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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 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.
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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, Haghardzin, 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, Haghardzin, 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. Haghardzin 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 Haghardzin, are quite far from the capital. Haghardzin 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 Haghardzin 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 Haghardzin and Tatev.

We wish to make two final points about the four cultural heritage sites of this study. First, Khor Virap, Haghardzin 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).
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
tavel 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. Finally, about 3 percent of the respondents belong to an environmental organization.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percent of the sample</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Devn.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (dummy)</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was born in Armenia (dummy)</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a University degree (dummy)</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is married (dummy)</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>40.43</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly household income in US $</td>
<td>237.6</td>
<td>341.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs to an environmental organization (dummy)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garni</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haghardzin</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khor Virap</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatev</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.\textsuperscript{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 Haghardzin and Tatev visitors rated the state of these monuments as “good” or “very good.”

\textit{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

\textsuperscript{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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Percent who would visit more frequently, at the same cost</th>
<th>Number of planned visits at the same cost (sample average)</th>
<th>Percent who would visit more frequently, at higher cost</th>
<th>Number of planned visits at higher cost (sample average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garni</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haghardzin</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khor Virap</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatev</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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:

\[ U = U(X, L, r). \]
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:

$$y + w \cdot [T - L - r(t_1 + t_2)] = X + \left( f + P_d \cdot d \right) \cdot r$$

where $y$ is non-work income, $w$ is the wage rate, $T$ 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:

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

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,

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

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 $q$, $\beta_3$, 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Nature of the scenario</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>$p_r$ (actual cost of the trip reported by the respondent)</td>
<td>Current conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>$p_r$</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hypothetical</td>
<td>$1.2 \times p_r$</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 $\Delta q$ 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:

\[
CS(p_0, q_0) = \frac{1}{\beta_2} r_0,
\]

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

\[
r_0 = \exp(\beta_o + \beta_{w1} + \beta_2 p_0).
\]

The surplus change brought by a quality improvement is:

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

where \( r_1 = \exp(\beta_o + \beta_{w1} + \beta_2 p_1 + \beta_{q1}) \), 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 \( \lambda_{ij} \):

\[
\Pr(Y_{ij} = y_{ij}) = \frac{\lambda_{ij}^{y_{ij}} e^{-\lambda_{ij}}}{y_{ij}!},
\]

where \( \lambda > 0 \) is the parameter of the Poisson distribution (which is equal to both the expected value and the variance of \( Y_{ij} \)), \( \lambda_{ij} = \exp(x_{ij} \beta_1 + p_{ij} \beta_2 + q_{ij} \beta_3) \), \( x \) 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. $\beta_1$, $\beta_2$, and $\beta_3$ are unknown coefficients. The subscripts $i$ and $j$ denote the respondent ($i=1, 2, \ldots, n$) and the scenario within the respondent, respectively ($j=1, 2, 3$, where $j=1$ refers the current conditions, and $j=2, 3$ refer to the scenarios with the hypothetical programs (see table 5).

Estimation of the $\beta$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 $\lambda_i$s. Accordingly, if we wish to estimate the parameters $\beta$s using the method of maximum likelihood, the correct contribution to the likelihood is:

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

where $\text{Pr}(\cdot)$ 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

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

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 \( x \) 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.\(^{12}\)
- Household income divided by the number of household members (PCAPPINC). 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, Haghardzin, 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.\footnote{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.}

- 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).\footnote{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.}

- 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.\footnote{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.}

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
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, Hagharden 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>standard error</th>
<th>t statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tatev</td>
<td>0.3214</td>
<td>0.1214</td>
<td>2.6474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garni</td>
<td>1.0231</td>
<td>0.0856</td>
<td>11.9521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagharden</td>
<td>0.9964</td>
<td>0.0955</td>
<td>10.4335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khovarap</td>
<td>0.8507</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>9.5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>-0.1263</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>-7.7963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcapinc</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>-2.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incmiss</td>
<td>0.5253</td>
<td>0.2552</td>
<td>2.0583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-357.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sites</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garni</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haghardzin</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khor Virap</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatev</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\[ \lambda_{ij} = \exp(x_i \beta_1 + p_i \beta_2 + q_j \beta_3). \]

