

Konrad, Kai A.

Working Paper

Search costs and corporate income tax competition

CESifo Working Paper, No. 3224

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Konrad, Kai A. (2010) : Search costs and corporate income tax competition, CESifo Working Paper, No. 3224, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/46479>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Search Costs and Corporate Income Tax Competition

Kai A. Konrad

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 3224

CATEGORY 1: PUBLIC FINANCE

OCTOBER 2010

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Search Costs and Corporate Income Tax Competition

Abstract

This paper studies corporate tax competition if it is costly to learn some of the elements that determine the effective tax burden. Search cost may, but need not, eliminate the tax competition pressure. The outcome depends on the boundaries of tax rate and tax base choices. Search cost can explain the empirically observed tax cuts cum base broadening.

JEL-Code: H70, H87.

Keywords: costly search, tax competition, corporate taxation, monopoly pricing paradox.

Kai A. Konrad
Max Planck Institute for Intellectual Property, Competition and Tax Law
Department of Public Economics
Marshallplatz 1
Germany - 80539 Munich
kai.konrad@ip.mpg.de

October 22, 2010

I thank Gerold Krause-Junk for making me interested in the role of tax base uncertainty and Aron Kiss for helpful suggestions. The usual caveat applies

1 Introduction

This paper introduces search cost in the theory of tax competition. It studies tax competition in search markets for foreign direct investors when the statutory tax rates are known but the effective tax base is not known, causing search costs to firms which are trying to find out countries' effective tax burdens prior to the investment location choice.¹ Tax rates of different countries are typically well advertised and known or are accessible virtually without cost. It is much more difficult to learn the details of a country's tax rules, such as depreciation allowances, tax treatment of R&D investment, treatment of capital gains, the integration of corporate taxation with other elements of the national tax system, a country's financial regulation and its rules regarding transfer pricing. A firm needs to know and to assess what these rules imply for tax optimization and for the resulting effective tax base for a given investment project.² We find: as a variant of Diamond's (1971) monopoly pricing paradox³, the cost of learning countries' effective tax base has drastic consequences for the equilibrium outcome of tax competition.⁴ From a structural point of view, Harrington and Leahey (2007) is closest to our paper. They consider price competition between firms with unobserved delivery costs adding to sales prices. In our framework, countries compete for firms, and the (observed) tax rate and the (unobserved) tax base inter-

¹For a recent survey of this large literature see Fuest, Huber and Mintz (2005). Search cost is not an issue that has been considered in this literature.

²As stated by the European Commission (2001, p.37): "[...] each Member State has its own sets of rules, in particular laws and conventions on financial accounting, rules for determining taxable profit, arrangements for collection and administration of tax and its own network of tax treaties. The need to comply with a multiplicity of different rules entails a considerable compliance cost and represents in itself a significant barrier to cross-border economic activity."

³Many variants of this Diamond paradox have been explored. Burdett and Judd (1983) analyzed a more general framework in which some firms may be informed about the prices in multiple firms, and showed that this may lead to an equilibrium with price dispersion, instead of monopoly pricing. More recent contributions are McAfee (1995), Baye and Morgan (2001), Arbatskaya (2007), Ireland (2007) who considers firms which sell through different outlets. Harrington (2001) considers competition in which price and quality are uncertain, with a high search cost for quality and a low search cost for the price.

⁴Unlike in Fuest (1995) who considers tax competition with redundancy of tax instruments, tax rate and tax base are not perfect substitutes here, as they differ by the aspect of search cost.

act multiplicatively. We show that competition pressure may occur, despite the existence of search cost, depending on the size of the minimum feasible tax base. Our results show why competition can lead to a tax-cut-cum-base-broadening and explain this recent trend in the context of corporate taxation. It contributes a further explanation for the puzzle⁵ as to why corporate tax rates dropped in the last 25 years in OECD countries, whereas tax revenues from corporate taxation were sustained.⁶

