



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Political Cycles : The Opposition Advantage

Pascal Gautier and Raphaël Soubeyran

NOTA DI LAVORO 129.2005

OCTOBER 2005

PRCG – Privatisation, Regulation, Corporate Governance

Pascal Gautier and Raphaël Soubeyran, *GREQAM, Université d'Aix-Marseille II*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=847604>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

Political Cycles: The Opposition Advantage

Summary

We propose a two dimensional infinite horizon model of public consumption in which investments are decided by a winner-take-all election. Investments in the two public goods create a linkage across periods and parties have different specialities. We show that the incumbent party vote share decreases the longer it stays in power. Parties chances of winning do not converge and, when the median voter is moderate enough, no party can maintain itself in power for ever. Finally, the more parties are specialized and the more public policies have long-term effects, the more political cycles are likely to occur.

Keywords: Cycles, Alternation, Public goods, Advantage, Opposition

JEL Classification: D72, H41, C72

This is a revised version of "Political Cycles: a suggested interpretation", GREQAM WP 12-2005. The authors thank Francis Bloch, Guillaume Girmens, Didier Laussel and Thierry Mayer as well as many seminars and congresses participants at Aix-en-provence, Beijing, Dublin, Lille, Marseille and New York for their helpful comments. We are also grateful to CORE members and staff for their hospitality during our time in Belgium.

Address for correspondence:

Pascal Gautier
GREQAM, Université d'Aix-Marseille II
Château Lafarge, Route des Milles
13290 Les Milles
France
Phone: +33 0 442935980
Fax: +33 0 442930968
E.mail: pgautier@univaix

In modern democracies, the alternation of political parties in power is a frequent phenomenon. Why isn't there a greater persistence of parties in power? How can one explain the turnover of parties in government? How can one explain political cycles? We propose a theoretical model of political cycles, where the share of a party's vote decreases with the time it controls government. This effect, that we call "the opposition advantage", is different from the well known incumbent effect. Indeed, the incumbency effect measures the advantage given to the incumbent candidate competing with a challenger. The opposition effect measures the advantage of a candidate affiliated to the opposition party, when he competes against a candidate of the party in power, who is not necessarily the incumbent politician.

We propose an explanation of the opposition advantage and show that it can be a cause for political and policy cycles. We propose an infinite horizon model of repeated elections with two parties built on two main assumptions: policies have long-term effects¹, but are not irreversible, and parties have comparative advantages for the provision of two public goods. The two goods are imperfectly substitutable for voters. For example, citizens need good education and security at the same time. When voters are moderate, they may wish that both parties govern, but they can only elect one of them at a time. In this context, the opposition party can offer more moderate policies. Indeed, the opposition can propose to keep the incumbent party policy long-term effect and satisfy voters in focusing on the public good that it has a comparative advantage upon. On the contrary, the party in power cannot benefit from the comparative advantage of the opposition party. These two arguments suggest that the opposition party may be advantaged.

Our analysis has to be distinguished from studies focusing on politicians' careers and swings in their popularity. A large strand of this literature deals with the "Incumbency advantage"². This theory is supported by overwhelming evidence, both in Senate elections and in elections to the House of representatives. Some of the major factors of the incumbency advantage are

¹Many public goods have long-term effect. Important examples are national defense activities, welfare programs, environmental clean-up, building states schools, roads

²Ansolabehere and Snyder (2002) provide an excellent survey of the incumbency advantage literature, and an empirical contribution on state and federal elections in U.S. for the period 1942-2000. They find strong support for the incumbency advantage in state executives elections and conclude that explanations specific to the legislators incumbency advantage are not convincing.

redistricting³, seniority systems⁴, and the lack of collective responsibility⁵.

Scholars explain political cycles with psychological arguments⁶, the main one being disappointment. The “Negativity effect” theory⁷ is built on the following remark: voters’ decisions are based on the incumbent’s past performance and negative pieces of information have a greater impact than positive pieces of information. There exist two different explanations for this observation, the first one suggests that voters have a high esteem for powerful figures and are more easily disappointed than positively surprised by the government performance; the second (Abelson and Levy, 1985) states that the electorate has a strong risk aversion for potential costs of re-electing a politician who has demonstrated his bad performance. In the light of the negativity effect, Aragonés (1997) obtains a result of systematic alternation of the two parties implementing different policies. In our analysis, there is no uncertainty and electorate decisions are not based on past performance, but as usually in political models, for their preferred party at each election. Finally, the negativity and incumbency effects affect the election outcome in opposing directions. The first one leads to the defeat of the incumbent, whereas the second one leads to the re-election of the incumbent. Both theories focus on individual politicians. Differently, our study does not deal with politicians but with parties.

In our model, political cycles emerge as a consequence of the opposition effect. There exists very few models considering this determinant of political cycles. Kramer (1977) and Bendor, Mookherjee and Ray (2005), study dynamic models of electoral competition between two parties with myopic behavior. Kramer (1977) suppose that the incumbent cannot change his policy whereas the challenger can locate anywhere in the policy space. He shows that candidates systematically alternate in power. Bendor, Mookherjee and

³Cox and Katz (2002) state that redistricting caused the rise of legislators incumbency advantage after the 60s.

⁴McKelvey and Riezman (1992) argue that seniority tends to create a discentive to vote for challengers.

⁵See Persson and Tabellini (2000, chapter 4) for a survey of the incumbents accountability literature.

⁶See Goertzel (2005) for a review of the american voters mood changes literature. Schlesinger (1949, 1986, 1992) consider that the electorate is inevitably disappointed by the party or the ideology that is in power. Klinberg (1952) suggests that American mood in public opinion balances between introversion and extroversion. This could explain why domestic and foreign concerns alternate through time and parties turnover in power.

⁷See Aragonés (1997) for a survey.

Ray (2005) propose a model based on a satisficing behavior of the incumbent and a search behavior of the challenger. If the winning candidate is satisfied, then he does not change his policy until he loses the election, whereas the challenger is not satisfied, then he searches a policy that can defeat the incumbent. In our study, parties, once elected, are not constrained to keep their policy the next election. Parties behave strategically, they try to win the present election in selecting their platforms and their behavior do not change whether they are in power or not.

Another topic related to our analysis are policy cycles. Many scholars argue that policy cycles are generated by economic cycles⁸. We propose a different explanation; in our model, policy cycles are not generated by economic shocks but by the political structure. Since parties implement different policies⁹, political turnover and policy changes are clearly related. In a very different framework, Roemer (1995) shows that policy cycles arise because of stochastic changes in voters preferences in a model with policy motivated candidates with uncertainty. Our approach is different in many aspects. We suppose that parties are only office motivated and the non-convergence of platforms does not result from uncertainty but from parties multidimensional heterogeneity. Furthermore, we show that perpetual cycles (but not necessarily periodic) appear in a context with no uncertainty.

In considering an infinite number of successive elections and a dynamic link coming from public policies long-term effects, our work contributes to the literature of infinite horizon models of repeated elections. This literature is mainly focused on the dynamic inefficiency of government¹⁰. Battaglini and Coate (2005) consider an infinite horizon model of collective spending and taxation. Public decisions are determined through a legislative bargaining process. Agents are forward looking, they take decisions in anticipating the

⁸A huge literature studies political business cycles. See Berry (1991) for a survey.

⁹Hibbs (1977), Beck (1982), and Chappel and Keech (1986) show that Democrat and Republican governments have different influences on the unemployment rate. Alesina and Sachs (1988) and Tabellini and La Via (1989) show that parties are associated with different monetary policies.

¹⁰Baron (1996) studies a dynamic model of pork barrel policies. Gomes and Jehiel (2004) analyze the persistence of inefficiencies in a general framework of social and economic interactions that can be applied to legislative bargaining, coalition formation or exchange economies. Hassler, Storesletten and Zilibotti (2003) study public good provision in an OLG model, where an age-dependant taxation creates distortions in human capital investment. Azzimonti, Sarte and Soares (2003) focus on the role of commitment in a dynamic public spending and taxation model.

outcomes of futures elections. The authors objective is very different from ours, because they concentrate on long-term government inefficiencies¹¹. We do not analyze taxation and debt problems, then we suppose that the tax rate is fixed and that there is no saving and no debt.

Finally, in considering parties with different competences, our work contributes to the literature on valence in politics. A growing literature deals with models where policy and quality are orthogonal dimensions¹². Here, we suppose that parties' competences are different according to the different policies¹³. Other authors analyze agency problems¹⁴, where politicians are associated to a policy-dependent competence level and voters have incomplete information on politicians type and/or actions¹⁵. We extend the assumption of heterogeneous competences to the case of two dimensions, but we suppose that they are common knowledge.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we present voters behavior and parties constraints. In section 2, we derive the multiple possible outcomes of the electoral competition. In section 3, we show that the opposition party is advantaged. In section 4, we present our main results: the probability of winning cannot converge; when the median voter is extremist, a party can stay in power for ever, whereas when he is moderate, no party can keep power for ever; and we show that cycles are more likely to occur when the depreciation rate is low and when parties are strongly specialized. In section

¹¹In a close study, Azzimonti-Renzo (2005) analyzes government long-term inefficiencies when the decision maker is atomistic.

¹²This literature, initiated by Stokes (1992) focus on the problem of equilibrium existence and platforms location in spatial models when candidates have different "scores" on the quality dimension. Ansolabehere and Snyder (2000) study the unidimensional model in a world of certainty; Aragonés and Palfrey (2002) analyze the case where candidates maximize their share of votes and overcome the pure strategy equilibrium non-existence problem in studying mixed strategy equilibrium for small advantage levels. Groseclose (1999) and Aragonés and Palfrey (2004) add candidates policy concerns.

¹³As noticed by Prat (2002): "One may doubt that [voters] utility is separable in policy and valence. A left wing voter may prefer an inept right-wing politician to an effective right-wing politician because the latter is more likely to live up to his or promises and pass right-wing legislation. Still, an inept politician creates pure inefficiencies which are costly to all citizens."

¹⁴See again Persson and Tabellini (2000, chapter 4, section 4.7) for a review of this literature.