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 \((\lambda_i+1)\), divided by the negative of the coefficient on price \((-\beta_2\)). 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, $\beta_2$, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specification I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Specification II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td>Std.error</td>
<td>T statistic</td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site dummies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TATEV</td>
<td>0.378584</td>
<td>0.063175</td>
<td>5.99259</td>
<td>0.136425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARNI</td>
<td>0.981292</td>
<td>0.050782</td>
<td>19.3238</td>
<td>0.621339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAGHARDZ</td>
<td>0.850836</td>
<td>0.05438</td>
<td>15.6463</td>
<td>0.526342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHIRVIRA</td>
<td>0.679794</td>
<td>0.054979</td>
<td>12.3645</td>
<td>0.271389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario dummies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE</td>
<td>0.478936</td>
<td>0.057185</td>
<td>8.37526</td>
<td>0.467258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRASTR</td>
<td>0.383777</td>
<td>0.059311</td>
<td>6.47057</td>
<td>0.381805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>0.533546</td>
<td>0.05642</td>
<td>9.4567</td>
<td>0.524222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price and income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>-0.1263</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCAPPINC</td>
<td>-4.11E-05</td>
<td>0.000228</td>
<td>-0.1808</td>
<td>0.000372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCMISS</td>
<td>0.541384</td>
<td>0.141048</td>
<td>3.83829</td>
<td>0.349232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other individual characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE</td>
<td>-0.30248</td>
<td>0.044169</td>
<td>-6.84818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.002846</td>
<td>0.001652</td>
<td>1.72246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>0.322318</td>
<td>0.058058</td>
<td>5.55164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODSTATE</td>
<td>0.420202</td>
<td>0.050361</td>
<td>8.34379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Haghardzin, 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 Haghardzin 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 sample—22—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

\[
\lambda_i / \beta_2 = \exp(x\beta_1 + \rho\beta_2) / (-\beta_2),
\]

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 million (population) \times 0.72 (percentage adults in the population) \times 0.1180 \times 11,742 AMD = 3,093 million AMD (=6 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


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.repec.org

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM 1.2004 Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries
ETA 2.2004 Masahiko FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries
PRA 3.2004 Adolfo Di CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy
ETA 4.2004 Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union
PRA 7.2004 Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): Merger Mechanisms
PRA 8.2004 Wolfgang AUSSENEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market
PRA 9.2004 Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets
PRA 11.2004 Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders
PRA 12.2004 Ohad KADAN (lxv): Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values
PRA 13.2004 Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): Auctions as Coordination Devices
PRA 14.2004 Gadi FIBICH, Arieh GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers
PRA 15.2004 Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination
PRA 16.2004 Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions
PRA 17.2004 Slim Ben YOUSSEF: R&D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade
NRM 20.2004 Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists
NRM 22.2004 Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare
NRM 26.2004 Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach
NRM 27.2004 Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports
NRM 30.2004 Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare
CTN 33.2004 Wilson PEREZ: Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution
An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests

Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON:

Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST:

Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN

(lxvi): Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Significance

Francesco RICCI

Kiflemariam HAMDE

Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF

Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG:

Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA

Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA

in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants

Heterogeneous Agents Implications

Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach

Netherlands Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis

Technology-based Climate Protocol Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon

Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management

Effects on Energy Scenarios

Micheal FINUS

Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON:

Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON:

Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR: Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability

NRM 45.2004, 46.2004

Sebastian BEROYETS and Nicolas GRAVEL (lxvi): Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach

Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition Economy

Information on Private Environmental Benefits: An Axiomatic Approach

Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER

Michael FINUS

Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA

Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio Rossi (lxvii): Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context


Kiflemeriam HAMDE (lxviii): Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm

Etha CAVALIERE: Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly

Andrea BIGANO and Stéf PROOST: The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?

