Corruption and the Shadow Economy:

An Empirical Analysis

by

DREHER, Axel and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich[*]

Working Paper No. 0603
July 2006

Corruption and the Shadow Economy: An Empirical Analysis

Axel Dreher[1]

and
Friedrich Schneider[2]

This version: 05 January 2006

Abstract

This paper analyzes the influence of the shadow economy on corruption and vice versa. We hypothesize that corruption and shadow economy are substitutes in high income countries while they are complements in low income countries. The hypotheses are tested for a cross-section of 120 countries and a panel of 70 countries for the period 1994-2002. Our results show that the shadow economy reduces corruption in high income countries, but increases corruption in low income countries. We also find that stricter regulations increase both corruption and the shadow economy.

Keywords: Corruption, Shadow Economy, Regulation, Tax Burden

JEL-Codes: D73, H26, 017, 05

[1] Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, KOF, ETH Zürich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich), CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland, E-mail: mail@axel-dreher.de

[2] Department of Economics, University of Linz, Altenbergerstraße 69, 4040 Linz-Auhof, Austria, Tel: 0043/70-2468-8210, Fax: 0043/70-2468-8209, e-mail: friedrich.schneider@jku.at, web-site: www.econ.jku.at

1 Introduction

As corruption and shadow economy activities are a fact of life around the world, most societies attempt to control their activities through various measures like punishment, prosecution, or education. To gather information about the extent of corruption and the shadow economy or who is engaged in corrupt or underground activities, the frequencies with which these activities are occurring, and the magnitude of them is thus crucial for making effective and efficient decisions. Unfortunately, neither corruption nor the shadow economy easily lend themselves to measurement. It is thus rather difficult to get correct information about the extent of corruption and shadow economy activities in the goods and labour market, because all individuals engaged in those activities wish not to be identified, of course. Hence doing research in these two areas can be considered as a scientific passion for knowing the unknown.

In this paper we explore the relationship between the shadow economy and corruption. We thereby combine two strands of the literature. The first deals with the impact of corruption on the shadow economy; the second with the influence of the shadow economy on corruption. In both strands there are important gaps. Regarding the impact of corruption on the shadow economy, first, previous studies employ rather small samples. For example, Johnson et al. (1997) find that corruption affects the shadow economy positively (and the official economy negatively) – in a cross section of, however, only 15 countries. Similar results are presented in Johnson et al. (1998), with 39 countries in the relevant equation. Employing instrumental variables techniques and even reliable control variables was thus infeasible.

Second, the few studies investigating the impact of corruption on the shadow economy focus on rather heterogeneous country samples. There is no separation of high income and low income countries, the exception being Friedman et al. (2000), distinguishing Latin America, OECD and transition countries. However, Friedman et al. (2000) have only 15, 20 and, respectively, 7 observations in their sample, so their results are far from reliable. Indeed, there is good reason to expect the relationship between corruption and the shadow economy to differ in high and low income countries. In high income countries, bribing government officials when detected engaging in the shadow market is rarely an option. Corruption might thus be independent of the size of the shadow economy. As Choi and Thum (2004) and Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005a) show, however, the shadow economy can mitigate government-induced distortions, so that corruption and the shadow economy could also be substitutes. Clearly, in high income countries entrepreneurs do not have to pay the bribes demanded by officials as they could always bring the corrupt officials to court.

Consequently, they can choose by themselves whether to pay a bribe or operate underground. In low income countries, to the contrary, entrepreneurs engaging in the shadow economy can reasonably expect to escape prison when their illegal engagement is detected. Officials collude with entrepreneurs and taxpayers in exchange for a bribe (e.g. Hindriks et al. 1999). To what extent corruption and the shadow economy are complements or substitutes is thus likely to vary among high and low income countries.

Third, the existing evidence is contradictory and insufficient. Friedman et al. (2000) claim "corruption is associated with more unofficial economy". However, in the relevant instrumental variables regression, when controlling for the income level, this holds for only three out of eight indices employed (p. 480). Further investigation – with a greater sample of countries – is needed.

Turning to the impact of the shadow economy on corruption, empirical evidence is virtually non-existent and the literature is not developed beyond the postulation of formal models. The exception is Dreher, Kotsogiannis, McCorriston (2005a), employing structural equations modeling to empirically confirm the negative impact from the shadow economy to corruption (in a sample of 18 OECD countries).

Finally, the use of perceptions based indices of corruption has recently been challenged. As one problem with these indices, it is not obvious, what they actually measure. According to Mocan (2004) perceived corruption is completely unrelated to actual corruption once other relevant factors are controlled for. Similarly, Weber Abramo (2005) shows that perceived corruption is not related to bribery.[1] Analyzing the relationship between corruption and shadow economy using a measure of corruption that is not based on perceptions is thus clearly warranted.

This paper makes an attempt to fill these gaps. For the first time in the literature, we employ a huge number of estimates of the size of the shadow economy based on the same method and all coming from the same source. We employ a cross-section of 120 countries over the period 1999-2002 to empirically analyze the relationship between corruption and the shadow economy.[2] We employ an index of actual corruption in addition to the usual perceptions based indices. The index has been developed in Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005b) and is based on a structural model. A panel of about 100 countries is also analyzed. The country sample is split in high and low income countries in order to get additional insights about the relationship between corruption and the shadow economy.

---

[1] See Andvig (2005) and Søreide (2005) for further criticism of perceptions based indices of corruption.
[2] Appendix D contains a list of countries included in the empirical analysis.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we derive our hypotheses, while section 3 discusses the data and method of estimation. In the fourth section, we present the empirical results. Finally section 5 gives a summary and draws some conclusions.

2 Hypotheses

Theoretically, corruption and the shadow economy can be either complements or substitutes. Choi and Thum (2004) present a model where the option of entrepreneurs to go underground constrains a corrupt official's ability to ask for bribes. Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005a) extend the model to the explicit specification of institutional quality. The model shows that corruption and shadow economy are substitutes in the sense that the existence of the shadow economy reduces the propensity of officials to demand grafts.

Johnson et al. (1997), to the contrary, model corruption and the shadow economy as complements. In their full-employment model, labour can be either employed in the official sector or in the underground economy. Consequently, an increase in the shadow economy always decreases the size of the official market. In their model, corruption increases the shadow economy, as corruption can be viewed as one particular form of taxation and regulation (driving entrepreneurs underground). Hindriks et al. (1999) also show that the shadow economy is a complement to corruption. This is because, in this case, the tax payer colludes with the inspector so the inspector underreports the tax liability of the tax payer in exchange for a bribe.[3]

Theoretically, the relationship between corruption and the shadow economy is thus unsettled. There is, however, reason to believe that the relationship might differ among high and low income countries. In high income countries, the official sector provides public goods like the rule of law, enforcement of contracts, and protection by an efficient police. Usually, only craftsmen or very small firms have (or take) the option of going underground. In this case, the shadow economy is hidden from tax inspectors and other officials. In other words, there are no bribes necessary or possible to buy the way out of the official sector. In high income countries – typically showing comparably small levels of corruption – individuals confronted with a corrupt official always have the choice to bring the official to court. Moreover, in high income countries corruption quite often takes place, for example, to bribe officials to get a (huge) contract from the public sector (e.g. in the construction sector). This contract is then handled in the official economy and not in the shadow economy. Hence, corruption in high income countries can be a means to achieve certain benefits which make

---

[3] See Dreher and Siemers (2005) for a formalization of this argument.

work in the official economy easier, e.g., winning a contract from a public authority, getting a licence (e.g. for operating taxes or providing other services or getting the permission to convert land into "construction ready" land, etc.). In high income countries people thus bribe in order to be able engaging in more official economic activities. As Schneider and Enste (2000) point out, at least two thirds of the income earned in the shadow economy is immediately spent in the official sector. The shadow economy and the official sector might thus be complements. The corresponding increase in government revenue and strengthened institutional quality is likely to decrease corruption. The prediction of a negative (substitutive) relation between corruption and the shadow economy is in line with the models of Choi and Thum (2004) and Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005a).[4]

In low income countries, to the contrary, we expect different mechanisms to prevail. Instead of working partly in the official sector and offering additional services underground as in high-income countries, enterprises completely engage in underground activity. Examples for enterprises operating completely underground are restaurants, bars, or haircutters – and even bigger production companies. As one reason for this, the public goods provided by the official sector are in many developing countries less efficient as compared to high income countries. Big companies, however, are comparably easy to detect and – in order to escape taxation and punishment – they have to bribe officials, thereby increasing corruption. Corruption often takes place in order to pay for activities in the shadow economy, so that the shadow economy entrepreneur can be sure not to be detected by public authorities. Here, shadow economy and corruption are likely to reinforce each other, as corruption is needed to expand shadow economy activities and – at the same time – underground activities require bribes and corruption. To get some additional income from the shadow economy entrepreneur, it is natural for public officials to ask for bribes and thus benefit from the shadow market. In low income countries, we therefore expect a positive (complementary) relation between corruption and the shadow economy. This corresponds to the predictions of the models of Hindriks et al. (1999) and Johnson et al. (1997).

In summary we expect:

Hypothesis 1: In low income countries, shadow economy activities and corruption are complements.

Hypothesis 2: In high income countries, shadow economy activities and corruption are substitutes.

---

[4] Consequently, Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005a) test their model employing data for OECD countries only.

Regarding our control variables, we follow Johnson et al. (1997, 1998) and Friedman et al. (2000). Our covariates thus belong to three groups: tax rates and government revenues, measures of regulation, and proxies of institutional quality. Johnson et al. (1997, 1998) argue that the shadow economy is expected to be higher when there is more regulation and thus more discretion for officials. Politicians might use the right to regulate to pursue their own interest, such as supporting allies. Politicians can also use the right to regulate to enrich themselves by offering relief from regulation in exchange for bribes (Shleifer and Vishny 1993, Dreher and Siemers 2005):

> **Hypothesis 3**: The more intensive the official economy is regulated, the higher is the shadow economy.

> **Hypothesis 4**: The more intensive the official economy is regulated, the higher is corruption.

As firms in the unofficial sector largely escape taxation, a higher share of the informal sector should be correlated with lower tax revenue (in percent of GDP). However, a heavy fiscal burden is likely to drive enterprises underground, a result obtained by Loayza (1996) for Latin America and by Johnson et al. (1997) for transition economies. When other relevant determinants of the shadow economy are controlled for we thus expect:

> **Hypothesis 5:** A huge fiscal burden increases the size of the shadow economy.

Regarding corruption, bribes are paid to avoid paying taxes or following regulations, so that a high fiscal burden is hypothesized to increase corruption.

> **Hypothesis 6:** The higher the fiscal burden, the higher is corruption.

Better institutional quality, finally, increases the benefits entrepreneurs can derive from operating in the official sector, most likely leading to a reduction of the unofficial sector. Almost by definition, better institutions also imply lower levels of corruption. We therefore hypothesize:

> **Hypothesis 7:** Better institutional quality reduces the size of the shadow economy.

> **Hypothesis 8:** Better institutional quality reduces corruption.

The next section outlines our method of estimation and presents the data.

3. Data and Estimation Technique

We start with estimating regressions for a cross-section of countries. The equations take the following form:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 X_i + \beta'_2 Z_i + \varepsilon_i , \tag{1}$$

where Y and X represent either corruption or, respectively, the shadow economy and Z is a vector of control variables.

In order to increase the number of observations, all data are averages over the period 2000-2002. Data for the shadow economy are taken from Schneider (2005a). Schneider calculates the size and development of the shadow economy of 145 countries, including developing, transition and highly developed OECD countries over the period 1999 to 2003 employing the dymimic and currency demand estimation technique.[5] The average size of the shadow economy as a percent of official GDP in 2002/03 in 96 developing countries was 38.7%, in 25 transition countries 40.1%, in 21 OECD countries 16.3%, and in 3 communist countries 22.3%.

To measure corruption, we employ an index provided by the International Country Risk Guide. This indicator is based on the analysis of a world-wide network of experts.[6] On the original scale, the index has a range from 0 – representing highest corruption – to 6 (no corruption). We rescaled the index, so that higher values represent more corruption. We have 120 countries in our sample for which both data for the shadow economy and corruption are available.

Again following the previous literature, each regression also includes the log of per capita GDP, taken from the World Bank's (2003) World Development Indicators. Measures for institutional quality and regulatory burden are from Gwartney and Lawson (2004), the Heritage Foundation (2005), and Kaufmann et al. (2003). The variables are discussed in more detail when we present the regression results. Appendix B lists all variables with their exact sources and definitions; Appendix C reports descriptive statistics.

After including each explanatory variable individually to our regressions, we follow a general to specific approach eliminating those variables with the smallest t-value until we end up with a model containing only those variables (in addition to per capita GDP, the index of corruption and, respectively, the shadow economy) that are significant at the ten percent level at least.

---

[5] See also Schneider (2005b).

[6] Note that the focus of this index is on capturing political risk involved in corruption. Since it is the only perception-based data on corruption providing consistent time series, the index has nevertheless been widely used in empirical studies.

In the full model, we check for the influence of outliers using an algorithm that is robust to them. The robust regression technique weighs observations in an iterative process. Starting with OLS, estimates are obtained through weighted least squares where observations with relatively large residuals get smaller weight. This results in estimates not being overly influenced by any specific observation.

The sample is then split in two income (per capita) groups to test our hypothesis 1 and 2.[7] Depending on which covariates are included in the regressions, there are between 43-71 countries in the low income group. The number of countries with high income is between 37-48. Due to the substantially reduced number of observations we have to interpret the results of some regressions cautiously.

