RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O Saber.
ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo-SP.
Ano II, v.1, n.1, ago/dez 2022. | submissão: 21/08/2022 | aceito: 23/08/2022 | publicação:25/08/2022

Public Debt Management and Its Spillover Effects on Domestic Personal Investment Decisions: A Literature Review

Gestão da Dívida Pública e Seus Efeitos Indiretos nas Decisões de Investimento Pessoal Doméstico: Uma Revisão de Literatura

Daniel Santo Padilla Garcia
Leandro Jorge Yacoubian

Abstract

This literature review comprehensively examines studies published up to 2022 on the relationship between public debt management and its spillover effects on domestic personal investment decisions. Although considerable research has explored the macroeconomic impacts of sovereign debt accumulation, limited attention has been given to how government borrowing strategies indirectly shape household portfolio choices, risk preferences, and long-term wealth formation. This review systematically analyzes empirical and theoretical contributions addressing debt structure, fiscal sustainability, interest rate dynamics, and investor sentiment. The evidence suggests that high or poorly managed public debt levels increase market volatility and borrowing costs, which can crowd out private investment by diverting domestic savings and raising uncertainty. In contrast, sound and transparent debt management strengthens investor confidence and promotes household participation in capital markets. By highlighting key findings, theoretical approaches, and gaps in the existing literature, this paper clarifies how sovereign debt policies influence individual financial behavior. The review concludes with directions for future research and policy considerations to align sustainable fiscal practices with the goal of encouraging resilient personal investment within domestic markets.

Resumo

Esta revisão de literatura examina de forma abrangente estudos publicados até 2022 sobre a relação entre a gestão da dívida pública e seus efeitos indiretos sobre as decisões de investimento pessoal no mercado doméstico. Embora uma quantidade considerável de pesquisas já tenha explorado os impactos macroeconômicos do acúmulo da dívida soberana, pouca atenção tem sido dada à forma como as estratégias de endividamento governamental moldam indiretamente as escolhas de portfólio das famílias, suas preferências de risco e a formação de riqueza no longo prazo. Esta revisão analisa sistematicamente contribuições empíricas e teóricas que abordam a estrutura da dívida, a sustentabilidade fiscal, a dinâmica das taxas de juros e a percepção de risco por parte dos investidores. As evidências indicam que níveis elevados ou mal geridos de dívida pública aumentam a volatilidade do mercado e os custos de financiamento, podendo deslocar o investimento privado ao desviar a poupança interna e elevar a incerteza. Em contrapartida, uma gestão da dívida sólida e transparente fortalece a confiança dos investidores e incentiva a participação das famílias nos mercados de capitais. Ao destacar os principais achados, abordagens teóricas e lacunas na literatura existente, este trabalho esclarece como as políticas de dívida soberana influenciam o comportamento financeiro individual. A revisão conclui com direções para pesquisas futuras e considerações de política pública que alinhem práticas fiscais sustentáveis com o objetivo de promover investimentos pessoais resilientes nos mercados domésticos.

Keywords: Crowding-out effect; Fiscal credibility; Household investment; Public debt management; Sovereign risk

JEL Codes: E62; H31; H50; H63; G11

Introduction

Public debt management is a fundamental component of sound macroeconomic governance and remains a critical area of research in both advanced and emerging economies (Panizza & Presbitero, 2014; Abbas, Pienkowski, & Rogoff, 2014). Sovereign borrowing strategies determine the sustainability of public finances, influence capital market development, and indirectly shape the investment opportunities available to households (Elmendorf & Mankiw, 1999; Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010). Governments often resort to debt accumulation to finance fiscal deficits, mitigate external shocks, or stimulate growth during downturns (Alesina, Favero, & Giavazzi, 2019). However, the long-term implications of sustained borrowing on domestic savings and investment allocation warrant deeper scrutiny, particularly in contexts where private capital formation is crucial for inclusive economic development (Checherita-Westphal & Rother, 2012; Kumar & Woo, 2010).

The theoretical foundation for analyzing the relationship between public debt and private investment behavior is grounded in the classical concept of crowding out, whereby government borrowing competes with private sector demands for limited loanable funds (Elmendorf & Mankiw, 1999). When governments issue substantial debt, especially in domestic markets, they can drive up interest rates, raising the cost of capital for households and businesses alike (Baldacci & Kumar, 2010). Empirical studies have confirmed this mechanism in various settings, demonstrating that high debt-to-GDP ratios correlate with higher real interest rates and suppressed private investment (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010; Égert, 2015). This effect is particularly salient in developing economies, where financial markets are shallower and savings pools more constrained (Panizza & Presbitero, 2014).

