

CENTRE FOR  
VOCATIONAL  
EDUCATION  
RESEARCH



## Investing in People: The Case for Human Capital Tax Credits

Rui Costa, Nikhil Datta, Stephen Machin and Sandra McNally

Briefing Note 007

March 2018

**This briefing paper is funded under the Centre for Economic Performance's "Informing the Industrial Strategy" project (ESRC ES/S000097/1).**

The Centre for Vocational Education Research (CVER) is an independent research centre funded by the UK Department for Education. CVER brings together four partners: the LSE Centre for Economic Performance; University of Sheffield; National Institute of Economic and Social Research and London Economics.

Any views expressed are those of the authors, and do not represent the views of DfE. For more details on the Centre, go to [cver.lse.ac.uk](http://cver.lse.ac.uk)

Published by:  
Centre for Vocational Educational Research  
London School of Economics & Political Science  
Houghton Street  
London WC2A 2AE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form other than that in which it is published.

Requests for permission to reproduce any article or part of the Briefing Paper should be sent to the editor at the above address.

© Rui Costa, Nikhil Datta, Stephen Machin and Sandra McNally, March 2018.

# **Investing in People: The Case for Human Capital Tax Credits**

**Rui Costa\*, Nikhil Datta\*, Stephen Machin\*\* and Sandra McNally\*\*\***

February 2018

\* *Department of Economics, University College London and Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics*

\*\* *Department of Economics and Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics*

\*\*\* *Centre for Vocational Education Research and Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics; School of Economics, University of Surrey*

## **1. Introduction**

It is now widely recognised that human capital accumulation and research and development (R&D) are key drivers of economic growth, as is documented in most standard textbooks (e.g. Acemoglu, 2007; Romer, 1996). Estimates from the US suggest that increasing levels of human capital over the second half of the last century accounted for approximately one third of productivity growth (Griliches, 1997), while some estimates of the social rate of return to R&D in the manufacturing sector have exceeded one hundred percent (Jones and Williams, 1998).

Despite the contribution of both human capital and R&D to economic growth, the UK fiscal system does not treat the two equally when it comes to employer incentives to invest. Specifically, firms that invest in R&D are able to claim generous tax relief on their investments whereas there is no such across-the-board incentive to invest in the training of their workers. This is despite the fact that the rationale for government support to firm investment in human capital is similar to that for R&D and both are important for economic growth. Moreover, this unequal treatment of physical and human capital stands in contrast to practice in many other countries.

In this briefing note, we explain the economic rationale for government support in the form of tax credits (Section 2). We discuss current practice in the UK in relation to R&D (Section 3) and evidence on effectiveness (Section 4). We then discuss how the policy might be adapted to provide similar incentives for investing in human capital (Section 5).

## **2. Rationale for Government Support**

The main rationale for incentivising employers to invest in either R&D or human capital is that such incentives produce positive externalities to the wider economy through a number of mechanisms such as knowledge spillovers. In the absence of incentives, there would of course be some investment by firms. However, there would be underinvestment, because an individual employer has no incentive to take account of the wider benefit of the firm's investment in R&D and skills. This problem is made worse by the riskiness of investment, as the process is inherently uncertain. This applies more to R&D than to human capital investment. However, firms investing in human capital also face the risk that employees may move employment before the firm has a chance to recoup its investment.

When government provides support to firms, this should do two things: (1) reduce the gap between the private and social returns to investment; (2) mitigate the risk taken on by firms when making an investment. When it comes to investment in human capital, an additional rationale is to overcome the credit constraints faced by individuals who might wish to invest in their own education and training.

The first rationale – the need to reduce the gap between the private and social returns to investment - is similar with regard to human capital investment as it is to R&D and innovation. Specifically, a highly skilled worker is more productive in their job irrespective of the employer (so long as the skills acquired are sufficiently general and appropriately

credentialed). As a result human capital investment creates a positive externality for the whole economy that the market fails to internalise.

