

HIDDEN ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE NATIONAL ECONOMY: REASONS AND FEATURES

ПРИХОВАНЕ ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВО У НАЦІОНАЛЬНІЙ ЕКОНОМІЦІ: ПРИЧИНИ ТА ОСОБЛИВОСТІ

The purpose of the article is to substantiate and systematize the causes and features of hidden entrepreneurship in the national economy. It is noted that the generalization of the problem of the appearance and reasons for the development of hidden entrepreneurship creates conditions for determining the methods of reducing its level in Ukraine at the current stage. Identification of the main reasons, as well as awareness of the negative consequences of the further development of hidden entrepreneurship for the national economy should become the foundation for the transformation of the institutional environment in the country. Attention is focused on the fact that in scientific works there is a position that the emergence of the "underground economy" is due to endogenous reasons of self-awareness of entrepreneurs, their attitude to existing restrictions and prohibitions, as well as their attitude to the justice of the existence of such restrictions. The reasons for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship are divided into general and partial. It was determined that common causes exist as a result of prohibitions and restrictions that are established regarding the regulation of the main aspects of economic activity. In turn, partial or specific reasons lead to the emergence of hidden entrepreneurship at the level of individual operations, types of activities, in relation to a specific restriction or prohibition. It was determined that the next stage in the development of social business began at the end of the 20th century as a result of the creation of the first social enterprises. It is during this period that the concept of "social business" begins to be used, which takes on the characteristics of a socio-economic phenomenon and is the subject of independent research by scientists. Thus, analyzing the given historical milestones in the development of the phenomenon of social entrepreneurship, two approaches to solving social problems that have arisen in society are highlighted: financial and institutional. It is substantiated that a significant reason for the possible appearance of hidden entrepreneurship is the practical implementation of the relationship between politics and the shadow economy. In addition, an important reason for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship is the intention and desire of business to "survive" in conditions of socio-economic instability. This is due to the fact that the excessive costs faced by entrepreneurship in the legal sphere put the entrepreneur himself on the edge of survival, which leads to the forced transfer of the business into the shadows. It is pointed out that the reasons for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship are also related to circumstances of an objective nature. In this case, it is not so much about a deliberate violation of the established restrictions as about their absence or insufficient formation. It is primarily about the emergence of operations and activities related to the intensification of the use and spread of information and communication technologies, the development of creative industries, social networks, etc. It is justified that in order to explain the cause-and-effect relationships of hidden entrepreneurship, it is advisable to pay attention to the possibilities of using a behavioral approach. That is, the study of the essence of behavior regarding the implementation of hidden entrepreneurship is expedient to conduct also from the standpoint of a behavioral approach and a separate aspect – deviant behavior. Attention is focused on the fact that the basis of behavior oriented towards hidden entrepreneurship is the motive of preserving activity, saving costs, and striving to increase one's own wealth. Usually, this behavior is accompanied by the choice of a form of shadow operations, given the scale of the business and risk appetite. It was determined that the main essential characteristics of behavior oriented towards hidden entrepreneurship are: individuality, propensity to risk, the search for a compromise between the expectation of income and the avoidance of losses. It was concluded that hidden entrepreneurship from the point of view of cause-and-effect relationships is one of the forms of the embodiment of the behavior of the subject of economic relations, which reflects the complex interaction of his rational and emotional motives. The main consequences of hidden entrepreneurship can be: a decrease in competition, especially in the case of an established partnership of shadow business with politics; receiving benefits, privileges, exclusive rights in the state, including due to corruption and lobbying for draft laws; reducing the risks of economic activity; the possibility of legalization of illegally obtained income; illegal appropriation of rights to economic benefits; the formation of stocks of money of shadow origin, due to the need to pay shadow expenses.

Key words: business, institutional environment, national economy, taxation, entrepreneurship, hidden business activity, shadow economy, management.

