

Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields

Biannually

Volume X

Issue 2(20)

Winter 2019

ISSN 2068 – 7710

Journal DOI

<https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref>

ASERS
Publishing



Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields



ASERS Publishing is an advanced e-publisher struggling to bring further worldwide learning, knowledge and research. This transformative mission is realized through our commitment to innovation and enterprise, placing us at the cutting-edge of electronic delivery in a world that increasingly considers the dominance of digital content and networked access not only to books and journals but to a whole range of other pedagogic services.

In both books and journals, ASERS Publishing is a hallmark of the finest scholarly publishing and cutting-edge research, maintained by our commitment to rigorous peer-review process.

Using pioneer developing technologies, ASERS Publishing keeps pace with the rapid changes in the e-publishing market.

ASERS Publishing is committed to providing customers with the information they want, when they want and how they want it. To serve this purpose, ASERS publishing offers digital Higher Education materials from its journals, courses and scientific books, in a proven way in order to engage the academic society from the entire world.

Editor in Chief

PhD Laura UNGUREANU

Spiru Haret University, Romania

Editor

PhD Ivan KITOV

Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Editorial Advisory Board

Monal Abdel-Baki

American University in Cairo, Egypt

Mădălina Constantinescu

SpiruHaret University, Romania

Jean-Paul Gaertner

Ecole de Management de Strasbourg,
France

Piotr Misztal

The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce,
Faculty of Management and Administration,
Poland

Russell Pittman

International Technical Assistance
Economic Analysis Group Antitrust Division,
USA

Rachel Price-Kreitz

Ecole de Management de Strasbourg,
France

Rena Ravinder

Politechnic of Namibia, Namibia

Andy Ștefănescu

University of Craiova, Romania

Laura Gavrilă (formerly Ștefănescu)

Spiru Haret University, Romania

Hans-Jürgen Weißbach

University of Applied Sciences - Frankfurt
am Main, Germany

Aleksandar Vasilev

University of Linkoln, UK

ASERS Publishing

<http://www.asers.eu/asers-publishing>

ISSN 2068 – 7710

Journal's Issue DOI:

[https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2\(20\).00](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2(20).00)

Table of Contents:

1	Where is Kenya Being Headed to? Empirical Evidence from the Box-Jenkins Arima Approach Thabani NYONI	87
2	William Nassau Senior and the Relationship between Abstinence, Capital and Interest Alessandro MORSELLI	96
3	Trade Openness and Industrial Output Growth in Nigeria: Empirical Lessons for Diversification Peter N. MBA, Anthony ORJI, Donald CHUKWUMAEZE, Onyinye ANTHONY-ORJI	105
4	Taxation and Welfare: Measuring the Effect of Bulgaria's 2007-08 Corporate-Personal Income Tax Reforms Aleksandar VASILEV	113
5	Offline Advertising versus Online Advertising Cristina Mihaela BARBU, Ștefan PONEA, Cristiana - Luminita BOGDĂNOIU	118
6	Predicting Disaggregated Tourist Arrivals in Sierra Leone Using ARIMA Model Emerson Abraham JACKSON, Edmund TAMUKE	132
7	Traditionalism or Modern in Romanian Management Accounting? Silvia SIMIONESCU, Elena BICĂ, Cristiana - Luminita BOGDĂNOIU	143
8	Fiscal Deficit and The Growth of Domestic Output in Nigeria Joseph Ibrahim ADAMA, Bright Onoriode OHWOFASA, Victor Ahmed AYODELE	150
9	European Unification and European Integration as a Philosophical Principle Bogdan GHIDIRMIC, Alexandru MATEI	159

Call for Papers

Volume XI, Issue 1(21), Spring 2020

Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields

Many economists today are concerned by the proliferation of journals and the concomitant labyrinth of research to be conquered in order to reach the specific information they require. To combat this tendency, **Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields** has been conceived and designed outside the realm of the traditional economics journal. It consists of concise communications that provide a means of rapid and efficient dissemination of new results, models and methods in all fields of economic research.

Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields publishes original articles in all branches of economics – theoretical and empirical, abstract and applied, providing wide-ranging coverage across the subject area.

