



Research on the Impact of Tax Incentives on Total Factor Productivity of Enterprises

Yueru Sheng

School of Economics, Anhui University, Hefei, 230000, China

877478033@qq.com

Abstract. The new round of technological revolution provides strategic opportunities for high-quality development. In the pursuit of the country's new development concept and high-quality development path, total factor productivity is the core factor that determines economic output. This article takes A-share listed companies in Shanghai and Shenzhen from 2012 to 2022 as the research object, and through theoretical and empirical analysis, determines the positive impact of tax preferential policies on improving the overall production efficiency of enterprises. Finally, this article suggests fully leveraging the economic effects brought about by tax incentives policies.

Keywords: Tax incentives; Total factor productivity; Enterprise innovation.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the scale of tax incentives in China has been continuously expanding, with a total tax reduction and fee reduction of nearly 10 trillion yuan from 2019 to 2022. In 2023, tax incentives and dividends will continue to be released, and there will be over 2.2 trillion yuan in new tax cuts, fee reductions, and deferred tax refunds nationwide. Tax incentives can alleviate the tax burden on enterprises, reduce research and development costs, encourage investment in the development of new technologies, products, and processes, and are one of the key factors in improving total factor productivity.

For enterprises, reducing or exempting value-added tax and corporate income tax is a key factor in helping their production and operation. Liu et al. (2019)^[1] constructed a double difference model based on a "quasi natural experiment" and empirically analyzed the positive impact of reducing the value-added tax rate on the disposable cash flow and innovative equipment investment of enterprises; Gemmel et al.(2016)^[11] found that reducing tax rates can increase the production enthusiasm of small enterprises. Wu Yili et al. (2021)^[2] confirmed that "retained tax refunds" can help fully leverage the tax neutrality; Hussain (2015)^[12] used VAR and DSGE calibration models to verify that tax growth suppresses the improvement of total factor productivity, and this inhibitory effect persists for a long time Zheng Baohong et al. (2018)^[3] studied the impact of reducing income tax rates on total factor productivity of enterprises based on income tax

© The Author(s) 2024

Q. Wu et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 3rd International Conference on Public Service, Economic Management and Sustainable Development (PESD 2024)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 309,

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-598-0_57

reform. Guceril Irem(2018)^[13], Mitchell^[14] et al.(2020) believed that tax incentives can reduce the R&D costs and risks of enterprises, thereby increasing their R&D investment level. This article draws on existing research results and uses enterprise micro data as support and basis to explore the impact of tax incentives on total factor productivity of enterprises, and specifically analyzes the ways to achieve this impact.

2 Theoretical Analysis and Research Hypotheses

As the main source of national public finance revenue, taxation directly affects the net profit of enterprises. The heavier the tax burden on enterprises, the less disposable income they have. Tax preferential policies can also release more funds for enterprises to use for daily operations or investments, reduce their dependence on external financing channels, and further promote the formation and flow of capital. ^[12]

Based on this, this article proposes hypothesis : Tax incentives promote the improvement of total factor productivity of enterprises.

3 Model Design and Data Source

3.1 Model Settings

To analyze the specific performance of different enterprises at different time points, a bidirectional fixed effects model is constructed for research.

$$TFP_{i,t}=\alpha_0+\alpha_1 Tax_{i,t}+\alpha_1 controls+\theta_i+\omega_t+\varepsilon_{i,t} \tag{1}$$

i represents the enterprise, t represents time, TFP represents the total factor productivity of the enterprise, Tax represents the tax benefits enjoyed by the enterprise, controls are the control variables, θ_i and ω_t represent the fixed effects and time fixed effects of the enterprise, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is random interference term ^[4].

3.2 Variable Selection

1. Explained variable. Total factor productivity is a measure of the production efficiency of a production unit after integrating all input factors.

2. Core explanatory variable: tax incentives, refer to Liu Guangqiang (2016) ^[5]: received tax refunds/(received tax refunds+paid tax refunds).

3. Control variables: This article selects some enterprise development indicators as control variables ^[6]. The specific variables are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Variable Declaration

| Variable type | Variable name | Variable symbol | Variable definition |
|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Explained Variable | Total factor productivity | TFP_LP | Total factor productivity of enterprises estimated by LP method |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------|---|
| Explanatory variable | Tax incentives | Tax | Tax refund/(tax refund+paid taxes)) |
| Intermediary variable | Technological innovation | Patent | The natural logarithm of the number of invention patent applications plus 1 |
| | Enterprise scale | Size | Natural logarithm of annual total assets |
| Control variable | Asset liability ratio | Lev | Total liabilities of the enterprise divided by total assets |
| | Profitability | ROA | Enterprise net profit /total assets |
| | Development capability | Growth | Business input growth rate |
| | Shareholding ratio of the largest shareholder | Top1 | Shareholding ratio of the largest shareholder |

3.3 Data Source

This article selects panel data of A-share listed companies in Shanghai and Shenzhen from 2012 to 2022 as samples, and processes them by: (1) removing samples with missing key financial indicators; (2) Exclude ST and ST * companies; (3) To eliminate the influence of outliers, perform a 1% tail reduction on continuous variables. Finally, 1353 companies and 14883 observations were obtained^[7].