2 The formal framework

We look for (weak) perfect Bayesian equilibrium in the following game with complete, but imperfect, information. There are n ex-ante identical countries $j = 1, \dots, n$, and a set of investors i with measure 1.⁷ Each country chooses a statutory tax rate $t_j \in [\tau_0, \tau_1] \subseteq [0, 1]$ and a tax base $b_j \in [\beta_0, \beta_1] \subseteq [0, 1]$. The product of tax rate and tax base in a country is called the *effective tax burden* and denoted

$$T_j = t_j b_j. \quad (1)$$

This T_j is the fiscal price which investors have to pay for investing in country j . Each investor maximizes his net profit. He costlessly observes the statutory tax rates t_1, \dots, t_n . The effective tax bases b_1, \dots, b_n are determined by a large number of details in the tax code such as depreciation rules or cost deduction allowances, the conduct of the tax administration, for instance, regarding transfer pricing issues or auditing habits, on specific characteristics of the investment project and its flexibility for tax optimization in the respective institutional framework. Evidently, b_j should be understood as a metaphor for the less easily observable co-determinants of effective tax burden. To learn the actual b_j of country j the investor has a positive cost that is equal to $c > 0$. To learn the tax bases of a set $K_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ of countries,

⁵See Sørensen (2007) and De Mooij and Nicodème (2008) for a balanced discussion.

⁶Devereux, Lockwood and Redoano (2008), for instance, report a drop in the average of the statutory rates of corporate taxation in the OECD countries from about 50 percent to under 35 percent in the period between the early Eighties and 2001. Devereux, Griffith and Klemm (2002) provide evidence for sustained tax revenue, despite these drops in rates.

⁷We deliberately choose a framework in which the different countries are as homogenous as possible along all dimensions ex ante, before choosing their tax burdens. Without search costs, this framework would yield a race to the bottom.

the search cost is equal to $(\#K_i)c$, with $\#K_i$ the number of countries in K_i . For these countries $j \in K_i$, investor i knows the effective tax burden T_j . For all $j \notin K_i$, i must form a belief about T_j , described by a (possibly degenerate) probability distribution $F_j(T_j)$. Each investor invests one unit of capital (or does not invest at all).⁸ The investment turns into a gross profit of size $\pi(T_j)$. For this function, we assume that a higher tax rate reduces this gross profit. More precisely, $\pi(0)$ is the ‘laissez-faire’ profit, π is a concave function of T_j (i.e., $\pi' < 0$ and $\pi'' \leq 0$) in the range $T_j \in [0, 1]$ and zero for $T_j > 1$. Intuitively, this is a short-hand notion for the idea that firms adjust their local business activity to taxation, that their activity will be negatively affected by a higher effective tax burden, and that firms have an exit option, which rules out an infinitely high tax burden. The gross profit π is subject to the effective tax burden. Hence, the profit net of taxes and net of search costs for the investor i who expends $(\#K_i)c$ units of search costs and invests in country j is

$$(1 - t_j b_j) \pi(t_j b_j) - (\#K_i)c. \quad (2)$$

Each government maximizes its tax revenues.⁹ If $\alpha_j \in (0, 1)$ is the share of investors who invest in country j , then the tax revenue in country j is

$$\alpha_j t_j b_j \pi(t_j b_j) \quad (3)$$

where α_j can, in general, be a function of $((t_1, b_1), \dots, (t_n, b_n))$

We consider the following timing. Stage 1: the countries choose their statutory tax rates and their tax base definitions. Stage 2: the investors choose which information they will acquire about tax base definitions. Stage 3: investment choices take place.

It is useful to define the following benchmark: in the absence of tax competition, α_j is exogenous. This makes (3) a monotonic and concave function of the effective tax burden and has a unique maximum that is implicitly defined by the first-order condition

$$T_j \pi'(T_j) + \pi(T_j) = 0. \quad (4)$$

⁸It is possible that the investor does not invest at all, but we will not consider this constraint explicitly in what follows, as it will not be binding under fairly general conditions.

⁹This is a standard assumption and may describe Leviathan government or a benevolent government that may want to extract revenue from non-resident investors on behalf of its population.

We denote the solution to (4) as T_m and call T_m the *effective monopoly tax*.

