

Zander, Tobias

## Article

# FDI flows and the effects of the shadow economy : evidence from gravity modelling

Athens journal of business & economics

## Provided in Cooperation with:

Athens Institute for Education and Research (ATINER)

*Reference:* Zander, Tobias (2023). FDI flows and the effects of the shadow economy : evidence from gravity modelling. In: Athens journal of business & economics 9 (4), S. 429 - 454.  
<http://www.athensjournals.gr/business/2023-9-4-3-Zander.pdf>.  
doi:10.30958/ajbe.9-4-3.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/631152>

## Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

## Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.



<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsfuse>

## Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*

## FDI Flows and the Effects of the Shadow Economy: Evidence from Gravity Modelling

By Tobias Zander\*

*This paper analyzes the question of if the size of the shadow economy affects foreign direct investment (FDI) flows and what effects, if any, there are. Since about 1990, FDI has become the second crucial pillar of economic globalization in OECD countries and worldwide; such FDI inward and outward flows contribute to higher per capita income and international technology transfer. To analyze this question, both fixed effects, as well as dyadic fixed effects gravity models, are used on an OECD-only dataset that allows for data on bilateral, bidirectional FDI flows for the years from 1992-2018. The empirical results suggest a positive effect of the shadow economy for FDI target countries and a negative effect for FDI origin countries. Additional findings via an interaction term show that the shadow economy can counteract the negative effects of an increase in government size on FDI inflows. From a policy perspective, changes in the size of the shadow economy – typically taking place in periods of recession, in a high taxation environment, or in the context of a pandemic shock – should be carefully monitored by economic policymakers as well as by policy monitoring international organizations such as the IMF and the EBRD. If a group of (OECD) countries decides to adopt anti-shadow economy economic policies, there will be pressure on other (OECD) countries to also adopt similar policies since the difference between the size of the shadow economy in the source country and the host country has a negative impact on FDI inflows. Thus, FDI could indirectly be a catalyst for reforms.*

**Keywords:** international economics, foreign direct investment, gravity model, shadow economy, OECD countries

**JEL classification:** C23, E26, F21, F23

### Introduction

Total foreign direct investment (FDI) flows in 2021 amounted to 1.65 trillion US dollars (USD), thus showing a recovery from their exceptionally low level in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic with an increase of 718 billion USD, with developed economies accounting for more than 500 billion USD, or more than three-quarters of total FDI flows (UNCTAD 2022a, 2022b). Compared to total FDI flows in 1990 of around 220 billion USD and it becomes obvious that FDI has grown very rapidly into a sizeable and important part of the world economy, particularly important in member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), some Newly Industrialized Countries, and

---

\*Research Associate, Schumpeter School of Business and Economics and European Institute of International Economic Relations (EIIW), University of Wuppertal, Germany.

China. It is noteworthy that FDI is also associated with many benefits for the target economy (the recipient of the FDI flow so to say):

- FDI inflows contribute to capital accumulation (greenfield investment) and international technology transfer (via both greenfield FDI and international mergers & acquisitions (M&A)). Thus, FDI inflows can result in job creation and access to new technologies, thus promoting labor productivity and possibly also economic growth in the respective host country.
- The introduction of new technologies also encourages the enhancement of human capital and skill upgrading where both effects also in turn raise domestic real income.
- FDI can also bring advantageous spillover effects resulting from horizontal and vertical linkages in the host economy (OECD 2002).

Therefore, unsurprisingly, FDI has been and still is a popular and relevant topic in the research community (see, e.g., Zander (2021), Baier (2020), van Cuong et al. (2021), Huynh et al. (2020), Roeger and Welfens (2021)). A lot of research is done concerning the locational factors of countries that affect FDI flows using gravity models, and this paper follows this established approach.

The topic of the shadow - or underground - economy has also been a topic for quite some time in the economic literature. In the late 1970s, this topic started to first appear within a broader economic debate. Another thing observed at that time was the growth in the size of government and rising levels of taxation and higher tax rates; higher unemployment rates also increased the incentive for certain workers to seek additional income in the shadow economy in many OECD countries in the 1970s. This, combined with more regulation, led to growing incentives for individuals and corporations to enter the shadow economic sector in order to avoid taxes and regulations. Thus, at that time, a good case could be made for the shadow economy to be a growing concern (Tanzi 1999).

The corona (COVID-19) pandemic which induced a recession in many countries in 2020 and the following years and considering the concerns related to the Russian invasion of Ukraine in early 2022, coupled with inflationary pressure due to a global temporary shipping crisis – partly related to the Corona lockdowns in Shanghai and other Chinese ports in 2022 – and general distortions in sectoral global value chains, as well as the increasingly evident effects of climate change on the economy, has resulted in higher pressure on governments to step in and actively fight these crises. This, of course, usually means increased government spending which could, in turn, lead to an increase in taxes (Nikopour et al. 2009). Therefore, the case can be made that the incentive to avoid taxes and regulations is growing once again. This also means that it is important to research the effects of tax evasion opportunities, such as the extent of the shadow economy, empirically since the shadow economy is an important part of the overall economic system and can affect every aspect of the economy (van Cuong et al. 2021). The costs associated with the shadow economy can include labor market distortions, the suboptimal provision of public goods, revenue losses due to the under-reporting of wages and production, and the reduced provision of and access to finance

(Kelmanson et al. 2019). The Corona shocks in OECD countries have been found to contribute to the growth of the shadow economy (Schneider 2022).

Therefore, it is important to explore the linkages between FDI and the shadow economy as well as other drivers of FDI. Conducting such research can provide policymakers with the necessary empirical evidence and knowledge as both FDI and the shadow economy are important aspects of a country. If the goal is to attract FDI, does the shadow economy work against achieving that goal? It may be that the size of the shadow economy is considered by foreign investors as a signal of a rather poor institutional framework or inconsistent economic policy strategies. Is it important to reduce the shadow economy to be more attractive for multinational companies (MNCs)? Or is it the case that maybe the shadow economy – with its size signaling excess labor supply – offers opportunities for MNCs and therefore acts as a factor that may indeed attract FDI? This paper provides evidence to answer these questions by researching the effects of the shadow economy on FDI inflows through the use of a gravity model. There are relatively few empirical studies when it comes to the nexus of FDI flows and the shadow economy. Thus, this paper adds to the literature by making several contributions to the existing empirical frontier, namely by creating a new dataset for the gravity model analysis of shadow economy effects on FDI flows for OECD countries for the years 1992-2018, by giving new insights from state-of-the-art gravity modeling into the nexus of FDI and the shadow economy; and by including three interaction terms, which attempt to capture potential interactions between independent variables and the shadow economy.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: next section provides a brief review of the theoretical literature regarding the shadow economy, and FDI as well as empirical studies regarding the nexus of the shadow economy and FDI. Then the following section reviews the literature regarding the gravity model as well as the data, FDI determinants, and the specification of the model. Afterwards, in the coming section presents the results and additional considerations while last section concludes with economic policy implications.

## **Literature Review**

In this section, the relevant theoretical and empirical literature will be reviewed. The goal is to build a theoretical basis and use empirical evidence in conjunction with the theoretical literature to build hypotheses concerning the links between the shadow economy and FDI flows which can be tested in the present analysis.

