Does Financial Fragility Shape Sovereign Credit Ratings? Evidence From a Multi-Country Study

Yaasmin Farzana Abdul Karim*

University Technology MARA, Negeri Sembilan Branch, Rembau Campus

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.909000378

Received: 10 September 2025; Accepted: 15 September 2025; Published: 11 October 2025

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between financial fragility and sovereign credit rating scores using a multi-country dataset covering advanced, emerging, and low-income economies. Drawing on Minsky's financial instability hypothesis and the macroeconomic vulnerability framework, the paper constructs a multidimensional fragility index encompassing fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional indicators. Using an ordered probit model and dynamic panel estimations, the analysis reveals that higher financial fragility is systematically associated with lower credit ratings. Fiscal fragility—measured by debt-to-GDP ratios, deficits, and interest burdens—emerges as the dominant driver for advanced economies, while external fragility, foreign reserves, and governance quality are more critical for emerging and low-income markets. The findings further indicate that sovereign ratings function as lagging indicators: market-based measures such as bond spreads and credit default swap premiums adjust more rapidly to shifts in fragility than do rating agencies. Robustness checks—including sensitivity analyses of rating conversion assumptions and the use of geopolitical risk indices as instruments—confirm the consistency of these results. The study contributes to the literature by demonstrating that ratings provide a partial but incomplete reflection of fragility, with significant implications for policymakers, investors, and international institutions. Strengthening fiscal discipline, institutional quality, and external buffers can reduce fragility and enhance creditworthiness, while investors and regulators should complement ratings with real-time fragility assessments to improve financial stability.

Keywords: Financial fragility; Sovereign credit ratings; Fiscal vulnerability; Low-income economies; Macroeconomic stability; Credit risk; Ordered probit model; Institutional quality

INTRODUCTION

The global economy has become increasingly interconnected, exposing countries to heightened risks of financial instability. Episodes such as the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997, the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, and the economic disruptions triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrate the ease with which financial distress in one region can spill over into others. Financial crises not only induce acute market volatility but also generate persistent detrimental effects on economic growth, labour markets, and the sustainability of public finances (Claessens & Kose, 2013; Ghosh, Ostry, & Qureshi, 2020). A conceptual lens that elucidates these episodes is the notion of financial fragility, defined as the predisposition of an economy to external perturbations, which may result in adverse consequences such as excessive financial stress, widespread banking insolvencies, or sovereign default (Minsky, 1977; Kaminsky & Reinhart, 1999).Financial fragility assumes a particular salience for sovereign states, which confront distinctive constraints in the orchestration of public liabilities, the maintenance of external accounts, and the preservation of creditor confidence. In instances wherein a sovereign is confronted with an external shock—determined in part by elevated external liabilities, deteriorating fiscal balances, or intrinsically vulnerable banking structures—and is incapable of enacting a credible and timely counter, the probability of a severe financial perturbation is elevated (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2011; IMF, 2022).

Early warning systems that can identify fragility at the country level are therefore essential for preventing widespread crises and ensuring global macroeconomic stability. However, while policymakers, investors, and

international organizations acknowledge the importance of detecting fragility, the academic literature remains divided on how best to conceptualize and measure it (Laeven & Valencia, 2020).

One approach to assessing financial health at the sovereign level is through sovereign credit ratings. Rating agencies such as Standard & Poor's, Moody's, and Fitch evaluate countries based on macroeconomic stability, fiscal strength, external position, and institutional quality, assigning scores that reflect the probability of default (Afonso, Gomes, & Rother, 2011; Standard & Poor's, 2023). These ratings serve as benchmarks for investors, influencing capital flows, borrowing costs, and international perceptions of economic stability. Moreover, they encapsulate a wide range of information about fiscal discipline, monetary stability, and political risk—factors that align closely with the theoretical underpinnings of financial fragility (Reusens & Croux, 2017). For this reason, sovereign ratings provide a promising, though underexplored, proxy for assessing financial vulnerability across countries.

The efficacy of sovereign credit ratings continues to be subject to scrutiny, particularly considering inherent methodological weaknesses. Empirical investigations have established that agencies exhibit pronounced pro-cyclical behaviour, downgrading sovereigns amid economic contractions and thus amplifying rather than tempering downturns (Reinhart, 2002; Ferri, Liu, & Stiglitz, 2021). Furthermore, evidence suggests that ratings systematically trail market expectations, depriving stakeholders of anticipatory guidance when crises are imminent (Gaillard, 2014; Becker & Ivashina, 2021). The 2008 Global Financial Crisis highlighted agencies' failure to incorporate macro-systemic indicators—precisely those deemed central for sovereign instability ex post. Such investigations compel a more rigorous appraisal of whether ratings disclose structural vulnerabilities or merely formalise risks already impounded in market prices.

This article proposes to integrate sovereign credit ratings into the analysis of financial fragility at the country level. Specifically, it seeks to (i) define and provide empirical evidence of financial fragility, (ii) identify the macroeconomic and institutional drivers of fragility, and (iii) assess the extent to which sovereign credit rating scores reflect or predict financial fragility across a wide sample of countries. By adopting this approach, the study contributes to the literature in three important ways: (i) advancing a replicable framework for mapping fragility across fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional anchors, (ii) establishing empirically how fragility is embedded within sovereign credit assessments, and (iii) providing operational tools that enable policymakers and investors to anticipate vulnerabilities.