Obvious differences separate the two kinds of externalities generated by investment in R&D and in human capital – for example, the broad contribution of patents versus a potentially narrow contribution of a single worker’s training. At first glance, patents are an outcome that can benefit and be used by a wider set of agents (firms, governments etc.) whereas the training of a given individual directly benefits that worker and the firm she/he works for. Nonetheless, one might argue that the difference is not so large after taking account of the large share of labour in production and its potential spillovers as described in Lucas (1988). Furthermore, a point in favour of investing in human capital relates to lack of risk at a social level. The nature of R&D investment is inherently risky and not all investments will lead to a positive return for the firm or for the economy as a whole. On the other hand, human capital investments are only risky for the firm if the employee leaves to work for another firm. But this does not imply a risk to the economy. This is because the worker is, in principle, still going to be more productive in his/her new job than would be the case in the absence of investment. We later discuss how to deal with the risk at a firm level. We first discuss how the R&D tax credit works and evidence on its effectiveness.

### **3. R&D tax credits in the UK**

The R&D tax credit system was originally introduced by the New Labour government in 2000, and initially only applied to small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs). In 2002 a similar though less generous system was introduced for larger companies, which has been replaced over the past few years by the new Research and Development Expenditure Credit (RDEC).

Upon meeting the eligibility criteria, SMEs have been eligible for a R&D tax relief of 230%, while losses can be claimed back at 14.5% as a payable tax credit (a cash sum paid by HMRC).<sup>1</sup>

An example of what this means in practice is the following:

- A company that spent £20,000 on R&D could reduce their tax liability by an additional 130% (£26,000) on top of a normal 'at cost' claim of 100%. This means that the tax liability on their yearly profit would reduce by £46,000.
- For example, if the same company made a profit of £26,000 before accounting for the R&D cost, this deduction means that a trading loss would be recorded of £20,000.
- 14.5% of this trading loss (i.e. £2900) could then be claimed back as a payable cash sum.

The current scheme for large companies, the RDEC, operates a tax relief rate of 112%, (i.e. 11% above the normal 'at cost' claim) and this scheme is also payable regardless of a firm's tax position.

There are three main guiding principles on what constitutes R&D. Investments must: (a) seek to achieve an advance in science or technology; (b) be subject to scientific or technological uncertainty; (c) be conducted in a systematic and thorough fashion. This might either include the creation of new products, processes or services, or the modification of an existing product or service. Costs that can be claimed for include staffing costs such as salaries, employer's national insurance and pension contributions, subcontractor costs, materials, consumable, utilities used by the R&D process and software costs.


In 2015-2016, the sectors Manufacturing, Professional, Scientific and Technical, and Information and Communication had the greatest volume of claims, and collectively accounted

---

<sup>1</sup> A company must have less than 500 employees and either annual turnover under £100 million or a balance sheet under £86 million.

for 75% of the value of the claims in the given period. The volume of claims under the SME scheme is much larger than the RDEC (large company) scheme, although this is unsurprising given that most companies in England are classified as SMEs.<sup>2</sup> While the RDEC scheme is less generous, of the £2.8 billion claimed in 2015-2016, £1.5 billion was claimed through the large company scheme, while the remaining £1.3 billion was claimed by SMEs. The geographic spread of claims and the amount is shown in Figure 1. This shows that London and the South East has the largest share.<sup>3</sup> Despite these incentives, the proportion of R&D spending to GDP in the UK is still among the lowest in the G7 and relatively low compared to many countries in the OECD (see Figure 2).


Figure 1: Claims by Registered Office Region  
(HMRC- Research and Development Tax Credits Statistics: September 2017)



<sup>2</sup> The 5.4 million SMEs in the UK make up over 99% of businesses.

<sup>3</sup> However, it should be noted that this relates to where the head office is registered, and thus companies with numerous offices may well be spending the claims elsewhere.

Figure 2: Gross Domestic Spending on R&D for OECD Countries in 2015 (OECD)



#### 4. Are tax credits effective?

There is empirical evidence documenting the net positive impact of an R&D tax credit system on actual investment in both the UK and in other countries. For example, Fowkes et al. (2015) finds that in the case of the UK, for each pound of tax forgone, between £1.53 and £2.35 of R&D is generated. Dechezleprêtre et al. (2015) makes use of changes in the eligibility criteria for SMEs in 2008. They find that R&D doubled and patenting rose by about 60% in those firms affected by the change. Griffith et al. (2001) simulated the impact of the tax credit policy on GDP. Although costs are likely to outweigh the short-run impact on GDP, long-term positive

impacts are predicted under a variety of assumptions which would be enough to outweigh the costs to the Exchequer.

