

The Lucrative Impact of Trade-Related Infrastructure: Meta-Analytic Evidence

Research Memorandum 2013-34

Mehmet Güney Celbiş
Peter Nijkamp
Jacques Poot

The Lucrative Impact of Trade-Related Infrastructure: Meta-Analytic Evidence¹

Mehmet Güney Celbiş
Maastricht University, The Netherlands, celbis@merit.unu.edu

Peter Nijkamp
VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands, p.nijkamp@vu.nl

Jacques Poot
University of Waikato, New Zealand, jpoot@waikato.ac.nz

ABSTRACT

Low levels of infrastructure quality and quantity can create trade impediments through increased transport costs. Since the late 1990s an increasing number of trade studies have taken infrastructure into account. The purpose of the present paper is to quantify the importance of infrastructure for trade by means of meta-analysis and meta-regression techniques that synthesize various studies. The type of infrastructure that we focus on is mainly public infrastructure in transportation and communication. We examine the impact of infrastructure on trade by means of estimates obtained from 36 primary studies that yielded 542 infrastructure elasticities of trade. We explicitly take into account that infrastructure can be measured in various ways and that its impact depends on the location of the infrastructure. We estimate several meta-regression models that control for observed heterogeneity in terms of variation across different methodologies, infrastructure types, geographical areas and their economic features, model specifications, and publication characteristics. Additionally, random effects account for between-study unspecified heterogeneity, while publication bias is explicitly addressed by means of the Hedges model. After controlling for all these issues we find that a 1 percent increase in own infrastructure increases exports by about 0.6 percent and imports by about 0.3 percent. Such elasticities are generally larger for developing countries, land infrastructure, IV or panel data estimation, and macro-level analyses. They also depend on the inclusion or exclusion of various common covariates in trade regressions.

Key words: *Infrastructure, Trade, Meta-Analysis*

JEL Classifications: *C10, F1, R4*

¹ Version dated 18 May 2013.

1. Introduction

In recent years the effects of infrastructure on trade have been increasingly become a focal point in studies examining the trade performance of countries and regions. The present study uses meta-analysis and meta-regression techniques to synthesize various “quantitative opinions” (Poot, 2013) that can be found in this literature. The type of infrastructure that we focus on is mainly public infrastructure in transportation and communication.

Infrastructure is a multidimensional concept and is measured in various ways, not just in relation to trade performance but also in estimating its impact on growth, welfare, efficiency, and other types of economic outcomes. Consequently, there exists a wide range of approaches in the literature regarding the conceptualization and classification of infrastructure. Martin and Rogers (1995, p.336) define public infrastructure as “any facility, good, or institution provided by the state which facilitates the juncture between production and consumption. Under this interpretation, not only transport and telecommunications but also such things as law and order qualify as public infrastructure” In this study, we focus exclusively on models that estimate the impacts of indicators of transportation and communication infrastructure. Nonetheless, the remaining types of public infrastructure such as rule of law, regulatory quality, etc. are to some extent considered by controlling for such attributes in the meta-regression models employed in this study.

We collected a large number research articles that use regression analysis with at least one transportation and/or communication infrastructure-related factor among the explanatory variables, and a dependent variable that represents either export or import volumes or sales. These papers have been collected by means of academic search engines and citation tracking. Our search yielded 36 articles published between 1999 and 2012 which provided sufficiently compatible information for meta-analytical methods. These papers are broadly representative of the literature in this area. Section 5 describes the selection of primary studies and coding of data.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a short narrative literature survey. The theoretical model that underlies most regression models of merchandise trade flows and the implications for meta-regression modeling are outlined in section 3. The meta-analytic methodology is briefly described in section 4. The data are discussed in section 5, which is followed by descriptive analysis in section 6 and meta-regression modeling in section 7. Section 8 presents some final remarks.

2. Literature Review

The broad literature on infrastructure and trade provides certain stylized facts: the relative locations of trade partners and the positioning of infrastructure, together with the trajectories of trade, can be seen as integral features that play a role in the relationship between infrastructure and trade flows. The location of physical infrastructure and the direction of trade strongly imply a spatial dimension to the relationship and can be subject to various costs that are closely linked with space, infrastructure quality and availability. Thus, the relationship in question is usually assessed in relation to space and trade costs. For instance, Donaghy (2009, p.66) states that “Trade, international or interregional, is essentially the exchange of goods and services over space. By definition, then, it involves transportation and, hence, some transaction costs.” The analysis of the impact of transport costs on trade has a long history starting with von Thünen (1826), and later elaborated by Samuelson (1952, 1954), Mundell (1957), Geraci and Prewo (1977), Casas (1983), Bergstrand (1985) and others. The specific role of infrastructure in trade has been attracting increasing attention more recently. Especially after seminal studies such as Bougheas et al. (1999) and Limao and Venables (2001), who empirically demonstrate that infrastructure plays an important role in determining transport costs, the relationship has become more prominent in the trade literature.

However, pinpointing the exact impact of infrastructure on trade remains a challenge. The range of estimates that can be found in the literature is wide. This may be due to numerous factors, such as: relevant geographical characteristics, interrelations of different infrastructure types, infrastructure capacity utilization, and study characteristics. Additionally there are challenges in the ways in which infrastructure is defined. Bouët et al. (2008, p.2) draw attention to this by stating:

“Quantifying the true impact of infrastructure on trade however is difficult mainly because of the interactive nature of different types of infrastructure. Thus, the impact of greater telephone connectivity depends upon the supporting road infrastructure and vice versa. Most importantly, the precise way this dependence among infrastructure types occurs is unknown and there does not exist any a priori theoretical basis for presuming the functional forms for such interactions.”

Thus, the infrastructure effects may be non-linear and may need to be explored through taking account of the interactions of different types of infrastructure. In addition to this, Portugal-Perez and Wilson (2012) draw attention to the possibility of infrastructure

“satiation” by pointing out that, based on their results from a sample of 101 countries, the impact of infrastructure enhancements on export performance is decreasing in per capita income while information and communication technology is increasingly influential for wealthier countries, implying diminishing returns to transport infrastructure.

Another question that arises in assessing the impact of infrastructure on trade is the asymmetry in the impact of infrastructure in the two directions of bilateral trade. In this regard, Martinez-Zarzoso and Nowak-Lehmann (2003) examine the EU-Mercosur bilateral trade flows and conclude that investing in a trade partner’s infrastructure is not beneficial because only exporter’s infrastructure enhances trade but not the importer’s infrastructure. This result is not universal, however. Limao and Venables (2001) consider importer, exporter, and transit countries’ levels of infrastructure separately and conclude that all these dimensions of infrastructure positively impact on bilateral trade flows. Similarly, Grigoriou (2007) concludes that, based on results obtained from a sample of 167 countries, road construction within a landlocked country may not be adequate to enhance trade since transit country infrastructure, bargaining power with transit countries, and transport costs also play very important roles in trade performance.

Additionally, the impact of infrastructure may not be symmetric for trade partners who have different economic characteristics. For example, Longo and Sekkat (2004) find that both exporter and importer infrastructure play a very significant role in intra-African trade. However, these authors do not find a significant infrastructure impact regarding trade flows between Africa and major developed economies. In another study on intra-African trade, Njinkeu et al. (2008) conclude that port and services infrastructure enhancement seem to be a more useful tool in improving trade in this region than other measures.

Another issue is that infrastructure that is specific to one geographical part of an economy may impact on exports or imports at another location within the same economy. If the two locations are relatively far apart, then this may yield unreliable results when broad regions are the spatial unit of measurement. Smaller spatial units of analysis may then be beneficial. However, sub-national level studies on the impact of infrastructure on trade are relatively rare. Wu (2007) provides evidence from Chinese regions and finds a positive impact of infrastructure (measured as total length of highways per square kilometer of regional area) on export performance. Similarly, in another sub-national level study, Granato (2008) examines the export performance of Argentinean regions to 23 partner countries. The author finds that transport costs and regional infrastructure are important determinants of regional export performance.

In the trade literature, infrastructure is usually measured in terms of stock or density, or by constructing a composite index using data on different infrastructure types. Adopting a broad view of infrastructure, Biehl (1986) distinguishes the following infrastructure categories: transportation, communication, energy supply, water supply, environment, education, health, special urban amenities, sports and tourist facilities, social amenities, cultural amenities, and natural environment. The transportation category can be classified into subcategories such as roads, railroads, waterways, airports, harbors, information transmission, and pipelines (Bruinsma *et al.*, 1989). Nijkamp (1986) identifies the features that distinguish infrastructure from other regional potentiality factors (such as natural resource availability, locational conditions, sectoral composition, international linkages and existing capital stock) as high degrees of: publicness, spatial immobility, indivisibility, non-substitutability, and monovalence. Based on the methods employed in the primary studies, we distinguish two main approaches regarding the measurement of infrastructure: specific types of infrastructure and infrastructure indices. This is elaborated in section 5.

3. The Theory of Modeling Trade Flows

An improvement in infrastructure is expected to lower the trade hindering impact of transport costs. Transport costs have a negative impact on trade volumes as trade takes place over space and various costs are incurred in moving products from one point to another. Such costs may include fuel consumption, tariffs, rental rates of transport equipment, public infrastructure tolls, and also time costs. A very convenient way to represent such costs is the “iceberg melting” model of Samuelson (1954) in which only a fraction of goods that are shipped arrive at their destination. Fujita et al. (1999) refer to von Thünen’s example of trade costs where a portion of grain that is transported is consumed by the horses that pull the grain wagon. Fujita et al. (1999) model the role of such trade costs in a world with a finite number of discrete locations where each variety of a product is produced in only one location and all varieties produced within a location have the same technology and price. The authors show that the total sales of a variety particular to a specific region depends, besides factors such as the income levels in each destination and the supply price, on the transportation costs to all destinations.

Anderson and van Wincoop (2003) show that bilateral trade flows between two spatial trading units depend on the trade barriers that exist between these two traders and all their other trade partners. The authors start with maximizing the CES utility function:

$$\left(\sum_i \beta_i^{(1-\sigma)/\sigma} c_{ij}^{\sigma-1/\sigma}\right)^{(\sigma/\sigma-1)} \quad (1)$$

with substitution elasticity σ (>1) and subject to the budget constraint

$$\sum_i p_{ij} c_{ij} = y_j \quad (2)$$

where subscripts i and j refer to regions and each region is specialized in producing only one good. c_{ij} is the consumption of the goods from region i by the consumers in region j , β_i is a positive distribution parameter, and y_j is the size of the economy of region j in terms of its nominal income. p_{ij} is the cost, insurance and freight (cif) price of the goods from region i for the consumers in region j and is equal to $p_i t_{ij}$ where p_i is the price of the goods of region i in the origin (supply price) and t_{ij} is the trade cost factor between the origin i and the destination j , and $p_{ij} c_{ij} = x_{ij}$ is the nominal value of exports from i to j . The income of region i is the sum of the values of all exports of i to the other regions:

$$y_i = \sum_j x_{ij} \quad (3)$$

Maximizing (1) subject to (2), imposing the market clearing condition (3), and assuming that $t_{ij} = t_{ji}$ (i.e. trade barriers are symmetric) leads to the gravity equation:

$$x_{ij} = \frac{y_i y_j}{y^w} \left(\frac{t_{ij}}{P_i P_j} \right)^{1-\sigma} \quad (4)$$

where $y^w \equiv \sum_j y_j$ is the world nominal income. Anderson and van Wincoop (2003, 2004) refer to P_i and P_j as “multilateral resistance” variables which are defined as follows:

$$P_i^{1-\sigma} = \sum_j P_j^{\sigma-1} \theta_j t_{ij}^{1-\sigma} \quad \forall i \quad (5)$$

$$P_j^{1-\sigma} = \sum_i P_i^{\sigma-1} \theta_i t_{ij}^{1-\sigma} \quad \forall j \quad (6)$$

in which θ is the share of region j in world income, $\frac{y_j}{y^w}$. Therefore, the authors show in equations (5) and (6) that the multilateral resistance terms depend on the bilateral trade barriers between all trade partners. Moreover, the gravity equation (4) implies that the trade between i and j depends on their bilateral trade barriers relative the average trade barriers between these economies and all their trading partners. Anderson and van Wincoop (2003) finalize their development of the above gravity model by defining the trade cost factor as a function of bilateral distance (d_{ij}) and the presence of international borders: $t_{ij} = b_{ij} d_{ij}^\rho$; where if an international border between i and j does not exist $b_{ij} = 1$, otherwise it is one plus the tariff rate that applies to that specific border crossing.

Infrastructure can be interpreted as the facilities and systems that influence the *effective* bilateral distance, d_{ij} . Lower levels of infrastructural quality can increase transportation costs, for example: the increased shipping costs in a port when there is congestion due to insufficient space; higher fuel consumption due to low quality roads; and more time spent in transit because of shortcomings in various types of facilities. Within the context of the iceberg melting model mentioned above, Bougheas et al. (1999) construct a theoretical framework in which better infrastructure increases the fraction that reaches the destination through the reduction of transport costs. By including infrastructure variables in their empirical estimation with a sample of European countries, the authors find a positive relationship between trade volume and the combined level of infrastructure of the trading partners. Similarly, in many other studies on bilateral trade flows, specific functional forms of the bilateral trade barriers (trade costs) that take the level of infrastructure into account have been constructed.

An important assumption in the derivation of the gravity model (4) is that $t_{ij} = t_{ji}$, which leads to $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$ (balanced bilateral trade). In practice, every trade flow is directional and infrastructure conditions at the origin of trade (the exporting country) may impact differently on the trade flow than conditions at the destination of trade (the importing country). Defining k_i (k_j) as the infrastructure located in origin i (destination j), referred to in the remainder of the paper as exporter infrastructure and importer infrastructure, this implies

that $\partial d_{ij}/\partial k_i \neq \partial d_{ij}/\partial k_j$. At the same time, there are also empirically two ways to measure the trade flow: as export at the point of origin or as import at the point of destination. This implies that from the perspective of any given country i , there are in principle four ways of measuring the impact of infrastructure on trade:

- The impact of k_i on x_{ij} (Own country infrastructure on own exports)
- The impact of k_i on x_{ji} (Own country infrastructure on own imports)
- The impact of k_j on x_{ij} (Partner country infrastructure on own exports)
- The impact of k_j on x_{ji} (Partner country infrastructure on own imports)

Logically, with a square trade matrix, i and j , can be chosen arbitrarily and the impact of k_i on x_{ij} must therefore be the same as the impact of k_j on x_{ji} (and the impact of k_i on x_{ji} the same as the impact of k_j on x_{ij}). Thus, in a cross-section setting, a regression of world trade on infrastructure gives only two effect sizes in theory. Such a regression equation when estimated with bilateral trade data may look like: $\ln(x_{ij}) = a + b_o \ln(k_i) + b_d \ln(k_j) + \text{others} + e_{ij}$ where a is a constant term, b_o is the origin infrastructure elasticity of trade (exporter infrastructure), b_d is the destination infrastructure elasticity of trade (importer infrastructure) and e_{ij} is the error term. With n countries, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$ and the number of regression observations is $n(n - 1)$.

