Documents
de travail

**« Detection avoidance and deterrence :
some paradoxical arithmetics »**

Auteur

Éric LANGLAIS

Document de travail n° 2007–**06**

Février 2007

CENTRE NATIONAL
DE LA RECHERCHE
SCIENTIFIQUE

ulp
UNIVERSITÉ LOUIS PASTEUR
STRASBOURG

Detection avoidance and deterrence: some paradoxical arithmetics

Eric Langlais[*]

BETA, CNRS and University Nancy 2

December 8, 2006

Abstract

This paper extends Malik's (1990) analysis to the case where criminals' avoidance efforts and public expenditures in the detection of criminals are strategic complements in the aggregate technology of control of illegal behaviours. In this set up, we show that whenever criminals' avoidance efforts are more sensitive to the frequency than to the severity of sanctions, it is always socially efficient to set the fine at the maximal possible level. However, several paradoxical consequences occur: there may exist overdeterrence at optimum; more repressive policies lead to less arrestations of offenders while more crimes may be committed; at the same time, the society may be closer to the first best number of crimes.

Keywords: deterrence, avoidance activities, optimal enforcement of law.
JEL Classification: D81, K42.

1 Introduction

Malik (1990) has initialy established that criminals' avoidance activities[1] may explain the optimality of less than maximum fines, contradicting the classical result of Becker (1968)[2]. The purpose of this note is to show that if criminals' avoidance expenditures are more sensitive to the frequency than to the severity of punishment, then the beckerian' s view always holds[3], but with paradoxical

---

[1]Avoidance expenditures correspond to self-protection activities undertaken by criminals in order to reduce the probability of being caught and punished by an enforcement agent. They comprise installing radar detectors to avoid speeding tickets, lobbying politicians to relax the enforcement of regulations, bribing an enforcement agent to let free a culprit, destroying or covering up incriminating evidence, or investing in long and costly litigations and so on.

[2]See the surveys by Garoupa (1997) and Polinsky and Shavell (2000).

[3]In a sense, our paper is in the same spirit as Nielson's (1998) one who challenged Polinsky and Shavell (1979)'s argument, showing that if risk averse criminals are more sensitive to the

consequences for enforcement authorities not previously described in the literature. On the one hand, some level of overdeterrence may be socially optimal. On the second, raising the fine may lead to a decrease in the level of deterrence. We will show that this may occur when criminals' avoidance efforts and public expenditures in deterrence are strategic complements in the aggregate technology of detection of illegal activities[4], meaning that the higher public expenditures in crime deterrence, the higher criminals' own avoidance efforts.

Thus, the paper suggests that the *fine tuning* of crime deterrence is far more uncertain than in standard models of law enforcement, adding to Sanchirico's (2006) recent analysis of the social cost of avoidance activities. When criminals' avoidance detection is taken into account, more repressive policies lead to less arrestations and less sanctions of offenders, but may also result in to less deterrence of offenses (more crimes). We show that paradoxically in such cases, the effectiveness of public policies may increase since the economy may be closer to the first best efficient level of deterrence (number of crimes).

For the sake of concreteness, consider the following example of speed limit violations: potential offenders have the opportunity to install radar detectors to avoid speeding tickets, which render them very sensitive to the frequency of police controls on roads. Notice that in such a case, the higher the tickets, the larger the incentives for offenders to buy such detectors. Nevertheless, given that such technology renders them very reactive to speed limit controls and less sensitive to penalties, high tickets are still optimal. At the same time, higher tickets may require more frequent controls on roads in order to maintain a given level of deterrence: this is because the use of radar detectors allows offenders to escape from police detection and sanction, and enforcers must compensate this with more efforts in monitoring drivers' behaviour. Putting it differently, it may not be efficient for the enforcers to substitute more frequent controls on roads by higher speeding tickets since drivers using radar detectors avoid police controls and detection, thus reducing the effectiveness and efficiency of controls. To summarise, increasing the fine of speeding tickets has at least two different adverse effects when radar detectors are bought by drivers: on the one hand, the observed number of drivers cimmitting speed limit violations who are caught and punished becomes smaller and smaller (police controls become less and less efficient); on the other hand, the effective number of speed limit violations may also become larger and larger (police controls may imply less and less deterrence effects on roads).

The paper analyses the driving force behind these results: criminals' avoidance expenditures always increase when enforcement authorities undertake more repressive policies. Thus, any increase in the maximal fine has a direct (positive) effect on the level of deterrence, plus an indirect and negative effect since

---

certainty than to the risk of punishment, then maximal fines are still optimal. It seems that there exists some emprirical evidence which is consistent with such an assumption: see Block and Gerety (1995) and Grogger (1991). Becker (1968) and Nielson and Winter (1997) argue that the expected utility assumption does not allow to rationalize these observations.

[4]Malik(1990) assumed that criminals' avoidance efforts are independant of public expenditures in deterrence.

2

as criminals invest more on avoidance detection, it decreases the effective probability of arrestation. Whether the direct effect is dominating or in contrast is dominated by the other one depends on the sensitivity of the avoidance activities with respect to the probability and the severity of sanctions. Moreover, the higher the cost of avoidance for criminals, the more likely the occurrence of overdeterrence. The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the basic model and analyses criminals' individual behaviour. Section 3 focuses on the optimal law enforcement issue and presents the main results of the paper. Section 4 briefly concludes.

2 A model of criminals' avoidance activities

2.1 the technology of arrestation and conviction

Let us consider the case where illegal activity allows the criminal to obtain a payment equal to $b > 0$, but imposes an externality cost $D > 0$ on the society. When caught, the offender has to pay a fine $f > 0$. Let us denote by p the level of public expenditures in the monitoring of the criminals' activity, which may be understood as the frequency of public control. Nevertheless, the probability of arrestation and conviction is less than p, since criminals have the opportunity to invest in avoidance activities.

Let the aggregate technology of arrestation and conviction be characterized by the probability function $q = q(p, x)$, x being the criminal's efforts of concealing the illegal activity and avoiding public controls. We also assume that the monetary equivalent of the utility cost of this effort is equal to x. The probability q corresponds to the effective probability of arrestation and sanction, and satisfies:

Assumption 1:
1) $q(p, 0) = p$, $\forall p$ with: $q(0, x) = 0$;
2) $q_p > 0$; $q_{pp} < 0$;
3) $q_x < 0$; $q_{xx} > 0$;
4) $q_{xp} < 0$.

