Document de treball de l'IEB 2012/25

VERTICAL EXTERNALITIES WITH LUMP-SUM TAXES: HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DOES UNEMPLOYMENT MAKE?

Diego Martinez, Tomas Sjögren

Fiscal Federalism

**VERTICAL EXTERNALITIES WITH LUMP-SUM TAXES:
HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DOES UNEMPLOYMENT MAKE?**

Diego Martinez, Tomas Sjögren

Postal Address:
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona
Facultat d'Economia i Empresa
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ Tinent Coronel Valenzuela, 1-11
(08034) Barcelona, Spain
Tel.: + 34 93 403 46 46
Fax: + 34 93 403 98 32
ieb@ub.edu
http://www.ieb.ub.edu

VERTICAL EXTERNALITIES WITH LUMP-SUM TAXES: HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DOES UNEMPLOYMENT MAKE? [*]

Diego Martinez, Tomas Sjögren

ABSTRACT: This paper analyses how the existence of unemployment affects the conventional approach to vertical externalities. We discuss the optimality rule for the provision of public inputs both in an unitary and a federal country. Our findings show that decentralizing the spending responsability on public inputs can bring its optimality rule closer to the production efficiency condition. Moreover, we describe the inability of the federal government, behaving as Stackelberg leader, to replicate the unitary outcome, unless to have new policy instruments at government's disposal.

JEL Codes: J2, H4, H7

Keywords: Public inputs, unemployment, vertical externalities

Diego Martinez
Department of Economics
University Pablo Olavide
Ctra. Utrera Km. 1
41013 Sevilla, Spain
Email: dmarlop1@upo.es

Tomas Sjögren
Department of Economics
Umeå University
SE-901 87 Umeå, Sverige

---

1   Introduction

The usual approach to vertical externalities establishes that sharing taxes between different levels of government has an impact on efficiency. From the seminar contribution by Keen (1998), a number a papers has dealt with this issue, offering various solutions to internalize this problem as well (see, for instance, Boadway and Tremblay, 2006). A common issue in all these contributions is assuming distortionary taxation. In fact, it is clear that vertical tax externalities only appear as households' decisions are influenced by distorting taxes; otherwise, the marginal cost of public funds is not affected by lump-sum taxes decided by one level of government and, consequently, the impact of fiscal policies across different tiers of government does not take place.

Another common feature in this literature is that the labor market is competitive, with the labor force matching exactly the demand for labor. Papers such as Dahlby and Wilson (2003) and Kotsogiannis and Martinez (2008) give a central role to the labor supply and demand for labor in determining equilibria but always with labor market clearing. In such a world, there is no scope for one of the conventional fiscal policies aimed at fighting against unemployment, namely the provision of public inputs. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, no paper so far has dealt with vertical expenditure externalities (caused by the provision of productivity-enhancing public expenditures in a federal context) in the presence of unemployment. This has not been the case when horizontal externalities are involved; Ogawa et al (2006) study the implications of labor market imperfections on capital tax competition at the same level of governments.

This paper precisely combines vertical externalities and labor market imperfections in a single model. Indeed, we build a theoretical framework in which the federal government is in charge of unemployment benefits and the states provide a public input with positive effects on demand for labor. Taxes are assumed to be lump-sum because we are interesting in focussing on the efficiency implications derived from the expenditure side of government decisions rather than on vertical tax externalities. Anyway, we will show that ignoring distortionary taxation as a policy variable may play a crucial role for correcting the vertical externality.

The following contributions can be summarized from our results. Firstly, we prove that, in spite of using exclusively lump-sum taxes to finance governments (and thus no space for tax externalities), a vertical expenditure externality arises when unemployment exists. This confirms a previous result found in the literature (Dahlby and Wilson, 2003; Martinez, 2008), namely, that both vertical (tax and expenditure) externalities are independent of each other. The provision of public inputs creates a positive vertical impact on federal revenues as long

as this type of public spending increases the demand for labor and, therefore, it reduces the resources needed at federal level for paying unemployment benefits. And this occurs without the co-occupancy of elastic tax bases.

Moreover, we also see how the optimality rule for the provision of public inputs at state level is closer to the production efficiency condition than the optimal condition in a unitary country with a non-clearing labor market. In a sense, one could say that more federalism does not necessarily leads to more inefficiency. Particularly, in the presence of a distortion (in the labor market, resulting in unemployment), it could be positive for efficiency to bring in a new distortion (that coming from the vertical expenditure externality).

Secondly, we have studied whether the federal government is able to replicate the equilibrium of an unitary country. As usual, we have assumed that the upper level of government knows the states' reaction functions and, behaving as Stackelberg leader, tries to achieve the centralized outcome. Our result deviates from previous papers as long as we conclude that the policy variables available for the federal government are not effective instruments to get the unitary equilibrium. We guess here that the fact of using exclusively lump-sum taxes prevents from affecting decisions taken by governments and households, in an attempt to internalize the effects from states' policy.

In a sense, this result can be placed on the discussion initiated by Sato (2000) about the capability of federal government to replicate second-best results depending on the federal instruments available. Precisely, as result of taking into consideration a new policy instrument, i. e., a public input provided by the federal government that is complement to that offered by the states, the upper level of government is able to replicate the second-best outcome of an unitary country.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the main features of the model and the different versions of the optimality rule for the provision of public inputs, taking account whether the country is federal or not. Sections 3 and 4 evaluate the ability of the federal government to replicate the unitary outcome with the policy instruments available and with a complementary public input, respectively. Finally, section 5 concludes.

