setting new deficit limits until 2018. The Debt Rules (2002-07; since 2009) were established as part of the FRL, with a maximum limit of 40% of GDP until 2014. Starting in 2009, the FRL was replaced by a new Social and Fiscal Responsibility Law to address the economic crisis.

  Strong economic growth and macroeconomic conditions favored the income expansion process of Panama's population in the 2000s. During the same period, Panama watched an increase in government instruments to promote higher-quality jobs, investments in education, greater inclusion of women in the economy, and a slight improvement in the distributive function of fiscal policy can be observed (OECD, 2017).

Figure 7 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in Panama

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

- **Poland**

  Poland doesn't have enforcement mechanisms only for Budget Balanced Rules. The Debt Rule (since 1997) capped general government debt at 60%, with corrective triggers if debt approached its limit and in exceptional cases (war, natural disasters, etc.). The Budget Balanced Rule (2006-07) stipulated that the central government should adhere to a fiscal anchor for 4 years. The Expenditure Rules (since 2011; revised in 2015) regulated discretionary spending increases to 1% of real growth. With the revision, price indexation was changed to create fiscal space for a child benefit program.

  After witnessing an increase in II, Poland made some changes that influenced the stability of this variable starting in 2007, with the main ones being the reforms of the tax-benefit system and the family allowance system, along with a decrease in wage dispersion, one of the main determinants of II previously (Brzeziński, 2017). In 2015, the launch of the Family 500+ social program was one of the main drivers that helped reduce II by reaching the lower-income layers of families (Jędrzejczak and Pekasiewicz, 2020).

Figure 8 – Gini Index and the Introduction of FR in Poland

Source: Own elaboration with data from Schachter et al. (2012) and Solt (2020).

Finally, the description of the countries includes events and facts that contributed to the change in the dynamics of the II, considering that the FR are not the only or primary causes for such changes. Graphic analysis is a limited tool for exploring the proposed theme, so the introduction of econometric methods can bring more relevant and robust conclusions. In other words, by considering the controls in the models, the aim is to isolate the short and long-term effects of other variables that influenced the change in II, whether cyclical, structural, or shock-related. Therefore, empirical models seek to demonstrate only the effects of FR on II. Additionally, the graphs suggest a certain lag between the implementation of FR and the change in II. Therefore, another advantage of adopting econometric methods is that we can verify if this hypothesis is valid.

3   Database and Methodology

3.1   Database

The sample utilized in this study consists of an unbalanced panel, primarily due to data availability constraints, with annual frequency. The selected period spans from 1995 to 2019, intending to capture the onset of the widespread implementation of FR at the same time that the dynamics of II are changing. Furthermore, the analysis includes a division in the estimates between emerging and advanced economies. This approach allows for a comprehensive examination of the effects of FR on II across different economic contexts over a significant period.

- **Income inequality:** To represent the variable of interest, this study utilized the Gini Index of Disposable Income (after transfers and taxes) from the Standardized World Income inequality Database (SWIID) developed by Solt (2020). The Gini Index ranges from 0 (indicating complete equality) to 100 (indicating complete inequality).

  One of the main advantages of using the SWIID lies in its ability to standardize data from various sources, including the World Bank, Eurostat, the OECD Income Distribution Database, among others. This standardization process helps to reduce the uncertainty associated with the Gini Index, allowing for more precise comparisons between different datasets.

  In summary, the standardization process of SWIID follows a Bayesian approach, which involves the application of statistical and probabilistic methods to adjust and harmonize the different data sources, making them comparable for analysis. This ensures the reliability and consistency of the Gini Index data used in the study.

- **Fiscal Rules:** This study utilized the IMF database constructed by Schachter et al. (2012) to represent the FR within the models. To do so, dummy variables were employed, where 0 represents the absence of a rule and 1 indicates its presence. These dummy variables correspond to Debt, Budget Balance, Expenditure and Revenue rules.

- **Controls:** In this research, the fiscal variables were obtained from the IMF database. The focus was on government expenditure as a percentage of GDP, as it is directly controlled by the government and has significant potential to influence II dynamics. Additionally, Central Government Debt expressed as a percentage of GDP was incorporated to assess the effectiveness of fiscal measures and the burdens associated with high public debt. This variable was lagged by one period, as suggested by Combes et al. (2019).

While national FR typically applies to the concept of "General Government," which includes various government entities, including state and local governments and social security funds, this study concentrated on the Central Government. This decision was made because the Central Government holds the majority of public debt and provides more comprehensive data. The dynamics of the Central Government did not significantly affect the results of this research. The selection of these variables aimed to cover the three main transmission channels of fiscal rules to the dynamics of public debt, as highlighted in the literature.

To capture economic growth, real GDP, expressed in millions of 2017 US dollars, divided by the population (in millions of people), sourced from the Penn World Table, was adopted. The variable was included with a logarithm, as suggested by Barro (2008).

For globalization, the KOF Globalization Index was used, which encompasses economic, social and political globalization sub-indices weighted equally to form the overall indicator. This indicator has been utilized by Bergh and Nilsson (2010) and other authors.

Lastly, the proxy for education was the V-Dem variable of average years of schooling of the total population aged 15 and above.

3.2 Method

The chosen method for exploring the topic of this study is Local Projections (LP) emerged in 2005 as an alternative to Vector Autoregressive Models (VAR) in applied macroeconomics. The fundamental concept behind LP is to estimate impulse-response functions within a dynamic system. Unlike VAR, LP applies a shock only to the reference period instead of propagating this shock to subsequent periods. This feature is particularly relevant for the present study, as it captures both a change in the dynamics of II and the implementation of FR.

LP offers several advantages, as highlighted by Jordà (2005). Firstly, it can accommodate estimations through the Ordinary Least Squares method and handle nonlinear relationships, which are common in multivariate scenarios. In the context of this study, LP demonstrates sufficient flexibility to estimate panel structures.

In terms of inference, LP provides both individual and joint results without the need for asymptotic approximations. Additionally, its results remain robust even in the presence of misspecifications, a significant advantage compared to VAR, as demonstrated by Ramey (2016). This robustness is particularly valuable as errors do not accumulate, contributing to the reliability of the analyses.

The choice of the LP method was driven by several factors. Firstly, LP is suitable for analyzing dummy variables, making it effective for handling the shock introduced by

FR in this study. Unlike the VAR method, LP can generate impulse-response functions for this type of data, providing a more appropriate framework for the analysis.

Secondly, there is a scarcity of studies that utilize LP to examine the relationship between II and FR. This presents an opportunity to contribute novel insights to the existing literature by employing LP in this context.

Thirdly, LP has been widely employed in studies investigating issues related to fiscal policy (Auerbach and Gorodnichenko, 2013; Jordà and Taylor, 2016; Ramey and Zubairy, 2018; Aye et al., 2019) and panel data (Owyang et al., 2013; **?**). Its versatility and applicability in similar research contexts lend credibility to its use in this study.

Lastly, LP allows for the estimation of impulse-response functions within the sample itself, enabling the testing of hypotheses regarding the lag in the propagation of the effects of implementing FR on II.

