Social Capital, R&D and Industrial Districts

Giulio Cainelli, Susanna Mancinelli
and Massimiliano Mazzanti

NOTA DI LAVORO 84.2005

JUNE 2005

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Giulio Cainelli, *University of Bari and CERIS-CNR*
Susanna Mancinelli and Massimiliano Mazzanti, *Economics Institutions and Territory, University of Ferrara*

Social Capital, R&D and Industrial Districts

Summary

The main idea behind this paper is that social capital is not, as generally suggested by the socio-economic literature, an individual attitude towards something which does not imply privately appropriable economic benefits. Actually, SC might and should be interpreted as a public component of an investment which implies private and public benefits entangled with each other. In order to put forward this idea, a dynamic theoretical model that assumes social capital as the public component of the impure public good R&D is developed. It shows that the 'civic culture' of the district area in which the firm works is not sufficient as an incentive to increase its investment in social capital, because this investment strictly depends on the economic convenience of investing in the impure public good. Social capital /networking dynamics might positively and complementarily evolve only if the opportunity cost of investing in innovation is sufficiently low. We consequently focus our attention on a specialized industrial district located in the Emilia Romagna region – the biomedical district of Mirandola (Modena) – characterised by a strong pattern of innovative activity. Using a proxy for innovative activity as dependant variable, we observe that R&D and networking/social capital arise as complementary driving forces for innovation outputs. When empirical evidence confirms that this complementarity plays a key role, and consequently strong links exist between market and non-market dynamics relating to firms, the role for policy actions targeted to social capital is larger. The policy effort should be targeted toward both market and non-market characteristics taken together, rather than solely to the production of (local) public goods (social capital) or innovation inputs as independent elements of firm processes. The input of SC alone is not sufficient to ensure innovation and growth: economic incentives matter. On the other hand, whenever SC dynamics are crucial for R&D private investments, the effect of economic incentives depends on the presence and degree of their complementarity.

Keywords: Social capital, R&D, Technological innovation, Industrial districts

JEL Classification: O32, D92, H49

Address for correspondence:

Massimiliano Mazzanti
Economics Institutions and Territory
University of Ferrara
Via del Gregorio 13
Ferrara
Italy
E-mail: ma.maz@iol.it

1. Introduction

The main idea behind this paper is that social capital (SC hereafter) is not, as generally suggested by the socio-economic literature, an individual attitude towards something which does not imply privately appropriable economic benefits, as it is for a pure public good. Actually, SC might and should be interpreted as a component of an investment which implies private and public benefits entangled with each other.

In order to put forward this idea, a dynamic theoretical model is developed, that assumes SC as a public component of an impure public good: i.e. R&D. This theoretical model shows that, assuming complementarity between SC and R&D, the 'civic culture' of an industrial district is not sufficient as an incentive, to increase investments in SC by any single firm joining the district, because this investment also depends on the economic convenience in investing in R&D.

The subsequent empirical analysis allows us to assess the degree of such complementarity between SC and R&D, in a specific district-based industrialised context, using original survey data. In particular, we focus our attention on a Marshallian industrial district located in the Emilia Romagna region – the biomedical district of Mirandola (Modena) – which is characterised by strong innovative activity. Using original survey data on firm innovation practices, investment strategies, and cooperation efforts concerning firm relationship and networking within and outside the district, a complementary positive effect between SC and R&D investments is detected, estimating different econometric specifications of an innovation equation.

A main conclusion of the paper is that if and only if the economic conditions, which determine a favourable environment for the investment in the impure public good, improve, investments in SC by district firms are likely to increase. SC/networking dynamics may only positively evolve if the opportunity cost of investing in innovation is sufficiently low.

The paper is organized as follows. In section two, we comment on and describe some of the main results of the recent SC literature. The most relevant definitions are presented and discussed. Hence a conceptual framework for SC is provided, essentially based on the concept of 'intensity of networking activities' concerning network-involved agents. The framework largely draws upon works of impure public good production and non-cooperative agreements. In section three, a theoretical model is presented, wherein the accumulation of SC is assumed as the public component of the impure public capital R&D, and the main implications of the

model are discussed. In section four, we present our empirical exercise. Estimating an innovation equation, we detect a positive rapport between the intensity of SC (measured by a firm's specific index of cooperative intensity within the district) and the level of innovative actions observed. Moreover, R&D and SC/networking arises as complementary driving forces behind innovative activity. The last section concludes the paper.

2. Social capital: a framework for theoretical and empirical analysis

The main problem concerning the economic analysis of what has been termed 'SC' is that the literature is strongly heterogeneous, and the notion of SC is not always clearly assessed and described to be operative on theoretical and applied grounds. This is probably caused by the past emphasis on inter-disciplinary research, which has characterised the SC arena over the nineties, and was definitely necessary in the initial phase to generate a conceptual and theoretical debate. Some definitions are nevertheless too sociologically biased; others are still too vague. Our first goal was thus to extract from the literature the definitions we retain consistent, then present our own framework.

Among the various definitions we came across in the literature, the following are the most relevant for defining the boundaries of the issue in question: (i) "A variety of different entities with two factors in common: they all consist of some aspects of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions – whether personal or corporate actors – within the structure" (Coleman, 1988); (ii) "Those features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinate actions" (Putnam, 1993); (iii) "A glue that holds societies together" (Serageldin, 1996).

Taking into account the above definitions, SC is possibly identifiable with the 'culture' of a group of agents, a culture of economic reciprocity and cooperation. More generally, two key issues arise up from the socio-economic literature, those of 'trust' and 'ease of cooperation'.

Paldam (2000) specifically provides meanings revolving around the notion of trust, cooperation and network. The author correctly defines SC as the glue generating excess cooperation; we here add 'in excess' with respect to an equilibrium intended in a Cournot-Nash meaning. Trust and ease of cooperation are two factors that simultaneously interact in the production of private and public goods, or forms of capital.

We argue it is essential to move away from 'associative' based concepts of SC as presented in Robison *et al.* (2002) and Putnam (1993), and from analysis of trust and cooperation relying on

'honesty' treated as a sort of public good, toward frameworks where SC is conceived as an intangible capital stock with some public good-like properties worth investigating further.

Theoretically speaking, SC may be included in a production function together with other inputs, linked with them to a different degree of complementarity. The effects of SC must be therefore analysed according to the shape of cost functions, returns to scale, factor productivity, market and shadow prices of capital investments.

A contingent definition of SC emerges strictly linked to the concepts of trust and cooperation presented above: SC is an intermediate capital good privately and intentionally produced, which endogenously accumulates from the flow of agents investments in voluntary cooperative effort. SC might be also conceived as the stock of the public component of an impure-public good, sustained by a set of private incentives. Its 'production' and accumulation are self-enforcing and sustained by reciprocal benefits of cooperation (Mancinelli and Mazzanti, 2004; Galassi and Mancinelli, 2004).

It is clear that the above definition hints at a microeconomic approach, differentiating the present analysis from that mostly found in the literature so far. It thus lies within the 'narrow' definition of SC, following the World Bank (1997) terminology for microeconomic approaches[1], in opposition to wider meso and macro approaches.

As far as the capital-like properties are concerned, SC as defined above has a transformation capacity, in the sense that its accumulation is targeted toward the production of other forms of capital (man made or organizational) or final outputs[2]. It endures as long as incentives exist to sustain it. In our case, the degree of durability is such that the stock elapses with the cooperative agreements established for specific objectives. Then, the breaking down of a coalition ends the value of the stock. Furthermore, SC accumulates or de-cumulates depending on the structure of individual incentives (benefits and costs), and it is subject to decay as a renewable 'collective resource'. In fact, decay depends on endogenous factors such as easy riding (non consistent

[1] Wherein SC is included and studied as the 'missing link', or residual and intangible capital factor, in explaining growth and development of economic systems. This is the 'orthodox' approach to SC within economics. SC is the fourth form of capital, after man made, natural and human capital, in other words the 'glue' that (i) may enhance other factor's productivity, (ii) reduces problems associated to 'common property resources' and (iii) generically helps development to occur on a sustainable basis (Cote and Healy, 2001). For a heterodox view on SC see Fine (2001).

