# Estimating Effect of Tax Incentives on Charitable Giving Considering Self-Selection of Tax Relief in South Korea

Hiroki Kato <sup>1</sup> Tsuyoshi Goto <sup>2</sup> Yong-Rok Kim <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Osaka University

<sup>2</sup>Chiba University

<sup>3</sup>Kansai University

2021/12/13

#### Introduction

- In many countries, tax relief for charitable giving are implemented.
- The elasticity of giving tax relief is known as a key parameter to evaluate the welfare implication (Saez, 2004).
  - Intuitively, if the elasticity is more than 1 in absolute value, \$1 of tax relief make more than \$1 of charitable giving.
- Many papers investigate the elasticity based on tax return data (Almunia et al., 2020; Auten et al., 2002).

#### Introduction

- However, the tax return data record only the declared charitable giving.
  - First issue: **Actual donations is different from declared donations.** (Fack and Landais, 2016; Gillitzer and Skov, 2018)
  - We use panel survey data in South Korea to deal with this issue.
- Tax payers decide the amount of donation and whether to declare tax relief based on the size of tax incentive and declaration cost.
  - Second issue: Neglect of this declaration cost may bias the estimations of elasticity.
  - We use instrumental variable (IV) and control function approach for this issue.
- Based on DID as an identification strategy, we investigate the giving price elasticity of South Korea.

#### Introduction

#### Result

- 1. Baseline results show that the giving price elasticity is less than -1.4 in terms of intensive margins and less than -1.7 in terms of extensive margins in Korea.
- 2. The estimated giving price elasticity for those who declare charitable giving is around -1.2 -1.6.
  - These estimates are more elastic than the estimates in the extant research, many of which show around -1.
- 3. (Not in the paper) The estimated declaration cost of giving is KRW (\$).
- 4. (Not in the paper) Given our estimates, increasing the subsidy on charitable giving will be desirable in Korea.

# Conceptual Frameworks

### Optimization Problem

Following Almunia et al. (2020), consider allocation problem between private consumption  $(x_{it})$  and charitable giving  $(g_{it})$ 

$$\max_{x_{it}, g_{it}, R_{it}} U(x_{it}, g_{it}, G_t) = u_i(x_{it}, g_{it}, G_t) - R_{it} K_{it}, \tag{1}$$

s.t. 
$$x_{it} + g_{it} = y_{it} - R_{it}T_{it}(y_{it}, g_{it}) - (1 - R_{it})T_{it}(y_{it}),$$
 (2)

$$G_t = g_{it} + G_{-it}, (3)$$

where  $y_{it}$  is pre-tax total income,  $R_{it}$  is a dummy of declaration of tax relief and  $T_{it}(y_{it})$  and  $T_{it}(y_{it},g_{it})$  are respectively the amount of tax when i does not declare tax relief and when i declares tax relief in year t.  $G_{-it}$  is public goods supplied by others.

### Remarks on Optimization Problem

#### We assume

- No saving
- $G_{-it}$  is large enough to  $\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial G}(x,g,G) \approx 0$

Given  $R_{it}$ , optimal level of donations sloves

$$\max_{g_{i,t}} u_i(y_{it} - R_{it}T_{it}(y_{it}, g_{it}) - (1 - R_{it})T_{it}(y_{it}) - g_{it}, g_{it}, g_{it} + G_{-it}). \tag{4}$$

#### First-Order Condition

$$-\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_{it}} \left( R_{it} \frac{\partial T_{it}}{\partial g_{it}} (y_{it}, g_{it}) + 1 \right) + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial g_{it}} = 0$$
 (5)

- $\partial T_{it}/\partial g_{it} < 0$  is tax incentive of charitable giving.
  - Let  $s_{it} \equiv |\partial T_{it}/\partial g_{it}|$  be size of tax incentive.
  - Relative giving price is  $1-s_{it}$
  - As we explain later, there is within variation of  $s_{it}$  due to tax reform.

Let  $g_i(y_{it}, 1 - R_{it}s_{it})$  be a demand function of charitable giving.

• Define  $g_i(1-s_{it},y_{it})$  and  $g_i(1,y_{it})$  to be the optimal levels of donations (potential outcomes) for choices  $R_{it}=1,0$  respectively.