Clearly, taking corruption and the shadow economy as exogenous determinants of each other contradicts our *a priori* hypotheses. We therefore employ instrumental variables to deal with the potential endogeneity of corruption and the shadow economy. We employ two sets of instruments for each variable. First, the determinants of corruption and the shadow economy identified in the general to specific approach are employed. Second, we use the instruments for corruption suggested by Friedman et al. (2000): Ethnic and religious fractionalization, a country's latitude, and French, socialist, German, and Scandinavian legal origin. The variables have been shown to be correlated with institutional development across a wide range of countries (La Porta et al. 1999). Regarding the shadow economy, a range of variables determining the costs of doing business in a country have recently been developed by the World Bank (Djankov et al. 2002). According to the results of Friedman et al. (2000) entrepreneurs go underground mainly to reduce the burden of bureaucracy. The variables measuring costs and required time to open a business and flexibility with respect to hiring and firing workers thus appear to be natural instruments for the shadow economy. We employ them as our second set. Our second equation takes the form:

$$X_i = \gamma'_1 I_i + \varepsilon_i, \tag{2}$$

with I representing the vector of instrumental variables. F-tests on the joint significance of our instruments show that they are good predictors of the degree of corruption and, respectively, the shadow economy. In most (but not all) cases, the overidentifying restrictions are also accepted.

---

[7] Countries are in the first group if their 2004 GNI per capita does not exceed $3,255, and in the second otherwise. We choose to split the sample instead of using interaction terms as specification tests reject most of the regressions including all countries but accept most sub-sample regressions.

Turning to the panel estimations, our data cover the years 1994-2002, for 70 countries. We employ averages over three years for all variables. However, some of the data are not available for all countries or every year. Therefore, our panel data are unbalanced and the number of observations depends on the choice of explanatory variables. Again, we also present results employing instrumental variables. We only employ those instruments that show some variation over time. Equation (1) and (2) transform to:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{it} + \beta'_2 Z_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} , \tag{3}$$

$$X_{it} = \gamma'_1 I_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} , \tag{4}$$

The next section presents the results.

4. Empirical Results

4.1 Stepwise Regression Results

Before we present the results of the full model, we turn to the regressions including one explanatory variable at the time. Results for the shadow economy are reported in Tables A-1 to A-6 in the Appendix. Except for the index of corruption, we have kept the original signs on the variables, so that different organizations' ratings differ in whether a high numerical value corresponds to "better" values. The Heritage Foundation measure of fiscal burden refers to average and marginal corporate and income taxation. Its index of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade captures international trade taxation and regulation. A higher score (on a scale of 1-5) implies a higher burden of taxation, i.e. higher average and marginal tax rates and, respectively, higher taxes on trade. The Fraser Institute's measures of taxes (Gwartney and Lawson 2004) show higher scores for countries with lower tax rates, on a scale of 1-10. We employ their indices for the top marginal income tax rate and taxes on international trade. In addition, we employ tax revenue and overall revenue (both in percent of GDP) from the World Bank's (2003) World Development Indicators.

The results show, surprisingly, that our measures of tax burden are not correlated with the shadow economy at the five percent level of significance (when we control for per capita GDP). There is thus no support for our hypothesis 5. However, at the ten percent level of significance higher fiscal burden is associated with less unofficial activity. This is in line with the results of Friedman et al. (2000) for a cross section of 69 countries, showing that higher tax rates imply a smaller shadow market and Johnson et al. (1998).

According to our results – and contrary to hypothesis 6 – corruption is significantly more severe in countries with smaller fiscal burden. Higher barriers to trade significantly

increase corruption. This is in line with the theoretical model and empirical evidence presented in Dreher and Siemers (2005) for capital account restrictions: Economic agents facing more severe restrictions engage in bribery to pursue their business anyway.

Turning to the importance of regulations, we employ seven measures produced by the Heritage Foundation and the Fraser Institute. Again, the Fraser Institute's measures range from 0 to 10, where higher values indicate less regulations. The indices refer to regulations in the credit market, minimum wage regulation, price regulation, administrative procedures, and the time to spend with government bureaucracy. We take two indices from Heritage. The first measures wage and price regulation, the second is an overall measure of the degree of regulations in the economy. Again the scale ranges from 1 to 5, with higher values indicating regulations that are worse for business.

As can be seen in the tables, at the five percent level at least, the shadow economy expands with fewer regulations in the credit market, higher minimum wages and stricter administrative procedures. While the first result is surprising, the latter two are in line with hypothesis 3. At least at the five percent level of significance, corruption is more severe with stronger regulation in the credit market, stronger wage and price regulations, and the overall Heritage index of regulations, supporting hypothesis 4.

Regarding institutional quality, we employ three indices constructed by the Fraser Institute, and two from the World Bank (Kaufmann et al. 2003). On the scale of the Fraser indices (0-10), higher values imply a "better" legal system. We employ their indices for judicial independence, impartial courts, and the integrity of the legal system. The World Bank's government effectiveness and rule of law indicators range from -2.28 to 2.59 and, respectively, -2.04 to 2.36, with higher scores showing "better" environments.

The results are straightforward: both corruption and the shadow economy are significantly smaller with better rule of law, greater government effectiveness, more judicial independence, impartial courts, and higher integrity of the legal system, supporting hypotheses 7 and 8.

So far, the results also show that corruption is rarely a significant determinant of the shadow economy. In those regressions where its coefficient is significantly different from zero, higher corruption implies a higher shadow economy. Similarly, the shadow economy is significantly associated with more corruption in some regressions. However, corruption and the shadow economy are never significant when variables controlling for the quality of institutions are included. Clearly, without the inclusion of additional control variables the regressions showing a significant effect of the shadow market or, respectively, of corruption,

are likely to be misspecified. The RESET test indicates that relevant variables are not included. In most regressions, there is also evidence that the residuals are not normally distributed.

4.2 Regression Results of the Full Model

Table 1 presents the results of the full model explaining the size of the shadow economy. As can be seen, only three variables turned out to be robust determinants of the unofficial sector. The shadow market shrinks with stronger regulations in the credit market, contradicting our *a priori* expectation. The coefficient is significant at the one percent level both in the OLS and the robust regression. Also at the one percent level, government effectiveness reduces the size of the informal sector. This is intuitive: the more effective the government, the greater the benefits of operating in the legal sector. Moreover, the risk of getting caught engaging in illegal activities is higher with more effective governments. Stronger minimum wage regulation also increases the shadow economy, with a coefficient significant at the one percent level in the OLS regression, and at the five percent level in the robust regression. The result is in line with our hypothesis 3: Stronger regulatory burden drives entrepreneurs underground.[8]

As the results of Table 1 show, corruption does not significantly affect the shadow economy. This is in contrast to the results of Johnson et al. (1998) reporting corruption to be among the major determinants of the unofficial sector. However, their regressions neglect the impact of institutional and governmental quality. Once institutional quality and government effectiveness is taken into account, neither GDP per capita nor corruption have a significant impact on the shadow economy. The results of Table 1 show that this is true for both income groups. This is in line with the results of Bjørnskov (2005) showing that the perceptions based index of corruption developed by Kaufmann et al. (2003) cannot be separated statistically from their other five indices of governance. Similarly, Andvig (2005), and Weber Abramo (2005) argue that perceptions based indices reflect the quality of a country's institutions rather than its actual degree of corruption.

Table 2 reports results for the full model explaining perceived corruption. As can be seen, price regulation leads to more corruption, while corruption is lower with better rule of law and greater democracy. While the fiscal burden significantly reduces corruption at the ten percent level of significance according to the OLS results, the coefficient is not significant in

---

[8] The correlation between credit market regulation and the rule of law is about 0.7, but the Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) are consistently low, so there should be no problem identifying effects due to collinearity.

the robust regression. GDP per capita has no significant impact on corruption in the overall sample – and neither does the shadow economy. However, a bigger shadow economy reduces corruption in high income countries, with a coefficient significant at the one percent level. Corruption and the shadow economy are thus substitutes in high income countries. Quantitatively, a ten percentage points increase of the shadow economy (in percent of GDP) reduces the index of corruption by 0.7 points in high income countries. The standardised regression (beta) coefficient is 0.47.

We proceed with our instrumental variables approach. Table 3 shows that the results for the shadow economy are very similar to those presented above. Again, the index of corruption is not significant at the five percent level in any regression (while corruption reduces the shadow market at the ten percent level of significance in high income countries). The Sargan test accepts the overidentifying restrictions at the one percent level in all but the final regressions, where the restrictions are accepted at the ten percent level. Table 4 shows the correlation between the two sets of instruments and the residuals of the full model. The table shows that the correlation between the instruments and the residuals is reasonably low. The table also shows the comparably high correlation between most of the instruments and the endogenous variable (corruption).

Tables 5 and 6 replicate the analysis with corruption as the dependent variable. Again, the results are similar to those presented previously. However, the shadow economy no longer significantly affects corruption in high income countries.

Finally, we report results for the combined cross-section time-series analysis in Tables 7 (shadow economy) and 8 (corruption). They show that corruption increases the size of the shadow economy. When both income groups are included, this is true when the regression is estimated with fixed or random effects, and when corruption is instrumented with the time varying set of instruments.[9] An increase in the index of corruption by one point increases the shadow economy (in percent of GDP) by 1.3-3.5 percentage points (which amounts to standardised (beta) coefficients between 0.12-0.32). In high income countries, corruption also increases the size of the informal sector, while it has no significant impact in low income countries.

Finally, Table 8 shows that corruption is higher with a bigger informal sector also. In the fixed and random effects specifications, its coefficient is significant at the one percent level. The same is true in low income countries, where corruption again rises with the size of

---

[9] Note that we do not instrument them with variables that do not change over time.

the shadow market. In high income countries no significant impact exists. The same is true when the shadow economy is instrumented.

In summary, there is some evidence that corruption and the shadow economy are complements in countries with low income (hypothesis 1), while going underground is an alternative to corruption in high income countries (hypothesis 2).

4.3 Further Discussion

We test the robustness of our results employing two alternative indicators of perceived corruption. The first is the corruption perceptions index developed by Transparency International (TI), ranging from zero to ten. The second index is from the World Bank's 'governance matters' database (Kaufmann et al. 2003) with values between -1.85 and 2.58. We transform both indices so that higher values represent greater perceived corruption.

The results show that there is no significant relationship between corruption and the shadow economy when the TI index is used. There is one exception: In high income countries, corruption decreases with a greater shadow economy, with a coefficient significant at the five percent level. The result is presented in Table 9. Table 9 also shows that the result remains when the World Bank index of corruption is used instead. No other regression shows a significant relation between the World Bank index and the size of the shadow economy (not reported in the table).

Perceptions based indices are, however, not free of problems. One such problem refers to the correlation between perceived corruption and actual corruption. According to Mocan (2004) the two are completely unrelated once other relevant factors are controlled for. Similarly, Weber Abramo (2005) shows that perceived corruption is not related to bribery. Our results might thus arise from the poor quality of the perceptions based indices of corruption. We therefore employ an alternative index of actual corruption to test the stability of the results. The index has been developed in Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005b) and is based on a structural model. The statistical method applied infers the magnitude of corruption from both the likely causes and likely effects of corruption. The index is available for about 100 countries for the year 2000 and ranges from 1 to 10, where higher values again represent more corruption.

When replicated with the index of actual corruption the regressions show that corruption does not significantly influence the size of the underground sector in any regression. We do therefore not present the results in a table. However, there is a significant impact of the shadow economy on corruption. The results of the OLS and robust regressions

are presented in Table 10; Table 11 presents the IV estimates.[10] As can be seen, corruption increases with the size of the underground sector, with coefficients significant at the ten percent level in the OLS and robust regressions. The disaggregated results show that the positive impact of the shadow economy on corruption is driven by low income countries. The results show that the magnitude of the coefficient is economically relevant. In low income countries, a one percentage point increase in the shadow economy (in percent of GDP) increases the index of corruption by 0.06 points (equivalent to a standardized beta coefficient of 0.36). The coefficient of the shadow economy is significant at the five percent level in low income countries, while it is insignificant in high income countries.

The results are similar when the shadow economy is instrumented with the two sets of instruments introduced above. When the determinants of the shadow economy identified by the general to specific approach are employed, corruption is again significantly higher with a larger shadow economy. This is true in the overall sample and in the low income sample (at the five percent level of significance). When the costs and flexibility of doing business are employed as instruments instead, the results are similar.

Table 12 summarizes our results. Overall, they show that an increase in perceived corruption over time also increases the shadow economy. This confirms the models of Johnson et al. (1997, 1998) and Hindriks et al. (1999). Across countries, however, greater perceived corruption does not lead to a greater shadow economy. To some extent this also supports the results of Méon and Sekkat (2004) showing the within-country variation to be important in their analysis of corruption on foreign direct investment and exports.

Regarding the impact of the shadow economy on perceived corruption, our results for the overall sample are similar to those for the other way round. In the cross-country regressions, all coefficients are completely insignificant. An increase in the shadow economy over time increases corruption according to the fixed and random effects estimator, but not when the endogeneity of the shadow is controlled for. Turning to the sub-samples, the results show that higher perceived corruption significantly reduces the shadow economy in high income countries, confirming the models of Choi and Thum (2004) and Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005a). In low income countries, to the contrary, corruption tends to increase with a higher shadow economy, again confirming the models of Johnson et al. (1997, 1998) and Hindriks et al. (1999). This is true for the impact of perceived corruption in the within-groups specification and actual corruption in all specifications.

---

[10] Note that the index of actual corruption shows no variation over time, so we can not replicate the panel regressions.

In summary, the results of our empirical analysis suggest that corruption and the shadow economy tend to be substitutes in high income countries, but complements in low income countries. There is thus some support for our main hypotheses (1 and 2). The analysis also shows, however, that the results do to some extent depend on the method of estimation.

