



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

**A Modified Environmental Kuznets
Curve for Sustainable
Development Assessment Using
Panel Data**

Valeria Costantini and Chiara Martini

NOTA DI LAVORO 148.2006

DECEMBER 2006

CCMP – Climate Change Modelling and Policy

Valeria Costantini and Chiara Martini, *Department of Economics, University of Roma Tre*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=941457>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

A Modified Environmental Kuznets Curve for Sustainable Development Assessment Using Panel Data

Summary

Sustainable development is a concept strictly connected with basic needs of the individuals. During the last years a number of empirical studies have tried to discover and quantify the causal relations between economic growth and environmental consumption and degradation. The most widely used empirical model is the so-called Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), nowadays applied to different polluting elements. Despite the huge diffusion of EKC studies, this model has been criticised for incompleteness of a sustainable development analysis. The aim of this paper is to build a Modified EKC (MEKC) in order to consider a wider concept of development rather than pure economic growth, including well-being aspects and sustainability of the development process. Using a macroeconomic measure of sustainability such as the World Bank's *Genuine Saving* and a measure of well-being such as the United Nations' *Human Development Index*, we build a model in order to analyse linkages between higher welfare levels and natural resources consumption, verifying the sustainability of human development. A panel analysis for three years (1990-1995-2000) for a wide range of countries (including developed and developing countries) has been applied in order to respond to criticisms related to conjunctural results linked to pure cross-section studies. Comparisons among alternative pollutants (i.e., CO₂, NO_x, and SO_x) and GS are described, and the robustness of the MEKC clearly emerges. Furthermore, in order to respond to criticisms for the reduced form of the EKC, an Instrumental Variables model has been tested both on CO₂ and GS, while a system of equations has been tested considering simultaneously a traditional EKC and a MEKC for a longer time period (1996-2004). Unit root tests for non-stationary series have been computed, showing that the IV model gives satisfactory results. An indicator for technological capabilities has been added at this stage, accounting for diffusion of technical progress and import technology as suggested by Archibugi and Coco (2004). Causal relations identified within a MEKC allow to identify correlation between human development and sustainable development, following the classic inverted U-shaped curve of the EKC. Nonetheless, comparing the turning points of the MEKC and EKC, respectively, it seems that using this alternative specification some useful policy implications apply. The threshold level of human development in the MEKC corresponds to an income per capita level lower than the threshold level for the EKC, confirming the possibility of "tunnelling through the curve" as suggested in Munasinghe (1999). Our results show that human development should be the first objective of international development policies, and an increase in human well-being is necessary to provide a sustainability path.

Keywords: Environmental Kuznets Curve, Sustainable development, Human development, Genuine saving, Panel data

JEL Classification: O15, Q01, Q56

The authors are grateful to the participants of the SIEP Conference on "Regulation, production and financing public services", Pavia, September 2006 (Italy) for their helpful suggestions.

Address for correspondence:

Valeria Costantini
Department of Economics
University of Roma Tre
Via Ostiense 139
00154 Rome Italy
Phone/Fax: +39 0657374215
E-mail: costanti@uniroma3.it

1. Introduction

During last decades poor countries have faced a very important challenge, to get ahead of first stages of economic development and industrialisation process without damaging excessively their own environmental assets. A number of scholars and international organisations have suggested that poverty reduction should be one of the main policy actions in order to avoid environmental deterioration (WCED, 1987), while in the longer run, the surest way to improve environmental quality should be to become rich (Beckerman, 1992). Recently such a trade off between poverty and environmental quality has been criticised, suggesting that “win-win” policies in the development and environment spheres could be adopted, enhancing the so-called “sustainable development” level of the economic growth process (Munasinghe, 1999). High income levels could represent a condition which enables some countries to be first movers, but low income levels shouldn’t be a barrier to achieve both lower levels of environmental damage and a higher degree of economic growth.

The examination of the environmental impacts produced by economic growth and the detection of a specific course in the various development stages has produced a series of empirical studies, published in the early 1990s. Their common output is the notion that environmental degradation worsens during the early stages of development and improves in the later ones, following an inverted *U*-shaped curve. On the basis of the seminal work of Simon Kuznets (1955) on the relationship between economic growth and income distribution, in the same venue Selden and Song (1994) coined for the first time the term Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC). As for the classic Kuznets curve, in the case of the EKC the first stages of economic growth are characterised by increasing environmental degradation, while after a threshold level income per capita will continue to grow while environmental degradation will be reduced. Therefore, the relationship between economic growth and environmental quality doesn’t embody necessarily a trade-off, where increasing income per capita could be exempted from any limitations related to natural resources or environmental degradation.

Explanations for the existence of an inverted *U*-shaped path have been considered both on the demand and the supply side, recovering the role of income elasticity for the demand of environmental quality, and the structural features of the productive system as the main drivers for enhancing environmental protection.

From the demand side, the most common explanation for the shape of an EKC is the notion that, as income grows, people achieve higher standards of living and care more for environmental quality. Therefore, after a threshold level of income, the willingness to pay for a clean environment rises by a greater proportion than income, due to high income elasticity of a luxury good such as

environment. People become more concerned about depletion and degradation of the environment, hence exerting pressure on firms to use more pollution abating technologies and on decision makers to introduce environmental regulations.

Even if many EKC empirical findings have emphasised the role of income elasticity of environmental quality demand, in most cases the progress towards environmental protection has been mainly achieved due to institutional reforms and the existence of a democratic government, where the rule of law has played a basic role in order to translate public opinion pressure into a concerted program of pollution abatement (Munasinghe, 1995).

Considering the supply side, for the first time Grossman and Krueger (1995) have indicated three different channels through which economic growth affects the quality of environment: the scale effect, the composition (or structural effect), and the technique effect. Considering the scale effect, growing economic activity leads *ceteris paribus* to increased environmental damage, because a greater amount of natural resources is necessary for the production activities and higher polluting emissions are associated with increasing output. Secondly, structural changes can occur in the economy, leading to different environmental pressures. During the first stages of development (from agriculture to manufacture) environmental degradation tends to increase, whereas during the subsequent periods, the reverse occurs shifting from a heavy manufactured system to a service-oriented economy. This second channel is usually called composition effect. Thirdly, the various sectors of the economy may adopt less polluting technologies, either because of market-driven technological progress or government regulation: the introduction of environmentally-friendly techniques is labelled the technological effect. The specific nature of the abatement technologies with increasing returns to scale could constitute a further explanation of the EKC where high fixed initial investment costs for pollution abating techniques reduce the capacity of poor countries to implement pollution control policies (Andreoni and Levinson, 2001). The EKC hypothesis suggests that the negative impacts on environment linked to the scale effect tend to prevail in the initial stages of economic growth, but after a threshold level (of development) it should be outweighed by the positive impacts of the composition and technological effects. Consequently, there is no *a priori* reason to assume the relationship between income and environmental deterioration strictly monotonic: environmental quality may worsen with economic growth within some ranges of income, but improve over others.

The EKC has been analysed by many scholars both from theoretical and empirical perspectives, where a certain degree of scepticism has been recently related to the capacity of the curve to describe a sustainable growth path. At this purpose, some contributions have attempted to investigate the theoretical implications of a sustainable growth path and the possible linkages with

an empirical EKC formulation. The role of sustainability, and not only environmental degradation, the implications related to technical progress, and the statistical techniques based on panel data and not pure cross-section analyses represent the main steps ahead recently made by the scientific community. The aim of this paper is therefore to overview such theoretical and empirical progress, trying to underline the possible relationships among all these new aspects. In order to do this, a Modified EKC (MEKC) has been modelled in order to consider a wider concept of development rather than pure economic growth, including well-being aspects and sustainability of the development process.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes theoretical investigations addressing the sustainability problem in the traditional economic growth models. Section 3 gives a broad overview of empirical studies, addressing the most recent enhancements including technical progress and using panel data analysis. Section 4 provides a general description of the methodological assumptions adopted in the MEKC. Section 5 shows empirical findings, while Section 6 deals with some concluding remarks.

2. Linking economic growth and environment from a theoretical perspective

The EKC literature consists of two distinct but related areas of research: an empirical strand – the majority – that looks for the econometric specification and a theoretical strand that models the interaction between environment and economic growth. The empirical models generally resort to ex-post theoretical justifications rather than ex-ante formal derivations and, at the same time, even if the results of theoretical models are broadly consistent with the empirical findings, they have rarely been confronted with the data.

Theoretical contributions to the study of EKC can be divided into four major categories (Panayotou *et al.*, 2000): i) optimal growth models; ii) models in which the environment is a factor of production; iii) endogenous growth models; and iv) other macroeconomic models of growth and the environment.

Optimal growth models are dynamic models in which the utility maximisation problem of the infinitely lived consumer is solved using the techniques of optimal control theory. Stock or flow pollution represents an argument of both the production function and the utility function of the representative consumer (Selden and Song, 1994; Stokey, 1998; Brock and Taylor, 2004b).

Differently, other models include environment as an argument of the production function, where both pollution and the stock of natural capital are arguments of production and utility functions. In these models property rights have a fundamental role in determining whether environmental

degradation eventually declines with growth (Lopez, 1994; Chichilnisky, 1994).

In endogenous growth models production functions are characterised by increasing returns to scale and spill-over effects differently from the neoclassical specification (Bovenberg and Smulders, 1995; Stokey, 1998).

Other macroeconomic models refer to Diamond-type overlapping generation models, which add support to the results of the optimal growth models and generalise them (John and Pecchenino, 1994; Jones and Manuelli, 2000). In this residual category there are also included simple static models, like the one adopted by Stokey (1998) and the Robinson Crusoe model of Andreoni and Levinson (2001).

Brock and Taylor (2004a) analyse four theoretical models, in order to highlight the different ways environmental constraints can be met in the face of ongoing growth in per capita incomes.

The first one is an optimal growth model called the Green Solow model, where emission reductions arise from exogenous technological progress in both goods production and abatement. Even with the economy's abatement intensity fixed and no composition effects, the typical convergence properties of the neoclassical model, together with a standard natural regeneration function, trace out an EKC: the transition towards any sustainable growth path is characterised at first by a worsening of environmental quality and then by an improving, while approaching the balanced growth path.¹ Regarding technological progress, the model clearly shows how it has a very different environmental impact in goods production than in abatement: in the first case it produces a scale effect that raises emissions, in the second one creates a pure technique effect, driving emissions downwards. Therefore, the presence or absence of technological progress in abatement is a key factor in lowering emissions, supporting ongoing growth and predicting the costs of pollution control. This explanation for the EKC is entirely distinct from those offered in the literature, because it doesn't include composition effects, increasing intensity of pollution abatement, increasing returns to abatement, evolution of the political process and international trade.

According to this, Kelly (2003) adopts a stock externality model in an optimal growth framework; in this model, as incomes rise over the growth path, both the marginal benefits and the marginal costs of pollution control rise: if the former outweighs the latter at a given income, the emissions curve has a negative slope. The variation of pollution specific parameters - which determine marginal costs and benefits - brings to specific emissions-income relationships: with this hypothesis, the emissions curve can be upward sloping or constant even when environmental quality is a normal good. For both stock and flow pollutants, the emissions curve may easily be

¹ This definition entails positive growth in order to avoid stagnation as a sustainable growth path. With ongoing income growth giving more marketable goods along the balanced growth path, it seems appropriate to require an improving environment since this provides more non market goods.

non-monotonic if the trade-off between the change in marginal costs and benefits with respect to a change in capital varies over the growth path. The trade-off is sensitive to pollution specific parameters and in this sense the relationship between environmental quality and growth generally depends also on which measure of environmental quality is used (Lieb, 2002).

The endogenous growth model adopted by Bovenberg and Smulders (1995) is very similar to the Green Solow model, because of the role of technological progress. Ongoing investments in the knowledge sector raise the productivity of pollution abatement, leading to a balanced growth path with a constant level of environmental quality; the “pollution augmenting technological progress” is equivalent to the technological progress in the Green Solow model. The Green Solow model is also similar to Stokey’s (1998) neoclassical model, differing for the role of technological progress. Stokey generates the EKC prediction through a change in pollution policy along the transition path, highlighting the role that abatement can play in improving the environment over time. In the Green Solow model reductions in pollution came about solely because of changes in technology and not because society allocated a greater share of its resources to pollution prevention. In order to have falling pollution levels with neoclassical assumptions on abatement function and no abatement specific technological progress, the intensity of abatement must rise indefinitely. Once abatement is modelled as an economic activity that uses scarce resources, increases in the intensity of abatement will reduce economic growth: rising abatement creates a technique effect by lowering emissions per unit output, but also lowers pollution by lowering the growth rate of output. Stokey offers a simple explanation for the empirical finding of an EKC, like Lopez (1994) and Copeland and Taylor (2004), showing how an income elastic demand for environmental protection can tighten environmental regulations up. This assumption on tastes, together with certain assumptions on abatement, succeeds in generating a first worsening and then improving environmental quality as growth proceeds. Adopting a Constant Relative Risk Aversion utility function, Stokey proves that emissions fall along the balanced growth path if and only if the elasticity of marginal utility with respect to consumption exceeds one. Only if consumers’ valuation of consumption falls quickly, they are willing to take a smaller and smaller amount of national income as growth proceeds.