As staffing is a key component of R&D (and is a deductible cost), one would expect an increase in demand for R&D workers and for this to have a positive impact on their wages. Estimates for the Netherlands show evidence for such an effect. Lokshin and Mohnin (2013) find that for every Euro increase in R&D tax disbursement, there was an increase to wages of 19 to 24 cents, for R&D workers. These estimates control for business cycle fluctuations, heterogeneity and the endogeneity of tax R&D tax credits.

Finally, surveys of the literature and meta-analysis examining R&D tax credit systems in a variety of countries has found there to be a strong positive impact of R&D tax credits on corporate R&D investments (Castellacci and Lie, 2015). However, the effect varies across sectors. Larger benefits have been experienced in low-tech industries as well as in the services sector. As low-tech industries generally start with lower R&D intensity, there may be more scope for them to respond to tax credit incentives, in comparison to high-tech industries that have already made sizeable R&D investments.

## **5. Human capital tax credits?**

The *prima facie* argument for human capital tax credits emerges from the well-established relationship between human capital and growth (e.g. as illustrated in Figure 3) and the externality problems that lead to underinvestment in R&D also apply to human capital (as argued in Section 2).

Figure 3: The relationship between Human Capital (measured by years of schooling) and labour productivity.



Source: Data from Daude and Fernandez-Arias (2014) and Barro and Lee (2001)

When considering tax incentives to human capital investments one should start by making the distinction between individual and firm targeted incentives. By individual tax incentives, we mean any form of tax deduction/exemption/credit applied to direct costs of training and education paid by the individual. On the other hand, firm tax incentives include any form of tax deduction/exemption/credit applied to costs incurred by the employer for the training and education of its employees.

The existence of positive externalities from human capital investment has led to an array of individual level interventions designed to increase human capital investment. Examples of this include free or subsidised post-compulsory schooling, income contingent student loans for higher education, means tested cash transfers (e.g. UK's now defunct Educational Maintenance

Allowance) and means tested training vouchers (e.g. for the unemployed). Here we focus on firm-level incentives to invest in human capital.

Torres (2012) offers an extensive review of the tax incentives to skill investment across OECD countries separately by the individual and firm/corporate dimension.<sup>4</sup> The Austrian tax system is a good example of one which incentivises firms to invest in human capital. Specifically, there is a full tax allowance for training expenses and a further 20% of actual expenses is deducted from taxable income. This implies a 120% tax allowance in real terms. Firms that do not make enough profit to benefit from this tax allowance can instead claim a tax credit of 6% of the actual training expenses. Additionally, individuals can claim a tax allowance on all reasonable expenses for education and training if this is aimed at improving skills in their job or to prepare them for a change in occupation.

Fitzpayne and Pollack (2017) propose a tax credit that “mirrors the policy design of the popular R&D Tax Credit” directed at encouraging employee training for low and middle skilled workers with a differential tax credit margins according to the firm size and employee composition.<sup>5</sup> They discuss systems already in place within several states of the US. Those States that implement tax credits for training include: Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Rhode Island and Virginia. The tax margins vary between 5 and 50% with different annual caps per employee across states. These are complemented by several federal tax credits and allowances aimed at individual expenses with training and education of the individuals and/or their dependent children/students.

Although the Austrian and US examples show that human capital tax credits can be implemented in practice, neither fully addresses the riskiness of human capital investments

---

<sup>4</sup> There is no human capital tax credit in the UK. However, firms may claim training expenses as tax deductible. The legal basis is set out in the Appendix.

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/worker-training-tax-credit-promoting-greater-employer-investments-in-the-workforce/>

from the firm's perspective. Specifically, employees may move before the employer has the opportunity to recoup the firm's investment. Two possible ways of diminishing the risk faced by firms when investing in human capital are as follows: (a) temporarily restrict the mobility of workers for whom the firm invests in training; (b) compensate the firm for the potential loss of their investment in cases where the worker decides to move.

