

IZA DP No. 7215

Comparing Inequality Aversion across Countries When Labor Supply Responses Differ

Olivier Bargain
Mathias Dolls
Dirk Neumann

Andreas Peichl
Sebastian Siegloch

February 2013

Comparing Inequality Aversion across Countries When Labor Supply Responses Differ

Olivier Bargain

*Aix-Marseille School of Economics, CNRS
& EHESS, IZA and CEPS-INSTEAD*

Andreas Peichl

IZA, University of Cologne and CESifo

Mathias Dolls

IZA and University of Cologne

Sebastian Sieglösch

IZA and University of Cologne

Dirk Neumann

IZA and University of Cologne

Discussion Paper No. 7215
February 2013

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post Foundation. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Comparing Inequality Aversion across Countries When Labor Supply Responses Differ^{*}

We analyze to which extent social inequality aversion differs across nations when controlling for actual country differences in labor supply responses. Towards this aim, we estimate labor supply elasticities at both extensive and intensive margins for 17 EU countries and the US. Using the same data, inequality aversion is measured as the degree of redistribution implicit in current tax-benefit systems, when these systems are deemed optimal. We find relatively small differences in labor supply elasticities across countries. However, this changes the cross-country ranking in inequality aversion compared to scenarios following the standard approach of using uniform elasticities. Differences in redistributive views are significant between three groups of nations. Labor supply responses are systematically larger at the extensive margin and often larger for the lowest earnings groups, exacerbating the implicit Rawlsian views for countries with traditional social assistance programs. Given the possibility that labor supply responsiveness was underestimated at the time these programs were implemented, we show that such wrong perceptions would lead to less pronounced and much more similar levels of inequality aversion.

JEL Classification: H11, H21, D63, C63

Keywords: social preferences, redistribution, optimal income taxation, labor supply

Corresponding author:

Andreas Peichl
IZA
P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany
E-mail: peichl@iza.org

^{*} We thank Dhammika Dharmapala (the editor) and three anonymous referees as well as discussants & participants at ZEW (Mannheim), the NTA conference 2010 (Chicago) and several seminars (IZA, FU Berlin, UCD) for helpful comments and suggestions. We are indebted to all past and current members of the EUROMOD consortium for the construction and development of EUROMOD, and to the NBER for access to TAXSIM. The ECHP and EU-SILC were made available by Eurostat; the Austrian version of the ECHP by Statistik Austria; the PSBH by the University of Liège and the University of Antwerp; the Estonian HBS by Statistics Estonia; the IDS by Statistics Finland; the EBF by INSEE; the GSOEP by DIW Berlin; the Greek HBS by the National Statistical Service of Greece; the Living in Ireland Survey by the ESRI; the SHIW by the Bank of Italy; the SEP by Statistics Netherlands; the Polish HBS by the University of Warsaw; the IDS by Statistics Sweden; and the FES by the UK ONS through the Data Archive. Material from the FES is Crown Copyright and is used by permission. None of the institutions cited above bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of the data reported here. The usual disclaimer applies.

1 Introduction

The level of redistribution through taxes and transfers differs greatly between countries. In the empirical literature, standard characterizations of these differences rely on the effect of tax-benefit systems on inequality and poverty. However, most studies ignore labor supply behavior when evaluating the level of redistribution, thus ignoring important constraints faced by governments when setting taxes. More comprehensive approaches, which account for the equity-efficiency trade-off underlying tax-benefit policy design, make use of “plausible” elasticities taken from the literature. For instance, Immervoll et al. (2007) compare the efficiency costs of redistribution across European countries by assuming “reasonable” uniform elasticities. The fact that some countries are willing to accept larger efficiency losses from redistribution reflects either highly redistributive views or – redistributive tastes being equal – larger labor supply responsiveness to taxation. Hence, to go one step further, it is necessary to estimate labor supply elasticities on the same data used for optimal tax characterization. In this way, country differences in social preferences can be disentangled from differences in individual consumption-leisure preferences.

This present paper addresses this issue by analyzing the extent to which social inequality aversion differs across nations when controlling for actual differences in labor supply responses. Using a common empirical approach, we estimate labor supply elasticities at both the extensive and intensive margin for 17 EU countries and the US. Applying the same estimation method and model specification provides estimates that can be consistently compared across countries. We focus on a homogenous group, namely childless single individuals, with individual responses aggregated to obtain elasticities at income group levels consistent with the discrete optimal tax model formulated by Saez (2002). As suggested by Bourguignon and Spadaro (2012) in the case of France, we invert Saez’s optimal tax model to retrieve parameters for the degree of social inequality aversion (implicitly) embodied in actual tax-benefit systems. Importantly, given the optimality of the observed systems and existing level of redistribution, social inequality aversion must be higher when labor supply is more responsive, i.e. efficiency losses from redistribution are higher.

Our results are as follows. We find relatively small differences in labor supply elasticities across countries. However, this changes the cross-country ranking in inequality aversion compared to scenarios following the standard approach of using uniform elasticities. Differences in redistributive views are significant between three groups of nations.¹ The revealed social inequality aversion parameters range from utilitarian preferences in Southern Europe and the US to Rawlsian²

¹That is, we obtain partial orderings. For instance, we can say that the French, Irish and UK systems are significantly “more Rawlsian” than the US system and less redistributive than the Swedish one. Yet we cannot conclude that inequality aversion is higher in France than in the UK or Ireland.

²Note that like many, we improperly use the term “Rawlsian” throughout the paper. Maximizing utility of the worst off person in the society is not the original version of Rawls (1972) but a kind of welfarist version of Rawls, as explained in Kanbur et al. (2006).

views in Nordic and some Continental European countries. We find that labor supply responses are systematically larger at the extensive margin – generalizing previous results for the US to a large group of Western countries – and often larger for the lowest earnings groups. This result necessarily exacerbates the implicit Rawlsian views revealed for Continental European countries with traditional social assistance programs. However, revealed redistributive tastes become less pronounced and much more similar across countries if we impose zero labor supply responses (for instance, reflecting that policymakers may have ignored efficiency constraints at the time these welfare programs were implemented). This finding highlights the importance of accounting for efficiency constraints when assessing social inequality aversion.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the related literature. Section 3 presents the optimal tax model and the inversion procedure. Section 4 describes the main elements of the empirical implementation (data, tax-benefit calculations and income concepts), while Section 5 presents the labor supply estimations. Inequality aversion results are reported and discussed in Section 6. Section 7 concludes. Descriptive statistics and labor supply elasticities are reported in an Appendix to this paper (Sections I and II). An additional Appendix (A–F) gathers additional material and robustness checks.

2 Related Literature

The increasing availability of representative household datasets has allowed bringing optimal tax theory to the data (see the survey of Piketty and Saez, 2013). However, empirical applications remain scarce and limited in policy relevance because two fundamental primitives of the model are difficult to obtain, in particular using consistent data, i.e. labor supply behavior and social preferences. While most applications assume “plausible” values for both of them (as discussed below), we estimate these individual and social preference parameters from the same data.

First, in terms of labor supply elasticities, most optimal tax applications have drawn estimates from the literature. However, the size of elasticities varies greatly across studies, even for the same country, due to different empirical approaches, data sources, data selection and time periods (see Blundell and MaCurdy, 1999; Bargain et al., 2012). Therefore, it is not clear which estimates to retain for cross-country comparisons. In our case, it is important to capture genuine differences in labor supply preferences across countries in order to retrieve tax-benefit implicit social preferences. The present study suggests a harmonized approach that nets out the main methodological differences (estimation method, model specification, type of data). Another important aspect is the distinction between intensive and extensive responses. The crucial role of the extensive margin has been acknowledged in the optimal tax literature since Diamond (1980). Our estimates on single individuals show the major role of the extensive margin to be a consistent result across all countries, with the largest responses found in the low income groups. This result necessarily impacts on normative analyses (see Eissa et al., 2008). Precisely, as explained by Immervoll et al. (2007), the prevalence of large participation

responses particularly affects the debate on whether redistribution should be directed to the workless poor (through traditional demogrant policies) or working poor (via in-work support). Countries choosing traditional social assistance programs despite large participation responses in low income groups must therefore have very high redistributive tastes.

Second, available studies typically choose reasonable levels of inequality aversion to characterize optimal tax schedules. Inversely, a country's redistributive preferences at a certain point in time can be explicitly retrieved by inverting the underlying optimal tax model. This approach was first suggested in the context of optimal commodity taxation (Christiansen and Jansen, 1978, Stern, 1977, Ahmad and Stern, 1984, Decoster and Schokkaert, 1989, Madden, 1996) and regulation of utilities (Ross, 1984). It has been extended to the Mirrlees' income tax problem by Bourguignon and Spadaro (2012), who characterize the properties of the tax-revealed social welfare function and provide an illustration on French data, making assumptions regarding the level of labor supply elasticities. These elasticities are estimated on data for the UK and Germany in Blundell et al. (2009), who retrieve the implicit social welfare functions for the two countries, focusing on single mothers. The present study adopts the optimal tax inversion approach to systematically compare redistributive tastes between European countries and the US.³ In a similar vein, Gordon and Cullen (2011) recover the implicit degree of redistribution between federal and state taxation in the US.

Our analysis follows the standard welfarist approach with the social planner maximizing a weighted sum of (increasing transformations of) individual utilities. In this way, optimal tax formulas can be expressed in terms of the social marginal welfare weights attached to each individual (or income group), which measure the social value of an extra dollar of consumption to each individual (group). This framework has recently been generalized by Saez and Stantcheva (2012) in considering endogenous social marginal welfare weights. On the one hand, in a normative approach, these weights can be ex-ante specified to fit some principle of justice. On the other hand, in a positive approach, implicit welfare weights can be derived empirically, namely by retrieving actual social preferences. Our tax-transfer revealed approach belongs to this second stream of research, which also includes attempts to directly elicit social preferences.⁴

Further to a mere measure of social preferences, it is also necessary to understand the mechanisms

³The present paper differs from its ancestor, Bargain and Spadaro (2008), and a follow-up available as Spadaro (2008), in several ways. Importantly, the present study integrates optimal tax analysis with labor supply estimation and we cover a much larger set of countries. Therefore, conclusions are simply different.

⁴Some studies elicit people's attitude towards inequality using survey data (see e.g. Fong, 2001, Corneo and Grüner, 2002, or Isaksson and Lindskog, 2009). Tax preferences obtained in surveys have also been compared with actual tax schedules (Singhal, 2008). In behavioral economics, experiments are often used to assess preferences of a group (see for instance Fehr and Schmidt, 1999). With the well-known 'leaky bucket' experiment, respondents are able to transfer money from a rich individual to a poor one but incur a loss of money in the process, so that the equity-efficiency trade-off is taken into account in measuring tastes for redistribution (see for instance Amiel et al., 1999); in recent experiments, participants have voted for alternative tax structures (e.g. Ackert et al., 2007). Finally, in the public economic literature, implicit value judgments may be drawn from inequality measures, assuming a natural rate of subjective inequality (see Lambert et al., 2003, Duclos, 2000).

shaping them (cf. Piketty, 1995) and investigate the political economy channel through which policies are designed and implemented. Real world tax-benefit schedules result from historical and political economy forces. Nonetheless, the fiction of a social planner can be seen as a proxy for a more complex political process. Probabilistic voting models suggest that particular social welfare functions are maximized in political equilibrium (cf. Coughlin, 1992).⁵ Saez and Stantcheva (2012) also show that the median voter optimal tax rate is a particular case of the optimal (linear) tax rate where social welfare weights are concentrated at the median. This clarifies the close connection between optimal tax theory and political economy. In the latter, social welfare weights that result from the political process are used rather than being derived from marginal utility of consumption as in the standard utilitarian tax theory. Nonetheless, the structure of resulting tax formulas is the same. Finally, another way to approach the problem is to take political economy forces as distortions in the optimal tax design (see Acemoglu et al., 2010). However, accounting for political economy considerations is beyond the scope of the present paper. Hence, as discussed in the next section, we assume the observed system to be optimal while being agnostic about the underlying political process and using the most simplistic political economy model: the fiction of a social planner.

3 Optimal Tax Model and its Inversion

We adopt the discrete version of the optimal tax model by Saez (2002), assuming the population to be partitioned into $I + 1$ income groups comprising I groups of individuals who work, ranked by increasing market income levels Y_i ($i = 1, \dots, I$), and a group $i = 0$ of non-workers. Disposable income is defined as $C_i = Y_i - T_i$, where T_i is the effective tax paid by group i (it is *effective* given that it includes all taxes and social contributions minus all transfers). Non-workers receive a negative tax, i.e. a positive transfer $-T_0$, identical to C_0 by definition and often referred to as a demogrant policy (minimum income, social assistance, etc.). Proportion h_i measures the share of group i in the population. With this discretized setting, Saez derives the following formula for the optimal tax rates:

$$\frac{T_i - T_{i-1}}{C_i - C_{i-1}} = \frac{1}{\zeta_i h_i} \sum_{j=i}^I h_j \left[1 - g_j - \eta_j \frac{T_j - T_0}{C_j - C_0} \right] \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, I, \quad (1)$$

⁵It would certainly be interesting to extend the present approach to some explicit political economy model (see Castanheira et al., 2012, for a survey and empirical assessment), despite basic representations such as the median voter hypothesis being of limited applicability (cf. Alesina and Giuliano, 2011). Many dimensions are involved in the case of tax-benefit policy design in the real world, including other institutions (e.g. labor market policies, as noted above), various actors (workers, unions, lobbies), and the role of expert and international influences (cf. Banks et al., 2005), which are often not accounted for by theory. Furthermore, social choice models in presence of endogenous labor supply are rare.

with η_i and ζ_i the elasticities at extensive and intensive margins respectively, and g_i the set of marginal social welfare weights assigned by the government to groups $i = 0, \dots, I$.⁶ The elasticities are defined as:

$$\zeta_i = \frac{C_i - C_{i-1}}{h_i} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial(C_i - C_{i-1})}, \quad (2)$$

$$\eta_i = \frac{C_i - C_0}{h_i} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial(C_i - C_0)}. \quad (3)$$

Responses are restricted to only occur from one group to the neighboring group, and vice versa. Social preferences are summarized by the set of welfare weights g_i . These weights can be interpreted as the *(per capita) marginal social welfare of transferring one euro to an individual in group i , expressed in terms of public funds*. The only assumption made on preferences is that there is no income effect, a traditional restriction in this literature, supported by our empirical results as discussed below.⁷ When income effects are ruled out, an additional constraint emerges from Saez's model, normalizing weights as follows:

$$\sum_i h_i g_i = 1. \quad (4)$$

The inverse optimal tax problem is relatively straightforward. A system consisting of I equations (1) and equation (4) can be inverted to retrieve the $I + 1$ marginal social welfare weights g_i given appropriate values for (observed) income levels Y_i , (simulated) net tax levels T_i and (estimated) elasticities. The complete demonstration of the inversion procedure is documented by Bourguignon and Spadaro (2012).⁸ To summarize redistributive tastes in each country by a single-valued index, we use the parameterization suggested by Saez (2002) to relate weights and net incomes, i.e.:

$$g_i = 1/(p \cdot C_i)^\gamma \quad \text{for all } i = 0, \dots, I. \quad (5)$$

⁶Note that $\frac{T_i - T_{i-1}}{C_i - C_{i-1}}$ corresponds to $\frac{T'_i}{1 - T'_i}$ in the standard formulation of optimal tax rules, with $T'_i = \frac{T_i - T_{i-1}}{Y_i - Y_{i-1}}$ the effective marginal tax rate (EMTR) faced by group i .

