Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0412 ISSN: 2277–7741
International Journal of
Asian Economic Light (JAEL) – Peer Reviewed Journal
SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.579 Volume: 13 | Issue: 9 | September 2025

# METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SHADOW ECONOMY LEGALIZATION THROUGH FISCAL POLICY TOOLS

**Ergasheva Malikaxon Avazxon qizi**
*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Economics,*
*Independent Researcher at Kimyo International University in Tashkent*

**ABSTRACT**
*The shadow economy undermines fiscal stability by reducing tax revenues and weakening public finance. This article examines how fiscal instruments such as tax incentives, digitalization, and budget transparency can support the legalization of informal activities. Drawing on international experiences and methodological insights, the study proposes a framework that balances enforcement with incentives to foster formalization in transition economies.*
**KEYWORDS:** *Shadow Economy, Fiscal Policy, Tax Incentives, Digitalization, Legalization, Public Finance.*

## INTRODUCTION

The shadow economy also referred to as the informal, hidden, or underground economy constitutes one of the most persistent challenges in modern public finance. It represents activities that are not recorded in official statistics, not taxed, and often remain outside the reach of legal and institutional frameworks. Although the informal sector can provide short-term survival mechanisms for vulnerable groups, in the long term it undermines tax revenues, erodes fiscal discipline, distorts fair competition, and reduces the state's capacity to deliver public goods.

Globally, the scale of the shadow economy is striking. Estimates suggest that in advanced economies the informal sector accounts for 8–15% of GDP, while in developing and transition countries this figure often ranges between 25–50% (Schneider & Medina, 2018). Such magnitude highlights not only the structural nature of the phenomenon but also the urgent need for systematic, policy-driven solutions. Importantly, the persistence of informality is strongly linked to fiscal mismanagement, ineffective tax systems, and insufficient institutional trust between the state and economic actors.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The phenomenon of the shadow economy has been widely studied in economic literature for decades, though approaches to its measurement, causes, and solutions have evolved significantly. Scholars agree that informality undermines fiscal sustainability, yet differ in their emphasis on the role of taxation, regulation, institutions, and governance.

The modern study of the shadow economy emerged with the pioneering works of Tanzi (1999) and Schneider (2005), who conceptualized informality as an outcome of high tax burdens and excessive regulation. They argue that when marginal tax rates are perceived as unfair, or when compliance costs exceed expected benefits, businesses and individuals opt for informal operations. Feige (1990) further deepened this discussion by defining the underground economy as an institutional response to overregulation, weak governance, and lack of transparency.

Bird and Zolt (2015) emphasized that fiscal policy is not only a revenue collection mechanism but also an instrument to shape behavior. Their research highlights that simplifying tax structures, broadening the tax base, and reducing distortions in tax codes can significantly reduce incentives for informality. Empirical studies (Alm & Torgler, 2006; Besley & Persson, 2014) demonstrate that voluntary compliance increases when taxpayers perceive fairness, transparency, and reciprocity in the fiscal system.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0412 ISSN: 2277–7741
International Journal of
Asian Economic Light (JAEL) – Peer Reviewed Journal
SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.579 Volume: 13 | Issue: 9 | September 2025

In addition, OECD (2018) and IMF (2019) reports stress the necessity of balancing *deterrence measures* (e.g., audits, penalties) with *incentive-based policies* (e.g., tax amnesties, reduced compliance costs) to encourage informal actors to transition into the formal economy.

Recent literature has increasingly highlighted digital transformation as a crucial fiscal instrument in reducing informality. Pomeranz (2015), analyzing Chile's VAT system, showed that introducing third-party reporting and electronic invoicing significantly decreased evasion. Similarly, Naritomi (2019) found that digital fiscal technologies—such as electronic receipts and e-filing systems—create positive spillovers by strengthening both enforcement and trust.

The World Bank (2020) underscores that fiscal digitalization is especially relevant for developing and transition economies, where administrative capacity is limited and cash transactions dominate. By reducing opportunities for concealment, digital platforms enhance both efficiency and compliance.

While fiscal instruments are essential, literature also points to institutional quality as a decisive factor. Schneider and Medina (2018) argue that weak rule of law and low trust in government reduce the effectiveness of fiscal policies. Kaufmann, Kraay, and Zoido-Lobatón (1999) introduced governance indicators showing that fiscal reforms in countries with high corruption levels often fail unless paired with institutional strengthening.

La Porta and Shleifer (2014) stress that informal economies persist not only because of fiscal inefficiencies but also because of the state's inability to provide reliable public goods. Thus, fiscal instruments must be embedded within a broader governance framework.

For transition economies, including those in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, scholars have shown that fiscal instruments are particularly important in shifting informal actors into the formal economy. Pashev (2005) studied Bulgaria and demonstrated that tax amnesties and VAT simplifications helped reduce informality in the short term, though long-term results depended on governance reforms. In the case of Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, recent studies (World Bank, 2021; IMF, 2022) highlight that fiscal transparency, combined with digitalization of tax administration, plays a decisive role in shrinking informality.