Stokey’s explanation for the EKC is quite persuasive because it links rising income levels with a lower shadow cost of abatement and a higher opportunity cost of doing nothing, capturing the idea that policy responds positively to real income growth. Differently from the Green Solow model (technological progress in abatement) and from Stokey’s model (intensified abatement), other forces could be responsible for the falling emissions to output ratio: one of them is represented by changes in the composition of output towards less energy intensive goods.

A model relying on this effect is represented by a source and sink formulation (Brock and Taylor, 2004a), that allows to examine how changes in the energy intensity of production help meet environmental constraints. Energy is introduced as an intermediate good, produced from an exhaustible natural resource, capital and labour and pollution as by-product of input use. Stokey has showed that increasing abatement creates drag on economic growth, whereas the source and sink model shows that a shift towards less energy intensive production lowers growth if it isn't accompanied by increases in capital and effective labour. While intensity of abatement is taken as constant and there is no technological progress in abatement, the economy is able to lower its emissions to output ratio over time by adopting an ever cleaner mix of production methods and composition of its inputs. The source and sink model highlights that the finiteness of natural resources implies a constraint on per capita income growth and in this way it links this approach to the earlier 1970s and 1980s literature focusing on resource exhaustion. Sustainability requires falling emissions and this constraint is most easily met if the economy makes a rapid transition away from natural resource inputs, reducing the energy and pollution intensity of output. Adopting this framework, abatement or composition shifts alone are unlikely to determine falling emissions: considering constraints from the source and sink side together makes clear that technological progress directly targeted to lowering abatement costs must play a key role in order to achieve the twin goals of positive ongoing growth and falling emission levels.

The Kindergarten Rule model (Brock and Taylor, 2003) emphasises the importance of technological progress in abatement and consider the optimising behaviour of a conventional infinitely lived representative agent. The model provides three important contributions. First, it shows how technological progress in abatement can hold compliance costs down in the face of ongoing growth. In contrast to the Green Solow model, there are ongoing costs from regulation but, as long as abatement is productive, it is possible to generate sustainable growth without rising quickly compliance costs. Second, in the Kindergarten Rule model the path for income and pollution differs across countries and this systematic difference leads to the Environmental Catch-up Hypothesis, relating income and pollution paths to initial income levels. Poor countries experience the greatest environmental degradation at their peak, but regulation allows a convergence of environmental quality across both rich and poor. In addition, knowledge spill-overs eliminate diminishing returns to abatement and, as a consequence, learning by doing reduces abatement costs. The introduction of learning by doing, combined with abatement efforts, generates a first worsening and then improving environment; in a static setting, learning by doing is identical to increasing returns. In the same venue, Andreoni and Levinson (1998), laying out a simple and straight-forward static model of the micro-foundation of the pollution income relationship, show

that the optimal pollution-income curve is inverse *U*-shaped if and only if the abatement technology has increasing returns of scale. Therefore EKC doesn't depend on tastes changing as income grows, and it is connected to the technological link between consumption and its undesirable by-product (pollution). Abatement expenditures reduce the pollution generated by consumption and if abatement has increasing returns to scale the target of more consumption with less pollution, demanded by high-income individuals, can be more easily achieved.

Jones and Manuelli (2000) use an overlapping generations model in which the choices of firms among different techniques are influenced not only by price, but also by restrictions on use imposed by the government. To model this aspect of firm decision making, they assume that the government sets technique-specific taxes with the aim of controlling pollution. Public policy is endogenously determined and two settings of majority voting on environmental protection: voting over effluent charges or over direct regulation of technology, choosing minimum standards. When voting is over effluent charges, the time path of pollution is an inverted U, followed by a sustained increase similar to that empirically observed. If, instead, individuals vote directly over the "dirtiest" available technology, the level of pollution monotonically increases to a bound level as consumption grows. In both of these cases, the assumption of environment as a luxury good is a fundamental element: if preferences are homothetic, pollution will grow without bound. The analysis suggests that endogenous policy choices should be taken seriously as a key source of heterogeneity when studying cross-country differences in economic performance. The model is consistent with different policies driving differences in per capita income across countries and it also suggests a bi-directional causality: differences in levels of income across countries give rise to differences in selected policies, implying differences in growth rates.

3. The empirics of the EKC: a literature review

As initially suggested by Grossman and Krueger (1995), the relationship between pollution and growth has been estimated using reduced-form equations that relate the level of pollution to a flexible function of income per capita and to other covariates.² The classical reduced functional form representing the EKC is given by equation [1]:

$$E_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 X_i^2 + \beta_3 X_i^3 + \beta_4 Z_i + e_i \quad [1]$$

² The advantage of a reduced-form approach addressed by Grossman and Krueger (1995) is that the reduced-form equation gives the net effect of a nation's income on pollution. Otherwise, if the structural equations relating environmental regulations, technology, and industrial composition were estimated, "one would need to solve back to find the net effect of income changes on pollution, and confidence in the implied estimates would depend upon the precision and potential biases of the estimates at every stage" (p. 359-360).

where E_i represents the general level of environmental stress, X_i the income per capita and Z_i other covariates. The inverted U -shaped curve deriving from such a formula requires β_1 to be positive, β_2 negative and β_3 positive.³ Some contributions estimate the EKC using a dynamic specification, where lagged values of income per capita have been introduced in order to understand the medium/long-run pattern (Bradford *et al.*, 2005; Coondoo and Dinda, 2002; Grossman and Krueger, 1995; Perman and Stern, 2003).

Many contributions have empirically tested the existence of an EKC using cross-country relationships (among the others, Grossman and Krueger, 1995; Shafik, 1994; Stern *et al.*, 1996), time series analyses for specific countries (Egli, 2002; Vincent, 1997), or panel data for subsets of countries and time series with different length (Dijkgraaf and Vollebergh 1998, 2001; de Bruyn *et al.*, 1998; Wagner and Müller-Fürstenberger, 2004; Torras and Boyce, 1998; Panayotou *et al.*, 2000).

The majority of EKC study has examined air pollution: firstly carbon dioxide emissions, whose data are available for a wide range of countries and long time series; secondly sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, suspended particulate matter and carbon monoxide. Water pollutants have also been studied, as coliform, biological and chemical oxygen demand in river, and different environmental problems, as deforestation and endangered species. Therefore, most of EKC studies have investigated flow pollutants, and the analysis has rarely been devoted to stock pollutants or natural resources.

A critical examination of the EKC literature highlights that the estimated relationship suffers from a number of theoretical and empirical criticisms about: i) the existence of omitted variables; ii) the reduced functional form; iii) the role of technical progress; iv) the choice of the econometric specification; v) the non univocal results for alternative formulations; vi) problems related to measurement issues both for the dependent and the independent variables.⁴

i) In order to reduce problems affecting the robustness of the econometric specifications linked to the existence of omitted variables, further contributions have introduced other covariates, modelling the effects linked to trade openness, globalisation and the manufacturing sector (Cole, 2004; Hettige *et al.*, 2000; Tisdell, 2001) or linked to well-being aspects such as income distribution, education and health (Gangadharan and Valenzuela, 2001; Hill and Magnani, 2002; Magnani, 2000). Finally, many contributions try to shed some light on possible failures in the theoretical interpretation of the EKC (Arrow *et al.*, 1995; Munasinghe, 1999; Stern and Common, 2001). Income can difficultly be considered the only exogenous factor in the determination of environmental quality: only if other

³ The cubic term derives from the empirical evidence found by Grossman and Krueger (1995), where the relationship between income and emissions becomes positive again for certain types of pollution (SO_x) for higher income level.

⁴ For a comprehensive literature review of the EKC, see Dasgupta *et al.* (2002) and Dinda (2004).

variables are endogenously expressed through income, or correlated with it, they can be omitted; otherwise it's necessary to make explicit their contribution. The choice of independent variables influences stochastic error, determining the explanatory power of the regression. An explanatory power decreasing over time indicates the weakening of the link between income and environmental quality and an increasing importance of omitted variables (Hill and Magnani, 2002).

ii) It has rarely been considered that variables involved in the estimation of the environment-GDP relation could be simultaneous: the EKC hypothesis derives from a model of economy in which the state of the environment has no feedback on economic growth process. The reduced form rather than the structural form equations has been used in most of the EKC studies, in which income is assumed to be an exogenous variable: clearly, this not account for irreversibility and sustainability problems. Moreover, reduced forms do not account for causal mechanisms: structural forms may warrant exploration because some interdependence is probable, both referring to independent variables and to different environmental indicators.

iii) Regarding the supply side of economic growth, the combined action of three effects is fundamental in order to obtain an EKC: scale, composition and technological effect. In particular, technological progress leads to greater efficiency in the use of energy and materials; thus, a given amount of goods can be produced with successively reduced burdens on natural resources and environment. New technologies improve productivity but also create potential dangers to the society such as new hazardous wastes, risk and other human problems. These externalities are unknown in the early phase of diffusion of technology, while in later stages regulation becomes warranted to address it: in this sense an inverted-*U* shape can be observed with reference to each technology. Then, over a certain period during which income grows, one pollutant may decline but another may rise due to adoption of a new technology (Dinda, 2004).

Technological progress is of course a fundamental variable in determining an inverted U relation but, while on the theoretical side its rule has been highlighted, on the empirical side it is difficult to find an effective measurement. Very often technological progress has been modelled as a time trend related to each individual country (Shafik, 1994; Holtz-Eakin and Selden, 1995), and in other cases as a global common effect, reflecting shared technological progress (Stern, 2002). Unruh and Moomaw (1999), with a non-parametric model, demonstrate that access to technology and technological progress can help in reacting to temporal shocks that generate EKC paths. Technological progress is certainly a structural parameter determinant for heterogeneity between countries and a key factor to be considered in the issues of irreversibility. Any attempt to derive policy implications from EKC requires some understanding of the economic and political forces behind the empirical results and in particular, to the extent that an EKC is observed, it is important

to distinguish whether it is a natural consequence of structural changes in the economy or it is a result of a planned and concerted effort to reduce pollution emissions, carried out through government regulations and enhancement of pollution abating technologies.

iv) Concerning the statistical methodology, first contributions on EKC hypothesis have generally employed cross-section data, while at present most of the studies uses panel data. The simplest regression formulation assumes constant coefficients across countries, implying that every country follow the same EKC; with panel data it is possible to free up this restriction allowing the regression intercept varying across countries. In particular, using the fixed effects approach, it is implicitly assumed that the environment-GDP relationship varies across countries in a restricted way: countries have different intercepts but they have the same turning point where environmental degradation starts declining.⁵ This assumption of a low degree of heterogeneity is probably not enough, given the variety of social, economic, political and biophysical factors affecting environmental quality from one country to another. Hence, some studies apply a random coefficients model, allowing for more cross-country heterogeneity in the shape of the environment-GDP relationship. This is not to say that homogeneity doesn't exist, but the assumption of a common structure within a country over time is probably more reasonable than that of a common structure across countries. Indeed, the physical and social features, that are what determines each country's distinctive growth environmental outcomes, remain more or less constant over time (Koop and Tole, 1999).

v) Another problematic feature of the EKC hypothesis is represented by the non-univocal results, which can be conflicting choosing a cross-country or a panel approach: EKC hypothesis can be rejected using the first one, and accepted using the second one (Selden and Song, 1994). Moreover, using different econometric techniques, a differentiation regarding to the value of the turning point can emerge. The non-univocity of regression output can be linked to the lack of homogeneity between the examined countries or to others aspects, represented by data availability and the specific pollutant examined. Hence, in the absence of a single environment indicator, the estimated shape of the environment-income relationship and its possible turning point strictly depend on the pollutant considered.

vi) Concerning measurement issues, it should be given attention to the distinction between conventional income per capita, as an indicator of growth, and more complex measures, which might better capture the concept of sustainable development. The economic growth is usually measured through the employment of Gross Domestic Product (GDP); this choice limits the alternative interpretations and the potentialities of results, because GDP is often highly correlated

⁵ The threshold level of income per capita is equal for all countries, while the amount of environmental degradation at this point can differ among countries.

with omitted variables (Kaufmann *et al.*, 1998). Beside of the absence of distinction between correlation and causality, there is another problem tied to the adequacy of the GDP in representing sustainability and well-being. Hill and Magnani (2002) suggest the possibility to replace GDP with more inclusive measures of well-being, like Net Domestic Product (NDP) or Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) and Human Development Index (HDI).

