

KOREA INSTITUTE  
FOR



# Using Panel Data to Exactly Estimate Income Under-Reporting by the Self Employed

INTERNATIONAL  
ECONOMIC POLICY

**Bonggeun Kim, John Gibson, and Chul Chung**

# Using Panel Data to Exactly Estimate Income Under-Reporting by the Self Employed

Bonggeun Kim, John Gibson, and Chul Chung



Korea Institute for International Economic Policy

**KOREA INSTITUTE FOR  
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY (KIEP)**

108 Yangjaedaero, Seocho-Gu, Seoul 137-747, Korea

Tel: (822) 3460-1178      Fax: (822) 3460-1144

URL: <http://www.kiep.go.kr>

Wook Chae, *President*

---

KIEP Working Paper 09-02

Published June 10, 2009 in Korea by KIEP

© 2009 KIEP

## **Executive Summary**

The income of the self-employed is often assumed to be understated in economic statistics. Controversy exists about the best method for estimating the extent of under-reporting and about the resulting measures of the size of the underground economy. This paper refines a method developed by Pissarides and Weber (1989) and uses discrepancies between food shares and reported incomes of the self-employed and other households to estimate under-reporting by the self-employed. In contrast to previous studies our panel data methodology distinguishes income under-reporting from transitory income fluctuations of the self-employed, and provides an exact estimate of the degree of under-reporting rather than just an interval estimate. Using panel data from Korea and Russia we estimate that 38 percent of the income of self-employed households in Korea and 47 percent of the income of Russian self-employed households is not reported.

**JEL: C43, E31**

**Keywords: Engel curve, Measurement error, Self-employment,  
Underground economy**

## 국문요약

소득의 규모가 쉽게 드러나 세금이 원천징수되는 임금근로자들과는 달리 자영업자들의 경우에는 소득을 축소하여 보고함으로써 조세회피가 상대적으로 용이하다는 것은 주지의 사실이다. 이러한 자영업자의 소득축소 보고 경향은 비단 우리나라만의 문제가 아니며, 외국에서도 조세정책과 관련하여 중요한 논제로 부각되고 있다. 자영업자들의 소득축소 보고에 따른 탈루규모가 국가경제에서 차지하는 비중이 얼마나 되는지를 정확히 측정하는 것은 조세회피가 국가경제에 미치는 영향을 파악하는 데 기초자료를 제공한다는 점에서 매우 중요하다.

본 연구는 기존연구에서 널리 사용되는 Pissarides and Weber 방법론의 문제점을 지적하고 앵겔곡선을 이용하여 이를 보완하는 방법론을 제시한다. 새롭게 개선된 방법론을 한국노동패널 데이터(KLIPS)와 러시아의 Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey(RLMS) 데이터에 적용하여 자영업자의 소득축소 보고율을 계산한 결과, 우리나라와 러시아의 자영업자들은 각각 소득의 38%와 47%를 축소하여 보고하는 것으로 나타났다. 본 연구에서 새롭게 제시한 방법론은 향후 탈루규모의 정확한 측정과 지하경제의 규모를 파악하는 데 도움이 될 것으로 기대된다.

**Bonggeun Kim** is Associate Professor of Economics at Sungkyunkwan University. He has been Assistant Professor at the University of Canterbury and Hanyang University after his Ph.D. in Economics at the University of Michigan. His main research agenda focuses on the spatial analysis of wage and housing prices, non-classical measurement errors, and a mechanism for public in-kind redistribution. His recent publications are "Implications of Mean-Reverting Measurement Error for Longitudinal Studies of Employment and Wages," *Review of Economics and Statistics* (2005), "The Role of Low Expectations in Health and Education Investment and Hazardous Consumption," *Canadian Journal of Economics* (2006), and "Paying vs. waiting in the pursuit of specific egalitarianism," *Oxford Economic Papers* (2007), "CPI Bias in Korea," *Journal of International Economic Studies* (2007).

**John Gibson** is Professor of Economics at the Waikato Management School. A graduate of Lincoln University, John has a doctorate from Stanford University. His research interests are in microeconomics and in the micro econometric aspects of development, labor and the international economy. His other research interests include poverty measurement, where he is a member of an expert group advising the United Nations Statistical Division, the design and analysis of household survey data, and economic development, especially in China and other Asian and Pacific economies. His recent publications are "CPI bias and real living standards in Russia during the transition," *Journal of Development Economics* (2008), "The effect of reporting errors on the cross-country relationship between inequality and crime," *Journal of Development Economics* (2008), and "Measurement error in recall surveys and the relationship between household size and food demand," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* (2007).

**Chul Chung** is the Head of WTO Team at the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP). Before joining KIEP in 2007, he served as an Assistant Professor at Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta for five years. He received Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. His main research areas are international trade, economic geography, and applied microeconomics. His recent research interests include various international trade issues from the perspectives of demand side, trade liberalization, trade and wage inequality, and cultural goods such as movies and welfare implications. His recent publications are "Is the increasing skill premium purely a metropolitan issue?," *Economics Letters* (2009), "Specialization, Fragmentation, and Factor Intensities: Evidence from Chilean Plant-level Data," *Journal of Developing Areas* (2008), "Technological Progress, Terms of Trade, and Monopolistic Competition," *International Economic Journal* (2007), "CPI Bias in Korea," *Journal of International Economic Studies* (2007).

## 김봉근(金峰謹)

University of Michigan 경제학 박사

성균관대학교 경제학부 부교수(現, E-mail: bgkim07@skku.edu)

### 저서 및 논문

"Paying vs. waiting in the pursuit of specific egalitarianism," *Oxford Economic Papers* (2007)

"CPI Bias in Korea," *Journal of International Economic Studies* (2007) 외

## John Gibson

Stanford University 박사

University of Waikato 경제학 교수(現, E-mail: jkgibson@waikato.ac.nz)

### 저서 및 논문

"CPI bias and real living standards in Russia during the transition," *Journal of Development Economics* (2008)

"The effect of reporting errors on the cross-country relationship between inequality and crime," *Journal of Development Economics* (2008) 외

## 정철(丁 澈)

서강대학교 경제학과 졸업

美, 미시간대학교 경제학 박사

대외경제정책연구원 무역투자정책실 WTO팀장(現, E-mail: cchung@kiep.go.kr)

### 저서 및 논문

"Specialization, Fragmentation, and Factor Intensities: Evidence from Chilean Plant-level Data," *Journal of Developing Areas* (2008)

"Is the increasing skill premium purely a metropolitan issue?," *Economics Letters* (2009) 외

# Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
I. Introduction .....	9
II. Methodology .....	13
III. Empirical Analysis.....	20
IV. Discussion and Conclusions.....	29
References .....	32
Appendix .....	40



# Tables

Table 1. Trend of main variables over time (KLIPS, 2000-05), obs.=6593 .....	34
Table 2. Trend of main variables over time (RMLS, 1994-00), obs.=5243 .....	34
Table 3. Food Engel Curve Estimations of Korea(KLIPS, 2000-05), obs.=6593 .....	35
Table 4. Food Engel Curve Estimations of Russia (RMLS, 1996-2000), obs.=5243..	36
Table 5. Exact Estimates of Income Under-Reporting by the Self-Employed.....	37
Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the KLIPS data, obs.=6593 .....	43
Appendix Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the RMLS data, obs.=5243 .....	44

# Figures

Figure 1. Shift of Engel Curve for the Self-employed .....	38
Figure 2. Upper and lower bound and interval for under-reporting parameter $\bar{k}$ using the Pissarides and Weber method on KLIPS data, 2000-2005.....	39

---

# Using Panel Data to Exactly Estimate Income Under-Reporting by the Self Employed

Bonggeun Kim<sup>\*</sup>

John Gibson<sup>\*\*</sup>

Chul Chung<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

## I. Introduction

The income of the self-employed is often assumed to be understated in both economic statistics generated from tax records and in data gathered from surveys. The motive for understating when dealing with tax collectors is clear but there may seem to be less reason for the self-employed to understate when talking to survey data collectors. However, as Pissarides and Weber (1989, p. 17) point out: “[d]espite assurances about confidentiality, people may have no incentive to reveal the true extent of their activities to the data collector from fear that they may not be, after all, protected from the law.” Nevertheless, it takes a sophisticated cheat to appear consistently poorer throughout all parts of a survey. A respondent may remember to reduce reported income

---

<sup>\*</sup> School of Economics, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Korea and Department of Economics, University of Waikato, bgkim07@skku.edu

<sup>\*\*</sup> Department of Economics, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, New Zealand.  
Fax: (64-7) 838-4035. jkgibson@waikato.ac.nz

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, cchung@kiep.go.kr

but not expenditure, or to reduce totals of both but not adjust the ratios between expenditure components, such as food shares, in ways that would be consistent with their claimed lower income level.

