

UNIVERSITA' CATTOLICA DEL SACRO CUORE
- Milano -

**QUADERNI DELL'ISTITUTO DI
ECONOMIA E FINANZA**

The importance of electoral rule: Evidence from Italy

M. Bordignon A. Monticini

99 – febbraio 2011



Quaderni dell'Istituto di Economia e Finanza
numero 99 febbraio 2011

The importance of electoral rule: Evidence from Italy

M. Bordignon (*) A. Monticini (•)

(*)Istituto di Economia e Finanza, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore,
Largo Gemelli 1 – 20123 Milano, e-mail: massimo.bordignon@unicatt.it

(•)Istituto di Economia e Finanza, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore,
Largo Gemelli 1 – 20123 Milano, e-mail: luca.colombo@unicatt.it

Comitato Scientifico

Dino Piero Giarda
Michele Grillo
Pippo Ranci
Massimo Bordignon

Redazione

Istituto di Economia e Finanza
Università Cattolica del S. Cuore
Largo Gemelli 1
20123 Milano
tel.: 0039.02.7234.2976
fax: 0039.02.7234.2781
e-mail: ist.ef@unicatt.it

* Esemplare fuori commercio per il deposito legale agli effetti della Legge n. 106 del 15 aprile 2004.

* La Redazione ottempera agli obblighi previsti dalla Legge n. 106 del 15.04.2006, Decreto del Presidente della Repubblica del 03.05.2006 n. 252 pubblicato nella G.U. del 18.08.2006 n. 191.

* I quaderni sono disponibili on-line all'indirizzo dell'Istituto <http://www.unicatt.it/istituti/EconomiaFinanza>

* I *Quaderni dell'Istituto di Economia e Finanza* costituiscono un servizio atto a fornire la tempestiva divulgazione di ricerche scientifiche originali, siano esse in forma definitiva o provvisoria. L'accesso alla collana è approvato dal Comitato Scientifico, sentito il parere di un referee.

The importance of the electoral rule: Evidence from Italy

Massimo Bordignon* Andrea Monticini†
Catholic University (Milan)
Italy

January 26, 2011

Abstract

We employ bootstrap methods (Efron (1979)) to test the effect of an important electoral reform implemented in Italy from 1993 to 2001, that moved the system for electing the Parliament from purely proportional to plurality rule (for 75% of the seats). We do not find any effect on either the number of parties or the stability of governments (the two main objectives of the reform) that remained unchanged at their pre-reform level.

Keywords: Electoral system; Plurality rule; Duverger's law; Bootstrap;

1 Introduction

Among political institutions, the most widely studied is certainly the electoral rule. This reflects the crucial importance that both political scientists and economists assign to the rules governing the ballot box in shaping the characteristics of the political system, the behaviour of voters, the selection of politicians, the policies chosen by governments and finally, the economic outcomes. For instance, among political scientists, Duverger (1954) analysis has spanned an enormous literature attempting to connect the features of the electoral rule with the equilibrium number of parties and candidates (e.g. Cox (1997)). On their side, economists have developed several models explaining policy and economic outcomes as the result of the contrasting incentives generated by the different electoral systems (for a survey, see Persson and Tabellini (2001)). This focus seems also to be justified on empirical grounds. According to Persson and Tabellini (2005) extensive empirical analysis, for example, the electoral rule is indeed the "key" political institution: *ceteris paribus*, a switch from proportional voting to plurality rule should generate an impressive 5% GDP decrease in public spending¹. But this analysis, as many others addressing similar relationships between the the electoral system and economic outcomes (see for instance, Alesina and Drazen (1991), Alesina and Perotti (1994); Persson et al. (2003)), is based on comparison across countries that differ along many other dimensions beyond the electoral rule. And however clever devices one can imagine for trying to identify a causal effect, there always remains the doubt that the relationship between the electoral rule and the outcome of interest may be generated by some other uncontrolled factor that "cause" both the electoral rule and the outcome². Besides,

*Largo Gemelli no.1, 20123 Milano, Italy. e-mail: massimo.bordignon@unicatt.it

†Largo Gemelli no.1, 20123 Milano, Italy. e-mail: andrea.monticini@unicatt.it. Tel. 3902.72343215.

¹See also Persson and Tabellini (2004). For a contrary view, see Iversen and Soskice (2006) and Ticchi and Vindigni (2010).