Journal promotes research that aim at the unification of the theoretical-quantitative and the empirical-quantitative approach to economic problems and that are penetrated by constructive and rigorous thinking. It explores a unique range of topics from the frontier of theoretical developments in many new and important areas, to research on current and applied economic problems, to methodologically innovative, theoretical and applied studies in economics. The interaction between empirical work and economic policy is an important feature of the journal.

Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields, starting with its first issue, it is indexed in EconLit, RePEC, EBSCO, ProQuest, Cabell Directories and CEEOL databases.

The primary aim of the Journal has been and remains the provision of a forum for the dissemination of a variety of international issues, empirical research and other matters of interest to researchers and practitioners in a diversity of subject areas linked to the broad theme of economic sciences.

All the papers will be first considered by the Editors for general relevance, originality and significance. If accepted for review, papers will then be subject to double blind peer review.

Invited manuscripts will be due till November 10th, 2019, and shall go through the usual, albeit somewhat expedited, refereeing process.

Deadline for submission of proposals: 10th May 2020

Expected publication date: June 2020

Website: <http://journals.aserspublishing.eu/tpref>

E-mail: tpref@aserspublishing.eu

To prepare your paper for submission, please see full author guidelines in the following file: [TPREF Full Paper Template.docx](#), on our site.



DOI: [https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2\(20\).04](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2(20).04)

TAXATION AND WELFARE: MEASURING THE EFFECT OF BULGARIA'S 2007-08 CORPORATE-PERSONAL INCOME TAX REFORMS

Aleksandar VASILEV
University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
avasilev@lincoln.ac.uk

Suggested Citation:

Vasilev, A. (2019). Taxation and Welfare: Measuring the Effect of Bulgaria's 2007-08 Corporate-Personal Income Tax Reforms, *Theoretical and Practical Research in Economic Fields* (Volume X, Winter 2019), 2(20): 113 - 117. DOI:[10.14505/tpref.v10.2\(20\).04](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2(20).04).

Article's History:

Received October 2019; Revised November 2019; Accepted December 2019.
2019. ASERS Publishing. All rights reserved.

Abstract: *This paper utilizes a simple general-equilibrium model to analyse the long-run effects of Bulgaria's 2007-08 corporate-personal income tax reforms. In particular, we consider the effect working through the firm's capital structure and argue that the new reforms incentivize firms to increase investment, as the new regime benefits retained earnings. The increase in capital increases output and productivity, which in turn increases consumption and welfare. On average, households are enjoying 8.65% higher consumption in the new steady-state in the benchmark scenario. As a robustness check, we allow for a variable labour supply, where the gain increases further by additional 3.9% of consumption, to produce an overall gain of 13.55%.*

Keywords: general equilibrium tax reform; firm's capital structure; welfare gain.

JEL Classification: H25; H32; O41; O52.

Introduction

We set up a general-equilibrium model with a detailed corporate finance sector in order to provide a quantitative assessment of the 2007-08 corporate-personal income tax reforms in Bulgaria. Starting from a rate of 32.5% in 2000, the corporate tax rate was decreased in several steps down to its current rate of 10% in 2007. Similarly, the progressive income tax schedule was flattened until a uniform rate of 10% was introduced in 2008, which is in place today as well. In addition, a dividend tax of 5% was introduced. The particular focus of the paper falls on the effect of tax changes for the cost of finance, and how that changes the firm's financial structure. Under the new regime, the firms realize certain benefits from retained earnings, which is an incentive to increase investment and accumulate physical capital. That in turn leads to expansion of output and profit. Since after tax profit is distributed to firm owners (households), consumption increases as well.

The novelty relative to Vasilev (2019) is that in this model households face an explicit utility-maximization problem, which is a function of their consumption path. This allows us to measure the welfare gain of the introduction of the two tax reforms in Bulgaria in terms of additional consumption enjoyed. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 outlines the model. Section 3 describes the calibration procedure and presents the results from the computational experiments performed in this paper. Section 4 concludes.

1. The Model

For the most part, the model follows closely Funke and Strulik (2006), which in turn is a general-equilibrium extension of Funke's (2002) partial-equilibrium representation. In particular, we start with a representative firm, which uses physical capital, K , and labour, L , and combines them using a Cobb-Douglas production function to maximize intertemporal profit

$$\pi = AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha} - wL - \delta K, \quad (1)$$

where: a denotes total factor productivity;
 δ is the economic depreciation rate.