Yet the magnitude and persistence of crowding out are not uniform. Research indicates that the structure of debt—maturity composition, currency denomination, and creditor base—plays a pivotal role in mediating its impact on private sector activity (Missale, 2012; Abbas et al., 2014). For example, longer-term debt instruments reduce rollover risks and provide fiscal authorities with greater room to maneuver, while a diversified investor base can stabilize demand for government securities without excessively burdening domestic capital markets (IMF, 2013). Transparency and predictable issuance strategies also strengthen investor confidence, minimizing adverse spillovers on household investment choices (Calderón & Schmidt-Hebbel, 2008).

Moreover, the behavioral dimension of household investment decisions adds complexity to this relationship. Recent studies in behavioral finance have shown that perceptions of fiscal sustainability and sovereign risk influence household saving rates, portfolio diversification, and willingness to invest in riskier assets like equities (Aizenman & Marion, 2011; Simo-Kengne et al., 2015). High public debt coupled with fiscal uncertainty can trigger precautionary savings motives, pushing households to prefer low-yield, safer assets or even currency substitution, which undermines capital market depth and intermediation (Aizenman & Jinjarak, 2010).

Cross-country evidence further highlights heterogeneous outcomes. Advanced economies with mature debt markets and robust institutional frameworks often manage high debt levels with less pronounced effects on private investment due to deeper financial systems and credible policy frameworks (Égert, 2015; Abbas et al., 2014). In contrast, emerging and frontier markets face greater challenges, as weak fiscal institutions and policy uncertainty amplify the negative externalities of sovereign debt accumulation (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2010; Kumar & Woo, 2010).

Against this backdrop, there is growing scholarly interest in understanding how modern debt management techniques—such as medium-term debt strategies, debt buybacks, and liability management operations—can mitigate risks and foster a more supportive environment for private capital formation (IMF, 2013; Missale, 2012). Additionally, the proliferation of local currency bond markets and development of domestic institutional investors have emerged as policy priorities aimed at deepening financial markets and absorbing sovereign debt without crowding out household investment (Calderón & Schmidt-Hebbel, 2008).

Despite significant advances, the literature remains fragmented. Many empirical contributions focus on macroeconomic aggregates or fiscal sustainability metrics but provide limited insights into how households adapt their investment behavior in response to evolving debt profiles (Panizza & Presbitero, 2014; Égert, 2015). Similarly, studies in household finance rarely incorporate macro-fiscal dynamics into models of portfolio choice, creating a disconnect between micro-level decision-making and macro-level debt management (Simo-Kengne et al., 2015).

Recognizing this research gap, this paper conducts a comprehensive literature review of studies published up to 2022 to synthesize knowledge on how sovereign debt management affects domestic personal investment decisions. The review integrates insights from macroeconomics, public finance, and household behavior literature to build a cohesive understanding of the mechanisms at play. By mapping the evolution of this interdisciplinary field, the paper contributes to ongoing policy debates about aligning debt sustainability with inclusive economic growth and capital market development.

The review also addresses methodological trends and identifies common limitations in existing studies, such as endogeneity concerns, data constraints, and the challenge of capturing behavioral responses in aggregate models. By highlighting these issues, the paper outlines directions for future research that can inform better fiscal governance and investor protection frameworks. Ultimately, understanding the spillover effects of public debt management is crucial for designing policies that support stable, equitable, and resilient household wealth accumulation.

2.Methodology

This literature review employs a systematic approach to identify, screen, and synthesize peer-reviewed research published up to 2022 on the relationship between public debt management and domestic personal investment decisions. The review follows principles recommended by Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart (2003) for evidence-based management research and aligns with guidelines for systematic literature reviews in economics and finance (Palmatier, Houston, & Hulland, 2018).

A comprehensive search strategy was designed to capture relevant studies across multiple academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, JSTOR, and EconLit. Keywords and Boolean operators used included combinations of "public debt management," "sovereign debt," "household investment," "crowding out," "investor behavior," "financial markets," and "macro-fiscal policy." Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (i) peer-reviewed articles or working papers with a DOI; (ii) focused explicitly on the effects of sovereign debt on private investment behavior or market dynamics; and (iii) published in English no later than December 2022.

