International Journal of Contemporary Impediments in Commerce and Management
E-ISSN: 3117-8324 | P-ISSN: 3117-8316
Volume: 01, Issue: 07, July 2026

Shadow Costs of Compliance Fatigue in Small Commerce Enterprises

Dr. Sofia Almeida
Associate Professor of Small Business Management and Regulatory Economics
Department of Commerce and Enterprise Studies
European School of Business and Enterprise Research
Porto, Portuga

Abstract

Regulatory compliance is necessary for consumer protection, fair competition, taxation, labour welfare, data security, financial transparency, and market stability. However, compliance obligations may generate costs that are not adequately represented in accounting records. Small commerce enterprises are particularly vulnerable because their owners frequently perform managerial, operational, financial, and compliance functions simultaneously. Repeated reporting, fragmented digital portals, ambiguous instructions, changing deadlines, inspections, licence renewals, and documentation requirements may therefore create compliance fatigue. This fatigue produces shadow costs in the form of managerial time displacement, delayed commercial decisions, cognitive exhaustion, duplicated work, compliance errors, foregone innovation, reduced customer engagement, and avoidance of business expansion. This paper examines the conceptual relationship between compliance fatigue and shadow costs in small retail, wholesale, and service-oriented commerce enterprises. It employs an integrative review of regulatory-burden literature and develops a scenario-based Compliance Fatigue Index and Shadow Cost Index. The model separates visible compliance expenditure from less observable operational, cognitive, temporal, and strategic costs. Three scenarios—low, moderate, and high compliance fatigue—are evaluated through a weighted scoring framework.

Keywords: Compliance Fatigue; Shadow Costs; Small Commerce Enterprises; Regulatory Burden; Administrative Costs; Managerial Attention; Opportunity Cost; Regulatory Complexity; Small Business Growth; Digital Compliance

1. Introduction

Small commerce enterprises perform an important economic function by connecting producers, consumers, local workers, distributors, and service providers. These enterprises include independent retailers, wholesalers, repair businesses, professional service establishments, hospitality units, online sellers, and family-operated commercial firms. Although their individual operations may be limited in scale, they collectively support employment, local supply chains, consumer access, and entrepreneurial mobility. Their survival, however, depends heavily on the ability of owners to allocate scarce financial and managerial resources efficiently.

Regulation forms an essential part of a trustworthy commercial environment. Tax reporting, employee protection, product safety, consumer rights, licensing, environmental standards, financial documentation, and data-protection rules can reduce market misconduct and protect social interests. The problem is therefore not the existence of regulation itself but the way multiple obligations accumulate, overlap, change, and interact. OECD research recognises that regulatory inconsistencies, duplicated inspections, uncoordinated permits, fragmented processes, and excessive compliance costs can impose disproportionate burdens on smaller firms. Recent OECD evidence also indicates that business organisations in many jurisdictions perceive regulatory implementation as inconsistent and insufficiently coordinated.

Traditional compliance-cost measurement primarily concentrates on visible expenditure, including licence fees, professional consultancy charges, accounting expenses, software subscriptions, employee training, audit fees, and document-preparation costs. The Standard Cost Model similarly measures the time and resources required to fulfil information obligations. Such methods are useful, but they may not fully capture the managerial attention diverted from customers, product development, market research, employee supervision, or business expansion. The World Bank and OECD have both used administrative-cost frameworks to identify the paperwork and process burdens associated with regulatory obligations.

Compliance fatigue emerges when the volume, repetition, ambiguity, or fragmentation of obligations causes mental and operational exhaustion. In a small enterprise, the owner may repeatedly switch between serving customers, managing suppliers, supervising employees, interpreting rules, uploading documents, correcting portal errors, responding to notices, and consulting external professionals. The burden is therefore not limited to the number of hours spent on compliance. It also includes concentration loss, interrupted workflows, delayed decisions, anxiety about penalties, over-cautious behaviour, and reluctance to expand into regulated activities.

This paper introduces the concept of the **shadow costs of compliance fatigue**. Shadow costs refer to economic and organisational losses that are real but are not separately or accurately recorded in conventional financial accounts. The study argues that compliance fatigue can gradually convert necessary regulatory activity into a hidden constraint on productivity, innovation, managerial judgement, and enterprise growth. It develops a conceptual measurement framework that combines administrative-burden theory, compliance-cost analysis, managerial attention, and opportunity-cost reasoning.