[2] The definition of SC as a stock of intangibles is not a completely shared vision. For instance, Arrow (1999) and Solow (1999) sharply conclude that the emphasis on capital is probably misplaced. SC derives instead from an association to the concept of human capital. In their view, the fact that factors such as trust, cooperativeness, and propensity to invest in a common effort have on the one hand a clear cut effect on total productivity, but on the other hand economics cannot consistently deal with SC as a proper form of capital. Other authors (Stiglitz, 1999) are more in favour of the SC consistency within economics.

actions of investment between agents) and on exogenous factors; investment flows are thus necessary to maintain the stock. Contrary to Sandler's analysis of intergenerational club goods (Sandler, 1982 and 1992), depreciation occurs because of a lack of strategic investment (reduced investment) in cooperation at any time *t*, rather than as a direct consequence of capital 'use' (crowding externality). In other words, depreciation derives from 'non use' rather than excessive use, as for many forms of collective manmade capital. Depreciation reflects the fact that much of SC investment is community-network specific.

The only capital-like property SC lacks is alienability, since we have shown that the stock of SC is intrinsically a relational dependent stock, consistent with Coleman's vision. It is not owned by individual agents or by the agents as a group, it is 'asset specific' and an instrument for the alliance purposes. Nevertheless, we argue that 'inalienability' is the main specificity of SC indented as an intangible real asset. Inalienability is linked to non-marketability, in that agents invest in some imperfectly observable assets: in respect to investment decisions, costliness and imperfect observability are the main factors responsible for the systemic easy riding. Thus, in respect to our definition, is SC a real form of (intangible) capital? We believe it is.

Moreover, in the definition proposed above SC is not simply considered as a public good, but as the public component of an impure public good[3], in which agents invest.

For instance, the environment faced by firms located within an industrial district may be depicted as follows: on the one hand, a firm has the option of investing either in standard technology or in incremental innovations which do not require cooperative efforts (the firm internalises investments and associated returns). Both options may be termed as 'Business as Usual' (BAU) scenarios. On the other hand, the firm may invest in R&D which implies innovations that involve structural breaks from the BAU (discrete changes concerning technological/organisational development) and that involve the concepts of skill, knowledge and competences, which are only partially owned by the firm. In this case, the innovation change usually requires a cooperative effort, and the investment may be thought of as one in an impure public good, that is each unit of investment produces some percentage units of private

[3] In the economic literature, an impure public good, or mixed-public good, is a good which jointly gives private and public benefits. A typical example is that of an individual who, by being inoculated against an infectious disease, confers both a private benefit on himself and a public benefit by reducing the risk of spreading the disease through the community. In this case inoculation is the impure public good. The definition of impure public good well applies "to an activity like philanthropy, where charitable activities provide private as well as public benefits to contributors" (Cornes and Sandler, 1984, p. 580). "The acquisition of certain types of education is often asserted to have benefits for society at large, in addition to purely private benefits generated for students. […] The acts of charity and of saving and the activities of military alliances are a few of the many instances that have been claimed as examples of the joint production of both a public and a private benefits." (Cornes and Sandler, 1986, p. 115).

benefits and some percentage units of public benefits. Private benefits are, for instance, technological amelioration appropriable by the firm and public benefits derive from the cooperative agreements among firms.

The framework highlights the fundamental need for agents to join their efforts to achieve benefits which derive from and build on public-like forms of investments. The most common and relevant benefit deriving from firm cooperation is that associated to the development of technological (process and product-based) innovations. This necessary joint effort to establish voluntary cooperative schemes, to achieve goals specific to the network but appropriable by participants, characterises most forms of (i) voluntary agreements, (ii) inter-firms intra district cooperation, (iii) inter-firms inter-districts cooperation. The relevance of points (i)-(iii) as engines for innovation and growth at a regional level has increased over the last decades, following both the less prominent role of the State as 'regulator' (top down approach), and the reshaping of governance and business strategies within the post-fordist society. Indeed socio-economic changes occurring in the post fordist (post-industrial) era shift the focus of interest from man made forms of capital to human, environmental and SC assets. Furthermore, market and non-market 'horizontal' networks play a major role with respect to 'vertical' and hierarchical relationships, creating a new scenario described by a cultural change in local and national production. The community benefits from positive network externalities. Nevertheless, in contrast o pure exogenous spillovers, the voluntary and intentional production of joint social benefits is costly: therefore incentives are crucial.

The public element of welfare function of one firm participating in the network agreement is, in our framework, the stock of SC on which the decision of action relies. SC is nevertheless strictly connected to private components of welfare (it is not a pure 'independent' public good), by a complementarity relationship.

It is worth underlining the voluntary element of the agreements in cooperation and production: SC is self-enforcing, self-financing, in opposition to third-party enforcement frameworks. Thus, we may say that our SC environment belongs to a Coasian-like framework characterised by horizontal relationships, in opposition to third-party enforcement pigouvian-like institutional frameworks.

As far as the measurement of SC is concerned, there are three main ways of approaching SC quantification at microeconomic level[4]: by using (i) regional/national official datasets; (ii)

[4] We do not follow the macro-economic direction, which has dominated until recently the empirical measurement of SC, for two reasons. First, the conceptual focus is here strictly microeconomic. Secondly, the weaknesses of that

revealed preference approaches (observing agent's behaviour), which includes both quantifying by observing choices (i.e. investment choices, participation rates, etc.); (iii) stated preferences methods (directly revealing behaviour when observation is difficult or we lack behavioural 'tracks'), which include quantifying SC by direct methods (i.e. interviewing economic agents).

The main obstacle in using the first method, generally less costly, is that SC features are usually non-market and non-accounted in regional and national dataset[5]. Thus, the only consistent way to elicit the SC private and public characteristics is often by implementing survey-based approaches aimed at eliciting specific information by structured questionnaires. The questionnaire should attempt to gather information consistent with conceptual definitions, by recovering data on SC factors, R&D dynamics and other firm-specific factors possibly affecting innovation, which we may use as "control" variables.

The next sections present (i) the theoretical model, which further defines the conceptual environment of the work, then (ii) the empirical investigation of the relationship between R&D and SC and their role in fostering innovation.

research direction (specifically the weak conceptual framework for SC) have recently been extensively highlighted by various authors, who claim the greater added value of a microeconomic applied research direction (Sobel, 2002; Durlauf, 2004; 2002).

[5] For this reason, most studies on SC using official data adopt SC proxies, which lack robustness in terms of conceptual and /or theoretical foundations. See, among the others, Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales (2000) who introduce some ad hoc SC proxies as determinants of financial development.

3. The model

In the analysis set out in the previous section, SC does not emerge as an individual attitude towards something which implies only public benefits; by contrast, SC emerges as the public component of an investment which implies a share of privately appropriable benefits[6].

The aim of this section is to analyse the accumulation of SC by district firms, through the development of a dynamic theoretical model where SC is assumed to be the public component of an impure public good – the R&D investment – following the example depicted above.

The analysis builds up and brings together the contributions given by Cornes and Sandler (1984, 1986) and Glaeser *et al.* (2002), in an attempt to shape an original framing.