Proposition 1 *The following strategy profile and beliefs constitute a weak perfect Bayesian equilibrium: (i) For $\tau_0\beta_1 < T_m$: All countries choose $t_j = \tau_0$ and $b_j = \beta_1$. Investors believe that*

$$\begin{aligned} b_j &= \beta_1 & \text{for } t_j &\leq T_m/\beta_1 \\ b_j &= T_m/t_j & \text{for } t_j &\in (T_m/\beta_1, T_m/\beta_0] \\ b_j &= \beta_0 & \text{for } t_j &> T_m/\beta_0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with probability 1. They choose $K_i = \emptyset$ and invest in one of the countries with the (according to the beliefs) lowest effective tax burden. (ii) For $\tau_0\beta_1 \geq T_m \geq \tau_0\beta_0$: All countries choose $t_j b_j$ with $t_j \in [\tau_0, \tau_1]$, $b_j \in [\beta_0, \beta_1]$ such that $t_j b_j = T_m$. Investors i believe that

$$\begin{aligned} t_j b_j &= T_m & \text{for } t_j &\in [T_m/\beta_1, T_m/\beta_0] \\ t_j b_j &= t_j \beta_0 > T_m & \text{for } t_j &> T_m/\beta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with probability 1. They choose $K_i = \emptyset$ and invest in one of the countries with the lowest (believed) effective tax burden.

Proof. (i) In stage 3, each investor i knows b_j for $j \in K_i$ and has beliefs (5) about countries' b_j for $j \notin K_i$. The investor chooses the country with the lowest $t_j b_j$ and randomizes between the different countries if there are several countries with the same effective tax burden. In stage 2, each investor i observes t_1, \dots, t_n and chooses K_i . Given that the beliefs (5) are degenerate, the investor does not expect to learn anything from search. Hence, $K_i = \emptyset$. Turning to stage 1, for $t_k = \tau_0, b_k = \beta_1$ for all $k \neq j$, the country j chooses (t_j, b_j) to maximize (3). For $t_j > \tau_0$ and given the beliefs in (5), all investors expect the fiscal burden to be higher in this country than in the other countries. The country receives a tax revenue equal to zero in the continuation game. For $t_j = \tau_0$, its expected tax revenue is equal to

$$\frac{1}{n}(\tau_0 b_j)\pi(\tau_0 b_j) \quad (7)$$

and, as $\tau_0\beta_1 < T_m$, this reaches its maximum for $b_j = \beta_1$. Note also that the beliefs are consistent along the equilibrium path.

The reasoning for case (ii) is analogous for stages 2 and 3. In stage 1, countries anticipate that $K_i = \emptyset$. Given the simultaneous choices $t_k b_k = T_m$ for $k \neq j$, country j anticipates that j 's tax revenue is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} t_j b_j \pi(t_j b_j) & \text{ if } t_j \in [T_m/\beta_1, T_m/\beta_0] \\ 0 & \text{ if } t_j > T_m/\beta_0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Accordingly, j chooses $t_j \in [T_m/\beta_1, T_m/\beta_0]$ and a tax burden definition that maximizes $t_j b_j \pi(t_j b_j)$ for this t_j . This maximand is $b_j = T_m/t_j$. Note also that the beliefs are consistent along the equilibrium path. ■

Cases (i) and (ii) have in common that no search costs are incurred. Given the expectations of identical equilibrium effective tax base choices in the different countries, a costly search does not pay. In turn, because no firm searches, countries cannot attract additional investors by the choice of a low effective tax base. If the firms could commit to search actively, this would introduce competitive pressure, as a country j that reduces b_j is rewarded with additional investment. Such search is, however, not time consistent. As a result, competitive pressure is limited for case (i) and vanishes completely for case (ii).

In case (ii) the tax burdens are equal to the tax burdens in autarchy. This result closely corresponds with the original result in Diamond (1971) and the recent result on additive two-component prices by Harrington and Leahey (2007).

The more important result is for case (i). It shows that, despite the absence of search in the equilibrium, the costless observability of the tax rate exerts some partial competitive pressure on the effective tax burdens. As the tax base is bounded from above, the maximum possible effective tax burden can credibly be limited by the country if it chooses a tax rate that is so small that the product of this tax rate with the maximum possible (unobserved) tax base is smaller than the effective monopoly tax (i.e., if $\tau_0 \beta_1 < T_m$). For $\tau_0 = 0$ even the full race to the bottom occurs. Note also that the equilibrium in case (i) has very low tax rates, combined with broad tax bases. This property is in line with the stylized facts on tax rate reductions and tax base broadening.