CCMP 41.2004, KTHC 38.2004

Michael FINUS (lxvii): International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems

Francesco CRESPI: Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis

SIEV 52.2004

Eastern Europe

Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI: Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies

Sebastian BERVOYETS and Nicolas GRAVEL (lxvi): Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach

NRM 46.2004

Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLESMARK THORSEN (lxvi): Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits

NRM 47.2004


NRM 48.2004

Ekis BIROL, Ağnes GYOVAR and Melinda SMALE (lxvi): Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition Economy

CCMP 49.2004

Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects

GG 50.2004

Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL: Optimal Disease Eradication

CTN 51.2004

Danko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG: Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games

GG 52.2004

Francesco RICCI: Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory

NRM 53.2004

Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON: Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?

GG 54.2004

Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF (lxvi): Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams

NRM 55.2004

Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN (lxvi): Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices

NRM 56.2004

Tom DEDEURWAERDERE (lxvi): Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance

CCMP 57.2004

Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON: The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households

CCMP 58.2004

Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN: Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios

NRM 59.2004

Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA (lxvii): Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management

NRM 60.2004

Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI (lxvi): Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon

CCMP 61.2004

Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol

NRM 62.2004

Eliasios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.

NRM 63.2004

Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMEALE and Mariann HAJDÚ (lxvi): Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis

NRM 64.2004

E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN (lxvi): The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands

NRM 65.2004


ETA 66.2004

Gianmir VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings

GG 67.2004

Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PAX: Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach

GG 68.2004

Michael FINUS: Modesty Pays: Sometimes!

NRM 69.2004

Tord BJÖRNDAHL and Ana BRASÃO: The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications

CTN 70.2004

Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAI’T: On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents

IEM 71.2004

Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants

IEM 72.2004

Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER: Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns

SIEV 73.2004

Margherita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA: The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests
Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND: Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment

Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO: Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach

Salvador BARBERA and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxv): On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union

Alex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMÉRÀ and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (lxv): Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion

Francis BLOCHE and Armando GOMES (lxv): Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options

Rabah AMIR, Eyssouni DIAMANTOU and Liacon XUE (lxv): Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains

Francis BLOCHE and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxv): The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players

Daniel DIERMIEJE, Hûlya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO (lxv): Bicameralism and Government Formation

Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT (lxv): Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation

Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN (lxv): Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement

Sanjeev GOTAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ (lxv): Economics: An Emerging Small World?

Edward CARTWRIGHT (lxv): Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players

Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL: Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power

Elissaios PAPYRakis and Reyer GERLAGH: Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income

Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMPFERT: Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey

A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSOS and D. STREMIKIE: Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?

Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL: Climate Agreements and Technology Policy

Sergei IZMALKOV (lxv): Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction

Gianmarco P.L. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI: Cities and Cultures

Massimo DEL GAITTO: Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities, Centralisation versus devolution

Pierre-André IOUJNET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON: Equilibrium with a Market of Permits

Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH: Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply

Francesco BOSello, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise

Gustavo BERGANTINOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA: Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form

Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK: Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation

Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA: The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements

Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP: Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents

Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP: A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reducing Pesticide Risk Exposure

Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN: Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test

Alessandra GORIA and Gretel GAMBARELLI: Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy

Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENI: The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation

John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGa: Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies

Kira BÖRNER: The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?

Pehr-Johan NORBACK and Lars PERSSON: Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets

Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAIORINO: Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective

Somdeb LAHIRI: The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results

Giuseppe DI VITA: Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look

Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA: Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study

Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI: Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making

Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP: The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements

Patrick CAYRade: Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure: What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?

Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: Oil Security, Short- and Long-Term Policies
Auctions

Price Sealed-Bid Auctions
the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets
Maximization and the Multiple-Good Monopoly
and Evidence from Timber Auctions
Roberto BURGUET

Externalities

in Stabilization Policies?
Bookbuilding is Dominating Auctions
Real Option Analysis
Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK
Influence of World Energy Prices
for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models
Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation
Savings

Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism

Environmental Taxation Game
Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK

Information: The Differential Tax Revisited

on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach
Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application

Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions

Simple Economics

and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions

A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism

Savings

An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with

Reluctant Privatization

Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth

A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy

The World Bank’s Prototype Carbon Fund and China

Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants

Bidding for Incompete Contracts

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions

Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions

Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-

A General Equilibrium A General Equilibrium

Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply

David FISK: Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?

Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?