⁷Utility functions are not directly specified in Saez's model. Yet, the weights g_i comprise the derivative of the implicit social welfare function (integrated over all the workers within group i) and the individuals' marginal utility of income. Utility functions are, however, necessary for the estimation of elasticities. For this, we choose a flexible functional form (see section 4). The condition of zero income effects is not imposed a priori, but rather checked a posteriori. We find small or insignificant effects, therefore this assumption is acceptable as a first approximation (see Appendix II).

⁸Due to the inversion procedure above we do not need to calculate elasticities for group 0 – there is no such elasticity according to definitions in equations (2),(3). In fact, the definition of the extensive/intensive elasticity for group 1 η_1 ($= \zeta_1$) can be interpreted as the decrease in h_1 due to a move to group 0 by workers when $C_1 - C_0$ decreases, or alternatively as the response by non-workers (a move to group 1) when $C_1 - C_0$ increases. This reverse response is entirely determined by normalization (4), i.e. simple algebra leads to:

$$\frac{C_1 - C_0}{h_0} \frac{\partial h_0}{\partial(C_1 - C_0)} = -\frac{h_1 g_1}{h_0 g_0} \eta_1.$$

It does not mean that groups 0 and 1 are similar in terms of labor supply preferences, simply that only one Saez elasticity (here η_1) is required to capture inter-group moves for these two groups.

In this expression, p denotes the marginal value of public funds and γ is a scalar parameter reflecting the social aversion to inequality. The higher γ , the more pro-redistributive the social preferences, from $\gamma = 0$ (utilitarian preferences) to $\gamma = +\infty$ (the Rawlsian maximin case). After obtaining the values of g_i by the inversion of the optimal tax model, we can estimate expression (5) to recover the parameter γ for each country.⁹

Both the behavioral elasticities η_i and ζ_i and group sizes h_i may be endogenous to the tax-benefit system (as explained by Saez, 2002, and discussed and analyzed in Bargain et al., 2012) or other institutions affecting labor supply behavior (such as child care arrangements) which depend on the social planner’s inequality aversion. While this source of endogeneity can be a serious problem for the standard optimal tax approach (that is using observed data and estimated elasticities to derive the optimal tax-benefit schedule), it is, by construction, not problematic in the inverted optimal tax approach that we use in this study to recover the inequality aversion of the social planner (see Bourguignon and Spadaro, 2012). As one of the central assumptions of this approach is that the observed system corresponds to the optimal one, this necessarily has to incorporate elasticities and populations weights as well. Without this optimality assumption, agents would respond to any ‘optimal’ policy set by the planner such that elasticities and group sizes change. This in turn invalidates equation (1), i.e., tax levels are no longer optimal, and the optimal tax rule must be applied again, generating further responses, etc. Therefore, it must be assumed that at least one fixed point exists in which the left and right-hand sides of equation (1) are consistent. Hence, the key identifying assumption is that the social planner optimally chooses taxes (and other institutions such as child care) in such a way that the resulting income distribution (taking into account behavioral responses) corresponds to the planner’s redistributive preferences. This general optimality assumption is hence crucial to the inverted tax approach as it overcomes the endogeneity issues encountered in the standard optimal tax problem and allows us to recover the planner’s inequality aversion by retrieving taxes and elasticities from the data.

⁹The present characterization could be based on alternative social objective functions. Kanbur and Tuomala (2011) have recently clarified the interrelationships between various types of social objectives, including some with sharp discontinuity at the poverty line (charitable conservatism and poverty radicalism) and less angular versions such as usual constant elasticity inequality aversion (as the measure γ used here) and the “slow, quick, slow” empirical property of the Gini weights. Notice, however, that it follows from the discrete form of the social welfare function used in the Saez optimal tax model that we do not impose any restriction on the shape of the marginal social welfare weights (and hence allow for any discontinuities, as those present in charitable conservatism, for instance). We only impose a constant elasticity inequality aversion in equation (5), i.e. to derive a single-valued approximation of redistributive tastes in each country for the purpose of international comparisons. It could be interesting to replicate our analysis with non-welfarist objectives (e.g. Kanbur et al., 2006) or welfare measures that preserve individual heterogeneity (see Fleurbaey, 2008).

4 Empirical Implementation

We now present the data and tax-benefit simulations used to calculate Y_i and C_i as well as the income group definition. We use datasets for the US, 14 members of the EU prior to May 1, 2004 (the so-called EU-15, except Luxembourg) and 3 new member states (NMS), namely Estonia, Hungary and Poland. The different data sources fulfill the basic requirements for our exercise, i.e. they provide a representative sample of the population (and in particular the income distribution), are comparable across countries (the definition of the key variables has been harmonized), and contain the necessary information to estimate labor supply behavior.

The fundamental information required by the optimal tax model is the effective tax $T_i = Y_i - C_i$ for each income group $i = 0, \dots, I$. Household gross income is aggregated to obtain Y_i . We simulate taxes, social contributions and benefits in order to obtain household disposable income, which can be aggregated at the group level to obtain C_i .¹⁰ Tax-benefit simulations are performed using two calculators: EUROMOD for EU countries and TAXSIM for the US. EUROMOD is designed to simulate the redistributive systems of EU-15 countries and NMS. This unique tool provides a complete picture of the redistributive and incentive potential of European welfare regimes.¹¹ The datasets associated to EUROMOD are presented in Tables I.1 and I.2 (Appendix I).¹² We cover the policy years 1998 and/or 2001 for EU-15 countries and 2005 for NMS.¹³ TAXSIM (version v9) is the NBER calculator presented in Feenberg and Coutts (1993), augmented here by simulations of social transfers. As in several contributions (e.g. Eissa et al., 2008, or Eissa and Hoynes, 2011), we use it in combination with the IPUMS version (Integrated Public Use Microdata Series) of the Current Population Survey (CPS) data. We use the 2006 data, which contains information on 2005 incomes.

Our selection focuses on potential salary workers in the age range 18 – 64 (thus excluding pensioners, students, farmers and the self-employed). We exclude all households where capital income represents more than 25% of the total gross income, as their labor supply differs from our target group. Most importantly, as with Blundell et al. (2009) we must focus on a homogenous demographic group, since aggregating across different household types within a social welfare function poses fundamental difficulties in terms of household comparisons and implicit equivalence scales. Furthermore, Saez’s model is formulated for single individuals; deriving optimal

¹⁰Simulated disposable incomes are used in place of self-reported incomes for two reasons. First, they give a better rendering of the redistributive intention of the social planner. Indeed, actual (and self-reported) levels of taxes or benefits are affected by non-intended behavior such as the low take-up rate of some benefits. Second, simulated incomes are also consistent with the need to simulate counterfactual disposable incomes for all options of hours worked in order to estimate the labor supply model.

¹¹An introduction to EUROMOD, a descriptive analysis of taxes and transfers in the EU countries and robustness checks are provided by Sutherland (2001). EUROMOD has been used in several empirical studies, notably in the comparison of European welfare regimes by Immervoll et al. (2007).

¹²Note that Appendices with roman numbers are directly attached to this document while Appendices starting with capital letters are part of an independent document.

¹³Note that we make use of those policy years available in EUROMOD at the time of writing (1998, 2001 or 2005). For comparison, we use TAXSIM simulations for the year 2005.

taxes for couple households with two potential earners is acknowledged as being much more difficult (see the survey of Piketty and Saez, 2013). For our analysis, we thus select *single men and single women without children*.¹⁴ Remarkably, we show that international comparisons on single individuals reflect much of the differences in overall redistribution across countries (see Appendix E).

In order to ease cross-country comparisons, we partition the population of each country into a small number of groups, $I + 1 = 6$. In our baseline, group 0 is composed of inactive individuals who report neither labor nor replacement income. Contributory benefits are treated as replacement income derived from a pure insurance mechanism; in particular, unemployment benefits are interpreted as delayed income. However, in the case of the UK, Ireland and Poland, unemployment benefits (UB) are paid according to flat rates and have no strong link to past contributions. Hence, for these three countries UB are treated as redistribution. Next, groups $i = 1, \dots, 5$ are simply calculated as income quintiles among workers. Descriptive statistics of our selected sample are reported in Tables I.1–I.2 of Appendix I.¹⁵

5 Labor Supply Estimation

5.1 Empirical Model

We estimate the behavioral elasticities from Saez’s optimal tax model, η_i and ζ_i , using a homogenous estimation method. We rely on a common structural discrete-choice model as used in well-known labor supply studies for Europe (e.g. Blundell et al., 2000, van Soest, 1995) or the US (e.g. Hoynes, 1996), which enables us to calculate comparable elasticity measures for all countries under study. Given that the structural labor supply model has become a standard tool in the literature, we only present our main modeling assumptions (more information can be found in the aforementioned studies as well as Blundell and MaCurdy, 1999). For each country separately (suppressing the country index in the following), we specify consumption-leisure preferences using a quadratic utility function, i.e. the utility of household k choosing the discrete choice $j = 1, \dots, J$ can be written as:

$$U_{kj} = V_{kj}(c_{kj}, h_{kj}) + \epsilon_{kj} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{with } V_{kj}(c_{kj}, h_{kj}) = \alpha_{ck}c_{kj} + \alpha_{cc}c_{kj}^2 + \alpha_{hk}h_{kj} + \alpha_{hh}(h_{kj})^2 + \alpha_{ch}c_{kj}h_{kj} - f_{kj} \quad (7)$$

with household consumption c_{kj} and hours worked h_{kj} . Coefficients on consumption and hours worked, α_{ck} and α_{hk} , vary linearly with several taste-shifters (gender, polynomial form of age,

¹⁴Blundell et al. (2009) focus instead on single mothers. In our case, samples of single parents in some countries are too small for meaningful results. Focusing on one homogenous group at a time implicitly assumes some separability in the social planner’s program, with a first stage of redistribution between demographic groups and a second stage with vertical redistribution within homogenous groups (see Bourguignon and Spadaro, 2012).

¹⁵Non-contributory social transfers and contributory UB are described in the Appendix (part D and E). Appendix F provides an extensive sensitivity analysis on the treatment of UB recipients.

region) and a normally-distributed random term for unobserved heterogeneity. As in Blundell et al. (2000), we introduce fixed costs of work f_{kj} , equal to zero if $j = 1$ (inactivity) and non-zero for $j > 1$ (implicitly accounting for differences in demand side constraints). We do not impose tangency conditions apart from increasing monotonicity in consumption, which is a minimum requirement for meaningful interpretation and policy analysis. The deterministic utility V_{kj} is complemented by i.i.d. error terms ϵ_{ij} . Tax-benefit simulations described in the previous section are used to evaluate disposable income $c_{kj} = d(w_k h_{kj}, m_k)$ for each hour choice j , as a function of labor income $w_k h_{kj}$ and non-labor income m_k . For wages w_k , we first calculate raw wages from data information on hours and income, proceed with an Heckman-corrected estimation and finally predict wages for all observations in order to reduce the problem of division bias (see Blundell and MaCurdy, 1999).

A common issue with the estimation of structural models of labor supply concerns the identification of behavioral parameters under the key assumption of wage exogeneity. Accordingly, unobserved characteristics (e.g. being a hard-working person) may in fact influence both wages and work preferences and thus potentially bias estimates obtained from cross-sectional wage variation across individuals. Our detailed simulation of nonlinear tax-benefit schedules provides a parametric source of identification which is frequently used in the empirical labor supply literature (e.g. Van Soest, 1995; Blundell et al., 2000). In addition, we benefit from some time variation (two years of data for 7 countries) and spatial variation in tax-benefit rules within each country (for instance state-level tax rules in the US, as exploited in Hoynes, 1996). The role of these exogenous sources of variation is discussed and analyzed in Bargain et al. (2012).


5.2 Labor Supply Elasticities

The labor supply model is estimated using $J = 7$ choices ranging from 0 to 60 hours/week with a step of 10 hours, which enables us to capture the country-specific variations in hours worked. Estimation results are reported and discussed in Appendix A (cf. Tables A.1–A.4), and goodness-of-fit measures and robustness checks in Appendix B (Table B.1). After the estimation of the labor supply model, we numerically simulate responses at the individual level and aggregate them at the income group level to calculate the elasticities specific to Saez’s optimal tax model.¹⁶ These results are reported in Tables II.1–II.2 (Appendix II).

For a more convenient comparison across countries, point estimates are shown in Figure 1 below for the different income groups. The first result is that responses at the extensive margin are systematically larger than at the intensive margin (except for group 1, for which both margins are identical by definition). This finding generalizes previous results for the US (e.g. Eissa and Liebman, 1996), Germany and the UK (Blundell et al., 2009).

A second result is that responses are usually larger for the lowest income groups of workers (groups 1 and 2). Despite this being expected for single individuals, there is currently very

¹⁶We calibrate uniform changes in disposable income at the individual level to obtain percent changes in income gaps, as defined in (2) and (3). Total responses, measured as a change in the population shares in each income group, are then obtained by aggregation to calculate η_i and ζ_i for $i = 1, \dots, I$ (see also Blundell et al., 2009).






Figure 2: Extensive Margin Elasticities: Comparisons

We make two final remarks. First, despite their specific definition, elasticities used in Saez’s model are highly correlated with “standard” wage-elasticities, i.e. intensive and extensive elasticities calculated as hour and participation responses to a 1% increase in wage rates. This is shown for the extensive margin in Figure II.2 (lower part). Second, as stated by Keane and Rogerson (2012), “*labor supply elasticities are neither a single number nor a primitive feature of preferences [... and] one important source of confusion in the literature is the idea that one can estimate a labor supply elasticity in one context and import this elasticity into other contexts.*” We have addressed this (Lucas) critique, firstly by using a fully structural labor supply model, which is secondly integrated with the optimal tax framework. The labor supply model allows disentangling the effect of tax-benefit systems from other components, most importantly preferences and demographic composition. The integration with the optimal tax framework ensures that those elasticities are perfectly consistent with the actual framework used for the analysis, namely the optimal tax model of Saez (2002). Bargain et al. (2012) decompose cross-country differences in elasticities to assess the relative contributions of tax-benefit systems, preferences and demographic composition. We present results for the specific sample under study in Appendix C. The findings convey that while tax-benefit systems explain part of the differences, there are also genuine differences in work preferences across countries.