An issue that arises in practice is that regressions may yield different results when estimated with export data as compared with import data. Hence, referring to b_{ox} and b_{dx} as b_o and b_d estimated with export data (and b_{om} and b_{dm} similarly defined with import data), in theory $b_{ox} = b_{om}$ and $b_{dx} = b_{dm}$, but we shall see that in our meta-regression analysis $b_{ox} > b_{om}$, while $b_{dx} < b_{dm}$. This simply means that a larger estimate is obtained when the trade flow is defined from the perspective of the country where the infrastructure is located rather than from the perspective of the partner country. Hence producer/exporter country infrastructure has a bigger effect when measured with export data, while consumer/importer country infrastructure has a bigger effect when measured with import data.

4. Methodology

Meta-analysis of empirical research, first defined by Glass (1976) as “the analysis of analyses” has been a common methodology in experimental research such as medicine and psychology since the early 20th century and has gained popularity in economic research in

recent decades (Poot, 2013, Ridhwan *et al.*, 2010). Stanley and Jarrell (1989) state that “Meta-analysis is the analysis of empirical analyses that attempts to integrate and explain the literature about some specific important parameter”. Results from meta-analytic research can potentially shed light on certain policy issues that require a research synthesis. Florax *et al.* (2002) draw attention to the area of applied, policy-related macroeconomics being very much open to the application of meta-analysis. Examples of recent applications of meta-analysis in economic policy include: Genc *et al.* (2012) on immigration and international trade; Cipollina and Pietrovito (2011) on trade and EU preferential agreements; Ozgen *et al.* (2010) on migration and income growth; Ridhwan *et al.* (2010) on monetary policy; de Groot *et al.* (2009) on externalities and urban growth; Doucouliagos and Laroche (2009) on unions and firm profits; and Nijkamp and Poot (2004) on fiscal policies and growth. Meta-analysis (MA) can be used to address the impact of differences between studies in terms of design of the empirical analysis, for example with respect to the choice of explanatory variables (Nijkamp *et al.*, 2011). Fundamentally, meta-analysis allows the researcher to combine results from several studies in order to reach a general conclusion (Holmgren, 2007). Cipollina and Salvatici state that “The main focus of MA is to test the null hypothesis that different point estimates, when treated as individual observations... , are equal to zero when the findings from this entire area of research are combined” (2010, p.65). However, in economics the emphasis is more frequently on identifying by means of meta-regression analysis (MRA) some average quantitative impact and those study characteristics that are statistically significant in explaining the variation in study outcomes (Poot, 2013). Meta-regression analysis can be employed to discover how much the results obtained in primary studies are influenced by methodological aspects of the research together with the geographical and temporal attributes of the data used. Since the impacts of infrastructure on trade estimated in various studies differ widely in magnitude and significance, MRA can yield important results with respect to the choice of empirical and theoretical attributes of the primary study. We use the guidelines for MRA as published in Stanley *et al.* (2013).

The methodology in this study can be broken into several components. We first report descriptively on the observed variation in infrastructure elasticities of trade in section 6. The results are reported based on several categorizations of study characteristics. Next, we employ a set of meta-regression models in section 7 for a better understanding of the joint effect of the various study characteristics, while also taking possible publication bias explicitly into account. But first we briefly comment on study selection in the next section.

5. Data

The presence of at least one infrastructure-related factor among the explanatory variables in a primary study, and a dependent variable that represents export or import volumes or sales has been the main prerequisite in our data collection. Articles have been collected using academic search engines such as JSTOR, EconLit, Google Scholar, SpringerLink, and Web of Science by using keywords such as “Infrastructure”, “Public Capital”, “Trade”, “Export”, “Import”, “Trade Facilitation”, “Trade Costs” in various combinations.

Numerous authors construct indices representing the stock or level of infrastructure in the countries or regions that are used for primary analyses. An index can be based on a very broad definition of infrastructure or on more specific categories, such as transportation or communication infrastructure. Depending on specific study attributes such as geographical coverage or spatial scale, infrastructure indexes are usually built by combining regional/national infrastructural data scaled by surface or population. Such indexes may include: road, railroad, or highway density or length, paved roads as a percentage of total road stock, number of fax machines, number of fixed and/or mobile phone line connections, number of computers, number of internet users, aircraft traffic and passengers, number of paved airports, maritime (port) traffic statistics, fleet share in the world, electricity consumption, etc. Some studies calculate these indexes either in a combined way for the trade partners, or separately for each partner, and sometimes also for the transit regions. For example, Bandyopadhyay (1999) uses road and railway, and phone network density, separately as proxies for the technological level and the efficiency of the distribution sector. Using a sample of OECD economies, the author finds strong evidence that the distribution sector of an economy has important implications for its international trade performance.

An alternative to the index approach is the measurement of infrastructure in one or more specific ways in the statistical analysis. Focusing explicitly on railroads, phone connections, or port traffic can be examples of this approach. For example, Shepherd and Wilson (2006) focus specifically on roads and construct minimum and average road quality indexes for the trading partners. Similarly, Nordas and Piermartini (2004) also construct, besides considering an overall index, indexes for specific types of infrastructure and employ in their estimation dummy variables to represent infrastructure quality. These authors find a significant and positive impact of infrastructural quality on bilateral trade with port efficiency being the most influential variable in the model.

An effect size is defined as any infrastructure elasticity of trade. After selecting those studies that directly report the impact of exporter and/or importer infrastructure in comparable elasticities, or that provided sufficient information for elasticities to be calculated, our dataset consists of 542 effect sizes from 36 primary studies ranging from 1999 to 2012. Table 1 describes the studies used in our analysis and reports several descriptive statistics. Table 1a reports the geographical coverage, the estimation techniques, the dependent variable use (exports or imports) and the way in which infrastructure was measured. Table 1b summarizes the reported elasticities in each of the 36 studies, categorized by whether the dependent variable was exports or imports; and whether the location of the infrastructure was at the point of production (exporter infrastructure), consumption (importer infrastructure), or measured as combined/transit infrastructure. Export equations yielded 307 elasticities within a huge range of about -2 to +15 and an average value of 0.76. Import equations yielded 235 elasticities within the range of -2 and +8, with an average value of 0.38. Hence regressions using export data clearly yielded larger elasticities.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Among our sample of 36 studies, 15 are published in peer-reviewed journals, and 21 studies are published as working/conference/discussion papers, policy documents, or book chapters. A total of 12 studies were published by international organizations such as the World Bank, OECD, and WTO or had at least one author affiliated to these organizations.² After, firstly, dropping studies that only use a combined or transit infrastructure measure (for the trade partners) or estimate the impact of transit infrastructure; secondly, one effect size for which the standard error was reported as zero (causing problems with meta-regression); and, thirdly, some outlier observations for exporter and importer infrastructure elasticities separately, twenty-seven studies and 379 effect sizes remain and are used for all further analyses in this paper. Figures 1 and 2 show the quantile plots of the effect sizes in our final dataset for exporter infrastructure and importer infrastructure respectively. The ranges for the restricted dataset are now similar, but a comparison of the medians and the interquartile ranges suggest a tendency for exporter infrastructure elasticities to be somewhat larger.

FIGURES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE

² Hence we include in our later analysis a variable representing possible advocacy for a higher effect size for studies conducted by these organizations.

6. Descriptive Analysis

In order to conduct descriptive and regression analyses in this study, the methodological attributes together with various other characteristics of the primary studies are coded numerically as binary variables. Definitions of the variables representing the study characteristics are provided in Table 2.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Overall, approximately 82 percent of the estimates in the final dataset find a positive and significant infrastructure impact on trade. The descriptive statistics for all effect sizes are grouped by direction of trade, methodology, infrastructure category, development level of the relevant economies, and publication status. The results are presented in Tables 3-7. For ease of comparison, the descriptive statistics for all groups combined are repeated in the bottom line of each table.³

Table 3 reinforces the earlier finding from Table 2 that studies where the dependent variable was exports, on average, yielded higher effect sizes than studies that use imports as the dependent variable. Thus, according to these raw averages, the mean effect size on exports is larger than on imports regardless of the location of infrastructure. However, irrespective of the trade data used (imports or exports), exporter infrastructure has a bigger impact than importer infrastructure, with elasticities on average 0.34 and 0.16 respectively. This implies a net gain in the balance of merchandise trade from expanding infrastructure, an important finding which we will quantify further after controlling for study heterogeneity and publication bias.

However, the greater impact of exporter infrastructure is not the case across all types of estimation methods (see Table 4). Heckman, Tobit, and Probit estimations (that control for zero trade flows) yield larger importer infrastructure elasticities than exporter elasticities (0.49 and 0.33 respectively). When considering the type of infrastructure (see Table 5), a composite measure has a bigger impact than the more specific infrastructure types of land transport, maritime or air transport, and communication infrastructure. However, leaving

³ In Table 4 the observations from the sub category add to 239 rather than the total effect size number of 237 for exporter infrastructure. This is because Elbadawi et al. (2006) use Tobit and IV for the two effect sizes they estimate.

aside the composite measure category, land transportation infrastructure appears on average, to affect trade in both directions more than the other types of infrastructure. Exporter infrastructure has again, on average, a higher effect size on trade than importer infrastructure for all categories except communication infrastructure. This is an interesting finding since communication infrastructure has a greater impact on transaction costs than on transportation costs, since it facilitates the flow of information which can enhance trade. It appears that communication infrastructure has a greater impact on the consumption side of the market than on the production side. Regression modeling will show that this effect is statistically significant in the model that corrects for publication bias.

In order to account for differences regarding the level of development of the economies included in the primary studies, the results have been grouped into originating from three types of datasets : a “Developed Economies” category if the author uses terms such as “Developed”, “Rich”, “North”, “OECD”, and “EU” to describe the part of the sample in which the infrastructure is located in the primary study, and a “Developing Economies” category if the classification is described as “Developing”, “South”, or “Poor”.⁴ In order to also examine the estimates obtained from samples that included both developed and developing countries, a “Mixed Samples” category was defined. Results are presented in Table 6. The average elasticity in mixed samples is in between those for developed countries and developing countries for exporter infrastructure. In all categories, the elasticity of exporter infrastructure is larger than that of importer infrastructure. Less developed economies seem to enjoy a higher return on infrastructure (especially if it is exporter infrastructure) compared to developed economies. This difference may be attributed to diminishing returns to investment in infrastructure capital, as is consistent with the neoclassical theory of long-run development.

In Table 7 we consider a measure of publication quality of the research by adopting the Australian Business Deans Council Journal Quality List (ABDC, 2010). “Highly Ranked Journals” refers to papers published in journals classified as A*, A, or B. “Other journals and unpublished” refers to outlets with classification C or D (this includes book chapters, non-refereed working papers and conference proceedings). Exporter infrastructure has again higher average effect sizes than importer infrastructure for all categories. Moreover, studies in highly ranked journals find on average higher effect sizes for both exporter and importer

⁴ Because classifications for some economies may change throughout the years or depending on the sources, we rely on the statement of the author(s) regarding their sample.

infrastructure compared to other studies. This is commonly attributed in meta-analysis to publication bias, but we shall see that the effect after controlling for such bias in the case of importer infrastructure.

TABLES 3-7 ABOUT HERE

The raw mean values that are presented in Tables 3-7 must be treated with caution since they pool the information obtained from primary studies without considering the standard errors of the estimates. If one “true” effect size (i.e. a universal impact of infrastructure on trade that should apply in all cases) is assumed to exist and there is no heterogeneity among primary studies, the fixed effect (FE) combined estimate, which is a weighted average of effect sizes, with the inverse of the estimated variance of each effect size as a weight, is a more efficient average than an ordinary mean (e.g., Genc et al., 2012). If there is heterogeneity among studies, but not in a systematic way that can be measured by study characteristics, the Random Effect (RE) weighted average accounts for such variability. We calculated the FE and RE estimates as described by Poot (2012) and others.

Because effect sizes come from studies with different geographical coverage, methodology, and model specifications, it is questionable that there would be an underlying universal effect size. This can be formally confirmed by means of a homogeneity test using a commonly used “ Q -statistic” (Engels et al., 2000). The Q -statistic (computation as in Peters *et al.* 2010) tests if the primary studies share a common effect size and whether an FE estimate is relevant to the analysis (Poot, 2013). Combining K effect sizes, if the resulting Q -statistic from this homogeneity test is greater than the upper-tail critical value of the chi-square distribution with $K-1$ degrees of freedom, the variance in effect sizes obtained from the primary studies is significantly greater than what can be observed due to random variation around a common effect size (Shadish and Haddock, 1994). If the existence of a shared true effect is rejected, the FE approach is not suitable and only the RE estimates should be considered (Poot, 2013).

The Q -statistics for exporter infrastructure and importer infrastructure respectively are about 33174.7 and about 4596.1 which both exceed the critical value of 493.6. Based on this outcome of the Q -test we conclude that effect sizes are from a highly heterogeneous pool of studies, and FE weighted average effect sizes are not meaningful.⁵ The RE average effect

⁵ The FE estimate for exporter infrastructure is -0.002. For importer infrastructure it is 0.044.

sizes for exporter and importer infrastructure are 0.167 and 0.145 respectively. Consequently, the result that exporter infrastructure is more influential on trade than importer infrastructure is supported. The RE estimates suggest that an enhancement in exporter infrastructure of 1 percent would increase annual merchandise trade by about 0.17 percent while importer infrastructure increases trade by about 0.15 percent. In the next section we re-assess this conclusion by controlling for study characteristics and publication bias.

7. Meta-Regression Models

The statistical consequence of the possible unwillingness by researchers or reviewers to publish statistically insignificant results is defined as “publication bias” or “file drawer bias.” The actions leading to publication bias can be the efforts of the researchers using small samples to obtain large-magnitude estimates (that are statistically significant) while researchers using large samples do not need to exhibit such efforts and report smaller estimates that are still statistically significant. This selection process results with positive correlation between the reported effect size and its standard error (Stanley et al., 2008; Stanley, 2005). As an initial exploration of the possibility of such bias we apply the Egger’s regression test⁶ (Egger et al., 1997) and the Fixed Effects Extended Egger Test⁷ (Peters et al. 2010). The results of both tests for exporter and importer infrastructure are reported in Table 8. Both variants of the test yield significant coefficients on the bias term when testing for publication bias in the impact of exporter infrastructure. The evidence for bias in estimation of the impact of importer infrastructure is less conclusive: confirmed with the Egger test but not with the extended Egger test. The much greater bias in estimating exporter infrastructure impact will also be demonstrated with the Hedges (1992) model of publication bias to which we now turn.

TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

⁶ Egger’s regression model can be represented as estimating the model $\hat{\beta}_i = \alpha + \rho Se_i + \varepsilon_i$ with WLS and weights equal to $1/Se_i^2$ where $\hat{\beta}_i$ and Se_i are the observed effect size and the associated standard error obtained from study i respectively, α is the intercept, and ε_i is the error term. The bias is measured by ρ . If ρ is significantly different from zero, this is a sign of publication bias (Peters et al., 2010).

⁷ The FE Extended Egger’s Test extends the base model presented in the previous footnote by including a group of covariates: $\hat{\beta}_i = \alpha + \rho Se_i + group_i + \varepsilon_i$ (Peters et al. 2010). The covariates within “group” are the same list of variables that are used later for the MRA analyses in this study.

The Hedges model is an extension of the RE model in which it is assumed that the likelihood of a result being publicly reported is greatest when the associated p -value of the coefficient of the variable of interest is smaller than 0.01. While this likelihood remains unknown, two *relative* probabilities, denoted here by ω_2 and ω_3 , are associated with the cases: $0.01 < p < 0.05$ and $p > 0.05$ respectively. We use the method proposed by Ashenfelter et al. (1999) to formulate a likelihood function to estimate ω_2 and ω_3 . These parameters should equal to 1 if publication bias is not present. Table 9 presents the estimates associated with the Hedges publication bias procedure. In part (a) of Table 9 we consider the case in which there is no observed heterogeneity assumed, i.e. there are no study characteristics that act as covariates. In part (b) of Table 9, covariates have been included. The model is estimated under the restriction that the probabilities of publication are all the same on the RHS of the table, while the LHS of the table estimates the relative probabilities with maximum likelihood.

TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

On the LHS of Table 9(a) we see that less significant estimates are less likely to be reported. The corresponding weights for $0.01 < p < 0.05$ and $p > 0.05$ are 0.739 and 0.137 for exporter's infrastructure, and 0.280 and 0.120 for imports. The RHS shows the results of the restricted model which assumes $\omega_2 = \omega_3 = 1$ (no publication bias). The chi-square critical value at 1 percent level with two degrees of freedom is 9.21. Two times the difference between the log-likelihoods of assuming and not assuming publication bias is 63.28 for exporter's infrastructure without study characteristics and 51.2 with study characteristics, in both cases greatly exceeding the critical value and providing evidence for publication bias at the 1 percent level. Similarly, evidence for the existence of publication bias is observed for importer infrastructure as well, with a test statistics of 53.62 and 151.8 for without and with covariates respectively.

We can also see that residual heterogeneity considerably decreases upon the introduction of study characteristics for both exporter and importer infrastructure (from 0.341 to 0.255 and from 0.231 to 0.0302 respectively). Accounting for publication bias and study heterogeneity (Table 9b) lowers the RE estimate of the exporter infrastructure elasticity from 0.300 to 0.254 but leaves the RE estimate of the importer infrastructure elasticity relatively

unaffected (0.256 and 0.259 respectively). This is consistent with the result of the extended Egger test reported above.

Taking into account the heterogeneity that is apparent in our dataset (as demonstrated formally by the Q-test) we now conduct MRA in order to account for the impact of differences between studies on study effect sizes.

The simplest MRA assumes that there are S independent studies ($s = 1, 2, \dots, S$) which each postulate the classic regression model $\mathbf{y}(s) = \mathbf{X}(s)\boldsymbol{\beta}(s) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(s)$, with the elements of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(s)$ identically and independently distributed with mean 0 and variance $\sigma^2(s)$. Study s has $N(s)$ observations and the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}(s)$ has dimension $K(s) \times 1$. The first element of this vector is the parameter of interest and has exactly the same interpretation across all studies (in our case it is either the exporter infrastructure elasticity of trade or the importer infrastructure elasticity of trade).

Under these assumptions, a primary study would estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}(s)$ by the OLS estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(s) = [\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1} [\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{y}(s)]$, which is best asymptotically normal distributed with mean $\boldsymbol{\beta}(s)$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2(s) [\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1}$. The S estimates of the parameter of interest are the effect sizes. We observe the effect sizes $\hat{\beta}_1(1), \hat{\beta}_1(2), \dots, \hat{\beta}_1(S)$. Given the data generating process for the primary studies,

$$\hat{\beta}_1(s) = \beta_1(s) + [[\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1} \mathbf{X}(s)' \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(s)]_1 \quad (7)$$

which are consistent and efficient estimates of the unknown parameters $\beta_1(1), \beta_1(2), \dots, \beta_1(S)$. These effect sizes have estimated variances $v(1), v(2), \dots, v(S)$. In study s , $v(s)$ is the top left element of the matrix $\hat{\sigma}^2(s) [\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1}$ with $\hat{\sigma}^2(s) = [\mathbf{e}(s)' \mathbf{e}(s)]' / N(s)$, and $\mathbf{e}(s) = \mathbf{y}(s) - \mathbf{X}(s) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(s)$ is the vector of least square residuals.

MRA assumes that there are P known moderator (or predictor) variables M_1, M_2, \dots, M_P that are related to the unknown parameters of interest $\beta_1(1), \beta_1(2), \dots, \beta_1(S)$ via a linear model as follows:

$$\beta_1(s) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 M_{s1} + \dots + \gamma_P M_{sP} + \eta_s \quad (8)$$

in which M_{sj} is the value of the j th moderator variable associated with effect size s and the η_s are independently and identically distributed random variables with mean 0 and variance τ^2 (the between-studies variance). Thus, equation (8) allows for both observable

heterogeneity (in terms of observable moderator variables) and unobservable heterogeneity (represented by η_s).

Combining (7) and (8), the MRA model becomes

$$\hat{\beta}_1(s) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 M_{s1} + \dots + \gamma_P M_{sP} + \underbrace{\{\eta_s + [[\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1} \mathbf{X}(s)' \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(s)]_1\}}_{\text{Error Term of MRA}} \quad (9)$$

with the term in curly bracket being the error term of the MRA. The objective of MRA is to find estimates of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_P$ that provide information on how observed estimates of the coefficients of the focus variable are linked to observed study characteristics. Typically, the meta-analyst observes for each $s = 1, 2, \dots, S$: $\hat{\beta}_1(s)$; its estimated variance $\hat{\sigma}^2(s) [[\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1}]_{11}$; the number of primary study observations $N(s)$, and information about the variables that make up $\mathbf{X}(s)$, possibly including means and variances, but not the actual data or the covariances between regressors.⁸ The P known moderator variables M_1, M_2, \dots, M_P are assumed to capture information about the covariates and the estimation method in case the estimations were obtained by techniques other than OLS. Clearly, the error term in regression model (9) is heteroskedastic and generates a between-study variance due to η_s and a within-study variance due to $[[\mathbf{X}(s)' \mathbf{X}(s)]^{-1} \mathbf{X}(s)' \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(s)]_1$.

We apply two different estimation methods for equation (9).⁹:

- a. Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML): In REML the between-study variance is estimated by maximizing the residual (or restricted) log likelihood function and a WLS regression weighted by the sum of the between-study and within-study variances is conducted to obtain the estimated coefficients (Harbord & Higgins, 2008). The standard error does not enter as an individual variable into this specification.
- b. The publication bias corrected maximum likelihood procedure proposed by Hedges (1992) and outlined above.

⁸ If covariances are known, Becker and Wu (2007) suggest an MRA that pools estimates of all regression parameters, not just of the focus variable, and that can be estimated with feasible GLS.

⁹ For robustness checks we also ran OLS and WLS regressions with standard errors clustered by primary study (with weights being the number of observations from each primary regression equation) and variables transformed to deviations from means, so that the estimated constant term becomes the estimated mean effect size. The results are reported in Table A in the Appendix.

The results of estimation of equation (9) with the REML and Hedges estimators are shown in Table 10. All explanatory variables are transformed in deviations from their original means. We analyze the results separately for each category of variables.

TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

Methodology

Results from estimation with the Hedges model suggest that studies that take zero trade flows into account by using Heckman sample selection, Tobit, or Probit models, on average, estimate a lower effect size for exporter infrastructure, and a higher effect size for importer infrastructure. For robustness checks, OLS and WLS estimates are reported in the Appendix. On the matter of sample selections, the results are not consistent across MRAs. In what follows, we will pay most attention to the results of the Hedges model since this is the only model that accounts for publication bias but emphasize those results that are found in the other MRAs as well.

According to both the REML and Hedges results, studies that use instrumental variable methods to deal with potential endogeneity observe a larger impact of exporter infrastructure on trade. Consequently, econometric methodology can be seen as an important study characteristic that affects the results. Not accounting for endogeneity of exporter infrastructure leads to an underestimation of its impact on trade. This is not the case for importer/consumer infrastructure.

The Point at Which the Trade is Measured

In both the REML and Hedges estimations, the coefficient on the dummy *Dependent Variable is Exports* is significant and positive for exporter infrastructure, suggesting that own infrastructure has a greater impact when trade is measured by export data rather than by import data. This is also found in the OLS and WLS MRAs in the Appendix. As discussed in section 3, in a primary study where all bilateral trading partners would be included and all trade is measured with transaction costs included (cif), the two effect sizes ought to be equal. However, data on any trade flow may differ dependent on measurement at the point of shipment or at the point of importation. Moreover, as noted previously, trade matrices may square, such as in an analysis of developing country exports to developed countries. For the same variable, the Hedges model yields a significant and negative coefficient for importer infrastructure, suggesting that the impact of the infrastructure located in the importing

economy is lower when measured with respect to the exports of its partner than with respect to its own imports.

Using the Hedges model, we can predict the overall impacts of exporter/producer infrastructure and importer/consumer infrastructure by combining these coefficients with the constant terms, which measure the overall average effects. The results can be directly compared with the “raw” averages reported in Table 3. We get:

- The own infrastructure of country i has an average effect size of $0.254+0.345=0.599$ on the exports of i ;
- The own infrastructure of country i has an average effect size of 0.259 on the imports of i ;
- The infrastructure in the partner country j of the exporting country i has an average effect size of 0.254 on the imports of i ;
- The infrastructure in the partner country j of the exporting country i has an average effect size of $0.259-0.126=0.133$ on the exports of i .

We see that after controlling for heterogeneity and publication bias, the exporter infrastructure effect continues to be larger when measured with export data than with import data, (0.599 versus 0.254 above, compared with 0.50 and 0.15 respectively in Table 3), while for importer infrastructure the opposite is the case (0.133 versus 0.259 above, versus 0.22 and 0.09 respectively in Table 3). The most important result from this analysis is that from any country perspective, the impact of own infrastructure on net trade (assuming roughly balanced gross trade) is $0.599-0.259=0.340$. Alternatively, if we take the average of the exporter infrastructure elasticities 0.599 and 0.254, and subtract the average of the importer infrastructure elasticities (0.133 and 0.259), we get a net trade effect of 0.23. Averaging the calculations from both perspectives, an increase in own infrastructure by 1 percent increases net trade by about 0.3 percent. We address the macroeconomic implication of this finding in section 8.

Infrastructure Category

Except the REML model for importer infrastructure, all our estimations suggest that land transport infrastructure is, on average, estimated to have a larger effect size on trade than the other infrastructure categories. The Hedges model suggest that maritime and air transportation infrastructure and communication infrastructure on the importer side are found to yield higher average effect sizes compared to elasticities obtained from composite infrastructure indexes.

Development Level of the Economy in Which the Infrastructure is Located

Both the REML and Hedges results suggest that exporter infrastructure matters more for trade if the exporting economy is developing rather than developed (also shown by the OLS model in the Appendix). This result was already noted previously and is commonly found in the literature. Moreover, importer infrastructure is less influential in trade when the importing economy is a developed one (also shown with the WLS model in the Appendix).

Sample Structure

The Hedges, REML, OLS and WLS MRAs all suggest that estimates obtained in studies where the units of analysis were sub-regional or firm level, a lower infrastructure elasticity of trade has been observed importer infrastructure. The same is found for exporter infrastructure, but only in the Hedges model. Sub-regional samples force the location where trade takes place and the location of infrastructure to be measured spatially more closer to one another. Therefore, such samples do not capture spillovers to the rest of the economy. The negative result on the variable *Sub-National or Firm Level* suggests that the estimated macro effects are larger than the micro effects.

Model Specification

The dummy variables are defined such that they are equal to unity when a particular covariate has been omitted from the primary regression. Consequently, the coefficients provide an explicit measure of omitted variable bias. The Hedges model results show some evidence that estimations which do not control for other infrastructure types (for example, if only road infrastructure is considered), the impact of importer infrastructure on trade is likely to be overestimated. The REML and Hedges models suggest that similar positive omitted variable bias arises for the importer infrastructure elasticity of trade when exporter infrastructure is not jointly considered (this is also found in the OLS and WLS MRAs).

Both models also suggest that excluding income and tariff or trade agreement variables can bias the estimate on exporter infrastructure downwards, while based on the Hedges results, an upward bias for importer infrastructure can result if tariffs or trade agreements are not controlled for. Both models suggest that omitting variables for education or human capital can cause a downward bias in the estimation of the importer infrastructure elasticity of trade (also found in the OLS and WLS MRAs). The same can be said for the estimation of both the exporter and importer infrastructure effect size based on the results of

both models if governance-related variables such as rule of law and corruption are omitted. Not considering population can cause the effect size of importer elasticity to be overestimated according to the Hedges results. Omitting the exchange rate in the trade regression leads to upward bias in the estimate for exporter infrastructure (also confirmed by the OLS and WLS MRAs).

Nature of Publication

Some evidence is provided by the Hedges model that studies which were published in highly ranked journals have estimated a larger effect size of importer infrastructure compared to other studies. A similar result is also the case for the advocacy variable: research published by institutes with potential advocacy motives for announcing a larger infrastructure effect have estimated, on average, a higher effect size for importer infrastructure. All advocacy coefficients are positive, but for exporter infrastructure, only the WLS one in the Appendix is statistically significant.

Model Prediction

A final useful exercise is to consider the goodness of fit of an MRA with respect to the set of effect sizes reported in the original studies. For this purpose we predicted for each study the mean squared error (MSE) of the comparison between the observed effect sizes and those predicted by the REML model (predictions by the Hedges model are more cumbersome). For each study, the MSE is reported in Table 11a for exporter infrastructure and Table 11b for importer infrastructure. Among the studies that contributed to both MRAs, the REML describes the studies of Raballand (2003), Grigoriou (2007), Bandyopadhyay (1999), Carrere (2006) and Brun et al. (2005) really well. On the other hand, the studies of Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2008), Fujimura & Edmonds (2006) and Ramos & Zarzoso (2005) yielded results that were not closely aligned with what the REML MRAs suggested.

TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

8. Concluding Remarks

In this study we have applied meta-analytic techniques to estimate the impact of exporter and importer infrastructure on trade and to examine the factors that influence the estimated elasticities of this impact. The initial dataset consisted of 542 estimates obtained

from 36 primary studies. We observe evidence that publication (or file drawer) bias exists in this strand of literature in question and apply the Hedges publication bias procedure.

The key result of our research is that the own infrastructure elasticity of the exports of a country is about 0.6 and own infrastructure elasticity on the imports of a country is about 0.3. This finding reconfirms that trade infrastructure is growth enhancing since it improves the external trade balance.

This result can be further elaborated. Assume that in a given economy, infrastructure is valued at about 50 percent of GDP (this is in line with e.g. the McKinsey (2013) report). The Hedges MRA results suggest that a 1 percent increase in infrastructure will increase exports by about 0.6 percent and imports by about 0.3 percent. Starting from a situation of exports and imports being of similar magnitude, net exports will then increase by about 0.3 percent of exports. Since $\Delta Y/Y = \Delta X/X \times X/Y$ where Y is GDP and X is exports, the impact of the increase of net exports on GDP will depend on the size of the external trade sector relative to GDP. Let $\alpha = X/Y$ be the export share in the economy. The cost of the infrastructure investment is $0.01 \times 0.5 \times Y$. The benefit of the infrastructure investment is $\Delta Y = 0.003\alpha Y$ for every year in the future. The present value of this perpetuity is $0.003\alpha Y/\beta$ where β is the discount rate. The Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) (although this is clearly just a rule of thumb and not a full cost-benefit analysis) is therefore $0.003\alpha Y/0.005\beta Y = 0.6\alpha/\beta$. The equivalent internal rate of return (IRR) is $0.003\alpha/0.005 = 0.6\alpha$. Take the case of an economy in which external trade accounts for 1/3 of GDP, i.e $\alpha = 0.333$ and the risk adjusted market interest rate is 10% ($\beta = 0.1$). Then $BCR = 2$ and $IRR = 20$ percent. It is therefore very attractive to invest in infrastructure.

On the other hand, external trade may matter less in an economy. Assume that external trade accounts for only 10 percent of GDP. Then, $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.1$, and $BCR = 0.6$ and the IRR is only 6 percent, which may be less than the relevant real interest rate and the infrastructure investment could be wasteful. Hence the actual return depends on trade openness and the potential for endogenous growth resulting from trade expansion.

The question remains what causes this differential impact of exporter infrastructure on exports vis-à-vis imports. Consider the export demand function as presented by Anderson and van Wincoop (2003):

$$x_{ij} = \left(\frac{\beta_i p_i t_{ij}}{P_j} \right)^{(1-\sigma)} y_j \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) implies that a decline in t due to improved infrastructure raises the demand for a country i 's (or region's) exports. Given that an exporting firm is a price taker in the foreign market and bears the transportation costs to compete there, increases in the stock or quality of origin infrastructure raises the profitability of exports to all possible destinations. On the other hand, from the point of view of a foreign firm that supplies imports to country i , this infrastructure enhancement in the home economy lowers the cost of transportation to one destination only. Thus, an increase in infrastructure affects all exports of the local firm but it affects only a proportion of the exports of foreign firm. Because imports are more income elastic than price elastic, the effect of the decrease in the price of imports (which already included the foreign freight and insurance) relative to the domestic price will be small. Consequently, the change in infrastructure in country i impacts the behavior of the foreign firm that produces the imports less than that of the domestic firm that produces exports (assuming the infrastructure in other countries remained constant). Therefore, the marginal impact is larger on exports than on imports.

Moreover, there may also be structural asymmetries and intangible aspects adding to this difference in the exporter and importer infrastructure elasticities of trade. Infrastructure may be tailored more towards exports and not be neutral to the direction of trade. Even if the quality and stock of infrastructure is identical, the way it is utilized may differ between incoming and outgoing traffic of goods. Differences between the two functions of the same infrastructure can be due to choices such as the amount of personnel allocated or prices charged for infrastructure utilization. Another possibility that causes this asymmetry may be due to political factors. If exporters have politically more lobbying power than importers, new infrastructure approved by governments may be biased to benefit exporters more than importers.

References

- Anderson, J.E., & van Wincoop, E. (2003). Gravity with Gravitas: A Solution to the Border Puzzle. *American Economic Review*, 93(1), 170-192.
- Anderson, J.E., & van Wincoop, E. (2004). Trade Costs. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42(3), 691-751.
- Ashenfelter, O., Harmon, C., & Oosterbeek, H. (1999). A Review of Estimates of the Schooling/Earnings Relationship, with Tests for Publication Bias. *Labour Economics*, 6(4), 453-470.
- ABDC (2010). Australian Business Deans Council Journal Quality List, Australian Business Deans Council. Retrieved on September 24 2012 from <http://www.abdc.edu.au/>

- Bandyopadhyay, U. (1999). Trade and the Distribution Sector: Some Evidence from OECD Countries. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 32(5), 1299-1312.
- Becker, B.J. and Wu, M.-J. (2007) The Synthesis of Regression Slopes in Meta-Analysis. *Statistical Science*, 22(3), 414-429.
- Bergstrand, J.H. (1985). The Gravity Equation in International Trade: Some Microeconomic Foundations and Empirical Evidence. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(3), 474-481.
- Biehl, D. (1986). *The Contribution of Infrastructure to Regional Development: Final Report*. Luxembourg & Washington, DC: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities - European Community Information Service [distributor].
- Bouët, A., Mishra, S., & Roy, D. (2008). *Does Africa Trade Less than It Should, and If So, Why?: The Role of Market Access and Domestic Factors*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Bougheas, S., Demetriades, P.O., & Morgenroth, E.L. (1999). Infrastructure, Transport Costs and Trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 47(1), 169-189.
- Bruinsma, F., Nijkamp, P. & Rietveld, P. (1989). Employment Impacts of Infrastructure Investments: a Case Study for the Netherlands. Serie Research Memoranda 0051, Faculty of Economics, Business Administration and Econometrics, VU University Amsterdam.
- Brun, J.-F., Carrère, C., Guillaumont, P., & de Melo, J. (2005). Has Distance Died? Evidence from a Panel Gravity Model. *World Bank Economic Review*, 19(1), 99 -120.
- Buys, P., Deichmann, U., & Wheeler, D. (2010). Road Network Upgrading and Overland Trade Expansion in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Economies*, 19(3), 399-432.
- Carrere, C. (2006). Revisiting the Effects of Regional Trade Agreements on Trade Flows with Proper Specification of the Gravity Model. *European Economic Review*, 50(2), 223-247.
- Casas, F.R. (1983). International Trade with Produced Transport Services. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35(1), 89-109.
- Cipollina, M., & Pietrovito, F. (2011). Trade Impact of EU Preferential Policies: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature. In: De Benedictis, L. & Salvatici, L. (eds) *The Trade Impact of European Union Preferential Policies*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Cipollina, M., & Salvatici, L. (2010). Reciprocal Trade Agreements in Gravity Models: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of International Economics*, 18(1), 63-80.
- Coulibaly, S., & Fontagne, L. (2005). South-South Trade: Geography Matters. *Journal of African Economies*, 15(2), 313-341.
- De, P. (2008). Empirical Estimates of Trade Costs for Asia. Mimeo. New Delhi: Research and Information System for Developing Countries (RIS).
- de Groot H.L.F., Poot, J. and Smit, M.J. (2009) Agglomeration Externalities, Innovation and Regional Growth: Theoretical Perspectives and Meta-Analysis. In: Capello, R. & Nijkamp, P. (eds) *Handbook of Regional Growth and Development Theories*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Dettmer, B. (2011). International Service Transactions: Is Time a Trade Barrier in a Connected World? *Jena Economic Research Papers*, 2011 – 003. Jena: Friedrich-Schiller-University.
- Donaghy, K.P. (2009). Regional Growth and Trade in the New Economic Geography and Other Recent Theories. In: Capello, R. & Nijkamp, P. (eds) *Handbook of Regional Growth and Development Theories*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Doucouliaagos, H., & Laroche, P. (2009). Unions and Profits: A Meta-Regression Analysis. *Industrial Relations*, 48(1), 146-184.

- Egger, P. & Larch, M. (2008). The Bilateral and Multilateral Trade Effects of Road and Railway Transport Infrastructure. Munich, Germany: Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich.
- Egger, M., Smith, G.D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in Meta-Analysis Detected by a Simple, Graphical Test. *British Medical Journal*, 315(7109), 629-634.
- Elbadawi, I.A., (1999). Can Africa Export Manufactures? The Role of Endowment, Exchange Rates, and Transaction Costs. *Policy Research Working Paper 2120*, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Elbadawi, I., Mengistae, T., & Zeufack, A. (2006). Market Access, Supplier Access, and Africa's Manufactured Exports: A Firm Level Analysis. *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 15(4), 493-523.
- Engels, E.A., Schmid, C.H., Terrin, N., Olkin, I., & Lau, J. (2000). Heterogeneity and Statistical Significance in Meta-Analysis: an Empirical Study of 125 Meta-Analyses. *Statistics in Medicine*, 19(13), 1707-1728.
- Florax, R.J.G.M., Groot, H.L.F. de, & de Mooij, R.A. (2002). Meta-analysis: A Tool for Upgrading Inputs of Macroeconomic Policy Models. Discussion Paper TI 2002-041/3. Amsterdam: Tinbergen Institute.
- Francois, J., & Manchin, M. (2007). Institutions, Infrastructure and Trade. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4152*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Fujimura, M., & Edmonds, J. (2006). Impact of Cross-border Transport Infrastructure on Trade and Investment in the GMS. *Asian Development Bank Institute Discussion Paper 48*. Tokyo: Asian Development Institute.
- Fujita, M., Krugman, P., & Venables, A.J. (1999). *The Spatial Economy: Cities, Regions, and International Trade*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Genc, M., Gheasi, M., Nijkamp, P. & Poot, J. (2012). The Impact of Immigration on International Trade: a Meta-Analysis. In: Nijkamp, P., Poot, J. and M. Sahin (eds) *Migration Impact Assessment: New Horizons*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Geraci, V.J., & Prewo, W. (1977). Bilateral Trade Flows and Transport Costs. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 59(1), 67-74.
- Glass, G.V. (1976). Primary, Secondary, and Meta-Analysis of Research. *Educational Researcher*, 5(10), 3-8.
- Granato, M.F. (2008). Regional Export Performance: First Nature, Agglomeration ... And Destiny? The Role of Infrastructure. Mimeo. Rio Cuarto, Argentina: National University of Rio Cuarto.
- Grigoriou, C. (2007). Landlockedness, Infrastructure and Trade: New Estimates for Central Asian Countries. Policy Research Working Paper 4335. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Harbord, R.M., & Higgins, J.P.T. (2008). Meta-regression in Stata. *Stata Journal*, 8(4), 493-519.
- Hedges, L.V. (1992). Modeling Publication Selection Effects in Meta-Analysis. *Statistical Science*, 7(2), 246-255.
- Hernandez, J., & Taningco, A. (2010). Behind-the-Border Determinants of Bilateral Trade Flows in East Asia. Working Paper 8010, *Asia-Pacific Research and Training Network on Trade (ARTNeT)*, an initiative of UNESCAP and IDRC, Canada.
- Holmgren, J. (2007). Meta-Analysis of Public Transport Demand. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 41(10), 1021-1035.
- Iwanow, T., & Kirkpatrick, C. (2007). Trade Facilitation, Regulatory Quality and Export Performance. *Journal of International Development*, 19(6), 735-753.
- Iwanow, T., & Kirkpatrick, C. (2008). Trade Facilitation and Manufactured Exports: Is Africa Different? *World Development*, 37(6), 1039-1050.

- Jansen M., Nordas, H.K., (2004). Institutions, Trade Policy and Trade Flows. *World Trade Organization Economic Research and Statistics Division Staff Working Paper*, No: ERSD-2004-02.
- Kurmanaliev, E., & Parpiev, Z. (2008). Geography and Trade in Central Asia. Mimeo. Tokyo, Japan: National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies.
- Lawless, M. (2010). Destinations of Irish Exports: A Gravity Model Approach. *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*, 34: 1-22.
- Limao, N., & Venables, A.J. (2001). Infrastructure, Geographical Disadvantage, Transport Costs, and Trade. *World Bank Economic Review*, 15(3), 451-479.
- Longo, R., & Sekkat, K. (2004). Economic Obstacles to Expanding Intra-African Trade. *World Development*, 32(8), 1309-1321.
- Marquez-Ramos, L. & Martinez-Zarzoso, I. (2005). Does Heterogeneity Matter in the Context of the Gravity Model? *Economics Bulletin*, 6(17), 1-7.
- Martin, P., & Rogers, C.A. (1995). Industrial Location and Public Infrastructure. *Journal of International Economics*, 39(3-4), 335-351.
- Martínez-Zarzoso, I., & Nowak-Lehmann, F. (2003). Augmented Gravity Model: An Empirical Application to Mercosur-European Union Trade Flows. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 6(2), 291-316.
- McKinsey (2013) *Infrastructure Productivity: How to Save \$1 Trillion a Year*. McKinsey Global Institute.
- Mundell, R.A. (1957). International Trade and Factor Mobility. *American Economic Review*, 47(3), 321-335.
- Nicoletti, G., Golub, S., Hajkova D., Mirza, D., Yoo, K. (2003). Policies and International Integration: Influences on Trade and Foreign Direct Investment. *OECD Economics Department Working Papers* 359. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Nijkamp, P. (1986). Infrastructure and Regional Development: A Multidimensional Policy Analysis. *Empirical Economics*, 11(1), 1-21.
- Nijkamp, P., Gheasi, M., & Rietveld, P. (2011). Migrants and International Economic Linkages: A Meta-Overview. *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 6(4), 359-376.
- Nijkamp, P., & Poot, J. (2004). Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Fiscal Policies on Long-Run Growth. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 20(1), 91-124.
- Nijkamp, P., & Poot, J. (2005). The Last Word on the Wage Curve? *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 421-450.
- Ninkovic, J., (2009) What Determines Export Success in Labor-Intensive Goods? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISA's 50th Annual Convention "Exploring the Past, Anticipating the Future", New York Marriott Marquis, New York City, USA.
- Njinkeu, D., Wilson, J.S., & Powo Fosso, B. (2008). *Expanding Trade within Africa: the Impact of Trade Facilitation*. Policy Research Working Paper 4790. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Nordås, H. K. and Piermartini, R. (2004). Infrastructure and Trade. WTO Staff Working Paper ERSD-2004-04. Geneva, Switzerland: Economic Research and Statistics Division WTO.
- Ozgen, C., Nijkamp, P., & Poot, J. (2010). The Effect of Migration on Income Growth and Convergence: Meta-Analytic Evidence. *Papers in Regional Science*, 89(3), 537-561.
- Persson, M. (2008). Trade Facilitation and the EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements. *Journal of Economic Integration*, 23(3), 518-546.
- Peters, J.L., Sutton, A.J., Jones, D.R., Abrams, K.R., Rushton, L., & Moreno, S.G. (2010). Assessing Publication Bias in Meta-Analyses in the Presence of Between-Study Heterogeneity. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 173(3), 575-591.