### *Theoretical Literature*

One of the early theories in International Economics stems from the neoclassical trade theory's Heckscher-Ohlin model. The idea behind the theory is that countries differ in relative factor endowment which leads to international factor price differences and thus a clear specialization pattern in production and exports as well as imports. Following this logic, a capital-abundant country would

specialize in capital-intensive goods production if it is highly endowed with capital (relative to labor) so that economic opening up leads to more production of the capital-intensive good and indeed also to exports of the capital-intensive goods produced; and if the capital intensity is rather low, a country will specialize in labor-intensive production and exports after economic opening up; moreover, there could also be international capital movements to a country where returns on capital are higher until factor price equalization is achieved (Faeth 2009).

The traditional theory though made little distinction between FDI and international portfolio flows. Hymer (1960) was the first to find inconsistency between this approach and FDI data. In short, “Hymer envisioned a world in which real (not financial) factors shape the location of multinational activity and financial flows are a mere consequence of the financial structure decisions of multinational firms.” (Antràs and Yeaple 2014). After refinement by multiple authors (see Antràs and Yeaple (2014) for more), the result was Dunning’s eclectic paradigm (Dunning 1977). Dunning looked more at the idea of what factors influence a firm’s decision to invest abroad. He identified three broad advantages in his eclectic paradigm: Ownership (e.g., a firm’s production processes), Location (e.g., market access), and Internationalization (e.g., lowering transaction costs) advantages. This became known as the OLI framework. These advantages can vary and depend on the characteristics of the country, industry, market, and the MNC itself (Faeth 2009).

Other models try to explain FDI dynamics using the concepts of horizontal FDI, vertical FDI, and the Knowledge-Capital (KC) Model. “Vertical MNEs [Multinational Enterprises] engage in trade and seek to exploit international factor price differentials whereas horizontal MNEs seek to save trade costs by serving markets locally” (Baltagi et al. 2007). Based on earlier work (see Markusen et al. (1996) and Markusen (1997)). Carr et al. (2001) develop the so-called “Knowledge-Capital model” which combines vertical and horizontal modes of MNC entry. The authors create a 2x2x2 model with three basic assumptions: firstly, knowledge-generating activities can be separated from production; secondly, these activities are skilled-labor-intensive, and - thirdly - knowledge-based activities have a joint-input character. The first and second assumptions lead to the motivation for vertical FDI (access low wages), whereas the third assumption delivers a motivation for horizontal FDI (access markets). This results in the horizontal firm being active in countries of a similar size and with similar relative factor endowments whereas vertical firms have an incentive to headquarter in countries with an abundance of skilled labor and have production in a country where skilled labor is relatively scarce.

Bergstrand and Egger (2007) extend the KC model into a three-factor, three-country, two-good model allowing now for physical capital as a third factor of production in addition to knowledge capital (skilled and unskilled labor). The assumption that physical capital is mobile leads to MNCs endogenously choosing “the optimal allocation of domestic physical capital between home and foreign locations to maximize profits” (Bergstrand and Egger 2010). This means that their “Knowledge-and-Physical-Capital model” actually has FDI. In their 2010 paper, Bergstrand and Egger create a more general version of their 2007 model, by

constructing a three-factor, three-country, three-good model thereby providing a theoretical rationale for estimating gravity equations for bilateral FDI flows (as well as bilateral final goods trade flows and bilateral intermediate goods trade flows) (Bergstrand and Egger 2010).

Regarding the definition of the shadow economy, this paper follows the definition of Medina and Schneider (2018, p. 4): “Shadow economic activities may be defined as those economic activities and income earned that circumvent government regulation, taxation or observation. More narrowly, the shadow economy includes monetary and non-monetary transactions of a legal nature; hence all productive economic activities that would generally be taxable were they reported to the state (tax) authorities.” Generally, the literature on the shadow economy identifies four overarching reasons when it comes to why one would be active in the shadow economy. The first is to avoid paying taxes (e.g., income or value-added taxes), the second is to avoid paying social security contributions, the third is to avoid compliance with certain labor market standards (e.g., minimum wages, maximum working hours, workplace safety regulation), and the fourth and last is to avoid certain administrative procedures. This also means that while these activities could be part of the national accounts, they do not show up due to their illicitness (Medina and Schneider 2018, Schneider and Buehn 2018, Schneider and Williams 2013).

Based on the reasons why one would be active in the shadow economy, Schneider (2008) identifies the main causes for an increase in the shadow economy as follows:

- Increase of the Tax and Social Security Contribution Burdens
- Intensity of Regulations
- Social Transfers
- Labor Market Standards
- Public Sector Services

Another relevant topic when talking about the shadow economy is the links with corruption. Regarding corruption, there are two strands in the literature the “grease the wheels” view and the “sand the wheels” view. Proponents of the former argue that corruption can lead to second-best solutions (Bardhan 1997) and can, for example, help circumvent business-hindering government policies or a badly working government in general (see, e.g., Leff (1964), Bayley (1966), Lui (1985), Beck and Maher (1986), Lien (1986)). Supporters of the “sand the wheels” view, on the other hand, argue that no matter the situation, corruption is always the worst choice. For example, while bribes might at times be used to circumvent bad policies, they might also be used to do so for sound policies and a government that accepts bribes also has a considerable incentive to create legislation in order to maximize the amounts of bribes they can receive (see, e.g., Kaufmann (1997), Rose-Ackerman (1997), Kaufmann and Wei (1999), Lambsdorff (2002)).

As one can see, the effect of corruption on the official economy is in theory still somewhat unsettled, therefore the relationship between corruption and the shadow economy is not clear either. Should corruption help economic growth and

wealth, this in turn should ultimately lead to a decline in corruption and also a decline in shadow economy activity. Should corruption on the other hand harm the economy, this then would ultimately lead to more corruption and more incentive to do business in the shadow economy (Schneider 2008, Schneider and Williams 2013). Although important, the main focus of this paper will be on the linkage between the shadow economy and FDI.

### *Empirical Literature*

The empirical literature examining the relationship between FDI and the shadow economy is relatively limited. The following papers represent, to the best of the author's knowledge, all empirical studies examining FDI and the shadow economy.

Nikopour et al. (2009) examine the relationship between the shadow economy and FDI using Granger causality analysis. For this, they first estimate a panel and then look for causality. The authors use data for 145 countries and 5 data points (1999/2000, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005). Using a system generalized methods of moment (GMM) estimation, they find in all specifications in their panel data model, a positive and significant effect of the shadow economy on FDI inflows. They then use Granger causality tests and find that the shadow economy Granger causes FDI inflows in all models finding support for one of their hypothesis that a higher shadow economy causes higher FDI inflows (Nikopour et al. 2009). Davidescu and Strat (2015) examine the relationship between the shadow economy and FDI for Romania using two different causality analysis methods (Granger and Toda-Yamamoto) over the period 2000-2010. Their findings reveal a short-run causality from FDI to the shadow economy. The authors argue that, due to FDI stimulating economic activity, tax reforms may be possible and lower taxes would lead to less incentive for individuals to engage in the shadow economy.

Ali and Bohara (2017) use a gravity model to explore the effects of the shadow economy on FDI inflows for 34 OECD countries from 1999 to 2007. Their results show a positive relationship between the shadow economy and FDI inflows indicating that MNCs are motivated to take advantage of the shadow economy. Huynh et al. (2020) investigate the relationship between FDI, shadow economy, and institutional quality for 19 developing Asian countries between 2002 and 2015. Focusing on their findings regarding the FDI-shadow economy nexus, the authors find that FDI has a negative impact on the size of the shadow economy. Additionally, an improvement in institutional quality from FDI increases the negative impact of FDI on the shadow economy. In the most recent study, van Cuong et al. (2021) investigate the effect of the shadow economy on FDI for 158 countries for the period from 2003-2018. Therefore, they investigate total FDI as well as greenfield investments and cross-border M&As. Their findings show no clear effect on total FDI inflows, but a positive effect on greenfield investments and a negative effect on cross-border M&As.

