IEB
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona

NEXT TRAIN TO THE POLYCENTRIC CITY: THE EFFECT OF RAILROADS ON SUBCENTER FORMATION

Miguel Ángel García-López, Camille Hémet, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal

Cities and Innovation

Document de

NEXT TRAIN TO THE POLYCENTRIC CITY: THE EFFECT OF RAILROADS ON SUBCENTER FORMATION

Miquel-Àngel Garcia-López, Camille Hémet, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal

The Barcelona Institute of Economics (IEB) is a research centre at the University of Barcelona (UB) which specializes in the field of applied economics. The IEB is a foundation funded by the following institutions: Applus, Abertis, Ajuntament de Barcelona, Diputació de Barcelona, Gas Natural, La Caixa and Universitat de Barcelona.

The **IEB** research program in **Cities and Innovation** aims at promoting research in the Economics of Cities and Regions. The main objective of this program is to contribute to a better understanding of agglomeration economies and 'knowledge spillovers'. The effects of agglomeration economies and 'knowledge spillovers' on the Location of economic Activities, Innovation, the Labor Market and the Role of Universities in the transfer of Knowledge and Human Capital are particularly relevant to the program. The effects of Public Policy on the Economics of Cities are also considered to be of interest. This program puts special emphasis on applied research and on work that sheds light on policy-design issues. Research that is particularly policy-relevant from a Spanish perspective is given special consideration. Disseminating research findings to a broader audience is also an aim of the program. The program enjoys the support from the **IEB-Foundation.**

Postal Address:
Institut d'Economia de Barcelona
Facultat d'Economia i Empresa
Universitat de Barcelona
C/ John M. Keynes, 1-11
(08034) Barcelona, Spain
Tel.: + 34 93 403 46 46
ieb@ub.edu
http://www.ieb.ub.edu

NEXT TRAIN TO THE POLYCENTRIC CITY: THE EFFECT OF RAILROADS ON SUBCENTER FORMATION [*]

Miquel-Àngel Garcia-López, Camille Hémet, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal

ABSTRACT: Recent evidence reveals that transportation's improvements within metropolitan areas have a clear effect on population and job decentralization processes. Yet, very little has been said on how these improvements affect the spatial organization of the economic activity in the suburbs. This paper analyses the effects of transportation's changes on employment subcenters formation. Using data from metropolitan Paris between 1968 and 2010, we first show that rail network improvements cause the expected job decentralization by attracting jobs to suburban municipalities. Our main contribution is to show that the new rail transit clearly affects the spatial organization of employment through the number and size of the employment subcenters: not only does the presence of a rail station increase the probability of a suburban municipality of belonging to a subcenter by 5 to 10 %, but a 10 % increase in municipality proximity to a suburban station is found to increase its chance to be part of a subcenter by 3 to 5 %.

JEL Codes: R11, R12, R14, R4, O2

Keywords: Urban spatial structure, decentralization, subcenters, polycentric city, transportation.

Miguel Ángel García-López
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona & IEB
E-mail: miquelangel.garcia@uab.cat

Camille Hémet
Ecole Normale Supérieure (PSE) & IEB
E-mail: camille.hemet@psemail.eu

Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal
Universitat de Barcelona & IEB
E-mail: eviladecans@ub.edu

1. Introduction

Over the past fifty years, the Paris metropolitan area has been undergoing an unprecedented process of employment decentralization, whereby the employment share of the central city (Paris) fell from more than 45% in 1968 to less than a third today. In the meantime, national and regional governments have dedicated huge amount of money to improve public transportation in the area, with particular attention paid to the rail transit network. Suggestive evidence of this investment is provided by the Regional Express Rail (*Réseau Express Régional* in French, RER henceforth), a new and more efficient regional railway network that started operating in 1975 and represented about 600 kilometers of rails in 2010. The main goal of this paper is thus to investigate the role played by the improvement of rail transit between 1968 and 2010 on Paris' job decentralization process and in particular on the formation of employment subcenters.

We organize our investigation in three parts. First, we study the effects of transit on the intrametropolitan distribution of employment: Does rail transit foster local employment growth and decentralization in metropolitan Paris? We not only show that there is concentration around transit (employment growth increases with proximity to rail stations), but we also provide evidence that transit actually causes job decentralization (employment growth in central Paris declines with proximity to rail stations).

Second, we analyze the spatial pattern of job decentralization: Is Paris decentralization diffuse or clustered around subcenters? The McMillen's nonparametric approach (McMillen, 2001) allows us to identify employment subcenters in all six census years. The number of subcenters grew from 21 in 1968 to 35 in 2010, some municipalities emerging as (part of) subcenters over the period while others were dropped out during the process. More importantly, our analysis reveals that employment growth in the subcenters during this period was very intense, both in absolute and relative terms. As a result, it seems clear that the spatial pattern of job decentralization in Paris is reinforcing the polycentric nature of its urban spatial structure.

Finally, we reach to the key question suggested before and our contribution to literature. We investigate the role played by transportation on the emergence of those employment subcenters: Does rail transit cause subcenter formation? Our results show that the answer is 'yes': (1) the presence of a rail station increases the probability of a suburban municipality of being (part of a) subcenter by 5%, and (2) a 10% increase in municipality proximity to a suburban station causes about a 3% increase in its probability of being (part of) a subcenter. These results are robust to subcenter size and definition, and we only find that the effects are heterogeneous in terms of the type of rail: the suburban train and the Regional Express Rail (RER). While the effects for suburban train are similar to the average results mentioned above, the effect of the RER are much higher: the presence of a RER station increases the probability of being (part of) a subcenter by 10%, and the corresponding effect of getting 10% closer to a RER station amounts to 5%.

Our investigation contributes to the literature in three ways. As far as we know, we are the first to simultaneously study employment decentralization and subcenter formation in a very long time period. As Duranton and Puga (2015) point out, very little is known about the details

of the spatial patterns of decentralized employment[1] and the frontier of knowledge was defined 15 years ago by Glaeser and Kahn (2001) and McMillen and Smith (2003). Using data at the county level for 335 US cities, Glaeser and Kahn (2001) show that job decentralization between 1950 and 1990 was mainly diffuse. On the contrary, McMillen and Smith (2003) use 1990 data at the Transportation Analysis Zone level to identify employment subcenters in 62 US cities and find that they are mainly polycentric[2]. In our paper, we analyze trends in job decentralization in a non-US city, Paris, and track the emergence of its employment subcenters from 1968 to 2010 using data at a fine spatial scale, the municipality. Our results reveal that the recent spatial pattern of job decentralization in Paris have reinforced its polycentric spatial configuration that was already apparent in 1968.

Second, this paper is the first to empirically study the role played by transportation on subcenter formation and thus the first to provide empirical evidence that supports theoretical models of urban spatial structure. As is well known, transportation plays a crucial role in the spatial distribution of residences and firms within cities. In the classical monocentric city model, transportation (accessibility) is the main factor that determines urban land use (Duranton and Puga, 2015). In nonmonocentric models, the emergence of subcenters (and their number) depends on the interplay between agglomeration economies, transportation and population (Fujita and Ogawa, 1982, Helsley and Sullivan, 1991, Henderson and Mitra, 1996, Henderson and Slade, 1996, Berliant, Peng, and Wang, 2002, Lucas and Rossi-Hansberg, 2002, Anas and Kim, 1996, Berliant and Wang, 2008). From an empirical point of view, McMillen and Smith (2003) are the only ones to explore the connection between transportation and subcenters. Because their work is restricted to 1990, they can only focus on the number of subcenters and not on subcenter formation. Furthermore, since the number of subcenters is arguably determined simultaneously with transportation (and metropolitan population), this paper provides an interesting description of the data but not an estimate of causal effects as noted by Duranton and Puga (2015). In our paper, we study the causal effect of transportation on subcenter formation by using decennial census data from 1968 to 2010 to track transportation improvements and the emergence of subcenters in metropolitan Paris. We follow Duranton and Turner (2012) and address endogeneity concerns relying on Instrumental Variables (IV) techniques with a historical instruments built on the 19th century railroads (1870). Our results confirm this causality.

A final contribution of our research is further our understanding of the role of transportation infrastructure on shaping cities. Transportation fosters urban growth (Duranton and Turner, 2012), population suburbanization (Baum-Snow, 2007, Garcia-López, 2012, Baum-Snow, Brandt, Henderson, Turner, and Zhang, 2015, Garcia-López, Holl, and Viladecans-Marsal, 2015b), employment decentralization (Baum-Snow, 2010, 2014), and modify zoning (Garcia-López, Solé-Ollé,

---

[1]Most papers characterize the intrametropolitan location of employment by identifying subcenters and/or estimating density functions: while Giuliano and Small (1991), McDonald and Prather (1994) and McMillen (2001, 2004) show the existence of employment subcenters in some US cities, Glaeser and Kahn (2004) consider that job decentralization is mainly diffuse and directly related with cars. Others study the determinants of intrametropolitan growth (e.g. Boarnet, 1994, Bollinger and Ihlanfeldt, 1997, 2003, Garcia-López and Muñiz, 2013, Mayer and Trévien, 2015) and of growth in (within) subcenters (e.g. Giuliano and Small, 1999, Genevieve, Redfearn, Agarwal, and He, 2012, Garcia-López, 2012)

[2]Similar results are obtained by Arribas-Bel and Sanz-Gracia (2014) using local indicators of spatial association (LISA) to identify subcenters in 359 MSAs with census tract data for 1990, 2000 and 2010.

and Viladecans-Marsal, 2015). Our results indicate that transportation also influences the spatial pattern of decentralized employment by fostering the emergence of employment subcenters.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the main features of population, employment and rairload changes in the Paris metropolitan area over the past fifty years, and shows that railroad improvements actually caused the observed employment decentralization process. Section 3 explores the pattern of this process, revealing that is has been clustered rather than diffused. Section 4 analyses the influence of railroad transit on the employment subcenters formation and finally Section 5, summarizes and concludes.

2. Does rail transit foster local growth and decentralization?

The main purpose of our paper is to establish whether rail transit causes subcenter formation. Prior to answering this question, we need to assess the role played by rail transportation in employment growth and in the decentralization process in the Paris metropolitan area.