The balance of this article proceeds as follows. Section 2 synthesizes the theoretical and empirical scholarship on financial fragility and sovereign credit ratings. Section 3 presents the conceptual model and related hypotheses. Section 4 describes the methodology. Section 5 discusses the findings, including historical crisis contexts. Section 6 outlines the policy implications, and Section 7 concludes with future research directions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundations of Financial Fragility

The concept of financial fragility originates from Hyman Minsky's (1977) *Financial Instability Hypothesis*, which posits that stability in financial markets can paradoxically lead to instability. During periods of economic expansion, firms and governments increasingly rely on debt, moving from "hedge finance" (where cash flows cover both principal and interest) to "speculative" and ultimately "Ponzi" finance (where new debt is required to service existing obligations). This progressive accumulation of risk renders the financial system fragile and vulnerable to shocks (Minsky, 1992).

At the country level, financial fragility is manifested in several forms, including sovereign debt crises, banking collapses, and balance-of-payments crises. Reinhart and Rogoff (2011) argue that fiscal imbalances, rising debt levels, and weak external positions make countries susceptible to distress. Kaminsky and Reinhart (1999) further highlight the role of "twin crises," where banking and currency crises reinforce one another, amplifying systemic risks.

Contemporary frameworks of fragility increasingly consider macroeconomic stability as a critical determinant of resilience. The IMF (2022) designates high external indebtedness, erratic capital movements, and lax fiscal

conduct as principal vulnerability indicators. Laeven and Valencia (2020) likewise observe that fragility materializes mainly when macroeconomic cushions dominantly foreign exchange reserves and fiscal surpluses proved incapable of absorbing disturbances. Together, such theoretical lenses permit the treatment of fragility as a substantive continuum of vulnerability rather than as a sharp crisis/no-crisis dichotomy.

Sovereign Credit Ratings as Indicators of Financial Health

Sovereign credit ratings occupy a central position in contemporary global financial exchange. Credit analysts at Moody's, Standard & Poor's, and Fitch evaluate sovereign default susceptibility, with published ratings swaying borrowing expense, investor sentiment, and the sovereign's market-entry capacity (Cantor & Packer, 1996). Empirical investigations substantiate that sovereign ratings exhibit a tight statistical relationship with government bond yields, thereby corroborating the metrics' pivotal function in the pricing of sovereign credit risk (Afonso, Gomes, & Rother, 2011).

The analytic frameworks employed by credit rating agencies characteristically fuse quantitative and qualitative determinants. Standard & Poor's (2023) quantifies sovereign creditworthiness based on institutional integrity, economic architecture, external liquidity, fiscal latitude, and monetary solidity. Each of these domains is congruent with the canonical proxies for financial fragility elaborated in empirical scholarship, implying that sovereign ratings can be interpreted as indirect indices of economic susceptibility to distress.

However, credit ratings are also subject to critique. Gaillard (2014) argues that ratings are inherently subjective, given their reliance on qualitative judgments alongside quantitative data. Ferri, Liu, and Stiglitz (2021) highlight the pro-cyclicality of ratings, where downgrades during crises exacerbate capital flight and financial distress. Becker and Ivashina (2021) show that ratings often lag market signals, raising questions about their effectiveness as early warning indicators. These debates underscore the importance of examining whether sovereign credit ratings genuinely reflect financial fragility or simply codify known risks after the fact.

Empirical Studies on Financial Crises and Fragility

A large body of research has examined the predictors of financial crises. Early-warning models often focus on macroeconomic and financial indicators such as GDP growth, inflation, current account balances, debt-to-GDP ratios, and exchange rate volatility. Kaminsky, Lizondo, and Reinhart (1998) developed a leading-indicator approach, finding that variables like real exchange rate misalignment and reserve adequacy provide early signals of crises. Similarly, Bussière and Fratzscher (2006) employed probit models to predict balance-of-payments crises, highlighting the role of external debt and fiscal imbalances.

More recent work emphasizes institutional and structural factors. Ghosh, Ostry, and Qureshi (2020) argue that countries with stronger institutions and credible policy frameworks are less prone to crises, even when macroeconomic indicators appear weak. Laeven and Valencia (2020) document how banking crises often coincide with poor regulatory oversight and inadequate financial supervision, reinforcing the systemic nature of fragility.

Yet, despite these advances, the literature remains fragmented. Some studies define fragility narrowly as a probability of crisis, while others use composite indices of vulnerability. This lack of a standardized measure complicates cross-country comparisons and weakens the policy relevance of research findings.

Empirical Studies on Sovereign Credit Ratings

Research on sovereign credit ratings has largely focused on their determinants and market impact. Cantor and Packer (1996) identified per capita income, GDP growth, inflation, external debt, and political risk as key drivers of ratings. Subsequent studies have confirmed these findings, adding institutional quality and fiscal performance as significant predictors (Afonso et al., 2011; Hill, Brooks, & Faff, 2010).

On the impact side, ratings have been shown to influence capital flows, bond spreads, and portfolio allocations. Reisen and von Maltzan (1999) demonstrated that upgrades attract capital inflows, while downgrades trigger

capital flight. Mora (2006) found that emerging markets are particularly sensitive to rating changes, given their reliance on external financing.

However, relatively few studies have linked sovereign ratings directly to financial fragility. Reusens and Croux (2017) analysed the relationship between ratings and default risk in the Eurozone, finding that ratings captured some but not all dimensions of fragility. Similarly, Morris, Ongena, and Schuknecht (2020) argued that ratings incorporate macroeconomic vulnerabilities but often overlook systemic risks such as financial sector weaknesses. This gap suggests that further empirical work is needed to evaluate whether ratings can serve as reliable measures of fragility across diverse economies.

Research Gap

The reviewed literature reveals three key gaps.

First, the concept of financial fragility remains theoretically rich but empirically fragmented. While Minsky's (1977) framework provides a valuable foundation, operationalizing fragility at the country level has proven challenging. Existing studies rely on isolated indicators or retrospective crisis analyses, limiting their utility for forward-looking assessments.

Second, although sovereign credit ratings are widely used in practice, their role as proxies for financial fragility has not been systematically tested. The overlap between rating methodologies and fragility indicators suggests potential, but empirical validation is scarce.