Conditions 1.2 and 1.3 say that i) the probability of criminals' arrestation and convinction increases with public monitoring, but decreases with private avoidance; and that ii) there exist decreasing returns to scale both in avoidance and in public monitoring. Finally, condition 1.4 says that private avoidance and public expenditures in monitoring are strategic complements in the aggregate technology of control. This basic assumption has a major consequence: $e_p^q \equiv \frac{\partial q}{\partial p} \frac{p}{q} \leq 1$, which is straightforward to proove given the concavity of the probability of criminals' arrestation and convinction with respect to public monitoring.

2.2 avoidance activity and criminals' behaviour

The maximum expected benefit obtained by the criminal when he undertakes the illegal activity and makes avoidance efforts is equal to:

$$u \equiv \max_x \left(b - q(p,x)f - x \right) \tag{1}$$

Assuming that $q_x(p,0)f + 1 > 0$, the crimiminal's optimal avoidance expenditures are given by the (necessary and sufficient) condition:

$$-q_x(p,x^*)f = 1 \tag{2}$$

as long as $u > 0$. According to (2), the optimal value of expenditures in avoidance activities is set such that the marginal cost of effort compensates the decrease in the expected value of the penalty.

By the implicit function theorem, it is easy to see that $sign\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p} = sign(-q_{xp})$ and $sign\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial f} = sign(-q_x)$; thus, the optimal x^* is unambiguously increasing with f and p. The value of the illegal benefit b matters only in the sense that it influences the decision to engage or not in the illegal activity and to undertake the avoidance expenditures. There exists a threshold value of the benefit $b^* \equiv q(p,x^*)f + x^* > 0$ such that the illegal activity is performed only if $b > b^*$. All else equal, deterrence occurs as far as $u \leq 0$ or equivalently: $b \leq b^*$. Given that individuals are not erroneously caught, they do not engage in avoidance activities once they do not engage in the illegal activity.

3 Optimal enforcement of the law

3.1 the efficient probability/penalty tradeoff

Let us assume that public authorities do not observe b nor the effort undertaken by the individuals[5]. They just know that b is distributed according to a cumulative distribution function $G(b)$ taking values on $[0, \infty)$, with a density $g(b) > 0$ everywhere. On the other hand, whatever the private benefit for the criminal, the loss for the rest of the society satisfies $D < \infty$. The management costs associated with the monetary penalty are negligeable, but monitoring the criminal activity entails a cost equal to $m(p)$, satisfying $m' > 0$ and $m'' \geq 0$. The issue for the government is to choose a fine (monetary sanction) f and a probability of control p (leading to the effective probability of detection and convinction $q(p,.) \leq p$), in order to maximize the social welfare function[6]:

---

[5] We do not consider the case where the enforcement authority undertakes costly activities to learn this type. Malik (1990) and Bebchuk and Kaplow (1993) show that this would allow to apply different fines to different offenders. Nalebuff and Scharfstein (1987) suggest more generally that "testing" to discover criminals' characteristics may overcome the inefficiency coming from asymmetric information.

[6] That criminals' welbeing - their illegal gain - appears in the social welfare is controversial (Levin and Trumbull (1990), Garoupa (1997) and Polinsky and Shavell (2000)). In order to tackle the divergence between private gains and the social value of criminal activities, we

$$W = \int_{b^*}^{\infty} (b - D)dG(b) - (1 - G(b^*))x^* - m(p)$$

with x^* satisfying (2), and under the constraint[7] $f \leq F$. The first (integral) term in W corresponds to the expected private benefit associated with the illegal activity (benefit of the criminals minus the external cost). The two other terms are the cost of avoidance activities per criminal, and the cost of monitoring for public authorities. As far as the fine corresponds here to a simple transfer between the (risk neutral) criminal and the government, they do not appear in the social welfare function - they have no value from a social point of view.

The solution to this problem (see Malik (1990)) may be no deterrence (for example, in the case of small values of the external cost of crime and/or large values of the public cost of monitoring), complete deterrence (opposite conditions) or conditional deterrence (if both the external cost of crime and the public monitoring cost are large enough in order to make the controle of criminals socially worth, but not to deter all of them). We focus here on this last case.

The solution with conditional deterrence (b^*, p^*, f^*) is characterized by the first order conditions of maximization:

$$g(b^*)q_p^* f(D - q^* f^*) = (1 - G(b^*))\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p} + m'(p^*) \qquad (3)$$

$$g(b^*)q^*(D - q^* f^*) = (1 - G(b^*))\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial f} + \lambda \qquad (4)$$

where $q^* = q(p^*, x^*)$, with $\lambda = 0$ if $f < F$ but $\lambda \geq 0$ otherwise, and $b^* \equiv q^* f^* + x^*$. They are necessary and sufficient as long as function m and/or function q exhibit sufficiently decreasing returns to scale. Let us denote as e_f^x the elasticity of the criminal's effort with respect to the fine, and e_p^x the elasticity of the criminal's effort with respect to public monitoring. The following proposition shows that the values of these elasticities play a key role[8].

Proposition 1 *The solution with conditional deterrence has the following properties:*

i) If $e_f^x \leq e_p^x$, the maximum fine $f^* = F$ is optimal, and the probability p^* must be set as small as possible.

---

could introduce a discounting factor on illegal benefits. Another solution would be to minimize the social cost of crime under a constrained level of utility for criminals. Formally, both are equivalent to the conventional approach used in the text.

[7] This is a natural assumption since criminals have a disutility from the avoidance effort. Introducing a monetary cost of effort would not significantly alter the results and main conclusions, although it would require us to modify the definition of the maximal fine (*i.e.* $f < F - x$) in order to take into account that wealth and the costly effort would now be perfect substitutes. Thus, the slight modification that would be obtained corresponds to the case where the constraint is binding, inducing a level of deterrence at optimum (*i.e.* $\bar{b} = qF + (1 - q)x$) which is smaller than under the disutility cost of effort assumption.

[8] All the proofs are in the appendix.

ii) If $e_f^x > e_p^x$, it may be optimal to choose $f^* < F$.

iii) The optimal expected fine is smaller than the external cost of crime ($q^* f^* < D$), and there may exist either over or under deterrence at optimum ($b^* \equiv q^* f^* + x^* \gtrless D$).

Malik's (1990) model allows only case ii). Hence, results i) and iii) deserve more specific discussion.