Note that in this paper we distinguish between economic depreciation and *accounting* depreciation, *i.e.* depreciation for tax purposes. In particular, following Sinn (1987), we divide tax depreciation into a part of gross investment (I) that is written off immediately (z), while the remainder $(1-z)$ depreciates at the economic rate δ . Therefore, total depreciation for tax purposes equals $z(I + \delta K) + (1 - z)\delta K = zI + \delta K$. Next, before-tax dividends are defined as follows:

$$D = \pi - I - T, \quad (2)$$

where:

$$T = \tau(\pi - zI - D) \quad (3)$$

are the corporate taxes on the firm's retained earnings. Equation (1) - (3) then imply that dividends are then

$$D = AK^\alpha L^{1-\alpha} - wL - \delta K - \frac{(1-\tau z)I}{1-\tau}.$$

Next, we introduce a "tax discrimination" variable θ to capture the opportunity cost of retained earnings in terms of the net dividend foregone, *e.g.* King (1977), where:

$$\theta = \frac{1-m}{1-\tau}, \quad (4)$$

and m is the personal tax rate on dividends.

Note that for $\theta < 1$, there is a preferential tax treatment of retained earnings, which will affect the financial structure of the firm and the choice of investment in particular.

The firm is assumed to maximize the discounted stream of after-tax dividends

$$V(0) = \int_0^\infty \theta D e^{-\int_t^v (1-m)r(s)ds} dv, \quad (6)$$

where: the real interest rate r is taken as given by the firm.

In addition, the maximization problem is subject to the following capital accumulation constraint:

$$\dot{K} = I. \quad (7)$$

Setting up a Hamiltonian, we can derive the optimality condition for the capital user cost:

$$\alpha A \left[\frac{K}{L} \right]^{\alpha-1} - \delta = \theta(1 - \tau z)r. \quad (8)$$

In other words, the net return on equity and bonds needs to be the same in order to prevent arbitrage opportunities.

Next, on the consumer side we have a representative on-member forward-looking household, which is infinitely-lived and maximized the sum of discounted utility streams, represented by:

$$U = \int_0^\infty \frac{C^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} e^{-\rho t} dt, \quad (9)$$

where: C denotes consumption;

ρ is the time preference parameter (assumed to be constant);

$1/\sigma$ is the intertemporal elasticity of substitution for consumption.

The household financial wealth (W) consists of equity (V) and bond (B) holdings. The law of motion for bonds is:

$$\dot{B} = (1 - m)w + (1 - m)rB + \theta D + Z - (1 + \tau_c)C, \quad (10)$$

where: Z is the lump-sum transfers from the government;

τ_c is the consumption tax rate.

Together with \dot{V} , the law of motion for wealth becomes:

$$\dot{W} = (1 - m)w + (1 - m)rW + Z - (1 + \tau_c)C. \quad (11)$$

The first-order condition emerging from the household's constrained optimization problem is the modified Ramsey rule:

$$\frac{\dot{c}}{c} = \frac{r(1-m)-\rho}{\sigma}. \quad (12)$$

Next, the government finances its expenditure G via taxes and issue of bonds (B^G), and its budget constraint is:

$$G + rG^G = \dot{B}^G + m \left[wL + rB^G + rB + \frac{D}{(1-\tau)} \right] + \tau_c C + \tau(\pi - zI - D) \quad (13)$$

Note that government debt is "Ricardian," which means that instead of debt we can have government transfers balancing the government budget constraint, or:

$$Z = m \left[wL + rB^G + rB + \frac{D}{(1-\tau)} \right] + \tau_c C + \tau(\pi - zI - D) - G \quad (14)$$

In other words, the path of government debt can be represented as a time series of government transfers. Additionally, we also assume that $G/Y=g=const$, and $L=1$.

National accounts then imply that:

$$I = (1 - g)AK^\alpha - C - \delta K. \quad (15)$$

Substituting this expression back into the law of motion for capital (7), and after some algebra, we can obtain:

$$\frac{\dot{K}}{K} = (1 - g)AK^{\alpha-1} - \frac{C}{K} - \delta, \quad (16)$$

where: we have defined $c = C/K$;

$$k = K/L.$$

We can further rewrite the equation above as:

$$\frac{\dot{k}}{k} = (1 - g)k^{\alpha-1} - c - \delta - 1. \quad (17)$$

Similarly, using (8), (12) could be rewritten as:

$$\frac{\dot{c}}{c} = \frac{\phi(\alpha k^{\alpha-1} - \delta) - \rho}{\sigma} - 1 - \frac{\dot{k}}{k}, \quad (18)$$

where: $\phi = (1 - \tau)(1 - \tau z)$.