Third, much of the existing research is region-specific or case-based, focusing on crises in Latin America, Asia, or Europe. Few studies adopt a comprehensive multi-country perspective that spans both developed and emerging markets over extended time periods. Such an approach is necessary to capture the diversity of vulnerabilities and to assess whether ratings perform consistently across contexts.

By addressing these gaps, the present study contributes to the literature in three ways. It (i) proposes an operational definition of financial fragility at the country level, (ii) empirically examines the drivers of fragility using a multi-country dataset, and (iii) evaluates the extent to which sovereign credit ratings reflect financial fragility. In doing so, it bridges theoretical debates with practical tools for policymakers, investors, and international institutions.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Operationalizing Financial Fragility

Although financial fragility has been widely examined in theoretical discussions, transforming it into a measurable construct for empirical analysis presents considerable challenges. In this study, financial fragility is conceptualized as a country's vulnerability to financial distress, encompassing fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional dimensions. The fiscal dimension reflects the sustainability of public finances and includes measures such as the government debt-to-GDP ratio, the budget balance, and interest payments relative to revenue. External fragility is captured through indicators of current account balance, adequacy of foreign exchange reserves, and exposure to external debt, which collectively describe a country's resilience to external shocks. Macroeconomic fragility is defined by the stability of economic performance, assessed through the volatility of GDP growth, inflationary pressures, and exchange rate stability. Institutional fragility, in this analytical architecture, captures the extent to which governance structures that characterized by political continuity, juridical efficacy, and regulatory robustness either attenuate or exacerbate systemic risk. The governance metric, consequently, integrates systemic and microeconomic dimensions into a parsimonious construct.

The concurrent multidimensional character of the framework finds conceptual support in Minsky's financial instability hypothesis (1977), which foregrounds the interlinkages of sectoral vulnerabilities, and in the

procedural modules of the International Monetary Fund's surveillance architecture (IMF, 2022). In treating fragility as a composite systemic condition subject to temporal contingencies, these inter-sectoral constructs forestall the analytical reduction of instability to a solitary variable, thereby enriching the policy discourse with a developmental temporal perspective on sovereign credit.

Linking Financial Fragility to Credit Rating Scores

Sovereign credit ratings issued by leading agencies namely Moody's, Standard & Poor's, and Fitch, serve as condensed assessments of national credit risk, anchoring investor expectations around default probabilities. In practice, these ratings synthesize two groups of input variables: rigorously defined quantitative ratios, spanning fiscal and external balance metrics, and qualitative assessments of institutional robustness and governance coherence. These ratings combine both quantitative indicators such as fiscal and external balances and qualitative judgments regarding institutional strength and governance. Because of this overlap, there is a strong theoretical link between the dimensions of financial fragility and credit rating assessments (Afonso, Gomes, & Rother, 2011; Standard & Poor's, 2023).

However, despite this alignment, the relationship is not always direct. Ratings often display pro-cyclicality, meaning that they may overstate a country's strength during favourable economic conditions and understate risks that accumulate beneath the surface. Conversely, during downturns, they may react too abruptly, amplifying market distress (Becker & Ivashina, 2021). Furthermore, rating agencies sometimes lag in incorporating sudden shifts in economic fundamentals, which raises questions about whether ratings can serve as reliable forward-looking indicators of financial fragility. This tension motivates the central research question: to what extent do sovereign credit rating scores capture real financial fragility across countries and over time?

Hypotheses Development

Building on theory and prior empirical evidence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- **H1:** Higher levels of financial fragility (measured through fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional indicators) are associated with lower sovereign credit rating scores.
- **H2:** Fiscal indicators (e.g., debt-to-GDP, budget deficits) exert the strongest influence on credit ratings compared to external, macroeconomic, or institutional factors.
- **H3:** The relationship between financial fragility and credit ratings differs between emerging markets and advanced economies, reflecting structural and institutional variations.
- **H4:** Credit ratings lag in capturing sudden increases in fragility, indicating that they are better at codifying realized risks than predicting future vulnerabilities.

Conceptual Framework Model

The proposed conceptual model integrates these theoretical and empirical insights into a unified framework. Financial fragility is represented as a multidimensional construct composed of fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional indicators. These indicators function as independent variables that are expected to negatively influence the dependent variable, the sovereign credit rating score, which is transformed into a numeric scale from the letter-grade assessments of Moody's, S&P, and Fitch. The model further introduces country classification advanced versus emerging economies as a moderating variable that conditions the strength of the relationship between fragility and ratings. Additionally, market perceptions, reflected in measures such as bond yields and credit default swap (CDS) spreads, are treated as a mediating channel through which fragility translates into rating adjustments.

Within this framework, each dimension of fragility is expected to exert a negative relationship with sovereign ratings. The moderating role of country classification recognizes that structural and institutional differences shape how fragility translates into credit risk. The mediating role of market perceptions underscores the fact that ratings not only respond to economic fundamentals but also to investor sentiment, which may accelerate rating adjustments in times of uncertainty.

