

# OPTIMUM DELAYED RETIREMENT CREDIT

EYTAN SHESHINSKI

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 889

CATEGORY 1: PUBLIC FINANCE

MARCH 2003

*An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded*

- *from the SSRN website:* [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- *from the CESifo website:* [www.CESifo.de](http://www.CESifo.de)

# OPTIMUM DELAYED RETIREMENT CREDIT

## Abstract

A central question for pension design is how benefits should vary with the age of retirement beyond early eligibility age. It is often argued that in order to be neutral with respect to individual retirement decisions benefits should be actuarially fair, that is, the present value of additional contributions and benefits ('Delayed Retirement Credit' - DRC) due to postponed retirement should be equal. We show that in a self-selection, asymmetric information model, because individual decisions are suboptimal, the socially optimal benefit structure should be less than actuarially fair.

JEL Code: D82, H55, J26.

Keywords: delayed retirement credit, self-selection, moral hazard.

*Eytan Sheshinski*  
*Department of Economics*  
*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*  
*Mount Scopus*  
*Jerusalem 91905*  
*Israel*  
*mseytan@mcc.huji.ac.il*

# 1 Introduction

A central question for pension design is how benefits should vary with the age of retirement beyond the earliest eligibility age.<sup>1</sup> For examples of widely varying pension benefits designs in many countries, see Gruber and Wise (1999). In the U.S., retirement ahead of the Normal Retirement Age (NRA), currently 65 but being raised to 67 by the year 2011, reduces benefits by 5/9 of one percent per month (about 6 percent annually). This is called the '*Actuarial Reduction Factor*'. Similarly, benefits increase for retirement beyond the NRA up to age 70. This is called '*Delayed Retirement Credit*' (DRC).

Workers vary in many ways - in life expectancy, income levels and in the degree of difficulty in continuing work. A good system needs to have flexibility in retirement ages to accommodate this diversity. (See Diamond (2000) lecture 3). It is often argued that it is desirable that the system be neutral with respect to individual retirement decisions, implying that the incentive design should be 'actuarially fair' on average. That is, the present value of additional contributions due to postponed retirement should equal the expected present discounted value of additional benefits.

The implicit assumption is that neutrality will preserve otherwise optimal individual decisions. We shall argue, however, that under asymmetric information, this is not the case. Certain individual attributes relevant to retirement decisions, such as labor disutility, are not observable by pension suppliers (government or private pension firms) and therefore pension schemes cannot depend on such attributes. Consequently, when individuals *self-select* their optimal retirement age based on their personal characteristics, the ensuing equilibrium is socially suboptimal: benefits to retirees are constrained by the need to provide sufficient incentives to continue work. DRC, by providing an incentive to continue to work, alleviates this constraint and leads to a better allocation of resources. This result holds even when all individuals have the same life expectancy (see Diamond (2000), lectures 6 - 7).

---

<sup>1</sup>Earliest eligibility age (62 in the U.S.) is designed to strike a balance between those who would, in the absence of such threshold, erroneously retire too early and others who have health or other reasons to retire earlier and for whom this imposes a liquidity constraint. One would like to know how this balance changes with increased life expectancy and morbidity. Interestingly, social security reforms in the U.S. and Sweden left the earliest eligibility age intact.

## 2 The Model

Consider three different consumption levels:  $c_a$  for active workers,  $c_b^0$  for early retirees and  $c_b^1$  for normal (or delayed) retirees. The utility function for a worker with labor disutility level  $\theta$  is written  $u(c_a) - \theta$ . We assume that  $\theta$  is non-negative and distributed in the population with distribution  $F(\theta)$  (and density  $f(\theta)$ ). For convenience, we assume that  $f(\theta)$  is continuous and positive for all non-negative  $\theta$ . The utility function of non-workers is  $v(c)$ , where  $c$  will take the values of  $c_b^0$  or  $c_b^1$ , depending on the age at retirement.

We assume that the marginal product of workers is equal and normalize it to one. Thus, the only difference between workers is in the level of labor disutility.

Let  $T_0$  be the age at which individuals have to make a decision whether to take early retirement or postpone retirement to age  $T_1$ ,  $T_1 > T_0$ . With a certain life span of  $T$ , the length of retirement time is either  $T - T_0$  for early retirees or  $T - T_1$  for delayed retirement.

