



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

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

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

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

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

The Value of Cultural Heritage Sites in Armenia: Evidence from a Travel Cost Method Study

Anna Alberini and Alberto Longo

NOTA DI LAVORO 112.2005

SEPTEMBER 2005

**SIEV – Sustainability Indicators and Environmental
Valuation**

Anna Alberini, AREC, *University of Maryland* and *Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei*
Alberto Longo, *Department of Economics and International Development, University of Bath*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

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

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=825569>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei

Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The Value of Cultural Heritage Sites in Armenia: Evidence from a Travel Cost Method Study

Summary

This paper applies the travel cost method to visits to cultural sites in Armenia by domestic visitors. Respondents intercepted at four cultural monuments provided information on their visitation patterns, experience at the site, perception of the state of conservation of the monuments, and rating of the quality of the services and infrastructures. We combine actual trips with stated trips under hypothetical programs that would enhance the conservation of the monuments and improve one of (i) the cultural experience at the site, (ii) the quality of the infrastructure, or (iii) the quality of the services, and use the combined actual and stated trips to fit a panel data model. Our investigation shows that there are significant use values associated with the four study monuments, and that conservation programs and initiatives that improve the cultural experience, or simply make it easier for the respondent to reach and spend time at the monument, are valued by domestic visitors and would encourage higher visitation rates.

Keywords: Valuation of cultural heritage sites, Non-market valuation, Travel cost, Consumer surplus, Contingent behavior

JEL Classification: Z10

This study was conducted for the World Bank, Europe and Central Asia Department. The opinions expressed in this document are solely the authors' and do not represent the official views of their respective institutions or the World Bank. We wish to thank Marina Djabarzade, Gaiané Casnati, Maria Cristina Alberghini, Arpik Nairian, Gayane Shagoyan, Sasun and Eva Tsirunyan.

Address for correspondence:

Anna Alberini
University of Maryland
AREC, 2200 Symons Hall
College Park, MD 20742
USA
Phone: +1 301 405 1267
Fax: +1 301 314 9091
E-mail: aalberini@arec.umd.edu

1. Introduction and Motivation.

The Republic of Armenia is renowned for its distinctive historic buildings—including churches, monasteries, fortresses and caravanserai—many of which date back to the middle ages. These buildings are an essential part of the cultural heritage of the Armenian people and make a great impression on tourists and visitors. Concerns over the limited resources available for restoring and conserving these cultural heritage sites—especially since the country's independence from the former Soviet Union—and its tendency to experience severe earthquakes have recently prompted international organizations to take an interest in Armenia's monuments. At this time, three Armenian monasteries, one church and one archeological site are on the World Heritage Sites list, and UNESCO considers 30% of Armenia's cultural heritage sites at risk.

Presumably, cultural heritage sites attract many of the foreign visitors to Armenia,¹ but little is known about the visitation rates by domestic visitors, despite the importance of this information for prioritizing interventions, assigning funding and personnel, and establishing management decisions and policies.

The purpose of this paper is to report on the findings from a travel cost method (TCM) study conducted at four cultural heritage site locations in Armenia in order to place a value on the conservation of these sites. Armenian visitors were intercepted by professional interviewers at Garni, Haghartsin, Khor Virap and Tatev, and were administered a questionnaire that queried them about this and other visits to the

¹ The number of foreign tourists in Armenia has grown from 31,800 in 1998 to 206,000 in 2003, according to the Ministry of Trade and Economic Development of Armenia. The re-opening of the cultural monuments that were repaired in 2002-03 is thought to play a significant role in the growth of tourist flows to Armenia (<http://www.minted.am/en/tourism.html>). Thirty percent of these foreign visitors are from the European Union, 20% from the United States, and 22% from former Soviet Republics.

monument. The survey was conducted on August 7-25, 2004, and resulted in a total of 500 completed questionnaires.

The travel cost method is one of the possible approaches for non-market valuation, i.e., for placing a monetary value on goods that are not bought and sold in regular markets, such as cultural heritage sites and the conservation of cultural heritage. In our study, we focus on the single-site travel cost model, and rely on both observed behaviors (the actual number of trips to a site) and stated behaviors (the number of trips that would be taken to the site under hypothetical circumstances) to infer the value of conservation.

We feel that the results of this study are interesting for three reasons. First, they provide useful information about the patterns of visitation to selected cultural heritage sites by Armenian nationals, and of the associated activities and expenditures. Second, our survey questions elicit what individuals judge to be the most rewarding and least satisfactory aspects of the visit experience, and their perceptions of the state of conservation of the monuments and of other aspects of sustainable tourism to these places. Third, we combine the actual number of trips and expected trips under hypothetical conditions, and use them to estimate a travel demand function, from which we infer the (use) value people place on the conservation of monuments.

The results suggest that there are significant use values associated with the four study monuments, and that conservation programs and initiatives that improve the cultural experience, or simply make it easier for the respondent to reach and spend time at

the monument, *are* valued by domestic visitors and would encourage higher visitation rates.²

To our knowledge, this is the first application of the travel cost method to date to study domestic visitation rates in a transition economy in southwestern Asia. The method has been used previously to assess the use values of an urban museum (Martin, 1994), of attending performances at the Royal Exchange Theatre in Manchester (Forrest et al., 2000), of visiting the historic city of St. Mary, Maryland (Poor and Smith, 2004), and of four instances of cultural tourism in Spain (Bedate et al., 2004). All in all, Pearce et al. (2002) point out that the majority of the studies that estimate the monetary value of cultural heritage sites and cultural goods (see Navrud and Ready, 2002) have employed contingent valuation, thus relying on stated preference methods, and indeed Mourato et al. have used contingent valuation to elicit the willingness to pay for the conservation of monasteries in Bulgaria.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the study sites, and section 3 the questionnaire and sampling plan. Section 4 describes the data. Section 5 presents the travel cost method and the econometric model of the demand for trips to the four cultural heritage sites. Section 6 presents the model of trips to the four sites under the current conditions and under hypothetical conservation programs. Section 7 concludes.