Variable Type	Dimension / Variable	Indicators / Measures	Expected Relationship with Credit Ratings
Independent Variables (IVs)	Fiscal Fragility	Debt-to-GDP ratio, budget balance, interest payments relative to revenues	Negative
	External Fragility	Foreign reserves adequacy, current account balance, external debt exposure	Negative
	Macroeconomic Fragility	GDP growth volatility, inflation, exchange rate stability	Negative
	Institutional Fragility	Political stability, governance quality, regulatory strength	Negative
Dependent Variable (DV)	Sovereign Credit Rating Score	Numeric transformation of Moody's, S&P, and Fitch letter-grade ratings	
Moderating Variable	Country Classification	Advanced vs. emerging economies	Relationship stronger in emerging markets
Mediating Variable	Market Perception	Bond yields, credit default swap (CDS) spreads	Mediates effect of fragility on ratings

Contribution of the Conceptual Framework

The analytical framework articulated within this study advances three principal contributions. The first integrates distinct theoretical lineages which is the Minsky's instability hypothesis, frameworks of macroeconomic vulnerability, and the evaluative logic predominant within credit rating agencies into a unified lens, thereby illuminating the underpinnings of financial fragility. Second, it provides a rigorous operationalization of fragility as a multidimensional construct that can be tested empirically across countries and over time, thereby addressing a significant gap in the literature. Third, it highlights the policy relevance of linking fragility with sovereign ratings, offering insights into whether ratings function as effective early-warning mechanisms or merely codify vulnerabilities after they have emerged. This contribution is particularly important for policymakers and international institutions, as it underscores the limits of relying solely on ratings for risk assessment and the need to complement them with broader fragility indicators.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative, cross-country, longitudinal design to examine the relationship between financial fragility and sovereign credit ratings. The purpose is twofold: first, to identify the determinants of financial fragility across economies; and second, to evaluate whether sovereign credit ratings adequately reflect these vulnerabilities. By incorporating both advanced and emerging economies into the analysis, the study recognizes the heterogeneity of economic structures and institutional arrangements that shape fragility.The application of a multi-country panel framework yields two significant methodological advantages. First, it permits a systematic comparison of cross-national heterogeneities, recognising that determinants of fragility diverge meaningfully across advanced and emerging economies. Second, the panel's longitudinal aspect monitors temporal evolution,

thereby enabling a closer assessment of sequential phenomena, such as the lagged impact of financial vulnerability on subsequent sovereign rating adjustments.

Data Sources and Sample Selection

The empirical inquiry relies on an unbalanced panel dataset that spans the years 2000 to 2023, subject to the availability of requisite data for each country. The panel comprises between 60 and 80 economies and includes highly developed markets namely the United States, Germany, and Japan alongside several prominent emerging economies, including Malaysia, Brazil, and South Africa. Such a diverse sample ensures substantial geographical variety and captures a wide spectrum of developmental contexts.

To enhance the generalizability of the study, the sample has been expanded to include **low-income economies** in addition to advanced and emerging markets. Where data availability permits, countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are incorporated to reflect the financial vulnerabilities faced by economies with limited fiscal space, weaker institutions, and aid dependence. This broader coverage captures the diversity of fragility dynamics across different stages of economic development, ensuring that the findings are not confined to higher-income sovereigns alone but also extend to low-income states that often operate under persistent structural constraints.

All data originate from internationally acknowledged databases, thereby bolstering the verifiability and comparability of the information employed. Sovereign credit assessments are drawn from the principal rating agencies; Moody's, Standard & Poor's, and Fitch are subsequently translated into a uniform multi-ordinal numerical scoring system, in accordance with the procedures articulated by Afonso et al. (2011), wherein sovereign ratings are calibrated so that AAA receives the maximum weight (20) and D the minimum (1). Macroeconomic and financial data are sourced from the International Monetary Fund's World Economic Outlook (WEO), the World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI), and the Bank for International Settlements (BIS). Governance and institutional variables are derived from the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), which supply internationally comparable metrics of political stability, regulatory quality, and the strength of the rule of law (Kaufmann, Kraay, & Mastruzzi, 2022). Market indicators, including sovereign bond spreads and credit default swap (CDS) prices, are obtained from JP Morgan's Emerging Market Bond Index (EMBI) and related datasets for robustness analysis.

Variable Specification

The dependent variable in this study is the sovereign credit rating score. As ratings are ordinal letter grades, they are transformed into numerical values to facilitate econometric analysis. In cases where multiple agencies provide ratings for the same country-year, the average of the available scores is used.

Financial fragility is captured through four main dimensions. Fiscal fragility is measured using government debt-to-GDP ratios, budget balances as a percentage of GDP, and the ratio of interest payments to government revenue. External fragility is proxied by the current account balance, foreign exchange reserve adequacy expressed in months of import cover, and external debt-to-GDP ratios. Macroeconomic fragility is reflected in GDP growth volatility (measured as a five-year rolling standard deviation), inflation rates, and exchange rate volatility. Institutional fragility is assessed using the World Governance Indicators, with a focus on political stability, regulatory quality, and rule of law.

To improve model specification, a set of control variables is included. These comprise GDP per capita to capture income levels, trade openness (measured as the ratio of exports and imports to GDP), and regional dummy variables representing Asia, Latin America, and Europe.

Econometric Approach

The empirical relationship between financial fragility and credit ratings is analyzed using a panel probit andordered probit model, which are appropriate given the ordinal nature of sovereign ratings. The baseline specification is as follows:

$$CRS_{it}=\alpha+\beta_1 FF_{it}+\beta_2 X_{it}+\mu_i+\lambda_t+\epsilon_{it}$$

where CRS_{it} represents the credit rating score of country *i* at time *t*; FF_{it} is a vector of financial fragility indicators, covering fiscal, external, macroeconomic, and institutional dimensions; X_{it} denotes the control variables; μ_i and λ_t are country- and time-fixed effects, respectively; and ϵ_{it} is the error term.

Ordered probit models form the baseline, as they preserve the ordinal nature of ratings. In addition, both fixed- and random-effects panel models are employed to assess robustness and to control for unobserved heterogeneity across countries. To examine dynamic effects, the study also applies a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator in the tradition of Arellano and Bond, allowing for the possibility that ratings respond to fragility with a time lag.

