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ABSTRACT:

An important debate exists with regards to the role that public investment must play for economic recovery and economic growth. The underlying idea behind this has much to do with the value of output elasticity of public capital. For this reason this paper presents a Meta-analysis of this elasticity. To do it, almost 2,000 elasticities previously estimated from 145 papers are considered. In addition, for each elasticity, some thirty associated features relative to the methodology used for each case or relative to the characteristics of data samples, are also taken into account. The results obtained reveal an average short-term elasticity of 0.13 (0.16 in the long-term). Evidence is also found of the importance of the methodology adopted for the results obtained as well as the publication bias. Finally, we find a minor reduction in the value of the elasticity as public capital endowments increase.
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1. Introduction

The importance during The Great Recession attached to fiscal consolidation has meant the significant contraction of the amounts accorded to public investment in advanced economies. This in fact provokes an important and increasing debate on the role that public investment must play for world economic recovery. In one side, some support larger public investment effort arguing that this type of public expenditure reinforces stronger long term growth as well as boosting aggregate demand in the short term (Group of Twenty, 2014 and Barbiero and Darvas, 2014). Furthermore, the weight of the stock of net public expenditure in GDP has declined in the majority of economies during the last decade. The lack of maintenance has reduced the quality and thus effectiveness of public capital in general, and of infrastructures and core capital, particularly. In line with these mentioned long term effects, the present investment in infrastructures may become self-financing due to the future increases in production (Abiad et al, 2014).

Even those supporting these ideas are cautious, as total long term macroeconomic impact —multiplier effect— of public investment depends on the degree of economic slack and monetary accommodation, the efficiency of public investment, the way in which public expenditure increases are financed, and the public-debt-to-GDP ratio and corresponding distorting effects.

Precisely, detractors of the increase in public investment argue that these expenditures may deteriorate notoriously and permanently public finances\(^1\), highlighting distorting effects of the excess in public investment being financed with taxes on future economic growth (Fisher and Turnovsky, 1998). In fact, based on the contributions of Barro (1990), there exists an optimal level of public productive expenditure —and hence infrastructure expending—. If expenditures exceed this optimal level, the additional distortionary taxation needed to be financed may provoke a reduction in growth rates. Additionally, it is often argued that the macroeconomic multiplier associated to public investment is small. This can be explained in terms of its little effectiveness associated to a low or null output elasticity of infrastructures. Other factors as the poor selection of investment projects, the existence of a certain waste of investment resources, or even the fall in the profitability of public investments resulting from decreasing returns to scale or the exhaustion of

\(^{1}\) The case of Japan in the 1990s is often pointed out. The increase in public investment contributed notoriously to the increase in its public-debt-to-GDP ratio (Syed, Kang and Tokuoka, 2009).
network effects, especially in those developed economies with acceptable public capital levels and full infrastructure networks, may help in understanding poor returns from public investments (Abiad et al, 2014 and Calderón and Servén, 2014).

The argument related to the efficiency of public investment seems to gain relevance in current debates. This efficiency depends on the sensibility of production (short and long term) to productive investment, as well as the management processes of public decision making in terms of projects selection and their implementation and monitoring. All these elements shape the output elasticity of public investment.

Evidence of the fact that public capital generates positive externalities in the private sector was first perceived back in the fifties of the last century. It was not, however, till the end of the last century that this idea became really important, as it attempted to link the fall in productivity in North America to the fall in public investment. Thereafter, a sizeable amount of publications, considered precursors in this sense, (for example Aschauer, 1989a) emphasized the important role of public capital in economic growth.

The influence of the wave papers previously mentioned, led to a frenzy of investment that, for many countries, meant a radical change in the infrastructure network. Nonetheless, the indiscriminate increase in the stock of infrastructure and the new literature results point to the fact that infrastructures may have less of an effect on productivity (even zero or negative effects), leading to some confusion on this issue.

Attempting to clarify this issue, Pfähler et al. (1996) look at 40 papers done on the United States, but arrive at no clear conclusion, since 40% of them showed positive and statistically significant results, while 44% of them showed no effect. A more recent study, done by Straub (2008), which analyzed 69 papers, shows that 61% of the studies obtained positive and significant elasticities for public capital while 36% of them showed statistically insignificant results. Other authors, applying the meta-analysis or meta-regression technique, attempted to provide a synthesis of these results (Button, 1998; Ligharth and Martin, 2011; Bom and Ligharth, 2014 and Melo et al.,

---

2 Certain papers (Meade, 1952; Hirschman, 1958; Hansen, 1965, among others) pointed to the need for a minimum of public infrastructure to attract productive factors, especially capital and skilled labour, that can support the economic development of certain territories.
2012), and came up with similar conclusions with regard to the positive impact – which is clearly prevalent – albeit the magnitude varies across different findings\(^3\).

The diversity of results is associated with the high level of methodological heterogeneity of these types of studies, as well as with the factors linked to the data sample (De la Fuente, 2010). Against such a backdrop, the aim of this paper is to offer a synthesis of previous empirical evidence, to assess the contribution of public capital investment to economic growth.

To that end, in the second section, we shall take a very close look at the production function approach, focusing on the output elasticity of capital, given that the meta-analysis requires that the parameter under study be the same in all the papers considered. In this revision, we shall place special emphasis on the different criticisms and limitations that gradually came to the fore in the approaches adopted, as well as those that gradually replaced them. Third section outlines the meta-analysis methodology and the meta-regression analysis that will be used later on to present a synthesis of the results of a representative sample of articles. Section four looks at how the meta-samples of articles and elasticities of public capital are obtained and discusses their main features. To do this, almost two thousand elasticities obtained from one hundred and forty-five papers are selected. Section five presents the results obtained, for both the meta-analysis and the meta-regression analysis. We shall then end, in the final section, with our conclusions and policy implications.

