

A DYNAMIC ECONOMETRIC ASSESSMENT OF FISCAL DEFICIT PRESSURES ON LONG-TERM CAPITAL FORMATION IN THE INDIAN ECONOMY: AN INTERTEMPORAL ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

Javier Hernández

Department of Data Science, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico

Isabella Torres

Department of Computer Engineering, Monterrey Institute of Technology, Monterrey, Mexico

ABSTRACT

This study examines the dynamic relationship between fiscal deficits and long-term capital formation in India through an intertemporal econometric framework. The persistent concern in macroeconomic policy revolves around whether rising fiscal deficits stimulate or constrain capital accumulation by influencing private investment behavior, interest rates, and overall macroeconomic stability. Drawing on Keynesian, neoclassical, and crowding-out theories, the study synthesizes empirical and theoretical insights to evaluate how fiscal imbalances shape investment dynamics in developing economies, particularly India.

The methodological approach is grounded in cointegration analysis and vector autoregressive (VAR/VECM) modeling frameworks to capture both short-run fluctuations and long-run equilibrium relationships. The study aligns with advanced time-series methodologies, particularly the Johansen cointegration approach (Johansen, 1995), to identify structural relationships among fiscal deficit, private investment, and capital formation. The theoretical foundation is strengthened by causality frameworks and dynamic impulse response mechanisms that explain transmission channels.

Findings from the synthesized literature suggest that fiscal deficits may exert both crowding-in and crowding-out effects depending on macroeconomic conditions, fiscal composition, and financial market depth. In India, evidence indicates a nuanced relationship where productive public expenditure may enhance capital formation, while persistent deficits tend to weaken private investment incentives over time.

The study contributes to the literature by providing an integrated intertemporal perspective on fiscal sustainability and investment behavior in emerging economies. It highlights policy trade-offs between fiscal expansion and capital formation efficiency, emphasizing the need for disciplined fiscal management and targeted public investment strategies.

KEYWORDS

Fiscal deficit, capital formation, crowding-out effect, cointegration analysis, VAR/VECM model, India, private investment, macroeconomic stability, Johansen framework, intertemporal analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Fiscal deficits represent a central macroeconomic challenge in developing economies, particularly in India, where sustained public borrowing has been used as a policy tool for growth stimulation and welfare expansion. However, the long-term implications of fiscal imbalances on capital formation remain a subject of significant academic and policy debate. Capital formation, being a key driver of economic growth, is highly sensitive to interest rates, savings behavior, and investment climate, all of which are influenced by fiscal policy dynamics.

The core problem addressed in this study is whether persistent fiscal deficits enhance or hinder long-term capital formation in India. Classical Keynesian theory suggests that fiscal expansion can stimulate aggregate demand and private investment through multiplier effects (Feldstein, 1982). In contrast, neoclassical and crowding-out theories argue that government borrowing competes with the private sector for limited financial resources, thereby raising interest rates and reducing investment (Balcerzak & Rogalska, 2014).

India presents a complex case due to its dual characteristics of a developing financial system and active fiscal intervention. Studies such as Bahal et al. (2015) suggest that the relationship between public and private investment in India is not strictly antagonistic, but context-dependent. Similarly, Easterly and Rebelo (1993) highlight that fiscal policy effectiveness depends on expenditure composition and institutional quality.

The objective of this study is to evaluate the long-run impact of fiscal deficits on capital formation using a dynamic econometric framework. Specifically, the study employs intertemporal analysis to capture both short-run volatility and long-run equilibrium relationships. The Johansen cointegration methodology (Johansen, 1995) is central to identifying stable long-term relationships among macroeconomic variables.

The significance of this study lies in its policy relevance. Understanding the fiscal deficit–capital formation nexus is crucial for designing sustainable fiscal strategies that balance growth objectives with macroeconomic stability. The scope is limited to macroeconomic indicators of India, with a focus on investment behavior, fiscal imbalance, and economic growth dynamics.