Consequently, several studies of the underground economy rely on relationships between survey sub-aggregates, such as income or expenditure components.<sup>1)</sup> For example, Pissarides and Weber (1989) [henceforth, PW] assume that all survey respondents correctly report food expenditure while only employees correctly report incomes. The relationship between food and income for employees is used to back out a range of estimates for true self employment income. That only a range can be estimated reflects the weakness of cross-sectional data, which cannot distinguish between under-reporting and the likely greater deviations of current income from permanent income for the self-employed. Despite this weakness, and a reliance on an assumed log-normal distribution to make the estimates tractable, the PW method has been used in several applied studies (Schuetze 2002; Johansson 2005). The PW method has also been extended to complete demand systems (Lyssiotou, Pashardes, and Stengos 2004) which is a useful refinement if self-employment income is not spent in the same way as other income, since preference heterogeneity may be confused with income under-reporting.<sup>2)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> A much larger literature relies on macroeconomic approaches that measure the underground economy by the gap between recorded activity and proxies for true economic activity like currency or electricity demand (Johnson, Kaufmann and Shleifer 1997). There is considerable criticism of these macroeconomic approaches (Thomas 1999).

<sup>2)</sup> For example, households may reserve self-employment income for 'big ticket' items and use

In this paper we further refine the PW method to obtain an improved measure of income under-reporting by the self-employed, by using panel data. Our approach can separate the effects of income under-reporting from the effects of transitory income variations. Hence we can form an exact estimate of the degree of under-reporting as opposed to the interval estimates from the original PW method. Our method avoids having to assume that the degree of under-reporting is independent of the degree of transitory fluctuations. This assumption carries the undesirable implication that when questioned about their income the self-employed adopt a rule such as 'always report 70% of true income' rather than a rule based on actual amounts like 'never report more than \$50,000 of income' or an under-reporting approach that varies from year to year as their income fluctuates.

These methodological refinements may be important since accurate measurement of income underreporting by the self-employed matters both to correct measurement of GDP and to tax policy. Undeclared economic activities reduce the tax base but raising tax rates to compensate for the loss of public revenue reinforces the incentive to under-report (Lyssiotou *et al.* 2004). Hence, having good estimates of the size of the underground economy may help the tax authorities decide on their best strategy. Also, correctly measuring self-employment income is important for many models of growth and aggregate technology that

---

wages for food and other regular expenses. A drawback of full demand systems is that they will include certain expenditure items that may qualify as business expenses and there could be measurement error in these for the self-employed. Such errors do not affect approaches that rely on reported food expenditures.

assume that functional income shares should be identical across time and space (Gollin 2002).

Our study also links to a more recent literature using food Engel curves to estimate CPI bias (Costa 2001; Hamilton 2001a; Beatty and Larson 2005). The logic of this method is that Engel curves should not drift over time if preferences are stable and nominal income variables and deflators have no systematic errors. In a related paper, Hamilton (2001b) backs out the true black-white income difference by observing that food budget shares in the U.S. fell substantially more for blacks than whites (over 1974-91) due to uneven CPI biases across race. In our case, the analogous drift in the Engel curve of the self-employed relative to that of employees is attributed to the income under-reporting of the self-employed.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section II discusses the empirical methodology and puts our refinement into the context of the Pissarides and Weber approach. We describe our two data sets and empirical results in section III and the discussion is in Section IV.

---

## II. Methodology

### 1. The Food Engel Curve

We use an Engel curve where the food expenditure share is a linear function of log transformed real permanent income, a relative price of food to non-food, and other household characteristics:

$$w_i = \phi + \gamma (\ln P_F - \ln P_N) + \beta \ln y_i^P + \mathbf{X}'\theta + \varepsilon_i, \quad (1)$$

$w_i$  is household  $i$ 's food budget share,  $P_F$  and  $P_N$  are the price indexes of food and non-food,  $y_i^P$  is the permanent income of household  $i$  deflated by a consumer price index,  $\mathbf{X}$  is a vector of other characteristics of household  $i$  and  $\varepsilon_i$  is a pure random error. Although this starts as the same Engel curve used in the CPI bias literature we develop it in a different way.

### 2. The Pissarides and Weber Method

Pissarides and Weber (1989) note that instead of  $y_i^P$ , surveys record income  $y_{it}^*$  in year  $t$  which has two error components compared to the true permanent income:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= g_{it} y_i^P, \quad y_{it} = k_{it} y_{it}^* \\ \Leftrightarrow \ln y_{it}^* &= \ln g_{it} + \ln y_i^P - \ln k_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The first component is that even with no under-reporting, the best that can be measured is  $y_{it}$  -- the actual income in year  $t$  -- which is expected to be sensitive to the business cycle and other fluctuations, with  $g_{it}$  degree of transitory income variations around permanent income  $y_i^P$ . If  $g_{it}$  is greater than one, a household has a good year and has positive transitory income. It is assumed by PW that  $g_{it}$  has the same mean for employees and the self-employed but that the variance of  $g_{it}$  is higher for the self-employed.

The other error component,  $k_{it}$  represents the degree of income under-reporting, and it is the factor (assumed to be greater than 1.0 for the self-employed and exactly 1.0 for employees) by which reported income has to be multiplied in order to obtain true current income. To make estimation of income under-reporting by the self-employed feasible, PW and subsequent applications assume that the components  $g_{it}$  and  $k_{it}$  follow log normal distributions:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln k_{it} &= \mu_k + v_{it} \\ \ln g_{it} &= \mu_g + u_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Inserting equation (2) and (3) into equation (1):

$$w_i = \phi + \gamma (\ln P_F - \ln P_N) + \beta \ln y_{it}^* + \beta(\mu_k - \mu_g) + \beta(v_{it} - u_{it}) + \mathbf{X}'\theta + \varepsilon_i. \quad (4)$$

The key part of equation (4) for estimating the degree of income under-reporting by the self-employed is  $\beta(\mu_k - \mu_g) + \beta(v_{it} - u_{it})$  which

has several unobserved components. If instead, an Engel curve is estimated using only observable variables, including a dummy variable to identify households with self-employment income:

$$w_{it} = \phi + \gamma (\ln P_{Ft} - \ln P_{Nt}) + \beta \ln y_{it}^* + \delta D_{it} + \mathbf{X}'\theta + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (5)$$

where  $D_{it} = 1$  for households with self-employment income, then the dummy coefficient is:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \beta [(\mu_{kSE} - \mu_{kEE}) - (\mu_{gSE} - \mu_{gEE})] \\ &= \beta [\mu_{kSE} + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{uSE}^2 - \sigma_{uEE}^2)] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the subscripts SE and EE denote the self-employed and employees. The simplification in equation (6) follows from  $\mu_{kEE}=0$ , under the assumption that  $k_{it}=1$  for employees and from the assumed log-normality of  $g_{it}$  which lets the mean be written in terms of the variance.

