Online Shopping and Taxes

Mallick Hossain

Background

 Online shopping has grown immensely over time (to 8.5% of total retail sales in 2017:Q1), even when retail sales have cratered



Background

- Sales taxes makes up 33% of state tax revenue
- People try to avoid paying taxes when possible [Citation needed]
- Online transactions have been effectively tax free
- In 2008, New York passed the first "Amazon Law" to require Amazon to collect sales tax instead of relying on consumer self-reporting
 - Amazon circumvented this law, but it began a slow cascade of state initiatives to recapture an important stream of revenue
- As of April 1, 2017, Amazon now collects sales tax in all states

Motivating Questions

- How responsive is consumer spending to sales taxes?
 - I explore a simpler question: Do consumers shift spending away from Amazon when Amazon collects sales tax in their state?
 - Are consumers shifting spending to non-taxed outlets, taxed outlets, or reducing their spending?
 - Are consumers shifting spending to other online outlets, offline outlets, or reducing their spending?
- Is consumer search behavior affected by sales taxes?
 - I explore a simpler question: Do consumers shift time (i.e. search and eyeballs) away from Amazon when Amazon collects sales tax?

Preview of Results

comScore Web Behavior Database

- Consumers are less likely to make an Amazon purchase when Amazon begins collecting sales tax in their state
- Consumers' implied tax-spending elasticity is about -0.5, meaning that for a 1pp increase in the tax rate, Amazon spending decreases by 0.5% conditional on Amazon collecting sales tax
 - This effect is even more pronounced for consumers that live in counties bordering states with no sales tax (i.e. Delaware, Oregon, New Hampshire, Montana)
- Consumers shift their spending to Amazon's taxed competitors, with the implied elasticity of 0.6, meaning that for a 1pp increase in the tax rate, spending on Amazon's taxed competitors increases by 0.6% conditional on Amazon collecting sales tax
- Similar results hold when looking at page views and time spent on Amazon versus Amazon's taxed competitors

Preview of Results

Nielsen Homescan Consumer Panel

- Expenditures at online-only stores is not affected when Amazon begins collecting sales tax
- Cross-border shopping is important
 - For every 1pp difference in sales tax rate between home and adjacent county rate, online-only spending drops by about 3.3% and this is slightly more sensitive in border counties
- Expenditures at stores with an offline presence (may or may not have an online store) are sensitive to taxes
 - A 1pp increase in the sales tax rate is associated with a 0.54% increase in spending at stores with an offline presence
 - Conditional on Amazon collecting sales tax, there is an additional 0.06% boost to spending at stores with an offline presence.

Related Literature

Cross-border Shopping

- Consumers living close to borders are more tax sensitive than those not close to borders
- Mikesell (1970); Asplund, Friberg, and Wilander (2007); Davis (2011);
 Agarwal, Marwell, and McGranahan (2017)

Online Shopping

- Sales taxes influence individual's decisions of whether to shop online and how much they spend
- Goolsbee (2000); Alm and Melnik (2005); Scanlan (2007); Ballard and Lee (2007); Einav et al (2014); Baugh, Ben-David, and Park (2017); Houde, Newberry, and Seim (2017)

Estimated Elasticities

Table 1: Cross-Border Shopping Elasticities

Elasticity Type	Paper	Estimate
	Asplund, Friberg, Wilander (2007) – Foreign price	0.2 to 0.5
	Asplund, Friberg, Wilander (2007) – Domestic price	-0.2 to -1.3
Cross-border	Agarwal, Marwell, McGranahan (2017)	-2 to -30
Price-Expenditure	Davis (2011)	-2.2 to -3.6
	Agarwal, Chomsisengphet, Qian, Xu (2017)	-2.3
	Mikesell (1970)	-6.3
	Scanlan (2007)	0.0
	Ballard & Lee (2007)	-0.2
Tax-Purchase	Alm & Melnik (2005)	-0.5
	Einav, Knoepfle, Levin, & Sundaresan (2014)	-1.8
	Goolsbee (2000)	-2.3
	Hossain (2017) - non-Amazon spending	0.6
Tax-Price	Hossain (2017) - Amazon spending	-0.5
Tax-Price	Baugh, Ben-David, & Park (2017)	-1.2 to -1.4
	Houde, Newberry, & Seim (2017)	-1.3

Data

comScore Web Behavior Database

- Captures computer-level browsing and transaction activity
- Households report various demographics and ZIP code
- Includes domain name
- Data from 2006 to 2016

Nielsen Homescan Panel

- Nationally representative panel that keeps track of all goods that they buy and consume
- High-quality data and well-maintained panel
- Stores are anonymized, but they are categorized
- Data from 2004-2015

Tax Data Systems

- Database of state, county, and local sales tax rates at a ZIP code level
- Data from 2006 to 2014

Research Design

- Before 2008, Amazon only collected sales tax in the 5 states it had a physical presence in
- In 2008, New York passed the first law requiring Amazon to collect sales tax even though it did not have a physical presence in New York
- Over the next 9 years, Amazon quasi-randomly began collecting sales tax in various states, either by entering into agreements with the states or because states passed laws requiring them to collect sales tax
- From a consumer perspective, these changes were largely unexpected and would be plausibly exogeneous shocks