### *Hypotheses*

Based on the theoretical and empirical literature presented in this chapter, the following hypotheses are stated here:

- 1) The shadow economy is expected to attract FDI, therefore a positive sign for FDI inflows can be expected.
- 2) The difference in the size of the shadow economy between two countries is expected to have a negative sign, as countries with similar levels of the shadow economy are expected to engage in more FDI with each other; MNCs from, for example, country 1 – with a large shadow economy – will find investing abroad in other countries with a relatively high level of shadow economic activity as representing economic conditions in a crucial field which are not very different from the conditions in the source country so that established business models can be transplanted to subsidiaries abroad in a rather easy way; moreover, international transaction costs for intra-company trade should be relatively small which would make vertical FDI particularly attractive in some sectors.
- 3) Inflation typically leads to government intervention, including anti-inflation measures which, following the logic of the Phillips curve, will temporarily raise unemployment rates (e.g., in the case of reduced government spending); hence inflation interacts with the shadow economy in a way that the effective labor supply from unemployed workers will increase. As inflation reduces real income in many countries with no wage indexation or weak trade unions, there is also an incentive for workers from the official economy to seek additional hours of work in the shadow economy in order to restore the previous real income growth.
- 4) The size of the government, proxied by government consumption as a percentage of GDP, is expected to interact with the shadow economy as a larger government can lead to a larger shadow economy (Zhanabekov 2022). Therefore, a positive sign is expected.
- 5) Finally, a crisis dummy for the transatlantic banking crisis (as a proxy for the Global Financial Crisis of 2007/08) is interacted with the shadow economy in that a significant international crisis affects both FDI and the shadow economy. Therefore, a positive sign is expected.

### **Gravity Model of FDI and Specification**

The broader theoretical foundation has been discussed in the previous section. Here we will focus more on the specification of the gravity model and best practices.



*Gravity Model and Model Specification*

The gravity model has a long history in science apart from the field of physics<sup>1</sup>. Ravenstein (1885) and Zipf (1946) were the earliest adopters of a gravity model followed by Tinbergen's (1962) adoption with regard to trade between countries<sup>2</sup>. The next big innovation concerning the gravity model of trade came in 2003 with the famous "gravity with gravitas" paper by Anderson and van Wincoop (2003). Building on the early intuition of the gravity model that the size of the country correlates positively with trade while the distance between countries correlates negatively with trade, Anderson and Van Wincoop (2003) introduced two new additional variables: outward and inward multilateral resistance (Benedictis and Taglioni 2011). The former captures the fact that exports from country *i* to country *j* depend on trade costs across all possible export markets while the latter captures the dependence of imports into country *i* from country *j* on trade costs across all possible suppliers.

Based on the aforementioned "gravity with gravitas" paper, Anderson et al. (2019) derive a structural gravity system for FDI, in particular for FDI stocks. Their model includes an equation for FDI and two multilateral resistance terms (one for the origin country and one for the target country). The main properties of the system are that FDI is related to the size of the host and origin countries' respective GDPs, is inversely related to FDI barriers, it links FDI to trade via a multilateral resistance term, and lastly, there is a relationship between the FDI stock and technology capital.<sup>3</sup>

The resulting gravity equation looks like this:

$$FDIflows_{odt} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{ot-1} + \alpha_2 X_{dt-1} + \alpha_3 X_{dt-1} Z_{dt} + \gamma Z_{odt} + \delta_{od} + \delta_d + \delta_d + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{odt}$$

Where

- $\alpha_0$  = regression constant
- $X_{o(t-1)}$  = lagged origin country shadow economy
- $X_{d(t-1)}$  = lagged destination/target country shadow economy
- $X_{d(t-1)}Z_{dt}$  = interaction terms for the target country
- $Z_{odt}$  = set of control variables for both origin/destination countries (set includes time-invariant characteristics of country-pairs from the CEPII database for the country fixed effects regressions)
- $\delta_{od}, \delta_{od}, \delta_{od}$  = time-invariant country and country-pair fixed effects<sup>4</sup>
- $\tau_t$  = time-fixed effects
- $\varepsilon_{odt}$  = error term

<sup>1</sup>The gravity model is based on Newton's Law of Gravity.

<sup>2</sup>A detailed history of the gravity model can be found in Benedictis and Taglioni (2011).

<sup>3</sup>For a more detailed explanation see Anderson et al. (2019).

<sup>4</sup>Of course, if country-pair fixed effects are used, country fixed effects are not included and vice versa. Also, the equation for the model with shadow economic distance is not presented. For the model without interaction terms simply drop  $X_{d(t-1)}Z_{dt}$

*Estimator and Best Practices*


There have been additional advances regarding FDI gravity, namely dyadic fixed-effects, and the Poisson-Pseudo-Maximum-Likelihood (PPML) estimation methods. Baldwin and Taglioni (2006) argue for the use of time-invariant pair dummies (dyadic fixed effects) when it comes to estimating gravity equations. They caution though that this means that the coefficients of interest will only be identified on their time variation, meaning that there needs to be a significant enough time variation in the policy variable one is trying to estimate (one also cannot include time-invariant parameters, e.g., distance). Egger and Pfaffermayr (2003) also advocate for using bilateral fixed effects (dyadic fixed effects) and time fixed effects (two-way model) rather than country (importer and exporter) fixed effects and time fixed effects (three-way model). Head and Ries (2008) also use dyadic fixed effects in their gravity equation for FDI.

PPML is an estimator developed by Santos Silva and Tenreyro (2006) to deal with heteroskedasticity in gravity equations. It does so by estimating the equation in levels and not, as with Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation, in log-linearized form, which, according to the authors, is inconsistent in the presence of heteroscedasticity. Additionally, it allows for the inclusion of zero FDI (or trade) flows and it takes account of observed heterogeneity (Santos Silva and Tenreyro 2006, Head and Mayer 2014, Kareem et al. 2016). Based on the original paper of Correia et al. (2019) the STATA command “ppmlhdfc” allows for a fast estimation of Poisson models with multiple high-dimensional fixed effects (HDFE). As Santos Silva and Tenreyro (2022) put it in their “The Log of Gravity at 15” paper: “PPML is efficient in the class of pseudo maximum likelihood estimators that are valid in models with fixed effects and are compatible with structural gravity models.” As Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg testing for heteroskedasticity confirms heteroskedasticity in the sample, PPML is chosen as the estimator for all models. Additionally, there are no serious correlation issues, see the correlation matrix in Table 6 in the Appendix. Potential endogeneity between the independent variable and the variable of interest, the shadow economy, is avoided by lagging the shadow economy variable by one year.

*The Determinants of FDI and a Description of the Data*


Figures 1 and 2 show the development of inward and outward flows and stocks, respectively, for OECD countries in comparison with the world total. The overall trend is that FDI stocks are growing for both the OECD group of countries and the world economy. FDI flows in comparison are more volatile and in the late 2010s are exhibiting more of a decline compared to the early and mid-2000s. Also, OECD countries stand for the majority of FDI flows and FDI stock in the world, albeit the proportion of OECD-related FDI is declining as other non-OECD countries increase investment.

**Figure 1.** FDI Inflows and Inward Stock for OECD Countries and the World from 1990-2020



Source: Own representation based on data available from UNCTAD (<https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Index.html>).

