UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA



## Managing The Risks To The Revenue: A New Model For Evaluating Taxpayer Audit Programs

i

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

A considerable number of people in the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) provided invaluable support in the preparation of this thesis. In particular, Bill Godfrey, Second Commissioner, provided early encouragement and advice. Likewise, within the Taxpayer Audit Group both Vince Mitchell, First Assistant Commissioner, and Peter Smith, Assistant Commissioner, provided much appreciated motivational and practical support; in particular they were highly supportive of my successful application in 1994/95 for a Commissioner's Scholarship. The scholarship was sought in order to complete the thesis as a full time PhD candidate.

I would also like to thank all my colleagues in the ATO's Compliance and Industry Research Unit for their sustained encouragement and assistance, particularly Denis Donoghue, John Gudgeon and Andrew Wirth. A special debt is also owed to Margaret Winter of the ATO's National Office Library who obtained numerous interlibrary loans for me, a significant number of which were difficult to trace. In addition, Steve Porch helped me keep abreast of important developments in other tax administration and regulatory agencies. I also wish to thank those numerous other ATO people who kindly provided information and advice, particularly those who reviewed sections of the thesis for technical and historical accuracy.

I would also like to acknowledge the encouragement and very helpful general advice I received from Professor John Scholz, State University of New York, at several stages in the development of the thesis.

My thanks of course also go to my supervisors at the University of Canberra, Professor Roman Tomasic and Professor Brian Andrew, for guiding me through the PhD research and thesis process. This was by no means an easy task given the essentially multidisciplinary nature of the subject matter.

Traditionally, tax administrations have used taxpayer audit program resources principally to deter deliberate noncompliance, 'encourage' due care in the exercise of tax obligations, and recoup otherwise forgone Revenue.

Usually, a corresponding perspective has been adopted by those policy analysts concerned with identifying and modelling the 'optimal' design characteristics of taxpayer audit programs. But, in the process, they have presumed that tax administrations make no efforts to *learn* from the results of taxpayer audits. Equally, most policy analysts have presumed that taxpayer audit programs can play no part in tax administrations' efforts to improve the underlying *willingness* and *ability* of taxpayers to comply with their tax obligations.

One important adverse consequence of these presumptions has been that the taxpayer compliance behavior literature has paid very little attention to the major policy issue of how tax administrations should go about allocating their taxpayer audit program resources so as to best manage what the candidate has termed the risks to the Revenue. These risks are defined to be those which stem from the lack of information available to tax administrations about both deliberate and inadvertent noncompliance by taxpayers.

In the empirical part of the taxpayer compliance behavior literature it is now well-appreciated that both the *nature* and the *degree* of taxpayer noncompliance can vary considerably across different categories (*populations*) of taxpayers. Thus the 'risks to the Revenue' can likewise vary considerably across taxpayer populations. In turn, different taxpayer populations may well require different program 'treatments'. Accordingly, it is now being recognised in the empirical literature that much more attention needs to be paid to the types of information tax administrations require about taxpayer noncompliance so as to better perform their central role.

It is already widely agreed by policy analysts that a tax administration's central role is a broad one, and that it entails ensuring, as far as is practicable and socially desirable, all taxpayers pay the correct amounts of tax - preferably voluntarily. However, a tax administration's performance in this regard has to be assessed largely on the results obtained from taxpayer audit programs.

There is therefore a need for a new conceptualisation (model) of what might constitute an 'optimal' taxpayer audit program, and which better captures both the various aspects of taxpayer noncompliance and the information requirements of tax administrations.

The need for such a model has now become an urgent one. This is especially because a number of tax administrations, including the Australian Taxation Office, are no longer seeking to use taxpayer audit program resources principally in the traditional deterrence, 'encouragement' and Revenue-recovery mode. Instead, these resources are increasingly being used to help identify those taxpayer populations, as distinct from individual noncompliant taxpayers, which represent the greatest 'risks to the Revenue'. In turn, the results from taxpayer audits conducted in the 'high risk' populations are being used to help the tax administration determine the most appropriate strategies for improving future compliance in these populations.