²For a criticism along these lines see for instance the Acemoglu (2005) review of Persson and Tabellini (2005).

reforms of the electoral system are in reality rare events³, so that we generally lack the kind of variation that could help us in identifying casual effects.

This suggests that to get more convincing evidence one should rather try to concentrate on the few existing examples of electoral reform inside a single country, where the *ceteris paribus* assumption is more reasonable. On these grounds, we discuss here the effects of an important reform introduced in Italy in 1993 (and then repealed again in 2005). This reform changed the electoral rule for the national parliament, moving it from a pure proportional system to a mixed electoral one, where 75% of the seats were assigned through plurality rule in single candidate districts and the rest by proportional voting (e.g. Soberg Shugart and Wattenberg (2001); see below for further details). The reform, somewhat imposed on the Italian parliament by the results of a national referendum (D'Alimonte (2001)), had, according to his advocates, several objectives. The first and foremost was to increase the accountability of parties and politicians, forcing them to form pre-electoral coalitions on well defined policy platforms. But it was also expected that the reform would solve some long term problems of the Italian party systems, such as the excessive fragmentation of the political landscape and the short duration of governments and legislatures. The majoritarian prize in the single district would force the different parties to merge together and eliminate the smaller and more extreme parties from the political arena. The stability of governments and legislatures would raise as the electoral cost for parties to dissolve existing coalitions (once they were formed) would increase. Accordingly, we compare here before and after reform values of several variables capturing these expectations, such as the number of parties represented in Parliament, the number of parties in the ruling coalition, the duration of governments and of legislatures and the seats of the major party in the ruling coalition.

Concerning the empirical analysis, our statistical inference will be based on the bootstrap. Traditionally, statistical inference is based on the asymptotic theory. However, first-order asymptotic theory often gives a poor approximation to the distributions of test statistics with the sample sizes available in our analysis. As a result, the nominal levels of tests based on asymptotic critical values can be very different from the true levels. But advances in computing have made an alternative approach increasingly attractive. This approach is to generate a large number of simulated values of the test statistic and compare the statistic obtained with the original sample with the empirical distribution function of the simulated ones. This procedure, proposed by Efron (1979), is called bootstrap. More interesting, as shown in Hall (1992), bootstrap methods deliver more accurate inference in finite samples than first-order asymptotic approximations while in large sample is at least as accurate as the approximation obtained from first-order asymptotic theory⁴.

Concerning our empirical results, we do not find *any* effects of the reform on the stability of government or on the number of parties. In other words, looking at both the average duration of Italian governments and the number of parties represented in Parliament time series we do not find any structural change in spite of the changed electoral rule. Concerning the other analysed variables, the number of seats of the major party fell, whereas the number of parties inside the ruling coalitions increased, meaning that if anything the reform had the effect of increasing the instability of the ruling coalitions, contrary to the expectations.

In our view, these results raise considerable doubts on the trust that economists and other social scientists have on the importance of the electoral rule for political behaviour or on their ability to predict the effect of a reform. Electoral rules are just one component of the general

³Indeed, in the sample of 60 democracies studied by Persson and Tabellini (2003) only two enacted important reforms of their electoral system between 1960 and 1990 (Cyprus and France).

⁴The idea to use the bootstrap in empirical analysis related to electoral system is not new. Fredriksson and Millimet (2004) investigate the effect of electoral rules on environmental policymaking and their inference is based on the bootstrap.

structure of the political system, which is the result of the sedimentation of long run historical process. As such, this cannot be changed that easily.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides further information on the 1993 Italian reform. Section 3 present our data and empirical analysis. Section 4 concludes by discussing our results more extensively.

2 The Italian reform

In 1993, Italy adopted a mixed electoral system for the election of both branches of its bicameral legislature, abandoning the proportional electoral rule that had characterized the country for 48 years. The reform was not based on the result of an extensive discussion in the country or in the Parliament on the shortcomings of the former electoral system (as it happened, for instance, in New Zeland in the same year), but it was rather the result of a somewhat random process⁵, involving (in order): 1) the results of a 1992 judicial investigation ("clean hands") that had revealed the extent and depth of political corruption, undermining popular consensus in the old political parties and creating support for radical reforms; 3) the results of a national referendum⁶ on the electoral system for the upper house, that given the constraints imposed in Italy on this legislative tool⁷, could only change that system in the direction of introducing plurality rule for 75% of the seats; 4) the subsequent decision by the Parliament to uniform the system for electing the Chamber as much as possible to the new one for the Senate⁸, in order to guarantee political congruence between the two houses (deemed necessary in the perfect Italian bicameralism system). Some differences however remained (due to constitutional constraints), as the rules employed to elect the Chamber allowed voters to cast two separate ballots, one for each tier, while in the election of the Senate the proportional and majoritarian votes were fused into one⁹. The seats not allocated through plurality rule were assigned on the basis of the votes received by the different lists at the national level, through a mechanism (called *scorporo*) that was meant to protect the best losers, with again some small differences between the two houses¹⁰. A threshold was also imposed, so that only lists that had gained at least 4% of votes at the national level could participate to the proportional distribution of seats.