2. Overview of methodological approaches, with special emphasis on the production function.

The studies that have attempted to establish the effect of public capital on private productivity have used different methodological approaches: the estimation of production functions (where the appreciable body of seminal papers is placed), those which, using the dual approach, estimate cost or benefit functions (Demetriades and Mamuneas, 2000; Bonaglia et al., 2000, Cohen and Morrison, 2004, among others), VAR models (Batina, 1998; Flores de Frutos et

\(^3\) Button (1998) analyses 26 studies and obtains an average elasticity of 0.343. Ligharth and Martin (2011) take 282 results from 49 papers and find an elasticity of between 0.169-0.184. Bom and Ligharth (2014) with a total of 578 estimators drawn from 68 papers, obtain an elasticity of between 0.082-0.103. Finally, Melo et al. (2012) present 563 observations from 33 different publications that exclusively analyze the effect of transport infrastructures, obtaining values in the range 0.0277-0.4068.
al., 1998; Pereira, 2000, 2001; Ligthart, 2002; among others) and models based on different theories of growth (Easterly and Rebelo, 1993; Sánchez-Robles, 1998; Esfahani and Ramírez, 2003; among others).

Of all these, the one most used is, without doubt, the production function –using Cobb-Douglas type-, which encompasses more than half of the publications (Straub, 2008) and which, therefore, will be the focus chosen for the analysis that follows.

Although some previous papers exist, the ones considered as seminal are those published towards the end of the eighties, and based on aggregate time series for the United States. Aschauer (1989a) and Munnell (1990) obtained elasticities around 0.4. Such high values led to the elaboration of a wide range of studies that returned a wide array of elasticity values for public capital that oscillated between 0.2 and 0.6. Such high elasticities led to reasonable doubts being raised about these results, pointing to many problems of an econometric and methodological nature, which led to extensive literature on the subject – some a thousand five hundred articles – that carefully outlined the importance of certain methodological decisions as well as the nature of information within the results found. These papers showed much more moderate, even non-significant elasticities. We shall now present these criticisms and alternatives, non-chronologically.

2.1. Specification of the production function

There has been a predominance of papers that use the restrictive Cobb-Douglas type production function. There is still no agreement on the restrictions imposed ex ante with regards to returns to scale: no restrictions (Munnell, 1993; Baltagi and Pinnoi, 1995, among others); constant returns only imposed on private factors (capital and labor); and those forcing constant returns over all productive factors (Aaron, 1990; Tatom, 1991, among others).

Another important factor is if public capital can be considered a productive factor not paid by companies – or paid for indirectly through taxes – (Arrow and Kurz, 1970), but which still have some of the features inherent to a private asset, given the possibility of congestion and partial

---

4 The first paper to estimate a production function with public capital (in this case social capital) was a study by Mera (1973), which obtained an elasticity of 0.2 for Japanese regions. This was followed by Bataner (1983), Costa et al. (1987) and Ram and Ramsey (1989), who analysed North America and came up with positive elasticities, although they also showed a wide range of estimated effects.

5 Some other more flexible types of production functions have been previously used, i.e. the translogarithmic formulation (Pinnoi, 1994; Charlott and Schmidt, 2000; Canning and Ben Nathan, 2000, among others). However, the results found for output elasticities of capital are not substantially different.
exclusion or if public capital is part of the technological restriction that determines productive efficiency (Duggall et al., 1999). In the first case this factor must be incorporated in the production function as an additional factor. In the latter, it should therefore not be included in the production function, although it would determine productive efficiency (as Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 1995, point out).

Finally, the additional variables included in the specifications of the production function differ across different papers. The economic cycle has been considered introducing variables such as the use of productive capacity, the rate of unemployment or annual indicators. Tatom (1991) points to the need to introduce energy prices because any increase (or decrease) in them leads to an increase (or fall) in the rate of obsolescence. Another body of papers introduces variables that capture the effect of economies of agglomeration on efficiency (Kelejian and Robinson, 1997). Finally, some authors (García-Milá and McGuire, 1992) also control for the human capital that can determine certain changes in the levels of productivity.

2.2. Measurement of the variables

Another feature of this literature is the use of different forms of measuring the variables. With regard to public capital, there is a crucial debate about the definition used. For the purposes of this paper, and with a view to providing a synthesis, there are as many as three different definitions of public capital. Total public capital includes all the elements of capital that are the property of the different Public Administrations. The definition of productive capital, which would consider capital goods aimed at health, education, housing and community services, energy installations, communication and transport infrastructure. Finally, the definition including just transport infrastructures or focusing on one of the four major elements that constitute them: roads (highways), railways, air and maritime infrastructures.

A second crucial factor regards the way in which public capital is quantified. Normally, monetary measurements are used, but they are criticized because the prices of capital goods vary

---

6 Baily (1981) purports that an increase in energy prices will provide an incentive to replace machinery that uses it intensively.

7 The exclusion of elements of health, education and housing, which correspond to the so-called social infrastructures, leads to a restricted definition of productive or economic capital which in literature is known as “core infrastructures”.

8 In fact, the greater use of value added is based on the fact that is more easily available, as well as the problems of identification of the elasticities resulting from the joint inclusion of intermediary consumption and labour.
importantly from country to country, as does the efficiency in the execution of the project (Pritchett, 1996). For that reason, some studies (Canning, 1998; and Estache and Goicoechea, 2005) opt for measuring in physical terms (e.g. length of the road or highway network, number of hospital beds, etc.), or use synthetic indices that bring together several categories of infrastructures (Cutanda and Paricio, 1994; Delgado and Alvarez, 2000; Mitra et al., 2002; and Sahoo et al., 2010).