3 Conclusions

Search cost for the effective tax burden is typically assumed away in tax competition analysis. However, if there is a cost to learning the true size of some of the determinants of the actual effective tax burden, this may limit the amount of competition pressure and may even support a tax competition equilibrium in which countries choose the effective tax burden that maximizes tax revenue, just as in the case with autarchy. The result is compatible with a large variety of combinations of tax rates and tax bases and may add to the existing explanations for why the trend towards lower statutory tax rates occurred in parallel with the increase in international openness in recent decades, and why it was complemented with a broadening of the corporate tax base.

References

- [1] Arbatskaya, M., 2007, Ordered search, *RAND Journal of Economics*, 38(1), 119-126.
- [2] Baye, M.R., and J. Morgan, 2001, Information gatekeepers on the Internet and the competitiveness of homogeneous product markets, *American Economic Review*, 91(3), 454-474.
- [3] Burdett, K., and K.L. Judd, 1983, Equilibrium price dispersion, *Econometrica*, 51(4), 955-969.
- [4] De Mooij, R.A., and G. Nicodème, 2008, How corporate tax competition reduces personal tax revenue, *CESifo DICE Report* 1/2008, 27-31.
- [5] Devereux, M.P., R. Griffith, and A. Klemm, 2002, Corporate income tax reforms and international tax competition, *Economic Policy*, 35, 451-488.
- [6] Devereux, M.P., B. Lockwood, and M. Redoano, 2008, Do countries compete over corporate tax rates?, *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(5-6), 2008, 1210-1235.
- [7] Diamond, P.A., 1971, A model of price adjustment, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 3(2), 156-168.

- [8] European Commission, 2001, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee, Towards an Internal Market without Tax Obstacles, A Strategy for Providing Companies with a Consolidated Corporate Tax Base for their EU-wide Activities, COM (2001), 582 Final, Brussels.
- [9] Fuest, C., 1995, Interjurisdictional competition and public expenditure: is tax coordination counterproductive?, *FinanzArchiv N.F.*, 52(3-4), 478-496.
- [10] Fuest, C., B. Huber and J. Mintz, 2005, Capital mobility and tax competition, a survey, *Foundations and Trends in Microeconomics*, 1(1), 1-62.
- [11] Harrington, J.E. Jr., 2001, Comment on: "Reducing buyer search costs: implications for electronic market places", *Management Science*, 47(12), 1727-1732.
- [12] Harrington, J.E. Jr., and M.F. Leahey, 2007, Equilibrium pricing in a (partial) search market: The shopbot paradox, *Economics Letters*, 94(1), 111-117.
- [13] Ireland, N.J., 2007, Posting multiple prices to reduce the effectiveness of consumer price search, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 55(2), 235-263.
- [14] McAfee, R.P., 1995, Multiproduct equilibrium price dispersion, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 67(1), 83-105.
- [15] Sørensen, P.B., 2007, Can capital income taxes survive? And should they? *CESifo Economic Studies*, 53 (2), 172-228.