² The travel cost method is only capable of measuring use values, and thus cannot capture non-use values. (Non-use values are those of people that do not visit the monuments, but wish to conserve them in their own right, for future generations, and in the event they should wish to visit them in the future.) Evidence that Armenian nationals *are* willing to pay for the protection of cultural heritage sites, even if they do not currently visit them nor plan to do so in the future, comes from a companion contingent valuation survey (Alberini, 2004).

2. The Study Sites

We gathered the data necessary to do a travel cost method study by interviewing domestic visitors on site at four locations—Garni, Haghartsin, Khor Virap, and Tatev—using a structured questionnaire. An equal number of respondents (125) were interviewed by professional enumerators at each of these sites.

Garni is the only Hellenistic temple in Armenia. It dates back to the first century AD and has an extensive archeological site, along with a modern shelter structure built around the remains of the bath house and its mosaic floor. It is the only major cultural heritage site in Armenia that charges a modest entrance fee. Khor Virap is one of the most visited sites in Armenia because of its religious importance.³ Haghartsin lies in forest and is one of Armenia's most visited monasteries. The Tatev monastery is part of a complex surrounded by a large fortified wall, and looks down on a gorge, in a beautiful natural environment.

The scenic quality is striking at all of these sites, except perhaps for Khor Virap. With the exception of Mount Ararat as a backdrop, the monastery of Khor Virap does not offer otherwise scenic views. The study sites are popular destinations among Armenian residents. Garni (20km from Yerevan) and Khor Virap (40km from Yerevan) are very close to the capital, Yerevan, and can be reached from the capital in about thirty minutes. The other two sites, Tatev and Haghartsin, are quite far from the capital. Haghartsin is at

³ Khor Virap is famous as the place where King Tiridates (Trdat) III imprisoned St. Gregory the Illuminator (the founder of Christianity in Armenia) for 13 years in the late 3rd century. Legend has it that, after ordering the execution of a group of Christian virgins led by Hripsime and Gayane, the King experienced a metamorphosis whereby his head turned into the head of a boar. Upon the release of St. Gregory and the conversion of the King to Christianity, he resumed his human aspect. This led to the adoption of Christianity as the country's official religion in 301 AD, which makes Armenia the first Christian nation in the world. It is still possible to visit the subterranean cell where St. Gregory was imprisoned.

a three-hour driving distance (125km) from the capital, while Tatev, located in the south of the country, is about 5 hours away (260km). (See Figure 1.)

The quality of the roads to these destinations, however, varies dramatically across the sites. Khor Virap is located very close to a major highway and can be reached relatively easily. The quality of the road to Garni is good. While reaching Haghartsin is relatively easy, visiting it is somewhat problematic because of the dearth of parking facilities. By comparison, Tatev is difficult to reach, given the poor condition of the local road, which is too steep and narrow for big tourist buses. Regarding visitor services, Khor Virap and Garni have souvenir stands, which are absent in Haghartsin and Tatev.

We wish to make two final points about the four cultural heritage sites of this study. First, Khor Virap, Haghartsin and Tatev have historical and religious significance to the Armenians, while Garni is mostly a historical and archeological site. Second, Garni is very close to another famous cultural heritage site, Geghard. Most people visiting Garni also visit Geghard—a unique monastery that is partly carved out of a cliff—in the course of the same trip, because these two locations are only a few minutes apart. In our study, we decided to consider a visit to Garni/Geghard as part of the same trip, and to intercept people at only one of these two locations (at Garni).

Figure 1. The Study Sites.



3. Structure of the Questionnaire and Sampling Plan

The questionnaire is divided into three sections. The first section gathers information about this visit. Specifically, we ask respondents how many trips were taken

to this site over the last twelve months. We also inquire about travel mode, the purpose of the present visit, the use of restaurants, shops and accommodations, and the length of time spent on-site and in the vicinity of the monument. To obtain the key inputs for the travel cost model, we ask respondents (i) how far they live from the site, and (ii) the cost of the trip, along with the size of the party they are traveling with.⁴

Finally, we ask the respondent to rate his level of satisfaction with the current visit and perception of the state of conservation of the cultural heritage site on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means “worse possible experience” (“very poor”) and 5 means “best possible experience” (“very good”).

In the second major section of the questionnaire, we propose a hypothetical program that would improve the quality of the site and/or the quality of the experience. People are randomly assigned to one of three hypothetical programs. These programs share a common part—conservation interventions at the site—and then branch into (a) initiatives that would enhance the cultural experience at the site (interpretive materials, small museum), (b) infrastructure improvements, such as repairing local roads to the cultural heritage site, building bathrooms and rest facilities, providing waste management services, and (c) tourism-related services, such as restaurant, cafes, shops, recreational activities and tourism information centers. Variants (a), (b) and (c)—which we dub **CULTURE, INFRASTR and SERVICES**—are mutually exclusive.

Were the program implemented, we ask, and assuming that the cost of a trip were the same, would the respondent visit the site more often? If so, how many times over the next year? What if the cost of a trip increased by 20%?

⁴ If the respondent mentioned other destinations visited or to be visited on this trip, we urged him to consider, to the best of his ability, only the costs associating with visiting this site and town/village.

The last major section of the survey instrument gathers information on the respondent's other recreational activities, cultural interests and attitudes, and sociodemographics. At the end of the interview, the enumerators were asked to fill out a short section containing debriefing questions.

4. The Data

A. Individual Characteristics of the Respondents

We gathered a total of 125 completed questionnaires at each of our survey locales. A total of 167 respondents received the CULTURE variant of the questionnaire, 166 received the INFRASTR version, and 167 were assigned to the SERVICES scenario.