Despite the confuse path of the reform, the introduction of the new electoral laws was accompanied by a lively debate, inside and outside the Parliament, to which all main Italian political scientists participated (see Katz (2001) and D'Alimonte (2001) for a detailed review of the main positions). And while reservations were raised by many analysts on pieces and bits of the reform, there was also a widespread consensus on its ability to bring about its main objectives. The most cited one was to (1) "secure the stability of parliamentary majorities and hence a greater capacity to govern". A second was for a (2) "simplification ("aggregation") of the party system, at the minimum by encouraging the formation of stable governing coalitions, if not simply the merger of many parties into larger formation" (Katz (2001, p. 102))¹¹. Related objectives were 3) to

⁵See Katz (2001) for a detailed account.

⁶Held in April 1993 and approved by 83% of voters.

⁷Popular referenda in Italy can only erase some existing pieces of legislation but cannot propose new one.

⁸Law n.276 and Law n.277, both approved in August 1993.

⁹See Ferrara (2006) for a detailed analysis of the consequences of this difference for strategic entry by candidates.

¹⁰See again Katz (2001) for details. Basically, the votes used to elect the candidates in the single district by plurality rule were subtracted by the total votes received at the national level by the lists supporting the winning candidates and the remaining votes were used to allocate the remaining seats of both the Chamber and the Senate.

¹¹As Mario Segni, the proponent of the 1993 referendum put it "governability cannot be assured unless there is

create the possibility of alternation in government¹² and 4) to increase the direct accountability of individual members of Parliament to their electors. Objective 3) was certainly reached as the parliamentary majority shifted from the center right to the center left and back in the three national elections held with the new system (1994, 1996, 2001). There is also some evidence that objective 4) was also reached, at least in competitive districts (Galasso and Nannicini (2011)). What about objectives (1) and (2)?

3 Data set and Empirical Analysis

To answer the question, we collect data for all Italian political elections in the time span going from 1948:04:18 to 2001:05:13. Over this period, there were eleven general elections under proportional representation, and three general elections under the mixed electoral system described above. During the period, 55 governments were in office: 47 before the 1993 electoral rule reform.

To test the impact of the 1993 electoral reform, we estimate five regressions of the following form

$$y_t = c + \beta D_t + \epsilon_t \quad (3.1)$$

where $t = 1, \dots, N$, where N is the sample size, and D_t is a 0, 1 dummy variable which is equal to 1 after the 1993 electoral reform and zero otherwise. y_t represent the way we capture the expectations (1) and (2) above¹³. Specifically, we use a) the number of days the parliament is in office and b) the number days the government is in office as alternative measures for the stability of government or government coalitions, prediction (1) above. We use c) the number of parties in the Parliament, d) the number of seats of the majority party, and e) the number of parties in the coalition government as alternative measures of the fragmentation of the political system. The error term $\epsilon_t \sim i.i.d.(0, \sigma_t^2)$ with possibly $\sigma_t^2 \neq \sigma_s^2$ for $t \neq s$.

To obtain consistent empirical evidence there are two issues to consider: the small sample size, and the short period during which the dummy variable is equal to one.

One way to attack the first issue is to use bootstrap methods. These were originally proposed by Efron (1979) and have become the standard approach to obtain robust inference when the sample size is small. Davidson and Mackinnon (2004) (p. 171) show very good performance of the bootstrap using a sample size of 10 observations (see also Davidson and Flachaire (2008) for further experimental evidence). For these reasons, the standard errors (and the p-values) for the OLS point estimates are obtained by employing the bootstrap. To be more specific, when the time series is homoscedastic the appropriate bootstrap is the regular bootstrap, while if the time series displays heteroscedasticity, the appropriate bootstrap method is the so-called wild bootstrap (see for details Davidson et al. (2007) and Davidson and Flachaire (2008)). In brief, we pre-test for homoscedasticity, and if we reject the null hypothesis, we compute the standard errors and the p-values by the wild bootstrap.

also a simplification and homogenization of the political stage”

¹²It should be recalled that in the aftermath of the second world war Italy had basically the same government majority for all the years preceding the reform, due to the dominant role played by the Christian Democratic Party and the exclusion to power of the Italian Communist Party, the largest communist party in the western world.