The impulse-response equations investigated in this study adhere to the subsequent specification:

$$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t} = \alpha_{i,h} + \beta_h FRi, t + \gamma_h X_{i,t} + \epsilon'_{i,t+h} \quad h = 0, 1, \ldots, H-1 \quad (1)$$

Where:

$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t} = Gini_{i,t+h} - Gini_{i,t-1}$,

$\alpha_{i,h}$ represents the fixed effects of the cross-sectional units indexed by i,

β_h is the coefficient associated with the shock given in $FR_{i,t}$,

γ_h is a vector of coefficients associated with the $X_{i,t}$, which is the vector of control variables,

$\epsilon'_{i,t+h}$ is the error term,

h is the time horizon, with H = 10 periods.

The estimation of this study involves creating a model for each rule and each interest group. In these models, the rule to which the shock was given is endogenous and the other variables are exogenous, including the other rules, since it is quite common in economies to use combinations of different types of rules (Eyraud et al., 2018). In other words, the remaining three rules from each model are considered control variables and are included in the X matrix.

4   Results

This section presents the results graphically (Figures 9 to 12) and provides a brief analysis. Subsequently, a discussion compares the results of this study with existing empirical literature, highlighting both convergences and divergences and outlining trends in the dynamics of the dissemination channels and each group analyzed. Lastly, the full set of estimates is available in the Appendix(C to F).

4.1   Debt Rule

As explained by Schachter et al. (2012), the Debt Rule effectively communicates fiscal anchoring but has limitations in its short-term orientation and stabilization. Therefore, these characteristics could favor pro-cyclical dynamics of fiscal policy, which may exacerbate economic slowdowns, for example.

The results (Figure 9) reflect some complexity, as a great part of them do not reach statistical significance and are characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, as evidenced by the confidence intervals of the shocks. When we specifically look at advanced economies, we observe that only one period of significance is identified, in which II shows a slight increase. On the other hand, emerging economies did not show statistically significant results.

Figure 9 – Response of Income Inequality to the Implementation of Debt Rule

Source: Own elaboration.

4.2 Budget Balance Rules

Similar to the Debt Rule, depending on the design of Budget Balance Rules, pro-cyclical dynamics and challenges in incorporating corrective and stabilization measures may emerge (Schachter et al., 2012). Another important characteristic is that such rules can alter the fiscal balance of the economy. Consequently, these characteristics might have negative implications for income distribution.

The results (Figure 10) of a shock to Budget Balance Rules pointed in opposite directions for advanced and emerging markets. While the former indicated an increase at certain moments, the latter suggested a decrease in II after some periods.

Figure 10 – Response of Income Inequality to the Implementation of Budget Balance Rules

Source: Own elaboration.

4.3 Expenditure Rules

This type of rule alone does not respond effectively to economic shocks, as it is not compatible with fiscal stimulus (Schachter et al., 2012). Therefore, during periods of economic slowdown, this rule might limit the support provided by fiscal policy. Another characteristic that could contribute to increased II is its potential implications for fiscal balance, as it restricts spending for control the size of government.

The results (Figure 11) of this application to advanced economies revealed a significant and positive impact, characterized by little uncertainty as reflected in the narrow confidence interval. In emerging economies, the shock did not show statistical significance.

Figure 11 – Response of Income Inequality to the Implementation of Expenditure Rules

Source: Own elaboration.

4.4 Revenue Rules

In the case of Revenue Rules, the models are more complex to analyze for several reasons. Firstly, few countries, both emerging and advanced, adopt this type of rule. Secondly, revenues are a variable that is often beyond the government's control and responds more to cyclical movements. Additionally, empirical studies on the analyzed topic generally choose not to analyze Revenue Rules. Therefore, interpreting the results requires caution, but some hypotheses can help explain the models.

This type of rule is not directly linked to fiscal sustainability as it does not control expenditure. However, it can help to control the size of government and, by doing so, influence the fiscal balance. Furthermore, alone this kind of rule can contribute to a pro-cyclical movement since floors (ceilings) typically do not account for the functioning of automatic stabilizers during a downturn (upturn) (Schachter et al., 2012; Jung and Kim, 2021; Davoodi et al., 2022).

The results (Figure 12) indicated an increase in II for advanced economies with varying periods of statistical significance. In contrast, emerging economies did not show significant results from the shock.

Figure 12 – Response of Income Inequality to the Implementation of Revenue Rules

Source: Own elaboration.

4.5 Discussion

Overall, the results converge in some aspects with empirical studies related to the theme but also present differences. Regarding emerging economies, significant impacts of shocks on II were not observed, except in the case of Budget Balance Rules. This is in line, to some extent, with the study by Ulloa-Suárez (2021), which did not find significant impacts of FR in Latin American countries and with the study by Combes et al. (2019), which highlighted that the implementation of the Budget Balance Rules is associated with a reduction in II. Additionally, according to Guerguil et al. (2017), Budget Balance Rules have significant effects on investment, potentially creating greater fiscal space to address issues related to income inequality.

In contrast, in advanced economies, all models indicated an increased II following the implementation of a FR, although at different times and intensities. This is similar to what was observed by Hartwig and Sturm (2019), who highlighted that FR had impacts on increasing II in the European Union.

A notable point, highlighted by Schachter et al. (2012), is that emerging economies have demonstrated having stricter national restrictions and enforcement mechanisms for various aspects of FR even before advanced economies. To some extent, advanced economies intensified such characteristics after the 2008 crisis. Several factors contribute to explaining the differences found, not only the design of the FR in each group but also the selected period and the economic structure of each.

Regarding advanced economies, fiscal consolidation programs in the 1990s were accompanied by higher short-term unemployment, the extent of the impact on income distribution depended on automatic stabilizers and private demand. Thus, the effects of anti-unemployment policies helped mitigate the effects on II. However, cuts in government services may have disproportionately affected low-income families, as explained by the Chu et al. (2012) and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2011).

Moreover, the way fiscal adjustments were made in advanced economies played a significant role in increasing II. These programs mostly emphasized cuts in public spending rather than tax increases. An analysis of the composition of reduced spending reveals that social transfers and distribution programs were affected (Alesina and Perotti, 1996; Alesina and Ardagna, 2009; Coady and Gupta, 2012). Consequently, as discussed earlier, cuts in social spending tend to have a more negative impact on income distribution (Agnello and Sousa, 2014).

On the other hand, emerging economies also underwent fiscal consolidation programs in the 2000s, but these episodes were shorter compared to advanced countries. This resulted in less intense effects on unemployment, which, according to the Coady and Gupta (2012), contributed to an improvement in income distribution after the adjustment period.

An additional significant characteristic of emerging economies, also highlighted by Coady and Gupta (2012), is the lack of progressivity in public spending. Therefore, during periods of fiscal adjustment, the concentration of cuts can result in a process that improves equity in public spending and provides protection to the most vulnerable families.

5   Conclusion

The present research aimed to empirically analyze the effects of four types of FR on II in two distinct economic groups. The relevance of this study lies in the need to understand how fiscal constraints can impact income distribution, considering that fiscal policy is a crucial tool in promoting social equity. II, in turn, is a relevant study topic as it tends to negatively influence various macroeconomic aggregates.

Within the analyzed period, the dynamics and composition of II changed, coinciding with the widespread implementation of FR globally. Public support for income distribution also gained more intensity within the selected time frame. Many recent studies on FR have not examined the side effects that the introduction of this type of practice has on different social variables, including II. Many of them opted to assess the behavior of public debt and fiscal sustainability, among other types of macroeconomic aggregates.