- Poot, J. (2013). Meta-Analysis of Previous Empirical Research Findings. In: Stimson, R.J. (ed.) *Handbook for Spatially Integrated Social Science Research Methods*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Portugal-Perez, A., & Wilson, J. S. (2012). Export Performance and Trade Facilitation Reform: Hard and Soft Infrastructure. *World Development*, 40(7), 1295-1307.
- Raballand, G. (2003). Determinants of the Negative Impact of Being Landlocked on Trade: An Empirical Investigation through the Central Asian Case. *Comparative Economic Studies*, 45(4), 520-536.
- Ridhwan, M.M., De Groot, H.L.F., Nijkamp, P., & Rietveld, P. (2010). The Impact of Monetary Policy on Economic Activity - Evidence from a Meta-Analysis. *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper 10-043/3*. Amsterdam: Tinbergen Institute.
- Samuelson, P.A. (1952). The Transfer Problem and Transport Costs: The Terms of Trade When Impediments are Absent. *Economic Journal*, 62(246), 278-304.
- Samuelson, P.A. (1954). The Transfer Problem and Transport Costs, II: Analysis of Effects of Trade Impediments. *The Economic Journal*, 64(254), 264-289.
- Shadish, W.R., & Haddock, C.K. (1994) Combining Estimates of Effect Size. In: H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (eds), *Handbook of Research Synthesis*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Shepherd, B., Wilson, J. S. (2006). Road Infrastructure in Europe and Central Asia: Does Network Quality Affect Trade? World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4104. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Stanley, T.D. (2001). Wheat From Chaff: Meta-Analysis As Quantitative Literature Review. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3), 131–150.
- Stanley, T.D. (2005). Beyond Publication Bias. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 309-345.
- Stanley, T.D. (2008). Meta-regression Methods for Detecting and Estimating Empirical Effects in the Presence of Publication Selection. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 70(1), 103-127.
- Stanley, T.D., Doucouliagos, C., & Jarrell, S.B. (2008). Meta-regression Analysis as the Socio-economics of Economics Research. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(1), 276-292.
- Stanley, T.D., Doucouliagos, H., Giles, M., Heckemeyer, J.H., Johnston, R.J., Loroche, P., Nelson, J.P., Paldam, M., Poot, J., Pugh, G., Rosenberger, R.S. and Rost, K. (2013) Meta-analysis of economics research reporting guidelines. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 27(2), 390-394.
- Stanley, T.D., & Jarrell, S.B. (1989). Meta-Regression Analysis: A Quantitative Method of Literature Surveys. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 3(2), 161.
- UNECA (2010). Supply-and-Demand Constraints to Intra-Africa Trade. In: *Assessing Regional Integration in Africa IV*, Chapter 9. Addis Adaba: Ethiopia: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.
- Vijil, M., & Wagner, L. (2012). Does Aid for Trade Enhance Export Performance? Investigating the Infrastructure Channel. *World Economy*, 35(7), 838–868.
- Von Thünen, J.H. (1826) *Der Isolierte Staat in Beziehung auf Landschaft und Nationalökonomie*. Hamburg.
- Wilson, J.S., Mann, C.L., & Otsuki, T. (2004). Assessing the Benefits of Trade Facilitation: A Global Perspective. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3224*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Wu, Y. (2007). Export Performance in China's Regional Economies. *Applied Economics*, 39(10), 1283-1293.

Table 1a. Primary Studies Included in the Sample

Author(s)	Geographical Coverage	Methods	Trade Measures	Infrastructure Measurement
1. Bandyopadhyay (1999)	23 OECD countries	OLS, IV, Cross Section, Fixed Effects	Total Exports	Density of road and railway network
2. Bougheas <i>et al.</i> (1999)	9 Core EU and Scandinavian countries	SUR, IV-SUR	Total Exports	The product of the stocks of public capital of exporter and importer
3. Elbadawi (1999)	32 Developing countries	Bilateral RE	Manufactured Exports/GDP	Length of paved roads
4. Limao & Venables (2001)	103 World countries	Tobit, FE	Total Imports	Index made using road and rail lengths, phone lines per person
5. Martínez-Zarzoso & Nowak-Lehmann (2003)	EU, Mercosur countries, Chile (20 countries)	OLS, OLS on means, FE, RE, Dynamic Panel	Total Exports	Index made using road and rail lengths, phone lines per person
6. Nicoletti <i>et al.</i> (2003)	28 OECD countries	Transformed Least Squares, FE	Services Exports	Length of motorways, no. of aircraft departures
7. Raballand (2003)	18 Land-locked countries, 10 Island countries, 18 Partners	2SLS, regression on FE's	Total Imports	Index made of road and railroad networks
8. Jansen & Nordas (2004)	101 World countries	OLS	Total Imports	Index of road and railroad length, phone lines, quality of ports, density of airports
9. Nordas & Piermartini (2004)	138 World countries	OLS, FE	Exports of Various Sectors	Index from no. of airports and aircraft departures, density of paved roads, telephone lines, a port efficiency index, median clearance time
10. Wilson <i>et al.</i> (2004)	75 World countries and sub-samples	OLS, WLS, Clustered SE's	Manufactured Exports	Indexes from port facilities, inland waterways, and air transport
11. Brun <i>et al.</i> (2005)	130 World countries, sub-samples	RE, IV	Total Imports	Index made from roads and railway length, and no. of telephone sets
12. Coulibaly & Fontagne (2005)	7 "South" countries	2SLS, FE	Total Imports	Paved bilateral roads
13. Márquez-Ramos & Martínez-Zarzoso (2005)	62 World countries	OLS, Tobit	Total Exports	Index made of various road type lengths
14. Carrere (2006)	130 World countries	OLS, RE, Hausman-Taylor	Total Imports	Average road, railroad and telephone line density
15. Elbadawi <i>et al.</i> (2006)	18 Developing countries	Maximum Likelihood, Reduced Form Tobit IV	Total Exports	Road density
16. Fujimura & Edmonds (2006)	6 Southeast Asian countries	OLS, GLS (RE)	Major exports via land or river	Road density
17. Shepherd & Wilson (2006)	27 European and Central Asian countries	OLS, FE, RE, Poisson ML, Negative Binomial Estimator, Bootstrapped SE's	Total Exports	Road quality index between the trading partners
18. De (2007)	10 Asian countries	OLS	Total Imports	Index from road and railroad density, air and port traffic, fleet share in world, phone lines, and electricity consumption
19. Francois & Manchin (2007)	140 World countries with sub-samples	OLS, Heckman Selection, Tobit	Total Imports	Index made of transportation and communication Indicators
20. Grigoriou (2007)	167 World countries	GLS, FE, RE, Hausman-Taylor Estimator.	Total Imports	Density of the roads, railroads, and no. of phone lines
21. Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2007)	78 World countries	GLS, Heckman selection	Manufactured Exports	Index from density of roads and railroads, and no. of phone subscribers

Table 1a. (Cont'd) Primary Studies Included in the Sample

Author(s)	Geographical Coverage	Methods	Trade Measures	Infrastructure Measurement
22. Persson (2007)	128 Countries (22 EU and 106 Developing countries)	Heckman Selection	Total Imports	No. of aircraft takeoffs
23. Bouet <i>et al.</i> (2008)	42 African countries, and their trade partners	OLS, Heckman Selection, Tobit	Total Exports	Road lengths and no. of phone lines
24. Egger & Larch (2008)	180 World Countries	FE, Gaussian, Gamma, Poisson Pseudo ML, Negative Binomial Estimator	Total Exports	Total road length
25. Granato (2008)	5 Argentinian regions and 23 trade partner countries	OLS, Poisson pseudo ML	Total Exports	Index from road length, electricity and gas consumption, no of phone subscribers
26. Kurmanalieva & Parpiev (2008)	171 World Countries	FE	Total Imports	Road density
27. Nijnkeu <i>et al.</i> (2008)	100 World Countries and sub-samples	OLS, FE, Tobit	Manufactured Exports	Index made from port and air transport infrastructure quality
28. Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2009)	124 World Countries and sub-samples	GLS, Heckman selection	Manufactured Exports	Index made of road and rail density, no. of phone subscribers
29. Ninkovic (2009)	26 Developing countries	FE, RE	Export share of labor-intensive sectors (sum) in GDP	Road, railroad, and phone line density
30. Buys <i>et al.</i> (2010)	36 Sub-Saharan Countries	OLS	Total Exports	Road quality index between the trading partners
31. Hernandez & Taningco (2010)	11 East Asian Countries	OLS	Total Imports, Imports of industrial supplies	Quality of port infrastructure
32. Lawless (2010)	Ireland and 137 trade partners	OLS	Total Exports	Density of phones and computers
33. UN Economic Commission for Africa (2010)	52 African countries and 48 non-African trade partners	Tobit	Total Exports	Road and phone line density
34. Dettmer (2011)	27 OECD countries and their trade partners	OLS, FE	ICT network and commercial service exports	Density of communication infrastructure and air traffic
35. Portugal-Perrez & Wilson (2012)	101 World Countries	OLS, Heckman Selection, Tobit, Poisson ML	Total Exports, Exports of New Goods	Indexes from quality of ports, roads, airports, ICT indicators, and railroads
36. Vijil & Wagner (2012)	96 Developing countries	OLS, IV	Total Exports, Exports/GDP	Index from road density and no. of phone subscribers

Table 1b. Descriptive Statistics by Primary Study

		Export Equation				Import Equation			
Author(s)	Location of Infrastructure	Obs.	Mean	Min	Max	Obs.	Mean	Min	Max
1. Bandyopadhyay (1999)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	8	0.35	0.14	0.52				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	8	0.01	-0.23	0.29				
2. Bougheas <i>et al.</i> (1999)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>	8	5.40	0.18	15.13				
3. Elbadawi (1999)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	4	0.56	0.46	0.64				
4. Limao & Venables (2001)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					3	1.10	1.10	1.11
	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>					4	0.64	0.58	0.77
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					4	1.38	1.32	1.45
5. Martinez-Zarzoso & Nowak-Lehmann (2003)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	13	0.05	-0.02	0.12				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	13	-0.05	-0.08	0.01				
6. Nicoletti <i>et al.</i> (2003)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>	4	0.33	0.21	0.38				
7. Raballand (2003)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					5	0.22	0.20	0.24
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					5	0.11	0.09	0.13
8. Jansen & Nordas (2004)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					3	0.70	0.67	0.73
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					3	0.45	0.35	0.55
9. Nordas & Piermartini (2004)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					40	0.27	-0.19	1.29
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					40	0.27	-0.60	2.14
10. Wilson <i>et al.</i> (2004)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	11	0.91	0.54	1.06				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	11	0.28	-0.28	0.47				
11. Brun <i>et al.</i> (2005)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					4	0.40	0.12	1.18
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					4	0.10	0.06	0.19
12. Coulibaly & Fontagne (2005)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>					12	1.72	1.17	2.77
13. Ramos & Zarzoso (2005)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	5	0.53	-0.29	1.38				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	5	0.38	-0.47	1.27				
14. Carrere (2006)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					5	0.10	0.01	0.41
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					5	0.07	0.02	0.20
15. Elbadawi <i>et al.</i> (2006)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	2	0.08	0.03	0.13				
16. Fujimura & Edmonds (2006)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	10	0.37	-0.66	1.47				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	10	0.30	-1.40	2.15				
17. Shepherd & Wilson (2006)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>	32	0.46	-2.09	1.50				
18. De (2007)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					14	0.13	-0.39	0.40
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					14	-0.12	-0.49	0.30
19. Francois & Manchin (2007)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					38	0.16	-0.01	1.17

Table 1b. (Cont'd) Descriptive Statistics by Primary Study

		Export Equation				Import Equation			
Author(s)	Location of Infrastructure	Obs.	Mean	Min	Max	Obs.	Mean	Min	Max
20. Grigoriou (2007)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					10	0.24	0.20	0.51
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					10	0.27	0.23	0.29
21. Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2007)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	11	1.05	0.68	1.76				
22. Persson (2007)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					1	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>					1	0.02	0.02	0.02
23. Bouet <i>et al.</i> (2008)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	24	0.24	-1.19	1.61				
24. Egger & Larch (2008)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>								
	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>	18	0.27	-0.02	2.85				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>								
25. Granato (2008)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	4	1.36	1.22	1.69				
26. Kurmanalieva <i>et al.</i> (2008)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>					1	0.05	0.05	0.05
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	1	0.05	0.05	0.05				
27. Nijnkeu <i>et al.</i> (2008)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	12	2.11	1.08	4.54				
	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	12	3.74	-0.69	8.62				
28. Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2009)	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	9	0.91	0.66	1.68				
29. Ninkovic (2009)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	4	-0.02	-0.60	0.34				
30. Buys <i>et al.</i> (2010)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	6	1.90	1.58	2.07				
31. Hernandez & Taningco (2010)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>					9	1.69	-2.36	8.10
32. Lawless (2010)	<i>Importer Infrastructure</i>	8	0.23	-0.17	0.58				
33. UN Economic Commission for Africa (2010)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	6	0.21	0.13	0.32				
34. Dettmer (2011)	<i>Combined or Transit Infrastructure</i>	20	0.06	-0.11	0.16				
35. Portugal-Perrez & Wilson (2012)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	14	-0.07	-1.68	0.87				
36. Vijil & Wagner (2012)	<i>Exporter Infrastructure</i>	14	1.68	0.47	2.39				
Overall	<i>Any Infrastructure Location</i>	307	0.76	-2.09	15.13	235	0.38	-2.36	8.10

Table 2. Variable Definitions

Variable Label	Definition
Methodology	
<i>Model Accounts for Zero Trade Flows Selection (Heckman, Tobit, Probit)</i>	Estimation is done by Heckman, Tobit, or Probit based sample selection procedures.
<i>Model Accounts for Endogeneity (IV-Based Estimation)</i>	Estimation attempts to deal with endogeneity by using instrumental variables or lags.
<i>Gravity Model</i>	The equation estimates the impact on origin-destination trade flows.
The Point at Which the Trade is Measured	
<i>Dependent Variable is Exports</i>	The effect size is obtained from an equation where the dependent variable is exports.
<i>Dependent Variable is Imports</i>	The effect size is obtained from an equation where the dependent variable is imports (Reference category).
Infrastructure Category	
Categorical variable with levels:	
<i>Land Transport Infrastructure</i>	The infrastructure variable measures roads or railroads.
<i>Maritime or Air Transport Infrastructure</i>	The infrastructure variable measures port or airport infrastructure.
<i>Communication Infrastructure</i>	The infrastructure variable measures communication infrastructure.
<i>Composite Measure (Index)</i>	The infrastructure measure is a composite index made from multiple types of infrastructure (Reference category).
Development Level of the Economy in which the Infrastructure is Located	
<i>Developed Economy</i>	All economies in which the infrastructure is measured are developed.
<i>Developing Economy</i>	All economies in which the infrastructure is measured are developing.
<i>Both Types of Economies (Mixed Sample)</i>	The study focuses on samples that include both developing and developed economies (Reference category).
Sample Structure	
<i>Sub-National or Firm Level</i>	The unit of observation is a sub-national region or firm.
<i>Not Cross-Section</i>	The primary study uses more than one time period.
Model Specification	
<i>Constrained Model</i>	The dependent variable is scaled by GDP, or a common single indicator such as a product or a sum of the exporter and importer GDP is included as an explanatory variable.
<i>Estimation Excludes Other Infrastructure Type(s)</i>	The equation takes into account only one kind of infrastructure, or the measured infrastructure type is not a composite index made from multiple types.
<i>Model Does not Control for Transit or Partner Infrastructure</i>	The model considers the infrastructure of only one trade partner, without taking into account the infrastructure of the other partner or the transit infrastructure.
<i>Equation Excludes Multilateral Resistances</i>	Study does not specifically control for multilateral resistance terms or use importer and exporter fixed effects.
<i>Equation Excludes Income</i>	GDP, per capita GDP, or per capita income difference is not included as a separate variable.
<i>Tariffs or Trade Agreements Not Considered</i>	Estimation does not control for the effects of tariffs or trade agreements/blocks.
<i>Equation Excludes Spatial/Geographic Variables</i>	Landlockedness, distance, or adjacency is not included.