The mean of the under-reporting component can be derived from the properties of the log-normal distribution for  $k_{it}$  and by substituting in from equation (6) for  $\mu_{kSE}$ :

$$\ln \bar{k} = \mu_{kSE} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{vSE}^2 = \frac{\delta}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2}[\sigma_{vSE}^2 - (\sigma_{uSE}^2 - \sigma_{uEE}^2)] \quad (7)$$

However in equation (7) the variances of transitory income of both occupational groups,  $\sigma_{uSE}^2$  and  $\sigma_{uEE}^2$  and the variance of the self-employed income under-reporting rate,  $\sigma_{vSE}^2$  are not known. So, PW turn to an independent source of information on those variances by



using the residual variance from a reduced-form regression for reported income as below:

$$\ln y_{it}^* = Z' \pi + \zeta_{it} \quad (8)$$

where  $Z$  is a set of proxy variables representing the permanent income. The composite error term contains deviations of transitory from permanent income, reporting deviations and random variation in permanent income. The residual variances for SE and EE are related by:

$$\sigma_{\zeta_{SE}}^2 - \sigma_{\zeta_{EE}}^2 = \sigma_{vSE}^2 + (\sigma_{uSE}^2 - \sigma_{uEE}^2) - 2 \text{cov}(uv)_{SE} \quad (9)$$

Pissarides and Weber then consider both the lower bound case ( $\sigma_{vSE}^2 = 0$ ) and the upper bound case ( $\sigma_{uSE}^2 = \sigma_{uEE}^2$ ) in equation (7), which gives an interval in which  $\bar{k}$  must lie:

$$\ln \bar{k} \in \left[ \frac{\delta}{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\zeta_{SE}}^2 - \sigma_{\zeta_{EE}}^2) + \text{cov}(uv)_{SE}, \frac{\delta}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\zeta_{SE}}^2 - \sigma_{\zeta_{EE}}^2) + \text{cov}(uv)_{SE} \right] \cdot \quad (10)$$

However, equation (10) still contains an unobservable,  $\text{cov}(uv)_{SE}$ , so PW further assume that  $\text{cov}(uv)_{SE} = 0$ . This (unlikely) assumption that the degree of under-reporting is independent of the degree of transitory income variation yields an empirically estimatable interval for  $k$  as:

$$\ln \bar{k} \in \left[ \frac{\delta}{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\zeta_{SE}}^2 - \sigma_{\zeta_{EE}}^2), \frac{\delta}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{\zeta_{SE}}^2 - \sigma_{\zeta_{EE}}^2) \right] \cdot \quad (11)$$

### 3. A More Exact Panel Data Method

With panel data it is possible to make an exact point estimate of the degree of income under-reporting by the self-employed. This exact estimate contrasts with the interval estimate from the Pissarides and Weber approach on cross-sectional data. A further advantage of panel data is that the under-reporting estimate can be made with fewer assumptions. In particular, there is no need to assume that the degree of under-reporting is independent of the degree of transitory income variation. This allows for the possibility that the self-employed may increase their under-reporting rate as positive transitory income increases, which is consistent with a rule based on actual amounts like ‘never report more than \$50,000 of income’.

Specifically, with panel data one can use “between estimation” where the mean value of reported incomes over time for the same household is used as the data in the regression. This use of household-specific means enables the transitory income variations of both self-employed and employee households to be controlled for. The potential comovements of these income variations with the degree of income under-reporting by the self-employed can also be controlled for so that there is no need to rely on simply assuming that the under-reporting rate is independent of the degree of transitory income variation.

With between estimation the counterpart to equation (2) is:

$$\overline{\ln y_{it}^*} = \overline{\ln k_{it}} + \overline{\ln y_{it}} = \overline{\ln k_{it}} + \overline{\ln y_i^p} + \overline{\ln g_{it}} \quad (12)$$

where  $\overline{\ln y_{it}^*}$  means  $\sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_{it}^* / T$ . This household-specific mean allows the positive and negative variations of transitory income over time to cancel each other out, since:

$$p \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{\bar{u}_i}^2 = p \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_u^2}{T} = 0. \quad (13)$$

In other words, with large enough  $T$ , we can make the variations of transitory income go away. Similarly, we also can make the covariance between the degree of under-reporting and the degree of transitory income variation disappear. This greatly simplifies the estimation task. For example, in comparison with equation (10) the  $\text{cov}(uv)_{SE}$  term disappears and since the variations due to transitory income have also disappeared it is logically true rather than just an assumption that  $(\sigma_{uSE}^2 = \sigma_{uEE}^2)$ .

Allowing  $\overline{\ln k_i} (= \mu_k + v_i)$  to follow a normal distribution, with the only stochastic contribution coming from the cross-sectional variance of the self-employment income under-reporting rate,  $\sigma_{vSE}^2$  the estimator of interest is:

$$\ln \bar{k} = \mu_{kSE} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{vSE}^2 = \frac{\delta}{\beta} + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_{\hat{\zeta}SE}^2 - \sigma_{\hat{\zeta}EE}^2) \quad (14)$$

Unlike in the cross-sectional case there is no need to estimate upper and lower bounds and we instead have an exact estimate of the under-reporting rate (albeit subject to sampling error, which also affects the

estimated bounds in the original PW approach). Thus with panel data it is possible to remove one source of uncertainty about the extent of income under-reporting, while not resorting to unrealistic assumptions about the independence of under-reporting from transitory income variations.

---

### III. Empirical Analysis

#### 1. Data

We use data from two panel surveys, the Korea Labor Income Panel Survey (KLIPS) from 2000-2005 and the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) from 1994-2000. The survey data for each country have been used in a number of other published papers. For example, the KLIPS data were used in Chung, Kim and Park (2007) and the RLMS data in a study of CPI bias by Gibson, Stillman and Le (2008).

In each case we restrict attention to urban households, since measured food shares for rural households may be distorted if the survey has difficulty in capturing consumption from own production, which is likely to be more important in rural areas. We also restrict attention to households that have two adults, with or without children, since more precise estimates of the under-reporting parameter may be obtained by focusing on a fairly homogeneous group. The samples are further restricted to those households whose food-at-home shares are in the 0.01-0.99 interval and where both the household head and their spouse are aged between 20-65 years. Descriptive statistics for the variables used in the analysis are in Appendix Table 1 and 2. Full details on the surveys and the construction of the variables are reported in the Appendix. Control variables include relative food price changes, demographic and educational characteristics, hours of work, and the ex-

penditure share for food out of home.<sup>3)</sup>

To show how our main variables like food shares and household incomes have changed over time, the beginning, middle and end-period averages of those variables are reported in Table 1 and 2. The first row of Table 1 for KLIPS shows that the average food-at-home share in Korea fell by about 12 percentage points from 30 percent in 2000 to 18 percent in 2005. Over the same period, nominal household income grew by 63 percent and its real value adjusted by the CPI grew about 40 percent.

This fall in the food share is large relative to the measured growth in real income which is consistent with the existence of a substantial CPI bias in Korea, as found by Chung, Kim and Park (2007). The implied CPI bias appears even more substantial for Russia since the first row of Table 2 shows that the average food-at-home share fell by about 10 percentage points during the sample period, but the average real household income apparently decreases. Indeed, Gibson, Stillman and Le (2008) report a large CPI bias for Russia from these same data. However these potential CPI biases should not affect the results reported below, since the same CPI is used for both self-employed and employee households. Moreover, our main aim in the empirical section

---

<sup>3)</sup> This form of consumption is not part of the dependent variable because it is assumed that restaurant meals are not perfect substitutes for food-at-home. Ideally, the substitution possibilities between restaurants and home cooking would be captured by including the relative price of restaurant meals but this is not available. Therefore, we follow the practice in the literature that uses Engel curves to measure CPI bias and we use the budget share for restaurant meals as an explanatory variable in place of the required price.

is to demonstrate how the use of panel data may give a more exact estimate of income under-reporting than is possible with the original PW approach rather than to justify a particular value for the under-reporting estimates.

