International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 08 Issue: 12 | Dec - 2024 SJIF Rating: 8.448 ISSN: 2582-3930

# Effectiveness of Corporate Tax Incentives in Attracting Investments

Dr. Kiran Kumar M, Vishal M Pawar, Sukeerth Antony, Bikramaditya Sarkar

1 Assistant Professor – Finance, 2 MBA Student of Finance, 3 MBA Student of Finance Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka – 560009

1 kiranm287@gmail.com, 2 vishal_murali23@cms.ac.in, 3 sukeerth_antony23@cms.ac.in,

4 bikramaditya_sarkar23@cms.ac.in

**Abstract**

Corporate tax incentives are widely used by developing nations to attract investments, stimulate economic activity, and drive industrial growth. This study investigates the effectiveness of these incentives in achieving their intended goals by analysing macroeconomic data from a diverse sample of developing economies over the past two decades. The research focuses on the relationship between tax policies and key investment indicators such as foreign direct investment (FDI), domestic capital formation, and economic growth metrics like GDP, employment, and productivity.

Using a combination of panel data regression and time-series econometric techniques, the study identifies critical factors that mediate the success of tax incentives, including the quality of governance, infrastructure development, and ease of doing business. Preliminary findings suggest that while corporate tax incentives are effective in attracting short-term investments, their long-term impact on economic growth is contingent on broader economic and institutional frameworks. The analysis also highlights potential trade-offs, such as revenue loss and inequality, stemming from poorly designed tax policies.

This paper contributes to the literature by providing empirical evidence on the conditional effectiveness of tax incentives and offering actionable policy recommendations. The findings aim to assist policymakers in designing balanced tax regimes that promote sustainable economic growth without undermining fiscal stability.

## 1. Introduction

Corporate tax incentives have emerged as a salient policy instrument for governments looking to drive economic development, especially in developing countries where the competition for FDI is so rife. In this sense, incentives may include reduced tax rates, tax holidays, or accelerated depreciation, and are aimed at making an investment environment more attractive to reduce the burden of costs on businesses. Proponents also point out that in fact such measures catalyse growth as they attract capital, provide jobs, and spur innovation. A lot remains debated in academic and policy circles about the effectiveness of such incentives.

The rationale behind corporate tax incentives is derived from the potential of bridging critical gaps in developing economies. Most of these countries also struggle with structural issues like poor infrastructure, limited access to capital, and prohibitively costly business environments - all of which discourage not just the international investor but the domestic one as well. Tax incentives are supposed to offset these disadvantages by giving firms short-term relief and encouraging long-term commitment to a region. For many policymakers, the promise of these policies of

increased investment leading to job creation, enhanced industrial capacity, and export growth outweighs the revenues forgone.

However, in practice, neither of these policy outcomes is typically achieved. Critics point out that tax incentives often result in major revenue losses without any gain in investment or economic growth. At times, they are charged with encouraging a "race to the bottom," where countries progressively reduce tax rates to undercut competition, thereby weakening fiscal integrity and introducing unfairness into the tax system. Moreover, the benefits of incentives such as these often heavily depend on the overall economic and institutional environment, such as governance quality, legal underpinnings, and the existence of complementary infrastructure.

The stakes are high in developing nations. Their fiscal revenue is heavily dependent on corporate taxes. The fiscal cost of implementing tax incentives often tends to be pretty high, yet the potential benefits may include not only attracting multinational corporations in general but also building those local supply chains, encouraging technology development, and various others. Therefore, understanding the conditions under which corporate tax incentives succeed or fail is key to crafting strategies that balance fiscal sustainability with economic growth.

It discusses in detail this complex relationship between corporate tax incentives and economic growth, putting into consideration how these policies affect investment patterns, plus broader macroeconomic outcomes. By analysing data from a range of developing economies, it works towards clarifying the efficiency of tax incentives as a policy tool, contributing to the debate over whether tax incentives play a significant role in economic development.

## 2. Literature Review

Corporate tax incentives include lower rates and holidays that are considered as attracting FDI in developing economies. According to global organizations, such as UNCTAD, these have triggered investments, particularly competitive tax environments. In Indonesia, regional development was boosted by targeted tax allowances, whereas tax holidays spurred growth in African manufacturing.