The next section concludes.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have made a first attempt to deal with the dual relationship between corruption and the shadow economy. We hypothesized that the shadow economy and corruption are substitutes in high income countries. In low income countries, to the contrary, we expected the shadow economy and corruption to be complements. The empirical findings are more or less in line with these two hypotheses, although the results depend to some extent on how the regressions are specified and how corruption is measured. In summary there is evidence that going underground is an alternative to corruption in high income countries (this means a substitutive relationship) while corruption and the shadow economy are complements in countries with low and middle income. We also find a positive impact of regulation on the shadow economy, while our results regarding taxation are mixed. Our results show that heavier regulation leads to more corruption, while better rule of law and greater democracy imply less corruption.

What type of conclusions can we draw from these results? In general we must admit we have no clear and robust pattern that confirms our hypotheses among the range of indicators and specifications employed. Clearly, one of the most important problems in empirical studies on corruption and the shadow economy is the unavailability of high quality data both across countries and – more severely – over time. Our analysis confirms the importance of the choice of indicator on the results. If we use actual corruption figures as calculated by Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005b) instead of indices of perceived corruption, e.g., our results show a strongly significant impact of the shadow economy on corruption in low income countries. However, these data are only available for one year. Testing our hypotheses with consistent panel data of actual corruption thus remains for future research.

References

Alesina, Alberto; William Easterly; Arnaud Devleeschauwer; Sergio Kurlat and Romain Wacziarg, 2003, Fractionalization, *Journal of Economic Growth* 8, 155-194.

Andvig, Jens C., 2005, 'A house of straw, sticks or bricks'? Some notes on corruption empirics, Paper presented to IV Global Forum on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, Session Measuring Integrity, June 7, 2005.

Bjørnskov, Christian, 2005, The Multiple Facets of Social Capital, *European Journal of Political Economy*, forthcoming.

Botero, Juan; Simeon Djankov; Rafael La Porta; Florencio Lopez de Silanes, and Andrei Shleifer, 2004, The Regulation of Labour, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119, 1339-1382.

Choi, J. and M. Thum, 2004, Corruption and the shadow economy, *International Economic Review*, forthcoming.

Djankov, S.; R. La Porta; F. Lopez de Silanes and A. Schleifer, 2002, The regulation of entry, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117, 1-37.

Dreher, Axel; Christos Kotsogiannis and Steve McCorriston, 2005a, How do Institutions Affect Corruption and the Shadow Economy? University of Konstanz and University of Exeter, mimeo.

Dreher, Axel; Christos Kotsogiannis and Steve McCorriston, 2005b, Corruption around the World: Evidence from a Structural Model, University of Konstanz and University of Exeter, mimeo.

Dreher, Axel and Lars-H.R. Siemers, 2005, The Intriguing Nexus Between Corruption and Capital Account Restrictions, KOF Working Paper 113, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich).

Easterly, William and Mirvat Sewadeh, 2001, Global Development Network Growth Database, http://www. worldbank.org/research/growth/GDNdata.htm.

Friedman, Eric; Simon Johnson; Daniel Kaufmann and Pablo Zoido-Lobatón, 2000, Dodging the grabbing hand: the determinants of unofficial activity in 69 countries, *Journal of Public Economics* 76: 459-493.

Gwartney, James and Robert Lawson, 2004, *Economic Freedom of the World: 2004 Annual Report.* Vancouver: The Fraser Institute. Data retrieved from www.freetheworld.com.

Heritage Foundation, 2005, Index of Economic Freedom, Washington, DC.

Hindriks, J.; A. Muthoo and M. Keen, 1999, Corruption, extortion and evasion, *Journal of Public Economics* 74: 395-430.

La Porta, R.; F. Lopez de Silanes; A. Shleifer and R.W. Vishny, 1999, The quality of government, *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 15, 1: 222-279.

Johnson, Simon; Daniel Kaufmann and Andrei Shleifer, 1997, The unofficial economy in transition, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2: 159-221.

Johnson, Simon; Daniel Kaufmann and Pablo Zoido-Lobatón, 1998, Corruption, Public Finances and the Unofficial Economy, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series 2169.

Kaufmann, Daniel; Aart Kraay and M. Mastruzzi, 2003, Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996–2002, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3106.

Loayza, Norman V., 1996, The Economics of the Informal Sector: A Simple Model and some Empirical Evidence from Latin America, *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 45: 129-62.

Méon, Pierre-Guillaume and Khalid Sekkat, 2004, Does the Quality of Institutions Limit the MENA's Integration in the World Economy? *The World Economy* 27, 9: 1475-1498.

Mocan, Naci, 2004, What determines corruption? International Evidence from Micro data, NBER working paper 10460.

Schneider, Friedrich, 2005a, Shadow Economies of 145 countries all over the world: Estimation results of the period 1999-2003, University of Linz: Department of Economics, Discussion paper Linz, Austria.

Schneider, Friedrich, 2005b, Shadow Economies around the world: What do we really know? *European Journal of Political Economy* 21, 3, 598-642.

Schneider, Friedrich and D.H. Enste, 2000, Shadow Economies: Size, Causes, and Consequences, *Journal of Economic Literature* 38, 77-114.

Shleifer, Andrei and Robert W. Vishny, 1993, Corruption, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* CVIII: 599-618.

Søreide, Tina, 2005, Is it right to rank? Limitations, implications and potential improvements of corruption indices, Paper presented to IV Global Forum on Fighting Corruption and Safeguarding Integrity, Session Measuring Integrity, June 7, 2005.

Weber Abramo, Claudio, 2005, How far Perceptions go, Transparency Brazil Working Paper.

World Bank, 2003, World Development Indicators, CD-Rom, Washington, DC.

Table 1: Determinants of the Shadow Economy – Full Model

	OLS	RR	Income Low	Income High
Corruption (ICRG)	1.88	1.32	3.57	-0.84
	(1.20)	(0.82)	(1.34)	(0.97)
Log GDP per capita	-2.42	-2.44	-2.41	-6.54
	(1.37)	(1.34)	(1.05)	(1.73*)
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	4.89	4.29	6.20	-0.27
	(2.74***)	(2.89***)	(3.13***)	(0.23)
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	-4.53	-3.71	-5.95	4.12
	(2.64***)	(2.29**)	(3.15***)	(1.26)
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)	-9.69	-9.80	-9.42	-7.81
	(3.17***)	(2.69***)	(2.51**)	(2.37**)
Adjusted R2	0.67		0.51	0.5
Observations	70	70	45	25
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.31	0.29	0.19	0.11
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.03		0.98	0.44
RESET (Prob>F)	0.16		0.59	0.92

Notes: OLS and robust (RR) regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), less regulation (Fraser), and better quality (World Bank).
Constant included but not reported.

Table 2: Determinants of Corruption – Full Model

| | OLS | RR | Income | |
			Low	High
Shadow Economy	0.003	0.003	0.008	-0.07
	(0.41)	(0.43)	(1.14)	(3.57***)
Log GDP per capita	0.07	0.01	0.029	1.13
	(0.62)	(0.08)	(0.24)	(3.98***)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-0.27	-0.18	-0.08	-0.41
	(1.91*)	(1.45)	(0.51)	(0.80)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.18	-0.19	-0.16	-0.14
	(3.67***)	(3.67***)	(2.91***)	(1.12)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-0.66	-0.64	-0.44	-2.88
	(3.80***)	(3.71***)	(2.38**)	(5.18***)
Democracy	-0.06	-0.07	-0.04	-0.05
	(2.59**)	(2.62***)	(1.504)	(0.42)
Adjusted R2	0.62		0.35	0.69
Observations	98	98	71	27
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.07	0.02	0.17	0.73
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.27		0.00	0.50
RESET (Prob>F)	0.05		0.06	0.69

Notes: OLS and robust (RR) regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.
Constant included but not reported.

Table 3: Determinants of the Shadow Economy, Full Model, Instrumental Variables

	(1)			(2)		
	All	Low	High	All	Low	High
Corruption (ICRG)	3.72	3.12	5.41	-4.04	5.14	-1.85
	(1.17)	(0.86)	(1.40)	(1.33)	(0.78)	(1.91*)
Log GDP per capita	-1.98	-2.52	-8.49	-3.17	-1.95	-6.24
	(1.10)	(1.11)	(2.17**)	(1.62)	(0.78)	(1.50)
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	5.82	6.05	5.96	2.38	6.87	-1.12
	(3.00***)	(2.92***)	(1.49)	(1.03)	(2.31**)	(0.95)
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	-4.49	-5.94	6.25	-4.18	-5.89	3.85
	(2.55**)	(3.18***)	(1.90*)	(2.32**)	(2.83***)	(1.10)
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)	-9.08	-9.60	-9.10	-12.64	-8.81	-8.08
	(2.59**)	(2.35**)	(2.07**)	(3.44***)	(2.01**)	(2.42**)
Adjusted R2	0.66	0.51	-0.11	0.60	0.47	0.43
Observations	69	45	24	67	43	24
Sargan Test (Prob. > F)	0.77	0.82	0.89	0.73	0.14	0.03

Notes:
(1) Corruption instrumented with Fiscal Burden (Heritage), Regulation of Prices (Fraser), Rule of Law (World Bank), Democracy.
(2) Corruption instrumented with Ethnic Fractionalization, Religious Fractionalization, Latitude, French Legacy, Socialist Legacy, German Legacy, Scandinavian Legacy.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), less regulation (Fraser), and better quality (World Bank).
Constant included but not reported.

Table 4: Instruments for Corruption – Correlation between Instruments and Residuals/ Endogenous Explanatory Variable

	Residuals of Full Model	Corruption (ICRG)
Corruption (ICRG)	-0.03	
Log GDP per capita	0.04	-0.61
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-0.08	-0.11
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	0.11	-0.46
Rule of Law (World Bank)	0.06	-0.72
Democracy	0.14	-0.50
Ethnic fractionalization	-0.08	0.34
Religious fractionalization	0.07	-0.02
Latitude	0.14	-0.52
French legal origin	0.06	0.17
Socialist legal origin	0.05	0.06
German legal origin	-0.02	-0.20
Scandinavian legal origin	-0.02	-0.40

Table 5: Determinants of Corruption, Full Model, Instrumental Variables

	(1)			(2)		
	All	Low	High	All	Low	High
Shadow Economy	-0.03	-0.01	-0.09	-0.02	-0.02	-0.11
	(1.28)	(0.42)	(1.57)	(0.66)	(0.46)	(1.45)
Log GDP per capita	-0.04	-0.17	1.11	-0.03	-0.08	1.06
	(0.25)	(1.30)	(2.58**)	(0.24)	(0.60)	(2.93***)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	0.004	0.11	-0.53	-0.40	-0.20	-0.50
	(0.02)	(0.67)	(0.84)	(2.17**)	(1.14)	(0.91)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.20	-0.21	-0.12	-0.16	-0.11	-0.13
	(3.04***)	(3.37***)	(0.90)	(2.09**)	(1.09)	(1.01)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-0.94	-0.57	-3.23	-0.84	-0.58	-3.30
	(2.96***)	(2.10**)	(4.17***)	(2.30**)	(1.83*)	(3.50***)
Democracy	-0.08	-0.07	-0.06	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03
	(2.44**)	(1.88*)	(0.82)	(1.50)	(0.96)	(0.28)
Adjusted R2	0.69	0.39	0.56	0.57	0.22	0.67
Observations	69	45	24	94	68	26
Sargan Test (Prob. > F)	0.14	0.33	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.45

Notes:
 (1) Shadow Economy instrumented with Credit Market Regulations (Fraser), Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser), Government Effectiveness (World Bank).
(2) Shadow Economy instrumented with Starting a Business (Duration), Starting a Business (Costs), Flexibility to Hire, Flexibility to Fire.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.
Constant included but not reported.

Table 6: Instruments for the Shadow Economy – Correlation between Instruments and Residuals/ Endogenous Explanatory Variable

	Residuals of Full Model	Shadow Economy
Shadow Economy	-0.05	
Log GDP per capita	0.15	-0.71
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	0.37	-0.37
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	0.04	-0.49
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)	0.13	-0.76
Starting a Business (Duration)	0.22	0.33
Starting a Business (Costs)	0.16	0.53
Flexibility to Hire	0.19	0.18
Flexibility to Fire	0.12	0.37

Table 7: Determinants of the Shadow Economy, Full Model, Panel

	All	All	Income Low	Income High	All
Corruption (ICRG)	1.34	1.59	1.36	0.69	3.46
	(2.63**)	(4.81***)	(1.42)	(1.98**)	(3.48***)
Log GDP per capita	-0.81	-5.48	-5.33	-2.95	-14.60
	(0.15)	(4.20***)	(0.86)	(0.42)	(1.88*)
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	0.06	0.48	0.11	0.33	-0.04
	(0.14)	(1.25)	(0.25)	(1.42)	(0.09)
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	-0.89	-1.04	-1.37	-0.33	-0.73
	(3.97***)	(5.54***)	(4.50***)	(1.76*)	(3.00***)
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)	-0.11	-1.47	-1.74	6.30	4.89
	(0.05)	(1.00)	(0.54)	(1.72*)	(1.53)
Method	FE	RE	FE	FE	IV
R2 (overall)	0.99	0.56	0.23	0.99	0.45
Observations	118	118	69	49	116
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.00
Sargan Test (Prob. > F)					0.10

Notes:
The low income group has not enough observations.
FE: fixed country effects included.
RE: random effects model.
IV: Corruption instrumented with Fiscal Burden (Heritage), Regulation of Prices (Fraser), Rule of Law (World Bank), Democracy.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), less regulation (Fraser), and better quality (World Bank).

