

# Does financial instability really undermine economic performance?

By [Jérôme Creel](#), [Paul Hubert](#) and Fabien Labondance

What relationship can be established between the degree to which an economy is financialized (understood as the ratio of credit to the private sector over GDP), financial instability and economic performance (usually GDP per capita) in the European Union (EU)? [A recent working paper \[1\]](#) attempts to provide a few answers to this question.

Two major competing approaches can be found in the economic literature. On the one hand, an approach inherited from Schumpeter emphasizes the need for entrepreneurs to access sources of credit to finance their innovations. The financial sector is thus seen as a prerequisite to innovative activity and a facilitator of economic performance. On the other hand, financial development can be viewed instead as the result or consequence of economic development. Development implies increased demand for financial services on the part of households and businesses. There is therefore a source of endogeneity in the relationship between financial development and economic growth, as one is likely to lead to the other, and vice versa.

Until recently, analytical studies that attempted to disentangle and quantify these causalities showed a positive significant link between an economy's financial depth and its economic performance ([Ang, 2008](#)). However, the onset of the international financial crisis led to nuancing these conclusions. In particular, [Arcand et al. \(2012\)](#) showed that beyond a certain level the impact of increased financialization becomes negative [\[2\]](#). The relationship

between financialization and economic performance can be represented by a bell curve: positive at the beginning and then, from a level of 80%-100% for the private credit to GDP ratio, fading to zero or turning negative.

Unlike other works that include both developed and emerging or developing countries, our study focuses on the EU Member States from 1998 to 2011. The advantage of this sample is that we include only economies whose financial systems are developed or at least in advanced stages of development [3]. Moreover, it is a relatively homogeneous political space that permits the establishment of common financial regulations. We adopt the methodology of [Beck & Levine \(2004\)](#) who, using a panel and instrumental variables, are able to resolve the endogeneity issues discussed above. Economic performance is explained by the usual variables in endogenous growth theory, namely initial GDP per capita, the accumulation of human capital over the average years of education, government expenditure, trade openness and inflation. In addition, we include the aforementioned financialization variables. We show that, contrary to the usual results in the literature, an economy's financial depth does not have a positive impact on economic performance as measured by GDP per capita, household consumption, business investment or disposable income. In most cases, the effect of financialization is not different from zero, and when it is, the coefficient is negative. It is therefore difficult to argue that financial and economic development go hand in hand in these economies!

In addition, we included in these estimates different variables quantifying financial instability so as to check whether the results set out above might be due simply to the effects of the crisis. These financial instability variables (Z-score [4], CISS[5], bad debt rate, the volatility of stock market indices and an index reflecting the microeconomic characteristics of Europe's banks) usually seem to have a significant *negative* impact on economic performance. At the

same time, the variables measuring the *degree* of an economy's financialization show no obvious effects on performance.

These various findings suggest that it is certainly unrealistic to expect a positive impact of any further increase in the degree of financialization of Europe's economies. It is likely that the European banking and financial systems have reached a critical size beyond which no improvement in economic performance can be expected. Instead, there are likely to be negative effects due to the financial instability arising out of a financial sector that has grown overly large and whose innovations are insufficiently or poorly regulated.

The findings of this study suggest several policy recommendations. The argument of the banking lobbies that regulating bank size would have a negative impact on growth finds absolutely no support in our results—quite the contrary. Furthermore, we show that financial instability is costly. It is important to prevent it. This undoubtedly requires developing a better definition of micro- and macro-prudential standards, together with effective supervision of Europe's banks. Will the forthcoming banking union help in this regard? There are many sceptics, including the economists of [Bruegel](#), the [Financial Times](#) and the [OFCE](#).

---

[1] Creel, Jérôme, Paul Hubert and Fabien Labondance, “Financial stability and economic performance”, *Document de travail de l'OFCE*, 2013-24. This study was supported by funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Program (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 266800 (FESSUD).

[2] We consider this work in an earlier [post](#).

[3] In addition to the ratio of private sector credit to GDP, the depth of financialization is also indicated by the turnover ratio, which measures the degree of liquidity of financial markets, measured as the ratio of the total value of shares traded to total capitalization.

[4] Index measuring the stability of banks based on their profitability, their capital ratio and the volatility of their net income.

[5] Index of systemic risk calculated by the ECB and including five components of the financial system: the banking sector, non-bank financial institutions, money markets, securities markets (stocks and bonds) and foreign exchange markets.

