

OPTIMAL ENDOWMENTS OF PUBLIC INVESTMENT: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS FOR THE SPANISH REGIONS*

Autores: *Óscar Bajo Rubio*^(a)
Carmen Díaz Roldán^(b)
M.^a Dolores Montávez Garcés^(c)

P. T. N.º 20/02

- (a) Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha,
- (b) Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha,
- (c) Universidad Pública de Navarra.

Address for correspondence: Department of Economics, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain. E-mail addresses: oscar.bajo@uclm.es, carmen.diazroldan@uclm.es, dolores.montavez@unavarra.es

(*) The authors wish to thank Beatriz Manotas for providing us with the data set, and Michael Pickhardt for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft. A first version of the paper was presented at the 52nd International Atlantic Economic Conference (Philadelphia, October 2001) and the IX Encuentro de Economía Pública (Vigo, February 2002). Financial support from the Spanish Institute for Fiscal Studies is also gratefully acknowledged.

N.B.: Las opiniones expresadas en este trabajo son de la exclusiva responsabilidad de los autores, pudiendo no coincidir con las del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales.

Desde el año 1998, la colección de Papeles de Trabajo del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales está disponible en versión electrónica, en la dirección: ><http://www.minhac.es/ief/principal.htm>.

Edita: Instituto de Estudios Fiscales

N.I.P.O.: 111-02-004-2

I.S.S.N.: 1578-0252

Depósito Legal: M-23772-2001

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION
 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
 3. EMPIRICAL MODEL AND RESULTS
 4. CONCLUSIONS
- REFERENCES

ABSTRACT

In this paper we try to find some evidence on the optimality in the provision of government capital in the Spanish regions, during the period 1965-1995. To this end, an optimality condition is derived from an optimization growth model, generalising the condition previously derived by Karras (1997) to the case of any kind of returns to scale over all inputs in the production function. Then, a simple production function is estimated, from which the marginal products of both private and government capital are computed. By comparing the estimates of those marginal products, we are able to infer whether the public capital stock in the Spanish regions is underprovided or not, relative to the private capital stock.

Key words: Economic growth, government capital, regions.

JEL Classification: E62, H54, O40.

1. INTRODUCTION

Following Aschauer's (1989) influential contribution, the role of public investment has been stressed as a crucial factor leading to higher private capital productivity, which would lead in turn to higher growth rates. According to this author, the decline in productivity growth experienced by the US economy during the seventies would have been explained to a great extent by the decrease in the provision of public infrastructures during that period. In this way, the following years witnessed the appearance of a great amount of empirical literature that analysed the impact of public investment on economic growth; a comprehensive survey of that literature can be found in Sturm, Kuper and de Haan (1998).

Although the first empirical studies made use of aggregate time series for countries, this approach has been also extended to a regional framework using panel data, obtaining results that were quantitatively lower than those found with aggregate data [see, e.g., Holtz-Eakin (1994)]. The reason would be the spillover effects related to the regional endowments of public capital, whose effect would extend not only to the own region, but also to the neighbouring regions. In any case, public infrastructures seem to play an important role in the growth process of regions that should not be neglected (Button, 1998).

On the other hand, the issue of the optimal endowments of public infrastructure has not been the subject of extensive research. In principle, the impact of public investment on economic performance should depend on the stage of development of the economy. For instance, in an empirical analysis for Sweden, Berndt and Hansson (1992) pointed that, since, according to their estimates, public infrastructure capital would have been above its optimal level, this could help to explain the relatively weak effect found for the latter on productivity growth. On the contrary, in a less advanced country such as Spain, a higher investment effort by the public sector should be more effective.

A recent contribution by Karras (1997) develops a simple condition to assess whether public capital is optimally provided, namely, whether the marginal productivities of both private and public capital are equal or not. By estimating a simple growth equation for fifteen European countries during the period 1960-1992, he was unable to reject the null hypothesis that the marginal productivities of private and public capital were equal, so that government investment would be neither underprovided nor overprovided in the fifteen countries of his sample.

In this paper we try to address this issue (i.e., whether the endowments of public investment are optimal or not) in a regional framework, using Spanish data for the period 1965-95. Unlike Karras (1997), who assumes that the production function exhibits constant returns to scale in all factors, we will generalise his result without needing this constraint. On the other hand, the

Spanish economy can provide an interesting case of study, since it has experienced a sustained period of growth in the last forty years, which has been accompanied by a strong process of structural change. In particular, the establishment of new regional governments after the restoration of democracy in 1977, coupled with the strong increase experienced by public investment since then, are reasons that can justify the interest of the Spanish case for the objectives of this paper.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, the theoretical condition under which public capital would be optimally provided is derived from an optimization growth model. In section 3, we provide an empirical application of the model, for the case of the Spanish regions during the period 1965-1995. Finally, the main conclusions are summarised in section 4.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section we will derive the condition that will allow us to assess whether public capital is optimally provided or not, generalising the approach of Karras (1997). The theoretical framework is based on Ramsey's optimization growth model [see Blanchard and Fischer (1989) or Romer (1996) for an overview], extended to incorporate the role of government capital into the production function.