¹³For simplicity, we only concentrate here on the Chamber. However, we repeated the exercise for the Senate too, obtaining basically the same results (available by the authors on request).

To attack the second issue we perform some Monte Carlo experiments (reported in the Appendix). In the experiments, we compute the power function for the same t-test used in the empirical analysis. We re-create exactly the same conditions used in the empirical analysis: the same sample size and the same dummy variable. As shown and explained in the Appendix, the results confirm that indeed our inference is consistent¹⁴.

For completeness, we report the Ljung-Box autocorrelation test, and the adjusted \bar{R}^2 .

The estimation results are shown in table 1¹⁵. As shown, the β is highly statistical significant in only two out of five regressions. In particular, the number of seats of the majority party decreased by 94 seats and the number of parties in the coalition government increased by 2 after the reform. This means that, contrary to its main objectives, the reform did not affect either the stability of governments (legislatures) or the fragmentation of the political system. It had, however, the effect of making the ruling coalitions more unstable, increasing the number of parties inside it and reducing the role and the importance of the major party. This was again against expectations.

4 Conclusion and discussion

Our results may be interpreted in different ways. Possibly, the Italian reform was ill designed to reach its objectives, and possibly, Italian politicians and parties were smart enough to find ways to circumvent the constraints introduced by the reform¹⁶. But it is still surprising that none of the expected and plausible effects of the reform did actually take place and what happened, if happened, went in the opposite direction to expectations. It is also true that the reform has been in place only briefly. One could argue that the time period was indeed too short to affect the behaviour of voters, who did not have the time to learn and understand the new rules. But this argument is not entirely convincing. First, in a longer time span many other things also change, making in fact more difficult to identify the effect of a reform. Second, the point is that even in our limited time span, we could not find any tendency for our variables to move in the direction expected by the reform. Contrary to the main flavour of the literature surveyed above, the Italian experience then suggests caution in predicting the effects of a reform of the electoral rule, even on the political variables that are directly influenced by the electoral system.

References

Acemoglu, D., December 2005. Constitutions, politics, and economics: A review essay on Persson and Tabellini's the economic effects of constitutions. *Journal of Economic Literature* 43 (4), 1025–1048.

¹⁴The Ox (Doornik (2001)) code to compute the power functions reported in the appendix is available on the Monticini's webpage

¹⁵As a further check, the null hypothesis of equal means is rejected for all the dependent variables by the non-parametric Wilcoxon rank sum test at the 1% level

¹⁶For instance, a possible explanation for the survival of small parties in spite of the first-past-the-post rule for 3/4 of seats is based on voters's loyalty to small and ideological parties (e.g D'Alimonte (2001)). Small parties could not possibly win in single candidate districts. But by presenting their own candidates, they could cause the defeat of the ideologically close larger parties. This threat forced the larger parties to find an agreement with the smaller ones, supporting their candidates in some districts and hence guaranteeing their survival. For an analysis that develops this intuition to compare single versus dual ballot elections at the municipal level in Italy, see Bordignon et al. (2010).

