Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Global Politics and Socio-Humanities
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

A Law and Economics Analysis of Penalties for Corporate Environmental Violations

Weichen Deng

Law School, University of Xiamen, Xiamen, China
965250144@qq.com

Abstract. Environmental degradation resulting from corporate violations constitutes a significant negative externality that market mechanisms often fail to correct effectively. This paper utilizes a law and economics methodology to analyze the efficiency of penalty structures imposed on enterprises violating environmental regulations. Employing the Becker model of crime and punishment, the study evaluates the deterrence effects of administrative fines versus civil liabilities. The central research question addresses how penalty magnitudes should be calibrated to achieve optimal social welfare while minimizing enforcement costs. The findings reveal that current regimes often suffer from under-deterrence due to low detection probabilities and fines that fail to internalize the full social costs of environmental harm. Specifically, when the probability of detection is low, the penalty must be significantly higher to ensure the expected cost of violation exceeds the cost of compliance. However, statutory caps on fines and the limited assets of firms often prevent reaching this threshold. Furthermore, the analysis highlights that without dynamic adjustment mechanisms, penalties quickly become obsolete in the face of inflation and rising corporate revenues. The conclusion proposes an emphasis on dynamic adjustment mechanisms for ensuring compliance and economic efficiency. These mechanisms should index penalties to corporate revenue and the severity of ecological damage, rather than relying on fixed statutory amounts. Additionally, the paper recommends a hybrid enforcement strategy combining high-certainty administrative fines for minor violations with severe civil liabilities for major harms to close the existing deterrence gap.

Keywords: Law and Economics, Environmental Violations, Penalty Structure, Deterrence Theory

1. Introduction

Industrialization has driven global economic growth but simultaneously exacerbated environmental pollution, creating a persistent conflict between corporate profit maximization and social welfare.

The urgency of this issue is underscored by the increasing frequency of industrial accidents, chronic air and water pollution, and the long-term threat of climate change. In reality, environmental governance faces a severe "dilemma of enforcement," where regulatory resources are often insufficient to monitor the vast number of polluting entities, and illegal gains frequently outweigh the expected costs of penalties.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

Traditional legal approaches often focus on retribution or strict compliance without fully considering the economic incentives facing potential violators. In recent years, the law and economics perspective has gained prominence, offering robust tools to analyze legal rules through the lens of efficiency and incentive compatibility. Despite significant progress in environmental legislation globally, enterprises frequently violate regulations when the expected cost of penalties is lower than the cost of compliance. This phenomenon highlights a critical gap between legal design and economic reality.

This paper adopts a theoretical analysis method utilizing the Becker model of crime and punishment, comparative institutional analysis, and mechanism design to examine the efficacy of current penalty mechanisms. The primary research question is how to design an optimal penalty structure that maximizes deterrence while minimizing social enforcement costs. Addressing this issue is significant for policymakers aiming to balance economic development with environmental sustainability, ensuring that legal sanctions serve as an effective tool.

2. Theoretical foundations of environmental enforcement

2.1. Externalities and the Coase Theorem

The foundational economic concept underlying environmental regulation is the theory of externalities. An externality occurs when the production or consumption activities of one party affect the welfare of another party in a way that is not reflected in market prices. In the context of corporate environmental violations, pollution is a negative externality where the firm enjoys the private benefits of production while society bears the costs of environmental degradation, health impacts, and ecological loss. Pigou argued that, under ideal conditions, the optimal solution to negative externalities is a tax equal to the marginal social damage, thereby internalizing the cost [1]. However, in legal practice, determining the exact marginal social damage is often infeasible due to information asymmetry, valuation difficulties, and the long-term nature of environmental harm.

The Coase Theorem offers an alternative perspective, positing that if property rights are well-defined and transaction costs are zero, parties will bargain to an efficient outcome regardless of the initial allocation of rights, although such allocation affects the distribution of welfare [2]. In environmental law, this suggests that if victims of pollution could negotiate with polluters without cost, the market would, in theory, resolve the inefficiency. However, in reality, transaction costs are prohibitively high. There are often numerous victims of pollution, making collective bargaining impractical due to free-rider problems. Furthermore, property rights over air, water, and biodiversity are often ill-defined or held collectively by the state.

As a result the conditions required for Coasean bargaining rarely hold, and market-based solutions fail to internalize environmental externalities effectively. Consequently, the legal system must intervene to approximate the efficient outcome that would have been achieved under negligible transaction costs. In this sense, legal rules function as a substitute for missing markets by imposing costs on violators that reflect, as closely as possible, the social harm caused by their actions. Without such intervention, a rational corporate actor will continue to pollute until private marginal cost equals private marginal benefit, disregarding broader social costs.