Table 1 also shows that in Korea the average reported income is higher for the employees than for the self-employed, but the food-at-home shares imply the opposite pattern. Assuming that survey respondents correctly report their consumption expenditures, the resulting Engel curve relationships between the two occupational groups indicate a substantial degree of income under-reporting by the self-employed.

For Russia there is a somewhat similar pattern (Table 2). Even though the average reported income is slightly higher for the self-employed the average food share is substantially lower. It would take an implausibly large income elasticity of demand for measured income to account for the gap in the food shares between the two employment groups.

Hence it seems likely that in both countries there is a downward shift in the food Engel curve for the self-employed. Figure 1 illustrates this pattern using the food shares for the self-employed households and employee households in the KLIPS of 2003. We attribute this downward shift to unmeasured real income of the self-employed, which in turn is due to the under-reporting of nominal income by the self-employed.<sup>4)</sup>

---

<sup>4)</sup> An alternative explanation can be considered for the lower food shares of the self-employed.

## 2. Estimation Methods

Equation (5) is a linear model and can be estimated separately for each year using OLS. In other words, one could treat the panels as six annual cross-sections. Such an approach would be consistent with the PW method and would yield a separate interval estimate for  $\bar{k}$  in each year. However, since the data for each country are actually a panel we also can use the method described in Section II.3, relying on between estimation. This application of OLS to six-year average values controls for the variations of transitory income, following equation (12). The resulting estimate for  $\bar{k}$  will be a single value, since there is no need to make an interval estimate and since the year-by-year fluctuations also disappear.

In many settings researchers apply another estimator to panel data, which is within estimation (also known as the fixed effects estimator). Rather than studying variations across mean values for cross-sectional units, this estimator looks at variations over time within units and can therefore allow fixed but unobservable household-specific effects to

---

Like Hamilton (2001b), the two occupational groups could face a differential CPI bias and the shift could result from the higher CPI bias for the self-employed than for the employees. However the difference from Hamilton (2001b) is that while Blacks and Whites are geographically segregated in the U.S., there is no similar segregation by employment status in either Korea or Russia or more generally. This lack of geographical segregation rules out one plausible source of differential CPI bias which is that living in different areas could contribute to differential outlet bias, whereby the statistics agency continues surveying prices at base period outlets while households have shifted to shopping at cheaper outlets.



drop out of the analysis. This fixed effects estimator also can be given a particular interpretation in our current context. If there is an intrinsic tendency for under-reporting income, such as for tax evasion purposes, people may self-select into self-employment since it offers potentially greater scope for disguising income than is possible for employees. Since we can control for such intrinsic tendencies with the fixed effects model it might be expected to yield smaller coefficients on the dummy variable for self-employment than does between estimation, which does not control for fixed effects. Therefore a comparison of coefficients from between and within estimation may reveal something about the underlying causes of income under-reporting by the self-employed.

### 3. Empirical Results

We first estimated equation (5), treating each year of the data as a separate cross-section, and then applied equation (11) to get the upper and lower bounds for  $\bar{k}$  in each year. This approach follows the traditional PW method, but applying it in multiple years rather than to a single cross-section. The resulting estimates of the upper bound, lower bound and the interval within which the under-reporting parameter  $\bar{k}$  lies are illustrated in Figure 2 for the case of Korea.<sup>5)</sup>

Two problems with the traditional PW method are highlighted by

---

<sup>5)</sup> The regression results for the year-by-year Engel curve estimates that the bounds for  $\bar{k}$  are derived from are not reported, to save space. Similarly, the results for Russia that are referred to in the text are not reported. Both sets of results are available from the authors.

the results in Figure 2. The first problem is the large gap between the upper and lower bounds that  $\bar{k}$  is estimated to lie within. The interval varies from 0.12 (in 2003) to 0.39 (in 2005), with an average interval over the six years of 0.29.<sup>6)</sup> Similarly, when the same approach is applied to the Russian data the interval ranges from 0.03 to 0.38, with an average value of 0.22. Since the upper and lower bounds are themselves stochastic, due to sampling error,<sup>7)</sup> there is likely to be a great deal of uncertainty about the actual extent of under-reporting when using the traditional PW method.

The second problem apparent in Figure 2 is that there is considerable year-to-year variation in the position of the interval within which  $\bar{k}$  is meant to lie. Over just a six year period for Korea the upper bound could be as high as 1.94 or as low as 1.42. Similarly the lower bound appears to vary between 1.08 and 1.46. Hence, two researchers who both used the PW method on the same survey but each worked with data from a different year might reach substantially different conclusions about the severity of income under-reporting by the self-employed.

Simply taking the mid-point of the intervals in Figure 2 and then averaging over these medians across the years gives the appearance of

---

<sup>6)</sup> If instead of estimating year-by-year OLS the data are pooled and equation (5) is estimated with year dummy variables included, and then equation (11) applied, the lower bound is estimated to be 1.43 and the upper bound to be 1.75. Hence the estimated interval of 0.32 from this pooled approach is very similar to the average interval of 0.29 from year-by-year OLS.

<sup>7)</sup> The standard errors for the upper and lower bounds that are calculated with the delta method range from 0.11 to 0.29.

exactness in estimating  $\bar{k}$  but is unlikely to provide correct estimates. Such an approach would be consistent with several applications of the PW method, which use the median of the interval as their best estimate of  $\bar{k}$ , the under-reporting parameter.<sup>8)</sup> Following this approach, the mean of the medians is 1.45 (1.58 for Russia) while the median of the medians is 1.41 (1.21 for Russia). As will be shown below, these estimates are quite different from those that result from applying equation (14) after between estimation on the panel.

If instead of following the original PW method we use the more exact panel data method outlined in Section II.3 we get substantially different results. The first step is to estimate the food Engel curves on the time-averaged values, using between estimation (reported in the first column of Table 3 for Korea and Table 4 for Russia). According to these estimates the food-at-home share in Korea is 2.1 percentage points lower for self-employed households who otherwise have the same reported income and same demographic characteristics as employee households. For Russia the gap is slightly larger, at 2.5 percentage points. The other key parameter readily apparent from Tables 3 and 4 is  $\beta$ , which is -0.05 in Korea and -0.04 in Russia. This negative and significant coefficient on the log transformed real income indicates that food shares fall as households become richer, which is precisely why food is used as the indicator good here. The ratio of  $\delta$ , the coefficient on

---

<sup>8)</sup> There is no necessary reason for choosing the mid-point of the interval as the best point estimate since the two sets of assumptions needed to derive the upper bound and lower bound are not necessarily equally realistic in any given setting.

the dummy variable for self employed households, to  $\beta$ , the coefficient on real income, provides part of the formula for the extent of under-reporting. It is apparent from comparing these ratios that under-reporting is potentially a larger problem in Russia.

When the Engel curve results from Table 3 and 4 are used in equation (14), the estimates of the under-reporting parameter  $\bar{k}$  are higher than are any of the averages of midpoints (or midpoint when panel data are pooled) from the original PW approach reported above. Specifically, the results, which are reported in Table 5, show that for Korea  $\bar{k} = 1.614$  (with a standard error of 0.112) and for Russia  $\bar{k} = 1.880$  (standard error of 0.596). These estimates are from 11-19 percent (33 percent) higher than the mean (median) of the midpoints in Figure 2. If these estimates are transformed into an under-reporting rate ( $= 1 - 1/\bar{k}$ ) they imply that 38 percent of the income of self-employed households in Korea and 47 percent of the income of Russian self-employed households is not reported.