**Figure 2.** FDI Outflows and Outward Stock for OECD Countries and the World from 1990-2020



Source: Own representation based on data available from UNCTAD (<https://unctadstat.unctad.org/EN/Index.html>).

In the following empirical analysis, bilateral FDI flow data from the OECD is used due to it being compiled more uniformly and it being less aggregated as compared to UNCTAD data, resulting in more data points. Moreover, looking at Figures 1 and 2 and especially the world inflows and outflows, one can see that in these graphs, which are made with UNCTAD data, there is a difference but there should not be a difference in terms of world inflows and outflows and this is most

likely a problem with data quality. Therefore, data from the OECD is preferred (Baier 2020).

The selection of the data and variables for the gravity model is based on empirical and theoretical literature. As Faeth (2009) puts it: “FDI should not be explained by single theories but more broadly by a combination of ownership advantages or agglomeration economics, market size and characteristics, cost factors, transport costs and protection and risk factors and policy variables.” Therefore, following research from Faeth (2009), Blonigen (2005), Blonigen and Piger (2014), and Eicher et al. (2012) regarding FDI determinants as well as previous empirical literature, real GDP, distance, cultural variables, agglomeration effects, inflation, a transatlantic banking crisis dummy, and openness are included, furthermore government consumption as a proxy for government size, following Zhanabekov (2022), is also included.

Data for real GDP, inflation, and openness comes from the World Bank, time-invariant country-pair characteristics come were taken from CEPII, and data on the shadow economy comes from Medina and Schneider (2019) and is estimated using the MIMIC approach (see their paper for more details on this), agglomeration effects data is from the OECD database, government consumption data was taken from the Penn World Tables 10, and data on the financial crisis dummy comes from Laeven (2018). Details regarding the definition and source of the variables can be found in the following Table 1.

**Table 1.** *List of Variables*

Variable	Definition	Source
inflow	FDI inflow, from origin to target in current USD; Negative values to zero, excluding missing values	OECD FDI database; BMD3 data 1992-2012, BMD4 data 2013-2018
ln_target_gdp	Real GDP of FDI target country in mln. USD	World Bank
ln_origin_gdp	Real GDP of FDI origin country in mln. USD	World Bank
ln_dist	Simple geodesic distance between two countries	CEPII GeoDist Database by Mayer and Zignago (2011)
contig	dummy variable indicating whether the two countries are contiguous	CEPII GeoDist Database by Mayer and Zignago (2011)
comlang_off	dummy variable indicating whether the two countries share a common language	CEPII GeoDist Database by Mayer and Zignago (2011)
colony	dummy variable indicating whether the two countries have ever had a colonial link	CEPII GeoDist Database by Mayer and Zignago (2011)
openness	Total import plus total export of FDI target country, divided by its GDP	World Bank
ln_agglo_target	Agglomeration effects (inward FDI stock) in the target country lagged by 1 year	OECD
target_gov_100	Share of government consumption at current PPPs multiplied by 100 <sup>5</sup>	PWT 10.0 by Feenstra et al. (2015)
target_inflation	Annual inflation based on Consumer Price Indices	OECD
target_fin_cri	Dummy describing whether a country was experiencing a systemic banking crisis as an effect of the transatlantic banking crisis	Laeven (2018)

<sup>5</sup>The original values are between 0 and 1. Multiplying by 100 makes the interpretation of the estimates easier.

shadow_target	Size of the shadow economy of the target country, in % of GDP	Medina and Schneider (2019)
shadow_origin	Size of the shadow economy of the origin country, in % of GDP	Medina and Schneider (2019)
shadow_diff	Absolute difference between size of the shadow economy of the target and origin country	Medina and Schneider (2019)
S_inf	Interaction term for the target country between inflation and shadow economy	Medina and Schneider (2019) and OECD
S_gov_100	Interaction term for the target country between government consumption and shadow economy	Medina and Schneider (2019) and Feenstra et al. (2015)
s_cri	Interaction term for the target country between financial crisis dummy and shadow economy	Medina and Schneider (2019) and Laeven (2018)
Eurozone	Dummy variable for when the target and origin country are both part of the eurozone	European Union

Source: Own representation.

In total, the resulting dataset has 19,921 observations for the years 1992-2018 for 35 OECD countries excluding Luxembourg<sup>6</sup>. Missing values get treated by deletion and negative values are set to zero following the methodology in Welfens and Baier (2018). Summary statistics can be found in Table 2.

**Table 2.** *Summary Statistics*

VARIABLE	OBS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	MIN	MAX
INFLOW	19,921	870.851	4160.598	0.0	116455.9
LN_TARGET_GDP	19,921	12.916	1.550	8.735	16.841
LN_ORIGIN_GDP	19,921	12.949	1.546	8.412	16.841
LN_DIST	19,921	7.946	1.171	4.088	9.883
CONTIG	19,921	0.077	0.266	0	1
COMLANG_OFF	19,921	0.071	0.257	0	1
COLONY	19,921	0.043	0.202	0	1
OPENNESS	19,921	0.828	0.410	0.158	2.274
LN_AGGLO_TARGET	19,921	11.561	1.567	4.761	15.875
T_GOV_100	19,921	18.326	4.850	6.701	33.758
TARGET_FIN_CRI	19,921	0.097	0.297	0.0	1.0
TARGET_INFLATION	19,921	3.391	7.335	-4.478	105.215
SHADOW_TARGET	19,921	16.359	6.597	5.1	35.8
SHADOW_ORIGIN	19,921	15.661	6.431	5.1	35.8
S_INF	19,921	75.935	241.228	-52.842	3661.482
S_CRI	19,921	1.428	4.623	0	23.1
S_GOV_100	19,921	304.123	146.887	36.634	757.133
EUROZONE	19,921	0.137	0.344	0	1

Source: Own representation.

<sup>6</sup>Luxembourg is excluded due to it being a major outlier in the dataset.

## Results

In this section, the results from the gravity model regressions are presented. The regressions are done using the PPML estimator (Stata command: `ppmlhdfc`) with country- and time-fixed effects as well as another regression with country-pair and time-fixed effects. The reason for estimating both types of fixed effects is that dyadic-fixed effects do not allow for time-invariant dyadic variables such as distance. It also helps to show the differences in estimation results between the three-way and the two-way model.

Table 3 shows the results for the country and time-fixed effects PPML regressions. Model 1 is simply a baseline model. It confirms the gravity intuition that market size (GDP) is positively correlated with FDI and distance is negatively correlated with FDI, with `ln_target_gdp` being significant at the 1% level in all models and `ln_origin_gdp` being significant at 1% level in Model 1 and 3 and the 5% level in model 2 and 4. This can also be seen as confirmation that the model behaves as expected. Other variables of interest are trade openness which shows a positive effect and is significant at the 1% level, government size (proxied by government consumption) which expresses a negative sign and also significance at the 1% level and agglomeration effects which are positive and significant at the 5% level in Model 1 to 4. The eurozone dummy is also positive and significant at the 1% level in Model 1 to 4. In Model 2, the variables for the shadow economy are introduced and both are statistically significant, with `shadow_target` being significant at the 1% level and `shadow_origin` being significant at the 5% level. For the target countries, a positive effect is found and for the origin countries, a negative effect is found. The other control variables remain roughly unchanged. In Model 3, the variable for the difference between the target and origin shadow economy is introduced, which shows a negative sign and is statistically significant at the 1% level. Interpreting the results for the shadow economy variables in Models 2 and 3, we get a 17.3% increase in FDI inflows for target countries when the shadow economy in the target country increases by 1% and a -11.75% decrease in FDI outflows from host countries when their shadow economy increases by 1%. For Model 3 and the shadow economy difference variable, we get a -3.9% decrease in FDI flows between countries when the difference in their respective shadow economies increases by 1%.