6 Revealed Social Inequality Aversion

In this section, we estimate the revealed inequality aversion implicit in the tax-benefit systems of the 17 European countries under study and the US. While some background information on international differences in tax-benefit policies are summarized in Tables D.1-D.3 in Appendix

D, it is clear that the most important redistributive elements for single individuals are transfers and progressive taxes, with the latter of particular importance in countries where singles are not eligible for any income support (for instance, the US or Hungary).

6.1 Baseline results

We start our analysis by considering the effective marginal tax rates (EMTRs) and effective participation tax rates (EPTRs), which provide an indication of the redistributive and incentive effects of the different welfare regimes. Appendix E highlights a U-shaped distribution of EMTRs across income groups for most countries in Nordic and Continental Europe, which is well in line with the results of Immervoll et al. (2007). This pattern is due to progressive taxation at the top and means-tested social benefits at the bottom. Furthermore, the working poor (groups 1 and 2) have been rather excluded from redistribution for the years under consideration.¹⁹ In the US and Southern Europe, the overall level of net taxation is usually lower and the distribution of EMTRs generally flatter. There are exceptions, notably fairly high levels of effective taxation in upper income groups in Poland, Hungary, Ireland and Italy, as well as more pronounced progressivity in Greece and Portugal.

Next, we report and discuss the distribution of revealed marginal social welfare weights g_i underlying our measure of inequality aversion, as derived from inverting the optimal tax formula (see Table 1). A necessary condition for the implicit social welfare function to be Paretian, i.e. non-decreasing at all productivity levels, is that weights g_i are positive at all income levels. Our results show that this is broadly the case for all countries and income groups. Marginal social welfare weights for group 0 are much larger than for the rest of the population in Nordic and Continental Europe, Ireland and the UK, which target non-marginal transfers towards the bottom of the distribution. As found by considering EMTR, the welfare weights pattern is much flatter in countries characterized by little redistribution through social transfers (Southern and Eastern Europe, the US). However, for this group of countries smaller weights on top incomes reflect higher tax progressivity (Portugal and Greece), while uniformly low weights on non-poor groups reflect high tax levels (Italy). Weights on group 1 (and sometimes 2) are smallest in countries with generous social assistance schemes, reflecting distortions imposed on the working poor as discussed in the EMTR analysis.

We estimate our main indicator of social inequality aversion, i.e. the single-value index of γ , according to equation (5) based on the distributions of marginal social welfare weights. Figure 3 reports the tax-benefit revealed inequality aversion obtained under different elasticity scenar-

¹⁹International heterogeneity in the degree of redistribution is not affected by the treatment of unemployment benefits (UB), i.e. whether they are counted as part of the redistribution function or market income (according to a pure insurance mechanism). Countries that do not redistribute much among childless single individuals do not redistribute much in general (see Figure E.2. in Appendix E). This suggests that redistribution among this group is representative of overall international differences in tastes for vertical equity, confirming that we can conduct the analysis on single individuals.

	g_0	g_1	g_2	g_3	g_4	g_5
AT	7.3	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7
BE	4.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.3
DK	4.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
FI	1.9	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
FR	2.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
GE	4.7	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7
GR	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8
IE	3.3	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.8	0.8
IT	2.5	1.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5
NL	4.3	0.2	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8
PT	1.6	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.1	0.9
SP	2.8	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.8
UK	2.3	0.2	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.9
SW	6.1	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.5	0.6
EE	1.4	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9
HU	2.5	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8
PL	3.5	0.5	-0.1	0.4	0.6	0.6
US	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9

Table 1: Marginal Social Welfare Weights g_i

ios.²⁰ The left panel shows inequality aversion when assuming that labor supply responses are uniform across countries – in fact, this is how inequality aversion has been analyzed in the literature to date. We apply the mean extensive margin elasticity over all countries to each country. First, we find that inequality aversion is in line with general perceptions, reflecting utilitarian preferences in Southern Europe and the US up to large levels close to Rawlsian views in Nordic and some Continental European countries. Values are actually very close to those used for calibration in previous empirical applications: Saez (2002) states that γ values around .25 (resp. 1) imply a reasonably low (resp. high) taste for redistribution, while a value of 4 is high enough to proxy the Rawlsian benchmark. Our estimated parameters span this range, from around .25 (US, Spain, Italy) or below (Greece) to above 1 in Nordic countries, France and Belgium, up to 3 in Denmark. Second, instead of the uniform mean elasticity estimated from our data, we apply the uniform elasticities used in Immervoll et al. (2007), i.e. from .4 in group 1 to 0 in group 5 with step .1. It turns out that the elasticities used in Immervoll et al. (2007) provide a good benchmark, as the distribution of inequality aversion parameters is hardly affected.

The central contribution of this paper is to assess inequality aversion when labor supply re-

²⁰We focus on the extensive margin because results for the key groups 0 and 1 depend less crucially on the intensive margin (cf. Saez, 2002). Note also that we take the mean inequality aversion over the two periods when two years of data are available, in order not to overload the graphs.




Figure 3: Tax-benefit Revealed Social Inequality Aversion γ

sponses differ across countries. Thus, in the middle graph of Figure 3, we confront the uniform “mean elasticity” scenario with our baseline, i.e. inequality aversion parameters obtained under country-specific elasticity estimates. Some reranking occurs for the 18 countries under study. Countries with below-average elasticities automatically appear less Rawlsian than when using mean elasticities, because the efficiency constraint is not as tight. Considering France, for instance, we find very low labor supply elasticities. Assigning France a mean elasticity would thus imply overestimating the efficiency constraints and consequently overestimating the inequality aversion. Conversely, large elasticities in Ireland push up the level of true inequality aversion. We can cluster countries according to three broad groups. First, for Continental Europe, the UK, Ireland and Finland we find a γ value around 1. Importantly, the large weight on group 0 (workless poor) drives the result of high inequality aversion for these countries, and is rationalized by the fact that the extensive margin dominates. As discussed above, if participation responses were small, traditional social assistance programs could be in place without efficiency costs. However, as the extensive margin is large, the policy choice in these countries must be interpreted by very high redistributive views. Second, our results for Southern/Eastern Europe and the US suggest rather low levels of inequality aversion (smaller than 1), reflecting a low weight on group 0 while the weight on group 1 (working poor) is higher on average. Last, Scandinavian countries and Belgium reveal inequality aversion parameters far above 1, which reflects an even higher weight on group 0 than observed for the first group of countries (see Table 1). Finally, we provide 95% confidence bands for the inequality aversion parameter, accounting for

the standard errors of the estimated participation elasticities (see the right panel of Figure 3). Some comparisons are unambiguous (e.g. redistributive views in Sweden are more Rawlsian than in the US). However, differences are not significant for all pairs of countries, i.e. the ordering of countries’ redistributive tastes is incomplete (for instance, differences between Sweden and Denmark). However, reassuringly, we can distinguish the same three groups of countries as delineated above.

6.2 Sensitivity Analyses

Our baseline results characterize the redistributive preferences embodied in actual tax-benefit systems given *estimated elasticities* and reasonable *income group* definitions. Despite it being plausible to assume that observed tax-benefit systems are optimal for the governments who implemented them, they may have actually had completely different priors about these two key parameters of the model.

Elasticities. We first discuss what would happen if we use “wrong” labor supply elasticities. In fact, it is possible that potential labor supply responses were underestimated or ignored by policymakers in continental Europe when generous demogrant policies were designed and implemented. It was only in the late 1990s that numerous policy reports released in Europe highlighted the possibility that safety nets designed to prevent extreme poverty caused work disincentives and “inactivity traps”. The same concern that welfare programs had pushed part of the population into a state of welfare dependency had previously led to the 1996 welfare reform in the US (see Piketty and Saez, 2013).²¹

Therefore, we suggest a polar case where extensive margin responses are set to zero, i.e. ‘simulating’ the case that politicians completely ignored behavioral responses. The left panel of Figure 4 shows that the international ranking is broadly preserved. However, absolute inequality aversion mechanically decreases: preferences are less Rawlsian if participation responses, i.e. mobility between the workless poor and the working poor, are ignored. Consequently, most of the differences between countries vanish. However, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, and to some extent the Netherlands, still exhibit a high taste for redistribution under the extreme assumption of a zero participation elasticity.

²¹In the context of the US and the UK, Piketty and Saez (2013) argue that governments retargeted transfers from groups unable to work to beneficiaries who were potentially able to work. This trend has led to a shift from traditional means-tested social assistance programs toward in-work benefits. This policy adjustment to the moral hazard problem attached to traditional demogrant policies can be seen as a revision of beliefs about labor supply responses and/or a change in social preferences (social welfare weights on non-workers fall relative to those on low income workers, as society believes that a majority of the former can actually work). It is probably impossible to differentiate between these two aspects (i.e. it is equivalent to say that the society reassesses labor supply responses upwards or increasingly favors desert-sensitive policies). As discussed in section 2, we do not attempt to explain how social preferences are formed and why they change – yet it is interesting to underscore the political economy forces at play and the possible role of international influence, with some noticeable convergence across countries on the principle of “making work pay” (see Banks et al., 2005).




Figure 4: Revealed Social Inequality Aversion: Sensitivity Checks

Income groups. Secondly, the definition of the $I + 1$ groups in Saez’s model necessarily bears some arbitrariness in how the population is partitioned. We analyze how results are affected by alternative definitions of the cut-off points for the income groups. They might be critical when trying to make group definitions comparable across countries. By construction, group 0 (workless poor) is identified as the population with zero market income. In our baseline, the other groups were simply determined by income quintiles among the workers. We suggest an alternative group definition that places particular focus on the crucial role of group 1 (the working poor).²² The middle panel of Figure 4 shows that results are mostly insensitive to the income group definition. We explain this finding as follows: (i) with reasonable definitions of group 1, we always capture the income gap between groups 0, 1 and 2 to some extent; (ii) the rest of the social welfare weight distribution is relatively flat, so alternative definitions of higher income groups have little impact.

Finally, we provide a sensitivity analysis with regard to the number of income groups. To

²²Since “working poor” is a imprecisely-defined concept, we suggest simply taking $(1 + x)$ times the minimum wage (full-time equivalent income) as the upper bound for the income of that group, rather than fixing an arbitrary poverty line. We are thus able to adopt institutional definitions of working poverty (e.g. individualized earned income tax credits targeted at the working poor in France and Belgium in the early 2000s relied on such a definition with $x = 30\%$, which we adopt here). We use official or implicit national minimum wages as reported by the OECD (Immervoll, 2007). Groups 2 to 5 are then defined in proportion to the median income, in order to consistently account for the income distributions of each country. The upper income bounds for groups 2-4 are 1, 1.5 and 4 times the median income, respectively.

ease comparisons across countries, we have initially opted for a small number of income groups ($I + 1 = 6$), checking results obtained with $I = 11$ groups (10 groups of workers and the unemployed). The right panel of Figure 4 shows very few changes compared to the baseline.

7 Conclusion

This paper retrieves inequality aversion parameters consistent with current tax-benefit systems in 18 Western countries under the assumption of optimality, while controlling for differences in labor supply responsiveness. Labor supply elasticities have been estimated on the same data used for the optimal tax inversion. We find relatively small differences in labor supply elasticities across countries, yet resulting redistributive views are significantly different between three groups of nations. Social inequality aversion is highest in Nordic and some Continental European countries, pointing to Rawlsian preferences, while Southern Europe and the US reflect a very low inequality aversion close to utilitarian views. Furthermore, countries with Rawlsian preferences only appear so because responses at the extensive margin – the dominant margin – are taken into account. If we impose zero labor supply responses, reflecting the possibility that policymakers ignored efficiency constraints at the time traditional social transfers were put in place, revealed redistributive tastes become less pronounced and much more similar. This highlights the importance of accounting for efficiency constraints when assessing social inequality aversion.

Future research should extend the scope of the policies under consideration. Indeed, we have considered a partial optimization problem by looking at direct taxes and transfers. Some other policies may well have redistributive effects, including non-cash benefits and public goods. Another limit to our work is the assumption of only one type of behavioral response, namely labor supply. This appears acceptable as a first approximation, especially as we focus on workers (thus excluding capitalists). Despite estimates being difficult to obtain, more general analyses could explore elasticities of other margins, e.g. migration, tax evasion or long-run behavioral responses such as educational and career choices. In addition, it might be worthwhile to extent the political economy perspective by accounting for the political process that generated the observed tax benefit systems in the analysis. For instance, political economy forces could be modelled as distortions in the optimal tax design before the inversion procedure is applied.

References

- [1] Acemoglu, D., M. Golosov and A. Tsyvinski (2010): "Dynamic Mirrlees taxation under political economy constraints", *Review of Economic Studies*, 77 (3), 841–881.
- [2] Ackert, L.F., J. Martinez-Vazquez and M. Rider (2007): "Social preferences and tax policy design: some experimental evidence", *Economic Inquiry*, 45 (3), 487–501.
- [3] Ahmad, E. and N. Stern (1984): "The theory of reform and Indian indirect taxes", *Journal of Public Economics*, 25, 259-298.
- [4] Alesina, A. and P. Giuliano (2011): "Preferences for Redistribution" in J. Benhabib, M.O. Jackson and A. Bisin, *Handbook of Social Economics*, 1B, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 93-132.
- [5] Amiel, Y., J. Creedy, and S. Hurn (1999): "Measuring attitudes towards inequality", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 101, 83-96.
- [6] Banks, J., R. Disney, A. Duncan and J. Van Reenen (2005): "The Internationalisation of Public Welfare Policy", *Economic Journal*, 115, C62-C8.
- [7] Bargain, O. and A. Spadaro (2008): "Optimal taxation, social contract and the four worlds of welfare capitalism", UCD School Of Economics, Working Papers No. 200816.
- [8] Bargain, O., K. Orsini and A. Peichl (2012): "Comparing Labor Supply Elasticities in Europe and the US: New Results", *IZA Discussion Paper 6735*.
- [9] Blundell, R. and T. MaCurdy (1999): "Labor Supply: A Review of Alternative Approaches", in O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 3A, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1559-1695.
- [10] Blundell, R.W., A. Duncan, J. McCrae and C. Meghir (2000): "The Labour Market Impact of the Working Families' Tax Credit", *Fiscal Studies*, 21, 1, 75-103.
- [11] Blundell, R., M. Brewer, P. Haan and A. Shephard (2009): "Optimal income taxation of lone mothers: an empirical comparison of the UK and Germany", *Economic Journal*, 119 (535), F101-F121.
- [12] Bourguignon, F. and A. Spadaro (2012): "Tax-benefit revealed social preferences", *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 10(1), 75-108.
- [13] Castanheira, M., G. Nicodème and P. Profeta (2012): "On the political economics of tax reforms: survey and empirical assessment", *International Tax and Public Finance*, 19, 598–624.
- [14] Christiansen, V. and E.S. Jansen (1978): "Implicit Social Preferences in the Norwegian System of Indirect Taxation", *Journal of Public Economics*, 10 , 217-245.
- [15] Coughlin, P.J. (1992), *Probabilistic Voting Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Corneo, G. and H.P. Grüner (2002): "Individual preferences for political redistribution", *Journal of Public Economics*, 83(1), 83-107.