### 2.1 Growth, decentralization and rail transit in the Paris metropolitan area

This study focuses on the Paris metropolitan area, a French administrative region known as *Ile de France*. Composed of 1,300 municipalities, it is the densest and most populated metropolitan area in France, with 981 inhabitants per square kilometer in 2010 for a total of 11,786,234 inhabitants. It is also the region with the highest employment density, with a total of 5,668,902 jobs in 2010 (21.6% of French employment). Relying on detailed population and employment data at the municipal level from six census waves (1968, 1975, 1982, 1990, 1999 and 2010), we are able to track the evolution of the urban spatial structure of the Paris metropolitan area over the past forty years. We also use precise transportation data, provided by Mayer and Trévien (2015) and the IAU, to characterize the changes in the area's public transportation over the period. This data illustrates two features that will be central to our analysis: (1) the Paris metropolitan area is undergoing a process of employment decentralization in which its central city (Paris) loses jobs in favor of suburban locations, and (2) its public transportation infrastructure is based on a rail transit network that has been dramatically improved since the 1960s.

The decentralization process can be illustrated by noting that the number of jobs in the CBD (Paris) declined by 7.1% between 1968 and 2010. Over the same period, while the metropolitan area as a whole grew by about one third, the share jobs located in Paris dropped from 45.3% to 31.7%. This evolution of jobs' location, which is described more precisely in Appendix A Table A.1, reveals that Paris is decentralizing both in absolute and relative terms[3]. Additional evidence of this decentralization process comes from estimating the traditional monocentric density function for each census year. Using municipal data, we regress the log of employment density on the distance to the center of the CBD (Paris). In order to take nonlinearities into account, our estimations are based on a nonparametric method known as Locally Weighted

---

[3]We generally refer to our companion paper Garcia-López, Hémet, and Viladecans-Marsal (2015*a*) (Section 2) for an extensive description of employment growth patterns and of subcenters' evolution.

Regression (LWR), with a bandwidth of 0.5[4] (McMillen, 2001)[5]. The LWR density estimates drawn in Figure 1 clearly illustrate the decentralization process between 1968 (blue line) and 2010 (red line). Indeed, between these two dates, employment density in the most central municipalities (0 to 10 km from the CBD) decreased, while it increased in municipalities located between 10 and 60 km from the CBD, in line with a decentralization of jobs from the CBD towards suburban municipalities. We can also note a reduction in employment density for the most peripheral (mostly rural) municipalities (more than 60 km from the CBD). This, combined with the increase observed for the suburban municipalities indicate the emergence of new suburban subcenters (and reinforcement of existing ones).

Figure 1: Employment decentralization in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

Note: Density estimates based on LWR with a window size of 0.5.

The second fact we want to emphasize is the recent improvement of rail transit in the Paris metropolitan area. The transportation infrastructure of the Paris metropolitan area today is mostly based on a railroad network made of more than 1,600 km of lines and including four network types, as illustrated in Figure A.1 of Appendix A. First, a suburban train (henceforth *train)* connecting Paris to the rest of the metropolitan area (suburbs as well as some of the most remote rural municipalities), that underwent substantial improvement over the 1960s. Second, the Paris region is endowed with a regional express network (*Réseau Express Régional* in French, RER henceforth) which started operating during the second half of the 1970s. Like the train, the RER connects Paris to the suburbs, but for a shorter maximum distance of about 30 km. Most of the RER lines follow the train lines and were designed to improve the existing train network. An important distinction between the train and RER networks is that the latter has connections

---

[4]A window size of 0.5 means that the nearest 50% of observations are weighted.

[5]Results are similar when using window sizes of 0.1, 0.3, 0.8 and 1.0 and are available upon request.

within Paris. This means the RER enables passengers to commute from one part of the Paris Metropolitan Area to another, going through Paris, but without having to switch to another train to cross the city. This represents a clear improvement to regional transit overall. As a whole, the RER network increased its number of lines from 1 to 5, its total length from 39 to 587 km, its number of stations from 22 to 243, and its number of municipalities with stations from 16 to 167 between 1975 and 2010. In addition to these regional railroad networks, Paris is characterized by a very dense subway system (*métro* henceforth), which started in 1900, and is mainly connecting areas within Paris. Between 1968 and 2010, the métro network kept expanding, such that a few métro stations are now located beyond Paris, in the immediate outskirts of the CBD. The city of Paris and its closest suburban area (the first ring of municipalities out of Paris) also enjoy a tramway network. This fourth network is much more recent, dating back from the beginning of the 1990s, and is still expanding[6].

Finally, it is important to note that the origins of these rail transit networks can be traced back to the 19th century. In the empirical strategy of the following sections, we exploit this link to correct for the potential biases related to the endogenous location of rail stations and subcenter formation. In particular, we rely on IV techniques with two historical instruments as sources of exogenous variation: the distance to the nearest 1870 railroad line and a dumy variable indicating whether a give municipality was crossed by a railroad line in 1870. In Appendix B we extensively document and discuss the validity of these 1870 rail variables as instruments for the location of modern railroad stations. A very close identification strategy is developed in our companion paper (Garcia-López *et al.*, 2015*a*), to which we refer for further details.

2.2 *Proximity to rail transit and local growth*

We can now turn to the main goal of this section: to assess the role played by rail transportation on the job decentralization process that we just identified, and on employment growth more generally. Using the 1968–2010 employment data and the location of railway stations for the 1,300 municipalities of the Paris metropolitan area, we therefore analyze the role of rail transportation on employment growth. To this aim, we estimate a growth function, focusing on the effects of proximity to railway stations by regressing the change in employment density on the distance between the center of the municipality and the nearest station:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_t \ln(\text{Employment density}) = {} & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times \ln(\text{distance to the nearest station})_{t-1} \\
& + \beta_2 \times \ln(\text{densities})_{t-1} + \beta_3 \times \ln(\text{distance to CBD}) \\
& + \sum_i (\beta_{4,i} \times \text{geography}_i) + \sum_i (\beta_{5,i} \times \text{history}_i) \\
& + \sum_i (\beta_{6,i} \times \text{socioeconomy}_{i,t-1})
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

We control for characteristics related to the initial urban spatial structure of metropolitan Paris such the distance to the CBD, and employment and population densities in year *t*-1). Also for

---

[6]Our companion work (Garcia-López *et al.*, 2015*a*) provides a more thorough description of this transportation network.

municipal geography with altitude, index of terrain ruggedness, and elevation range variables. History variables are the population levels between 1962 and year t-2 and dummy variables for municipalities (1) that were Roman settlements (based on DARMC[7] maps), (2) that were major towns between the 10th and the 15th centuries (based on DARMC maps), and (3) between the 16th and the 19th centuries (based on Bairoch, 1988), and (4) with a monastery built between the 12th and 16th centuries (based on DARMC maps). Socioeconomic variables are computed for year t-1 and are the unemployment rate, the shares of employment in Manufacturing, in Construction, and in Services, the share of executives and professionals, and the share of population with university degree.

In order to address endogeneity concerns between railroad and employment location, we estimate Eq. (1) by two stage least squares (TSLS) and instrument the distance to the nearest modern railroad station with the distance the nearest 1870 railroad line.

Table 1: The effect of rail transit on employment growth and decentralization, TSLS estimates

Dependent variable:	Δln(Employment density)						
	40 year period		Subperiods		Decentralization?		
	1968–2010	1968–2010	1968–1990	1990–2010	1968–2010	1968–1990	1990–2010
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
ln(Dist to station) in year t-1	-0.229^a	-0.407^a	-0.236^b	-0.158^b	-0.428^a	-0.249^b	-0.148^b
	(0.050)	(0.134)	(0.118)	(0.067)	(0.133)	(0.119)	(0.065)
ln(Dist to station) in year t-1					1.425^a	0.900^b	0.223^b
$\times$ CBD dummy					(0.429)	(0.352)	(0.130)
ln(Emp density) in year t-1		-0.678^a	-0.513^a	-0.368^a	-0.646^a	-0.492^a	-0.368^a
		(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.043)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.043)
ln(Pop density) in year t-1		0.504^a	0.407^a	0.349^a	0.433^a	0.360^a	0.345^a
		(0.106)	(0.098)	(0.054)	(0.106)	(0.103)	(0.055)
First-stage statistic	176.52	42.25	42.25	84.19	42.12	42.12	88.50
ln(Distance to CBD)	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Geography	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
History	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Instrument/s:	ln(Distance to the nearest 1870 railroad line)				ln(Dist to 1870 rail)		
					ln(Dist 1870 rail) $\times$ CBD dummy		

Notes: 1300 observations in each regression. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

The estimated coefficients are displayed in Table 1. In columns 1 and 2, the results for the whole 1968–2010 period show that the further away a municipality was from a station, the more its employment density decreased over the period. To put it differently, these estimates reveal that proximity to rail stations fosters employment growth. Decomposing the total period into two

---

[7]The Digital Atlas of Roman and Medieval Civilizations (DARMC) is a website with free GIS maps for the Roman and medieval worlds (see darmc.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do).

subperiods (columns 3 and 4) shows that this concentration around transit is observable both at the beginning and at the end of the period, but is more marked in the early years of the period (1968 to 1990), corresponding to the first and main improvements of the railway network.

Evidence of the decentralization process described in the previous subsection is presented in columns 5 to 7, in which the regressions control for the interaction between the distance to the closest railway station and a dummy variable indicating the CBD. The coefficients for this interaction term reveal that conditional on belonging to the CBD (the 20 *arrondissements* of Paris), getting closer to rail station tends to reduce employment over time, a clear sign of job decentralization.

Finally, we can note that the estimated coefficients for proximity to rail stations remain stable when we control for the proximity to highway ramps, as reported in Appendix D. These regressions also show that the distance to the closest highway ramp does not relate to employment growth.

3. Is Paris decentralization diffuse or clustered around subcenters?

After establishing that the Paris metropolitan area went through a job decentralization process related to the improvement of the railway transportation network, we now want to characterize the spatial pattern of this process: Does decentralization follow a *polycentric* spatial pattern, reinforcing existing secondary centers (subcenters) and/or fostering the emergence of new ones? Or does it rather reflect a *dispersed* spatial pattern, in which suburban land is occupied by low-density settlements? To answer these questions, we first identify subcenters for each census year between 1968 and 2010 before analyzing the evolution of employment inside these subcenters versus noncentral locations between 1968 and 2010.

3.1 Identifying and characterizing subcenters

An employment subcenter is a place with a significantly larger employment density than nearby locations that has a significant effect on the overall spatial distribution of jobs. We identify employment subcenters using the method first developed by McDonald and Prather (1994) and improved by McMillen (2001). The main idea is to estimate densities following a monocentric spatial pattern. The predicted densities obtained are then substracted from the corresponding real densities. The positive and statistically significant residuals are finally selected.