Normalizing the length of maximum retirement to one, delayed retirement entails work for a period of length  $\alpha$  ( $= \frac{T_1 - T_0}{T - T_0}$ ),  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , and retirement for a period of length  $1 - \alpha$  ( $= \frac{T - T_1}{T - T_0}$ ), while early retirement is for a period of one. We further assume a zero subjective discount rate and zero rate of interest.<sup>2</sup>

If all those with labor disutility below a certain level,  $\theta_0$ , work while the others take early retirement, social welfare,  $W$ , is

$$W = \alpha \int_0^{\theta_0} (u(c_a) - \theta) dF(\theta) + (1 - \alpha) \int_0^{\theta_0} v(c_a^1) dF(\theta) + \int_{\theta_0}^{\infty} v(c_b^0) dF(\theta). \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The results carry-over, with obvious changes, to the case with positive subjective discount and interest rates.

The budget constraint for the system is

$$\alpha \int_0^{\theta_0} (c_a - 1) dF(\theta) + (1 - \alpha) \int_0^{\theta_0} c_b^1 dF(\theta) + \int_{\theta_0}^{\infty} c_b^0 dF(\theta) = R \quad (2)$$

where  $R$  are the resources available to the economy.

When  $c_b^1 - c_b^0$  is positive, we call this difference the **Delayed Retirement Credit (DRC)**. Our objective is to analyze whether such credit is optimal and examine the dependence of its level on exogenous factors.

### 3 First-Best: Labor Disutility Observable

To ensure that the maximization of (1) s.t.(2) entails that some individuals work, we assume that when no one works, those with the least disutility of labor prefer to work for an additional consumption equal to their marginal product:

$$u(R + \alpha) > v(R) \quad (3)$$

This condition is called (Diamond-Sheshinski (1995)) the **poverty condition**.

When labor disutility is observable, it is possible to determine the optimum consumption levels and the cutoff  $\theta$  so as to maximize (1) s.t.(2). Optimum consumption,  $(c_a^*, c_b^{0*}, c_b^{1*})$ , is allocated to equate marginal utilities of consumption:

$$u'(c_a^*) = v'(c_b^{0*}) = v'(c_b^{1*}). \quad (4)$$

All non-workers enjoy the same level of consumption,  $c_b^{0*} = c_b^{1*}$ . Consequently, the First-Best entails no DRC.

All individuals with disutility levels below a cutoff  $\theta^*$ ,  $\theta^* > 0$ , should work and the rest retire. The cutoff is determined by comparing the utility gain from extra work,  $\alpha(u(c_a^*) - \theta^*) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^{1*}) - v(c_b^{0*})$  with the value of extra consumption as a consequence of work,  $u'(c_a^*)(c_a^* - \alpha - c_b^{0*})$ .

By (4), this condition becomes:

$$\alpha(u(c_a^*) - \theta^* - v(c_b^{0*})) = u'(c_a^*)(c_a^* - \alpha - c_b^{0*}) \quad (5)$$

The *First-Best* allocation is determined by (4), (5) and the resource constraint (2).

## 4 Second-Best: Self-Selection Equilibrium

Suppose now that labor disutility is not observable. Consequently, the cutoff  $\theta$  is determined by individuals: given consumption levels, those with disutility above the level which equates the utility of continued work and delayed retirement to that of early retirement, will prefer working. Thus, the threshold  $\theta, \hat{\theta}$ , is determined by:

$$\alpha(u(c_a) - \hat{\theta}) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1) = v(c_b^0)$$

or

$$\hat{\theta} = \frac{1}{\alpha}[\alpha u(c_a) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1) - v(c_b^0)]. \quad (6)$$

A sufficient condition to make a retirement program socially desirable is that the marginal utility of non-workers exceeds that of workers with the least disutility of work. This condition:

$$u(x) = v(y) \text{ implies } u'(x) < v'(y) \quad (7)$$

is termed (Diamond-Mirrlees, (1978)) the **moral hazard condition**. By (3), there is some work at the optimal allocation. Thus, at least the most able worker ( $\theta = 0$ ) must work, implying  $u(c_a) > v(c_b^0)$ , and so, by (7),  $u'(c_a) < v'(c_b^0)$ .