It will be argued in this thesis that the capture of these important strategic characteristics of modern taxpayer audit programs cannot be achieved by augmenting the existing deterrence-based models. A complementary model, more suitable for wider policy analysis, is therefore developed which can readily encompass these characteristics. This model is based on the construct of a budget-constrained tax administration seeking to manage the risks to the Revenue in (what is described in the organizational literature as) a Learning Organization environment, and where market segmentation techniques are drawn on when making inter-population resource allocation decisions.

The policy value of this model is then demonstrated by applying it to both quantitative and qualitative data compiled by the candidate for the Business Audit Program of the Australian Taxation Office. In the process, a number of separate, substantive contributions are made to the program monitoring, program evaluation and taxpayer compliance behavior literatures.

Collectively, these contributions provide support for the central argument of this thesis that both taxpayer compliance behavior researchers and policy analysts now need to pay much more attention to the *information-gathering* and *strategic resource allocation* challenges confronting tax administrations. The policy issues arising here, it will be argued, go to the heart of what constitutes successful and accountable tax administration, and (in turn) a 'high integrity' tax regime which is both efficient and equitable.

## **SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS**

| CHAPTER 1  | OVERVIEW OF THESIS   | 1   |
|------------|--|-----|
| CHAPTER 2  | THE ROLES OF TAXPAYER AUDIT PROGRAMS: INSIGHTS FROM THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE   | 33  |
| CHAPTER 3  | FOCUS, APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY  | 56  |
| CHAPTER 4  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN<br>A LEARNING ORGANIZATION ENVIRONMENT  | 88  |
| CHAPTER 5  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT:<br>TAX REGIME AND OPERATIONAL FACTORS   | 130 |
| CHAPTER 6  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT: THE CASE FOR A MARKET SEGMENTATION APPROACH   | 159 |
| CHAPTER 7  | MONITORING TAX ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM PERFORMANCE: THE CASE FOR APPLYING A NEW MODEL                                   | 192 |
| CHAPTER 8  | THE ATO's BUSINESS AUDIT PROGRAM, 1988-1993:<br>ORIGINS, DEVELOPMENTS AND TRENDS                                       | 216 |
| CHAPTER 9  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN PRACTICE:<br>A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ATO's<br>BUSINESS AUDIT PROGRAM 'STRIKE RATE' | 250 |
| CHAPTER 10 | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN PRACTICE:<br>A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ATO'S<br>'PROJECT BASED AUDIT' APPROACH        | 304 |
| CHAPTER 11 | SUMMARY AND MAIN CONCLUSIONS   | 350 |
| POSTSCRIPT |  | 366 |

## CONTENTS

| SYN        | OPSIS   |  | i        |
|------------|---------|--|----------|
| ACK        | NOWLED  | GEMENTS  | i        |
| SUM        | MARY OF | CHAPTERS   |          |
|            |         | PART 1: INTRODUCTION   |          |
| СНА        | PTER 1  | OVERVIEW OF THESIS   |          |
| 1.1        | The Co  | entral Role Of Tax Administrations   | 1        |
| 1.2        |         | nforcement Role  | 5        |
| 1.3        |         | Of Thesis  | 7        |
| 1.4        |         | ablic Policy Perspective   | 11       |
|            | 1.4.1   |  | 11       |
|            | 1.4.2   |  | 14       |
|            | 1.4.3   |  | 15       |
|            | 1.4.4   | The Case For 'Supply-Side' Research  | 17       |
| 1.5        | Summ    | ary And Thesis Structure   | 19       |
| Endn       | otes    |  | 23       |
|            |         | PART 2: AN ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE  |          |
| INTE       | RODUCT  | ION  | 31       |
| CHAPTER 2  |         | THE ROLES OF TAXPAYER AUDIT PROGRAMS: INSIGHTS FROM THE THEORETICAL LITERATURE |          |
|            |         |  |          |
| 2.1        |         |  | 33       |
| 2.2        |         | ompliance Propensity   | 34       |
| 2.3        |         | ence-Based Models Of Taxpayer Audit Programs                                   | 39       |
|            |         | The Expected Utility Paradigm  | 39       |
|            | 2.3.2   | Principal-Agent Models   | 43       |
| <b>.</b> . | 2.3.3   | Game Theoretic Models  | 46       |
| 2.4        | Inferer | ices   | 48<br>50 |
| Endn       | otes    |  | 30       |
| CHA        | PTER 3  | FOCUS, APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY  |          |
| 3.1        | The Fo  | cus  | 56       |
| 3.2        |         |  | 58       |
| 3.3        | The Ap  | pproach  | 59       |
|            | 3.3.1   | Overview   | 59       |
|            | 3.3.2   | Usage Of The Term 'Model'  | 63       |
|            | 3.3.3   | The Nature Of The External Risk Environment                                    | 65       |
|            | 3.3.4   | The Nature Of The Internal Decision-Making Environment                         | 66       |
|            | 3.3.5   | Demonstrating The Merits Of The Model  | 71       |
|            | 3.3.6   | Usage Of The Terms 'Goals', 'Objectives', 'Strategies' And                     |          |
|            |         | 'Tactics'  | 72       |

