

Implementación de un impuesto negativo sobre la renta en España. Impacto en el mercado de trabajo

Amadeo Fuenmayor

Rafael Granell

Teresa Savall



III Workshop en Evaluación de Políticas Públicas

València, 4 de febrero 2022
Aula 2P04 Departament d'Economia Aplicada
Facultat d'Economia. Universitat de València

 Cátedra de Tributación Autonómica  EVALUACIÓN ECONÓMICA PÚBLICA  UNIVERSITAT ID VALÈNCIA  Facultat d'Economia  GENERALITAT VALENCIANA

EVALPUB
EVALUACIÓN ECONÓMICA PÚBLICA

CTA Cátedra en Tributación Autónoma

INTRODUCTION

- The tax-benefit system ability to fight against inequality and poverty is limited.
- Among the proposed measures to fight poverty a Basic Income (BI) scheme can be stressed. It could be implemented through:
 1. A periodic, monetary and personal **transfer**
 2. Using the Tax Administration with a **Negative Income Tax (NIT)**.
Advantage: NIT manages combining the tax system and the public benefit system into a single mechanism.
- Criticism: such a reform will make people leave the labour market
- Index:
 - Simulating a NIT
 - Estimation of wages
 - Labour Supply Estimation
 - Changes in labour behavior due to NIT

1. Introduction

2. NIT Simulation

3. Estimation of wages

4. Labour supply estimation

5. Results

NIT SIMULATION

1. Introduction
2. **NIT Simulation**
3. Estimation of wages
4. Labour supply estimation
5. Results

- Base Scenario 2018 Spanish Income Tax (EU-SILC 2019, data 2018)
- Self-financing reform (revenue neutral)
 - Expenditure side: removal of non-contributory public benefits (no needed due to the negative side of NIT).
 - Positive part of NIT: Changes in tax rates, Simplifying: eliminating joint taxation, dual tax base, removing deductions and tax credits...
- NIT Key Parameters: **BI = ME x TR**
 - BI amount: € 5,550 (General deduction in 2018 PIT) close to minimum non-contributory Social Security pension in 2018 (€5,321.40) \approx 40% Median Equivalent Income (Children 30%)
 - Tax rates (TR): 50% (both for positive and negative side)
 - Minimum Exemption (ME): €11,100

ESTIMATION OF WAGES

1. Introduction
2. NIT Simulation
3. **Estimation of wages**
4. Labour supply estimation
5. Results

- Database: 2018 EUROMOD (≈ SILC for Spain)
- Two-step Heckman selection model: estimating wage salaries for potential workers
 - First step: estimating the probability of labour participation (Probit) → Inverse of Mills ratio.
 - Second step: use the Mills ratio to estimate wage rates (OLS),

Ln Wage Rate Equation (OLS)

	Women	Men
Experience	0.0529393***	0.0278306***
Experience ² /100	-0.0643393***	-0.0111569**
Education (<Primary as reference)		
Primary	0.1193719	0.1168879***
Secondary	0.0729114	0.1302139***
Secondary+	0.2566916**	0.1306699**
Post-Secondary	0.1283973	0.4483846**
Higher Education	0.7338344***	0.1465729**
Region (Galicia as reference)
Constant	0.9371978***	1.994635***

Participation Equation (Probit)

	Women	Men
Age	0.1115461***	0.1149692***
Age ² /100	-0.1453415***	-0.1412149***
Income of the partner	-0,00000615	0.0000999***
Number of children	-0.0655665**	0.017160
Education (Primary or less as reference)		
Post-Secondary	0.419810***	0.4169121***
Higher Education	1.156756***	0.8165719***
Immigrant	-0.585827***	-0.5865955***
Region (Galicia as reference)
Constant	-2.11018***	-1.657727***
Mills Ratio (Lambda)	-0.102821***	-1.302445***
Chi ²	550.36	221.74
N	5831	4468

*p<0,1; **p<0,05; ***p<0,01

Source: Own calculations using EUROMOD

LABOUR SUPPLY ESTIMATION

- Having wages and hours of work for men and women, we can now estimate labour behaviour.
- We perform a structural labour supply model: labour supply as a discrete choice problem, considering family as a unitary agent (Aaberge et al., 1995; Van Soest, 1995; Creedy & Kalb, 2005; Sommer, 2016; Paniagua, 2015; Oliver & Spadaro, 2017).
- We assume a utility function, depending on leisure and disposable income.

$$U^* = \beta_h h + \beta_y y + v$$

U deterministic utility function

Error term which extreme value type I density function:

$$f(v) = e^{-v} e^{-e^{-v}}$$

- In the case of couples, the deterministic utility function takes this form:

$$U = \beta_{h_f} h_f + \beta_{h_m} h_m + \beta_y y$$

LABOUR SUPPLY ESTIMATION


- For individuals, we consider three categories, based on [working hours distribution](#), both for males and females:
 - No work (if they declare 8 or less hours of work per week)
 - Part-time work (9 or more hours, and less than 30 hours),
 - Full-time work (30 or more hours of work per week).
- We calculate net income for individuals (using EUROMOD) under the three categories. $U = \beta_h h + \beta_y y$
- This model is estimated by maximum likelihood: find the **parameters** that produce the highest probability of observing the actual hour values.
- For couples: nine different possibilities

1. Introduction
2. NIT Simulation
3. Estimation of wages
- 4. Labour supply estimation**
5. Results


LABOUR SUPPLY ESTIMATION: Working hours distribution in Spain

- 1. Introduction
- 2. NIT Simulation
- 3. Estimation of wages
- 4. Labour supply estimation**
- 5. Results

Female



Male



LABOUR SUPPLY ESTIMATION

- 1. Introduction
- 2. NIT Simulation
- 3. Estimation of wages
- 4. Labour supply estimation**
- 5. Results

- The estimators are as expected: utility increases with income and decreases with leisure, but both functions are convex.
- We use these estimators to calculate utilities for each individual in the dataset, using net income and leisure under **different labour choices**.
- And we know how the actual behaviour of this individual was.