To illustrate i), assume that initially $f < F$, and consider that enforcement authorities decrease the probability of control and just compensate it by an increase in the fine in order to keep the level of deterrence $b^* = qf + x^*$ constant. Thus, the total effect on social welfare can be written:

$$\Delta W = (1 - G(b)) \frac{x^*}{p} \left(e_f^{x^*} \times e_p^q - e_p^{x^*} \right) \Delta p - m'(p) \Delta p$$

When criminals' efforts are more sensitive to the probability than to the severity of the punishment (*i.e.* the fine), then a decrease in the probability of control leads to a decrease in the (private) cost of avoidance activities that more than compensates the increase in cost which is associated with the even higher fine; moreover, it adds to the cost cut associated with the public monitoring activity, thus improving the social welfare.

The second result (iii) means that although the expected fine is always smaller than the external cost of crime at the optimum, the cost of private avoidance activities may be large enough to induce a level of deterrence greater than the external cost of crime, implying an excessive level of deterrence at optimum; however, the opposite result may arise. It is important to notice that whether individual avoidance expenditures are more or less sensitive to the frequency than to the penalty is irrelevant for this last (ambiguous) result.

3.2   on the effectiveness of public policies

The effect pointed out in Sanchirico's (2006) analysis also holds in our model: any increase in public expenditures in deterrence gives incentives to criminals to undertake more avoidance expenditures, which has an adverse effect on the effective probability of arrestation. Here, we add to it, investigating whether the enforcement authority has the opportunity or not to reach a fine tuning of the level of optimal deterrence. First, we have the following result:

Proposition 2 *Consider a solution where $f^* = F$.*

i) An increase in the maximal fine may yield an increase or a decrease in the optimal probability.

ii) Moreover, assume that F is small enough to give a large level of underdeterrence; then the optimal probability and the maximal fine may be substitutes.

iii) On the contrary, even if F is large enough to produce a level of deterrence arbitrarly close to full internalization of the external cost of crime, the optimal probability and the maximal fine may be complements.

Given that criminals' expenditures in avoidance detection are sensitive both to the probability and to the severity of sanction, the general finding i) is hardly a surprise. Nevertheless, what proposition 3 makes clear is that the probability and the fine may be either substitutes or complements whatever the initial level of deterrence, which is in contrast with the usual results obtained in the canonical set up (Garoupa (2001)). The driving force behind these results is that any increase in the maximum level of the fine all else held equal has a direct and positive effect on the level of deterrence, plus an indirect and negative effect; the latter reflects that as the fine increases, criminals invest more on avoidance activities, implying that the effective probability of arrestation and sanction decreases.

Consider for example a situation where the maximal fine is very large, such that the level of deterrence is close to the full internalization of crime ($b^* \rightarrow D$); in such an event, increasing the fine entails a large increase in criminals' avoidance expenditures, and it may be socially worth compensating the induced impact on the effective probability of sanction by an increase in the optimal probability of control. In the opposite case with a low level of the maximal fine ($F \rightarrow 0$, meaning criminals' assets are small), the level of crime deterrence is also very low ($b^* \rightarrow 0$). Thus, the social benefits coming from the increase in the level of deterrence associated with the larger fine may be more than compensated by the decrease in the effective frequency of sanction coming from the increase in the criminal's private cost of avoidance, requiring that the optimal probability be reduced.

The next issue is the impact of monetary sanctions on the level of deterrence at optimum.

Proposition 3 *Consider a solution where $f^* = F$.*

i) An increase in the maximal fine always yields an increase in the threshold of deterrence when the probability and the fine are complements at optimum, whereas the effect is ambiguous in the case where they are substitutes.

ii) If $q_{xp} = 0$, then an increase in the maximal fine always yields an increase in the threshold of deterrence.

iii) If $q_{xp} < 0$, then an increase in the maximal fine may lead to a decrease in the threshold of deterrence.

Once more, this finding is in contrast with the usual results obtained in the canonical set up (Garoupa (2001)), where the expected fine is an increasing function of the maximal fine, irrespectively of the fact that the sanction and the probability are complements rather than substitutes.

First notice that the ambiguity only arises when the maximal fine and the probability of control are substitutes (see i)): whether the direct effect of the increase in the fine dominates or in contrast is dominated by the second one depends on the sensitivity of the avoidance activities with respect to the probability as shown by results ii)[9] and iii). Specifically, the larger the elasticity of

---

[9]Which corresponds to Malik's assumption.

criminals' avoidance expenditures with the probability, the larger the likelihood that the level of deterrence decreases with the maximal fine (see iii)).

A straightforward consequence of proposition 3 is the following:

Corollary 4 *An increase in the maximal fine always yields a decrease (respectively, an increase) in the level of underdeterrence (overdeterrence) when the probability and the fine are complements at optimum, whereas the effect is ambiguous in the case where they are substitutes.*

4 Final remarks

We have shown the existence of several uncomfortable albeit unavoidable consequences that arise for enforcers when criminals invest in avoidance activities, which adds to Sanchirico's recent analysis. Specificaly, when public invesments in deterrence and criminals' avoidance expenditures are strategic complements in the aggregate technology of crimes detection, we have found a great degree of ambiguity and indetermination 1/ concerning the optimal tradeoff between the probability and the severity of punishment - excepted when criminals are more sensitive to the risk of control than to the severity of punishment (an effect absent from Malik's (1990) paper), or 2/ with respect to their complementarity *versus* substitutability, as well as 3/ with respect to the level of deterrence reached since the existence of avoidance investments by criminals may result in underdeterrence as well as in overdeterrence.

Hence, as far as detection avoidance is a by-product of criminal activities, the fine tuning of illegal activities by enforcement authorities appears as a very controversial issue: in fact, we obtain ambiguous prescriptions from a practical point of view. The basic reason is that depending on the technology of detection avoidance available for criminals, they become more or less sensitive to the frequency of punishment relatively to the severity of punishment; and depending on the cost of this detection avoidance, there may exist over or under deterrence.

References

Bebchuk A. and Kaplow L. (1993), Optimal sanctions and differences in individuals' likelihood of avoiding detection, *International Review of Law and Economics*, **13**, 217-224.

Becker G. (1968), Crime and punishment: an economic approach, *Journal of Political Economy*, **76**, 169-217.

Block M. and Gerety V. (1995), Some experimental evidence on differences between student and prisoner reactions to monetary penalies and risk, *Journal of Legal Studies*, 123-138.