2. Objectives of the Study

2.1 Conceptual Objectives

The study seeks to:

1. Define compliance fatigue in the specific context of small commerce enterprises.

2. Distinguish direct compliance expenditure from indirect and shadow compliance costs.
3. Classify the temporal, cognitive, operational, and strategic consequences of repeated compliance obligations.
4. Extend administrative-burden theory from citizen–government interactions to owner-managed commercial enterprises.

2.2 Analytical Objectives

The analytical objectives are to:

1. Develop a Compliance Fatigue Index for evaluating the intensity of regulatory exhaustion.
2. Construct a Shadow Cost Index covering owner-time displacement, delays, errors, psychological strain, and foregone commercial opportunities.
3. Examine whether shadow costs increase proportionately or non-linearly as compliance fatigue rises.
4. Compare low-, moderate-, and high-fatigue enterprise scenarios.

2.3 Managerial and Policy Objectives

The study also aims to:

1. Identify compliance processes that generate avoidable repetition or fragmentation;
2. Recommend enterprise-level practices for reducing compliance fatigue;
3. Propose proportionate and risk-based regulatory interventions for small businesses; and
4. Encourage regulators to assess managerial attention and opportunity losses alongside monetary compliance expenditure.

3. Review of Literature

3.1 Regulatory Compliance Costs in Small Enterprises

Regulatory compliance costs generally include internal labour, professional services, technology, documentation, training, reporting, and fees incurred to satisfy legal requirements. Earlier taxation studies demonstrated that compliance costs are often regressive because they consume a larger proportion of the resources of small firms than of large firms. Larger organisations can spread fixed compliance expenditure across greater revenue, more employees, and specialised departments, whereas small businesses frequently depend on the owner or a small number of administrative workers.

Chittenden, Kauser, and Poutziouris compared small-business tax regulation across the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand and identified a disproportionate burden on smaller enterprises. Evans similarly found that the operating costs of taxation must be distinguished from the tax payment itself because record keeping, interpretation, professional assistance, and administrative time create separate economic burdens.

Firm-level evidence also connects regulatory intensity with enterprise performance. A Canadian econometric analysis found that the intensity of compliance costs declines as enterprise size and revenue increase and that greater regulatory-cost intensity is negatively associated with labour productivity. Research involving Philippine SMEs likewise concluded that greater time spent dealing with government regulations reduced the probability of employment and sales growth.

3.2 Administrative Burden and Compliance Fatigue

Administrative-burden theory divides the experience of government procedures into learning costs, compliance costs, and psychological costs. Learning costs arise when regulated parties must discover which rules apply and understand how to meet them. Compliance costs include completing forms, supplying documents, maintaining records, attending inspections, and communicating with authorities. Psychological costs include anxiety, frustration, stigma, uncertainty, and loss of autonomy. Although originally developed around citizen–state interactions, this framework is relevant to owner-managed firms because owners personally experience many of these burdens.

Compliance fatigue represents the accumulated effect of these burdens. A single licence renewal may be manageable, but simultaneous tax filings, employment reports, data-protection requirements, product documentation, local permits, payment records, inspections, and portal updates may produce overload. Frequent regulatory changes further increase learning costs because earlier knowledge and procedures become obsolete. Fragmented digitalisation can also increase rather than reduce the burden when firms must use several unconnected portals, passwords, file formats, and authentication procedures.

Mallett, Wapshott, and Vorley emphasise that the relationship between regulation and SME growth is complex rather than uniformly negative. Regulation may create legitimacy, improve processes, protect customers, and encourage professionalisation. However, outcomes depend on how entrepreneurs interpret regulation, the resources available to them, and the manner in which rules are enforced. Their review demonstrates the need to examine regulation as an experienced management challenge rather than merely counting the number of laws.

3.3 Shadow Costs and Enterprise Performance

Direct costs appear in financial statements, but shadow costs are dispersed across normal business activity. When an owner spends an afternoon correcting a compliance submission, the visible expense may be zero. Nevertheless, the enterprise may lose sales discussions, supplier negotiations, customer follow-ups, employee supervision, and strategic planning. Similarly, uncertainty regarding future regulation may cause the enterprise to postpone hiring, avoid a new product category, reject a government contract, or remain below a regulatory threshold.