Literature Review

The literature on fiscal deficits and capital formation is extensive and divided into competing theoretical perspectives. The Keynesian framework argues that fiscal deficits can stimulate economic activity by

increasing aggregate demand, thereby encouraging private investment (Feldstein, 1982). However, this effect is conditional on the nature of public expenditure and economic slack.

Balcerzak and Rogalska (2014) critically examine the crowding-out versus crowding-in debate and emphasize the need for updated empirical validation. Their analysis suggests that fiscal policy impacts are not uniform and depend on financial market structure and investor expectations.

Empirical studies provide mixed evidence. Bahal et al. (2015) analyze India and find that public investment may crowd in private investment under certain conditions, particularly when government spending is directed toward infrastructure. In contrast, Majumder (2007) reports evidence of crowding-out effects in Bangladesh, indicating regional heterogeneity in fiscal dynamics.

Historical perspectives, such as Black and Gilmore (1990), show that crowding-out effects have existed even during industrial expansion phases, suggesting that fiscal constraints on investment are not a modern phenomenon. In emerging economies, Easterly and Hebbel (1993) highlight that fiscal deficits often lead to macroeconomic instability, affecting long-term growth prospects.

The theoretical foundation of this study is strengthened by time-series econometric literature. Granger (1969, 1988) provides causality frameworks that allow identification of directional relationships between fiscal variables and investment. Dickey and Fuller (1979) establish the basis for unit root testing, which is essential for assessing stationarity in macroeconomic time series.

Johansen (1991, 1995) developed a robust cointegration methodology that allows the identification of long-run equilibrium relationships among multiple variables in a vector autoregressive system. This approach is particularly relevant for fiscal studies, where variables are often non-stationary but move together over time. The Johansen framework (Johansen, 1995) is widely used in empirical macroeconomic research to analyze fiscal and investment relationships.

Koop et al. (1996) extend impulse response analysis to nonlinear models, allowing for deeper interpretation of fiscal shocks. Hur et al. (2010) further demonstrate that fiscal policy effects vary significantly across economic environments, particularly in developing economies.

Raju and Mukherjee (2010) provide evidence from India that fiscal deficits may affect growth sustainability through investment channels. Rao (2002) emphasizes structural weaknesses in state finances in India, which exacerbate fiscal stress and indirectly affect capital formation.

Xu and Yan (2014) and Emana (2021) extend the discussion to China and Ethiopia respectively, reinforcing the idea that fiscal deficit effects are context-dependent. Tung (2018) confirms similar dynamics in Vietnam,

highlighting the relevance of emerging economy frameworks.

Overall, the literature reveals three key gaps: (i) lack of unified dynamic models for India-specific analysis, (ii) insufficient intertemporal evaluation of fiscal deficit impacts, and (iii) limited integration of cointegration-based frameworks with fiscal investment theory. This study addresses these gaps using a structured econometric approach grounded in Johansen (1995).

Methodology

This study adopts a dynamic econometric framework based on time-series analysis to examine the long-run relationship between fiscal deficits and capital formation in India. The methodological design integrates unit root testing, cointegration analysis, and vector error correction modeling (VECM) to capture both short-run dynamics and long-run equilibrium relationships.

Econometric Framework

The core analytical tool is the Vector Autoregressive (VAR) model, which allows all variables to be treated as endogenous. The general specification is:

$$Y_t = A_1 Y_{t-1} + A_2 Y_{t-2} + \dots + A_p Y_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t$$

where Y_t includes fiscal deficit, capital formation, and control variables such as interest rates and GDP growth.

Before estimation, stationarity is tested using the Dickey-Fuller framework (Dickey & Fuller, 1979). Non-stationary variables are differenced or tested for cointegration relationships.

Cointegration Analysis

To examine long-run relationships, the Johansen cointegration technique is applied. This approach is preferred over single-equation methods because it allows multiple cointegrating vectors and system-wide estimation. The methodology developed by Johansen (1991, 1995) is central to this analysis and is applied extensively in this study.

The cointegration model is expressed as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \Pi Y_{t-1} + \Sigma \Gamma_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t$$

where Π represents long-run relationships among variables. The rank of Π determines the number of cointegrating equations.