Maximization of (1) s.t.(2), with  $\theta_0$  replaced by  $\hat{\theta}$  (which, by (6), is a function of  $c_a$ ,  $c_b^0$  and  $c_b^1$ ) yields the following F.O.C.:

$$\alpha(u'(c_a) - \lambda) \int_0^{\hat{\theta}} dF = \lambda A u'(c_a) \quad (8)$$

$$\alpha(v'(c_b^0) - \lambda) \int_{\hat{\theta}}^{\infty} dF = -\lambda A v'(c_b^0) \quad (9)$$

$$\alpha(v'(c_b^1) - \lambda) \int_0^{\hat{\theta}} dF = \lambda A v'(c_b^1) \quad (10)$$

where

$$A = [\alpha(c_a - 1) + (1 - \alpha)c_b^1 - c_b^0] f(\hat{\theta}) \quad (11)$$

We have used (6) to obtain the derivatives of  $\hat{\theta}$  w.r.t.  $c_a$ ,  $c_b^0$  and  $c_b^1$ . The R.H.S. of these equations are the social values of resource savings from induced changes in labor supply due to altered benefits. The private return to working is  $\alpha c_a + (1 - \alpha)c_b^1 - c_b^0$ . Comparing this with the marginal product,  $\alpha$ , we see that there is an implicit tax on work when  $\alpha c_a + (1 - \alpha)c_b^1 - c_b^0 < \alpha$ . As seen from (9), this is the case if at the optimum there are some non-workers

and  $v'(c_b^0) > \lambda$ . When  $\hat{\theta}$ , (6), is an interior solution then (7) ensures that this condition is satisfied.

Conditions (8)-(10) and the resource constraint (2) solve for optimum consumption and the corresponding Lagrangean, denoted  $\hat{c}_a$ ,  $\hat{c}_b^0$ ,  $\hat{c}_b^1$  and  $\hat{\lambda}$  respectively.

From (8) and (10) we see that  $u'(\hat{c}_a) = v'(\hat{c}_b^1)$ . Optimum delayed retirement benefits provide the same marginal utility as workers' consumption.<sup>3</sup>

Dividing (8)-(9) by the respective marginal utilities and adding, we see that the inverse of the Lagrangean equals the average of the inverses of the marginal utilities:

$$\hat{\lambda}^{-1} = u'(\hat{c}_a)^{-1} \int_0^{\hat{\theta}} dF + v'(\hat{c}_b^0)^{-1} \int_{\hat{\theta}}^{\infty} dF. \quad (12)$$

**Proposition.** *When the optimum allocation has workers and non-workers, it has a positive delayed retirement credit (DRC) and an implicit tax on work.*

**Proof.** With  $u'(\hat{c}_a) = v'(\hat{c}_b^1)$ , we have from (6) and (7) that  $u'(\hat{c}_a) < v'(\hat{c}_b^0)$ . Hence, from (12),  $u'(\hat{c}_a) < \hat{\lambda} < v'(\hat{c}_b^0)$  and  $v'(\hat{c}_b^1) < v'(\hat{c}_b^0)$  or  $\hat{c}_b^0 < \hat{c}_b^1$ .

The explanation of this result is straightforward. From the moral hazard condition, (6), we know that an attempt to implement the First-Best allocation, (4), is impossible because nobody will work. Any feasible policy that can increase the benefits of retirees without reducing workers' welfare is desirable. In the absence of DRC,  $c_b^1 = c_b^0$ , the cutoff  $\hat{\theta}$  is determined by the condition

---

<sup>3</sup>If  $u(c)$  is a constant shift function of  $v(c)$ , then  $\hat{c}_a = \hat{c}_b^1$ .



$$\begin{aligned} \text{or} \quad & \alpha(u(\widehat{c}_a) - \widehat{\theta}) + (1 - \alpha)v(\widehat{c}_b^0) = v(\widehat{c}_b^0) \\ & u(\widehat{c}_a) - \widehat{\theta} - v(\widehat{c}_b^0) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Now introduce a small DRC, raising retirement benefits for workers by  $\frac{\Delta}{1 - \alpha}$ . Since these higher benefits apply for a period of  $(1 - \alpha)$ , total costs for each worker increase by  $\Delta$  and utility increases by  $v'(c_b^0)\Delta$ . Similarly, reducing workers' consumption by  $\frac{\Delta}{\alpha}$  saves  $\Delta$  over the working period  $\alpha$  and decreases utility by  $u'(c_a)\Delta$ . By the moral hazard condition,  $v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) - u'(c_a) > 0$ , and hence workers' utility increases. Furthermore, the following inequality holds for the marginal worker,

$$\alpha(u(\widehat{c}_a) - \widehat{\theta}) + (1 - \alpha)v(\widehat{c}_b^0) + (v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) - u'(\widehat{c}_a))\Delta > v(\widehat{c}_b^0), \tag{14}$$

implying that labor supply increases (by  $f(\widehat{\theta})$ ). Since there is a tax on labor,  $\widehat{c}_a - 1 - \widehat{c}_b^0 < 0$ , this enables an increase in benefits for early retirees,  $c_b^0$ .