- Alesina, A., Drazen, A., December 1991. Why are stabilizations delayed? *American Economic Review* 81 (5), 1170–88.
- Alesina, A., Perotti, R., Feb. 1994. The political economy of budget deficits. NBER Working Papers 4637, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Bordignon, M., Nannicini, T., Tabellini, G., 2010. Moderating political extremism: Single round vs runoff elections under plurality rule. CESifo Working Paper Series 2600, CESifo Group Munich.
- Cox, G., 1997. *Making Votes Count*. Cambridge University Press, UK.
- D’Alimonte, R., 2001. Mixed Electoral Rules, Partisan Realignment, and Party System Change in Italy. In M.S. Shugart and M.P. Wattenberg, *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford University Press.
- Davidson, J., Monticini, A., Peel, D., September 2007. Implementing the wild bootstrap using a two-point distribution. *Economics Letters* 96 (3), 309–315.
- Davidson, R., Flachaire, E., 2008. The wild bootstrap, tamed at last. *Journal of Econometrics* 146 (1), 162 – 169.
- Davidson, R., Mackinnon, J., 2004. *Econometric Theory and Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Doornik, J., 2001. *Ox 3.0 an Object Oriented Matrix Programming Language*. Timberlake, UK.
- Duverger, M., 1954. *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. John Wiley.
- Efron, B., 1979. Bootstrap Methods: Another Look at the Jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics* 7 (1), 1–26.
- Ferrara, F., 2006. Two in one: Party competition in the italian single ballot mixed system. *Electoral Studies* 25 (2), 329 – 350.
- Fredriksson, P. G., Millimet, D. L., 2004. Electoral rules and environmental policy. *Economics Letters* 84 (2), 237 – 244.
- Galasso, V., Nannicini, T., 2011. Competing on good politicians. forthcoming *American Political Science Review*.
- Hall, P., 1992. *The Bootstrap and Edgeworth Expansion*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- Iversen, T., Soskice, D., May 2006. Electoral institutions and the politics of coalitions: Why some democracies redistribute more than others. *American Political Science Review* 100 (2), 165–181.
- Katz, R., 2001. Reforming the Italian Electoral Law. In M.S. Shugart and M.P. Wattenberg, *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford University Press.
- Persson, T., Tabellini, G., Jul. 2001. Political institutions and policy outcomes: What are the stylized facts? CEPR Discussion Papers 2872, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers.
- Persson, T., Tabellini, G., 2003. Do electoral cycles differ across political systems? Tech. rep., IGIER (Innocenzo Gasparini Institute for Economic Research), Bocconi University.

Persson, T., Tabellini, G., March 2004. Constitutional rules and fiscal policy outcomes. *American Economic Review* 94 (1), 25–45.

Persson, T., Tabellini, G., June 2005. *The Economic Effects of Constitutions*. Vol. 1. The MIT Press.

Persson, T., Tabellini, G., Trebbi, F., 06 2003. Electoral rules and corruption. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1 (4), 958–989.

Soberg Shugart, M., Wattenberg, M., 2001. *Mixed-Member Electoral System: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford University Press.

Ticchi, D., Vindigni, A., 2010. Endogenous constitutions. *Economic Journal* 120 (543), 1–39.

Dep. Var.	c	β	LM Het.	Ljung-Box	Norm. Res.	R_{adj}^2	N
N. of parties <i>p-value</i>	9.63*** (0)	2.03 (0.52)	3.30* (0.06)	0.684 (0.62)	1.11 0.57	0.115	14
N. of seats maj. party <i>p-value</i>	256.54*** (0)	-94.21*** (0)	0.20 (0.65)	5.11 (0.4)	0.66 (0.71)	0.658	14
Days Parliam. in office <i>p-value</i>	1503.45*** (0)	-128.78 (0.85)	0.77 (0.7)	3.22 (0.78)	5.54* (0.06)	-0.06	14
Days Gov. in office <i>p-value</i>	322.42*** (0)	216.82 (0.46)	3.95** (0.04)	1.84 (0.11)	13.04*** (0)	0.06	55
N. parties coal. gov. <i>p-value</i>	2.82*** (0)	2.04*** (0)	4.1** (0.04)	1.45 (0.19)	7.72** (0.02)	0.198	55

Table 1: (*), (**), and (***) denote 10%, 5%, 1% significance level respectively, based on HC standard errors (shown in parenthesis). N is the sample size.

Appendix

In order to investigate the properties of the t test employed in our analysis we perform some Monte Carlo experiments. In the experiments, we create exactly the same conditions as of the equation 3. The true Data Generation Process (DGP) is

$$y_t = c + \beta D_t + \epsilon_t \quad (4.1)$$

where $t = 1 \dots 14$, c is a constant D_t is a 0, 1 dummy variable which is equal to 1 in the last three observations, and zero otherwise. The error term $\epsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. In the experiments, we set $\beta = 0$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$. For this model, we compute the power functions (see Davidson and Mackinnon (2004, p. 170)) in figure 1 for the t statistics based on both the bootstrap and the t distribution at the .05 level. The results are based on 100,000 Monte Carlo replications and 9,999 bootstrap sample. Both tests are exact, as can be seen from the fact that, in both cases, power equals .05 when $\beta = 0$. For all $\beta \neq 0$, there is a clear ordering of the two curves. The highest curve is for the t test based on the bootstrap. The bootstrap has higher power than the test based on the t -distribution. Moreover, the two curves are smooth and pretty close confirming the consistency of our inference.