2   The Basic Model

This section aims to show two points. First, to characterize the equilibrium in a centralized country with unemployment; this will allow us not only to see how the optimal rule for the

provision of public inputs must be modified with respect to a situation with full employment, but also having a benchmark scenario to compare with federal equilibria. Second, to highlight that the fiscal decisions taken by one level of government (particularly that with spending responsabilities on public inputs) will affect other levels of government; consequently, vertical expenditure externalities will arise despite of using exclusively lump-sum taxes.

The theoretical framework consists of firms, households and two different tiers of government: the federal level and k subnational states. Firms are identical across the country and, for the sake of simplicity, we assume that their number is normalized to one in each state. All of them produce a single good on the basis of the following production function:

$$F(N, K, G) = N^\alpha K^{1-\alpha} G^\beta, \tag{1}$$

where N is labor, K a fixed factor and G a public input. Such a production technology allows us to qualify the public input as factor-augmenting[1]. In this context, the public spending will increase the return to the fixed production factor K, which we normalized to one, in which case the profit can be expressed as:[2]

$$\pi = F(N, G) - wN, \tag{2}$$

where w is the wage rate. Profit maximization implies to define the first-order condition $w = F_N(N, G)$, that implictly defines the following function for labor demand:

$$N(w, G) = \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} G^{\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}} w^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \tag{3}$$

Combining equations (2) and (3), the profit function can be obtained:

$$\pi(w, G) \tag{4}$$

We consider that all households have the same preferences for consumption c across the federation and described by a utility function $u(c)$, which is increasing in c. Each state is populated by three types of consumers: a firm-owner, employed and unemployed workers,

---

[1] An alternative approach would imply a production function with constant returns to scale in all the inputs (private and public). This would be the case of firm-augmenting public input. It would create economic rents that, in terms of the model we develop here, would not exhibit substantial differences with respect to what we obtain below.

[2] The return to labor is not affected by the public input, although this would be the normal situation with factor-augmenting public inputs. This is not the case here because we are interested in considering the impact of the public input on employment, and the demand for labor we obtain below implies that the wage rate is independent of G. In a model with full-employment, however, we should set up $w(M, g)$.

which are denoted by superindices "f", "e" and "u", respectively. The firm-owner, endowed with the production factor K, is who receives the profit in return for hiring the fixed factor to the firm. His budget-constraint is defined by $c^f = \pi - \tau^f$, where τ^f is a lump-sum tax. Regarding the other two types of consumers, we insert here a distinction between the total labor force available for working M and the number of households that effectively are employed N. Obsviously, full employment is characterized by $M = N$. The budget constraint for an employed worker is $c^e = w - \tau^e$, where τ^e is a lump-sum tax, while workers without jobs faces $c^u = b$, where b denotes a net of tax unemployment benefit.

In a centralized country, for the policy variables $\left\{\tau^f, \tau^e, b, G\right\}$, the government maximizes a utilitarian welfare function

$$W = kNu^e + k\left[M - N\right]u^u + ku^f \tag{5}$$

subject to the following budget constraint:

$$kN\tau^e + k\tau^f - kG - k\left[M - N\right]b = 0 \tag{6}$$

In a situation where there is no unemployment, the first-order conditions are as follows:

$$FOC\left(\tau^f\right) : \lambda = \left(u^f\right)' \tag{7}$$

$$FOC\left(\tau^e\right) : \lambda = \left(u^e\right)' \tag{8}$$

$$FOC\left(G\right) : F_G = 1 \tag{9}$$

$$FOC\left(\lambda\right) : N\tau^e + \tau^f - G = 0, \tag{10}$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier. The two first equations show the usual result from optimization with lump-sum taxes and transfers: private marginal utility (of each type of consumer) must be equal to social welfare cost of taxation, which is represented here by the Lagrange multiplier of government budget constraint. The equation (9) is the standard production efficiency condition in the provision of public inputs. Finally, (10) is the budget constraint of central government, where the last term of LHS in (6) has been dropped as $M = N$.

Let us turn to the equilibrium with unemployment. For institutional reasons (i. e., the existence of a minimum wage), the rate wage is assumed to exceed the market-clearing wage and, consequently, $M > N$. Things dramatically change for the optimal provision of G when unemployment appears; additionally, the first-order condition for the unemployment benefit b also must be taken into consideration:

$$FOC\left(b\right) : \lambda = \left(u^u\right)' \tag{11}$$

$$FOC\,(G): \frac{N_G\,(u^e - u^u)}{\lambda} + N_G\tau^e + N_G b + F_G = 1. \tag{12}$$

Let us consider now the case of different tiers of governments. We assume that the federal level is in charge of providing the unemployment benefit while the states provide the public inputs[3]. Both levels of government share the tax on employed workers (with the tax rates T^e and t^e chosen by the federal and states governments, respectively; $\tau^e = T^e + t^e$). The revenues collected from the tax on profits are assigned in a proportion θ (which is exogenously determined) to the states ($0 \leq \theta \leq 1$), while the tax rate τ^f is exclusively decided by the federal government.

Under such a framework, let us assume that the states behave as Nash players, that is, each subnational government ignores the impact of its fiscal decisions on federal revenues. Therefore, the optimization problem to be solved by the states is:

$$Max \quad W = Nu^e\,(w - \tau^e) + (M - N)\,u^b(b) + u^f\,(\pi - \tau^f) \tag{13}$$

$$s.t. \quad Nt^e + \theta\tau^f - G + S = 0$$

$$N = N\,(w, G)$$

$$w^o > w^e,$$

where S is a vertical lump-sum from the federal government to states. Last inequality refers to the distorsion existing in the labor market, which is the reason for unemployment. First-order conditions for t^e, G and λ give:

$$FOC\,(t^e): \lambda = (u^e)' \tag{14}$$

$$FOC\,(G) \quad : \quad \frac{N_G\,(u^e - u^u)}{\lambda} + N_G t^e + F_G - 1 = 0 \equiv \Omega \tag{15}$$

$$FOC\,(\lambda) \quad : \quad Nt^e + \theta\tau^f - G + S = 0 \equiv \Psi \tag{16}$$

Expression (14) sets up an identical rule for chosing the optimal tax rate on employed workers in a centralized country than in a world with two tiers of government. This is a direct consequence of using lump-sum taxes. Even in the presence of tax sharing between different levels of government, if the households' behavior is not affected by taxes, there is no scope for vertical tax externalities.