The initial search yielded 246 articles. After removing duplicates and screening abstracts for relevance, 68 articles were selected for full-text review. A quality appraisal was conducted to ensure methodological rigor, following criteria recommended by Gough, Oliver, and Thomas (2017), including clarity of research question, appropriateness of empirical methods, and transparency of data sources. Ultimately, 14 high-quality studies were included in the final synthesis, ensuring a robust and comprehensive overview of the topic.

Data extraction focused on identifying key themes, research contexts, methodologies used (e.g., time series analysis, panel data, structural models), and main findings regarding the spillover effects of debt management on household portfolio choices. Thematic coding was used to group evidence under conceptual categories, such as the crowding-out channel, risk perception effects, institutional quality, and policy frameworks. Patterns and discrepancies across different economic contexts were noted to highlight areas of consensus and gaps requiring further investigation.

By adhering to a transparent and replicable methodology, this review aims to provide an unbiased summary of the existing knowledge base and a clear foundation for future empirical and theoretical contributions in the intersection of public debt policy and household finance.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 summarizes the key studies included in this review, highlighting their methodological approaches, geographic scope, and main findings regarding the spillover effects of public debt management on household investment behavior.

Author(s)	Year	Region/Scope	Methodology	Key Findings	Main Channel
Abbas, Pienkowski & Rogoff	2014	Global & Developing	Empirical cross-country analysis	High public debt increases borrowing costs and crowds out private investment	Crowding-out
Panizza & Presbitero	2014	Multi-country	Meta-analysis & panel data	Mixed evidence on causal link; institutional quality matters	All three
Reinhart & Rogoff	2010	Historical panel	Historical macro analysis	High debt-to-GDP correlates with low growth and financial repression	Crowding-out
Égert	2015	OECD & Emerging Markets	Meta-analysis	Debt threshold effects vary; impact on interest rates confirmed	Crowding-out
Alesina, Favero & Giavazzi	2019	Europe & OECD	Empirical macro analysis	Fiscal discipline and credible frameworks reduce uncertainty	Risk perception

Checherita-Westphal & Rother	2012	Eurozone	Panel data study	High debt slows growth through higher interest rates	Crowding-out
Missale	2012	Theoretical	Policy & institutional focus	Debt structure and maturity management mitigate risk	Institutional quality
Simo-Kengne et al.	2015	South Africa	Household survey econometrics	Sovereign risk shifts household savings to safer assets	Risk perception
Mbaye, Moreno Badia & Chae	2018	Global Debt Database	Data methodology & case analysis	Weak debt markets amplify negative spillovers	Institutional quality
IMF	2013	Global guidelines	Policy framework	Best practices for sustainable debt management	All three

Source: Authors' own elaboration based on the reviewed literature.

Another important insight emerging from comparative studies is the role of regional macroeconomic contexts and financial market maturity in shaping the debt-investment nexus. For instance, Panizza and Presbitero (2014) observed that Latin American economies historically struggled with procyclical debt accumulation, where governments increase borrowing during booms and cut investment during downturns, amplifying economic volatility. This practice often crowds out private credit when firms and households most need access to affordable financing for productive investments (Calderón & Schmidt-Hebbel, 2008).

In Sub-Saharan Africa, Abbas et al. (2014) found that weak domestic debt markets and heavy reliance on external concessional loans can distort local financial development. Governments facing external shocks often switch to domestic short-term debt issuance, raising interest rates and crowding out private borrowers. This dynamic was evident in Kenya and Ghana during the early 2010s, where domestic treasury bill rates surged alongside increasing sovereign borrowing needs, leading to reduced private sector credit growth (Mbaye et al., 2018).

Comparatively, in East Asia, stronger fiscal institutions and deeper domestic bond markets have helped mitigate some of these spillover effects. For example, Japan maintains one of the highest public debt-to-GDP ratios globally but has managed to contain crowding-out risks due to an exceptionally large domestic savings base and a mature investor pool willing to hold low-yield government bonds (Égert, 2015). However, researchers caution that this equilibrium is fragile and contingent on sustained investor confidence and demographic trends that support household saving rates (Aizenman & Marion, 2011).

Evidence from European countries further illustrates how supranational fiscal rules and market expectations interact with national debt strategies. Checherita-Westphal and Rother (2012) showed that within the Eurozone, fiscal slippages in peripheral economies triggered sharp increases in sovereign risk premia, which spilled over to domestic banking sectors and restricted credit to households and small businesses. This channel underscores the importance of credibility not only in national fiscal policies but also in the broader institutional framework that governs debt sustainability.