4 Empirical Result Analysis

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

As shown in Table 2, the maximum and minimum values of total factor productivity are 11.236 and 4.064, respectively, with an average of 8.400, indicating that the total factor productivity of most enterprises has reached a certain standard. The maximum value of Tax is 0.809, the minimum value is 0.000, and the standard deviation is 0.198, indicating that there are certain differences in the tax relief obtained by each enterprise.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

| Variable | Sample size | Minimum value | Mean value | Maximum value | standard deviation |
|----------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------|--------------------|
| TFP_LP | 14883 | 4.064 | 8.400 | 11.236 | 1.403 |
| Patent | 14883 | 0.000 | 2.057 | 6.535 | 1.641 |
| Tax | 14883 | 0.000 | 0.149 | 0.809 | 0.198 |
| Size | 14883 | 20.259 | 22.660 | 26.344 | 1.322 |
| Lev | 14883 | 0.061 | 0.442 | 0.866 | 0.198 |
| ROA | 14883 | -0.147 | 0.040 | 0.204 | 0.053 |
| Growth | 14883 | -0.497 | 0.132 | 1.700 | 0.315 |
| Top1 | 14883 | 0.089 | 0.343 | 0.729 | 0.148 |

4.2 Benchmark Regression Analysis

As shown in Table 3. The regression process of column (1) only explores the effect of tax incentives on the total factor productivity of enterprises. Columns (1) - (9) gradually added control variables for research, and the impact coefficients were significant at the 1% level. Column (9) indicates that after adding all control variables, for every one percentage point increase in tax incentives, the total factor productivity of enterprises increases by 0.259 percentage points. Hypothesis 1 is validated.

Table 3. Benchmark Regression Analysis

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP | TFP_LP |
| Tax | 0.161*** (2.85) | 0.175*** (3.43) | 0.153*** (3.01) | 0.255*** (5.12) | 0.249*** (5.04) | 0.248*** (5.03) | 0.249*** (5.05) | 0.249*** (5.06) | 0.259*** (5.25) |
| Size | | 0.827*** (40.14) | 0.803*** (37.15) | 0.754*** (34.87) | 0.742*** (34.39) | 0.742*** (34.40) | 0.741*** (34.34) | 0.741*** (34.08) | 0.745*** (34.30) |
| Lev | | | 0.297*** (4.04) | 0.673*** (8.79) | 0.575*** (7.50) | 0.573*** (7.47) | 0.565*** (7.33) | 0.565*** (7.33) | 0.558*** (7.26) |
| ROA | | | | 2.470*** (16.91) | 1.895*** (12.42) | 1.910*** (12.52) | 1.906*** (12.51) | 1.906*** (12.51) | 1.694*** (10.83) |
| Growth | | | | | 0.232*** (10.92) | 0.234*** (10.97) | 0.234*** (10.97) | 0.234*** (10.97) | 0.234*** (10.99) |
| Top1 | | | | | | -0.188* (-1.68) | -0.175 (-1.56) | -0.174 (-1.56) | -0.163 (-1.46) |
| Age | | | | | | | 0.085 (0.77) | 0.086 (0.77) | 0.074 (0.67) |
| Board | | | | | | | | 0.012 (0.23) | 0.014 (0.25) |
| Cash | | | | | | | | | 0.586 *** (5.28) |
| Sample size | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 | 14883 |
| R ² | 0.807 | 0.845 | 0.846 | 0.850 | 0.852 | 0.852 | 0.852 | 0.852 | 0.852 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

4.3 Robustness Test

Replace the Explained Variable. This article further uses the OLS method to re measure total factor productivity, as shown in column (1) of Table 4. The regression coefficient of Tax is 0.215 and significant at the 1% significance level.

Lag by One Period. To reduce the adverse effects of potential endogeneity issues, the approach of lagged the core explanatory variable by one period was adopted, and the results showed that: L The regression coefficient of Tax is 0.125, which passed the 1% significance test.

Table 4. Robustness Test

| Variable | Replace OLS method(1) | Lag by one period(2) |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | TFP OLS | TFP LP |
| Tax | 0.215*** (4.501) | |
| L.Tax | | 0.125*** (2.586) |
| Sample size | 14,883 | 13,530 |
| R ² | 0.898 | 0.864 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

4.4 Heterogeneity Analysis

Heterogeneity of Enterprise Property Rights. As shown in Table 5, the regression results for both state-owned and non-state-owned enterprises are significantly positive at the 1% level, but the impact of tax incentives on state-owned enterprises is more significant because they are more likely to obtain resources and financial support. The incentive effects of fiscal and tax policies on R&D investment vary among enterprises with different equity types, and state-owned enterprises are more conducive to using fiscal and tax policies to encourage enterprises to invest in technological innovation. (Yu Xiaoyu et al., 2019^[8]; Xu Nini et al., 2020^[9]; Wei Shuyu et al., 2021^[10])

Heterogeneity of Enterprise Scale. This article divides the research objects into large-scale enterprises and small-scale enterprises based on the average size of enterprises. The results show that the regression results of small-scale enterprises are significantly positive at the 1% level, while large-scale enterprises did not pass the significance test. This is because small-scale enterprises are often more sensitive to tax incentives due to limitations in their business scale and financial capabilities.