Model 4 introduces interaction terms for the three variables that potentially interact with the shadow economy variable. These are inflation, the banking crisis dummy, and the government size variable all for the target country. Two interaction terms show statistical significance, with the `shadow*gov` term being significant at 10% and the `shadow*crisis` term at 5%. Both show a positive sign for their effect. This would mean that the effect of the shadow economy on FDI increases by **0.338%** for every 1% increase in gov consumption. In other words, the greater government consumption, the larger the effect of the shadow economy on FDI inflows. The `shadow*crisis` interaction term follows the same interpretation in that for target countries that are experiencing a financial crisis, the effect of the shadow economy on FDI increases by **3.7%**. The interaction term for `shadow*inflation` is negative but not statistically significant.

**Table 3.** PPML Country- and Time-Fixed Effects Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
ln_target_gdp	0.842*** (0.304)	1.313*** (0.324)	0.805*** (0.305)	1.337*** (0.326)
ln_origin_gdp	1.135*** (0.369)	0.840** (0.415)	1.109*** (0.375)	0.840** (0.413)
ln_dist	-0.427*** (0.0810)	-0.426*** (0.0812)	-0.441*** (0.0808)	-0.427*** (0.0812)
contig	-0.127 (0.187)	-0.128 (0.187)	-0.110 (0.188)	-0.126 (0.187)
comlang_off	0.267** (0.132)	0.264** (0.133)	0.268** (0.127)	0.263** (0.132)
colony	0.263* (0.144)	0.263* (0.144)	0.272* (0.141)	0.265* (0.144)
openness	1.540*** (0.407)	1.775*** (0.419)	1.496*** (0.410)	1.920*** (0.431)
ln_agglo_target	0.257** (0.129)	0.296** (0.126)	0.257** (0.129)	0.248** (0.126)
t_gov_100	-0.0583** (0.0258)	-0.068*** (0.026)	-0.0564** (0.0258)	-0.128*** (0.0399)
target_fin_cri	0.125 (0.0903)	0.127 (0.0904)	0.115 (0.0907)	-0.237 (0.193)
target_inflation	0.0005 (0.0054)	-0.0044 (0.0054)	0.0028 (0.0054)	0.0635 (0.0489)
eurozone	0.366*** (0.127)	0.378*** (0.126)	0.335*** (0.121)	0.375*** (0.126)
shadow_target		0.171*** (0.0391)		0.161*** (0.0544)
shadow_origin		-0.115** (0.0574)		-0.117** (0.057)
S_inf				-0.0022 (0.0015)
S_gov				0.331* (0.184)
S_cri				0.0348** (0.0162)
shadow_diff			-0.0379*** (0.0086)	
Constant	-20.67*** (7.735)	-24.51*** (9.074)	-19.44** (7.870)	-23.98*** (9.162)
Observations	19,921	19,921	19,921	19,921

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p&lt;0.01, \*\* p&lt;0.05, \* p&lt;0.1

**Table 4.** PPML Country-Pair- and Time-Fixed Effects Results

	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
VARIABLES	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
ln_target_gdp	0.812*** (0.307)	1.312*** (0.327)	0.791** (0.315)	1.337*** (0.329)
ln_origin_gdp	0.926*** (0.355)	0.634 (0.402)	0.911** (0.354)	0.630 (0.398)
openness	1.452*** (0.399)	1.685*** (0.410)	1.425*** (0.405)	1.825*** (0.421)
ln_agglo_target	0.248* (0.129)	0.292** (0.127)	0.250* (0.130)	0.247* (0.127)
t_gov_100	-0.0589** (0.0257)	-0.0698*** (0.0259)	-0.0582** (0.0259)	-0.129*** (0.0392)
target_fin_cri	0.136 (0.0889)	0.139 (0.0887)	0.130 (0.0881)	-0.179 (0.194)
target_inflation	9.37e-05 (0.0053)	-0.0049 (0.0053)	0.0008 (0.0053)	0.0663 (0.0489)
eurozone	0.407*** (0.139)	0.502*** (0.153)	0.401*** (0.138)	0.482*** (0.155)
shadow_target		0.183*** (0.0400)		0.170*** (0.0554)
shadow_origin		-0.114** (0.0582)		-0.115** (0.0579)
S_inf				-0.0023 (0.0015)
S_gov				0.333* (0.178)
S_cri				0.0306* (0.0164)
shadow_diff			-0.0184 (0.0347)	
Constant	-20.02*** (7.299)	-24.54*** (8.730)	-19.44*** (7.326)	-24.00*** (8.824)
Observations	19,214	19,214	19,214	19,214

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p&lt;0.01, \*\* p&lt;0.05, \* p&lt;0.1

Table 4 shows the results for the country-pair and time-fixed effect PPML regressions. Models 5 to 8 repeat models 1 to 4 but with dyadic fixed effects instead of country fixed effects. As is the norm when using dyadic fixed effects, time-invariant variables get dropped (such as distance, etc.). Moreover, the number of observations falls because ppmlhdf drops 841 observations due to them being singletons. This is done to guarantee that the PPML estimator converges. Generally, most control variables remain the same when it comes to significance and sign and only vary slightly in their point estimate (usually slightly lower) except for origin\_GDP which loses statistical significance in models 6 and 8, when the shadow economy variables get introduced. Also, the variable shadow\_diff in model 7 is no longer statistically significant (while the sign stays the same), which means that the time-variant part of the variable (since it is dyadic) is not statistically significant. The variables shadow\_target and shadow\_origin exhibit the same signs



and significance levels as in the previous estimations, findings for the two interaction terms, *s\_cri*, and *s\_gov* are also basically the same, except that *s\_cri* drops from significance at the 5% level to the 10% level. Overall, the results point to robust and good findings coming from the gravity model which is corroborated by the constant, e.g. in model 2 the constant is slightly lower than in model 1 but model 2 exhibits higher GDP effects meaning that model 1 and 2 are of similar fit. Similar behavior can be observed in the other models as well.

## Discussion

Regarding the hypotheses from the second section:

- 1) The shadow economy is expected to attract FDI, therefore a positive sign for FDI inflows is expected.
  - This hypothesis is accepted, as the shadow economy target country variable in both models is positive and significant and confirms the results of Ali and Bohara (2017). This also means that economies with a larger shadow economy receive more FDI.
  - Regarding the results for the origin country, here the sign of *shadow\_origin* is negative which means that countries with a larger shadow economy send less FDI abroad. This might reflect the negative impact of the shadow economy on the profits of MNCs in the respective country – a lack of equity capital then becomes a problem for leveraged potential international M&A projects (assuming imperfect international capital markets so that the relative size of equity capital is relevant).
- 2) The difference in the size of the shadow economies between two countries is expected to have a negative sign, as countries with similar levels of shadow economy are expected to engage in more FDI with each other.
  - In the three-way model, this hypothesis is accepted as the variable is significant and the sign is negative but in the dyadic fixed-effects model this finding cannot be replicated. Therefore, the hypothesis can neither be accepted nor rejected.<sup>7</sup>
- 3) Inflation interacts with the shadow economy as inflation can be seen as a decline in real income and therefore increases the incentive to engage in shadow economy activities.
  - This hypothesis can neither be accepted nor rejected as both estimations have failed to produce statistically significant results that allow for a conclusive statement.
- 4) The size of the government, proxied by government consumption as a percentage of GDP, is expected to interact with the shadow economy as a

---

<sup>7</sup>One could argue for a tentative accept, but we will not do so here on the basis of the empirical evidence at hand.

larger government can lead to a larger shadow economy (Zhanabekov 2022). Therefore, a positive sign is expected.