Regarding the studies addressing the theme of this study, they focused on unfolding the behavior of II only in isolated economic groups and analyzing only three types of rules (Debt, Expenditure and Budget Balanced). Unlike them, this study chose to divide the applications into emerging and advanced economies, given that economic structure matters for both II and the design of FR, and to create an estimation for Revenue Rule. Furthermore, the study also differs through the method. The choice of LP is based on the intention to impacts of FR on II may only be observed with a lag.

Regarding the transmission channels between the variables of interest, we can mention at least three. The first one concerns the composition of the fiscal balance, which has a direct effect on aggregate demand. The second one is fiscal consolidation programs, where the pursuit of fiscal sustainability tends to generate effects on income distribution. Finally, the costs of public debt and the cyclicality of fiscal policy affect the distributive function of this type of policy and, therefore, create impacts on determinants of II.

In analyzing the results, it was observed that the shocks on FR exhibited varying intensity and significance over different time horizons in II. In other words, the results suggested that not all FR can affect II, and when they do, the effects are not symmetrical in terms of intensity and persistence. Some control variables sometimes proved to be more relevant in addressing II than an FR, as supposed in the section on particular cases. Additionally, the economic structure of the selected groups emerged as a relevant factor.

In general, all models for advanced economies showed an increase in II with the implementation of an FR. Conversely, models associated with Budget Balance and Expenditure Rules for emerging markets indicated a mitigating effect on II, while the remaining models showed a neutral stance.

The main differences found in the results between the groups can be explained, in part, by the transmission channels. While fiscal consolidation programs in advanced economies lasted longer, mainly focusing on spending cuts, emerging economies, on the

other hand, had shorter programs that generated greater progressivity of public spending. In other words, the fiscal balance of these countries contributed significantly to driving changes in the dynamics of II.

Another point to highlight is the response of public debt to shocks, which unanimously proved to be an important vector for reducing II (Appendix C to F). This fact is tied to the issue of the cyclicality and costs of debt. For both groups, the reduction of debt may have created greater fiscal space, thus favoring governments' ability to promote countercyclical policies, investments, social policies and others.

Finally, the work can be extended in various ways. Among some of them, we can mention an application on poverty to verify the different effects of FR regarding II, a comparison between the effects of subnational rules with national rules, the specific characteristics of each FR and why they generate different impacts among nations, including a variable summarizing revenue dynamics. Moreover, the IMF dataset contains various additional information about FR and we leave these features for future research.

References

Aaberge, R. and Brandolini, A. (2015). Multidimensional poverty and inequality. In *Handbook of income distribution*, pages 141–216. Elsevier.

Aghion, P. and Bolton, P. (1997). A theory of trickle-down growth and development. *Review of Economic Studies*, 64:151–172.

Agnello, L. and Sousa, R. (2014). How does fiscal consolidation impact on income inequality? *Review of Income and Wealth*, 60:702–726.

Alesina, A. and Ardagna, S. (2009). Large changes in fiscal policy: Taxes versus spending. Technical report, NBER Working Paper 15438. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Alesina, A. and Tabellini, G. (1990). Voting on the budget deficit. *American Economic Review*, 80(1):37–49.

Alesina, A. F. and Perotti, R. (1996). Income distribution, political instability and investment. *European Economic Review*, 40(6):1,203–1,228.

Anghel, B., Bover, O., Hospido, L., Ortega, J., and Regil, A. (2023). Inequality in spain: 2005–2021.

Auerbach, A. J. and Gorodnichenko, Y. (2013). Corrigendum: measuring the output responses to fiscal policy. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 5(3):320–322.

Ayala, L. and Cantó, O. (2018). The driving forces of rising inequality in spain: Is there more to it than a deep worsening of low-income households living standards? In *Inequality and inclusive growth in rich countries: Challenges and contrasting fortunes*, pages 250–295.

Aye, G. C., Clance, M. W., and Gupta, R. (2019). The effectiveness of monetary and fiscal policy shocks on us inequality: the role of uncertainty. *Quality and Quantity*, 53:283–295.

Ball, L., Furceri, D., Leigh, M., and Loungani, M. (2011). The distributional effects of fiscal consolidation. Technical report, IMF Working Paper 151.

Banerjee, A. V. and Newman, A. F. (1993). Occupational choice and the process of development. *Journal of Political Economy*, 101(2):274–298.

Barro, R. (2013). Education and economic growth. *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 14(2):301–328.

Barro, R. J. (2000). Inequality and growth in a panel of countries. *Journal of economic growth*, 5:5–32.

Barro, R. J. (2008). Inequality and growth revisited. *ADB Working paper series on regional economic integration.*

Berg, J. (2015). *Labour Markets, Institutions and Inequality.* Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham UK, Northampton MA USA.

Bergh, A. and Nilsson, T. (2010). Do liberalization and globalization increase income inequality? *European Journal of Political Economy*, 26(4):488–505.

Bertola, G. (2000). Macroeconomics of distribution and growth. In Atkinson, A. B. and Bourguignon, F., editors, *Handbook of income distribution*, volume 1, pages 477–540. North Holland, Amsterdam.

Blanchard, O., Dell'Ariccia, G., and Mauro, P. (2010). Rethinking macroeconomic policy. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 42(Supplement 1):199–215.

Blomgren, J. et al. (2014). Finland: Growing inequality with contested consequences. In *Changing Inequalities and Societal Impacts in Rich Countries: Thirty Countries' Experiences*, page 222.

Bonasia, M. et al. (2020). Fiscal rule compliance, poverty and social exclusion in the eurozone. *Metroeconomica*, 71(2):316–332.

Bova, M. E., Carcenac, N., and Guerguil, M. M. (2014). Fiscal rules and the procyclicality of fiscal policy in the developing world. Technical report, International Monetary Fund.

Bozio, A. et al. (2023). Inequality in france: 1968–2022. *Fiscal Studies.*

Brzeziński, M. (2017). Is high inequality an issue in poland. Technical report, IBS Policy Paper.

Chancel, L. et al., editors (2022). *World inequality report 2022.* Harvard University Press.

Chu, K.-Y., Davoodi, H., and Gupta, S. (2012). Income inequality and fiscal policy. Technical report, International Monetary Fund.

Ciminelli, G., Ernst, E., Merola, R., and Giuliodori, M. (2019). The composition effects of tax-based consolidation on income inequality. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 57:107–124.

Coady, D. and Dizioli, A. (2018). Income inequality and education revisited: persistence, endogeneity and heterogeneity. *Applied Economics*, 50(25):2747–2761.

Coady, M. D. and Gupta, M. S. (2012). *Income inequality and fiscal policy.* International Monetary Fund.

Combes, J.-L., Debrun, X., Minea, A., and Tapsoba, R. (2018). Inflation targeting, fiscal rules and the policy mix: Cross-effects and interactions. *The Economic Journal*, 128:2755–2784.

Combes, J. L., Minea, A., Vinturis, C., and Sawadogo, P. N. (2019). Can fiscal rules curb income inequality? evidence from developing countries. Technical report.

Corak, M. (2013). Income inequality, equality of opportunityand intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(3):79–102.

Cubero, R. and Hollar, I. V. (2010). Equity and fiscal policy: The income distribution effects of taxation and social spending in central america. Technical report, IMF Working Paper No. 10/112.

Dahan, M. and Strawczynski, M. (2013). Fiscal rules and the composition of government expenditures in oecd countries. *J. Pol. Anal. Manag.*, 32(3):484–504.

Daron, D. and Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperityand Poverty.* Crown Business.