¹⁵Rogoff and Siebert (1988) propose a model of adverse selection and Rogoff and Sundaram (1993, 1996) study politician accountability in models with moral hazard and adverse selection.

6, we discuss two candidates objectives (re-election concerns and rent-seeker candidates). Finally, we conclude in section 7.

1 The model

We consider an infinite horizon model of repeated elections with two opportunistic parties A and B . Each period, voters elect a party and the new government implements his platform. Then, another election takes place, and so on. The government provides two durable public goods, a and b , that depreciate each period with a constant rate δ in $[0, 1]$, and the government's budget is normalized to 1 at any period. A new government can either keep the existing stocks or transform one of the public good into the other. Specifically, if the level of public good g ($g = a, b$) after election t is g_t and $I_{g,t+1}$ new units are produced by the government in period $t + 1$, then the level in period $t + 1$ is¹⁶:

$$g_{t+1} = (1 - \delta) g_t + I_{g,t+1},$$

where $g = a, b$. The level g_{t+1} can be either greater or smaller than g_t . When $g_{t+1} \geq g_t$, this means that the government at time $t + 1$ chooses to keep the stock of public good g . If $g_{t+1} < g_t$, the government either undoes or does not invest enough in good g to maintain its level. A policy z_t is a couple of public goods quantities (a_t, b_t) .

Voters:

Voters differ in the weight they place on the two public goods. Voter i 's weight for the first public good is denoted by α_i , belonging to the unit interval $[0, 1]$. The preferences of voter i are represented by:

$$W_i(a_t, b_t) = \alpha_i \ln(a_t) + (1 - \alpha_i) \ln(b_t),$$

where a_t and b_t are the public goods stocks after date t . The policy after election t is noticed $z_t = (a_t, b_t)$.

This kind of preferences, introduced by Tabellini and Alesina (1990), allows voters to disagree about which quantities of public goods to consume.

¹⁶Azzimonti-Renzo (2005) and Battaglini and Coate (2005) make the same assumption on the long-term effect of public spending.

Furthermore, these preferences belong to the class of "intermediate preferences" defined by Grandmont (1978), and verify the single crossing property (Grandmont, 1978). The median voter theorem applies, i.e. the median voter's preferred policy is the unique Condorcet winner. The preferred policy of the median voter, characterized by α_m , is thus the Condorcet winner in our context.

It is important to notice that the identity of the median voter α_m , does not depend on the date, i.e, is independent of the dynamics of the model.

Parties:

At each period, both parties propose credible platforms in order to win the election. The government's

budget constraint is:

$$I_{a,t} + I_{b,t} \leq 1,$$

We define a party as a stable organization, which can provide the two public goods. We suppose that the two parties are specialized: party A has a comparative advantage in providing good a and party B a comparative advantage in providing good b . This advantage will be captured by two constants, $\eta^A \in]1, \bar{\eta}]$ and $\eta^B \in]1, \bar{\eta}]$ which are inversely related to the marginal cost of providing the public goods. Finally, we suppose that the technology for providing both public goods has constant returns to scale, with marginal costs of $1/\eta^A$ and 1 for party A and 1 and $1/\eta^B$ for party B . With these specifications in mind, we write the budget constraints of the two parties at an election at date t as:

Party A:

$$\frac{a_t - (1 - \delta) a_{t-1}}{\eta^A} + b_t - (1 - \delta) b_{t-1} \leq 1, \tag{A}$$

Party B:

$$a_t - (1 - \delta) a_{t-1} + \frac{b_t - (1 - \delta) b_{t-1}}{\eta^B} \leq 1, \tag{B}$$

where stocks of the two public goods must be positive, i.e., $a_t, b_t \geq 0$. Inequality (A) defines party A 's set of policy $\mathbf{A}(t)$ and inequality (B) define party B 's set of policy $\mathbf{B}(t)$.

2 Political Equilibria

2.1 The median voter choice

The median voter selects the winning party, and her choice drives the dynamics of successive elections. We start the analysis by deriving her preferred platform over the set of credible platforms. The median voter's preferred policy over $\mathbf{A}(t)$, denoted m_t^A is the solution to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{(a_t, b_t)}{\text{Max}} [W_i(a_t, b_t)] & (\text{MA}) \\ & \text{s.t. : } (a_t, b_t) \in \mathbf{A}(t) \end{aligned}$$

and her preferred platform over $\mathbf{B}(t)$, denoted m_t^B is the solution to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{(a_t, b_t)}{\text{Max}} [W_i(a_t, b_t)] & (\text{MB}) \\ & \text{s.t. : } (a_t, b_t) \in \mathbf{B}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Straightforward calculations allow us to characterize the median voters' preferred policies:

$$\begin{aligned} m_t^A &= (\eta^A \alpha_m s_{t-1}^A, (1 - \alpha_m) s_{t-1}^A), \\ m_t^B &= (\alpha_m s_{t-1}^B, \eta^B (1 - \alpha_m) s_{t-1}^B), \end{aligned}$$

where $s_{t-1}^A = 1 + (1 - \delta) \left(b_{t-1} + \frac{a_{t-1}}{\eta^A} \right)$ and $s_{t-1}^B = 1 + (1 - \delta) \left(a_{t-1} + \frac{b_{t-1}}{\eta^B} \right)$.

Hence, the derivation of the median voter's preferred platform depends on the public goods stocks a_{t-1} and b_{t-1} . She has to compare m_t^A and m_t^B . Let $\Lambda_t(\cdot)$ be such that:

$$\Lambda_t(\alpha_m) = \frac{s_{t-1}^A}{s_{t-1}^B} \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}},$$

The median voter weakly prefers m_t^A to m_t^B if and only if $W_i(m_t^A) \geq W_i(m_t^B)$. With simple computations, one can show that the median voter weakly prefers m_t^A to m_t^B if and only if $\Lambda_t(\alpha_m) \geq 1$. Not surprisingly, the more A is competent, the less B is competent, and the more α_m is high, the higher the likelihood that the median voter chooses a policy in A 's policy set.

2.2 Equilibria

Parties select their platforms in order to win the election. Party A (respectively party B) maximizes its probability of victory π_t^A (respectively π_t^B). In the case where the median voter is indifferent between the two programs, we suppose that each party is equally likely to win the election. We denote by z_t^A party A 's platform and by z_t^B party B 's platform in the election at date t . Let $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$ (respectively $\mathbf{M}^B(t)$) be the set of party A platforms strictly preferred to m_t^B (respectively to m_t^A). Formally:

$$\mathbf{M}^A(t) = \{z_t \in \mathbf{A}(t) : W_m(z_t) > W_m(m_t^B)\},$$

$$\mathbf{M}^B(t) = \{z_t \in \mathbf{B}(t) : W_m(z_t) > W_m(m_t^A)\},$$

Since parties are only interested in winning the election, a platform that the rival cannot defeat is an equilibrium strategy. This leads to a multiplicity of Nash equilibria, summarized in the following proposition:

Proposition 1 *The set of Nash equilibrium is always non empty and is:*

- (i) $\mathbf{M}^A(t) \times \mathbf{B}(t)$ if $\Lambda_t > 1$, and A is elected,
- (ii) $\mathbf{A}(t) \times \mathbf{M}^B(t)$ if $\Lambda_t < 1$, and B is elected,
- (iii) (m_t^A, m_t^B) if $\Lambda_t = 1$, and A and B are elected with probability $\frac{1}{2}$.

(Proofs are reported in the appendix.)

These results lead to several observations. First, because parties only want to win the election and the information is complete, one party is in general certain to be elected (in cases (i) and (ii)). This party can propose many winning platforms, whereas the loser locates anywhere in his policy set. Figure 2 illustrates this kind of equilibrium:

Second, in very specific circumstances (in case (iii)), the median voter is indifferent between the two parties (see Figure 3). If this event occurs, it will dramatically change the dynamics of elections, as we discuss section 4.1.




Figure 1: Candidate A winning strategies when $\Lambda_t > 1$




Figure 2: Equilibrium strategies when $\Lambda_t = 1$

3 The opposition advantage

In this section, we discuss about the advantage conferred to the party in the opposition. Consider two elections at dates t and $t + 1$, and suppose that B wins the election at date t . Then B implements his policy $z_t^B = (a_t^B, b_t^B) \in$

$\mathbf{M}^B(t)$, one of his equilibrium platform for election t . Since B is the winner, it is necessarily true that $\Lambda_t \leq 1$. First remark that $z_t^B \notin \mathbf{A}(t)$ because of the definitions of $\mathbf{M}^B(t)$ and m_t^A , so that z_t^B must satisfy

$$\frac{a_t^B - (1 - \delta) a_{t-1}}{\eta^A} + b_t^B - (1 - \delta) b_{t-1} > 1,$$

This simply means that if A would try to imitate B at election t , then he would violate his budget constraint. Furthermore, since B wins at t , then $(a_t, b_t) = (a_t^B, b_t^B)$. This last equation can be then rewritten as follows:

$$s_t^A - 1 > (1 - \delta) s_{t-1}^A. \quad (1)$$

By definition, $z_t^B \in \mathbf{B}(t)$, so that:

$$a_t^B - (1 - \delta) a_{t-1} + \frac{b_t^B - (1 - \delta) b_{t-1}}{\eta^B} \leq 1,$$

or, equivalently,

$$s_t^B - 1 \leq (1 - \delta) s_{t-1}^B. \quad (2)$$

Using equations 1 and 2, we obtain:

$$\frac{s_{t-1}^A}{s_t^B} < \frac{s_t^A - 1}{s_t^B - 1},$$

Furthermore, it is easy to check that $\frac{s_t^A}{s_t^B} \geq \frac{s_t^A - 1}{s_t^B - 1}$, only because s_t^A and s_t^B are strictly greater than 1. Finally, the relative advantage of party A is strictly greater at election $t + 1$ than at election t . This result is summarized in the next proposition:

Proposition 2 *At each election, the relative advantage of the opposition party increases: for all t where A is the opposition party, $\Lambda_{t+1} > \Lambda_t$.*

(Proof: see the reasoning above.)