|       | 3.3.7   | Usage Of The Term 'Optimal'                              | 7   |
|-------|---------|--|-----|
|       | 3.3.8   | Summary  | 75  |
| 3.4   | Genera  | al Methodological Considerations                         | 76  |
|       | 3.4.1   | Ad Hominem Issues  | 70  |
|       | 3.4.2   | Quasi-Participant Observer Status                        | 7   |
| Endno | otes    | •  | 79  |
|       |         |  |     |
|       | PAR     | T 3: MANAGING THE 'RISKS TO THE REVENUE'                 |     |
| INTR  | ODUCT   | ION  | 86  |
| CHA   | PTER 4  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN                             |     |
|       |         | A LEARNING ORGANIZATION ENVIRONMENT                      |     |
| 4 1   | Introd  | u ati a m  | 00  |
| 4.1   |         | <del></del>  | 88  |
| 4.2   |         | elationship Between Strategic Risk Management And        | 0.0 |
|       | Progra  | m Optimisation   | 90  |
| 4.3   | Alterna | ative Constructions Of Risk                              | 92  |
| 4.4   | The As  | sumed Taxpayer Audit Program Strategy And                |     |
|       | Corres  | ponding Objectives                                       | 95  |
|       | 4.4.1   | The Strategy   | 95  |
|       | 4.4.2   | 1 0 )  | 96  |
|       | 4.4.3   | Four Basic Types Of Strategic Risk Management Challenges | 97  |
| 4.5   |         | eral Construct Of Strategic Risk Management              | 99  |
| 4.6   |         | sic Risk Paradigm  | 104 |
|       | 4.6.1   | The Decision Tree  | 104 |
|       | 4.6.2   |  | 109 |
|       |         | Uncertainty Analysis                                     | 110 |
|       |         | Utility Analysis   | 114 |
|       | 4.6.5   | Optimisation Analysis                                    | 114 |
| 4.7   |         | onstructs Of 'Risk' And 'Risk Management' In             |     |
|       | The Ta  | xpayer Compliance Behavior Literature                    | 115 |
| 4.8   | A Wide  | er Perspective On The Basic Risk Paradigm                | 118 |
|       | 4.8.1   | Identifying And Managing Risks                           | 118 |
|       | 4.8.2   | A Taxonomy Of Ignorance                                  | 121 |
|       | 4.8.3   | Summary  | 123 |
| Endno | otes    |  | 123 |
| CHAI  | PTER 5  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT:                               |     |
|       |         | TAX REGIME AND OPERATIONAL FACTORS                       |     |
| 5.1   | Introdu | ıction   | 130 |
| 5.2   | Tax Ad  | ministrations As Regulatory Agencies                     | 132 |
| 5.3   |         | nditional Roles Played By Taxpayer Audit Programs        | 136 |
|       | 5.3.1   | Self-enforcing Tax Regimes                               | 137 |
|       | 5.3.2   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                    | 140 |
|       | 5.3.3   | Quasi-Voluntary Compliance                               | 141 |
|       | 5.3.4   | Summary  | 143 |
| 5.4   | A Typo  | ology Of Taxpayer Audit Program Environments             | 144 |