Another key factor refers to the output variable used: production or, mainly, value added. Sims (1969) and Arrow (1972) point out, the value added function is a theoretical concept that is valid if the underlying gross production function has a nested form (i.e., it can be easily separated between the value added function and intermediary consumption) and efficiency only affects value added.

2.3. The nature and disaggregation of statistical information

The seminal papers used aggregate time series (Ashauer, 1989a; Munnell, 1990; among others). Other papers incorporating cross-section variability amongst countries (Ford and Poret, 1991; Nourzad and Vrieze, 1995, among others) and amongst regions (Munnell and Cook, 1990; Hulten and Schwab, 1991, among others) became available. After that, based on the overestimation of the parameters that were used in the latter studies, as well as the availability of new data bases, data panels began to be used (Bonaglia et al., 2000; Charlot and Schmitt, 2000, among others). These new databases allowed the use of econometric techniques that can control for unobserved individual effects.

The consideration of information with high geographic disaggregation (regions or states, provinces or counties, municipalities, etc.) generates a debate as to what is the crucial public capital that must be considered: Public capital that is administered by territorial administrations (Hulten and Schwab, 1991; Holtz-Eakin and Lovely, 1996, among others), or the capital of all levels of the administration in each geographical area (Eberts, 1990; Boarnet, 1998, among others).

In some studies, it is notable that greater geographical disaggregation have effects in the results obtained due to the impossibility to take into account the so-called network effect and the measurement problem linked to the border effect. It is for this reason that the capital of neighboring territories is often incorporated (Boarnet, 1998; Berechman et al., 2006; Delgado and
Alvarez, 2007; among others), or to a lesser degree, the accessibility that the territory possesses (Petersen, 2011a, 2011b).

Another crucial factor here is linked to the use of sectorial information. It is usually pointed out that the manufacturing branches will be those most favored by public capital, even if the results haven’t always corroborated this hypothesis (Shanks and Barnes, 2008; Fernald, 1999; among others).

2.4. Econometric methodology

Although in this field of economic analysis a great variety of econometric techniques has been used, we shall only refer here to the problems that have caused the greatest concern. So, a first consideration is that the analyses that incorporate a great number of countries, states, regions or municipalities show great heterogeneity in their behavior, determined by idiosyncratic factors that can produce inconsistency in the estimations if they are correlated with the error term. To address this problem, a within model is used (of fixed effects, first differences, deviations from the time mean, etc.).

However, the main source of concern in this context is endogeneity between production and some productive factors like public capital (which in fact derives from a problem of causality). Put differently, public investment would be considered a superior asset, so governments would tend to invest more in periods of rapid growth (De la Fuente, 2010). Consequently, there will be an upward bias in the estimations of public capital returns (Eisner, 1991; Munnell, 1992 and Gramlich, 1994). The literature suggests different methodologies to address this problem, through the use of any of the variants implemented within Instrumental Variables methodologies –2SLS, 3SLS, GMM, etc. – (Holtz-Eakin, 1994; Baltagi and Pinnoi, 1995; Finn, 1993; Ai and Casssoou, 1995; among others).

Another economic problem arises due to the presence of spurious correlation (Rubin, 1991) due to the presence of time trends in the variables (see, for example, Sturm and De Haan, 1995). To solve this problem, estimators in first differences are introduced (Aaron, 1990; Hulten

---

9 Some authors have used the Granger test to examine the relation of causality between public capital and output. Duffy-Deno and Eberts (1991) suggest that causality is established in both directions, Holtz-Eakin (1994) finds a certain ambiguity in the direction of causality and Tatom (1993) finds that causality can be greater from infrastructures towards production than in reverse.
and Schwab, 1991; Tatom, 1991, among others). However, Munnell (1992) criticizes this solution since it modifies the nature of the relationship between variables, given that it eliminates the long term component of the possible correlation between variables. For these reason some papers argue that if the estimators in levels are carried out with non-stationary but cointegrated variables, the estimators would be consistent. The literature offers different econometric procedures to test the null hypothesis of no cointegration that has been used in this field of research (Bajo and Sosvilla, 1993; Argimón et al., 1994; Crescenzi and Rodríguez-Pose, 2008; Bronzini and Piselli, 2009; among others).

3. Meta-analysis methodology

Meta-analysis is a statistical technique used to synthesize the individual results of many previous studies, with the aim of obtaining more accurate and statistically robust general conclusions, on a parameter of interest. Precisely as a result of this, in recent years, the use of this methodology has been extended to the socio-economic field (Stanley, 2005, 2008; Brons et al., 2006, 2008; Bom and Ligthart, 2014; Feld and Heckemeyer, 2011, among others)\(^{10}\).

Meta-analysis attempts to find the “consensus” value of a parameter of interest \((\eta_0)\) from the estimation of the expression,

\[
\hat{\eta}_{is} = \eta_0 + v_{is}
\]

where \(\hat{\eta}_{is}\) denotes value \(i\) for the parameter of interest obtained from study \(s\), and \(v_{is}\) is the error term with the usual assumptions.