This result states that the share of votes of the opposition party generally increases from one election to the next. The intuition of this result is that when a party is elected, since he must implement his promises, he gives the opposition party the opportunity to propose a more satisfactory platform on both dimensions. This effect drives the dynamics of elections and, when it is sufficiently large, can lead to a switch in power between the majority and the minority.

4 Political Cycles

In this section, we study the dynamics of elections and public good provision. The questions arising at this point are: What is the long run behavior of the dynamics of elections? Does the parties' probability of winning converge to one half? How do cycles depend on the median voter preferences? On the parties' competences? On the durability of public goods?

4.1 Do parties' winning probabilities converge?

We focus on the special case (iii), where each candidate has one half chance of winning election k . We have shown that the sequence $(\Lambda_t)_t$ is decreasing when A is not in power, and, by symmetry, is increasing when A is in power. Then, the sequence is either always increasing and then for all t , $\Lambda_t \leq 1$, always decreasing and for all t , $\Lambda_t \geq 1$, or follows a cycle.

This sequence can not converge to 1. Indeed, suppose that there exists an election k such that $\Lambda_k = 1$. Then each party has one half chance of being elected in k . Without loss of generality, suppose that A is elected, then $\Lambda_{k+1} < \Lambda_k = 1$, and party B is elected for sure in $k + 1$. The following corollary of proposition 2 summarizes this result:

Corollary 1 *If $\Lambda_k = 1$, the elected party in k is defeated in $k + 1$.*

(The proof relies on the simple argument above.)

The intuition of this result is that, when the median voter is indifferent between both platforms ($\Lambda_k = 1$), he would indeed like both platforms to be implemented in turn¹⁷. But only one party is elected, and provides a polarized platform. At the next election, the opposition party will provide a policy which uses the stock of public goods implemented by the majority, but is closer to the median voter's preferences.

4.2 Stable power

The following proposition provides sufficient conditions for a party to constantly remain in power.

¹⁷The intuition is close to Alesina and Rosenthal (1996) at the difference that, in our model, voters cannot mix policies during a unique mandate, but they get mixed policies through successive mandates with parties turnover.

Proposition 3 *There exists $0 < \underline{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha} < 1$ such that, for all $(\alpha_m, \delta, \eta^A, \eta^B, a_0, b_0) \in [0, 1]^2 \times]1, \bar{\eta}]^2 \times R_+^2$:*

(i) If $\alpha_m \in [0, \underline{\alpha}]$, then party B wins all elections,

(ii) If $\alpha_m \in [\bar{\alpha}, 1]$, then party A wins all elections.

(Proof: see the appendix)

The intuition of this result is straightforward. If the median voter has extreme tastes, then one of the two parties is able to keep power forever by exploiting its comparative advantage in providing one of the two policies.

4.3 Cycles

We now analyze cycles where parties alternate in power. We wish to know when these cycles are not conjunctural, namely, when they are independent of the initial stocks of public good, a_0 and b_0 . We define political cycles in the following way:

Definition 1 *A set of parameters $(\alpha_m, \delta, \eta^A, \eta^B, a_0, b_0) \in [0, 1]^2 \times]1, \bar{\eta}]^2 \times R_+^2$, exhibits **political cycles** if and only if no party wins an infinite number of consecutive elections.*

Formally, we study the case where the sequence $(\Lambda_t)_t$ does not converge and does not diverge. Unfortunately, because there exist many equilibria at each election, we cannot give necessary and sufficient conditions on the set of parameters such that it exhibits political cycles. However, we propose a sufficient condition for the existence of political cycles:

Proposition 4 *For all $(\delta, \eta^A, \eta^B, a_0, b_0) \in]0, 1[\times]1, \bar{\eta}]^2 \times R_+^2$, there exist $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ both in $[0, 1]$, such that: if $\alpha_m \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$ no party can maintain itself indefinitely in power.*

4.4 Comparative statics

Since there exist many equilibria, it seems complicated to provide general comparative statics. To give an insight into the influence of the depreciation rate and the candidates competences on political cycles we suppose, for simplicity, that the winning candidate always implements the median voter

preferred platform¹⁸, that is m_t^A (respectively m_t^B) when candidate A (respectively candidate B) wins the election t . Furthermore, we consider the simple case where $\eta^A = \eta^B = \eta$, i.e. when candidates are equally competent in their respective specialities. Under these assumptions, we obtain the following comparative statics results:

Proposition 5 *The interval $[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$ defined in Proposition 4 is unique and,*

$$\frac{\partial (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)}{\partial \eta} > 0,$$

and,

$$\frac{\partial (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)}{\partial \delta} < 0.$$

The higher the specialization of parties, the larger the parameter range for which political cycles occur. When parties become more specialized, they implement more extreme policies and the median voter is more willing to switch in order to see the other good provided. When the depreciation rate increases, goods have shorter effects and voters need less power turnover.

5 Extensions: parties' lexicographic preferences

The results presented in the precedent sections hold without specifying the choice of an elected party among the generally large set of winning policies. We now allow parties to select one policy in order to maximize a sub-objective function. In other words, parties of lexicographic preferences: they first want to be elected, and select among the winning platforms that platform which maximizes their subobjective. Formally, party A 's program becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z_t^{A*} \in \mathbf{A}(t)}{\text{Max}} \quad \Pi_t^A(z_t^{A*}, z_t^B), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \forall z_t^A \in \mathbf{A}(t), \quad \pi_t^A(z_t^{A*}, z_t^{B*}) \geq \pi_t^A(z_t^A, z_t^{B*}), \end{aligned}$$

¹⁸The median voter preferred platform is always an equilibrium platform for the winning candidate.

and candidate B 's program is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z_t^{B*} \in \mathbf{B}(t)}{\text{Max}} \quad \Pi_t^B(z_t^A, z_t^{B*}), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \forall z_t^B \in \mathbf{B}(t), \quad \pi_t^B(z_t^{A*}, z_t^{B*}) \geq \pi_t^B(z_t^{A*}, z_t^B), \end{aligned}$$

5.1 Re-election concerns

Suppose that parties want to be re-elected, and consider the following reduced form for a long-run, non myopic behavior of political parties. At the election at date t , the winning party's subobjective is to maximize his relative advantage in the next election, that is Λ_{t+1} for party A , and $\frac{1}{\Lambda_{t+1}}$ for party B . A party first wishes to be elected, and then to create the most favorable conditions for its re-election. If $\Lambda_t = 1$, then equilibrium programs are derived from their first objective of victory and they play (m_t^A, m_t^B) . But, if $\Lambda_t \neq 1$, for example $\Lambda_t > 1$, then party A can choose many winning programs. In this case, it chooses a platform $z_t^A = (a_t^A, b_t^A) \in \mathbf{M}^A(t)$. Hence, its relative advantage for the next election is $\Lambda_{t+1} = \frac{1+(1-\delta)(b_t + \frac{a_t}{\eta^A})}{1+(1-\delta)(a_t + \frac{b_t}{\eta^B})} \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha m}}$. Intuitively, since Λ_{t+1} is decreasing in a_t and increasing in b_t , party A will choose a program with a minimum of good a and a maximum of good b . Unfortunately, Λ_{t+1} has no maximum in $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$, but it has a supremum value:

Proposition 6 Λ_{t+1} admits a supremum over $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$ and there exists a unique corresponding program with a minimum quantity of a and a maximum quantity of b .

(The Proof is in the appendix)

This result suggests that parties seeking re-election choose very inefficient platforms, because they do not fully exploit their comparative advantage. The intuition is that a party has to provide some of the public good that he is not competent at producing, in order to induce voters to reelect him next period. Figure 4 illustrates this inefficient platform, denoted \bar{z}_t^A , when A wins the election:




Figure 3: When candidate A has re-election concerns and $\Lambda_t > 1$

5.2 Rent-seeker candidates

The results of previous sections also hold when the candidates' sub-objective is to extract rents from power. Formally, if A wins the election, he chooses to maximize his rent from power:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{r_t^A}{\text{Max}} [r_t^A] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & : \frac{a_t^A}{\eta^A} + b_t^A + r_t^A \leq s_{t-1}^A \\ & \text{and, } (a_t^A, b_t^A) \in \mathbf{M}^A(t) \end{aligned}$$

As in the case of reelection concerns, the problem has no maximum in $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$, but a supremum exists:

Proposition 7 (i) If $\Lambda_t \geq 1$, $r_t^{A*} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Lambda_t}\right) s_{t-1}^A$ is the supremum of r_t^A over $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$,
(ii) If $\Lambda_t \leq 1$, $r_t^{B*} = (1 - \Lambda_t) s_{t-1}^B$ is the supremum of r_t^B over $\mathbf{M}^B(t)$.

One can approximate the maximization program in supposing that the winning candidate P chooses to extract $r_t^{P*} - \varepsilon$, with ε being an infinitesimal positive real number. Then, the higher the relative advantage of candidate

A (Λ_t), the higher the rents he can extract. Figure 5 illustrates this result, where candidate A 's equilibrium platform is denoted \bar{z}_t^A :




Figure 4: When candidate A has re-election concerns and $\Lambda_t > 1$

Furthermore, notice that we know from Proposition 2, that $\Lambda_{t+1} > \Lambda_t$. Hence, if A wins the election at t and $t + 1$, we obtain that $r_{t+1}^{A*} < r_t^{A*}$. This would suggest that the longer a party is in power, the smaller the rents he can extract.. We have to be cautious with this observation because of problems of enforceability. Indeed, if parties cannot be forced to implement their promises, an incumbent who is certain to lose the next election will extract all the rents from power. Persson and Tabellini (2000, chapter 4).discusses this issue and provides a survey of the relevant literature.

6 Conclusion

We have considered an infinite horizon dynamic model of public consumption with durable public goods. We have shown that the longer a party keeps power, the more the opposition is likely to come back to power. Therefore, we have been able to show that policy and political cycles can occur, when

the median voter preferences are balanced enough between the public goods provided by the two parties. This result holds when the parties' main objective is to win the election and is compatible with a large range of candidates sub-objectives, that may change from one election to the next. In particular, we have shown that a candidate seeking re-election will choose a very inefficient platform, providing the minimal quantity of the public good in which he has a comparative advantage.

