International Journal of Financial Management and Economics

P-ISSN: 2617-9210
E-ISSN: 2617-9229
IJFME 2023; 6(2): 15-18
www.theeconomicsjournal.com
Received: 13-04-2023
Accepted: 20-05-2023

Anita Rani
Research Scholar, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Alka
Assistant Professor, Govt. College, Bherian Pehowa, Haryana, India

Sumit Kumar
Research Scholar, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Corresponding Author:
Anita Rani
Research Scholar, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India

Impact of fiscal policy on interstate economic inequality

Anita Rani, Alka and Sumit Kumar

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26179210.2023.v6.i2.212

Abstract
This paper investigates the effects of various fiscal policy instruments on economic growth and income inequality. Transfer payments or an income tax are examples of fiscal policy. The amount of development, income distribution, and degree of political franchise all influence fiscal policy. Political equilibrium endogenous growth models that handle distributional concerns provide reduced-form equations. Furthermore, the data show that government size, education spending, and health spending are all adversely related to wealth disparity only in developed nations. The global distribution of income was shown to be unaffected by public debt. For institutional capability, we discovered that corruption and government effectiveness had no substantial impact on income distribution in developed and developing nations. However, the coefficients of the interactions between fiscal policy and institutional capability, while minor in most situations, show the predicted signals. Some policy suggestions have been made.

Keywords: Fiscal policy, economy, inequality, interstate

Introduction

One probable cause for disparities in nations' economic growth rates is differences in governmental policy. People will not invest as much as they would otherwise if the incentives to acquire capital are limited (e.g., under conditions of financial repression or heavy taxes), private ownership of capital is prohibited, or legal titles are ambiguous. Growth will be slower if it is linked to investment. However, public policy is the result of the interests and political strengths of many social groups and people. One important distinction between people is the ownership of possessions and the quantity of income they get. Thus, income disparity influences policy decisions (principally, in decisions on taxation and public expenditures).

In recent years, there has been a significant deal of focus on the linkages between economic growth and income disparity. While earlier research revealed a negative trade-off between growth and inequality in the early phases of development, more current research suggests ways by which inequality is exacerbated by economic growth or income disparity influences growth (positively or negatively).

However, if government transfers are beneficial to growth (e.g., higher education spending), the nature of the link alters slightly. At the most extreme, the beneficial impact of transfers on growth may outweigh the negative impact of taxes, and the link between high inequality and heavy redistribution (on the one hand) and strong growth (on the other) may be positive. Saint Paul and Verdier make this point (1991).

Too far, the cross-country regression framework has been employed in the majority of empirical investigations. However, some of the theoretical assertions are linked to the time series evolution of economies. While the cross-country regression framework has been widely utilized in the growth literature to derive intertemporal inferences, extremely rigorous model specification assumptions must be made for this technique to be viable.

Fiscal policy is often seen as an important policy tool for ensuring income distribution. Fiscal policy, in the form of taxation and social spending, affects the well-being of family members through monetary payment via taxes and transfers, as well as the provision of in-kind social benefits, such as free education and healthcare access

(Clements *et al.* 2015, p. 3; Gupta 2018) [8, 13].

Fiscal consolidation influences the quantity and mix of taxes and spending, as well as disposable income, in addition to market income. Income inequality tends to rise when fiscal adjustment depends more on raising regressive taxes and reducing progressive spending. According to econometric research, fiscal consolidations focused on expenditure cutbacks aggravate inequality more than revenue-driven ones (Ball and others, 2013 [14]; Woo and others, 2013 [7]; Agnello and Sousa, 2012) [15]. While adopted when unemployment is already high, frontloaded adjustments can have a particularly large impact on social welfare (Blanchard and Leigh, 2013) [16].

Measurement and Determinants of Income Inequality

An increasing worry over the widening income gap between the affluent and the poor, as well as policy misalignment in addressing relative poverty and income inequality, has prompted a slew of studies from academics, and international and national organizations. "Inequality affects the strength of the economy and leads to economic instability," writes Stiglitz (2012) [17]. In recent times, especially after witnessing the Wall Street movement, the issue of inequality has compelled governments to pay quick attention to fixing the issues and to priorities it as an important policy objective.

Advanced Economies' Fiscal Policy

Fiscal policy, including direct income tax and transfers, has been shown to be distributive and progressive in advanced countries in general. Some research have discovered a positive association between fiscal consolidations and an increase in the income gap, which includes the influence of the European Monetary Union on income disparity. There are differing perspectives on the impact of fiscal policy on income disparity in one fell swoop. This section examines income inequality, economic growth, fiscal consolidation, and the other implications of advanced nations' fiscal policies.

What is Fiscal Policy?

The use of government spending and tax policies to alter economic conditions, particularly macroeconomic conditions, is referred to as fiscal policy. These include total goods and services demand, employment, inflation, and economic growth. During a recession, the government may reduce tax rates or boost expenditure in order to stimulate demand and economic activity. To counteract inflation, it may raise interest rates or slash spending to calm the economy.