- The hypothesis is accepted. In both models 4 and 8, the interaction term between the shadow economy and government consumption is positive, indicating that a larger government strengthens the effect of the shadow economy on FDI inflows. This could mean that the shadow economy allows for opportunities for MNCs in countries with big governments (and presumably high taxes or distorting policies). Vice-versa, the shadow economy lessens the effect (negative sign of  $t\_gov\_100$ ) of an increase in government consumption on FDI inflows
- 5) Lastly, a crisis dummy for the transatlantic banking crisis (as a proxy for the Global Financial Crisis) is interacted with the shadow economy in that a crisis affects both FDI and the shadow economy.
- The hypothesis is accepted. Indeed, for countries that are experiencing a banking crisis, the effect of the shadow economy on FDI inflows is increased, indicating that the shadow economy might offer opportunities even in a crisis struck country.

The findings here are in line with the previous empirical literature on the topics of FDI and the shadow economy in that there seems to be a positive correlation between FDI inflows and the size of the shadow economy. The motif of low labor costs comes to mind, in the sense that MNCs might interpret a bigger shadow economy as a locational advantage because it allows for the possibility of low labor costs. The findings of the negative sign of the shadow distance variable support this because MNCs invest in countries with a similar shadow economy size as their home country relying on the experience from doing business at home. The interaction terms support the findings from the theoretical literature in that government size as well as a banking crisis affect the size of the shadow economy positively. Of course, it is hard to say if the positives of attracting foreign investment outweigh the negatives of having people be part of the shadow economy and not paying taxes and social security contributions.

### *Additional Considerations*

In this paragraph, the paper discusses certain additional considerations that are not part of the main analysis, namely institutional distance and corruption.

For institutional distance, the absolute difference between the origin and target countries' economic freedom index scores from the Heritage Foundation is used (Kostova et al. 2020). For the corruption measure, the control of corruption index from the World Bank's World Governance Indicator series is used<sup>8</sup>. See the results of models with these variables in the Appendix. Both variables are tested only with dyadic-fixed effects and, in the case of corruption, for target countries. Institutional distance is not significant in the models, corruption is significant and negative, and the shadow\_target variable loses significance once the shadow\_

---

<sup>8</sup>It is transformed so as to have an index that goes from 0 (high corruption) to 5 (no corruption). Missing years are interpolated.

corruption interaction term gets introduced. The interaction term is not significant aside from model 4A and only at the 10% significance level. Shadow\_origin stays significant (albeit at 10%). Signs are the same for both shadow economy variables. What is notable is that in models 1 to 3, the inflation\_shadow interaction term becomes significant and negative, meaning that more inflation leads to a lower shadow economy effect on FDI but again this is only significant at the 10% level. One can see a positive sign at the 10% level for the corruption\_shadow interaction term. This means that an increase in the corruption variable (which indicates lower levels of corruption) increases the shadow economy effect on FDI inflows and vice versa. This can be seen as an indicator that the shadow economy and corruption are substitutes, as suggested by Schneider (2008) for rich countries since lower corruption levels increase the shadow economy effect and higher levels of corruption decrease it. Overall, the inclusion of the corruption variable and institutional distance variable did not result in robust findings and certainly more in-depth research is required here.

### **Conclusion and Economic Policy Implications**

This paper explores the subject of the effect of the shadow economy on FDI flows. For this analysis, a dataset for 35 OECD countries from the years 1992-2018 was compiled and used in a state-of-the-art gravity model setting. For policymakers aiming to attract FDI, a sizeable shadow economy might not be a serious hindrance as the existence of the shadow economy does not deter FDI as the results of the gravity models have shown. The shadow economy seems to be recognized as an opportunity by MNCs rather than a risk. However, as the difference between the size of the shadow economy in the origin country *i* and destination country *j* has a negative impact on FDI, it is also clear that once a large group of (OECD) countries decides in favor of fighting the shadow economy – and the respective countries are successful in this policy – there will be a growing pressure on the other (OECD) countries to follow suit with a similar anti-shadow economy policy since those other countries will be afraid of losing out on potential FDI flows. From this perspective, FDI can be a transmission channel for similar policy strategies in a broad group of countries. To the extent that such anti-shadow economy policies, in the end, raise total factor productivity and bring significant efficiency gains, the broader picture and the relevant implications suggest that FDI and anti-shadow economic policies in some countries could contribute to major international welfare gains.

Moreover, an increase in government size seems to increase the shadow economy effect on FDI even further, the same is true in the case of a country experiencing a systemic banking crisis. A possible interpretation here is that a larger government is associated with a higher need for government financing which could mean higher taxes. As higher taxes lead to lower FDI inflows (see, e.g., Baier 2020) the shadow economy and its potential for tax evasion might present an opportunity for MNCs to avoid these higher taxes. Regarding the systemic banking crisis effect, one could say that in uncertain markets and a

struggling economy, the shadow economy presents MNCs with some kind of opportunity, possibly due to being able to employ people without having to pay labor taxes. This might even allow people to earn an income and two-thirds of income made in the shadow economy is immediately spent in the real economy (Schneider 2008).

As mentioned in the introduction, FDI comes with several benefits but, on the other hand, the shadow economy also comes with certain drawbacks. Thus, for policymakers aiming to combat the shadow economy efficiently, a fair and equitable tax regime seems necessary<sup>9</sup>. Moreover, the government needs to be able to collect taxes to maximize its tax revenue. Additionally, to reduce incentives for corporations to engage in the shadow economy and tax evasion, a country could impose heavy sentences for accountants engaged in facilitating tax evasion. Over time though, the shadow economy in OECD countries has reduced while FDI has grown. So, countries can reap the benefits of FDI while slowly working on improving the welfare situation for people thereby reducing the incentive to be active in the shadow economy. It is beyond the scope of this paper to assess if the FDI positives outweigh the shadow economy negatives or vice versa.

Overall, there are both positive and negative effects and it is up to policymakers to decide, which effects outweigh the other. The shadow economy is not necessarily a bad thing for a country, so focusing on policies that reduce regulation, make doing business easier, and a social security and tax burden that leaves people with more than just a livable income, as well as robust and trustworthy institutions, seems to be the best way to move forward, which ultimately will result in fewer incentives to engage in the shadow economy and a better

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Prof. Dr. Paul Welfens, Dr. Fabian Baier (DLR/EIWI), and colleagues at the EIWI/University of Wuppertal for their helpful comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank the participants of the 17th Annual International Symposium on Economic Theory, Policy and Applications 27- 30 June 2022, Athens, Greece for helpful feedback and discussion. Furthermore, I would like to give my thanks to David Hanrahan and Julia Bahlmann (University of Wuppertal/EIWI) for their excellent editorial assistance. The usual caveat applies. economic climate overall for all economic actors.

---

<sup>9</sup>For example, in Greece, the unique geography of the country makes it very costly to administer and collect all taxes (see Papanikos 2015).