- [17] Decoster, A. and E. Schokkaert (1989): "Equity and efficiency of a reform of Belgian indirect taxes", *Recherches Economiques de Louvain*, 55(2), 155-176.
- [18] Diamond, P. (1980): "Income taxation with fixed hours of work", *Journal of Public Economics*, 13(1), 101-110.
- [19] Duclos, J.-Y. (2000): "Gini Indices and the Redistribution of Income", *International Tax and Public Finance*, 7, 141-162.
- [20] Eissa, N. and J.B. Liebman (1996): "Labor supply response to the earned income tax credit", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(2), 605-37.
- [21] Eissa, N. and H. Hoynes (2011): "Redistribution and Tax Expenditures: The Earned Income Tax Credit", *National Tax Journal*, 64 (2, Part 2), 689-730.
- [22] Eissa, N., H. J. Kleven and C.T. Kreiner (2008): "Evaluation of Four Tax Reforms in the United States: Labor Supply and Welfare Effects for Single Mothers", *Journal of Public Economics*, 92, 795-816.
- [23] Feenberg, D. and E. Coutts (1993): "An introduction to the TAXSIM model", *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 12 (1), 189-194.
- [24] Fehr E. and K.M. Schmidt (1999): "A theory of fairness, competition and cooperation", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114, 817-868.
- [25] Fleurbaey, M. (2008), *Fairness, responsibility and welfare*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [26] Fong, C. (2001): "Social Preferences, Self-interest, and the Demand for Redistribution", *Journal of Public Economics*, 82(2), 225-246.
- [27] Gordon, R.H. and J.B. Cullen (2011): "Income Redistribution in a Federal System of Governments", *Journal of Public Economics*, forthcoming.
- [28] Hoynes, H. W. (1996): "Welfare transfers in two-parent families: Labor supply and welfare participation under AFDC-UP", *Econometrica*, 64(29), 295-332.
- [29] Immervoll H., H. J. Kleven, C.T. Kreiner and E. Saez (2007): "Welfare reform in European countries: A microsimulation analysis", *Economic Journal*, 117(516), 1-44.
- [30] Isaksson, A.-S. and A. Lindskog (2009): "Preferences for redistribution: A country comparison of fairness judgements", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 72(3), 884-902.
- [31] Kanbur, R. and M. Tuomala (2011): "Charitable Conservatism, Poverty Radicalism and Inequality Aversion", *Journal of Economic Inequality*, Vol. 9(3), 417-431.
- [32] Kanbur, R., J. Pirttilä and M. Tuomala (2006): "Non-welfarist optimal taxation and behavioural public economics", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 20(5), 849-868.
- [33] Keane, M. and R. Rogerson (2012): "Reconciling Micro and Macro Labor Supply Elasticities: A Structural Perspective", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 50(2), 464-476.

- [34] Lambert P..J., Millimet D.L. and Slottje D. (2003) ‘Inequality aversion and the natural rate of subjective inequality’, *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(5): 1061-1090(30).
- [35] Madden, D. (1996): ”An analysis of indirect tax reform in Ireland in the 1980s”, *Fiscal Studies*, 16: 18-37.
- [36] Piketty, T. (1995): ”Social Mobility and Redistributive Politics,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), 551-584.
- [37] Piketty, T. and E. Saez (2013): ”Optimal Labor Income Taxation”, *Handbook of Public Economics*, Vol. 5, (Amsterdam: North Holland), forthcoming.
- [38] Ross T.W. (1984): ”Uncovering Regulator’s Social Welfare Weights”, *Rand Journal of Economics* 15, 152–155.
- [39] Saez, E. (2002): ”Optimal income transfer programs: Intensive versus extensive labor supply responses”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(3), 1039-1073.
- [40] Saez, E. and S. Stantcheva (2012): ”Endogenous Social Welfare Weights for Optimal Tax Theory”, mimeo.
- [41] Singhal, M. (2008): ”Quantifying preferences for redistribution”, paper presented at the AEA Annual Meeting January 2009.
- [42] Spadaro A. (2008): ”Optimal taxation, social contract and the four worlds of welfare capitalism”. PSE Working Paper n° 38-2008.
- [43] Stern, N. (1977): ”Welfare Weights and the Elasticity of the Marginal Valuation of Income”, in M. Artis and R. Nobay, eds., *Studies in Modern Economic Analysis*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publishers).
- [44] Sutherland, H. (2001): ”Final report EUROMOD: an integrated European benefit-tax model”, EUROMOD Working Paper No. EM9/01, ISER.
- [45] van Soest, A. (1995): ”Structural models of family labor supply: a discrete choice approach”, *Journal of Human Resources*, 30(1), 63-88.

I Descriptive Statistics

Since the selected population is relatively homogenous, Tables I.1 and I.2 essentially focus on the characteristics of the discretized income groups, i.e., the main ingredients of the optimal tax model. This includes income group shares h_i , average levels of gross income Y_i and disposable income C_i for each group $i = 0, \dots, 5$. We also report effective “marginal” tax rates $T'_i = \frac{T_i - T_{i-1}}{Y_i - Y_{i-1}}$ and effective participation tax rates $\frac{T_i - T_0}{Y_i - Y_0}$.

Table I.1: Description of the Discretized Population of Childless Singles

Country	AT	BE	BE	DK	FI	FI	FR	FR	GE	GE	GR	IE	IE
Year	98	98	01	95	98	01	95	01	98	01	95	95	00
Data	ECHP	PSB	PSB	ECHP	IDS	IDS	HBS	HBS	SOEP	SOEP	HBS	LIS	LIS
<i>Gross income Y_i (note: $Y_0 = 0$)</i>													
1	222	203	238	127	190	185	139	189	172	145	113	215	187
2	376	347	392	397	329	356	286	301	373	359	165	371	361
3	452	436	502	545	398	437	360	373	471	490	216	470	454
4	577	532	613	646	481	528	457	467	576	605	263	542	651
5	845	737	856	860	704	769	732	703	814	889	476	724	882
<i>Disposable income C_i</i>													
0	61	96	138	140	110	113	110	151	59	80	1	67	65
1	183	181	214	154	178	181	134	171	148	141	101	199	206
2	277	243	284	282	242	273	217	232	245	250	145	287	334
3	321	286	341	367	279	314	267	276	298	320	189	337	433
4	394	333	394	428	326	368	335	338	345	381	219	374	539
5	533	435	510	518	434	491	519	482	475	520	358	478	689
<i>Effective "Marginal" Tax Rate (EMTR)</i>													
1	45%	58%	68%	89%	64%	64%	83%	89%	49%	58%	12%	38%	24%
2	39%	57%	54%	53%	54%	46%	43%	45%	51%	49%	15%	44%	27%
3	42%	52%	48%	42%	46%	48%	34%	39%	47%	47%	14%	49%	-6%
4	42%	50%	53%	40%	43%	42%	28%	34%	55%	47%	37%	49%	46%
5	48%	50%	52%	58%	51%	49%	33%	39%	45%	51%	35%	43%	35%
<i>Effective Participation Tax Rate (EPTR)</i>													
1	45%	58%	68%	89%	64%	64%	83%	89%	49%	58%	12%	38%	24%
2	43%	57%	63%	64%	60%	55%	62%	73%	50%	53%	13%	41%	25%
3	42%	56%	59%	58%	58%	54%	57%	66%	49%	51%	13%	43%	19%
4	42%	55%	58%	55%	55%	52%	51%	60%	50%	50%	17%	43%	27%
5	44%	54%	57%	56%	54%	51%	44%	53%	49%	51%	25%	43%	29%
<i>Group size h_i (in %)</i>													
0	0.04	0.20	0.15	0.19	0.23	0.20	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.12	0.31	0.30	0.13
1	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.15	0.18
2	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.20
3	0.19	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.14	0.15
4	0.20	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.13	0.16	0.19
5	0.18	0.16	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.14	0.12	0.16
# observations	206	357	278	518	931	963	1,080	1,013	967	933	164	148	130

This table reports information on income groups for the selected samples. Policy years are 1998, 2001 or 2005. Countries are: AT=Austria, BE=Belgium, DK=Denmark, FI=Finland, FR=France, GE=Germany, GR=Greece, IE=Ireland. Datasets are: ECHP=European Community Household Panel, PSB=Panel Survey on Belgian Households, HBS=Household Budget Survey, IDS=Income Distribution Survey, SOEP=German Socio-Economic Panel, LIS=Living in Ireland Survey. Group 0 = non-participants and $Y_0=0$. Other groups: increasing income levels of participants. EMTR are calculated as $1 - \{C_i - C_{i-1}\} / \{Y_i - Y_{i-1}\}$ and EPTR as $1 - \{C_i - C_0\} / \{Y_i - Y_0\}$ for all income groups $i > 0$. All incomes in euros per week.

Table I.2: Description of the Discretized Population of Childless Singles (cont.)

Country	IT	NL	PT	SP	SP	UK	UK	SW	EE	HU	PL	US
Year	95	00	01	96	01	95	01	01	05	05	05	06
Data	SHIW	SOEP	ECHP	ECHP	ECHP	FES	FES	IDS	HBS	HBS	HBS	CPS
<i>Gross income Y_i (note: $Y_0 = 0$)</i>												
1	188	189	88	134	165	221	229	172	33	41	36	162
2	314	400	150	238	250	361	397	359	56	72	71	362
3	381	505	222	327	335	463	522	439	77	109	102	528
4	484	617	368	458	423	573	661	522	102	151	141	715
5	632	867	639	649	646	818	999	760	152	267	238	1194
<i>Disposable income C_i</i>												
0	3	137	25	17	6	133	144	151	13	16	3	17
1	129	186	77	126	151	191	205	179	33	44	17	149
2	209	298	128	204	215	289	316	247	48	64	25	303
3	251	361	182	268	281	362	406	293	65	86	40	426
4	299	443	273	364	339	441	507	345	84	105	59	557
5	375	599	416	496	491	622	751	478	120	162	106	863
<i>Effective "Marginal" Tax Rate (EMTR)</i>												
1	33%	74%	41%	19%	13%	74%	73%	84%	38%	33%	60%	18%
2	37%	47%	18%	25%	24%	30%	34%	64%	35%	35%	78%	23%
3	37%	40%	24%	27%	23%	28%	28%	43%	21%	42%	53%	26%
4	53%	27%	38%	27%	34%	28%	28%	36%	23%	55%	50%	30%
5	48%	37%	47%	31%	32%	26%	28%	44%	27%	50%	52%	36%
<i>Effective Participation Tax Rate (EPTR)</i>												
1	33%	74%	41%	19%	13%	74%	73%	84%	38%	33%	60%	18%
2	34%	60%	31%	22%	16%	57%	57%	73%	37%	34%	69%	21%
3	35%	55%	29%	23%	18%	50%	50%	68%	32%	36%	64%	23%
4	39%	50%	33%	24%	21%	46%	45%	63%	30%	42%	60%	25%
5	41%	47%	39%	26%	25%	40%	39%	57%	29%	45%	57%	29%
<i>Group size h_i (in %)</i>												
0	0.16	0.10	0.08	0.13	0.09	0.24	0.15	0.11	0.15	0.10	0.19	0.06
1	0.18	0.18	0.20	0.18	0.20	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.19
2	0.16	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.20
3	0.16	0.18	0.24	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.19
4	0.17	0.18	0.13	0.18	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.18
5	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.18	0.16	0.19
# observations	163	555	106	191	202	561	669	1,768	233	354	1,273	7,053

This table reports information on income groups for the selected sample. Policy years are 1998, 2001 or 2005. Countries are: IT=Italy, NL=the Netherlands, PT=Portugal, SP=Spain, UK=the United Kingdom, SW=Sweden, EE=Estonia, HU=Hungary, PL=Poland, US=the United States. Datasets are: ECHP=European Community Household Panel, HBS=Household Budget Survey, IDS=Income Distribution Survey, SOEP=Dutch Socio-Economic Panel, SHIW=Survey of Households Income and Wealth, FES=Family Expenditure Survey, CPS=Current Population Survey. Notes: Group 0 = non-participants and $Y_0=0$. Other groups: increasing income levels of participants. EMTR are calculated as $1 - \{C_i - C_{i-1}\} / \{Y_i - Y_{i-1}\}$ and EPTR as $1 - \{C_i - C_0\} / \{Y_i - Y_0\}$ for all income groups $i > 0$. All incomes in euros per week.

II Standard and Saez Elasticities

Once the labor supply model is estimated, we numerically simulate elasticities at the individual level by predicting the labor supply effect of a change in income. For a comparison with the literature, we first calculate "standard" wage (resp. non-labor income) elasticities for each worker, defined as the increase in working time or participation rate when wage rates increase by 1%. Standard errors are obtained by repeated random draws of the preference parameters from their estimated distributions and, for each draw, by recalculating elasticities.

In fact, despite the large increase in the number of childless single individuals over the last few decades, their labor supply behavior has received little attention. Part of it is due to the fact that recent evidence on labor supply responsiveness stems from natural experiments based on changes in tax and welfare policies, mainly in the US and the UK, and that these policies are usually confined to families with children (e.g., Eissa and Liebman, 1996). Mean wage elasticities together with bootstrapped standard errors are reported in the upper panels of Tables II.1–II.2. They are in line with limited available evidence as surveyed in Bargain et al. (2012). Elasticities are especially large in Spain, Ireland and Italy, as supported by Callan et al. (2009) and Aaberge et al. (2002). Other countries show intermediary values, which correspond to small elasticities around .1 – .2, for instance in Germany (see Haan and Steiner, 2000). Hour elasticities, which incorporate both change in hours for those in work and participation effects, are close to participation elasticity. This supports that most of the total hour adjustment occurs at the extensive margin. Income elasticities are found to be very small in all countries, often not significantly different from zero and systematically smaller than .1 in absolute value. Ignoring income effects in the theoretical model and for the selected population is therefore a reasonable approximation.

For the particular elasticities used in Saez' optimal tax model, we calibrate uniform changes in disposable income at the individual levels to obtain percent changes in income gaps as defined in equations (2) and (3) in the paper. Total responses, measured as a change in the population shares in each income group, are then obtained by aggregation to calculate the extensive and intensive margins, i.e., η_i and ζ_i , for income groups $i = 1, \dots, I$ (see also Blundell et al., 2009). These elasticities are reported in the lower part of Tables II.1–II.2 and discussed in the main part of the paper.