Fiscal Policy Categories

- **Expansionary Policy and Instruments:** Consider a recessionary economy to demonstrate how the government may utilize fiscal policy to influence the economy. The government may give tax refunds to stimulate aggregate demand and economic development.
  This method is based on the premise that when people pay reduced taxes, they have more money to spend or invest, which stimulates stronger demand. This demand causes enterprises to recruit more people, lowering unemployment and creating severe rivalry for workers. As a result, salaries are rising and consumers have more money to spend and invest. It's a positive feedback loop or virtuous cycle.
- **Policy Restrictions and Tools:** In the face of rising inflation and other expansionary signs, a government might undertake Contractionary fiscal policy, even if it means provoking a temporary recession, in order to restore economic cycle balance. The government does this through raising taxes, lowering government expenditure, and reducing public sector salaries or employment opportunities. Whereas expansionary fiscal policy entails budget deficits, Contractionary fiscal policy requires budget surpluses. This approach, however, is rarely employed since it is extremely unpopular politically.

Inequality in interstate economic and fiscal policy

To assess the influence of fiscal policies on income distribution, earnings in the presence of tax and transfer policies must be compared to incomes in the absence of such policies. The fact that the actual incidence of tax and transfer schemes may differ from their legislative incidence complicates this comparison. In general, determining the actual incidence of fiscal policies necessitates specifying the economy's structure (including the competitiveness of various sectors and the economy's openness) as well as having information on the magnitude of consumers' and producers' Behavioural responses to taxes and transfers. In reality, however, because relevant data on market structure and Behavioural reactions are frequently lacking, most research focuses on statutory incidence. The incidence of commodity taxes is often considered to fall on consumers in these studies, whereas the incidence of factor taxes is supposed to fall on factor suppliers, and transfers to beneficiaries do not modify their factor supply. Almost all of the research examined here make such assumptions.

Impact of fiscal policy on interstate economic inequality

Our data demonstrate that income before taxes and transfers are distributed more unequally in lower-income nations than in others. We also show that inequality is growing in many nations, even richer, more equal ones. However, there is significant variety in income inequality and poverty outcomes between income nation groups and geographic locations, both before and after the impacts of fiscal policy are analyzed. This variability highlights the significance of both political and social decisions, as well as policy formulation and execution. While lower-income nations have narrower tax bases and redistribute less than affluent countries, there is evidence that social expenditure grows in tandem with fiscal capability. Impact of fiscal policy on interstate economic inequality giver below:

1. Fiscal policy has the potential to lower intra-country income disparity by up to 40%. Richer countries may redistribute more than poorer countries. Fiscal policy in low-income nations generates an average 3% reduction in inequality.
2. The variation in income inequality within-country income groups suggests that policy choices matter, regardless of development level. While fiscal capacity must be expanded overall in most low-income settings to achieve greater fiscal redistribution, better-designed fiscal policy can also improve impact.
3. Increased progressivity of income taxes, improved efficiency of consumption taxes, elimination of

inefficient subsidies and tax exemptions to help finance enhanced social insurance, and a mix of complementary in-kind transfers and targeted equitable cash transfers are all opportunities for equitable economic growth. The design and quality of financial and in-kind transfers made via the delivery of public health and education services are critical to ensuring favourable net returns on fiscal intervention.
4. Tax mobilization does not have to prevent more equitable policy options since some revenue changes may be both efficient and equitable, especially when paired with high-quality equitable social transfers. Lowering income disparity both before and after fiscal intervention can benefit economic development and, as a result, revenue mobilization as the tax base grows.
5. These changes will meet political and institutional hurdles in their implementation. Improved understanding of the net effects of taxation and expenditure on income inequality and poverty may help guide country-specific decisions, and a whole-of-government approach can help achieve the

Combating Inequality

Policymakers have many options for achieving efficient and equitable outcomes. The Fiscal Monitor is concerned with three policy debates: Progressive taxation, universal basic income (UBI), and government spending on education and health

- **Income taxation is progressive:** Personal income tax progressivity fell precipitously in the 1980s and 1990s and has subsequently stayed essentially constant. OECD member nations' average top-income tax rate declined from 62 percent in 1981 to 35 percent in 2015. Furthermore, tax regimes are less equitable than the statutory rates suggest, because wealthier persons have greater access to tax breaks. Importantly, we discover that, as long as progressivity is not extreme, certain advanced economies may improve progressivity without stifling development.
- **Basic income for all (UBI):** For decades, economists have discussed a universal basic income (UBI), which is defined as a cash payment of an equal amount to all persons in a country. There is now increased interest, which is linked to expectations of how technology and artificial intelligence may affect the future of employment. The Fiscal Monitor does not advocate for or against UBI, but rather participates to the policy debate by offering information and arguments pertinent to assessing a UBI. Because it covers all persons at the bottom of the income distribution, a UBI has the potential to have a substantial influence on inequality and poverty. However, because it is ubiquitous, it is expensive. As a result, the debate of a UBI cannot be separated from the discussion of its funding in order to make it budget neutral. Key issues for its implementation include its compatibility with other budgetary objectives (to prevent crowding out expenditures in infrastructure, education, and health, for example), as well as its funding strategy, which must be efficient and equitable. A UBI might be an alternative in cases where it replaces inequitable and ineffective social spending.
- **Education and health spending:** Despite advancements, disparities in access to excellent education and health care services between socioeconomic levels persist in many nations. Males with postsecondary education, for example, live up to 14 years longer than those with secondary education or less in sophisticated nations. Better public expenditure can assist, for example, by reallocating education and health spending from the wealthy to the poor while maintaining overall public education and health spending constant. According to the Fiscal Monitor, eliminating the inequality gap in basic health coverage may increase life expectancy in emerging and developing nations by 1.3 years on average.