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 3160 Philip E. Graves, Appropriate Fiscal Policy over the Business Cycle: Proper Stimulus Policies Can Work, August 2010
- 3161 Michael Binder and Marcel Bluhm, On the Conditional Effects of IMF Program Participation on Output Growth, August 2010
- 3162 Michael Binder, Qianying Chen, and Xuan Zhang, On the Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks on Exchange Rates, August 2010
- 3163 Felix J. Bierbrauer, On the Optimality of Optimal Income Taxation, August 2010
- 3164 Nikolaus Wolf, Europe's Great Depression – Coordination Failure after the First World War, September 2010
- 3165 Dan Kovenock and Brian Roberson, Conflicts with Multiple Battlefields, September 2010
- 3166 Jean-Pierre Ponssard and Catherine Thomas, Capacity Investment under Demand Uncertainty. An Empirical Study of the US Cement Industry, 1994-2006, September 2010
- 3167 Jørgen Juel Andersen, Jon H. Fiva and Gisle James Natvik, Voting when the Stakes are High, September 2010
- 3168 Michael Hoel, Is there a Green Paradox?, September 2010
- 3169 Scott Alan Carson, Nineteenth Century US African-American and White Female Statures: Insight from US Prison Records, September 2010
- 3170 Gil S. Epstein, Yosef Mealem and Shmuel Nitzan, Political Culture and Discrimination in Contests, September 2010
- 3171 Sara Fisher Ellison, Jeffrey Greenbaum and Wallace P. Mullin, Diversity, Social Goods Provision, and Performance in the Firm, September 2010
- 3172 Silvia Dominguez-Martinez, Randolph Sloof and Ferdinand von Siemens, Monitoring your Friends, not your Foes: Strategic Ignorance and the Delegation of Real Authority, September 2010
- 3173 Marcus Dittrich and Beate Schirwitz, Union Membership and Employment Dynamics: A Note, September 2010
- 3174 Francesco Daveri, Paolo Manasse and Danila Serra, The Twin Effects of Globalization – Evidence from a Sample of Indian Manufacturing Firms, September 2010

- 3175 Florian Blöchl, Fabian J. Theis, Fernando Vega-Redondo and Eric O’N. Fisher, Which Sectors of a Modern Economy are most Central?, September 2010
- 3176 Dag Morten Dalen, Marilena Locatelli and Steinar Strøm, Longitudinal Analysis of Generic Substitution, September 2010
- 3177 Armin Falk, Stephan Meier and Christian Zehnder, Did we Overestimate the Role of Social Preferences? The Case of Self-Selected Student Samples, September 2010
- 3178 Christian Fahrholz and Cezary Wójcik, The Bail-Out! Positive Political Economics of Greek-type Crises in the EMU, September 2010
- 3179 Klaus Abberger and Wolfgang Nierhaus, The Ifo Business Cycle Clock: Circular Correlation with the Real GDP, September 2010
- 3180 Walter Krämer and Gerhard Arminger, “True Believers” or Numerical Terrorism at the Nuclear Power Plant, September 2010
- 3181 Bernard M.S. Van Praag, Dmitri Romanov and Ada Ferrer-i-Carbonell, Happiness and Financial Satisfaction in Israel. Effects of Religiosity, Ethnicity, and War, September 2010
- 3182 Dimitrios Koumparoulis and Paul De Grauwe, Public Capital, Employment and Productivity: An Empirical Investigation for Greece, September 2010
- 3183 John Whalley and Tanmaya Shekhar, The Rapidly Deepening India-China Economic Relationship, September 2010
- 3184 Andreas Schäfer and Thomas Steger, History, Expectations, and Public Policy: Economic Development in Eastern Germany, September 2010
- 3185 Thomas Eichner and Marco Runkel, Subsidizing Renewable Energy under Capital Mobility, September 2010
- 3186 Konstantinos Angelopoulos and James Malley, Fear of Model Misspecification and the Robustness Premium, September 2010
- 3187 Philip E. Graves, A Note on the Design of Experiments Involving Public Goods, September 2010
- 3188 Glenn Ellison, How does the Market Use Citation Data? The Hirsch Index in Economics, September 2010
- 3189 Barbara Hanel and Regina T. Riphahn, The Employment of Mothers – Recent Developments and their Determinants in East and West Germany, September 2010
- 3190 Alexander Haupt and Silke Uebelmesser, Integration, Mobility, and Human Capital Formation, September 2010