2.2. The Becker model of crime and punishment

To understand how penalties influence corporate behavior, one must apply the Becker model of crime and punishment. Becker conceptualized illegal behavior as a rational choice in which

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

individuals or firms weigh expected benefits against expected costs [3]. The expected cost of violation depends on the probability of detection and the magnitude of the penalty. Formally, a firm will violate environmental regulations if the expected gain from violation exceeds the expected penalty. This can be expressed as:

Expected Penalty = Probability of Detection × Magnitude of Penalty

If this value is lower than the cost savings from non-compliance, the rational firm will choose to violate the law.

This model implies that deterrence can be achieved by increasing either the probability of detection or the magnitude of the penalty. However, increasing the probability of detection typically entails substantial enforcement costs, such as monitoring, inspection, and litigation. From an efficiency standpoint, it is often cheaper to increase the penalty magnitude while keeping detection probabilities lower, provided the penalties are not so high as to cause bankruptcy or risk aversion that stifles legitimate activity. Shavell expanded on this by noting that if actors are risk-neutral, the optimal penalty should equal the harm divided by the probability of detection [4]. This ensures that the expected penalty equals the marginal social damage, thereby internalizing the externality. However, if firms are risk-averse or subject to the judgment-proof problem (unable to pay large fines), the effectiveness of high penalties is limited, and the model requires adjustment.

Overall, the Becker framework provides the analytical backbone for evaluating whether current environmental penalties are sufficient to alter corporate calculus.

2.3. Corporate rationality and agency problems

A critical extension of the basic model involves the internal structure of the corporation. Corporations are not monolithic actors; rather, they consist of managers and shareholders with potentially divergent interests. Agency problems arise when managers pursue personal goals, such as short-term profit bonuses, at the expense of long-term compliance.

If penalties are imposed only on the corporation, the financial burden is largely borne by shareholders, while managers may escape personal liability. This separation between decision-making and liability can weaken deterrence. Therefore, an efficient penalty structure must also consider personal liability for executives to align internal incentives. When managers face personal reputational damage or criminal liability, the internal cost of violation increases, reinforcing the external penalty. This layer of analysis is crucial for understanding why corporate fines alone often fail to change behavior within the firm's decision-making hierarchy.

3. Economic efficiency in penalty structures

3.1. Administrative fines versus civil liability

Environmental enforcement typically utilizes two main mechanisms: administrative fines imposed by regulatory agencies and civil liability awarded through courts. Each mechanism has distinct economic implications for efficiency and deterrence. Administrative fines are generally lower in magnitude but often have a higher probability of imposition due to simplified procedures and lower evidentiary requirements. Ogus noted that regulatory frameworks often internalize externalities through ex-ante planning controls and administrative sanctions rather than ex-post tort liability [5]. This reduces the transaction costs for the state but may result in penalties that are too low to deter large corporations. For a multinational corporation, a standard administrative fine may be internalized as a routine operating cost rather than a deterrent.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

Civil liability, on the other hand, often involves higher magnitudes, including compensatory and punitive damages, but suffers from a lower probability of enforcement due to high litigation costs and evidentiary hurdles. Polinsky and Shavell emphasized that the legal system must account for administrative costs alongside the primary costs of harm when designing liability rules [6]. Civil suits allow victims to internalize the harm directly, potentially leading to higher compensation that reflects actual damage. However, the uncertainty of litigation outcomes can create inefficiencies. Firms may over-invest in compliance to avoid the risk of massive punitive damages, or they may under-invest if they believe they can settle for less. An efficient system likely requires a hybrid approach where administrative fines handle minor, frequent violations with high certainty, while civil liability reserves for major, catastrophic harms where the social cost is immense. In many jurisdictions, the imbalance, where administrative fines are too low and civil liability is too uncertain, creates a gap in the deterrence spectrum.

3.2. Optimal penalty calculation

The core of the economic analysis lies in calculating the optimal penalty. According to the theory of optimal law enforcement, the penalty should be set such that the expected cost of violation equals the social harm caused. For example, if the probability of detection is 10%, the penalty should be ten times the harm to maintain equivalent deterrence [7]. However, current regimes often fail this calibration. Fines are frequently capped by statute at levels that do not reflect the true social cost of environmental damage. For instance, a fine of $50,000 for a violation that saves a firm $1 million in disposal costs creates a clear economic incentive to pollute. This leads to under-deterrence, where violations are economically rational.