Davoodi, H. et al. (2022). Fiscal rules and fiscal councils: Recent trends and performance during the covid-19 pandemic.

Debrun, X. and Kumar, M. S. (2007). Fiscal rules, fiscal councils and all that: Commitment devices, signaling tools or smokescreens? In *Fiscal Policy: Current Issues and Challenges*.

Delong, J. B. and Summers, L. H. (2012). Fiscal policy in a depressed economy. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1:233–97.

Dorn, F., Fuest, C., and Potrafke, N. (2018). Globalization and income inequality revisited.

Doumbia, D. and Kinda, M. T. (2019). Reallocating public spending to reduce income inequality: Can it work? *International Monetary Fund.*

Egger, H., Egger, P., and Kreickemeier, U. (2013). Trade, wagesand profits. *European Economic Review*, 64:332–350.

Egger, H. and Kreickemeier, U. (2009). Firm heterogeneity and the labor market effects of trade liberalization. *International Economic Review*, 50(1):187–216.

Eyraud, L. et al. (2018). Second-generation fiscal rules: balancing simplicity, flexibilityand enforceability. Technical report, International Monetary Fund.

Fabrizio, S. and Mody, A. (2006). Can budget institutions counteract political indiscipline? *Econ. Pol.*, 21(48):689–739.

Fatás, A. and Mihov, I. (2006). The macroeconomic effects of fiscal rules in the us states. *Journal of Public Economics*, 84(1):9–27.

Feenstra, R. and Hanson, G. (1996). Globalization, outsourcingand wage inequality. *American Economic Review*, 86(2):240–245.

Feenstra, R. and Hanson, G. (1999). The impact of outsourcing and high-technology capital on wages: Estimates for the united states, 1979–1990. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(3):907–940.

Figini, P. and Gorg, H. (2011). Does foreign direct investment affect income inequality? an empirical investigation. *The World Economy*, 34:1455–1475.

Frias, J., Kaplan, D., and Verhogen, E. (2012). Exports and within-plant wage distributions: Evidence from mexico. *American Economic Review*, 102:435–440.

Fund, I. M. (2014). Fiscal policy and income inequality. Policy Paper 14/123, International Monetary Fund.

Fund, I. M. (2017). Tackling inequalities. Technical report, Fiscal Monitor, Fall 2017, 48.

Galor, O. and Zeira, J. (1993). Income distribution and macroeconomics. *Review of Economic Studies*, 60(1):35–52.

Gasparini, L. C. and Cruces, G. A. (2010). A distribution in motion: The case of argentina.

Gemmell, N. and Morrissey, O. (2005). Distribution and poverty impacts of tax structure reform in developing countries: How little we know. *Development Policy Review*, 23(2):131–144.

Godechot, O. (2012). Is finance responsible for the rise in wage inequality in france? *Socio-Economic Review*, 10(3):447–470.

Goldin, C. and Katz, L. (2009). *The Race Between Education and Technology.* Harvard University Press.

Goñi, E., López, J. H., and Servén, L. (2008). Fiscal distribution and income inequality in latin america. Technical report, Policy Research Working Paper 4487.

Guerguil, M., Mandon, P., and Tapsoba, R. (2017). Flexible fiscal rules and countercyclical fiscal policy. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 52:189–220.

Guichard, S., Kennedy, M., Wurzel, E., and André, C. (2007). What promotes fiscal consolidation: Oecd country experiences. Technical report, OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 553.

Hallerberg, M., Strauch, R., and von Hagen, J. (2009). *Fiscal Governance in Europe.* Cambridge University Press.

Hanushek, E. and Wobmann, L. (2010). Education and economic growth. In *International Encyclopedia of Education*, volume 2, page 245–252.

Hartwig, J. and Sturm, J.-E. (2019). Do fiscal rules breed inequality? first evidence for the eu. *Economics Bulletin*, 39(2):1508–1515.

Iara, A. and Wolff, G. B. (2014). Rules and risk in the euro area. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 34:222–236.

Jha, S. K. (1996). The kuznets curve: A reassessment. *World Development*, 24(4):773–780.

Jordà, (2005). Estimation and inference of impulse responses by local projections. *American economic review*, 95(1):161–182.

Jordà, and Taylor, A. M. (2016). The time for austerity: estimating the average treatment effect of fiscal policy. *The Economic Journal*, 126(590):219–255.

Joumard, I., Pisu, M., and Bloch, D. (2012). Less income inequality and more growth – are they compatible? part 3. income redistribution via taxes and transfers across oecd countries. Technical report, OECD Economic Department Working Paper No. 926.

Jung, H. and Kim, B. H. (2021). Fiscal rules and income inequality: The case of oecd countries. *FinanzArchiv: Public Finance Analysis*, 77(2):197–224.

Jędrzejczak, A. and Pekasiewicz, D. (2020). Changes in income distribution for different family types in poland. *International Advances in Economic Research*, 26(2):135–146.

Kumar, M. et al. (2009). Fiscal rules—anchoring expectations for sustainable public finances. *IMF staff paper*.

Lledó, V., Yoon, S., Fang, X., Mbaye, S., and Kim, Y. (2017). Fiscal rules at a glance. Technical report, International Monetary Fund.

Loury, G. (1981). Intergenerational transfers and the distribution of earnings. *Econometrica*, 49(4):843–867.

Lustig, N. et al. (2011). Fiscal policy and income distribution in latin america: Challenging the conventional wisdom. Technical report, Tulane Economics Working Paper 1124.

Lustig, N., Lopez-Calva, L. F., and Ortiz-Juarez, E. (2013). Declining inequality in latin america in the 2000s: The cases of argentina, brazil, and mexico. *World development*, 44:129–141.

Manasse, P. and Turrini, A. (2001). Trade, wagesand 'superstars'. *Journal of International Economics*, 54(1):97–117.

Martinez-Vazquez, J., Moreno-Dodson, B., and Vulovic, V. (2012). The impact of tax and expenditure policies on income distribution: Evidence from a large panel of countries. *Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Research Paper Series*, (12-30).

Maurizio, R. (2015). Transitions to formality and declining inequality: Argentina and brazil in the 2000s. *Development and Change*, 46(5):1047–1079.

Milesi-Ferretti, G. M. (2003). Good, bad, or ugly? on the effects of fiscal rules with creative accounting. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(1):377–94.

Munch, J. R. and Skaksen, J. R. (2008). Human capital and wages in exporting firms. *Journal of International Economics*, 75(2):363–372.

Neyapti, B. (2013). Fiscal decentralization, fiscal rules and fiscal discipline. *Econ. Lett.*, 121(3):528–532.

OECD (2007). *OECD Economic Surveys: France 2007*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2017). *Multi-Dimensional Review of Panama: Volume 1. Initial Assessment*. OECD Publishing, Paris.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2011). *Divided We Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising*. Paris.

Owyang, M. T., Ramey, V. A., and Zubairy, S. (2013). Are government spending multipliers greater during periods of slack? evidence from twentieth-century historical data. *American Economic Review*, 103(3):129–134.

Paukkeri, T., Ravaska, T., and Riihelä, M. (2023). Inequality in finland: 1987–2021.

Paulus, A. et al. (2009). The effects of taxes and benefits on income distribution in the enlarged eu. *EUROMOD Working Paper*, (8/09).

Peletier, B., Dur, R., and Swank, O. (1999). Voting on the budget deficit: Comment. *American Economic Review*, 89(5):1377–1381.