The most basic method is the fixed effects model, which assumes the existence of one single real value within the population, which implies that \(v_l \sim N(0, \sigma^2)\). On the contrary, the random effects method assumes that the studies are a random population sample and, therefore, randomly distributed around the population mean. That is to say, the different papers are going to show a different value as a result of their methodological heterogeneity, with differences between

\(^{10}\) It was Pearson (1934) who proposed this technique, even though the first meta-analysis was carried out by David (1934).
the results of different studies and intra-studies, which means that $v_i \sim N\left(0, \sigma_i^2 + \tau^2\right)$. To choose between both estimators, the Q homogeneity test (Shadish and Haddock, 1994) is applied. If the null hypothesis is rejected, one accepts the existence of important methodological differences that modify the value of the parameter of interest. Rewriting equation (1) as follows,

$$\hat{\eta}_{ls} = \bar{\eta}_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \alpha_k Z_{ik} + \bar{v}_{ls} \quad (2)$$

where $Z$ are the independent $k$ variables (meta-regressors) that capture the relevant methodological differences or the characteristics of the data samples of the different empirical studies and explain the systematic variation of the results among studies. Expression (2) can be estimated using fixed or random effects —also called mixed effects—. Solution to the Q homogeneity test provides the suitable estimator to use.

This methodology considers two sources of publication biases, one originated in the size of the samples used in each paper of the meta-sample, and the other derived from the exclusion of results that do not match the dominant paradigm.

The problems related to the size of the samples are initially controlled through the WLS estimation. However, estimators obtained with small samples usually show more erratic values that may not be necessarily corrected with the mentioned weighting procedure. This problem can be addressed following Card and Krueger (1995), Ashenfelter et al. (1999), Görg and Strobl (2001), introducing the standard error of the parameter as an additional independent variable in the regression.

The greater predisposition on the part of reviews, evaluators and institutions to accept results that match the dominant paradigm is controlled with the inclusion in the meta-sample of results published not only in articles that go through stricter filters, but also in books or grey literature (working papers, reports, papers presented at congresses, etc.), including an indicator variable to differentiate between the two types of publications. Similarly, the authors themselves

---

11 Fixed and random effects models are estimated by means of the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) estimator. In the fixed effect model the weights are the inverse of the variance of each estimator of the meta-sample ($w_i = 1/\sigma_i^2$). In the random effects the weights are obtained as the inverse of the sum of the variances between-studies and intra-studies ($w_i = 1/(\sigma_i^2 + \tau^2)$).

12 The Q statistic follows a $\chi^2$ distribution, and the $H_0$ is the homogeneity hypothesis ($\tau^2 = 0$).
might be more interested in finding the most conventional results in order to publish their articles. In this way, the self-selection of the authors can be contrasted by building a dummy variable that points to the preference explicitly shown by authors between results included in their paper (Born and Ligthart, 2014).

4. Meta-sample

To carry out the meta-analysis, it is necessary to gather an important number of values of estimated elasticities obtained from previous studies (meta-sample). The meta-sample has been built at two levels: papers consulted, and the output elasticities of public capital estimated within them.

4.1. Meta-sample of articles

In order to carry out a proper meta-analysis, the studies selected have to be representative of the population of studies done. To achieve this, a biblio-metric study was first carried out, aimed at finding the fundamental studies or "core articles" of the literature and at quantifying the size of the population of studies. To do so, we selected the references on the topic included in the most recently published literature reviews, Pfähler et al. (1996), Sturm et al. (1998), Button (1998), Gillen (2001), Romp and De Haan (2007), Straub (2008), Boscá et al. (2011), Ligthart and Martin (2011), Pereira and Andraz (2011), Melo et al. (2012) and Bom and Ligthart (2014). Some 280 different references were gathered -including 30 papers, published solely as working papers, and more than five years old-.

Next we obtain and analyze all cited articles in those available papers. The result of this was the accumulation of a total of some 5,639 quotes, where a half of those correspond to 750 papers which deal specifically with the interrelation between some kind of public capital and the productive activity (production, productivity, costs, benefits, etc.). Eleven of these cited articles13 account for more than 50% of the quotes. This reduced group of papers is therefore considered the tight and most influential nucleus of research on this question, all of them having been published between 1989 and 1996. We then consulted the WoK (Web of Knowledge) and the EBSCO

---

13 All of these articles received more than 25 quotes. These articles are indicated by an asterisk in Table 1.
to obtain the articles that cite these 11 papers. This allowed us to estimate the population of papers that deal with this issue, calculated to be in the region of 1,500. So, using the so-called Bradford Law (Bradford, 1946) of the dispersion of literature, it can be concluded that with a sample equivalent to 10% (150 articles), we will obtain between 50% and 67% of the information content of this literature15.

From the 280 initial papers, the meta-sample was reduced to 145, either because the studies were not available or did not meet any of the methodological requirements in order to be included in the final meta-sample. For instance, whenever a Cobb-Douglas type production function—or equivalent—were not estimated, or even when included, the article was not offering the elasticity of output with respect to public capital and its standard deviation.

Of these papers, 110 are published in academic reviews. On the other hand, the period encompassed, with respect to the year of publication, goes from 1983 to 2011. Furthermore, the vast majority of papers focus solely on the study of one single country (119 articles) while some 18 countries are represented, with the USA, with 44, being the economy with the greatest presence.

4.2. Meta-sample of elasticities

Following the suggestions of Bijmolt and Pieters (2001), we built the meta-sample of elasticities considering all the values provided by each study. This also allows for a better control and testing of publication biases and of the influence of methodological decisions16. The sample is made up of some 1,928 estimated values for the output elasticity of public capital, which implies an average of 13 values per article (see Table 1). Of these elasticities, 58% refer to positive and statistically significant values, close to 37% are non-significant and only 5% are statistically negative.