Grogger J. (1991), Certainty vs. severity of punishment, *Economic Inquiry*, **29**, 297-309.

Garoupa N. (1997), The theory of optimal law enforcement, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, **11**, 267-295.

Garoupa N. (2001), Optimal magnitude and probability of fines, *European Economic Review*, **45**, 1765-1771.

Levin J. and Trumbull W. (1990), The social value of crime?, *International Review of Law and Economics*, **10**, 271-284.

Malik A. (1990), Avoidance, screening and optimum enforcement, *RAND Journal of Economics*, **21**, 341-353.

Nalebuff B. and Scharfstein D. (1987), Testing in models of asymmetric information, *Review of Economic Studies*, **54**, 265-277.

Neilson W. and Winter H. (1997), On criminals' risk attitude, *Economics Letters*, **55**, 97-102.

Neilson W. (1998), Optimal punishment schemes with state-dependent preferences, *Economic Inquiry*, **36**, 266-271.

Polinsky M. and Shavell S. (1979), The optimal trade-off between the probability and magnitude of fines, *American Economic Review*, **69**, 880-891.

Polinsky M. and Shavell S. (2000), The economic theory of public enforcement of law, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **38**, 45-76.

Sanchirico C. (2006), Detection avoidance, *New York University Law Review*, **81**, 1331-1399.

APPENDIX

Proof of proposition 2

Let us consider a solution where the optimal fine satisfies $f^* < F$. Substituting (4) into (3) gives:

$$(1 - G(b^*)) \left(q_p^* f^* \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial f} - q^* \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p} \right) = q^* m'(p^*) \qquad (5)$$

where the bracketed term writes: $\frac{q^* x^*}{p} \left(e_f^{x^*} \times e_p^q - e_p^{x^*} \right)$. Hence, there are two cases:

A/ assume that $e_f^{x^*} \times e_p^q - e_p^{x^*} \leq 0$: given that $e_p^q \leq 1$, this condition is satisfied for example (but not uniquely) when for all (p, f) we have $e_f^x \leq e_p^x$; then, the LHS in (5) would be negative, meaning that any positive value for p implies a loss of social welfare: thus $f^* < F$ cannot be optimal. Then assume that $f^* = F$; using (3), p^* must be set as low as possible according to the condition:

$$g(b^*) q_p^* F(D - q^* F) - (1 - G(b^*)) \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p} = m'(p^*) \qquad (6)$$

B/ assume now that $e_f^{x^*} \times e_p^q - e_p^{x^*} > 0$; obviously, this occurs for example (but not uniquely) when $e_p^{x^*} = 0$ (which occurs when $q_{xp} = 0$). More generally,

9

in order to hold, the inequality $e_f^{x^*} \times e_p^q - e_p^{x^*} > 0$ requires (condition necessary but not sufficient) that for all (p, f) we have $e_f^x > e_p^x$. Then it may be optimal to choose $f^* < F$, although, there are cases where it is not.

Finally, since the RHS of (3) is positive, we obtain that $D > q^* f^*$ both when $f^* = F$ or $f^* < F$; hence, there may exist at optimum either over or under deterrence since $b^* = q^* f^* + x^* \gtrless D$, which depends on the private cost of avoidance borne by criminals.

Proof of proposition 3

It is sufficient to give the proof only for specific cases. For ease of exposition, assume that $q_{xp} = 0$ (which implies that x^* does not depend on p). In contrast, it is easy to verify that when avoidance expenditures are sensitive to public detection, additional terms appear which make more likely that W_{pF} takes a positive sign. This is left to the reader.

Applying the implicit function theorem to (3) with $q_{xp} = 0$, we obtain that $sign \frac{\partial p^*}{\partial F} = sign W_{pF}$ where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{pF} &= g(b^*) q_p^* \left\{ (D - 2q^* F) + (D - q^* F) \frac{g'(b^*)}{g(b^*)} q^* F + \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial F} (-q_x^* F) \right\} \\
&= g(b^*) q_p^* \left\{ \left(\frac{D - 2q^* F}{D - q^* F} - e \right) (D - q^* F) + \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial F} (-q_x^* F) \right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

with: $e = -\frac{g'(b^*)}{g(b^*)} q^* F$ denoting to the elasticity of the density with respect to the expected fine. Remark that the first bracketed term $\left(\frac{D - 2q^* F}{D - q^* F} - e \right)$ is negative soon as the elasticity term satisfies $e \geq 1$. But the last term is always positive. It is easy to see that the condition $e \leq \frac{D - 2q^* F}{D - q^* F} \Leftrightarrow q^* F \leq \frac{1-e}{2-e}$ is sufficient (but not necessary) to obtain that the probability and the fine are complementary instruments (i.e. $W_{pF} > 0$). On the other hand (in contrast to Garoupa (2001)), the condition $e > 1$ is no longer sufficient to obtain that the probability and the fine are substitutable instruments (i.e. $W_{pF} < 0$).

ii) To go a little further, assume that $F \to 0$ (criminals are poor), such that $q^* F \to 0$: hence, as far as criminals entail a small cost of avoidance (in the limit we also obtain: $x^* \to 0$) when they face low sanctions in case of detection, there exists a large degree of underdeterrence at optimum ($b^* \to 0$). As a result, $W_{pF} = g(b^*) q_p^* \{1 - e\} D < 0$ soon as $e > 1$, meaning that both instruments are substitutes near any arbitrary small level of deterrence.

iii) On the contrary, assume that b is uniformaly distributed (hence $g(b) = cst$) and that the maximal possible level of fine is large enough to induce a level of deterrence which is close to full internalization of the cost of crime at optimum ($b^* \to D$); then: $W_{pF} = g(b^*) q_p^* \left\{ (x^* - q^* F) + \frac{\partial x^*}{\partial F} (-q_x^* F) \right\} > 0$ as soon as $x^* \geq q^* F$, meaning that when the cost of avoidance is large enough, both instruments are complements even near full internalization of the cost of the crime.