Метою статті є обґрунтування та систематизація причин і особливостей прихованого підприємництва у національній економіці. Зазначено, що узагальнення проблеми появи та причин розвитку прихованого підприємництва створює умови для визначення методів зниження його рівня в Україні на сучасному етапі. Виявлення основних причин, а також усвідомлення негативних наслідків подальшого розвитку прихованого підприємництва для національної економіки має стати фундаментом трансформації інституційного середовища в країні. Акцентовано увагу на тому, що у наукових працях вирізняється позиція, що поява «підпільної економіки» зумовлена ендогенними причинами самоусвідомлення підприємців, їх ставленням до існуючих обмежень та заборон, а також відношенням до справедливості існування подібних обмежень. Причини появи прихованого підприємництва поділено на загальні та часткові. Визначено, що загальні причини існують внаслідок заборон і обмежень, які встановлюються щодо регулювання основних аспектів здійснення господарської діяльності. В свою чергу часткові чи специфічні причини зумовлюють появу прихованого підприємництва на рівні окремих операцій, видів діяльності, щодо конкретного обмеження чи заборони. Обґрунтовано, що вагомою причиною можливої появи прихованого підприємництва є реалізація на практиці взаємозв'язку політики та тіньової економіки. Крім того, важливою причиною появи прихованого підприємництва є намір та прагнення бізнесу до «виживання» в умовах

UDC 331.101

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/bses.86-12>

Shaposhnykov Kostiantyn

Doctor of Economy, Professor,
Honored Worker of Science
and Technology of Ukraine,
Head of the Research and Certification
of Scientific Personnel Department
SSI "Institute of Education Context
Modernization",
MES of Ukraine

Шапошников К.С.

д.е.н., професор,
Заслужений діяч науки і техніки України,
начальник відділу
науково-дослідної роботи
та атестації наукових кадрів,
ДНУ «Інститут модернізації змісту освіти»
МОН України

соціально-економічної нестабільності. Це пов'язано з тим, що надмірні витрати, з якими стикається підприємництво в легальній площині ставить на межу виживання самого підприємця, що призводить до вимушеного переведення бізнесу у тінь. Вказано на те, що причини появи прихованого підприємництва пов'язані також з обставинами об'єктивної природи. У даному разі мова йде не стільки про свідоме порушення встановлених обмежень, скільки про відсутність чи недостатню їх сформованість. Йдеться у першу чергу про появу операцій та діяльності, пов'язаної з активізацією використання та поширення інформаційно-комунікаційних технологій, розвитком креативних індустрій, соціальними мережами тощо. Обернуто, що для пояснення причинно-наслідкових зв'язків прихованого підприємництва доцільно звернути увагу на можливості використання поведінкового підходу. Тобто дослідження сутності поведінки щодо здійснення прихованого підприємництва доцільно проводити також з позицій поведінкового підходу та окремого аспекту – девіантної поведінки. Акцентовано увагу на тому, що основу поведінки, орієнтованої на приховане підприємництво складає мотив збереження діяльності, економії витрат, прагнення примножити власне багатство. Зазвичай така поведінка супроводжується вибором форми тіньових операцій з огляду на масштаби бізнесу та схильності до ризику. Визначено, що основними сутнісними характеристиками поведінки, орієнтованої на приховане підприємництво є: індивідуальність, схильність до ризику, пошук компромісу між очікуванням доходу та уникненням втрат. Зроблено висновок про те, що приховане підприємництво з позицій причинно-наслідкових зв'язків є однією з форм втілення поведінки суб'єкта економічних відносин, яка відображає комплексну взаємодію його раціональних та емоційних мотивів. Основними наслідками прихованого підприємництва можуть стати: зниження конкуренції, особливо у разі налагодженого партнерства тіньового бізнесу з політикою; отримання пільг, привілеїв, виняткових прав у державі, в тому числі й за рахунок корупції і лобювання законопроектів; зниження ризиків здійснення економічної діяльності; можливість легалізації отриманих у незаконний спосіб доходів; незаконне привласнення прав на економічні блага; формування запасів грошових коштів тіньового походження, зумовлених необхідністю оплати тіньових витрат.

Ключові слова: бізнес, інституційне середовище, національна економіка, оподаткування, підприємництво, прихована підприємницька діяльність, тіньова економіка, управління.

Introduction and problem statement. The problem of the shadowing of the economy gained great importance at the end of the 20th century, when the shadow sector began to penetrate into all spheres of economic and social relations in almost all countries of the world, regardless of the level of development of the national economy. However, in some countries, the shadow economy is at a level that does not have a significant impact on the economy (5–12% of GDP), while in others it negatively affects all socio-economic processes (over 30% of GDP) [1]. The theoretical generalization of the problem of the appearance and reasons for the development of hidden entrepreneurship creates conditions for determining the methods of reducing its level in Ukraine at the current stage.