The first of these options is already common practice in some firms employing high skilled labour (such as some large consultancy firms, investment banks, and some public sector bodies). The employee is offered a contract that restricts job movement for a certain time horizon in exchange for the firm's sponsorship of specific training or education programs such as MBAs, masters, diplomas, and so on. This enables the firm to recoup its investment through the worker's productivity gain subsequent to training. Although this is a pragmatic solution to the riskiness of human capital investment, this option goes against free movement of labour within the economy, potentially creating inefficiency. Furthermore, such initiatives tend to be concentrated among larger firms in sectors that already employ high skilled workers. Firms operating in sectors that employ low and medium skilled workers may not have the same financial capacity to sponsor improvements to the skills of their employees (though one would imagine that a generous human capital tax credit policy would address this).

The second alternative (not used to our knowledge) would be to provide a tax credit/allowance for "unsuccessful/unrealised" investment. This would diminish the loss to firms in the case of worker movement while not restricting the free movement of labour within the economy.

## **6. Concluding comments**

The litany of problems currently faced by the UK economy includes the chronic shortage of intermediate skills, recent productivity stagnation and falling real wages. Promoting human capital investment by firms bypasses the liquidity constraints faced by individuals, while enhancing productivity and pay in the medium to long term. While the apprenticeship levy (and associated incentives) only covers large firms and only for a very specific type of human capital investment, a human capital tax credit would cover the full distribution of firms and not be limited to types of training that can be classified as ‘apprenticeships’. This could help to redress the current imbalance between investment in physical and human capital.

## **Appendix**

### *UK Tax Allowance Law – Training Expenses*

There is no human capital tax credit in the UK. However, training expenses are tax deductible for employers.

More specifically, in the case of the UK, Section 250 of the ITEPA 2003 law “removes any possible tax charge where an employer, or a third party, incurs expenditure on work-related training for employees”. The exemption:

- applies to both internal and external courses
- covers the costs of the employer or those of a third party providing training
- has no territorial limitation on training location
- extends to a broader range of training materials
- extends to other related costs such as the cost of additional child care and the travelling and subsistence costs of the trainee
- extends to training which is linked to charitable and voluntary activities
- is mirrored in a NIC exemption.

## References

- Acemoglu, D. (2008), “Introduction to Modern Economic Growth”, Princeton University Press.
- Fernández-Arias, E. and Daude, C. (2014), “Productivity and Factor Accumulation in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Database”, *Washington: BID*
- Barro, R. and Lee, J., (2001), “International Data on Educational Attainment: Updates and Implications”. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 53(3), pp.541-563.
- Card, D., (2001), “Estimating the Return to Schooling: Progress on Some Persistent Econometric Problems”, *Econometrica*, 69(5), pp.1127-1160.
- Castellacci, F. and Mee Lie, C. (2015), “Do the Effects of R&D Tax Credits Vary Across Industries? A Meta-Regression Analysis.”, *Research Policy*, 44, 819-832.
- Dechezleprêtre, A., Einiö, E., Martin, R., Nguyen, K. and Van Reenen, J. (2016), “Do Tax Incentives for Research Increase Firm Innovation? An RD Design for R&D.”, CEP Discussion Paper Series.
- Fitzpayne, A. and Pollack, E. (2017), “Worker Training Tax Credit: Promoting Employer Investments in the Workforce”, Aspen Institute – Future of Work Initiative
- Fowkes, R., Sousa, J. and Duncan, N. (2015), “Evaluation of Research and Development tax credit.”, HMRC Working Paper 17, HM Revenue and Customs.
- Griffith, R., Redding, S. and Van Reenen, J. (2001), “Measuring the Cost Effectiveness of an R&D Tax Credit for the UK.”, *Fiscal Studies*, 22, 375-399.
- Griliches, Z., (1997), “Education, Human Capital, and Growth: A Personal Perspective.”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15(1, Part 2), pp.S330-S344

Jones, C. and Williams, J. (1998), "Measuring the social return to R&D.", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(4), pp.1119-1135.