Piketty, T. (1997). The dynamics of the wealth distribution and the interest rate with credit rationing. *Review of Economic Studies*, 64:173–189.

Ramey, V. A. (2016). Macroeconomic shocks and their propagation. In Taylor, J. and Uhlig, H., editors, *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, volume 2, page 71–162. Elsevier.

Ramey, V. A. and Zubairy, S. (2018). Government spending multipliers in good times and in bad: evidence from us historical data. *Journal of political economy*, 126(2):850–901.

Rodrik, D. (1997). Where did all the growth go? external shocks, social conflict and growth collapses. Mimeo.

Rodrik, D. (2000). Institutions for high-quality growth: what they are and how to acquire them. *Studies in comparative international development*, 35:3–31.

Sampson, T. (2014). Selection into trade and wage inequality. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 6(3):157–202.

Schachter, M. A. et al. (2012). Fiscal rules in response to the crisis: Toward the "next-generation"rules: A new dataset. Technical report, International Monetary Fund.

Solt, F. (2020). Measuring income inequality across countries and over time: The standardized world income inequality database. *Social Science Quarterly*, 101(3):1183–1199.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2016). Inequality and economic growth.

Taps, R. (2012). Do national numerical fiscal rules really shape fiscal behaviors in developing countries? a treatment effect evaluation. *Economic Modelling*, 29:1356–1369.

Ulloa-Suárez, C. (2021). Can fiscal rules affect income inequality?

UNCTAD (2019). *Trade Policies for Combating Inequality*. United Nations Publications, New York.

Verhoog, E. (2008). Trade, quality upgrading and wage inequality in the mexican manufacturing sector. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2):489–530.

Woo, J., Bova, E., Kinda, T., and Zhang, Y. S. (2017). Distributional consequences of fiscal adjustments: What do the data say? *IMF Economic Review*, 65(2):273–307.

Yeaple, S. (2005). A simple model of firm heterogeneity, international tradeand wages. *Journal of International Economics*, 65(1):1–20.

6 Appendix

6.1 Appendix A: Selected Countries

The definitions of emerging and advanced economies followed the IMF division.

Emerging Economies

Albania	Algeria	Angola	Argentina
Armenia	Aruba	Azerbaijan	Bahrain
Bangladesh	Barbados	Belarus	Belize
Benin	Bhutan	Botswana	Brazil
Brunei Darussalam	Bulgaria	Burkina Faso	Burundi
Cabo Verde	Cameroon	Chad	Chile
China	Colombia	Comoros	Costa Rica
Djibouti	Dominica	Dominican Republic	Ecuador
Egypt	El Salvador	Equatorial Guinea	Eswatini
Ethiopia	Fiji	Gabon	Georgia
Ghana	Grenada	Guatemala	Guinea
Guinea-Bissau	Haiti	Honduras	Hungary
India	Indonesia	Iraq	Jamaica
Jordan	Kazakhstan	Kenya	Kuwait
Lebanon	Lesotho	Liberia	Madagascar
Malawi	Malaysia	Maldives	Mali
Mauritania	Mauritius	Mexico	Mongolia
Montenegro	Morocco	Mozambique	Myanmar
Namibia	Nepal	Nicaragua	Niger
Nigeria	North Macedonia	Oman	Pakistan
Panama	Paraguay	Peru	Poland
Philippines	Qatar	Romania	Rwanda
Saudi Arabia	Senegal	Serbia	Seychelles
Sierra Leone	South Africa	Sri Lanka	Sudan
Suriname	Tajikistan	Thailand	Togo
Trinidad and Tobago	Tunisia	Turkmenistan	Uganda
Ukraine	Uruguay	Uzbekistan	Yemen
Zambia	Zimbabwe		

Advanced Economies

Australia	Austria	Belgium	Canada
Croatia	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark
Estonia	Finland	France	Germany
Greece	Iceland	Ireland	Israel
Italy	Japan	Latvia	Lithuania
Luxembourg	Malta	New Zealand	Norway
Portugal	Singapore	Slovenia	Spain
Sweden	Switzerland	United Kingdom	

6.2 Appendix B: Empirical Studies Review

Table 3 – Empirical Studies on the Determinants of Income inequality

Authors	Objective	Sample	Conclusions
Hailemariam; Sakutukwa and Dzhumashev (2021)	Investigate the main determinants of income inequality using the Local Projections and Vector Autoregressive methods.	OECD countries from 1870 to 2016.	Income inequality is negatively associated with government spending and educationand positively with GDP per capita, with significance in all cases.
Coady and Dizioli (2017)	Present new results on the impacts of education on income inequality through a dynamic panel with Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Seemingly Unrelated Regressions (SURE).	Advanced and emerging countries with Gini index in five-year intervals from 1980 to 2010.	The results indicate a large, positive, statistically significant relationship between educational inequality and income inequality, especially in emerging and developing economies.
Bergh and Nilsson (2010)	Investigate the effects of economic freedom and globalization on income inequality through a dynamic panel with Generalized Method of Moments (GMM).	Various countries from 1970 to 2005.	International trade freedom and deregulation tend to increase income inequality, with more pronounced effects in richer countries. Social globalization also increases income inequality, but this effect is more evident in middle- and low-income countries.
Dorn, Clemens and Potrafke (2018)	Reexamine the effects of globalization on income inequality through a dynamic panel with OLS and another dynamic panel with two-stage least squares (2SLS) estimation.	140 countries from 1970-2014	Emerging countries showed a significant, positive relationship, while advanced ones did not demonstrate significance.

Doumbia and Kinda (2019)	Evaluate if a government can reduce income inequality by altering the composition of public spending, keeping total expenditure constant, through a dynamic panel of fixed effects.	83 countries from different income groups.	Affirms that reallocating spending to social protection and infrastructure can reduce income inequality. In countries with weak institutions and high conflict risk, reducing defense spending to finance infrastructure and social programs does not improve income distribution. When social protection and infrastructure spending are reallocated to other areas, income inequality tends to increase.
Anderson, Jalles D'Orey, Duvendack and Esposito (2017)	Explore the effects of government spending on income inequality through a meta-regression.	Focusing on low- and middle-income countries, the work uses a sample of 84 separate studies and over 900 estimates of the effects of various spending measures.	Results suggest a moderate negative relationship between government spending and income inequality, with more pronounced effects for social spending.

| Muinelo-Gallo and Roca-Sagalés (2013) | Analyze the effects of economic growth through fiscal policies on income inequality, using SURE and Simultaneous Equations models. | High-income OECD countries for the period from 1972 to 2006. | The results show that distributive spending and direct taxes can result in significant reductions in income inequality. Lastly, the results indicate that the most appropriate fiscal policy strategy in a context of fiscal consolidation is to reduce non-distributive spending, as this can increase GDP growth and, at the same time, reduce income inequality. |

Table 4 – Empirical Studies on Fiscal Rules and Income inequality

Authors	Objective	Sample	Conclusions
Ulloa-Suarez (2021)	Analyzes the impact of implementing Fiscal Rules (FR) on Income inequality (DR) using the Synthetic Control Method.	Four Latin American countries (Brazil, Chile, Colombiaand Mexico) for the period from 1980 to 2014.	Implementing FR does not increase DR, regardless of the measures used. Analysis of the rules in each country shows that compliance with the existing economic context is crucial and avoids undesirable social effects.
Hartwig and Sturm (2019)	Explore whether FR have side effects, such as a reduction in social spending, using the Dynamic Panel Method with Fixed Effects.	European Union countries for the period from 1975 to 2012.	The application of strict FR is associated with an increase in DR.
Combes et al. (2019)	Investigate countries that adopted or did not adopt FR to analyze the effects on DR using the Propensity Score Method.	84 developing countries for the period from 1990 to 2015.	Implementing FR is associated with a reduction in DR in certain cases. Balance Budget and Debt Rules consistently decrease DR, while spending rules increase it. Additionally, the effects of FR on DR vary depending on structural factors.