Table 2. (Cont'd) Variable Definitions

Variable Label	Definition
<i>Equation Excludes Education and Human Capital</i>	An education or human capital variable is not included.
<i>Population Not Considered</i>	Population is not included as a separate variable.
<i>Governance Variable(s) Not Included</i>	A variable controlling for government effectiveness, corruption, rule of law, accountability, business regulation, or regulatory quality is not included.
<i>Equation Excludes Exchange Rate</i>	An exchange rate variable is not included.
<i>Equation Excludes Colonial, Cultural, Linguistic Relations</i>	Colonial or cultural relationships are not accounted for
Other Study Characteristics	
<i>Highly Ranked Journals</i>	Equals one if the study is published in a journal with rank A*, A, or B, equals zero if the rank is C or D, using ABDC (2010) ranking.
<i>Advocacy</i>	Publisher of the Study is World Bank, OECD, WTO, or UN.

Table 3. Effect Sizes by Direction of Trade

	<u>Exporter Infrastructure</u>				<u>Importer Infrastructure</u>			
	Obs	Mean	Min	Max	No. Obs	Mean	Min	Max
Exports	129	0.50	-1.19	1.88	70	0.22	-1.40	1.78
Imports	108	0.15	-0.39	0.61	72	0.09	-0.44	0.59
Overall	237	0.34	-1.19	1.88	142	0.16	-1.40	1.78

Table 4. Effect Sizes by Methodology

	<u>Exporter Infrastructure</u>				<u>Importer Infrastructure</u>			
	Obs	Mean	Min	Max	No. Obs	Mean	Min	Max
Heckman Sample Selection, Tobit, or Probit	82	0.33	-1.19	1.76	15	0.49	-0.69	1.68
IV or Other Control for Endogeneity	24	0.44	0.01	1.88	19	0.15	-0.23	0.29
Other Estimation Method	133	0.32	-0.66	1.69	108	0.11	-1.40	1.78
Overall	237 ¹⁰	0.34	-1.19	1.88	142	0.16	-1.40	1.78

¹⁰ As stated earlier, Elbadawi et al. (2006) uses IV and Tobit, resulting the observations to sum to 239 rather than 237.

Table 5. Effect Sizes By Infrastructure Category

	<u>Exporter Infrastructure</u>				<u>Importer Infrastructure</u>			
	Obs	Mean	Min	Max	No. Obs	Mean	Min	Max
Land Transport Infrastructure	43	0.36	-0.66	1.61	22	0.15	-1.40	1.78
Maritime or Air Transport Infrastructure	13	0.16	-0.07	0.61	11	0.14	-0.10	0.59
Communication Infrastructure	56	0.08	-1.19	0.71	20	0.12	-0.21	0.58
Composite Measure (Index)	125	0.47	-0.90	1.88	89	0.17	-0.69	1.68
Overall	237	0.34	-1.19	1.88	142	0.16	-1.40	1.78

Table 6. Effect Sizes By the Development Level of the Economy in which the Infrastructure is Located

	<u>Exporter Infrastructure</u>				<u>Importer Infrastructure</u>			
	Obs	Mean	Min	Max	No. Obs	Mean	Min	Max
Developed Economy	9	0.32	0.12	0.52	11	0.05	-0.23	0.34
Developing Economy	72	0.49	-1.19	1.88	11	0.07	-1.40	1.78
Both Types of Economies (Mixed Sample)	156	0.27	-0.90	1.44	120	0.18	-0.69	1.68
Overall	237	0.34	-1.19	1.88	142	0.16	-1.40	1.78

Table 7. Effect Sizes By Publication Quality

	<u>Exporter Infrastructure</u>				<u>Importer Infrastructure</u>			
	Obs	Mean	Min	Max	No. Obs	Mean	Min	Max
Highly Ranked Journals	67	0.40	-0.90	1.88	44	0.20	-0.23	1.68
Other Journals and Unpublished	170	0.31	-1.19	1.69	98	0.14	-1.40	1.78
Overall	237	0.34	-1.19	1.88	142	0.16	-1.40	1.78

Table 8. Egger Tests

VARIABLES	Egger Test		Extended Egger Test	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
bias	7.009*** (0.632)	2.308*** (0.566)	4.318*** (0.736)	-0.464 (0.442)
Observations	237	142	237	142
R-squared	0.344	0.106	0.705	0.852

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 9. Hedges Publication Bias

Study Characteristics not Considered

Exporter Infrastructure Assuming Publication Bias			Exporter Infrastructure not Assuming Publication Bias		
		SE			SE
ω_2	0.739***	(0.193)	ω_2		
ω_3	0.137***	(0.0395)	ω_3		
RE	0.225***	(0.0231)	RE	0.292***	(0.0262)
τ	0.341***	(0.0177)	τ	0.382***	(0.0209)
Log-likelihood	109.7		Log-likelihood	78.06	
n	237		n	237	
Importer Infrastructure Assuming Publication Bias			Importer Infrastructure not Assuming Publication Bias		
		SE			SE
ω_2	0.280***	(0.105)	ω_2		
ω_3	0.120***	(0.0368)	ω_3		
RE	0.101***	(0.0187)	RE	0.158***	(0.0272)
τ	0.231***	(0.0165)	τ	0.300***	(0.0228)
Log-likelihood	97.84		Log-likelihood	71.03	
n	142		n	142	
Study Characteristics Considered					
Exporter Infrastructure Assuming Publication Bias			Exporter Infrastructure not Assuming Publication Bias		
		SE			SE
ω_2	0.747***	(0.196)	ω_2		
ω_3	0.156***	(0.0464)	ω_3		
RE	0.254***	(0.0199)	RE	0.300***	(0.0210)
τ	0.255***	(0.0145)	τ	0.273***	(0.0163)
Log-likelihood	168.3		Log-likelihood	142.7	
n	237		n	237	
Importer Infrastructure Assuming Publication Bias			Importer Infrastructure not Assuming Publication Bias		
		SE			SE
ω_2	0.0716***	(0.0266)	ω_2		
ω_3	0.0142***	(0.00409)	ω_3		
RE	0.259***	(0.0191)	RE	0.256***	(0.0499)
τ	0.0302***	(0.00590)	τ	0.136***	(0.0160)
Log-likelihood	210.0		Log-likelihood	134.1	
n	142		n	142	

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 10. Estimation Results

	REML		Hedges	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
Methodology				
<i>Model Accounts for Zero Trade Flows Selection (Heckman, Tobit, Probit)</i>	-0.103 (0.0803)	-0.128 (0.143)	-0.108* (0.0629)	0.0888** (0.0371)
<i>Model Accounts for Endogeneity (IV-Based Estimation)</i>	0.256** (0.113)	-0.0453 (0.111)	0.245*** (0.0949)	-0.0187 (0.0194)
<i>Gravity Model</i>	-0.362 (0.346)		-0.347 (0.296)	
The Point at Which the Trade is Measured				
<i>Dependent Variable is Exports</i>	0.410*** (0.143)	-0.117 (0.138)	0.345*** (0.115)	-0.126*** (0.0366)
Infrastructure Category				
<i>Land Transport Infrastructure</i>	0.197** (0.0770)	0.106 (0.0889)	0.170*** (0.0611)	0.0743*** (0.0245)
<i>Maritime or Air Transport Infrastructure</i>	0.0239 (0.0877)	0.115 (0.117)	0.0413 (0.0691)	0.0592** (0.0254)
<i>Communication Infrastructure</i>	0.0611 (0.0901)	0.0591 (0.0835)	0.0674 (0.0727)	0.0555** (0.0229)
<i>Composite Measure (Index)</i>				
	Reference Dummy			
Development Level of the Economy in Which the Infrastructure is Located				
<i>Developing Economy</i>	0.229*** (0.0705)	-0.138 (0.141)	0.169*** (0.0574)	-0.00963 (0.0383)
<i>Developed Economy</i>	0.163 (0.203)	-0.0547 (0.132)	0.122 (0.159)	-0.124*** (0.0320)
<i>Both Types of Economies (Mixed Sample)</i>				
	Reference Dummy			

Table 10. (Cont'd) Estimation Results

	REML		Hedges	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
Sample Structure				
<i>Sub-National or Firm Level</i>	-0.383 (0.269)	-0.474** (0.203)	-0.476** (0.204)	-0.495*** (0.0550)
<i>Not Cross-Section</i>	0.0661 (0.111)	0.190* (0.106)	0.0951 (0.0919)	0.161*** (0.0342)
Model Specification				
<i>Constrained Model</i>	0.0469 (0.180)	0.314 (0.281)	-0.00682 (0.155)	0.0758 (0.0623)
<i>Estimation Excludes Other Infrastructure Categories</i>	0.00950 (0.150)	0.255 (0.176)	0.0424 (0.126)	0.113** (0.0506)
<i>Model Does not Control for Transit or Partner Infrastructure</i>	-0.188 (0.195)	0.644** (0.296)	-0.145 (0.162)	0.439*** (0.0788)
<i>Equation Excludes Multilateral Resistances</i>	-0.126 (0.134)	0.0399 (0.141)	-0.0877 (0.106)	0.0474 (0.0360)
<i>Equation Excludes Income</i>	-0.535* (0.298)		-0.379* (0.228)	
<i>Tariffs or Trade Agreements Not Considered</i>	-0.291** (0.130)	0.0943 (0.116)	-0.240** (0.104)	0.130*** (0.0265)
<i>Equation Excludes Spatial/Geographic Variables</i>	-0.0600 (0.116)	-0.105 (0.0923)	-0.105 (0.0946)	0.000848 (0.0161)
<i>Equation Excludes Education and Human Capital</i>	0.0476 (0.137)	-0.911*** (0.282)	0.131 (0.111)	-0.829*** (0.0708)
<i>Population Not Considered</i>	0.0466 (0.0821)	0.0584 (0.0909)	0.0289 (0.0655)	0.101*** (0.0246)
<i>Governance Variable(s) Not Included</i>	-0.395*** (0.0902)	-0.425*** (0.156)	-0.402*** (0.0731)	-0.297*** (0.0458)
<i>Equation Excludes Exchange Rate</i>	0.293*** (0.0964)	0.000271 (0.0852)	0.281*** (0.0779)	0.00635 (0.0150)
<i>Equation Excludes Colonial, Cultural, Linguistic Relations</i>	0.0261 (0.179)	0.140 (0.126)	0.00984 (0.158)	0.0296 (0.0463)

Table 10. (Cont'd) Estimation Results

Nature of Publication	REML		Hedges	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
<i>Highly Ranked Journals</i>	-0.0261 (0.139)	0.316 (0.240)	-0.0129 (0.112)	0.122** (0.0560)
<i>Advocacy</i>	0.128 (0.135)	0.362 (0.245)	0.0650 (0.112)	0.115** (0.0500)
<i>Constant</i>	0.302*** (0.0242)	0.258*** (0.0721)	0.254*** (0.0199)	0.259*** (0.0191)
<i>Log-Likelihood</i>	75.25	67.45	168.3	210.0
τ	0.09	0.03		
<i>Proportion of Between Study Variance Explained</i>	0.40	0.66		
<i>% Residual Variance Due to Heterogeneity</i>	0.981	0.828		
<i>Observations</i>	237	142	237	142

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 11a. Ranking of the Studies by their Mean Squared Errors: Exporter Infrastructure

Author	MSE
Kurmanalieva & Parpiev (2008)	0.002
Brun <i>et al.</i> (2005)	0.005
Raballand (2003)	0.023
Bandyopadhyay (1999)	0.043
Persson (2007)	0.053
Carrere (2006)	0.058
Nordas & Piermartini (2004)	0.063
Elbadawi (1999)	0.087
Francois & Manchin (2007)	0.111
Grigoriou (2007)	0.151
Nijnkeu <i>et al.</i> (2008)	0.167
Wilson <i>et al.</i> (2004)	0.202
Martinez-Zarzoso & Nowak-Lehmann (2003)	0.211
Fujimura & Edmonds (2006)	0.389
Ninkovic (2009)	0.442
De (2007)	0.445
UNECA (2010)	0.518
Vijil & Wagner (2012)	0.925
Portugal-Perrez & Wilson (2012)	1.014
Ramos & Zarzoso (2005)	1.047
Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2007)	1.969
Bouet <i>et al.</i> (2008)	2.013
Elbadawi <i>et al.</i> (2006)	7.348
Granato (2008)	7.727

Table 11b. Ranking of the Studies by their Mean Squared Errors: Importer Infrastructure

Author	MSE
Raballand (2003)	0.000
Grigoriou (2007)	0.006
Bandyopadhyay (1999)	0.012
Carrere (2006)	0.012
Jansen & Nordas (2004)	0.014
Brun <i>et al.</i> (2005)	0.016
Martinez-Zarzoso & Nowak Lehmann (2003)	0.020
Wilson <i>et al.</i> (2004)	0.026
Nordas & Piermartini (2004)	0.067
Kurmanalieva & Parpiev (2008)	0.116
Persson (2007)	0.118
De (2007)	0.147
Nijnkeu <i>et al.</i> (2008)	0.149
Iwanow & Kirkpatrick (2008)	0.461
Fujimura & Edmonds (2006)	0.541
Ramos & Zarzoso (2005)	0.541
Lawless (2010)	0.672

Figure 1.