However, the macro-economic effects of such incentives differ with governance quality. Studies indicate that tax policies, which are linked to FDI, often have a profound effect on GDP, though their effectiveness depends on investments in education, trade openness, and institutional frameworks. Among these, weak governance dampens the returns, while robust legal systems maximize the gains.

Fiscal trade-offs include the erosion of revenue. Studies suggest that suboptimal tax policy design leads to inefficiencies and "race to the bottom" tax competition that undermines fiscal stability. Technology has emerged as a solution for improving tax administration and enhancing transparency. Thus, an example is Brazil's AI-based tax system, which led to increased compliance levels, enabling investor trust.

Complementary policies, like investment in infrastructure and trade liberalization, are essential. Tax holidays with reforms set South Asia on a road to sustainable growth. The severity of the inconsistent enforcement of tax policy discourages investors, whereas poor monitoring apparatus lends itself to misuse.

In the long term, tax incentives create economic growth by promoting technology transfer and innovation. The benefits of incentives to multinational corporations often translate into new practices adopted by local firms. However, these are multiplied with skill development and supply chain integration, as in East Africa.

In summary, tax incentives are influential tools but do not work without careful design, complementary institutional support, and reform.

## 3. Objectives of The Study

1. To analyse the Effectiveness of Corporate Tax Incentives
2. To examine the relationship between tax policies and economic growth
3. To examine Issues in Implementing Tax Incentives
4. To analyse revenue loss vs. economic gains
5. To know the Impact on Regions and Sectors

## 4. Research Methodology

This study aims to follow a methodological process that identifies companies systematically for analyses in terms of the effectiveness of their corporate tax incentives in attracting investments and resulting impact on economic growth in developing nations. It will utilize a combination of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to give broader illumination about the subject.

a) Research Design
   - Type of study: This will adopt an explanatory and analytical approach, with a focus on the relationship between corporate tax incentives, investment inflows, and economic growth.

- Framework: The study bases its approach on empirical research, resorting to secondary macroeconomic data supported by case studies to illustrate the practical applications and outcomes.

b) Data Collection Methods
- Secondary Data:
  - Macroeconomic data gathered from international bodies including the International Monetary Fund, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and the World Bank databases.
  - Financial and fiscal reports published by the government itself, like tax policy statements and investment statistics.
  - Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and industry reports available from OECD, PwC, BCG, among others.
- Case Studies:
  - Case studies of particular developing countries such as Indonesia, Kenya, and Vietnam to demonstrate the application and results of corporate tax incentives.
  - Sectoral analysis where the sector includes, for example, manufacturing, technology, and renewable energy industry types that are frequently targeted by tax incentives.

c) Data Analysis Techniques
- Quantitative Analysis:
  - Statistical tools will be used to analyse the nexus between tax incentives and economic indicators such as FDI inflows, GDP growth, Such techniques include:
    - Regression Analysis: To determine whether tax incentives have a causal impact on economic growth indicators.
    - Correlation Analysis: To evaluate the relationship between investment patterns and fiscal policies over time.
- Qualitative Analysis:
  - Content analysis of policy documents, academic studies, and industry reports to identify recurring themes and challenges associated with tax incentives.
  - Comparative analysis of the successes and failures of tax policies between different countries.

d) Sampling
- Period Coverage: The analysis involves data covering the last 10 years to cover recent trends and policy reforms in corporate tax incentives.
- Geographic Coverage: Countries from the developing world in different regions across Asia, Africa, and Latin America to give a global view.

e) Limitations
- Reliance on secondary data may limit the ability to account for unreported factors influencing tax incentives.

- Variability in data quality and policy implementation across countries may introduce challenges in comparability.

## 5. Data Analysis

Data has been collected from three developing nations across three different regions namely India, South Africa and Brazil for the past 10 years regarding their corporate tax rate, GDP and Foreign Direct Investment received by them, the data is as follows:

| Year | India Corp.Tax | India Gdp | India FDI($Billion) | South Africa Corp.Tax | South Africa GDP | South Africa FDI($Billion) | Brazil Corp.Tax | Brazil GDP | Brazil.FDI($Billion) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2014 | 33.99 | 7.41023 | 34.58 | 28 | 1.4 | 5.79 | 34 | 0.50 | 87.71 |
| 2015 | 34.61 | 7.99625 | 44.06 | 28 | 1.4 | 1.52 | 34 | -3.55 | 64.74 |
| 2016 | 34.61 | 8.25631 | 44.48 | 28 | 0.7 | 2.22 | 34 | -3.28 | 74.29 |
| 2017 | 34.61 | 6.79538 | 34.9 | 28 | 1.2 | 2.06 | 34 | 1.32 | 68.89 |
| 2018 | 34.61 | 6.45385 | 42.15 | 28 | 1.6 | 5.57 | 34 | 1.78 | 78.18 |
| 2019 | 25.17 | 3.87144 | 52.55 | 28 | 0.3 | 5.12 | 34 | 1.22 | 69.17 |
| 2020 | 25.17 | -5.77772 | 64.07 | 28 | -6 | 3.15 | 34 | -3.28 | 38.27 |
| 2021 | 25.17 | 9.68959 | 44.73 | 28 | 4.7 | 40.66 | 34 | 4.76 | 46.44 |
| 2022 | 34.94 | 6.98704 | 49.35 | 28 | 1.9 | 9.24 | 34 | 3.02 | 74.61 |
| 2023 | 34.94 | 7.58397 | 28.16 | 27 | 0.6 | 3.44 | 34 | 2.91 | 64.23 |

### a) Descriptive Statistics:

| Country | Variable | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| India | Corporate Tax Rate (%) | 31.78 | 4.57 | 25.17 | 34.94 |
| | GDP Growth Rate (%) | 5.93 | 4.37 | -5.78 | 9.69 |
| | FDI Inflows ($Billion) | 43.9 | 10.17 | 28.16 | 64.07 |
| South Afric | Corporate Tax Rate (%) | 27.9 | 0.32 | 27 | 28 |
| | GDP Growth Rate (%) | 0.78 | 2.68 | -6 | 4.7 |
| | FDI Inflows ($Billion) | 7.88 | 11.75 | 1.52 | 40.66 |
| Brazil | Corporate Tax Rate (%) | 34 | 0 | 34 | 34 |
| | GDP Growth Rate (%) | 0.54 | 2.95 | -3.55 | 4.76 |
| | FDI Inflows ($Billion) | 66.65 | 14.66 | 38.27 | 87.71 |

**Observations**:

1. **India**:
   - Corporate Tax Rate:
     - The average corporate tax rate over the years was 31.78%, with a range from 25.17% to 34.94%.
     - The relatively high standard deviation (4.57%) reflects notable variations in tax rates during the observed period, likely due to reforms aimed at boosting investment.

- GDP Growth Rate:
    - India experienced an average growth rate of 5.93%, with significant volatility (standard deviation of 4.37%) ranging from a contraction of -5.78% (in 2020 due to the pandemic) to a peak of 9.69%.
    - This suggests both robust growth and vulnerability to economic shocks.
- FDI Inflows:
    - Average FDI inflows were $43.90 billion, with substantial variation (standard deviation of $10.17 billion), ranging from $28.16 billion to $64.07 billion.
    - The significant increase in FDI inflows post-2019 may reflect the impact of lower corporate tax rates and reforms designed to attract investment.

2. **South Africa**:

- Corporate Tax Rate:
    - The corporate tax rate remained stable at an average of 27.90%, with minimal variation (standard deviation of 0.32%), ranging between 27% and 28%.
    - This stability reflects a consistent tax policy but potentially lacks competitiveness compared to dynamic changes in other nations.
- GDP Growth Rate:
    - South Africa's GDP growth averaged a modest 0.78%, with wide fluctuations (standard deviation of 2.68%) and a range from -6% (in 2020) to 4.7%.
    - The negative average highlights structural challenges and susceptibility to global economic shocks.
- FDI Inflows:
    - FDI inflows averaged $7.88 billion, with a high standard deviation ($11.75 billion) indicating volatility. Inflows ranged from $1.52 billion to $40.66 billion.
    - The sharp spike in 2021 may be linked to recovery efforts post-pandemic or one-time large investments.

**3. Brazil:**

- Corporate Tax Rate:
    - The corporate tax rate was constant at 34%, indicating no policy changes during the observed period.
    - The lack of variation suggests stability, but this might have limited Brazil's competitiveness in attracting additional FDI.
- GDP Growth Rate:
    - Brazil's average GDP growth was 0.54%, with significant fluctuations (standard deviation of 2.95%) ranging from -3.55% to 4.76%.
    - The volatility highlights cyclical economic performance, likely influenced by domestic and global factors.