By contrast, and leaving aside the discussion on the optimal levels of G (see Martinez and Sjongren (2009) for a further analysis), expression (15) shows the main difference by comparing

---

[3]This distribution of spending responsabilities is not crucial for the results, which would be symmetric with an inverse vertical assignment of public expenditures. Anyway, the scheme we follow here is in line with the mainstream of theory of fiscal federalism.

it to the expression (12). The term $N_G t^e$ differs from its equivalent in (12), namely, $N_G(\tau^e + b)$. As long as the federal government sets up a non-negative tax rate T^e on employed workers, the fact of having states deciding on G leads to reduce the overprovision bias that the presence of unemployment creates in the provision of public inputs. In other words, expression (15) is closer to (9) than equation (12).[4]

In this regard, and contrary to the conventional view in previous literature on vertical externalities, we guess here that more federalism may lead to more efficiency in the design of fiscal policies. To see this in an extreme case, assume that all rent taxes accrue to the states ($\theta = 1$); the federal government needs to be financed by a negative fiscal grant (from states) and/or by charging a positive tax rate T^e on workers. This latter solution involves an optimal rule for the provision of public inputs closer to the production efficiency condition, minimizing the differential effect that the presence of unemployment creates in the discussion on optimality.

Consequently, the behavior of federal government becomes a crucial issue to determine the effect of unemployment on the achivement of production efficiency condition in the provision of public inputs. This is what we study in the next section.

3 The ability of federal government to replicate the centralized outcome

A usual way of correcting vertical (tax and expenditure) externalities is assuming a federal government behaving as Stackelberg leader. In such a context, the sequence of the game is as follows. Firstly, the federal government decides on T^e, τ^f, S and, residually, on b, taking into consideration the states' reaction to changes in federal policy variables. Secondly, the states choose G and t^e, taken as exogenous all the decision variables of the upper-level of government.

---

[4]It is straightforward to show that with full employment no vertical (tax and expenditure) externalities appear.

Consequently, the optimization problem of the federal government is:

$$Max \quad W = kNu^e \left(w - \tau^e\right) + k \left(M - N\right) u^b(b) + ku^f \left(\pi - \tau^f\right) \tag{17}$$

$$s.t. \quad kNT^e + k(1 - \theta)\tau^f - k(M - N)b - kS = 0$$

$$G = G(T^e, \theta, \tau^f, S, M, N) \tag{18}$$

$$t^e = t^e(T^e, \theta, \tau^f, S, M, N) \tag{19}$$

$$N = N\left(w, G\right)$$

$$w^o > w^e.$$

Expressions (18) and (19) are the states' reaction functions. Therefore, for solving the federal problem, some information on comparative statics of these reaction functions is required. To do that, we start from the first-order conditions of states (15) and (16)[5]. Differentiating totally Ω and Ψ (and ignoring superindex "e" for sake of simplicity in the notation), we have:

$$\Omega_G dG + \Omega_t dt + \Omega_T dT + \Omega_S dS + \Omega_{\tau^f} d\tau^f = 0$$

$$\Psi_G dG + \Psi_t dt + \Psi_T dT + \Psi_S dS + \Psi_{\tau^f} d\tau^f = 0$$

This two-equation system can be expressed using a matricial form as follows (and after solving for dG and dt):

$$\begin{pmatrix} dG \\ dt \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_G & \Omega_t \\ \Psi_G & \Psi_t \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_T & \Omega_S & \Omega_{\tau^f} \\ \Psi_T & \Psi_S & \Psi_{\tau^f} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dT \\ dS \\ d\tau^f \end{pmatrix} \tag{20}$$

Matricial manipulation on (20) shows that:

$$\frac{dG}{dT} = G_T = A(\Psi_t \Omega_T - \Omega_t \Psi_T) \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{dG}{dS} = G_S = A(\Psi_t \Omega_S - \Omega_t \Psi_S) \tag{22}$$

$$\frac{dG}{d\tau^f} = G_{\tau^f} = A(\Psi_t \Omega_{\tau^f} - \Omega_t \Psi_{\tau^f}) \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{dt}{dT} = t_T = A(-\Psi_g \Omega_T - \Omega_g \Psi_T) \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{dt}{dS} = t_S = A(-\Psi_g \Omega_S - \Omega_g \Psi_S) \tag{25}$$

$$\frac{dt}{d\tau^f} = t_{\tau^f} = A(-\Psi_g \Omega_{\tau^f} - \Omega_g \Psi_{\tau^f}) \tag{26}$$

---

[5]The first-order condition (14) can be ignored in this analysis. In a sense, this expression does not admit any influence from federal variables and, consequently, it does not matter at this point. Anyway, expression (14) can be easily inserted in (15) without modifying substantially the analysis below.

where A is $-\frac{1}{\Omega_G \Psi_t - \Psi_G \Omega_t}$.