## 5 No Early Retirement

Suppose that  $\theta$  has a finite upper bound,  $\bar{\theta} > 0$ . The '*poverty-condition*', (3), ensures that the optimum involves some work. At the other end, suppose that the optimum allocation involves no non-workers, that is,  $\widehat{\theta} = \bar{\theta}$ . This means that the consumption of non-workers,  $\widehat{c}_b^0$ , is set at a level (possibly zero) such that nobody chooses early retirement. From (12) it follows that in this case,  $\widehat{\lambda} = u'(\widehat{c}_a)$  ( $= v'(\widehat{c}_b^1)$ ).

From (8) (or (10)) and (11)<sup>4</sup> we now obtain the condition,  $\alpha(\widehat{c}_a - 1) + (1 - \alpha)\widehat{c}_b^1 - \widehat{c}_b^0 \geq 0$ . Since there are no non-workers to support, there is no

---

<sup>4</sup>Modified (Kuhn-Tucker) conditions for a boundary solution.

implicit tax on work<sup>5</sup>.

## 6 Two-Class Case: Comparative Statics

Consider an economy with two types of individuals: those with labor disutility  $\theta_1$  and those with  $\theta_2$  ( $\theta_1 < \theta_2$ ). Population weights of these groups are  $f_1$  and  $f_2 = 1 - f_1$ , respectively. We assume that the optimum has the form that the  $\theta_1$  types work while the  $\theta_2$  types take early retirement.

Social welfare optimization now takes the form

$$\text{Max} \{[\alpha(u(c_a) - \theta_1) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1)] f_1 + v(c_b^0)(1 - f_1)\} \quad (15)$$

subject to

$$[\alpha(c_a - 1) + (1 - \alpha)c_b^1] f_1 + c_b^0(1 - f_1) = R \quad (16)$$

$$\alpha(u(c_a) - \theta_1) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1) \geq v(c_b^0) \geq \alpha(u(c_a) - \theta_2) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1) \quad (17)$$

Condition (17) ensures that individual behavior coincides with that described in the objective function and the resource constraint, (16). The **moral hazard condition** and (17) imply that

$$\alpha(u(c_a) - \theta_1) + (1 - \alpha)v(c_b^1) = v(c_b^0) \quad (18)$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Another way to see this: from the resource constraint (2), when  $\hat{\theta} = \bar{\theta}$ ,  $\alpha(\hat{c}_a - 1) + (1 - \alpha)\hat{c}_b^1 = R$ . Hence,  $\hat{c}_b^0 \leq R$  (in particular, with no exogenous resources,  $R = 0$ ,  $\hat{c}_b^0 = 0$ ). None of the output of workers,  $\alpha$ , is allocated to non-workers.

Performing the maximization of (15) subject to (16)-(18), we obtain that at the optimum  $u'(\hat{c}_a) = v'(\hat{c}_b^1) < v'(\hat{c}_b^0)$ . Hence,  $\hat{c}_b^1 - \hat{c}_b^0 > 0$ .

We can use this example to analyze the effect on the optimal configuration of an increase in longevity, i.e. a decrease in  $\alpha$ .

Differentiating (16) and (18) totally w.r.t.  $\alpha$ , viewing  $\hat{c}_b^1$  as dependent on  $\hat{c}_a$  through the relation  $u'(\hat{c}_a) = v'(\hat{c}_b^1)$ , yields

$$\frac{d\hat{c}_b^1}{d\alpha} = \frac{-\beta}{u'(\hat{c}_a)(1-f) + v'(\hat{c}_b^0)f_1} [(u(\hat{c}_a) - \theta_1 - v(\hat{c}_b^1))(1-f_1) + (\hat{c}_a - 1 - \hat{c}_b^1)v'(\hat{c}_b^0)f_1] \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{d\hat{c}_b^0}{d\alpha} = \frac{-1}{u'(\hat{c}_a)(1-f_1) + v'(\hat{c}_b^0)f_1} [(\hat{c}_a - 1 - \hat{c}_b^1)u'(\hat{c}_a) - (u(\hat{c}_a) - \theta_1 - v(\hat{c}_b^1))]f_1 \quad (20)$$

where

$$\beta = \frac{u''(\hat{c}_a)}{\alpha v''(\hat{c}_b^1) + (1-\alpha)u''(\hat{c}_a)} > 0.$$