7 Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1:

(i) If $\Lambda_t > 1$, by definition, the median voter strictly prefers m_t^A than m_t^B . Hence, $m_t^A \in \mathbf{M}^A(t) \neq \emptyset$. Let $z_t^A \in \mathbf{M}^A(t)$ and $z_t^B \in \mathbf{B}(t)$, then $W_m(z_t^A) > W_m(m_t^B) \geq W_m(z_t^B)$. Then $(\pi_t^A, \pi_t^B) = (1, 0)$ and no party has an incentive to deviate. This implies that $\mathbf{M}^A(t) \times \mathbf{B}(t) \subset \mathbf{E}(t)$. Now, choose $z_t^A \notin \mathbf{M}^A(t)$, then $W_m(m_t^B) \geq W_m(z_t^A)$. In this case $\pi_t^A < 1$, then party A has an incentive to move and play, for example, m_t^A .

(ii) The proof is the symmetric reasoning of case (i).

(iii) If $\Lambda_t = 1$, by definition, $W_m(m_t^A) = W_m(m_t^B)$. Suppose that party A plays m_t^A and party B chooses $z_t^B \neq m_t^B$. Since m_t^B is the unique preferred program of the median voter in $\mathbf{B}(t)$, we have that $W_m(m_t^B) > W_m(z_t^B)$, and $\pi_t^B(m_t^A, z_t^B) = 0 < \pi_t^B(m_t^A, m_t^B) = \frac{1}{2}$. The same is true concerning party A , then (m_t^A, m_t^B) is the unique equilibrium.

Proof of Proposition 3:

Let us consider an election at date t . Public goods stocks are $((1 - \delta) a_{t-1}, (1 - \delta) b_{t-1})$, and:

$$\Lambda_t(\alpha_m) = \frac{1 + (1 - \delta) \left(b_{t-1} + \frac{a_{t-1}}{\eta^A} \right) (\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{1 + (1 - \delta) \left(a_{t-1} + \frac{b_{t-1}}{\eta^B} \right) (\eta^B)^{1 - \alpha_m}},$$

This is a continuous and strictly increasing function of α_m . Its value is $\frac{1 + (1 - \delta) \left(b_{t-1} + \frac{a_{t-1}}{\eta^A} \right)}{\eta^B + (1 - \delta) (\eta^B a_{t-1} + b_{t-1})} < 1$, and $\frac{\eta^A + (1 - \delta) (\eta^A b_{t-1} + a_{t-1})}{1 + (1 - \delta) \left(a_{t-1} + \frac{b_{t-1}}{\eta^B} \right)} > 1$ when $\alpha_m = 1$. Then, there exists a unique value of α_m , denoted $\hat{\alpha}_t$, such that $\Lambda_t = 1$:

$$0 < \hat{\alpha}_t = \frac{\ln \left(\eta^B \frac{s_{t-1}^B}{s_{t-1}^A} \right)}{\ln(\eta^A \eta^B)} < 1,$$

Since this is true for all t , there exist $0 < \underline{\alpha} < \bar{\alpha} < 1$, such that for all t :

$$\underline{\alpha} < \hat{\alpha}_t < \bar{\alpha},$$

Finally, if $0 \leq \alpha_m \leq \underline{\alpha}$, then, for all t , $\Lambda_t < 1$, and B wins. If $\bar{\alpha} \leq \alpha_m \leq 1$, then, for all t , $\Lambda_t > 1$, then A wins.

Proof of Proposition 4:

In section 3, we have shown that, when B wins the election t , the two following inequalities hold:

$$s_t^A > (1 - \delta) s_{t-1}^A + 1, \quad (3)$$

and,

$$s_t^B \leq (1 - \delta) s_{t-1}^B + 1. \quad (4)$$

Claim 1: We claim that there exists k such that for all $t \geq k$, B wins the election t . Then the two precedent inequalities hold for all $t \geq k$, then, for all $t > k$:

$$s_t^A > (1 - \delta)^{t-k} s_k^A + t - k, \quad (5)$$

$$s_t^B \leq (1 - \delta)^{t-k} s_k^B + t - k. \quad (6)$$

Combining Inequalities 5 and 6 leads to the following inequality:

$$\frac{s_t^A}{s_t^B} > \frac{(1 - \delta)^{t-k} s_k^A + t - k}{(1 - \delta)^{t-k} s_k^B + t - k},$$

Since B wins forever after k , then for all $t > k$, $\Lambda_t \leq 1$. Furthermore $(\Lambda_t)_t$ is increasing, then it converges to a value $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Remember that $\Lambda_{t+1} = \frac{s_t^A}{s_t^B} \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}}$. Hence, since $(1 - \delta) < 1$,

$$\tilde{\Lambda} > \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}},$$

Then, there exists a real number $0 < \varepsilon_1 < 1$, such that a necessary condition for Claim 1 is:

$$\tilde{\Lambda} > \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}} + \varepsilon_1 > \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}}.$$

Claim 2: We claim that there exists k such that for all $t \geq k$, A wins the election t . Then for all $t > k$, $\Lambda_t \geq 1$. By an argument symmetric to that of Claim 1, $(\Lambda_t)_t$ converges to $\hat{\Lambda}$, and there exists a real number $0 < \varepsilon_2 < 1$, such that a necessary condition for Claim 2 is:

$$\hat{\Lambda} < \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}} - \varepsilon_2 < \frac{(\eta^A)^{\alpha_m}}{(\eta^B)^{1-\alpha_m}}.$$

Finally, if,

$$\frac{\ln(\eta^B) + \ln(1 - \varepsilon_1)}{\ln(\eta^A \eta^B)} \leq \alpha_m \leq \frac{\ln(\eta^B) + \ln(1 + \varepsilon_2)}{\ln(\eta^A \eta^B)},$$

then $\widehat{\Lambda} < 1 < \widetilde{\Lambda}$, and Claim 1 and 2 are contradictory, so that no party can win an infinite number of consecutive elections. Then there exist $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ such that no party can win an infinite number of consecutive elections.

Proof of Proposition 6:

First we prove that $\bar{a}_t = \arg \min_{a_t \in [0, \eta^A s_{t-1}^A]} \left(W_m \left(a_t, s_{t-1}^A - \frac{a_t}{\eta^A} \right) = W_m(m_t^B) \right)$ exists

and is unique. This equation is equivalent to:

$$\left(\frac{\mu}{\alpha_m} \right)^{\alpha_m} \left(\frac{1 - \mu}{1 - \alpha_m} \right)^{1 - \alpha_m} = \frac{1}{\Lambda_t(\alpha_m)}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mu = \frac{a_t}{\eta^A s_{t-1}^A} \in [0, 1]$. Here $\Lambda_t > 1$, and, by proposition 3, $\alpha_m > 0$. The right-hand side of (7) is null when $\mu = 0$ and equal to 1 when $\mu = \alpha_m$. Thus 7 admits a solution. If $\alpha_m = 1$, then the right-hand side is strictly decreasing in μ , and the solution is unique. If $\alpha_m < 1$, then the right-hand side is concave in μ , is null when $\mu = 0$ or 1, and maximal when $\mu = \alpha_m$. Thus 7 has two different solutions. Hence, the set of solutions is finite, then the argmin exists and is unique. Now, consider the following maximization program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z_t^A \in \mathbf{A}(t)}{\text{Max}} \quad \Lambda_{t+1}, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & W_m(z_t^A) \geq W_m(m_t^B). \end{aligned}$$

Since Λ_{t+1} is strictly decreasing in a_t and strictly increasing in b_t , $\bar{z}_t = \left(\bar{a}_t, s_{t-1}^A - \frac{\bar{a}_t}{\eta^A} \right)$ is the unique solution to this maximization problem, and the optimal value of Λ_{t+1} is a supremum of Λ_{t+1} over $\mathbf{M}^A(t)$.

Proof of Proposition 7: (i) It is simple to verify that the median voter's preferred program in $\mathbf{A}(t)$ when candidate A extracts a rent r_t^A is $\tilde{z}_t^A = \left(\eta^A \alpha_m (s_{t-1}^A - r_t^A), (1 - \alpha_m) (s_{t-1}^A - r_t^A) \right)$. Then, the median voter weakly prefers \tilde{z}_t^A to m_t^B if and only if:

$$r_t^A \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\Lambda_t} \right) s_{t-1}^A.$$

(ii) Symmetrically, the median voter preferred platform in $\mathbf{B}(t)$, when candidate B extracts a rent r_t^B , is $\tilde{z}_t^B = (\alpha_m (s_{t-1}^B - r_t^B), \eta^B (1 - \alpha_m) (s_{t-1}^B - r_t^B))$. Then, the median voter weakly prefers \tilde{z}_t^B to m_t^A if and only if:

$$r_t^B \leq (1 - \Lambda_t) s_{t-1}^B.$$

Proof of Proposition 5:

Claim 1: There exists k such that for all $t \geq k$, B wins the election t . Then at $t + 1$, he implements $m_{t+1}^B = (\alpha_m s_t^B, \eta (1 - \alpha_m) s_t^B)$ and:

$$s_{t+1}^A = 1 + (1 - \delta) \left(\eta (1 - \alpha_m) + \frac{\alpha_m}{\eta} \right) s_t^B,$$

and,

$$s_{t+1}^B = 1 + (1 - \delta) s_t^B.$$

Since $\delta > 0$, then s_t^B converges to $\frac{1}{\delta}$, and s_t^A to $1 + \frac{1-\delta}{\delta} \left(\eta (1 - \alpha_m) + \frac{\alpha_m}{\eta} \right)$. Hence, Λ_t converges to:

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) = \left(\delta + (1 - \delta) \left(\eta (1 - \alpha_m) + \frac{\alpha_m}{\eta} \right) \right) (\eta)^{2\alpha_m - 1},$$

By Proposition 2, $(\Lambda_t)_t$ increases and we obtain that *Claim 1* is equivalent to $\tilde{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) \leq 1$. The inequality is weak, because by Corollary 2 Λ_t cannot attain its limit when $\tilde{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) = 1$. Let $f^B(\alpha_m) = \tilde{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) - 1$, then *Claim 1* is equivalent to $f^B(\alpha_m) \leq 0$. Now we turn to the symmetric Claim for party A :