We begin by assuming an aggregate production function such as:

$$Y_t = A_t F(K_t, KG_t, L_t) \quad (1)$$

where Y denotes real output, which depends on the amounts utilized of private capital, K , government capital, KG , and labour, L ; A is an index of the level of technology. The function F is assumed twice continuously differentiable, with

$$F_X = \frac{\partial F}{\partial X_t} > 0 \text{ and } F_{XX} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial X_t^2} < 0 \text{ (for } X = K, KG, L\text{); however, unlike Karras}$$

(1997), we will assume that the function F is homogeneous of degree z ($z \neq 1$) in all production factors. In other words, we make no particular presumption on the kind of returns to scale over all three inputs, which might be increasing, constant or decreasing, according if z is greater than, equal to, or lower than one, respectively.

Next, we write the production function in *per capita* terms:

$$y_t = L_t^{z-1} A_t f(k_t, kg_t) \quad (2)$$

where $x = X/L$ denote a variable in per capita terms (for $X = Y, K, KG$), with

$$f_x = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_t} > 0 \text{ and } f_{xx} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_t^2} < 0 \text{ (for } x = k, kg\text{)}.$$

The output is either consumed or invested, so that, in *per capita* terms:

$$\dot{k} = L_t^{z-1} A_t f(k_t, kg_t) - c_t - (\delta + n)k_t - \tau_t \quad (3)$$

where $\dot{k} = \frac{dk_t}{dt}$, c is *per capita* consumption, δ is the rate of depreciation of private capital, n is the rate of population growth, and τ denotes taxes *per capita*. The latter are used to finance government capital's accumulation following the government budget constraint, also in *per capita* terms:

$$\dot{kg} = \tau_t - (\delta + n)kg_t \quad (4)$$

where $\dot{kg} = \frac{dkg_t}{dt}$, and government capital is assumed to depreciate at the same rate than private capital.

On the other hand, the representative individual is assumed to maximize utility, which depends on *per capita* consumption, over an infinite planning horizon:

$$U = \int_0^{\infty} u(c_t) e^{-\rho t} dt \quad (5)$$

where ρ is the rate of time preference and $u_c = \frac{du}{dc_t} > 0$, subject to (3), (4), and $k_0, kg_0 > 0$. This optimization problem is solved by setting the Hamiltonian:

$$H_t = u(c_t) e^{-\rho t} + \lambda_1 (L_t^{z-1} A_t f(k_t, kg_t) - c_t - (\delta + n)k_t - \tau_t) + \lambda_2 (\tau_t - (\delta + n)kg_t)$$

from which the first-order conditions would be:

$$\frac{\partial H_t}{\partial c_t} = e^{-\rho t} u_c - \lambda_1 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial H_t}{\partial \tau_t} = -\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial H_t}{\partial k_t} = \lambda_1 L_t^{z-1} A_t f_k - \lambda_1 (\delta + n) = -\dot{\lambda}_1$$

$$\frac{\partial H_t}{\partial kg_t} = \lambda_1 L_t^{z-1} A_t f_{kg} - \lambda_2 (\delta + n) = -\dot{\lambda}_2$$

In this way, from the first three conditions we get:

$$-\frac{\dot{u}_c}{u_c} = [L_t^{z-1} A_t f_k - (\delta + n)] - \rho \quad (6)$$

and, from the last three:

$$L_t^{z-1} A_t f_k = L_t^{z-1} A_t f_{kg} \quad (7)$$



where $L_t^{z-1}A_t f_k$ and $L_t^{z-1}A_t f_{kg}$ are the marginal products of private and government capital, respectively. Equation (6) is the Euler condition, which implies that, the higher the marginal product of private capital (net of depreciation and population growth) relative to the rate of time preference, the more it pays to depress the current level of consumption in order to enjoy higher consumption later. In turn, equation (7) states that optimal accumulation of private and government capital requires that their marginal products be equal, and coincides with the condition already derived by Karras (1997), but generalised to the case of any kind of returns to scale over all inputs in the production function.

In this way, the latter condition would imply that, given the marginal product of private capital, if the marginal product of government capital would be higher than that of private capital, it would be profitable for the government to raise public investment; in other words, and assuming that private capital is optimally provided, a marginal product of government capital above (below) the marginal product of private capital would mean that government capital is underprovided (overprovided), relative to private capital. In the next section we will provide an empirical test of equation (7), using Spanish regional data.