While McDonald and Prather (1994) estimate by OLS a two dimensional density function (log of employment density on the distance to CBD), as in Figure 1, McMillen (2001) suggests estimating a three-dimensional density function (log of employment density on north-south and east-west distances to CBD) with a Locally Weighted Regression (LWR). Both improvements allow to take into account geographical differences, which, in terms of the spatial pattern of densities, can occur in any direction from the CBD (e.g. steeper density gradients on the north side than on the south side of the city). They additionally allow to define any type of monocentric spatial pattern: concave, convex or linear.

We therefore estimate the following employment density function:

$$\ln(\text{Employment density}) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \times \text{north-south distance to CBD}$$
$$+ \gamma_2 \times \text{east-west distance to CBD}$$

(2)

where density is measured as jobs per hectare, and distances are in kilometers. The CBD is defined as the 20 *arrondissements* that make up the city of Paris. Distance to CBD is the distance to the centroid of the 4th *arrondissement* (corresponding to the town-hall of Paris).

Since our estimates are based on LWR, we need to define a bandwidth. As McMillen (2001) points out, this is a critical choice because we need a monocentric benchmark. We experiment with alternative window sizes ranging from 1% to 9% and from 10% to 90% (see Table C.1 in Appendix C). After visual inspection, we find that the first monocentric spatial structure appears when the nearest 50% observations are included in each local regression. Interestingly, this is the value used by McMillen (2001) for some US cities. We also experimented with a selection rule based on the Akaike information criterion. However, the selected window size (7%) was clearly related to a polycentric spatial structure (see and compare Tables C.1 and C.2 in Appendix C).

Second, for each site we compute the residual as the difference between the log of real employment density and the estimated log of employment density. We then select those that are significantly positive, according to their own standard errors that can vary over space (McMillen, 2001). We use two critical thresholds, 1.96 and 1.64, that are associated with a 5% and a 10% significance level, respectively.

Finally, we group the selected sites in subcenters when they are contiguous. We use a "queen" criterion for contiguity: two sites (municipalities) are contiguous if they share at least one point in their boundaries. See McMillen (2001, 2003) and Garcia-López (2010) for further details on this procedure.

This methodology enables us to identify subcenters for each census year between 1968 and 2010, which are described in Table 2. For each year, we report two figures, corresponding to subcenters identified using positive residuals significant at the 5 and at the 10% level, respectively. From Panel A, we can see that the number of subcenters identified at the 5% level (respectively, at the 10% level) increased from 20 to 26 (respectively from 21 to 35) between 1968 and 2010. Panel B reveals that these subcenters hosted 1,756,000 jobs in 2010 (respectively 1,979,000), corresponding to an increase of about 600,000 jobs since 1968 (respectively 560,000). We can also observe that subcenters are heterogeneous in terms of size, with an increasing number of large subcenters (more than 20,000 jobs), in line with the decentralization process: in 1968, between 15% and 20% of subcenters hosted more than 20,000 jobs, contrasting with a range of 42% to 50% in 2010. Finally, we want to emphasize that the number of subcenters and the number of jobs in the subcenters do not differ much whether the subcenters are identified using positive residuals a the 5% level or at the 10% level. We will henceforth use the subcenters identified at the 10% level in our analysis.

Table 2: Employment subcenters in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

Resid. significant at:	1968		1975		1982		1990		1999		2010	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
Panel A: Number of subcenters												
All subcenters	20	21	26	27	30	32	29	34	31	34	26	35
$\geq$ 10,000 jobs	7	8	13	14	18	16	19	21	19	19	19	23
$\geq$ 20,000 jobs	3	4	8	7	9	12	13	13	13	12	13	15
Panel B: Jobs ('000) in subcenters												
All subcenters	1,152	1,419	1,319	1,667	1,237	1,665	1,373	1,788	1,441	1,782	1,756	1,979
$\geq$ 10,000 jobs	1,088	1,350	1,254	1,601	1,169	1,582	1,326	1,720	1,369	1,693	1,714	1,909
$\geq$ 20,000 jobs	1,022	1,290	1,184	1,501	1,040	1,513	1,252	1,618	1,281	1,602	1,624	1,788

Note: LWR estimates use a window size of 0.5 (i.e., the nearest of the 50% observations).

Table 3 further describes the identified subcenters (at the 10% level) regarding the number of municipalities they encompass. We can first notice that the number of municipalities that form a subcenter of their own or that are part of a subcenter is quite stable, from 88 in 1968 to 89 in 2010, oscillating between 93 to 97 in the meantime. The last line of Panel A illustrates a certain stability in the composition of subcenters: among all the municipalities belonging to a subcenter, 57 are constantly identified as a subcenter (or as part of a subcenter) over time. The remaining municipalities may have emerged as part of a subcenter at some point, or, alternatively, stopped being considered as such.

Table 3: Municipalities in employment subcenters in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

	1968	1975	1982	1990	1999	2010
Panel A: All subcenters						
All municipalities	88	97	93	95	95	89
Emerging as (part of) subcenters	–	18	7	11	12	5
Disappearing as (part of) subcenters	–	9	11	9	12	11
Always in subcenters	57	57	57	57	57	57
Panel B: Subcenters $\geq$ 10,000 jobs						
All municipalities	73	81	75	80	78	76
Always in subcenters	42	42	42	42	42	42
Panel C: Subcenters $\geq$ 20,000 jobs						
All municipalities	67	73	69	68	69	65
Always in subcenters	38	38	38	38	38	38

Note: Employment subcenters identified using McMillen (2001)'s method with a LWR window size of 50%, and for positive residuals significant at the 10% level.

3.2 *The spatial pattern of decentralization*

In order to determine the spatial pattern of employment decentralization, we now compare the evolution of employment inside and outside these subcenters over the period of interest.

Table 4 displays the number of jobs in each type of area (e.g. subcenter versus non-central) for all census years (columns 1 to 6), and the corresponding variation between 1968 and 2010 (column 7). In the *non-constant geography* panel (Panel A), the figures correspond to all subcenters and all non-central locations identified at a given date, some of them having appeared or disappeared as subcenters since the previous wave. In other words, the geography is not constant in the sense that the municipalities included in the *Subcenters* category (or, by symmetry, in the *Non-central* category) differ between two points in time. By contrast, the figures reported in the *constant geography* panel (Panel B) correspond to geographical zones that are fixed over time according to various criteria. Here, the geography is constant in the sense that the municipalities included in each type of zone considered are the same at each point in time. For instance, the *Always subcenters* category includes the 57 municipalities that are identified as a subcenters (or part of one) in all six years, while the *Always noncentral* group refers to municipalities that were not identified as (part of) a subcenter in *any* year. Similarly, the 35 municipalities identified as (part of) a subcenter in 2010 are included in the *Subcenters in 2010* group for all years, even if they may not have been (part of) a subcenter before 2010, while the remaining 1,265 municipalities go under the *Non-central in 2010* label. Finally, *1968 Non-central to subcenters* refers to municipalities that were non-central in 1968 and, at some point, became (part of) a subcenter and remained as such until 2010, while municipalities that were (part of) a subcenter in 1968 and, at some point, lost this status up to 2010 are labeled as 1968 *Subcenters to non-central*.

Table 4: The spatial pattern of decentralized employment in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

	1968	1975	1982	1990	1999	2010	1968–2010
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
Panel A: Non-constant geography							
Subcenters	1,419	1,667	1,665	1,788	1,782	1,979	560 (39.5%)
MA share	33.2%	35.7%	35.4%	35.2%	35.3%	34.9%	
Non-central	992	1,090	1,232	1,472	1,659	1,893	901 (90.8%)
MA share	21.6%	23.3%	26.2%	29.1%	32.9%	33.4%	
Panel B: Constant geography							
Always subcenters	1,028	1,136	1,112	1,168	1,183	1,372	344 (33.5%)
Always non-central	754	880	961	1,136	1,260	1,383	629 (83.4%)
Subcenters in 2010 (not all years)	104	221	316	438	506	606	502 (482.7%)
1968 Non-central to subcenters	63	176	267	381	450	537	474 (752.4%)
Non-central in 2010 (not all years)	455	518	508	519	493	510	55 (12.1%)
1968 Subcenters to non-central	359	374	348	347	330	342	-17 (-4.7%)

Note: Employment values are thousands of jobs. Growth rates are in parentheses. Employment subcenters identified using McMillen (2001)'s method with a LWR window size of 50%, and for positive residuals significant at a 10% level.

The figures reported in Table 4 reveal several interesting characteristics of the decentralization process. We can see from the non-constant geography panel (Panel A) that subcenters always concentrate around a third of all jobs in the Paris metropolitan area. Non-central municipalities represented around one fifth of all jobs in the metropolitan area in 1968, but up to one third in 2010 (while they include roughly 1,200 municipalities out of the 1,300 under study). Since the municipalities included in a given category vary from one year to another, it is however difficult to compare the employment shares at different dates and to appreciate the increase in employment share for non-central municipalities in this panel.

For this reason, we now turn to the figures of the constant geography panel (Panel B). We can first note that the number of jobs located in the 57 municipalities that are always identified as (part of) a subcenter has increased over time, from 1,028 thousands in 1968 to 1,372 thousands in 2010, which corresponds to a growth rate of 33.5% (column 7). The increase in the number of jobs in *always non-central* municipalities is even more striking: this subset of municipalities saw its number of jobs grow by 83.4% over the period, with 629 thousands additional jobs. Although this increase in the number of jobs is almost twice as large as the one experienced by *always subcenters* municipalities, we must bear in mind that the latter represent less than 5% of municipalities. We can also observe that the magnitude of employment growth in *2010 subcenters* and in *1968 noncentral to subcenters* is very large, both in absolute and relative terms.

4. Does rail transit cause subcenter formation?

After analyzing the job decentralization process in the Paris metropolitan area, we now turn to the most important part of this paper, where we contribute to the literature by establishing that rail transit causes subcenter formation. To answer to this key question, we proceed in two steps. We first investigate whether the existence of a rail station in a suburban municipality increases the probability that this municipality becomes (part of) a subcenter. Then, we examine whether proximity to rail stations also increases the likelihood of becoming (part of) a subcenter, even when the station is not built on the municipal ground.