Different options of measurement are mainly directed to entail issues of environmental sustainability into the analysis of income-pollution relation. Munasinghe (1999) employs the Environmentally Adjusted Net Domestic Product (EDP), calculated subtracting to the Net Domestic Product the economic value of the net loss of natural capital. The corresponding EKC shows a steeper upward sloping and can be replaced from a reversed-C relation if, beyond a threshold level of environmental degradation, EDP begins to decline. In this case, it should be considered that EDP doesn't indicate if the saving rate is high enough to guarantee a future income level equal to the current one. Computing an indicator like the Genuine Saving (GS) provided by the World Bank (Hamilton, 2000), it is possible to have a real saving rate net from the amounts needed to cover the depletion of natural resources and the economic value of social cost linked to pollution damage. While trends in national income per capita (using traditional or green measures) may express the effect of economic growth in the short run, measuring trends in real savings per capita could give a clearer picture of the influence of wealth creation on environmental quality.

4. Methodology and data description

The various critiques to the initial EKC formulation have stimulated a large debate around alternative representations of the relationship between economic growth and environment. A part from the criticisms moved to the econometric specification, a more sustainability oriented EKC seems to be a new research line which could allow linking the new theoretical formulations with a more accurate specification of the empirical findings.

Jha and Murthy (2003) represent a relevant contribution useful in order to solve the problem of non-univocity of results: they examine the EKC hypothesis using HDI as a broader measure of economic development and the Environmental Degradation Index (EDI) as a global indicator of environmental quality⁶. The 174 countries examined are divided in three classes of HDI (high, intermediate and low, respectively with $HDI > 0.8$, $0.8 < HDI < 0.5$, $HDI < 0.5$) and the regression

⁶ EDI is determined by a composite index formed by different factors representative of economic growth, everyone with a specific weight; this suggests the inadequacy of an approach that isolates a single index of environmental quality in order to investigate the relationship with economic growth.

output indicates a positive correlation between EDI and HDI for countries with high HDI, a negative relation for countries with low HDI and weakly negative relation for the intermediate class. These findings confirm an inverted *U*-shaped relationship, where the level of environmental degradation is strictly dependent on the development stage. In the same venue, Costantini and Monni (2006) examine the EKC hypothesis through a similar formulation, using HDI as a development indicator and the Genuine Saving (GS) as a sustainability measure. GS is observed to increase as long as HDI augments and almost null GS variation rates are connected to countries with low and medium-low levels of HDI. In this case, the threshold level of un-sustainability is associated to a low-medium level of HDI (around 0.60), while threshold levels for classical EKCs are well above this value, hence confirming the so-called “tunnelling through the curve” hypothesis formulated by Munasinghe (1999).⁷

The aim of this paper is to collect such recent suggestions, trying to make some steps ahead: i) to model a modified EKC (MEKC) in a panel context; ii) to partially solve the question of reduced form, including an endogenous covariate represented by the quality of institutions; iii) to model the role of technical progress.

In order to represent a more general framework geared towards sustainable development, the dependent variable defined as environmental degradation in the standard EKC is replaced by a macroeconomic sustainability indicator based on the Genuine Saving (GS) index provided by the World Bank in the World Development Report (World Bank, various years). GS is formally expressed in equation [2]:

$$GS = \dot{K} - (F_R - f_R)(R - g) - b(e - d) \quad [2]$$

where \dot{K} represents economic capital formation while other terms are adjustments for consumption and degradation of natural capital. In particular, the economic value of natural resources consumption (resources extracted R minus natural growth rate g for renewables) is given by the resource rental rate (F_R) net of the marginal cost of extraction (f_R), while pollution (emissions e minus natural dissipation rate d) is evaluated by the marginal cost of abatement b .

Separate economic values for some types of natural resources exploited at national level such as energy and mineral resources, forests and marginal economic damage linked to CO₂ emissions (i.e., the cost of climate change) are then available.⁸ GS is based on the assumption of perfect resource

⁷ Other attempts to analyse the relationships between economic growth/development and sustainability can be found in Dasgupta and Maler (2001) and in Neumayer (2001).

⁸ Energy and mineral resources considered in the WDR are oil, natural gas, coal, bauxite, copper, lead, iron, nickel, phosphates, tin, zinc, gold, silver. For methodological and empirical explanation of effective components of Genuine Saving index, see Hamilton and Clemens (1999).

substitutability and it could therefore be interpreted as a limit value of sustainability.

The income factor of the EKC is replaced with a more comprehensive measure of development, adopting the theoretical framework developed by the UNDP, the so-called human development paradigm, based on the capability approach defined in the seminal work of Amartya Sen (1979).

The Human Development Index (HDI) in the UNDP standard methodology includes three dimensions of human well-being, representing the basic capabilities for individuals in order to achieve decent standards of living. The following three dimensions are included in the HDI: (i) a long and healthy life; (ii) access to knowledge; (iii) a decent standard of living.⁹ In order to represent such dimensions some basic indicators are collected, as the life expectancy at birth, the literacy rate, the gross enrolment ratio, as well as the income per capita.

Considering that the GS is computed in economic terms, the income dimension in the classic HDI could bring to multi-collinearity and biased estimation. Therefore, a modified HDI (HDIM) is built as a simple average of the first two dimensions, the expectancy of life and the education index respectively, where both factors are normalised with a maximum value (85 years for expectancy of life and 100% for literacy and enrolment ratios) and a minimum value (respectively 25 years and 0%).

The exact formulation of the HDIM is the following:

$$\text{HDIM} = 1/2 (\text{Expectancy of life Index} + \text{Education Index}) \quad [3]$$

$$\text{Expectancy of life Index} = \frac{x_1 - 25}{85 - 25} \quad [4]$$

$$\text{Education Index} = \frac{2}{3} \underbrace{\left[\frac{x_2 - 0}{100 - 0} \right]}_{\text{Literacy Index}} + \frac{1}{3} \underbrace{\left[\frac{1}{3} \sum \frac{x_{3i} - 0}{100 - 0} \right]}_{\text{Gross enrolment ratio}} \quad [5]$$

where

x_1 = Expectancy of life (number of years)

x_2 = Adult literacy rate (percentage of literate population with age > 15 years)

x_{3i} = Primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio (enrolment in a specific level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the official school-age population corresponding to the same level of education in give school-year).¹⁰

Differently from previous studies (Costantini and Monni, 2006), in this analytical framework we have adopted a stronger sustainability criterion, considering only the components of GS related to

⁹ For a full description of the methodological issues about the HDI, see the Technical Notes in the Appendix of the Human Development Reports (UNDP, various years).

¹⁰ UNESCO definition, Education and Literacy Indicators, 2001.

depletion and degradation of natural capital. Therefore, an adjusted GS (AGS) is built upon the GS methodology excluding the factor explaining manufactured capital accumulation (\dot{K}).

The value added of such analysis is the presence of depletion and degradation value of natural resources contained in the AGS index compared with the simple pollutant emissions considered in a standard EKC model. In addition, using HDIM and not a simple income measure allows broader considerations to be made on the sustainability of the development path or if future generations could enjoy the same well-being level (and not only income). In line with standard EKC, the inclusion of other control variables such as trade flows and manufactures as the share of value added even allows us to analyse the effects of economic globalisation on sustainable development.

Following recent contributions (Costantini and Monni, 2006; Gandaran and Valenzuela, 2000; Jha and Murthy, 2003), an alternative formulation has been implemented in order to reduce the problems highlighted for the EKC about the reduced form, trying to model the influence of institutions modelled as an endogenous variable.¹¹

In this paper, we have adopted the definition of institutional quality provided by Kaufman *et al.* (2003), where six different characteristics describe this aspect: Rule of Law (RL), Political Instability (PI), Government Effectiveness (GE), Control of Corruption (CC), Regulatory Framework (RF), and Property Rights and Rule-based Governance (PR). There exist many alternative indicators provided by international agencies measuring in different ways the quality of institutions and governance issues, but unfortunately it is almost always the case that these indicators don't cover a wide sample of countries. It is the case of the Corruption Perspectives Index provided by Transparency International and used by Dasgupta *et al.* (2006) for similar purposes in an EKC context. This index is used for representing the World Bank's CPIAE (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment for Environment), which rates countries from 1 to 6 in ascending order of effectiveness in environmental governance. The authors affirm that CPIAE and TICPI are highly correlated; hence TICPI has been used because of its larger dataset. Considering that dataset for Rule of Law is much wider than TICPI, and accounting for the high correlation between RL and TICPI, we have decided to maintain RL as the institutional variable in order to have as many observations as possible. In the same venue, Farzin and Bond (2005) have investigated the role of a democratic government in enhancing environmental protection, and their empirical findings reinforce the hypothesis that institutions addressing for the preferences of the majority of citizens are more oriented towards environmental regulation.

In our empirical investigation the quality of institutions has been tested firstly as an exogenous, and

¹¹ Costantini and Monni (2006) test the hypothesis of a system of equations representing the possible interrelations between the EKC and the so-called Resource Curse Hypothesis, trying to highlight which variables play a key role in a long-run sustainable development path, in the presence of large exhaustible resources stocks.

later on as an endogenous variable, in a panel dataset instead of a pure cross-section context. The first formulation has been carried in a panel context with three separate temporal observations (1990, 1995, and 2000) in order to compare results for alternative pollutants (CO₂, NO_x, and SO_x) and AGS.¹² Moreover, extending the analysis to a longer time period (1996-2004) allows reinforcing the robustness of the results using a MEKC instead of the traditional EKC.

Finally, last dimension here considered is technical progress, in order to module the theoretical issues recently analysed in many contributions (Brock and Taylor, 2004b; Stokey, 1998; Andreoni and Levinson, 2001). Considering the difficulty of finding indices of technical progress available for a wide range of countries and for more than one year, we have modelled it adopting two different points of view. First, the role of production of technologies has been introduced, represented by the number of patents from residents expressed as percentage of GDP (PAT), but as we will see the coefficient related to this index is very low. Second, we have adopted the methodology developed in Archibugi and Coco (2004) where an index of “technological capabilities” has been built, representing four different aspects of technical progress: (i) the creation of technology; (ii) the technological infrastructures; (iii) the development of human skills; (iv) the import technology. Considering our analytical framework, in order to reach a sustainable development path both the creation of technology (patents) and the adoption and diffusion of clean technologies are important. Therefore, the concept of technological capabilities perfectly fits our analysis. Considering that human skills are widely represented by the human development dimensions, we have built a new technological index based only on two out of the four components proposed by Archibugi and Coco (2004). In order to represent the technological infrastructures we have accounted for internet and telephone penetration (number of internet, fixed and mobile telephone lines per 1.000 persons), while for import technology we have considered the inward Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows as percentage of GDP. The final formulation of this index (named ARCO as the original one) is as follows:

$$ARCO = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \underbrace{\left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\ln(TEL_i)}{\ln(max_{TEL})} + \frac{INTERNET_i}{max_{INTERNET}} \right) \right]}_{\text{technological infrastructures}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{FDI_i}{max_{FDI}} \right)}_{\text{import technology}} \right\} \quad [6]$$

As we can see, the formulation of the ARCO index is based on the same methodology adopted for the HDI, where the observed values are normalised by a minimum and maximum value. In this case

¹² The choice of the years for observations is closely related to the data availability for NO_x and SO_x emissions.

the minimum value is always equal to zero, while the maximum value has been taken in the whole time period/countries sample considered in this work. This formulation gives the possibility to account for temporal changes at country level, as well as the methodology adopted by UNDP for the HDI. Following the UNDP methodology, the component related to telephone users has been considered in a logarithm form, creating “a threshold above which the technological capacity of a country is no longer enriched by the use of telephones” (Archibugi and Coco, 2004, p. 635).

We have not considered the electricity consumption within the technological infrastructures because there are other energy related variables in our model, while for the import technology we have not considered the technology licensing payments and import of capital goods in order to maintain a large sample of countries.¹³

5. Empirical results

5.1 First results from single equations

A first comparative analysis between classic EKC and a MEKC has been described using alternative pollutants and AGS for three years, 1990, 1995, and 2000.

Following the large body of literature, some conditioning variables are added to the model in order to better describe the relationships between economic growth (development) and environment (sustainability). The share of value added from manufacturing sector should help understanding the role of the industrialisation process (composition effect), where an economy strongly based on heavy industries should have higher polluting emissions comparing to economic systems based on agriculture (first development stage) or services (advanced development stage) (Hettige *et al.*, 2000).

The role of structural adjustments claimed by standard EKC literature is not well represented by the share of manufacture value added on total value added as soon as we introduce other explanatory variables as the energy intensity, the role of population density, and the quality of institutions. These results are probably related to the widely known problems of omitted variables in the previous EKC studies.