Table II.1: Labor Supply Elasticities

	AT	BE	BE	DK	FI	FI	FR	FR	GE	GE	GR	IE	IE
	98	98	01	95	98	01	95	01	98	01	95	95	00
<i>Standard elasticities</i>													
Wage elasticity - Hours	.13	.25	.31	.09	.27	.16	.14	.13	.20	.17	.24	.25	.50
	(.05)	(.05)	(.06)	(.04)	(.05)	(.03)	(.02)	(.02)	(.03)	(.02)	(.05)	(.07)	(.08)
Wage elasticity - Participation	.10	.22	.24	.12	.28	.15	.11	.11	.19	.16	.23	.32	.44
	(.04)	(.03)	(.05)	(.03)	(.04)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.04)	(.06)	(.07)
Income elasticity - Hours	.00	.00	.00	.00	.10	.01	.00	.00	.01	.00	.00	-.03	-.02
	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)
<i>Saez (2002)'s elasticities</i>													
Intensive margin:													
Mean	.10	.16	.25	.04	.08	.04	.08	.06	.09	.11	.09	.20	.36
Group 1	.14	.43	.38	.04	.23	.09	.06	.05	.38	.39	.18	.66	.45
	(.06)	(.11)	(.09)	(.01)	(.04)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.07)	(.08)	(.09)	(.17)	(.08)
Group 2	.17	.20	.47	.06	.05	.03	.09	.06	.03	.02	.07	.26	.86
	(.06)	(.04)	(.10)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.00)	(.02)	(.11)	(.17)
Group 3	.05	.13	.28	.05	.02	.03	.06	.04	.03	.07	.02	.15	.52
	(.02)	(.03)	(.02)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.05)
Group 4	.10	.07	.09	.04	.04	.02	.06	.05	.03	.05	.07	.03	.19
	(.04)	(.01)	(.01)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.05)
Group 5	.04	.10	.22	.04	.05	.03	.12	.12	.03	.04	.08	.03	.33
	(.02)	(.02)	(.11)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.05)
Extensive margin:													
Mean	.15	.35	.35	.17	.30	.14	.09	.09	.20	.22	.34	.57	.38
Group 1	.14	.43	.38	.04	.23	.09	.06	.05	.38	.39	.18	.66	.45
	(.04)	(.07)	(.05)	(.01)	(.03)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)	(.05)	(.05)	(.08)	(.08)
Group 2	.16	.53	.46	.16	.32	.11	.12	.07	.17	.21	.53	.78	.56
	(.05)	(.08)	(.07)	(.03)	(.05)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.10)	(.10)	(.10)
Group 3	.19	.25	.24	.24	.35	.13	.10	.09	.25	.25	.40	.51	.49
	(.05)	(.04)	(.03)	(.06)	(.05)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.07)	(.08)	(.08)
Group 4	.14	.38	.42	.18	.22	.20	.11	.09	.11	.15	.34	.60	.27
	(.04)	(.04)	(.07)	(.04)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.06)	(.05)	(.05)
Group 5	.11	.15	.23	.23	.36	.19	.07	.14	.10	.08	.27	.30	.12
	(.02)	(.02)	(.07)	(.05)	(.05)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.05)	(.11)	(.11)

Note: standard elasticities are computed numerically by simulation of responses to a 1% uniform increase in wage rates or unearned income. Saez elasticities are obtained by simulated increases corresponding to 1% of the difference in mean disposable incomes between a given income group and the closest lower group (mobility) or the group of nonworkers (participation). Bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

Table II.2: Labor Supply Elasticities (cont.)

	IT	NL	PT	SP	SP	UK	UK	SW	EE	HU	PL	US	Mean
	95	00	01	96	01	95	01	01	05	05	05	06	
<i>Standard elasticities</i>													
Wage elasticity - Hours	.47	.11	.04	.27	.39	.41	.21	.17	.15	.14	.08	.20	.22
	(.10)	(.02)	(.04)	(.07)	(.04)	(.05)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)
Wage elasticity - Participation	.42	.09	.04	.27	.32	.33	.20	.14	.14	.13	.07	.17	.20
	(.09)	(.01)	(.03)	(.06)	(.04)	(.04)	(.02)	(.01)	(.03)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.03)
Income elasticity - Hours	.03	.00	.00	-.01	-.01	.00	.00	.01	.00	.06	.00	.00	.01
	(.02)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)	(.01)	(.00)	(.01)	(.00)	(.00)	(.00)
<i>Saez (2002)'s elasticities</i>													
Intensive margin:													
Mean	.28	.12	.08	.12	.44	.06	.07	.06	.07	.07	.04	.18	.13
Group 1	.70	.16	.11	.25	.87	.10	.13	.11	.10	.11	.09	.33	.26
	(.14)	(.04)	(.26)	(.10)	(.12)	(.02)	(.02)	(.03)	(.03)	(.04)	(.01)	(.01)	(.07)
Group 2	.47	.19	.07	.11	.50	.07	.05	.12	.02	.06	.03	.09	.17
	(.10)	(.04)	(.15)	(.04)	(.06)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)
Group 3	.14	.04	.05	.03	.37	.01	.01	.04	.05	.09	.03	.13	.06
	(.03)	(.01)	(.06)	(.01)	(.04)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Group 4	.08	.05	.07	.08	.11	.03	.04	.02	.07	.05	.03	.12	.05
	(.02)	(.01)	(.05)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Group 5	.03	.15	.09	.12	.33	.06	.11	.04	.10	.04	.05	.20	.10
	(.01)	(.16)	(.04)	(.04)	(.12)	(.01)	(.07)	(.03)	(.05)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)
Extensive margin:													
Mean	.59	.11	.06	.32	.43	.21	.18	.17	.12	.06	.09	.28	.24
Group 1	.70	.16	.11	.25	.87	.10	.13	.11	.10	.11	.09	.33	.26
	(.11)	(.02)	(.03)	(.07)	(.12)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.03)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)
Group 2	.67	.13	.13	.50	.62	.21	.20	.21	.08	.03	.09	.34	.30
	(.11)	(.02)	(.04)	(.13)	(.07)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.05)
Group 3	.50	.14	.07	.25	.36	.17	.21	.14	.11	.08	.07	.33	.24
	(.09)	(.01)	(.02)	(.06)	(.03)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.04)
Group 4	.64	.09	.01	.32	.17	.23	.19	.21	.14	.03	.10	.25	.22
	(.11)	(.01)	(.02)	(.05)	(.02)	(.02)	(.02)	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.01)	(.01)	(.03)
Group 5	.46	.04	.01	.26	.12	.34	.18	.17	.17	.05	.09	.13	.17
	(.09)	(.01)	(.02)	(.04)	(.02)	(.04)	(.04)	(.03)	(.03)	(.01)	(.01)	(.00)	(.04)

Note: standard elasticities are computed numerically by simulation of responses to a 1% uniform increase in wage rates or unearned income. Saez elasticities are obtained by simulated increases corresponding to 1% of the difference in mean disposable incomes between a given income group and the closest lower group (mobility) or the group of nonworkers (participation). Bootstrapped standard errors in brackets.

Comparing Inequality Aversion across Countries
When Labor Supply Responses Differ

Additional Appendix. Revised: February 2013

This document gathers the following additional results:

- A. Labor supply estimations
- B. Fit of the labor supply model and robustness checks
- C. International variation in elasticities: assessing the role of tax-benefit policies and preferences
- D. Tax-benefit policy descriptions
- E. Redistributive and incentive effects of tax-benefit systems
- F. Robustness Check on the Treatment of Replacement Incomes
- G. Optimal Tax Inversion

A Labor Supply Estimations

Estimates are broadly in line with usual findings, in that taste shifters related to age most often display a parabolic pattern and are often, but not systematically, significant. Costs of work are most often significantly positive. Higher education leads to lower costs, which can be interpreted as lower job search costs for educated workers (see van Soest and Das, 2001).

Table A.1: Labor Supply Estimations: Single Women

Coeff.	AT	BE	BE	DK	FI	FR	FR	GE	GE	GR	IE	IE	IT
	98	98	01	98	98	98	01	98	01	98	98	01	98
income ² / 10,000	-0.058 (.051)	0.007 (.050)	-0.073 (.071)	-0.040 (.040)	-0.150 (.043)	-0.072 (.017)	-0.061 (.017)	-0.097 (.031)	-0.050 (.033)	-0.041 (.130)	-0.242 (.070)	-0.125 (.032)	-0.087 (.036)
hours ² / 1,000	-0.092 (.074)	-0.269 (.079)	-0.099 (.099)	-0.320 (.065)	0.035 (.046)	-0.015 (.024)	0.014 (.027)	-0.056 (.052)	-0.108 (.056)	-0.171 (.104)	0.156 (.071)	0.144 (.056)	0.046 (.048)
hours x income / 1,000	-0.092 (.074)	-0.269 (.079)	-0.099 (.099)	-0.320 (.065)	0.035 (.046)	-0.015 (.024)	0.014 (.027)	-0.056 (.052)	-0.108 (.056)	-0.171 (.104)	0.156 (.071)	0.144 (.056)	0.046 (.048)
income	-0.045 (.027)	0.021 (.030)	0.098 (.047)	-0.033 (.015)	-0.020 (.013)	-0.015 (.011)	0.014 (.010)	-0.021 (.013)	-0.020 (.014)	-0.034 (.043)	0.021 (.034)	0.012 (.022)	-0.049 (.033)
x age/10	0.026 (.013)	-0.002 (.015)	-0.036 (.022)	0.028 (.009)	0.015 (.007)	0.012 (.006)	-0.004 (.005)	0.017 (.007)	0.016 (.007)	0.019 (.022)	-0.002 (.018)	-0.001 (.011)	0.024 (.016)
x age ² /100	-0.003 (.001)	0.000 (.002)	0.004 (.003)	-0.003 (.001)	-0.002 (.001)	-0.001 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	-0.002 (.001)	-0.002 (.001)	-0.002 (.003)	0.000 (.002)	0.000 (.001)	-0.003 (.002)
hours	0.526 (.179)	0.138 (.124)	-0.059 (.219)	0.457 (.104)	0.856 (.075)	0.254 (.055)	0.152 (.045)	0.422 (.072)	0.324 (.081)	0.562 (.142)	0.300 (.168)	0.138 (.163)	0.644 (.176)
x age/10	-0.080 (.084)	0.061 (.063)	0.212 (.110)	-0.069 (.061)	-0.011 (.031)	0.064 (.027)	0.125 (.022)	-0.030 (.037)	-0.005 (.041)	0.014 (.067)	0.000 (.085)	0.025 (.087)	-0.122 (.085)
x age ² /100	0.007 (.010)	-0.009 (.008)	-0.029 (.013)	0.007 (.008)	0.000 (.004)	-0.009 (.003)	-0.016 (.003)	0.001 (.005)	-0.002 (.005)	-0.006 (.008)	0.000 (.011)	-0.007 (.011)	0.014 (.010)
x 1(region) §	-0.007 (.011)	0.027 (.012)	-0.008 (.013)		0.026 (.006)	0.024 (.007)	0.019 (.006)	0.001 (.007)	0.005 (.007)	0.002 (.007)	0.018 (.012)	0.007 (.010)	-0.021 (.007)
fixed cost	4.727 (.914)	4.712 (.535)	5.503 (.735)	7.155 (.757)	15.717 (.992)	6.539 (.463)	6.127 (.367)	6.469 (.430)	5.450 (.430)	11.264 (1.313)	8.396 (1.144)	3.637 (.633)	8.149 (.672)
x high educ.	0.278 (.559)	-0.550 (.315)	-0.132 (.400)	-0.548 (.403)	-0.378 (.239)	-0.867 (.306)	-0.845 (.182)	-0.083 (.219)	-0.518 (.263)	-0.194 (.363)	-1.454 (.521)	-1.125 (.470)	-2.029 (.330)
Nb of observations	217	334	249	392	738	1118	1167	906	813	291	202	220	409
Log-Likelihood	-333	-488	-353	-491	-915	-1677	-1733	-1265	-1169	-341	-220	-333	-620
pseudo-R2	0.21	0.25	0.27	0.36	0.36	0.23	0.24	0.28	0.26	0.40	0.44	0.22	0.22

Note: Region dummy corresponds to Vienna & Niederösterreich, Brussels, Helsinki, Paris region, East Germany, Dublin, Southern Italy. Region not available for Denmark. Std. errors in brackets.

Table A.2: Labor Supply Estimations: Single Women (cont.)

Coeff.	NL	PT	SP	SP	UK	UK	SW	SW	EE	HU	PL	US
	01	01	98	01	98	01	98	01	05	05	05	05
income ² / 10,000	0.027 (.033)	0.151 (.040)	0.027 (.033)	0.081 (.042)	-0.061 (.022)	-0.043 (.012)	-0.128 (.036)	-0.099 (.024)	0.331 (.281)	0.101 (.266)	-0.014 (.039)	-0.006 (.001)
hours ² / 1,000	-0.208 (.064)	-0.226 (.067)	-0.110 (.046)	-0.194 (.063)	0.028 (.036)	0.008 (.031)	-0.087 (.044)	-0.060 (.036)	-0.184 (.168)	-0.099 (.124)	-0.036 (.036)	-0.003 (.000)
hours x income / 1,000	-0.208 (.064)	-0.226 (.067)	-0.110 (.046)	-0.194 (.063)	0.028 (.036)	0.008 (.031)	-0.087 (.044)	-0.060 (.036)	-0.184 (.168)	-0.099 (.124)	-0.036 (.036)	-0.036 (.005)
income	-0.028 (.012)	-0.071 (.039)	0.014 (.026)	0.006 (.024)	0.020 (.013)	0.015 (.010)	-0.025 (.007)	-0.028 (.008)	-0.023 (.070)	-0.049 (.063)	0.016 (.015)	0.008 (.002)
x age/10	0.019 (.007)	0.039 (.019)	-0.006 (.012)	-0.005 (.011)	-0.003 (.007)	-0.001 (.005)	0.019 (.004)	0.017 (.005)	0.015 (.035)	0.036 (.031)	-0.008 (.008)	0.007 (.001)
x age ² /100	-0.002 (.001)	-0.005 (.002)	0.001 (.001)	0.001 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	-0.002 (.001)	-0.002 (.001)	-0.002 (.004)	-0.005 (.004)	0.001 (.001)	-0.017 (.000)
hours	0.282 (.083)	0.322 (.124)	0.148 (.130)	0.333 (.146)	0.164 (.072)	0.170 (.062)	0.174 (.030)	0.243 (.050)	1.029 (.121)	0.787 (.114)	0.658 (.042)	5.252 (.210)
x age/10	0.040 (.042)	0.011 (.057)	0.098 (.062)	0.067 (.069)	0.015 (.036)	0.043 (.030)	0.014 (.017)	-0.015 (.027)	-0.021 (.050)	-0.021 (.051)	0.087 (.017)	0.020 (.008)
x age ² /100	-0.008 (.006)	-0.001 (.007)	-0.014 (.007)	-0.010 (.008)	-0.001 (.004)	-0.004 (.004)	-0.001 (.002)	0.001 (.003)	0.002 (.006)	0.003 (.006)	-0.012 (.002)	-0.002 (.001)
x 1(region)		0.042 (.011)	0.003 (.007)	-0.007 (.008)	-0.017 (.007)	0.008 (.007)	0.009 (.003)	0.017 (.005)	0.012 (.009)	0.013 (.007)	0.007 (.003)	0.006 (.002)
fixed cost	5.271 (.537)	6.579 (.767)	6.202 (.618)	7.147 (.722)	4.235 (.465)	5.117 (.509)	4.321 (.241)	3.785 (.389)	19.329 (1.385)	14.882 (.964)	15.123 (.461)	10.259 (.200)
x high educ.	-1.073 (.329)	-2.041 (.940)	-0.691 (.275)	-1.259 (.373)	-0.708 (.311)	-0.539 (.336)	-1.307 (.184)	-1.102 (.331)	-1.744 (.418)	-1.645 (.288)	-1.221 (.096)	0.032 (.064)
Nb of observations	450	278	373	329	753	779	1924	1307	476	646	3106	9277
Log-Likelihood	-636	-407	-575	-498	-1019	-1114	-3115	-2168	-564	-803	-3864	-12690
pseudo-R2	0.27	0.25	0.21	0.22	0.30	0.27	0.17	0.15	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.30

Note: Region dummy corresponds to Lisboa, Catalunya, London, Stockholm, Tallin, Budapest region, Warsaw region, US metropolitan areas. Region not available for the Netherlands. Std. errors in brackets.