10

Proof of proposition 4

It is straightforward to show that:

$$\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial F} = q^* + q_p^* F \frac{\partial p^*}{\partial F} = q^* - q_p^* F \frac{W_{pF}}{W_{pp}}$$

As a result, $\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial F}$ is always positive when the probability and the fine are complements at optimum (*i.e.* $-\frac{W_{pF}}{W_{pp}} \geq 0$). This proves i) More generally, we have:

$$sign\left(\frac{\partial b^*}{\partial F}\right) = sign\left(q_p^* F W_{pF} - q^* W_{pp}\right)$$

ii) Given that $\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p} = 0$ when $q_{xp} = 0$, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
q_p^* F W_{pF} - q^* W_{pp} &= g(b^*) q_p^{*2} F (D - q^* F) + q^* m'' \\
&\quad + g(b^*) F \left(\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial F} \left(-q_x^* F \right) q_p^{*2} + q^* (-q_{pp}^*)(D - q^* F) \right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is always positive.

iii) On the other hand, when we assume that $q_{xp} < 0$, additional terms appear which depend on $\frac{\partial x^*}{\partial p}$ (it is easy to verify that some of them are negative), $\frac{\partial^2 x^*}{\partial p \partial F}$ or $\frac{\partial^2 x^*}{\partial p^2}$ (they have an ambiguous sign, which may be solved with more restrictions on the third derivatives of q).

Documents de travail du BETA

___

2000–**01**   *Hétérogénéité de travailleurs, dualisme et salaire d'efficience.*
Francesco DE PALMA, janvier 2000.

2000–**02**   *An Algebraic Index Theorem for Non–smooth Economies.*
Gaël GIRAUD, janvier 2000.

2000–**03**   *Wage Indexation, Central Bank Independence and the Cost of Disinflation.*
Giuseppe DIANA, janvier 2000.

2000–**04**   *Une analyse cognitive du concept de « vision entrepreneuriale ».*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Babak MEHMANPAZIR, février 2000.

2000–**05**   *Common knowledge and consensus with noisy communication.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, mars 2000.

2000–**06**   *Sunspots and Incomplete Markets with Real Assets.*
Nadjette LAGUÉCIR, avril 2000.

2000–**07**   *Common Knowledge and Interactive Behaviors : A Survey.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, mai 2000.

2000–**08**   *Knowledge and Expertise : Toward a Cognitive and Organisational Duality of the Firm.*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Olivier DUPOUËT, Francis KERN, Francis MUNIER, mai 2000.

2000–**09**   *Tie–breaking Rules and Informational Cascades : A Note.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, Anthony ZIEGELMEYER, juin 2000.

2000–**10**   *SPQR : the Four Approaches to Origin–Destination Matrix Estimation for Consideration by the MYSTIC Research Consortium.*
Marc GAUDRY, juillet 2000.

2000–**11**   *SNUS–2.5, a Multimoment Analysis of Road Demand, Accidents and their Severity in Germany, 1968–1989.*
Ulrich BLUM, Marc GAUDRY, juillet 2000.

2000–**12**   *On the Inconsistency of the Ordinary Least Squares Estimator for Spatial Autoregressive Processes.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Agénor LAHATTE, septembre 2000.

2000–**13**   *Turning Box–Cox including Quadratic Forms in Regression.*
Marc GAUDRY, Ulrich BLUM, Tran LIEM, septembre 2000.

2000–**14**   *Pour une approche dialogique du rôle de l'entrepreneur/managerdans l'évolution des PME : l'ISO comme révélateur ...*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Blandine LANOUX, septembre 2000.

2000–**15**   *Diversity of innovative strategy as a source of technological performance.*
Patrick LLERENA, Vanessa OLTRA, octobre 2000.

2000–**16**   *Can we consider the policy instruments as cyclical substitutes ?*
Sylvie DUCHASSAING, Laurent GAGNOL, décembre 2000.

2001–**01**   *Economic growth and CO2 emissions : a nonparametric approach.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Phu NGUYEN VAN, janvier 2001.

2001–**02**   *Distributions supporting the first–order approach to principal–agent problems.*
Sandrine SPÆTER, février 2001.

2001–**03**   *Développement durable et Rapports Nord–Sud dans un Modèle à Générations Imbriquées : interroger le futur pour éclairer le présent.*
Alban VERCHÈRE, février 2001.

2001–**04**   *Modeling Behavioral Heterogeneity in Demand Theory.*
Isabelle MARET, mars 2001.

2001–**05**   *Efficient estimation of spatial autoregressive models.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, mars 2001.

2001–**06**   *Un modèle de stratégie individuelle de primo–insertion professionnelle.*
Guy TCHIBOZO, mars 2001.

2001–**07**   *Endogenous Fluctuations and Public Services in a Simple OLG Economy.*
Thomas SEEGMULLER, avril 2001.

2001–**08**   *Behavioral Heterogeneity in Large Economies.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Isabelle MARET, avril 2001.

2001–**09**   *GMM Estimation of Lattice Models Using Panel Data : Application.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, avril 2001.

2001–**10**   *Dépendance spatiale sur données de panel : application à la relation Brevets–R&D au niveau régional.*
Jalal EL OUARDIGHI, avril 2001.

2001–**11**   *Impact économique régional d'un pôle universitaire : application au cas strasbourgeois.*
Laurent GAGNOL, Jean–Alain HÉRAUD, mai 2001.

2001–**12**   *Diversity of innovative strategy as a source of technological performance.*
Patrick LLERENA, Vanessa OLTRA, mai 2001.

2001–**13**   *La capacité d'innovation dans les regions de l'Union Européenne.*
Jalal EL OUARDIGHI, juin 2001.

2001–**14**   *Persuasion Games with Higher Order Uncertainty.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, juin 2001.

2001–**15**   *Analyse empirique des fonctions de production de Bosnie–Herzégovine sur la période 1952–1989.*
Rabija SOMUN, juillet 2001.

2001–**16**   *The Performance of German Firms in the Business–Related Service Sectors : a Dynamic Analysis.*
Phu NGUYEN VAN, Ulrich KAISER, François LAISNEY, juillet 2001.

2001–**17**   *Why Central Bank Independence is high and Wage indexation is low.*
Giuseppe DIANA, septembre 2001.

2001–**18**   *Le mélange des ethnies dans les PME camerounaises : l'émergence d'un modèle d'organisation du travail.*
Raphaël NKAKLEU, octobre 2001.

2001–**19**   *Les déterminants de la GRH des PME camerounaises.*
Raphaël NK AKLEU, octobre 2001.

2001–**20**   *Profils d'identité des dirigeants et stratégies de financement dans les PME camerounaises.*
Raphaël NKAKLEU, octobre 2001.

2001–**21**   Concurrence Imparfaite, Variabilité du Taux de Marge et Fluctuations Endogènes.
Thomas SEEGMULLER, novembre 2001.