3.1 Firms belonging to an industrial district

We assume that there exists an industrial district composed of N firms[7]. Each firm invests in two kinds of capital, y_i and R_i. y_i has mere private characteristics and R_i has the characteristics of an impure public good. It has (produces) either a private characteristic, z_i (which has no effects on the other firms) and a public characteristic, s_i (which has effects also on the other districts firms).

The investment in the private kind of capital, y_i, can represent an investment in a BAU ('business as usual') capital stock, and the investment in the 'impure public' capital[8], R_i, can represent an investment in R&D. In this case we can take as example of the private component, z_i, the technological amelioration appropriable by the firm, and as example of the 'public component', s_i, the formation of voluntary and self enforcing agreements among firms.

Therefore, the public component, s_i, is consistent with the definition of SC presented in section two. Actually, s_i is an intermediate capital good produced privately and intentionally, which endogenously accumulates from the flow of agents investments in voluntary cooperative effort; and it is also the public component of an impure-public good.

Since R_i has the characteristic of an impure public good, each unit of investment by the firm i in R_i is such that:

$$z_i = \alpha_i R_i \qquad 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq 1 \ \textit{given} \tag{1}$$

[6] The idea that investment in SC is linked to economic factors, which imply private benefits, has already been investigated in other works (Galassi, 2001).

[7] Each firm is indexed by the subscript $i=1,..., N$.

[8] Notice that we do not deal with club goods because here the size of the community (network) consuming the public good is exogenously fixed. This characteristic (community size) does not appear explicitly in the analysis.

(2) $s_i = \beta_i R_i \qquad 0 < \beta_i \leq 1$ *given*

Where α_i and β_i are exogenously given coefficients reflecting a simple process, whereby z_i and s_i are jointly generated in fixed proportion by the investment in R_i.

We are hence assuming that whenever a firm invests in one unit of R_i, she invests in $1/\alpha_i$ given units of a private characteristic and in $1/\beta_I$ given units of SC[9]. That is whenever a firm invests in one unit of R_i, her investment is to percent an investment in a private asset and to some percent an investment in SC.

Moreover, since s_i exerts effects also on the other firms inside the industrial district and *vice versa*, we define:

(3) $$S_{\neq i} = \sum_{j \neq i} s_j = \sum_{j \neq i} \beta_j R_j \qquad \forall\, i, j$$

and:

(4) $$S = \sum_{i=1}^{N} s_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_i R_i = s_i + S_{\neq i}$$

The whole quantity of the public characteristic (S) is given by the sum of the single contributions by any firm.

We adopt the Nash-Cournot assumption that the single firm i regards $S_{\neq i}$ as exogenously given.

From equations (1), (2), (3) and (4) the investment of firm i in one unit of R_i has therefore three effects: (i) an increase in i's private benefits due to the private characteristic, z_i ($=\alpha_i R_i$); (ii) an increase in the total amount of the public component available to any firm inside the network ($S = s_i + S_{\neq i}$); (iii) an increase in i's private benefits due to the public characteristic ($s_i + S_{\neq i}$).

Hence, we can define firm i's benefit function of the investment in the impure public capital, R_i as:

(5) $$B_i = B_i\left[\left(S_{\neq i} + s_i\right), z_i, I_{R_i}\right] \qquad \forall i$$

and, from equations (1) and (2) it can be written as:

(6) $$B_i = B_i\left[\left(\beta_i R_i + S_{\neq i}\right), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right] \qquad \forall i$$

[9] Notice that, by equation (2) we assume that s_i can never be zero, because we suppose that each firm inside the district invests at least a minimum positive amount in "networking" and establishes even the simplest form of contacts or agreement. We are, hence, assuming that district firms are already investing in SC.

Since, from equation (6) firm *i*'s benefit function depends on the firm *i*'s choice concerning the investment R_i-related flow variable (I_{R_i}), on the consequent choice on the stock variable (R_i) and on the other firms choice concerning $S_{\neq i}$, it can also be expressed as follows:

$$(7) \qquad B_i\left[(S_{\neq i} + s_i), z_i, I_{R_i}\right] = B_i\left[(\beta_i R_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right] = V_i\left[, R_i, I_{R_i}, S_{\neq i}\right] \qquad \forall i$$

We assume that firm *i*'s benefit function is continuous, strictly increasing, strictly quasi-concave, and twice differentiable with respect to all its arguments.

We can define the investment cost function of any firm *i* regarding the impure public capital R_i as:

$$(8) \qquad C_i = C_i(I_{R_i}) \qquad \forall i$$

with $C_i^{'}(.) \geq 0$, and $C_i^{''}(.) \geq 0$.

Since the variation of R_i stock in time is:

$$(9) \qquad \frac{\partial R_i}{\partial t} = \dot{R}_i = I_{R_i} - \delta R_i \qquad \forall i$$

where δ is the exogenous depreciation factor, we can write the firm's investment cost function in R_i as:

$$(10) \qquad C_i = C_i(\dot{R}_i + \delta R_i) \qquad \forall i$$

Moreover we assume that firms are symmetric: they have identical investment cost functions, and we assume that the opportunity cost of the impure public capital R_i is *r* (that is the value of the private capital, y_i).

From equations (7), (9) and (10), the problem of each district firm can be expressed as the typical problem of the determination of the optimal control path ($I_{R_i}^{*}(t)$) and of the optimal state path ($R_i^{*}(t)$).

Since we have assumed that R_i is an impure public capital, that is it jointly produces a private characteristic, z_i, and a public characteristic, s_i, we can assert, following Cornes and Sandler

(1984, 1986), that the two characteristics, z_i and s_i, are complements. Therefore an increase in one of the two characteristics increases the benefits of increasing the other (Milgrom and Roberts, 1995). In terms of mixed-partial derivatives of firm *i*'s benefit function, complementarity between z_i and s_i can be expressed as:

$$\frac{\partial^2 B_i}{\partial z_i \partial s_i} \geq 0. \tag{11}$$

3.2 The accumulation of social capital inside an industrial district

We assume that each firm inside the industrial district has a known lifespan of T periods and that she discounts the future with the discount factor ρ.

Each firm wants to maximise her net benefit function[10], in the interval of time [0, T]:

$$Maximize \int_0^T \left\{V_i\left[, R_i, I_{R_i}, S_{\neq i}\right] - rC_i\left(I_{R_i}\right)\right\} e^{-\rho t} dt$$

s.t:

$$\dot{R}_i = I_{R_i} - \delta R_i .$$

Where the transversality conditions are: $R_i(0) = \bar{R}_i$, $R_i(T)$ free ($\bar{R}_i$, T given), and $\lambda(T)=0$.

From equation (2) and (7) firm *i*'s problem may be expressed also as:

$$Maximize \int_0^T \left\{B_i\left[\left(s_i + S_{\neq i}\right), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right] - rC_i\left(I_{R_i}\right)\right\} e^{-\rho t} dt$$

s.t.:

$$\dot{R}_i = I_{R_i} - \delta R_i .$$

The Hamiltonian is:

$$H(t, R_i, I_{R_i}, \lambda) = \left\{B_i\left[\left(s_i + S_{\neq i}\right), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right] - rC_i\left(I_{R_i}\right)\right\} e^{-\rho t} + \lambda(t)(I_{R_i} - \delta R_i)$$

From the second maximum principle condition (equation of motion for λ, $\dot{\lambda} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial R_i}$), we get[11]:

[10] For each firm, R_i is the state variable and I_{Ri} is the control variable.