The results in Table 5 appear to be robust to changes in the estimation sample. The first sensitivity check was to drop 22 observations that were potential outliers, having food-at-home shares that were either less than 0.05 or more than 0.80. This deletion changed the estimate of  $\bar{k}$  only slightly, from 1.614 ( $\pm 0.112$ ) to 1.605 ( $\pm 0.110$ ) when using the KLIPS data. The second sensitivity check was to drop 1588 observations where the household received some transfer income, since such income might be spent in a different way than other income and thereby change the food shares. This deletion also made only a small difference, changing the estimate of  $\bar{k}$  to 1.546 ( $\pm 0.126$ ) when using the

KLIPS data.

In addition to these sensitivity analyses we also changed the estimation method from between estimation to within estimation. The Engel curve results when household-specific fixed effects are included in the regression are reported in the second columns of Tables 3 and 4. According to these within estimates, the food share in Korea is only 0.7 percentage points lower (and insignificantly different from zero) for self-employed households who otherwise have the same reported income and same demographic characteristics as employee households, while for Russia the food share is 1.8 percentage points lower. In both countries, the within estimates for the coefficient on the self-employed dummy variable are smaller than the between estimates. Hence, the impact of adding the household-specific fixed effects appears consistent with the hypothesis that people with an intrinsic tendency to under-report for tax evasion purposes may self-select into self-employment. If instead, the under-reporting behavior was mainly from the occupational characteristics then the addition of the household-specific fixed effects would not have been expected to have the same attenuating impact on the coefficient estimates.

---

## IV. Discussion and Conclusions

In this paper we have presented a refinement of the Pissarides and Weber (1989) method for estimating income under-reporting by the self-employed. Such estimates are important for measuring the size of the underground economy, and may be relevant for tax policy. The original Pissarides and Weber method has been applied to household survey data in several countries but has two weaknesses. First, only an interval estimate of the under-reporting parameter  $\bar{k}$  is possible. Second, even this interval relies on a troubling assumption that the degree of under-reporting is independent of the degree of transitory income fluctuations. These weaknesses both come from the method using cross-sectional data, which cannot distinguish between under-reporting and the likely higher variance of transitory income for the self-employed.

In contrast our panel data method allows us to untangle income under-reporting from transitory income fluctuations. Consequently we can provide an exact estimate of the degree of under-reporting rather than just an interval estimate. Moreover we do not need to assume that the degree of under-reporting is independent of the degree of transitory income variation. This allows for the possibility that the self-employed may increase their under-reporting rate as positive transitory income increases, which seems likely if they adopt a reporting rule based on monetary thresholds rather than proportions of true income.

We illustrate use of our method with panel data from Korea and Russia and estimate the under-reporting parameter  $\bar{k}$  in each country. We find that the income under-reporting rates are 38.0 percent in Korea and 46.8 percent in Russia, so that the true incomes are 1.61 and 1.88 times the reported incomes for households with self-employment income. Our estimate of  $\bar{k}$  is 11-19 percent (33 percent) higher than the mean (median) of the midpoints of interval estimates that are derived from the traditional Pissarides and Weber approach estimated on cross-sections. Moreover, these interval estimates average 21 percent of the median midpoints in Korea (18 percent in Russia), and this wide range may be too large to be of practical value for guiding tax policy.

Our method relies on between estimation where the mean value of reported incomes over time for the same household is used as the data in the regression. This use of household-specific means enables transitory income variations to be controlled for. In our illustration we used 6-year averages in both countries to control for the variations in transitory income over time. One outstanding question is whether this is a large enough  $T$  to make the variations of transitory income disappear and the covariance between the degree of under-reporting and the degree of transitory income variation disappear. One argument in support of this time period is that in the literature on intergenerational income mobility (Solon 1992), this same multi-year average has been used extensively to correct for errors-in-variable bias arising from the variations of transitory income. In most cases in this literature the maximum  $T$  is five so it may be reasonable to assume that in our illustration a  $T=6$  is sufficient to control for the transitory income variations.

A useful task for future research would be to apply our method to longer panels in order to see if the choice of  $T$  has any bearing on the resulting estimates of income under-reporting.



---

## References

- Beatty, T. and E. Larsen. 2005. "Using Engel curves to estimate bias in the Canadian CPI as a cost of living index." *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 38 (2), pp. 482-499.
- Chung, C., B. Kim, and M. Park. 2007. "CPI bias in Korea." *Journal of International Economic Studies*, 11 (2), pp. 261-284.
- Costa, D. 2001. "Estimating real income in the United States from 1888 to 1994: Correcting CPI bias using Engel curves." *Journal of Political Economy*, 109 (6), pp. 1288-1310.
- Gibson, J., S. Stillman, and T. Le. 2008. "CPI bias and real living standards in Russia during the transition." *Journal of Development Economics*, 87 (1), pp. 140-160.
- Gollin, D. 2002. "Getting income shares right." *Journal of Political Economy*, 110 (2), pp. 458-474.
- Hamilton, B. 2001a. "Using Engel's Law to estimate CPI bias." *American Economic Review*, 91 (3), pp. 619-630.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001b. "Black-White difference in inflation: 1974-1991." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 50 (1), pp. 77-96.
- Johansson, E. 2005. "An estimate of self-employment income underreporting in Finland." *Nordic Journal of Political Economy*, 31 (1), pp. 99-109.
- Johnson, S., D. Kaufmann, and A. Shleifer. 1997. "The unofficial economy in transition." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, pp. 159-221.
- Lyssiotou, P., P. Pashardes, and T. Stengos. 2004. "Estimates of the black economy based on consumer demand approaches." *Economic*

*Journal*, 114 (July), pp. 622-640.

Pissarides, C. and G. Weber. 1989. "An expenditure based estimate of Britain's black economy." *Journal of Public Economics*, 39 (1), pp. 17-32.

Schuetze, H. 2002. "Profiles of tax noncompliance among the self-employed in Canada: 1969-1992." *Canadian Public Policy*, 28 (2), pp. 219-237.

Solon, G. 1992. "Intergenerational income mobility in the United States." *American Economic Review*, 82 (3), pp. 393-408.

Thomas, J. 1999. "Quantifying the black economy: measurement without theory yet again?" *Economic Journal*, 109 (June), pp. F381-F389.

# Tables

**Table 1. Trend of main variables over time (KLIPS, 2000-05), obs.=6593**

Variable	Employees			Self-employed		
	2000	2003	2005	2000	2003	2005
$W$ (Food Expenditure Share at Home)	.303	.218	.184	.292	.208	.185
$X_{res}$ (Food Expenditure Share out of Home )	.040	.033	.034	.033	.030	.030
$\ln(Y / P)$ (Log Transformed Real Household Income)	16.87	17.12	17.19	16.78	17.08	17.05

**Table 2. Trend of main variables over time (RMLS, 1994-00), obs.=5243**

Variable	Employees			Self-employed		
	Round 5 (1994)	Round 7 (1996)	Round 10 (2000)	Round 5 (1994)	Round 7 (1996)	Round 10 (2000)
$W$ (Food Expenditure Share at Home)	.561	.542	.466	.527	.510	.432
$X_{res}$ (Food Expenditure Share out of Home )	.048	.037	.037	.047	.035	.049
$\ln(Y / P)$ (Log Transformed Real Household Income)	12.83	12.62	12.79	13.11	12.88	12.99

Table 3. Food Engel Curve Estimations of Korea(KLIPS, 2000-05), obs.=6593

<i>Variable</i>	<i>(1) Between OLS (KLIPS, 2000-05)</i>	<i>(2) Fixed Effect (KLIPS, 2000-05)</i>
Intercept	1.2635 (.0571)***	1.4664 (.1351)***
Log (Real Household Income)	-.0545 (.0035)***	-.0171 (.0028)***
Log (Food CPI/Non-food CPI)	-.6559 (.0522)***	.1881 (.0858)**
Dummy: Self-employed	-.0205 (.0040)***	-.0067 (.0053)
Food Expenditure Share out of home	-.1583 (.0560)***	-.0951 (.0382)**
Age of Householder	-.0001 (.0005)	.0324 (.0305)
Age of Spouse	.0001 (.0006)	-.0590 (.0305)*
Education Years of House- holder	-.0032 (.0008)***	-.0036 (.0023)
Education Years of Spouse	-.0021 (.0009)	.0023 (.0025)
Yearly Hours of Work of Householder	2.13e-9 (1.95e-09)	-6.47e-10 (1.41e-09)
Yearly Hours of Work of Spouse	-8.88e-10 (1.45e-09)	-2.88e-10 (1.28e-09)
Number of children under 15 years old in the house- hold	.0060 (.0022)***	.0016 (.0031)
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	.3039	.2183

Note: \*\*\*, \*\*, \* represent the levels of statistical significance of 1%, 5%, and 10% respectively.