2001–**22**   *Determinants of Environmental and Economic Performance of Firms : An Empirical Analysis of the European Paper Industry.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Phu NGUYEN VAN et Marcus WAGNER, novembre 2001.

2001–**23**   *The policy mix in a monetary union under alternative policy institutions and asymmetries.*
Laurent GAGNOL et Moïse SIDIROPOULOS, décembre 2001.

2001–**24**   *Restrictions on the Autoregressive Parameters of Share Systems with Spatial Dependence.*
Agénor LAHATTE, décembre 2001.

2002–**01**   *Strategic Knowledge Sharing in Bayesian Games : A General Model.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, janvier 2002.

2002–**02**   *Strategic Knowledge Sharing in Bayesian Games : Applications.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, janvier 2002.

2002–**03**   *Partial Certifiability and Information Precision in a Cournot Game.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, janvier 2002.

2002–**04**   *Behavioral Heterogeneity in Large Economies.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Isabelle MARET, janvier 2002.
(Version remaniée du Document de Travail n°2001–**08**, avril 2001).

2002–**05**   *Modeling Behavioral Heterogeneity in Demand Theory.*
Isabelle MARET, janvier 2002.
(Version remaniée du Document de Travail n°2001–**04**, mars 2001).

2002–**06**   *Déforestation, croissance économique et population : une étude sur données de panel.*
Phu NGUYEN VAN, Théophile AZOMAHOU, janvier 2002.

2002–**07**   *Theories of behavior in principal–agent relationships with hidden action.*
Claudia KESER, Marc WILLINGER, janvier 2002.

2002–**08**   *Principe de précaution et comportements préventifs des firmes face aux risques environnementaux.*
Sandrine SPÆTER, janvier 2002.

2002–**09**   *Endogenous Population and Environmental Quality.*
Phu NGUYEN VAN, janvier 2002.

2002–**10**   *Dualité cognitive et organisationnelle de la firme au travers du concept de communauté.*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Olivier DUPOUËT, Francis KERN, Francis MUNIER, février 2002.

2002–**11**   *Comment évaluer l'amélioration du bien–être individuel issue d'une modification de la qualité du service d'élimination des déchets ménagers ?*
Valentine HEINTZ, février 2002.

2002–**12**   *The Favorite–Longshot Bias in Sequential Parimutuel Betting with Non–Expected Utility Players.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, Anthony ZIEGELMEYER, Marie–Hélène BROIHANNE, février 2002.

2002–**13**   *La sensibilité aux conditions initiales dans les processus individuels de primo–insertion professionnelle : critère et enjeux.*
Guy TCHIBOZO, février 2002.

2002–**14**   *Improving the Prevention of Environmental Risks with Convertible Bonds.*
André SCHMITT, Sandrine SPÆTER, mai 2002.

2002–**15**   *L'altruisme intergénérationnel comme fondement commun de la courbe environnementale à la Kuznets et du développement durable.*
Alban VERCHÈRE, mai 2002.

2002–**16**   *Aléa moral et politiques d'audit optimales dans le cadre de la pollution d'origine agricole de l'eau.*
Sandrine SPÆTER, Alban VERCHÈRE, juin 2002.

2002–**17**   *Parimutuel Betting under Asymmetric Information.*
Frédéric KŒSSLER, Anthony ZIEGELMEYER, juin 2002.

2002–**18**   *Pollution as a source of endogenous fluctuations and periodic welfare inequality in OLG economies.*
Thomas SEEGMULLER, Alban VERCHÈRE, juin 2002.

2002–**19**   *La demande de grosses coupures et l'économie souterraine.*
Gilbert KŒNIG, juillet 2002.

2002–**20**   *Efficiency of Nonpoint Source Pollution Instruments with Externality Among Polluters : An Experimental Study.*
François COCHARD, Marc WILLINGER, Anastasios XEPAPADEAS, juillet 2002.

2002–**21**   *Taille optimale dans l'industrie du séchage du bois et avantage compétitif du bois–énergie : une modélisation microéconomique.*
Alexandre SOKIC, octobre 2002.

2002–**22**   *Modelling Behavioral Heterogeneity.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Isabelle MARET, novembre 2002.

2002–**23**   *Le changement organisationnel en PME : quels acteurs pour quels apprentissages ?*
Blandine LANOUX, novembre 2002.

2002–**24**   *TECHNOLOGY POLICY AND COOPERATION : An analytical framework for a paradigmatic approach.*
Patrick LLERENA, Mireille MATT, novembre 2002.

2003–**01**   *Peut–on parler de délégation dans les PME camerounaises ?*
Raphaël NKAKLEU, mars 2003.

2003–**02**   *L'identité organisationnelle et création du capital social : la tontine d'entreprise comme facteur déclenchant dans le contexte africain.*
Raphaël NKAKLEU, avril 2003.

2003–**03**   *A semiparametric analysis of determinants of protected area.*
Phu NGUYEN VAN, avril 2003.

2003–**04**   *Strategic Market Games with a Finite Horizon and Incomplete Markets.*
Gaël GIRAUD et Sonia WEYERS, avril 2003.

2003–**05**   *Exact Homothetic or Cobb–Douglas Behavior Through Aggregation.*
Gaël GIRAUD et John K.–H. QUAH, juin 2003.

2003–**06**   *Relativité de la satisfaction dans la vie : une étude sur données de panel.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Phu NGUYEN VAN, Thi Kim Cuong PHAM, juin 2003.

2003–**07**   *A model of the anchoring effect in dichotomous choice valuation with follow–up.*
Sandra LECHNER, Anne ROZAN, François LAISNEY, juillet 2003.

2003–**08**   *Central Bank Independence, Speed of Disinflation and the Sacrifice Ratio.*
Giuseppe DIANA, Moïse SIDIROPOULOS, juillet 2003.

2003–**09**   *Patents versus ex–post rewards : a new look.*
Julien PÉNIN, juillet 2003.

2003–**10**   *Endogenous Spillovers under Cournot Rivalry and Co–opetitive Behaviors.*
Isabelle MARET, août 2003.

2003–**11**   *Les propriétés incitatives de l'effet Saint Matthieu dans la compétition académique.*
Nicolas CARAYOL, septembre 2003.

2003–**12**   *The 'probleme of problem choice' : A model of sequential knowledge production within scientific communities.*
Nicolas CARAYOL, Jean–Michel DALLE, septembre 2003.