The two non-linear ordinary differential equations above comprise the dynamic system of the model economy, together with an initial condition for capital, as well as a boundary ("transversality") condition for capital preventing non-stationary solution paths. Next, in steady-state,

$$k^* = \left[\frac{\sigma + \rho + \phi \delta}{\alpha \phi} \right]^{1/(\alpha-1)} \quad (19)$$

$$c^* = (1 - g)(k^*)^{\alpha-1} - 1 - \delta \quad (20)$$

It is easy to show that $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau} < 0$, and also that $\frac{\partial k^*}{\partial \phi} < 0$. In other words, a reduction in the corporate tax rate increases investment and steady-state capital stock. Steady-state consumption will then also increase, as consumption is a monotone function of capital.

Using the notation we introduced earlier, and holding total factor productivity level constant ($A=1$), the utility function can be expressed as follows:

$$U = \int_0^\infty \frac{(C/A)^{1-\sigma} A^{1-\sigma} e^{-\rho t}}{1-\sigma} dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{(ck)^{1-\sigma} e^{-\rho t + (1-\sigma)t}}{1-\sigma} dt, \quad (21)$$

And the equilibrium interest rate is given by $r^* = \sigma + \rho$. Next, as in Lucas (2003) we will compute the compensatory variation as the welfare gain measured in percentage of additional consumption relative to the consumption under the old tax policy. But before we can provide a quantitative assessment of the tax reforms, we need first to assign values to all parameters in the model. We do this in the next section.

2. Model Parameterization and Calibration

We follow the tradition in modern quantitative macroeconomics, e.g. Vasilev (2105c, 2016b, 2017e) and calibrate the model in order to perform a quantitative analysis of the tax reforms through the use of a computational experiment. First as in Vasilev (2015a), the capital share is set to its average rate in data, or $\alpha = 0.429$. Next the discount rate was set to $\rho = 0.02$ as in Vasilev (2019). Due to the lack of data, we set $\sigma = 1.01$, as in Vasilev (2015b), which results into an approximately logarithmic specification for utility.

As in Vasilev (2017a), the capital-output ratio was set to $K/Y = 3.5$. Depreciation rate was estimated in Vasilev (2016) to be $\delta = 0.05$. Thus, produces an investment-to-output ratio of 0.18% which is very close to that in data. Next, as in Vasilev (2017b) the value of g was set to the average government consumption-to-output in Bulgaria (0.15). The depreciation for tax purposes is $d = 0.2$, which reflects the five-year depreciation plan adopted in Bulgaria. As in Vasilev (2017d), the value added tax was set to $\tau_c = 0.2$, and the tax on wage and dividend income is $m = 0.325$ ($=0.14+0.135+0.05$) pre-reform, and $m = 0.281$ ($=0.1+0.131+0.05$) post-reform. Corporate tax equals $\tau = 0.325$ pre-reform, and $\tau = 0.1$ post-reform. This in turn produces $\theta = 1$ pre-reform, and $\theta = 0.8$, post-reform, clearly benefitting investment, due to the now preferential treatment for retained earnings. Finally, as in Funke and Strulik (2006), we set $z=0.72$.

We then perform the computational experiment, which asks how much household's consumption under the old tax regime should go up in order to make it as well off as under the new tax regime. The quantitative analysis performed predicts a long-run consumption gain of 8.65 % between the two steady-states. As a result of the introduction of the new tax regime, capital and investment are higher by 22%, and output is higher by 9.4% as well.

One of the limitations of this analysis is that the household works all the time, and labour supply is held fixed at unity, as the household does not value leisure. As a robustness check, we therefore extend the analysis by allow for leisure in the household's utility function, which means that the households will now choose their hours of work. Following Funke and Strulik (2006), this amends the utility function to:

$$U = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{(x^\eta C)^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} e^{-\rho t} dt, \quad (22)$$

where: $L=1-x$ denotes the household's labour supply.