[11] The analytical steps to get equation (12) are shown in Appendix 1.

$$(12)\ \lambda^*(t) = \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}(e^{-\rho t} - e^{-(\rho+\delta)T+\delta t}).$$

Substituting in the first maximum principle condition ($\frac{\partial H}{\partial I_{R_i}}$), we have:

$$(13)\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial I_{R_i}} : e^{-\rho t}\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial I_{R_i}} - r\frac{\partial C_i(.)}{\partial I_{R_i}}\right] + \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}(e^{-\rho t} - e^{-(\rho+\delta)T+\delta t}) = 0$$

Equation (13) represents, the optimal control path ($I^*_{R_i}(t)$).

Differentiating (13) with respect to *r* we get:

$$(14)\ \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial I_{R_i}\partial r} : -e^{-\rho t}\frac{\partial C_i(.)}{\partial I_{R_i}} < 0$$

That is, in each period *t* firm *i*'s optimal level of investment in R_i decreases at the increasing of the opportunity cost of R_i.

Moreover, if we totally differentiate equation (13) with respect to s_i and $S_{\neq i}$, we get[12]:

$$(15)\ \frac{ds_i}{dS_{\neq i}} = -\frac{\beta_i B_{i_{S S\neq i}}}{\left[\beta_i B_{i_{S_{s_i}}} + \alpha_i B_{i_{R_{s_i}}}\right]}$$

The sign of the numerator of eq. (15) depends on the sign of $\beta_i B_{i_{S S\neq i}} = \beta_i \frac{\partial^2 B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})^2}$, which is certainly non-positive, since we have assumed the strictly quasi-concavity of firm *i*'s benefit function.

The sign of the term that appears in the square bracket at the denominator in equation (15) depends on the sign of $(\beta_i B_{i_{S_{s_i}}} + \alpha_i B_{i_{R_{s_i}}})$. Whereas $\beta_i B_{i_{S_{s_i}}} = \beta_i \frac{\partial^2 B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})^2}$ is certainly non-positive, $B_{i_{R_{s_i}}}$ is nonnegative, since we have assumed that z_i and s_i are complementary, hence $\frac{\partial^2 B_i}{\partial \alpha_i R_i \partial s_i} \geq 0$. Since the technological parameters, α_i and β_i, are

[12] Remind that: $s_i = \beta_i R_i$ and $S = s_i + S_{\neq i}$.

independently determined, one cannot rule out the possibility that $\left|\alpha_i B_{i_{R_{S_i}}}\right| > \left|\beta_i B_{i_{S_{S_i}}}\right|$. In this way, complementarity between z_i and s_i can produce, in each period t, a positive response:

(16) $$\frac{ds_i}{dS_{\neq i}} > 0$$

Hence, in the case depicted above ($ds_i / dS_{\neq i} > 0$), the reaction curve may have positive slope: in this case, an increase in $S_{\neq i}$ raises firm i's benefits due to the public characteristic (s_i+$S_{\neq i}$), which, in turn, rises the single firm's marginal valuation for the complementary private characteristic z_i. As a consequence, the single firm now wishes to increase her investment in R_i. To do this, the single firm must increase her stock of R_i, which has the effect of increasing s_i (via $s_i = \beta_i R_i$), her own generation of the public characteristic (SC).

The conclusion is that if the other firms' investment in SC ($S_{\neq i}$) increases, also the single firm i's investment in SC may increase. Hence a positive 'culture' in an industrial district may have positive effects on the investment of SC by the single firm.

But the increases of the investment in s_i pass through firm i's investment in R_i.

And from equation (14) we know that in each period t firm i's optimal level of investment in R_i decreases at the increasing of the opportunity cost of R_i.

Hence, whenever the opportunity cost of R_i increases, the single firm i reduces her investment in R_i and, as a consequence, she reduces her investment in SC.

From the third maximum principle conditions (equation of motion for R_i, $\dot{R}_i = \partial H / \partial \lambda$) we get[13] the optimal state path:

(17) $$R_i^*(t) = \left(\bar{R}_i - \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta}\right)e^{-\delta t} + \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta}$$

Substituting with $I^*_{R_i}$:

(18) $$R_i^*(t) = \bar{R}_i\, e^{-\delta t} + \frac{I^*_{R_i}}{\delta}(1 - e^{-\delta t})$$

From the results of the model we can deduce that if SC is the public component of an impure public capital, an increase of the other firms' investment in the public component (SC) may induce firm i to increase her own investment of the impure public capital R_i, and, as a consequence, to increase her own investment of SC (s_i). If we consider high levels of

[13] The analytical steps to get equation (17) are shown in Appendix 2.

investments in SC by the district firms as strictly associated to the level of 'civic culture' of that district, the result of the model confirms what part of the literature on SC[14] asserts. That is, the level of investment in SC by an individual economic agent is positively boosted by the civic culture of the geographic area in which the economic agent acts.

Nevertheless, as shown above, this virtuous circle happens only when the opportunity cost of the impure public capital is sufficiently low: if the opportunity cost of R_i is too high, the single firm will not increase her investment in R_p, and as a consequence, will not increase her investment in SC, even if the availability of SC provided by the other firms is high.

Hence, if SC is definable as the public component of an impure public capital, the 'civic culture' of the district area to which the firm belongs is not sufficient to increase her investment in SC, because this investment depends also on the economic profitability in investing in the impure public capital. This is true for each firm inside the industrial district. Therefore, the whole level of investment in SC inside the district tend to be correlated to the costs of the economic actions. In the case depicted above, the higher the opportunity costs of R&D (conversely, the lower the profitability of innovation), the lower the stock level of SC.

As a conclusion, if and only if the economic conditions, which determine a favourable environment to the investment in the impure public capital, improve, it is possible to expect an increase of the investments in SC by economic agents. If SC is assessed as the public component of an impure public good which is a crucial intermediate capital good for firm performance and innovation practices, the incentive devices to invest in SC are also economic-biased, and they are not only linked to the 'civic culture' of the geographic area.

The aim of the following empirical analysis is to test the assumption of complementarity between SC and R&D in a specific Italian industrial district: the biomedical district of Mirandola (Modena). It is worth noting that the applied analysis is meant to be a first empirical test, circumscribed to the district under investigation, without the attempt of achieving any generalisation of results. A larger dataset referring to a sufficient number of industrial districts,

[14] We refer to that line of analysis which mainly stems from the famous contributions associated to the work of Fukuyama (1995) and Putnam (1993). The latter is indeed famous for a study on SC taking Italy as case study. The interest of both approaches is on 'culture' and 'institutions', but no attempt is made to analyse what the causes of SC formation and development are. The interest is here on effects and on comparative analyses between areas and regions. The main risk of this approach is to explain social phenomenon only by the (observed) status quo culture, with minor attention to economic and political dynamic elements. What often emerges from this approach to SC is that geographic areas in which investments in SC are low are typically characterised by a low level of 'civic culture'. The reasons for which this happens are not explored and, as a consequence, the economic incentives behind the investments in SC are not investigated.

and a panel structure would allow a more sophisticated econometric test. In this sense our empirical analysis is preliminary in scope, suggesting a direction for further research.

4. SC and R&D investments as complements: an empirical test

4.1 The data-set

The framework depicted above characterises different real-world situations where inter-firm cooperation is the primary and leading key to the successful performance of industrial districts. Along this line, networking is a capital good and an intermediate input to production. Although we underline that the present analysis is highly specific concerning the elicited data, recent works taking a similar perspective are, among the others, Cassiman and Veugelers (2002), Becker and Dietz (2004), Fritsch and Franke (2004), Negassi (2004). These papers deal with innovation activities, R&D cooperation and (knowledge) spillovers, taking different perspectives and research directions. Summing up, they attempt to identify what the determinants of R&D intensity, R&D cooperation and innovation activities are, by specifying diverse reduced forms[15]. Building on that research, we here attempt to focus attention on the nexus of complementarity between networking and R&D as joint inputs for technological innovation.