Claim 2: There exists k such that for all $t \geq k$, A wins the election t . With the same arguments as those of *Claim 1*, we obtain that $(\Lambda_t)_t$, which is now decreasing, converges to:

$$\hat{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) = \frac{1}{\delta + (1 - \delta) \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_m}{\eta} + \eta \alpha_m \right)} (\eta)^{2\alpha_m - 1},$$

And *Claim 2* is equivalent to $\hat{\Lambda}(\alpha_m) \geq 1$. Let $f^A(\alpha_m) = \frac{1}{\hat{\Lambda}(\alpha_m)} - 1$, then *Claim 2* is equivalent to $f^A(\alpha_m) \leq 0$. Furthermore,

$$f^A(\alpha_m) \propto \delta + (1 - \delta) \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_m}{\eta} + \eta \alpha_m \right) - (\eta)^{2\alpha_m - 1},$$

The right-hand term is clearly strictly concave in α_m and is equal to $\delta \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta}\right) > 0$ when $\alpha_m = 0$ and $\delta(1 - \eta) < 0$ when $\alpha_m = 1$. Hence, $f^A(\alpha_m)$ as a unique root in $]0, 1[$, denoted α_2 . Furthermore, $f^A\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \delta + \frac{(1-\delta)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\eta} + \eta\right) > 0$, then $\alpha_2 > \frac{1}{2}$. Observe that $f^A(1 - \alpha_m) = f^B(\alpha_m)$, then $f^B(\alpha_m)$ has a unique root $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. Finally, *Claim 1* and *Claim 2* are both contradicted if and only if $\alpha_m \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$.

Now we can turn to the comparative statics. α_2 is implicitly defined as a function of δ and η by:

$$\delta\eta + (1 - \delta)(1 - \alpha_2 + \eta^2\alpha_2) - (\eta)^{2\alpha_2} = 0, \quad (8)$$

Then, differentiating this equation with respect to η leads to $\frac{\partial\alpha_2}{\partial\eta} = \frac{N(\delta, \eta)}{D(\delta, \eta)}$ with,

$$N = 2\alpha_2(\eta)^{2\alpha_2-1} - \delta - 2\alpha_2(1 - \delta)\eta,$$

and,

$$D = (1 - \delta)(\eta^2 - 1) - 2(\eta)^{2\alpha_2} \ln \eta,$$

It is easy to verify that $\frac{\partial N}{\partial\delta} = 2\alpha_2\eta - 1 > 0$ because $\alpha_2 > \frac{1}{2}$. Since $\eta > 1$, we obtain:

$$N \leq 2\alpha_2((\eta)^{2\alpha_2-1} - \eta) < 0,$$

Furthermore,

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial\eta} \propto (1 - \delta)(\eta)^{2(1-\alpha_2)} - (1 + 2\alpha_2 \ln \eta),$$

Let $g(\alpha_2) = (1 - \delta)(\eta)^{2(1-\alpha_2)} - (1 + 2\alpha_2 \ln \eta)$, then $g'(\alpha_2) < 0$. Since $g(1) = -\delta - 2\alpha_2 \ln \eta$, then $\frac{\partial D}{\partial\eta} < 0$. Furthermore, when $\eta = 1$, $D = 0$, then,

$$D < 0,$$

Finally,

$$\frac{\partial\alpha_2}{\partial\eta} > 0.$$

Concerning the depreciation rate, differentiating 8 with respect to δ leads to:

$$\frac{\partial\alpha_2}{\partial\delta} = \frac{1 + (\eta^2 - 1)\alpha_2 - \eta}{D},$$

Here, the numerator of the right-hand side is increasing in α_2 and is equal to $(\eta - 1)^2$ when $\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, then it is always positive, hence:

$$\frac{\partial \alpha_2}{\partial \delta} < 0.$$

References

- [1] Abelson, R.P., and A. Levy (1985), “Decision Making and and Decision Theory”, in G. Lindzey and E. Aronson eds., *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed., vol. 1), New York: Random House.
- [2] Alesina, A., and H. Rosenthal (1996), “A Theory of Divided Government”, *Econometrica* 64, 6: 1311-1341.
- [3] Ansolabehere, S. and J.M. Snyder (2002), “The Incumbency Advantage in U.S. Elections: An Analysis of State and Federal Offices, 1942-2000”, *mimeo*, MIT.
- [4] Alesina, A. and J. Sachs (1988), “Political Parties and the Business Cycle in the United States, 1948-1984”, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* (February): 63-84.
- [5] Ansolabehere, S. and J.M. Snyder (2000), “Valence Politics and Equilibrium in Spatial Election Models”, *Public Choice* 103: 327-336.
- [6] Aragonés, E. (1997), “Negativity Effect and the emergence of ideologies”, *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 9, 2: 198-210.
- [7] Aragonés, E., and T. Palfrey 2002. ”Mixed Equilibrium in a Downsian Model with a Favored Candidate.” *Journal of Economic Theory* 103: 131-161.
- [8] Azzimonti-Renzo, M. (2005), “On the dynamic inefficiency of government”, *mimeo*, University of Iowa.
- [9] Azzimonti-Renzo, M., P. Sarte, and J. Soares (2003), “Optimal public investment and time consistency”, *Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond Working Paper* 03-10.
- [10] Banks, J., and R. Sundaram (1996), “Electoral accountability and selection effects”, *mimeo*, University of Rochester.
- [11] Banks, J., and R. Sundaram (1993), “Adverse selections and moral hazard in a repeated elections model”, in *Political Economy: Institutions, Information, Competition and Representation*, W. Barnett, M. Hinich, and N. Schofield eds., New York: Cambridge University Press.

- [12] Baron, D. (1996), “A Dynamic Theory of Collective Goods Programs”, *American Political Science Review* 90, 2: 316-330.
- [13] Battaglini, M., and S. Coate (2005), “Inefficiency in Legislative Policy-Making: A Dynamic Analysis”, *NBER Working Paper* #11495.
- [14] Beck, N. (1982), “Parties, Administrations, and American Economic Outcomes”, *American Political Science Review* 76: 83-94.
- [15] Bendor, J., D. Mookherjee and D. Ray, “Satisficing and Selection in Electoral Competition”, *New York University Working Paper*.
- [16] Berry, J.L.(1991), *Long-Wave Rhythms in Economic Development and Political Behavior*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- [17] Chappel, H., and W. Keech (1986), “Party Differences in Macroeconomic Policies and Outcomes”, *American Economic Review* (may): 71-74.
- [18] Cox, G.W., and J. Katz (2002), *Elbridge Gerry’s Salamander: The Electoral Consequences of the Reappointment Revolution*, New York: University of Cambridge Press.
- [19] Goertzel, T. (2005), “Cycles in the Mass Psychology of American Electoral Behavior”, forthcoming in *Journal of Psicologia Politica*.
- [20] Gomes, A., and P. Jehiel (2004), “Dynamic Processes of Social and Economic Interactions: On the Persistence of Inefficiencies”, *PIER Working Paper* 01-13, University of Pennsylvania.
- [21] Grandmont, J.M. (1978), “Intermediate preferences and the majority rule”, *Econometrica* 46: 317-330.
- [22] Groseclose, T. (1999), “Character, charisma, and candidate locations: Downsian models when one candidate has a valence advantage”, *Working Paper*, Stanford University.
- [23] Hassler, J., K. Storesletten and F. Zilibotti (2003), “Democratic Public Good Provision”, *mimeo*, IIES: Stockholm.
- [24] Hibbs, D.A (1977), “Political parties and Macroeconomic policy”, *American Political Science Review* 71: 1467-78.

- [25] Klinberg F. 1952. "The historical alternation of moods in American foreign policy." *World Politics* 4: 239-273.
- [26] Kramer, G. (1977), "A dynamical model of political equilibrium", *Journal of Economic Theory* 16: 310-334.
- [27] Persson T., and G. Tabellini (2000), *Political Economics: Explaining Economic Policy*, The MIT Press.
- [28] McKelvey, R.D. and R.G. Riezman (1992), "Seniorty in Legislatures", *American Political Science Review* 86: 951-965.
- [29] Prat, A., (2002), "Campaign Spending with Office-Seeking Politicians, Rational Voters, and Multiple Lobbies", *Journal of Economic Theory* 103: 162-189.
- [30] Rogoff, K. (1990), "Equilibrium political business cycles", *American Economic Review* 80: 21-36.
- [31] Rogoff, K., and A. Siebert (1988), "Elections and macroeconomic policy cycles", *Review of Economic Studies* 55: 1-16.
- [32] Roemer, J.E. (1995), "Political Cycles", *Economics and Politics* 7: 1-20.
- [33] Schlesinger A. (1992),. "The turn of the cycle.". *The New Yorker* 68 (November 16): 46-54.
- [34] Schlesinger A. (1986),. *The Cycles of American History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- [35] Schlesinger A. (1949), *Paths to the Present*. New York: MacMillan.
- [36] Stokes, D. (1992), "Valence Politics", in *Electoral Politics*, Dennis Kavanaugh eds., Oxford: Clarendon Press: 141-164.
- [37] Tabellini, G., and A. Alesina (1990), "Voting on the budget deficit", *American Economic Review* 80: 37-39.
- [38] Tabellini, G., and V. La Via (1989), "Money, Debt, and Deficits in the U.S.", *Review of Economics and Statistics* (february).