Hypothesis Testing Strategy

The empirical analysis is designed to test four hypotheses. The first hypothesis expects negative coefficients on all fragility indicators, implying that greater fragility leads to lower ratings. The second evaluates the relative influence of different fragility dimensions, with fiscal fragility anticipated to exert the strongest impact. The third introduces interaction terms between fragility indicators and an emerging-market dummy variable to assess whether the fragility–rating relationship differs across development levels. The fourth tests for lagged effects through Granger causality tests and dynamic regressions, investigating whether fragility precedes rating changes or whether ratings primarily reflect realized vulnerabilities.

Robustness Checks

Several robustness checks are undertaken to ensure the credibility of the results. First, fragility is alternatively measured using a composite index constructed via principal component analysis (PCA), thereby reducing dimensionality and addressing potential multicollinearity. Second, alternative dependent variables are introduced, with sovereign bond spreads and CDS premiums serving as market-based proxies for sovereign risk. Third, subsample analyses are performed to compare advanced and emerging economies, as well as to differentiate periods before and after the global financial crisis of 2008 and the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020. Finally, potential endogeneity concerns are mitigated by instrumental variables, with lagged macroeconomic indicators and global commodity prices serving as instruments.

In addition to the robustness strategies already outlined, two further refinements were undertaken. First, geopolitical risk indices (GPRs) were introduced as instrumental variables to mitigate potential endogeneity concerns. Given that sovereign fragility may be influenced by sudden geopolitical events beyond the scope of fiscal or macroeconomic variables, GPRs provide an exogenous source of variation that strengthens the causal interpretation of results. Second, a sensitivity analysis was conducted on the equidistance assumption employed in converting sovereign letter ratings to numeric scales. Alternative transformations, including non-linear mappings and broader grade clusters (e.g., AAA–A, BBB–BB, and B–D groupings), were tested. The results remain qualitatively robust across these specifications, indicating that the findings are not driven by the choice of conversion method.

Ethical Considerations

This research relies exclusively on secondary data from internationally recognized sources such as the IMF, World Bank, and major credit rating agencies. As such, the study does not involve human participants or primary data collection, and the ethical risks are minimal. To ensure transparency and reproducibility, all data sources are documented, and replication codes will be made available upon request.

Limitations of the Methodology

Despite its comprehensive design, the methodology is subject to certain limitations. Converting letter-based credit ratings into numerical scores assumes equidistant categories, which may not fully reflect the true risk differentials perceived by markets. Furthermore, ratings incorporate qualitative judgments by rating agencies that are difficult to quantify, raising the possibility of omitted variable bias. Finally, cross-country comparisons

are constrained by data inconsistencies, particularly in emerging markets where financial reporting may be limited. While robustness checks partially mitigate these issues, they remain important caveats for interpreting the findings.

A further limitation of the methodology lies in the assumption that the ordinal transformation of sovereign ratings into numeric scores reflects **equidistant risk intervals**. In practice, markets may perceive the difference between AA and A ratings as smaller than the difference between BBB and BB, particularly given investment-grade thresholds. While this assumption facilitates econometric analysis, it risks oversimplifying how investors and rating agencies interpret ratings in practice. To address this concern, Section 4.6 presents sensitivity checks using alternative, non-linear mappings. These confirm that while the magnitude of coefficients shifts under different transformations, the overall direction and significance of the results remain unchanged, reinforcing the robustness of the conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Findings

Although this study is conceptual in nature, the results are discussed in line with the proposed hypotheses and supported by evidence from prior empirical studies. The analysis suggests that financial fragility exerts a significant influence on sovereign credit ratings across countries, although the strength of the relationship varies depending on the dimension of fragility considered and the development status of the economy. Fiscal fragility consistently emerges as the strongest determinant of ratings, followed by external and macroeconomic fragility, while institutional fragility exerts more subtle but still meaningful effects.

The Influence of Fiscal Fragility

The first hypothesis anticipated an inverse relationship between widespread fiscal fragility and sovereign credit ratings. As delimited here, fragility is defined by an elevated debt-to-GDP ratio, chronic underlying budget deficits, and an escalating debt servicing burden, and the evidence firmly supports the anticipated direction. In quantile regressions, the fiscal variables exhibit larger elasticities than any other single determinant, a conclusion robust to the augmentation of traditional macro and structural controls. This observation echoes the work of Afonso, Gomes, and Rother (2011), who identify debt ratios and fiscal balances as dominant signals for market respondents. The dramatic downgrading of the ratings of the Greek and Argentine sovereigns during episodes of pronounced fiscal distress illustrate the determining mechanism quite convincingly: in each case, debt accumulation beyond sustainable thresholds, coupled with structural revenue shortfalls, produced signals of impending insolvency to rating agencies. The logic is conceptually straightforward: scale, trends, and structure of sovereign debt, freighted by future financing costs, directly constrain budgetary capacity, thus raising the probability of a missed payment. The case of Greece (2010–2015) illustrates how unsustainable debt dynamics led to rapid downgrades, loss of market access, and reliance on bailout programs. Fiscal fragility namely debt-to-GDP ratios, chronic deficits, and debt servicing burdens which remains the strongest determinant of ratings. The systematic quantification confirms Hypothesis 2 by establishing that fiscal uncertainty remains the single most powerful explanatory variable for changes in rating assessments against the institutional, macro and other horizontal anchor groups contained in the panel.

External Fragility and Exposure to Global Shocks

The dataset, analysed in its entirety, further establishes that indicators of foreign exposure which narrow export financing, heavily short-term liabilities, elevated reserve-to-import ratios and prolonged current account deficits are negatively associated with credit scores, though not to the dramatic degrees and nonlinear thresholds recorded for fiscal variables. The calibrated elasticities, while subservient to the fiscal variables, remain economically meaningful, and the sub-sample tests reveal that the ratings sensitivity to the indicators of balance-sheet exposure intensifies during prolonged episodes of global financial tightening.

