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• **Data:** IRS admin data – population of taxpayers 2000-13

• **Identification:** Policy reform in 2009 that ↓ amount WH for ppl with certain benefits

• **Variation:** Across indivs who were subject to the reform

• **Findings:**
  1. WH ↓ no. of taxpayers who are late by 1.4pp, amount of tax late by 5c/$
     Or 6pp and 20c/$ among those who don’t receive refunds
  2. Not liquidity constraints: same effect among ppl earning interest income
  3. Is explained by cognitive frictions: late payers more likely to have errors
Data: balanced panel of 48 states, 1944-80

Identification: State policy reforms that introduced WH, 1948-76

Variation: Across states as reform rolled out

Findings:

1. Increase in tax rev collected of 28%
2. Doesn’t affect compliance on federal returns
3. Not explained by change in base, increased enforcement or reduced salience
Complementarities (and framing the differences!)

- Same big picture question, but...

- Different data: individual vs state level
  Indiv has more data, but only gives local effects (LATE).

- Different variation: single policy change vs state level roll-outs
  State level closer to the policy we are directly interested in, but different implementation in diff places.

- Different time periods: 2009 vs 1944-80
  2009 closer to current policy environ., but also a time of crisis.

- Similar results: both find increases in tax, but very different magnitudes.
Comments for Boning

• selection? highlight that combo of two reforms means TP at margin of owing tax wouldn’t otherwise receive a tax rebate in either group.

• maybe more mistakes with this than with "normal" income? can you show whether error rates were higher that year?

• is matched DiD better at removing pre-trends than linear controls?

• supplement DiD results with QTE?

• Why (Fig 5) is there a big increase in having tax debt between May and June?

• TPs with interest income (Fig 6) look quite diff in 2007 (prereform). Maybe more financially exposed: 2007 was good, things get bad after?
• again DiD with controls. might worry about functional form. could try matched DiD? could also try looking at a smaller window around reform, using only states without other reforms in window?

• how do overall results look if California is excluded?

• variables measuring tax base (balance) and tax rate (control) treated differently. Any reason?

• Suggestive evidence from California that reform $\rightarrow \uparrow$ filing. Why not describe this as $\uparrow$ tax base?

• framing issue: can be hard to sell papers with negative results. anything positive about mechanism?
Directions for work on withholding

- Both great contributions to an important and growing area.
- Clear evidence that WH helps bring in revenue.
- Some positive evidence on mechanism, but could still use more.
- Also value of WH has fallen: previously bringing in money, now mostly bringing forward collection. So how important is it to extend to other sources of income?
- How does WH fit in with other tax admin policies: which are complements/substitutes?