3. EMPIRICAL MODEL AND RESULTS

In order to test empirically equation (7), we start from the production function above, equation (1), written for simplicity in a Cobb-Douglas form:

$$Y_t = A_t K_t^\alpha K G_t^\beta L_t^\gamma \quad (8)$$

where α , β , and γ are the output elasticities of the production factors private capital, government capital, and labour, respectively. In *per capita* terms, the production function (8) becomes:

$$y_t = L_t^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma-1} A_t k_t^\alpha k g_t^\beta \quad (9)$$

so that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma$ would amount to z in the preceding section (see equation (2)), indicating the degree of returns to scale for all production factors. Finally, assuming that $A_t = A_0 e^{\mu t}$, where A_0 is the initial level of technology and μ the rate of technical progress, we can write equation (9) in logarithms as follows:

$$\log y_t = \log A_0 + \mu t + (\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 1) \log L_t + \alpha \log k_t + \beta \log k g_t \quad (10)$$

We have estimated equation (10) for the 17 regions (“comunidades autónomas”) established after the approval of the current Spanish Constitution in 1978, along the period 1965-1995. The data are taken from Fundación BBVA (various years) for GDP; from Mas, Pérez and Uriel (various years) for the private and public capital stock; and from Mas, Pérez, Uriel and Serrano (various years) for employment. Notice that our public capital variable embodies only

the directly productive items included into the whole government capital stock (i.e., roads, water infrastructures, urban structures, ports, railroads, and airports), hence excluding the non directly productive items (i.e., education and health); see Mas, Pérez and Uriel (various years) for details. On the other hand, *per capita* variables (y , k , and kg) are defined in terms of employment (L), and valued in real terms (at 1986 prices).

There is some available evidence on the favourable effect of the public capital stock on the productivity of private capital for the Spanish case, both with aggregate data, as in Bajo-Rubio and Sosvilla-Rivero (1993); and with regional data, as in Mas, Maudos, Pérez and Uriel (1996) or Gil, Pascual and Rapún (1998). We can also quote some other studies specifically addressed to the analysis of economic growth, such as Bajo-Rubio and Sosvilla-Rivero (1998), who found a positive effect on growth for public investment as a percentage of GDP using aggregate data for the whole Spanish economy; and Bajo-Rubio, Díaz-Roldán and Montávez-Garcés (1999), where the same result was obtained when estimating a convergence regression using regional data over the period 1967-91.

Finally, we refer now to other two recent studies, more directly related to the objective of this paper. Boscá, Escribá and Murgui (2001) find, using the dual approach based on cost functions for the period 1980-93, that there would still remain a substantial gap between observed and optimal public capital, which would justify a further increase in public investment. However, when computing real and observed relative profitabilities for public capital, de la Fuente (2001) concludes that public investment would have been too redistributive, in the sense that too much public capital would have been located in poorer regions. Therefore, we will try to address this somewhat conflicting evidence by using the more traditional approach of estimating a production function, as explained above.

Some descriptive evidence is provided in Figures 1 and 2. These figures show, for the first and last year of our sample period and for the 17 Spanish regions, the levels of real GDP per employee, and the GDP share of the government capital stock, respectively. As can be seen in Figure 1, GDP per employee would have experienced a significant increase between both dates, reaching twice its initial level in most regions; the growth of this variable would have been somewhat stronger in the case of poorer regions, supporting previous findings on convergence [see, e.g., Cuadrado-Roura, García-Greciano and Raymond (1999) or de la Fuente (2002)]. In turn, the evolution of the GDP share of the government capital stock would have been also impressive, being its increase especially remarkable after the first eighties, when the first Socialist government took office.

The results of the econometric estimation of equation (10) are shown in Table 1. The estimated equations include individual effects for each region, which would proxy the initial level of technology A_0 . On the other hand, due to the potential endogeneity of some of the explanatory variables, the above equation has been estimated using the Generalized Method of Moments, which

might be thought as a generalization of the Instrumental Variables estimator. This method derives linear transformations of the original disturbances and instruments that are orthogonal, using these orthogonality conditions to estimate the parameters optimally; useful summaries can be found in Pagan and Wickens (1989) or Greene (2000).

The results for the whole set of regions appear in column (1). Notice that the coefficient on employment would be negative and significantly different from zero, so that the hypothesis of decreasing returns to scale over all inputs would not be rejected. Both capital stocks, private and public, would have a positive and significant effect on the evolution of output per employee, with estimated elasticities of 0.49 and 0.04, respectively.

We have also divided the whole set of regions into two groups, i.e., those enjoying a GDP per employee above and below the Spanish level, on average over the whole period of analysis. This procedure allows us to classify regions into “richer” and “poorer” or, more precisely, into “more productive” or “less productive”, according whether GDP per employee (that is, average labour productivity) is above or below the Spanish average level. The results for both groups of regions appear, respectively, in columns (2) and (3) for the more productive regions (Madrid, Baleares, Cataluña, País Vasco, Navarra, Rioja, and Canarias), and in columns (4) and (5) for the less productive regions (Comunidad Valenciana, Aragón, Cantabria, Asturias, Murcia, Andalucía, Castilla y León, Castilla-La Mancha, Extremadura, and Galicia). As can be seen in columns (2) and (4), the coefficient on employment would not be significantly different from zero, so that the hypothesis of constant returns to scale over all inputs would not be rejected when both groups of regions are taken separately. Accordingly, in columns (3) and (5) this variable was dropped, so that positive and significant elasticities for the stocks of both private and public capital were obtained: 0.45 and 0.05 for the more productive regions, and 0.58 and 0.05 for the less productive regions (even though the latter coefficient is significant only at the 10% level).