14 This tool has allowed for a joint search in the Academic Search Premier, Business Source Complete, Econlit and Eric data bases of the following words: Production and Public capital, Production and Infrastructures, Productivity & Public capital, Productivity & Infrastructures, Effects and Infrastructures.

15 The Bradford law is a particularization of the Zipf law (Zipf, 1972). In concrete terms, this law indicates that the information content included in consecutive groups of reviews and articles follows the 1, 1/k, 1/k^2, 1/k^3 progression. The empirical contrasts of that law allocate k values in the (2-3) interval (Urbizagastegui, 1996 and Potter, 1998). In Garfield (1980), there is a detailed discussion of both regularities. In order to obtain the information content in relative terms (%) to the first decile—that including most influential papers—the value of x in \( \sum_{i=1}^{10} \frac{x}{k^{i-1}} = 100 \) must be derived.

16 On the one hand, had we opted for calculating the mean of all the results of each paper (Stanley, 1998), we would lose the option of being able to test, at least, the self-selection bias of the authors; as well, only meta-regressors that capture between-study differences and non-intra-studies (such as the use of different econometric techniques) would be included. On the other hand, had we chosen to take one single value per work (Van der Sluis et al., 2005), as well as the previous limitations, it would not always have been possible to do so, due to the fact that in many articles the authors do not clearly decide for one of their results. Furthermore, in both cases, a considerable amount of observations would be lost: instead of 1,928, it would be 145.
Figure 1 shows the distribution of the meta-sample of elasticities. It also shows an important accumulation of values around the average. The presence of some outliers, especially in the positive region, can also be observed, which leads to clear asymmetry to the right, with a sample median of 0.115, clearly below the overall mean (0.189).

4.3. Meta-regressors

In order to analyze the influence of methodological decisions and the nature of information on the values of the output elasticity of public capital, we take as many as 29 different features associated to each elasticity value. An outline of these features is presented in an orderly fashion in Table 2. In the first column of this Table we present the number of elasticities in the meta-sample in each of considered categories.

For the specification of the production function, we have gathered four different aspects. The first refers to the theoretical focus used where there is a prevalence of results obtained from direct estimations of production functions (about 85% of the sample). There are also other values that correspond to papers that estimate elasticities from models of growth (10%), quasi-production functions17 (3%) or production frontier (2%). Secondly, we also gather the assumptions done on the returns to scale issue, where it is discernible that it has been normal not to impose, a priori (71%), or imposing constant returns on all production factors (15%) or only the private ones (14%). A third aspect distinguishes between results that directly introduce public capital in the production function (51%) either by calculating or estimating a productivity indicator and then analyzing the impact on it of public capital endowments (49%).

Finally, we also consider the additional variables incorporated in the production function. The most common variables were obviously selected, i.e. the economic cycle (27%), any human capital indicator (17%), any element that captures the effect of energy prices on the obsolescence of physical capital (4%), and finally, production density indicators (5%). Moreover, we take into

---

17 In this context, functions which are generally of productivity with semi-logarithmic specification are called quasi-production functions.
account the inclusion in the estimated equation of public capital as an additional factor of production (20%)\(^{18}\). The way in which estimations control for the time dimension, i.e. technical progress, was also taken into account, distinguishing between consideration either of a time trend (22%), or time fixed effects (23%).

With regard to the definition of the public capital used, 44% include the total of this magnitude, while only 23% remains with some measure of productive public capital and 33% choose the one specific to transport infrastructures. Another factor refers to the specific measure of public capital: stock variables (93%) or flows (7%)\(^{19}\). A distinction is also made between the specific ways of measuring: it could be through monetary evaluation (83%) or non-monetary evaluation (17%). Greater homogeneity is found in relation to the output variable selected, given that 90% of the studies use value added, as against only 10% that do so with production.

In relation to the nature of the data, there is a predominance of panels (71%). An important number of papers use time series (24%), and a minority uses cross-sectional data (5%). With regard to the geographical scope of the sample, most are elasticities referred to one single country (75%), even though an important number of elasticities refer to a group of countries (17%), and, more exceptionally, those that focus on the specific analysis of administrative units beneath country level – zones or specific regions – (8%).

Information was also taken from the administrative level that manages capital: only state – central or federal – (4%), or only corresponding to Territorial Administrations (4%), the remaining incorporate aggregated public capital in the territory (92%). In the same way, we also considered whether public capital belonging to other administrative levels is included (4%), as well as that of neighboring territories (13%). Another important factor refers to sectorial coverage: for the economy as a whole (69%) or referring to specific sectors: industry (22%), or the rest of sectors (95%).

A fourth group of differential features of the studies focuses on econometric procedures. Here, it is common to control for the existence of individual effects (61%) and less common to do corrections to obtain efficient estimators – heterocedasticity and serial correlation – (37%), to deal

\(^{18}\) For instance, if the considered public capital is productive capital, but within the production function, social public capital was also introduced.

\(^{19}\) This is the option used in growth models as well as in estimations of the production function in first differences.
with the problem of endogeneity through some procedure of instrumental variables (25%), to calculate long-term elasticities – usually through dynamic models – (11%), and, to control for the possible existence of spurious correlation (21%).

Finally, within the fifth group of features, there is a predominance of elasticities taken from articles in journals (69%), although there also is a noted presence in the sample of other forms of dissemination (31%). Furthermore, most of the values correspond to studies published in this century (62%), although in the 90s there was a notable concentration of such papers (35%) and only a small minority of the same in the 80s (3%). With respect to each value obtained, we consider if the author gives greater credibility to them than the others included in the work (69% are credible for the authors). In this sense, it must be pointed out that although there always is a credible value in each study, it is also common to present various estimations, without showing preferences for any of them. Only in 25 articles were just one value presented as the preferred value.