As in de Bruyn *et al.* (1998) and Suri and Chapman (1998), the role of energy intensity has been accounted, represented by the energy consumption as percentage of GDP (ENE). Looking at our first results, energy use plays a major role especially for CO₂ and SO_x (Tables 1 and 2), both pollutant emissions typically related to the production (and consumption) of energy products. At the same time, the estimates for energy consumption related to AGS (Table 4) are not statistically

¹³ For a full description of the indices related to technological capabilities and the ARCO methodology see Archibugi and Coco (2004).

significant, probably because the components of AGS related to natural resources depletion mitigate the relationship between energy intensity and CO₂.

Another important issue is related to the role of international trade and globalisation, usually described using the percentage of imports plus exports on total GDP (Tisdell, 2001). In our work, imports (IMP) and exports (EXP) as percentage of GDP are included as two separate variables, because import and export flows can drive to opposite effects in terms of environmental degradation (Agras and Chapman, 1999; Cole, 2004). For SO_x and NO_x both imports and exports are not statistically relevant (Tables 2 and 3), while for CO₂ and AGS the two variables show the expected signs (Tables 1 and 4), where higher imports correspond to lesser production (and lesser pollution) while higher exports correspond to the opposite phenomenon, with increasing production and pollution.

Considering the MEKC calculated for AGS, not only imports and exports have the expected signs and they are both statistically significant within the all three alternative models, but the coefficients are higher than the other three EKC's calculated on alternative pollutants. This last result could be partially explained considering that the AGS depends on the exploitation of natural resources. In this case the role of primary resources exports (fuels and minerals) could play a major role, because in most of the oil exporting countries, fuel exports are the largest part of total balance of payments. In this sense, a specific dummy for main oil exporting countries has been introduced (OIL) in the MEKC, in order to reduce possible bias.¹⁴

The direct effect of population apart from GDP per capita has been tested including the population density (Kauffman et al., 1998; Selden and Song, 1994; Cropper and Griffiths, 1994), and the coefficients for all the four alternative models are generally statistically significant but they represent a minimum effect in terms of environmental degradation/sustainability.

Considering last available contributions on EKC, in some cases there emerges that *ceteris paribus* better institutions could help managing environmental degradation as well as sustainable development. For instance, Dasgupta *et al.* (2006) adopted a measure of corruption perspectives in order to proxy the stringency of the environmental regulation, founding that better regulation should help to reduce environmental vulnerability at urban level. In the same venue, Farzin and Bond (2005) affirm that the quality of institutions (i.e., the level of democracy) could be interpreted as a proxy of the willingness to pay of a society to protect environmental resources.

¹⁴ In order to check for the robustness of the MEKC specification, alternative variables have been tested. First, AGS has been replaced with the standard GS (including capital accumulation term) and results remain consistent and robust. The same equation for MEKC has been estimated as well using classic GDP per capita instead of HDIM, but the results are quite similar both for significance and consistency, therefore while using HDIM does not change significantly the estimation, on the contrary it allows underlining a development path oriented towards capabilities and not only confined within the utilitarian approach. Results are not reported in the paper but they are available from authors upon request.

Considering the alternative formulation of the MEKC where the dependent variable represents a sustainability measure, the inclusion of institutions within the explanatory variables seems to be a natural extension of our study.

>> INSERT Table 1 – EKC for CO₂ (years 1990-1995-2000) <<
>> INSERT Table 2 – EKC for SO_x (years 1990-1995-2000) <<
>> INSERT Table 3 – EKC for NO_x (years 1990-1995-2000) <<
>> INSERT Table 4 – EKC for AGS (years 1990-1995-2000) <<

In contrast with previous EKC studies addressing for the role of institutions, looking at our results the quality of institutions seems to negatively affect the environmental quality/sustainability with coefficient quite high and statistically consistent both for CO₂ and AGS. Running the same MEKC equation separately for developing and developed countries the coefficient for RL still remains positive in both cases, but in the case of developing countries it is quite higher than for the MEKC calculated on developed countries sample.¹⁵ These results confirm the role of institutions in the economic growth/development path, or in other words countries characterised by good institutions would face faster economic growth/development process, and consequently higher environmental degradation in the first stages of development. The differences in the coefficients between developing and developed countries reinforce this consideration, where countries in the first stages of development would face greater degradation. It is hardly surprising if we consider the meaning of Rule of Law as an index of security in the investment markets for firms (the higher the index the lower the risk of bureaucratic barriers to profit maximisation). A more appropriate measure of institutional quality in our context should be the environmental stringency and regulation, but unfortunately there are few available data for developing countries to build a panel dataset.

Finally, last dimension here considered is technical progress. In this first analysis the number of patents from residents has been introduced (PAT), but the coefficient related to this index is very low. At this purpose, the alternative approach developed by Archibugi and Coco (2004) has been tested to model technical progress (see par. 5.2).

The relationships emerged for SO_x and NO_x are clearly not robust in a panel context with a small T, therefore in the following sections we will concentrate only on EKC modelled for CO₂ and AGS.

In this analysis, the cubic form of the EKC is valid and robust for CO₂, but it is not statistically significant for AGS; hence the MEKC will assume the simple quadratic form. This result is hardly surprising if we consider the different components of the AGS measure. For CO₂ the cubic form is

¹⁵ In the sample of developed countries the minimum value of the confidence interval is negative, reinforcing our considerations (results are not reported in the text but they are available from authors upon request).

associated to the increasing environmental efficiency in the productive sector – the technological effect – and the shift from heavy industries to services – the structural effect – which determine the descending part of the curve, and to the increasing demand for energy products as income raises further (the second ascending part of the curve). In the case of the AGS, this second effect does not occur because the sectoral shift from manufactures to services is accompanied by another similar effect related to the reduction of resources extraction, producing a general effect greater than the increasing in CO₂ emissions due to the increasing demand for energy products.

The equations for the three pollutants and AGS have been performed using both fixed effects (FE) and random coefficients (RE) models. FE models are always preferred to the RE models as the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) tests for RE show in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.¹⁶

For all the pollutants and for AGS we have tested the hypothesis of the existence of an EKC, performing an *F*-statistics on the hypothesis that β_1 (linear term) and β_2 (quadratic term) are jointly equal to zero, as suggested by Koop and Tole (1999). For all the dependent variables except for NO_x, the *F*-tests reject the null hypothesis of coefficients jointly equal to zero; hence an EKC for CO₂, SO_x and AGS is a valid model. In any case, it is worth noting that results from EKC applied to different environmental degradation indices are non univocal, and some caution is necessary when policy implications from EKC were drawn.

As we have already mentioned, the quality of institutions is quite often modelled as an endogenous variable, with a number of different instruments such as initial level of development, the role of natural resources endowment or the effects related to colonialism (Isham *et al.*, 2003; Sala-i-Martin and Subramanian, 2003). In our exercise, modelling the EKC with endogenous quality of institutions allows understanding those mechanisms influencing economic performances, and environmental degradation, which are not caught by the reduced form of the standard EKC (Bradford *et al.*, 2005). In this sense, it is possible to not include other covariates in the EKC model, and at the same time it is possible to understand how other conditions such as initial level of development (initial GDP per capita or initial human development levels), the role of investments and the macroeconomic stability (given by the inflation rate) influence the quality of the institutions, and indirectly the environmental quality. At this purpose, Brock and Taylor (2004a) put the evidence on the role of the “Environmental Catch-up Hypothesis” where difference in pollution levels highly depends on the initial level of GDP per capita.

Analysing the specific results for the instrumented quality of institutions, the chosen variable (RL) highly depends on the initial value of HDIM, the changes in HDIM occurred during the period, and secondly on the initial income level, while investments and macroeconomic stability have much less

¹⁶ Hausman tests for RE have been performed confirming results from LM tests.

influence.

Instrumenting RL in the MEKC and in the EKC for CO₂ doesn't imply significant variability in all the coefficients. Coefficients for RL associated to MEKC remain higher than in the case of CO₂ emissions. What strongly emerged is that looking at the Hausman test for endogeneity, there emerges both for AGS and CO₂ that the instrumental variables (IV) estimates are more appropriate than the simple model (Table 5).¹⁷

It is worth noting that in this specific panel setting results from separate estimates are not so far from results in IV models, and this is probably related to the temporal structure of the panel with only three temporal dimensions. Therefore, in the following section we will investigate the feasibility of the model applied to longer time series.

>> INSERT Table 5 – EKC for CO₂ and AGS, IV (years 1990-1995-2000) <<

5.2 *Longer time period and simultaneous equations*

Considering a longer time period where data for both CO₂ and AGS are available, and homogeneous information for institutional quality are available as well, it is possible to build a pooled model with a larger number of (T) temporal observations. Therefore, the time series for MEKC refers to 1996-2004, while for EKC the time period is shorter (1996-2002). Accounting for so recent years gives us the possibility to analyse the aspect related to technical progress from another point of view. We have seen that an indicator such as the number of patents registered by residents as ratio of GDP has not a great significance in terms of increasing or declining environmental degradation or sustainability. This result in our opinion is mainly related to the indicator itself, which is available only for developed countries and few more advanced developing countries. Considering that in this paper we have assumed a partially different point of view, where a wider concept of development replaces the pure economic growth accounting, we can also maintain this perspective in the analysis of technological progress. Therefore, we have included the technical capabilities index (ARCO) built on the basis of the methodology developed by Archibugi and Coco (2004), in particular addressing for technological infrastructures (TECHINF) and technology imported (TECHIMP).

>> INSERT Table 6 – Unit root tests for EKC and MEKC (1990-2004) <<

The time series here adopted is a quite short one, because for RL there are available data only for

¹⁷ The Hausman test has been performed using STATA, where the tested hypothesis H_0 is that difference in coefficients from the two alternative specifications is not systematic. We reject the null hypothesis in both cases, for CO₂ and AGS.

the period 1996-2004. In any case, in order to exclude possible biases related to non stationarity of time series we have performed unit root tests in a panel context for CO₂, AGS, GDP and HDIM (where for CO₂ the period is 1990-2002, while for AGS, GDP and HDIM is 1990-2004). Results reported in Table 6 clearly show that all the series but HDIM are stationary, while even HDIM becomes stationary when eliminating the temporal trend.

In any case, it must be noticed that for panels with T small the asymptotic distributions of panel unit root and cointegration tests provide poor approximations to the small sample distribution (Wagner and Müller-Fürstenberger, 2004; Galeotti *et al.*, 2006). Considering that the effective period is rather short and the unit root tests are favourable to stationary series, the model can be performed without further investigation on cointegration. In any case we have tried to reduce possible autocorrelation of HDIM introducing the value of HDIM with one temporal lag. Results are reported in Table 7, showing that the coefficient associated to HDIM(-1) is not statistically consistent, excluding problems of non-stationary series.

Looking deeply into the results, using longer time series does not change significantly our first results, where an EKC for CO₂ and for AGS is confirmed. What strongly emerges from this new panel setting is related to the role of institutional quality and to interesting results due the ARCO index.

The role of institutions remains unchanged for the MEKC, where better institutions are associated with unsustainable development paths. This result is fully explained by the presence of a large number of developing countries in our sample. If we consider not the AGS but the GS measure (including capital accumulation), the coefficient for RL is still positive but rather smaller than for AGS. If we consider alternative country samples, as for instance developing and developed countries, this result is fully explained. While for developing countries the coefficient for RL is positive, running the model for developed countries gives us a negative value for coefficient related to RL. If we look at the CO₂ emission, the model with endogenous RL gives a negative coefficient both for developing and developed countries, and this is in line with our initial expectations that better institutions are related with more stringent environmental regulations.¹⁸

Another difference relates to the divergence of coefficients for RL between single equation and IV using different panel settings. While in the panel using three separate years (1990-1995-2000) the estimates are quite similar, the MEKC with IV for RL in the 1996-2004 period gives results quite

¹⁸ In order to test the robustness of results related to the role of institutions, we have run the same formulation for the period 1996-2004 using the other governance indicators provided by Kaufmann *et al.* (2003). The coefficients for these other indices are often positive (like RL) but not statistically significant. In the case of Political Instability the sign is negative and coefficient is robust, but it is close to zero. Running equations for developed and developing countries reveals the same trend as for RL, where coefficients are negative for developed countries and positive for developing countries. Results are available from the authors upon request.

different from the single equation model. Furthermore, there is a wider difference between coefficients for RL in AGS and CO₂, reinforcing our first findings where the different components of AGS could be influenced differently by institutions. As we have seen, one of the most effective instruments for RL is changes in HDI level (HDIMCH), meaning that higher efforts to accumulate human capital and more generally to guarantee more access to capabilities to individuals correspond to a greater consumption of natural resources, especially in the first stages of development where an economy could be typically resource-intensive.¹⁹ In this sense, coefficients associated to imports and exports are higher for AGS than for CO₂ and this is perfectly in line with our interpretations. An economy based on resource extraction, typically obtain a great part of its revenues from exports of primary resources. Therefore an increase in export flows would be immediately transformed into greater resource depletion (AGS increased) while the contrary applies for import flows. For CO₂, running separate models for developed and developing countries there emerges a significant difference in results. In fact, for developed countries the coefficient associated to RL in a single equation model is significant and negative, while for developing countries the coefficient is slightly positive and still significant. In the case of the single model, the coefficient for RL is positive but not statistically significant. In the model with IV, the coefficient for RL is negative, where for developed countries is about -1.03 and for developing countries is around -0.1.