In both steps, our empirical strategy consists in regressing the probability that a municipality becomes a subcenter on a *rail station variable*. In section 4.1, where we explore the role of the existence of a rail station, this variable indicates whether there is a station within the administrative boundaries of the municipality or the number of stations and lines in the municipality. Alternatively, in section 4.2, this variable measures the distance between a municipality and the closest station. All regressions include controls for the characteristics related to Paris urban spatial structure (geography, history, and socio-economic variables) that were used in Equation (1). The general equation, that will be estimated using probits, can thus be expressed as follows:

$$\text{Prob(subcenter)}_t = \beta_0 + \delta_1 \times \text{Rail station variable}_t$$
$$+ \delta_2 \times \ln(\text{densities})_t + \delta_3 \times \ln(\text{distance to CBD})$$
$$+ \sum_i (\delta_{4,i} \times \text{geography}_i) + \sum_i (\delta_{5,i} \times \text{history}_i) \qquad (3)$$
$$+ \sum_i (\delta_{6,i} \times \text{socioeconomy}_{i,t})$$

In order to correct for the potential biases related to the endogenous location of rail stations, we use the distance to the nearest 1870 railroad line (Section 4.1) and a dummy variable indicating whether a given municipality was crossed by a rail (a train line) in 1870 (Section 4.2) as instruments, as explained in Section 2 and documented and discussed in Appendix B. However, the use of these historical instruments comes with a caveat: since they are time invariant, we can not estimate using panel data techniques. As a result, we pool all observations together, irrespective of the year, and include year fixed effects in our regressions. As a robutness, we also run some cross-sectional regressions.

4.1 Do rail stations lead to subcenters?

In order to establish whether the existence of a rail station in a suburban municipality increases the probability that this municipality becomes (part of) a subcenter, we estimate Eq. (3) using the subsample of the 1,280 suburban municipalities (excluding the 20 *arrondissements* of Paris).

The marginal effects of the corresponding (second-stage) results are displayed in Table 5. Columns 1 to 7 presents results estimated on the full subsample of all suburban municipalities. In columns 1 and 2, the station variable represents the number of lines times station, which counts the total number of lines having a stop in a municipality (it can be seen as a weighted count of the number of stations). The station variable then simply counts the number of stations in columns 3 and 4, and indicates the existence of a station in columns 5 to 7.[8] We will restrict our comments on the specifications that control for the geographical and historical characteristics, after noting that the marginal effects are significantly reduced in the conditional regressions.

Column 4 indicates that an additional station increases the probability that the municipality becomes (part of) a subcenter by 2.8%. This effect is exactly the same as that of having an additional line stopping in the municipality (column 2). This does not come as a surprise given that most of the suburban municipalities are only crossed by one train line, so that the number of lines-stations is actually very close to the number of stations.

Regarding the existence of a station, we estimate a slightly larger effect, around 4% over the whole period (column 6). This difference in magnitude can be interpreted as saying that *what matters the most in explaining subcenter formation is the mere existence of a train station, not the number of stations*. This effect increases to 4.7% when we focus on the 1975-2010 period (column 7),

---

[8]Therefore, if a municipality has two stations, with n_1 lines stopping in one station and n_2 lines in the other one, the "number of lines-stations" variable takes a value of $n_1 + n_2$, the "number of stations" variable takes a value of 2, and the dummy variable is equal to 1.

suggesting either that the effect is delayed in time, or that the transportation system built after 1975 (mostly the RER) explains a larger part of the overall effect.

Table 5: The effect of rail stations on subcenter formation, IV Probit - Marginal effects

Dependent var.:	Probability of being (part of) a subcenter									
	All suburban municipalities							Without always subcenters		
Variable type:	Number of lines-stations		Number of stations		Dummy=1 for municipality with stat			Dummy=1 for municipality with stat		
Period/year:	68-10 [1]	68-10 [2]	68-10 [3]	68-10 [4]	68-10 [5]	68-10 [6]	75-10 [7]	75-10 [8]	1975 [9]	2010 [10]
Station variable	0.087^a	0.027^b	0.092^a	0.028^b	0.142^a	0.040^c	0.047^c	0.053^b	0.035^c	0.075^c
	(0.024)	(0.012)	(0.025)	(0.013)	(0.046)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.045)
F-S statistic	73.24	26.99	71.68	25.34	127.12	41.11	39.41	38.04	33.81	31.63
ln(Densities)	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Geography	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
History	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Observations:	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	7680	6400	6115	1223	1223
	(1280 suburban municipalities × 6 census years)						(1280×5)	(1223×5)		
Instrument:	Dummy=1 if municipality is crossed by a 1870 rail									

Notes: Regressions in columns 1 to 8 include year effects. Robust standard errors and are in parentheses (and are clustered by municipality in regressions in columns 1 to 8). [a], [b], and [c] indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

In order to dig further into this time variation, we focus on the 1975-2010 period in columns 8 to 10, taking the municipalities systematically identified as subcenters out of the sample. The estimated effect over the period jumps to 5.3% (column 8) confirming the idea of an reinforced effect in the most recent period (the effect goes from 3.5% in 1975 to 7.5% in 2010 (columns 9 and 10), but the difference is not significant).

We check the robustness of our results in Appendix E. In Table E.1 Panel A we show that estimates are robust to subcenter size and definition: the effect is always between 3.5% and 4.4%, whether we focus on municipalities of more or less than 50,000 inhabitants (columns 1 and 2), and whether we rely on subcenters identified using the 5% criterion (columns 3 and 4) (instead of 10% in the main results). In Table E.2 Panel A we test the validity of our identification strategy by dropping some observations of municipalities. Since the 1870 railroad network was probably planned to serve the most important municipalities during the 19th centuries, we first drop municipalities that were important. We do not have population data at the municipality level for these years, as a result we use our historical dummy variables that signal the most important towns through history. That is, we drop municipalities that were Roman settlements and/or major towns during the 10th and 19th centuries and/or with a monastery built between the 12th and 16th centuries (columns 1 and 2). Alternatively, we also drop observations of municipalities with a rail station built during the 19th century (columns 3 adn 4). In both cases, results still show a significant and positive effect of having a rail station on the probability of becoming (part of) a subcenter.

We now refine our results by investigating the train station effect, looking alternatively at two different train types: suburban trains versus RER. The corresponding results are displayed in columns 1 to 4 of Table 6 for the former train type, and in columns 5 to 8 for the latter. Over the 1968-2010 period, we estimate that the presence of a suburban train station in a municipality increases the likelihood that it becomes a subcenter by 3.4% (column 2). As before, this effect slightly increases (to 3.9%) when we focus on the 1975-2010 period (column 3), and goes up to 4.4% once we exclude municipalities that are always identified as a subcenter (column 4). These figures are of the same order of magnitude, although slightly lower than the estimates obtained for all train types in the previous table (the corresponding figures being 4%, 4.7% and 5.3% respectively).

Table 6: The effect of train and RER stations on subcenter formation, IV Probit - Marginal effects

Dependent var.:	Probability of being (part of) a subcenter							
	Train stations				RER stations			
	All suburban municipalities			Without always sub	All suburban municipalities			Without always sub
Period:	68-10	68-10	75-10	75-10	68-10	68-10	75-10	75-10
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Station dummy	0.175^a	0.034^c	0.039^c	0.044^a	0.680^a	0.140^a	0.135^a	0.102^a
	(0.049)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.191)	(0.046)	(0.036)	(0.034)
F-S statistic	114.12	44.56	43.62	36.83	29.43	10.74	9.91	11.21
ln(Densities)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Geography	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
History	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Observations:	7680	7680	6400	6115	7680	7680	6400	6115
	(1280 × 6 years)	(1280×5)	(1223×5)		(1280 × 6 years)	(1280×5)	(1223×5)	
Instrument:	Dummy=1 if municipality is crossed by a 1870 rail							

Notes: All regressions include year effects. Robust standard errors are clustered by municipality and are in parentheses. [a], [b], and [c] indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

On the other hand, the RER results reveal that this particular type of train has a much stronger impact on subcenter formation. The existence of a RER station is indeed found to increase the probability of becoming (part of) a subcenter by 14% over the 1968-2010 period (column 6), an effect about four times as large as for suburban trains. Interestingly, looking at the later period (after 1975) does not show a significantly different effect (13.5%, column 7).

4.2 Does proximity to rail stations lead to subcenters?

We now want to examine the effect of the distance to a train station on subcenter formation. This presents a double advantage: it enables us to measure the spatial effect of the presence of

a train station, and allows to consider the effect of a train station on municipalities that do not possess any. In other words, we investigate whether the effect of a rail station can go beyond the boundaries of the municipality where the station is located.

To this aim, we now use the distance (in log) of a municipality's centroid to the closest train station as the *train station variable*. The main conclusion to be drawn from the results reported in Table 7 is that train stations have extended spatial effects: being closer to a station increases the probability to be (part of) a subcenter, even for municipalities without any station.

Table 7: The effect of rail proximity on subcenter formation, IV Probit - Marginal effects

Dependent var.:	Probability of being (part of) a subcenter										
	All suburban stations				Train stations				RER stations		
	All suburban muni			Without muni-stat	All suburban muni			Without muni-stat	All muni		Without muni-stat
Period:	68-10	68-10	75-10	75-10	68-10	68-10	75-10	75-10	75-10	75-10	75-10
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]
ln(Distance)	-0.092^a	-0.024^a	-0.027^a	-0.027^a	-0.105^a	-0.024^a	-0.027^a	-0.030^b	-0.127^a	-0.042^b	-0.049^a
	(0.014)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.019)
F-S statistic	203.20	82.82	82.44	39.92	171.24	43.08	42.40	19.25	87.80	21.28	12.92
ln(Densities)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Geography	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
History	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Observations:	7680	7680	6400	4885	7680	7680	6400	4885	6400	6400	4885
	(1280×6)		(1280×5)	(977×5)	(1280×6)		(1280×5)	(977×5)	(1280×5)		(977×5)
Instrument:	ln(Distance to the nearest 1870 rail)										

Notes: All regressions include year effects. Robust standard errors are clustered by municipality and are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

As in the previous section, we find a very similar effect of the proximity to any type of train or to suburban train alone. In this case, getting closer to a station by one kilometer increases the probability of becoming a subcenter by 2.4% (columns 2 and 6), or by 2.7% considering the 1975-2010 period (columns 3 and 7). On the other hand, the effect of being one kilometer closer to an RER station is estimated at 4.2% (column 10). Therefore, proximity to a station matters in the suburbanization process, especially for RER station.

We obtain similar results when we restrict our sample to the 977 suburban municipalities that do not have any station within their boundaries (columns 4, 8 and 11). This effect, of 3% for suburban trains and 4.9% for RER, confirms the spatially lagged effect of train stations.

Finally, we check that our results are robust to subcenter size (more or less than 50,000 inhabitants) and definition (subcenters identified using the 5% threshold instead of 10%), and to a more restrictive sample after dropping observations for historical towns and municipalities

crossed by railroads during the 19th century. These tests are reported in Tables E.1 Panel B and E.2 Panel B in Appendix E.