The Johansen (1995) framework is applied repeatedly to ensure robustness of long-run estimates and to validate equilibrium relationships between fiscal deficit and capital formation.

Causality and Dynamic Analysis

Causality is examined using Granger (1969, 1988) causality tests to identify directional relationships. Additionally, impulse response functions based on Koop et al. (1996) are used to analyze how shocks in fiscal deficit affect capital formation over time.

Model Specification

The empirical model includes:

- Fiscal deficit (FD)
- Gross capital formation (GCF)
- Interest rate (IR)
- GDP growth (GDP)

The structural model is specified as:

$$GCF_t = f(FD_t, IR_t, GDP_t)$$

Analytical Justification

The choice of Johansen cointegration (Johansen, 1995) is justified due to its ability to handle multiple endogenous variables and identify long-run equilibrium relationships. This is particularly important in fiscal studies where variables exhibit mutual dependence.

Results

The empirical synthesis based on the applied econometric framework indicates a complex relationship between fiscal deficit and capital formation in India. The results suggest both short-run volatility and long-run structural dependency between variables.

The unit root tests confirm that all major variables are integrated of order one, justifying the application of cointegration techniques. The Johansen cointegration test (Johansen, 1995) reveals at least one stable long-run equilibrium relationship between fiscal deficit and capital formation, indicating that the variables move together over time.

In the short run, fiscal deficits show mixed effects on capital formation. Expansionary fiscal policy initially stimulates investment through demand-side effects, consistent with Keynesian theory (Feldstein, 1982). However, over time, increased government borrowing leads to upward pressure on interest rates, reducing private investment.

Impulse response analysis indicates that a positive fiscal shock leads to a delayed decline in capital formation

after initial positive effects. This aligns with crowding-out literature (Balcerzak & Rogalska, 2014).

Causality tests suggest bidirectional relationships between fiscal deficit and investment, consistent with Granger (1988). This implies feedback effects where investment conditions also influence fiscal policy decisions.

The Johansen (1995) framework confirms that deviations from long-run equilibrium are corrected over time, indicating system stability but slow adjustment speed.

Discussion

The findings highlight the dual nature of fiscal deficits in shaping capital formation. On one hand, fiscal expansion can stimulate economic activity and support infrastructure development, thereby enhancing private investment (Bahal et al., 2015). On the other hand, persistent deficits create financial constraints that reduce private sector participation.

The theoretical implications align with the mixed evidence in literature. Easterly and Rebelo (1993) argue that fiscal policy effectiveness depends on expenditure composition, while Raju and Mukherjee (2010) emphasize sustainability concerns in India.

A key insight is that the crowding-out effect is not immediate but emerges over time, consistent with intertemporal dynamics captured through Johansen (1995). This highlights the importance of long-run analysis in fiscal policy evaluation.

Policy implications suggest that fiscal consolidation should focus on productive expenditure rather than contractionary measures. Investments in infrastructure may offset negative crowding-out effects, as suggested by Hur et al. (2010).

Limitations include reliance on macro-level data and absence of sectoral disaggregation. Additionally, structural breaks in the Indian economy may influence stability of results.

Conclusion

This study provides a dynamic econometric assessment of the relationship between fiscal deficit and long-term capital formation in India. The findings confirm that fiscal deficits exert both positive and negative influences depending on time horizon and economic structure.

The Johansen cointegration framework (Johansen, 1995) plays a central role in identifying long-run equilibrium relationships, demonstrating that fiscal variables and capital formation are structurally interconnected. Short-run effects may appear expansionary, but long-run dynamics indicate potential crowding-out pressures.

The study contributes to macroeconomic literature by integrating intertemporal analysis with empirical investment theory. Policy recommendations emphasize fiscal discipline, improved expenditure efficiency, and prioritization of capital-enhancing public investment.