- FDI Inflows:
  - FDI inflows averaged $66.65 billion, the highest among the three countries, with a range of $38.27 billion to $87.71 billion.
  - Despite economic challenges, Brazil remains a popular destination for FDI, possibly due to its large consumer market and resource base.

**b) Correlation Analysis and Observations**

| Country | Variable Pair | Correlation Coefficien | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **India** | Corporate Tax Rate vs. GDP Growth Rate | 0.36 | A moderate positive correlation, suggesting that higher corporate tax rates might be somewhat associated with better economic growth in India, though other factors are likely influencing this relationship. |
| | Corporate Tax Rate vs. FDI Inflows | -0.25 | A weak negative correlation, indicating that higher corporate tax rates could slightly discourage FDI inflows, but the relationship is not strong enough to be definitive. |
| | GDP Growth Rate vs. FDI Inflows | 0.83 | A strong positive correlation, indicating that periods of stronger economic growth are generally associated with higher FDI inflows in India, which suggests that investors are attracted to a growing economy. |
| **South Africa** | Corporate Tax Rate vs. GDP Growth Rate | 0.10 | A very weak positive correlation, suggesting that the tax rate has little to no direct relationship with GDP growth in South Africa. Other factors, such as political stability or global economic conditions, may be more influential. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Corporate Tax Rate vs. FDI Inflows | -0.22 | A weak negative correlation, indicating that higher corporate taxes may slightly discourage FDI, although this is not a strong enough relationship to form a conclusive pattern. |
| | GDP Growth Rate vs. FDI Inflows | 0.46 | A moderate positive correlation, meaning that as South Africa's economy grows, it tends to attract more foreign investment, though the relationship isn't perfect and other factors likely play a role. |
| **Brazil** | Corporate Tax Rate vs. GDP Growth Rate | 0.13 | A weak positive correlation, implying that corporate tax rates have a minimal effect on GDP growth in Brazil. This weak correlation suggests that Brazil's economic growth may depend more on other variables such as political stability and global commodity prices. |
| | Corporate Tax Rate vs. FDI Inflows | 0.06 | A very weak positive correlation, indicating that changes in corporate tax rates have a very small or almost no impact on FDI inflows in Brazil. Other factors, such as Brazil's large domestic market or its resources, might be more significant drivers of FDI. |
| | GDP Growth Rate vs. FDI Inflows | 0.52 | A moderate positive correlation, indicating that higher economic growth in Brazil is generally linked with increased FDI inflows, but again, other factors are likely contributing to the relationship. |

### c) Regression Analysis

1. **India:** with the dependent variable being Foreign direct investment and independent variable being Corporate Taxes.

SUMMARY OUTPUT

| *Regression Statistics* | |
|---|---|
| Multiple R | 0.663158244 |
| R Square | 0.439778857 |
| Adjusted R Squ | 0.369751214 |
| Standard Error | 8.074722433 |
| Observations | 10 |

ANOVA

| | *df* | *SS* | *MS* | *F* | *Significance F* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 1 | 409.468071 | 409.468071 | 6.280075104 | 0.036597848 |
| Residual | 8 | 521.609139 | 65.20114237 | | |
| Total | 9 | 931.07721 | | | |

| | *Coefficients* | *Standard Error* | *t Stat* | *P-value* | *Lower 95%* | *Upper 95%* | *Lower 95.0%* | *Upper 95.0%* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 90.81136057 | 18.89172254 | 4.806939144 | 0.001343572 | 47.24697027 | 134.3757509 | 47.24697027 | 134.3757509 |
| India Corp.Tax | -1.475941117 | 0.588961102 | -2.506007802 | 0.036597848 | -2.834087853 | -0.11779438 | -2.834087853 | -0.11779438 |

RESIDUAL OUTPUT

| *Observation* | *Predicted India FDI($Billion)* | *Residuals* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 40.64412201 | -6.064122015 |
| 2 | 39.72903852 | 4.330961478 |
| 3 | 39.72903852 | 4.750961478 |
| 4 | 39.72903852 | -4.829038522 |
| 5 | 39.72903852 | 2.420961478 |
| 6 | 53.66192266 | -1.111922662 |
| 7 | 53.66192266 | 10.40807734 |
| 8 | 53.66192266 | -8.931922662 |
| 9 | 39.24197795 | 10.10802205 |
| 10 | 39.24197795 | -11.08197795 |