The next step would be computing the marginal products of private and government capital (denoted by MPK and MPKG, respectively) from their estimated elasticities, α and β , as follows:

$$MPK = \alpha \frac{Y}{K}$$

and

$$MPKG = \beta \frac{Y}{KG}$$

where $\frac{Y}{K}$ and $\frac{Y}{KG}$ are the average products of private and government capital, respectively, taken as their mean values over the sample period. As can be seen in Table 2, for the whole set of regions the marginal product of private capital

would be higher than that of government capital, which would mean that government capital would be overprovided, relative to the available endowment of private capital. A more complete picture, however, can be obtained when the same computation is performed for the two groups of regions differentiated above. Although the previous result keeps (even more strongly) for the less productive regions, it turns that the marginal product of private capital would be lower than that of government capital for the more productive regions, so that in this case government capital would be underprovided, relative again to the available endowment of private capital.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have tried to find some evidence on the optimality in the provision of government capital in the Spanish regions. To this end, we have derived a theoretical condition allowing us to assess whether public capital would be under or overprovided, which generalises the condition previously derived by Karras (1997) to the case of any kind of returns to scale over all inputs in the production function. This theoretical condition makes use of the result that the marginal products of private and government capital should be equal in an optimum, according to a Ramsey-type optimization growth model.

This condition has been tested empirically using Spanish regional data over the period 1965-1995, by estimating a simple production function, and then computing the marginal products of private and government capital from their estimated elasticities and their mean average products over the sample period. Our results showed a positive effect of government capital on the evolution of GDP per employee, although its marginal product would be below that of private capital. However, when dividing the whole set of regions between those with a GDP per employee above and below the Spanish average, the previous result would only kept for the less productive regions, whereas the opposite result (i.e., a higher marginal product for government capital than for private capital) was obtained in the case of the more productive regions. Therefore, assuming that private capital was optimally provided, these results would suggest that government capital would be underprovided in the more productive regions, unlike the less productive regions, where the opposite result would hold. The policy implications of the results in this paper would be in line with those recently derived in de la Fuente (2001): although government capital would have been a relevant factor behind the growth process experienced by Spanish regions in last years, on strictly efficiency grounds public investment efforts should be more intensively addressed to the more productive regions at the expense of the less productive ones, assuming that private capital was optimally provided.



This last qualification is essential, and leads us to take with some caution the above results. So, leaving aside equity considerations, which could justify by themselves the use of a regional infrastructures policy as a redistributive device (de la Fuente, 2001), the need of an even increased investment in both private and public capital in order to enhance real convergence with the more advanced EU countries (Martín and Velázquez, 2001) could be an important reason to provide a higher investment in government infrastructures, even in poorer regions. So, a regional infrastructures policy directed to poorer regions could be justified if it would serve as a means of attraction of private investment to those regions. In this sense, the positive effect of public productive investment on enhancing private investment at the regional level, found in a recent study using the same time period than in this paper (Martínez-López, 2002), could validate this conclusion.

Table 1
ESTIMATION OF A PRODUCTION FUNCTION FOR THE SPANISH REGIONS,
1965-1995 (Dependent variable: log y)


	(1) All regions	(2) More produc- tive regions	(3) More produc- tive regions	(4) Less produc- tive regions	(5) Less produc- tive regions
t	0.0070 (13.8427)	0.0074 (10.0734)	0.0069 (11.6834)	0.0057 (6.8684)	0.0060 (7.6316)
log L	-0.1557 (-2.0515)	-0.1911 (-1.2990)	—	0.0581 (0.3421)	—
log k	0.4889 (18.4356)	0.4524 (13.2606)	0.4507 (12.4587)	0.5987 (9.1069)	0.5770 (21.4252)
log kg	0.0402 (2.2125)	0.0392 (1.3864)	0.0536 (2.1672)	0.0498 (1.7217)	0.0480 (1.6053)
R ²	0.9885	0.9835	0.9815	0.9893	0.9897

Note: t-statistics in parentheses.

Table 2
MARGINAL PRODUCTS OF PRIVATE AND GOVERNMENT CAPITAL IN THE SPANISH
REGIONS, 1965-1995

	(1) All regions	(2) More productive regions	(3) Less productive regions
Private capital	0.1340	0.1252	0.1518
Government capital	0.1016	0.1705	0.0944


Figure 1
GDP PER EMPLOYEE IN THE SPANISH REGIONS, 1965 AND 1995
 (Thousand Pesetas per occupied person, at 1986 prices)



Note: The regions shown in the figure are, from left to right, Andalucía, Aragón, Asturias, Baleares, Canarias, Cantabria, Castilla-La Mancha, Castilla y León, Cataluña, Comunidad Valenciana, Extremadura, Galicia, Madrid, Murcia, Navarra, País Vasco, and Rioja.