The majority of our respondents (64.80%) are residents of Yerevan. This is not surprising, since Yerevan accounts for a large proportion of the population of Armenia, and the sites are relatively close to it (with the possible exception of Tatev). About 27.6% reside in another city, and the remainder (7.60%) is comprised of residents of villages.

Descriptive statistics of the respondents are reported in table 1. Almost 60% of the people we interviewed were males, and almost 87% were born in Armenia. The average age is about 40 years. Our sample is very highly educated, since almost 55% of the respondents have a University degree or a higher title. Comparison with official statistics for the Armenian population suggest that this sample is indeed more highly educated than the population at large (17% of the Armenian population aged 17 and older has received a University degree).

Three-quarters of our respondents are married, and the average household size is 4.8 persons. The average household income is about 238 US dollars per month.⁵ Finally, about 3 percent of the respondents belong to an environmental organization.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the respondents.

Variable	Percent of the sample	Mean	Std. Devn.	Minimum	Maximum
Male (dummy)	59.8				
Was born in Armenia (dummy)	86.6				
Has a University degree (dummy)	54.6				
Is married (dummy)	74.4				
Age (years)		40.43	13.21	18	75
Household size		4.79	1,86	1	13
Monthly household income in US \$		237.6	341.32	0	2000
Belongs to an environmental organization (dummy)	3.2				

B. Current Visitation Patterns

Descriptive statistics of the number of visits in the last 12 months are shown in table 2. Table 2 shows that the number of visits ranges from 1 to 51 (at Garni), and that the average number of visits is between 2 and 3.

⁵ ARMSTAT (2003) reports an average annual income of 1,045 US\$ per household for the population of Armenia in year 2001. Moreover, the 2001 Republic of Armenian Population Census indicates that women account for 51.8% of Armenian population, that 62.1% of the Armenians are married, and that the average age is 38. This suggests that our interviewees tend to be wealthier and more educated than the average Armenian, and are slightly more likely to be male and married, but are roughly of the same age as the average Armenian.

Table 2. Frequency of visitation by site: Visits in the last 12 months.

Site	mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Garni	2.82	5.24	1	51
Haghartsin	2.35	4.25	1	41
Khor Virap	2.38	2.85	1	21
Tatev	2.07	3.49	1	31

The majority of our respondents (467) report spending a few hours—from a minimum of a half hour to a maximum of 10—in the town or village where the monument is located. When asked about time spent at the actual monument site, the responses ranged from a half-hour to six hours, for an average of 1.55. Only 24 respondents out of 500 spend one or more nights in the village or town near the monument. Regarding accommodations, six of these people reported camping, 14 stayed with friends or family, and 4 used a rental home. Taken together with the fact that most respondents bring their own meals, this suggests that there is very little expenditure at the monument's locale.⁶

Three quarters of our respondents travel to the site by their own car and 14.6% of respondents rent a vehicle (cars or motorcycles). Public transportation accounts only 6.4 percent of the visitors. The remainder walks to the site, or reaches it using office cars or minibuses.

The average cost of the trip is 18,538 Armenian Drams (AMD) for the respondent and his or her travel party.⁷ When we divide the cost by the number of people (4.31 on

⁶ In addition to “visiting the monument” (40.6% of the respondents) and “religious purposes” (19%), many respondents (23.3% of the sample) mentioned that the reason for their visit was to “take foreign guests.”

⁷ At the time of the survey, one US dollars was equivalent to 515 AMD.

average) expenses are incurred for, we obtain cost per trip per person. This ranges from 40 to 25,000 AMD, averages 4,648 AMD, and has a median value of 3,400 AMD.⁸

Regarding their experience at the site, people complained about the quality of the local roads to Tatev, found the cleanliness of the four sites acceptable, praised the beauty of the monuments and their natural settings, and did not report problems with congestion levels. Over three-quarters of the Garni and Khor Virap visitors reported that these are in “good” or “very good” state of conservation, but only about one-third of the Haghartsin and Tatev visitors rated the state of these monuments as “good” or “very good.”

C. Contingent Behavior Questions.

When asked how their visits would be affected by the implementation of the program, assuming that the cost of visiting the site was the same as now, 47.6% of the respondents stated that they would visit more often. When a respondent stated he would visit the site more often after the works were completed, we asked him to tell us how many times he would visit in a year. Intended visits ranged from zero to 50, and averaged 3.49 per year. If the cost of a trip were increased by 20%, about 29% of the respondents would visit more. On average, these persons would visit 3 times a year.

In table 3, we examine contingent behaviors by site. The site where the program would bring—on average—the largest increase in the number of visits is Garni. Khor Virap stands out, relative to the other sites, for the fact that only 20% of the respondents at this locale would visit more often if the program were implemented and there was a

⁸ We note that while everyone reported information about the total cost of the present trip, missing values for the number of people for whom the cost is incurred result in only 469 valid observations for the price of the trip per person.

20% increase in the cost of a visit. By contrast, over 30% of the respondents at the other sites would visit the site more often under the same hypothetical circumstances, although Tatev visitors would increase their visits to this destination less than visitors to the other sites.⁹

Table 3. Hypothetical visitation patterns by site. All questions posit that a program would improve the quality of the site.

Site	Percent who would visit more frequently, at the same cost	Number of planned visits at the same cost (sample average)	Percent who would visit more frequently, at higher cost	Number of planned visits at higher cost (sample average)
Garni	48.8	4.68	32.26	4.26
Haghartsin	48.0	3.51	31.71	3.42
Khor Virap	49.6	3.14	20.16	1.45
Tatev	44.0	2.57	31.45	2.47

Does the fraction of the sample who wishes to visit the site more often if the program is implemented vary across the variants of the program? As shown in table 4, there are negligible differences across locales in the percentages of people who would visit more if the program was implemented. Pairwise t-tests fail to reject the null that there are no differences in the respective percentages across the groups of respondents that were assigned to the different scenarios.