Now let us show how we prepared and designed the case study analysis for the biomedical industrial district of Mirandola (Modena). The empirical identification of the manufacturing firms belonging to this industrial district was carried out taking into account two different dimensions: (i) productive specialization and (ii) geographic area in which firms are located. In regards to productive specialization, all the manufacturing firms belonging to the ATECO classes 33.10[16] (*Manufacture of medical and surgical equipment and orthopaedic appliances)* were included in the sample. Concerning the localization area of the district, we took into consideration the following seven municipalities of the *Provincia* of Modena[17]: Mirandola, Medolla, Concordia, Cavezzo, San Felice sul Panaro, San Possidonio and San Prospero. The reason behind this choice is that these municipalities are associated with a concentration of biomedical firms. We identified the 'biomedical district of Mirandola' by taking into account only those firms that

[15] Becker and Dietz (2004) estimate reduced forms for input and output innovation measures regressed over R&D cooperation and networking proxies. Fritsch and Franke (2004) use patent datasets to estimate the effect of both R&D intensity and R&D regional spillovers. Cassiman and Veugelers (2002) try instead to use R&D cooperation as dependant variable, explained by spillovers measures. Negassi (2004) exploits information concerning the budget spent on R&D cooperation and turnover based innovation measures.

[16] Economic activity classes defined by the Italian National Statistical Institute (ISTAT).

satisfied the following requirements: (i) operating in the sector 33.10 *Manufacture of medical and surgical equipment and orthopaedic appliances* and (ii) headquarters are located in one of the seven municipalities already listed.

We then identified a universe population of district firms that was identified during an extensive research project carried out years ago on this district (Baracchi and Bigarelli, 2001)[18]. Interviews were held with firm managers over a two-months period (February-March 2004) on administering a short but structured questionnaire, in order to elicit data on innovation practice, R&D investment, and cooperation efforts concerning firm's relationship and networking within and outside the local district. The selected period of reference is 2000-2002. As far as R&D data is concerned, it was reasonably possible to ask firms for annual data covering the years 2000 to 2002, while all questions regarding networking activities and innovation practices were set to determine a 'trend' over the 2000-2002 period[19]. We decided not to elicit information on performance to minimise the rejection rate; furthermore, survey data on performance is known to often lack reliability. The first section of the questionnaire deals with general features of firms, the second section focuses on innovation practice, the third section on networking activities. The final dataset accounts for 40 of the 70 firms making up the district 'population'. Some firms refused to take part, most of the data losses derived from firm shutdowns, especially smaller establishments. As it turns out from Tables A.1, A.2, and A.3 in Appendix 3, the coverage rate of our dataset appears to be quite good. This is true both when considering all the firms (Table A.1), firms producing for final markets (Table A.2), and sub-contractors (Table A.3).

4.2 The empirical analysis

This section illustrates the econometric methodology used to empirically test the aforementioned complementarity between R&D and SC/networking. In order to perform this exercise, we estimate an innovation equation, which expresses the relationship between innovation output and innovation inputs within a 'conceptual framework' of a knowledge

[17] Modena is a central Province of the Emilia-Romagna Region. Emilia Romagna is an area of Italy characterised by a high density of industrial districts, a GDP per capita (about 27000€ in 2003) higher than the Italian average and with four millions residents represents the 7% of the Italian population.

[18] We argue that the main added value of current empirical analysis on SC may derive from focused survey study eliciting specific and often 'latent' information which are not accounted for in market transaction and official data (i.e. Community Innovation Survey, national or regional statistics). With this respect, our analysis differs from studies using large, public but not focussed dataset (Cassiman and Veugelers, 2003).

[19] This is a key problem for empirical analysis concerning innovation and SC dynamics, since such data are difficulty, if not impossibly, revealed on an annual basis by firms.

production function (Griliches, 1979; Fritsch and Franke, 2004). The estimable reduced form we use is:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{INN}_{i,t} = 1 \qquad \text{if} \quad \mathrm{INN}_{i,t}^{*} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot RD_{i,t-1} + \alpha_2 \cdot NET_i + \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1}\beta_1 + u_i \\ &\mathrm{INN}_{1,t} = 0 \qquad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

A brief description is necessary. $INN_{i,t}$ is a binary variable taking the value of 1 whether the firm *i* introduced product and/or process technological innovations over the 2000-2002 period[20]. RD_i is the Research and Development expenditure per employee of firm *i*.

In order to cope with endogeneity, we decided to use the 2000 value as independent variable proxy for R&D. NET_i is a variable capturing the networking effect concerning the SC oriented activity of firm *i*, which was addressed by a specific and focussed part of the questionnaire. More specifically, two different dummies are introduced: one is a specific proxy for SC, the other is a variable mainly capturing the information spillovers between district firms[21]. The first takes the value of one when a firm is associated to formal or informal networking relationships, dealing with production issues, innovation issues and market strategies. The second dummy takes the value of one if a firm exploits other firms belonging to the same district (exchanging flows of critical information)[22] as a main source of information. The vector $\mathbf{X_i}$ includes a set of control variables (firm's typology, size, age, and export propensity) which we included to better specify the vector of innovation inputs. Otherwise, the effect of R&D and networking could be overestimated. Finally, u_i denotes the error term with the standard statistical properties. It is worth noting that all the explanatory variables are expressed in natural logarithms.

Before showing and commenting the findings of the econometric investigation, we first present some results of the field survey (Tables 1 and 2) and then some descriptive statistics concerning the variables used (Table 3).

[20] See Negassi (2004), among others, for a critical debate over the various innovation proxy measures, on the input and output side.

[21] We observe that this second networking variable is weaker as SC proxy, compared to the first. It is included since it captures relevant firm networking aspects, mostly related to district-specific information spillovers. It may thus act as a sort of control variable, mitigating any problem of omitted information when the aim is to test the 'direct' effect of networking relationships.

[22] See Cassiman and Veugelers (2002) for a discussion on the role of incoming (information) spillovers as an engine for R&D cooperation and, indirectly, for innovation.

Table 1 – Firm size and R&D

Size classes	*Firms*	*Firms*	*Employees*	*Employees*	*R&D per employee*
	N.	%	N.	%	€
0-19	21	52.5	190	7.5	1,323
20-49	10	25.0	257	10.1	530
50-249	6	15.0	659	26.1	2,138
>249	3	7.5	1,424	56.3	6,017
Total	40	100.0	2,530	100.0	4,097

Table 2 – Innovations and networking

Size classes	*Final firms*	*Product innovations*	*Process innovations*	*Innovations*	*Networking(a)*	*Networking(b)*
	%	%	%	%	%	%
0-19	90.9	38.0	38.0	57.1	85.7	28.6
20-49	50.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	30.0	10.0
50-249	100.0	83.3	83.3	83.3	100.0	0.0
>249	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.6	33.3
Total	60.0	45.0	45.0	60.0	72.5	20.0

(a) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm is characterised by formal or informal networking relationships dealing with both production issues, innovation issues and market strategies.
(b) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm exploits and receives critical information from agents belonging to the same district.

From analysis of Tables 1 and 2 it emerges (i) that the percentage of innovative firms in this industrial district is quite high and, (ii) that this tendency increases in accordance with the firms' size. Taking into account the first networking variable, one notes that also in this case a high percentage of district firms are involved. The second networking variable instead does not show the same pattern. In fact, this latter networking factor, with the exception of small-sized firms, seems to be less widespread.

The R&D per employee increases by size, confirming the expected positive correlation between the two variables. In comparison, the italian industrial R&D value (year 2000) elicited by the Third Community Innovation Survey is about 3000€ for only formalised R&D, and more than 8000€ including expenditures on innovative man-made capitals, skilled labour training and acquisitions of know-how.