Source: Fundación BBVA (various years) and Mas, Pérez, Uriel and Serrano (various years).

Figure 2
GOVERNMENT CAPITAL STOCK AS A PERCENTAGE OF GDP IN THE SPANISH REGIONS, 1965 AND 1995



Note: See Figure 1.

Source: Fundación BBVA (various years) and Mas, Pérez and Uriel (various years).

REFERENCES

- ASCHAUER, D. (1989): "Is public expenditure productive?", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 23, pp. 177-200.
- BAJO RUBIO, O. and SOSVILLA RIVERO, S. (1993): "Does public capital affect private sector performance? An analysis of the Spanish case, 1964-88", *Economic Modelling* 10, pp. 179-185.
- (1998): "El crecimiento económico en España, 1964-1993: Algunas regularidades empíricas", in de la Torre, J. and García-Zúñiga, M. (eds.): *Hacienda y crecimiento económico*, Marcial Pons, Madrid, pp. 213-248.
- BAJO RUBIO, O., DÍAZ ROLDÁN, C. and MONTÁVEZ GARCÉS, M. D. (1999): "Fiscal policy and growth revisited: The case of the Spanish regions", Working Paper 9904, Departamento de Economía, Universidad Pública de Navarra.
- BERNDT, E. R. and HANSSON, B. (1992): "Measuring the contribution of public infrastructure capital in Sweden", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 94, S151-S168.
- BLANCHARD, O. and FISCHER, S. (1989): *Lectures on Macroeconomics*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- BOSCA, J. E., ESCRIBÁ, J. and MURGUI, M. J. (2001): "The effects of public infrastructures on the private productive sector of Spanish regions", Working Paper D-2001-03, Dirección General de Presupuestos, Ministerio de Hacienda, Madrid.
- BUTTON, K. (1998): "Infrastructure investment, endogenous growth and economic convergence", *Annals of Regional Science* 32, pp. 145-162.
- CUADRADO ROURA, J. R., GARCÍA GRECIANO, B. and RAYMOND, J. L. (1999): "Regional convergence in productivity and productive structure: The Spanish case", *International Regional Science Review* 22, pp. 35-53.
- DE LA FUENTE, A. (2001): "Infraestructuras y política regional", *Estudios sobre la Economía Española* 122, FEDEA, Madrid (available online at <ftp://ftp.fedea.es/pub/eee/eee122.pdf>).
- (2002): "On the sources of convergence: A close look at the Spanish regions", *European Economic Review* 46, pp. 569-599.
- Fundación BBVA (previously Fundación BBV, various years): *Renta nacional de España y su distribución provincial*, Bilbao.
- GIL, C., PASCUAL, P. and RAPÚN, M. (1998): "Public capital, productivity and spatial spillovers", Working Paper 9811, Departamento de Economía, Universidad Pública de Navarra.

- GREENE, WILLIAM H. (2000): *Econometric analysis* (4th edition), Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- HOLTZ EAKIN, D. (1994): "Public-sector capital and the productivity puzzle", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 76, pp. 12-21.
- KARRAS, G. (1997): "Is government investment underprovided in Europe? Evidence from a panel of fifteen countries", *Economia Internazionale* 50, pp. 223-235.
- MARTÍN, C. and VELÁZQUEZ, F. J. (2001): "An assessment of real convergence of less developed EU members: Lessons for the CEEC candidates", Working Paper 5/2001, European Economy Group, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- MARTÍNEZ LÓPEZ, D. (2002): "Relaciones entre inversión pública y privada. El caso de las regiones españolas, 1965-1995", paper presented at the IX Encuentro de Economía Pública, Vigo.
- MAS, M., MAUDOS, J., PÉREZ, F. and URIEL, E. (1996): "Infrastructures and productivity in the Spanish regions", *Regional Studies* 30, pp. 641-649.
- MAS, M., PÉREZ, F. and URIEL, E. (various years): *El stock de capital en España y sus comunidades autónomas*, Fundación BBV, Bilbao.
- MAS, M., PÉREZ, F., URIEL, E. and SERRANO, L. (various years): *Capital humano, series históricas*, Fundació Bancaixa, Valencia.
- PAGAN, A. R. and WICKENS, M. R. (1989): "A survey of some recent econometric methods", *Economic Journal* 99, pp. 962-1025.
- ROMER, D. (1996): *Advanced Macroeconomics*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- STURM, J.-E., KUPER, G. H. and DE HAAN, J. (1998): "Modelling government investment and economic growth at the macro level: A review", in Brakman, S., van Ees, H. and Kuipers, S. (eds.): *Market behaviour and macroeconomic modelling*, Macmillan/St. Martin's Press, London, pp. 359-406.