5. Results

The meta-regression analysis is carried out by incorporating as meta-regressors dummy variables built from the characteristics of the different results. In this sense, in every group of dummy variables we have eliminated one of them, to avoid perfect multi-collinearity. Once the dummy variables are constructed, the mean is subtracted, so that the inclusion of the different groups of dummies does not modify the value of the constant, which is the estimated average elasticity. However, the interpretation of the coefficients associated to the different methodological options is still carried out in relation to the omitted one (in Table 2 the omitted dummy is indicated by an asterisk). The variable identifying the year of publication is introduced in logarithm. Furthermore, we have included the interaction of dummies for countries and five-year periods when we have five or more observation belonging to the corresponding groups.

The results of the meta-regression analysis by mixed effects, the preferred procedure departing from the Q statistic, are also summed up in Table 2²⁰. Second column offers the meta-

---
²⁰ In the basic meta-analysis, expression (1), the Q test value rejects the null hypothesis that \( \tau^2 \) equals zero, and therefore, the results obtained by the random effects model are preferred to those obtained by fixed effects. This supports the need for a meta-regression analysis. The \( \tau^2 \) between-studies variance was estimated through maximum restricted likelihood, an approach recommended by Thompson and Sharp (1999) as the most adequate.
regression with the complete sample. Last column carries out a meta-regression solely for the values that the authors have considered credible. In general, the results obtained in the two regressions practically match; with very slight discrepancies.

The (constant) mean values obtained for the output elasticity of public capital elasticity are statistically significant and positive in both cases, with values between 0.120 and 0.132. These values are very much below (about a third) the value obtained by Aschauer, and above those taken as definitive in some recent meta-analyses (Bom and Ligthart, 2014). In the first column we included a dummy variable that captures self-selection carried out by the author himself from amongst his results. Furthermore, in both columns we indicate if the results are published in journals. In both cases, these dummies are statistically significant, confirming the presence of both types of biases, towards higher values.

The larger coefficient obtained for the quadratic standard error when the elasticity is positive in relation to when it is negative, can be interpreted as the existence of publication bias originated by those erratic results provided by small samples, being corrected.

With regard to meta-regressors, there is evidence of the importance of the theoretical focus adopted. The use of a growth model or a frontier approach would imply a fall in the estimated elasticities with respect to the production function. On the contrary, the value increases notably (trebling) in cases where the quasi-production function is used. Additionally, results suggest that when constant returns to scale on all factors are imposed, the elasticity of public capital tends to increase, the opposite occurs when this restriction is forced on private factors. However, the values obtained show that the elasticities are statistically equal or slightly higher if public capital is obtained through the estimation of a productivity function.

On the other hand, a certain positive influence is perceived on the elasticity of public capital when the economic cycle is introduced in the estimated function. The inclusion of variables that control for the density of economic activity reduces the elasticity value, as expected.

It is discernible that productive capital shows a higher effect on productivity than public capital as a whole. Surprisingly, we find the contrary effect with the use of transport infrastructures.
A negative effect results if the public capital variable is measured through a flow. The way in which capital is measured and the used output variable don't show statistically significant differences.

The use of time series offers, as was to be expected, mean elasticities that are generally much higher than those which used panel or cross sectional data. In the same way, when the sample refers to a geographical area smaller than the country, the elasticities obtained increase. In this same sense, a very important negative effect is detected when territorial public capital is used against the total. The conjunction of these results implies that the effect of the public capital of all the Public Administrations in a territory, when the units of analysis are in a range smaller than the State, is greater than the simple consideration of the one pertaining to these territorial administrations, which underlines the importance of the network effects. That is why it is found that the inclusion of capital of another administrative level in the same equation brings down the elasticity of the one being analyzed. The net result of all the previous effects indicates that greater territorial disaggregation brings elasticities down.

With regard to the econometric procedure, the studies considering individual effects obtain higher values for the mean elasticity of public capital that offset, but does not compensate, the effect obtained for panels - necessary to carry out this control-. The contrary occurs with the analyses that introduce mechanisms for the improvement of efficiency in the results and, also, control for the possible existence of spurious correlations. As expected, long term elasticities are statistically higher than short term ones (0.16 vs 0.13).

Finally, with respect to the year of publication, it has been observed that there is a very slight downward tendency only when the values preferred by the authors are considered, which might be due to three possible explanations: improvement in econometric techniques conveniently not controlled in the meta-regression specification, a more accurate measuring of the different variables with an improvement in the quantification procedures especially relative to public capital, and, finally, to the fact that the general increase in public capital endowments has lessened the impact, which would be indicative of a very weak presence of decreasing returns in this factor. However, it is striking that this negative effect of the passage of time on elasticity is only detected in
the case of the results chosen by the authors themselves, which would perhaps be indicative of another self-selection bias towards lower values as a result of a change in the paradigm.

However, this very slight downward tendency in the output elasticity of public capital requires careful analysis as it has important and evident implications on the effectiveness of infrastructure investment policies. In those economies with high capital endowments, additional public capital investments could be losing effectiveness. Infrastructure investment expenditure may have overcome Barro’s golden rule and thus the optimal ratio. In fact, the original elasticities of the meta-sample are negatively correlated with the period in which they are observed (Figure 2.A). However, when per capita GDP of the country is used as a proxy of its public capital (Figure 2.B), the tendency reverses, probably due to the influence of those papers published in late 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s using US data and offering very high elasticities.