Research on business performance supports the importance of these indirect effects. Tu's Canadian study associates regulatory-cost intensity with lower labour productivity, while Francisco and colleagues link greater regulatory time with lower growth probability. Studies of GDPR implementation also show that compliance can improve risk management and data discipline while simultaneously increasing internal bureaucracy, restricting certain business activities, and creating particular difficulty for small firms.

Table 1: Selected Literature Relevant to Compliance Fatigue and Shadow Costs

Author/Institution	Area of Study	Principal Finding	Relevance to Present Study
Bickerdyke and Lattimore (1997)	Firm size and regulatory burden	Fixed regulatory requirements affect smaller firms disproportionately.	Supports size-sensitive burden analysis.
Chittenden et al. (2003)	Tax regulation and small businesses	Tax compliance imposes comparatively high costs on smaller firms.	Establishes the regressive nature of compliance costs.
Evans (2003)	Taxation operating costs	Administrative and compliance costs are separate from tax liability.	Supports separation of direct payments and hidden costs.
Moynihan et al. (2015)	Administrative-burden theory	Burden includes learning, compliance, and psychological costs.	Provides the theoretical basis for compliance fatigue.
Mallett et al. (2019)	Regulation and SME growth	Regulatory effects depend on interpretation, context, resources, and implementation.	Prevents an oversimplified regulation-versus-growth argument.
Tu (2020)	Compliance	Higher	Connects burden

International Journal of Contemporary Impediments in Commerce and Management
E-ISSN: 3117-8324 | P-ISSN: 3117-8316 Volume: 01, Issue: 07, July 2026

	costs and productivity	compliance-cost intensity is associated with lower labour productivity.	with firm-level performance.
Francisco et al. (2022)	Regulatory costs and small-business growth	Time spent on regulatory processes reduces the likelihood of sales and workforce growth.	Supports the managerial-time displacement argument.
European Parliament (2023)	Tax compliance costs of European enterprises	Smaller enterprises carry a disproportionate tax-compliance burden.	Demonstrates the continuing relevance of size-based effects.
OECD (2026)	Regulatory simplification	Inconsistency, duplication, unpredictable inspections, and weak coordination increase business burdens.	Supports integrated and proportionate regulatory design.

The literature establishes that regulatory obligations create both monetary and non-monetary effects. However, direct expenditure, administrative burden, psychological fatigue, and strategic opportunity loss are often studied separately. The present paper integrates these elements under the concept of shadow costs.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design and Source Strategy

The study adopts a **conceptual and scenario-based analytical design**. It does not present results from completed human-subject fieldwork. Academic studies, institutional reports, SME regulatory-cost research, administrative-burden theory, and regulatory-simplification literature were examined to identify recurring dimensions of compliance pressure.

The literature was organised around five themes:

1. Direct regulatory-compliance expenditure;
2. Administrative and documentation time;
3. Learning and interpretation costs;
4. Psychological and cognitive burden; and
5. Firm-level productivity, innovation, and growth effects.

An integrative approach was selected because compliance fatigue intersects regulatory economics, entrepreneurship, organisational behaviour, public administration, and small-business management. The framework therefore combines established concepts rather than treating tax, licensing, labour, data, and reporting obligations as isolated burdens.

4.2 Construction of the Analytical Indices

Two indices were developed for scenario analysis.

A. Compliance Fatigue Index

The Compliance Fatigue Index measures the intensity of the conditions producing exhaustion:

Where:

- **RF** = regulatory change frequency;
- **RA** = regulatory ambiguity;
- **DR** = documentation repetition;
- **DF** = digital fragmentation; and
- **DD** = deadline density.

Each component is measured on a scale from 0 to 100. Equal weighting is used in the basic model because the literature does not provide a universally accepted weighting arrangement.

B. Shadow Cost Index

The Shadow Cost Index measures hidden enterprise consequences:

Where:

- **OT** = owner-time displacement;
- **DL** = operational and decision delays;
- **ER** = errors, corrections, and rework;
- **SO** = strategic opportunity loss; and
- **PS** = psychological strain and risk sensitivity.

Owner-time displacement receives the highest weight because the owner-manager is normally the most constrained and strategically important human resource in a small commerce enterprise.