Lokshin, B and Mohnen, P. (2013), "Do R&D Tax Incentives Lead to Higher Wages for R&D Workers? Evidence from the Netherlands.", *Research Policy*, 42, 823-830.

Lucas, R. (1988), "On the Mechanics of Economic Development" *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22, 3-42.

Romer, D. (1996), "Advanced Macroeconomics", McGraw-Hill Companies.

Torres, C. (2012), "Taxation and Investment in Skills", OECD Taxation Working Paper, 13, OECD Publishing

# CVER PUBLICATIONS

## Research Papers

**Skills, Signals, and Employability: An Experimental Investigation**, *CVER Research Paper 012*, February 2018  
Marc Piopiunik, Marc Piopiunik, Guido Schwerdt, Guido Schwerdt, Lisa Simon and Ludger Woessmann

**Building apprentices' skills in the workplace: Car Service in Germany, the UK and Spain**, *CVER Research Paper 011*, December 2017

Philipp Grollmann, Hilary Steedman, Anika Jansen and Robert Gray

**Apprenticeships for Young People in England: Is there a Payoff?** *CVER Research Paper 010*, November 2017  
Chiara Cavaglia, Sandra McNally and Guglielmo Ventura

**The Payoff to Vocational Qualifications: Reconciling Estimates from Survey and Administrative Data**, *CVER Research Paper 009*, November 2017

Gavan Conlon, Sophie Hedges, Steven McIntosh, Damon Morris and Pietro Patrignani

**Peer Effects and Social Influence in Post-16 Educational Choice**, *CVER Research Paper 008*, November 2017  
Sophie Hedges and Stefan Speckesser,

**The earnings differentials associated with vocational education and training using the Longitudinal Education Outcomes data**, *CVER Research Paper 008*, October 2017

Gavan Conlon, Sophie Hedges and Pietro Patrignani

**The longer the better? The impact of the 2012 apprenticeship reform in England on achievement and other outcomes**, *CVER Research Paper 006*, September 2017

Vahé Nafilyan and Stefan Speckesser

**Post 16 remedial policies: a literature review**, *CVER Research Paper 005*, April 2017

Clémentine Van Effenterre

**Young people in low level vocational education: characteristics, trajectories and labour market outcomes** *CVER Research Paper 004*, March 2017

Sophie Hedges, Vahé Nafilyan, Stefan Speckesser and Augustin de Coulon

**Vocational vs. General Education and Employment over the Life-Cycle: New Evidence from PIAAC**

*CVER Research Paper 003*, November 2016

Franziska Hampf and Ludger Woessmann

**Labour Market Returns to Vocational Qualifications in the Labour Force Survey**, *CVER Research Paper 002*, October 2016

Steven McIntosh and Damon Morris

**Post-Compulsory Education in England: Choices and Implications**, *CVER Research Paper 001*, July 2016

Claudia Hupkau, Sandra McNally, Jenifer Ruiz-Valenzuela and Guglielmo Ventura

## **Briefing Notes**

**Further analysis of the earnings differentials associated with BTECs, *CVET Briefing Note 006***, February 2018  
Gavan Conlon, Sophie Hedges and Pietro Patrignani

**Effectiveness of CEOs in the Public Sector: Evidence from Further Education Institutions, *CVET Briefing Note 005***, December 2017  
Jenifer Ruiz-Valenzuela, Camille Terrier, Clémentine Van-Effenterre

**An analysis of the duration and achievement of apprenticeships in England, *CVET Briefing Note 004***,  
September 2017  
Matthew Bursnall, Vahé Nafilyan, Stefan Speckesser

**The incidence of publicly funded training in England, *CVET Briefing Note 003***, March 2017  
Gavan Conlon, Sophie Hedges, Daniel Herr and Pietro Patrignani

**The Decision to Undertake an Apprenticeship: A Case Study, *CVET Briefing Note 002***, March 2017  
Steven McIntosh

**Further Education in England: Learners and Institutions, *CVET Briefing Note 001***, February 2017  
Claudia Hupkau and Guglielmo Ventura

<http://cver.lse.ac.uk>