- 3191 Vincenzo Galasso and Paola Profeta, When the State Mirrors the Family: The Design of Pension Systems, September 2010
- 3192 Stéphane Zuber and Geir B. Asheim, Justifying Social Discounting: The Rank-Discounted Utilitarian Approach, September 2010
- 3193 Alexander Kemnitz, Educational Federalism and the Quality Effects of Tuition Fees, September 2010
- 3194 Claudia M. Buch, Sandra Eickmeier and Esteban Prieto, Macroeconomic Factors and Micro-Level Bank Risk, September 2010
- 3195 May Elsayyad and Kai A. Konrad, Fighting Multiple Tax Havens, September 2010
- 3196 Laszlo Goerke and Markus Pannenberg, Trade Union Membership and Dismissals, September 2010
- 3197 Ferdinand Mittermaier and Johannes Rincke, Do Countries Compensate Firms for International Wage Differentials?, September 2010
- 3198 John Boyd, Gianni De Nicoló and Abu M. Jalal, Bank Competition, Asset Allocations and Risk of Failure: An Empirical Investigation, September 2010
- 3199 Guido Heineck and Bernd Süßmuth, A Different Look at Lenin's Legacy: Trust, Risk, Fairness and Cooperativeness in the two Germanies, September 2010
- 3200 Ingvild Almås, Tarjei Havnes and Magne Mogstad, Baby Booming Inequality? Demographic Change and Earnings Inequality in Norway, 1967-2000, October 2010
- 3201 Thomas Aronsson and Sören Blomquist, The Standard Deviation of Life-Length, Retirement Incentives, and Optimal Pension Design, October 2010
- 3202 Thorvaldur Gylfason and Eduard Hochreiter, Growing Together: Croatia and Latvia, October 2010
- 3203 Ken Burdett and Melvyn Coles, Tenure and Experience Effects on Wages: A Theory, October 2010
- 3204 Wendy Carlin, Good Institutions are not enough: Ongoing Challenges of East German Development, October 2010
- 3205 Tobias König and Andreas Wagener, Tax Structure and Government Expenditures under Tax Equity Norms, October 2010
- 3206 Daniel W. Sacks, Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers, Subjective Well-Being, Income, Economic Development and Growth, October 2010
- 3207 Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler, Why "Buy American" is a Bad Idea but Politicians still Like it, October 2010

- 3208 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Luis A. Gil-Alana, US Disposable Personal Income and Housing Price Index: A Fractional Integration Analysis, October 2010
- 3209 Bruno S. Frey, Withering Academia?, October 2010
- 3210 Eva Mörk, Anna Sjögren and Helena Svaleryd, Childcare Costs and the Demand for Children – Evidence from a Nationwide Reform, October 2010
- 3211 Dan Kovenock, Brian Roberson and Roman M. Sheremeta, The Attack and Defense of Weakest-Link Networks, October 2010
- 3212 Shmuel Nitzan and Kaoru Ueda, Prize Sharing in Collective Contests, October 2010
- 3213 Erling Eide, Kristine von Simson and Steinar Strøm, Rank Dependent Utility, Tax Evasion and Labor Supply, October 2010
- 3214 Thomas Eichner and Marco Runkel, Interjurisdictional Spillovers, Decentralized Policymaking and the Elasticity of Capital Supply, October 2010
- 3215 Susan Athey and Glenn Ellison, Dynamics of Open Source Movements, October 2010
- 3216 Christian Bjørnskov, Axel Dreher, Justina A.V. Fischer and Jan Schnellenbach, Inequality and Happiness: When Perceived Social Mobility and Economic Reality do not Match, October 2010
- 3217 Thomas Cornelissen, Oliver Himmler and Tobias Koenig, Fairness Spillovers – The Case of Taxation, October 2010
- 3218 David E. Wildasin, State Corporation Income Taxation - An Economic Perspective on Nexus, October 2010
- 3219 Andreas Peichl, Nico Pestel and Hilmar Schneider, Does Size Matter? The Impact of Changes in Household Structure on Income Distribution in Germany, October 2010
- 3220 Alexander Kemnitz, A Simple Model of Health Insurance Competition, October 2010
- 3221 Johannes Becker and Marco Runkel, Even Small Trade Costs Restore Efficiency in Tax Competition, October 2010
- 3222 Paul Belleflamme and Martin Peitz, Digital Piracy: Theory, October 2010
- 3223 Andrea Kollmann and Friedrich Schneider, Why does Environmental Policy in Representative Democracies Tend to be Inadequate? A Preliminary Public Choice Analysis, October 2010
- 3224 Kai A. Konrad, Search Costs and Corporate Income Tax Competition, October 2010