4.3 Scenario Development and Analytical Procedure

Three enterprise conditions were constructed:

- **Low-fatigue scenario:** stable requirements, coordinated deadlines, limited duplication, and accessible guidance.
- **Moderate-fatigue scenario:** periodic rule changes, some portal fragmentation, recurring professional assistance, and occasional rework.
- **High-fatigue scenario:** frequent changes, overlapping deadlines, ambiguous instructions, duplicated submissions, unpredictable inspections, and repeated corrections.

Scores were assigned to demonstrate how the framework operates. These scores are illustrative analytical values rather than observations collected from actual enterprises. Sensitivity analysis was conducted by varying the opportunity-loss and owner-time components to determine whether the main relationship remained stable.

A limitation of the methodology is that modelled scenarios cannot estimate the actual prevalence of compliance fatigue in a particular jurisdiction or sector. The framework must be tested through owner-manager surveys, time diaries, compliance records, interviews, and longitudinal business-performance data.

5. Analysis

5.1 Composition of the Hidden Compliance Burden

The analytical framework identifies five principal shadow-cost channels.

First, **owner-time displacement** occurs when the owner replaces revenue-generating or strategic activity with paperwork, interpretation, portal use, or regulatory communication. Unlike an employee’s administrative time, owner time carries a high opportunity cost because it includes business judgement, customer relationships, negotiation authority, and entrepreneurial initiative.

Second, **operational delays** arise when approvals, registrations, renewals, clarifications, inspections, or document corrections interrupt normal commerce. These delays may affect inventory purchases, shop openings, product launches, employee appointments, credit applications, and supplier contracts.

Third, **error and rework costs** emerge when unclear rules or incompatible systems cause rejected forms, duplicate submissions, inconsistent records, missed fields, or repeated professional consultations. The time spent correcting a failed submission is a shadow cost even when no penalty is ultimately imposed.

Fourth, **strategic opportunity costs** occur when the enterprise avoids expansion, formal hiring, new technology, interstate or international sales, digital platforms, or regulated products because additional compliance is perceived as unmanageable.

Fifth, **psychological strain** changes managerial behaviour. Owners facing persistent uncertainty may become excessively cautious, defer decisions, rely heavily on external advisers, or interpret all regulatory communication as a possible threat. These responses can reduce entrepreneurial confidence and commercial experimentation.

5.2 Scenario-Based Results

Table 2: Compliance Fatigue and Shadow Cost Scenarios

Indicator	Low Fatigue	Moderate Fatigue	High Fatigue
Compliance Fatigue Index	24	52	81
Direct Compliance Cost Index	18	36	57
Owner Time Diverted per Month	11 hours	29 hours	61 hours
Average Decision Delay per Quarter	2 days	7 days	16 days
Error and Rework Index	14	43	76
Strategic Opportunity-Loss Index	19	55	91
Psychological-Strain Index	21	49	82
Overall Shadow Cost Index	22	51	84
Estimated Growth Capacity Retained	88%	67%	39%

Note: All values are illustrative outputs of the conceptual scoring model and do not represent a completed field survey.

The table shows that direct compliance expenditure increases across the three scenarios, but the Shadow Cost Index increases more rapidly. Moving from low to moderate fatigue raises the direct cost index by 18 points, while the shadow cost index rises by 29 points. Moving from moderate to high fatigue raises the direct cost index by 21 points, but the shadow cost index rises by 33 points.

The difference is produced by interaction effects. A new reporting requirement does not merely add the time needed to complete one form. It may require the owner to understand new terminology, locate historical records, consult an accountant, change internal processes, train an employee, revise software, and delay another managerial activity. When several such requirements overlap, interruptions and uncertainty multiply.

5.3 Sensitivity and Threshold Effects

Sensitivity analysis indicates that the model remains directionally stable when individual weights are changed. Reducing the weight of strategic opportunity loss from 20% to 10% lowers the high-fatigue Shadow Cost Index, but it does not eliminate the substantial difference between direct and hidden costs. Increasing the owner-time weight strengthens the relationship because owner-managed enterprises depend heavily on the judgement and personal involvement of the proprietor.

A potential threshold effect appears between the moderate- and high-fatigue conditions. At lower levels, enterprises can respond by working additional hours, using spreadsheets, seeking occasional professional advice, or delegating paperwork. After a threshold is crossed, these adjustments become inadequate. The enterprise may then require permanent administrative support, expensive software, a compliance consultant, or a reduction in commercial activity.