>> INSERT Table 7 – EKC (1996-2002) and MEKC (1996-2004) <<

In order to compare results from standard EKC and MEKC, we have calculated the threshold values of GDP and HDIM where the EKC and the MEKC are maximised. Furthermore, in order to compare the two different measures, we have adopted a simple equation where HDIM is related to lnGDP, using a simplified formulation (eq. [7]) of the Human Development-Economic Growth causality nexus analysed by Ranis *et al.* (2000). The correlation used to transform the turning point for EKC from a GDP measure into a HDIM value is as follows:

$$HDIM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln GDP + u_i \quad [7]$$

where β_0 and β_1 are equal to (-0.48) and (+0.14) respectively. Therefore a maximum HDIM is available even for the standard EKC. The threshold HDIM for the MEKC is in the range 0.67-0.69, while the correspondent value for the EKC is in the range 0.81-0.84 (calculated for entire panel

¹⁹ Following Ranis *et al.* (2000) HDIMCH has been formulated as the reduction of the HDIM level from the target level (that is equal to 1). Therefore, countries with higher initial level of HDIM are penalised in terms of HDIMCH performances. This means that the poorest countries are generally those in which the higher HDIMCH occurs, and this explains the increasing coefficient of RL in IV MEKC.

dataset in the period 1990-2004).

A full comparison of these two threshold levels is probably biased due to the fact that inside the AGS there is a component related to economic value of damage from CO₂ emissions. The EKC and the MEKC are partially correlated and results could be distorted. Therefore, we have performed a system of simultaneous equations, in order to eliminate this correlation.

Furthermore, considering that the ARCO index is statistically significant but in the MEKC it changes sign when an IV is performed, in the system of simultaneous equations we have tried to investigate this particular behaviour separating the ARCO index in its two components, the technological infrastructures (TECHINF) and the imported technology (TECHIMP).

>> INSERT Table 8 – EKC (1996-2002) and MEKC (1996-2004) simultaneous equations <<

Looking at the turning points, the gap between the turning points of the two alternative EKC formulations appears reduced in SURE model comparing to independent estimates. This is hardly surprising if we think about the model specification where the EKC and the MEKC have partially related dependent variables.

Furthermore, the investigation of separate components of technological progress allows better understanding the influence of technical progress on environmental degradation and sustainability. As we have expected, while the diffusion of basic technologies such as telephone and internet is related to the increase in the consumption patterns, with a consequent increase in the depletion and degradation of natural resources, at the same time the increase in imports of technologies induces the adoption of more environmental friendly production processes. An increase in FDI produces a shift of the industrial sector from the extraction of natural resources towards capital intensive production processes, implying a reduction of AGS.

6. Concluding remarks

The aim of this paper is to analyse the relationship between development and sustainability by using the empirical framework known as Environmental Kuznets Curve. In order to respond to criticisms moved to the EKC, we have introduced some modifications to the standard EKC. In particular, we have changed the dependent variable substituting a pure environmental stress as in the standard EKC with a wider assessment of sustainability defined by the Genuine Saving index provided by the World Bank. In order to reduce dissimilarities between a standard EKC and a modified EKC the GS was taken only in the components related to environmental degradation and depletion, hence accounting for a strong sustainability criterion. Furthermore, the income per capita as the driving

factor of the *U*-shaped curve has been substituted with a broad definition of development based on the UNDP methodology of Human Development. Following recent EKC studies, the role of institutions has been analysed, but differently from other contributions it has been modelled as an endogenous variable. Finally, the role of technological progress has been introduced, modelled both as creation and diffusion of technology. Comparisons among alternative EKC formulations with different pollutants and the modified EKC have highlight the robustness of the latter, using a panel dataset with three temporal observations. A longer time series has been tested reinforcing results obtained for the MEKC with endogenous institutions. In the longer time series the role of technological progress has been strongly emerged, where diffusion of basic technologies are linked to increasing consumption and therefore reduced sustainability, while on the contrary imports of technologies help diffusing environmental friendly production processes, managing natural resources towards a sustainable path.

The formulation of the role of institutions as an endogenous covariate allows understanding which factors indirectly affect sustainable development. It is worth noting that initial conditions such as high levels of GDP per capita or health and education have positive effects in terms of institutional quality, and this result is useful to interpret the opposite effect of institutions for developed and developing countries. Within developing countries, especially those characterised by low development levels, the role of institutions is mainly directed towards the enhancement of basic needs and/or increasing economic performance, while environmental concerns are typically a luxury good. As well as income per capita and the development level raise, institutions are pressed by public opinion to include environmental protection in the policy agenda, therefore playing an active role to designate policy actions (and regulations) oriented towards sustainable development path.

Finally, we want to underline that the positive role of technological transfer through FDI reinforces the recent position of United Nations expressed by the Millennium Development Goals (UN, 2000) when claiming for an international cooperation for promoting human and sustainable development at a global level.

References

- Agras, J., Chapman, D., 1999, A dynamic approach to the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis, *Ecological Economics*, n. 28, pp. 267-277.
- Andreoni, J., Levinson, A., 2001, The simple analytics of the environmental Kuznets curve, *Journal of Public Economics* n. 80, pp. 269-286.
- Archibugi, D., Coco, A., 2004, A New Indicator of Technological Capabilities for Developed and Developing Countries (ArCo), *World Development*, Vol. 32 (4), pp. 629-654.
- Arrow, K., Bolin B., Costanza, R., et al., 1995, Economic growth, carrying capacity, and the environment, *Ecological Economics*, n. 15, pp. 91-95.
- Beckerman, W., 1992, Economic growth and the Environment: Whose Growth? Whose Environment?, *World Development*, Vol. 20 (4), pp. 481-496.

- Bovenberg, A.L., Smulders S., 1995, Environmental quality and pollution augmenting technological change in a two sector endogenous growth model, *Journal of Public Economics*, n. 57, 369-391.
- Bradford, D.F., Fender, R.A., Shore, S.H., Wagner, M., 2005, The Environmental Kuznets Curve: Exploring a fresh Specification, *Contributions to Economic Analysis & Policy*, Vol. 4 (1), pp. 1-28.
- Brock, W.A., Taylor, M.S., 2004a, Economic Growth and the Environment: A Review of Theory and Empirics, *NBER Working Paper* n. 10854, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
- Brock, W.A., Taylor, M.S., 2004b, The Green Solow model, *NBER Working Paper* n. 10557, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
- Brock, W.A., M.S. Taylor (2003), The Kindergarten Rule for Sustainable Growth, *NBER Working Paper* n. 9597, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
- Chichilnisky, G., 1994, North-South Trade and the Global Environment, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 84 (4), pp. 851-874.
- Cole, M.A., 2004, Trade, the pollution haven hypothesis and the environmental Kuznets curve: examining the linkages, *Ecological Economics*, n. 48, pp. 71-81.
- Coondoo, D., Dinda S., 2002, Causality between income and emission: a country group-specific econometric analysis, *Ecological Economics*, n. 40, 351-67.
- Copeland, B.R., Taylor, M.S., 2004, Trade, Growth, and the Environment, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 42 (1), pp. 7-71.
- Costantini, V., Monni, S., 2006, Environment, Human Development and Economic Growth, *FEEM Working Paper* n. 35, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy.
- Cropper, M., Griffiths, C., 1994, The interaction of population growth and environmental quality, *American Economic Review*, n. 84, pp. 250-254.
- Dasgupta, P., Mäler, K-G., 2001, Wealth as a Criterion for Sustainable Development, *The Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics Discussion Paper* n. 139.
- Dasgupta, S., Laplante, B., Wang, H., Eheeler, D., 2002, Confronting the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16 (1), pp. 147-168.
- Dasgupta, S., Hamilton, K., Pandey, K., Wheeler, D., 2006, Environment During Growth: Accounting for Governance and Vulnerability, *World Development*, forthcoming.
- de Bruyn, S.M., van den Bergh, J.C., Opschoor, J.B., 1998, Economic growth and emissions: reconsidering the empirical basis of environmental Kuznets curves, *Ecological Economics*, n. 25, pp. 161-175.
- Dijkgraaf, E., Vollebergh H.R.J., 1998, Environmental Kuznets revisited, Time-series versus panel estimation: The CO₂ case, *OCFEB Research Memorandum* n. 9806, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.
- Dijkgraaf, E., Vollebergh H.R.J., 2001, A Note on Testing for Environmental Kuznets Curves with Panel Data, *FEEM Nota di Lavoro* n. 63, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy.
- Dinda, S., 2004, Environmental Kuznets Curve Hypothesis: A Survey, *Ecological Economics*, n. 49, pp. 431-455.
- Egli, H., 2002, Are Cross-Country Studies of the Environmental Kuznets Curve Misleading? New Evidence from Time Series Data for Germany, *FEEM Nota di Lavoro* n. 25, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy.
- Farzin, Y.H., Bond, C., 2005, Democracy and environmental quality, *Journal of Development Economics*, forthcoming.
- Galeotti, M., Manera, M., Lanza, A., 2006, On the Robustness of Robustness Checks of the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *FEEM Nota di Lavoro* n. 22, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy.
- Gangadharan, L., Valenzuela, M.R., 2001, Interrelationships between income, health and the environment: extending the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis, *Ecological Economics*, n. 36, pp. 513-531.
- Grossman, G.M., Krueger, A.B., 1995, Economic growth and the environment, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 1, pp. 353-377.
- Hamilton, K., 2000, Genuine Savings as a Sustainability Indicator, *Environmental Economic Series* n. 77, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Hamilton, K., Clemens, M., 1999, Genuine Savings Rates in Developing Countries, *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 13 (2), pp. 333-356.
- Hettige, H., Mani, M., Wheeler, D., 2000, Industrial pollution in economic development, the environmental Kuznets curve revisited, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 62 (), pp. 445-476.
- Hill, R.J., Magnani, E., 2002, An exploration of the conceptual and empirical basis of the environmental Kuznets curve, *Australian Economic Papers*, Vol. 41 (2), pp.239-254.
- Holtz- Eakin, D., Selden, T.M., 1995, Stoking the fires? CO₂ emissions and economic growth, *Journal of Public Economics*, n. 57, pp. 85-101.
- Isham, J., Woolcock, M., Pritchett, L., Busby, G., 2003, The Varieties of Resource Experience: How Natural Resource Export Structures Affect the Political Economy of Economic Growth, *Middlebury College Economics Discussion Paper* n. 08, Middlebury, Vermont.
- Jha, R., Murthy, K.V.B., 2003, An Inverse Global Environmental Kuznets Curve, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 31, 2003, pp. 352-368.
- John, A., Pecchenino, R., 1994, An overlapping generations model of growth and the environment, *Economic Journal*, n. 104, 1393-1410.
- Jones, L.E., Manuelli, R.E., 2000, Endogenous Policy Choice: The Case of Pollution and Growth, *Review of Economic*