Figure 2.



Appendix

Table A. Robustness Analysis

	OLS on Deviations from the Mean		WLS on Deviations from the Mean (Weighted by the Number of Observations In the Primary Study)	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
Methodology				
<i>Model Accounts for Zero Trade Flows Selection (Heckman, Tobit, Probit)</i>	-0.104 (0.0882)	-0.459** (0.193)	-0.0367 (0.0398)	-0.890** (0.310)
<i>Model Accounts for Endogeneity (IV-Based Estimation)</i>	0.362*** (0.124)	0.0267 (0.180)	-0.0718 (0.0867)	-0.0179 (0.0110)
<i>Gravity Model</i>	-0.188 (0.383)		0.777 (0.708)	
The Point at Which the Trade is Measured				
<i>Dependent Variable is Exports</i>	0.324** (0.161)	-0.151 (0.230)	0.765*** (0.139)	0.118 (0.214)
Infrastructure Category				
<i>Land Transport Infrastructure</i>	0.194** (0.0887)	0.112 (0.133)	0.0540 (0.109)	0.181 (0.117)
<i>Maritime or Air Transport Infrastructure</i>	-0.000187 (0.100)	0.104 (0.173)	0.0960 (0.0821)	0.101 (0.1000)
<i>Communication Infrastructure</i>	0.0491 (0.102)	0.0377 (0.125)	0.0754 (0.0885)	0.0307 (0.0896)
<i>Composite Measure (Index)</i>	Reference Dummy			
Development Level of the Economy in Which the Infrastructure is Located				
<i>Developing Economy</i>	0.208** (0.0821)	-0.0880 (0.200)	0.0501 (0.0648)	0.0538 (0.0715)
<i>Developed Economy</i>	0.0896 (0.235)	0.0456 (0.206)	-0.158 (0.202)	-0.0265* (0.0141)
<i>Both Types of Economies (Mixed Sample)</i>	Reference Dummy			

Table A. (Cont'd) Estimation Results

		OLS on Deviations from the Mean		WLS on Deviations from the Mean (Weighted by the Number of Observations In the Primary Study)	
		Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
Sample Structure	<i>Sub-National or Firm Level</i>	0.248 (0.256)	-0.584* (0.332)	-0.0829 (0.649)	-0.713* (0.377)
	<i>Not Cross-Section</i>	0.0339 (0.124)	0.197 (0.156)	0.226* (0.119)	0.259* (0.138)
Model Specification	<i>Constrained Model</i>	0.0584 (0.192)	0.738* (0.441)	0.312 (0.216)	0.371 (0.385)
	<i>Estimation Excludes Other Infrastructure Categories</i>	-0.0766 (0.164)	0.263 (0.225)	0.144 (0.129)	0.208 (0.216)
	<i>Model Does not Control for Transit or Partner Infrastructure</i>	-0.137 (0.214)	1.255*** (0.448)	-0.104 (0.186)	0.962** (0.339)
	<i>Equation Excludes Multilateral Resistances</i>	-0.0337 (0.152)	0.149 (0.236)	0.0469 (0.200)	-0.104 (0.245)
	<i>Equation Excludes Income</i>	-0.352 (0.343)		0.349 (0.665)	
	<i>Tariffs or Trade Agreements Not Considered</i>	-0.395*** (0.138)	-0.0598 (0.167)	0.101 (0.0760)	0.0605** (0.0247)
	<i>Equation Excludes Spatial/Geographic Variables</i>	0.122 (0.124)	-0.191 (0.133)	-0.192 (0.247)	-0.152 (0.0916)
	<i>Equation Excludes Education and Human Capital</i>	0.0240 (0.160)	-1.276*** (0.465)	0.614*** (0.121)	-1.044*** (0.270)
	<i>Population Not Considered</i>	0.124 (0.0911)	0.0224 (0.143)	0.0330 (0.0811)	0.0188 (0.0430)
	<i>Governance Variable(s) Not Included</i>	-0.406*** (0.107)	-0.271 (0.237)	0.0216 (0.0667)	-0.458** (0.187)
	<i>Equation Excludes Exchange Rate</i>	0.316*** (0.114)	0.0161 (0.151)	0.123* (0.0612)	0.0225 (0.0247)
	<i>Equation Excludes Colonial, Cultural, Linguistic Relations</i>	0.00978 (0.193)	0.184 (0.169)	-0.0238 (0.118)	-0.0107 (0.0858)

Table A. (Cont'd) Estimation Results

Nature of Publication	OLS on Deviations from the Mean		WLS on Deviations from the Mean (Weighted by the Number of Observations In the Primary Study)	
	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure	Exporter Infrastructure	Importer Infrastructure
<i>Highly Ranked Journals</i>	0.00919 (0.158)	0.692* (0.377)	0.307 (0.200)	0.290 (0.287)
<i>Advocacy</i>	0.151 (0.152)	0.825** (0.399)	0.382** (0.155)	0.434 (0.285)
<i>Constant</i>	0.329*** (0.0272)	0.365*** (0.103)	0.394*** (0.0600)	0.312*** (0.0910)
<i>R-Squared</i>	0.41	0.33	0.58	0.77
<i>Observations</i>	237	142	237	142

Standard errors in parentheses
 *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

2009-1	Boriana Rukanova Rolf T. Wignand Yao-Hua Tan	From national to supranational government inter-organizational systems: An extended typology, 33 p.
2009-2	Marc D. Bahlmann Marleen H. Huysman Tom Elfring Peter Groenewegen	Global Pipelines or global buzz? A micro-level approach towards the knowledge-based view of clusters, 33 p.
2009-3	Julie E. Ferguson Marleen H. Huysman	Between ambition and approach: Towards sustainable knowledge management in development organizations, 33 p.
2009-4	Mark G. Leijssen	Why empirical cost functions get scale economies wrong, 11 p.
2009-5	Peter Nijkamp Galit Cohen-Blankshtain	The importance of ICT for cities: e-governance and cyber perceptions, 14 p.
2009-6	Eric de Noronha Vaz Mário Caetano Peter Nijkamp	Trapped between antiquity and urbanism. A multi-criteria assessment model of the greater Cairo metropolitan area, 22 p.
2009-7	Eric de Noronha Vaz Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Spatial analysis for policy evaluation of the rural world: Portuguese agriculture in the last decade, 16 p.
2009-8	Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Multitasking in the rural world: Technological change and sustainability, 20 p.
2009-9	Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Vincenzo Torrieri Peter Nijkamp	An operational information systems architecture for assessing sustainable transportation planning: Principles and design, 17 p.
2009-10	Vincenzo Del Giudice Pierfrancesco De Paola Francesca Torrieri Francesca Pagliari Peter Nijkamp	A decision support system for real estate investment choice, 16 p.
2009-11	Miruna Mazurencu Marinescu Peter Nijkamp	IT companies in rough seas: Predictive factors for bankruptcy risk in Romania, 13 p.
2009-12	Boriana Rukanova Helle Zinner Hendriksen Eveline van Stijn Yao-Hua Tan	Bringing is innovation in a highly-regulated environment: A collective action perspective, 33 p.
2009-13	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp Jolanda Verbraak	Evaluating social science and humanities knowledge production: an exploratory analysis of dynamics in science systems, 20 p.

2009-14	Roberto Patuelli Aura Reggiani Peter Nijkamp Norbert Schanne	Neural networks for cross-sectional employment forecasts: A comparison of model specifications for Germany, 15 p.
2009-15	André de Waal Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	The relationship between the level of completeness of a strategic performance management system and perceived advantages and disadvantages, 19 p.
2009-16	Vincenzo Punzo Vincenzo Torrieri Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Biagio Ciuffo Peter Nijkamp	Modelling intermodal re-balance and integration: planning a sub-lagoon tube for Venezia, 24 p.
2009-17	Peter Nijkamp Roger Stough Mediha Sahin	Impact of social and human capital on business performance of migrant entrepreneurs – a comparative Dutch-US study, 31 p.
2009-18	Dres Creal	A survey of sequential Monte Carlo methods for economics and finance, 54 p.
2009-19	Karima Kourtit André de Waal	Strategic performance management in practice: Advantages, disadvantages and reasons for use, 15 p.
2009-20	Karima Kourtit André de Waal Peter Nijkamp	Strategic performance management and creative industry, 17 p.
2009-21	Eric de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Historico-cultural sustainability and urban dynamics – a geo-information science approach to the Algarve area, 25 p.
2009-22	Roberta Capello Peter Nijkamp	Regional growth and development theories revisited, 19 p.
2009-23	M. Francesca Cracolici Miranda Cuffaro Peter Nijkamp	Tourism sustainability and economic efficiency – a statistical analysis of Italian provinces, 14 p.
2009-24	Caroline A. Rodenburg Peter Nijkamp Henri L.F. de Groot Erik T. Verhoef	Valuation of multifunctional land use by commercial investors: A case study on the Amsterdam Zuidas mega-project, 21 p.
2009-25	Katrin Oltmer Peter Nijkamp Raymond Florax Floor Brouwer	Sustainability and agri-environmental policy in the European Union: A meta-analytic investigation, 26 p.
2009-26	Francesca Torrieri Peter Nijkamp	Scenario analysis in spatial impact assessment: A methodological approach, 20 p.
2009-27	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder: A logistic regression analysis of sustainability and locality as competitive vehicles for human settlements, 14 p.

2009-28	Marco Percoco Peter Nijkamp	Individual time preferences and social discounting in environmental projects, 24 p.
2009-29	Peter Nijkamp Maria Abreu	Regional development theory, 12 p.
2009-30	Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	7 FAQs in urban planning, 22 p.
2009-31	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Turkey's rurality: A comparative analysis at the EU level, 22 p.
2009-32	Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	An agent-based decision support model for the development of e-services in the tourist sector, 21 p.
2009-33	Mediha Sahin Peter Nijkamp Marius Rietdijk	Cultural diversity and urban innovativeness: Personal and business characteristics of urban migrant entrepreneurs, 27 p.
2009-34	Peter Nijkamp Mediha Sahin	Performance indicators of urban migrant entrepreneurship in the Netherlands, 28 p.
2009-35	Manfred M. Fischer Peter Nijkamp	Entrepreneurship and regional development, 23 p.
2009-36	Faroek Lazrak Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld Jan Rouwendal	Cultural heritage and creative cities: An economic evaluation perspective, 20 p.
2009-37	Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	Bridging the gap between institutions of higher education and small and medium-size enterprises, 32 p.
2009-38	Francesca Medda Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Dynamic effects of external and private transport costs on urban shape: A morphogenetic perspective, 17 p.
2009-39	Roberta Capello Peter Nijkamp	Urban economics at a cross-yard: Recent theoretical and methodological directions and future challenges, 16 p.
2009-40	Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	The low participation of urban migrant entrepreneurs: Reasons and perceptions of weak institutional embeddedness, 23 p.
2009-41	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp	Knowledge investments, business R&D and innovativeness of countries. A qualitative meta-analytic comparison, 25 p.
2009-42	Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	Knowledge and innovation: The strings between global and local dimensions of sustainable growth, 16 p.
2009-43	Chiara M. Traversi Peter Nijkamp	Managing environmental risk in agriculture: A systematic perspective on the potential of quantitative policy-oriented risk valuation, 19 p.
2009-44	Sander de Leeuw	Logistics aspects of emergency preparedness in flood disaster prevention, 24 p.

	Iris F.A. Vis Sebastiaan B. Jonkman	
2009-45	Eveline S. van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Social accounting matrices. The development and application of SAMs at the local level, 26 p.
2009-46	Tibert Verhagen Willemijn van Dolen	The influence of online store characteristics on consumer impulsive decision-making: A model and empirical application, 33 p.
2009-47	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	A micro-simulation model for e-services in cultural heritage tourism, 23 p.
2009-48	Andrea Caragliu Chiara Del Bo Peter Nijkamp	Smart cities in Europe, 15 p.
2009-49	Faroek Lazrak Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld Jan Rouwendal	Cultural heritage: Hedonic prices for non-market values, 11 p.
2009-50	Eric de Noronha Vaz João Pedro Bernardes Peter Nijkamp	Past landscapes for the reconstruction of Roman land use: Eco-history tourism in the Algarve, 23 p.
2009-51	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp Teresa de Noronha Vaz	The Multi-functional use of urban green space, 12 p.
2009-52	Peter Bakker Carl Koopmans Peter Nijkamp	Appraisal of integrated transport policies, 20 p.
2009-53	Luca De Angelis Leonard J. Paas	The dynamics analysis and prediction of stock markets through the latent Markov model, 29 p.
2009-54	Jan Anne Annema Carl Koopmans	Een lastige praktijk: Ervaringen met waarderen van omgevingskwaliteit in de kosten-batenanalyse, 17 p.
2009-55	Bas Straathof Gert-Jan Linders	Europe's internal market at fifty: Over the hill? 39 p.
2009-56	Joaquim A.S. Gromicho Jelke J. van Hoorn Francisco Saldanha-da-Gama Gerrit T. Timmer	Exponentially better than brute force: solving the job-shop scheduling problem optimally by dynamic programming, 14 p.
2009-57	Carmen Lee Roman Kraeussl Leo Paas	The effect of anticipated and experienced regret and pride on investors' future selling decisions, 31 p.
2009-58	René Sitters	Efficient algorithms for average completion time scheduling, 17 p.

2009-59

Masood Gheasi
Peter Nijkamp
Piet Rietveld

Migration and tourist flows, 20 p.

2010-1	Roberto Patuelli Norbert Schanne Daniel A. Griffith Peter Nijkamp	Persistent disparities in regional unemployment: Application of a spatial filtering approach to local labour markets in Germany, 28 p.
2010-2	Thomas de Graaff Ghebre Debrezion Piet Rietveld	Schaalsprong Almere. Het effect van bereikbaarheidsverbeteringen op de huizenprijzen in Almere, 22 p.
2010-3	John Steenbruggen Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Peter Nijkamp Henk Scholten	Real-time data from mobile phone networks for urban incidence and traffic management – a review of application and opportunities, 23 p.
2010-4	Marc D. Bahlmann Tom Elfring Peter Groenewegen Marleen H. Huysman	Does distance matter? An ego-network approach towards the knowledge-based theory of clusters, 31 p.
2010-5	Jelke J. van Hoorn	A note on the worst case complexity for the capacitated vehicle routing problem, 3 p.
2010-6	Mark G. Lijesen	Empirical applications of spatial competition; an interpretative literature review, 16 p.
2010-7	Carmen Lee Roman Kraeusl Leo Paas	Personality and investment: Personality differences affect investors' adaptation to losses, 28 p.
2010-8	Nahom Ghebrihiwet Evgenia Motchenkova	Leniency programs in the presence of judicial errors, 21 p.
2010-9	Meindert J. Flikkema Ard-Pieter de Man Matthijs Wolters	New trademark registration as an indicator of innovation: results of an explorative study of Benelux trademark data, 53 p.
2010-10	Jani Merikivi Tibert Verhagen Frans Feldberg	Having belief(s) in social virtual worlds: A decomposed approach, 37 p.
2010-11	Umut Kiliç	Price-cost markups and productivity dynamics of entrant plants, 34 p.
2010-12	Umut Kiliç	Measuring competition in a frictional economy, 39 p.