Table 4. Food Engel Curve Estimations of Russia (RMLS, 1996-2000), obs.=5243

<i>Variable</i>	<i>(1) Between Estimation (RMLS, 1994-2000)</i>	<i>(2) Fixed Effect (RMLS, 1994-2000)</i>
Intercept	.8147 (.0760)***	1.4856 (.0915)***
Log (Real Household Income)	-.0403 (.0055)***	-.0368 (.0041)***
Log (Food CPI/Non-food CPI)	.1100 (.0436)**	.0589 (.0344)*
Dummy: Self-employed	-.0253 (.0118)**	-.0178 (.0091)*
Food Expenditure Share out of home	-.4824 (.0618)***	-.4919 (.0377)***
Age of Householder	.0023 (.0012)*	-.0047 (.0021)**
Age of Spouse	.0027 (.0011)**	-.0064 (.0019)***
Dummy: Tertiary Education for Head	-.0456 (.0106)***	-.0095 (.0162)
Dummy: Tertiary Education for Spouse	.0045 (.0098)	.0293 (.0161)*
Yearly Hours of Work of Head	-6.15e-6 (4.51e-06)	-1.04e-6 (3.21e-06)
Yearly Hours of Work of Spouse	-6.76e-6 (4.68e-06)	-1.04e-6 (3.09e-06)
ln (household size)	.0407 (.0248)	-.0262 (.0292)
% of household $\leq$ 2 years old	.1262 (.0802)	.2477 (.0692)***
% of HH 3-14 year old boys	.0921 (.0473)*	.0836 (.0555)
% of HH 3-14 year old girls	.1220 (.0467)***	.2349 (.0557)***
% of HH 15-17 year old boys	.1004 (.0752)	.0574 (.0529)

Table 4 continued.

% of HH 15-17 year old girls	-.1330 (.0819)	.2234 (.0528)***
Dummy: detached dwelling	-.0259 (.0158)	.0342 (.0285)
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	.1876	.0994

Note: \*\*\*, \*\*, \* represent the levels of statistical significance of 1%, 5%, and 10% respectively.

**Table 5. Exact Estimates of Income Under-Reporting by the Self-Employed**

	(1) <i>Korea</i> (KLIPS, 2000-05)	(2) <i>Russia</i> (RLMS, 1994-2000)
Under-reporting parameter, $\bar{k}$	1.614 (0.112)	1.880 (0.596)
Under-reporting rate $(= 1 - 1/\bar{k})$	0.380	0.468

Note: The estimates are calculated using equation (14) in the text, and based on the between estimates of the Engel curve results in the first columns of Tables 3 and 4. Standard errors in ( ) are from the delta method.

---

# Figures

**Figure 1. Shift of Engel Curve for the Self-employed**





Figure 2. Upper and lower bound and interval for under-reporting parameter  $\bar{k}$  using the Pissarides and Weber method on KLIPS data, 2000-2005





---

# Appendix

## Description of the Datasets

### *Korea*

The Korean data are drawn from the Korean Labor Income Panel Study (KLIPS) an on-going nationally representative longitudinal household survey fielded since 1998 by the Korea Labor Institute. KLIPS collects data on an exhaustive list of individual and household characteristics including detailed income and expenditure data. We use six rounds of KLIPS data from 2000 to 2005,<sup>9)</sup> and combine these with the annual CPI for food and non-food that is calculated for each of the 16 regions of Korea. We use a sample of two-adult families which are headed by a man, with or without children, where the adults are between 20-65 years old. We drop the households who had experienced changes in their composition during the sample period to remove the effects of food consumption changes due to newly added members or exits of original members. The resulting sample size is 6593 households.

The dependent variable is the budget share for food consumed at home, while control variables include real total income (deflated by the CPI with a 2000 average base), relative food price changes, demographic, educational and employment characteristics. The model also in-

---

<sup>9)</sup> The collection of data on food expenditure at home starts only in 2001, so earlier waves of KLIPS data cannot be used in this study.

cludes the budget share for food out of the home. This form of consumption is not part of the dependent variable because it is assumed that restaurant meals are not perfect substitutes for food-at-home. Ideally, the substitution possibilities between restaurants and home cooking would be captured by including the relative price of restaurant meals but this is not available. The self-employment variable is based on whether self-employment is the main job of the household head.

A description of the dependent and explanatory variables is shown in Appendix Table 1. The dependent variable, which is the expenditure share of food consumption at home, averages 23.8 percent for the sample period. The share of food out of home averages 3.6 percent. Reported real total household income including labor income and financial income averages 3,400 million Korean won which is approximately equal to USD 30,000 in 2003. On average the household head is 41.2 years old and has 12.7 years of schooling while the spouse has one year less and is about three years younger. The share of self-employed averages 33.5 percent which did not change much during the sample period.

### *Russia*

The Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) is also an ongoing nationally representative longitudinal household survey, designed and implemented by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina, in collaboration with the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian Institute of Nutrition. RLMS collects data on

an exhaustive list of individual and household characteristics including detailed expenditure data. We use six waves of data from Phase II, which began in 1994 and collects data annually or bi-annually from approximately 4,000 households.<sup>10)</sup> The sampling is based on a division of Russia into 38 strata, with one primary sampling unit (PSU) chosen from each stratum.

The dependent variable is the budget share for food consumed at home, while control variables include real total income (deflated by the CPI with a November 1994 base), relative food price changes, demographic, educational and employment characteristics, indicators of dwelling characteristics, an indicator for whether the household head or spouse is self-employed and the budget share for food out of the home. The self-employment variable is based on whether the household head or their spouse is either an owner or co-owner of the enterprise where they work.

A description of the dependent and explanatory variables is shown in Appendix Table 2. The expenditure share of food consumption at home averages 52.6 percent for the sample period. The household head averages 44.3 years old and 25.6 percent of household heads have tertiary education. Spouses are about three years younger in age and 28.4 percent have tertiary education. The share of self-employed households averages 25.6 percent for the sample period.

---

<sup>10)</sup> Surveys were conducted in late autumn of 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 2000, and 2001 with field-work typically centered on November.