The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets

Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy

An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application

Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach

Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited

Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach

Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic

Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach

Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models

Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions

Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions

Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism

Savings

An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with

Reluctant Privatization

Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth

A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy

The World Bank’s Prototype Carbon Fund and China

Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants

Bidding for Incompete Contracts

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions

Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions

Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-

A General Equilibrium A General Equilibrium

Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply

David FISK: Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?

Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?

The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets

Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy

An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application

Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach

Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited

Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach

Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic

Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach

Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models

Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions

Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions

Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

How to Win Twice at an Auction. On

Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions

Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory

Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of

A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism

Savings

An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with

Reluctant Privatization

Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth

A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy
NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

CCMP 1.2005  Stéphane HALLEGATTE: Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change
CCMP 2.2005  Qiang WU and Paulo Augusto NUNES: Application of Technological Control Measures on Vehicle Pollution: A Cost-Benefit Analysis in China
CCMP 3.2005  Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON, Maren LAU, Richard S.J. TOL and Yuan ZHOU: A Global Database of Domestic and International Tourist Numbers at National and Subnational Level
CCMP 4.2005  Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice
ETA 5.2005  Hubert KEMPF: Is Inequality Harmful for the Environment in a Growing Economy?
CCMP 9.2005  Angelo ANTOCI: Environmental Resources Depletion and Interplay Between Negative and Positive Externalities in a Growth Model
CTN 10.2005  Frédéric DEROIAN: Cost-Reducing Alliances and Local Spillovers
NRM 11.2005  Francesco SINDICO: The GMO Dispute before the WTO: Legal Implications for the Trade and Environment Debate
PRCG 14.2005  Clara GRAZIANO and Annalisa LUPORINI: Ownership Concentration, Monitoring and Optimal Board Structure
CSRM 15.2005  Parashar KULKARNI: Use of Ecolabels in Promoting Exports from Developing Countries to Developed Countries: Lessons from the Indian LeatherFootwear Industry
KTHC 16.2005  Adriana DI LIBERTO, Roberto MURA and Francesco PIGLIARU: How to Measure the Unobservable: A Panel Technique for the Analysis of TFP Convergence
KTHC 17.2005  Alireza NAGHAVI: Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms
KTHC 18.2005  Alireza NAGHAVI: Strategic Intellectual Property Rights Policy and North-South Technology Transfer
KTHC 19.2005  Mombert HOPPE: Technology Transfer Through Trade
PRCG 20.2005  Roberto ROSON: Platform Competition with Endogenous Multihoming
CCMP 21.2005  Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: Regional and Sub-Global Climate Blocs: A Game Theoretic Perspective on Bottom-up Climate Regimes
CTN 23.2005  Michael FINUS, Pierre v. MOUCHE and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN: Uniqueness of Coalitional Equilibria
CTN 25.2005  Somdeb LAHIRI: The Core of Directed Network Problems with Quotas
NRM 27.2005  Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Anna MONTINI: The Determinants of Residential Water Demand Empirical Evidence for a Panel of Italian Municipalities
CCMP 28.2005  Laurent GILOTTE and Michel de LARA: Precautionary Effect and Variations of the Value of Information
NRM 29.2005  Paul SARFO-MENSAH: Exportation of Timber in Ghana: The Menace of Illegal Logging Operations
CCMP 30.2005  Andrea BIGANO, Alessandra GORIA, Jacqueline HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: The Effect of Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events on Tourism
NRM 31.2005  Maria Angeles GARCIA-VALINAS: Decentralization and Environment: An Application to Water Policies
NRM 32.2005  Chiara D’ALPAOS, Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: Concession Length and Investment Timing Flexibility
CCMP 33.2005  Joseph HUBER: Key Environmental Innovations
CTN 34.2005  Antoni CALVÓ-ARMENGOL and Rahimi ILKILIC (lxxii): Pairwise-Stability and Nash Equilibria in Network Formation
CTN 35.2005  Francesco FERI (lxxii): Network Formation with Endogenous Decay
CTN 36.2005  Frank H. PAGE, Jr. and Myrna H. WOODERS (lxxii): Strategic Basins of Attraction, the Farsighted Core, and Network Formation Games

CTN 38.2005  Matthew O. JACKSON and Alison WATTS (lxxii): Social Games: Matching and the Play of Finitely Repeated Games