The estimation of these functions using the meta-regression elasticities and introducing interaction dummies for five-year periods and country, gives different results due to the depuration of elasticities from the effects provoked by methodological decisions and/or the diversity of the employed data. The downward tendency with the time dimension is still observed (Figure 2.C), although resulting slope is much smaller. However, the correlation between per capita GDP and the elasticities is negative (Figure 2.D), evidencing the fall in the effectiveness of additional public capital investments.

Figure 2.E depicts the mean of original elasticities together with country specific estimated ones. Extreme values are corrected when controlling for methodological aspects. However, there are still relevant and significant differences amongst countries, either due to existing public capital endowments when investments are carried out, or because the selection of investment projects is more adequate and more efficient in the use of public resources in some economies than in others, where corruption may be more settle down.

6. Conclusions

21 Both the original elasticities and estimated ones depicted in Figure 2 refer to countries and five-year periods appropriately indicated by corresponding dummy variables. The last Figure shows mean values by country for each considered five-year period. The computation of the elasticities for each country and five-year period is carried out by adding up the estimated intercept resulting from the whole meta-sample (Table 2) and the obtained coefficient for the corresponding dummy.
Nowadays, there exists an important debate with regards to the role that public investment must play in the process of economic recovery and long term growth. The basics of this debate have to do with the actual effectiveness of public investment, and more precisely, those investments in infrastructures.

This paper carries out a meta-regression analysis with the aim of providing a synthesis of previous evidence on the value of output elasticity of public capital or public infrastructures, obtained in a Cobb-Douglas type production function or an equivalent specification. The need for this meta-analysis is justified by the high level of disparity in the results found in literature. This great variability is, for some authors, the result of methodological differences adopted in studies. We therefore also offered a succinct overview of these controversies.

To obtain the meta-sample, we carried out a biblio-metric analysis with the aim of estimating the population of articles on the question, selecting a representative sample and calculating the information content. Almost two thousand values were obtained, corresponding to 145 articles, which account for 50-67% of the information content of the body of work. In this sense, the present meta-analysis on this question, as far as the authors know, is broader and stricter than those carried out to date, more than tripling the information content.

The results of the meta-analysis, especially the acceptance of the random effects model, suggests a need for carrying out a meta-regression analysis in order to assess the extent to which the different methodological decisions and the nature of the information used influence the results obtained. Taking as many as 29 different features associated with each of the values for output elasticity of capital, the meta-regressors were constructed. The results of the meta-regression analysis again confirmed the undeniable, positive effect of public infrastructures on productivity: mean elasticity is found to be at 0.13, about a third of the figure obtained for seminal articles of the late 1980s. Furthermore, evidence was also found of the importance of methodological decisions and the nature of information to the results. In concrete terms, it was found that the theoretical focus adopted, the inclusion of certain variables in the production function, the definition and way of measuring public capital, the structure and range of the sample, the geographical and sectorial
disaggregation and coverage considered and the econometric procedures, all have an influence on the results obtained.

There is, as well, a degree of certainty regarding the importance of the different concepts of publication bias. Particularly worrying is what is derived from the self-selection of authors and of reviewers for the acceptance of papers that publish and veer towards conventional results. This behavior could possibly be limiting the possibility of further of knowledge, due to a certain degree of scientific conservatism.

We find at least four relevant results with regards to the effectiveness of public investments. First, there exists a systematic, statistically significant and positive effect of public capital on productivity. Secondly, this effect is as expected larger in the long run than it is in the short term. Obtained elasticities are slightly higher than those usually employed to compute multipliers, suggesting that public investments will be self-financed in the long term due to generated returns. Nonetheless, it must be noticed that there exists some conditioning elements as the degree of economic slack and monetary accommodation, the efficiency of public investment, and the way in which public expenditure expansions are financed, paying special attention to the public-debt-to-GDP ratio and associated distorting effects.

In third place, the effects are similar amongst different economies, but with a clear influence of the institutional context and the different capacities of countries to properly select and execute investment projects. Without doubts, this provides evidence of the importance of adequate selection and monitoring processes when carrying out new public investments.

Finally, we find a very slight reduction in the value of the elasticities as public capital endowments increase —approximated by the level of per capita GDP—, nevertheless, the values are always positive. This again, confirms that the selection of projects should be more selective in order to benefit more from network effects, and thus avoid the investment in unproductive projects. A proper maintenance of existing infrastructures seems also crucial, as early deterioration of these infrastructures may well be behind the observed fall in effectiveness.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ratner (1983)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Da Costa et al. (1987)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aitchhiser (1989)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aitcheaer (1989)*</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rahn and Rameau (1989)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aaron (1989)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aitchhiser (1990)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elbert (1990)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kornell (1989)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Munnell and Cook (1989)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bernitz and Hawker (1992)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>0.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Duffy-Deno and Elba (1991)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Elmar (1987)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Estevade-Montagut et al. (2001)</td>
<td>28 developing countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hulse (1991)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Talpin (1987)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Garcia and McGinn (1992)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hulse (1986)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mee et al. (1993a)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mee et al. (1993b)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Munter (1993)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jorgens et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Cutillas and Pinero (1984)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Enner (1984)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Enros and Karras (1994a)</td>
<td>OECD Countries</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Enros and Karras (1994b)</td>
<td>OECD Countries</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Garcia Torales and Sierra (1994)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hoti-Eshik (1994)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kees et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Otto and Voss (1996)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A. and Caeiro (1997)</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Andrews and Swanson (1995)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ballagi and Pignolet (1995)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chritical and Pompulian (1995)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dalaleka (1995)</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>De la Fuente y Vives (1995)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>González-Peñaranda (1995)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hult-Eskin and Schwieterman (1995a)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hult-Eskin and Schwieterman (1995b)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hult-Eskin and Vivas (1995)</td>
<td>OECD Countries</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sturm and de Rian (1995)</td>
<td>USA and Holland</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Garcia and McGinn (1995)*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hultenark (1995)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hult-Eskin and Lewis (1996)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Khosh (1996)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Kees et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Otto and Voss (1996)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Grooten and Hirschman (1997)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Kielan and Robinson (1997)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mavrou and Navis (1997)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Vilerod and Vajiac (1997)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Aitchhiser (1999)</td>
<td>46 developing countries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>BFitina (1968)</td>
<td>6 European countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Boister (1996)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Carring (1998)</td>
<td>153 Countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Embry (1998)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Flores de Frutos et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Moua (1998)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Neumann (1998)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Otto and Voss (1998)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sanchez-Roiz (1998)</td>
<td>57 Countries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sturm et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Coder et al. (1999)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Carring (1999)</td>
<td>37 developing countries</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Dalan and Lemo (1999)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Decker et al. (1999)</td>
<td>136 countries and territories</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Gareckb (1999a)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Gareckb (1999b)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pici (1999)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Blythh and Kjdlman (2000)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Bomke (2001)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Carring and Bennathan (2001)</td>
<td>67 Countries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Charlot and Schmitt (1999)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 1928 observations