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

<http://www.repec.org>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u></i>
ETA	2.2004	<i>Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u></i>
PRA	3.2004	<i>Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u></i>
ETA	4.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u></i>
ETA	5.2004	<i>Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u></i>
CCMP	6.2004	<i>Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u></i>
PRA	7.2004	<i>Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u></i>
PRA	8.2004	<i>Wolfgang AUSENNEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u></i>
PRA	9.2004	<i>Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u></i>
PRA	10.2004	<i>Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u></i>
PRA	11.2004	<i>Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u></i>
PRA	12.2004	<i>Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u></i>
PRA	13.2004	<i>Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u></i>
PRA	14.2004	<i>Gadi FIBICH, Arieh GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u></i>
PRA	15.2004	<i>Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u></i>
PRA	16.2004	<i>Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	17.2004	<i>Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u></i>
NRM	18.2004	<i>Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u></i>
SIEV	19.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u></i>
NRM	20.2004	<i>Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u></i>
NRM	21.2004	<i>Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u></i>
NRM	22.2004	<i>Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u></i>
NRM	23.2004	<i>Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u></i>
NRM	24.2004	<i>Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u></i>
NRM	25.2004	<i>Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u></i>
NRM	26.2004	<i>Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u></i>
NRM	27.2004	<i>Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u></i>
CSRM	28.2004	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u></i>
NRM	29.2004	<i>Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u></i>
NRM	30.2004	<i>Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u></i>
CCMP	31.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u></i>
CCMP	32.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u></i>
CTN	33.2004	<i>Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u></i>
KTHC	34.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u></i>
KTHC	35.2004	<i>Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u></i>

KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI</i> (Ixviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE</i> (Ixviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE</i> (Ixviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE</i> : <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST</i> : <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS</i> (Ixix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u>
KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI</i> : <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>
CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRHUELA-VILLAR</i> : <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL</i> (Ixvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLES MARK THORSEN</i> (Ixvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU</i> (Ixvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE</i> (Ixvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition al Economy</u>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG</i> : <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI</i> : <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF</i> (Ixvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN</i> (Ixvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE</i> (Ixvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON</i> : <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN</i> : <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (Ixvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI</i> (Ixvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO</i> : <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ</i> (Ixvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN</i> (Ixvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK</i> (Ixvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> : <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA</i> : <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO</i> : <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER</i> : <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA</i> : <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u>

CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (lxx): <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES</i> (lxx): <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u>
CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE</i> (lxx): <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO</i> (lxx): <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u>
CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT</i> (lxx): <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN</i> (lxx): <u>Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement</u>
CTN	84.2004	<i>Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ</i> (lxx): <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT</i> (lxx): <u>Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players</u>
IEM	86.2004	<i>Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power</u>
KTHC	87.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPHAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income</u>
CCMP	88.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT</i> : <u>Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey</u>
IEM	89.2004	<i>A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE</i> : <u>Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?</u>
GG	90.2004	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Agreements and Technology Policy</u>
PRA	91.2004	<i>Sergei IZMALKOV</i> (lxx): <u>Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction</u>
KTHC	92.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI</i> : <u>Cities and Cultures</u>
KTHC	93.2004	<i>Massimo DEL GATTO</i> : <u>Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution</u>
CCMP	94.2004	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON</i> : <u>Equilibrium with a Market of Permits</u>
CCMP	95.2004	<i>Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply</u>
CCMP	96.2004	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise</u>
CTN	97.2004	<i>Gustavo BERGANTIÑOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA</i> : <u>Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form</u>
CTN	98.2004	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK</i> : <u>Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation</u>
GG	99.2004	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA</i> : <u>The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements</u>
SIEV	100.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents</u>
SIEV	101.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP</i> : <u>A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reductions in Pesticide Risk Exposure</u>
NRM	102.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN</i> : <u>Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test</u>
CCMP	103.2004	<i>Alessandra GORIA e Gretel GAMBARELLI</i> : <u>Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy</u>
PRA	104.2004	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENI</i> : <u>The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation</u>
PRA	105.2004	<i>John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGA</i> : <u>Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies</u>
PRA	106.2004	<i>Kira BÖRNER</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?</u>
PRA	107.2004	<i>Pehr-Johan NORBÄCK and Lars PERSSON</i> : <u>Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets</u>
SIEV	108.2004	<i>Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAINARDI</i> : <u>Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective</u>
CTN	109.2004	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI</i> : <u>The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results</u>
NRM	110.2004	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look</u>
SIEV	111.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study</u>
KTHC	112.2004	<i>Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI</i> : <u>Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making</u>
SIEV	113.2004	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Laura ONOFRI</i> : <u>The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications</u>
IEM	114.2004	<i>Patrick CAYRADE</i> : <u>Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?</u>
IEM	115.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA</i> : <u>Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies</u>

IEM	116.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Social Costs of Energy Disruptions</u></i>
IEM	117.2004	<i>Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply</u></i>
IEM	118.2004	<i>David FISK: <u>Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?</u></i>
IEM	119.2004	<i>Giacomo LUCIANI: <u>Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?</u></i>
IEM	120.2004	<i>L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT: <u>The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets</u></i>
KTHC	121.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
NRM	122.2004	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslaw MYSLAK and Anita FASSIO: <u>An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application</u></i>
NRM	123.2004	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach</u></i>
ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK: <u>Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited</u></i>
NRM	125.2004	<i>Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI: <u>Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach</u></i>
PRA	126.2004	<i>Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI: <u>The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic</u></i>
CCMP	127.2004	<i>Maria BERRITTELLA, Andrea BIGANO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism</u></i>
CCMP	128.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH: <u>A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy Savings</u></i>
NRM	129.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth</u></i>
PRA	130.2004	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Mara FACCIO: <u>Reluctant Privatization</u></i>
SIEV	131.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA and Mara THIENE: <u>Destination Choice Models for Rock Climbing in the Northeast Alps: A Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation</u></i>
SIEV	132.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA Kenneth G. WILLIS and Melinda ACUTT: <u>Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models</u></i>
IEM	133.2004	<i>Santiago J. RUBIO: <u>On Capturing Oil Rents with a National Excise Tax Revisited</u></i>
ETA	134.2004	<i>Ascensión ANDINA DÍAZ: <u>Political Competition when Media Create Candidates' Charisma</u></i>
SIEV	135.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI: <u>Robustness of VSL Values from Contingent Valuation Surveys</u></i>
CCMP	136.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: <u>Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices</u></i>
ETA	137.2004	<i>Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK: <u>Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game</u></i>
CCMP	138.2004	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG: <u>The World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund and China</u></i>
CCMP	139.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Time Profile of Climate Change Stabilization Policy</u></i>
NRM	140.2004	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS and Michele MORETTO: <u>The Value of Flexibility in the Italian Water Service Sector: A Real Option Analysis</u></i>
PRA	141.2004	<i>Patrick BAJARI, Stephanie HOUGHTON and Steven TADELIS (lxxi): <u>Bidding for Incomplete Contracts</u></i>
PRA	142.2004	<i>Susan ATHEY, Jonathan LEVIN and Enrique SEIRA (lxxi): <u>Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions</u></i>
PRA	143.2004	<i>David GOLDREICH (lxxi): <u>Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions</u></i>
PRA	144.2004	<i>Roberto BURGNET (lxxi): <u>Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics</u></i>
PRA	145.2004	<i>Ali HORTACSU and Samita SAREEN (lxxi): <u>Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions</u></i>
PRA	146.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH, Patrick LEGROS and Nicolas SAHUGUET (lxxi): <u>How to Win Twice at an Auction. On the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets</u></i>
PRA	147.2004	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI, Aleksandar PEKEČ and Ilia TSETLIN (lxxi): <u>Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions</u></i>
PRA	148.2004	<i>John ASKER and Estelle CANTILLON (lxxi): <u>Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions</u></i>
PRA	149.2004	<i>Philip A. HAILE, Han HONG and Matthew SHUM (lxxi): <u>Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions</u></i>
PRA	150.2004	<i>François DEGEORGE, François DERRIEN and Kent L. WOMACK (lxxi): <u>Quid Pro Quo in IPOs: Why Bookbuilding is Dominating Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	151.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Silvia DALL'OLIO: <u>Russia: The Long Road to Ratification. Internal Institution and Pressure Groups in the Kyoto Protocol's Adoption Process</u></i>
CCMP	152.2004	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Does Endogenous Technical Change Make a Difference in Climate Policy Analysis? A Robustness Exercise with the FEEM-RICE Model</u></i>
PRA	153.2004	<i>Alejandro M. MANELLI and Daniel R. VINCENT (lxxi): <u>Multidimensional Mechanism Design: Revenue Maximization and the Multiple-Good Monopoly</u></i>
ETA	154.2004	<i>Nicola ACOCELLA, Giovanni Di BARTOLOMEO and Wilfried PAUWELS: <u>Is there any Scope for Corporatism in Stabilization Policies?</u></i>
CTN	155.2004	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with Externalities</u></i>
CCMP	156.2004	<i>Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants</u></i>

CCMP	157.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Marzio GALEOTTI and Alessandro LANZA: <u>How Consistent are Alternative Short-Term Climate Policies with Long-Term Goals?</u></i>
ETA	158.2004	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO: <u>Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Individual Labor Supply</u></i>
ETA	159.2004	<i>William BROCK and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: <u>Spatial Analysis: Development of Descriptive and Normative Methods with Applications to Economic-Ecological Modelling</u></i>
KTHC	160.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>On the Incidence of a Tax on PureRent with Infinite Horizons</u></i>
IEM	161.2004	<i>Xavier LABANDEIRA, José M. LABEAGA and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ: <u>Microsimulating the Effects of Household Energy Price Changes in Spain</u></i>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