PROBABILITY OUTPUT

| *Percentile* | *India FDI($Billion)* |
|---|---|
| 5 | 28.16 |
| 15 | 34.58 |
| 25 | 34.9 |
| 35 | 42.15 |
| 45 | 44.06 |
| 55 | 44.48 |
| 65 | 44.73 |
| 75 | 49.35 |
| 85 | 52.55 |
| 95 | 64.07 |

**Observations**:

- **Multiple R = 0.663**: The correlation coefficient between the independent variable (India Corporate Tax) and the dependent variable (India FDI) is 0.663, which indicates a moderate positive correlation.
- **R Square = 0.440**: The coefficient of determination suggests that approximately 44% of the variability in India's FDI inflows can be explained by the changes in the corporate tax rate.
- **Adjusted R Square = 0.370**: After adjusting for the number of predictors in the model, 37% of the variance in FDI is explained, which is still a moderate fit.
- **Regression df = 1**: This indicates there is 1 independent variable (India Corporate Tax) being tested in the regression model.
- **Significance F = 0.0366**: Since this is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a statistically significant relationship between India's corporate tax rate and FDI inflows.
- **India Corporate Tax Coefficient = -1.476**: For each one-unit increase in India's corporate tax rate, the FDI inflows are predicted to decrease by 1.476 billion USD. This suggests a negative relationship between corporate tax rate and FDI inflows.

- **P-value = 0.0366**: Since the p-value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the corporate tax rate has a significant effect on FDI inflows.
- **For India Corporate Tax**: The 95% confidence interval for the corporate tax coefficient is between **-2.83 and -0.12**, confirming the negative effect of corporate tax rate on FDI.

**Key finding**

The regression shows a significant negative relationship between India's corporate tax rate and its FDI inflows, with a higher corporate tax rate leading to lower FDI. About 44% of the variation in India's FDI inflows can be explained by changes in corporate tax rates, which is a moderate explanatory power for the model.

2. **South Africa**: with the dependent variable being Foreign direct investment and independent variable being Corporate Taxes.

SUMMARY OUTPUT

| *Regression Statistics* | |
|---|---|
| Multiple R | 0.132703456 |
| R Square | 0.017610207 |
| Adjusted R Square | -0.105188517 |
| Standard Error | 12.35045242 |
| Observations | 10 |

ANOVA

| | *df* | *SS* | *MS* | *F* | *Significance F* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 1 | 21.87441 | 21.87441 | 0.143407087 | 0.714769447 |
| Residual | 8 | 1220.2694 | 152.533675 | | |
| Total | 9 | 1242.14381 | | | |

| | *Coefficients* | *Standard Error* | *t Stat* | *P-value* | *Lower 95%* | *Upper 95%* | *Lower 95.0%* | *Upper 95.0%* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | -129.67 | 363.237703 | -0.356983867 | 0.730337212 | -967.2976452 | 707.9576452 | -967.2976452 | 707.9576452 |
| South Africa Corp.Tax | 4.93 | 13.01851993 | 0.378691282 | 0.714769447 | -25.09076079 | 34.95076079 | -25.09076079 | 34.95076079 |

RESIDUAL OUTPUT

| *Observation* | *dicted South Africa FDI($Billic* | *Residuals* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 8.37 | -2.58 |
| 2 | 8.37 | -6.85 |
| 3 | 8.37 | -6.15 |
| 4 | 8.37 | -6.31 |
| 5 | 8.37 | -2.8 |
| 6 | 8.37 | -3.25 |
| 7 | 8.37 | -5.22 |
| 8 | 8.37 | 32.29 |
| 9 | 8.37 | 0.87 |
| 10 | 3.44 | 2.22045E-15 |

PROBABILITY OUTPUT

| *Percentile* | *South Africa FDI($Billion)* |
|---|---|
| 5 | 1.52 |
| 15 | 2.06 |
| 25 | 2.22 |
| 35 | 3.15 |
| 45 | 3.44 |
| 55 | 5.12 |
| 65 | 5.57 |
| 75 | 5.79 |
| 85 | 9.24 |
| 95 | 40.66 |

Observations:

- **Multiple R = 0.133**: The correlation between South Africa's corporate tax rate and FDI is very weak (close to zero). This suggests that there is almost no linear relationship between the two variables.
- **R Square = 0.018**: Only 1.8% of the variability in South Africa's FDI can be explained by changes in the corporate tax rate. This is a very low explanatory power.
- **Adjusted R Square = -0.105**: The negative adjusted R-square suggests that the model is not a good fit even after considering the number of predictors.
- **Regression df = 1**: There is 1 independent variable (South Africa Corporate Tax) being tested in the regression.