Modelling deterministic utility

Disposable Income (Yd)	0.0047734***
Yd x Yd	-3.88e-07***
Yd x h	-.000029***
Hours of work (h)	-.2334928***
h x age	0.0013593***
h x gender	0.0195699***
h x h	0.002002***
N	22623

Source: Own calculations using EUROMOD

LABOUR SUPPLY ESTIMATION

- **Calibration process:** we add random draws from the extreme value distribution to the deterministic utility function in order to obtain U^* . Draws are only kept if the resulting hours derived by maximizing U^* are the same as the observed in the data. We perform 100 'good' draws for each case (Baseline Scenario).

$$U^* = \beta_h h + \beta_y y + v$$

- **Performing the NIT proposal:**
 - We re-calculate disposable income for every unit, considering the new NIT and removing prior benefits. We do that for every possible scenario (3 cases for individuals, 9 cases for couples)
 - We calculate the utility of individual / couples under these different scenarios: new disposable income and different work situation after the reform. We make individuals / households choice the new best option after NIT.
 - We compare the labour behaviour before and after the reform.

1. Introduction
2. NIT Simulation
3. Estimation of wages
4. **Labour supply estimation**
5. Results

RESULTS: ONE-WORKER HOUSEHOLDS

1. Introduction
2. NIT Simulation
3. Estimation of wages
4. Labour supply estimation
5. Results

Transition matrix of working hours (one-worker households) before and after the NIT reform					
a) ALL THE PEOPLE		Individual working hours after NIT			Total
		0	20	40	
Current individual working hours	0	88,39%	0,54%	11,07%	100.0%
	20	5,56%	82,68%	11,76%	100.0%
	40	9,85%	1,93%	88,22%	100.0%
Total		103,80%	85,14%	111,06%	
b) MALES		Individual working hours after NIT			Total
		0	20	40	
Current individual working hours	0	69,02%	0,86%	30,12%	100.0%
	20	1,14%	73,53%	25,33%	100.0%
	40	5,44%	1,11%	93,45%	100.0%
Total		75,61%	75,50%	148,90%	
c) FEMALES		Individual working hours after NIT			Total
		0	20	40	
Current individual working hours	0	95,75%	0,42%	3,84%	100.0%
	20	7,79%	87,30%	4,91%	100.0%
	40	13,83%	2,67%	83,50%	100.0%
Total		117.37%	90.38%	92.25%	

Shorrocks (1978)

$$\widehat{M}_S(P) = \frac{n - \text{trace } P}{n - 1}$$

Bartholomew (1973)

$$\widehat{M}_B(P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r_{ij} |i - j| r_i$$

Net Bartholomew Index

$$\widehat{M}_N(P) = \widehat{M}_B(+)- - \widehat{M}_B(-)$$

Mobility indexes of one-worker households. NIT reform			
	Male	Female	Total
Shorrocks index: $\widehat{M}_S(P)$	0.32004472	0.167257872	0.203551361
Bartholomew index: $\widehat{M}_B(P)$	0.22206230	0.206782454	0.212962472
Positive part: $\widehat{M}_B(+)$	0.13549508	0.032774438	0.074320382
Negative part: $\widehat{M}_B(-)$	0.08656721	0.174008016	0.138642090
Net Bartholomew Index: $\widehat{M}_N(P)$	0.04892787	-0.141233578	-0.064321708

Source: own calculations

RESULTS: TWO-WORKER HOUSEHOLDS

1. Introduction
2. NIT Simulation
3. Estimation of wages
4. Labour supply estimation
5. Results

Transition matrix of working hours (two-worker households) before and after the NIT reform							
		Total household working hours after NIT					Total
		0	20	40	60	80	
Current total working hours	0	45.5%	0.0%	21.4%	6.6%	26.4%	100.0%
	20	2.0%	24.6%	24.5%	9.3%	39.6%	100.0%
	40	0.4%	0.1%	82.8%	1.9%	14.8%	100.0%
	60	0.8%	0.1%	6.1%	69.2%	23.8%	100.0%
	80	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	99.7%	100.0%
Total		48.8%	24.8%	135.2%	87.0%	204.3%	

Mobility indexes of two-worker households.	
NIT reform	
	Total
Shorrocks index: $\widehat{M}_S(P)$	0.445551223
Bartholomew index: $\widehat{M}_B(P)$	0.107078900
Positive part: $\widehat{M}_B(+)$	0.093711928
Negative part: $\widehat{M}_B(-)$	0.013367006
Net Bartholomew Index: $\widehat{M}_N(P)$	0.080344923

Bartholomew (1973)

$$\widehat{M}_B(P) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r_{ij} |i - j| r_i$$

Net Bartholomew Index

$$\widehat{M}_N(P) = \widehat{M}_B(+)$$

Source: own calculations

Implementación de un impuesto negativo sobre la renta en España. Impacto en el mercado de trabajo

¡GRACIAS!

(Amadeo.Fuenmayor@uv.es)