For typical calibration value, setting η such that $L=0.333$ as in Vasilev (2017c). As expected, endogenizing labour supply brings additional gains, more specifically another 3.9% towards steady-state consumption. The higher consumption gain in this scenario is due to the increase in employment (which follows directly from the complementarity between capital and labour in the Cobb-Douglas production function), which generates an increase in income and consumption, which more than compensates for the lower utility of leisure. Note that in this scenario labour income equals wL . Households increase hours worked due to the increase in wages. Labour markets are competitive and in equilibrium the wage rate equals the marginal product of labour, which in turn is increasing in capital.

Conclusions


In this paper, we set up a dynamic general equilibrium model with fiscal policy to study the welfare effect of Bulgaria's 2007-08 corporate and personal income tax reforms. Overall, the model suggests that the tax reforms increase investment incentives, and thus bring positive effect in the long-run in the form of expanded output, and higher consumption and welfare under the new regime.

References

- [1] Funke, M., and Strulik, H. 2006. Taxation, growth and welfare: Dynamic effects of Estonia's 2000 income tax act. *Finnish Economic Papers*, 19(1): 25-38.
- [2] Funke, M. 2002. Determining the taxation and investment impacts of Estonia's 2000 Income tax reform. *Finnish Economic Papers*, 15: 102-09.
- [3] King, M. 1977. *Public policy and the corporation*. Chapman & Hall: London, UK. ISBN: 0470992638, 9780470992630, 309 p.
- [4] Lucas, R. 2003. Macroeconomic priorities. *American Economic Review*, 93: 1-15.

- [5] Sinn, H.W. 1987. *Capital income taxation and resource allocation*. North-Holland: Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Available at: <http://www.hanswernersinn.de/dcs/sinn-capital-income-taxation-1987-ref.pdf>
- [6] Vasilev, A. 2015a. Welfare effects of flat income tax reform: The case of Bulgaria. *Eastern European Economics*, 53(2): 205-220.
- [7] Vasilev, A. 2015b. Welfare gains from the adoption of proportional taxation in a general-equilibrium model with a grey economy: The case of Bulgaria's 2008 flat tax reform. *Economic Change and Restructuring*, 48(2): 169-185.
- [8] Vasilev, A. 2015c. Macroeconomic effects of public-sector unions. *LABOUR*, 29(2): 101-126.
- [9] Vasilev, A. 2016a. Progressive taxation and (in) stability in an endogenous growth model with human capital accumulation. *Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, 59(2): 1-15.
- [10] Vasilev, A. 2016b. *Search and matching frictions and business cycle fluctuations in Bulgaria*. Bulgarian Economic Papers BEP 03-2016, Center for Economic Theories and Policies, Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Sofia, Bulgaria.
- [11] Vasilev, A. 2017a. Business cycle accounting: Bulgaria after the introduction of the currency board arrangement (1999-2014). *European Journal of Comparative Economics*, 14(2): 197-219.
- [12] Vasilev, A. 2017b. A Real-Business-Cycle model with efficiency wages and a government sector: The case of Bulgaria. *Central European Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, 9(4): 359-377.
- [13] Vasilev, A. 2017c. A Real-Business-Cycle model with reciprocity in labor relations and fiscal policy: The case of Bulgaria. *Journal of Economics and Econometrics*, 61(2): 47-76.
- [14] Vasilev, A. 2017d. VAT evasion in Bulgaria: A general-equilibrium approach. *Review of Economics and Institutions*, 8(2): 2-17.
- [15] Vasilev, A. 2017e. On the cost of opportunistic behavior in the public sector: A general-equilibrium approach. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 19(2): 565-582.
- [16] Vasilev, A. 2019. Determining the investment impact of Bulgaria's 2007-08 income tax reforms. *Journal of Advanced Studies in Finance*, Volume X, Issue 2(20), Winter 2019.

ASERS



The logo for ASERS Publishing, featuring the word "ASERS" in a bold, orange, sans-serif font, with a stylized orange and yellow fan-like graphic to the left. Below "ASERS" is the word "Publishing" in a smaller, orange, sans-serif font.

Web: www.aserspublishing.eu

URL: <http://journals.aserspublishing.eu/tpref>

E-mail: tpref@aserspublishing.eu

ISSN 2068 – 7710

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref>

Journal's Issue DOI: [https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2\(20\).00](https://doi.org/10.14505/tpref.v10.2(20).00)