Given that the level of the shadow sector in Ukraine is now quite high (over 30% of GDP) [1], its impact on the development of the economy is negative. Therefore, the identification of the main reasons, as well as the awareness of the negative consequences of the further development of hidden entrepreneurship for the national economy, should become the foundation for the transformation of the institutional environment in the country. Understanding these consequences will determine the most promising ways to reduce the level of the shadow economy and will contribute to the use of positive effects from hidden entrepreneurship to develop the necessary incentives for the functioning of entrepreneurs.

Analysis of recent research and publications. It should be noted that the regulation of hidden entrepreneurship as a separate phenomenon is understudied due to the complexity of its identification, multifaceted and ambiguous manifestation. The works of foreign researchers Contini B., Gutmann P., Feige E., Frans A., Tanzi V., E. de Soto, etc. are of great importance [4; 13–17]. The works of such scientists as Biriukov I., Varnaliy Z., Vasenko V., Hordenchuk M., Kvasov S., Mazur I., Pirnykoza P., Prystupa T are devoted to the study of certain

aspects of shadowing of economic and, in particular, entrepreneurial activity in the context of regulation, Skoruk O., Tsvigun T. [1–12] and others.

However, taking into account the significant scientific output of researchers, the degree of study of this problem does not allow to formulate a clear idea about the causes of hidden entrepreneurship, the issues of identifying the connection between the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship and the state of the institutional environment remain insufficiently researched.

The aim of the article is the justification and systematization of the causes and features of hidden entrepreneurship in the national economy.

Results of the research. Taking into account the specifics of the appearance and development of hidden entrepreneurship, among the main reasons it is worth noting prohibitions and restrictions, as well as the ineffectiveness of the functioning of the business regulatory system [6].

Evaluating the various variations of the manifestation of the shadow economy and its varieties, the scientific works distinguish the position that the emergence of the "underground economy" is due to endogenous reasons of self-awareness of entrepreneurs, their attitude to existing restrictions and prohibitions, as well as their attitude to the justice of the existence of such restrictions.

The explanation of such a point of view lies in the principles of conducting business within the framework of the official economy with reference to the advantages of this method of realizing the business interests of entrepreneurs. Among such advantages are most often noted [1; 3; 4; 7–11] the possibility of free advertising of one's activities and goods, the use of benefits in the implementation of relevant types of activities or specific economic transactions. However, there are also shortcomings or omissions for business, which are associated with fixed prices for certain groups of goods, the need to comply with restrictions, obtaining permits, etc. [5; 6].

Research often supports the point of view that the manifestation of hidden entrepreneurship is caused by differences in business management methods and its scale.

Another important aspect of the functioning of hidden entrepreneurship is distinguished, which enabled Schneider and Enst to consider its positive impact on the country's economy. Thus, they noted that almost two-thirds of the profit received from operations in the shadow sector of the economy is spent in the official sector of the economy, i.e. it invigorates its development [1; 5; 7].

The reasons for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship should be generally divided into general and partial [1].

General reasons exist as a result of prohibitions and restrictions that are established regarding the regulation of the main aspects of economic activity. First of all, such restrictions or prohibitions are legally defined and reflect the relevant general rules. Among such general reasons, there are also certain objective reasons that have historically formed in society in relation to moral and ethical behavior, the level of culture, in relation to entrepreneurship, the fairness of punishment for non-compliance with legislation, tax culture, business culture, etc. [1; 2; 5–12]. In fact, common causes determine the most general characteristics of the external environment of entrepreneurship. Such reasons for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship are more intensively manifested in countries with crisis situations of a socio-economic nature. At the same time, the emergence of hidden entrepreneurship is less intense in developed and stable countries.

Partial or specific reasons lead to the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship at the level of individual operations, types of activities, in relation to a specific restriction or prohibition. These reasons include a high tax burden, an inefficient tax administration system, pressure on business from regulatory bodies, bureaucratization of procedures for conducting business and setting up business processes, creation of artificial obstacles of a permissive nature for carrying out entrepreneurial activities, mistrust of government institutions and the judicial system, high level of corruption, etc. Among such reasons, it is also reasonable to include the interaction of the shadow economy and politics [1; 5–12].