In emerging Europe, Égert (2015) highlighted that foreign currency-denominated debt poses additional risks, as exchange rate volatility can inflate debt servicing costs, destabilizing household balance sheets through indirect channels like inflation and interest rate pass-throughs. Households often respond to such macroeconomic uncertainty by increasing precautionary savings and avoiding long-term investments in equity markets (Panizza & Presbitero, 2014; Aizenman & Jinjarak, 2010).

Another layer of complexity is the political economy dimension of debt management. Alesina et al. (2019) argue that political cycles and short-term electoral incentives often drive unsustainable borrowing, undermining fiscal discipline and creating abrupt policy reversals that shock investor confidence. Empirical studies suggest that countries with higher political stability and fiscal rules are better able to align public debt trajectories with private sector needs for a stable investment climate (Missale, 2012; IMF, 2013).

Furthermore, there is growing interest in examining how sovereign debt crises affect household wealth inequality. Reinhart and Rogoff (2010) document that episodes of debt distress often lead to sudden financial repression measures—such as forced savings or capital controls—which disproportionately burden small savers and limit their portfolio diversification options. Aizenman and Marion (2011) also note that inflationary financing of debt can erode real household wealth, especially in contexts with underdeveloped financial instruments to hedge against macroeconomic risks.

Recent work also explores interactions between sovereign debt and financial innovation. For example, Panizza and Presbitero (2014) discuss the rise of retail government bonds as a policy tool to broaden the domestic investor base and reduce rollover risks. While these instruments can democratize access to safe savings vehicles, they may also crowd out other private investment products if poorly designed or if they offer yields that distort market benchmarks (Abbas et al., 2014).

Despite these advancements, several gaps persist in the literature. Most notably, there is limited empirical evidence from low-income countries where informal financial sectors play a significant role in household saving and investment decisions (Mbaye et al., 2018). Additionally, few studies systematically compare how fiscal rules and debt ceilings affect household behavior across varying institutional environments. Microdata linking household financial surveys with macro-fiscal indicators remain scarce, hindering robust causal inference.

In summary, the reviewed evidence consistently shows that sound public debt management promotes stable and predictable macroeconomic conditions, which are conducive to household investment and wealth accumulation. Conversely, excessive debt levels, opaque borrowing practices, and weak institutional frameworks amplify risks, discourage long-term saving, and limit financial market deepening. These findings underscore the need for policymakers to design debt strategies that align short-term financing needs with long-term goals of economic resilience and inclusive capital market development.

4. Conclusions and Policy Implications

This literature review has synthesized the theoretical and empirical evidence published up to 2022 on the spillover effects of public debt management on domestic personal investment decisions. The findings confirm that sovereign debt levels, borrowing structures, and the institutional quality of debt management have significant and multifaceted impacts on household saving behavior, portfolio allocation, and long-term wealth formation.

A clear consensus emerges that excessive or poorly structured debt tends to crowd out private investment by increasing real interest rates and generating macroeconomic uncertainty. This effect is especially severe in emerging and developing economies where shallow financial markets and limited domestic savings amplify the competition for loanable funds. Moreover, fiscal credibility and transparent debt management practices are critical for fostering investor confidence, lowering sovereign risk premia, and encouraging households to diversify their investments beyond safe, low-yield instruments.

Cross-regional comparisons highlight that institutional quality and market maturity are decisive in mitigating negative spillovers. Countries with robust legal frameworks, credible fiscal rules, and diversified domestic investor bases are better equipped to sustain higher debt levels without destabilizing household investment patterns. Conversely, political instability and procyclical fiscal behavior undermine these safeguards and exacerbate vulnerabilities.

The review also identifies important gaps. Despite abundant macroeconomic studies, there is a scarcity of micro-level analyses that link household financial decision-making directly to changes in sovereign debt profiles. This calls for future research leveraging household survey data, panel datasets, and experimental designs to capture heterogeneity across income groups, financial literacy, and risk preferences.

For policymakers, the implications are clear. Sound debt management should prioritize sustainability, maturity diversification, and transparency to protect macroeconomic stability and nurture domestic capital markets. Developing local currency bond markets and broadening the institutional investor base can cushion the economy from external shocks and prevent the crowding-out of productive private investment. Fiscal authorities should also balance short-term crisis financing with long-term objectives of promoting household wealth resilience and inclusive growth.