Table 3 – Descriptive statistics (explanatory variables)

	N. OBS.	*MEAN*	*STD. DEV.*	*MIN.*	*MAX.*
Log(employees)	40	2.996	1.435	0	6.526
Firm Typology (a)	40	0.6	0.496	0	1
Firm Age (years)	40	13.8	8.811	2	34
Log(export/total turnover) in 2000	40	1.586	1.872	0	4.499

Dummy networking [b]	40	0.725	0.452	0	1
Dummy networking [c]	40	0.2	0.405	0	1
Log(R&D expenditure/employees in 2000)	40	3.193	3.880	0	10.183

(a) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm sells its products on the final market, 0 if the firm is primarily a sub-contractor.
(b) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm is characterised by formal or informal networking relationships dealing with both production issues, innovation issues and market strategies.
(c) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm exploits and receives critical information from agents belonging to the same district.

From the econometric point of view, the equation (19) estimation poses at least three problems. First, heteroskedasticity, as is often found when cross sectional data are used, may reduce the efficiency of econometric estimates. Thus, all estimates are carried out adopting a 'robust' estimator for the Logit model which addresses this source of bias. Secondly, there is a potential endogeneity of R&D in the regression. In fact, as many contributions have shown, a lagged impact effect between R&D input and innovation output is a general plausible assumption often verified by empirical assessment. We thus use the R&D data for 2000 as an explanatory factor for innovation over 2000-2002, introducing a 'lagged' term into the regression (thus specifying a hybrid cross sectional model)[23]. Third, potential endogeneity may also affect the networking-related variables. According to some contributions on Italian industrial districts (Cainelli and Nuti, 1996; Brusco *et al.*, 1996; Cainelli and Zoboli, 2004), this kind of formal and informal networking relationship, as well as information spillovers, may be interpreted as quasi-fixed factors of 'production', in any case slow evolving over time. This means that those variables can be considered as pre-determined factors, exogenous with respect to district firm innovative activity[24].

Let us now go back to the econometric findings. In Table 4, we report results for various specifications of (19). In particular, column [1] shows the reduced form when only control variables are included. In this case, all these explanatory variables result as non-significant.

Focussing on the extended specifications [2-6] we note that the impact of R&D and networking as inputs of innovation is highly significant. It is worth highlighting two points. First, both the networking dummy variables are statistically significant when included separately as added covariate to the control variables of (19) (columns [2] and [5]). Secondly, the two 'inputs' for which we hypotheses a complementarity nexus emerge statistically significant, when both are included (column [4] and [6]). This is an assessment of the joint/complementary driving stimulus provided by R&D and SC. Regressions [4] and [6] also shows the two highest

[23] See Huselid and Becker (1996) and Cassiman and Veugelers (2002) for more insights on the issue.
[24] Similar considerations are put forward by Brynolfson *et al.*, 2002 for organizational capital.

pseudo-R^2. Specifications [5-6] also show a significant effect of size. Size nevertheless does not arise a primary force behind innovation.

We may conclude this section summarising the outcome of the econometric exercise. SC investments, proxied by two variables concerning networking activities, emerge as a crucial driving force for innovation. Innovation is also triggered by expenditures in R&D, confirming *ex ante* expectations. Furthermore, and more important, SC/networking and R&D arise jointly determining technological innovation. The outcome is robust as confirmed by different econometric specifications of an innovation equation. Those aforementioned driving forces appear to overwhelm the effect of other explanatory factors of innovation, like firm size, which is usually found as a key driving force of innovation and high-performance practices. Only in considering the second networking variable, the variable capturing the market orientation of firms, firm size results as statistically significant in the regression. This finding, although circumscribed to the district observed, is in contrast to the predominant size effects often emerging from studies on innovation practices, and with other evidence, which also tends to reduce the emphasis on R&D cooperation with respect to size, market share ad other firm-specific characteristics (Negassi, 2004). Further empirical evidence is thus necessary for a generalisation of results.

Table 4 – The innovation equation: estimates

	Dependent variable: *innovation dummy (2000-2002)*					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
ESTIMATION METHOD	LOGIT(1)	LOGIT(1)	LOGIT(1)	LOGIT(1)	LOGIT(1)	LOGIT(1)
Constant	-0.400 [1.303]	-3.090 [2.190]	-0.094 [1.599]	-2.934 [2.242]	-1.483 [1.920]	-1.673 [1.883]
Log (employees)	0.292 [0.337]	0.657* [0.400]	0.175 [0.313]	0.488 [0.325]	0.687** [0.342]	0.645** [0.285]
Typology (c)	2.113 [1.102]	2.082 [1.706]	0.816 [1.215]	0.459 [1.688]	3.292** [1.171]	1.627 [1.083]
Log (Age)	-0.503 [0.586]	-0.297 0.669	-0.613 [0.778]	-0.343 [0.825]	-0.985 [0.752]	-1.061 [1.031]
Log(export/total turnover) in 2000	-0.024 [0.310]	-0.311 0.606	0.163 [0.385]	-0.022 [0.605]	-0.170 [0.327]	0.186 [0.471]

Dummy networking [a]	…	2.350** [1.162]	…	2.470** [1.063]	…	…
Dummy networking [b]	….	…	…	…	3.776** [1.758]	4.168** [1.859]
Log (R&D expenditure/employee) in 2000	…	…	0.303** [0.136]	0.319** [0.157]	…	0.354** [0.173]
N. Obs.	40	40	40	40	40	40
Pseudo-R^2	0.196	0.299	0.293	0.388	0.363	0.469

** significant at 5%; * significant at 10%

(1) Standard errors [in brackets] are computed with the White method in order to correct for heteroschedasticity.

(a) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm is characterised by formal or informal networking relationships dealing with th production issues, innovation issues and market strategies.

(b) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm exploits and receives critical information from agents belonging to the same district.

(c) This dummy takes value 1 if the firm sells its products on the final market, 0 if the firm is primarily a sub-contractor.

5. Conclusions

Building on the literature on SC mainly developed during the last decade, the main aim of this paper was to explore new perspectives, based on a microeconomic approach. The analysis conducted, both theoretical and empirical, helps shed light on the ongoing SC debate, since it investigates the effective role of this capital input in stimulating innovative activity and thus economic performance.

Introducing a nexus of complementarity between R&D and SC, a dynamic theoretical model then has shown that when SC is the public component of the impure public good R&D in a district of firms, the 'civic culture' of the district area where the firm acts is not a sufficient explanatory factor to increase the firm investment in social capital, since this investment strictly depends also on the economic profitability (private opportunity costs) linked to innovative strategies involving firm cooperation. In other words, only if the economic conditions, which determine a favourable environment to the investment in the "impure public capital", improve, we may expect an increase of investments in SC.

Empirical results confirm the nexus of complementarity between R&D and SC/networking activities, in assessing the effective role of this capital input in stimulating innovation and, consequently, economic growth. We focused our attention on a biomedical industrial district. Econometric analysis shows that R&D and SC/networking consistently arise as complementary inputs for innovation outputs.