Source: Own elaboration
### TABLE 2: ELASTICITY VALUES OF THE META-SAMPLE ACCORDING TO CHARACTERISTICS AND METHODOLOGICAL OPTIONS FOLLOWED IN THE PAPERS OF THE META-SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics and Methodological Options</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mean Self-selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Specification of Production Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.a. Theoretical approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Function</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-production function</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function frontier</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.b. Economies of scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No constant returns</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant returns in all factors</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant returns in private factors</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.c. Inclusion of public capital in the production function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the production function</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a productivity function</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.d. Variables incorporated in the production function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density of activity</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another type of public capital</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary effects</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Measuring the variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.a. The definition of public capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.b. Form of measure public capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmonetary</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.c. Variable output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Nature and disaggregation of statistical information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.a. Data structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time series</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross section</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.b. Sample geographical breadth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Country</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group countries</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than country</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.c. Responsible administrative level of capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Capital</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Capital of central public administrations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Capital of territorial public administrations</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another territorial public capital</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public capital neighbors</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.d. Sector coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All sectors</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of sectors</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Econometric methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.a. Individual effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individual effects</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With individual effects</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.b. Econometric treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental variables</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious correlation</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Publication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.a. Publication type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No journal</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.b. Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credible</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not credible</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.c. Year of publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade 80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade 90</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade 00</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>CREDIBLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.132***</td>
<td>0.120***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-selection</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
<td>0.026***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication in Journal</td>
<td>0.037***</td>
<td>0.029***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se2</td>
<td>-2.820***</td>
<td>-2.053***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se2*</td>
<td>6.137***</td>
<td>7.348***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Specification of Production Function**

**A.a. Theoretical approach**

- Production Function 1639
- Growth 186
- Quasi production function 69
- Function frontier 34
- Constant returns on all factors 300
- Constant returns on private factors 265

**A.b. Economies of scale**

- In the production function 988
- Through a productivity function 940
- Cycle 518
- Human capital 319
- Energy 68
- Temporary effects 450

**A.c. Inclusion of public capital in the production function**

- In a productivity function 940
- Public capital of central public admin 71
- Public capital of territorial public 79
- Another territorial public capital 78

**A.d. Variables incorporated in the production function**

- Productive 435
- Monetary 1607
- Value added 1737

**B. Measuring the variables**

**B.a. The definition of public capital**

- Total 853
- Productive 435
- Transport 640

**B.b. Form of measure public capital**

- Stock 1751
- Flow 137
- Monetary 1607
- Nonmonetary 321

**B.c. Variable output**

- Value added 1737
- Production 191

**C. Nature and disaggregation of statistical information**

**C.a. Data structure**

- Panel 1372
- Cross section 85

**C.b. Sample geographical breadth**

- Individual Country 1447
- Less than country 162

**C.c. Responsible administrative level of capital**

- Total Public Capital 1778
- Public Capital of central public admin 71
- Public Capital of territorial public 79

**C.d. Sector coverage**

- All sectors 1337
- Industry 421
- Rest of sectors 170

**D. Econometric methodology**

**D.a. Individual effects**

- No individual effects 748
- With individual effects 1180

**D.b. Econometric treatments**

- Efficiency 705
- Instrumental variables 457
- Spurious correlation 216
- Long term 405

**E. Publication**

- Year of publication 0.001

**Q-test**

- Total Observations 35486.003*** 19990.035***

---

In parenthesis are presented p-values for the H0: B=0. *** and * denote significance at 1, 5 and 10% respectively. In all estimations we introduced a set of dummy variables for each country in every five years periods when there are at least 5 observations referring to it. (1) Refers to the number of observations of the sample -elastilities in the metasample- that fulfill every criterion (i.e. the number of ones in the dummy)
FIGURE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF THE VALUES OF OUTPUT ELASTICITY OF PUBLIC CAPITAL IN THE META-SAMPLE
FIGURE 2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORIGINAL AND ESTIMATED ELASTICITIES AND TIME, PER-CAPITA GDP AND COUNTRIES

A. Original elasticities (meta-sample) and five-years periods

B. Original elasticities (meta-sample) and Per-capita GDP

C. Estimated elasticities (from meta-regression) and five-years periods

D. Estimated elasticities (from meta-regression) and Per-capita GDP

E. Average original and estimated elasticities by country