Regression Specification

$$E_{hct}^{j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(\mathbb{1}_{ct}^{Collect} * SalesTax_{ct}) + \beta_2 TaxDiff_{ct} + \lambda_h + \lambda_c + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{hct}$$

- The above regression relates log expenditures (on various channels) to
 - Local sales tax rate conditional on Amazon collecting sales tax
 - Difference in tax rates between a consumer's home county and an adjacent county
 - Household income and race
 - Month-year and county fixed effects

Regression Results (Expenditures)

Table 2: Amazon Expenditures

				D	ependent varia	able:					
					.og Expenditu	res					
		All Counties Border Counties									
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)		
Collect	-0.037*** (0.011)					-0.233** (0.105)					
Log(1 + Sales Tax)		0.525 (1.198)					-12.144* (6.498)		-12.267* (6.494)		
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax\; *\;Collect)$			-0.500** (0.233)	-0.498** (0.233)	-0.498** (0.233)			-3.892** (1.729)	-3.920** (1.728)		
Tax Diff				-0.346 (1.440)							
Tax Ratio					-0.392 (1.510)						
Observations R ² Adjusted R ²	156,462 0.067 0.051	99,541 0.064 0.040	99,541 0.065 0.040	99,541 0.065 0.040	99,541 0.065 0.040	3,443 0.102 0.061	3,443 0.101 0.061	3,443 0.102 0.061	3,443 0.103 0.062		

Note:

^{*}p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Expenditures)

 Table 3: Taxed Non-Amazon Expenditures

				Depe	ndent variab	le:			
				Log	Expenditure	s			
			Border	der Counties					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Collect	0.002 (0.010)					0.081 (0.124)			
$Log\big(1 + Sales\;Tax\big)$		-1.147 (0.816)					3.427 (5.174)		3.297 (5.177)
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax\; \boldsymbol{*}\;Collect)$			0.583*** (0.184)	0.586*** (0.184)	0.586*** (0.184)			1.681 (2.050)	1.640 (2.051)
Tax Diff				-0.580 (1.013)					
Tax Ratio					-0.601 (1.063)				
Observations R ² Adjusted R ²	227,411 0.044 0.032	181,217 0.048 0.033	181,217 0.048 0.033	181,217 0.048 0.033	181,217 0.048 0.033	5,584 0.059 0.032	5,584 0.059 0.032	5,584 0.059 0.032	5,584 0.059 0.032

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Household race and income as well as month-year, county, and product category fixed effects are included in the above regressions and standard errors are

Regression Results (Expenditures)

Table 4: Non-Taxed Non-Amazon Expenditures

				De	ependent va	riable:							
		Log Expenditures											
		All Counties Border Counties											
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)				
Collect	0.006 (0.011)					-0.182 (0.130)							
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax)$		-0.265 (0.894)					19.211*** (5.694)		19.446*** (5.698)				
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax\; *\;Collect)$			-0.084 (0.216)	-0.083 (0.216)	-0.083 (0.216)			-2.087 (2.104)	-2.352 (2.103)				
Tax Diff				-0.192 (1.126)									
Tax Ratio					-0.161 (1.182)								
Observations R ²	213,613	167,907 0.043	167,907 0.043	167,907 0.043	167,907 0.043	4,914 0.063	4,914 0.065	4,914 0.063	4,914 0.065				
Adjusted R ²	0.024	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.033	0.035	0.032	0.035				

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Search)

Table 5: Amazon Search Duration

					Dependent	variable:			
					Log Exper	nditures			
			All Counties		Border	Counties			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Collect	-0.030*** (0.010)					-0.290*** (0.100)			
Log(1 + Sales Tax)		-1.782 (1.096)					-20.383*** (6.214)		-20.537*** (6.207)
Log(1 + Sales Tax * Collect)			-0.401° (0.213)	-0.401° (0.214)	-0.401* (0.213)			-4.857*** (1.654)	-4.902*** (1.652)
Tax Diff				0.037 (1.318)					
Tax Ratio					0.063 (1.382)				
Observations R ²	156,462 0.076 0.060	99,541 0.082 0.057	99,541 0.082 0.057	99,541 0.082 0.057	99,541 0.082 0.057	3,443 0.118 0.078	3,443 0.118 0.079	3,443 0.118 0.078	3,443 0.121 0.081
Adjusted R ²	0.000	0.057	0.057	0.057	0.057	0.078	0.079	0.078	0.081

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Search)

Table 6: Taxed Non-Amazon Search Duration

				De	ependent va	riable:			
				L	og Expendit	tures			
			All Counties		Border	Counties			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Collect	0.011 (0.009)					-0.029 (0.106)			
$Log \big(1 + Sales \; Tax \big)$		0.270 (0.706)					16.928*** (4.405)		16.964*** (4.407)
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax\; \boldsymbol{*}\;Collect)$			0.094 (0.159)	0.091 (0.159)	0.091 (0.159)			-0.236 (1.747)	-0.447 (1.746)
Tax Diff				0.580 (0.877)					
Tax Ratio					0.692 (0.921)				
Observations R ² Adjusted R ²	227,411 0.046 0.034	181,217 0.052 0.037	181,217 0.052 0.037	181,217 0.052 0.037	181,217 0.052 0.037	5,584 0.059 0.032	5,584 0.061 0.035	5,584 0.059 0.032	5,584 0.061 0.035