6.3   Appendix C: Debt Rule Models Results

Table 5 – Debt Rule Model Results for Advanced Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Debt Rule (Shock)	0.182	0.108	0.134	0.040	0.016	0.119	0.158	0.226	0.327	0.540**
	(0.129)	(0.216)	(0.371)	(0.463)	(0.472)	(0.397)	(0.407)	(0.316)	(0.248)	(0.217)
Expenditure Rules	−0.004	−0.072*	−0.200***	−0.350***	−0.485***	−0.622***	−0.752***	−0.847***	−0.917***	−0.891***
	(0.021)	(0.042)	(0.076)	(0.110)	(0.135)	(0.161)	(0.188)	(0.193)	(0.199)	(0.270)
Revenue Rules	0.119***	0.212**	0.264**	0.327**	0.405**	0.477**	0.573**	0.684***	0.698***	0.644***
	(0.045)	(0.084)	(0.127)	(0.160)	(0.191)	(0.231)	(0.232)	(0.201)	(0.202)	(0.176)
Budget Balance Rules	0.141***	0.268***	0.309**	0.275	0.190	0.091	0.033	0.073	0.196	0.332
	(0.044)	(0.093)	(0.140)	(0.174)	(0.203)	(0.244)	(0.280)	(0.303)	(0.337)	(0.337)
Education	−0.007	0.063	0.112	0.129	0.093	0.087	0.139	0.230	0.458	0.928*
	(0.101)	(0.215)	(0.319)	(0.368)	(0.373)	(0.360)	(0.332)	(0.368)	(0.445)	(0.499)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.002**	−0.004***	−0.006***	−0.006**	−0.006	−0.006	−0.005	−0.004	−0.008	−0.013**
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)
KOF Index	0.006	0.011	0.019	0.027	0.035	0.037	0.032	0.014	−0.019	−0.049*
	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.029)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.411*	−0.827*	−1.138*	−1.234	−1.083	−0.538	0.505	1.398	1.836	1.831
	(0.229)	(0.488)	(0.676)	(0.750)	(0.768)	(0.943)	(1.202)	(1.505)	(1.644)	(1.600)
Expenditures	0.011***	0.018**	0.027*	0.035**	0.045***	0.048***	0.044***	0.036*	0.031	0.021
	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.021)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 6 – Debt Rule Model Results for Emerging Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Debt Rule (Shock)	0.019	0.029	0.096	0.123	0.143	0.164	0.204	0.208	0.098	0.050
	(0.048)	(0.088)	(0.118)	(0.127)	(0.155)	(0.181)	(0.222)	(0.249)	(0.212)	(0.205)
Expenditure Rules	−0.044	−0.077	−0.120	−0.176	−0.186	−0.132	−0.061	0.048	0.185	0.408*
	(0.053)	(0.096)	(0.130)	(0.151)	(0.144)	(0.103)	(0.101)	(0.124)	(0.198)	(0.218)
Revenue Rules	0.175***	0.366***	0.550***	0.708***	0.843***	0.958***	1.032***	1.110***	1.230***	1.349***
	(0.044)	(0.082)	(0.127)	(0.162)	(0.185)	(0.225)	(0.234)	(0.217)	(0.218)	(0.192)
Budget Balance Rules	−0.231***	−0.461***	−0.687***	−0.861***	−0.959***	−1.034***	−1.063***	−1.060***	−1.047***	−1.025***
	(0.030)	(0.049)	(0.084)	(0.124)	(0.150)	(0.183)	(0.203)	(0.205)	(0.201)	(0.159)
Education	0.148***	0.274***	0.379**	0.436**	0.463	0.428	0.382	0.312	0.265	0.245
	(0.044)	(0.093)	(0.150)	(0.216)	(0.287)	(0.347)	(0.389)	(0.393)	(0.380)	(0.375)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.001	−0.003**	−0.007***	−0.010***	−0.013***	−0.017***	−0.021***	−0.024***	−0.028***	−0.032***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
KOF Index	0.008	0.006	−0.004	−0.015	−0.019	−0.0003	0.023	0.041	0.057	0.054
	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.027)	(0.036)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.043)	(0.036)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.220	−0.426	−0.660	−0.866	−0.889	−1.014	−1.193	−1.199	−1.229	−0.985
	(0.174)	(0.362)	(0.529)	(0.620)	(0.693)	(0.861)	(1.070)	(1.230)	(1.336)	(1.238)
Expenditures	−0.005	−0.010	−0.016	−0.021	−0.021	−0.018	−0.018	−0.017	−0.019	−0.022
	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.036)	(0.036)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

6.4 Appendix D: Budget Balance Rules Models Results

Table 7 – Budget Balance Rules Model Results for Advanced Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	$h=1$	$h=2$	$h=3$	$h=4$	$h=5$	$h=6$	$h=7$	$h=8$	$h=9$	$h=10$
Budget Balance Rules (Shock)	0,197	0,364**	0,652**	0,716***	0,717***	0,522**	0,265	0,198	0,155	0,287
	(0,119)	(0,182)	(0,269)	(0,232)	(0,244)	(0,209)	(0,286)	(0,271)	(0,252)	(0,275)
Debt Rule	0,079	0,109	0,158	0,261	0,414	0,650	0,811	0,906	0,965*	0,907*
	(0,071)	(0,168)	(0,298)	(0,390)	(0,456)	(0,509)	(0,542)	(0,564)	(0,582)	(0,546)
Revenue Rules	0,123***	0,215***	0,265**	0,318**	0,381**	0,432*	0,512**	0,607***	0,605***	0,564***
	(0,042)	(0,081)	(0,126)	(0,160)	(0,190)	(0,227)	(0,226)	(0,198)	(0,213)	(0,186)
Expenditure Rules	−0,003	−0,065	−0,199**	−0,364***	−0,523***	−0,689***	−0,836***	−0,931***	−0,984***	−0,934***
	(0,022)	(0,050)	(0,090)	(0,123)	(0,141)	(0,163)	(0,188)	(0,197)	(0,202)	(0,269)
Education	−0,035	−0,015	0,027	0,063	0,077	0,145	0,254	0,365	0,577	1,015**
	(0,105)	(0,224)	(0,335)	(0,388)	(0,391)	(0,366)	(0,315)	(0,337)	(0,409)	(0,459)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0,002**	−0,004***	−0,006***	−0,006**	−0,006	−0,006	−0,004	−0,003	−0,007	−0,012*
	(0,001)	(0,002)	(0,002)	(0,003)	(0,004)	(0,004)	(0,005)	(0,005)	(0,005)	(0,006)
KOF Index	0,005	0,012	0,019	0,021	0,018	0,006	−0,010	−0,034	−0,066	−0,091*
	(0,011)	(0,023)	(0,036)	(0,045)	(0,048)	(0,051)	(0,053)	(0,052)	(0,051)	(0,047)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0,502**	−0,992**	−1,367**	−1,542***	−1,497***	−1,139	−0,255	0,481	0,759	0,761
	(0,206)	(0,412)	(0,543)	(0,554)	(0,556)	(0,767)	(1,019)	(1,286)	(1,316)	(1,153)
Expenditures	0,010**	0,018*	0,026*	0,033*	0,041**	0,043***	0,037**	0,028	0,023	0,014
	(0,004)	(0,010)	(0,015)	(0,017)	(0,017)	(0,016)	(0,015)	(0,017)	(0,019)	(0,019)