⁹ We conjecture that this is because Tatev is far from the capital, Yerevan, where most of our respondents come from. It is difficult to visit Tatev on a daily trip from the capital because of the time it takes to reach it. Matters are further complicated by the lack of accommodations. We may reasonably expect that an improvement of the quality of the roads and of the services at the site might enhance the enjoyment of the visit.

Table 4. Hypothetical visitation patterns by scenario. Percentage of the sample who...

Description	Scenario 1: Culture	Scenario 2: Infrastructure	Scenario 3: Services
...would visit more often if the program were implemented and the cost of a trip were the same	46.11	48.80	47.90
..would visit more often if the program were implemented and the cost of a trip increased by 20%	29.88	28.92	27.88

One concern we had when we drafted the survey questionnaire was that people would not accept the hypothetical scenario and the contingent behavior questions. Fortunately, interviewer debriefs suggest that virtually everyone (97.6 percent of the sample) was comfortable with the hypothetical program and the related questions. Over 95 percent of the respondents appeared to answer the questions in an honest and truthful manner.

5. The Travel Cost Model.

We use the actual trips to the site in the last 12 months and the trips per year the respondent expects to make if the program is implemented to fit single-site travel cost models. These models allow us to estimate (i) the surplus associated with visits at the current conditions, plus (ii) the welfare change associated with the program.

A. The Single-site Model

In a single-site travel cost method (TCM) model, it is assumed that an individual's utility depends on aggregate consumption, X , leisure, L and trips r to the site:

$$(1) \quad U = U(X, L, r).$$

We further assume weak complementarity of trips with quality at the site, q . In other words, $\partial U / \partial q = 0$ when $r = 0$ (when a person does not visit the site, his or her utility is not affected by its quality), and r is increasing in q . The individual chooses X , L and r to maximize utility subject to the budget constraint:

$$(2) \quad y + w \cdot [\bar{T} - L - r(t_1 + t_2)] = X + (f + P_d \cdot d) \cdot r$$

where y is non-work income, w is the wage rate, \bar{T} is total time, t_1 is travel time to the site, t_2 is time spent at the site, f is the access fee (if any), P_d is the cost per kilometer, and d is the distance to the site.¹⁰ This yields the demand function for trips:

$$(3) \quad r^* = r^*(y, w, p_r, q)$$

where $p_r = w(t_1 + t_2) + f + P_d \cdot d$ is the full price of a trip.

In this study, we assume that the demand function is log linear. Formally,

$$(4) \quad r^* = \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 w + \beta_2 p_r + \beta_3 q).$$

In our econometric model below, r^* is the expected number of trips. To estimate the coefficients in equation (4), it is necessary to ask a sample of visitors to report the number of trips they took in a specified period (year or season), cost per trip p_r , plus w , y , and other individual characteristics that might affect the demand for visits to the site.

Since q —the quality of the site—does not change over time, to estimate the coefficient on q , β_3 , we devised a hypothetical program that would deliver an improvement in q , and asked our respondents to tell us how many trips they would take if

¹⁰ This model further assumes that travel time and time spent at the site are exogenous, that there is no utility or disutility from traveling to the site, and that each trip to the site is undertaken for no other purpose than visiting the site. It also assumes that individuals perceive and respond to changes in travel costs in the same way they would to changes in a fee for being admitted to the site (Freeman, 2003). Finally, the model assumes that work hours are flexible.

the program was implemented under two alternative assumptions for p_r . Specifically, we first instructed respondents to hold p_r at the same level as the current cost of the trip, and then we asked them to consider a *new* cost of the trip, this new cost being equal to $(p_r \times 1.2)$ (i.e., a 20% increase).

This means that we have a total of three observations on trips for each respondent. The first is the actual number of trips to the site in the last year, while the second and the third are the number of trips the respondent says he would take if the program is implemented, assuming no change, and a 20% increase, respectively, in the cost of the trip. This design is summarized in table 5. The quality of the site, q , is here the state of conservation of the monument and additional amenities or services offered by the hypothetical public program.

Table 5. Scenarios used in the questionnaire.

Scenario	Nature of the scenario	Price	Quality
1	Actual	p_r (actual cost of the trip reported by the respondent)	Current conditions
2	Hypothetical	p_r	Improved
3	Hypothetical	$1.2 \times p_r$	Improved

Equation (4) means that as the quality of the site is improved through the program, the demand function shifts out, implying that for all trip prices people will take more trips. The increase in expected trips is $r^* \cdot \beta_3 \cdot \Delta q$, where Δq is the quality change. The percentage change in expected trips is thus $\beta_3 \cdot \Delta q$.

B. Welfare Measures

Once the demand function has been estimated, the consumer surplus provides an approximation of the welfare associated with visiting the site. Formally, based on equation (4), the consumer surplus is equal to:

$$(5) \quad CS(p_0, q_0) = -\frac{1}{\beta_2} r_0,$$

where r_0 is r^* in equation (4) for the initial levels of quality (here, $q=0$) and price:

$$r_0 = \exp(\beta_o + \beta_1 w + \beta_2 p_0).$$

The surplus change brought by a quality improvement is:

$$(6) \quad \Delta CS = CS(p_1, q_1) - CS(p_0, q_0) = -\frac{1}{\beta_2} [r_1 - r_0],$$

where $r_1 = \exp(\beta_o + \beta_1 w + \beta_2 p_1 + \beta_3)$, where p_1 is the new price level. In our questionnaire, $p_1 = p_0$ in the first contingent behavior question, and $p_1 = 1.2 \cdot p_0$ in the second.