Turning back to the federal problem, it is clear that its budget constraint can be written as $b = \frac{NT^e + (1-\theta)\tau^f - S}{(M-N)}$. Plugging this into the objective function (17), we obtain the first-order conditions for the policy variables of the federal government:

$$FOC(T^e) : -N(u^e)'(1 + t_T) + (M - N)(u^b)'(b_T + b_t t_T + b_G G_T) \qquad (27a)$$
$$+(u^f)'(F_N N_G G_T - w N_G G_T) - u^b N_G G_T = 0$$

$$FOC(\tau^f) : -N(u^e)'(t_{\tau^f}) - u^b N_G G_{\tau^f} + (M - N)(u^b)'(b_{\tau^f} + b_t t_{\tau^f} + b_G G_{\tau^f}) \qquad (27b)$$
$$+(u^f)'(F_N N_G G_{\tau^f} - w N_G G_{\tau^f}) - (u^f)' = 0$$

$$FOC(S) : -N(u^e)'(t_S) + (M - N)(u^b)'(b_S + b_t t_S + b_G G_S) - u^b N_G G_S \qquad (27c)$$
$$+(u^f)'(F_N N_G G_S - w N_G G_S) = 0$$

$$FOC(\lambda) : kNT^e + k(1 - \theta)\tau^f - k(M - N)b - kS = 0 \qquad (27d)$$

Taking into account that b can be residually obtained from the above four equation-system, we symplify (27a)-(27d) and the following result is achieved:

$$t_T = 0 \qquad (28)$$
$$t_{\tau^f} = -\frac{\theta}{N} \qquad (29)$$
$$t_S = -\frac{1}{N}, \qquad (30)$$

where $w = F_N(N, G)$, (21)-(23) and the corresponding partial derivatives of Ω and Ψ (according to (15) and (16)) have been used. What is implicitly established in (28)-(30) is the inability of federal government to affect states' behavior. In fact, not only the federal tax rate on employed workers T^e has no effect on the equivalent state tax rate t^e (equation (28)), but also none of the policy variables of upper level of government has any impact on the state provision of public inputs. Indeed, from expressions (21)-(23), it is clear that $G_T = G_{\tau^f} = G_S = 0$, that is, there is no way through which the federal government can modify the provision of public inputs. The unique impact of the federal policy variables (τ^f and S on t^e) is trivial: an increase (decrease) in some of them reduces (rises) the state tax rate in a magnitude given by the number of employed workers N. Therefore, the highest level of government is not able to replicate not only the first-best outcome of (9) but also the optimality rule for the provision of public inputs in an unitary country with unemployment[6].

---

[6] Anyway, we must be aware that the first-best values for T^e and t^e are guaranteed in each scenario as long as they are lump-sum taxes.

4 New instruments for federal government: complementary public inputs

Things may be different if federal government is also in charge of providing public inputs, namely G^F, which is assumed to be complementary with the state public input (now G^S). Production, profit and labor demand functions have to be conveniently modified:

$$F\left(N, K, G^F, G^S\right) = N^\alpha K^{1-\alpha} \left(G^F\right)^\gamma \left(G^\beta\right)^\beta \tag{31}$$

$$\pi = F\left(N, G^F, G^S\right) - wN, \tag{32}$$

$$N\left(w, G^F, G^S\right) = \alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \left(G^F\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}} \left(G^S\right)^{\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}} w^{-\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}. \tag{33}$$

As before, combining (32) and (33), the profit function can be written as follows:

$$\pi\left(w, G^F, G^S\right).$$

In an unitary country, the government maximizes $W = kNu^e + k\left[M - N\right]u^u + ku^f$, subject to $kN\tau^e + k\tau^f - kG^F - kG^S - k\left[M - N\right]b = 0$. In a situation characterized by full employment $(M = N)$, the optimal provision of public inputs is given by the standard production efficiency condition: $F_{G^F} = F_{G^S} = 1$. By contrast, when unemployment appears as a result of non market-clearing wage rate, the first-order conditions for G^F and G^S are, respectively:

$$FOC\left(G^F\right) \quad : \quad \frac{N_{G^F}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} + N_{G^F}\tau^e + N_{G^F}b + F_{G^F} = 1 \tag{34}$$

$$FOC\left(G^S\right) \quad : \quad \frac{N_{G^S}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} + N_{G^S}\tau^e + N_{G^s}b + F_{G^S} = 1 \tag{35}$$

It is trivial to show that when the government is concerned with the level of employment, if the effect of, say, the state public input on labor demand is higher than the equivalent effect by the federal public input $(N_{G^S} > N_{G^F})$, then the optimal amount of G^S will exceed G^F.

In a decentralized environment, in which both federal and state government behave as Nash competitors, the first-order conditions for G^F and G^S are, respectively:

$$FOC\left(G^F\right) \quad : \quad \frac{N_{G^F}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} + N_{G^F}T^e + N_{G^F}b + F_{G^F} = 1 \tag{36}$$

$$FOC\left(G^S\right) \quad : \quad \frac{N_{G^S}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} + N_{G^S}t^e + N_{G^s}b + F_{G^S} = 1 \tag{37}$$

Comparing these expressions with (34) and (35), it is clear that both types of public inputs will be underprovided if governments set positive tax rates on employed workers. Under these circumstances, the levels of G^F and G^S will be below the optimal ones derived from a centralized

setting. In other words, each level of government decides a level of public input without considering its impact on other jurisdictions. Consequently, we are in the presence of a double vertical expenditure externality from each level of government to the other.