To summarize the results of this section, two main points can be highlighted. First, train stations do play a role in the subcenter formation process, and this effect is spatially lagged: the existence of a train station increases the probability of becoming part of a subcenter by 4 to 5%, and decreases at a rate of about 3% per kilometer. Second, the RER is the type of train having the most important effect, with a direct effect of around 14% for municipalities with a station, and a spatial decay of about 5% per kilometer.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we investigate the effect of railroad construction on the emergence of employment subcenters in metropolitan Paris between 1968 and 2010. Because of the potential endogeneity problem of railroad provision, we rely on IV estimations that use historical instruments built on the 19th century railroad network: a dummy for municipalities crossed by 1870 railroads, and the (log) distance to the nearest 1870 railroad.

We provide descriptive evidence of an employment decentralization process: while the number of jobs grew by 30% in the whole metropolitan area, it declined by 7.1% in central and increased by 65% in suburban municipalities between 1968 and 2010. Simultaneously, we highlight the important railroad improvements in the same period: the construction of the *Réseau Exoress Réginal* increased the railroad network with 5 new lines with 587 km and 243 stations. Our first results confirm that only railroads foster local employment growth: our average estimates reveal that job growth increases with proximity to rail stations. When we focus on central Paris, results confirm that railroads do cause job decentralization: getting closer to a rail station tends to reduce employment over time.

We then focus on the suburbs to study the spatial pattern of job decentralization. We identify employment subcenters and, despite some municipalities emerge as (part of) subcenters whereas others were dropped, the number of subcenters grew from 21 in 1968 to 35 in 2010. Since employment growth in these subcenters was very intense over the period, we conclude that employment decentralization in Paris is more clustered around subcenters than diffuse, thus reinforcing the polycentric nature of the city.

Finally, we investigate whether railroads cause the emergence of employment subcenters in Paris and our results confirm the causal effect. On average, the probability of a suburban municipality of being (part of a) subcenter increases by 5% if the municipality has a rail station within its boundaries, or by 3% if, although not having a rail station, municipality proximity to a rail station increases by 10%. Results for the RER confirm its effect is stronger: a 10% and a 5% increase in the probability of becoming (part of a) subcenter if the municipality has a RER station or if municipality proximity to a RER station increases by 10%, respectively.

The contribution of the paper is relevant because, as far as we know, it provides the first empirical evidence on the causal effect of transportation (railroad) on subcenter formation. Furthermore, these new results are useful for urban planners facing and dealing the consequences

of urban growth and, in particular, of population suburbanization, employment decentralization and urban sprawl: while these phenomena might reduce city's agglomeration economies (Glaeser and Kahn, 2004), the emergence of employment subcenters can potentially compensate and even overcome these loses by offering new agglomeration economies and avoiding CBD's congestion costs (McMillen, 2004).

References

Anas, Alex and Ikki Kim. 1996. General Equilibrium Models of Polycentric Urban Land Use with Endogenous Congestion and Job Agglomeration. *Journal of Urban Economics* 40(2): 232–256.

Arribas-Bel, Daniel and Fernando Sanz-Gracia. 2014. The validity of the monocentric city model in a polycentric age: US metropolitan areas in 1990, 2000 and 2010. *Urban Geography* 35(7): 980–997.

Bairoch, Paul. 1988. *Cities and Economic Development: From the Dawn of History to the Present*. University of Chicago Press.

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel. 2007. Did highways cause suburbanization? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122(2): 775–805.

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel. 2010. Changes in transportation infrastructure and commuting patterns in us metropolitan areas 1960-2000. *American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings* 100: 378–382.

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel. 2014. Urban transport expansions, employment decentralization, and the spatial scope of agglomeration economies. *Mimeo* .

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel, Loren Brandt, J. Vernon Henderson, Matthew A. Turner, and Qinghua Zhang. 2015. Roads, railroads and decentralization of chinese cities. *Mimeo* .

Berliant, Marcus, Shin-Kun Peng, and Ping Wang. 2002. Production Externalities and Urban Configuration. *Journal of Economic Theory* 104(2): 275–303.

Berliant, Marcus and Ping Wang. 2008. Urban growth and subcenter formation: A trolley ride from the Staples Center to Disneyland and the Rose Bowl. *Journal of Urban Economics* 63(2): 679–693.

Boarnet, Marlon G. 1994. The monocentric model and employment location. *Journal of Urban Economics* 36(1): 79–97.

Bollinger, Christopher and Keith Ihlanfeldt. 1997. The impact of rapid rail transit on economic development: The case of atlanta's marta. *Journal of Urban Economics* 42(2): 179–204.

Bollinger, Christopher and Keith Ihlanfeldt. 2003. The intraurban spatial distribution of employment: which government interventions make a difference? *Journal of Urban Economics* 53(3): 396–412.

Duranton, Gilles and Diego Puga. 2015. Urban land use. In Gilles Duranton, J. Vernon Henderson, and William C. Strange (eds.) *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics Volume 5*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 467–560.

Duranton, Gilles and Matthew A. Turner. 2012. Urban growth and transportation. *The Review of Economic Studies* 79(4): 1407–1440.

Fujita, Masahisa and Hideaki Ogawa. 1982. Multiple equilibria and structural transition of non-monocentric urban configurations. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 12(2): 161–196.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Àngel. 2010. Population suburbanization in Barcelona, 1991-2005: Is its spatial structure changing? *Journal of Housing Economics* 19(2): 119–132.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Angel. 2012. Urban spatial structure, suburbanization and transportation in Barcelona. *Journal of Urban Economics* 72(2–3): 176–190.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Àngel, Camille Hémet, and Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2015*a*. How does transportation shape intrametropolitan growth? an answer from the regional express rail. Working paper 2015/20, IEB.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Àngel, Adelheid Holl, and Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2015*b*. Suburbanization and highways in Spain when the Romans and the Bourbons still shape its cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* 85(0): 52 – 67.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Àngel and Ivan Muñiz. 2013. Urban spatial structure, agglomeration economies, and economic growth in barcelona: An intra-metropolitan perspective. *Papers in Regional Science* 92(3): 515–534.

Garcia-López, Miquel-Àngel, Albert Solé-Ollé, and Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2015. Does zoning follow highways? *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 53(C): 148–155.

Genevieve, Giuliano, Christian L. Redfearn, Ajay Agarwal, and Syvia He. 2012. Network accessibility and employment centers. *Urban Studies* 49(1): 77–95.

Giuliano, Genevieve and Kenneth A. Small. 1991. Subcenters in the Los Angeles region. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21(2): 163 – 182.

Giuliano, Genevieve and Kenneth A. Small. 1999. The determinants of growth of subcenters. *Journal of Transport Geography* 7: 189 – 201.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Matthew E. Kahn. 2001. Decentralized employment and the transformation of the American city. In W.G. Gale and J.R. Pack (eds.) *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs: 2001*. Brookings Institution Press, 1–47.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Matthew E. Kahn. 2004. Sprawl and urban growth. In J. Vernon Henderson and Jacques-François Thisse (eds.) *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics Volume 4*. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 2481–2527.

Helsley, Robert W. and Arthur M. Sullivan. 1991. Urban subcenter formation. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21(2): 255–275.

Henderson, Vernon and Arindam Mitra. 1996. The new urban landscape: Developers and edge cities. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 26(6): 613–643.

Henderson, Vernon and Eric Slade. 1996. Development games in non-monocentric cities. *Journal of Urban Economics* 34(2): 207–229.

Lucas, Robert E. and Esteban Rossi-Hansberg. 2002. On the internal structure of cities. *Econometrica* 70(4): 1445–1476.

Martí-Henneberg, Jordi. 2013. European integration and national models for railway networks (1840–2010). *Journal of Transport Geography* 26(0): 126–138.

Mayer, Thierry and Corentin Trévien. 2015. The impacts of urban public transportation. Evidence from the Paris metropolitan area. Working Paper g2015/03, INSEE.

McDonald, John F. and Paul J. Prather. 1994. Suburban employment centers: The case of Chicago. *Urban Studies* 31(2): 201–218.

McMillen, Daniel P. 2001. Nonparametric employment subcenter identification. *Journal of Urban Economics* 50(3): 448–473.

McMillen, Daniel P. 2003. Identifying sub-centres using contiguity matrices. *Urban Studies* 40(1): 57–69.

McMillen, Daniel P. 2004. Employment densities, spatial autocorrelation, and subcenters in large metropolitan areas. *Journal of Regional Science* 44(2): 225–244.

McMillen, Daniel P. and Stefani C. Smith. 2003. The number of subcenters in large urban areas. *Journal of Urban Economics* 53(3): 321–338.

Michaels, Guy. 2008. The effect of trade on the demand for skill: Evidence from the interstate highway system. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 90(4): 683–701.

Appendix A. 1968-2010: Decentralization and transportation improvements

Table A.1: Employment trends in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

	1968	1975	1982	1990	1999	2010	1968–2010
Metropolitan area	4,277	4,675	4,705	5,076	5,042	5,669	1,392 (32.6%)
CBD (municipality of Paris)	1,936	1,918	1,808	1,815	1,601	1,798	-138 (-7.1%)
MA share	45.3%	41.0%	38.4%	35.8%	31.8%	31.7%	
Suburban municipalities	2,341	2,757	2,897	3,261	3,441	3,871	1,530 (65.4%)
MA share	54.7%	59.0%	61.6%	64.2%	68.2%	68.3%	

Note: Employment values are thousands of jobs. Growth rates are in parentheses.

Figure A.1: Transportation infrastructures in metropolitan Paris, 2010

Appendix B. Rail transit in Paris: Past and present

One of the main purposes of this paper is to evaluate whether and to what extent transportation has fostered the emergence of employment subcenters in metropoliran Paris. However, first we need to deal with an identification issue because transportation and its improvements are not placed randomly. On the contrary, they are endogenous to employment and/or population location and growth. Planners may for instance decide to improve the connection of deprived areas in order to boost their economic activity or attract population. In order to address this issue, we adopt an instrumental variable approach in which some variables, named instruments, are used as sources of exogenous variation for our transportation endogenous variables.

Recent literature highlights the advantages in terms of exogeneity and relevance of using 'historical' and 'planned' instruments. For instance, Baum-Snow (2007), Michaels (2008) and Duranton and Turner (2012) use the 1947 plan of the interstate highway system as an instrument for modern highways in the US, and Duranton and Turner (2012) additionally rely on the 1898 railroad network. Garcia-López (2012) uses the ancient Roman roads, and the 19th century main road and railroad networks as instruments for highways and railroads in metropolitan Barcelona. Finally, Garcia-López *et al.* (2015*b*) use the ancient Roman roads and the 1760 Bourbon roads (post routes) to instrument current highways in Spain.