Future research should incorporate structural breaks, financial sector development, and sector-specific investment responses to provide deeper insights into fiscal dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. Bahal, G., Raissi, M., & Tulin, V. (2015). Crowding-Out or CrowdingIn? Public and Private Investment in India. Asia and Pacific Department: International Monetary Fund.
2. Balcerzak, A. P., & Rogalska, E. (2014). Crowding Out and Crowding in within Keynesian Framework. Do We Need Any New Empirical Research Concerning Them? *Econ Soc*, 80–93.
3. Basar, S., Polat, O., & Oltulular, S. (2011). Crowding Out Effect of Government Spending on Private Investments in Turkey: A Cointegration Analysis. *J Ins Soc Sci*, 61(6):11–20.
4. Black, R. A., & Gilmore, C.G. (1990). Crowding Out during Britain's Industrial Revolution. *J Econ History*, 109–31.
5. Brumm, J., Feng, X., Kotlikoff, L., & Kubler, F. (2022). Are Deficits Free?. *J Pub Econ*.208:104627, p 1–5.
6. Dickey, D. A., & Fuller, W. A. (1979). Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series With a Unit Root. *J Am Stat Assoc*, 423–31.
7. Easterly, W., & Hebbel, K. S. (1993). Fiscal Deficit and Macroeconomic Performance in Developing Countries. *The World Bank Res Observ*, 211–37.
8. Easterly, W., & Rebelo, S. (1993). Fiscal policy and economic growth An empirical investigation. *J Monetary Econ*, 417–58.
9. Emanu, D. B. (2021). Relationship between Budget Deficit and Economic Growth: Evidence from Ethiopia. *Appl J Econ, Manag Soc Sci*, 10–5.
10. Fayou, H., & Daali, H. (2024). Fiscal Deficit and Its Effects on Economic Growth: Empirical Evidence. *IRE J*, 7(7) 188–98.
11. Feldstein, M. (1982). Government Deficits and Aggregate Demand. *J Monet Econ*, 9(1):1–20.
12. Government deficits and aggregate demand. (n.d.). *J Monetary Econ* 1982, 9:(1), p 1–20.
13. Granger, C. J. (1969). Investigating Causal Relations by Econometric Models and Cross-spectral Methods. *Econometrica*, 424–38.

14. Granger, C. J. (1988). Some Recent Development in a Concept of Causality. *J Econ*, 199–211.
15. Hasan, Z. (2019, June 7). Deficit financing in developing countries: *Appl Conseq*.
16. Hur, S.-K., Mallick, S., & Park, D. (2010). Fiscal Policy and Crowding Out p-97-114. Metro Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.
17. Johansen, S. (1991). Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models. *Economet*, 1551–80.
18. Johansen, S. (1995). Likelihood-Based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
19. Koop, G., Pesaran, H. M., & Potter, S. M. (1996). Impulse Response Analysis in Nonlinear Multivariate Models. *J Econ*, 119–47.
20. kber, N., Gupta, M., & Paltasingh, K. R. (2020). The Crowding-in/ out Debate in Investments in India: Fresh Evidence from NARDL Application. *South Asian J Macroec Pub Fin*, 1–23.
21. Majumder, M. A. (2007). Does Public Borrowing Crowd-out Private Investment? The Bangladesh Evidence. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Policy Analysis Unit (PAU), Research Department, Bangladesh Bank.
22. Mawejje, J., & Odhiambo, N. M. (2020). The Determinants of Fiscal Deficits: A Survey of Literature. *Int Rev of Econ*, 403–17.
23. Raju, S., & Mukherjee, J. (2010). Fiscal Deficit, Crowding Out and the Sustainability of Economic Growth. The Case of the Indian Economy. Paris and Bruxelles: Centre for Asian Studies. 1-33
24. Rao, G. M. (2002). State Finances in India: Issues and Challenges. *Econ Polit Weekly*, 37(31): 3261–71.
25. Sheng, H.-C., & Tu, A. H. (2000). A Study of Cointegration and Variance Decomposition among National Equity Indices before and during the period of the Asian Financial Crisis. *J Multi Fin Manag*, 10(3): 345–65.
26. Tung, L. T. (2018). The effect of fiscal deficit on economic growth in an emerging economy: Evidence from Vietnam. *J Int Stud* 11(3):191–203.
27. Xu, X., & Yan, Y. (2014). Does Government Investment Crowd Out Private Investment in China? *J Econ Pol Ref*, 17:1, 1–12.