CCMP	1.2005	<i>Stéphane HALLEGATTE: <u>Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change</u></i>
CCMP	2.2005	<i>Qiang WU and Paulo Augusto NUNES: <u>Application of Technological Control Measures on Vehicle Pollution: A Cost-Benefit Analysis in China</u></i>
CCMP	3.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON, Maren LAU, Richard S.J. TOL and Yuan ZHOU: <u>A Global Database of Domestic and International Tourist Numbers at National and Subnational Level</u></i>
CCMP	4.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice</u></i>
ETA	5.2005	<i>Hubert KEMPF: <u>Is Inequality Harmful for the Environment in a Growing Economy?</u></i>
CCMP	6.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>The Dynamics of Carbon and Energy Intensity in a Model of Endogenous Technical Change</u></i>
IEM	7.2005	<i>David CALEF and Robert GOBLE: <u>The Allure of Technology: How France and California Promoted Electric Vehicles to Reduce Urban Air Pollution</u></i>
ETA	8.2005	<i>Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>An Empirical Contribution to the Debate on Corruption Democracy and Environmental Policy</u></i>
CCMP	9.2005	<i>Angelo ANTOCI: <u>Environmental Resources Depletion and Interplay Between Negative and Positive Externalities in a Growth Model</u></i>
CTN	10.2005	<i>Frédéric DEROLAN: <u>Cost-Reducing Alliances and Local Spillovers</u></i>
NRM	11.2005	<i>Francesco SINDICO: <u>The GMO Dispute before the WTO: Legal Implications for the Trade and Environment Debate</u></i>
KTHC	12.2005	<i>Carla MASSIDDA: <u>Estimating the New Keynesian Phillips Curve for Italian Manufacturing Sectors</u></i>
KTHC	13.2005	<i>Michele MORETTO and Gianpaolo ROSSINI: <u>Start-up Entry Strategies: Employer vs. Nonemployer firms</u></i>
PRCG	14.2005	<i>Clara GRAZIANO and Annalisa LUPORINI: <u>Ownership Concentration, Monitoring and Optimal Board Structure</u></i>
CSRM	15.2005	<i>Parashar KULKARNI: <u>Use of Ecolabels in Promoting Exports from Developing Countries to Developed Countries: Lessons from the Indian LeatherFootwear Industry</u></i>
KTHC	16.2005	<i>Adriana DI LIBERTO, Roberto MURA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How to Measure the Unobservable: A Panel Technique for the Analysis of TFP Convergence</u></i>
KTHC	17.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI: <u>Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms</u></i>
KTHC	18.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI: <u>Strategic Intellectual Property Rights Policy and North-South Technology Transfer</u></i>
KTHC	19.2005	<i>Mombert HOPPE: <u>Technology Transfer Through Trade</u></i>
PRCG	20.2005	<i>Roberto ROSON: <u>Platform Competition with Endogenous Multihoming</u></i>
CCMP	21.2005	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Regional and Sub-Global Climate Blocs. A Game Theoretic Perspective on Bottom-up Climate Regimes</u></i>
IEM	22.2005	<i>Fausto CAVALLARO: <u>An Integrated Multi-Criteria System to Assess Sustainable Energy Options: An Application of the Promethee Method</u></i>
CTN	23.2005	<i>Michael FINUS, Pierre v. MOUCHE and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN: <u>Uniqueness of Coalitional Equilibria</u></i>
IEM	24.2005	<i>Wietze LISE: <u>Decomposition of CO2 Emissions over 1980–2003 in Turkey</u></i>
CTN	25.2005	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>The Core of Directed Network Problems with Quotas</u></i>
SIEV	26.2005	<i>Susanne MENZEL and Riccardo SCARPA: <u>Protection Motivation Theory and Contingent Valuation: Perceived Realism, Threat and WTP Estimates for Biodiversity Protection</u></i>
NRM	27.2005	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Anna MONTINI: <u>The Determinants of Residential Water Demand Empirical Evidence for a Panel of Italian Municipalities</u></i>
CCMP	28.2005	<i>Laurent GILOTTE and Michel de LARA: <u>Precautionary Effect and Variations of the Value of Information</u></i>
NRM	29.2005	<i>Paul SARFO-MENSAH: <u>Exportation of Timber in Ghana: The Menace of Illegal Logging Operations</u></i>
CCMP	30.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Alessandra GORIA, Jacqueline HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>The Effect of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events on Tourism</u></i>
NRM	31.2005	<i>Maria Angeles GARCIA-VALIÑAS: <u>Decentralization and Environment: An Application to Water Policies</u></i>
NRM	32.2005	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS, Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Concession Length and Investment Timing Flexibility</u></i>
CCMP	33.2005	<i>Joseph HUBER: <u>Key Environmental Innovations</u></i>
CTN	34.2005	<i>Antoni CALVÓ-ARMENGOL and Rahmi İLKILIÇ (Ixxii): <u>Pairwise-Stability and Nash Equilibria in Network Formation</u></i>
CTN	35.2005	<i>Francesco FERI (Ixxii): <u>Network Formation with Endogenous Decay</u></i>
CTN	36.2005	<i>Frank H. PAGE, Jr. and Myrna H. WOODERS (Ixxii): <u>Strategic Basins of Attraction, the Farsighted Core, and Network Formation Games</u></i>

CTN	37.2005	<i>Alessandra CASELLA and Nobuyuki HANAOKI</i> (lxxii): <u>Information Channels in Labor Markets. On the Resilience of Referral Hiring</u>
CTN	38.2005	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON and Alison WATTS</i> (lxxii): <u>Social Games: Matching and the Play of Finitely Repeated Games</u>
CTN	39.2005	<i>Anna BOGOMOLNAIA, Michel LE BRETON, Alexei SAVVATEEV and Shlomo WEBER</i> (lxxii): <u>The Egalitarian Sharing Rule in Provision of Public Projects</u>
CTN	40.2005	<i>Francesco FERI</i> : <u>Stochastic Stability in Network with Decay</u>
CTN	41.2005	<i>Aart de ZEEUW</i> (lxxii): <u>Dynamic Effects on the Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
NRM	42.2005	<i>C. Martijn van der HEIDE, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH, Ekko C. van IERLAND and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Measuring the Economic Value of Two Habitat Defragmentation Policy Scenarios for the Veluwe, The Netherlands</u>
PRCG	43.2005	<i>Carla VIEIRA and Ana Paula SERRA</i> : <u>Abnormal Returns in Privatization Public Offerings: The Case of Portuguese Firms</u>
SIEV	44.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Valentina ZANATTA and Paolo ROSATO</i> : <u>Combining Actual and Contingent Behavior to Estimate the Value of Sports Fishing in the Lagoon of Venice</u>
CTN	45.2005	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>Participation in International Environmental Agreements: The Role of Timing and Regulation</u>
CCMP	46.2005	<i>Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Are EU Environmental Policies Too Demanding for New Members States?</u>
IEM	47.2005	<i>Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Modeling Factor Demands with SEM and VAR: An Empirical Comparison</u>
CTN	48.2005	<i>Olivier TERCIEUX and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH</i> (lxx): <u>A Characterization of Stochastically Stable Networks</u>
CTN	49.2005	<i>Ana MAULEON, José SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Vincent J. VANNETELBOSCH</i> (lxxii): <u>R&D Networks Among Unionized Firms</u>
CTN	50.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Optimal Transfers and Participation Decisions in International Environmental Agreements</u>
KTHC	51.2005	<i>Valeria GATTAI</i> : <u>From the Theory of the Firm to FDI and Internalisation: A Survey</u>
CCMP	52.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Trade Obligations: A Theoretical Analysis of the Doha Proposal</u>
SIEV	53.2005	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Gretel GAMBARELLI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Economic Valuation of On Site Material Damages of High Water on Economic Activities based in the City of Venice: Results from a Dose-Response-Expert-Based Valuation Approach</u>
ETA	54.2005	<i>Alessandra del BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI, Charles P. HIMMELBERG and Paola ROTA</i> : <u>Investment and Time to Plan: A Comparison of Structures vs. Equipment in a Panel of Italian Firms</u>
CCMP	55.2005	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>Emissions Trading, CDM, JI, and More – The Climate Strategy of the EU</u>
ETA	56.2005	<i>Maia DAVID and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ</i> : <u>Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry</u>
ETA	57.2005	<i>Alain-Désiré NIMUBONA and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESGAGNÉ</i> : <u>The Pigouvian Tax Rule in the Presence of an Eco-Industry</u>
NRM	58.2005	<i>Helmut KARL, Antje MÖLLER, Ximena MATUS, Edgar GRANDE and Robert KAISER</i> : <u>Environmental Innovations: Institutional Impacts on Co-operations for Sustainable Development</u>
SIEV	59.2005	<i>Dimitra VOUVAKI and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> (lxxiii): <u>Criteria for Assessing Sustainable Development: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Evidence for the Case of Greece</u>
CCMP	60.2005	<i>Andreas LÖSCHEL and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE</i> : <u>Impure Public Goods and Technological Interdependencies</u>
PRCG	61.2005	<i>Christoph A. SCHALTEGGER and Benno TORGLER</i> : <u>Trust and Fiscal Performance: A Panel Analysis with Swiss Data</u>
ETA	62.2005	<i>Irene VALSECCHI</i> : <u>A Role for Instructions</u>
NRM	63.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Gianni LOCATELLI</i> : <u>A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach to the Assessment of Natural Parks' Economic Efficiency and Sustainability. The Case of Italian National Parks</u>
SIEV	64.2005	<i>Arianne T. de BLAEIJ, Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH</i> : <u>Modeling 'No-choice' Responses in Attribute Based Valuation Surveys</u>
CTN	65.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI</i> : <u>Applications of Negotiation Theory to Water Issues</u>
CTN	66.2005	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI</i> : <u>Advances in Negotiation Theory: Bargaining, Coalitions and Fairness</u>
KTHC	67.2005	<i>Sandra WALLMAN</i> (lxxiv): <u>Network Capital and Social Trust: Pre-Conditions for 'Good' Diversity?</u>
KTHC	68.2005	<i>Asimina CHRISTOFOROU</i> (lxxiv): <u>On the Determinants of Social Capital in Greece Compared to Countries of the European Union</u>
KTHC	69.2005	<i>Eric M. USLANER</i> (lxxiv): <u>Varieties of Trust</u>
KTHC	70.2005	<i>Thomas P. LYON</i> (lxxiv): <u>Making Capitalism Work: Social Capital and Economic Growth in Italy, 1970-1995</u>
KTHC	71.2005	<i>Graziella BERTOCCHI and Chiara STROZZI</i> (lxxv): <u>Citizenship Laws and International Migration in Historical Perspective</u>
KTHC	72.2005	<i>Elsbeth van HYLCKAMA Vlieg</i> (lxxv): <u>Accommodating Differences</u>
KTHC	73.2005	<i>Renato SANSA and Ercole SORI</i> (lxxv): <u>Governance of Diversity Between Social Dynamics and Conflicts in Multicultural Cities. A Selected Survey on Historical Bibliography</u>
IEM	74.2005	<i>Alberto LONGO and Anil MARKANDYA</i> : <u>Identification of Options and Policy Instruments for the Internalisation of External Costs of Electricity Generation. Dissemination of External Costs of Electricity Supply Making Electricity External Costs Known to Policy-Makers</u> <u>MAXIMA</u>