Table 8: Determinants of Corruption, Full Model, Panel

	All	All	Income		All
			Low	High	
Shadow Economy	0.09	0.02	0.10	0.09	0.01
	(2.88***)	(2.64***)	(2.77***)	(0.76)	(0.12)
Log GDP per capita	2.10	0.15	1.54	2.99	3.88
	(2.39**)	(1.49)	(1.16)	(2.15**)	(2.85***)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-0.33	-0.44	-0.27	-0.33	-0.69
	(1.51)	(4.00***)	(1.12)	(0.59)	(2.42**)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.06	-0.06	-0.07	0.03	-0.09
	(1.04)	(1.44)	(0.99)	(0.17)	(1.00)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-0.64	-0.75	-0.48	-0.53	-2.61
	(1.03)	(4.18***)	(0.67)	(0.31)	(2.39**)
Democracy	0.08	-0.05	0.08	0.76	0.03
	(2.21**)	(2.54***)	(2.33**)	(1.07)	(0.27)
Method	FE	RE	FE	FE	IV
R2 (overall)	0.91	0.58	0.54	0.91	0.21
Observations	183	183	131	52	116
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.00	0.77	0.09	0.00	0.00
Sargan Test (Prob. > F)					0.03

Notes:

FE: fixed country effects included.

RE: random effects model.

IV: Corruption instrumented with Fiscal Burden (Heritage), Regulation of Prices (Fraser), Rule of Law (World Bank), Democracy.

* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level

Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.

Table 9: Determinants of Corruption in high income countries (TI and World Bank) – Full Model

	TI	World Bank
Shadow Economy	-0.06	-0.01
	(2.35**)	(2.76**)
Log GDP per capita	0.19	-0.29
	(0.49)	(2.80**)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-0.29	-0.14
	(0.52)	(1.62)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.30	-0.06
	(2.55**)	(1.91*)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-3.38	-1.41
	(3.93*)	(8.44***)
Democracy	-0.08	0.03
	(1.69)	(1.18)
Adjusted R2	0.80	0.90
Observations	24	27
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.00	0.07
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.14	0.47
RESET (Prob>F)	0.30	0.83

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (Transparency International (TI) and World Bank), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.
Constant included but not reported.

Table 10: Determinants of Corruption (DKM) – Full Model

	OLS	RR	Income Low	Income High
Shadow Economy	0.04	0.04	0.06	-0.10
	(1.77*)	(1.69*)	(2.49**)	(1.50)
Log GDP per capita	-0.17	-0.31	-0.16	-0.58
	(0.53)	(0.95)	(0.44)	(0.39)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	0.10	0.11	0.35	-1.72
	(0.33)	(0.24)	(0.73)	(1.51)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.19	-0.20	-0.26	-0.18
	(1.46)	(1.18)	(1.70*)	(0.45)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	0.88	1.13	0.76	-0.46
	(1.50)	(1.98**)	(1.24)	(0.22)
Democracy	-0.07	-0.06	-0.03	0.28
	(0.97)	(0.67)	(0.30)	(0.86)
Adjusted R2	0.01		0.16	0.69
Observations	90	90	65	25
F-test (Prob>F)	0.33	0.37	0.05	0.61
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.01
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.87		0.57	0.22
RESET (Prob>F)	0.23		0.46	0.14

Notes: OLS and robust (RR) regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (Dreher, Kotsogiannis, McCorriston 2005b), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.
Constant included but not reported.

Table 11: Determinants of Corruption (DKM), Full Model, Instrumental Variables

	(1)			(2)		
	All	Low	High	All	Low	High
Shadow Economy	0.14	0.10	-0.32	0.12	0.12	0.04
	(2.59**)	(2.65**)	(1.22)	(2.45**)	(2.50**)	(0.19)
Log GDP per capita	0.41	0.26	-0.94	0.13	0.12	-0.16
	(0.76)	(0.41)	(0.46)	(0.35)	(0.27)	(0.11)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	0.09	0.82	-3.51	0.11	0.39	-1.47
	(0.18)	(1.18)	(2.20**)	(0.34)	(0.71)	(1.31)
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)	-0.44	-0.41	-0.16	-0.41	-0.45	-0.20
	(2.10**)	(2.00**)	(0.41)	(2.45**)	(2.29**)	(0.42)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	1.58	0.67	-4.04	1.66	1.29	0.82
	(1.80*)	(0.83)	(1.23)	(2.61**)	(1.94*)	(0.28)
Democracy	-0.08	0.04	0.18	-0.12	-0.07	0.20
	(0.79)	(0.34)	(0.98)	(1.50)	(0.76)	(0.60)
Adjusted R2	0.30	0.23	-0.18	-0.04	0.25	-0.23
Observations	66	43	23	86	62	24
Sargan Test (Prob. > F)	0.89	0.17	0.01	0.83	0.87	0.21

Notes:
(1) Shadow Economy instrumented with Credit Market Regulations (Fraser), Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser), Government Effectiveness (World Bank).
(2) Shadow Economy instrumented with Starting a Business (Duration), Starting a Business (Costs), Flexibility to Hire, Flexibility to Fire.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level
Higher values represent more corruption (Dreher, Kotsogiannis, McCorriston 2005b), higher burden (Heritage), less regulation (Fraser), better quality (World Bank), and more democracy.
Constant included but not reported.

Table 12: Summary

Dependent Variable:	Shadow Economy			Corruption		
Independent Variable:	Corruption			Shadow Economy		
	All	Low	High	All	Low	High
ICRG index of corruption						
OLS	1.88	3.57	-0.84	0.00	0.01	-0.07
	(1.20)	(1.34)	(0.97)	(0.41)	(1.14)	(3.57***)
Robust regression	1.32			0.00		
	(0.82)			(0.43)		
IV, set 1	3.72	3.12	5.41	-0.03	-0.01	-0.09
	(1.17)	(0.86)	(1.40)	(1.28)	(0.42)	(1.57)
IV, set 2	-4.04	5.14	-1.85	-0.02	-0.02	-0.11
	(1.33)	(0.78)	(1.91*)	(0.66)	(0.46)	(1.45)
Panel, fixed effects	1.34	1.36	0.69	0.09	0.10	0.09
	(2.63**)	(1.42)	(1.98**)	(2.88***)	(2.77***)	(0.76)
Panel, random effects	1.59			0.02		
	(4.81***)			(2.64***)		
Panel IV	3.46			0.01		
	(3.48***)			(0.12)		
TI index of corruption						
OLS						-0.06
						(2.35**)
World Bank Index of corruption						
OLS						-0.01
						(2.76**)
DKM index of corruption						
OLS				0.04	0.06	-0.10
				(1.77*)	(2.49**)	(1.50)
Robust regression				0.04		
				(1.69*)		
IV, set 1				0.14	0.10	-0.32
				(2.59**)	(2.65**)	(1.22)
IV, set 2				0.12	0.12	0.04
				(2.45**)	(2.50**)	(0.19)

Notes:
Instruments for the shadow economy are: (1) Credit Market Regulations (Fraser), Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser), Government Effectiveness (World Bank); (2) Starting a Business (Duration), Starting a Business (Costs), Flexibility to Hire, Flexibility to Fire.
Instruments for corruption are: (1) Fiscal Burden (Heritage), Regulation of Prices (Fraser), Rule of Law (World Bank), Democracy; (2) Ethnic Fractionalization, Religious Fractionalization, Latitude, French Legacy, Socialist Legacy, German Legacy, Scandinavian Legacy.

* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level

Appendix A

Table A-1: Determinants of the Shadow Economy – Tax Burden

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Corruption (ICRG)	1.45	1.71	1.91	2.18	3.04	3.26
	(1.41)	(1.54)	(1.90*)	(2.40**)	(1.62)	(1.98*)
Log GDP per capita	-5.28	-5.61	-5.41	-5.28	-3.82	-3.68
	(7.61***)	(7.62***)	(5.62***)	(5.70***)	(2.16**)	(2.31**)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-2.47					
	(1.89*)					
Top marginal income tax rate (Fraser)		-0.05				
		(0.20)				
Taxes on international trade (Fraser)			0.26			
			(0.29)			
Trade Barriers (Heritage)				-1.22		
				(0.87)		
Taxes (percent of GDP)					-0.10	
					(0.56)	
Revenue (percent of GDP)						-0.20
						(1.15)
Adjusted R2	0.44	0.46	0.47	0.45	0.25	0.29
Observations	118	95	103	118	57	59
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.04
RESET (Prob>F)	0.13	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.07

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), higher burden (Heritage) and smaller burden (Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Table A-2: Determinants of the Shadow Economy – Measures of Regulation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Corruption (ICRG)	2.22	1.13	2.24	0.76	1.05	2.41	2.01
	(2.15**)	(0.80)	(2.12**)	(0.54)	(0.75)	(2.43**)	(2.14**)
Log GDP per capita	-6.19	-6.16	-5.68	-6.22	-5.85	-5.34	-4.86
	(8.33***)	(4.49)	(6.25***)	(4.71***)	(3.42***)	(8.04***)	(6.86***)
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	1.48						
	(2.16**)						
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)		-5.78					
		(3.22***)					
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)			0.63				
			(0.89)				
Administrative Procedures (Fraser)				-5.65			
				(2.58**)			
Time with government bureaucracy (Fraser)					-1.97		
					(1.30)		
Wage and Price Regulation (Heritage)						-3.39	
						(1.78*)	
Regulation (Heritage)							-0.24
							(0.16)
Adjusted R2	0.49	0.56	0.48	0.56	0.51	0.45	0.43
Observations	103	70	102	70	70	117	117
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.10	0.02	0.01
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.02	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.02
RESET (Prob>F)	0.13	0.42	0.18	0.12	0.27	0.03	0.03

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), more regulation (Heritage), and less regulation (Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Table A-3: Determinants of the Shadow Economy – Institutional Quality

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Corruption (ICRG)	-0.17	0.07	-0.06	1.17	1.04
	(0.17)	(0.07)	(0.03)	(1.04)	(1.03)
Log GDP per capita	-0.82	-1.82	-5.25	-3.55	-3.96
	(0.84)	(1.85*)	(5.00***)	(4.07***)	(4.93)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-8.81				
	(5.01***)				
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)		-7.16			
		(4.09***)			
Judicial independence (Fraser)			-2.16		
			(2.23**)		
Impartial courts (Fraser)				-2.22	
				(2.37**)	
Integrety of Legal System (Fraser)					-1.64
					(2.67***)
Adjusted R2	0.52	0.49	0.58	0.50	0.5
Observations	118	118	57	103	103
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.01	0.02
RESET (Prob>F)	0.62	0.58	0.65	0.44	0.12

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG) and better quality (World Bank, Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Table A-4: Determinants of Corruption – Tax Burden

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Shadow Economy	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
	(1.35)	(1.43)	(1.77*)	(2.32**)	(1.65)	(1.98**)
Log GDP per capita	-0.42	-0.39	-0.31	-0.23	-0.44	-0.40
	(5.66***)	(4.02***)	(2.99***)	(2.79***)	(4.03***)	(3.43***)
Fiscal Burden (Heritage)	-0.34					
	(2.32**)					
Top marginal income tax rate (Fraser)		0.03				
		(0.95)				
Taxes on international trade (Fraser)			-0.06			
			(0.80)			
Trade Barriers (Heritage)				0.24		
				(2.85***)		
Taxes (percent of GDP)					-0.05	
					(0.42)	
Revenue (percent of GDP)						0.02
						(1.23)
Adjusted R2	0.41	0.39	0.38	0.25	0.38	0.32
Observations	118	95	103	118	57	59
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.35	0.19	0.33	0.15	0.18	0.24
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.15	0.47	0.71	0.53	0.68	0.33
RESET (Prob>F)	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), higher burden (Heritage) and smaller burden (Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Table A-5: Determinants of Corruption – Measures of Regulation

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Shadow Economy	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01
	(2.40**)	(0.81)	(2.00**)	(1.44)	(1.76*)	(2.25**)	(1.97**)
Log GDP per capita	-0.20	-0.62	-0.24	-0.42	-0.34	-0.28	-0.23
	(2.09**)	(5.71***)	(2.57**)	(4.10***)	(3.34***)	(3.36***)	(2.43**)
Credit Market Regulations (Fraser)	-0.21						
	(2.51**)						
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)		-0.01					
		(0.07)					
Regulation of Prices (Fraser)			-0.20				
			(3.22***)				
Administrative Procedures (Fraser)				-0.07			
				(0.60)			
Time with government bureaucracy (Fraser)					0.26		
					(0.26)		
Wage and Price Regulation (Heritage)						0.30	
						(2.22**)	
Regulation (Heritage)							0.35
							(2.56**)
Adjusted R2	0.41	0.38	0.25	0.50	0.32	0.40	0.32
Observations	103	70	103	88	88	118	118
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.88	0.16	0.75	0.60	0.39	0.39	0.51
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.29	0.17	0.17	0.42	0.32	0.50	0.04
RESET (Prob>F)	0.00	0.67	0.00	0.05	0.08	0.00	0.01

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG), more regulation (Heritage) and less regulation (Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Table A-6: Determinants of Corruption – Institutional Quality

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Shadow Economy	-0.003	-0.002	0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.46)	(0.21)	(0.46)	(0.69)	(0.89)
Log GDP per capita	0.003	-0.02	-0.35	-0.26	-0.27
	(0.04)	(0.17)	(4.21***)	(2.96***)	(2.97***)
Rule of Law (World Bank)	-0.86				
	(5.54***)				
Government Effectiveness (World Bank)		-0.82			
		(5.09***)			
Judicial independence (Fraser)			-0.17		
			(3.82***)		
Impartial courts (Fraser)				-0.19	
				(3.12***)	
Integrety of Legal System (Fraser)					-0.14
					(3.18***)
Adjusted R2	0.50	0.49	0.55	0.42	0.41
Observations	118	118	88	103	103
F-test (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Normality test (Prob>chi2)	0.48	0.20	0.77	0.46	0.91
Heteroscedasticity test (Prob>chi2)	0.71	0.41	0.78	0.61	0.95
RESET (Prob>F)	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.00

Notes: OLS regressions; robust absolute t-statistics in parentheses.
* denotes significant at 10% level; ** significant at 5% level; *** significant at 1% level.
Higher values represent more corruption (ICRG) and better quality (World Bank, Fraser).
Constant included but not reported.