The question now is whether the federal government, behaving as Stackelberg leader, is able to replicate the second-best outcome. Recall that the answer to this question was "no" in a setting in which the federal instruments were T^e, τ^f, S and b. With the federal government also providing a public input, its optimization problem is now:

$$Max \qquad W = kNu^e\left(w - \tau^e\right) + k\left(M - N\right)u^b(b) + ku^f\left(\pi - \tau^f\right) \qquad (38)$$

$$s.t. \qquad kNT^e + k(1-\theta)\tau^f - k(M-N)b - kG^F - kS = 0$$

$$G^S = G(T^e, \theta, \tau^f, S, M, N, G^F) \qquad (39)$$

$$t^e = t^e(T^e, \theta, \tau^f, S, M, N, G^F) \qquad (40)$$

$$N = N\left(w, G^S, G^F\right)$$

$$w^o > w^e.$$

Note that the states' reaction functions (39) and (40) now include a new argument: the federal public input G^F. As before, we first need to know some comparative statics of these functions. Equations (21)-(26) are still valid in the new context -with a slight change: the term A must be substituted by A' -(see below)- and we only have to add the corresponding response of G^S and t^e to the new federal policy instrument G^F. Particularly, we can write:

$$\frac{dG^S}{dG^F} = A'(\Psi_t\Omega_{G^F} - \Omega_t\Psi_{G^F}) \qquad (41)$$

$$\frac{dt}{dG^F} = A'(-\Psi_{G^S}\Omega_{G^F} - \Omega_{G^S}\Psi_{G^F}), \qquad (42)$$

where A' is $-\frac{1}{\Omega_{G^S}\Psi_t - \Psi_{G^S}\Omega_t}$.

In this regard, a principal difference with respect to the previous framework appears. While in Section 3 the federal government only had a very limited (and trivial) impact on state tax rate t (recall expressions (28)-(30) and the fact that $G_T = G_{\tau^f} = G_S = 0$), things are quite different now. Consider first the case of $\frac{dG^S}{dG^F}$; after some algebra manipulations it can be seen that the effect of changes in the federal public input on the state provision of public inputs is given by:

$$\frac{dG^S}{dG^F} = -\frac{\left(N_{G^SG^F}\left(u^e - u^u\right)/\lambda\right) + N_{G^SG^F}t + F_{G^SG^F}}{\left(N_{G^SG^S}\left(u^e - u^u\right)/\lambda\right) + N_{G^SG^S}t + F_{G^SG^S}} > 0.$$

This means that an increase in the federal public input encourages the provision of the state public input. That is, there is an additional channel through which the federal government can

affect states' behavior. In the case of the state tax rate it happens something similar:

$$\frac{dt}{dG^F} = -\frac{t}{N}\left(N_{G^S}\frac{dG^S}{dG^F} - N_{G^F}\right) \lesseqgtr 0.$$

But here the effect of federal public input on state policy variable is not so clear. Indeed, an increase in the federal public input may lead to either an increase or a decrease in the state tax rate on employed workers. Anyway, it is worth to noting that again federal government may affect states' behavior, which was not possible under the previous assumptions.

Given this, the first-order condition for the optimal provision of G^F is as follows:

$$FOC\left(G^F\right): \frac{N_{G^F}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} + \frac{N_{G^S}\frac{dG^S}{dG^F}\left(u^e - u^u\right)}{\lambda} - N\frac{dt}{dG^F} + N_{G^F}T + N_{G^S}\frac{dG^S}{dG^F}T + b(N_{G^F} + N_{G^S}\frac{dG^S}{dG^F}) = 1.$$
(43)

After some algebra manipulations, it can be shown that to replicate the second-best condition (34) requires to hold:

$$N_{G^S}\frac{dG^S}{dG^F}\left(\frac{u^e - u^u}{\lambda} - \tau + b\right) = F_{G^F}.$$
(44)

If the individual utility is assumed to be linear ($u(c) = c$), it is straightforward to prove that both sides of expression (44) have the same sign. Hence, to replicate the second best outcome for the provision of public inputs is a real possibility when federal government can spend money in public inputs which are complementary to state public inputs.

5   Concluding Remarks

Vertical externalities use to involve challenges for efficiency in federal countries. Sharing taxes between different levels of government or the provision of certain public expenditures with effects on other tiers of government's revenues, imply deviations from the optimality rules which would be obtained in a centralized world. However, the presence of vertical (tax and expenditures) externalities can be disregarded if lump-sum taxes are used. Indeed, the idea of governments affecting fiscal decisions taken by others requires distorting taxes able to modify households' behavior.

All these general statements have to be qualified in the presence of unemployment, and this has been what we have done in this paper. Particularly, we have built a simple model with lump-sum taxes and unemployment in which the optimal rule for the provision of public inputs depends on whether the structure of the country is federal or not. Indeed, while there

is no scope for vertical tax externalities (the fact of using lump-sum taxes here is crucial), a deviation from the second-best outcome takes place when states are in charge of the provision of productivity-enhancing public factors and the federal government finances unemployment benefits.

We have confirmed that the optimality condition for the provision of public inputs must consider the impact of this type of public expenditures on employment and, consequently, on public spending in unemployment benefits. As the production efficiency condition for public inputs is not satisfied even in the case of a centralized country, we have analyzed what would occur when states behaving as Nash players take part in the game. Since subnational governments do not take into account the effect of their public expenditures on unemployment benefits, the overprovision of public inputs (compared to the first-best case with full employment) is lower with a federal structure than in an unitary country. In a sense, one can say that considering a new distortion (a vertical expenditure externality) in a world with previous distortions (unemployment) may improve the efficiency in the sense of coming close the state behavior to the production efficiency in public inputs.

When we have wondered about the capability of federal government to replicate the outcome of an unitary country, we have assumed that the upper level of government behaves as Stackelberg leader, considering the states reaction's functions. Under such a scenario, we have concluded that, unlike previous papers, federal government is not able to internalize the vertical expediture externality. Federal policy variables have no impact on states' decision variables.

In part, this is caused by using lump-sum taxes; indeed, distortionary taxation can affect agents' behavior and this is the way through which all the effects of public inputs can be internalized. By contrast, when the federal government is also in charge of providing a public input which is complementary to the state public input, it is possible to replicate the second-best outcome for the optimal provision of such as public inputs.