A significant reason for the possible emergence of hidden entrepreneurship is the practical realization of the relationship between politics and the shadow economy. In the vast majority of cases, shadow business implements its interests in politics by establishing financial control, offering administrative services, participating in the distribution of positions, etc.

The consequences of the existence of a shadow partnership in the literature determine the possibility

of avoiding punishment for entrepreneurs when they violate the current legislation; receiving privileges and tax benefits; abuse of competitive conditions with impunity; free use of financial, economic, intellectual, legal and other state resources; creation of favorable conditions for the realization of economic interests of related companies during the development of legislative and regulatory acts, etc. [6].

An important reason for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship is the intention and desire of business to "survive" in conditions of socio-economic instability. Such reasons especially apply to small and medium-sized businesses that do not have the financial ability to establish a partnership with politics.

In the conditions of constant crises, instability of the future, inefficiency of regulatory measures, massive increase in prices at the same time as the level of solvency of the population decreases, which leads to a narrowing of consumption, entrepreneurs are unable to work legally, because the "price of legality" exceeds the "price of illegality". Excessive costs faced by entrepreneurship in the legal sphere put the entrepreneur on the edge of survival, which leads to the forced transfer of the business into the shadows [1].

The lack of sufficient guarantees for the protection of property rights also causes the manifestation of hidden entrepreneurship, which causes massive "capital flight" from the country. In addition, the reasons for such transfer of capital outside the country can be not only the desire to minimize the tax burden, tax avoidance, but also the concealment of real sources of wealth, as well as sources of income.

The reasons for the appearance of hidden entrepreneurship are also related to circumstances of an objective nature [4–12]. In this case, it is not so much about a deliberate violation of the established restrictions as about their absence or insufficient formation. It is primarily about the emergence of operations and activities related to the intensification of the use and spread of information and communication technologies, the development of creative industries, social networks, etc.

Hidden entrepreneurship became the most widespread as a result of the use of shadowy practices of tax and other mandatory payment evasion.

That is why, to explain the cause-and-effect relationships of hidden entrepreneurship, it is advisable to pay attention to the possibilities of using a behavioral approach. That is, the study of the essence of behavior regarding the implementation of hidden entrepreneurship is expedient to conduct also from the standpoint of a behavioral approach and a separate aspect – deviant behavior [1; 13–17]. Behavior as a reaction to reality is determined by the social environment and the set of moral principles

formed in society. At the heart of deviation, and therefore deviant behavior, lie not only internal conflicts in the perception of society's norms, but also the discrepancy between the desires of the individual and the demands of society, the deformation of social relations, the deepening of social stratification, the discrepancy between the amount of tax payments by tax payers and the amount and quality of public goods received. Thus, the problem of the subject's behavior when considering the cause-and-effect relationships of hidden entrepreneurship orients the scientific search in the plane of contradictions between the interests of taxpayers and the state.

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Thus, when forming his behavior regarding hidden entrepreneurship, the subject focuses on certain motives that he considers the most important for him, and therefore, the reasons that determine the implementation of hidden entrepreneurship.

It is worth emphasizing that the basis of behavior oriented towards hidden entrepreneurship is the motive of maintaining activity, saving costs, and the desire to increase one's own wealth. Usually, this behavior is accompanied by the choice of a form of shadow operations, given the scale of the business and risk appetite.

Taking this into account, we will determine that the main essential characteristics of behavior oriented towards hidden entrepreneurship are: individuality, propensity to risk, finding a compromise between the expectation of income and the avoidance of losses.

Therefore, hidden entrepreneurship from the point of view of cause-and-effect relationships is one of the forms of the embodiment of the behavior of the subject of economic relations, which reflects the complex interaction of his rational and emotional motives.

Depending on the purpose of hiding certain operations, the consequences of hidden entrepreneurship can be: a decrease in competition, especially in the case of an established partnership of shadow business with politics; receiving benefits, privileges, exclusive rights in the state, including due to corruption and lobbying for draft laws; reducing the risks of economic activity; the possibility of legalization of illegally obtained income; illegal appropriation of rights to economic benefits; the formation of stocks of money of shadow origin, due to the need to pay shadow expenses.