Table A.3: Labor Supply Estimations: Single Men

Coeff.	AT	BE	BE	DK	FI	FR	FR	GE	GE	GR	IE	IE	IT
	98	98	01	94	98	95	01	97	00	94	94	00	95
income ² / 10,000	-0.041 (.031)	0.102 (.070)	0.131 (.082)	0.076 (.025)	-0.032 (.037)	0.026 (.009)	0.053 (.019)	0.037 (.034)	0.056 (.025)	0.076 (.073)	-0.082 (.064)	-0.157 (.070)	-0.010 (.033)
hours ² / 1,000	-8.681 (1.007)	-9.255 (1.014)	-5.686 (.984)	-4.361 (.620)	-7.244 (.539)	-6.165 (.403)	-5.427 (.399)	-3.753 (.439)	-4.470 (.469)	-5.948 (.870)	-2.150 (.707)	-5.057 (1.029)	-7.862 (.755)
hours x income / 1,000	0.035 (.062)	-0.275 (.107)	-0.656 (.141)	-0.314 (.058)	-0.156 (.055)	-0.076 (.029)	-0.186 (.041)	-0.287 (.067)	-0.335 (.061)	-0.041 (.075)	-0.264 (.101)	0.042 (.130)	-0.074 (.053)
income	-0.033 (.028)	0.071 (.034)	-0.049 (.050)	0.037 (.015)	0.007 (.012)	0.002 (.012)	0.008 (.010)	0.006 (.013)	0.011 (.014)	0.040 (.059)	0.070 (.034)	0.005 (.046)	0.012 (.028)
x age/10	0.017 (.016)	-0.023 (.017)	0.051 (.023)	-0.015 (.008)	0.000 (.006)	0.001 (.006)	-0.002 (.006)	0.003 (.007)	0.000 (.007)	-0.019 (.030)	-0.024 (.017)	0.016 (.024)	-0.005 (.013)
x age ² /100	-0.002 (.002)	0.002 (.002)	-0.007 (.002)	0.002 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	0.002 (.004)	0.003 (.002)	-0.002 (.003)	0.001 (.002)
hours	0.648 (.211)	0.589 (.141)	1.026 (.231)	0.278 (.113)	0.575 (.070)	0.341 (.068)	0.169 (.057)	0.291 (.076)	0.244 (.089)	0.457 (.249)	0.094 (.190)	0.572 (.380)	0.396 (.191)
x age/10	0.009 (.116)	0.091 (.063)	-0.247 (.107)	0.089 (.062)	0.039 (.033)	0.084 (.033)	0.153 (.028)	0.036 (.040)	0.092 (.046)	0.001 (.132)	0.086 (.094)	-0.170 (.192)	0.132 (.089)
x age ² /100	-0.004 (.015)	-0.010 (.008)	0.032 (.012)	-0.013 (.008)	-0.007 (.004)	-0.011 (.004)	-0.020 (.004)	-0.006 (.005)	-0.014 (.006)	0.001 (.017)	-0.011 (.011)	0.020 (.023)	-0.017 (.010)
x 1(region)	0.032 (.015)	-0.029 (.014)	-0.025 (.017)		0.012 (.005)	0.020 (.008)	0.009 (.008)	-0.011 (.007)	0.003 (.008)	0.017 (.010)	-0.027 (.011)	-0.029 (.014)	-0.044 (.008)
fixed cost	12.268 (1.643)	16.034 (1.603)	12.524 (1.460)	9.423 (.948)	12.730 (.830)	9.491 (.681)	7.380 (.558)	6.469 (.560)	6.961 (.636)	9.755 (1.359)	7.789 (1.030)	7.161 (1.106)	11.997 (1.123)
x high educ.	-1.445 (.793)	-1.521 (.472)	-0.983 (.568)	-0.468 (.386)	-0.562 (.198)	-0.812 (.377)	-0.726 (.268)	0.313 (.322)	0.675 (.390)	-0.986 (.488)	-1.669 (.508)	1.054 (.634)	-0.211 (.340)
Nb of observations	176	267	207	351	724	796	746	657	676	151	188	159	334
Log-Likelihood	-219	-315	-240	-473	-990	-1160	-1084	-984	-947	-222	-240	-208	-455
pseudo-R2	0.36	0.39	0.40	0.31	0.30	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.28	0.24	0.34	0.33	0.30

Note: Region dummy corresponds to *Vienna & Niederoesterreich, Brussels, Helsinki, Paris region, East Germany, Dublin, Southern Italy*. Region not available for Denmark. Std. errors in brackets.

Table A.4: Labor Supply Estimations: Single Men (cont.)

Coeff.	NL	PT	SP	SP	UK	UK	SW	SW	EE	HU	PL	US
	99	00	95	99	96	01	97	01	05	05	05	05
income ² / 10,000	-0.017 (.023)	-0.060 (.071)	0.054 (.048)	0.059 (.039)	0.049 (.026)	-0.010 (.016)	-0.049 (.029)	-0.016 (.015)	1.919 (1.310)	-0.292 (.221)	0.089 (.087)	-0.002 (.001)
hours ² / 1,000	-4.102 (.573)	-6.063 (.804)	-8.780 (.968)	-6.384 (.662)	-4.383 (.585)	-5.626 (.596)	-1.852 (.188)	-2.235 (.226)	-7.287 (1.026)	-6.190 (.518)	-10.332 (.520)	-6.375 (.170)
hours x income / 1,000	-0.100 (.062)	-0.103 (.111)	-0.180 (.067)	-0.125 (.057)	-0.211 (.060)	-0.101 (.047)	-0.197 (.040)	-0.168 (.032)	-0.742 (.406)	0.069 (.132)	-0.146 (.057)	-0.060 (.006)
income	0.026 (.018)	0.028 (.057)	0.136 (.044)	0.018 (.034)	0.045 (.013)	0.013 (.014)	-0.022 (.006)	-0.015 (.007)	-0.232 (.088)	0.045 (.078)	0.041 (.030)	0.009 (.002)
x age/10	-0.011 (.010)	-0.007 (.029)	-0.064 (.021)	-0.014 (.016)	-0.018 (.007)	-0.001 (.007)	0.020 (.004)	0.012 (.004)	0.108 (.045)	-0.019 (.039)	-0.015 (.015)	0.000 (.001)
x age ² /100	0.002 (.001)	0.001 (.003)	0.008 (.003)	0.002 (.002)	0.002 (.001)	0.000 (.001)	-0.002 (.000)	-0.001 (.001)	-0.012 (.006)	0.003 (.005)	0.002 (.002)	0.000 (.000)
hours	-0.046 (.123)	0.605 (.176)	-0.025 (.235)	0.474 (.225)	0.191 (.085)	0.437 (.097)	0.191 (.026)	0.253 (.048)	1.016 (.169)	0.443 (.125)	0.690 (.053)	0.461 (.022)
x age/10	0.216 (.070)	-0.057 (.083)	0.390 (.112)	0.081 (.105)	0.121 (.040)	0.016 (.045)	-0.023 (.015)	-0.027 (.027)	-0.162 (.070)	0.035 (.059)	0.057 (.019)	0.038 (.009)
x age ² /100	-0.030 (.009)	0.006 (.010)	-0.048 (.013)	-0.013 (.012)	-0.014 (.005)	-0.002 (.005)	0.002 (.002)	0.002 (.003)	0.017 (.008)	-0.006 (.007)	-0.009 (.002)	-0.005 (.001)
x 1(region)		0.017 (.014)	0.014 (.008)	0.006 (.009)	-0.010 (.008)	-0.006 (.009)	0.002 (.003)	0.004 (.004)	-0.015 (.014)	0.034 (.008)	0.000 (.004)	0.005 (.002)
fixed cost	4.639 (.802)	9.076 (1.233)	14.994 (1.498)	10.175 (1.043)	9.882 (.973)	10.106 (.971)	3.449 (.216)	3.305 (.397)	12.886 (1.705)	9.438 (.842)	14.417 (.716)	11.912 (.285)
x high educ.	-0.053 (.575)	-3.244 (1.775)	-0.575 (.338)	-0.735 (.389)	-0.834 (.464)	-1.018 (.521)	-0.874 (.166)	-0.161 (.342)	-1.201 (.564)	-0.458 (.334)	-0.804 (.141)	0.114 (.082)
Nb of observations	313	170	295	273	424	442	2386	1405	154	418	1228	5726
Log-Likelihood	-467	-243	-369	-390	-629	-637	-3989	-2359	-212	-611	-1518	-7904
pseudo-R2	0.23	0.27	0.36	0.27	0.24	0.26	0.14	0.14	0.29	0.25	0.36	0.29

Note: Region dummy corresponds to Lisboa, Catalunya, London, Stockholm, Tallin, Budapest region, Warsaw region, US metropolitan areas. Region not available for the Netherlands, too few observations with elderly for Sweden. Std. errors in brackets.





B Fit of the Labor Supply Model and Robustness Checks

Pseudo-R2 reported in the Tables A.1-A4 range from .14 to .44 depending on the country and the year. Yet they cannot be interpreted as standard R2. A more meaningful assessment, conducted in this section, consists of the comparison between observed and predicted choices. In the Tables below, we see that the model fits the data reasonably well, in the sense that predicted participation rates and predicted mean hours according to the model are very similar to the sample participation rates and the sample averages of hours worked. The discrepancy is less than 5% in almost all cases. In addition, we focus on the three cases with the largest discrepancies (Belgium 1998, Ireland 1998 and Portugal 2001) and present their complete hour distributions. We also show this for a country with particularly good fit (France, 2001) for a comparison. Generally, differences in mean hours are due to discrepancies between observed and predicted participation rates, as it is the case for Ireland (resp. Portugal) where non-participation is overestimated (resp. underestimated). It is also due to the fact that the model is not able to reproduce the hours distribution for the workers (this is the case for Belgium, more than a problem of fit concerning participation). In particular, the model does not predict the bunching of hours at 40 hours per week very well, which is a common problem with fitting this type of model to data on weekly hours worked (see Euwals and van Soest, 1999, for example). For Belgium, we can see that the 30 hours/week option and, to a lesser extent, the overtime option (50 hours/week) are slightly overpredicted. This is so even in cases where the overall fit is good (for instance France, 2001, in our illustration). Since most of the response to financial incentives occurs at the extensive margin, we see this as a minor problem. A satisfying fit in terms of participation rates is reassuring and the most important aspect for the robustness of our empirical analysis.

Discrete choice models are very general and impose minimum constraints on preferences. Yet, estimates may be sensitive to the approximation that consists in discretizing the choice set, or in the specification of the model. An extensive robustness analysis on these aspects is suggested in Bargain et al. (2013). First, alternative model with $J = 4$ choices (capturing the commonly agreed durations of work: non-participation, part-time, full-time and overtime) as well as a thinner discretization with $J = 13$ choices (closer to a continuous specification, with steps of 5 hours) yield very similar elasticities as the baseline used in the present paper. Second, alternative specifications of the model (increasing order of the polynomial in the utility function, or replacing fixed costs by part-time dummies, as in Blundell et al., 2000) also confirm the stability of the results with different modeling choices. Bargain et al. (2013) also convey that the size of elasticities, and cross-country differences, are not driven by methodological choices.

Table B.1: Goodness of Fit: Hour Mean and Distributions

	AT 98	BE 98	BE 01	DK 98	FI 98	FR 98	FR 01	GE 98	GE 01	GR 98	IE 98	IE 01
Particip.: observed	.88	.78	.81	.80	.78	.83	.83	.80	.82	.66	.56	.73
Particip.: predicted	.90	.77	.82	.80	.76	.83	.84	.79	.80	.64	.53	.71
gap %	2.8%	-1.2%	1.4%	-0.4%	-3.0%	-0.5%	0.3%	-2.0%	-3.1%	-3.7%	-4.8%	-1.8%
Hours: observed	32.8	30.2	31.0	30.7	30.8	31.6	30.2	28.9	29.7	26.6	21.1	24.9
Hours: predicted	33.7	28.6	30.2	30.4	29.6	31.4	30.1	28.4	28.7	25.5	20.3	24.4
gap %	2.7%	-5.2%	-2.5%	-1.0%	-3.8%	-0.5%	0.0%	-1.7%	-3.6%	-4.2%	-3.8%	-1.9%
	IT 98	NL 01	PT 01	SP 98	SP 01	UK 98	UK 01	SW 01	EE 05	HU 05	PL 05	US 05
Particip.: observed	.74	.85	.79	.70	.79	.64	.72	.87	.81	.83	.66	.83
Particip.: predicted	.74	.85	.83	.69	.80	.64	.73	.86	.81	.83	.66	.82
gap %	-1.0%	0.7%	6.1%	-1.9%	1.4%	0.4%	0.9%	-0.6%	-0.1%	-0.6%	0.5%	-0.7%
Hours: observed	28.0	30.1	30.2	26.8	30.1	24.5	27.2	30.9	31.9	33.1	24.6	34.5
Hours: predicted	27.9	30.1	31.6	26.3	30.6	24.5	27.4	30.1	31.9	32.8	24.6	34.3
gap %	-0.4%	0.0%	4.8%	-1.8%	1.4%	0.2%	0.9%	-2.5%	0.0%	-0.8%	0.0%	-0.6%



C International differences in Elasticities: Preferences versus Tax-benefit Policies

We investigate whether cross-country heterogeneity in elasticities is due to genuine difference in work preferences or to existing tax-benefit systems themselves (recall that elasticities are endogenous to tax-benefit policies). For simplicity, we proceed with traditional wage elasticities of participation. Detailed results for these checks are available from the authors upon request (see also Bargain et al., 2011). First, since different tax-benefit policies may affect the gross wage increment differently, we numerically simulate effective marginal tax rates (EMTR) and calculate elasticities when incrementing *net* wages by 1%. In this way, we cancel out differences in EMTR across countries due to different tax schedules or benefit withdrawal rates. We find that cross-country variation is barely affected when accounting for differences in implicit taxation of labor income (as expected, elasticities after a 1% increase in net wage are slightly larger than our base elasticities). Second, since tax-benefit systems can also affect hours and participation, and, in this way, the size of elasticities, we have also simulated a scenario where existing tax-benefit systems are withdrawn completely (and an alternatively scenario where they are replaced by a uniform flat tax system – this yields similar conclusions). As expected, given this radical reform, labor supply increases while elasticities mechanically decrease in almost all countries. Importantly, countries with larger responses in the baseline also tend to have larger responses in the no-tax-benefit counterfactual situation. These results thus suggest that individual work-consumption preferences are sufficiently heterogeneous between countries to explain significant differences in elasticities and, hence, in efficiency constraints for governments.