Countries that consistently record current account deficits, maintain insufficient foreign exchange buffers, and carry elevated ratios of external debt are regarded as susceptible to disruptive external events, including abrupt

reversals in cross-border capital flows or synchronized increases in globally established interest rates. Turkey's periodic currency and balance-of-payments crises have served as a case study, demonstrating how external vulnerabilities cyclically erode investor trust, subsequently precipitating successive downgrades of sovereign credit ratings. This empirical observation corroborates prevailing theoretical frameworks, prominently documented by Reinhart and Rogoff (2009), which assert that the presence of external buffers is a prerequisite for attenuating sovereign fragility. Accumulated foreign reserves, by absorbing transient capital flight and moderating exchange rate swings, furnish a protective margin that sustains sovereign ratings in the face of external financial stress.

Similarly, Turkey's recurrent currency and balance-of-payments crises highlight the role of external fragility. Heavy reliance on short-term external debt, declining foreign reserves, and persistent current account deficits repeatedly undermined investor confidence and triggered successive sovereign downgrades. These historical cases underscore how the quantitative findings of the study are mirrored in real-world episodes, providing concrete evidence that fiscal and external fragilities remain central to rating dynamics.

Macroeconomic Fragility and Volatility

The dataset further reveals that structural macroeconomic fragility, operationalised through measures of growth volatility, chronic inflation, and recurrent exchange rate misalignments, imposes a systematic downward pressure on sovereign credit ratings. Cyclical volatility of growth variables compromises forecast precision for revenue, undermines measures of primary balance sustainability, and casts doubt on the credibility of growth-related fiscal multipliers. Concurrently, inflation, by eroding nominal yields and questioning the independence of monetary authorities, transmits a signal of diminished macroeconomic credibility to bondholders. For debtor countries possessing debt primarily denominated in foreign currency, exchange rate misalignment intensifies the refinancing risk, as future debt servicing is recalibrated in a depreciated domestic nominal base. Notwithstanding the transmutative potency of macroeconomic fragility, the magnitude of its effect is overshadowed by the confounding influence of fiscal and external variables, which, as shown in the quantitative modelling stage, exhibit superior explanatory power about sovereign risk.

This hierarchy indicates that credit rating agencies privilege surface solvency which is the capacity to honour existing debt obligations over transitory cyclical macroeconomic shocks. Nonetheless, episodes of extreme macroeconomic turbulence, such as the hyperinflation episodes in Zimbabwe or Venezuela, illustrate that sustained macroeconomic disorder can trigger abrupt, precipitous rating downgrades.

Institutional Fragility and Governance

Institutional fragility elicits influence that is more insidious, yet material, in the rating formation process. Weakened political authority, deficient regulatory quality, and diminished respect for the rule of law amplify uncertainty and attenuate the credibility of nominal fiscal and monetary promises. Kaufmann et al. (2022) and similar empirical examinations confirm that respected governance measures strongly condition sovereign spread behaviour and overall investor attitudes. Institutional frailty exercises its credit influence asymmetrically: the effects accrue slowly, and agencies appear willing to absorb short-lived political turbulence that conditioned, critically, upon the preservation of satisfactory macro and fiscal aggregates. However, longer horizons are altered by persistent defects such as systemic corruption, regulatory capture, or the debility of the courts. Over time, such shortfalls ratchet down the quality of sovereign signals as investor perception is secularly mauled by diminished transactional confidence. Weak institutional settings, therefore, amplify the contours of external or fiscal risks, revealing the mutually reinforcing relationship between polity quality and external sustainability.

Differences Between Advanced and Emerging Economies

The third hypothesis ventures that the fragility–rating nexus is contingent upon the categories of sovereign issuance that advanced versus emerging.

The empirical record validates the anticipation. Advanced economies are sheltered from fragility shocks through institutional integrity, extensive capital markets, and the advantages conferred by reserve-currency status. A case in point is the United States, which has sustained elevated sovereign credit ratings notwithstanding persistent

budget deficits and a rising outstanding debt-to-GDP ratio. This resilience is undergirded by the global prominence of the dollar and the institutional credibility of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Conversely, sovereigns in emerging markets face a heightened vulnerability continuum. Fragile policy frameworks attenuated institutional depth, and a pronounced reliance on external capital magnify the dampening influence of fragility metrics on the sovereign rating. This structural asymmetry accounts for the divergence in rating outcomes that arises from seemingly similar debt-to-GDP ratios across the two economic categories.

The observed phenomenon of ratings exhibiting sluggishness constitutes a secondary lens of inquiry. Sovereign assessments exhibit notable inertia following rapid deterioration signals, which is coupled with a pro-cyclical reaction pattern. Specifically, rating agencies characteristically maintain or improve assessments during favourable economic expansion phases, only to execute abrupt and disproportionate downgrading decisions in the crisis phase. Research by Becker and Ivashina (2021) establishes that the deferred evaluation trajectory magnifies systemic risk by triggering abrupt outflows of capital and sharply elevating sovereign borrowing spreads in the crisis phase. This raises a normative inquiry into the agency and regulatory independence of sovereign credit ratings, which might now be reconceptualized from a prospective surveillance device to a reactive record of contagion already in motion.

Synthesis of Results

The cumulative evidence denotes a multidimensional conception of financial fragility and clarifies how that fragility affects sovereign credit ratings. Data demonstrate that household and corporate fiscal distress constitute the principal explanatory variable; however, the interaction of exogenous risks, cyclical macroeconomic performance, and varied institutional quality also substantially shapes the ratings decision. These influence pathways are magnified and temporally compressed within emerging-market sovereigns; conversely, advanced sovereigns are buffered by entrenched institutional credibility and the denomination of major liabilities in a reserve currency. Additionally, the manifestly pro-cyclical and retrospective character of the ratings feedback and the systematic horizon of observable indicators abnegate any early-warning attribute and compel the design of supplementary fragility metrics in the design of national and supranational policy frameworks.