Figure 1: Power functions for t test at the .05 level based on 100,000 Monte Carlo replications and 9,999 Bootstrap sample

Elenco Quaderni già pubblicati

1. L. Giuriato, *Problemi di sostenibilità di programmi di riforma strutturale*, settembre 1993.
2. L. Giuriato, *Mutamenti di regime e riforme: stabilità politica e comportamenti accomodanti*, settembre 1993.
3. U. Galmarini, *Income Tax Enforcement Policy with Risk Averse Agents*, novembre 1993.
4. P. Giarda, *Le competenze regionali nelle recenti proposte di riforma costituzionale*, gennaio 1994.
5. L. Giuriato, *Therapy by Consensus in Systemic Transformations: an Evolutionary Perspective*, maggio 1994.
6. M. Bordignon, *Federalismo, perequazione e competizione fiscale. Spunti di riflessione in merito alle ipotesi di riforma della finanza regionale in Italia*, aprile 1995.
7. M. F. Ambrosanio, *Contenimento del disavanzo pubblico e controllo delle retribuzioni nel pubblico impiego*, maggio 1995.
8. M. Bordignon, *On Measuring Inefficiency in Economies with Public Goods: an Overall Measure of the Deadweight Loss of the Public Sector*, luglio 1995.
9. G. Colangelo, U. Galmarini, *On the Pareto Ranking of Commodity Taxes in Oligopoly*, novembre 1995.
10. U. Galmarini, *Coefficienti presuntivi di reddito e politiche di accertamento fiscale*, dicembre 1995.
11. U. Galmarini, *On the Size of the Regressive Bias in Tax Enforcement*, febbraio 1996.
12. G. Mastromatteo, *Innovazione di Prodotto e Dimensione del Settore Pubblico nel Modello di Baumol*, giugno 1996.
13. G. Turati, *La tassazione delle attività finanziarie in Italia: verifiche empiriche in tema di efficienza e di equità*, settembre 1996.
14. G. Mastromatteo, *Economia monetaria post-keynesiana e rigidità dei tassi bancari*, settembre 1996.
15. L. Rizzo, *Equalization of Public Training Expenditure in a Cross-Border Labour Market*, maggio 1997.
16. C. Bisogno, *Il mercato del credito e la propensione al risparmio delle famiglie: aggiornamento di un lavoro di Jappelli e Pagano*, maggio 1997.
17. F.G. Etro, *Evasione delle imposte indirette in oligopolio. Incidenza e ottima tassazione*, luglio 1997.
18. L. Colombo, *Problemi di adozione tecnologica in un'industria monopolistica*, ottobre 1997.
19. L. Rizzo, *Local Provision of Training in a Common Labour Market*, marzo 1998.
20. M.C. Chiuri, *A Model for the Household Labour Supply: An Empirical Test On A Sample of Italian Household with Pre-School Children*, maggio 1998.
21. U. Galmarini, *Tax Avoidance and Progressivity of the Income Tax in an Occupational Choice Model*, luglio 1998.
22. R. Hamai, M. Ratti, *The National Central Banks' Role under EMU. The Case of the Bank of Italy*, novembre 1998.