A number of issues arises for further research. Asymmetries at regional level in the federation can be taken into consideration. Given our federal budget constraint, the characterization of equilibria may then involve that not all the resources collected by the upper level of government in a region must be spent in such territory; consequently, some possibilities for horizontal redistribution arise and even for explicit equalization schemes. Also under this framework, in the presence of mobile production factors, phenomena of tax competition may take place, with the consequent effects on efficiency and regional labor markets.

As policy implication we would underline how important the coordination of different levels

of government is to get social welfare gains. Indeed, the design of federal and state fiscal policies must take into account the magnitude of their cross effects on tax revenues of others liers of government. Particularly, this is specially true in the case of public infrastructure because this type of government expenditure is very vulnerable to public spending cuts and the visibility of its benefits. Improving efficiency here, for instance, increasing the coordination in the provision of public transport infrastructure (some of them provided at regional level, say, roads; others by the federal government, say, railways) means more social welfare, part of it in terms of employment.

References

[1] Boadway, R. and Tremblay, J. F. (2006): A theory of fiscal imbalance, FinanzArchiv 62 (1), 1-27.

[2] Dahlby, B. and Wilson, L. S. (2003): Vertical fiscal externalities in a federation, Journal of Public Economics 87, 917–930.

[3] Keen, M., (1998): Vertical tax externalities in the theory of fiscal federalism, IMF Staff Papers 45 (3), 454-485.

[4] Kotsogiannis, C. and Martinez, D. (2008): Ad valorem taxes and the fiscal gap in federations Economics Letters 99 (3), 431-434.

[5] Martinez, D. (2008): Optimal federal taxes with public inputs", FinanzArchiv /Public Finance Analysis 64, 422-433.

[6] Martinez, D. and Sjongren, T. (2009): Can labor market imperfections cause overprovision of public inputs?, WP ECON 09/13, University Pablo de Olavide.

[7] Ogawa, H., Sato, Y. and Tamai, T. (2006): A note on unemployment and capital tax competition, Journal of Urban Economics 60, 350-356.

[8] Sato, M. (2000): Fiscal externalities and efficient transfers in a federation, International Tax and Public Finance, 7, 119–139.

2010

2010/1, De Borger, B., Pauwels, W.: "A Nash bargaining solution to models of tax and investment competition: tolls and investment in serial transport corridors"

2010/2, Chirinko, R.; Wilson, D.: "Can Lower Tax Rates Be Bought? Business Rent-Seeking And Tax Competition Among U.S. States"

2010/3, Esteller-Moré, A.; Rizzo, L.: "Politics or mobility? Evidence from us excise taxation"

2010/4, Roehrs, S.; Stadelmann, D.: "Mobility and local income redistribution"

2010/5, Fernández Llera, R.; García Valiñas, M.A.: "Efficiency and elusion: both sides of public enterprises in Spain"

2010/6, González Alegre, J.: "Fiscal decentralization and intergovernmental grants: the European regional policy and Spanish autonomous regions"

2010/7, Jametti, M.; Joanis, M.: "Determinants of fiscal decentralization: political economy aspects"

2010/8, Esteller-Moré, A.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.: "Should tax bases overlap in a federation with lobbying?"

2010/9, Cubel, M.: "Fiscal equalization and political conflict"

2010/10, Di Paolo, A.; Raymond, J.L.; Calero, J.: "Exploring educational mobility in Europe"

2010/11, Aidt, T.S.; Dutta, J.: "Fiscal federalism and electoral accountability"

2010/12, Arqué Castells, P.: "Venture capital and innovation at the firm level"

2010/13, García-Quevedo, J.; Mas-Verdú, F.; Polo-Otero, J.: "Which firms want PhDS? The effect of the university-industry relationship on the PhD labour market"

2010/14, Calabrese, S.; Epple, D.: "On the political economy of tax limits"

2010/15, Jofre-Monseny, J.: "Is agglomeration taxable?"

2010/16, Dragu, T.; Rodden, J.: "Representation and regional redistribution in federations"

2010/17, Borck, R; Wimbersky, M.: "Political economics of higher education finance"

2010/18, Dohse, D; Walter, S.G.: "The role of entrepreneurship education and regional context in forming entrepreneurial intentions"

2010/19, Åslund, O.; Edin, P-A.; Fredriksson, P.; Grönqvist, H.: "Peers, neighborhoods and immigrant student achievement - Evidence from a placement policy"

2010/20, Pelegrín, A.; Bolance, C.: "International industry migration and firm characteristics: some evidence from the analysis of firm data"

2010/21, Koh, H.; Riedel, N.: "Do governments tax agglomeration rents?"

2010/22, Curto-Grau, M.; Herranz-Loncán, A.; Solé-Ollé, A.: "The political economy of infrastructure construction: The Spanish "Parliamentary Roads" (1880-1914)"

2010/23, Bosch, N.; Espasa, M.; Mora, T.: "Citizens' control and the efficiency of local public services"

2010/24, Ahamdanech-Zarco, I.; García-Pérez, C.; Simón, H.: "Wage inequality in Spain: A regional perspective"

2010/25, Folke, O.: "Shades of brown and green: Party effects in proportional election systems"

2010/26, Falck, O.; Heblich, H.; Lameli, A.; Südekum, J.: "Dialects, cultural identity and economic exchange"

2010/27, Baum-Snow, N.; Pavan, R.: "Understanding the city size wage gap"

2010/28, Molloy, R.; Shan, H.: "The effect of gasoline prices on household location"

2010/29, Koethenbuerger, M.: "How do local governments decide on public policy in fiscal federalism? Tax vs. expenditure optimization"

2010/30, Abel, J.; Dey, I.; Gabe, T.: "Productivity and the density of human capital"

2010/31, Gerritse, M.: "Policy competition and agglomeration: a local government view"

2010/32, Hilber, C.; Lyytikäinen, T.; Vermeulen, W.: "Capitalization of central government grants into local house prices: panel data evidence from England"

2010/33, Hilber, C.; Robert-Nicoud, F.: "On the origins of land use regulations: theory and evidence from us metro areas"

2010/34, Picard, P.; Tabuchi, T.: "City with forward and backward linkages"

2010/35, Bodenhorn, H.; Cuberes, D.: "Financial development and city growth: evidence from Northeastern American cities, 1790-1870"

2010/36, Vulovic, V.: "The effect of sub-national borrowing control on fiscal sustainability: how to regulate?"