Appendix Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the KLIPS data, obs.=6593

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
$W$ (Food Expenditure Share at Home)	.2317	.1048	.0132	.9
$X_{res}$ (Food Expenditure Share out of Home)	.0361	.0369	0	.4
$\ln(Y / P)$ (Log Transformed Household Real Income)	17.04	.6200	10.64	19.78
Age of Householder	41.40	7.20	21	65
Age of Spouse	38.48	7.07	20	65
Education Years of Householder	12.77	3.03	0	27
Education Years of Spouse	11.91	2.73	0	25
Yearly Hours of Work of Householder	2743	1010	0	8400
Yearly Hours of Work of Spouse	1171	1393	0	8400
Dummy: Self-Employed	.3321	.4710	0	1
Number of children under 15 years old in the household	1.357	.8952	0	4

Appendix Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the RMLS data, obs.=5243

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
$W$ (Food Expenditure Share at Home)	.526	.220	.0152	.989
$X_{res}$ (Food Expenditure Share out of Home)	.040	.084	0	.830
$\ln(Y / P)$ (Log Transformed Household Real Income)	12.70	.934	7.16	16.54
Age of Householder	44.29	10.02	21	65
Age of Spouse	41.88	10.94	21	65
Dummy: Tertiary Education for Head	.256	.436	0	1
Dummy: Tertiary Education for Spouse	.284	.451	0	1
Yearly Hours of Work of Head	1382.86	1155.92	0	5600
Yearly Hours of Work of Spouse	1351.70	1141.78	0	7000
Dummy: Self-Employed	.250	.433	0	1
$\ln$ (household size)	1.107	.295	.693	2.302
% of household $\leq 2$ years old	.0178	.0708	0	0.5
% of HH 3-14 year old boys	.0846	.1437	0	0.6
% of HH 3-14 year old girls	.0843	.1442	0	0.6
% of HH 15-17 year old boys	.0248	.0802	0	0.5
% of HH 15-17 year old girls	.0244	.0797	0	0.5
Dummy: detached dwelling	.081	.274	0	1

## List of KIEP Working Papers (2001- 09.6)

- 09-02 Using Panel Data to Exactly Estimate Income Under-Reporting by the Self Employed  
Bonggeun Kim, John Gibson, and Chul Chung
- 09-01 Determinants of Staging Categories for the Tariff Elimination in the FTA Negotiations  
Nakgyoon Choi
- 08-08 Empirical Analyses of U.S.Congressional Voting on Recent FTA Bills  
Hyejoon Im and Hankyoung Sung
- 08-07 Sub-Prime Financial Crisis and US Policy Choices  
Yonghyup Oh and Wonho Song
- 08-06 Real Exchange Rate Dynamics in the Presence of Nontraded Goods and Transaction Costs  
Inkoo Lee and Jonghyup Shin
- 08-05 Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC): Legal Aspects of Regional Trade Integration  
Sherzod Shadikhodjaev
- 08-04 The Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth: A Case Study of Ireland  
Kyuntae Kim and Hokyung Bang
- 08-03 Flexible BBC Exchange Rate System and Exchange rate Cooperation in East Asia  
Yen Kyun Wang
- 08-02 FDI Inflows, Exports and Economic Growth in First and Second Generation ANIEs: Panel data Causality Analysis  
Yongkul Won, Frank S.T. Hsiao, and Doo Yong Yang
- 08-01 National Treatment on Internal Taxation: Revisiting GATT Article III:2  
Sherzod Shadikhodjaev
- 07-08 Experimental Economic Approaches on Trade Negotiations  
Hankyoung Sung
- 07-07 What Kinds of Countries Have More Free Trade Partner Countries? : Count Regression Analysis  
Jung Hur and Backhoon Song
- 07-06 Understanding Wage Inequality: Trade, Technology, and Location  
Chul Chung and Bonggeun Kim
- 07-05 An Empirical Assessment of a Tradeoff Between FDI and Exports  
Hongshik Lee and Joon Hyung Lee
- 07-04 A Roadmap for East Asian Monetary Integration: The Necessary First Step  
Kyung Tae Lee and Deok Ryong Yoon

A List of all KIEP publications is available at: <http://www.kiep.go.kr>

- 07-03 The Determinants of Cross-border M&As: the Role of Institutions and Financial Development in Gravity Model Hea-Jung Hyun and Hyuk Hwang Kim
- 07-02 Financial Liberalization, Crises, and Economic Growth  
Inkoo Lee and Jong-Hyup Shin
- 07-01 Determinants of Intra-FDI Inflows in East Asia: Does Regional Economic Integration Affect Intra-FDI? Jung Sik Kim and Yonghyup Oh
- 06-03 Regional Currency Unit in Asia: Property and Perspective  
Woosik Moon, Yeongseop Rhee and Deokryong Yoon
- 06-02 Does FDI Mode of Entry Matter for Economic Performance?: The Case of Korea  
Seong-Bong Lee and Mikyung Yun
- 06-01 Investment Stagnation in East Asia and Policy Implications for Sustainable Growth Hak K. Pyo
- 05-06 Exchange Rate System in India: Recent Reforms, Central Bank Policies and Fundamental Determinants of the Rupee-Dollar Rates  
Vivek Jayakumar, Tae Hwan Yoo, and Yoon Jung Choi
- 05-05 Exchange Rates, Shocks and Inter-dependency in East Asia: Lessons from a Multinational Model Sophie Saglio, Yonghyup Oh, and Jacques Mazier
- 05-04 A Roadmap for the Asian Exchange Rate Mechanism  
Gongpil Choi and Deok Ryong Yoon
- 05-03 Have Efficiency and Integration Progressed in Real Capital Markets of Europe and North America During 1988-1999  
Yonghyup Oh
- 05-02 Financial Market Integration in East Asia: Regional or Global?  
Jongkyou Jeon, Yonghyup Oh, and Doo Yong Yang
- 05-01 Natural Resources, Governance, and Economic Growth in Africa  
Bokyeong Park and Kang-Kook Lee
- 04-14 Income Distribution, Intra-industry Trade and Foreign Direct Investment in East Asia  
Chan-Hyun Sohn and Zhaoyong Zhang
- 04-13 Location Choice of Multinational Companies in China: Korean and Japanese Companies  
Sung Jin Kang and Hongshik Lee
- 04-12 Geographic Concentration and Industry Characteristics: An Empirical Investigation of East Asia  
Soon-Chan Park, Hongshik Lee, and Mikyung Yun
- 04-11 Marginal Intra-industry Trade, Trade-induced Adjustment Costs and the Choice of FTA Partners  
Chan-Hyun Sohn and Hyun-Hoon Lee
- 04-10 Exchange Rate Volatilities and Time-varying Risk Premium in East Asia  
Chae-Shick Chung and Doo Yong Yang

- 04-09 North Korea's Economic Reform Under An International Framework  
Jong-Woon Lee
- 04-08 International Capital Market Imperfections: Evidence from Geographical Features of International Consumption Risk Sharing  
Yonghyup Oh
- 04-07 Impacts of Exchange Rates on Employment in Three Asian Countries: Korea, Malaysia, and the Philippines  
Wanjoong Kim and Terrence Kinal
- 04-06 Finance and Economic Development in Korea  
Yung Chul Park, Wonho Song, and Yunjong Wang
- 04-05 Expansion Strategies of South Korean Multinationals  
Hongshik Lee
- 04-04 E-Finance Development in Korea  
Choong Yong Ahn and Doo Yong Yang
- 04-03 Complementarity of Horizontal and Vertical Multinational Activities  
Sungil Bae and Tae Hwan Yoo
- 04-02 Regional vs. Global Risk Sharing in East Asia  
Soyoung Kim, Sunghyun H. Kim, and Yunjong Wang
- 04-01 The Macroeconomic Consequences of Terrorism  
S. Brock Blomberg, Gregory D. Hess, and Athanasios Orphanides
- 03-17 Trade Structure and Economic Growth - A New Look at the Relationship between Trade and Growth  
Chan-Hyun Sohn and Hongshik Lee
- 03-16 Specialization and Geographical Concentration in East Asia: Trends and Industry Characteristics  
Soon-Chan Park
- 03-15 Corporate Restructuring in Korea: Empirical Evaluation of Corporate Restructuring Programs  
Choong Yong Ahn and Doo Yong Yang
- 03-14 Intra-industry Trade and Productivity Structure: Application of a Cournot-Ricardian Model  
E. Young Song and Chan-Hyun Sohn
- 03-13 Financial Integration and Consumption Risk Sharing in East Asia  
Soyoung Kim, Sunghyun H. Kim, and Yunjong Wang
- 03-12 The Decision to Invest Abroad: The Case of Korean Multinationals  
Hongshik Lee
- 03-11 Exchange Rate Uncertainty and Free Trade Agreement between Japan and Korea  
Kwanho Shin and Yunjong Wang
- 03-10 Finance and Economic Development in East Asia  
Yung Chul Park, Wonho Song, and Yunjong Wang
- 03-09 The Effect of Labor Market Institutions on FDI Inflows  
Chang-Soo Lee
- 03-08 Potential Impact of Changes in Consumer Preferences on Trade in the Korean