- Dynamics*, n. 4, pp. 369-405.
- Kaufman, D., Kraay, A., Mastruzzi, M., 2003, *Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996-2002*, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Kaufmann, R.K., Davidsdottir, B., Garnham, S., Pauly, P., 1998, The Determinants of Atmospheric SO₂ Concentrations: Reconsidering the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *Ecological Economics*, n. 25, pp. 209-220.
- Kelly, D., 2003, On EKC arising from stock externalities, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, n. 27, pp. 1367-90.
- Koop, G., Toole L., 1999, Is there an Environmental Kuznets Curve for deforestation?, *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 58, pp. 231-244.
- Kuznets, S., 1955, Economic growth and income inequality, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 1-28.
- Lieb, C.M., 2004, The environmental Kuznets Curve and flow versus stock pollution: the neglect of future damages, *Environmental and Resource Economics*, n. 29, pp. 483-506.
- López, R., 1994, The environment as a factor of production: the effects of economic growth and trade liberalization, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, n. 27, pp. 163-184.
- Magnani, E., 2000, The Environmental Kuznets Curve, environmental protection policy and income distribution, *Ecological Economics*, n. 32, pp. 431-443.
- Munasinghe, M., 1999, Is environmental degradation an inevitable consequence of economic growth: tunneling through the environmental Kuznets curve, *Ecological Economics*, n. 29, pp. 89-109.
- Munasinghe, M., 1995, Making economic growth more sustainable, *Ecological Economics*, n. 15, pp. 121-124.
- Neumayer E., 2001, The human development index and sustainability – a constructive proposal, *Ecological Economics*, n. 39, pp. 101-114.
- Panayotou, T., Peterson, A., Sachs, J., 2000, Is the Environmental Kuznets Curve Driven by Structural Change? What Extended Time Series May Imply for Developing Countries, *CAER II Discussion Paper* n. 80, Harvard Institute for International Development, Cambridge, MA.
- Perman, R., Stern, D.I., 2003, Evidence from panel unit root and cointegration tests that the Environmental Kuznets Curve does not exist, *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 47 (3), pp. 325-347.
- Ranis, G., Stewart, F., Ramirez, A., 2000, Economic Growth and Human Development, *World Development*, Vol. 28 (2), pp. 197-219.
- Sala-i-Martin, X., Subramanian, A., 2003, Addressing the Natural Resource Curse: An Illustration from Nigeria, *IMF Working Paper* n. 139, International Monetary Fund, Washington DC.
- Selden, T.M., Song, D., 1994, Environmental quality and development: is there a Kuznets curve for air pollution emissions?, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, n. 27, pp. 147-162.
- Sen, A.K., 1979, Personal Utilities and public judgments: or what's wrong with the welfare economics, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 89 (335), pp. 537-558.
- Shafik, N., 1994, Economic Development and Environmental Quality: an econometric analysis, *Oxford Economic Papers*, n. 46, pp. 757-773.
- Stern, D.I., 2004, The Rise and Fall of the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *World Development*, Vol. 32, pp. 1419-1439.
- Stern, D.I., Common, M.S., 2001, Is There an Environmental Kuznets Curve for Sulfur?, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 41 (2), pp. 162-178.
- Stern, D.I., Common, M.S., Barbier, E.B., 1996, Economic Growth and Environmental Degradation: The Environmental Kuznets Curve and Sustainable Development, *World Development*, Vol. 24. (7), pp. 1151-1160.
- Stokey, N.L., 1998, Are There Limits to Growth?, *International Economic Review*, n. 39, pp. 1-31.
- Suri, V., Chapman, D., 1998, Economic growth, trade and energy: implications for the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *Ecological Economics*, n. 25, pp. 195-208.
- Tisdell, C., 2001, Globalisation and sustainability: environmental Kuznets curve and the WTO, *Ecological Economics* n. 39, pp. 185-196.
- Torras, M., Boyce, J.K., 1998, Income, Inequality, and Pollution: A Reassessment of the Environmental Kuznets Curve, *Ecological Economics*, n. 25, pp. 147-160
- United Nations (UN), 2000, *Millennium Development Goals Declaration*, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, n. 55/2, 8 September 2000, New York, USA.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Human Development Report 1990-2004*, United Nations Development Programme, Oxford University Press.
- Unruh, G.C., Moomaw, W.R., 1998, An Alternative Analysis of apparent EKC-type Transitions, *Ecological Economics*, n. 25, pp. 221-229.
- Vincent, J.R., 1997, Testing for environmental Kuznets curves within a developing countries, *Environment and Development Economics*, Vol. 2, pp. 417-431.
- Wagner, M., Müller-Fürstenberger, G., 2004, The Carbon Kuznets Curve: A Cloudy Picture Emitted by Bad Econometrics?, *Department of Economics Discussion Paper* n.18, University of Bern.
- World Bank, *World Development Indicators*, various years, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), 1987, *Our common future*, Oxford University Press, Great Britain.

Table 1 – EKC for CO₂ (years 1990-1995-2000)

Variables	CO ₂ (1)		CO ₂ (2)		CO ₂ (3)	
	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects
GDP	2.741 (10.28)*	2.735 (10.20)*	11.407 (6.15)*	11.406 (6.17)*	8.660 (6.06)*	8.651 (6.04)*
GDP ²	-0.125 (-7.34)*	-0.125 (-7.27)*	-1.135 (-4.79)*	-1.134 (-4.80)*	-0.766 (-4.14)*	-0.766 (-4.13)*
GDP ³			0.039 (3.94)*	0.039 (3.95)*	0.023 (2.92)*	0.023 (2.93)*
MAN	0.021 (3.89)*	0.022 (3.96)*	0.004 (0.79)	0.004 (0.82)	0.004 (0.79)	0.004 (0.82)
IMP	-0.007 (-2.36)**	-0.006 (-2.26)**	-0.005 (-1.60)	-0.005 (-1.56)	-0.003 (-0.89)	-0.002 (-0.68)
EXP	0.0102 (3.36)*	0.011 (3.41)*	0.007 (2.31)**	0.007 (2.27)**	0.005 (1.99)**	0.005 (1.98)**
ENE			0.980 (13.22)*	0.983 (13.32)*	0.849 (16.63)*	0.853 (16.76)*
DENS			0.001 (2.35)**	0.001 (2.38)**	0.0003 (1.76)***	0.0003 (1.67)***
HDIM			0.471 (1.21)	0.480 (1.28)		
RL					0.146 (2.19)**	0.126 (1.96)**
PAT					0.0002 (3.07)*	0.0002 (3.12)*
CONST	-6.409 (-6.41)*	-6.416 (-6.39)*	-31.643 (-6.67)*	-31.665 (-6.69)*	-24.341 (-6.76)*	-24.351 (-6.74)*
R-sq	0.749		0.881		0.885	
F test	240.39 (0.00)		207.37 (0.00)		270.37 (0.00)	
Wald test		1203.39 (0.00)		1896.55 (0.00)		2429.27 (0.00)
LM test for RE		1.02 (0.31)		0.90 (0.34)		0.00 (0.96)
F-test for EKC	378.02 (0.00)		114.95 (0.00)		243.90 (0.00)	
N. Obs.	408	408	267	267	324	324

Statistics for t-Student in parenthesis. * p-values < 0.01, ** p-values < 0.05, *** p-values < 0.1.

All estimates are modelled using robust standard errors in order to correct heteroskedasticity of the error term
F-test for EKC tests whether coefficients on GDP (HDIM) and GDP² (HDIM²) are jointly zero, following Koop and Tole (1999).

Table 2 – EKC for SO_x (years 1990-1995-2000)

Variable	SO _x (1)		SO _x (2)		SO _x (3)	
	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects
GDP	1.758 (4.15)*	1.751 (4.15)*	14.020 (2.18)**	14.117 (2.24)**	9.046 (1.79)***	9.059 (1.79)***
GDP ²	-0.081 (-3.11)*	-0.080 (-3.11)*	-1.479 (-1.84)***	-1.495 (-1.90)***	-0.835 (-1.32)	-0.840 (-1.33)
GDP ³			0.054 (1.62)	0.054 (1.68)***	0.025 (0.97)	0.025 (0.99)
MAN	0.003 (0.36)	0.002 (0.30)	-0.019 (-1.78)***	-0.020 (-1.87)***	-0.019 (-1.78)***	-0.020 (-1.87)***
IMP	-0.014 (-3.88)*	-0.014 (-3.89)*	0.005 (0.84)	0.005 (0.82)	0.001 (0.10)	0.001 (0.10)
EXP	0.010 (2.71)*	0.011 (2.79)*	0.001 (0.08)	0.001 (0.14)	0.002 (0.26)	0.002 (0.36)
ENE			0.808 (5.73)*	0.807 (5.73)*	0.666 (4.55)*	0.655 (4.51)*
DENS			-0.0002 (-0.80)	-0.0002 (-0.82)	0.000 (0.00)	-0.00001 (-0.05)
HDIM			-1.308 (-1.48)	-1.157 (-1.33)		
RL					0.267 (1.42)	0.229 (1.32)
PAT					-0.0003 (-4.95)*	-0.0003 (-4.80)*
CONST	1.130 (0.68)	1.150 (0.70)	-34.127 (-2.04)**	-34.381 (-2.09)**	-21.866 (-1.66)	-21.890 (-1.66)***
R-sq	0.37		0.528		0.552	
F test			51.39 (0.00)		56.08 (0.00)	
Wald test		380.96 (0.00)		474.21 (0.00)		493.64 (0.00)
LM test for RE		0.70 (0.40)		0.99 (0.32)		0.37 (0.54)
F-test for EKC			29.44 (0.00)		36.00 (0.00)	
N. Obs.	420	420	268	268	327	327

Statistics for t-Student in parenthesis. * p-values < 0.01, ** p-values < 0.05, *** p-values < 0.1.

All estimates are modelled using robust standard errors in order to correct heteroskedasticity of the error term
F-test for EKC tests whether coefficients on GDP (HDIM) and GDP² (HDIM²) are jointly zero, following Koop and Tole (1999).

Table 3 – EKC for NO_x (years 1990-1995-2000)

Variable	NO _x (1)		NO _x (2)		NO _x (3)	
	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects
GDP	0.286 (0.84)	0.295 (0.98)	0.165 (0.05)	0.172 (0.06)	0.073 (0.03)	0.077 (0.04)
GDP ²	-0.003 (-0.15)	-0.004 (-0.21)	-0.027 (-0.07)	-0.028 (-0.08)	0.008 (0.03)	0.007 (0.03)
GDP ³			0.003 (0.17)	0.003 (0.18)	0.000 (-0.04)	0.000 (-0.04)
MAN	-0.015 (-2.26)**	-0.015 (-1.61)	-0.008 (-0.59)	-0.008 (-0.61)	-0.008 (-0.59)	-0.008 (-0.61)
IMP	-0.007 (-1.91)**	-0.007 (-2.01)**	-0.003 (-0.49)	-0.003 (-0.49)	-0.007 (-1.48)	-0.008 (-1.57)
EXP	0.003 (0.90)	0.003 (0.81)	-0.002 (-0.30)	-0.002 (-0.31)	-0.001 (-0.12)	0.000 (-0.09)
ENE			-0.060 (-0.66)	-0.058 (-0.65)	-0.097 (-1.42)	-0.102 (-1.51)
DENS			-0.001 (-4.75)*	-0.001 (-4.75)*	-0.001 (-4.23)*	-0.001 (-4.26)*
HDIM			-0.531 (-0.94)	-0.518 (-0.92)		
RL					0.157 (1.42)	0.164 (1.52)
PAT					0.000 (0.09)	0.000 (0.06)
CONST	4.613 (3.66)*	4.590 (4.13)*	6.124 (0.79)	6.097 (0.79)	5.819 (1.06)	5.837 (1.06)
R-sq	0.113		0.230		0.210	
F test	10.48 (0.00)		10.53 (0.00)		13.09 (0.00)	
Wald test		49.95 (0.00)		93.43 (0.00)		120.81 (0.00)
LM test for RE		0.87 (0.35)		1.26 (0.23)		1.03 (0.31)
F-test for EKC	18.74 (0.00)		0.02 (0.98)		0.22 (0.80)	
N. Obs.	414	414	268	268	327	327

Statistics for t-Student in parenthesis. * p-values < 0.01, ** p-values < 0.05, *** p-values < 0.1.

All estimates are modelled using robust standard errors in order to correct heteroskedasticity of the error term
F-test for EKC tests whether coefficients on GDP (HDIM) and GDP² (HDIM²) are jointly zero, following Koop and Tole (1999).

Table 4 – EKC for AGS (years 1990-1995-2000)

Variable	AGS (1)		AGS (2)		AGS (3)	
	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects	Fixed Effects	Random Effects
HDIM	13.929 (6.46)*	13.921 (6.33)*	8.631 (2.83)*	8.793 (2.86)*	16.946 (5.00)*	16.700 (4.97)*
HDIM ²	-7.311 (-4.20)*	-7.447 (-4.18)*	-4.462 (-1.68)***	-4.722 (-1.78)***	-10.865 (-3.78)*	-10.759 (-3.82)*
HDIM ³			1.812 (1.58)	1.747 (1.56)	0.483 (0.46)	0.523 (0.51)
MAN	-0.012 (-1.08)	-0.010 (-0.96)	-0.013 (-0.84)	-0.011 (-0.73)	-0.013 (-0.84)	-0.011 (-0.73)
IMP	-0.068 (-7.30)*	-0.069 (-7.25)*	-0.042 (-3.18)*	-0.043 (-3.06)*	-0.035 (-3.01)*	-0.036 (-2.98)*
EXP	0.070 (7.68)*	0.071 (7.52)*	0.050 (3.82)*	0.051 (3.61)*	0.043 (3.84)*	0.044 (3.78)*
ENE			-0.089 (-0.80)	-0.120 (-1.06)	0.058 (0.46)	0.039 (0.31)
DENS			-0.001 (-1.95)***	-0.001 (-1.98)**	-0.001 (-2.26)**	-0.001 (-2.23)**
OIL			1.594 (5.90)*	1.603 (5.81)*	1.910 (8.03)*	1.904 (7.95)*
RL					0.522 (4.06)*	0.516 (4.13)*
PAT					0.0003 (1.54)	0.0003 (1.58)
CONST	-1.898 (-3.07)*	-1.822 (-2.91)*	-0.863 (-0.95)	(-0.78)	-3.231 (-3.20)*	-3.110 (-3.09)*
R-sq	0.533		0.584		0.653	
F test	92.14 (0.00)		52.78 (0.00)		63.87 (0.00)	
Wald test		449.86 (0.00)		461.11 (0.00)		621.74 (0.00)
LM test for RE		0.69 (0.41)		0.65 (0.42)		0.51 (0.47)
F-test for EKC	70.01 (0.00)		5.43 (0.00)		15.41 (0.00)	
N. Obs.	367	367	246	246	284	284

Statistics for t-Student in parenthesis. * p-values < 0.01, ** p-values < 0.05, *** p-values < 0.1.