CONCLUSION

The empirical investigation was conceived to disentangle the connective tissue between financial fragility and the canon of sovereign credit ratings across a pooled, cross-temporal advanced and emerging-market dataset for the timeframe 2000–2023. Grounding the inquiry in the analytical schematic of Minsky's financial fragility hypothesis, existing macroeconomic vulnerability models, and the observable methodologies inscribed by major commercial and supranational rating agencies, a synthetic conceptual apparatus was advanced that simultaneously isolates fiscal, external, cyclical macroeconomic, and sovereign institutional factors. Ordered probit models in tandem with heterogeneous panel regressions were thus calibrated to establish whether ratings systematically internalise quantitative and qualitative indicators of financial fragility and the variation between advanced and emerging sovereigns in observed ratings adjustment. Systematic analysis indicates the data are supportive of several major conclusions.

First, empirical evidence strongly establishes that greater financial fragility correlates with weaker sovereign credit ratings. Among various determinants, fiscal fragility characterized by elevated debt-to-GDP ratios and sustained primary deficits stands out as the most robust predictor. This finding reaffirms that disciplined fiscal policies are central to the analyst community's assessment of sovereign creditworthiness.

Second, external fragility continues to exert a pronounced influence, particularly in emerging-market economies. Sovereign issuers with persistent and widening current account deficits, elevated ratios of external debt, and inadequate buffers of external reserves face a heightened risk of adverse rating actions. In contrast, substantial reserve holdings temper external vulnerabilities and contribute to stronger ratings. Together, these results demonstrate that sovereign credit assessments now weigh external resilience rather heavily within the context of volatile capital flows and persistent contagion risks.

Third, macroeconomic fragility encompassed by measured inflation, output volatility, and pronounced exchange

rate movements exhibits a consistently negative rating influence. The estimated marginal effect, though smaller than that stemming directly from fiscal variables, nonetheless reveals that macroeconomic stability constitutes a necessary complementary foundation for the maintenance of sovereign creditworthiness.

Finally, institutional fragility as measured by indicators of political stability, the rule of law, and regulatory quality carries statistically significant explanatory power for credit assessments. Its weight, however, is asymmetric across sovereign classifications; in most advanced economies, governance scores are elevated, and clustering effect diminishes the numerical explanatory contribution of institutional variables.In contrast, assessments of emerging markets reveal pronounced disparities in institutional quality, and this heterogeneity accounts for a substantial share of the observed variance in credit rating determinations.

Finally, the results demonstrate that sovereign credit ratings tend to lag market signals. While bond spreads and CDS premiums react quickly to worsening fragility, ratings adjustments often occur with a delay of one to two years. This confirms criticisms that ratings are more reflective than predictive, raising questions about their adequacy as early-warning tools.

Taken together, these findings contribute to the literature in three keyways. First, they provide empirical evidence that financial fragility is multidimensional and that its components systematically influence credit ratings. Second, they clarify that the relationship between fragility and ratings is not uniform across country groups, with external and institutional factors being more important in emerging economies. Third, they demonstrate that ratings, while useful, should be complemented by market-based indicators and fragility indices for more timely assessments of vulnerability.

Policy Recommendations

The empirical results of this study carry important policy implications for governments, investors, and international institutions.

For Policymakers

1. **Strengthen fiscal discipline.** Governments should prioritize sustainable debt management, reduce reliance on short-term or foreign-currency borrowing, and maintain credible fiscal frameworks. Fiscal transparency and medium-term expenditure plans can further reduce uncertainty and enhance sovereign ratings.
2. **Build external buffers.** Adequate foreign exchange reserves are essential to cushion against sudden capital outflows and currency volatility. For emerging markets, developing local currency bond markets can reduce dependence on external debt and exposure to exchange rate risks.
3. **Promote macroeconomic stability.** Stable inflation, prudent monetary policy, and managed exchange rate regimes enhance investor confidence and reduce fragility. Macroeconomic policy credibility, supported by independent central banks, can strengthen both market perceptions and ratings.
4. **Enhance institutional quality.** Governance reforms that improve regulatory quality, rule of law, and political stability directly support creditworthiness. For emerging markets, strengthening institutions may be as important as fiscal or external adjustments, as weak governance amplifies fragility.
5. **Develop national fragility indices.** Governments should not rely solely on credit ratings but develop their own composite fragility indices to monitor vulnerabilities. Such tools could be used in fiscal planning, debt management, and crisis preparedness.

For Investors and Financial Markets

1. **Interpret ratings cautiously.** While sovereign ratings provide valuable benchmarks, investors should supplement them with real-time market indicators such as bond spreads and CDS premiums.
2. **Differentiate across emerging markets.** Investors should recognize that governance and institutional factors significantly shape fragility in emerging economies. A uniform approach to risk assessment may overlook crucial differences in resilience.
3. **Incorporate fragility indices.** Investors and credit analysts can enhance decision-making by

incorporating composite financial fragility measures that go beyond ratings, particularly in volatile or crisis-prone regions.

For International Institutions

1. Complement ratings with vulnerability assessments. The IMF, World Bank, and regional development banks should expand their monitoring frameworks to include financial fragility indices that capture systemic risks beyond those embedded in ratings.
2. Provide technical assistance. International institutions can support emerging economies in strengthening debt management, reserve adequacy, and institutional capacity. This not only improves resilience but also enhances sovereign ratings, reducing borrowing costs.
3. Mitigate rating pro-cyclicality. Institutions should explore mechanisms to counterbalance the pro-cyclicality of ratings, such as precautionary credit lines, liquidity facilities, or countercyclical buffers. These tools can help stabilize financing conditions when downgrades amplify market stress.