C. Econometric Model.

Given the relatively few annual trips to our sites, a count data model is the appropriate model for the number of trips Y . We specify a Poisson model with individual-specific λ_{ij} :

$$(7) \quad \Pr(Y_{ij} = y_{ij}) = \frac{e^{-\lambda_{ij}} \lambda_{ij}^{y_{ij}}}{y_{ij}!},$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the parameter of the Poisson distribution (which is equal to both the expected value and the variance of Y_{ij}), $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\mathbf{x}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + p_{ij} \beta_2 + q_j \beta_3)$, \mathbf{x} is a vector of determinants of visits to the cultural heritage site (including income), p_{ij} is the price per

trip faced by the respondent, and q_j is a vector of three dummies capturing the presence/absence of a specific type of hypothetical program. β_1 , β_2 and β_3 are unknown coefficients. The subscripts i and j denote the respondent ($i=1, 2, \dots, n$) and the scenario within the respondent, respectively ($j=1, 2, 3$, where $j=1$ refers to the current conditions, and $j=2, 3$ refer to the scenarios with the hypothetical programs (see table 5)).

Estimation of the β s is further complicated by the nature of our sample. Because we intercept people on site, Y is truncated from below at 1, and the people that we are more likely to run into are the most avid visitors, i.e., those persons with the highest λ_{ij} s. Accordingly, if we wish to estimate the parameters β s using the method of maximum likelihood, the correct contribution to the likelihood is:

$$(8) \quad h(y) = \frac{y \cdot \Pr(y)}{\sum_{w=1}^{\infty} w \cdot \Pr(w)} = \frac{y \cdot \Pr(y)}{\lambda},$$

where $\Pr(\cdot)$ is the Poisson distribution function (equation (7)), and the subscripts have been omitted to avoid notational clutter. This amendment allows us to infer the demand for trips in the population from our on-site sample.

Assuming that the observations on trip frequencies are independent within and across respondents, the likelihood function of the sample is thus $\prod_i \prod_j h(y_{ij})$, and the log likelihood function is

$$(9) \quad \sum_i \sum_j \log h(y_{ij}).$$

It is easily shown (see Shaw, 1988) that (8) is simplified to the probability function of a Poisson variate defined as $Y' = Y - 1$.

D. The Dependent Variable and the Choice of the Independent Variables.

The vector \mathbf{x} includes the following regressors:

- Dummy variables for the site where the interview was conducted;¹¹
- Dummy variables for the variant of the program the respondent was told to consider. The dummies CULTURE, INFRASTR, and SERVICES denote the variants of the program that, in addition to implementing conservation and restoration measures, emphasize provision of cultural and historical information at the site, improve the infrastructure at or near the site, and improve tourist-related services, respectively. These dummies were always assigned a value of zero when $j=1$, i.e., the observation on trips refers to *actual* trips.

- The total cost of the trip as reported by the respondent, divided by the number of people for whom this cost was incurred. We label this variable PRICE. We do *not* include the opportunity cost of time in our price variable.¹²

We created a companion dummy variable, INCMISS, which takes on a value of one if the respondent fails to answer the income question. PCAPPINC is recoded to zero when the

¹¹ We include dummies for Tatev, Garni, Haghartsin, and Khor Virap. The model does not, therefore, contain the intercept.

¹² Most theoretical models assume that the opportunity cost of time is the wage rate. Much of the empirical literature (since Cesario, 1976) imputes a fraction (usually, about one-third) of the market wage rate as the opportunity cost of time, but Azevedo et al. (2002) point out that doing so is likely to introduce measurement error into the price variable, which in turn biases the coefficient on the price downward. As in Hanley et al (2003) and Alberini et al. (2005) we prefer to enter the out-of-pocket cost of a trip and income separately.

respondent did not report his or her household income, and both the recoded PCAPPINC and INCMISS are included in the right-hand side of the model.¹³

- Other individual characteristics of the respondent, such as education (measured by a dummy, COLLEGE, denoting whether the respondent has a University degree or better), age, and marital status (the dummy MARRIED).¹⁴
- A dummy denoting whether the respondent finds the site to be in “very good” condition (GOODSTATE).

Finally, it is important to tackle the issue of substitute sites. Ideally, *if* substitute sites exist, the price per trip to a substitute site should be included in the model. Failure to do so results in a biased estimate of the coefficient on price per trip, the severity of the bias depending on the correlation between the two price variables. In practice, we do not have information about which sites, if any, would be considered reasonable substitute for the study sites. This forces us to omit this variable altogether from the regression model.¹⁵

6. Results

A. Actual Trips

Our first order of business is to fit the Poisson equation corrected for the on-site nature of sample using only the actual trips taken by the respondents. In other words, the sample is restricted to $j=1$ and results in a total sample size of 468 (32 observations are

¹³ The coefficient on INCMISS captures any systematic differences in the number of trips among those respondents who did and did not report income. The coefficient on PCAPPINC should be interpreted as the marginal effect of income on trips, conditional on information on income being available.

¹⁴ In our initial runs, we experimented with including age squared, household size, and other variables, but the models were poorly behaved, so we decided to exclude these regressors from the specifications reported in this document.

¹⁵ Similar reasons drove Forrest et al. (2000) and Poor and Smith (2004) to omit the travel cost to a substitute site in their applications of the travel cost method.

lost because of missing observations on the covariates). In this run, we omit the scenario dummies, since in this sample they would all be identically equal to zero. For simplicity, this specification does not include variables about the respondent's marital status, education, and perception of the state of conservation of the monument.

The results of this run are reported in table 6. The coefficient on the site dummies are positive and statistically significant. They imply that, all else the same, people take fewer trips to Tatev than they do to the other sites. This is reasonable, considering the difficulty of traveling to Tatev, due to the distance from the capital and the poor quality of the roads. The coefficients on the Garni, Haghardzin and Khor Virap dummies are not statistically discernible from one another.

Table 6. Single-site travel cost model. Dependent variable: annual number of trips (actual visits only). Poisson model with on-site endogenous sampling. Maximum likelihood estimation. N=468.