From (12) and (18),  $u(\hat{c}_a) - \theta_1 - v(\hat{c}_b^1) = \frac{1}{\alpha}(v(\hat{c}_b^0) - v(\hat{c}_b^1)) < 0$ . Also, from (8) - (12),  $\hat{c}_a - 1 - \hat{c}_b^1 < \frac{1}{\alpha}(\hat{c}_b^0 - \hat{c}_b^1) < 0$ . It follows from (19) that  $\frac{d\hat{c}_b^1}{d\alpha} > 0$ , while the sign of  $\frac{d\hat{c}_b^0}{d\alpha}$  is ambiguous.

By (19) - (20), the effect on the DRC is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{c}_b^1}{d\alpha} - \frac{d\hat{c}_b^0}{d\alpha} &= \frac{-1}{u'(\hat{c}_a)(1-f_1) + v'(\hat{c}_b^0)f_1} [\beta(u(\hat{c}_a) - \theta_1 - v(\hat{c}_b^1)) + \\ &\quad + (1-\beta)(u(\hat{c}_a) - \theta_1 - v(\hat{c}_b^1))f_1 + \\ &\quad + (\hat{c}_a - 1 - \hat{c}_b^1)(v'(\hat{c}_b^0) - u'(\hat{c}_a))f_1] \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

A sufficient condition for (21) to be positive is that  $\beta \leq 1$ . This condition holds when  $v''(\widehat{c}_b^1) \leq u''(\widehat{c}_a)$  or, in terms of coefficients of risk aversion (since  $v'(\widehat{c}_b^1) = u'(\widehat{c}_a)$ ),  $\frac{v''(\widehat{c}_b^1)}{v'(\widehat{c}_b^1)} \leq \frac{u''(\widehat{c}_a)}{u'(\widehat{c}_a)}$ <sup>6</sup>. A reduction in  $\alpha$  reduces total output and consequently the consumption of workers.

The change in consumption of non-workers depends on the magnitude of the change in output relative to the change in consumption of workers. The above condition implies that in order to maintain equal marginal utility of workers before and after their (delayed) retirement, the reduction in workers' retirement consumption,  $\widehat{c}_b^1$ , is not larger than the reduction in their consumption while working,  $\widehat{c}_a$ .

In the special case where  $u(c) = v(c)$ , since  $\widehat{c}_a = \widehat{c}_b^1$ , equations (19) - (21) take the simple form:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\widehat{c}_b^1}{d\alpha} &= \frac{\theta_1(1-f_1) + v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) f_1}{u'(\widehat{c}_a)(1-f_1) + v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) f_1} > 0 \\ \frac{d\widehat{c}_b^0}{d\alpha} &= \frac{u'(\widehat{c}_a) - \theta_1}{u'(\widehat{c}_a)(1-f_1) + v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) f_1} \begin{matrix} \geq \\ \leq \end{matrix} 0 \\ \frac{d\widehat{c}_b^1}{d\alpha} - \frac{d\widehat{c}_b^0}{d\alpha} &= \frac{(v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) - u'(\widehat{c}_a)) f_1 + \theta_1}{u'(\widehat{c}_a)(1-f_1) + v'(\widehat{c}_b^0) f_1} > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The sign of the last expression is unambiguous due to the **moral hazard condition**.

---

<sup>6</sup>This holds, for example, when  $u(c)$  is a constant shift of  $v(c)$ .

## References

Diamond P.A. (2000), **Taxation, Incomplete Markets and Social Security**, Munich Lectures (forthcoming, MIT Press).

Gruber, J. and D. Wise (eds.) (1999), **Social Security and Retirement Programs Around the World** (NBER, Chicago University Press).

# CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see [www.cesifo.de](http://www.cesifo.de))

---

- 824 Syed M. Ahsan and Panagiotis Tsigaris, Measuring the Social Discount Rate under Uncertainty: A Methodology and Application, December 2002
- 825 Kai A. Konrad, Altruism and Envy in Contests: An Evolutionarily Stable Symbiosis, December 2002
- 826 Robert S. Chirinko and Huntley Schaller, A Revealed Preference Approach to Understanding Corporate Governance Problems: Evidence from Canada, December 2002
- 827 Geir B. Asheim, Green National Accounting for Welfare and Sustainability: A Taxonomy of Assumptions and Results, December 2002
- 828 Andrea Gebauer, Chang Woon Nam, and Rüdiger Parsche, Lessons of the 1999 Abolition of Intra-EU Duty Free Sales for Eastern European EU Candidates, December 2002
- 829 Giacomo Corneo, Work and Television, December 2002
- 830 Vivek H. Dehejia and Yiagadeesen Samy, Trade and Labour Standards – Theory, New Empirical Evidence, and Policy Implications, December 2002
- 831 Geir B. Asheim and Wolfgang Buchholz, A General Approach to Welfare Measurement through National Income Accounting, December 2002
- 832 Aaron Tornell and Frank Westermann, The Credit Channel in Middle Income Countries, January 2003
- 833 Gebhard Flaig, Time Series Properties of the German Monthly Production Index, January 2003
- 834 Campbell Leith and Jim Malley, Estimated Open Economy New Keynesian Phillips Curves for the G7, January 2003
- 835 Burkhard Heer and Bernd Süßmuth, Inflation and Wealth Distribution, January 2003
- 836 Erkki Koskela and Leopold von Thadden, Optimal Factor Taxation under Wage Bargaining – A Dynamic Perspective, January 2003
- 837 Carola Grün and Stephan Klasen, Growth, Income Distribution, and Well-Being: Comparisons across Space and Time, January 2003
- 838 Robert S. Chirinko and Ulf von Kalckreuth, On the German Monetary Transmission Mechanism: Interest Rate and Credit Channels for Investment Spending, January 2003

- 839 Sascha O. Becker, Andrea Ichino, and Giovanni Peri, How Large is the “Brain Drain” from Italy?”, January 2003
- 840 Albert Berry and John Serieux, All About the Giants: Probing the Influences on Growth and Income Inequality at the End of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, January 2003
- 841 Robert Fenge and Martin Werding, Ageing and the Tax Implied in Public Pension Schemes: Simulations for Selected OECD Countries, January 2003
- 842 Robert Fenge and Martin Werding, Ageing and Fiscal Imbalances Across Generations: Concepts of Measurement, January 2003
- 843 Giovanni Andrea Cornia, The Impact of Liberalisation and Globalisation on Income Inequality in Developing and Transitional Economies, January 2003
- 844 Peter Fredriksson and Per Johansson, Program Evaluation and Random Program Starts, January 2003
- 845 Bernd Hayo and Matthias Wrede, Fiscal Equalisation: Principles and an Application to the European Union, January 2003
- 846 Syed M. Ahsan and Jaideep Oberoi, Inequality, Well-being and Institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean, January 2003
- 847 Chang Woon Nam and Doina Maria Radulescu, The Role of Tax Depreciation for Investment Decisions: A Comparison of European Transition Countries, January 2003
- 848 V. Bhaskar and Steinar Holden, Wage Differentiation via Subsidised General Training, January 2003
- 849 Paloma Lopez-Garcia, Labour Market Performance and Start-up Costs: OECD Evidence, January 2003
- 850 Christian Keuschnigg and Soren Bo Nielsen, Public Policy for Start-up Entrepreneurship with Venture Capital and Bank Finance, January 2003
- 851 Yin-Wong Cheung, Menzie D. Chinn, and Eiji Fujii, China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan: A Quantitative Assessment of Real and Financial Integration, January 2003
- 852 Gregory D. Hess, The Economic Welfare Cost of Conflict: An Empirical Assessment, February 2003
- 853 Douglas J. Cumming and Jeffrey G. MacIntosh, Comparative Venture Capital Governance. Private versus Labour Sponsored Venture Capital Funds, February 2003
- 854 Eckhard Janeba and John Douglas Wilson, Decentralization and International Tax Competition, February 2003
- 855 Tapio Palokangas, Capital Accumulation and Employment Cycles in a Model of Creative Destruction, February 2003