Note: $^*p<0,1$; $^{**}p<0,05$; $^{***}p<0,01$

Table 8 – Budget Balance Rules Model Results for Emerging Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	$h=1$	$h=2$	$h=3$	$h=4$	$h=5$	$h=6$	$h=7$	$h=8$	$h=9$	$h=10$
Budget Balance Rules (Shock)	−0.006	−0.018	−0.108	−0.261	−0.331**	−0.440***	−0.513***	−0.530***	−0.556***	−0.523**
	(0.072)	(0.105)	(0.127)	(0.161)	(0.144)	(0.165)	(0.174)	(0.197)	(0.205)	(0.207)
Debt Rule	0.043	0.112	0.212	0.322	0.417*	0.469**	0.463**	0.426**	0.343*	0.290
	(0.059)	(0.118)	(0.169)	(0.210)	(0.230)	(0.226)	(0.211)	(0.202)	(0.176)	(0.181)
Revenue Rules	−0.022	−0.063	−0.125	−0.190	−0.221	−0.219	−0.174	−0.087	0.093	0.257
	(0.046)	(0.096)	(0.145)	(0.187)	(0.213)	(0.216)	(0.205)	(0.182)	(0.147)	(0.173)
Expenditure Rules	−0.082*	−0.154*	−0.246**	−0.348**	−0.389***	−0.355***	−0.306**	−0.227	−0.095	0.106
	(0.046)	(0.087)	(0.122)	(0.146)	(0.143)	(0.128)	(0.145)	(0.208)	(0.285)	(0.291)
Education	0.068	0.111	0.146	0.151	0.139	0.077	0.035	−0.013	−0.036	−0.010
	(0.045)	(0.094)	(0.155)	(0.224)	(0.301)	(0.369)	(0.419)	(0.439)	(0.448)	(0.440)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.001**	−0.004***	−0.008***	−0.013***	−0.016***	−0.020***	−0.024***	−0.026***	−0.030***	−0.033***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
KOF Index	0.002	−0.005	−0.019	−0.028	−0.030	−0.014	0.005	0.020	0.035	0.028
	(0.008)	(0.020)	(0.033)	(0.043)	(0.050)	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.047)	(0.038)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.188	−0.371	−0.554	−0.755	−0.813	−1.001	−1.293	−1.455	−1.570	−1.228
	(0.177)	(0.375)	(0.541)	(0.620)	(0.646)	(0.808)	(1.041)	(1.294)	(1.499)	(1.477)
Expenditures	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.007	0.011	0.009	0.004	−0.001	−0.011
	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.035)	(0.036)

Note: $^*p<0.1$; $^{**}p<0.05$; $^{***}p<0.01$

6.5 Appendix E: Expenditure Rules Models Results

Table 9 – Expenditure Rules Model Results for Advanced Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Expenditure Rules (Shock)	0.144***	0.259***	0.283***	0.251***	0.214***	0.100	−0.033	−0.230	−0.375*	−0.421
	(0.042)	(0.050)	(0.031)	(0.049)	(0.050)	(0.091)	(0.143)	(0.210)	(0.214)	(0.316)
Debt Rule	−0.090	−0.209	−0.233	−0.018	0.353	0.852	1.165**	1.314***	1.262***	0.972***
	(0.085)	(0.202)	(0.332)	(0.458)	(0.540)	(0.580)	(0.535)	(0.482)	(0.428)	(0.366)
Revenue Rules	0.139***	0.239***	0.280**	0.310**	0.339**	0.329*	0.333*	0.362**	0.329**	0.307**
	(0.051)	(0.092)	(0.126)	(0.143)	(0.158)	(0.186)	(0.178)	(0.161)	(0.164)	(0.153)
Budget Balance Rules	0.203***	0.362***	0.374**	0.199	−0.097	−0.458	−0.681**	−0.699***	−0.530**	−0.212
	(0.057)	(0.116)	(0.181)	(0.247)	(0.292)	(0.328)	(0.311)	(0.247)	(0.223)	(0.229)
Education	0.016	0.066	0.083	0.075	0.007	−0.041	−0.012	0.145	0.400	0.855**
	(0.088)	(0.200)	(0.309)	(0.371)	(0.397)	(0.407)	(0.376)	(0.368)	(0.411)	(0.417)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.002**	−0.005***	−0.007***	−0.008***	−0.010***	−0.010**	−0.009**	−0.008*	−0.012**	−0.016***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)
KOF Index	0.007	0.013	0.018	0.011	0.0004	−0.018	−0.033	−0.053	−0.080	−0.096**
	(0.011)	(0.024)	(0.035)	(0.045)	(0.049)	(0.053)	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.051)	(0.047)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.325	−0.644	−0.974	−1.325*	−1.593***	−1.705***	−1.273**	−0.932	−0.713	−0.404
	(0.233)	(0.501)	(0.680)	(0.700)	(0.606)	(0.513)	(0.641)	(1.027)	(1.242)	(1.331)
Expenditures	0.011**	0.020**	0.030**	0.039**	0.049***	0.053***	0.051***	0.046***	0.044***	0.034**
	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.016)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 10 – Expenditure Rules Model Results for Emerging Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Expenditure Rules (Shock)	0.011	0.105	0.195	0.077	−0.006	−0.071	−0.145	−0.197	−0.344	−0.083
	(0.059)	(0.107)	(0.118)	(0.122)	(0.141)	(0.179)	(0.300)	(0.366)	(0.356)	(0.298)
Debt Rule	0.170***	0.373***	0.614***	0.806***	0.970***	1.070***	1.078***	1.031***	0.919***	0.827***
	(0.052)	(0.094)	(0.119)	(0.140)	(0.160)	(0.179)	(0.201)	(0.219)	(0.225)	(0.249)
Revenue Rules	0.086**	0.165*	0.222*	0.269	0.302	0.352	0.409	0.485**	0.617***	0.745***
	(0.041)	(0.087)	(0.133)	(0.168)	(0.195)	(0.233)	(0.248)	(0.240)	(0.231)	(0.211)
Budget Balance Rules	−0.295***	−0.603***	−0.922***	−1.158***	−1.308***	−1.414***	−1.433***	−1.393***	−1.320***	−1.254***
	(0.031)	(0.040)	(0.072)	(0.114)	(0.145)	(0.183)	(0.205)	(0.205)	(0.192)	(0.146)
Education	0.133***	0.240**	0.323*	0.368	0.386	0.331	0.266	0.199	0.167	0.184
	(0.049)	(0.103)	(0.175)	(0.251)	(0.335)	(0.414)	(0.471)	(0.483)	(0.476)	(0.447)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.001	−0.003**	−0.007***	−0.010***	−0.013***	−0.017***	−0.020***	−0.023***	−0.027***	−0.030***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)
KOF Index	0.008	0.006	−0.003	−0.012	−0.013	0.005	0.029	0.046	0.058	0.049
	(0.007)	(0.016)	(0.028)	(0.037)	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.045)	(0.046)	(0.045)	(0.040)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.237	−0.470	−0.732	−0.984	−1.060	−1.203	−1.398	−1.449	−1.595	−1.424
	(0.170)	(0.358)	(0.522)	(0.608)	(0.663)	(0.814)	(1.015)	(1.211)	(1.372)	(1.330)
Expenditures	−0.004	−0.007	−0.011	−0.015	−0.013	−0.009	−0.008	−0.008	−0.010	−0.015
	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.033)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