Threshold behaviour may also affect enterprise growth. A proprietor may deliberately avoid hiring the employee who would activate additional labour obligations, avoid entering a new product category requiring a permit, or keep turnover below a reporting threshold. Such behaviour protects the enterprise from immediate administrative pressure but creates a long-term loss of productive capacity.

6. Discussion

6.1 Why Shadow Costs Exceed Recorded Expenditure

The results suggest that visible expenditure represents only the most measurable layer of the compliance burden. An accounting system records an adviser’s invoice but generally does not record the value of a postponed customer meeting. It records a licence fee but not the mental effort required to interpret contradictory instructions. It may record a penalty but not months of over-cautious decision-making caused by fear of another error.

This distinction explains why enterprise owners may describe regulation as highly burdensome even when reported monetary expenditure appears moderate. Their evaluation incorporates interrupted routines, lost autonomy, uncertainty, emotional pressure, and foregone opportunities. Administrative-burden theory is therefore valuable because it recognises that learning and psychological costs accompany formal compliance activity.

The relationship should not be interpreted as proof that all regulation harms small business. Certain regulations improve consumer confidence, formalise business records, strengthen employee protection, and reduce commercial risk. GDPR research, for example, found benefits relating to privacy awareness, information security, data quality, and risk management, alongside bureaucracy and implementation difficulty. The relevant policy question is whether regulatory objectives can be achieved with less duplication, ambiguity, delay, and fragmentation.

6.2 Managerial Implications for Small Commerce Enterprises

Small enterprises cannot control the regulatory environment, but they can reduce internally generated fatigue. The first requirement is to create a consolidated compliance calendar covering tax, employee, licence, insurance, data, consumer, product, and local-authority obligations. Deadlines should be classified by frequency, risk, responsible person, required documentation, and expected preparation time.

Second, enterprises should maintain a central digital evidence repository. Certificates, identification records, invoices, contracts, employee files, tax records, licences, policy documents, and earlier submissions should follow standard naming and retention conventions. This reduces repeated document searches and inconsistent submissions.

Third, owners should distinguish routine compliance from high-risk compliance. Routine obligations may be delegated, standardised, or automated, whereas high-risk matters should receive professional or owner-level attention. The owner should not personally perform every low-complexity task merely because the firm is small.

Fourth, an enterprise should record compliance time as a managerial metric. A monthly compliance-time register can reveal which obligations create repeated corrections, which portals produce delays, and which processes should be outsourced or redesigned. Without such measurement, shadow costs remain invisible.

Finally, trade associations, chambers, accountants, and business networks can provide shared compliance services. Standard templates, pooled training, common software, regulatory alerts, and sector-specific guidance can distribute fixed learning costs across several enterprises.

6.3 Regulatory and Policy Implications

The findings support a proportionate approach to small-business regulation. Proportionality does not necessarily mean exemption. It may involve simpler forms, less frequent reporting, consolidated inspections, longer transition periods, differentiated evidence requirements, or standard templates for low-risk enterprises.

Regulators should apply a “submit once, use many times” principle. Information already held by one government unit should not repeatedly be requested by another unless verification is necessary. Integrated digital identities, interoperable databases, pre-filled forms, and common document standards can reduce duplication.

Regulatory-impact assessments should measure more than official fees and estimated form-completion time.

They should include:

1. Time spent understanding changes;
2. Professional-advice requirements;
3. Digital-system adaptation;
4. Repeated document retrieval;
5. Interruption of owner-manager activity;
6. Expected correction and resubmission rates;
7. Uncertainty created by overlapping authorities; and
8. Possible effects on hiring, investment, and market entry.

The OECD's recent regulatory-simplification work similarly recommends looking beyond narrow administrative burdens and considering the wider range of costs that can be reduced while preserving regulatory objectives.

Stable implementation is as important as simplified rules. Even a relatively clear obligation can create fatigue when deadlines, portals, interpretations, or evidence requirements change repeatedly. Regulators should therefore publish consolidated guidance, announce changes in advance, provide transition periods, and communicate through a single authoritative channel.

7. Conclusion

The paper examined the shadow costs generated by compliance fatigue in small commerce enterprises. It argued that conventional compliance-cost measurement tends to emphasise visible payments while underestimating managerial-time displacement, operational delays, learning effort, psychological strain, correction work, risk avoidance, and lost strategic opportunities.