- and World Motor Vehicle Industry Sang-yirl Nam and Junsok Yang
- 03-07 Macroeconomic Adjustments and the Real Economy In Korea and Malaysia Since 1997 Zainal-Abidin Mahani, Kwanho Shin, and Yunjong Wang
- 03-06 Fear of Inflation: Exchange Rate Pass-Through in East Asia  
Sammo Kang and Yunjong Wang
- 03-05 The Effects of Capital Outflows from Neighboring Countries on a Home Country's Terms of Trade and Real Exchange Rate: The Case of East Asia  
Sammo Kang
- 03-04 Dynamics of Open Economy Business Cycle Models: The Case of Korea  
Hyungdo Ahn and Sunghyun H. Kim
- 03-03 International Capital Flows and Business Cycles in the Asia Pacific Region  
Soyoung Kim, Sunghyun H. Kim, and Yunjong Wang
- 03-02 How to Mobilize the Asian Savings within the Region: Securitization and Credit Enhancement for the Development of East Asia's Bond Market  
Gyutaeg Oh, Daekeun Park, Jaeha Park, and Doo Yong Yang
- 03-01 Trade Integration and Business Cycle Synchronization in East Asia  
Kwanho Shin and Yunjong Wang
- 02-17 How far has Regional Integration Deepened?-Evidence from Trade in Services  
Soon-Chan Park
- 02-16 Korea's FDI into China: Determinants of the Provincial Distribution  
Chang-Soo Lee and Chang-Kyu Lee
- 02-15 Measuring Tariff Equivalents in Cross-Border Trade in Services  
Soon-Chan Park
- 02-14 How FTAs Affect Income Levels of Member Countries: Converge or Diverge?  
Chan-Hyun Sohn
- 02-13 An Examination of the Formation of Natural Trading Blocs in East Asia  
Chang-Soo Lee and Soon-Chan Park
- 02-12 Has Trade Intensity in ASEAN+3 Really Increased? - Evidence from a Gravity Analysis  
Heungchong KIM
- 02-11 Exchange Rate Regimes and Monetary Independence in East Asia  
Chang-Jin Kim and Jong-Wha Lee
- 02-10 Bailout and Conglomeration  
Se-Jik Kim
- 02-09 A Dynamic Analysis of a Korea-Japan Free Trade Area: Simulations with the G-Cubed Asia-Pacific Model  
Warwick J. McKibbin, Jong-Wha Lee, and Inkyo Cheong

- 02-08 Trade Integration and Business Cycle Co-movements: the Case of Korea with Other Asian Countries Kwanho Shin and Yunjong Wang
- 02-07 Korea's FDI Outflows: Choice of Locations and Effect on Trade Chang-Soo Lee
- 02-06 Hanging Together: Exchange Rate Dynamics between Japan and Korea Sammo Kang, Yunjong Wang, and Deok Ryong Yoon
- 02-05 Interdependent Specialization and International Growth Effect of Geographical Agglomeration Soon-chan Park
- 02-04 Who Gains Benefits from Tax Incentives for Foreign Direct Investment in Korea? Seong-Bong Lee
- 02-03 New Evidence on High Interest Rate Policy During the Korean Crisis Chae-Shick Chung and Se-Jik Kim
- 02-02 A Framework for Exchange Rate Policy in Korea Michael Dooley, Rudi Dornbusch, and Yung Chul Park
- 02-01 Macroeconomic Effects of Capital Account Liberalization: The Case of Korea Soyoung Kim, Sunghyun H. Kim, and Yunjong Wang
- 01-05 Aggregate Shock, Capital Market Opening, and Optimal Bailout Se-Jik Kim and Ivailo Izvorski
- 01-04 Impact of FDI on Competition: The Korean Experience Mikyung Yun and Sungmi Lee
- 01-03 Is APEC Moving Towards the Bogor Goal? Kyung Tae Lee and Inkyo Cheong
- 01-02 Impact of China's Accession to the WTO and Policy Implications for Asia-Pacific Developing Economies Wook Chae and Hongyul Han
- 01-01 Does the Gravity Model Fit Korea's Trade Patterns?: Implications for Korea's FTA Policy and North-South Korean Trade Chan-Hyun Sohn and Jinna Yoon



KIEP is on-line. Access <http://www.kiep.go.kr> for details of our latest publications.

## KOREA INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY O R D E R F O R M

- Fax number: 822-3460-1144
- Address:  
Publication Section, Department of Information & Library Services  
Korea Institute For International Economic Policy  
108 Yangjaedaero, Seocho-gu, Seoul 137-747 Korea
- E-mail: [publications@kiep.go.kr](mailto:publications@kiep.go.kr)
- Please call: 822-3460-1142 if you have any questions.

### ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID

Date of Order \_\_\_\_\_

Name: Mr/Ms \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_

State / Post Code \_\_\_\_\_ Country \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone \_\_\_\_\_ Fax \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_



Quantity	Title/Author/Series No.	ISBN	Price

• Total Cost of Book(s) is US\$ \_\_\_\_\_.

• Cost of Postage is US\$ \_\_\_\_\_.

\* Postage charge per copy is US\$ 5 within Asia. For all other countries, the postage charge per copy is US\$ 9. All order will be shipped by air mail.

#### PAYMENT

☐ Check (payable to KIEP)

☐ International Money Order

☐ Visa Card

☐ Master Card

• Card Number \_\_\_\_\_

• Expiry date \_\_\_\_\_

• Signature \_\_\_\_\_

#### Standing Order for Residents Outside Korea

Type of Membership (One-Year)	Annual Fee*	
	Institutions	Individuals
All Publications (60-70 titles, including periodicals, annually)	US\$ 500	US\$ 250

\* Airmail charges are included.

\* Subject to change without prior notice.



108 Yangjaedaero, Seocho-gu, Seoul 137-747 Tel. (822) 3460-1142 Fax. (822) 3460-1144

## Using Panel Data to Exactly Estimate Income Under-Reporting by the Self Employed

Bonggeun Kim, John Gibson, and Chul Chung

The income of the self-employed is often assumed to be understated in economic statistics. Controversy exists about the best method for estimating the extent of under-reporting and about the resulting measures of the size of the underground economy. This paper refines a method developed by Pissarides and Weber (1989) and uses discrepancies between food shares and reported incomes of the self-employed and other households to estimate under-reporting by the self-employed. In contrast to previous studies our panel data methodology distinguishes income under-reporting from transitory income fluctuations of the self-employed, and provides an exact estimate of the degree of under-reporting rather than just an interval estimate. Using panel data from Korea and Russia we estimate that 38 percent of the income of self-employed households in Korea and 47 percent of the income of Russian self-employed households is not reported.

**KIEP** Korea Institute for International  
Economic Policy

108 Yangjaedaero, Seocho-gu, Seoul 137-747, Korea  
P.O.Box 235, Seocho, Seoul 137-602, Korea  
Tel 02-3460-1001, 1114 / Fax 02-3460-1122, 1199  
<http://www.kiep.go.kr>



ISBN 978-89-322-4196-8  
978-89-322-4026-8(Set)  
Price USD 3

Government Publications Registration Number  
11-B090003-001142-14