D Tax-Benefit Descriptions

Table D.1: Taxes, Social Contributions and Transfers of Childless Singles

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France
<i>Income Tax System</i>						
No of tax bands	4	5	3	1	6	6
Lowest/highest tax band limit * §	17 / 231	24 / 318	12 / 100	21	35 / 223	30 / 336
Lowest/highest tax rate £	.21 / .50	.25 / .55	.40 / .59	.24 / .24	.235 / .557	.185 / .62
Main tax credit*	5					PPE (in 2001)
<i>Employee Social Security Contributions</i>						
SSC exemption below earnings*	13	some SSC rebates				
Lower/upper contrib. limit **	no / 145					
Starting/finishing rate (%)	18.06	13.07	8 + lump sum charge (3% of AW) ³	3	6.6	21.36 / 8.61 (4 rates)
Maximum contribution**	26.1					
Tax deductible	yes	yes	yes		yes	yes
<i>Social Assistance (not taxable, except Denmark)</i>						
Max. amount*	32	39	34 + housing allowance up to 9	9 + housing supplements	18 + reasonable housing costs	24
Disregard*		9				
Withdrawal rate	1	1	1		1	1
<i>Housing Benefit</i>						
Max. amount*			3	see Social Assistance	17	15
Withdrawal rate			.75		.80	.34
<i>Unemployment Benefits (shown for initial phase of unempl., after waiting period if applicable, for persons aged 30+. Insurance to some extent voluntary in DK and FI)</i>						
Floor*	7	31 (if previously full-time)	56 (if previously full-time)		22	30
Payment Rate**	55% of net	42-60% of gross	90% of gross minus SSC	40-50% of gross	up to 42% of net > 22 (basic benefit)	57-75% of gross, downward scaling factor
Duration	4.5-12 months (dep. on age and contribution)	no limit in general	1+3 years (partly dep. on program participation)	6-12 months (dep. on contribution period)	max. 16.5 months (renewable under conditions)	4-60 months (dep. on age and contribution)
Ceiling*	min(56, 80% of net)	48 (if previously full-time)	68			313
Taxable @	IT: no, SSC: no	IT: reduced, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: partly	IT: no, SSC: no	IT: no, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: yes

Source: EUROMOD country reports, OECD Benefit and Wages, MISSOC 1998.

Notes: We focus here on taxation and transfers to childless singles (all benefit and tax rates above are for this demographic group) for the year 1998 except PL, HU, EE and US (year 2005/6).

* All monetary levels in % of median gross employment income (not including employer social security contributions)

** All monetary level in % of Average Worker Wage (AWW)

§ The lowest bound accounts for std tax-free allowances/deductions/exemptions for single employees, i.e. represents the upper bound of the zero-tax income range

£ Rates include special social security tax. In France, CSG: 7.5% and CRDS: 0.5%. They combine flat-tax municipal taxation and progressive national taxation for Finland and Denmark (municipal tax rates differ between municipalities and we count here the average: 17.5% in Finland, 32.4% in Denmark). In Denmark, a "tax shield" of 59% is applied as the top rate.

@ IT = income tax; SSC = social security contributions

Table D.2: Taxes, Social Contributions and Transfers of Childless Singles (cont.)

	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Netherlands
<i>Income Tax System</i>						
No of tax bands	3 £	3	2	2	5	4
Lowest/highest tax band limit * §	30 / 252	56 / 478	0 / 82	25 / 80	0 / 118	20 / 212
Lowest/highest tax rate £	.273 / .557	.05 / .45	.18 / .36	.24 / .46	.185 / .455	.36 / .60
Main tax credit * &		max. 15% of accepted expenditure			up to 6	
<i>Employee Social Security Contributions</i>						
Lower/upper contrib. limit **	12 / 150	no / 285		51 / no	no / 371	
Starting/finishing rate [%]	20.85 / 13 (2 rates)	16	8.5 / 5 (2 rates)	4 / 2 (2 rates)	9.19 / 10.19 (2 rates)	32.6 / 5.85 (4 rates) + lump sum charge
Maximum contribution**	27.4	45.6			36.1	32.2
Tax deductible	yes	yes	no	no	yes	partly
Special features	phase-in; +0.25%					extra payments for some employees
<i>Social Assistance (not taxable)</i>						
Max. amount*	13		11	29 + housing supp. 19 for partner's income	none at the national level	24
Disregard*	4					
Withdrawal rate	.75 - 1		1	1		1
<i>Housing Benefit</i>						
Max. amount*	25		2	see Social Assistance	none at the national level	6 (for low rents)
Withdrawal rate	.40					0.54
<i>Unemployment Benefits (shown for initial phase of unempl., after waiting period if applicable, for persons aged 30+)</i>						
Floor*		28				41 (if previous job full-time)
Payment Rate**	60% of net	40-70% of gross	65% of gross	flat-rate: 16 (EUR 96/week)	30% of gross	70% of gross
Duration	6-32 months (dep. on age and contribution)	5-12 months (dep. on employment period)	up to 9 months (dep. on contribution)	13 months	6 months	9-60 months (dep. on employment period)
Ceiling*	125	min. of 126 or 70% of gross	2x the bottom limit, i.e. 90% of minimum old-age pension		66	156
Taxable @	no	IT: reduced, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: partly	IT: reduced, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: yes

£: In Germany: MTR increases progressively between lower and middle / middle and top tax bands; rates include solidarity surplus tax of 5.5%

&: Employment-related benefits exist in Ireland (FIS) and Italy but do not concern childless single households

Table D.3: Taxes, Social Contributions and Transfers of Childless Singles (cont.)

	Poland	Portugal	Spain	Sweden	United Kingdom	United States
<i>Income Tax System</i>						
No of tax bands	3	6	8	2	3	6
Lowest/highest tax band limit * §	5 / 259	0 / 490	22 / 492	4 / 92	29 / 220	26 / 1066
Lowest/highest tax rate	.19 / .40	.05 / .40	.20 / .56	.30 / .55	.20 / .40	10 / 35
Main tax credit *		3	3		WFTC (not for childless)	EITC (not for childless)
<i>Employee Social Security Contributions</i>						
SSC exemption below earnings threshold *			35	5		
Lower/upper contrib. limit **			no / 165	no / 110	17 / no	
Starting/finishing rate [%]	25.62	11	6.35	7	11 / 1 (2 rates)	7.65 / 1.45 (2 rates)
Maximum contribution**			10.5	7.7		
Tax deductible	partly	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Special features			lump-sum charge below threshold	87.5% can be claimed as tax credit, rest is tax deductible	rebate for some employees	
<i>Social Assistance (not taxable)</i>						
Max. amount*	20	20	none at the national level	15 + reasonable housing cost	18	4
Disregard*					2 - 4	occasional income up to USD 120
Withdrawal rate	1	0.8		1	1	1
<i>Housing Benefit</i>						
Max. amount*	15	none at the national level	none at the national level	6 (only if aged <30)	100% of recognised rent; 100% of council tax	
Withdrawal rate				33% (disregard of 18)	65% (housing benefit); 20% (council tax benefit)	
<i>Unemployment Benefits (shown for initial phase of unempl., after waiting period if applicable, for persons aged 30+. Insurance to some extent voluntary in SW)</i>						
Floor*		49 (if previous job full-time)	33	28		
Payment Rate**	flat-rate: 26 (EUR 35/week)	65% of gross	70% of gross for 6 months then 60%	80% of gross	flat-rate: 11-14 (EUR 65-83 / week)	53% of gross (average over all States)
Duration	max. 18 months	10-30 months (dep. on age)	dep. on contribution period	10-15 months (dep. on age)	max. 6 months	max. 6 months
Ceiling*		146	75	66	18%	61% of average worker
Taxable @		IT: no, SSC: no	IT: yes, SSC: reduced	IT: yes, SSC: yes	IT: yes, SSC: no	

E Redistributive and Incentive Effects of Tax-Benefit Systems


We show here the diversity of situations that may, to some extent, reveal important differences in political and normative views across countries. For that purpose we present a suggestive characterization of the redistributive and incentive potentials of the different tax-benefit systems. Both dimensions are integrated in the optimal tax approach in the paper.

Redistributive Effects. We consider the three main groups of policy instruments, namely benefits, social security contributions (SSC) and taxes, and how they affect Gini coefficients for each country. We could use decomposition of inequality indices by income sources, but prefer a more visual check in Figure E.1 below by calculating the Gini for different income concepts, starting from gross incomes then including gradually each of the policy instruments (incomes are equalized by the modified OECD scale).¹ The percentage reduction in Gini coefficients is mostly due to transfers.² In Nordic and Continental Europe, benefits alone bring the Gini coefficient below the .35 mark. For these countries, redistribution to the poor through means-tested social assistance is substantial. In contrast, it is absent in Southern Europe or the US (with the exception of some disability benefits), at least when our selection of childless singles is considered. In some countries in the middle of the ranking, like Ireland and the UK, benefits (and non-contributory income support in particular) also help to reduce considerably the initially high levels of market income inequality. SSC levied on earnings (and sometimes on benefits) are generally designed as a flat-rate scheme and, hence, are relatively neutral in terms of redistribution. The effect of income taxation is more important. Taxes naturally have a larger redistributive impact than transfers in countries where the latter are small (e.g., Hungary or the US). They sometimes have a significant role even when benefits are generous (e.g., in Denmark). Tax structures in almost all countries are progressive, with the exception of flat tax schemes in Baltic countries (represented here by Estonia). Low earners do not usually pay taxes thanks to tax allowances or tax-free brackets. The degree of vertical redistribution due to income tax schedules depends on a complex mix of tax level, tax progressivity and scope (tax base), as studied in Wagstaff et al. (1999). International rankings on the levels of public spending (and in particular spending on redistribution) mirror tax levels, with lower taxation in Southern and Eastern Europe and the US at one end and high tax redistribution in Nordic countries at the other. Further, Figure E.2 first plots the Gini-reduction effect of tax-benefit policies as previously defined, i.e., which include unemployment benefits (UB) as part of the redistribution function, against the same effect when UB are treated as market income. We see that the international ranking is broadly preserved ($corr = .91$). That is, countries with high levels of redistribution through the tax-benefit system alone also provide high replacement rates to the unemployed (the latter may make the system even more redistributive than when mere tax-benefit policies are accounted for, for instance in Denmark). As argued before, we shall treat UB as pure insurance in our main results in order to be consistent with the logic of the optimal tax model. Figure E.2 also compare redistributive effects in our selection of working-age childless singles with effects for the whole population. As expected, more redistribution occurs in the latter because many transfers are available only for families with children (or more generous for these families), notably social assistance

¹We report results only for childless single individuals. Additional results for the whole sample show that Gini of disposable income are in line with common wisdom (notably Gottschalk and Smeeding, 1997).

²This result holds whatever the order in which policy instruments are added to (or withdrawn from) gross income. The order retained here is justified by the fact that benefits are taxable in some countries (so that certain combinations, such as gross income minus SSC and taxes, would lead to negative incomes).

(e.g., TANF in the US) and in-work support (e.g., in-work transfers, like the US EITC or the UK WFTC). Interestingly, however, the figure shows a high correlation (.90), i.e., countries which do not redistribute much among childless single individuals do not redistribute much in general. Thus, the views of each social planners in terms of vertical equity is well reflected even when focusing on a relatively restrictive selection of single individuals, which is reassuring for the analysis that follows.³



Sample: selection of childless singles. Bars (left x-axis) represent Gini coefficients of equivalized income for different income concepts from gross/market income to disposable income (gross income + benefits - SSC - taxes). We also represent (right x-axis) the % reduction in Gini due to tax-benefit policies. Countries are ranked according to the Gini of disposable income.

Figure E.1: Redistributive Effects of Tax-Benefit Policies (Singles)




Figure E.2: Vertical Redistribution: Impact of Unemployment Benefits and Sample Selection

³Of course, this claim is limited to the instruments simulated in our exercise. Public health system or other sort of in-kind benefits may change this picture.

Incentive Effects. Incentive effects of tax-benefit systems are summarized by EMTRs and EPTRs as reported in Tables I.1.-I.2 in the Appendix to the paper. They are compared graphically in Figure E.3-E.4 below. To be consistent with the optimal tax model, EMTRs are calculated at the income group level, i.e., $\frac{T_i - T_{i-1}}{Y_i - Y_{i-1}}$, as explained in the paper. In a similar way, EPTRs are calculated as $\frac{T_i - T_0}{Y_i - Y_0}$. This is slightly different from other studies which sometimes define EMTRs at the individual level (e.g., in Immervoll et al., 2007). Our characterization is nonetheless very much in line with previous international comparisons (see Immervoll, 2004). In Figure E.3, the upper quadrants show that in Continental (left) and Nordic (right) European countries, EMTRs are larger in upper income groups, due to progressive taxation. In addition, they are particularly large for group 1 (and sometimes group 2). Such high implicit taxation on poor workers is due to high withdrawal rates of means-tested social assistance programs together with the absence of transfers to the working poor (with a few exceptions). The resulting U-shaped pattern is extensively discussed in the literature (e.g., Immervoll, 2004). The lower panels show EMTRs in Eastern European countries and Anglo-Saxon countries (bottom left) and Southern Europe (bottom right). In contrast to Continental/Nordic Europe, the overall level of net taxation is lower, and the distribution of EMTR flatter, with a few exceptions. For one thing, this characterizes the absence of social assistance schemes in most of these countries. In the US, and to some lesser extent in the UK and Ireland, redistribution is usually targeted to those in-work and with children (hence it is not apparent in our results). Yet social assistance (Income Support) in the UK is not marginal and also creates high implicit taxation among low-wage workers, which is not compensated by tax credits in the case of childless singles for the years under consideration. There are other exceptions on the income tax side, notably fairly higher tax levels can be observed in some Eastern countries (Poland, Hungary) as well as in Ireland and Italy. Tax progressivity is also more pronounced in the income tax schedule of several Southern countries (Greece, Portugal, Italy). Note that Tables I.1.-I.2., as well as Figure E.4, also report average effective tax rates (or effective participation rates), defined as $\frac{T_i - T_0}{Y_i - Y_0}$ for $i = 1, \dots, I$. They add to the picture that implicit taxation when leaving assistance and taking up a job on the labor market is very high in Continental/Nordic Europe.