6.6 Appendix F: Revenue Rules Models Results

Table 11 – Revenue Rules Model Results for Advanced Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Revenue Rules (Shock)	0.129**	0.289**	0.296*	0.280	0.378*	0.492***	0.415**	0.431***	0.405**	0.390**
	(0.052)	(0.128)	(0.158)	(0.197)	(0.197)	(0.175)	(0.167)	(0.158)	(0.164)	(0.166)
Debt Rule	−0.058	−0.112	−0.052	0.226	0.661	1.207**	1.531***	1.632***	1.509***	1.178***
	(0.095)	(0.218)	(0.354)	(0.469)	(0.537)	(0.582)	(0.541)	(0.481)	(0.433)	(0.387)
Budget Balance Rules	0.200***	0.348***	0.354*	0.176	−0.124	−0.483*	−0.688***	−0.684***	−0.488**	−0.163
	(0.062)	(0.124)	(0.185)	(0.241)	(0.267)	(0.288)	(0.262)	(0.203)	(0.204)	(0.235)
Expenditure Rules	0.0004	−0.061	−0.187**	−0.349***	−0.503***	−0.662***	−0.792***	−0.862***	−0.899***	−0.853***
	(0.022)	(0.046)	(0.087)	(0.120)	(0.136)	(0.157)	(0.189)	(0.217)	(0.226)	(0.282)
Education	−0.008	0.031	0.059	0.048	−0.025	−0.062	−0.007	0.087	0.334	0.825
	(0.094)	(0.209)	(0.316)	(0.366)	(0.374)	(0.357)	(0.345)	(0.403)	(0.477)	(0.519)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.002**	−0.004***	−0.005***	−0.006**	−0.006	−0.005	−0.004	−0.003	−0.007	−0.012**
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)
KOF Index	0.008	0.015	0.023	0.022	0.015	−0.003	−0.021	−0.045	−0.074	−0.093**
	(0.011)	(0.024)	(0.036)	(0.044)	(0.048)	(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.050)	(0.047)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.367	−0.750	−1.127	−1.484**	−1.780***	−1.895***	−1.328**	−0.719	−0.235	0.152
	(0.262)	(0.548)	(0.734)	(0.743)	(0.590)	(0.442)	(0.636)	(1.001)	(1.142)	(1.200)
Expenditures	0.011**	0.019*	0.027*	0.034*	0.041**	0.042**	0.036**	0.028*	0.024	0.017
	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.018)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 12 – Revenue Rules Model Results for Emerging Economies

	$\Delta_h Gini_{i,t-1}$									
	h = 1	h = 2	h = 3	h = 4	h = 5	h = 6	h = 7	h = 8	h = 9	h = 10
Revenue Rules (Shock)	−0.021	−0.052	0.019	0.050	0.033	0.068	0.026	−0.042	0.073	0.095
	(0.061)	(0.100)	(0.166)	(0.226)	(0.278)	(0.331)	(0.337)	(0.320)	(0.336)	(0.357)
Debt Rule	0.181***	0.397***	0.642***	0.842***	1.016***	1.125***	1.143***	1.119***	1.037***	0.989***
	(0.053)	(0.094)	(0.124)	(0.146)	(0.166)	(0.179)	(0.193)	(0.203)	(0.205)	(0.217)
Budget Balance Rules	−0.286***	−0.582***	−0.889***	−1.121***	−1.270***	−1.379***	−1.395***	−1.355***	−1.286***	−1.225***
	(0.032)	(0.036)	(0.061)	(0.102)	(0.129)	(0.167)	(0.190)	(0.196)	(0.189)	(0.159)
Expenditure Rules	−0.051	−0.087	−0.138	−0.210*	−0.238**	−0.204**	−0.136	−0.025	0.120	0.348
	(0.048)	(0.081)	(0.102)	(0.119)	(0.109)	(0.087)	(0.113)	(0.166)	(0.232)	(0.237)
Education	0.116**	0.205**	0.275*	0.313	0.332	0.275	0.203	0.112	0.048	0.044
	(0.046)	(0.098)	(0.164)	(0.235)	(0.313)	(0.380)	(0.424)	(0.433)	(0.428)	(0.406)
Lagged Central Government Debt	−0.001	−0.003**	−0.007***	−0.010***	−0.013***	−0.017***	−0.021***	−0.023***	−0.028***	−0.031***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
KOF Index	0.008	0.006	−0.003	−0.013	−0.015	0.001	0.024	0.041	0.053	0.046
	(0.007)	(0.016)	(0.027)	(0.036)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.035)
Ln GDP per Capita	−0.243	−0.486	−0.760	−1.015*	−1.091*	−1.250*	−1.490	−1.590	−1.817	−1.634
	(0.163)	(0.341)	(0.496)	(0.567)	(0.602)	(0.736)	(0.931)	(1.145)	(1.322)	(1.288)
Expenditures	−0.003	−0.005	−0.009	−0.011	−0.009	−0.006	−0.006	−0.007	−0.012	−0.018
	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.029)	(0.035)	(0.035)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

6.7 Appendix G: Database Descriptive Statistics

Table 13 – Description of Advanced Economies Variables

Variable	Mín.	1st Quartile	Median	Average	Maximum	3rd Quartile
Expenditure Rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.45	1.00	1.00
Revenue Rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.00
Budget Balance Rules	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.84	1.00	1.00
Debt Rule	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.66	1.00	1.00
Gini Index	22.00	26.50	29.90	29.92	39.30	32.90
Central Government Debt (% GDP)	0.82	28.45	48.72	57.13	199.91	80.48
Education (Years of Schooling)	6.66	10.53	11.46	11.32	13.30	12.48
KOF Index	48.39	75.58	80.70	79.33	90.81	85.06
Expenditures (% GDP)	24.26	39.24	44.75	44.71	66.82	49.90
GDP per Capita (Millions of USD)	8969.00	28946.00	38593.00	40115.00	96812.00	46632.00

Table 14 – Description of Emerging Economies Variables

Variable	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	Average	Maximum	3rd Quartile
Expenditure Rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.15	1.00	0.00
Revenue Rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	1.00	0.00
Budget Balance Rules	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.52	1.00	1.00
Debt Rule	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.45	1.00	1.00
Gini Index	23.70	38.00	42.10	42.21	67.10	46.40
Central Government Debt (% GDP)	0.29	26.44	42.69	52.01	658.22	64.11
Education (Years of Schooling)	0.66	4.58	6.89	6.71	11.75	8.72
KOF Index	22.47	43.70	52.18	52.66	85.40	61.63
Expenditures (% GDP)	5.40	18.74	25.03	26.06	141.50	32.00
GDP per Capita (Million of USD)	289.20	2989.40	7985.00	11510.90	120747.90	13577.00