Variable	coefficient	standard error	t statistic
Tatev	0.3214	0.1214	2.6474
Garni	1.0231	0.0856	11.9521
Haghardzin	0.9964	0.0955	10.4335
Khorvirap	0.8507	0.089	9.5584
Price	-0.1263	0.0162	-7.7963
Pcappinc	-0.002	0.0007	-2.8571
Incmiss	0.5253	0.2552	2.0583
Log likelihood	-357.73		

The coefficient on price is negative, as expected, and strongly significant. Its magnitude, -0.1263, is reasonable, and implies that, starting at 3 trips per year, an increase in price by 3,000 AMD (a little less than 5 US dollars) reduces the number of trips by one. Trip frequency is negatively related to income, and tends to be greater among those people that did not report their income.

The surplus associated with access at the current conditions are reported in table 7. These figures refer to the average visitor at each site, i.e., they average in-sample predictions.¹⁶ Briefly, they imply that the value of accessing the site in its current conditions is over 21,000 AMD at Garni, 19,000 AMD at each of Haghardzin and Khor Virap, and 13,850 AMD at Tatev.

Table 7. Surplus at current conditions and price by site based on the estimates in table 6. All figures in thousand AMD.

Site	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
All sites	18.44	5.32	8.21	44.00
Garni	21.68	4.78	9.59	29.13
Haghardzin	19.07	6.00	8.69	44.00
Khor Virap	19.24	4.49	8.21	29.38
Tatev	13.85	2.87	8.58	24.19

B. Combining Actual and Hypothetical Data

We combine actual and contingent behavior trips to estimate the value of programs that restore the sites and improve their quality. Each respondent contributes three observations to our sample, and we pool the observations from the four sites to estimate a Poisson model with the correction for on-site sampling where $\lambda_{ij} = \exp(\mathbf{x}_{ij}\beta_1 + p_{ij}\beta_2 + q_j\beta_3)$.¹⁷ Results based on the full panel of data are displayed in table 8.

¹⁶ As detailed in Englin and Shonkwiler (1995), the value of access for a visitor, or his consumer surplus at the current conditions, is thus the number of visits predicted by the model for this visitor ($\lambda_i + 1$, where $\lambda_i = \exp(\mathbf{x}_i\beta_1 + p_i\beta_2)$), divided by the negative of the coefficient on price (- β_2). This formula applies to our sample of visitors, who are likely to visit more frequently than the population of visitors at large.

¹⁷ We constructed the dependent variable for the hypothetical visits ($j=2, 3$) as follows. For $j>1$, we assigned the number of trips respondents said that they would take. If they said that they would visit the same number of times as during the previous year, then $y_j = y_1$. Once again, correcting for the on-site intercept nature of the sample implies that we estimate a Poisson equation where the dependent variable is the number of visits minus 1.

The first specification (specification I) is our basic model, while specification II is broader and explores the possible effects of individual characteristics and perceptions about conservation. In both specifications, mean actual trips are obtained by setting all the scenario dummies to zero. Both models fit the data well, in the sense that likelihood ratio tests of the null that all slopes are equal to zero reject the null soundly.

In both models we impose the restriction that the coefficient on price, β_2 , to be equal to -0.1263—the estimate from running the model on actual trip data only. We believe that this approach is desirable because it “grounds” intended behaviors to observed behaviors, thus providing reasonable and conservative estimates of the benefits of conservation of monuments in Armenia.^{18, 19, 20}

¹⁸ This approach is in the spirit of Azevedo et al.’s point that revealed preference data (i.e., actual trips) should be viewed as complementary sources of values and information with stated preference data (i.e., hypothetical trips) (Azevedo et al., 2003). Revealed preference methods bring the “discipline of the market” to stated preference valuations, while the latter can shed light on consumer preferences for price and quality levels that are currently not observed.

¹⁹ Of course, we attempted to estimate the unrestricted model, but were dissatisfied with the fit of the model and with the implausible value of the unrestricted coefficient on price. All other coefficients, however, were very close to those of the restricted model. Accordingly, we opted for imposing the restriction and for reporting only the results of the restricted maximum likelihood estimation in this paper. We also explored random effects Poisson to allow for the possibility of correlation among the responses provided by the same person. In the unrestricted model we find some evidence of the presence of random effects, but the coefficients on all other variables are virtually the same as those of the model where the observations are independent within respondents. The random effect model does not converge when we impose the restriction that $\beta_2 = -0.1263$.

²⁰ Other researchers have investigated whether the slope of the demand function implied by the responses to the hypothetical questions is different from that implied by actual travel. Results are mixed. For example, Rosenberger and Loomis (1999) find that the slope of the demand function (i.e., the coefficient on price per trip) is the same across actual and hypothetical data, and Alberini et al. (2005) report a similar result in a travel cost method study that examines fishing trips to the Lagoon of Venice by a sample of anglers in the Venice area. By contrast, Azevedo et al. (2003) find that individuals appear to be less sensitive to price in contingent behavior questions than we observe them to be in real life. They are, however, careful to point out that this could be due to the researcher’s poor measurement of the respondents’ travel costs. Finally, Grijalva et al. (2002) observe rock climbers on multiple occasions before and after the implementation of a policy for the management of rock climbing routes in natural parks in Texas, finding that pre-policy responses (a combination of actual and stated trips) are less price-responsive than post-policy behaviors. Our interpretation of the literature is that stated and actual trips may or may not exhibit a different degree of sensitivity to price and to changing other conditions, depending on the study and the context.

The coefficients on the site dummies are positive and significant. The magnitude of the coefficients indicates that people visit Garni more than Haghardzin, that Haghardzin is visited more than Khor Virap, and that in turn the latter is visited more than Tatev.

The coefficients on the scenario dummies suggest that people valued most highly programs that offer conservation *and* improve services like food and lodging, information centers, etc. for visitors, followed by programs that enhance the cultural experience of the visit. In practice, however, the coefficients on the dummies for the SERVICES and CULTURE scenarios are not statistically different from one another. They are, however, statistically different from the coefficient on the INFRASTR scenario.