It is worth noting that the main outcome arising from the theoretical and empirical analysis – the pivotal role of complementarity associated between R&D and SC/networking on the input side of the production-innovation process – influences the perspective concerning policy action. Whenever empirical evidence highlights this keystone complementarity (though further evidence is needed to generalise the result), consequently, strong links exist between market and non-market dynamics relating to firms, and the role for policy actions targeted to SC should be larger in spirit. The policy effort should be targeted toward both market and non market (i.e. R&D and SC) characteristics taken together, rather than an effort directed to the production of (local) public goods (SC) or innovation inputs as independent elements of firm's specific processes. The difference is not purely speculative, but is important as far as policy effectiveness is concerned. In fact, we argue that SC/networking dynamics might positively evolve only if the private opportunity cost of investing in non-BAU innovation is sufficiently low. Nevertheless, this (exogenous) economic incentive works as long as complementarity, as here defined, holds. Otherwise, opportunistic behavior concerning cooperation for networking activities may

undermine the development of R&D and innovation, even when economic conditions are favourably evolving (i.e. decreasing opportunity costs). Moreover, SC/networking is not a sufficient driver, as some authors have suggested, for generating innovative behavior and better economic performances, in absence of favourable economic incentives. This perspective leads to new research lines, given the necessity of investigating what the opportunity cost threshold may be in a specific environment.

The results of the theoretical model may deserve further empirical analysis. Particularly, it will be helpful to compare the accumulation of social capital by firms joining districts situated in two different geographic areas characterized by different opportunity costs of investing in the impure public capital.

To conclude, we argue that more attention should be paid to causality links and endogeneity when dealing with the issue at both empirical and conceptual levels. We think that only a joint theoretical-empirical effort can provide benefit for the SC framework. Otherwise, there is a risk of focussing too much attention on an untested hypothesis as guidance for policymaking. We recommend further work on the applied direction, where there is a high possibility of providing new evidence stemming from specific and micro-oriented survey studies.

References

ARROW K.J (1999), "Observations on social capital", in: DASGUPTA P., SERAGELDIN I. (eds.) (1999), *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

BARACCHI M., BIGARELLI D. (2001), *Osservatorio sul settore biomedicale nel distretto mirandolese, Seconda rilevazione*, Ricerche e Interventi di politica industriale e del lavoro (R&I), Carpi.

BECKER W. DIETZ J. (2004), "R&D cooperation and innovation activities of firms. Evidence for the German manufacturing industry", *Research Policy*, vol. 33, pp. 209-23.

BRYNJOLFSSON E. HITT L. M. YANG S. (2002), "Intangible Assets: Computers and Organizational Capital", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*: *Macroeconomics* vol.1, pp.137-199.

BRUSCO S., CAINELLI G. FORNI F.., FRANCHI M., MALUSARDI A., RIGHETTI R. (1996), "The evolution of industrial districts in Emilia Romagna", in: COSSENTINO F., PYKE F., SENGENBERGER W. (eds.), (1996) *Local Response to Global Pressures: the Case of Italy and its Districts*, Research Series n. 103, International Labour Office (ILO), Geneve, pp. 17-36.

CAINELLI G., NUTI F. (1996), "Directions of change in Italy's manufacturing industrial districts. The case of the Emilian footwear districts of Fusignano and San Mauro Pascoli", in: *Journal of Industry Studies*, n.2, pp. 106-118.

CAINELLI G., ZOBOLI R. (2004), *The Evolution of Industrial Districts. Changing Governance, Innovation, and Internalisation of Local Capitalism in Italy*, Contributions to Economics, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg (Germany).

CASSIMAN B.,VEUGELERS R. (2002), "R&D cooperation and spillovers: some empirical evidence from Belgium", *American Economic Review*, vol.92, n.4, pp.1169-1184.

CALOGHIROU Y., IOANNIDES S., VONORTAS S. (2003), "Research joint ventures", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, vol.17, n.4, pp. 541-70.

COLEMAN J. (1988), "Social capital in the creation of human capital", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 94, supplement, pp. 95-120

CORNES R., SANDLER T. (1984), "Easy riders, joint production and public goods", *The Economic Journal*, vol. 94, n. 375, pp. 580-598

CORNES R., SANDLER T. (1986), *The Theory of Externalities, Public Goods, and Club Goods*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA

COTE S., HEALY T. (2001), *The Well Being of Nations. The Role of Human and Social Capital*, OECD, Paris

DASGUPTA P., SERAGELDIN I. (eds.) (1999), *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

DURLAUF S., FAFCHAMPS M. (2004), "Social Capital", *NBER Working paper n.10485*, NBER.

DURLAUF S (2002), "On the empirics of social capital", *The Economic Journal,* vol. 112, n. 483, pp. 459-79.

FINE B. (2001), *Social Capital vs Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science and the Turn of the New Millenium*, Routledge, New York.

FRITSCH M. FRANKE G. (2004), "Innovation, regional knowledge spillovers and R&D cooperation", *Research Policy*, vol. 33, pp. 245-55.

FUKUYAMA F. (1995), *Trust: the Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity,* The Free Press, New York

GALASSI F. (2001), "Measuring social capital: Culture as an explanation of Italy's economic dualism", *European Review of Economic History*, n. 5, pp. 29-59.

GALASSI F., MANCINELLI S. (2004), "Why is social capital a 'capital'? Public goods, co-operative efforts and the accumulation of intangible assets", in: BIANCHI P., LABORY S. (eds.) (2004), *The Economics Importance of Intangible Assets,* Ashgate, London.

GLAESER L., LAIBSON D., SACERDOTE B. (2002), "The economic approach to social capital", *The Economic Journal,* vol.112, n. 483, pp.437-458.

GRILICHES S. (1979), Issues in assessing the contribution of R&D to productivity growth, *Bell Journal of Economics*, vol. 10, pp. 92-116.

GUISO L., SAPIENZA P., ZINGALES L. (2004), "The Role Of Social Capital In Financial Development", *American Economic Review*, vol. 94, pp. 526-556.

HUSELID M., BECKER B. (1996), "Methodological Issues in cross sectional and panel estimates of the human resource-firm performance link", *Industrial relations*, vol.35, n.3, pp.400-22

LA PORTA, R., LOPEZ DE SILANES, F., SHLEIFER, A., VISHNY, R. (1997), "Trust in Large Organizations", *American Economic Review*, papers and proceedings vol. 87, n.2, pp. 333-38

MANCINELLI S., MAZZANTI M (2004), "Agent's Cooperation and Network Sustainability. A Note on a Microeconomic Approach to Social Capital", *Economia Politica*, n.2, pp.299-321.

MILGROM P., ROBERTS J. (1995), "Complementarities and fit Strategy, structure, and organizational change in manufacturing", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, n. 19, pp. 179-208.

NEGASSI S. (2004), "R&D cooperation and innovation in a microeconometric study on French firms", *Research Policy*, vol. 33, pp. 365-384.

NYBERG S. (1997), "The honest society: stability and policy considerations", *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 64, pp. 83-99.

OSTROM E. (1999), "Social capital: a fad or a fundamental concept", in: DASGUPTA P., SERAGELDIN I. (eds.) (1999), *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, The World Bank, Washington D.C

OUGHTON C., WHITTAM G. (1997), "Competition and cooperation in the small firm sector", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 44, n. 1 pp. 1-30

PALDAM M. (2000), "Social Capital: one or many? Definition and measurement", *Journal of Economic Surveys,* vol. 14, n. 5, pp. 629-653

PALDAM M., SVENDSEN G. T. (2000), "An essay on social capital: looking for the fire behind the smoke", *European Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 16, n. 2, pp. 339-366

PISELLI F. (2001), "Capitale sociale: un concetto situazionale e dinamico", in Bagnasco A., Piselli F., Pizzorno A., Trigilia C. (2001), *Il Capitale Sociale,* il Mulino, Bologna

PUTNAM R.D. (1993), "The prosperous community-social capital and public life", *The American Prospect*, vol. 14, n. 13, pp. 35-42

ROBISON L.J., SCHMID A., SILES, M. (2002), "Is social capital really capital?", *Review of Social Economy,* vol.60, n.1, pp.1-21.