NORMAS DE PUBLICACIÓN DE PAPELES DE TRABAJO DEL INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES

Esta colección de *Papeles de Trabajo* tiene como objetivo ofrecer un vehículo de expresión a todas aquellas personas interesadas en los temas de Economía Pública. Las normas para la presentación y selección de originales son las siguientes:

1. Todos los originales que se presenten estarán sometidos a evaluación y podrán ser directamente aceptados para su publicación, aceptados sujetos a revisión, o rechazados.
2. Los trabajos deberán enviarse por duplicado a la Subdirección de Estudios Tributarios. Instituto de Estudios Fiscales. Avda. Cardenal Herrera Oria, 378. 28035 Madrid.
3. La extensión máxima de texto escrito, incluidos apéndices y referencias bibliográficas será de 7000 palabras.
4. Los originales deberán presentarse mecanografiados a doble espacio. En la primera página deberá aparecer el título del trabajo, el nombre del autor(es) y la institución a la que pertenece, así como su dirección postal y electrónica. Además, en la primera página aparecerá también un abstract de no más de 125 palabras, los códigos JEL y las palabras clave.
5. Los epígrafes irán numerados secuencialmente siguiendo la numeración arábica. Las notas al texto irán numeradas correlativamente y aparecerán al pie de la correspondiente página. Las fórmulas matemáticas se numerarán secuencialmente ajustadas al margen derecho de las mismas. La bibliografía aparecerá al final del trabajo, bajo la inscripción "Referencias" por orden alfabético de autores y, en cada una, ajustándose al siguiente orden: autor(es), año de publicación (distinguiendo a, b, c si hay varias correspondientes al mismo autor(es) y año), título del artículo o libro, título de la revista en cursiva, número de la revista y páginas.
6. En caso de que aparezcan tablas y gráficos, éstos podrán incorporarse directamente al texto o, alternativamente, presentarse todos juntos y debidamente numerados al final del trabajo, antes de la bibliografía.
7. En cualquier caso, se deberá adjuntar un disquete con el trabajo en formato word. Siempre que el documento presente tablas y/o gráficos, éstos deberán aparecer en ficheros independientes. Asimismo, en caso de que los gráficos procedan de tablas creadas en excel, estas deberán incorporarse en el disquete debidamente identificadas.

Junto al original del Papel de Trabajo se entregará también un resumen de un máximo de dos folios que contenga las principales implicaciones de política económica que se deriven de la investigación realizada.

PUBLISHING GUIDELINES OF WORKING PAPERS AT THE INSTITUTE FOR FISCAL STUDIES

This serie of *Papeles de Trabajo* (working papers) aims to provide those having an interest in Public Economics with a vehicle to publicize their ideas. The rules governing submission and selection of papers are the following:

1. The manuscripts submitted will all be assessed and may be directly accepted for publication, accepted with subjections for revision or rejected.
2. The papers shall be sent in duplicate to Subdirección General de Estudios Tributarios (The Deputy Direction of Tax Studies), Instituto de Estudios Fiscales (Institute for Fiscal Studies), Avenida del Cardenal Herrera Oria, nº 378, Madrid 28035.
3. The maximum length of the text including appendices and bibliography will be no more than 7000 words.
4. The originals should be double spaced. The first page of the manuscript should contain the following information: (1) the title; (2) the name and the institutional affiliation of the author(s); (3) an abstract of no more than 125 words; (4) JEL codes and keywords; (5) the postal and e-mail address of the corresponding author.
5. Sections will be numbered in sequence with arabic numerals. Footnotes will be numbered correlatively and will appear at the foot of the corresponding page. Mathematical formulae will be numbered on the right margin of the page in sequence. Bibliographical references will appear at the end of the paper under the heading "References" in alphabetical order of authors. Each reference will have to include in this order the following terms of references: author(s), publishing date (with an a, b or c in case there are several references to the same author(s) and year), title of the article or book, name of the journal in italics, number of the issue and pages.
6. If tables and graphs are necessary, they may be included directly in the text or alternatively presented altogether and duly numbered at the end of the paper, before the bibliography.
7. In any case, a floppy disk will be enclosed in Word format. Whenever the document provides tables and/or graphs, they must be contained in separate files. Furthermore, if graphs are drawn from tables within the Excell package, these must be included in the floppy disk and duly identified.

Together with the original copy of the working paper a brief two-page summary highlighting the main policy implications derived from the research is also requested.

**ÚLTIMOS PAPELES DE TRABAJO EDITADOS POR EL
INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES**

2000

- 1/00 Crédito fiscal a la inversión en el impuesto de sociedades y neutralidad impositiva: Más evidencia para un viejo debate.
Autor: Desiderio Romero Jordán.
Páginas: 40.
- 2/00 Estudio del consumo familiar de bienes y servicios públicos a partir de la encuesta de presupuestos familiares.
Autores: Ernesto Carrillo y Manuel Tamayo.
Páginas: 40.
- 3/00 Evidencia empírica de la convergencia real.
Autores: Lorenzo Escot y Miguel Ángel Galindo.
Páginas: 58.