This specification predicts that at Garni, for example, the average welfare change from the current situation to be 8,871 AMD for the culture-enhancing scenario, 6,458 AMD for the infrastructure-enhancing program, and 10,346 for the service-oriented program. (Once again, these are the averages of in-sample predictions for the visitors we interviewed on-site, not for the population of visitors at large.).

In specification II, the coefficients on the scenario dummies are very close to their counterparts in specification I, whereas somewhat larger differences are observed for the coefficients on the site dummies.²¹ We also find that persons with a University degree visit somewhat less frequently (25% fewer times, all else the same), married individuals visit 37% more (about one visit a year, all else the same), and that age has a positive association with demand for trips, although its coefficient is significant only at the 10%.

²¹ A likelihood ratio test shows that adding individual characteristics of the respondents, as we do in specification II, improves the fit of the model significantly. The results of specification II are qualitatively similar to those of specification I.

Most important, the demand for trips is greater among persons who regard the cultural heritage site to be in good shape. Persons who hold this opinion visit about 52% more often—on average, 1.5 times a year more—than the others.

Table 8. Single-site travel cost model. Dependent variable: annual number of trips. Poisson model with on-site endogenous sampling. Maximum likelihood estimation imposing the restriction that the coefficient on price is -0.1263. N=1322.

	Specification I			Specification II		
	Coeff.	Std.error	T statistic	Coeff.	Std. error	T statistic
<i>Site dummies</i>						
TATEV	0.378584	0.063175	5.99259	0.136425	0.09453	1.4432
GARNI	0.981292	0.050782	19.3238	0.621339	0.093056	6.67707
HAGHARDZ	0.850836	0.05438	15.6463	0.526342	0.094028	5.5977
KHORVIRA	0.679794	0.054979	12.3645	0.271389	0.096033	2.826
<i>Scenario dummies</i>						
CULTURE	0.478936	0.057185	8.37526	0.467258	0.057245	8.16246
INFRASTR	0.383777	0.059311	6.47057	0.381805	0.059338	6.43442
SERVICE	0.533546	0.05642	9.4567	0.524222	0.056504	9.27762
<i>Price and income</i>						
PRICE	-0.1263	n/a	n/a	-0.1263	n/a	n/a
PCAPPINC	-4.11E-05	0.000228	-0.1808	0.000372	0.000246	1.5151
INCMISS	0.541384	0.141048	3.83829	0.349232	0.142306	2.4541
<i>Other individual characteristics</i>						
COLLEGE				-0.30248	0.044169	-6.84818
AGE				0.002846	0.001652	1.72246
MARRIED				0.322318	0.058058	5.55164
GOODSTATE				0.420202	0.050361	8.34379

7. Discussion and Conclusions

We have conducted a travel cost study with the purpose of placing a value on conservation of cultural monuments in Armenia. The study gathered information about trips to four cultural heritage sites—Garni, Haghartsin, Khor Virap and Tatev—by administering a carefully designed questionnaire to domestic visitors that were intercepted on site.

Our travel cost model of the actual trips to the sites pegs the coefficient on price at -0.1263. This implies that for the average visitor it would take an increase in price of 3000 AMD to see a decrease of one in the annual number of trips to the site. The surplus (what the average person is willing to pay, above and beyond what he spends to visit the site) at the current conditions is almost 22,000 AMD for Garni, 19,000 AMD for Haghartsin and Khor Virap and 13,850 AMD for Tatev.

Actual trips alone do not allow us to estimate the value of conservation works and other initiatives that would enhance the cultural experience of the visitor or make his trip more comfortable, as these programs do not currently exist. To circumvent this problem, we pool the actual trips with intended trips under hypothetical scenarios to estimate the value of public conservation and enhancement programs. In estimating our Poisson model (amended for the on-site nature of our sample), we restrict the coefficient on the price per trip to be equal to the value estimated from the Poisson model of actual trips. This is a somewhat novel approach that brings together the “discipline of the market forces” with the flexibility of questions about hypothetical circumstances.

We find that, all else the same, people equally value the scenario with improved tourist service and the scenario that enhances the cultural experience, and that these are valued a little more than the infrastructure-enhancing scenario. For example, within our sample the welfare change associated with implementation of the culture-enhancing scenario at Garni is 8,871 AMD. It is 6,458 AMD for the infrastructure-enhancing program, and 10,346 for the service-oriented program. These figures are equivalent to about 17, 12, and 20 US dollars, respectively, and are expressed on a per-year basis.

How do we extrapolate these figures to the *population* of domestic visitors? We wish to emphasize once again that by intercepting people on-site, we end up observing only people who have taken at least one trip for this year, and visitors that tend to be more avid than the average. First, we need to calculate the appropriate welfare measure for the average visitor in the population, which must then be multiplied by the number of people that visit each of the selected sites.

For illustrative purposes, we compute out-of-sample predictions for Garni using specification I in table 8, the monthly household income of the average Armenian—which we conservatively estimate this to be 21.28 US dollars, or a little less than half that in our sample²²—and further assume that the cost of a trip to Garni for the representative domestic visitor is the same as the average in our sample. This time, since the prediction is for the population of domestic visitors, and not for the sample we intercepted on site, the appropriate formula for the consumer surplus is $\lambda_i /(-\beta_2) = \exp(x\beta_1 + p\beta_2) /(-\beta_2)$, which pegs the value of access for the representative domestic visitor at 11,742 AMD a year.

We know from a companion CV survey of Armenian households that 11.80% of the respondents have visited Garni in the last year. Assuming that this percentage mirrors the population share, then the total consumer surplus is $3.1 \text{ million (population)} \times 0.72 \text{ (percentage adults in the population)} \times 0.1180 \times 11,742 \text{ AMD} = 3,093 \text{ million AMD} (= 6 \text{ million US dollars per year})$.

²² To arrive at this estimate, since the average annual income of an Armenian household was 1045 US dollars in 2001, we increased this figure by 10% to conservatively account for growth, divided it by 12, and further divided it by 4.5, the number of household members of the average Armenian households.