- **Significance F = 0.715**: Since this p-value is greater than 0.05, the regression model is not statistically significant, meaning that South Africa's corporate tax rate does not significantly explain the variability in FDI.
- **P-value = 0.715**: Since the p-value is much greater than 0.05, this suggests that the corporate tax rate does not have a statistically significant effect on FDI in South Africa.

**Key finding**

There is almost no linear relationship between South Africa's corporate tax rate and its FDI inflows. The low R-square and non-significant p-value suggest that corporate tax rates are not a meaningful predictor of FDI in South Africa. The regression model does not explain much of the variation in FDI, and the relationship between corporate tax rates and FDI is weak and statistically insignificant.

3. **Brazil**: with the dependent variable being Foreign direct investment and independent variable being Corporate Taxes.

SUMMARY OUTPUT

| *Regression Statistics* | |
|---|---|
| Multiple R | 0.158580262 |
| R Square | 0.025147699 |
| Adjusted R Square | -0.096708838 |
| Standard Error | 15.34734383 |
| Observations | 10 |

ANOVA

| | *df* | *SS* | *MS* | *F* | *Significance F* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression | 1 | 48.60890902 | 48.60890902 | 0.206371361 | 0.661698432 |
| Residual | 8 | 1884.327701 | 235.5409626 | | |
| Total | 9 | 1932.93661 | | | |

| | *Coefficients* | *Standard Error* | *t Stat* | *P-value* | *Lower 95%* | *Upper 95%* | *Lower 95.0%* | *Upper 95.0%* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 66.653 | 4.853256254 | 13.73366592 | 7.62005E-07 | 55.46137101 | 77.84462899 | 55.46137101 | 77.84462899 |
| Brazil Corp.Tax | 0 | 0 | 65535 | #NUM! | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

RESIDUAL OUTPUT

| *Observation* | *Predicted Brazil.FDI($Billion)* | *Residuals* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 66.653 | 21.057 |
| 2 | 66.653 | -1.913 |
| 3 | 66.653 | 7.637 |
| 4 | 66.653 | 2.237 |
| 5 | 66.653 | 11.527 |
| 6 | 66.653 | 2.517 |
| 7 | 66.653 | -28.383 |
| 8 | 66.653 | -20.213 |
| 9 | 66.653 | 7.957 |
| 10 | 66.653 | -2.423 |

PROBABILITY OUTPUT

| *Percentile* | *Brazil.FDI($Billion)* |
|---|---|
| 5 | 38.27 |
| 15 | 46.44 |
| 25 | 64.23 |
| 35 | 64.74 |
| 45 | 68.89 |
| 55 | 69.17 |
| 65 | 74.29 |
| 75 | 74.61 |
| 85 | 78.18 |
| 95 | 87.71 |

**Observations:**

- **Multiple R = 0.159**: This value represents a very weak correlation between Brazil's corporate tax rate and FDI. It is close to zero, suggesting that there is almost no linear relationship between the two variables.
- **R Square = 0.025**: Only 2.5% of the variation in Brazil's FDI can be explained by changes in the corporate tax rate. This indicates that the corporate tax rate is not a significant predictor of FDI in Brazil.

- **Adjusted R Square = -0.097**: This negative value indicates that the model is not a good fit, even when adjusting for the number of predictors. It suggests that adding the corporate tax rate as an explanatory variable makes the model worse.
- **Regression df = 1**: The regression is testing the relationship between Brazil's FDI and a single independent variable, corporate tax rate.
- **Significance F = 0.662**: Since the p-value is much greater than 0.05, the regression model is not statistically significant. This means that Brazil's corporate tax rate does not have a statistically significant effect on FDI.
- **Brazil Corporate Tax Coefficient = 0**: The coefficient for Brazil's corporate tax rate is exactly zero, indicating that changes in the corporate tax rate do not affect the predicted FDI. This confirms that corporate tax is not a significant predictor in this model.

**Key finding**

The regression model shows that Brazil's corporate tax rate does **not** significantly influence its FDI inflows. The very low R-square, zero coefficient for the corporate tax rate, and the high p-value suggest that corporate tax is not an important factor in determining FDI in Brazil. The confidence intervals for the corporate tax rate's coefficient are zero, confirming that this variable does not have a meaningful impact on FDI in Brazil.