2003–**13**   *Distribution Dynamics of CO_2 Emissions.*
Phu NGUYEN VAN, décembre 2003.

2004–**01**   *Utilité relative, politique publique et croissance économique.*
Thi Kim Cuong PHAM, janvier 2004.

2004–**02**   *Le management des grands projets de haute technologie vu au travers de la coordination des compétences.*
Christophe BELLEVAL, janvier 2004.

2004–**03**   *Pour une approche dialogique du rôle de l'entrepreneur/manager dans l'évolution des PME : l'ISO comme révélateur …*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Blandine LANOUX, février 2004.

2004–**04**   *Consistent Collusion–Proofness and Correlation in Exchange Economies.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Céline ROCHON, février 2004.

2004–**05**   *Generic Efficiency and Collusion–Proofness in Exchange Economies.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Céline ROCHON, février 2004.

2004–**06**   *Dualité cognitive et organisationnelle de la firme fondée sur les interactions entre les communautés épistémiques et les communautés de pratique..*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Olivier DUPOUËT, Francis KERN, Francis MUNIER, février 2004.

2004–**07**   *Les Portails d'entreprise : une réponse aux dimensions de l'entreprise « processeur de connaissances ».*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, février 2004.

2004–**08**   *Cumulative Causation and Evolutionary Micro–Founded Technical Change : A Growth Model with Integrated Economies.*
Patrick LLERENA, André LORENTZ, février 2004.

2004–**09**   *Les CIFRE : un outil de médiation entre les laboratoires de recherche universitaire et les entreprises.*
Rachel LÉVY, avril 2004.

2004–**10**   *On Taxation Pass–Through for a Monopoly Firm.*
Rabah AMIR, Isabelle MARET, Michael TROGE, mai 2004.

2004–**11**   *Wealth distribution, endogenous fiscal policy and growth : status–seeking implications.*
Thi Kim Cuong PHAM, juin 2004.

2004–**12**   *Semiparametric Analysis of the Regional Convergence Process.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Jalal EL OUARDIGHI, Phu NGUYEN VAN, Thi Kim Cuong PHAM, Juillet 2004.

2004–**13**   *Les hypothèses de rationalité de l'économie évolutionniste.*
Morad DIANI, septembre 2004.

2004–**14**   *Insurance and Financial Hedging of Oil Pollution Risks.*
André SCHMITT, Sandrine SPAETER, septembre 2004.

2004–**15**   *Altruisme intergénérationnel, développement durable et équité intergénérationnelle en présence d'agents hétérogènes.*
Alban VERCHÈRE, octobre 2004.

2004–**16**   *Du paradoxe libéral–parétien à un concept de métaclassement des préférences.*
Herrade IGERSHEIM, novembre 2004.

2004–**17**   *Why do Academic Scientists Engage in Interdisciplinary Research ?*
Nicolas CARAYOL, Thuc Uyen NGUYEN THI, décembre 2004.

2005–**01**   *Les collaborations Université Entreprises dans une perspective organisationnelle et cognitive.*
Frédéric CRÉPLET, Francis KERN, Véronique SCHAEFFER, janvier 2005.

2005–**02**   *The Exact Insensitivity of Market Budget Shares and the 'Balancing Effect'.*
Gaël GIRAUD, Isabelle MARET, janvier 2005.

2005–**03**   *Les modèles de type Mundell–Fleming revisités.*
Gilbert KOENIG, janvier 2005.

2005–**04**   *L'État et la cellule familiale sont–ils substituables dans la prise en charge du chômage en Europe ? Une comparaison basée sur le panel européen.*
Olivia ECKERT–JAFFE, Isabelle TERRAZ, mars 2005.

2005–**05**   *Environment in an Overlapping Generations Economy with Endogenous Labor Supply : a Dynamic Analysis.*
Thomas SEEGMULLER, Alban VERCHÈRE, mars 2005.

2005–**06**   *Is Monetary Union Necessarily Counterproductive ?*
Giuseppe DIANA, Blandine ZIMMER, mars 2005.

2005–**07**   *Factors Affecting University–Industry R&D Collaboration : The importance of screening and signalling.*
Roberto FONTANA, Aldo GEUNA, Mireille MATT, avril 2005.

2005–**08**   *Madison–Strasbourg, une analyse comparative de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche en France et aux États–Unis à travers l'exemple de deux campus.*
Laurent BUISSON, mai 2005.

2005–**09**   *Coordination des négociations salariales en UEM : un rôle majeur pour la BCE.*
Blandine ZIMMER, mai 2005.

2005–**10**   *Open knowledge disclosure, incomplete information and collective innovations.*
Julien PÉNIN, mai 2005.

2005–**11**   *Science–Technology–Industry Links and the 'European Paradox' : Some Notes on the Dynamics of Scientific and Technological Research in Europe.*
Giovanni DOSI, Patrick LLERENA, Mauro SYLOS LABINI, juillet 2005.

2005–**12**   *Hedging Strategies and the Financing of the 1992 International Oil Pollution Compensation Fund.*
André SCHMITT, Sandrine SPAETER, novembre 2005.

2005–**13**   *Faire émerger la coopération internationale : une approche expérimentale comparée du bilatéralisme et du multilatéralisme.*
Stéphane BERTRAND, Kene BOUN MY, Alban VERCHÈRE, novembre 2005.

2005–**14**   *Segregation in Networks.*
Giorgio FAGIOLO, Marco VALENTE, Nicolaas J. VRIEND, décembre 2005.

2006–**01**   *Demand and Technology Determinants of Structural Change and Tertiarisation : An Input–Output Structural Decomposition Analysis for four OECD Countries.*
Maria SAVONA, André LORENTZ, janvier 2006.

2006–**02**   *A strategic model of complex networks formation.*
Nicolas CARAYOL, Pascale ROUX, janvier 2006.

2006–**03**   *Coordination failures in network formation.*
Nicolas CARAYOL, Pascale ROUX, Murat YILDIZOGLU, janvier 2006.

2006–**04**   *Real Options Theory for Lawmaking.*
Marie OBIDZINSKI, Bruno DEFFAINS, août 2006.

2006–**05**   *Ressources, compétences et stratégie de la firme : Une discussion de l'opposition entre la vision Porterienne et la vision fondée sur les compétences.*
Fernand AMESSE, Arman AVADIKYAN, Patrick COHENDET, janvier 2006.

2006–**06**   *Knowledge Integration and Network Formation.*
Müge OZMAN, janvier 2006.