Furthermore, the calculation must account for the harm to future generations and ecological systems, which are difficult to quantify monetarily. Cooter and Ulen explained that when the cost of preventing harm exceeds the harm itself, efficiency dictates that the harm should be tolerated, but this rarely applies to irreversible environmental damage [8]. Therefore, penalties for irreversible harm should be disproportionately high to account for the option value of preserving the environment. Dynamic adjustment mechanisms are necessary to ensure penalties keep pace with inflation, corporate profitability, and evolving scientific understanding of environmental harm.

For example, a static fine system that sets a maximum penalty of $1 million may have been effective in 1990, but for a modern multinational corporation with annual revenues in the billions, this amount is negligible. A dynamic mechanism would index the fine to a percentage of the firm's annual revenue or the profits gained from the violation. This ensures that the penalty remains a significant threat regardless of the firm's size or the passage of time. The optimal penalty structure must be flexible, allowing regulators to adjust sanctions based on the specific economic context of the violator and the severity of the ecological impact. This ensures that the penalty remains a binding constraint on corporate behavior rather than a fixed fee.

3.3. The problem of judgment-proof corporations

A significant limitation in penalty enforcement is the phenomenon of judgment-proof firms. If a corporation's assets are insufficient to pay the optimal penalty, the deterrence effect is capped at the level of its assets. This creates a moral hazard where firms may under-capitalize intentionally to limit liability exposure. In such cases, even massive statutory penalties are ineffective because they cannot be collected. Economic theory suggests that in such scenarios, regulatory controls must shift from ex-post penalties to ex-preventative measures, such as mandatory insurance or bonding

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

requirements. Requiring firms to post bonds helps ensure that funds are available for remediation regardless of the firm's solvency. This shifts the risk back to the firm, as the cost of the bond reflects their risk profile, thereby restoring the economic incentive for safety even when liability caps exist.

4. Challenges in implementation and deterrence

4.1. Information asymmetry and enforcement costs

A major barrier to efficient enforcement is information asymmetry. Regulators often lack complete information about a firm's production processes, pollution levels, and compliance costs. This asymmetry allows firms to hide violations or misreport data. Stavins noted that experience with market-based environmental policy instruments shows that monitoring is crucial for effectiveness [9]. When monitoring is costly, the probability of detection drops, requiring higher penalties (or improved monitoring) to maintain deterrence. However, political and legal constraints often limit the maximum allowable penalty. This creates a dilemma where neither the probability nor the magnitude can be raised sufficiently in practice to achieve optimal deterrence.

Enforcement costs also include the resources required to litigate violations. If the cost of prosecuting a violation exceeds the expected enforcement benefits, agencies may be discouraged from pursuing cases. This leads to selective enforcement, where only the most egregious violations are punished, while routine non-compliance goes unchecked. Kolstad argued that environmental economics must account for the institutional costs of regulation [10]. To mitigate this, some jurisdictions employ self-reporting incentives, where firms receive reduced penalties for voluntarily disclosing violations. While this reduces information asymmetry, it risks creating a moral hazard where firms violate intentionally expecting to report later if caught. Balancing these incentives requires careful calibration of the penalty discount for self-reporting to ensure it does not undermine the overall deterrence structure.

4.2. Repeat violations and dynamic consistency

Another challenge is dealing with repeat violators. A static penalty model assumes a one-off interaction, whereas corporate regulation typically takes the form of a repeated game. Firms may calculate that, even if violation are detected multiple times, the cumulative penalties are still lower than the cost of full compliance. Dynamic consistency therefore requires that penalties escalate for repeat offenses, preventing firms from treating fines as a routine cost of continued non-compliance. Endres discussed the economics of environmental law, highlighting that sanctions must increase at the margin to deter habitual offenders [11]. If the penalty for subsequent violations does not increase, the additional deterrent effect is limited.

Moreover, the credibility of future regulation plays a critical role. If firms believe that regulations may be relaxed due to political or economic pressure, they will discount the expected value of future penalties, thereby reducing current deterrence. This time inconsistency problem undermines the credibility of the legal framework. To address this issue, legal structures should incorporate automatic escalation mechanisms for repeat violations and strengthen the institutional independence of enforcement agencies. Kaplow and Shavell noted that legal systems often balance efficiency with distributional considerations; however, in the context of environmental enforcement, efficiency must take precedence to prevent irreversible harm [12]. Ensuring dynamic consistency requires designing penalty structures that increase progressively with repeated violations, signaling that continued non-

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

compliance will eventually threaten the firm's viability. This aligns the long-term interests of the firm with the long-term interests of society.