SANDLER T. (1982), "A theory of intergenerational clubs", *Economic Inquiry,* vol. 20, n. 2, pp. 191-207

SANDLER T. (1992), *Collective Action. Theory and Applications*, Wheatsheaf

SERAGELDIN I. (1996), "Sustainability as opportunity and the problem of social capital", *The Brown Journal of World Affairs,* n. 3, pp. 187-203

SOBEL J. (2002), "Can we trust social capital?, *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. XL, pp. 139-154

SOLOW R. M. (1999), "Notes on social capital and economic performance", in: DASGUPTA P., SERAGELDIN, I. (eds.) (1999), *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, The World Bank, Washington D.C.

STIGLITZ J. (1999), "Formal and informal institutions", in: DASGUPTA P., SERAGELDIN, I. (eds.) (1999), *Social Capital. A Multifaceted Perspective*, The World Bank, Washington D.C

WESTLUND H., BOLTON R. (2003), "Local social capital and entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, vol.21, pp.77-113.

WORLD BANK (1997), "Social capital: the missing link?", in *Monitoring Environmental Progress: Expanding the Measure of Wealth,* The World Bank, Washington D.C.

Appendix 1

(Equation of motion for λ).

The equation of motion for λ, $\dot{\lambda} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial R_i}$, is:

$$\dot{\lambda} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial R_i} = -e^{-\rho t}\left[\frac{\partial B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right] + \delta\lambda(t)$$

from which:

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t} - \delta\lambda = -\left[\frac{\partial B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i\left[(s_i + S_{\neq i}), \alpha_i R_i, I_{R_i}\right]}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]e^{-\rho t}$$

The complementary function is:

$\lambda_c(t) = Ae^{\delta t}$ (*A arbitrary*)

To find the particular integral we put:

$$\lambda' - \delta\lambda = -\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]e^{-\rho t}$$

and:

$\lambda(t) = -De^{-\rho t}$

$\lambda'(t) = \rho De^{-\rho t}$

$\rho De^{-\rho t} + \delta De^{-\rho t}$ = *left side*

From which:

$$D = -\frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho + \delta)}$$

$\lambda_P = -De^{-\rho t}$

The particular integral, hence, is:

$$\lambda_P = \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho + \delta)}e^{-\rho t}$$

The sum of the complementary function and the particular integral then constitutes the general solution of the complete equation:

(1A) $$\lambda(t) = Ae^{\delta t} + \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}e^{-\rho t} \qquad (A \text{ arbitrary})$$

From the transversality conditions ($\lambda(T)$)=0), we can assert that in T:

$$0 = Ae^{\delta t} + \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}e^{-\rho t}$$

from which:

$$A = -\frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}e^{-(\rho+\delta)T}$$

Hence, substituting in equation (1A), we get equation (12):

$$\lambda^*(t) = \frac{\left[\frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial(s_i + S_{\neq i})}\beta_i + \frac{\partial B_i(.)}{\partial R_i}\alpha_i\right]}{(\rho+\delta)}(e^{-\rho t} - e^{-(\rho+\delta)T+\delta t}).$$

Appendix 2

(Equation of motion for R_i).

The equation of motion for R_i, $\dot{R}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda}$, is:

$$\dot{R}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{\partial R_i}{\partial t} = I_{R_i} - \delta R_i$$

The complementary function is:

$$R_{i_c}(t) = Ae^{-\delta t}$$

and the particular integral is:

$$R_{i_P} = \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta} \qquad (\delta \neq 0)$$

The sum of the complementary function and the particular integral then constitutes the general solution of the complete equation:

$$R_i^*(t) = Ae^{-\delta t} + \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta} \qquad (A \text{ arbitrary})$$

Moreover, by setting t=0 in this result, it is easily shown that $A + \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta}$ represents the initial stock of R_i ($= \bar{R}_i$).

Hence the optimal state path is:

$$R_i^*(t) = \left(\bar{R}_i - \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta} \right) e^{-\delta t} + \frac{I_{R_i}}{\delta}.$$

Appendix 3

Table A.1 – A comparison between sample and population (year 2000)

	POPULATION(*)				*SURVEY*			
	Firms		Employees		Firms		Employees	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Final firm	35	50.0	3,114	85.1	18	45.0	1,812	77.2
Sub-contractor	35	50.0	546	14.9	22	65.0	536	22.8
Total	70	100.0	3,660	100.0	40	100.0	2,348	100.0

Source: Baracchi and Bigarelli, 2001

Table A.2 – The distribution of final firms by employees class (year 2000)

	POPULATION(*)				*SURVEY*			
	Firms		Employees		Firms		Employees	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
0-49	24	68.5	461	14.8	12	66.8	184	10.2
50-249	7	20.0	692	22.2	3	16.6	304	16.8
>249	4	11.5	1,961	63.0	3	16.6	1,324	73.1
Total	35	100.0	3,114	100.0	18	100.0	1,812	100.0

Source: Baracchi and Bigarelli, 2001

Table A.3 – The distribution of sub-contractors by employees class (year 2000)

	POPULATION(*)				*SURVEY*			
	Firms		Employees		Firms		Employees	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
0-9	11	31.4	50	9.2	7	31.8	23	4.3
10-19	15	42.9	196	35.9	9	40.9	120	22.4
>20	9	25.7	300	54.9	6	27.3	393	73.3
Total	35	100.0	546	100.0	22	100.0	536	100.0

Source: Baracchi and Bigarelli, 2001

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

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

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

IEM	75.2005	*Margherita GRASSO and Matteo MANERA*: Asymmetric Error Correction Models for the Oil-Gasoline Price Relationship
ETA	76.2005	*Umberto CHERUBINI and Matteo MANERA*: Hunting the Living Dead A "Peso Problem" in Corporate Liabilities Data
CTN	77.2005	*Hans-Peter WEIKARD*: Cartel Stability under an Optimal Sharing Rule
ETA	78.2005	*Joëlle NOAILLY, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Cees A. WITHAGEN* (lxxvi): Local and Global Interactions in an Evolutionary Resource Game
ETA	79.2005	*Joëlle NOAILLY, Cees A. WITHAGEN and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH* (lxxvi): Spatial Evolution of Social Norms in a Common-Pool Resource Game
CCMP	80.2005	*Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Roberto ZOBOLI*: Economic Instruments and Induced Innovation: The Case of End-of-Life Vehicles European Policies
NRM	81.2005	*Anna LASUT*: Creative Thinking and Modelling for the Decision Support in Water Management
CCMP	82.2005	*Valentina BOSETTI and Barbara BUCHNER*: Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Assess the Relative Efficiency of Different Climate Policy Portfolios
ETA	83.2005	*Ignazio MUSU*: Intellectual Property Rights and Biotechnology: How to Improve the Present Patent System
KTHC	84.2005	*Giulio CAINELLI, Susanna MANCINELLI and Massimiliano MAZZANTI*: Social Capital, R&D and Industrial Districts

(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

2004 SERIES	
CCMP	*Climate Change Modelling and Policy* (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	*Global Governance* (Editor: Carlo Carraro*)*
SIEV	*Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation* (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	*Natural Resources Management* (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	*Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital* (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	*International Energy Markets* (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	*Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management* (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRA	*Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust* (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	*Economic Theory and Applications* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	*Coalition Theory Network*

2005 SERIES	
CCMP	*Climate Change Modelling and Policy* (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
SIEV	*Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation* (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	*Natural Resources Management* (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	*Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital* (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	*International Energy Markets* (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	*Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management* (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRCG	*Privatisation Regulation Corporate Governance* (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	*Economic Theory and Applications* (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	*Coalition Theory Network*