## References

- Ali M, Bohara AK (2017) How does FDI respond to the size of shadow economy: an empirical analysis under a gravity model setting. *International Economic Journal* 31(2): 159–178.
- Anderson JE, van Wincoop E (2003) Gravity with gravitas: a solution to the border puzzle. *American Economic Review* 93(1): 170–192.
- Anderson JE, Larch M, Yotov YV (2019) Trade and investment in the global economy: A multi-country dynamic analysis. *European Economic Review* 120(Nov): 103311.
- Antràs P, Yeaple SR (2014) Multinational firms and the structure of international trade. In *Handbook of International Economics*, volume 4, 55–130. Elsevier
- Baier FJ (2020) Foreign direct investment and tax: OECD gravity modelling in a world with international financial institutions. *Athens Journal of Business & Economics* 6(1): 45–72.
- Baldwin R, Taglioni D (2006) *Gravity for dummies and dummies for gravity equations*. Cambridge, MA.
- Baltagi BH, Egger P, Pfaffermayr M (2007) Estimating models of complex FDI: are there third-country effects? *Journal of Econometrics* 140(1): 260–281.
- Bardhan P (1997) Corruption and development: a review of issues. *Journal of Economic Literature* (35): 1320–1346.
- Bayley DH (1966) The effects of corruption in a developing nation. *Western Political Quarterly* 19(4): 719–732.
- Beck PJ, Maher MW (1986) A comparison of bribery and bidding in thin markets. *Economics Letters* 20(1): 1–5.
- Benedictis L, Taglioni D (2011) The gravity model in international trade. In L de Benedictis, L Salvatici (eds.), *Trade Impact of European Union Preferential Policies: An Analysis Through Gravity Models*, 55–89. Berlin, Heidelberg: Scholars Portal.
- Bergstrand JH, Egger P (2007) A Knowledge-and-Physical-Capital Model of International Trade Flows, Foreign Direct Investment, and Multinational Enterprises. *Journal of International Economics* 73(2): 278–308.
- Bergstrand JH, Egger P (2010) A general equilibrium theory for estimating gravity equations of bilateral FDI, final goods trade, and intermediate trade flows. In PAG van Bergeijk (ed.), *The Gravity Model in international Trade. Advances and Applications*, 29–70. 1st paperback ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blonigen BA (2005) A review of the empirical literature on FDI determinants. *Atlantic Economic Journal* 33(4): 383–403.
- Blonigen BA, Piger J (2014) Determinants of foreign direct investment. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* 47(3): 775–812.
- Carr DL, Markusen JR, Maskus KE (2001) Estimating The knowledge-capital model of the multinational enterprise. *American Economic Review* 91(3): 693–708.
- Correia S, Guimarães P, Zylkin T (2019) *ppmlhdfe: fast poisson estimation with high-dimensional fixed effects*. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.01690>.
- Davidescu AAM, Strat VA (2015) Shadow economy and foreign direct investments: an empirical analysis for the case of Romania. *Atlantic Economic Journal* 33(4): 383–403.
- Dunning JH (1977) Trade, location of economic activity and the MNE: a search for an eclectic approach. In B Ohlin, P-O Hesselborn, PM Wijkman (eds.), *The International Allocation of Economic Activity*, volume 61, 395–418. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

- Egger P, Pfaffermayr M (2003) The proper panel econometric specification of the gravity equation: A three-way model with bilateral interaction effects. *Empirical Economics* 28(3): 571–580.
- Eicher TS, Helfman L, Lenkoski A (2012) Robust FDI determinants: Bayesian model averaging in the presence of selection bias. *Journal of Macroeconomics* 34(3): 637–651.
- Faeth I (2009) Determinants of foreign direct investment - A tale of nine theoretical models. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 23(1): 165–196.
- Feenstra RC, Inklaar R, Timmer MP (2015) The Next generation of the Penn world table. *American Economic Review* 105(10): 3150–3182.
- Head K, Mayer T (2014) Gravity equations: workhorse, toolkit, and cookbook. In *Handbook of International Economics*, volume 4, 131–195. Elsevier.
- Head K, Ries J (2008) FDI as an outcome of the market for corporate control: theory and evidence. *Journal of International Economics* 74(1): 2–20.
- Huynh CM, Nguyen VHT, Nguyen HB, Nguyen PC (2020) One-way effect or multiple-way causality: foreign direct investment, institutional quality and shadow economy? *International Economics and Economic Policy* 17(1): 219–239.
- Hymer SH (1960) *The international operations of national firms: a study of direct foreign investment*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Economics. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kareem FO, Martinez-Zarzoso I, Brümmer B (2016) *Fitting the gravity model when zero trade flows are frequent: a comparison of estimation techniques using Africa's trade data*. GlobalFood Discussion Papers No. 77.
- Kaufmann D (1997) Corruption: the facts. *Foreign Policy* (107): 114–131.
- Kaufmann D, Wei S-J (1999) *Does "grease money" speed up the wheels of commerce?* Cambridge, MA.
- Kelmanson B, Kirabaeva K, Medina L, Mircheva B, Weiss J (2019) Explaining the shadow economy in Europe. Size, causes and policy options. IMF Working Paper, WP/19, 278. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Kostova T, Beugelsdijk S, Scott WR, Kunst VE, Chua CH, van Essen M (2020) The construct of institutional distance through the lens of different institutional perspectives: Review, analysis, and recommendations. *Journal of International Business Studies* 51(4): 467–497.
- Laeven L (2018) *Systemic banking crises revisited*. With assistance of Fabian Valencia. Washington, D. C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Lambsdorff JG (2002) Corruption and rent seeking. *Public Choice* 113(1/2): 97–125.
- Leff NH (1964) Economic development through bureaucratic corruption. *American Behavioral Scientist* 8(3): 8–14.
- Lien D-HD (1986) A note on competitive bribery games. *Economics Letters* 22(4): 337–341.
- Lui FT (1985) An equilibrium queuing model of bribery. *Journal of Political Economy* 93(4): 760–781.
- Markusen J (1997) *Trade versus investment liberalization*. Cambridge, MA.
- Markusen J, Venables AK, Denise E, Zhang K (1996) *A unified treatment of horizontal direct investment, vertical direct investment, and the pattern of trade in goods and services*. Cambridge, MA.
- Mayer T, Zignago S (2011) Notes on CEPII's distances measures: the GeoDist database. *SSRN Journal*.
- Medina L, Schneider F (2018) *Shadow economies around the world*. Washington, D. C.: International Monetary Fund.