CTN 39.2005  Anna BOGOMOLNAIA, Michel LE BRETON, Alexei SAVVATEEV and Shlomo WEBER (lxxii): The Egalitarian Sharing Rule in Provision of Public Projects

CTN 40.2005  Francesco FERI: Stochastic Stability in Network with Decay

CTN 41.2005  Aart de ZEEUW (lxxii): Dynamic Effects on the Stability of International Environmental Agreements

CTN 42.2005  Measuring the Economic Value of Two Habitat Defragmentation Policy Scenarios for the Veluwe, The Netherlands

PRCG 43.2005  Carla VIEIRA and Ana Paula SERRA: Abnormal Returns in Privatization Public Offerings: The Case of Portuguese Firms

SIEV 44.2005  Anna ALBERINI, Valentina ZANATTA and Paolo ROSATO: Combining Actual and Contingent Behavior to Estimate the Value of Sports Fishing in the Lagoon of Venice

CTN 45.2005  Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDHAGEN: Participation in International Environmental Agreements: The Role of Timing and Regulation

CCMP 46.2005  Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH: Are EU Environmental Policies Too Demanding for New Members States?

IEM 47.2005  Matteo MANERA: Modeling Factor Demands with SEM and VAR: An Empirical Comparison

CTN 48.2005  Olivier TERCIEUX and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH (lxxii): A Characterization of Stochastically Stable Networks

CTN 49.2005  Ana MAULEÓN, José SEMPERE-MONERRIS and Vincent J. VANNETELBOSCH (lxxii): R&D Networks Among Unionized Firms

CTN 50.2005  Carlo CARRARO, Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: Optimal Transfers and Participation Decisions in International Environmental Agreements

KTHC 51.2005  Valeria GATTA: From the Theory of the Firm to FDI and Internationalisation: A Survey

CCMP 52.2005  Alixere NAGHAVI: Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Trade Obligations: A Theoretical Analysis of the Doha Proposal


ETA 54.2005  Alessandra del BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI, Charles P. HIMMELBERG and Paola ROTA: Investment and Time to Plan: A Comparison of Structures vs. Equipment in a Panel of Italian Firms


ETA 56.2005  Maia DAVID and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESAGNÉ: Environmental Regulation and the Eco-Industry

ETA 57.2005  Alain-Désiré NIMUBONA and Bernard SINCLAIR-DESAGNÉ: The Pigouvian Tax Rule in the Presence of an Eco-Industry


CCMP 60.2005  Andreas LOSCHEL and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE: Impure Public Goods and Technological Interdependencies

PRCG 61.2005  Christoph A. SCHALTEGGER and Benno TORGLER: Trust and Fiscal Performance: A Panel Analysis with Swiss Data

ETA 62.2005  Irene VALSECHI: A Role for Instructions

SIEV 63.2005  Valentina BOSETTI and Gianni LOCATELLI: A Data Envelopment Analysis Approach to the Assessment of Natural Parks’ Economic Efficiency and Sustainability. The Case of Italian National Parks

SIEV 64.2005  Arianne T. de BLAEIJ, Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH: Modeling ‘No-choice’ Responses in Attribute Based Valuation Surveys

CTN 65.2005  Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI: Applications of Negotiation Theory to Water Issues

CTN 66.2005  Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Alessandra SGOBBI: Advances in Negotiation Theory: Bargaining, Coalitions and Fairness

KTHC 67.2005  Sandra WALLMAN (lxxiv): Network Capital and Social Trust: Pre-Conditions for ‘Good’ Diversity?