2011-1	Yoshifumi Takahashi Peter Nijkamp	Multifunctional agricultural land use in sustainable world, 25 p.
2011-2	Paulo A.L.D. Nunes Peter Nijkamp	Biodiversity: Economic perspectives, 37 p.
2011-3	Eric de Noronha Vaz Doan Nainggolan Peter Nijkamp Marco Painho	A complex spatial systems analysis of tourism and urban sprawl in the Algarve, 23 p.
2011-4	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Strangers on the move. Ethnic entrepreneurs as urban change actors, 34 p.
2011-5	Manie Geyer Helen C. Coetzee Danie Du Plessis Ronnie Donaldson Peter Nijkamp	Recent business transformation in intermediate-sized cities in South Africa, 30 p.
2011-6	Aki Kangasharju Christophe Tavera Peter Nijkamp	Regional growth and unemployment. The validity of Okun's law for the Finnish regions, 17 p.
2011-7	Amitrajeet A. Batabyal Peter Nijkamp	A Schumpeterian model of entrepreneurship, innovation, and regional economic growth, 30 p.
2011-8	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Levent Peter Nijkamp	The engine of sustainable rural development: Embeddedness of entrepreneurs in rural Turkey, 17 p.
2011-9	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	A systemic perspective on multi-stakeholder sustainable development strategies, 26 p.
2011-10	Tibert Verhagen Jaap van Nes Frans Feldberg Willemijn van Dolen	Virtual customer service agents: Using social presence and personalization to shape online service encounters, 48 p.
2011-11	Henk J. Scholten Maarten van der Vlist	De inrichting van crisisbeheersing, de relatie tussen besluitvorming en informatievoorziening. Casus: Warroom project Netcentrisch werken bij Rijkswaterstaat, 23 p.
2011-12	Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	A socio-economic impact analysis of cultural diversity, 22 p.
2011-13	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Repositioning rural areas as promising future hot spots, 22 p.
2011-14	Selmar Meents Tibert Verhagen Paul Vlaar	How sellers can stimulate purchasing in electronic marketplaces: Using information as a risk reduction signal, 29 p.

2011-15	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Measuring regional creative capacity: A literature review for rural-specific approaches, 22 p.
2011-16	Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Tourism, culture and e-services: Evaluation of e-services packages, 30 p.
2011-17	Peter Nijkamp Frank Bruinsma Karima Kourtit Eveline van Leeuwen	Supply of and demand for e-services in the cultural sector: Combining top-down and bottom-up perspectives, 16 p.
2011-18	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Climate change: From global concern to regional challenge, 17 p.
2011-19	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Operational advances in tourism research, 25 p.
2011-20	Aliye Ahu Akgün Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Creative capacity for sustainable development: A comparative analysis of European and Turkish rural regions, 18 p.
2011-21	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan-Levent Peter Nijkamp	Business dynamics as the source of counterurbanisation: An empirical analysis of Turkey, 18 p.
2011-22	Jessie Bakens Peter Nijkamp	Lessons from migration impact analysis, 19 p.
2011-23	Peter Nijkamp Galit Cohen-blankshtain	Opportunities and pitfalls of local e-democracy, 17 p.
2011-24	Maura Soekijad Irene Skovgaard Smith	The 'lean people' in hospital change: Identity work as social differentiation, 30 p.
2011-25	Evgenia Motchenkova Olgerd Rus	Research joint ventures and price collusion: Joint analysis of the impact of R&D subsidies and antitrust fines, 30 p.
2011-26	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Strategic choice analysis by expert panels for migration impact assessment, 41 p.
2011-27	Faroek Lazrak Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld Jan Rouwendal	The market value of listed heritage: An urban economic application of spatial hedonic pricing, 24 p.
2011-28	Peter Nijkamp	Socio-economic impacts of heterogeneity among foreign migrants: Research and policy challenges, 17 p.
2011-29	Masood Gheasi Peter Nijkamp	Migration, tourism and international trade: Evidence from the UK, 8 p.
2011-30	Karima Kourtit	Evaluation of cyber-tools in cultural tourism, 24 p.

	Peter Nijkamp Eveline van Leeuwen Frank Bruinsma	
2011-31	Cathy Macharis Peter Nijkamp	Possible bias in multi-actor multi-criteria transportation evaluation: Issues and solutions, 16 p.
2011-32	John Steenbruggen Maria Teresa Borzacchiello Peter Nijkamp Henk Scholten	The use of GSM data for transport safety management: An exploratory review, 29 p.
2011-33	John Steenbruggen Peter Nijkamp Jan M. Smits Michel Grothe	Traffic incident management: A common operational picture to support situational awareness of sustainable mobility, 36 p.
2011-34	Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	Students' interest in an entrepreneurial career in a multicultural society, 25 p.
2011-35	Adele Finco Deborah Bentivoglio Peter Nijkamp	Integrated evaluation of biofuel production options in agriculture: An exploration of sustainable policy scenarios, 16 p.
2011-36	Eric de Noronha Vaz Pedro Cabral Mário Caetano Peter Nijkamp Marco Paíño	Urban heritage endangerment at the interface of future cities and past heritage: A spatial vulnerability assessment, 25 p.
2011-37	Maria Giaoutzi Anastasia Stratigea Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Scenario analysis in foresight: AG2020, 23 p.
2011-38	Peter Nijkamp Patricia van Hemert	Knowledge infrastructure and regional growth, 12 p.
2011-39	Patricia van Hemert Enno Masurel Peter Nijkamp	The role of knowledge sources of SME's for innovation perception and regional innovation policy, 27 p.
2011-40	Eric de Noronha Vaz Marco Painho Peter Nijkamp	Impacts of environmental law and regulations on agricultural land-use change and urban pressure: The Algarve case, 18 p.
2011-41	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp Steeff Lowik Frans van Vught Paul Vulto	From islands of innovation to creative hotspots, 26 p.
2011-42	Alina Todiras Peter Nijkamp Saidas Rafijevas	Innovative marketing strategies for national industrial flagships: Brand repositioning for accessing upscale markets, 27 p.

- 2011-43 Eric de Noronha Vaz
Mário Caetano
Peter Nijkamp A multi-level spatial urban pressure analysis of the Giza Pyramid Plateau in Egypt, 18 p.
- 2011-44 Andrea Caragliu
Chiara Del Bo
Peter Nijkamp A map of human capital in European cities, 36 p.
- 2011-45 Patrizia Lombardi
Silvia Giordano
Andrea Caragliu
Chiara Del Bo
Mark Deakin
Peter Nijkamp
Karima Kourtit An advanced triple-helix network model for smart cities performance, 22 p.
- 2011-46 Jessie Bakens
Peter Nijkamp Migrant heterogeneity and urban development: A conceptual analysis, 17 p.
- 2011-47 Irene Casas
Maria Teresa
Borzacchiello
Biagio Ciuffo
Peter Nijkamp Short and long term effects of sustainable mobility policy: An exploratory case study, 20 p.
- 2011-48 Christian Bogmans Can globalization outweigh free-riding? 27 p.
- 2011-49 Karim Abbas
Bernd Heidergott
Djamil Aïssani A Taylor series expansion approach to the functional approximation of finite queues, 26 p.
- 2011-50 Eric Koomen Indicators of rural vitality. A GIS-based analysis of socio-economic development of the rural Netherlands, 17 p.

2012-1	Aliye Ahu Gülümser Tüzin Baycan Levent Peter Nijkamp Jacques Poot	The role of local and newcomer entrepreneurs in rural development: A comparative meta-analytic study, 39 p.
2012-2	Joao Romao Bart Neuts Peter Nijkamp Eveline van Leeuwen	Urban tourist complexes as Multi-product companies: Market segmentation and product differentiation in Amsterdam, 18 p.
2012-3	Vincent A.C. van den Berg	Step tolling with price sensitive demand: Why more steps in the toll makes the consumer better off, 20 p.
2012-4	Vasco Diogo Eric Koomen Floor van der Hilst	Second generation biofuel production in the Netherlands. A spatially-explicit exploration of the economic viability of a perennial biofuel crop, 12 p.
2012-5	Thijs Dekker Paul Koster Roy Brouwer	Changing with the tide: Semi-parametric estimation of preference dynamics, 50 p.
2012-6	Daniel Arribas Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp	Benchmarking of world cities through self-organizing maps, 22 p.
2012-7	Karima Kourtit Peter Nijkamp Frans van Vught Paul Vulto	Supernova stars in knowledge-based regions, 24 p.
2012-8	Mediha Sahin Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	The economic importance of migrant entrepreneurship: An application of data envelopment analysis in the Netherlands, 16 p.
2012-9	Peter Nijkamp Jacques Poot	Migration impact assessment: A state of the art, 48 p.
2012-10	Tibert Verhagen Anniek Nauta Frans Feldberg	Negative online word-of-mouth: Behavioral indicator or emotional release? 29 p.

2013-1	Tüzin Baycan Peter Nijkamp	The migration development nexus: New perspectives and challenges, 22 p.
2013-2	Haralambie Leahu	European Options Sensitivities via Monte Carlo Techniques, 28 p.
2013-3	Tibert Verhagen Charlotte Vonkeman Frans Feldberg Plon Verhagen	Making online products more tangible and likeable: The role of local presence as product presentation mechanism, 44 p.
2013-4	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	A Multi-actor multi-criteria scenario analysis of regional sustainable resource policy, 24 p.
2013-5	John Steenbruggen Peter Nijkamp Maarten van der Vlist	Urban traffic incident management in a digital society. An actor-network approach in information technology use in urban Europe, 25 p.
2013-6	Jorge Ridderstaat Robertico Croes Peter Nijkamp	The force field of tourism, 19 p.
2013-7	Masood Gheasi Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	Unknown diversity: A study on undocumented migrant workers in the Dutch household sector, 17 p.
2013-8	Mediha Sahin Peter Nijkamp Soushi Suzuki	Survival of the fittest among migrant entrepreneurs. A study on differences in the efficiency performance of migrant entrepreneurs in Amsterdam by means of data envelopment analysis, 25 p.
2013-9	Kostas Bithas Peter Nijkamp	Biological integrity as a prerequisite for sustainable development: A bioeconomic perspective, 24 p.
2013-10	Madalina-Stefania Dirzu Peter Nijkamp	The dynamics of agglomeration processes and their contribution to regional development across the EU, 19 p.
2013-11	Eric de Noronha Vaz Agnieszka Walczynska Peter Nijkamp	Regional challenges in tourist wetland systems: An integrated approach to the Ria Formosa area, 17 p.
2013-12	João Romão Eveline van Leeuwen Bart Neuts Peter Nijkamp	Tourist loyalty and urban e-services: A comparison of behavioural impacts in Leipzig and Amsterdam, 19 p.
2013-13	Jorge Ridderstaat Marck Oduber Robertico Croes Peter Nijkamp Pim Martens	Impacts of seasonal patterns of climate on recurrent fluctuations in tourism demand. Evidence from Aruba, 34 p.
2013-14	Emmanouil Tranos Peter Nijkamp	Urban and regional analysis and the digital revolution: Challenges and opportunities, 16 p.
2013-15	Masood Gheasi	International financial transfer by foreign labour: An analysis of remittances

	Peter Nijkamp Piet Rietveld	from informal migrants, 11 p.
2013-16	Serenella Sala Biagio Ciuffo Peter Nijkamp	A meta-framework for sustainability assessment, 24 p.
2013-17	Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp Aliye Ahu Akgün Masood Gheasi	Foresights, scenarios and sustainable development – a pluriformity perspective, 19 p.
2013-18	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Analytical support tools for sustainable futures, 19 p.
2013-19	Peter Nijkamp	Migration impact assessment: A review of evidence-based findings, 29 p.
2013-20	Aliye Ahu Akgün Eveline van Leeuwen Peter Nijkamp	Sustainability science as a basis for policy evaluation, 16 p.
2013-21	Vicky Katsoni Maria Giaoutzi Peter Nijkamp	Market segmentation in tourism – An operational assessment framework, 28 p.
2013-22	Jorge Ridderstaat Robertico Croes Peter Nijkamp	Tourism development, quality of life and exogenous shocks. A systemic analysis framework, 26 p.
2013-23	Feng Xu Nan Xiang Shanshan Wang Peter Nijkamp Yoshiro Higano	Dynamic simulation of China's carbon emission reduction potential by 2020, 12 p.
2013-24	John Steenbruggen Peter Nijkamp Jan M. Smits Ghaitrie Mohabir	Traffic incident and disaster management in the Netherlands: Challenges and obstacles in information sharing, 30 p.
2013-25	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp Enno Masurel	From innovation to commercialization through networks and agglomerations: Analysis of sources of innovation, innovation capabilities and performance of Dutch SMEs, 24 p.
2013-26	Patricia van Hemert Peter Nijkamp Enno Masurel	How do SMEs learn in a systems-of-innovation context? The role of sources of innovation and absorptive capacity on the innovation performance of Dutch SMEs, 27 p.
2013-27	Mediha Sahin Alina Todiras Peter Nijkamp	Colourful entrepreneurship in Dutch cities: A review and analysis of business performance, 25 p.
2013-28	Tüzün Baycan Mediha Sahin Peter Nijkamp	The urban growth potential of second-generation migrant entrepreneurs. A sectoral study on Amsterdam, 31 p.

2013-29	Eric Vaz Teresa de Noronha Vaz Peter Nijkamp	The architecture of firms' innovative behaviors, 23 p.
2013-30	Eric Vaz Marco Painho Peter Nijkamp	Linking agricultural policies with decision making: A spatial approach, 21 p.
2013-31	Yueting Guo Hengwei Wang Peter Nijkamp Jiangang XU	Space-time changes in interdependent urban-environmental systems: A policy study on the Huai River Basin in China, 20 p.
2013-32	Maurice de Kleijn Niels van Manen Jan Kolen Henk Scholten	User-centric SDI framework applied to historical and heritage European landscape research, 31 p.
2013-33	Erik van der Zee Henk Scholten	Application of geographical concepts and spatial technology to the Internet of Things, 35 p.
2033-34	Mehmet Güney Celbiş Peter Nijkamp Jacques Poot	The lucrative impact of trade-related infrastructure: Meta-Analytic Evidence, 45 p.