IEM	75.2005	<i>Margherita GRASSO and Matteo MANERA: <u>Asymmetric Error Correction Models for the Oil-Gasoline Price Relationship</u></i>
ETA	76.2005	<i>Umberto CHERUBINI and Matteo MANERA: <u>Hunting the Living Dead A “Peso Problem” in Corporate Liabilities Data</u></i>
CTN	77.2005	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD: <u>Cartel Stability under an Optimal Sharing Rule</u></i>
ETA	78.2005	<i>Joëlle NOAILLY, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Cees A. WITHAGEN (lxxvi): <u>Local and Global Interactions in an Evolutionary Resource Game</u></i>
ETA	79.2005	<i>Joëlle NOAILLY, Cees A. WITHAGEN and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH (lxxvi): <u>Spatial Evolution of Social Norms in a Common-Pool Resource Game</u></i>
CCMP	80.2005	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Roberto ZOBOLI: <u>Economic Instruments and Induced Innovation: The Case of End-of-Life Vehicles European Policies</u></i>
NRM	81.2005	<i>Anna LASUT: <u>Creative Thinking and Modelling for the Decision Support in Water Management</u></i>
CCMP	82.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Assess the Relative Efficiency of Different Climate Policy Portfolios</u></i>
ETA	83.2005	<i>Ignazio MUSU: <u>Intellectual Property Rights and Biotechnology: How to Improve the Present Patent System</u></i>
KTHC	84.2005	<i>Giulio CAINELLI, Susanna MANCINELLI and Massimiliano MAZZANTI: <u>Social Capital, R&D and Industrial Districts</u></i>
ETA	85.2005	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI, Michele MORETTO and Vincenzo REBBA: <u>Quality and Investment Decisions in Hospital Care when Physicians are Devoted Workers</u></i>
CCMP	86.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and Laurent GILOTTE: <u>Carbon Capture and Sequestration: How Much Does this Uncertain Option Affect Near-Term Policy Choices?</u></i>
CSRM	87.2005	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Value Through Diversity: Microfinance and Islamic Finance and Global Banking</u></i>
ETA	88.2005	<i>A. MARKANDYA and S. PEDROSO: <u>How Substitutable is Natural Capital?</u></i>
IEM	89.2005	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Security of Energy Supply: Comparing Scenarios From a European Perspective</u></i>
CCMP	90.2005	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Andreas LÖSCHEL and Rob DELLINK: <u>Energy Biased Technical Change: A CGE Analysis</u></i>
PRCG	91.2005	<i>Carlo CAPUANO: <u>Abuse of Competitive Fringe</u></i>
PRCG	92.2005	<i>Ulrich BINDSEIL, Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAEV (lxv): <u>Bidding and Performance in Repo Auctions: Evidence from ECB Open Market Operations</u></i>
CCMP	93.2005	<i>Sabrina AUCI and Leonardo BECCHETTI: <u>The Stability of the Adjusted and Unadjusted Environmental Kuznets Curve</u></i>
CCMP	94.2005	<i>Francesco BOSELLO and Jian ZHANG: <u>Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture</u></i>
CTN	95.2005	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Jean-Christophe PEREAU and Tarik TAZDAÏT: <u>Bargaining with Non-Monolithic Players</u></i>
ETA	96.2005	<i>William BROCK and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS (lxxvi): <u>Optimal Control and Spatial Heterogeneity: Pattern Formation in Economic-Ecological Models</u></i>
CCMP	97.2005	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL (lxxvii): <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Human Health</u></i>
CCMP	98.2005	<i>Rob DELLINK, Michael FINUS and Niels OLIEMAN: <u>Coalition Formation under Uncertainty: The Stability Likelihood of an International Climate Agreement</u></i>
CTN	99.2005	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI, Riccardo CRESCENZI, Fabrizio De FILIPPIS, and Luca SALVATICI: <u>Bargaining Coalitions in the Agricultural Negotiations of the Doha Round: Similarity of Interests or Strategic Choices? An Empirical Assessment</u></i>
IEM	100.2005	<i>Giliola FREY and Matteo MANERA: <u>Econometric Models of Asymmetric Price Transmission</u></i>
IEM	101.2005	<i>Alessandro COLOGNI and Matteo MANERA: <u>Oil Prices, Inflation and Interest Rates in a Structural Cointegrated VAR Model for the G-7 Countries</u></i>
KTHC	102.2005	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI and Roberto CAMAGNI: <u>Sustainability of Urban Sprawl: Environmental-Economic Indicators for the Analysis of Mobility Impact in Italy</u></i>
ETA	103.2005	<i>Livingstone S. LUBOOBI and Joseph Y.T. MUGISHA: <u>HIV/AIDS Pandemic in Africa: Trends and Challenges</u></i>
SIEV	104.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Erik LICHTENBERG, Dominic MANCINI, and Gregmar I. GALINATO: <u>Was It Something I Ate? Implementation of the FDA Seafood HACCP Program</u></i>
SIEV	105.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI and Aline CHIABAI: <u>Urban Environmental Health and Sensitive Populations: How Much are the Italians Willing to Pay to Reduce Their Risks?</u></i>
SIEV	106.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Aline CHIABAI and Lucija MUEHLENBACHS: <u>Using Expert Judgment to Assess Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change: Evidence from a Conjoint Choice Survey</u></i>
CTN	107.2005	<i>Michele BERNASCONI and Matteo GALIZZI: <u>Coordination in Networks Formation: Experimental Evidence on Learning and Saliency</u></i>
KTHC	108.2005	<i>Michele MORETTO and Sergio VERGALLI: <u>Migration Dynamics</u></i>
NRM	109.2005	<i>Antonio MUSOLESI and Mario NOSVELLI: <u>Water Consumption and Long-Run Urban Development: The Case of Milan</u></i>
SIEV	110.2005	<i>Benno TORGLER and Maria A. GARCIA-VALIÑAS: <u>Attitudes Towards Preventing Environmental Damage</u></i>
SIEV	111.2005	<i>Alberto LONGO and Anna ALBERINI: <u>What are the Effects of Contamination Risks on Commercial and Industrial Properties? Evidence from Baltimore, Maryland</u></i>
SIEV	112.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI and Alberto LONGO: <u>The Value of Cultural Heritage Sites in Armenia: Evidence from a Travel Cost Method Study</u></i>
CCMP	113.2005	<i>Mikel GONZÁLEZ and Rob DELLINK: <u>Impact of Climate Policy on the Basque Economy</u></i>
NRM	114.2005	<i>Gilles LAFFORGUE and Walid OUESLATI: <u>Optimal Soil Management and Environmental Policy</u></i>

NRM	115.2005	<i>Martin D. SMITH and Larry B. CROWDER</i> (Ixxvi): <u>Valuing Ecosystem Services with Fishery Rents: A Lumped-Parameter Approach to Hypoxia in the Neuse River Estuary</u>
NRM	116.2005	<i>Dan HOLLAND and Kurt SCHNIER</i> (Ixxvi): <u>Protecting Marine Biodiversity: A Comparison of Individual Habitat Quotas (IHQs) and Marine Protected Areas</u>
PRCG	117.2005	<i>John NELLIS</i> : <u>The Evolution of Enterprise Reform in Africa: From State-owned Enterprises to Private Participation in Infrastructure — and Back?</u>
PRCG	118.2005	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI</i> : <u>Italy's Privatization Process and Its Implications for China</u>
SIEV	119.2005	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Marcella VERONESI and Joseph C. COOPER</i> : <u>Detecting Starting Point Bias in Dichotomous-Choice Contingent Valuation Surveys</u>
CTN	120.2005	<i>Federico ECHENIQUE and Mehmet B. YENMEZ</i> : <u>A Solution to Matching with Preferences over Colleagues</u>
KTHC	121.2005	<i>Valeria GATTAI and Corrado MOLTENI</i> : <u>Dissipation of Knowledge and the Boundaries of the Multinational Enterprise</u>
KTHC	122.2005	<i>Valeria GATTAI</i> : <u>Firm's Intangible Assets and Multinational Activity: Joint-Venture Versus FDI</u>
CCMP	123.2005	<i>Socrates KYPREOS</i> : <u>A MERGE Model with Endogenous Technological Change and the Cost of Carbon Stabilization</u>
CCMP	124.2005	<i>Fuminori SANO, Keigo AKIMOTO, Takashi HOMMA and Toshimasa TOMODA</i> : <u>Analysis of Technological Portfolios for CO₂ stabilizations and Effects of Technological Changes</u>
CCMP	125.2005	<i>Fredrik HEDENUS, Christian AZAR and Kristian LINDGREN</i> : <u>Induced Technological Change in a Limited Foresight Optimization Model</u>
CCMP	126.2005	<i>Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>The Value of ITC under Climate Stabilization</u>
PRCG	127.2005	<i>John NELLIS</i> : <u>Privatization in Africa: What has happened? What is to be done?</u>
PRCG	128.2005	<i>Raphaël SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>Contest with Attack and Defence: Does Negative Campaigning Increase or Decrease Voters' Turnout?</u>
PRCG	129.2005	<i>Pascal GAUTIER and Raphael SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>Political Cycles : The Opposition Advantage</u>

- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003
- (lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004
- (lxxi) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004
- (lxxii) This paper was presented at the 10th Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Paris, France on 28-29 January 2005 and organised by EUREQua.
- (lxxiii) This paper was presented at the 2nd Workshop on "Inclusive Wealth and Accounting Prices" held in Trieste, Italy on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics
- (lxxiv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Trust and social capital in multicultural cities” Athens, January 19-20, 2004
- (lxxv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Diversity as a source of growth” Rome November 18-19, 2004
- (lxxvi) This paper was presented at the 3rd Workshop on Spatial-Dynamic Models of Economics and Ecosystems held in Trieste on 11-13 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics
- (lxxvii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on Infectious Diseases: Ecological and Economic Approaches held in Trieste on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics.

2004 SERIES

CCMP	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRA	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

2005 SERIES

CCMP	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRCG	<i>Privatisation Regulation Corporate Governance</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>