- Medina L, Schneider FG (2019) Shedding light on the shadow economy: a global database and the interaction with the official one. *SSRN Journal*.
- Nikopour H, Shah HM, Schneider F, Law SH (2009) Foreign direct investment and shadow economy: a causality analysis using panel data. In *MPRA Paper 14485*. Available at: [https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/14485/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_14485.pdf](https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/14485/1/MPRA_paper_14485.pdf).
- OECD (2002) *Foreign Direct investment for development. Maximising benefits, minimising costs*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Papanikos GT (2015) Taxing wealth and only wealth in an advanced economy with an oversized economy and vast tax evasion: the case of Greece. *Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung* 84(3): 85–106.
- Ravenstein EG (1885) The laws of migration. *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* 48(2): 167.
- Roeger W, Welfens P (2021) *Direct investment and innovations: transmission dynamics of persistent demand and technology shocks in a macro model*. Edited by Universität Wuppertal/EIWW. Available at: [https://eiw.wiwi.uni-wuppertal.de/fileadmin/eiww/Daten/Publikationen/Gelbe\\_Reihe/disbei300.pdf](https://eiw.wiwi.uni-wuppertal.de/fileadmin/eiww/Daten/Publikationen/Gelbe_Reihe/disbei300.pdf).
- Rose-Ackerman S (1997) Corruption: causes, consequences and cures. *Trends in Organized Crime* 3(1): 109–111.
- Santos Silva JMC, Tenreyro S (2006) The log of gravity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(4): 641–658.
- Santos Silva JMC, Tenreyro S (2022) *The log of gravity at 15. Portuguese Economic Journal* 21(Jan): 423–437.
- Schneider F (2008) Shadow economy. In CK Rowley, FG Schneider (eds.), *Readings in Public Choice and Constitutional Political Economy*, 511–532. Boston, MA: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Schneider F (2022) New COVID-related results for estimating the shadow economy in the global economy in 2021 and 2022. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 19(2): 299–313.
- Schneider F, Buehn A (2018) Shadow economy: estimation methods, problems, results and open questions. *Open Economics* 1(1): 1–29.
- Schneider F, Williams CC (2013) *The shadow economy*. The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Tanzi V (1999) Uses and abuses of estimates of the underground economy. *The Economic Journal* 109(456): 338–347.
- Tinbergen J (1962) *Shaping the world economy; suggestions for an international economic policy*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- UNCTAD (2022a) *International tax reforms and sustainable investment*. In *World Investment Report*.
- UNCTAD (2022b) *Investment trends monitor*. Issue 40. Edited by UNCTAD. Available at: [https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/diaeiainf2021d3\\_en.pdf](https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/diaeiainf2021d3_en.pdf).
- van Cuong H, Luu HN, Le Tuan Q (2021) The impact of the shadow economy on foreign direct investment. *Applied Economics Letters* 28(5): 391–396.
- Welfens P, Baier F (2018) BREXIT and foreign direct investment: key issues and new empirical findings. *International Journal of Financial Studies* 6(2): 46.
- Zander T (2021) Does corruption matter for FDI flows in the OECD? A gravity analysis. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 18(2): 347–377.
- Zhanabekov S (2022) Robust determinants of the shadow economy. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, Article boer.12330.
- Zipf GK (1946) The P1 P2/D hypothesis: on the intercity movement of persons. *American Sociological Review* 11(6): 677–686.

## Appendix

**Table 5.** Regressions for the Additional Considerations Section, PPML Dyadic Time Fixed Effects

	(1A)	(2A)	(3A)	(4A)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
ln_target_gdp	1.353*** (0.354)	1.466*** (0.352)	1.537*** (0.354)	1.506*** (0.349)
ln_origin_gdp	0.673 (0.442)	0.708 (0.436)	0.708* (0.428)	0.679 (0.427)
openness	1.864*** (0.435)	1.948*** (0.433)	2.021*** (0.434)	2.008*** (0.435)
ln_agglo_target	0.234* (0.136)	0.209 (0.134)	0.219 (0.133)	0.224* (0.133)
t_gov_100	-0.131*** (0.0407)	-0.122*** (0.0417)	-0.122*** (0.0422)	-0.120*** (0.0421)
target_fin_cri	-0.216 (0.199)	-0.288 (0.206)	-0.284 (0.205)	-0.293 (0.208)
target_inflation	0.0784 (0.0517)	0.0836 (0.0514)	0.0804 (0.0514)	0.0790 (0.0515)
shadow_target	0.167*** (0.0618)	0.165*** (0.0616)	0.0411 (0.0854)	0.0311 (0.0880)
shadow_origin	-0.123** (0.0613)	-0.117* (0.0607)	-0.116* (0.0610)	-0.118* (0.0610)
S_inf	-0.00290* (0.00163)	-0.00310* (0.00162)	-0.00273* (0.00163)	-0.00267 (0.00163)
S_cri	0.0332** (0.0168)	0.0363** (0.0171)	0.0348** (0.0168)	0.0353** (0.0170)
s_gov_100	0.00340* (0.00184)	0.00282 (0.00194)	0.00349* (0.00199)	0.00335* (0.00195)
inst_distance	0.0122 (0.0110)			0.0128 (0.0112)
target_coc		-0.409** (0.202)	-0.839** (0.330)	-0.863*** (0.335)
s_corr			0.0326 (0.0207)	0.0355* (0.0213)
Constant	-24.53*** (9.467)	-24.74*** (9.468)	-24.38*** (9.385)	-23.55** (9.307)
Observations	17,412	17,412	17,412	17,412

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p&lt;0.01, \*\* p&lt;0.05, \* p&lt;0.1



**Table 6. Correlation Matrix**

	inflow	gdp_t	Gdo_o	ln_dist	contig	comlan ~f	colony	openness	Agglo_ t	t_go-10 0	Fin_cri	Inflation	Shadow_t	Shadow_	S_inf	S_cri	s_go-100
inflow	1																
ln_target_gdp	0.2024	1															
ln_origin_gdp	0.1912	-0.0174	1														
ln_dist	-0.0708	0.1128	0.1349	1													
Contig	0.1096	0.0605	0.0308	-0.4402	1												
comlang_off	0.1774	0.1168	0.1017	-0.0026	0.2858	1											
colony	0.1175	0.0682	0.0526	-0.0525	0.2131	0.3462	1										
openness	-0.0372	-0.5222	0.069	-0.2803	0.026	-0.0446	-0.0689	1									
ln_agglo_targ	0.2418	0.8209	0.0333	0.0249	0.0662	0.1693	0.0581	-0.127	1								
t_gov_100	-0.1213	-0.5046	0.0282	-0.1968	-0.0275	-0.1896	-0.0274	0.4201	-0.3499	1							
target_fin	0.0444	0.0225	0.0581	-0.0268	-0.0074	0.0251	0.0069	0.0957	0.1201	0.0744	1						
target_inf	-0.0362	-0.1029	-0.0184	0.0204	-0.0209	-0.048	0.0015	-0.1304	-0.2057	-0.0258	-0.0237	1					
shadow_targ	-0.1452	-0.2315	-0.0598	0.0618	-0.0704	-0.1712	-0.0478	-0.0769	-0.3761	0.135	-0.0851	0.4229	1				
shadow_orig	-0.1527	0.0063	-0.298	0.0229	-0.0464	-0.1268	-0.0224	-0.0469	-0.0305	-0.041	-0.0588	0.0179	0.0345	1			
S_inf	-0.0395	-0.0797	-0.02	0.0239	-0.0215	-0.0498	-0.0019	-0.1355	-0.1922	-0.0407	-0.0447	0.9902	0.4525	0.0168	1		
S_cri	0.0141	-0.0367	0.0536	-0.038	-0.0088	-0.0031	-0.0033	0.118	0.0478	0.1285	0.9401	-0.0188	0.0014	-0.053	- 0.034 5	1	
s_go_100	-0.1587	-0.4587	-0.0213	-0.0823	-0.0558	-0.2115	-0.0512	0.1944	-0.4695	0.6451	-0.0136	0.2903	0.8147	0.0001	0.302 2	0.0854	1

Source: own representation.

**Table 7.** *List of Countries*

Australia	Korea, Republic of
Austria	Latvia
Belgium	Lithuania
Canada	Mexico
Chile	Netherlands
Czech Republic	New Zealand
Denmark	Norway
Estonia	Poland
Finland	Portugal
France	Slovakia
Germany	Slovenia
Greece	Spain
Hungary	Sweden
Iceland	Switzerland
Ireland	Turkey
Israel	United Kingdom
Italy	United States
Japan	

Source: own representation.