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Search)

Table 7: Non-Taxed Non-Amazon Search Duration

				Depe	endent varia	ble:						
				Log	Expenditur	es						
		All Counties Border Counties										
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)			
Collect	0.018 (0.013)					0.112 (0.155)						
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax)$		2.690*** (1.029)					-1.413 (6.811)		-1.629 (6.815)			
$Log\big(1 + Sales\;Tax\; \boldsymbol{*}\;Collect\big)$			0.592** (0.248)	0.588** (0.248)	0.588** (0.248)			2.139 (2.514)	2.161 (2.516)			
Tax Diff				1.480 (1.295)								
Tax Ratio					1.517 (1.360)							
Observations R ² Adjusted R ²	213,613 0.075 0.062	167,907 0.075 0.060	167,907 0.075 0.060	167,907 0.075 0.060	167,907 0.075 0.060	4,914 0.090 0.061	4,914 0.090 0.061	4,914 0.091 0.061	4,914 0.091 0.061			

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Nielsen)

Table 8: Online Expenditures

					Deper	dent variable:				
					Log	Expenditures				
			All		Border Counties					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Collect	0.010 (0.006)						-0.235*** (0.055)			
Log(1 + Sales Tax)		-0.392 (0.590)		-0.356 (0.592)				-4.088 (3.860)		-4.010 (3.857)
Log(1 + Sales Tax * Collect)			-0.095 (0.112)	-0.090 (0.113)	-0.055 (0.113)	-0.056 (0.113)			-4.022*** (0.910)	-4.018*** (0.910)
Tax Diff					-3.339*** (0.693)					
Tax Ratio						-3.534*** (0.728)				
Observations R ²	618,386 0.064	444,606 0.072	444,606 0.072	444,606 0.072	444,606 0.072	444,606 0.072	12,131 0.099	12,131 0.097	12,131 0.099	12,131 0.099
Adjusted R ²	0.059	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.086	0.085	0.087	0.

Note:

^{*}p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Nielsen)

Table 9: Offline Expenditures

					Dependent	variable:				
					Log Expen	ditures				
			All Co	ounties				Border	Counties	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Collect	0.008*** (0.001)						-0.002 (0.014)			
Log(1 + Sales Tax)		0.545*** (0.119)		0.530*** (0.119)				-1.672** (0.800)		-1.675** (0.800)
Log(1 + Sales Tax * Collect)			0.064** (0.026)	0.057** (0.026)	0.062** (0.026)	0.062** (0.026)			0.031 (0.227)	0.042 (0.227)
Tax Diff					0.174 (0.144)					
Tax Ratio						0.182 (0.152)				
Observations R ²	6,001,547 0.088	4,209,893 0.091	4,209,893 0.091	4,209,893 0.091	4,209,893 0.091	4,209,893 0.091	107,630 0.094	107,630 0.094	107,630 0.094	107,630 0.094
Adjusted R ²	0.088	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.090	0.093	0.093	0.093	0.093

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Regression Results (Nielsen)

Table 10: Total Expenditures

					Dependent	variable:				
					Log Expen	ditures				
			All Co	ounties				Border	Counties	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Collect	0.010*** (0.001)						0.004 (0.014)			
$Log(1+Sales\;Tax)$		0.616*** (0.118)		0.597*** (0.118)				-1.814** (0.798)		-1.823** (0.798)
$Log(1 + Sales\;Tax\; \boldsymbol{*}\;Collect)$			0.085*** (0.026)	0.078*** (0.026)	0.084*** (0.026)	0.084*** (0.026)			0.108 (0.227)	0.120 (0.227)
Tax Diff					0.112 (0.144)					
Tax Ratio						0.115 (0.151)				
Observations R ² Adjusted R ²	6,006,028 0.089 0.088	4,213,437 0.091 0.091	4,213,437 0.091 0.091	4,213,437 0.091 0.091	4,213,437 0.091 0.091	4,213,437 0.091 0.091	107,711 0.095 0.093	107,711 0.095 0.093	107,711 0.095 0.093	107,711 0.095 0.093

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Future Research

- Connect these results with either a fully rational agent story or a salience story
- Explore the browsing (comScore) and shopping trips (Nielsen) data to estimate search costs
- Explore the labor and public finance impact of these shifts (is a hot topic in the press)
 - Big question: Is ecommerce making traditional retailing disappear and what are the impacts of it?
 - Almost 16 million people are employed in "Retail Trade". If you remove Food and Beverage, Gasoline, and Motor Vehicles, you still have 9 million people.
 - Manufacturing only employs 12 million people
 - The Economist (May 13, 2017): Sorry, we're closed: The decline of established American retailing threatens jobs
 - The Atlantic (May 23, 2017): The Viscious Cycle of Retail's Decline

Questions?



Thanks!