The scenario analysis showed that the hidden burden can increase more rapidly than direct expenditure. At low levels, enterprises can absorb compliance through routine administration. At moderate levels, the owner begins to lose substantial managerial time and becomes dependent on professional assistance. At high levels, compliance fatigue changes strategic behaviour by discouraging hiring, investment, innovation, product diversification, and market expansion.

Compliance fatigue should not be used as an argument against necessary consumer, employee, tax, safety, financial, or environmental protection. Instead, it should be treated as an implementation risk. A regulation that is repeatedly misunderstood, duplicated, delayed, or processed through fragmented systems may fail to achieve efficient compliance even when its policy objective is legitimate.

For small commerce enterprises, the practical response involves consolidated calendars, standard documentation, central digital records, delegation, automation, time measurement, and shared advisory services. For regulators, the response requires proportionality, risk-based supervision, integrated portals, plain-language guidance, stable implementation schedules, coordinated inspections, and reuse of information already submitted.

Future empirical research should test the proposed Compliance Fatigue Index and Shadow Cost Index using owner-manager surveys, time-use diaries, accounting records, portal logs, interviews, and longitudinal performance data. Comparative studies should also examine whether fatigue differs across retail, wholesale, hospitality, online commerce, repair services, and professional establishments. Such research would allow policymakers to distinguish the legitimate cost of protection from avoidable administrative friction.

References

1. Bickerdyke, I., & Lattimore, R. (1997). *Reducing the regulatory burden: Does firm size matter?* Industry Commission Staff Research Paper.

2. Buckley, G., Caulfield, T., & Becker, I. (2021). “It may be a pain in the backside but…”: Insights into the impact of GDPR on business after three years. *arXiv Preprint*, arXiv:2110.11905.
3. Chittenden, F., Kauser, S., & Poutziouris, P. (2003). Tax regulation and small business in the USA, UK, Australia and New Zealand. *International Small Business Journal, 21*(1), 93–115. doi:10.1177/0266242603021001244.
4. European Parliament. (2023). *Overview on the tax compliance costs faced by European enterprises, with a focus on SMEs*. Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life Policies.
5. Evans, C. (2003). Studying the studies: An overview of recent research into taxation operating costs. *eJournal of Tax Research, 1*(1), 64–92.
6. Francisco, J. P., Flaminiano, J. P., Santamaria, J. G., & Abad, J. U. (2022). Firm-level impact of regulatory compliance costs on small business growth. *International Review of Entrepreneurship, 20*(1), 1–26.
7. George Washington University Regulatory Studies Center. (2022). *Regulatory compliance burdens: Literature review and synthesis*. Washington, D.C.
8. Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2018). *Administrative burden: Policymaking by other means*. Russell Sage Foundation.
9. Mallett, O., Wapshott, R., & Vorley, T. (2018). *Understanding the firm-level effects of regulation on the growth of small and medium-sized enterprises*. UK Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.
10. Mallett, O., Wapshott, R., & Vorley, T. (2019). How do regulations affect SMEs? A review of the qualitative evidence and a research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 21*(3), 294–316. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12191.
11. Moynihan, D. P., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden: Learning, psychological, and compliance costs in citizen–state interactions.

Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, *25*(1), 43–69. doi:10.1093/jopart/muu009.

12. OECD. (2001). *Businesses' views on red tape: Administrative and regulatory burdens on small and medium-sized enterprises*. OECD Publishing.
13. OECD. (2007). *Comparing administrative burdens across countries*. OECD Publishing.
14. OECD. (2019). *OECD SME and entrepreneurship outlook 2019*. OECD Publishing.
15. OECD. (2026). *Smart regulations, strong business: Enabling growth and societal protection in a fast-changing world*. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/93d38770-en.
16. Sandford, C., Godwin, M., & Hardwick, P. (1989). *Administrative and compliance costs of taxation*. Fiscal Publications.
17. Tu, J. (2020). *The impact of regulatory compliance costs on business performance*. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada.
18. Wapshott, R., & Mallett, O. (2023). Regulation as a management challenge for small businesses. In C. Nolan and B. Harney (Eds.), *Reframing human resource management in SMEs* (pp. 23–49). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-34279-0_2.
19. World Bank and International Finance Corporation. (2010). *Here is your money: Using the Standard Cost Model to measure regulatory compliance costs in developing countries*. World Bank Group.