| 5.5   | -       | tional Aspects Of The Risk Management Process 💂           | 147        |
|-------|---------|---|------------|
|       | 5.5.1   | Context   | 147        |
|       | 5.5.2   | The Policy Importance Of The Resource Allocation Function | 148        |
|       | 5.5.3   | Recognising Risks   | 150        |
|       | 5.5.4   | The Heterogeneity Problem                                 | 152        |
|       | 5.5.5   | Adjusting Risks And Allocating Resources                  | 153        |
|       | 5.5.6   | Evaluating Risks And Tracking Outcomes                    | 154        |
| Endn  | otes    |   | 155        |
| СНА   | PTER 6  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT: THE CASE FOR                   |            |
|       |         | A MARKET SEGMENTATION APPROACH                            |            |
| 6.1   | Introd  |   | 159        |
| 6.2   | v       | ram Evaluation Perspective                                | 161        |
|       | 6.2.1   | A General Constraint                                      | 162        |
| 6.3   |         | ket Segmentation Overview                                 | 163        |
| 6.4   |         | portance Of Fairness In Tax Administration                | 166        |
| 6.5   |         | al Insights From The Literature                           | 167        |
|       | 6.5.1   | Constraints   | 167        |
|       | 6.5.2   | •   | 168        |
| 6.6   | The Ro  | oles Played By Taxpayer Audit Programs In Promoting       | 451        |
|       |         | ver Compliance  | 171        |
|       | 6.6.1   |   | 171        |
|       | 6.6.2   | <b>▲</b>  | 172        |
|       | 6.6.3   | ,                   | 173        |
| 6.7   | 6.6.4   | Improving Compliance Propensities                         | 178        |
| - • - |         | iusai Considerations                                      | 184<br>184 |
| Endn  | otes    |   | 104        |
|       | PA      | RT 4: PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MONITORING                      |            |
|       |         | AND EVALUATION ISSUES                                     |            |
| INTE  | RODUCTI | ON  | 189        |
|       |         |   |            |
| CHA   | PTER 7  | MONITORING TAX ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM                     |            |
|       |         | PERFORMANCE: THE CASE FOR APPLYING                        |            |
|       |         | A NEW MODEL   |            |
| 7.1   | Introdu | action  | 192        |
| 7.2   | The Ba  | sic Input, Output, Outcome Model                          | 194        |
| 7.3   |         | ms In Categorising Program Performance Indicators         | 198        |
| 7.4   |         | ations For The Future Development Of Program              |            |
|       | Perform | nance Indicators For Tax Administrations                  | 201        |
| 7.5   | The Au  | igmented Input, Output, Outcome Model                     | 203        |
| 7.6   |         | ng Ambiguity In Program Performance Indicators            | 205        |
|       | 7.6.1   | Allocative Efficiency And 'X-efficiency'                  | 205        |
|       | 7.6.2   | The Interdependence Problem                               | 208        |
|       | 7.6.3   | 'Quality' Considerations                                  | 210        |
| 7.7   | Conclu  | sions And Observations                                    | 211        |
| Endn  | otes    |   | 212        |

