

Formal institutional intervention and firm performance:
A study in the context of tax intervention by
government revenue authority



सिद्धिंमूलं प्रवक्ष्याम
भा. प्र. सं. इन्दौर
IIM INDORE

By

ASIT BALWANTRAI ACHARYA

A Doctoral Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the

Fellow Programme in Management

of the

Indian Institute of Management Indore

September, 2016

**Formal institutional intervention and firm performance:
A study in the context of tax intervention by
government revenue authority**



A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Fellow Programme in Management

**Indian Institute of Management
Indore**

By
Asit Balwantrao Acharya
2010FPM03

Submitted on
September, 2016

Thesis Advisory Committee:

Prof. (Dr.) Prashant Salwan
(Chair)

Prof. Sushanta Kumar Mishra
(Member)

Prof. Shaleen Gopal
(Member)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Para No. | Particulars | Page No. |
|------------------|----------|--|-----------|
| | | Acknowledgement | 5 |
| | | Executive summary | 6 |
| | | International news headlines on tax interventions | 8 |
| | | News headlines on tax interventions in India | 9 |
| Chapter 1 | | Introduction | 10 |
| Chapter 2 | | Literature Review | 17 |
| | 2.1 | Firm(s) | 18 |
| | 2.2 | Institutions and firm | 19 |
| | 2.3 | Organizational legitimacy | 23 |
| | 2.4 | Transgression, Deinstitutionalization & Delegitimation | 24 |
| | 2.4.1 | Transgressing firms | 24 |
| | 2.4.2 | Deinstitutionalization and Delegitimation | 27 |
| | 2.4.3 | Characteristics of tax transgressing firms | 28 |
| | 2.4.4 | Tax transgression and firm performance | 31 |
| | 2.4.5 | Transgression and intervention | 32 |
| | 2.4.6 | Transgressor prominence | 33 |
| | 2.4.6.1 | Business-to-Business (B2B) firms versus Business-to-Consumer (B2C) firms | 33 |
| | 2.5 | 2.5.1 Government intervention | 37 |
| | | 2.5.2 Government intervention and firm performance | 39 |
| | 2.6 | Organizational stigma | 41 |
| | 2.7 | Reintegration | 45 |
| Chapter 3 | | Transgression by firms and intervention in various countries | 48 |
| | 3.1 | Australia | 49 |
| | 3.2 | Brazil | 50 |
| | 3.3 | Canada | 51 |
| | 3.4 | China | 51 |
| | 3.5 | Denmark | 52 |
| | 3.6 | European Union | 52 |
| | 3.7 | France | 53 |
| | 3.8 | Germany | 54 |
| | 3.9 | Malaysia | 55 |
| | 3.10 | Mexico | 55 |
| | 3.11 | Nigeria | 56 |
| | 3.12 | Romania | 56 |
| | 3.13 | Russia | 57 |
| | 3.14 | Singapore | 57 |
| | 3.15 | South Africa | 58 |
| | 3.16 | United Kingdom | 59 |
| | 3.17 | United States of America | 59 |
| | 3.18 | India | 62 |
| | 3.18.1 | Search and seizure action (Raid) | 63 |
| | 3.18.2 | Survey action | 65 |

| Chapter | Para No. | Particulars | Page No. |
|------------------|----------|--|------------|
| Chapter 4 | | Hypotheses | 68 |
| | 4.1 | Relationship between tax intervention and firm performance | 69 |
| | | H1a | 71 |
| | | H1b | 74 |
| | 4.2 | Types of intervention and firm performance | 75 |
| | | H2a | 76 |
| | | H2b | 78 |
| | 4.3 | Types of Business, intervention and firm performance | 79 |
| | | H3a | 80 |
| | | H3b | 81 |
| | 4.4 | Firm size, intervention and firm performance | 82 |
| | | H4a | 83 |
| | | H4b | 85 |
| Chapter 5 | | Empirical Analysis | 86 |
| | 5.1 | Sampling procedure | 87 |
| | 5.2 | Data collection | 88 |
| | | 5.2.1 Search Action | 88 |
| | | 5.2.2 Survey Action | 89 |
| | 5.3 | Intervention Time line | 92 |
| | 5.4 | Variables | 93 |
| | | 5.4.1 Dependent Variable | 93 |
| | | 5.4.2 Independent Variables | 93 |
| | | 5.4.3 Controls | 94 |
| | 5.5 | Method | 95 |
| Chapter 6 | | Results | 96 |
| | 6.1 | Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation | 97 |
| | 6.2 | Model 1 : Control Variables | 99 |
| | 6.3 | Model 2 : Raid Year and Time | 100 |
| | 6.4 | Model 3 : Types of intervention | 102 |
| | 6.5 | Model 4 : Types of Business – B2B & B2C | 104 |
| | 6.6 | Model 5 : Size of firm | 107 |
| | 6.7 | Model 6 : Interaction | 110 |
| | 6.8 | Consolidated Statistical results | 110 |
| | 6.9 | Definition of variables | 111 |
| Chapter 7 | | Conclusion, Implications, Limitations and Future Research | 112 |
| | 7.1 | Conclusion | 113 |
| | 7.2 | Implications | 117 |
| | 7.3 | Limitations and future research | 119 |
| Chapter 8 | | References | 120 |
| | | Websites | 147 |
| | | Legislatures, Acts, Rules referred | 148 |

FIGURES

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| Figure 1 | Transgression and intervention in various countries | 61 |
| Figure 2 | Sample – Gujarat, India | 88 |
| Figure 3 | Intervention timeline | 92 |
| Figure 4 | Model 2 – Raid Year and Time | 100 |
| Figure 5 | Model 3 – Types of intervention | 102 |
| Figure 6 | Model 4 – Types of Business | 106 |
| Figure 7 | Model 5 – Size | 109 |

TABLES

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table 1 | Details of year of intervention | 90 |
| Table 2 | Details of public firms and private firms covered under search and survey action | 91 |
| Table 3 | Details of B2B and B2C firms covered under search and survey action | 91 |
| Table 4 | Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation statistics | 98 |
| Table 5 | Model 1 – Control Variables | 99 |
| Table 6 | Model 2 – Raid Year and Time | 101 |
| Table 7 | Model 3 – Types of intervention | 103 |
| Table 8 | Model 4 – Types of Business | 105 |
| Table 9 | Model 5 – Size | 108 |
| Table 10 | Consolidated statistical results | 110 |
| Table 11 | Definition of variables | 111 |