### Self-Selection of Tax Relief

We can write indirect utility as

$$\begin{aligned} v_i(1-s_{it},y_{it},G_{-it}) - K_{it}, & (6) \\ v_i(1,y_{it},G_{-it}). & (7) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, individual i applies for tax relief in year t, that is,  $R_{it}=1$  iff

$$\Delta v_{it} \equiv v_i (1 - s_{it}, y_{it}, G_{-it}) - v_i (1, y_{it}, G_{-it}) \geq K_{it}. \tag{8} \label{eq:delta_vi}$$

### Summary of Conceptual Framework

Potential outcomes:  $g_i(1-s_{it},y_{it})$  if  $R_{it}=1.$   $g_i(1,y_{it})$  if  $R_{it}=0$ 

Observed outcome:

$$g_i(1-R_{it}s_{it},y_{it}) = g_i(1,y_{it}) + R_{it}(g_i(1-s_{it},y_{it}) - g_i(1,y_{it})) \tag{9} \label{eq:gi}$$

Selection of tax relief:

$$R_{it} = 1[\Delta v_{it} - K_{it} \ge 0] \tag{10}$$

## **Identification Strategy**

### Statistical Model

We assume the demand function  $g_i(y_{it},1-R_{it}s_{it})$  can be written as the following log-log demand function with two-way FEs:

$$\ln g_{it} = \theta_i + \gamma \ln(1 - R_{it} s_{it}) + \beta X'_{it} + \iota_t + u_{it}. \tag{11}$$

- $\theta_i$  and  $\iota_t$  are individual and time FE, respectively.
- $X_{it}$  includes pre-tax income  $(y_{it})$  and others.
- If  $R_{it}=1$ , then the logged price of giving is  $\ln(1-s_{it})$ . Otherwise,  $\ln 1=0$ .

### Within Price Variation for Identification $\gamma$

The within price variation can be decomposed into two variations:

- 1. Within variation of tax incentive  $(s_{it})$ 
  - Major source: 2014 tax reform
  - Before 2014, tax deduction (所得控除) was used for tax relief on charitable giving.
    - · the giving price depended on income level.
  - After 2014, tax credit (税額控除) started to be used for tax relief on charitable giving.
  - The tax credit rate was determined as 15%.
  - Giving price is 0.85, irrespective of income level.
- 2. Within variation of application for tax relief  $(R_{it})$ 
  - This variation is endogenous (self-selection problem)

### 2014 Tax Reform in South Korea

### Tax deduction system (until 2013)

$$T_{it}(y_{it}, g_{it}) = T_{it}(y_{it} - g_{it})$$
 (12)

- In 2012 and 2013, the marginal tax rate was the same, though it was different from ones before 2011.
- Tax incentive is  $s_{it} = T'(y_{it} g_{it})$

### Tax credit system (from 2014)

$$T_{it}(y_{it}, g_{it}) = T_{it}(y_{it}) - mg_{it}$$
 (13)

- m is tax credit rate and is m=0.15
- Tax incentive is  $s_{it} = m$

### Source of Endogenity

- 1. Usage of tax return data only captures declared charitable giving.
  - If the charitable giving is not declared, tax relief has a little effect.
  - Some papers use survey data to deal with this problem (e.g.~Rehavi and Shack, 2013).
  - Following them, we use survey panel data of Korea.
- 2. If the declaration cost is ignored, the estimation should be biased.
  - The giving price depends not only on marginal tax rate and tax credit rate, but also
    on the declaration behavior.
  - As far as we know, only Almunia et al.~(2020) deal with this problem, though they
    used tax return data.
  - We use instrumental variable (IV) strategy to control this endogneity.

### References

#### References

- Almunia, M., Guceri, I., Lockwood, B., Scharf, K., 2020. More giving or more givers? The effects of tax incentives on charitable donations in the UK. Journal of Public Economics 183. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.104114
- Auten, G.E., Sieg, H., Clotfelter, C.T., 2002. Charitable giving, income, and taxes: An analysis of panel data. American Economic Review 92, 371–382.
- Fack, G., Landais, C., 2016. The effect of tax enforcement on tax elasticities: Evidence from charitable contributions in france. Journal of Public Economics 133, 23–40. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2015.10.004
- Gillitzer, C., Skov, P.E., 2018. The use of third-party information reporting for tax deductions: evidence and implications from charitable deductions in Denmark. Oxford Economic Papers 70, 892–916. doi:10.1093/oep/gpx055
- Saez, E., 2004. The optimal treatment of tax expenditures. Journal of Public Economics 88, 2657–2684. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2003.09.004