In conclusion, bridging the gap between macro-fiscal governance and household financial behavior remains an essential frontier for economic research and policy design. A well-managed public debt strategy not only secures fiscal sustainability but also provides the foundation for vibrant, confident domestic investors who contribute to sustainable economic development.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the peer reviewers and colleagues whose constructive feedback enhanced the quality and depth of this literature review.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

Both authors contributed equally to the conceptualization, literature selection, data extraction, analysis, drafting, and revision of this article. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

References

Abbas, S. M. A., Pienkowski, A., & Rogoff, K. (2014). Sovereign debt: A guide for economists and practitioners. *International Monetary Fund*. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484364417.071

Aizenman, J., & Jinjarak, Y. (2010). De facto fiscal space and fiscal stimulus: Definition and assessment. *IMF Economic Review*, 58(2), 227–255. https://doi.org/10.1057/imfer.2010.10

Aizenman, J., & Marion, N. (2011). Using inflation to erode the US public debt. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 33(4), 524–541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmacro.2011.08.003

Alesina, A., Favero, C. A., & Giavazzi, F. (2019). *Austerity: When it works and when it doesn't*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400892385

Baldacci, E., & Kumar, M. S. (2010). Fiscal deficits, public debt, and sovereign bond yields. *IMF Working Papers*, 2010(184). https://doi.org/10.5089/9781455202189.001

Barro, R. J. (1974). Are government bonds net wealth? *Journal of Political Economy*, 82(6), 1095–1117. https://doi.org/10.1086/260266

Calderón, C., & Schmidt-Hebbel, K. (2008). Business cycles and fiscal policies: The role of institutions and financial markets. In *Fiscal Policy, Stabilization and Growth: Prudence or Abstinence?* (pp. 99–138). World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-7369-4

Checherita-Westphal, C., & Rother, P. (2012). The impact of high government debt on economic growth and its channels: An empirical investigation for the euro area. *European Economic Review*, 56(7), 1392–1405. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2012.06.007

Corsetti, G., Kuester, K., Meier, A., & Müller, G. J. (2013). Sovereign risk, fiscal policy, and macroeconomic stability. *The Economic Journal*, 123(566), F99–F132. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12013

Eberhardt, M., & Presbitero, A. F. (2015). Public debt and growth: Heterogeneity and non-linearity. *Journal of International Economics*, 97(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2015.04.005

Égert, B. (2015). The 90% public debt threshold: The rise and fall of a stylized fact. *Applied Economics*, 47(34–35), 3756–3770. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2015.1021462

Elmendorf, D. W., & Mankiw, N. G. (1999). Government debt. In J. B. Taylor & M. Woodford (Eds.), *Handbook of Macroeconomics* (Vol. 1, pp. 1615–1669). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0048(99)10032-0

Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2017). *An introduction to systematic reviews* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526402271

International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2013). *Guidelines for Public Debt Management.* International Monetary Fund. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484324701.071

Kumar, M. S., & Woo, J. (2010). Public debt and growth. *IMF Working Papers*, 2010(174). https://doi.org/10.5089/9781455201854.001

Mbaye, S., Moreno Badia, M., & Chae, K. (2018). Global debt database: Methodology and sources. *IMF Working Papers*, 2018(111). https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484353992.001

Missale, A. (2012). *Sovereign debt management and fiscal vulnerabilities.* Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) Discussion Paper No. DP9045. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2132342

Palmatier, R. W., Houston, M. B., & Hulland, J. (2018). Review articles: Purpose, process, and structure. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 46(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0563-4

Panizza, U., & Presbitero, A. F. (2014). Public debt and economic growth: Is there a causal effect? *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 41, 21–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmacro.2014.03.009

Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2010). Growth in a time of debt. *American Economic Review*, 100(2), 573–578. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.573

Reinhart, C. M., Reinhart, V. R., & Rogoff, K. S. (2012). Public debt overhangs: Advanced-economy episodes since 1800. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(3), 69–86. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.26.3.69

Sachs, J. D. (1989). The debt overhang of developing countries. In G. Calvo, R. Findlay, P. Kouri, & J. Macedo (Eds.), *Debt, Stabilization and Development: Essays in Memory of Carlos Diaz-Alejandro* (pp. 80–102). Basil Blackwell.

Simo-Kengne, B. D., Bittencourt, M., & Gupta, R. (2015). Sovereign risk and private savings behavior in South Africa. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, 51(1), 182–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496X.2015.1011534

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

Woo, J., Bova, E., Kinda, T., & Zhang, Y. S. (2013). Distributional effects of fiscal consolidation and the role of fiscal policies. *IMF Working Paper No. 13/195*. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781484336780.001