| CHAPTER 8 |  | THE ATO's BUSINESS AUDIT PROGRAM, 1988-1993:              |            |
|-----------|--|---|------------|
|           |  | ORIGINS, DEVELOPMENTS AND TRENDS                          |            |
| 8.1       | Introd   | uction  | 216        |
| 8.2       | Origin   |   | 217        |
| 8.3       | Developments And Trends Over The Period 1988-1993  |   |            |
|           | 8.3.1  | The Audit Monitoring System Database                      | 223<br>223 |
|           | 8.3.2  | 'Project Based' Auditing                                  | 225        |
|           | 8.3.3  | 'Improving Future Compliance' v 'Recovering Otherwise     | ~~~        |
|           | 0.0.0  | Forgone Revenue'  | 226        |
|           | 8.3.4  | The Subsequent Compliance Of Audited Taxpayers            | 227        |
|           | 8.3.5  | General Changes In Program Resource Usage                 | 228        |
|           | 8.3.6  | The Choice Of A Primary Performance Indicator             | 232        |
|           | 8.3.7  | The Audit Strike Rate                                     | 234        |
|           | 8.3.8  | The Impact Of Scoping Audits                              | 238        |
|           | 8.3.9  | The Impact Of Agency-Level 'Change Processes'             | 239        |
|           | 8.3.10   | The Impact Of Changing The Strike Rate 'Dollar Threshold' | 242        |
|           | 8.3.11   | The Changing Mix Of Industries                            | 243        |
|           | 8.3.12   | Substantive Importance And Statistical Significance       | 244        |
| 8.4       | Summa  | ary   | 245        |
| Endno     | tes  |   | 245        |
| CHAD      | TER 9  | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN PRACTICE:                    |            |
| CHAP      | 1ER 9  |   |            |
|           |  | A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ATO'S                      |            |
|           |  | BUSINESS AUDIT PROGRAM 'STRIKE RATE'                      |            |
| 9.1       | Introdu  | ıction  | 250        |
| 9.2       | The Present Approach                               |   | 251        |
| 9.3       | Characteristics Of The Audit Program 'Strike Rate' |   | 253        |
| 9.4       | The Th   | ree Components Of The Observed                            |            |
|           |  | Program 'Strike Rate'                                     | 256        |
|           | 9.4.1  | Definitions And Overview                                  | 256        |
|           | 0.43   | Drasticalities And Dalated Dravious Descarab              | 2/0        |

|     | 9.4.2  | Practicalities And Related Previous Research             | 260 |  |
|-----|--|--|-----|--|
| 9.5 | Determinants Of The ATO's Business Audit Program 'Strike Rate' |  |     |  |
|     | 9.5.1  | Overview   | 263 |  |
|     | 9.5.2  | The Explanatory Variables                                | 264 |  |
|     | 9.5.3  | The Choice Of Modelling Technique                        | 264 |  |
|     | 9.5.4  | The Estimation Model                                     | 266 |  |
|     | 9.5.5  | Sensitivity Tests  | 267 |  |
|     | 9.5.6  | The Results  | 267 |  |
|     | 9.5.7  | Endogeneity Considerations                               | 276 |  |
|     | 9.5.8  | Dollar Threshold Considerations                          | 279 |  |
|     | 9.5.9  | Summary  | 283 |  |
| 9.6 | Accounting For Changes In The Overall Observed 'Strike Rate':  |  |     |  |
|     | -  | pplication Of Regression And Standardisation Techniques  | 284 |  |
|     | 9.6.1  | Introduction   | 284 |  |
|     | 9.6.2  | Resource Allocation, Performance And Interaction Effects | 286 |  |
| 9.7 | The A  | pplication Of Regression Techniques                      | 287 |  |
|     |  |  |     |  |
|     |  |  |     |  |
|     |  |  |     |  |