Table 5. Heterogeneity Analysis

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Variable | State-owned | Non-state-owned | Large-scale | Small-scale |
| Tax | 0.433*** (5.083) | 0.159*** (2.607) | -0.058 (-1.302) | 0.571*** (7.531) |
| Sample size | 6,542 | 8,319 | 6,536 | 8,261 |
| R ² | 0.872 | 0.829 | 0.929 | 0.750 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

5 Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The study found that: (1) tax incentives have a significant driving effect on total factor productivity; (2) The analysis of intermediary effects reveals that some of the pathways through which tax incentives promote total factor productivity of enterprises are achieved through strengthening innovation activities. After endogeneity and robustness tests, the conclusion still holds true.

Based on the above research results, suggestions are proposed:

5.1 Deepen Tax Reform and Stimulate Innovation Vitality

Deeply study the needs and pain points of enterprise innovation and development, construct a scientific and reasonable tax preferential policy system, focus on technology innovation enterprises and manufacturing enterprises, accurately implement tax reduction and fee reduction policies, strengthen policy guidance, guide various factor resources to invest in the real economy, create a better development environment for enterprises, and promote the economy towards a high-quality development path.

5.2 Lowering the Eligibility Threshold and Relaxing Preferential Conditions

Design targeted tax incentives to expand tax policies to a wider range of industries and economically underdeveloped areas, alleviate financing constraints, and promote regional development balance. At the same time, it is necessary to balance the stimulating effect of lowering the threshold and the potential risk of tax losses to avoid policy abuse.

5.3 Collaborate with Fiscal and Tax Policies to Optimize the Development Environment

According to the needs of economic development, various policy tools should be used to moderately expand the scale of fiscal expenditure, adjust and optimize the tax structure and fiscal expenditure structure, effectively compensate for market failures, better play the regulatory role of fiscal and tax policies, and help enterprises make long-term investment and business decisions.

References

1. Liu Xing, Zhao Jianyu Tax incentives and corporate innovation: a "quasi natural experiment" based on value-added tax transformation reform *Accounting Research*, 2019, (09): 43-49.
2. Wu Yili, Lv Changjiang, Ni Chenkai Can the retention and refund of value-added tax promote enterprise risk-taking? [J]. *Accounting Research*, 2022, (12): 46-59.
3. Zheng Baohong, Zhang Zhaoguo Will the reduction of corporate income tax rate affect total factor productivity—— Empirical evidence from listed companies in China [J] *Accounting Research*, 2018, (05): 13-20.

4. Song Jian, Bao Chen Can tax incentives stimulate innovation in Chinese enterprises——Exploration from the Perspective of Innovation Chain [J] Journal of Nanjing Audit University, 2023, 20 (01): 60-67.
5. Liu Guangqiang, Analysis of the Incentive Effects of Tax Preferential and Fiscal Subsidy Policies: An Empirical Study from the Perspective of Asymmetric Information Theory [J] Managing the World, 2016, (10): 62-71.
6. Zhou Xuan, Liu Yanhong, Liu Ran The current situation, problems and policy suggestions of tax policies for Chinese venture capital enterprises [J] Fiscal Research, 2012, (07): 37-40.
7. Wang Pei, Huang Shan, Yang Zhijie, Guo Fan Research on the Impact of Environmental Protection Tax on Enterprise Green Total Factor Productivity [J] Tax Research, 2022, (11): 66-73.
8. Yu Xiaoyu, Zhuang Qinqin The impact of government subsidies on innovation of high-tech enterprises in China: taking listed companies in the information technology industry as an example Technology and Economics, 2019, 38 (04): 15-22.
9. Xu Nini, Guo Junhua Research on the Impact of Government Subsidies on Technological Innovation in the Electronic Information Industry: Empirical Evidence from Chinese Listed Companies [J] Industrial Technology and Economics, 2020, 39 (06): 13-20.
10. Wei Shuyu, Xiao Peng Tax incentives, fiscal subsidies, and corporate R&D investment: empirical analysis based on Shanghai and Shenzhen A-share listed companies [J] Tax Research, 2021, (05): 40-46.
11. Gemmel N, Kneller R, McGowan D, et al. Corporate Taxation and Productivity Catch-Up: Evidence from European firms[J]. Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 2016, 120(2): 372-399.
12. Huusain S M. The Contractionary Effects of Tax Shocks on Productivity: An Empirical and Theoretical Analysis[J]. Journal of Macroeconomics, 2015, 43: 93-107.
13. Gucer Irem. Will the Real R&D Employees Please Stand UP? Effect of Tax Breaks on Firm-Level Outcomes[J]. International Tax and Public Finance. 2018, 25: 1-63.
14. Mitchell Jessica, Testa Giuseppina, Martinez Mguel Sanchez, Cunningham Paul N, Sakuta Katarzyna. Tax Incentives for R&D: Supporting innovative scale-ups?[J] Research Evaluation. 2020, 29: 121-134.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