Appendix B: Sources and Definitions

Variable	Description	Source
Shadow Economy	Size of the shadow economy in percent of GDP calculated with dymimic and currency demand estimation techniques.	Schneider (2005a)
Corruption (ICRG)	Measures corruption in the political system as a threat to foreign investment based on the analysis of a worldwide network of experts. Rescaled so that 0 represents no corruption and 6 highest corruption.	International Country Risk Guide (ICRG)
Corruption (TI)	Corruption Perception Index. Rescaled so that 0 represents no corruption and 10 highest corruption.	Transparency International
Corruption (World Bank)	Control of Corruption Index.	Kaufman et al. (2003)
Corruption (DKM)	Index infered from a structural model using both the likely causes and likely effects of corruption. The index ranges from 1 to 10, where higher values represent more corruption.	Dreher, Kotsogiannis and McCorriston (2005b)
GDP per capita	GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. Data are in constant U.S. dollars.	World Bank (2003)
Fiscal burden (Heritage)	The index of the fiscal burden refers to average and marginal corporate and income taxation where a score of 1 signifies an economic environment most conducive to economic freedom, while a score of 5 signifies least economic freedom.	Heritage (2005)
Top marginal income tax rate (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with lower tax rates, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Taxes on international trade (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with lower tax rates, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Trade barriers (Heritage)	Captures international trade taxation and regulation. A higher score implies a higher burden of taxation, i.e. higher average and marginal tax rates and, respectively, higher taxes on trade.	Heritage (2005)
Taxes (percent of GDP)	Tax revenue in percent of GDP.	World Bank (2003)
Revenue (percent of GDP)	Current revenue (excluding grants) in percent of GDP.	World Bank (2003)
Credit Market Regulation (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with less regulation, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with less regulation, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Credit Market Regulation (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with less regulation, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Regulation of prices (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with less regulation, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Administrative procedures (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with fewer procedures, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Time with government bureaucracy (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with less bureaucracy, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Wage and price regulation (Heritage)	Index of wage and price regulation where a score of 1 signifies an economic environment most conducive to economic freedom, while a score of 5 signifies least economic freedom.	Heritage (2005)
Regulation (Heritage)	Index of regulation where a score of 1 signifies an economic environment most conducive to economic freedom, while a score of 5 signifies least economic	Heritage (2005)
Rule of law (World Bank)	Ranges from -2.58 to 2.48, with higher scores showing "better" environments.	Kaufmann et al. (2003)

Appendix B (continued)

Variable	Description	Source
Government effectiveness (World Bank)	Ranges -2.31 to 2.22, with higher scores showing "better" environments.	Kaufmann et al. (2003)
Judicial independence (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with greater judicial independence, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Impartial courts (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with greater impartiality, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Integrity of legal system (Fraser)	Show higher scores for countries with higher integrity, on a scale of 1-10.	Gwartney and Lawson (2004)
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	$\text{Fractionalization}_j = 1 - \sum_{i}^{n} s_{ij}^2$ with s_{ij} being the share of group i in country j.	Alesina et al. (2003)
Latitude	Absolute value of latitude.	Easterly and Sewadeh (2001)
Legal origin	Dummies representing French, German, Socialist, and Scandinavian legal origin.	La Porta et al. (1999)
Costs to start business	Measures the costs of the start-up of commercial or industrial firms with up to 50 employees and start-up capital of 10 times the economy's per-capita Gross National Income. All procedures required to register a firm are counted, including screening procedures by overseeing government entities, tax- and labour-related registration procedures, health and safety procedures, and environment-related procedures. The costs of these procedures are calculated as percentage of income per capita.	Djankov et al. (2002)
Duration to start business	Measures the duration of the start-up of commercial or industrial firms with up to 50 employees and start-up capital of 10 times the economy's per-capita Gross National Income. All procedures required to register a firm are counted, including screening procedures by overseeing government entities, tax- and labour-related registration procedures, health and safety procedures, and environment-related procedures. Time is recorded in calendar days.	Djankov et al. (2002)
Hiring flexibility index	The hiring cost indicator measures all social security payments (including retirement fund; sickness, maternity and health insurance; workplace injury; family allowance; and other obligatory contributions) and payroll taxes associated with hiring an employee. The cost is expressed as a percentage of the worker's salary.	Botero et al. (2004)
Firing flexibility index	The firing cost indicator measures the cost of advance notice requirements, severance payments and penalties due when dismissing a redundant worker, expressed in weekly wages.	Botero et al. (2004)
Religious fractionalization	$\text{Fractionalization}_j = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_{ij}^2$ with s_{ij} being the share of group i in country j.	Alesina et al. (2003)

Appendix C: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
Shadow Economy	31.78	6.90	68.20	12.72
Corruption (ICRG)	3.26	0.00	6.00	1.32
Corruption (TI)	5.20	0.00	9.95	2.61
Corruption (World Bank)	0.00	-1.85	2.58	0.98
Corruption (DKM)	0.08	-0.91	0.35	0.29
GDP per capita	7.50	3.98	10.72	1.55
Fiscal burden (Heritage)	3.82	1.30	5.00	0.75
Top marginal income tax rate (Fraser)	4.95	0.00	10.00	3.01
Taxes on international trade (Fraser)	6.44	0.00	10.00	2.34
Trade barriers (Heritage)	3.55	1.00	5.00	1.22
Taxes (percent of GDP)	20.20	0.37	47.28	9.69
Revenue (percent of GDP)	24.63	0.04	58.76	10.48
Credit Market Regulation (Fraser)	6.27	0.00	10.00	2.46
Minimum Wage Regulation (Fraser)	4.65	1.80	8.30	1.35
Credit Market Regulation (Fraser)	5.76	0.35	9.80	2.35
Regulation of prices (Fraser)	4.30	0.00	10.00	2.65
Administrative procedures (Fraser)	4.10	1.30	7.33	1.11
Time with government bureaucracy (Fraser)	6.10	2.20	9.70	1.32
Wage and price regulation (Heritage)	2.86	1.00	5.00	0.87
Regulation (Heritage)	3.37	1.00	5.00	0.93
Rule of law (World Bank)	0.00	-2.04	2.36	0.98
Government effectiveness (World Bank)	-0.02	-2.28	2.59	0.95
Judicial independence (Fraser)	5.76	0.35	9.80	2.34
Impartial courts (Fraser)	5.49	0.00	9.50	1.85
Integrity of legal system (Fraser)	6.52	0.00	10.00	2.59
Ethnolinguistic fractionalization	0.44	0.00	0.93	0.26
Latitude	17.89	-36.89	64.22	23.77
Legal origin British	0.35	0.00	1.00	0.48
Legal origin French	0.44	0.00	1.00	0.50
Legal origin Socialist	0.16	0.00	1.00	0.37
Legal origin German	0.03	0.00	1.00	0.16
Legal origin Scandinavian	0.03	0.00	1.00	0.16
Costs to start business	79.90	0.00	861.30	134.67
Duration to start business	54.60	2.00	203.00	40.15
Hiring flexibility index	49.30	17.00	81.00	17.09
Firing flexibility index	37.95	1.00	74.00	17.57
Religious fractionalization	0.44	0.00	0.86	0.23

Appendix D: Countries included in the Analysis

Albania	Guatemala	Pakistan
Algeria	Guinea	Panama
Angola	Haiti	Papua New Guinea
Argentina	Honduras	Paraguay
Armenia	Hong Kong, China	Peru
Australia	Hungary	Philippines
Austria	India	Poland
Azerbaijan	Indonesia	Portugal
Bangladesh	Iran, Islamic Rep.	Romania
Belarus	Iraq	Russian Federation
Belgium	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Bolivia	Israel	Senegal
Botswana	Italy	Sierra Leone
Brazil	Jamaica	Singapore
Bulgaria	Japan	Slovak Republic
BurkinaFaso	Jordan	Slovenia
Cameroon	Kazakhstan	South Africa
Canada	Kenya	Spain
Chile	Korea, Rep.	SriLanka
China	Kuwait	Sweden
Colombia	Latvia	Switzerland
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Lebanon	Syrian Arab Republic
Congo, Rep.	Lithuania	Taiwan, China
Costa Rica	Madagascar	Tanzania
Cote d' Ivoire	Malawi	Thailand
Croatia	Malaysia	Togo
Cyprus	Mali	Tunisia
Czech Republic	Mexico	Turkey
Denmark	Moldova	Uganda
Dominican Republic	Mongolia	Ukraine
Ecuador	Morocco	United Arab Emirates
Egypt, Arab Rep.	Mozambique	United Kingdom
El Salvador	Namibia	United States
Estonia	Netherlands	Uruguay
Ethiopia	New Zealand	Venezuela, RB
Finland	Nicaragua	Vietnam
France	Niger	Yemen,Rep.
Gabon	Nigeria	Yugoslavia, Fed. Rep.
Germany	Norway	Zambia
Ghana	Oman	Zimbabwe
Greece		

ARBEITSPAPIERE 1991-2006
des Instituts für Volkswirtschaftslehre, Johannes Kepler Universität Linz

9101 WEISS, Christoph: Price inertia and market structure under incomplete information. Jänner 1991. in: *Applied Economics*, 1992.

9102 BARTEL, Rainer: Grundlagen der Wirtschaftspolitik und ihre Problematik. Ein einführender Leitfaden zur Theorie der Wirtschaftspolitik. Jänner 1991; Kurzfassung erschienen unter: Wirtschaftspolitik in der Marktwirtschaft, in: *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 17. 1991,2, S. 229-249

9103 FALKINGER, Josef: External effects of information. Jänner 1991

9104 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich; Mechanik und Ökonomie: Keplers Traum und die Zukunft. Jänner 1991, in: R. Sandgruber und F. Schneider (Hrsg.), "*Interdisziplinarität Heute*", Linz, Trauner, 1991

9105 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Manpower training programs and employment stability, in: *Economica*, 63. 1995, S. 128-130

9106 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Partial retirement and the earnings test. Februar 1991, in: *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie / Journal of Economics*, 57. 1993,3, S. 295-303

9107 FALKINGER, Josef: The impacts of policy on quality and price in a vertically integrated sector. März 1991. Revidierte Fassung: On the effects of price or quality regulations in a monopoly market, in: *Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft*.

9108 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael, WEISS, Christoph R., ZWEI-MÜLLER, Josef: Farm income, market wages, and off-farm labour supply, in: *Empirica*, 18, 2, 1991, S. 221-235

9109 BARTEL, Rainer, van RIETSCHOTEN, Kees: A perspective of modern public auditing. Pleading for more science and less pressure-group policy in public sector policies. Juni 1991, dt. Fassung: Eine Vision von moderner öffentlicher Finanzkontrolle, in: *Das öffentliche Haushaltswesen in Österreich*, 32. 1991,3-4, S. 151-187

9110 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and LENZELBAUER, Werner: An inverse relationship between efficiency and profitability according to the size of Upper--Austrian firms? Some further tentative results, in: *Small Business Economics*, 5. 1993,1, S. 1-22

9111 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Wirtschaftspolitische Maßnahmen zur Steigerung der Effizienz der österreichischen Gemeinwirtschaft: Ein Plädoyer für eine aktivere Industrie- und Wettbewerbspolitik. Juli 1991, in: *Öffentliche Wirtschaft und Gemeinwirtschaft in Österreich*, Wien, Manz, 1992, S. 90-114

9112 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Unequal promotion on job ladders, in: *Journal of Labor Economics, 15. 1997,1,1, S. 70-71*

9113 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Bargaining with reasonable aspirations. Oktober 1991, in: *Theory and Decision, 37*, 1994, S 311-321.

9114 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Gender wage differentials and private and public sector jobs. Oktober 1991, in: *Journal of Population Economics*, 7. 1994, S. 271-285

9115 BRUNNER, Johann K., WICKSTRÖM, Bengt-Arne: Politically stable pay-as-you-go pension systems: Why the social-insurance budget is too small in a democracy. November 1991, in: *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie = Journal of Economics*, 7. 1993, S. 177-190.

9116 WINTER-EBMER; Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Occupational segregation and career advancement. Dezember 1991, in: *Economics Letters*, 39. 1992, S. 229-234

***

9201 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Ecological objectives in a market economy: Three simple questions, but no simple answers? Jänner 1992, in: Giersch, H. (Hrsg.), *Environmental economics*, Heidelberg, Springer-Verl., 1993

9202 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The federal and fiscal structures of representative and direct democracies as models for a European federal union: Some preliminary ideas using the public-choice approach, in: *Journal des Economistes et des Etudes Humaines*, 3. 1993,2

9203 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The development of the shadow economy under changing economic conditions: Some tentative empirical results for Austria. Revised version. März 1992.

9204 HACKL, Franz, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, WITHERS, Glenn: The public sector in Australia: A quantitative analysis. März 1992, in: Gemmell, N. (ed), *The growth of the public sector*, Aldershot, Elgar, 1993, S. 212-231

9205 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The federal and fiscal structures of western democracies as models for a federal union in former communist countries? Some thoughts using the public-choice approach. April 1992, in: Wagner, H.-J. (ed.), *On the theory and policy of systematic change*, Heidelberg, Springer-Verl., 1993, S. 135-154

9206 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Endogenous growth, human capital, and industry wages. in: *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 4/1994, 289-314.

9207 BARTEL, Rainer: Gleichgewicht, Ungleichgewicht und Anpassung in der komparativen Statik. August 1992; 1. Teil erschienen unter: Auf welchen Grundlagen beruhen unsere ökonomischen Aussagen? in: *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 19, 2, 1993, S. 153-170; 2. Teil erschienen unter: Neoklassische Rationierung, in: *WiSt*, 23, 3, 1993, S. 151-154

9208 WEISS, Christoph R.: Market structure and pricing behaviour in Austrian manufacturing. August 1992. in: *Empirica*, 21. 1994, S. 115-131.