- 856 Brendan Walsh, When Unemployment Disappears: Ireland in the 1990s, February 2003
- 857 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, A General Approach to the Stochastic Rotation Problem with Amenity Valuation, February 2003
- 858 Christian Schultz, Strategic Campaigns and Redistributive Politics, February 2003
- 859 Ernst Fehr and Joseph Henrich, Is Strong Reciprocity a Maladaptation? On the Evolutionary Foundations of Human Altruism, February 2003
- 860 Haizhou Huang, Dalia Marin, and Chenggang Xu, Financial Crisis, Economic Recovery and Banking Development in Former Soviet Union Economies, February 2003
- 861 Pedro Cardoso and Bernard M.S. van Praag, How Sustainable Are Old-age Pensions in a Shrinking Population with Endogenous Labour Supply?, February 2003
- 862 Volker Meier, Efficient Transfer of Aging Provisions in Private Health Insurance, February 2003
- 863 Edward Castronova, Theory of the Avatar, February 2003
- 864 Robert S. Chirinko, Hans van Ees, Harry Garretsen, and Elmer Sterken, Investor Protections and Concentrated Ownership: Assessing Corporate Control Mechanisms in the Netherlands, February 2003
- 865 Bernard M.S. van Praag and Pedro Cardoso, The Mix Between Pay-as-you-go and Funded Pensions and what Demography has to do with it, February 2003
- 866 Ernst Fehr, Urs Fischbacher, Bernhard von Rosenblatt, Jürgen Schupp, and Gert G. Wagner, A Nation-Wide Laboratory. Examining Trust and Trustworthiness by Integrating Behavioral Experiments into Representative Survey, February 2003
- 867 Frank Heinemann, The Inflationary Impact of Wage Indexation, February 2003
- 868 Eytan Sheshinski, Bounded Rationality and Socially Optimal Limits on Choice in a Self-Selection Model, February 2003
- 869 M. Hashem Pesaran, Estimation and Inference in Large Heterogenous Panels with Cross Section Dependence, February 2003
- 870 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, On the Tree-Cutting Problem under Interest Rate and Forest Value Uncertainty, February 2003
- 871 Norbert Berthold and Rainer Fehn, Unemployment in Germany: Reasons and Remedies, February 2003
- 872 Clemens Fuest, Bernd Huber, and Philipp Tilleßen, Tax Policy and Entrepreneurship in the Presence of Asymmetric Information in Capital Markets, February 2003
- 873 Eytan Sheshinski, Optimum and Risk-Class Pricing of Annuities, February 2003



- 874 Willi Leibfritz, Paul O'Brien and Jean-Christophe Dumont, Effects of Immigration on Labour Markets and Government Budgets – An Overview, February 2003
- 875 M. Hashem Pesaran and Allan Timmermann, How Costly is it to Ignore Breaks when Forecasting the Direction of a Time Series?, February 2003
- 876 Thorvaldur Gylfason and Gylfi Zoega, Education, Social Equality and Economic Growth: A View of the Landscape, February 2003
- 877 Robin Boadway and Jean-François Tremblay, Public Economics and Startup Entrepreneurs, February 2003
- 878 Erkki Koskela and Roope Uusitalo, The Un-Intended Convergence: How the Finnish Unemployment Reached the European Level, February 2003
- 879 Robert Fenge and Volker Meier, Pensions and Fertility Incentives, February 2003
- 880 Eytan Sheshinski, Note on Income Taxation and Occupational Choice, February 2003
- 881 A B Atkinson, Income Inequality in OECD Countries: Data and Explanations, February 2003
- 882 Thomas Gehrige and Rune Stenbacka, Venture Cycles: Theory and Evidence, February 2003
- 883 Ralf Becker and Thomas Hellmann, The Genesis of Venture Capital - Lessons from the German Experience, March 2003
- 884 Eytan Sheshinski, Note on the Optimum Pricing of Annuities, March 2003
- 885 Paul De Grauwe and Magdalena Polan, Globalisation and Social Spending, March 2003
- 886 F. van der Ploeg, Do Social Policies Harm Employment and Growth?, March 2003
- 887 Mirjam van Praag, Initial Capital Constraints Hinder Entrepreneurial Venture Performance: An empirical analysis, March 2003
- 888 Bernard Steunenberg, Coordinating Sectoral Policymaking: Searching for Countervailing Mechanisms in the EU Legislative Process, March 2003
- 889 Eytan Sheshinski, Optimum Delayed Retirement Credit, March 2003