The Relationship between Taxes and Economic Growth among the 20 Largest Manufacturing States

Leondra S. Lawson

VIGRE/ALLIANCE Summer Program University of Iowa

Outline

- •Objectives
- Empirical Strategy
- Study Region and Data
- Preliminary Findings
- Conclusion
- Next Steps

Objectives

Is there statistical evidence to suggest a relationship between business taxes and economic growth?

- Existing research suggests that a ten percent decrease in taxes would cause a one to six percent increase in state economic growth.
- Existing research used average taxes when businesses are concerned with marginal taxes.
- We model the growth in value added for 15 manufacturing industries in the 20 largest manufacturing states as a function of product demand, worker wages, and the marginal business tax rates estimated from the representative firm method described in Peters and Fisher (2002 and 2004).

Empirical Strategy

Aggregated Model

1) $\ln Y_{s,m,2000} - \ln Y_{s,m,1989} = \mathbf{X}_{s} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{s} + u_{s}$ 2) $\ln Y_{s,m,2000} - \ln Y_{s,m,1989} = \mathbf{X}_{s} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{s} + \boldsymbol{\rho} \mathbf{W} (\ln Y_{s,m,2000} - \ln Y_{s,m,1989}) + u_{s}$ 3) $u_{s} = \lambda \mathbf{W} u + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{s}$

$\frac{\text{Industry Model}}{4) \quad \ln Y_{i, s, 2000} - \ln Y_{i, s, 1989} = \mathbf{X}_{i, s} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{x} + F_{i} + u_{i, s}}{5) \quad \ln Y_{i, s, 2000} - \ln Y_{i, s, 1989} = \mathbf{X}_{i, s} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{x} + F_{i} + F_{s} + u_{i, s}}{u_{i, s}} = v_{s} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i, s}$

Variables

<u>Dependent Variables</u> $\left(\ln y_{s,2000} - \ln y_{s,1989}\right)$

Natural log of growth in industry value added 1989-2000 for industry models or manufacturing value added for aggregate models $(\ln growth_{s,2000})$

Independent Variables $(\mathbf{X}_{i,s})$

- 1. Natural log of expected state industry value added in 2000 given growth in national industry value added 1989 to 2000 $(\ln shift_{i,s})$
- 2. Predicted natural log wage index for 1990 $(\ln wage_{i,s})$
- 3. Natural log of marginal business tax rate in 1990 $(\ln taxrate_{i,s})$





300 State-Industry Combinations Taxes and Growth



Preliminary Findings

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
constant	-0.0601 (3.03532)	0.1206 (2.6999)	-0.0246 (2.6473)	1.2665 (0.6796)	1.6530 (0.9573)	1.3826 (0.7153)
ln <i>shift</i> _{i, s}	0.0394 (0.0675)	0.0403 (0.0598)	0.0399 (0.0607)	-0.0383 (0.0241)	-0.0847 (0.0322)*	-0.0598 (0.0275)*
lnwage _{i, s}	0.0757 (1.0971)	0.0323 (0.9720)	0.0541 (0.9563)	-0.2481 (0.2464)	-0.1671 (0.2800)	-0.2149 (0.2551)
Intaxrate _{i, s}	0.1287 (0.1086)	0.1213 (0.0963)	0.1228 (0.0983)	0.0534 (0.0505)	0.0967 (0.1847)	0.0693 (0.0729)
ρ	n/a	-0.3581 (0.6589)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
λ	n/a	n/a	-0.2181 (0.6280)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Industry fixed effects	n/a	n/a	n/a	yes	yes	yes
State fixed effects	n/a	n/a	n/a	no	yes	no
State random effects	n/a	n/a	n/a	no	no	yes
AIC/ (Pseudo) R ²	AIC=-11.179	AIC=-9.4	AIC =-9.2698	R ²⁼ 0.5107	R ²⁼ 0.5869	R ²⁼ 0.5369

Residuals





Residuals



Map by: Leondra S. Lawson

Spatial Autocorrelation



Conclusion/Next Steps

- H_o: taxes have no effect on growth
- Unable to reject H_o
- We expect that the estimators are biased due to not accounting for public services such as education that are valued by firms.
- There also may the possibility that in contrast to the assumption that taxes affect growth, growth may be influencing the tax rates.
- Instrumental Variables Estimator

Thank You!!!