9209 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Unemployment and individual pay: Wage curve or compen-sating differentials? erscheint u.d.T.: Wage Curve, Unemployment Duration and Compensating Differentials, in: *Labour Economics*, 3/1996,4, S. 425-434

9210 SCHUSTER, Helmut: Chaostheorie und Verkehrswissenschaft? September 1992, in: *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Verkehrswissenschaft*, 1-2, 38. 1992, S. 48-51

9211 BARTEL, Rainer, PRUCKNER, Gerald: Strukturelle und konjunkturelle Charakteristika der Budgetpolitik von Bund und Gesamtstaat in Österreich. Oktober 1992, in: *Wirtschaftspolitische Blätter*, 40. 1993,2, S. 134-154

9212 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Foreign direct investment and exports: A time series approach. Oktober 1992

9213 HACKL, Franz, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Austrian economic policy since 1945: An ex-ploratory analysis. Oktober 1992, in: Paldam, M. (ed.), *Economic development of small open economies in Europe and South America*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, forthcoming 1994

9214 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Die Kunst als Wirtschaftsfaktor - vernachlässigbar oder beach-tenswert? Oktober 1992, in: *Musicologica Austriaca*, 11. 1993,1, S. 19-29

9215 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Measuring the size and the development of the shadow economy: Can the causes be found and the obstacles be overcome? November 1992, in: Brandstätter, Hermann and Güth, W. (eds.), *Essays on Economic Psychology*, Heidelberg, Springer-Verl., 1994, S. 208-211

9216 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Public choice - economic theory of politics: A survey in selected areas. Dezember 1992, in: Brandstätter, Hermann and Güth, W. (eds.), *Essays on*

Economic Psychology, Heidelberg, Springer-Verl., 1994, S. 188-192

***

9301 SCHUSTER, Helmut: Energiepolitik im Spannungsfeld zwischen Wirtschaft und Umwelt. Jänner 1993, in: Friedrich Schneider (Hrsg.), *Energiepolitik in Österreich*, Linz, Trauner, 1993

9302 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Motivation to migrate and economic success. März 1993, erscheint u.d.T.: Motivation for Migration and Economic Success, in: *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 15. 1994, S. 282-284

9303 LANDESMANN, Michael and GOODWIN, Richard: Productivity growth, structural change and macroeconomic stability. März 1993

9304 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Foreign outward direct investment and exports in Austrian manufacturing. März 1993

9305 BARTEL, Rainer: Zur Ökonomie der öffentlichen Finanzkontrolle. April 1993, erschienen unter: Öffentliche Finanzkontrolle als politische Machtkontrolle. Eine ökonomische Fundierung, in: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift*, 34. 1993,4, S. 613-639

9306 HACKL, Franz: Die Internalisierung von überbetrieblichen Leistungen der Landwirtschaft aus allokationstheoretischer Sicht. April 1993.

9307 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, FALKINGER, Josef: Retirement of spouses and social security reform, in: *European Economic Review*, 40/1996, S. 471-472

9308 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Abilities, needs, and the size of the cake: an axiomatic bargaining approach to redistributive taxation. Juli 1993.

9309 HACKL, Franz, PRUCKNER, Gerald: Touristische Präferenzen für den ländlichen Raum: Die Problematik ihrer empirischen Erfassung und Internalisierung. Juli 1993. Ersch. in: Gesellschaftliche Forderungen an die Landwirtschaft / Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues (GEWISOLA), hrsg. von Konrad Hagedorn ... 1994, Schriften der GEWISOLA, Bd. 30

9310 NECK, Reinhard, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Steuersystem und Schattenwirtschaft. Juli 1993.

9311 POINTNER, Johannes und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Österreich im internationalen Writschaftssystem, August 1993, in: Ewald Nowotny und Günther Winckler (Hrsg.), *Grundzüge der Wirtschaftspolitik Österreichs,* 1994.

9312 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The Relationship between efficiency and profitability with respect to the size of firms: an empirical investigation for Austria. September 1993.

9313 ÖTSCH, Walter: Die mechanistische Metapher in der Theoriengeschichte der Nationalökonomie. September 1993.

9314 BARTEL, Rainer: Wirtschaftspolitische Kontrolle und Beratung: Grundlagen, Probleme, Erfordernisse. September 1993, erschienen als: Kontrolle und Beratung in der Wirtschaftspolitik, in: *Wirtschaftspolitische Blätter*, 41. 1994,4, S. 442-462

9315 BARTH, Erling and ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Relative wages under decentralized and under corporatist bargaining systems, in: *Scandinavian Journal of Economics,* 97. 1995,3, S. 369-384

9316 FALKINGER, Josef and ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: The impact of income inequality on product diversity and economic growth. Oktober 1993.

9317 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Anreizorientierte Systeme im Gesundheitswesen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des stationären Sektors. Oktober 1993.

9318 HORSTMANN, Winfried and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Deficits, bailout and free riders: Fiscal elements of European constitution. Oktober 1993.

9319 BARTEL, Rainer: Egoismus, Altruismus, Ineffizienz und Kontrolle im öffentlichen Bereich: Ein kurzer Blick auf die Argumente und ihre Implikationen. November 1993, in: *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 20. 1994,2, S. 231-246

9320 BURGER, Christina: Theorien der Koalitionsbildung und ihre Anwendbarkeit auf österreichische Regierungen. November 1993.

9321 BARTEL, Rainer: Konjunkturelle Selbststabiliserung oder kompensatorische Nachfragepolitik? Ein Leitfaden für Studenten. Dezember 1993, tw. erschienen unter: Konjunkturprobleme - Selbstheilung oder Staatseingriffe?, in: *WISO,* 17. 1994,4, S. 111-39, erscheint tw. unter: Lohnindexierung - Effiziente Institution zur Stabilisierung der Wirtschaft?, in: *WiSt,* 26. 1997,3, S. 154-156

***

9401 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Immigration and the Earnings of Young Native Workers. Jänner 1994, in: *Oxford Economic Papers*, 48. 1996, S. 473-491

9402 KUNST, Robert, HAUSER, Michael: Fractionally Integrated Models With ARCH Errors. Jänner 1994.

9403 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Internal Markets and Firm-Specific Determination of Earnings in the Presence of Immigrant Labor, in: *Economics Letters*, 48. 1995, S. 185-191

9404 SCHUSTER, Helmut: Energie und Umwelt. März 1994.

9405 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Testing for Ownership Advantages of Direct Investing Firms. März 1994.

9406 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Determinanten der Steuerhinterziehung und der Schwarzarbeit im internationalen Vergleich. März 1994.

9407 FALKINGER, Josef: Social Stability and the Equity-Efficiency Trade-off. April 1994.

9408 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Do Immigrants Displace Native Workers? Mai 1994, erscheint in: *Journal of Population Economics*, 1998.

9409 FALKINGER, Josef: How to overcome free-riding: Rewarding deviations from average. Mai 1994. Revidierte Fassung: Efficient Private Provision of Public Goods by Rewarding Deviations from Average, in: *Journal of Public Economics*, 62. 1996,3, S. 413-422

9410 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Wealth distribution, innovations, and economic growth. Mai 1994.

9411 GANTNER, Manfried, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Budgetausgliederungen - eine polit-ökonomische Analyse. Juni 1994.

9412 AIGINGER, Karl: The use of game theoretical models for empirical research - A survey of testing non-cooperative game theory with real world data in recent industrial organization literature. Juni 1994.

9413 FALKINGER, Josef: The private provision of public goods when the relative size of contribution matters. Juli 1994, in: *Finanzarchiv*, 51, 1994, S. 358 - 371.

9414 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Sex discrimination and competition in product and labour markets, in: *Applied Economics*, 27. 1995,9, S. 849-857

9415 FALKINGER, Josef, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: The cross-country Engel curve for product diversification, August 1994, in: *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics,* 7. 1996,1, S. 79-97

9416 FALKINGER, Josef: Tax evasion, consumption of public goods and fairness, August 1994, in: *Journal of Economics Psychology*, 16, 1995, S. 63 - 72.

9417 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Einige Gedanken zur Harmonisierung indirekter Steuern in der Europäischen Union, September 1994.

9418 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Firm size, earnings and displacement risk, Oktober 1994, erscheint in: *Economic Inquiry*, 2000.

9419 WEISS, Christoph: Labour market adjustment in U.S. manufacturing: Does market structure matter? Oktober 1994.

9420 WEISS, Christoph: State dependence, symmetry and reversibility of off-farm employment, November 1994.

9421 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Is there a European public choice perspective?, Dezember 1994.

***

9501 BARTEL, Rainer: Reform des öffentlichen Sektors - Grundlagen und Grundsätze, Jänner 1995.

9502 RIESE, Martin: The GINI-index as a measure of the goodness of prediction, Jänner 1995, in: *Bulletin of Economic Research,* 49. 1997,2, S. 127-135.

9503 AIGINGER, Karl, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf und ZWEI-MÜLLER, Josef: Eastern European Trade and the Austrian Labour Market, in: *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv,* 132. 1996,3, S. 476-500

9504 WEISS, Christoph: Size, Growth, and Survival of Upper Austrian Farms in the 1980s, Februar 1995. in: Sotte, F. and Zanoli, R.: "The Regional Dimension of Agricultural Economics and Politics", forthcoming (1995).

9505 BARTEL, Rainer: Umweltpolitik in den Reformländern Europas. Voraussetzungen und Erfordernisse, Februar 1995.

9506 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Foreign Outward Direct Investment and Exports in Austrian Manufacturing: Substitutes or Complements?, March 1995.

9507 BURGER, Christina, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: How Valuable is the Health of the Elderly- Evaluation of the Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease; April 1995.

9508 BRUNNER, Johann, RIESE, Martin: Measuring the Severity of Unemployment, April 1995.

9509 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Volkswirtschaftliche Aspekte der Mitarbeiterbeteiligung, Mai 1995.

9510 ÖTSCH, Walter: Erwartungen und Framing. Keynes und die "Anomalien" der Erwartungsnutzentheorie, Mai 1995.

9511 ÖTSCH, Walter: Die Herausforderung des Konstruktivismus für die ökonomische Theorie, Mai 1995, in: Birger P. Priddat und Gerhard Wegner, Hrsg., Zwischen Evolution und Institution, Metropolis-Verl., Marburg, 1996, S. 35 - 55

9512 ÖTSCH, Walter: Kreativität und Logik im ökonomischen Handlungsmodell, Mai 1995.

9513 WEISS, Christoph: Determinants of Farm Survival and Growth, Mai 1995.

9514 BARTEL, Rainer: Zum Verhältnis von Ökonomie und Politik des öffentlichen Sektors. Einige kurze Anmerkungen, Juni 1995.

9515 KUNST, Robert M.: The Myth of Misspecification. Some Metaphors, Juni 1995.

9516 VAN DER BURG, Brigitte, SIEGERS, Jacques, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Gender and Promotion in the Academic Labour Market. Juli 1995.

9517 FALKINGER, Josef, FEHR, Ernst, GÄCHTER, Simon, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: A simple mechanism for the efficient private provision of public goods - experimental evidence, August 1995, erscheint in: *American Economic Review*, 1999.

9518 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Some Elements of a European Federal Union: A Public Choice Approach, September 1995.

9519 BRUNNER, Johann, FALKINGER, Josef: Nonneutrality of taxes and subsidies for the private provision of public goods, September 1995.

9520 WEISS, Christoph: Product Market Power and Dynamic Labour Demand, September 1995.

9521 LANDESMANN, Michael, PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Technological Competition and Trade Performance, October, 1995.

***

9601 WEISS, Christoph: Exits From a Declining Sector: Econometric Evidence From a Panel of Upper-Austrian Farms 1980-90., Jänner 1996.

9602 BÖS, Dieter und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Private-public partnership: Gemeinschaftsunternehmen zwischen Privaten und der öffentlichen Hand, Februar 1996.

9603 GÄCHTER, Simon, FEHR, Ernst, KMENT, Christiane: Does Social Exchange Increase Voluntary Cooperation?, Februar 1996.

9604 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef, BRUNNER, Johann: Heterogeneous consumers, vertical product differentiation and the rate of innovation, März 1996.

9605 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The Contributions of Werner W. Pommerehne to Public Choice, März 1996.

9606 SEDJAV, Tsagaan-Uvgun: Wissenschaftlich-technologische Entwicklungsfragen der Mongolei, April 1996, Wissenschaftlicher Betreuer: o.Univ.-Prof. Dr. Helmut Schuster, B.Com.

9607 KEUSCHNIGG, Christian u. KOHLER Wilhelm: Innovation, Capital Accumulation and Economic Transition, revised version April 1996.

9608 AIGINGER, Karl: Beyond Trade Balances: the competitive race between the US, Japan and Europe, Juni 1996.

9609 POMMEREHNE, Werner W., HART, Albert und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Tragic Choices and Collective Decision-Making: An Empirical Study of Voter Preferences for Alternative Collective Decision-Making Mechanisms, Juli 1996.

9610 BARTEL, Rainer, POINTNER, Johannes, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Österreich im internationalen Wirschaftssystem, Juli 1996, erschienen in: E.Nowotny und G. Winckler (Hg.), Grundzüge der Wirtschaftspolitik Österreichs, 2. Aufl., Manz-Verlag, Wien 1997, S. 49-98.

9611 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, VOLKERT, Jürgen: Die Realisierung ökologisch-orientierter Wirtschaftspolitik - eine Unmöglichkeit? Überlegungen aus Sicht der Neuen Politischen Ökonomie, Juli 1996.