2010/37, Flamand, S.: "Interregional transfers, group loyalty and the decentralization of redistribution"

2010/38, Ahlfeldt, G.; Feddersen, A.: "From periphery to core: economic adjustments to high speed rail"

2010/39, González-Val, R.; Pueyo, F.: "First nature vs. second nature causes: industry location and growth in the presence of an open-access renewable resource"

2010/40, Billings, S.; Johnson, E.: "A nonparametric test for industrial specialization"

2010/41, Lee, S.; Li, Q.: "Uneven landscapes and the city size distribution"

2010/42, Ploeckl. F.: "Borders, market access and urban growth; the case of Saxon towns and the Zollverein"

2010/43, Hortas-Rico, M.: "Urban sprawl and municipal budgets in Spain: a dynamic panel data analysis"

2010/44, Koethenbuerger, M.: "Electoral rules and incentive effects of fiscal transfers: evidence from Germany"

2010/45, Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Lobbying, political competition, and local land supply: recent evidence from Spain"

2010/46, Larcinese, V.; Rizzo; L.; Testa, C.: "Why do small states receive more federal money? Us senate representation and the allocation of federal budget"

2010/47, Patacchini, E.; Zenou, Y.: "Neighborhood effects and parental involvement in the intergenerational transmission of education"

2010/48, Nedelkoska, L.: "Occupations at risk: explicit task content and job security"

2010/49, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Marín-López, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "The mechanisms of agglomeration: Evidence from the effect of inter-industry relations on the location of new firms"

2010/50, Revelli, F.: "Tax mix corners and other kinks"

2010/51, Duch-Brown, N.; Parellada-Sabata M.; Polo-Otero, J.: "Economies of scale and scope of university research and technology transfer: a flexible multi-product approach"

2010/52, Duch-Brown, N.; Vilalta M.: "Can better governance increase university efficiency?"

2010/53, Cremer, H.; Goulão, C.: "Migration and social insurance"

2010/54, Mittermaier, F; Rincke, J.: "Do countries compensate firms for international wage differentials?"

2010/55, Bogliacino, F; Vivarelli, M.: "The job creation effect or R&D expenditures"

2010/56, Piacenza, M; Turati, G.: "Does fiscal discipline towards sub-national governments affect citizens' well-being? Evidence on health"

2011

2011/1, Oppedisano, V; Turati, G.: "What are the causes of educational inequalities and of their evolution over time in Europe? Evidence from PISA"

2011/2, Dahlberg, M; Edmark, K; Lundqvist, H.: "Ethnic diversity and preferences for redistribution "

2011/3, Canova, L.; Vaglio, A.: "Why do educated mothers matter? A model of parental help"

2011/4, Delgado, F.J.; Lago-Peñas, S.; Mayor, M.: "On the determinants of local tax rates: new evidence from Spain"

2011/5, Piolatto, A.; Schuett, F.: "A model of music piracy with popularity-dependent copying costs"

2011/6, Duch, N.; García-Estévez, J.; Parellada, M.: "Universities and regional economic growth in Spanish regions"

2011/7, Duch, N.; García-Estévez, J.: "Do universities affect firms' location decisions? Evidence from Spain"

2011/8, Dahlberg, M.; Mörk, E.: "Is there an election cycle in public employment? Separating time effects from election year effects"

2011/9, Costas-Pérez, E.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.: "Corruption scandals, press reporting, and accountability. Evidence from Spanish mayors"

2011/10, Choi, A.; Calero, J.; Escardíbul, J.O.: "Hell to touch the sky? private tutoring and academic achievement in Korea"

2011/11, Mira Godinho, M.; Cartaxo, R.: "University patenting, licensing and technology transfer: how organizational context and available resources determine performance"

2011/12, Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.; Montolio, D.: "The link between public support and private R&D effort: What is the optimal subsidy?"

2011/13, Breuillé, M.L.; Duran-Vigneron, P.; Samson, A.L.: "To assemble to resemble? A study of tax disparities among French municipalities"

2011/14, McCann, P.; Ortega-Argilés, R.: "Smart specialisation, regional growth and applications to EU cohesion policy"

2011/15, Montolio, D.; Trillas, F.: "Regulatory federalism and industrial policy in broadband telecommunications"

2011/16, Pelegrín, A.; Bolancé, C.: "Offshoring and company characteristics: some evidence from the analysis of Spanish firm data"

2011/17, Lin, C.: "Give me your wired and your highly skilled: measuring the impact of immigration policy on employers and shareholders"

2011/18, Bianchini, L.; Revelli, F.: "Green polities: urban environmental performance and government popularity"

2011/19, López Real, J.: "Family reunification or point-based immigration system? The case of the U.S. and Mexico"

2011/20, Bogliacino, F.; Piva, M.; Vivarelli, M.: "The impact of R&D on employment in Europe: a firm-level analysis"

2011/21, Tonello, M.: "Mechanisms of peer interactions between native and non-native students: rejection or integration?"