Following the above mentioned literature, we instrument modern railroads in metropolitan Paris with a historical instrument, the 1870 railroad network. The first French railroads were built at the beginning of the 19th century, but slightly later than in the UK due to Napoleon wars: the first line connecting Paris to a city located 18 km away (Saint-Germain) was not opened before 1837. In 1870, the railroad network was based on 698 km of railroad lines. Due to the high levels of centralization in France, it had a star-shaped form centered around Paris (Figure B.1).

Figure B.1: The 1870 railroads

Source: Own elaboration based on Martí-Henneberg (2013) maps.

Is the 1870 rail network a valid instrument?

As above mentioned, the fact that modern roads and railroads were built following ancient infrastructures has already been argued and used in the literature. Common sense would suggest that in France as well, past infrastructures shape current ones due to practical reasons: it is easier and cheaper to build new transportation infrastructures as an improvement of old ones for instance, or close to them (Duranton and Turner, 2012). We now test empirically the credibility of this assumption in the context of the metropolitan area of Paris. To do so, we conditially regress our endogenous rail variables on their historical counterparts and some control variables:

$$\text{2010 Rail transit variable} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \times \text{1870 rail transit variable}$$
$$+ \sum_i (\alpha_{2,i} \times \text{control variables}) \tag{B.1}$$

It is important to point out the importance of the control variables, in particular geography and history. Although ancient transportation infrastructures may be exogenous because of the length of time since they were built, the significant changes undergone by society and economy in the intervening years, and, in particular, because neither of them were built to anticipate employment and population changes in a distant future; it is also true that other factors such as the geography are likely to have influenced the construction and location of both ancient and modern transportation infrastructures for obvious reasons related to the feasibility and convenience of infrastructure building. From this point of view, it is crucial to include geographic characteristics such as altitude, index of terrain ruggedness, and elevation range as controls to comply with the exogeneity condition.

On the other hand, it is equally important to control for the historical context, since it may explain both the presence of former infrastructure and the economic importance of present-days municipalities. In order to fulfill the exclusion restriction, and because there are no historical employment and population data at the municipal level prior to 1962 and 1968, we control for history by including the population level in 1962 and dummy variables indicating (1) whether municipalities were Roman settlements, (2) whether they used to be major towns between the 10th and the 15th centuries and (3) between the 16th and the 19th centuries, and (4) whether they had a monastery built between the 12th and 16th centuries. These dummy variables come from the Digital Atlas of Roman and Medieval Civilizations, with the exception of the major cities of the 16th to 19th centuries which are identified in Bairoch (1988). To put it differently, we assume *conditional* exogeneity of the proposed instruments, as suggested by (Duranton and Turner, 2012).

Regarding the relevance of our potential instruments, Table B.1 shows results for versions of Eq. (B.1) in which we analyze the relationship between modern and past railroads in terms of the presence of stations and proximity to them. In particular, in Panel A, we study whether suburban municipalities crossed by a 1870 rail receive a rail stations. In all cases (pooled vs. cross section regressions in columns 1 and 2-3, all railroads vs. train and RER regressions in columns 1 and 4-5) we find significant and positive coefficients for the presence of 1870 rails. In Panel B, we estimate the effect of municipality proximity to 1870 rail on the municipality proximity to the

nearest modern rail. Conditional on control variables, estimated coefficients for the 1870 distance variable are positive and highly significant. As a whole, results in Table B.1 clearly show that historical rails matter for modern rail construction and location.

Table B.1: Modern rail transit as a function of past rail transit, OLS estimates

Panel A: Rail stations						**Panel B:** Proximity to rail stations			
Dependent var.:	Dummy=1 if muni with station					Dependent var.:	ln(Dist to nearest station)		
Rail type:		Rail		Train	RER		Rail	Train	RER
Period/year:	75-10 [1]	1975 [2]	2010 [3]	75-10 [4]	75-10 [5]	Period:	75-10 [6]	75-10 [7]	75-10 [8]
Dummy=1 if crossed by 1870 rail	0.179^a (0.029)	0.177^a (0.030)	0.168^a (0.030)	0.173^a (0.028)	0.031^a (0.009)	ln(Distance to nearest 1870 rail)	0.180^a (0.029)	0.121^a (0.028)	0.093^a (0.026)
Adjusted R^2	0.37	0.30	0.39	0.24	0.24	Adjusted R^2	0.54	0.42	0.71
F-S statistic	38.04	33.81	31.63	36.83	11.21	F-S statistic	39.92	19.25	12.92
ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y
Geography	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Geography	Y	Y	Y
History	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	History	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y
Observations:	6115 (1223×5)	1223	1223	6115 (1223×5)	6115	Observations:	4885 (977 muni × 5 years)	4885	4885

Notes: Pooled regressions in Columns 1 and 4 to 8 include year effects. Cross section regressions in Columns 2 and 3 include a constant. Columns 1 to 3, Columns 4 and 5, and Columns 6 to 8 show first-stage results for regressions in Table 5 Columns 8 to 10, Table 6 Columns 4 and 8, and Table 7 Columns 4, 8 and 11, respectively. Robust standard errors are clustered by municipality and are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

Appendix C. LWR and urban spatial structure in metropolitan Paris, 1968–2010

Table C.1: Employment spatial structure and LWR: A benchmark to identify subcenters

	1968	1975	1982	1990	1999	2010
1% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
3% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
5% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
7% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
9% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
10% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
30% LWR Benchmark	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric	Polycentric
50% LWR Benchmark	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric
70% LWR Benchmark	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric
90% LWR Benchmark	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric	Monocentric

Table C.2: Employment spatial structure and LWR: Akaike information criterion

	1968	1975	1982	1990	1999	2010
1% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	746	767	770	778	774	782
3% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	397	433	446	462	460	479
5% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	346	386	402	423	422	446
7% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	336	377	393	417	417	444
9% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	340	380	396	421	421	450
10% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	345	386	401	426	426	456
30% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	573	598	593	605	590	631
50% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	817	837	820	828	797	843
70% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	1081	1112	1094	1109	1067	1120
90% LWR Akaike inf. crit.	1284	1331	1318	1346	1301	1364

Appendix D. Do rails and highways jointly foster local growth in Paris?

Table D.1: The effect of rail transit and highways on employment growth, TSLS estimates

Dependent variable:	Δln(Employment density)		
Period:	1968–2010	1968–1990	1990–2010
	[1]	[2]	[3]
ln(Dist to rail station) in year *t-1*	-0.446^a	-0.276^b	-0.165^c
	(0.123)	(0.110)	(0.089)
ln(Dist to highway ramp) in year *t-1*	-0.090	-0.092	-0.314
	(0.126)	(0.105)	(0.202)
ln(Emp density) in year *t-1*	-0.677^a	-0.512^a	-0.381^a
	(0.071)	(0.071)	(0.041)
ln(Pop density) in year *t-1*	0.478^a	0.380^a	0.308^a
	(0.101)	(0.094)	(0.066)
First-stage statistic	58.00	58.00	53.19
ln(Distance to CBD)	Y	Y	Y
Geography	Y	Y	Y
History	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y
Instruments:	ln(Distance to the nearest 1870 railroad line)		
	ln(Distance to the nearest Roman road)		

Notes: 1300 observations in each regression. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

Appendix E. Does rail transit cause subcenter formation? Robustness checks

Table E.1: The effect of rail on subcenter formation, IV Probit - Marginal effects:
Robustness to subcenter size and significance

	Panel A: The effect of rail stations					**Panel B:** The effect of proximity to rail stations			
Dependent var.:	Probability of being subcenter				Dependent var.:	Probability of being subcenter			
	Subcenter jobs		5% residuals			Subcenter jobs		5% residuals	
				Without					Without
	$\geq$50,000	<50,000	All obs	alw-sub		$\geq$50,000	<50,000	All obs	alw-sub
Period:	75-10	75-10	75-10	75-10	Period:	75-10	75-10	75-10	75-10
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]		[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Station dummy	0.036^c	0.039^c	0.035^c	0.044^b	ln(Distance)	-0.015^a	-0.017^a	-0.013^c	-0.011^c
	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.021)		(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.006)
F-S statistic	34.20	42.76	38.95	38.29	F-S statistic	81.35	80.63	80.41	84.55
ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Geography	Y	Y	Y	Y	Geography	Y	Y	Y	Y
History	Y	Y	Y	Y	History	Y	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y	Y
Observations:	6214	6117	6400	6195	Observations:	6214	6117	6400	6195
Instrument:	Dummy=1 if crossed by a 1870 rail				Instrument:	ln(Dist to the nearest 1870 rail)			

Notes: All regressions include year effects. Robust standard errors are clustered by municipality and are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

Table E.2: The effect of rail on subcenter formation, IV Probit - Marginal effects:
Robustness to identification strategy

	Panel A: The effect of rail stations					**Panel B:** The effect of proximity to rail stations			
Dependent var.:	Probability of being subcenter				Dependent var.:	Probability of being subcenter			
	No historic towns		No 1870 stations			No historic towns		No 1870 lines	
	All obs.	Without alw-sub	All obs	Without alw-sub		Without mun-stat	Without alw-sub	Without mun-stat	Without alw-sub
Period:	75-10 [1]	75-10 [2]	75-10 [3]	75-10 [4]	Period:	75-10 [5]	75-10 [6]	75-10 [7]	75-10 [8]
Station dummy	0.067^a	0.046^b	0.049^b	0.037^c	ln(Distance)	-0.023^a	-0.010^c	-0.025^a	-0.020^a
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.021)		(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.004)
F-S statistic	34.55	35.13	8.53	10.64	F-S statistic	52.85	50.69	95.90	90.45
ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Densities)	Y	Y	Y	Y
ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y	Y	ln(Dist to CBD)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Geography	Y	Y	Y	Y	Geography	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lagged pop	Y	Y	Y	Y	Lagged pop	Y	Y	Y	Y
Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Socioeconomy	Y	Y	Y	Y
Observations:	6185	5955	5385	5245	Observations:	4780	4675	4110	3945
Instrument:	Dummy=1 if crossed by a 1870 rail				Instrument:	ln(Dist to the nearest 1870 rail)			

Notes: All regressions include year effects. Robust standard errors are clustered by municipality and are in parentheses. ^{a}, ^{b}, and ^{c} indicates significant at 1, 5, and 10 percent level, respectively.