4.3. Regulatory capture and political economy

Beyond purely economic calculation, the political economy of regulation plays a crucial role in shaping enforcement outcomes. Regulatory capture occurs when agencies become influenced or dominated by the industries they regulate, leading to softer enforcement. This distorts the penalty structure, making it less efficient. Posner argued that legal institutions must be designed to resist capture to maintain efficiency [13].

Mechanisms such as citizen suit provisions, where private parties can enforce regulations, help mitigate capture by introducing external monitoring. Additionally, transparency requirements that mandate public disclosure of violation records empower consumers and investors to penalize violators through market mechanisms, supplementing state enforcement. This multi-layered approach reduces the reliance on a single enforcement channel that may be susceptible to political manipulation.

5. Comparative perspectives and policy recommendations

5.1. US versus EU approaches

Comparing the United States and European Union approaches reveals different economic trade-offs in environmental enforcement. The US system relies heavily on mechanisms such as punitive damages and citizen suits, creating high variance in penalties but strong deterrence for large cases. By contrast, the EU system tends to favor administrative harmonization and standardized fines, offering greater certainty but potentially lower maximum penalties.

From an efficiency perspective, an effective enforcement framework may benefit from combining elements of both systems. A hybrid approach could integrate the high-stakes deterrence characteristic of the US model with the consistency and predictability associated with EU-style administrative enforcement. Such a framework would ensure that penalties are predictable enough for compliance planning but severe enough to prevent calculation-based violations.

5.2. Policy recommendations for reform

Based on the economic analysis, several reforms are recommended:

First, penalties should be indexed to corporate revenue rather than fixed amounts to ensure they bite equally for small and large firms. Second, personal liability for executives should be expanded to address agency problems. Third, mandatory environmental insurance should be required for high-risk industries to solve the judgment-proof problem. Finally, revenue from fines should be earmarked for environmental remediation rather than general funds, creating a direct link between violation and restoration. These steps would align the legal framework more closely with economic efficiency principles.

6. Conclusion

This study concludes that the current penalty structures for corporate environmental violations often fail to achieve optimal deterrence due to misalignment with economic incentives. The research confirms that under-deterrence is a systemic issue caused by low detection probabilities and fines

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU35803

that do not internalize full social costs. By applying the Becker model and theory of externalities, it is evident that penalties must be calibrated to ensure the expected cost of violation exceeds the private benefit of non-compliance. The analysis suggests that a hybrid approach combining certain administrative fines for minor violations and severe civil liability for major harms is most efficient. Furthermore, dynamic adjustment mechanisms are essential to maintain deterrence over time and account for repeat offenses.

However, this paper has limitations. It primarily analyzes the issue through a theoretical law and economics framework, potentially overlooking political economy constraints that prevent the implementation of optimal penalties. The analysis assumes rational corporate actors, which may not always hold true due to internal agency problems within corporations. Additionally, the valuation of environmental harm remains subjective and contentious, complicating the calculation of optimal penalties. Future research should concentrate on empirical studies measuring the actual deterrence effects of penalty increases in specific jurisdictions. Improvements could involve designing algorithmic penalty systems that adjust automatically based on real-time monitoring data. Ultimately, bridging the gap between doctrinal law and economic reality remains essential for creating a legal system that supports sustainable environmental governance while ensuring corporate accountability.

References

[1] Pigou, A. C. (1920). *The economics of welfare*. Macmillan, London.
[2] Coase, R. H. (1960). The problem of social cost. *Journal of Law and Economics, 3*, 1–44.
[3] Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy, 76*(2), 169–217.
[4] Shavell, S. (2004). *Foundations of economic analysis of law*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
[5] Ogus, A. (2004). *Regulation: Economic theory and public policy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
[6] Polinsky, A. M., & Shavell, S. (2000). The economic theory of public enforcement of law. *Journal of Economic Literature, 38*(1), 45-76.
[7] Landes, W. M., & Posner, R. A. (1987). The positive economic theory of tort law. *Harvard University Press,* Cambridge.
[8] Cooter, R., & Ulen, T. (2016). *Law and economics*. Pearson, London.
[9] Stavins, R. N. (2003). Experience with market-based environmental policy instruments. In K. G. Mäler & J. R. Vincent (Eds.), *Handbook of environmental economics*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
[10] Kolstad, C. D. (2000). *Environmental economics*. Oxford University Press, New York.
[11] Endres, A. (2004). *Economics of environmental law*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
[12] Kaplow, L., & Shavell, S. (2002). *Fairness versus welfare*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
[13] Posner, R. A. (2014). *Economic analysis of law*. Wolters Kluwer, New York.