2011/22, García-Quevedo, J.; Mas-Verdú, F.; Montolio, D.: "What type of innovative firms acquire knowledge intensive services and from which suppliers?"

2011/23, Banal-Estañol, A.; Macho-Stadler, I.; Pérez-Castrillo, D.: "Research output from university-industry collaborative projects"

2011/24, Ligthart, J.E.; Van Oudheusden, P.: "In government we trust: the role of fiscal decentralization"

2011/25, Mongrain, S.; Wilson, J.D.: "Tax competition with heterogeneous capital mobility"

2011/26, Caruso, R.; Costa, J.; Ricciuti, R.: "The probability of military rule in Africa, 1970-2007"

2011/27, Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Local spending and the housing boom"

2011/28, Simón, H.; Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.: "Occupational mobility of immigrants in a low skilled economy. The Spanish case"

2011/29, Piolatto, A.; Trotin, G.: "Optimal tax enforcement under prospect theory"

2011/30, Montolio, D; Piolatto, A.: "Financing public education when altruistic agents have retirement concerns"

2011/31, García-Quevedo, J.; Pellegrino, G.; Vivarelli, M.: "The determinants of YICs' R&D activity"

2011/32, Goodspeed, T.J.: "Corruption, accountability, and decentralization: theory and evidence from Mexico"

2011/33, Pedraja, F.; Cordero, J.M.: "Analysis of alternative proposals to reform the Spanish intergovernmental transfer system for municipalities"

2011/34, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "Welfare spending and ethnic heterogeneity: evidence from a massive immigration wave"

2011/35, Lyytikäinen, T.: "Tax competition among local governments: evidence from a property tax reform in Finland"

2011/36, Brülhart, M.; Schmidheiny, K.: "Estimating the Rivalness of State-Level Inward FDI"

2011/37, García-Pérez, J.I.; Hidalgo-Hidalgo, M.; Robles-Zurita, J.A.: "Does grade retention affect achievement? Some evidence from Pisa"

2011/38, Boffa, f.; Panzar. J.: "Bottleneck co-ownership as a regulatory alternative"

2011/39, González-Val, R.; Olmo, J.: "Growth in a cross-section of cities: location, increasing returns or random growth?"

2011/40, Anesi, V.; De Donder, P.: "Voting under the threat of secession: accommodation vs. repression"

2011/41, Di Pietro, G.; Mora, T.: "The effect of the l'Aquila earthquake on labour market outcomes"

2011/42, Brueckner, J.K.; Neumark, D.: "Beaches, sunshine, and public-sector pay: theory and evidence on amenities and rent extraction by government workers"

2011/43, Cortés, D.: "Decentralization of government and contracting with the private sector"

2011/44, Turati, G.; Montolio, D.; Piacenza, M.: "Fiscal decentralisation, private school funding, and students' achievements. A tale from two Roman catholic countries"

2012

2012/1, Montolio, D.; Trujillo, E.: "What drives investment in telecommunications? The role of regulation, firms' internationalization and market knowledge"

2012/2, Giesen, K.; Suedekum, J.: "The size distribution across all "cities": a unifying approach"

2012/3, Foremny, D.; Riedel, N.: "Business taxes and the electoral cycle"

2012/4, García-Estévez, J.; Duch-Brown, N.: "Student graduation: to what extent does university expenditure matter?"

2012/5, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, A.; Salvadori, L.: "Empirical evidence on horizontal competition in tax enforcement"

2012/6, Pickering, A.C.; Rockey, J.: "Ideology and the growth of US state government"

2012/7, Vergolini, L.; Zanini, N.: "How does aid matter? The effect of financial aid on university enrolment decisions"

2012/8, Backus, P.: "Gibrat's law and legacy for non-profit organisations: a non-parametric analysis"

2012/9, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Marín-López, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "What underlies localization and urbanization economies? Evidence from the location of new firms"

2012/10, Mantovani, A.; Vandekerckhove, J.: "The strategic interplay between bundling and merging in complementary markets"

2012/11, Garcia-López, M.A.: "Urban spatial structure, suburbanization and transportation in Barcelona"

2012/12, Revelli, F.: "Business taxation and economic performance in hierarchical government structures"

2012/13, Arqué-Castells, P.; Mohnen, P.: "Sunk costs, extensive R&D subsidies and permanent inducement effects"

2012/14, Boffa, F.; Piolatto, A.; Ponzetto, G.: "Centralization and accountability: theory and evidence from the Clean Air Act"

2012/15, Cheshire, P.C.; Hilber, C.A.L.; Kaplanis, I.: "Land use regulation and productivity – land matters: evidence from a UK supermarket chain"

2012/16, Choi, A.; Calero, J.: "The contribution of the disabled to the attainment of the Europe 2020 strategy headline targets"

2012/17, Silva, J.I.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "The ins and outs of unemployment in a two-tier labor market"

2012/18, González-Val, R.; Lanaspa, L.; Sanz, F.: "New evidence on Gibrat's law for cities"

2012/19, Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "Job search methods in times of crisis: native and immigrant strategies in Spain"

2012/20, Lessmann, C.: "Regional inequality and decentralization – an empirical analysis"

2012/21, Nuevo-Chiquero, A.: "Trends in shotgun marriages: the pill, the will or the cost?"

2012/22, Piil Damm, A.: "Neighborhood quality and labor market outcomes: evidence from quasi-random neighborhood assignment of immigrants"

2012/23, Ploeckl, F.: "Space, settlements, towns: the influence of geography and market access on settlement distribution and urbanization"

2012/24, Algan, Y.; Hémet, C.; Laitin, D.: "Diversity and local public goods: a natural experiment with exogenous residential allocation"

Fiscal Federalism