Figure E.3: Effective Marginal Tax Rates





Figure E.4: Effective Participation Tax Rates

F Robustness Check on the Treatment of Replacement Incomes

For contributory benefits – essentially unemployment benefit (since we exclude pensioners) – we have suggested the following treatment: In most countries, contributory unemployment benefits can be seen as pure insurance, i.e., payments are closely linked to workers’ past earnings through social security contributions.⁴ Thus, unemployment benefits (UB) are interpreted in this case as delayed salaries and treated *stricto sensus* as replacement incomes, i.e., those who receive this insurance are treated as workers in our baseline.⁵ In our view it would not make much sense to mix in group 0 high-skill workers who receive high levels of UB (when replacement rates are very high, as in Scandinavian countries) together with low-skill workers who live on social assistance. In some countries, however, unemployment insurance payments are detached from contributions and hence can be interpreted as a form of redistribution. This is the case for the UK, Ireland and Poland: UB are paid according to flat rates and have no strong link to past contributions. Hence, they are treated as redistribution in our baseline. In fact the treatment of unemployment insurance has little effect for these countries since, for singles, payments of UB are very similar to levels of income support.



F.1: Revealed Social Inequality Aversion: Robustness Checks

We suggest here a variant that takes an alternative and slightly longer-term perspective by treating all non-workers as if they had exhausted their rights to social security (this may indeed take several

⁴This treatment is also consistent with the pure supply-side logic of the optimal tax model, in which involuntary unemployment is ignored and job seekers who claim benefits are treated as (potential) workers. For explicit introduction of involuntary unemployment and search decisions in an optimal tax model, see Boone and Bovenberg (2004) and the survey by Sørensen (1997). The most important mechanisms at work, the tension between group 0 and 1, is qualitatively unchanged: in imperfect labor market models, a reduction of average tax rates leads to higher employment, where the effect is channelled through lower equilibrium wages; accordingly, a working poor policy would lead to increased job opportunities, while a demogrant policy would reduce the chances of finding a job.

⁵In their baseline, Immervoll et al. (2007) assign UB recipients to group 0, i.e., treat UB as pure redistribution, but recognize that this is a relatively conservative approach. Alternatively, they replace UB by social assistance for job seekers in group 0, which is the same variant presented here. More generally, note that the differences in the extent of social security programs among developed countries, along with the substitution between public and private insurance, have driven the literature to limit redistributive analyses to non-contributive social benefits and taxes.

months or years). That is, unemployment benefits are set to zero for job seekers, and they receive (simulated) social assistance, when available. The size of group 0 is then necessarily larger in this scenario. Results are presented in Figure F.1. Some countries like Denmark appear to favor redistribution slightly less in this case, but the international ranking is broadly preserved. It is reassuring that previous interpretations of our results survive this alternative, reasonable treatment.

G Optimal Tax Inversion

In Figure G.1, we present, for each country, the marginal social welfare weights g_i for the six income groups $i = 0, \dots, 5$, as derived from the inverse optimal tax approach and calculated on the basis of estimated labor supply elasticities. Recall that each of these weights represents the dollar equivalent value for governments of distributing an extra dollar uniformly to individuals working in group i .

Social Welfare Functions: Basic Properties. We first check whether tax-benefit revealed social welfare functions show reasonable properties. Weights g_i correspond in part to the marginal social welfare function in the continuous model à la Mirrlees. Therefore, a necessary condition for the implicit social welfare function to be Paretian, i.e. non-decreasing at all productivity levels, is that weights g_i are positive at all income levels. Our results show that this is broadly the case for all countries and income groups. Weights are however close to zero in some specific cases concerning groups 1 and 2, which we shall discuss in length below.

Social Welfare Functions: International Comparisons. Next we discuss the shape of the implicit social welfare functions and compare countries' degree of "Rawlsianity".⁶ We first see that the patterns are consistent with some social aversion to inequality, with the largest welfare weight placed on the poorest, the workless poor of group 0, in all countries. Yet the pattern is relatively flat, in places where social assistance schemes for childless singles are absent or marginal, i.e., in Southern Europe, Hungary, Estonia and the US. In these countries, revealed preferences are close to utilitarianism. There are some exceptions and notably a slightly lower weight on the top income groups in Portugal and Greece, that can be explained by progressive taxation as discussed above. Also, fairly high tax levels in Italy are reflected here by welfare weights significantly lower than 1 in the upper half of the distribution.

All the other countries (essentially Nordic and Continental Europe, Ireland and the UK) operate non-marginal transfers towards the bottom of the distribution. As a result, we observe much higher weights on group 0 there (sometimes very high, as is the case of Austria, Denmark, Sweden and Belgium). At the same time, weights on group 1 (and sometimes 2) are extremely small in most of these systems. This result does not come as a surprise. It simply reflects the way the optimal tax model rationalizes the very high distortions imposed on the working poor, as discussed in the EMTR analysis in the paper.⁷ For these countries the concavity of the implicit social welfare function is not ensured at all income levels. This apparent inconsistency may simply reveal that governments have neglected the working poor, which represent a relatively small population in countries with highly regulated labor markets (as compared to the US for instance).

Elasticities: from Econometrics to Politics. Another possible interpretation is that governments had completely different beliefs about the extent of behavioral responses than what is measured by the econometrician, at the time generous social assistance programs were implemented. Indeed, if demogrant policies were implemented in place of in-work transfers, this may be due to the fact that

⁶Note that like many, we improperly use the term "Rawlsian" throughout the paper. Maximizing utility of the worst off person in the society is not the original version of Rawls (1972) but a kind of welfarist version of Rawls, as explained in Kanbur et al. (2006).

⁷There are exceptions, e.g., Denmark, where a small extensive-margin elasticity on group 1 compensates this effect.




Figure 1: G.1: Marginal Social Welfare g_i

politician partly or totally ignored behavioral responses.⁸ Thus, in the paper, we suggest exploring a polar case with zero extensive margin elasticities. We provide more detailed results here. The first two graphs of Figure G.2 compare social welfare weights in the baseline and in the zero-elasticity scenario. We focus on four countries with generous demogrant policies and high implicit taxation on group 1. In the zero-elasticity case, irregularities on group 1 partly disappear, i.e., the distribution of marginal social welfare weights becomes flatter. Smaller and more similar weights on group 0 can be observed. Admittedly, weights on group 1 (and 2) are still lower than for most other groups because the policy behind the result has not changed, i.e., the model still rationalizes the fact that workless poor receive substantial transfers, while working poor receive nothing.⁹ However, and most importantly, our results show that the likely understatement of behavioral responses by policy makers, together with a genuine desire to redistribute to the poorest, partly explains apparent non-concavity in implicit social welfare functions.




Figure 2: G.2: Tax-Benefit Revealed Social Welfare Weights: Alternative Elasticities and Years

Recent Trends Interestingly, it also seems that recent reforms tend to correct these "inconsistencies". The last graph of Figure G.2 describes the case of Finland. The situation in 1998 shows a much lower weight for group 1 compared to others, which partly disappears when zero-elasticities are assumed. Many policy changes occur during the following years (see Förster and Mira d'Ercole, 2005), which contribute to increase inequalities (notably a reduction in tax progressivity) and reduce "incentive traps" (especially tax allowances for low-wage workers and relative decline in social transfers due to slow nominal adjustment). The effect of these reforms is clearly visible on Figure 2 with the change between 1998 and 2001. Notably, the gap between groups 0 and 1 is considerably narrowed

⁸Recall that with small extensive margin elasticities, negative marginal tax rates resulting from in-work support, such as the US Earned Income Tax Credit, are never optimal, since they discourage productive workers at the intensive margin. If participation response are large, however, optimal schedules are more likely to feature small guaranteed income for non-workers and large in-work support (and possibly negative marginal taxes at low income levels, see Saez, 2002, Choné and Laroque, 2005).

⁹In addition, intensive margin elasticities are non-zero and are actually associated to a move from 1 to 0 for the group of working poor.

and the weight on group 1 is almost at the level of middle income groups. Reforms with similar effects have taken place in other countries (unfortunately for a more recent period that is not covered by our data and tax-benefit simulations). They take the form of lowered tax rates for low-wage earners (as in Finland), reduced social assistance (in particular Denmark since 2003) and notably a generalization of in-work supports (the implementation of refundable earned income tax credits in France, the Netherlands and Belgium 2002–2004, cf. Orsini, 2006) or exemptions of social security contributions (“mini-job” reform in Germany, cf. Steiner and Wrohlich, 2005, and Belgium after 2004).¹⁰ These developments may denote a reassessment of potential labor supply responses by governments, as argued above, but also a likely change in social preferences toward more desert-sensitive policies.

Comparison with Subjective Redistributive Preferences. Tax-implicit preferences could also be compared with direct evidence on people’s ethical views. This closely relates to studies focusing on redistributive preferences (e.g., Corneo and Fong, 2008) or comparisons between tax preferences and actual tax schedules (Singhal, 2008). We have performed a simple check by exploiting a question from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) on *whether it is the responsibility of the government to reduce differences between high and low incomes*. For a subset of countries for which similar periods are available, we compare it to the revealed inequality aversion index. Not surprisingly, the most robust result is the divide between the US and Continental/Nordic Europe (see also Alesina and Angeletos, 2005). This is mainly because low tastes for redistribution in the US support the low inequality aversion embodied in the tax-benefit system. The UK has a somewhat intermediary position. For some other groups of country, results are in contrast. Citizens of Southern and Eastern countries show the highest levels of support for redistribution, while living among the least redistributive systems. Why redistributive tastes do not translate into more redistributive policies is still an open question to be addressed in future work.¹¹

¹⁰Interestingly, most of these reforms consist of individualized schemes. Hence, they directly affect the group of childless singles under study. This is even the case in the UK in 2003, as the Working Tax Credit became available to all working poor, with or without children. Some of the reduction in social assistance came through new activation policies (for instance in Denmark). This type of workfare policy is rarely simulated since information concerning active job search is missing. However this would boil down to a reduction in the (long-run) expected value of social assistance and hence a decrease in the weight on group 0 (and the gap between 0 and 1) in our framework.

¹¹We can say that the broad group of countries with low levels of revealed inequality aversion in our results is mixed and influenced by possibly very different cultural and historical characteristics. For Eastern countries, the negative correlation between declared preferences and revealed inequality aversion is not only consistent with persistent left-wing ideology (Alesina and Fuchs-Schündeln, 2007) but also with the increasing public sentiment that the process of income distribution was in fact flawed and inefficient (Grosfeld and Senik, 2010). In Southern Europe, family support is still seen as a substitute to state intervention towards the unemployed and low-wage workers (see Bentolila and Ichino, 2008).

References

- [1] Aaberge, R., U. Colombino and T. Wennemo (2002): "Heterogeneity in the elasticity of labor supply in Italy and some policy implications", WP CHILD. #21/2002.
- [2] Alesina, A. and G.-M. Angelotos (2005): "Fairness and redistribution: US vs. Europe", *American Economic Review*, 95(4), 960-980.
- [3] Alesina, A. and N. Fuchs-Schündeln (2007): "Good-bye Lenin (or not?): the effect of communism on people's preferences", *American Economic Review*, 97(4), 1507-1528.
- [4] Bargain O, Decoster A, Dolls M, Neumann D, Peichl A, Siegloch S (2013): "Welfare, labor supply and heterogeneous preferences: evidence for Europe and the US", forthcoming in *Social Choice and Welfare*.
- [5] Bentolila, S. and A. Ichino (2008): "Unemployment and Consumption: Near and Far Away from the Mediterranean", *Journal of Population Economics*, 21(2), 255-280
- [6] Boone, J. and L. Bovenberg (2004): "The optimal taxation of unskilled labor with job search and social assistance", *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(11), 2227-2258
- [7] Callan, T., A. van Soest and J. Walsh (2009): "Tax structure and female labor supply: evidence from Ireland", *Labour*, 23(1), 1-35
- [8] Corneo, G. and C.M. Fong (2008): "What's the monetary value of distributive justice?", *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(1-2), 289-308.
- [9] Euwals, R. and A. van Soest (1999): "Desired and actual labour supply of unmarried men and women in the Netherlands", *Labour Economics*, 6, 95-118.
- [10] Gottschalk, P and T.M. Smeeding (1997): "Cross-national comparisons of earnings and income inequality", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(2), 633-87.
- [11] Grosfeld, I. and C. Senik (2010): "The emerging aversion to inequality Evidence from subjective data", *Economics of Transition*, 18(1), 1-26
- [12] Haan, P. and V. Steiner (2006): "Labor market effects of the German tax reform 2000", in C. Dreger, H.P. Galler and U. Walwei (eds.), *Determinants of Employment: The macroeconomic view*, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 101-117.
- [13] Immervoll, H. (2004): "Average and marginal effective tax rates facing workers in the EU: A micro-level analysis of levels, distributions and driving factors", OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper No.19, Paris: OECD.
- [14] Immervoll, H. (2007): "Minimum wages, minimum labour costs and the tax treatment of low-wage employment", OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper 46.
- [15] Orsini, K. (2007): "Is Belgium making work pay?", *Brussels Economic Review*, 50(2), 193-220.
- [16] Saez, E. (2001): "Using elasticities to derive optimal income tax rates", *Review of Economic Studies*, 68(1), 205-229.
- [17] Singhal, M. (2008): "Quantifying preferences for redistribution", paper presented at the AEA Annual Meeting January 2009.
- [18] Sørensen, P. B. (1997): "Public finance solutions to the European unemployment problem?", *Economic Policy*, 12(25), 223-64.

- [19] Steiner, V. and K. Wrohlich (2005): "Work incentives and labor supply effects of the 'Mini-Jobs reform' in Germany", *Empirica*, 32(1), 91-116.
- [20] van Soest, A. and M. Das (2000): "Family labor supply and proposed tax reforms in the Netherlands", *De Economist*, 149(2), 191-218
- [21] Wagstaff, A. et al. (1999): "Redistributive effect, progressivity and differential tax treatment: Personal income taxes in twelve OECD countries", *Journal of Public Economics*, 72(1), 73-98.