Nueva Época

- 4/00 The effects of human capital depreciation on experience-earnings profiles: Evidence salaried spanish men.
Autores: M. Arrazola, J. de Hevia, M. Risueño y J. F. Sanz.
Páginas: 24.
- 5/00 Las ayudas fiscales a la adquisición de inmuebles residenciales en la nueva Ley del IRPF: Un análisis comparado a través del concepto de coste de uso.
Autor: José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas: 44.
- 6/00 Las medidas fiscales de estímulo del ahorro contenidas en el Real Decreto-Ley 3/2000: análisis de sus efectos a través del tipo marginal efectivo.
Autores: José Manuel González Páramo y Nuria Badenes Pla.
Páginas: 28
- 7/00 Análisis de las ganancias de bienestar asociadas a los efectos de la Reforma del IRPF sobre la oferta laboral de la familia española.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez y Santiago Álvarez García.
Páginas 32.
- 8/00 Un marco para la discusión de los efectos de la política impositiva sobre los precios y el *stock* de vivienda.
Autor: Miguel-Ángel López García.
Páginas 36.
- 9/00 Descomposición de los efectos redistributivos de la Reforma del IRPF.
Autores: Jorge Onrubia Fernández y María del Carmen Rodado Ruiz.
Páginas 24.
- 10/00 Aspectos teóricos de la convergencia real, integración y política fiscal.
Autores: Lorenzo Escot y Miguel-Ángel Galindo.
Páginas 28.

2001

- 1/01 Notas sobre desagregación temporal de series económicas.
Autor: Enrique M. Quilis.
Páginas 38.
- 2/01 Estimación y comparación de tasas de rendimiento de la educación en España.
Autores: M. Arrazola, J. de Hevia, M. Risueño, J.F. Sanz.
Páginas 28.
- 3/01 Doble imposición, “efecto clientela” y aversión al riesgo.
Autores: Antonio Bustos Gisbert y Francisco Pedraja Chaparro.
Páginas 34.
- 4/01 Non-Institutional Federalism in Spain.
Autor: Joan Rosselló Villalonga.
Páginas 32.
- 5/01 Estimating utilisation of Health care: A groupe data regression approach.
Autor: Mabel Amaya Amaya.
Páginas 30.
- 6/01 Shapley inequality descomposition by factor components.
Autores: Mercedes Sastre y Alain Trannoy
Páginas 40.
- 7/01 An empirical analysis of the demand for physician services across the European Union.
Autores: Sergi Jiménez Martín, José M. Labeaga y Maite Martínez-Granado
Páginas 40.
- 8/01 Demand, childbirth and the costs of babies: evidence from spanish panel data.
Autores: José M.^a Labeaga, Ian Preston y Juan A. Sanchis-Llopis
Páginas 56.
- 9/01 Imposición marginal efectiva sobre el factor trabajo: Breve nota metodológica y comparación internacional.
Autores: Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz
Páginas 40.
- 10/01 A non-parametric decomposition of redistribution into vertical and horizontal components.
Autores: Irene Perrote, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 28.
- 11/01 Efectos sobre la renta disponible y el bienestar de la deducción por rentas ganadas en el IRPF.
Autora: Nuria Badenes Plá.
Páginas 28.
- 12/01 Seguros sanitarios y gasto público en España. Un modelo de microsimulación para las políticas de gastos fiscales en sanidad.
Autora: Ángel López Nicolás.
Páginas 40.
- 13/01 A complete parametrical class of redistribution and progressivity measures
Autores: Isabel Rabadán y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 20.
- 14/01 La medición de la desigualdad económica.
Autor: Rafael Salas.
Páginas 40.

- 15/01 Crecimiento económico y dinámica de distribución de la renta en las regiones de la UE: un análisis no paramétrico.
Autores: Julián Ramajo Hernández y María del Mar Salinas Jiménez.
Páginas 32.
- 16/01 La descentralización territorial de las prestaciones asistenciales: efectos sobre la igualdad.
Autores: Luis Ayala Cañón, Rosa Martínez López y Jesus Ruiz-Huerta.
Páginas 48.
- 17/01 Redistribution and labour supply.
Autores: Jorge Onrubia, Rafael Salas y José Félix Sanz.
Páginas 24.
- 18/01 Medición de la eficiencia técnica en la economía española: El papel de las infraestructuras productivas.
Autoras: M.^a Jesús Delgado Rodríguez e Inmaculada Álvarez Ayuso.
Páginas 32.
- 19/01 Inversión pública eficiente e impuestos distorsionantes en un contexto de equilibrio general.
Autores: José Manuel González-Páramo y Diego Martínez López.
Páginas 28.
- 20/01 La incidencia distributiva del gasto público social. Análisis general y tratamiento específico de la incidencia distributiva entre grupos sociales y entre grupos de edad.
Autor: Jorge Calero Martínez.
Páginas 36.
- 21/01 Crisis cambiarias: Teoría y evidencia.
Autor: Óscar Bajo Rubio.
Páginas 32.
- 22/01 Distributive impact and evaluation of devolution proposals in Japanese local public finance.
Autores: Kazuyuki Nakamura, Minoru Kunizaki and Masanori Tahira.
Páginas 36.
- 23/01 El funcionamiento de los sistemas de garantía en el modelo de financiación autonómica.
Autor: Alfonso Utrilla de la Hoz.
Páginas 48.
- 24/01 Rendimiento de la educación en España: Nueva evidencia de las diferencias entre Hombres y Mujeres.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 36.
- 25/01 Fecundidad y beneficios fiscales y sociales por descendientes.
Autora: Anabel Zárata Marco.
Páginas 52.
- 26/01 Estimación de precios sombra a partir del análisis Input-Output: Aplicación a la economía española.
Autora: Guadalupe Souto Nieves.
Páginas 56.
- 27/01 Análisis empírico de la depreciación del capital humano para el caso de las Mujeres y los Hombres en España.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 28.