For the average visitor in the population, the welfare change for the public program with an emphasis on the cultural experience is 7,210 AMD, that for the infrastructure program 5,490 AMD, and that for the SERVICE program 8,270 AMD per year. When aggregated over the population of visitors—and ignoring those persons who start visiting the site after the conservation program is implemented—the total welfare change is thus 3.690 million US dollars a year for the cultural program, 2.800 million US dollars a year for the infrastructure program, and 4.230 million US dollars for the services program.

Clearly, these figures suggest that public programs that maintain, restore, and enhance the cultural experience at the monuments, or make it easier to get and spend time there, *are* highly valued by Armenian visitors. One interesting finding is that people value improved hospitality services. This leads to speculate that, although people do not spend much on food and lodging at the site now, they may do so in the future as they become wealthier and accommodations and eating establishments become increasingly available. Our survey respondents complained about the quality of many of the roads to the site, and indeed they would be prepared to pay for improved road quality, although not quite as much as they would be prepared to pay for programs that emphasize the cultural experience and tourist services.

References

Alberini, Anna (with Alberto Longo) (2004), "Willingness to Pay to Protect Cultural Monuments: Evidence from a Survey of Armenian Households," Report to the World Bank, Washington, DC, December.

Alberini, Anna, Valentina Zanatta, and Paolo Rosato, (2005) "Combining Actual and Contingent Behavior in Travel Cost Method Studies: An Application to Sport Fishing in the Lagoon of Venice," draft paper, Washington, DC, January.

ARMSTAT (2003) "Income and expenditure and food consumption of population of the Republic of Armenia," National Statistical Service of the Republic of Armenia, available at www.armstat.am.

Azevedo, C.D., J.A. Herriges and C.L. Kling (2003), "Combining Revealed and Stated Preferences: Consistency Tests and Their Interpretations," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 85(3): 525-37.

Bedate, A., L.C. Herrero and J.A. Sanz (2004), "Economic Valuation of the Cultural Heritage: Application to Four Case Studies in Spain," *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 5(1): 101-111.

Cesario, F.J. (1976), "Value of Time in Recreation Benefit Studies," *Land Economics* 52(1): 32-41.

Englin, J. and J.S. Shonkwiler (1995), "Estimating Social Welfare Using Count Data Models: An Application to Long-Run Recreation Demand Under Conditions of Endogenous Stratification or Counting," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 77(2), 104-112.

Feather, P. and W.D. Shaw (1999), "Estimating the Cost of Leisure Time for Recreation Demand Models," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 38(1): 49-65.

Feather, P. and W.D. Shaw (2000), "The Demand for Leisure Time in the Presence of Constrained Work Hours," *Economic Inquiry* 38(4): 651-61.

Forrest, D., K. Grime and R. Woods (2000), "Is It Worth Subsidizing Regional Repertory Theatre?," *Oxford Economic Papers*, 52: 381-397.

Freeman, M. A. (2003), "The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values Theory and Methods," Second Edition, Resources for the Future Press, Washington, DC.

Grijalva, T.C., R.P. Berrens, A.K. Bohara and W.D. Shaw. (2002), "Testing the Validity of Contingent Behavior Trip Responses," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 84(2): 401-414.

Hanley, N., D. Bell, and B. Alvarez-Farizo (2003), "Valuing the Benefits of Coastal Water Quality Improvements Using Contingent and Real Behavior," *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 24, 273-285

Mourato, Susana, Andreas Kontoleon, and Alexi Danchev (2002), "Preserving Cultural Heritage in Transition Economies: A Contingent Valuation Studies of Bulgarian Monasteries," in Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready (2002), *Valuing Cultural Heritage*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pearce, D., S. Mourato, S. Navrud and R.C. Ready (2002), "Review of Existing Studies, Their Policy Use and Future Research Needs," in Stale Navrud and Richard C. Ready (eds.), *Valuing Cultural Heritage*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Poor, P.J. and J.M. Smith (2004), "Travel Cost Analysis of a Cultural Heritage Site: The Case of Historic St. Mary's City of Maryland," *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 28: 217-229.

Rosenberger, R.S. and J.B. Loomis (1999), "The value of ranch open space to tourists: Combining contingent and observed behavior data," *Growth and Change* 30(3): 366-383.

Shaw, D. (1988), "On-Site Samples' Regression: Problems of Non-negative Integers, Truncation, and Endogenous Stratification," *Journal of Econometrics* 37(2): 211-23.

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

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

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

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

<http://www.repec.org>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

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

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

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

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

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

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

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

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

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

(lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications" organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003

(lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on "Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation" organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL) , Venice, August 28-29, 2003

(lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on "Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues" jointly organised by CRENOS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003

(lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities", Rome, June 5-6, 2003

(lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference "The Future of Climate Policy", Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003

(lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

(lxxi) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on "Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications", organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004

(lxxii) This paper was presented at the 10th Coalition Theory Network Workshop held in Paris, France on 28-29 January 2005 and organised by EUREQua.

(lxxiii) This paper was presented at the 2nd Workshop on "Inclusive Wealth and Accounting Prices" held in Trieste, Italy on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics

(lxxiv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Trust and social capital in multicultural cities" Athens, January 19-20, 2004

(lxxv) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on "Diversity as a source of growth" Rome November 18-19, 2004

(lxxvi) This paper was presented at the 3rd Workshop on Spatial-Dynamic Models of Economics and Ecosystems held in Trieste on 11-13 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics

(lxxvii) This paper was presented at the Workshop on Infectious Diseases: Ecological and Economic Approaches held in Trieste on 13-15 April 2005 and organised by the Ecological and Environmental Economics - EEE Programme, a joint three-year programme of ICTP - The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, FEEM - Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics.

2004 SERIES

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

2005 SERIES

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