9612 AIGINGER, Karl, WEISS, Christoph R.: Does it Pay to be Flexible? Empirical Evidence on the Relation- ship between Labour Demand Flexibility and Profit Margins, Juli 1996.

9613 WEISS, Christoph R.: Beneficial Concentration in a Menu Cost Model: A Note, August 1996.

9614 GUSENLEITNER, Markus, WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: The Distribution of Earnings in Austria, 1972-1991*, Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv*, 3/98.

9615 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf:: Benefit Duration and Unemployment Entry: Quasi-Experimental Evidence for Austria, Oktober 1996.

9616 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf:: Potential Unemployment Benefit Duration and Spell Length: Lessons from a Quasi-Experiment in Austria, in: *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 60. 1998,1, S. 33-45

9617 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, FREY, Bruno S.: Warum wird die Umweltökonomik kaum angewendet?, November 1996.

9618 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Aktuelle Ergebnisse über die Schattenwirtschaft (Pfusch) in Österreich, November 1996.

9619 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Die langfristige Entwicklung der Transformationsländer Osteuropas: Welche Rolle spielt die Integration der Märkte?, Dezember 1996.

9620 BRUNNER, Johann K., PRINZ, Christopher, WIRTH, Friedrich: Die Zukunft der gesetzlichen Pensionsversicherung, Dezember 1996.

9621 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, GAWEL, Erik: Umsetzungsprobleme ökologisch orientierter Steuerpolitik: Eine polit-ökonomische Analyse, Dezember 1996.

***

9701 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Hält der EURO, was er verspricht? Ökonomische Überlegungen zur Stabilität und zur Einführung des EURO, Jänner 1997.

9702 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Welche Chancen hat Österreich als Wirtschaftsstandort im EU- und Globalisierungskontext derzeit und in Zukunft?, Jänner 1997.

9703 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Ökonomische Analyse des umlagefinanzierten Pensionsversicherungssystems, Jänner 1997.

9704 PFAFFERMAYR, Michael, WEISS, Christoph R.: On Market Power and Investment Behaviour, January 1997.

9705 LANDESMANN, Michael A., STEHRER, Robert: Industrial Specialisation, Catching-up and Labour Market Dynamics, January 1997.

9706 BARTEL, Rainer: Taking even introductory textbooks seriously. A note on the importance of a usual neglect, February 1997.

9707 KUNST, Robert M.: Decision bounds for data-admissible seasonal models, March 1997.

9708 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf, ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Intra-firm Wage Dispersion and Firm Performance, *Kyklos*, 1999.

9709 PRITZL, F. J. Rupert und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Korruption, März 1997.

9710   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Empirical Results for the Size of the Shadow Economy of Western European Countries Over Time, März 1997.

9711   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und VOLKERT, Jürgen: No Chance for Incentive-orientated Environmental Policies in Representative Democracies? A Public Choice Approach, März 1997.

9712   FALKINGER, Josef: Wachstum, Verteilung und Beschäftigung, März 1997.

9713   PRITZL, F. J. Rupert und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Zur Politischen Ökonomie autokratischer politischer Systeme - Ein theoretischer und empirischer Ansatz, April 1997.

9714   SCHUSTER, Helmut: Das Phänomen der strukturellen Arbeitslosigkeit und Maßnahmen zu seiner Bekämpfung,, Mai 1997.

9715   BARTEL, Rainer: Paradigmatik versus Pragmatik in der (Umwelt-)Ökonomie. Eine epistemologische Sicht, Mai 1997.

9716   BERGER, Helge und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Does the Bundesbank Yield in Conflicts? Frey and Schneider Revisited, Juni 1997.

9717   RIESE, Martin und BRUNNER, Johann K.: Interpreting risk with demographic statistics, Juni 1997.

9718   KUNST, Robert M.: Asymptotics for Unit-Root Processes with Underspecified Deterministic Structures, Juni 1997.

9719   GAWEL, Erik und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Implementation Problems of Eco-Taxation: A Political-Economy Analysis, Juli 1997

9720   PRITZL, Rupert und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Political Economy of Autocratic Political Regimes: A Theoretical and Empirical Approach, Juli 1997

9721   WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Unknown Wage Offer Distribution and Job Search Duration, *Economics Letters*, 1998.

9722   BRUNNER, Johann K.: Optimal Taxation of Income and Bequests, August 1997

9723   KEUSCHNIGG, Christian and KOHLER, Wilhelm: Eastern Enlargement of the EU: How Much is it Worth for Austria?, November 1997

9724   HOFER, Helmut, KEUSCHNIGG, Christian und Wilhelm KOHLER, A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Model for the Austrian Economy With Special Emphasis on the Eastern EU Enlargement, November 1997.

***

9801   WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf und Klaus F. ZIMMERMANN: East-West Trade and Migration: The Austro-German Case, Jänner 1998, erscheint in: Jaime de Melo, Riccardo Faini und Klaus F. Zimmermann (eds.): Trade and Factor Mobility, Cambridge (CUP).

9802   ICHINO, Andrea und Rudolf WINTER-EBMER: The Long-Run Educational Cost of World War 2: An Application of Local Average Treatment Effect Estimation, Jänner 1998.

9803   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Deregulierung und Privatisierung als Allheilmittel gegen ineffiziente Produktion von öffentlichen Unternehmen? Ein Erklärungsversuch mit Hilfe der ökonomischen Theorie der Politik, Jänner 1998.

9804   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Märkte, Moral und Umwelt: Was sagt die Ökonomie dazu?, Jänner 1998.

9805   LENK, Thomas, FUGE, Heidi und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Zurück zu mehr Föderalismus: Ein Vorschlag zur Neugestaltung des Finanzausgleichs in der BRD unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der ökonomischen Theorie der Politik, Jänner 1998.

9806   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Stellt das starke Anwachsen der Schwarzarbeit eine wirtschaftspolitische Herausforderung dar? Einige Gedanken aus volkswirtschaftlicher Sicht, Jänner 1998.

9807   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Einige grundlegende Elemente einer europäisch-föderalen Verfassung unter Zuhilfenahme der konstitutionellen ökonomischen Theorie, Jänner 1998.

9808   LANDESMANN, Michael: Vertical produkt differentiation and international trade: an econometric analysis, März 1998.

9808a   BARTEL, Rainer: Öffentliche Finanzen, Finanzkontrolle und gesellschaftliche Wohlfahrt. Volkswirtschaftliche Thesen, Antithesen und mögliche Synthesen, März 1998. Erschienen in überarbeiteter Version in: F. Klug (Hrsg.), Wesen und staatspolitische Funktion der öffentlichen Finanzkontrolle, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Kommunalwissenschaften an der Universität Linz, Bd. 107, S. 85-127.

9809   AIGINGER, Karl und PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Product quality, cost asymmetry and the welfare loss of oligopoly, Februar 1998.

9810   KOHLER, Wilhelm: Die Ost-Erweiterung der EU: Eine österreichische Perspektive, April 1998.

9811   BERGER, Mathias und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Schattenwirtschaft und Steuerhinterziehung: Ökonomische und psychologische Aspekte, April 1998.

9812   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und STIEGLER, Harald: Controlling als effizienzsteigerndes Instrument der Universitätsführung – Zauber- oder Leerformel?, April 1998.

9813   KUNST, Robert M.: Some aspects of modeling seasonality in economic time series, Juni 1998.

9814   KOHLER, Wilhelm: Fifty Years Later: A New Marshall Plan for Eastern Europe?, Juli 1998.

9815   RAPHAEL, Steven und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Identifying the Effect of Unemployment on Crime, September 1998.

9816   ICHINO, Andrea und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Lower and Upper Bounds of Returns to Schooling: An Exercise in IV Estimation with Different Instruments, September 1998, erscheint in: *European Economic Review*, 1999.

9817   PÖLL, Günther und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Schattenwirtschaft, Juli 1998.

9818   BRUNNER, Johann K.: Kapitaldeckungsverfahren versus Umlageverfahren: Grundsätzliches zur Systemdiskussion, August 1998.

9819   SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und ENSTE, Dominik: Increasing Shadow Economies all over the world - Fiction or Reality? A Survey of the Global Evidence of its Size and of its Impact from 1970 to 1995, November 1998.

9820   LENK, Thomas und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Zurück zu mehr Föderalismus: Ein Vorschlag zur Neugestaltung des Finanzausgleichs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Bundesländer, November 1998.

9821   KOHLER, Wilhelm: Die Bedeutung der EU-Osterweiterung für verschiedene Sektoren der österreichichen Wirtschaft, November 1998.

9822   KOHLER, Wilhelm: Die pan-europäische Integration: Herausforderungen für die Wirtschaftswissenschaft, November 1998.

9823   ATKINSON, Anthony B.: The Changing Distribution of Income: Evidence and Explanations (1. K.W. Rothschild Vorlesung), November 1998.

9824   PECH, Susanne und PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Strategic Environmental Taxation in the Presence of Involuntary Unemployment and Endogenous Location Choice, November 1998.

9825   BARTEL, Rainer: Reform und Öffnung Osteuropas, November 1998.

9826   ÖTSCH, Walter: Zur Geschichte und Zukunft von Grundkategorien des ökonomischen Denkens: Raum, Zeit, Objekt und Ich, November 1998.

9827   ÖTSCH, Walter: „Äußere" und „Innere" Glücksmodelle in der Theoriegeschichte der Ökonomie, November 1998, erscheint in: Zinn, Bellebaum und Schaaf: Ökonomie und Glück, Frühjahr 1999.

9828   ÖTSCH, Walter: Konstruktivismus und ökonomische Theorie, November 1999, erscheint in: Lehmann und Pillath: Handbuch der Evolutorischen Ökonomik, Springer Verlag, 1999.

***

9901   WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf and ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef: Firm Size Wage Differentials in Switzerland: Evidence from Job Changers, Jänner 1999, erscheint in: *American Economic Review, Papers & Proceedings*, 1999.

9902 BRANDSTÄTTER, Eduard, KÜHBERGER, Anton und SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: "Surprise in Decision making under Uncertainty, Jänner 1999.

9903 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und WAGNER, Alexander: "The Role of International Monetary Institutions after the EMU and after the Asian Crises: Some Preliminary Ideas Using Constitutional Economics", Februar 1999

9904 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Transfers zwischen den Generationen, Februar 1999.

9905 LACKÓ, Mária: Hidden Economy – An Unknown Quantity? Comparative Analysis of Hidden Economies in Transition Countries in 1989-1995, Februar 1999

9906 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Trade and Wages: What Can Factor Contents Tell Us? Februar 1999.

9907 LANDESMANN, Michael und STEHRER Robert: The European Unemployment Problem: A Structural Approach, März 1999.

9908 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Das Verhältnis von Innovation und Beschäftigung aus wirtschaftlicher Sicht – Jobkiller oder Jobwunder?, Mai 1999.

9909 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und LENK, Thomas: Zurück zum Trennsystem als Königsweg zu mehr Föderalismus in Zeiten des „Aufbau Ost", Juni 1999.

9910 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Die Entwicklung der Sozialpolitik in repräsentativen und in direkten Demokratien: Königsweg oder Sackgasse? Einige Bemerkungen aus der „Public Choice"-Perspektive, Juni 1999.

9911 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Ist Schwarzarbeit ein Volkssport geworden? Ein internationaler Vergleich des Ausmaßes der Schwarzarbeit von 1970 bis 1997, Juni 1999.

9912 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel, und KOHLER, Wilhelm: Zur ökonomischen Logik spekulativer Attacken, Juli 1999.

9913 FERSTERER, Josef und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Returns to Education - Evidence for Austria, August 1999.

9914 BARTEL, Rainer: Social economic issues in sexual orientation – Where do we stand?, September 1999.

9915 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und ENSTE, Dominik: Shadow Economies: Sizes, Causes, and Consequences, September 1999.

9916 BARTEL, Rainer: Ökonomische Rationalität im System der öffentlichen Finanzkontrolle. Die Funktionalität des neuen Oö. Landesrechnungshofs. September 1999.

9917 FERSTERER, Josef und Rudolf WINTER-EBMER: Are Austrian Returns to Education Falling Over Time?, Oktober 1999.

9918 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und WINNER, Hannes: Ein Vorschlag zur Reform der österreichischen Unternehmensbesteuerung, November 1999.

9919 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Induzieren ökologische Steuerreformen einen Lenkungseffekt oder nur volle Staatskassen? Einige volkswirtschaftliche Überlegungen, November 1999.

9920 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Wer gewinnt, wer verliert durch die Osterweiterung der EU?, November 1999.

9921 DRÈZE, Jacques: On the Macroeconomics of Uncertainty and Incomplete Markets, November 1999.

9922 STIGLBAUER, Alfred M. und WEISS, Christoph R.: Family and Non-Family Succession in the Upper-Austrian Farm Sector, Dezember 1999.

9923 HOLZLEITNER, Christian: Linear Profit-Sharing in Regulatory Contracts, Dezember 1999.

9924 ÖTSCH, Walter: Objekt, Subjekt und Wert. Zur Kulturgeschichte in Georg Simmels "Philosophie des Geldes", Dezember 1999.

***

0001 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Die Osterweiterung der EU aus der Sicht bestehender Mitgliedsländer: Was lehrt uns die Theorie der ökonomischen Integration?, Jänner 2000.

0002 FERSTERER, Josef und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Smoking, Discount Rates, and Returns to Education, Jänner 2000.

0003 BARTEL, Rainer: Quo vadimus. Grundgedanken zum Verhältnis von Wirtschaft, Staat und Gesellschaft, Februar 2000.

0004 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und FREY, Bruno S.: Informal and Underground Economy, Februar 2000.

0005 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und FELD, Lars P.: State and Local Taxation, Februar 2000.

0006 ZWEIMÜLLER, Josef und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Firm-specific Training - Consequences for Job Mobility, März 2000.