---

## **Important change of course at the Elysée Palace. Austerity is no longer the priority**

By [Xavier Timbeau](#), Twitter: @XTimbeau

(published in [Le Monde on Thursday 16 January 2014](#), p. 17)

When he was elected François Hollande made fiscal discipline his main goal. The 2008 crisis was continuing to have an impact on the developed economies; in the face of a sovereign debt crisis, Europe's governments had been implementing austerity measures that were to cause a second recession, a "double dip", to use the language of economists. For example, when François Hollande came to power, the situation in France seemed disastrous: the public deficit was 5.2%, with a rise in

the public debt of more than 600 billion euros since 2008 along with a 2-point rise in unemployment (to 9.6% of the workforce). The pressure was intense, and, the euro zone states were falling like dominos, with Spain and Italy in danger of following Greece, Portugal and Ireland. In this context, it seemed that only budgetary discipline could help Germany to support a faltering euro zone.

Yet the worst was still to come. By underestimating the magnitude of the fiscal multipliers (the impact of fiscal policy on activity), as was eventually recognized by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the European Commission, and as we had pointed out in July 2012, the consequences of generalizing this unprecedented fiscal effort throughout the European Union were dismissed.

What Francois Hollande had presumed would be a painful recovery preceding a rebound that would open up new possibilities proved instead to be a period of economic stagnation, where rising unemployment went in hand with bad fiscal news. When the fiscal multiplier is high, nothing works. The budget efforts were weighing down economic activity, and there was no real re-absorption of the government deficits. If this infamous multiplier had been low, François Hollande's strategy – and that of the euro zone as a whole – would have worked. But the multiplier is not at our beck and call; it was the result of an economic situation in which the balance sheets of agents were degraded, with the banks suffocating and expectations dire.

The second part of François Hollande's five-year term, which the press conference of 14 January 2014 was to launch, is now much more complicated than expected. Instead of a recovery in public finances, the debt has barely been stabilized despite an incredible effort. Instead of a strong recovery, what we have is, in the understated language of the INSEE, a "sluggish recovery", which really amounts to continuing recession, with unemployment rising relentlessly. Our businesses are anaemic,

and to try to restore their margins, the tax credit for competitiveness and employment (the "CICE"), inspired by the Gallois report, has not really injected new blood.

To lower the cost of labour without increasing the deficit, households, though exhausted, have to be hit again. The fiscal multiplier is still high, and growth, along with a reversal in the trend in unemployment, is being postponed. Worse, the commitment to Brussels to reduce the public deficit (a structural effort of 0.8 GDP point by the end of the five-years, *i.e.* 50 billion euros in total) will postpone a reduction in unemployment until after 2017. The patient may well die from the cure, and at best it will be Hollande's successor in the 2017 elections, which he's lost in advance, who might hope to reap the benefits of a policy that prioritized deficit reduction at the worst possible time.

The responsibility pact now proposed by François Hollande is setting out a different path, a different choice. Instead of austerity, a reduction in the cost of labour is to be financed not by taxes but by fiscal spending (amounting to 1 GDP point). The bet is that the growth stimulated will bring in additional revenue to meet the commitments on the public deficit. A reduction in social charges of thirty billion euros was announced, replacing the current CICE (20 billion). This means an additional 10 billion euros that can be obtained by companies that are to engage in collective bargaining under the watchful eye of a bipartisan watchdog. While this does not simplify the complex CICE, it will promote social dialogue.

On the other hand, François Hollande confirmed that the target for cutting public expenditure remains, *i.e.* 16 billion euros in 2015 and 18 billion in 2016 and 2017, for a total of 50 billion, with no increase on previous announcements. The CICE was partially funded by an increase in VAT (6 billion euros from 2014) and environmental taxes (4 billion). Replacing the CICE with cuts in social charges gives room for finesse: if companies benefit from the lower labour costs to

boost their profits, then taxes on these profits will reduce the bill for the state by 10 billion euros (one-third of 30 billion). If, however, they increase employment and wages or lower their prices or invest, then there will be an increase in activity and the financing will come through growth.

Compared with France's budget commitments to Brussels (an 0.8 point reduction in the structural deficit every year), there will be a 20 billion euro fiscal stimulus based on lowering labour costs by 2017. This GDP point could lead to the creation of 250,000 jobs by 2017 and allow a one-point drop in unemployment. This is a substantial change of course from the priority given up to now to deficit reduction. A choice has been made to focus on business and push companies to create new activity or jobs through a pact. This is a significant step, but there is still more to be done to put an end to austerity, to repair the social damage done and to take radical action to reduce unemployment.