KTHC 68.2005  Asimina CHRISTOFOROU (lxxiv): On the Determinants of Social Capital in Greece Compared to Countries of the European Union

KTHC 69.2005  Eric M. USLANER (lxxiv): Varieties of Trust


KTHC 71.2005  Grazziella BERTOCCHI and Chiara STROZZI: Applications of Negotiation Theory to Water Issues

IEM 72.2005  Elisabeth van HYLCKAMA VLJEG (lxxv): Accommodating Differences

KTHC 73.2005  Renato SANS and Ercole SORI (lxxv): Governance of Diversity Between Social Dynamics and Conflicts in Multicultural Cities. A Selected Survey on Historical Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Asymmetric Error Correction Models for the Oil-Gasoline Price</td>
<td>Anna Lasut, Michele Moretto and Vincenzo Rebba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hunting the Living Dead: A “Peso Problem” in Corporate</td>
<td>Hans-Peter Weikard, Antonio Musolesi and Mario Nosvelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liabilities Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Cartel Stability under an Optimal Sharing Rule</td>
<td>Joëlle Noailly, Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh and Cees A. Withagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local and Global Interactions in an Evolutionary Resource Game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Spatial Evolution of Social Norms in a Common-Pool Resource Game</td>
<td>Joëlle Noailly, Cees A. Withagen and Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Economic Instruments and Induced Innovation: The Case of</td>
<td>Maxsimiliano Mazzanti and Roberto Zoboli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-Life Vehicles European Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Creative Thinking and Modelling for the Decision Support in Water Management</td>
<td>Anna Lasut, Laurent Gilotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Assess the Relative Efficiency of Different Climate Policy Portfolios</td>
<td>Valentina Bosetti and Barbara Buchner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Social Capital, R&amp;D and Industrial Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Quality and Investment Decisions in Hospital Care when Physicians are Devoted Workers</td>
<td>Rosella Levaggi, Michele Moretto and Vincenzo Rebba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Carbon Capture and Sequestration: How Much Does this Uncertain Option Affect Near-Term Policy Choices?</td>
<td>Valentina Bosetti and Laurent Gilotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Microfinance and Islamic Finance and Global Banking</td>
<td>Nicoletta Ferro, Value Through Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>How Substitutable is Natural Capital?</td>
<td>Anil Markandy, Valeria Costantini, Francesco Gracceva and Giorgio Vicini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Supply: Comparing Scenarios From a European Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Abuse of Competitive Fringe</td>
<td>Carlo Capuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The Stability of the Adjusted and Unadjusted Environmental Kuznets Curve</td>
<td>Sabrina Auci and Leonardo Bèchetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Agriculture</td>
<td>Francesco Bosello and Jian Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Bargaining with Non-Monolithic Players</td>
<td>Alejandro Caparròs, Jean-Christophe Perreau and Tarik Tazdaït</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Coalition Formation under Uncertainty: The Stability of an International Climate Agreement</td>
<td>Valeria Costantini, Riccardo Creszenzi, Fabrizio De Filippis and Luca Salvatici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Similarity of Interests or Strategic Choices?</td>
<td>An Empirical Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Econometric Models of Asymmetric Price Transmission</td>
<td>Giliolà Frey and Matteo Manera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Oil Prices, Inflation and Interest Rates in a Structural</td>
<td>Alessandro Cologni and Matteo Manera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cointegrated VAR Model for the G-7 Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Sustainability of Urban Sprawl: Environmental-Economic</td>
<td>Chiara M. Travisi and Roberto Camagni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators for the Analysis of Mobility Impact in Italy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Pandemic in Africa: Trends and Challenges</td>
<td>Livingstone S. Luboobi and Joseph Y.T. Mugisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Urban Environmental Health and Sensitive Populations: How Much are the Italians Willing to Pay to Reduce Their Risks?</td>
<td>Anna Albertini and Aline Chiabai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Pandemic in Africa: Trends and Challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Coordination in Networks Formation: Experimental Evidence on Learning and Salience</td>
<td>Michele Bernasconi and Matteo Galizzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Migration Dynamics</td>
<td>Michele Moretto and Sergio Vergalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Water Consumption and Long-Run Urban Development: The Case of Milan</td>
<td>Antonio Musolesi and Mario Nosvelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Attitudes Towards Preventing Environmental Damage</td>
<td>Benno Torgler and Maria A. García-Valiñas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>What are the Effects of Contamination Risks on Commercial and Industrial Properties? Evidence from Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>Alberto Longo and Anna Albertini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The Value of Cultural Heritage Sites in Armenia: Evidence from a Travel Cost Method Study</td>
<td>Anna Albertini and Alberto Longo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2004 SERIES

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

### 2005 SERIES

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