0007 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Schattenwirtschaft – Tatbestand, Ursachen, Auswirkungen, April 2000

0008 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The Increase of the Size of the Shadow Economy of 18 OECD Countries: Some Preliminary Explanations, April 2000.

0009 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und AHLHEIM, Michael: Allowing for Household Preferences in Emission Trading – A Contribution to the Climate Policy Debate, Mai 2000

0010 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Illegal Activities, but still value added ones (?): Size, Causes, and Measurement of the Shadow Economies all over the World, Mai 2000.

0011 WEICHSELBAUMER, Doris: Is it Sex or Personality? The Impact of Sex-Stereotypes on Discrimination in Applicant Selection, Mai 2000.

0012 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel, und KOHLER, Wilhelm: Effizienz- und Verteilungswirkungen der Handelsliberalisierung, Juni 2000.

0013 EGGER, Peter und PFAFFERMAYR, Michael: Trade, Multinational Sales, and FDI in a Three-Factors Model, Juni 2000.

0014 LANDESMANN, Michael und STEHRER, Robert: Potential Switchovers in Comparative Advantage: Patterns of Industrial Convergence, Juni 2000.

0015 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und WAGNER, Alexander: Korporatismus im europäischen Vergleich: Förderung makroökonomischer Rahmenbedingungen?, Juli 2000.

0016 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich und LENK, Thomas: Grundzüge der föderalen Finanzverfassung aus ökonomischer Perspektive: Trennsystem vs. Verbundsystem, Juli 2000.

0017 HOLZLEITNER, Christian: Efficient Cost Passthrough, August 2000.

0018 HOLZLEITNER, Christian: Evolution of Regulatory Contracts in the Real World - A Change for Good?, August 2000.

0019 KOHLER, Wilhelm: International Fragmentation: A Policy Perspective, August 2000.

0020 KOHLER, Wilhelm: A Specific-Factors View on Outsourcing, August 2000.

0021 WEICHSELBAUMER, Doris: Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring, September 2000.

0022 KOHLER; Wilhelm: Internationale Migration: Anmerkungen aus der Sicht der Außenwirtschaftstheorie, Oktober 2000.

0023 AIGINGER, Karl und DAVIES, S.W.: Industrial Specialisation and geographic Concentration: Two sides of the same coin? Not for the European Union, Oktober 2000.

0024 EGGER, Hartmut und EGGER, Peter: Outsourcing and Skill-Specific Employment in a Small Economy: Austria and the Fall of the Iron Curtain, Oktober 2000.

0025 KOHLER, Wilhelm: An Incumbent Country View on Eastern Enlargement of the EU - Part I: A Gerneral Treatment, November 2000.

0026 KOHLER, Wilhelm: An Incumbent Country View on Eastern Enlargement of the EU - Part II: The Austrian Case, November 2000.

0027 FREY, Bruno S.: What are the sources of happiness?, November 2000

0028 RIESE, Martin: Weakening the SALANT-condition for the Comparison of mean durations, Dezember 2000

0029 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Long-term consequences of an innovative redundancy-retraining project: The Austrian Steel Foundation, Dezember 2000.

0030 BRUNNER, Johann K. und PECH, Susanne: Adverse Selection in the annuity market when payoffs vary over the time of retirement, Dezember 2000.

***

0101 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Osterweiterung der EU: Die Mitgliedschaft wird teurer – Wird sie auch wertvoller?, Jänner 2001.

0102 STEHRER, Robert: Industrial specialisation, trade, and labour market dynamics in a multisectoral model of technological progress, Jänner 2001.

0103 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich; SALHOFER, Klaus; SCHMID, Erwin, und STREICHER, Gerhard: Was the Austrian Agricultural Policy Least Cost Efficient?, März 2001.

0104 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich; KIRCHLER, Erich und MACIEJOVSKY, Boris: Social Representations on Tax Avoidance, Tax Evasion, and Tax Flight: Do Legal Differences Matter?, März 2001.

0105 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich; PITLIK, Hans, und STROTMANN, Harald: On the Politicization of Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations in Germany after Unification, März 2001.

0106 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Privatisierung und Deregulierung in Österreich in den 90er Jahren: Einige Anmerkungen aus Sicht der Neuen Politischen Ökonomie, März 2001.

0107 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich; BRAITHWAITE, Valerie, and REINHART, Monika: Individual Behavior in the Cash / Shadow Economy in Australia: Facts, Empirical Findings and some Mysteries, März 2001.

0108 BRUNELLO, Giorgio; LUCIFORA, Claudio, und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: The Wage Expectations of European College Students, März 2001.

0109 BRUNNER, Johann K. und PECH, Susanne: Die Dritte Säule der Altersvorsorge - Sparen und Versichern?, Juni 2001.

0110 STÖGER, Klaus und WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Lehrlings-ausbildung in Österreich: Welche Betriebe bilden Lehrlinge aus? Juli 2001.

0111 HEIJDRA, Ben J.; KEUSCHNIGG, Christian, und KOHLER, Wilhelm: Eastern Enlargement of the EU: Jobs, Investment and Welfare in Present Member Countries, Oktober 2001

0112 BRUNNER, Johann und BUCHEGGER, Reiner: Gesundheitsgüter und Gesundheitsdienstleistungen in Österreich, Dezember 2001.

0113 MALINVAUD, Edmond: On methodolgy in macroeconomics – with application to the demand for unskilled labour, November 2001.

***

0201 KOHLER, Wilhelm: The Distributional Effects of International Fragmentation, April 2002.

0202 WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf and WIRZ, Aniela: Public Funding and Enrolment into Higher Education in Europe, April 2002.

0203 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Issues of US-EU Trade Policy, May 2002.

0204 BRUNNER, Johann K. und PECH, Susanne: Adverse selection in the annuity market with sequential and simultaneous insurance demand, May 2002.

0205 Stiglbauer, Alfred, Stahl, Florian, Winter-Ebmer, Rudolf and Josef Zweimüller: Job Creation and Job Destruction in a Regulated Labor Market: The Case of Austria, July 2002.

0206 BÖHEIM, René und TAYLOR, Mark P: Job search methods, intensity and success in Britain in the 1990s, July 2002.

0207 BURGSTALLER, Johann: Are stock returns a leading indicator for real macroeconomic developments?, July 2002.

0208 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Aspects of International Fragmentation, August 2002.

0209 PECH Susanne: Tax incentives for private life annuities and the social security reform: effects on consumption and on adverse selection, August 2002.

0210 BRUNELLO, Giorgio and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Why Do Students Expect to Stay Longer in College? Evidence from Europe, August 2002.

0211 RIESE, Martin: A New Class of Ageing Distributions, December 2002.

0212 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Welfare Effects of Pension Finance Reform, December 2002.

***

0301 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and BAJADA, Christopher: The Size and Development of the Shadow Economies in the Asia-Pacific, April 2003.

0302 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, CHAUDHURI, Kausik and CHATTERJEE, Sumana: The Size and Development of the Indian Shadow Economy and a Comparison with other 18 Asian Countries: An Empirical Investigation, April 2003.

0303 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, WAGNER, Alexander F. and DUFOUR, Mathias: Satisfaction not guaranteed - Institutions and sastisfaction with democracy in Western Europe, April 2003.

0304 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and WAGNER; Alexander, F.: Tradeable permits - Ten key design issues, April 2003.

0305 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Factor Price Frontiers with International Fragmentation of Multistage Production, April 2003.

0306 BURGSTALLER, Johann: Interest Rate Transmission to Commercial Credit Rates in Austria, May 2003.

0307 WEICHSELBAUMER, Doris and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: The effects of competition and equal treatment laws on the gender wage differential, July 2003.

0308 MAYR, Karin: Immigration and Majority Voting on Income Redistribution - Is there a Case for Opposition from Natives?, July 2003.

0309 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Optimum taxation of income from labour and capital in a dynamic two-person economy, September 2003.

0310 BRUNNER, Johann K.: Optimale direkte und indirekte Steuern bei unterschiedlicher Anfangsausstattung, September 2003.

0311 WEICHSELBAUMER, Doris and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: A meta-analysis of the international gender wage gap, September 2003.

0312 WEICHSELBAUMER, Dors and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Rhetoric in Economic Research: The Case of Gender Wage Differentials, September 2003.

0313 DULLECK, Uwe, FRIJTERS, Paul and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Reducing Start-up costs for New Firms. The Double Dividend on the Labor Market, October 2003.

0314 Aiginger, Karl: Insufficient investment into future growth: the forgotten cause of low growth in Germany, November 2003

0315 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel J. and LICANDRO, Omar: The underestimated virtues of the two-sector AK model, December 2003.

0316 KOHLER, Wilhelm: Eastern Enlargement of the EU: A Comprehensive Welfare Assessment, December 2003.

0317 RODRIK, Dani: Growth Strategies, December 2003.

***

0401 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel and KOHLER, Wilhelm: Immigration and Native Welfare, February 2004.

0402 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel: Specialization on a Technologically Stagnant Sector Need Not Be Bad for Growth, March 2004.

0403 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and KLINGLMAIR, Robert: Shadow Economies around the World: What do we know?, April 2004.

0404 BELKE, Ansgar and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Privatization in Austria: Some Theoretical Reasons and Performance Measures, June 2004.

0405 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and BURGER, Christina: Formal and Informal Labour Markets: Challenges and Policy in the Central and Eastern European new EU Members and Candidate Countries, June 2004.

0406 SCHOR, Juliet: Sustainable Consumption and Worktime Reduction, June 2004.

0407 FELBERMAYR, Gabriel: Does Trade Cause Divergence? Dynamic Panel Data Evidence, Juni 2004.

0408 BUCHEGGER, Reiner and WÜGER Michael: Private Expenditures for Children in Austria - Variations in Results applying different Models, July 2004.

0409 MAYR, Karin: The Fiscal Impact of Immigrants in Austria – A Generational Accounting Analysis, July 2004.

0410 HALLA, Martin: Unterhalt, Obsorge und Scheidungsanwälte: Eine ökonometrische Untersuchung der einvernehmlichen Scheidung in Österreich., August 2004.

0411 RAFERZEDER, Thomas and WINTER-EBMER Rudolf: Who is on the Rise in Austria: Wage Mobility and Mobility Risk, September 2004.

0412 PECH, Susanne: Adverse Selection with individual- and joint-life annuities, November 2004.

0413 LICHTENECKER, Ruperta: Gender Budget Analyse: Akademische Übung oder politische Relevanz?, December 2004.

0414 PECH, Susanne: Portfolio decisions on life annuities and financial assets with longevity and income uncertainty, December 2004.

0415 HACKL, Franz, HALLA, Martin and PRUCKNER, Gerald, J.: The Fallacy of the Good Samaritan: Volunteering as a Weird Way of Making Money, December 2004.

***

0501 BUCHEGGER, Reiner and RIEDL, René: Asymmetric Information as a Cause for Market Failure - Application Service Providing (ASP) in Austria, January 2005.

0502 SCHNEEWEIS, Nicole and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: Peer Effects in Austrian Schools, March 2005.

0503 BURGSTALLER, Johann: When and why do Austrian companies issue shares?, April 2005.

0504 BÖHEIM, René, STIGLBAUER, Alfred and WINTER-EBMER, Rudolf: When and how to create a job: The survival of new jobs in Austrian firms, May 2005.

0505 HALLA, Martin, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Taxes and Benefits: Two Distinct Options to Cheat on the State?, August 2005

0506 BRUNNER, Johann and PECH, Susanne: Optimum Taxation of Life Annuities, November 2005.

0507 SCHUSTER, Helmut: Reduktionismus, interaktionistischer Eigenschafts-Dualismus und Epiphänomenalismus, Dezember 2005.

0508 DULLECK, Uwe and KERSCHBAMER, Rudolf: Price Discrimination via the Choice of Distribution Channels, December 2005.

0509 DULLECK, Uwe and KERSCHBAMER, Rudolf: Experts vs. Discounters: Consumer Free Riding and Experts Withholding Advice in Markets for Credence Goods, December 2005.

0510 BURGSTALLER, Johann: Interest rate pass-through estimates from vector autoregressive models, December 2005.

0511 HACKL Franz, HALLA Martin and PRUCKNER, Gerald, J.: Coasian Payments for Agricultural External Benefits – An Empirical Cross Section Analysis, December 2005.

0512 BÖHEIM René and MAYR, Karin: Immigration and Public Spending, December 2005.

***

0601 LICHTENECKER, Ruperta: Umwelttechnikindustrie-Zukunftsmarkt China, Jänner 2006

0602 BURGSTALLER, Johann: The cyclicality of interest rate spreads in Austria: Evidence for a financial decelerator?, July 2006.

0603 DREHER, Axel and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Corruption and the Shadow Economy: An Empirical Analysis, July 2006.

0604 SAVASAN, Fatih and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: What Determines Informal Hiring? Evidence from the Turkish Textile Sector, July 2006.

0605 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich, SOOKRAM Sandra and WATSON, Patrick Kent: Characteristics of the Household Sector of the Hidden Economy in an Emerging Economy, July 2006.

0606 BELKE, Ansgar, BAUMGÄRTNER, Frank, SETZER, Ralph and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: The Different Extent of Privatisation Proceeds in EU Countries: A Preliminary Explanation Using a Public Choice Approach, July 2006.

0607 DELL'ANNO, Roberto and SCHNEIDER, Friedrich: Estimating the Underground Economy by Using MIMIC Models: A Response to T. Breusch´s critique, July 2006.

0608 SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and TORGLER, Benno: What Shapes Attitudes Toward Paying Taxes? Evidence from Multicultural European Countries, July 2006.

0609 DREHER Axel, MÉON, Pierre-Guillaume, SCHNEIDER, Friedrich and WEILL, Laurent: Does the shadow economy raise observed aggregate efficiency? A cross-country comparison, July 2006.