2012

2012/1, Montolio, D.; Trujillo, E.: "What drives investment in telecommunications? The role of regulation, firms' internationalization and market knowledge"

2012/2, Giesen, K.; Suedekum, J.: "The size distribution across all "cities": a unifying approach"

2012/3, Foremny, D.; Riedel, N.: "Business taxes and the electoral cycle"

2012/4, García-Estévez, J.; Duch-Brown, N.: "Student graduation: to what extent does university expenditure matter?"

2012/5, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, A.; Salvadori, L.: "Empirical evidence on horizontal competition in tax enforcement"

2012/6, Pickering, A.C.; Rockey, J.: "Ideology and the growth of US state government"

2012/7, Vergolini, L.; Zanini, N.: "How does aid matter? The effect of financial aid on university enrolment decisions"

2012/8, Backus, P.: "Gibrat's law and legacy for non-profit organisations: a non-parametric analysis"

2012/9, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Marín-López, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "What underlies localization and urbanization economies? Evidence from the location of new firms"

2012/10, Mantovani, A.; Vandekerckhove, J.: "The strategic interplay between bundling and merging in complementary markets"

2012/11, Garcia-López, M.A.: "Urban spatial structure, suburbanization and transportation in Barcelona"

2012/12, Revelli, F.: "Business taxation and economic performance in hierarchical government structures"

2012/13, Arqué-Castells, P.; Mohnen, P.: "Sunk costs, extensive R&D subsidies and permanent inducement effects"

2012/14, Boffa, F.; Piolatto, A.; Ponzetto, G.: "Centralization and accountability: theory and evidence from the Clean Air Act"

2012/15, Cheshire, P.C.; Hilber, C.A.L.; Kaplanis, I.: "Land use regulation and productivity – land matters: evidence from a UK supermarket chain"

2012/16, Choi, A.; Calero, J.: "The contribution of the disabled to the attainment of the Europe 2020 strategy headline targets"

2012/17, Silva, J.I.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "The ins and outs of unemployment in a two-tier labor market"

2012/18, González-Val, R.; Lanaspa, L.; Sanz, F.: "New evidence on Gibrat's law for cities"

2012/19, Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "Job search methods in times of crisis: native and immigrant strategies in Spain"

2012/20, Lessmann, C.: "Regional inequality and decentralization – an empirical analysis"

2012/21, Nuevo-Chiquero, A.: "Trends in shotgun marriages: the pill, the will or the cost?"

2012/22, Piil Damm, A.: "Neighborhood quality and labor market outcomes: evidence from quasi-random neighborhood assignment of immigrants"

2012/23, Ploeckl, F.: "Space, settlements, towns: the influence of geography and market access on settlement distribution and urbanization"

2012/24, Algan, Y.; Hémet, C.; Laitin, D.: "Diversity and local public goods: a natural experiment with exogenous residential allocation"

2012/25, Martinez, D.; Sjögren, T.: "Vertical externalities with lump-sum taxes: how much difference does unemployment make?"

2012/26, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "The effect of within-group inequality in a conflict against a unitary threat"

2012/27, Andini, M.; De Blasio, G.; Duranton, G.; Strange, W.C.: "Marshallian labor market pooling: evidence from Italy"

2012/28, Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Do political parties matter for local land use policies?"

2012/29, Buonanno, P.; Durante, R.; Prarolo, G.; Vanin, P.: "Poor institutions, rich mines: resource curse and the origins of the Sicilian mafia"

2012/30, Anghel, B.; Cabrales, A.; Carro, J.M.: "Evaluating a bilingual education program in Spain: the impact beyond foreign language learning"

2012/31, Curto-Grau, M.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.: "Partisan targeting of inter-governmental transfers & state interference in local elections: evidence from Spain"

2012/32, Kappeler, A.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Stephan, A.; Välilä, T.: "Does fiscal decentralization foster regional investment in productive infrastructure?"

2012/33, Rizzo, L.; Zanardi, A.: "Single vs double ballot and party coalitions: the impact on fiscal policy. Evidence from Italy"

2012/34, Ramachandran, R.: "Language use in education and primary schooling attainment: evidence from a natural experiment in Ethiopia"

2012/35, Rothstein, J.: "Teacher quality policy when supply matters"

2012/36, Ahlfeldt, G.M.: "The hidden dimensions of urbanity"

2012/37, Mora, T.; Gil, J.; Sicras-Mainar, A.: "The influence of BMI, obesity and overweight on medical costs: a panel data approach"

2012/38, Pelegrín, A.; García-Quevedo, J.: "Which firms are involved in foreign vertical integration?"

2012/39, Agasisti, T.; Longobardi, S.: "Inequality in education: can Italian disadvantaged students close the gap? A focus on resilience in the Italian school system"

2013

2013/1, Sánchez-Vidal, M.; González-Val, R.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Sequential city growth in the US: does age matter?"

2013/2, Hortas Rico, M.: "Sprawl, blight and the role of urban containment policies. Evidence from US cities"

2013/3, Lampón, J.F.; Cabanelas-Lorenzo, P-; Lago-Peñas, S.: "Why firms relocate their production overseas? The answer lies inside: corporate, logistic and technological determinants"

2013/4, Montolio, D.; Planells, S.: "Does tourism boost criminal activity? Evidence from a top touristic country"

2013/5, Garcia-López, M.A.; Holl, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Suburbanization and highways: when the Romans, the Bourbons and the first cars still shape Spanish cities"

2013/6, Bosch, N.; Espasa, M.; Montolio, D.: "Should large Spanish municipalities be financially compensated? Costs and benefits of being a capital/central municipality"

2013/7, Escardíbul, J.O.; Mora, T.: "Teacher gender and student performance in mathematics. Evidence from Catalonia"

2013/8, Arqué-Castells, P.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Banking towards development: evidence from the Spanish banking expansion plan"

2013/9, Asensio, J.; Gómez-Lobo, A.; Matas, A.: "How effective are policies to reduce gasoline consumption? Evaluating a quasi-natural experiment in Spain"

2013/10, Jofre-Monseny, J.: "The effects of unemployment benefits on migration in lagging regions"

2013/11, Segarra, A.; García-Quevedo, J.; Teruel, M.: "Financial constraints and the failure of innovation projects"

2013/12, Jerrim, J.; Choi, A.: "The mathematics skills of school children: How does England compare to the high performing East Asian jurisdictions?"

2013/13, González-Val, R.; Tirado-Fabregat, D.A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Market potential and city growth: Spain 1860-1960"

2013/14, Lundqvist, H.: "Is it worth it? On the returns to holding political office"

2013/15, Ahlfeldt, G.M.; Maennig, W.: "Homevoters vs. leasevoters: a spatial analysis of airport effects"

2013/16, Lampón, J.F.; Lago-Peñas, S.: "Factors behind international relocation and changes in production geography in the European automobile components industry"

2013/17, Guío, J.M.; Choi, A.: "Evolution of the school failure risk during the 2000 decade in Spain: analysis of Pisa results with a two-level logistic mode"

2013/18, Dahlby, B.; Rodden, J.: "A political economy model of the vertical fiscal gap and vertical fiscal imbalances in a federation"

2013/19, Acacia, F.; Cubel, M.: "Strategic voting and happiness"

2013/20, Hellerstein, J.K.; Kutzbach, M.J.; Neumark, D.: "Do labor market networks have an important spatial dimension?"

2013/21, Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.: "Is money all? Financing versus knowledge and demand constraints to innovation"

2013/22, Lin, J.: "Regional resilience"

2013/23, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.; García-Quevedo, J.: "R&D drivers and obstacles to innovation in the energy industry"

2013/24, Huisman, R.; Stradnic, V.; Westgaard, S.: "Renewable energy and electricity prices: indirect empirical evidence from hydro power"

2013/25, Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.: "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"

2013/26, Lambertini, L.; Mantovani, A.: "Feedback equilibria in a dynamic renewable resource oligopoly: pre-emption, voracity and exhaustion"

2013/27, Feld, L.P.; Kalb, A.; Moessinger, M.D.; Osterloh, S.: "Sovereign bond market reactions to fiscal rules and no-bailout clauses – the Swiss experience"

2013/28, Hilber, C.A.L.; Vermeulen, W.: "The impact of supply constraints on house prices in England"

2013/29, Revelli, F.: "Tax limits and local democracy"

2013/30, Wang, R.; Wang, W.: "Dress-up contest: a dark side of fiscal decentralization"

2013/31, Dargaud, E.; Mantovani, A.; Reggiani, C.: "The fight against cartels: a transatlantic perspective"

2013/32, Saarimaa, T.; Tukiainen, J.: "Local representation and strategic voting: evidence from electoral boundary reforms"

2013/33, Agasisti, T.; Murtinu, S.: "Are we wasting public money? No! The effects of grants on Italian university students' performances"

2013/34, Flacher, D.; Harari-Kermadec, H.; Moulin, L.: "Financing higher education: a contributory scheme"

2013/35, Carozzi, F.; Repetto, L.: "Sending the pork home: birth town bias in transfers to Italian municipalities"

2013/36, Coad, A.; Frankish, J.S.; Roberts, R.G.; Storey, D.J.: "New venture survival and growth: Does the fog lift?"

2013/37, Giulietti, M.; Grossi, L.; Waterson, M.: "Revenues from storage in a competitive electricity market: Empirical evidence from Great Britain"

2014

2014/1, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "When police patrols matter. The effect of police proximity on citizens' crime risk perception"

2014/2, Garcia-López, M.A.; Solé-Ollé, A.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Do land use policies follow road construction?"