2006–**07**   *Networks and Innovation : A Survey of Empirical Literature.*
Müge OZMAN, février 2006.

2006–**08**   *A.K. Sen et J.E. Roemer : une même approche de la responsabilité ?*
Herrade IGERSHEIM, mars 2006.

2006–**09**   *Efficiency and coordination of fiscal policy in open economies.*
Gilbert KOENIG, Irem ZEYNELOGLU, avril 2006.

2006–**10**   *Partial Likelihood Estimation of a Cox Model With Random Effects : an EM Algorithm Based on Penalized Likelihood.*
Guillaume HORNY, avril 2006.

2006–**11**   *Uncertainty of Law and the Legal Process.*
Giuseppe DARI–MATTIACCI, Bruno DEFFAINS, avril 2006.

2006–**12**   *Customary versus Technological Advancement Tests.*
Bruno DEFFAINS, Dominique DEMOUGIN, avril 2006.

2006–**13**   *Institutional Competition, Political Process and Holdup.*
Bruno DEFFAINS, Dominique DEMOUGIN, avril 2006.

2006–**14**   *How does leadership support the activity of communities of practice ?*
Paul MULLER, avril 2006.

2006–**15**   *Do academic laboratories correspond to scientific communities ? Evidence from a large European university.*
Rachel LÉVY, Paul MULLER, mai 2006.

2006–**16**   *Knowledge flows and the geography of networks. A strategic model of small worlds formation.*
Nicolas CARAYOL, Pascale ROUX, mai 2006.

2006–**17**   *A Further Look into the Demography–based GDP Forecasting Method.*
Tapas K. MISHRA, juin 2006.

2006–**18**   *A regional typology of innovation capacities in new member states and candidate countries.*
Emmanuel MULLER, Arlette JAPPE, Jean–Alain HÉRAUD, Andrea ZENKER, juillet 2006.

2006–**19**   *Convergence des contributions aux inégalités de richesse dans le développement des pays européens.*
Jalal EL OUARDIGHI, Rabiji SOMUN–KAPETANOVIC, septembre 2006.

2006–**20**   *Channel Performance and Incentives for Retail Cost Misrepresentation.*
Rabah AMIR, Thierry LEIBER, Isabelle MARET, septembre 2006.

2006–**21**   *Entrepreneurship in biotechnology : The case of four start–ups in the Upper–Rhine Biovalley.*
Antoine BURETH, Julien PÉNIN, Sandrine WOLFF, septembre 2006.

2006–**22**   *Does Model Uncertainty Lead to Less Central Bank Transparency ?*
Li QIN, Elefterios SPYROMITROS, Moïse SIDIROPOULOS, octobre 2006.

2006–**23**   Enveloppe *Soleau et droit de possession antérieure : Définition et analyse économique.*
Julien PÉNIN, octobre 2006.

2006–**24**   *Le territoire français en tant que Système Régional d'Innovation.*
Rachel LEVY, Raymond WOESSNER, octobre 2006.

2006–**25**   *Fiscal Policy in a Monetary Union Under Alternative Labour–Market Structures.*
Moïse SIDIROPOULOS, Eleftherios SPYROMITROS, octobre 2006.

2006–**26**   *Robust Control and Monetary Policy Delegation.*
Giuseppe DIANA, Moïse SIDIROPOULOS, octobre 2006.

2006–**27**   *A study of science–industry collaborative patterns in a large european university.*
Rachel LEVY, Pascale ROUX, Sandrine WOLFF, octobre 2006.

2006–**28**   *Option chain and change management : a structural equation application.*
Thierry BURGER–HELMCHEN, octobre 2006.

2006–**29**   *Prevention and Compensation of Muddy Flows : Some Economic Insights.*
Sandrine SPAETER, François COCHARD, Anne ROZAN, octobre 2006.

2006–**30**   *Misreporting, Retroactive Audit and Redistribution.*
Sandrine SPAETER, Marc WILLINGER, octobre 2006.

2006–**31**   *Justifying the Origin of Real Options and their Difficult Evaluation in Strategic Management.*
Thierry BURGER–HELMCHEN, octobre 2006.

2006–**32**   *Job mobility in Portugal : a Bayesian study with matched worker–firm data.*
Guillaume HORNY, Rute MENDES, Gerard J. VAN DEN BERG, novembre 2006.

2006–**33**   *Knowledge sourcing and firm performance in an industrializing economy : the case of Taiwan in the 1990s.*
Chia–Lin CHANG, Stéphane ROBIN, novembre 2006.

2006–**34**   *Using the Asymptotically Ideal Model to estimate the impact of knowledge on labour productivity : An application to Taiwan in the 1990s.*
Chia–Lin CHANG, Stéphane ROBIN, novembre 2006.

2006–**35**   *La politique budgétaire dans la nouvelle macroéconomie internationale.*
Gilbert KOENIG, Irem ZEYNELOGLU, décembre 2006.

2006–**36**   *Age Dynamics and Economic Growth : Revisiting the Nexus in a Nonparametric Setting.*
Théophile AZOMAHOU, Tapas MISHRA, décembre 2006.

2007–**01**   *Transparence et efficacité de la politique monétaire.*
Romain BAERISWYL, Camille CORNAND, janvier 2007.

2007–**02**   *Crowding–out in Productive and Redistributive Rent–Seeking.*
Giuseppe DARI–MATTIACCI, Éric LANGLAIS, Bruno LOVAT, Francesco PARISI, janvier 2007.

2007–**03**   *Co–résidence chez les parents et indemnisation des jeunes chômeurs en Europe.*
Olivia ÉKERT–JAFFÉ, Isabelle TERRAZ, janvier 2007.

2007–**04**   *Labor Conflicts and Inefficiency of Relationship–Specific Investments : What is the Judge's Role ?*
Bruno DEFFAINS, Yannick GABUTHY, Eve–Angéline LAMBERT, janvier 2007.

2007–**05**   *Monetary hyperinflations, speculative hyperinflations and modelling the use of money.*
Alexandre SOKIC, février 2007.

2007–**06**   *Detection avoidance and deterrence : some paradoxical arithmetics.*
Éric LANGLAIS, février 2007.

La présente liste ne comprend que les Documents de Travail publiés à partir du 1er janvier 2000. La liste complète peut être donnée sur demande.
This list contains the Working Paper writen after January 2000, 1rst. The complet list is available upon request.

_____