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In analyzing the legalization of the shadow economy through fiscal instruments, theoretical approaches, international experiences, and practical applications were examined in an interconnected manner. The study reviewed the mechanisms of various fiscal instruments and assessed their prospects for implementation within the national context.

**Table 1. Main directions of fiscal instruments for legalizing the shadow economy**

| Fiscal Instrument | Practical Mechanism | Significance for Legalization |
|---|---|---|
| Optimization of tax policy | Rationalizing tax rates, introducing targeted incentives | Encourages entrepreneurs in the informal sector to enter the formal economy |
| Strengthening budget discipline | Ensuring transparency of expenditures, public oversight of state spending | Enhances fiscal discipline by reinforcing taxpayers' trust in government |
| Digital fiscal technologies | Online cash registers, electronic invoicing, digital registration | Reduces cash circulation and ensures full documentation of economic activity |
| Utilization of international experience | Practices of OECD, EU, and Asian countries | Facilitates adaptation of innovative mechanisms to local conditions |

*Source: Compiled by the author*

As seen in Table 1, fiscal instruments function in diverse directions and should be considered as complementary mechanisms. Optimizing tax policy incentivizes the formalization of informal activities, while strengthening budget discipline consolidates the fiscal contract between state and citizens. Digital technologies enhance monitoring and accountability. When integrated with international best practices, these processes yield higher effectiveness.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0412 ISSN: 2277–7741
International Journal of
Asian Economic Light (JAEL) – Peer Reviewed Journal
SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.579 Volume: 13 | Issue: 9 | September 2025

**Table 2. Main mechanisms of digitalization in legalizing the shadow economy**

| Mechanism | Practical Application | Expected Outcome |
|---|---|---|
| Electronic invoicing system | Recording all financial transactions between enterprises in electronic form | Expands the tax base and reduces hidden transactions |
| Online cash registers | Mandatory use in retail trade and service sectors | Reduces cash circulation and fosters a fiscal receipt culture |
| Electronic taxpayer registration | Integrating individuals and legal entities into a unified database | Strengthens tax discipline and limits opportunities for tax evasion |
| Digital monitoring systems | Real-time tracking of financial operations | Increases the efficiency of state oversight and ensures transparency |

*Source: Compiled by the author*

As shown in Table 2, digitalization plays a central role in reducing the shadow economy. Electronic invoicing and online cash registers strengthen the documentation of transactions, while electronic registration establishes a comprehensive taxpayer base and eliminates systemic loopholes. Digital monitoring systems provide tax authorities with timely and effective oversight mechanisms. Through such a comprehensive approach, economic transparency increases, state budget revenues become more stable, and the quality of economic governance advances to a new stage.

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The analysis of legalizing the shadow economy through fiscal instruments demonstrates that achieving effectiveness requires a comprehensive approach. First, tax policy must be optimized by aligning rates with economic conditions, applying incentives only to targeted sectors, and broadening the tax base. At the same time, the introduction of digital fiscal technologies such as electronic invoicing, online cash registers, and real-time monitoring systems ensures the full documentation of financial operations.

Furthermore, enhancing transparency in budgetary processes, strengthening public oversight of state expenditures, and establishing an open reporting system consistent with international standards are essential for building taxpayer trust. These measures should be reinforced through strong legal and institutional frameworks, the reduction of corruption risks, and the adaptation of advanced foreign practices to national circumstances. Most importantly, cultivating a “fiscal contract” between the state and taxpayers based on mutual trust and a culture of compliance can significantly reduce informal activity.

In conclusion, the legalization of the shadow economy holds strategic importance for the country’s economic development and fiscal stability. The integrated use of the above instruments will expand the tax base, stabilize budget revenues, increase economic transparency, and lay a solid foundation for Uzbekistan’s long-term socio-economic growth.

## REFERENCES

1. *Alm, J., & Torgler, B. (2006). Culture differences and tax morale in the United States and in Europe. Journal of Economic Psychology, 27(2), 224–246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2005.09.002*
2. *Besley, T., & Persson, T. (2014). Why do developing countries tax so little? Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28(4), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.4.99*
3. *Bird, R., & Zolt, E. (2015). Fiscal contracting in Latin America. World Development, 67, 323–335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.10.011*
4. *Feige, E. L. (1990). Defining and estimating underground and informal economies: The new institutional economics approach. World Development, 18(7), 989–1002. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(90)90081-8*
5. *International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2019). Fiscal Monitor: Curbing corruption. Washington, DC: IMF.*
6. *International Monetary Fund (IMF). (2022). Republic of Uzbekistan: Selected Issues. Washington, DC: IMF.*
7. *Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Zoido-Lobatón, P. (1999). Governance matters. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2196.*
8. *La Porta, R., & Shleifer, A. (2014). Informality and development. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28(3), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.3.109*
9. *Naritomi, J. (2019). Consumers as tax auditors. American Economic Review, 109(9), 3031–3072. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20171746*