2014/3, Piolatto, A.; Rablen, M.D.: "Prospect theory and tax evasion: a reconsideration of the Yitzhaki puzzle"

2014/4, Cuberes, D.; González-Val, R.: "The effect of the Spanish Reconquest on Iberian Cities"

2014/5, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, E.: "Tax professionals' view of the Spanish tax system: efficiency, equity and tax planning"

2014/6, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "Difference-form group contests"

2014/7, Del Rey, E.; Racionero, M.: "Choosing the type of income-contingent loan: risk-sharing versus risk-pooling"

2014/8, Torregrosa Hetland, S.: "A fiscal revolution? Progressivity in the Spanish tax system, 1960-1990"

2014/9, Piolatto, A.: "Itemised deductions: a device to reduce tax evasion"

2014/10, Costa, M.T.; García-Quevedo, J.; Segarra, A.: "Energy efficiency determinants: an empirical analysis of Spanish innovative firms"

2014/11, García-Quevedo, J.; Pellegrino, G.; Savona, M.: "Reviving demand-pull perspectives: the effect of demand uncertainty and stagnancy on R&D strategy"

2014/12, Calero, J.; Escardíbul, J.O.: "Barriers to non-formal professional training in Spain in periods of economic growth and crisis. An analysis with special attention to the effect of the previous human capital of workers"

2014/13, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "Gender differences and stereotypes in the beauty"

2014/14, Piolatto, A.; Schuett, F.: "Media competition and electoral politics"

2014/15, Montolio, D.; Trillas, F.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Regulatory environment and firm performance in EU telecommunications services"

2014/16, Lopez-Rodriguez, J.; Martinez, D.: "Beyond the R&D effects on innovation: the contribution of non-R&D activities to TFP growth in the EU"

2014/17, González-Val, R.: "Cross-sectional growth in US cities from 1990 to 2000"

2014/18, Vona, F.; Nicolli, F.: "Energy market liberalization and renewable energy policies in OECD countries"

2014/19, Curto-Grau, M.: "Voters' responsiveness to public employment policies"

2014/20, Duro, J.A.; Teixidó-Figueras, J.; Padilla, E.: "The causal factors of international inequality in co2 emissions per capita: a regression-based inequality decomposition analysis"

2014/21, Fleten, S.E.; Huisman, R.; Kilic, M.; Pennings, E.; Westgaard, S.: "Electricity futures prices: time varying sensitivity to fundamentals"

2014/22, Afcha, S.; García-Quevedo, J,: "The impact of R&D subsidies on R&D employment composition"

2014/23, Mir-Artigues, P.; del Río, P.: "Combining tariffs, investment subsidies and soft loans in a renewable electricity deployment policy"

2014/24, Romero-Jordán, D.; del Río, P.; Peñasco, C.: "Household electricity demand in Spanish regions. Public policy implications"

2014/25, Salinas, P.: "The effect of decentralization on educational outcomes: real autonomy matters!"

2014/26, Solé-Ollé, A.; Sorribas-Navarro, P.: "Does corruption erode trust in government? Evidence from a recent surge of local scandals in Spain"

2014/27, Costas-Pérez, E.: "Political corruption and voter turnout: mobilization or disaffection?"

2014/28, Cubel, M.; Nuevo-Chiquero, A.; Sanchez-Pages, S.; Vidal-Fernandez, M.: "Do personality traits affect productivity? Evidence from the LAB"

2014/29, Teresa Costa, M.T.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Retail price effects of feed-in tariff regulation"

2014/30, Kilic, M.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "The stabilizing effect of hydro reservoir levels on intraday power prices under wind forecast errors"

2014/31, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Duch-Brown, N.: "The diffusion of patented oil and gas technology with environmental uses: a forward patent citation analysis"

2014/32, Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.; Simón, H.: "Public-private sector wage differentials by type of contract: evidence from Spain"

2014/33, Backus, P.; Esteller-Moré, A.: "Is income redistribution a form of insurance, a public good or both?"

2014/34, Huisman, R.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Costs of power supply flexibility: the indirect impact of a Spanish policy change"

2014/35, Jerrim, J.; Choi, A.; Simancas Rodríguez, R.: "Two-sample two-stage least squares (TSTSLS) estimates of earnings mobility: how consistent are they?"

2014/36, Mantovani, A.; Tarola, O.; Vergari, C.: "Hedonic quality, social norms, and environmental campaigns"

2014/37, Ferraresi, M.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.: "Local infrastructures and externalities: Does the size matter?"

2014/38, Ferraresi, M.; Rizzo, L.; Zanardi, A.: "Policy outcomes of single and double-ballot elections"

2015

2015/1, Foremny, D.; Freier, R.; Moessinger, M-D.; Yeter, M.: "Overlapping political budget cycles in the legislative and the executive"

2015/2, Colombo, L.; Galmarini, U.: "Optimality and distortionary lobbying: regulating tobacco consumption"

2015/3, Pellegrino, G.: "Barriers to innovation: Can firm age help lower them?"

2015/4, Hémet, C.: "Diversity and employment prospects: neighbors matter!"

2015/5, Cubel, M.; Sanchez-Pages, S.: "An axiomatization of difference-form contest success functions"

2015/6, Choi, A.; Jerrim, J.: "The use (and misuse) of Pisa in guiding policy reform: the case of Spain"

2015/7, Durán-Cabré, J.M.; Esteller-Moré, A.; Salvadori, L.: "Empirical evidence on tax cooperation between sub-central administrations"

2015/8, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Analysing the sensitivity of electricity system operational costs to deviations in supply and demand"

2015/9, Salvadori, L.: "Does tax enforcement counteract the negative effects of terrorism? A case study of the Basque Country"

2015/10, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "How time shapes crime: the temporal impacts of football matches on crime"

2015/11, Piolatto, A.: "Online booking and information: competition and welfare consequences of review aggregators"

2015/12, Boffa, F.; Pingali, V.; Sala, F.: "Strategic investment in merchant transmission: the impact of capacity utilization rules"

2015/13, Slemrod, J.: "Tax administration and tax systems"

2015/14, Arqué-Castells, P.; Cartaxo, R.M.; García-Quevedo, J.; Mira Godinho, M.: "How inventor royalty shares affect patenting and income in Portugal and Spain"

2015/15, Montolio, D.; Planells-Struse, S.: "Measuring the negative externalities of a private leisure activity: hooligans and pickpockets around the stadium"

2015/16, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Costa-Campi, M.T.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Unexpected consequences of liberalisation: metering, losses, load profiles and cost settlement in Spain's electricity system"

2015/17, Batalla-Bejerano, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Impacts of intermittent renewable generation on electricity system costs"

2015/18, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Paniagua, J.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "Are energy market integrations a green light for FDI?"

2015/19, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Sánchez-Vidal, M.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Big plant closures and agglomeration economies"

2015/20, Garcia-López, M.A.; Hémet, C.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "How does transportation shape intrametropolitan growth? An answer from the regional express rail"

2015/21, Esteller-Moré, A.; Galmarini, U.; Rizzo, L.: "Fiscal equalization under political pressures"

2015/22, Escardíbul, J.O.; Afcha, S.: "Determinants of doctorate holders' job satisfaction. An analysis by employment sector and type of satisfaction in Spain"

2015/23, Aidt, T.; Asatryan, Z.; Badalyan, L.; Heinemann, F.: "Vote buying or (political) business (cycles) as usual?"

2015/24, Albæk, K.: "A test of the 'lose it or use it' hypothesis in labour markets around the world"

2015/25, Angelucci, C.; Russo, A.: "Petty corruption and citizen feedback"

2015/26, Moriconi, S.; Picard, P.M.; Zanaj, S.: "Commodity taxation and regulatory competition"

2015/27, Brekke, K.R.; Garcia Pires, A.J.; Schindler, D.; Schjelderup, G.: "Capital taxation and imperfect competition: ACE vs. CBIT"

2015/28, Redonda, A.: "Market structure, the functional form of demand and the sensitivity of the vertical reaction function"

2015/29, Ramos, R.; Sanromá, E.; Simón, H.: "An analysis of wage differentials between full-and part-time workers in Spain"

2015/30, Garcia-López, M.A.; Pasidis, I.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Express delivery to the suburbs the effects of transportation in Europe's heterogeneous cities"

2015/31, Torregrosa, S.: "Bypassing progressive taxation: fraud and base erosion in the Spanish income tax (1970-2001)"

2015/32, Choi, H.; Choi, A.: "When one door closes: the impact of the hagwon curfew on the consumption of private tutoring in the republic of Korea"

2015/33, Escardíbul, J.O.; Helmy, N.: "Decentralisation and school autonomy impact on the quality of education: the case of two MENA countries"

2015/34, González-Val, R.; Marcén, M.: "Divorce and the business cycle: a cross-country analysis"

2015/35, Calero, J.; Choi, A.: "The distribution of skills among the European adult population and unemployment: a comparative approach"

2015/36, Mediavilla, M.; Zancajo, A.: "Is there real freedom of school choice? An analysis from Chile"

2015/37, Daniele, G.: "Strike one to educate one hundred: organized crime, political selection and politicians' ability"

2015/38, González-Val, R.; Marcén, M.: "Regional unemployment, marriage, and divorce"

2015/39, Foremny, D.; Jofre-Monseny, J.; Solé-Ollé, A.: "'Hold that ghost': using notches to identify manipulation of population-based grants"

2015/40, Mancebón, M.J.; Ximénez-de-Embún, D.P.; Mediavilla, M.; Gómez-Sancho, J.M.: "Does educational management model matter? New evidence for Spain by a quasiexperimental approach"

2015/41, Daniele, G.; Geys, B.: "Exposing politicians' ties to criminal organizations: the effects of local government dissolutions on electoral outcomes in Southern Italian municipalities"

2015/42, Ooghe, E.: "Wage policies, employment, and redistributive efficiency"

2016

2016/1, Galletta, S.: "Law enforcement, municipal budgets and spillover effects: evidence from a quasi-experiment in Italy"

2016/2, Flatley, L.; Giulietti, M.; Grossi, L.; Trujillo-Baute, E.; Waterson, M.: "Analysing the potential economic value of energy storage"

2016/3, Calero, J.; Murillo Huertas, I.P.; Raymond Bara, J.L.: "Education, age and skills: an analysis using the PIAAC survey"

2016/4, Costa-Campi, M.T.; Daví-Arderius, D.; Trujillo-Baute, E.: "The economic impact of electricity losses"

2016/5, Falck, O.; Heimisch, A.; Wiederhold, S.: "Returns to ICT skills"

2016/6, Halmenschlager, C.; Mantovani, A.: "On the private and social desirability of mixed bundling in complementary markets with cost savings"

2016/7, Choi, A.; Gil, M.; Mediavilla, M.; Valbuena, J.: "Double toil and trouble: grade retention and academic performance"

2016/8, González-Val, R.: "Historical urban growth in Europe (1300–1800)"

2016/9, Guio, J.; Choi, A.; Escardíbul, J.O.: "Labor markets, academic performance and the risk of school dropout: evidence for Spain"

2016/10, Bianchini, S.; Pellegrino, G.; Tamagni, F.: "Innovation strategies and firm growth"

2016/11, Jofre-Monseny, J.; Silva, J.I.; Vázquez-Grenno, J.: "Local labor market effects of public employment"

2016/12, Sanchez-Vidal, M.: "Small shops for sale! The effects of big-box openings on grocery stores"

2016/13, García-López, M.A; Hémet, C.; Viladecans-Marsal, E.: "Next train to the polycentric city: The effect of railroads on subcenter formation"

Cities and Innovation