| 9.8   | The Ap  | pplication Of Standardisation Techniques 💢 💂  | 29 |
|-------|---------|---|----|
|       | 9.8.1   | Introduction  | 29 |
|       | 9.8.2   | The Analysis  | 29 |
|       | 9.8.3   | The Results   | 29 |
| 9.9   | Summa   | ary   | 29 |
| Endno | otes    |   | 3  |
| CHAI  | PTER 10 | STRATEGIC RISK MANAGEMENT IN PRACTICE:<br>A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ATO's<br>'PROJECT BASED AUDIT' APPROACH |    |
| 10.1  | Introdu | ıction  | 30 |
| 10.2  | The Ro  | les Of Qualitative And Secondary Quantitative   |    |
|       |         | m Performance Information   | 3  |
| 10.3  |         | pment And Implementation Of The   |    |
|       | •       | t Based Audit' Approach To Managing   |    |
|       |         | sks To The Revenue'   | 3  |
|       |         | First Steps   | 3: |
|       | 10.3.2  | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,   | 3  |
|       | 10.3.3  | <b>▲</b>  | 3  |
|       | 10.3.4  |   | 3  |
|       | 10.3.5  | 4   | 3: |
|       | 10.3.6  | 1 0   | •  |
|       | . 5     | And Reporting   | 3: |
| 10.4  | _       | ising And Evaluating Risks In A 'Mixed Scanning' Mode   | 32 |
| 10.5  |         | ring Taxpayer Compliance:   | _  |
|       | •       | And Methodological Issues   | 3: |
|       | 10.5.1  | Policy Issues   | 3: |
|       | 10.5.2  | Methodological Issues   | 3  |
| 10.6  | Summar  | У   | 34 |
| Endno | otes    |   | 3  |
| F     | PART 5: | SUMMARY, MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND POSTSCRI  | PT |
| CHAI  | PTER 11 | SUMMARY AND MAIN CONCLUSIONS  |    |
| 11.1  | Summa   |   | 3. |
|       | 11.1.1  | The Need For A New Model Of Tax Administration  | 3  |
|       | 11.1.2  | Ç Ü   | 3. |
|       | 11.1.3  | The Notion Of The Learning Organization  The Application Of Market Commentation Techniques                      | 35 |
|       | 11.1.4  | The Application Of Market Segmentation Techniques   | 3  |
|       | 11.1.5  | Demonstrating The Value Of The New Model  | -  |
|       |         | Of Tax Administration   | 3  |
| 11.2  |         | Conclusions   | 3. |
|       | 11.2.1  | Ambiguities In Quantitative   | ۵. |
|       | 11.00   | Program Performance Indicators  | 35 |
|       | 11.2.2  | The Choice Of A Primary Quantitative  | 21 |
|       |         | Performance Indicator   | 35 |

| 11.2.3           | Zumming.  |      |
|------------------|---|------|
| 11.0             | Performance Indicators  | 359  |
| 11.2.4           | 0   | 360  |
| 11.2.5<br>11.2.6 |   | 361  |
| 11.2.(           | Wider implications  | 363  |
| POSTSCRIP        | T   |      |
| Recent Deve      | lopments In The Australian Taxation Office  | 366  |
|                  | lopments In Risk Management And   | 0.45 |
| Program Per      | formance Monitoring   | 367  |
| APPENDICE        | S   | 369  |
| Appendix 3.1     | Location Of Thesis Within A Wider Research Typology   | 370  |
| Appendix 3.2     | A Brief Organizational Perspective Of The Australian Taxation Office                                  | 372  |
| Appendix 3.3     | A Schematic Representation Of Different Approaches To<br>Modelling Tax Administration Decision-Making | 374  |
| Appendix 4.1     | A Schematic Overview Of The Strategic Risk  Management Domain   | 375  |
| Appendix 7.1     | Related Developments In The Australian Public Service   | 377  |
| Appendix 8.1     | The AMS And SCORE Databases   | 380  |
| Appendix 9.1     | Sensitivity Tests Of The OLS Model  | 385  |
| Appendix 9.2     | A Diagrammatic Representation Of The Resource Allocation, Performance And Interaction Effects         | 389  |
| BIBLIOGRA        | РНҮ   | 391  |
| FIGURES          |   |      |
| Figure 2.1       | The Compliance Propensity Function: A Diagrammatic Representation                                     | 37   |
| Figure 4.1       | The REACT Model Of Strategic Risk Management  | 100  |
| Figure 4.2       | A Sequential Decision Tree  | 105  |
| Figure 4.3       | A Resource Allocation Decision Tree   | 108  |
| Figure 4.4       | A MAUT Resource Allocation Tree   | 113  |
| Figure 4.5       | A Taxonomy Of Ignorance   | 122  |
| Figure 5.1       | A Typology Of Taxpayer Audit Program Environments   | 144  |
| Figure 5.2       | A Typology Of Taxpayer Audit Program Strategies   | 148  |
| Figure 6.1       | The Compliance Propensity Function: A Diagrammatic Representation                                     | 172  |
| Figure 6.2       | Taxpayer Compliance: A Causal Path Representation   | 173  |