- 28/01 Equivalence scales in tax and transfer policies.
Autores: Luis Ayala, Rosa Martínez y Jesús Ruiz-Huerta
Páginas 44.
- 29/01 Un modelo de crecimiento con restricciones de demanda: el gasto público como amortiguador del desequilibrio externo.
Autora: Belén Fernández Castro.
Páginas 44.
- 30/01 A bi-stochastic nonparametric estimator.
Autores: Juan G. Rodríguez and Rafael Salas.
Páginas 24.

2002

- 1/02 Las cestas autonómicas.
Autores: Alejandro Esteller, Jorge Navas y Pilar Sorribas.
Páginas 72.
- 2/02 Evolución del endeudamiento autonómico entre 1985 y 1997: la incidencia de los Escenarios de Consolidación Presupuestaria y de los límites de la LOFCA.
Autores: Julio López Laborda y Jaime Vallés Giménez.
Páginas 60.
- 3/02 Optimal Pricing and Grant Policies for Museums.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez y Víctor Fernández Blanco.
Páginas 28.
- 4/02 El mercado financiero y el racionamiento del endeudamiento autonómico.
Autores: Nuria Alcalde Fradejas y Jaime Vallés Giménez.
Páginas 36.
- 5/02 Experimentos secuenciales en la gestión de los recursos comunes.
Autores: Lluís Bru, Susana Cabrera, C. Monica Capra y Rosario Gomez.
Páginas 32.
- 6/02 La eficiencia de la universidad medida a través de la función de distancia: Un análisis de las relaciones entre la docencia y la investigación.
Autores: Alfredo Moreno Sáez y David Trillo del Pozo.
Páginas 40.
- 7/02 Movilidad social y desigualdad económica.
Autores: Juan Prieto-Rodríguez, Rafael Salas y Santiago Álvarez-García.
Páginas 32.
- 8/02 Modelos BVAR: especificación, estimación e inferencia.
Autor: Enrique M. Quilis.
Páginas 44.
- 9/02 Imposición lineal sobre la renta y equivalencia distributiva: un ejercicio de microsimulación.
Autores: Juan Manuel Castañer Carrasco y José Felix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas 44.
- 10/02 The evolution of income inequality in the European Union.
Autores: Santiago Álvarez-García, Juan Prieto-Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 36.

- 11/02 Una descomposición de la redistribución en sus componentes vertical y horizontal: una aplicación al IRPF.
Autora: Irene Perrote.
Páginas 32.
- 12/02 Análisis de las políticas públicas de fomento de la innovación tecnológica en las regiones españolas.
Autor: Antonio Fonfria Mesa.
Páginas 40.
- 13/02 Los efectos de la política fiscal sobre el consumo privado: nueva evidencia para el caso español.
Autores: Agustín García y Julián Ramajo
Páginas 52.
- 14/02 Micro-Modelling of retirement behavior in Spain.
Autores: Michele Boldrin, Sergi Jiménez-Martín y Franco Peracchi.
Páginas 96.
- 15/02 Estado de salud y participación laboral de las personas mayores.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez, Desiderio Romero Jordán y Santiago Álvarez García.
Páginas 40.
- 16/02 Technological change, efficiency gains and capital accumulation in labour productivity growth and convergence: an application to the Spanish regions.
Autora: M.^a del Mar Salinas Jiménez.
Páginas 40.
- 17/02 Déficit público, masa monetaria e inflación. Evidencia empírica en la Unión Europea.
Autor: César Pérez López.
Páginas 40.
- 18/02 Tax evasion and relative contribution
Autora: Judith Panadés i Martí.
Páginas 28.
- 19/02 Fiscal policy and growth revisited: the case of the Spanish regions.
Autores: Oscar Bajo Rubio, Camen Díaz Roldán y M. Dolores Montávez Garcés.
Páginas 28.
- 20/02 Optimal endowments of public investment: an empirical analysis for the Spanish regions.
Autores: Oscar Bajo Rubio, Camen Díaz Roldán y M.^a Dolores Montávez Garcés.
Páginas 28.