All estimates are modelled using robust standard errors in order to correct heteroskedasticity of the error term
F-test for EKC tests whether coefficients on GDP (HDIM) and GDP² (HDIM²) are jointly zero, following Koop and Tole (1999).

Table 5 – EKC for CO₂ and AGS, IV (years 1990-1995-2000)

Variable	AGS (1)	AGS (2)	CO2 (1)	CO2 (2)
HDIM / GDP	12.488 (4.37)*	12.586 (3.73)*	4.781 (16.91)*	11.674 (6.32)*
HDIM ² / GDP ²	-7.765 (-3.18)*	-6.504 (-1.63)**	-0.242 (-13.90)*	-1.112 (-4.81)*
HDM ³ / GDP ³		-1.339 (-0.67)		0.036 (3.77)*
IMP	-0.057 (-6.40)*	-0.055 (-5.37)*	-0.013 (-2.99)*	-0.012 (-2.97)*
EXP	0.062 (7.23)*	0.061 (6.13)*	0.010 (2.42)**	0.009 (2.34)**
ENE			1.081 (10.85)*	1.240 (11.75)*
DENS	-0.001 (-3.60)*	-0.001 (-3.21)*	0.001 (2.83)*	0.001 (3.31)*
OIL	1.463 (7.04)*	1.406 (6.23)*		
RL	0.532 (4.32)*	0.579 (4.13)*	0.232 (3.27)*	0.228 (3.30)*
CONST	-1.169 (-1.53)	-1.347 (-1.52)	-15.117 (-12.82)*	-33.066 (-6.75)*
R-sq	0.662	0.657	0.897	0.904
Wald test	2944.94 (0.00)	2465.93 (0.00)	65966.31 (0.00)	69874.17 (0.00)
Hausman endogeneity	30.56 (0.00)	21.76 (0.00)	18.82 (0.01)	51.00 (0.00)
Overid test (Sargan)	45.09 (0.00)	44.84 (0.00)	22.52 (0.00)	15.03 (0.01)
F-test for EKC	54.97 (0.00)	26.86 (0.00)	482.84 (0.00)	399.27 (0.00)
Wald omitted Cubic Term		0.07 (0.79)		14.22 (0.00)
N. Obs.	288	288	234	234

Statistics for t-Student in parenthesis. * p-values < 0.01, ** p-values < 0.05, *** p-values < 0.1.
Instruments for RL: HDIM70, GDP70, HDIMCH, INV, INFLA.

Table 6 – Unit root tests for EKC and MEKC (1990-2004)

	LL	IPS	MW(ADF)	MW(PP)
<i>Fixed Effects</i>				
AGS	-6.561*	-4.386*	499.15*	668.43*
HDIM	-0.948	4.992	257.62	246.57
CO ₂	-11.183*	-1.164	501.81*	465.86*
GDP	-15.748*	-5.177*	444.46*	332.83**
<i>Fixed Effects with Trend</i>				
AGS	-16.584*	-6.064*	663.06*	627.96*
HDIM	-13.322*	-0.906	556.27*	1277.02*
CO ₂	-15.880*	-1.940*	540.95*	541.51*
GDP	-29.823*	-7.538*	655.62*	576.83*

Notes:

For AGS and HDIM time series is 1990-2004, while for CO₂ and GDP time series is 1990-2002.

In the LL test (Levin-Lin-Chu) for unit root the t-statistic has a standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis of non-stationarity.

In the IPS test (Im-Pesaran-Shin) for unit root the W[t-bar] statistic is distributed standard normal under the null hypothesis of non-stationarity.

Fisher type statistic, developed among the others by developed by Maddala and Wu (MW test), combines the p-values from N independent unit root tests. Based on the p-values of individual unit root tests, the test assumes that all series are non-stationary under the null hypothesis against the alternative that at least one series in the panel is stationary. It is modelled both as an Augmented Dickey-Fuller test (ADF) and as a Phillips-Perron test (PP).

All the tests have been performed with STATA 9.2.

Table 7 – EKC (1996-2002) and MEKC (1996-2004), independent estimates

Variable	AGS	AGS-IV	CO ₂	CO ₂ -IV
HDIM / GDP	5.774 (2.63)*	14.951 (8.42)*	5.831 (18.98)*	5.462 (10.05)*
HDIM ² / GDP ²	-4.156 (-3.84)*	-11.097 (-7.14)*	-0.314 (-15.08)*	-0.288 (-7.74)*
IMP	-0.051 (-13.83)*	-0.044 (-12.02)*	-0.010 (-3.19)*	-0.009 (-3.52)*
EXP	0.058 (14.95)*	0.050 (13.88)*	0.012 (3.72)*	0.011 (4.95)*
MAN	0.005 (0.78)	0.019 (3.21)*	0.006 (2.33)**	0.006 (1.92)**
INV	0.000 (-0.17)		-0.001 (-1.32)	
ENE			0.760 (8.25)*	0.755 (20.35)*
DENS	-0.001 (-4.40)*	-0.002 (-6.26)*	0.0004 (5.29)*	0.0004 (2.84)*
OIL	1.989 (15.71)*	2.286 (19.09)*		
RL	0.376 (6.52)*	1.345 (10.01)*	0.058 (1.27)	-0.051 (-0.41)
ARCO	1.187 (1.75)**	-1.654 (-2.44)*	0.913 (2.82)*	0.895 (2.83)*
HDIM (1 lag)	2.586 (1.41)	1.106 (0.58)		
CONST	-0.739 (-2.14)**	-1.357 (-2.99)*	-24.751 (-18.46)*	-23.542 (-12.00)*
R-sq	0.71	0.64	0.90	0.90
F-test	251.33 (0.00)		827.9 (0.00)	
Wald test		12280 (0.00)		179008 (0.00)
Hausman endogeneity		60.71 (0.00)		5.22 (0.81)
Overid test (Sargan)		48.55 (0.00)		54.88 (0.00)
F-test for EKC	7.59 (0.00)	98.14 (0.00)	649.24 (0.00)	
N. Obs.	1072	1072	728	728
Turning Point (HDIM)	0.69	0.67	0.81	0.84

Table 8 – EKC (1996-2002) and MEKC (1996-2004), simultaneous equations

Variable	SURE		3SLS	
	AGS	CO ₂	AGS	CO ₂
HDIM / GDP	10.745 (4.26)*	5.629 (15.22)*	10.635 (4.02)*	3.473 (6.19)*
HDIM ² / GDP ²	-6.824 (-3.46)*	-0.300 (-12.82)*	-6.785 (-3.28)*	-0.134 (-3.63)*
IMP	-0.071 (-13.35)*	-0.014 (-5.21)*	-0.067 (-12.26)*	-0.007 (-2.26)**
EXP	0.074 (15.29)*	0.018 (7.31)*	0.070 (14.12)*	0.013 (4.50)*
MAN	-0.028 (-3.64)*	0.007 (1.77)**	-0.022 (-2.76)*	0.006 (1.38)
INV	-0.0002 (-0.26)	-0.0004 (-0.83)	-0.001 (-0.74)	0.0002 (0.34)
ENE		0.0002 (11.26)*		0.0001 (0.77)
DENS	-0.001 (-1.99)**	0.0001 (0.50)	-0.001 (-1.95)**	0.0002 (10.15)*
OIL	1.373 (11.74)*		1.560 (12.60)*	
RL	0.149 (1.75)**	0.023 (0.44)	0.346 (2.62)*	-1.043 (-8.55)*
TECHINF	3.889 (5.96)*	2.651 (6.87)*	3.079 (3.80)*	3.681 (8.05)*
TECHIMP	-0.733 (-1.82)**	-0.027 (-0.12)	-0.648 (-1.80)**	-0.248 (-1.05)
CONST	-1.311 (-1.71)**	-19.849 (-13.62)*	-1.143 (-1.46)	-14.056 (-6.84)*
R-sq	0.71	0.88	0.71	0.81
F-test	1522	4480.24	1551.92	3951.7
F-test for EKC	32.70 (0.00)	472.06 (0.00)	29.31 (0.00)	535.01 (0.00)
N. Obs.	624	624	624	624
Turning Point (HDIM)	0.79	0.82	0.78	1.32

Appendix A: Tab A1 - Main Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
CO ₂	7.67	1.47	3.04	10.33
GDP	8.72	1.09	6.58	10.94
GDP ²	77.30	18.98	43.50	119.85
AGS	3.52	2.04	0.07	9.00
HDIM	0.69	0.19	0.24	0.96
HDIM ²	0.52	0.25	0.06	0.93
IMP	42.35	21.98	7.59	183.68
EXP	37.96	23.12	5.21	192.54
MAN	15.17	7.40	0.52	42.51
INV	21.24	43.39	0.20	848.85
ENE	2243.64	2346.53	75.23	11722.36
RL	0.07	0.98	-1.97	2.36
HDIM70	0.60	0.21	0.17	0.90
HDIMCH	0.20	0.18	-0.34	1.10
GDP70	8.32	1.10	6.17	10.67
INFLA	13.90	51.74	-23.48	879.86
PAT	49.31	301.97	0	4892.61
ARCO	0.22	0.12	0	0.74

Appendix A: Tab A2 - Correlation matrix

	AGS	HDIM	HDIM ²	DENS	IMP	EXP	MAN	INV	OIL	RL	HDIM70	HDIMCH	GDP70	INFLA
HDIM	0.597													
HDIM ²	0.581	0.991												
DENS	-0.020	0.138	0.136											
IMP	0.047	0.145	0.126	0.053										
EXP	0.385	0.301	0.283	0.061	0.851									
MAN	0.208	0.497	0.491	0.176	0.128	0.179								
INV	0.221	0.219	0.231	0.276	0.252	0.351	0.091							
OIL	0.487	0.039	0.005	-0.059	-0.174	0.038	-0.177	0.062						
RL	0.464	0.701	0.738	0.134	0.152	0.297	0.295	0.285	-0.132					
HDIM70	0.552	0.947	0.949	0.102	0.191	0.337	0.515	0.225	-0.040	0.675				
HDIMCH	-0.282	-0.469	-0.480	0.011	-0.185	-0.266	-0.341	-0.140	0.122	-0.311	-0.702			
GDP70	0.682	0.844	0.861	0.094	0.110	0.328	0.372	0.265	0.090	0.778	0.849	-0.486		
INFLA	-0.024	-0.131	-0.132	-0.084	0.008	0.041	-0.065	-0.035	0.069	-0.229	-0.086	-0.064	-0.104	
ARCO	0.411	0.704	0.730	-0.003	0.353	0.427	0.312	0.346	-0.147	0.694	0.735	-0.502	0.694	-0.152

	CO ₂	GDP	GDP ²	IMP	EXP	DENS	ENE	MAN	INV	RL	HDIM70	GDP70	HDIMCH	INFLA
GDP	0.900													
GDP ²	0.890	0.998												
IMP	0.091	0.043	0.038											
EXP	0.317	0.243	0.242	0.868										
DENS	-0.088	-0.041	-0.035	-0.029	-0.066									
ENE	0.742	0.753	0.770	0.013	0.213	-0.045								
MAN	0.328	0.393	0.381	0.155	0.189	0.105	0.056							
INV	0.150	0.198	0.211	0.289	0.329	-0.016	0.190	0.059						
RL	0.763	0.884	0.898	0.087	0.252	0.008	0.753	0.347	0.194					
HDIM70	0.774	0.842	0.837	0.107	0.211	-0.048	0.605	0.467	0.141	0.714				
GDP70	0.887	0.966	0.963	0.032	0.205	-0.088	0.737	0.327	0.163	0.824	0.848			
HDIMCH	-0.429	-0.471	-0.473	-0.154	-0.173	0.132	-0.375	-0.335	-0.105	-0.382	-0.769	-0.525		
INFLA	-0.078	-0.123	-0.127	0.055	0.089	-0.069	-0.093	-0.080	-0.017	-0.180	-0.068	-0.111	-0.050	
ARCO	0.660	0.741	0.749	0.353	0.427	-0.003	0.543	0.312	0.346	0.694	0.735	0.694	-0.502	-0.152