| Figure 6.3    | Summary Of Cialdini's Six Compliance Principles  | 181 |
|---------------|--|-----|
| Figure 7.1    | The Basic Input, Output, Outcome (IOO) Model   | 194 |
| Figure 7.2    | Examples Of Performance Indicators For The ATO's Business Audit Program                            | 199 |
| Figure 7.3    | The Augmented Input, Output, Outcome (IOO) Model   | 204 |
| Figure 7.4    | The Relationship Between Allocative And X-Efficiency   | 206 |
| Figure 9.1    | The Observed Strike Rate: Possible Explanatory Variables   | 264 |
| Figure 10.1   | The Main Supporting Roles Of Secondary Quantitative And Qualitative Information                    | 309 |
| Figure 10.2   | The Risk Management Cycle For The ATO's Business Audit Program                                     | 321 |
| Figure 10.3   | Illustrative Noncompliance Prevalence Profiles For Three Taxpayer Populations                      | 342 |
| Figure A3.1.1 | The Four Main Types Of Thesis  | 370 |
| Figure A3.1.2 | Approach Involved In A Thesis With<br>A Theory-Construction Emphasis                               | 371 |
| Figure A3.3.1 | A Schematic Representation Of Different Approaches To Modelling Tax Administration Decision-Making | 374 |
| Figure A4.1.1 | A Schematic Overview Of The Strategic Risk Management Domain                                       | 375 |
| Figure A9.2.1 | A Diagrammatic Representation Of The Resource Allocation,<br>Performance And Interaction Effects   | 390 |
| TABLES        |  |     |
| Table 8.1     | Reduced AMS Database, 1988-1993:<br>Key Program Characteristics And Performance Data:              | 224 |
| Table 8.2     | Single-Year Audits (%), 1988-1993, by Entity Type  | 230 |
| Table 8.3     | Issue-Specific Audits (%), 1988-1993, by Entity Type   | 230 |
| Table 8.4     | Omitted Income Detected, per Audit Hour, per Productive Audit,<br>1988-1993                        | 231 |
| Table 8.5     | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by State   | 234 |
| Table 8.6     | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by Audit Technique Used  | 235 |
| Table 8.7     | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by Number Of Years Audited                                       | 237 |
| Table 8.8     | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by Number Of Hours per Audit                                     | 237 |
| Table 8.9     | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by Scoping And<br>Nonscoping Audits                              | 238 |
| Table 8.10    | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1989-1993, by Auditor ASO Level   | 240 |
| Table 8.11    | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, by Dollar Threshold  | 242 |
| Table 8.12    | Audit Strike Rate (%), 1988-1993, Weighted<br>And Unweighted Versions                              | 244 |
| Table 9.1     | The OLS Industry-specific Estimation Model, 1988-1993  | 268 |
|               |  |     |

| Table | 9.2    | Number Of Unproductive Audit Hours, 1988-1993, by Number Of Years Audited                                    | 271 |
|-------|--------|--|-----|
| Table | 9.3    | Audit Strike Rate (%; \$1 prevalence-based), 1988-1993,<br>by Entity Type                                    | 273 |
| Table | 9.4    | The OLS Industry-Level Estimation Model, 1988-1993,<br>Dollar Threshold Results                              | 280 |
| Table | 9.5    | Consistency Check On The Estimated Values Of The CSER  | 281 |
| Table | 9.6    | Estimates Of The Resource Allocation Index, 1988-1993  | 287 |
| Table | 9.7    | Estimates Of The Resource Allocation (R) Effect, 1988-1993   | 288 |
| Table | 9.8    | Estimates Of The Year-Specific Case Selection Efficiency Rates, 1991-1993                                    | 291 |
| Table | 9.9    | Standardisation Components Of The Observed Strike Rate $(OSR_w)$ , 1988-1993                                 | 296 |
| Table | 9.10   | Major Contributors To The Standardisation Components,<br>1991-1993   | 297 |
| Table | 10.1   | Estimated Level Of Noncompliance: \$000 Omitted Taxable Income per 1000 Taxpayers, by Industry, by Estimator | 338 |
| Table | A8.1.1 | Original And Reduced Number Of AMS cases, 1988-1993  | 382 |
| Table | A8.1.2 | Comparisons Between Original And Reduced AMS databases,<br>1988-1993   | 383 |