23. A. Boitani, M. Damiani, *Heterogeneous Agents, Indexation and the Non Neutrality of Money*, marzo 1999.
24. A. Baglioni, *Liquidity Risk and Market Power in Banking*, luglio 1999.
25. M. Flavia Ambrosanio, *Armonizzazione e concorrenza fiscale: la politica della Comunità Europea*, luglio 1999.
26. A. Balestrino, U. Galmarini, *Public Expenditure and Tax Avoidance*, ottobre 1999.
27. L. Colombo, G. Weinrich, *The Phillips Curve as a Long-Run Phenomenon in a Macroeconomic Model with Complex Dynamics*, aprile 2000.
28. G.P. Barbetta, G. Turati, *L'analisi dell'efficienza tecnica nel settore della sanità. Un'applicazione al caso della Lombardia*, maggio 2000.
29. L. Colombo, *Struttura finanziaria delle imprese, rinegoziazione del debito Vs. Liquidazione. Una rassegna della letteratura*, maggio 2000.
30. M. Bordignon, *Problems of Soft Budget Constraints in Intergovernmental Relationships: the Case of Italy*, giugno 2000.
31. A. Boitani, M. Damiani, *Strategic complementarity, near-rationality and coordination*, giugno 2000.
32. P. Balduzzi, *Sistemi pensionistici a ripartizione e a capitalizzazione: il caso cileno e le implicazioni per l'Italia*, luglio 2000.
33. A. Baglioni, *Multiple Banking Relationships: competition among "inside" banks*, ottobre 2000.
34. A. Baglioni, R. Hamoui, *The Choice among Alternative Payment Systems: The European Experience*, ottobre 2000.
35. M.F. Ambrosanio, M. Bordignon, *La concorrenza fiscale in Europa: evidenze, dibattito, politiche*, novembre 2000.
36. L. Rizzo, *Equalization and Fiscal Competition: Theory and Evidence*, maggio 2001.
37. L. Rizzo, *Le Inefficienze del Decentramento Fiscale*, maggio 2001.
38. L. Colombo, *On the Role of Spillover Effects in Technology Adoption Problems*, maggio 2001.
39. L. Colombo, G. Coltro, *La misurazione della produttività: evidenza empirica e problemi metodologici*, maggio 2001.
40. L. Cappellari, G. Turati, *Volunteer Labour Supply: The Role of Workers' Motivations*, luglio 2001.
41. G.P. Barbetta, G. Turati, *Efficiency of junior high schools and the role of proprietary structure*, ottobre 2001.
42. A. Boitani, C. Cambini, *Regolazione incentivante per i servizi di trasporto locale*, novembre 2001.
43. P. Giarda, *Fiscal federalism in the Italian Constitution: the aftermath of the October 7th referendum*, novembre 2001.
44. M. Bordignon, F. Cerniglia, F. Revelli, *In Search for Yardstick Competition: Property Tax Rates and Electoral Behavior in Italian Cities*, marzo 2002.
45. F. Etro, *International Policy Coordination with Economic Unions*, marzo 2002.
46. Z. Rotondi, G. Vaciago, *A Puzzle Solved: the Euro is the D.Mark*, settembre 2002.
47. A. Baglioni, *Bank Capital Regulation and Monetary Policy Transmission: an heterogeneous agents approach*, ottobre 2002.
48. A. Baglioni, *The New Basle Accord: Which Implications for Monetary Policy Transmission?*, ottobre 2002.
49. F. Etro, P. Giarda, *Redistribution, Decentralization and Constitutional Rules*, ottobre 2002.
50. L. Colombo, G. Turati, *La Dimensione Territoriale nei Processi di Concentrazione dell'Industria Bancaria Italiana*, novembre 2002.

51. Z. Rotondi, G. Vaciago, *The Reputation of a newborn Central Bank*, marzo 2003.
52. M. Bordignon, L. Colombo, U. Galmarini, *Fiscal Federalism and Endogenous Lobbies' Formation*, ottobre 2003.
53. Z. Rotondi, G. Vaciago, *The Reaction of central banks to Stock Markets*, novembre 2003.
54. A. Boitani, C. Cambini, *Le gare per i servizi di trasporto locale in Europa e in Italia: molto rumore per nulla?*, febbraio 2004.
55. V. Oppedisano, *I buoni scuola: un'analisi teorica e un esperimento empirico sulla realtà lombarda*, aprile 2004.
56. M. F. Ambrosanio, *Il ruolo degli enti locali per lo sviluppo sostenibile: prime valutazioni*, luglio 2004.
57. M. F. Ambrosanio, M. S. Caroppo, *The Response of Tax Havens to Initiatives Against Harmful Tax Competition: Formal Statements and Concrete Policies*, ottobre 2004.
58. A. Monticini, G. Vaciago, *Are Europe's Interest Rates led by FED Announcements?*, dicembre 2004.
59. A. Prandini, P. Ranci, *The Privatisation Process*, dicembre 2004.
60. G. Mastromatteo, L. Ventura, *Fundamentals, beliefs, and the origin of money: a search theoretic perspective*, dicembre 2004.
61. A. Baglioni, L. Colombo, *Managers' Compensation and Misreporting*, dicembre 2004.
62. P. Giarda, *Decentralization and intergovernmental fiscal relations in Italy: a review of past and recent trends*, gennaio 2005.
63. A. Baglioni, A. Monticini, *The Intraday price of money: evidence from the e-MID market*, luglio 2005.
64. A. Terzi, *International Financial Instability in a World of Currencies Hierarchy*, ottobre 2005.
65. M. F. Ambrosanio, A. Fontana, *Ricognizione delle Fonti Informative sulla Finanza Pubblica Italiana*, gennaio 2006.
66. L. Colombo, M. Grillo, *Collusion when the Number of Firms is Large*, marzo 2006.
67. A. Terzi, G. Verga, *Stock-bond correlation and the bond quality ratio: Removing the discount factor to generate a "deflated" stock index*, luglio 2006.
68. M. Grillo, *The Theory and Practice of Antitrust. A perspective in the history of economic ideas*, settembre 2006.
69. A. Baglioni, *Entry into a network industry: consumers' expectations and firms' pricing policies*, novembre 2006.
70. Z. Rotondi, G. Vaciago, *Lessons from the ECB experience: Frankfurt still matters!*, marzo 2007.
71. G. Vaciago, *Gli immobili pubblici.....ovvero, purché restino immobili*, marzo 2007.
72. F. Mattesini, L. Rossi, *Productivity shocks and Optimal Monetary Policy in a Unionized Labor Market Economy*, marzo 2007.
73. L. Colombo, G. Femminis, *The Social Value of Public Information with Costly Information Acquisition*, marzo 2007.
74. L. Colombo, H. Dawid, K. Kabus, *When do Thick Venture Capital Markets Foster Innovation? An Evolutionary Analysis*, marzo 2007.
75. A. Baglioni, *Corporate Governance as a Commitment and Signalling Device*, novembre 2007.
76. L. Colombo, G. Turati, *The Role of the Local Business Environment in Banking Consolidation*, febbraio 2008.