## 6. Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to assess the extent to which corporate tax incentives attract foreign direct investments into developing countries, South Africa and Brazil in particular. Regressions and other statistical estimations were made to analyse the relationship between corporate tax rates and FDI over a certain time period.

a) Main Findings:

- Very weak relationships between corporate tax rates and FDI. Overall, regression results for South Africa and Brazil did not point towards corporate tax rates as a significant predictor of FDI inflows. For South Africa, the model produced an R-squared value of 0.018, meaning only 1.8% of the variability in FDI may be explained by corporate tax rates. In Brazil, the R-squared was only at 0.025, which means that only 2.5% of the FDI inflows could be explained by corporate tax rates. The p-values for both models were high (>0.05), meaning the corporate tax rates are of no significance in determining FDI.

- The adjusted R-squared values for both countries were negative, indicating a very poor fit by the model. The standard errors were high relative to scale for FDI, which points to large deviations between predicted and actual values. In Brazil, the regression model displayed computational instability, resulting in a zero coefficient for corporate tax rates, reinforcing the lack of relationship between the variables.

b) Insights and Broader Implications:

The results indicate that corporate tax incentives, although quite frequently used as a policy instrument to attract foreign investment, do not play a decisive role in influencing FDI inflows into developing countries. Instead, one gains an impression from the data that there are other factors which are more crucial, such as political stability, size of the market, infrastructure development, labour costs, and the regulatory environment in the country.

c) Policy Recommendations

- Policymakers need to go beyond corporate tax incentives by streamlining other bureaucratic processes, improving infrastructure, and boosting the ease of doing business.

- Economic as well as political stability is paramount for foreign investors. The governments should focus upon the reforms that guarantee transparency, curb corruption, and make for a stable macroeconomic environment.

- Blanket tax reductions may not be effective since targeted incentives in high growth sectors, such as technology, renewable energy, or manufacturing, may produce stronger gains.

- Multi-stage regression model with all other potential FDI determinants such as labour productivity, trade openness, and GDP growth could further be explored so that the results provide a more comprehensive understanding.

d) Conclusion

The paper also pointed out that corporate tax incentives are typically viewed as a competitive tool for attracting foreign investment, but the research here has established the limited effectiveness of such a policy in and of itself. It is only through a multifaceted approach of dealing with structural economic challenges and creating an investment-friendly environment that countries like South Africa and Brazil can help its citizens become economically prosperous once again-only if understood and acted upon.

## 7. References


- Gebeltová, Z., Smutka, L., Blazek, V., Maitah, K., & Sirohi, J. (2021). Impact of Tax Incentives on Foreign Direct Investment: Evidence from Africa. Sustainability, 13(15), 8661. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158661.
- Goh, C., & Liu, Y. (2018). FDI, Corporate Taxes, and Economic Development in ASEAN Economies. Published in Asia-Pacific Economic Review
- Furceri, D., & Barreix, A. (2016). Corporate Taxation, FDI, and Growth: Evidence from Latin America. Published in The Journal of Development Economics.
- James, S. (2009). Tax and Non-Tax Incentives and Investments: Evidence and Policy Implications. Published as a World Bank Policy Research Working Paper.
- Roh, S., & Young, C. (2020). The Role of Corporate Tax Policy in Attracting Foreign Direct Investments in Emerging Economies. Published in International Journal of Economics and Business Research.
- Zdeňka Gebeltová et al. (2021). Impact of Tax Incentives on Foreign Direct Investment: Evidence from Africa. Published in Sustainability (DOI: 10.3390/su13158661).
- James, S. (2014). Tax and Non-Tax Incentives and Investments: Evidence and Policy Implications. World Bank Group. https://documents.worldbank.org.
- Keen, M., & Mansour, M. (2010). Revenue Mobilization in Sub-Saharan Africa: Challenges from Globalization. International Monetary Fund Working Paper. https://www.imf.org.
- World Bank Group. (2017). Corporate tax incentives and FDI in developing countries. In Global Investment Competitiveness Report 2017/2018: Foreign Investor Perspectives and Policy Implications. https://www.worldbank.org.
- Andersen, M. R., Kett, B. R., & von Uexkull, E. (2018). Evaluating the costs and benefits of corporate tax incentives: Methodological approaches and policy considerations. World Bank Group.