Conclusion

Government spending, taxation, and deficit financing have recently moved to the center of policy debate. Fiscal policy has an impact on aggregate demand, wealth distribution, and the economy's capacity to generate goods and services. However, the bulk of previous empirical research have concentrated on the impacts of fiscal policy on economic activity without taking into account the redistributive consequences and, as a result, have not provided an examination of the impact of various fiscal policy tools. There appears to be a sufficient reason for using fiscal policy in transitional and developing nations in combination with initiatives to address income disparity. The given decompositions show a largely constant pattern in the components of inequality increases related to changes in income and population, as well as the identification of states that contribute the most significantly to conventionally assessed interstate inequality. Fiscal policy in developed nations has a considerably longer history of addressing inequality and promoting inclusive growth than in emerging economies. As a result, as emerging nations investigate more active fiscal policy for inclusive aims, they can benefit from established countries' experiences. These experiences clearly show that fiscal policy can have a significant impact on inequality, which gives reason to be optimistic about its ability to promote equity.

Reference

1. Alesina A, Rodrik D. Distributive Politics and Economic Growth, Quarterly Journal of Economics. 1994;109:465-490.
2. Barro RJ. Inequality and Growth Revisited. Working Paper Series on Regional Economic Integration, Asian Development Bank; c2008. p. 11.
3. Jorda O, AM Taylor. The Time for Austerity: Estimating the Average Treatment Effect of Fiscal Policy, Paper presented at the NBER Summer Institute; c2013.
4. Lustig N, S Higgins, M Jaramillo, W Jimenez, G Molina, V Paz Arauco, *et al.* Fiscal Policy and Income Distribution in Latin America: Challenging the Conventional Wisdom, Tulane Economics Working Paper 1124 (New Orleans: Tulane University); c2011.
5. Meyer B. Unemployment and Workers' Compensation Programmes: Rationale, Design, Labor Supply and Income Support, Fiscal Studies. 2002;23(1):1-49.
6. Shang B. Pension Reform and Equity: The Impact of Reducing Pension Benefits on Poverty, in Equitable and Sustainable Pensions: Challenges and Experience, ed. by Benedict Clements, Frank Eich, and Sanjeev Gupta (Washington, forthcoming); c2014.

7. Woo J, E Bova T, Kinda, S Zhang. Distributional Consequences of Fiscal Consolidation and the Role of Fiscal Policy: What Do the Data Say?, IMF Working Paper No. 13/195 (Washington: International Monetary Fund); c2013.
8. Clements B, R De Mooij, M Francese, S Gupta, M Keen. Fiscal Policy and Income Inequality: An Overview. In Fiscal Policy and Income Inequality. Edited by B. Clements, R. De Mooij, S. Gupta and M. Keen. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund; c2015. p. 3-20.
9. Huynh, Cong Minh. Foreign direct investment and income inequality: Does institutional quality matter? The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development. 2021;30:1231-43.
10. Tsibouris G, MA Horton, MJ Flanagan, WS Maliszewski. Experience with Large Fiscal Adjustments, IMF Occasional Paper No. 246 (Washington: International Monetary Fund); c2006.
11. Berrebi ZM, Silber J. Regional Differences and the Components of Growth and Inequality Change, Economics Letters. 1987;25:295-298.
12. Perera LDH, Lee GHY. Have economic growth and institutional quality contributed to poverty and inequality reduction in Asia?, Journal of Asian Economics. 2013;27:71-86.
13. Gupta A, Johnson J, Fei-Fei L, Savarese S, Alahi A. Social Gan: Socially acceptable trajectories with generative adversarial networks. In Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition; c2018. p. 2255-2264.
14. Guimarães RM, Ball BC, Tormena CA, Giarola NF, Da Silva ÁP. Relating visual evaluation of soil structure to other physical properties in soils of contrasting texture and management. Soil and Tillage Research. 2013 Mar 1;127:92-9.
15. Agnello L, Mallick SK, Sousa RM. Financial reforms and income inequality. Economics Letters. 2012 Sep 1;116(3):583-7.
16. Blanchard OJ, Leigh D. Growth forecast errors and fiscal multipliers. American Economic Review. 2013 May 1;103(3):117-20.
17. Battiston S, Gatti DD, Gallegati M, Greenwald B, Stiglitz JE. Liaisons danger uses Increasing connectivity, risk sharing, and systemic risk. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control. 2012 Aug 1;36(8):1121-41.