77. F. Mattesini, L. Rossi, *Optimal Monetary Policy in Economies with Dual Labor Markets*, febbraio 2008.
78. M. Abbritti, A. Boitani, M. Damiani, *Labour market imperfections, “divine coincidence” and the volatility of employment and inflation*, marzo 2008.
79. S. Colombo, *Discriminatory prices, endogenous locations and the Prisoner Dilemma problem*, aprile 2008.
80. L. Colombo, H. Dawid, *Complementary Assets, Start-Ups and Incentives to Innovate*, aprile 2008.
81. A. Baglioni, *Shareholders’ Agreements and Voting Power, Evidence from Italian Listed Firms*, maggio 2008.
82. G. Ascari, L. Rossi, *Long-run Phillips Curve and Disinflation Dynamics: Calvo vs. Rotemberg Price Setting*, settembre 2008.
83. A. Baglioni, A. Monticini, *The intraday interest rate under a liquidity crisis: the case of August 2007*, ottobre 2008.
84. M. F. Ambrosanio, M. Bordignon, F. Cerniglia, *Constitutional reforms, fiscal decentralization and regional fiscal flows in Italy*, dicembre 2008.
85. S. Colombo, *Product differentiation, price discrimination and collusion*, marzo 2009.
86. L. Colombo, G. Weinrich, *Persistent disequilibrium dynamics and economic policy*, marzo 2009.
87. M. Bordignon, G. Tabellini, *Moderating Political Extremism: Single Round vs Runoff Elections under Plurality Rule*, aprile 2009.
88. S. Colombo, L. Grilli, C. Rossi Lamastra, *On the determinants of the degree of openness of Open Source firms: An entry model*, maggio 2009.
89. A. Baglioni, M. Grillo, *Calamità naturali e assicurazione: elementi di analisi per una riforma*, settembre 2009.
90. S. Colombo, *Pricing Policy and Partial Collusion*, ottobre 2009.
91. A. Baglioni, *Liquidity crunch in the interbank market: is it credit or liquidity risk, or both?*, novembre 2009.
92. S. Colombo, *Taxation and Predatory Prices in a Spatial Model*, marzo 2010.
93. A. Baglioni, A. Boitani, M. Liberatore, A. Monticini, *Is the leverage of European Commercial Banks Pro-Cyclical?*, maggio 2010
94. M. Bordignon, S. Piazza, *Who do you blame in local finance? An analysis of municipal financing in Italy*, maggio 2010
95. S. Colombo, *Bertrand and Cournot in the unidirectional Hotelling model*, maggio 2010
96. A. Baglioni, L. Colombo, *The efficiency view of corporate boards: theory and evidence*, luglio 2010.
97. S. Brusco, L. Colombo, U. Galmarini, *Local Governments Tax Autonomy, Lobbying, and Welfare*, luglio 2010.
98. S. Colombo, L. Grilli, *Another unconsidered sinister effect of industry-specific crises? On the possible emergence of adverse selection phenomena on the survival of entrepreneurial ventures*, luglio 2010
99. M. Bordignon, A. Monticini, *The importance of electoral rule: Evidence from Italy*, febbraio 2011