REFERENCES:

1. Biriukov I.V. (2019) Teoretyzatsiia prykhovanoho pidpriemnytstva za prychnamy proiavu ta lehalizatsiieiu rezultativ. *Biznes-navihator. Naukovo-vyrobnychyi zhurnal*. Vyp. 4 (53). P. 167–171.
2. Vasenko V.K. (2016) Tinova ekonomika Ukrainy ta shliakhy yii detinizatsii. *Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu. Seriiia «Ekonomichni nauky»*. № 1. P. 15–23.

3. Hordenchuk M. (2019) Tinova ekonomika: pozytyvni ta nehatyvni efekty. *Traektorii Nauki – Path of Science*. Vyp. 5. № 3. P. 2001–2007. URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/pos/journal/44-3.html> (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024)
4. Ernando de Soto. *Zahadka kapitalu*. M.: Olimp-Biznes, 2004. 272 p.
5. Kvasov S.A. (2005) Orhanizatsiino-ekonomichniy mekhanizm vyavleniia ta poperedzhenniia tinovoi diialnosti : avtoref. dys... kand. ekon. Nauk : 08.02.03 / S. A. Kvasov ; N.-d. ekon. in-t M-va ekonomiky ta z pytan yevrop. intehr. Ukrainy. Kyiv, 19 p.
6. Mazur I., Shyshak A. (2017) Sotsialno-ekonomichna pryroda tinovoi ekonomiky ta prychny yii rozvytku v pidpriemnytstvi. *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. EKONOMIKA*, no. 1(190), pp. 13–20. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339617037_socialno-ekonomichna_pryroda_tinovoi_ekonomiky_ta_prychny_yii_rozvytku_v_pidpriemnytstvi (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024)
7. Mazur I.I. (2007) Detinizatsiia ekonomiky v transformatsiinykh suspilstvakh : avtoref. dys... d-ra ekon. Nauk : 08.00.01 / I. I. Mazur; Kyiv. nats. un-t im. T.Shevchenka. Kyiv, 40 p.
8. Pirnykoza P.V. (2016) Prychny znachnykh obsiahiv tinovoi ekonomiky v Ukraini ta shliakhy yikh usunenniia: fiskalni aspekty. *Efektivna ekonomika*, no. 4. URL: <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=4918> (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024).
9. Prystupa T.V., Chaikovska M.A. (2019) Tinova ekonomika ta yii vplyv na sotsialno-ekonomichniy rozvytok Ukrainy. *Pryazovskiy ekonomichnyi visnyk*, no. 1/12, pp. 56–61. URL: http://pev.kpu.zp.ua/journals/2019/1_12_ukr/1_12_2019.pdf (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024).
10. Skoruk O.V. (2017) Tinova ekonomika : sutnist, prychny vynyknenniia ta shliakhy podolanniia. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, no. 11, pp. 127–131. URL: <http://www.economyandsociety.in.ua/index.php/journal/> (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024)
11. Tinova ekonomika: sutnist, osoblyvosti ta shliakhy lehalizatsii / [Varnalii Z.S., Honcharuk A.Ia., Zhalilo Ya.A. ta in.]; za red. Z.S. Varnalii, Nats. in-t strateh. doslidzh. Kyiv, 2006. 574 h.
12. Tsvihun T.V., Nechyporuk O.I. (2018) Tinizatsiia ekonomiky: prychny ta osoblyvosti vplyvu na ekonomichnyi rozvytok. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, no. 19, pp. 251–254. URL: http://economyandsociety.in.ua/journals/19_ukr/37.pdf (data zvernennia: 15.02.2024)
13. Contini B. (1989) The irregular economy of Italy: a survey of contributions. In *The underground economies: Tax evasion and information distortion*, Feige, E. (Ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
14. Feige E.L. (1979) How Big is the Irregular Economy? *Challenge*. November/December. P. 5–13.
15. Frans A. (1992) Guide-book to statistics on the hidden economy: conference of European statisticians. United Nations. N.Y. P. 67–78.
16. Gutmann P.M. (1977) The Subterranean Economy. *Financial Analysis*, vol. 1, pp. 33–50.
17. Tanzi V. (1983) The Underground Economy in the United States: Annual Estimates, 1930-80. *Staff Papers (International Monetary Fund)*. Vol. 30, no. 2 (Jun., 1983), pp. 283–305.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНИЙ СПИСОК:

1. Бірюков І.В. Теоретизація прихованого підприємництва за причинами прояву та легалізацією результатів. *Бізнес-навігатор*. Науково-виробничий журнал. Херсон, 2019. Вип. 4 (53). С. 167–171.
2. Васенко В.К. Тіньова економіка України та шляхи її детінізації. *Вісник Черкаського університету. Серія «Економічні науки»*. 2016. № 1. С. 15–23.
3. Горденчук М. Тіньова економіка: позитивні та негативні ефекти. *Traektoriâ Nauki – Path of Science*. 2019. Вип. 5. № 3. С. 2001–2007. URL: <https://ideas.repec.org/a/pos/journal/44-3.html> (дата звернення: 15.02.2024)
4. Ернандо де Сото. Загадка капіталу. М.: Олімп-Бізнес, 2004. 272 с.
5. Квасов С. А. Організаційно-економічний механізм виявлення та попередження тіньової діяльності : автореф. дис... канд. екон. Наук : 08.02.03 / С.А. Квасов ; Н.-д. екон. ін-т М-ва економіки та з питань європ. інтегр. України. Київ, 2005. 19 с.
6. Мазур І., Шишак А. Соціально-економічна природа тіньової економіки та причини її розвитку в підприємстві. *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. ЕКОНОМІКА*. 2017. № 1(190). С. 13–20. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339617037_socialno-ekonomichna_priroda_tinovoi_ekonomiki_ta_pricini_ii_rozvitku_v_pidpriemnistvi (дата звернення: 15.02.2024)
7. Мазур І.І. Детінізація економіки в трансформаційних суспільствах : автореф. дис... д-ра екон. Наук : 08.00.01 / І.І. Мазур; Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т.Шевченка. Київ, 2007. 40 с.
8. Пірнікоза П.В. Причини значних обсягів тіньової економіки в Україні та шляхи їх усунення: фінкальні аспекти. *Ефективна економіка*. № 4. 2016. <http://www.economy.nayka.com.ua/?op=1&z=4918> (дата звернення: 15.02.2024).
9. Приступа Т.В., Чайковська М.А. Тіньова економіка та її вплив на соціально-економічний розвиток України. *Приазовський економічний вісник*. 2019. №. 1/12. С. 56–61. URL: http://rev.kpu.zp.ua/journals/2019/1_12_uk/1_12_2019.pdf (дата звернення: 15.02.2024).
10. Скорук О.В. Тіньова економіка : сутність, причини виникнення та шляхи подолання. *Економіка та суспільство*. 2017. № 11. С. 127–131. URL: <http://www.economyandsociety.in.ua/index.php/journal/> (дата звернення: 15.02.2024)
11. Тіньова економіка: сутність, особливості та шляхи легалізації / [Варналій З.С., Гончарук А.Я., Жаліло Я.А. та ін.]; за ред. З.С. Варналія, Нац. ін-т стратег. дослідж. Київ, 2006. 574 с.
12. Цвігун Т.В., Нечипорук О.І. Тінізація економіки: причини та особливості впливу на економічний розвиток. *Економіка та суспільство*. 2018. № 19. С. 251–254. URL: http://economyandsociety.in.ua/journals/19_ukr/37.pdf (дата звернення: 15.02.2024)
13. Contini B. The irregular economy of Italy: a survey of contributions. In *The underground economies: Tax evasion and information distortion*, Feige, E. (Ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 1989.
14. Feige E. L. How Big is the Irregular Economy? *Challenge*. 1979. November/December. P. 5–13.
15. Frans A. Guide-book to statistics on the hidden economy: conference of European statisticians. United Nations. N.Y., 1992. P. 67–78.
16. Gutmann P.M. The Subterranean Economy. *Financial Analysis*, 1977. Vol.1, pp. 33–50.
17. Tanzi V. The Underground Economy in the United States: Annual Estimates, 1930-80. *Staff Papers (International Monetary Fund)*. Vol. 30, No. 2 (Jun., 1983), pp. 283–305.