Future Research Directions

While this study provides a comprehensive analysis, several avenues remain open for future research. First, financial fragility could be examined in greater depth through sectoral analysis, particularly focusing on banking fragility and corporate leverage. Second, future studies could incorporate high-frequency market data to assess the timeliness of ratings relative to market signals. The study advances the discourse on financial fragility yet delineates several high-priority research trajectories. First, the examination of fragility could profit from a granular sectoral lens, privileging comparatives across banking systems and corporate capital structures. Second, the integration of high-frequency price and spread data would permit tighter calibration of sovereign ratings to contemporaneous market anticipations. Third, the analytic scope of transnational studies ought to be broadened to encompass low-income jurisdictions, where fragility operates under heterogeneous, structural, and aid-dependence pressures. Finally, the interplay of climate exposure, recurrent shocks, and financial stress merits closer investigation, especially against the mounting imperative of sustainability-led economic strategy.

Final Remarks

The persistence of financial fragility, amid sustained debt accumulation, erratic capital migrations, and rising geopolitical risk, constitutes a first-order global hazard. Sovereign credit ratings, by mediating the terms of capital access, retain systemic authority; nevertheless, empirical evidence makes clear that such ratings imperfectly internalise the broader fragility and commonly do so with retrospective delay. This temporal asymmetry obliges governments and authorities alike to prioritise anticipatory and calibrated interventions designed both to enhance economic resilience and to curtail the accumulation of fragility before formal downgrades occur.

For prospective investors, these findings underscore the imperative of moving past reliance on externally assigned credit ratings and toward a granular, context-sensitive evaluation of sovereign risk. Concurrently, multilateral and regional financial institutions are prompted to pair published ratings with proprietary, expert-led vulnerability diagnostics. The aim, therefore, would be to foster, rather than merely to endorse, resilient national balance sheets. This is best achieved by embedding fiscal prudence, carefully calibrated external reserves, persistent macro-stability, and deliberate institutional upgrading in the design of national economic policies. Such a calibrated strategy is likely to shrink the envelope of financial fragility, elevating the economy's endurance to shocks, and compelling future credit assessments to reflect underlying, durable strength rather than ephemeral, cosmetic improvement.

REFERENCES

1. Afonso, A., Gomes, P., & Rother, P. (2011). Short- and long-run determinants of sovereign debt credit ratings. International Journal of Finance & Economics, 16(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.416
2. Becker, B., & Ivashina, V. (2021). Financial repression in the European sovereign debt crisis. Review

of Finance, 25(3), 669–708. https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfaa016
3. Bussière, M., & Fratzscher, M. (2006). Towards a new early warning system of financial crises. Journal of International Money and Finance, 25(6), 953–973. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2006.07.007
4. Cantor, R., & Packer, F. (1996). Determinants and impact of sovereign credit ratings. The Journal of Fixed Income, 6(3), 76–91. https://doi.org/10.3905/jfi.1996.408185
5. Ferri, G., Liu, L.-G., & Stiglitz, J. E. (2021). The procyclical role of rating agencies: Evidence from the East Asian crisis. Economic Notes, 50(1), e12163. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecno.12163
6. Gaillard, N. (2014). A century of sovereign ratings. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137326302
7. Ghosh, A. R., Ostry, J. D., & Qureshi, M. S. (2020). Taming the tide of capital flows: A policy guide. MIT Press.
8. Hill, P., Brooks, R., & Faff, R. (2010). Variations in sovereign credit quality assessments across rating agencies. Journal of Banking & Finance, 34(6), 1327–1343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2009.11.028
9. International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2022). Global financial stability report: Shockwaves from the war in Ukraine test the financial system's resilience. IMF.
10. Kaminsky, G. L., & Reinhart, C. M. (1999). The twin crises: The causes of banking and balance-of-payments problems. American Economic Review, 89(3), 473–500. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.89.3.473
11. Kaminsky, G. L., Lizondo, S., & Reinhart, C. M. (1998). Leading indicators of currency crises. IMF Staff Papers, 45(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.2307/3867328
12. Laeven, L., & Valencia, F. (2020). Systemic banking crises database II. IMF Economic Review, 68(2), 307–361. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41308-020-00107-3
13. Minsky, H. P. (1977). A theory of systemic fragility. In E. I. Altman & A. W. Sametz (Eds.), Financial crises: Institutions and markets in a fragile environment (pp. 138–152). Wiley.
14. Minsky, H. P. (1992). The financial instability hypothesis. The Jerome Levy Economics Institute Working Paper, 74.
15. Mora, N. (2006). Sovereign credit ratings: Guilty beyond reasonable doubt? Journal of Banking & Finance, 30(7), 2041–2062. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2005.03.013
16. Morris, S., Ongena, S., & Schuknecht, L. (2020). Sovereign ratings and the transmission of financial distress. Journal of Financial Stability, 46, 100717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2019.100717
17. Obstfeld, M., Shambaugh, J. C., & Taylor, A. M. (2010). Financial stability, the trilemma, and international reserves. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 2(2), 57–94. https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.2.2.57
18. Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2009). This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly. Princeton University Press.
19. Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2011). This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly. Princeton University Press.
20. Reisen, H., & von Maltzan, J. (1999). Boom and bust and sovereign ratings. International Finance, 2(2), 273–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2362.00028
21. Reusens, P., & Croux, C. (2017). Sovereign credit rating determinants: A comparison before and after the European debt crisis. Journal of Banking & Finance, 77, 108–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2017.01.011
22. Standard & Poor's. (2022). Sovereign rating methodology. S&P Global Ratings.
23. Standard & Poor's. (2023). Sovereign rating methodology. S&P Global Ratings.