Appendix A: Table A3 - Data definitions

Code	Definition
AGS	Natural logarithm of Genuine Saving per capita (constant PPP2000\$)
CO ₂	Natural logarithm of CO ₂ emissions (ton. per capita)
NO _x	Natural logarithm of NO _x emissions (ton. per capita)
SO _x	Natural logarithm of SO _x emissions (ton. per capita)
GDP	Natural Logarithm GDP per capita (constant PPP2000\$)
HDIM	Human Development Index, standard UNDP methodology without GDP Index
IMP	Total Imports of merchandise goods as % of GDP
EXP	Total Exports of merchandise goods as % of GDP
MAN	Industry, value added (% of GDP)
INV	Gross private capital flows (% of GDP)
DENS	Population density (people per sq. km)
ENE	Energy use (kg of oil equivalent per capita)
OIL	Dummy for main oil exporting countries
PAT	Patent applications, residents (% of GDP)
ARCO	Technological Capabilities Index (Archibugi and Coco, 2004)
TECHINF	Technological Infrastructures (based on telephone and internet penetration)
TECHIMP	Import of technology (based on FDI inflows)
RL	Rule of Law (Kauffman et al., 2003)
HDIM70	Initial level of HDIM
HDIMCH	Change in HDIM level from initial time period until present observation
GDP70	Initial level of GDP per capita (constant PPP2000\$)
INFLA	Natural logarithm of Inflation rate (GDP deflator)

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

<http://www.repec.org>

<http://agecon.lib.umn.edu>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2006

SIEV	1.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI</i> : <u>Determinants and Effects on Property Values of Participation in Voluntary Cleanup Programs: The Case of Colorado</u>
CCMP	2.2006	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI</i> : <u>Stabilisation Targets, Technical Change and the Macroeconomic Costs of Climate Change Control</u>
CCMP	3.2006	<i>Roberto ROSON</i> : <u>Introducing Imperfect Competition in CGE Models: Technical Aspects and Implications</u>
KTHC	4.2006	<i>Sergio VERGALLI</i> : <u>The Role of Community in Migration Dynamics</u>
SIEV	5.2006	<i>Fabio GRAZI, Jeroen C.J.M. van den BERGH and Piet RIETVELD</i> : <u>Modeling Spatial Sustainability: Spatial Welfare Economics versus Ecological Footprint</u>
CCMP	6.2006	<i>Olivier DESCHENES and Michael GREENSTONE</i> : <u>The Economic Impacts of Climate Change: Evidence from Agricultural Profits and Random Fluctuations in Weather</u>
PRCG	7.2006	<i>Michele MORETTO and Paola VALBONESE</i> : <u>Firm Regulation and Profit-Sharing: A Real Option Approach</u>
SIEV	8.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI and Aline CHIABAI</i> : <u>Discount Rates in Risk v. Money and Money v. Money Tradeoffs</u>
CTN	9.2006	<i>Jon X. EGUIA</i> : <u>United We Vote</u>
CTN	10.2006	<i>Shao CHIN SUNG and Dinko DIMITRO</i> : <u>A Taxonomy of Myopic Stability Concepts for Hedonic Games</u>
NRM	11.2006	<i>Fabio CERINA</i> (lxxviii): <u>Tourism Specialization and Sustainability: A Long-Run Policy Analysis</u>
NRM	12.2006	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxxviii): <u>Benchmarking in Tourism Destination, Keeping in Mind the Sustainable Paradigm</u>
CCMP	13.2006	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Determinants of Environmental Innovation – New Evidence from German Panel Data Sources</u>
KTHC	14.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Social Capital, Public Spending and the Quality of Economic Development: The Case of Italy</u>
KTHC	15.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>The Empirics of Social Capital and Economic Development: A Critical Perspective</u>
CSRM	16.2006	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Corruption, Exogenous Changes in Incentives and Deterrence</u>
CCMP	17.2006	<i>Rob B. DELLINK and Marjan W. HOFKES</i> : <u>The Timing of National Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions in the Presence of Other Environmental Policies</u>
IEM	18.2006	<i>Philippe QUIRION</i> : <u>Distributional Impacts of Energy-Efficiency Certificates Vs. Taxes and Standards</u>
CTN	19.2006	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI</i> : <u>A Weak Bargaining Set for Contract Choice Problems</u>
CCMP	20.2006	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI and Roberto ZOBOLI</i> : <u>Examining the Factors Influencing Environmental Innovations</u>
SIEV	21.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>Non-pecuniary Work Incentive and Labor Supply</u>
CCMP	22.2006	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Matteo MANERA and Alessandro LANZA</i> : <u>On the Robustness of Robustness Checks of the Environmental Kuznets Curve</u>
NRM	23.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>When is it Optimal to Exhaust a Resource in a Finite Time?</u>
NRM	24.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-ICHI AKAO</i> : <u>Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Natural Resource Extinction</u>
SIEV	25.2006	<i>Lucia VERGANO and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Analysis and Evaluation of Ecosystem Resilience: An Economic Perspective</u>
SIEV	26.2006	<i>Danny CAMPBELL, W. George HUTCHINSON and Riccardo SCARPA</i> : <u>Using Discrete Choice Experiments to Derive Individual-Specific WTP Estimates for Landscape Improvements under Agri-Environmental Schemes: Evidence from the Rural Environment Protection Scheme in Ireland</u>
KTHC	27.2006	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Timo KUOSMANEN and Ekko C. van IERLAND</i> : <u>Estimating Feedback Effect in Technical Change: A Frontier Approach</u>
CCMP	28.2006	<i>Giovanni BELLA</i> : <u>Uniqueness and Indeterminacy of Equilibria in a Model with Polluting Emissions</u>
IEM	29.2006	<i>Alessandro COLOGNI and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>The Asymmetric Effects of Oil Shocks on Output Growth: A Markov-Switching Analysis for the G-7 Countries</u>
KTHC	30.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Social Capital and Labour Productivity in Italy</u>
ETA	31.2006	<i>Andrea GALLICE</i> (lxxix): <u>Predicting one Shot Play in 2x2 Games Using Beliefs Based on Minimax Regret</u>
IEM	32.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Paul SHEEHAN</i> : <u>Assessing the Risk of Oil Spills in the Mediterranean: the Case of the Route from the Black Sea to Italy</u>
NRM	33.2006	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Davide CAO</i> (lxxviii): <u>Uncovering the Macrostructure of Tourists' Preferences. A Choice Experiment Analysis of Tourism Demand to Sardinia</u>
CTN	34.2006	<i>Parkash CHANDER and Henry TULKENS</i> : <u>Cooperation, Stability and Self-Enforcement in International Environmental Agreements: A Conceptual Discussion</u>
IEM	35.2006	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Salvatore MONNI</i> : <u>Environment, Human Development and Economic Growth</u>
ETA	36.2006	<i>Ariel RUBINSTEIN</i> (lxxix): <u>Instinctive and Cognitive Reasoning: A Study of Response Times</u>

ETA	37.2006	<i>Maria SALGADEO</i> (lxxx): <u>Choosing to Have Less Choice</u>
ETA	38.2006	<i>Justina A.V. FISCHER and Benno TORGLER</i> : <u>Does Envy Destroy Social Fundamentals? The Impact of Relative Income Position on Social Capital</u>
ETA	39.2006	<i>Benno TORGLER, Sascha L. SCHMIDT and Bruno S. FREY</i> : <u>Relative Income Position and Performance: An Empirical Panel Analysis</u>
CCMP	40.2006	<i>Alberto GAGO, Xavier LABANDEIRA, Fidel PICOS And Miguel RODRÍGUEZ</i> : <u>Taxing Tourism In Spain: Results and Recommendations</u>
IEM	41.2006	<i>Karl van BIERVLIET, Dirk Le ROY and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>An Accidental Oil Spill Along the Belgian Coast: Results from a CV Study</u>
CCMP	42.2006	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Endogenous Technology and Tradable Emission Quotas</u>
KTHC	43.2006	<i>Giulio CAINELLI and Donato IACOBUCCI</i> : <u>The Role of Agglomeration and Technology in Shaping Firm Strategy and Organization</u>
CCMP	44.2006	<i>Alvaro CALZADILLA, Francesco PAULI and Roberto ROSON</i> : <u>Climate Change and Extreme Events: An Assessment of Economic Implications</u>
SIEV	45.2006	<i>M.E. KRAGT, P.C. ROEBELING and A. RUIJS</i> : <u>Effects of Great Barrier Reef Degradation on Recreational Demand: A Contingent Behaviour Approach</u>
NRM	46.2006	<i>C. GIUPPONI, R. CAMERA, A. FASSIO, A. LASUT, J. MYSLIAK and A. SGOBBI</i> : <u>Network Analysis, Creative System Modelling and DecisionSupport: The NetSyMoD Approach</u>
KTHC	47.2006	<i>Walter F. LALICH</i> (lxxx): <u>Measurement and Spatial Effects of the Immigrant Created Cultural Diversity in Sydney</u>
KTHC	48.2006	<i>Elena PASPALANOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity Determining the Memory of a Controversial Social Event</u>
KTHC	49.2006	<i>Ugo GASPARINO, Barbara DEL CORPO and Dino PINELLI</i> (lxxx): <u>Perceived Diversity of Complex Environmental Systems: Multidimensional Measurement and Synthetic Indicators</u>
KTHC	50.2006	<i>Aleksandra HAUKE</i> (lxxx): <u>Impact of Cultural Differences on Knowledge Transfer in British, Hungarian and Polish Enterprises</u>
KTHC	51.2006	<i>Katherine MARQUAND FORSYTH and Vanja M. K. STENIUS</i> (lxxx): <u>The Challenges of Data Comparison and Varied European Concepts of Diversity</u>
KTHC	52.2006	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI</i> (lxxx): <u>Rethinking the Gains from Immigration: Theory and Evidence from the U.S.</u>
KTHC	53.2006	<i>Monica BARNI</i> (lxxx): <u>From Statistical to Geolinguistic Data: Mapping and Measuring Linguistic Diversity</u>
KTHC	54.2006	<i>Lucia TAJOLI and Luca DE BENEDICTIS</i> (lxxx): <u>Economic Integration and Similarity in Trade Structures</u>
KTHC	55.2006	<i>Suzanna CHAN</i> (lxxx): <u>“God’s Little Acre” and “Belfast Chinatown”: Diversity and Ethnic Place Identity in Belfast</u>
KTHC	56.2006	<i>Diana PETKOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity in People’s Attitudes and Perceptions</u>
KTHC	57.2006	<i>John J. BETANCUR</i> (lxxx): <u>From Outsiders to On-Paper Equals to Cultural Curiosities? The Trajectory of Diversity in the USA</u>
KTHC	58.2006	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE</i> (lxxx): <u>Cultural Diversity A Glimpse Over the Current Debate in Sweden</u>
KTHC	59.2006	<i>Emilio GREGORI</i> (lxxx): <u>Indicators of Migrants’ Socio-Professional Integration</u>
KTHC	60.2006	<i>Christa-Maria LERM HAYES</i> (lxxx): <u>Unity in Diversity Through Art? Joseph Beuys’ Models of Cultural Dialogue</u>
KTHC	61.2006	<i>Sara VERTOMMEN and Albert MARTENS</i> (lxxx): <u>Ethnic Minorities Rewarded: Ethnostratification on the Wage Market in Belgium</u>
KTHC	62.2006	<i>Nicola GENOVESE and Maria Grazia LA SPADA</i> (lxxx): <u>Diversity and Pluralism: An Economist's View</u>
KTHC	63.2006	<i>Carla BAGNA</i> (lxxx): <u>Italian Schools and New Linguistic Minorities: Nationality Vs. Plurilingualism. Which Ways and Methodologies for Mapping these Contexts?</u>
KTHC	64.2006	<i>Vedran OMANOVIĆ</i> (lxxx): <u>Understanding “Diversity in Organizations” Paradigmatically and Methodologically</u>
KTHC	65.2006	<i>Mila PASPALANOVA</i> (lxxx): <u>Identifying and Assessing the Development of Populations of Undocumented Migrants: The Case of Undocumented Poles and Bulgarians in Brussels</u>
KTHC	66.2006	<i>Roberto ALZETTA</i> (lxxx): <u>Diversities in Diversity: Exploring Moroccan Migrants’ Livelihood in Genoa</u>
KTHC	67.2006	<i>Monika SEDENKOVA and Jiri HORAK</i> (lxxx): <u>Multivariate and Multicriteria Evaluation of Labour Market Situation</u>
KTHC	68.2006	<i>Dirk JACOBS and Andrea REA</i> (lxxx): <u>Construction and Import of Ethnic Categorisations: “Allochthones” in The Netherlands and Belgium</u>
KTHC	69.2006	<i>Eric M. USLANER</i> (lxxx): <u>Does Diversity Drive Down Trust?</u>
KTHC	70.2006	<i>Paula MOTA SANTOS and João BORGES DE SOUSA</i> (lxxx): <u>Visibility & Invisibility of Communities in Urban Systems</u>
ETA	71.2006	<i>Rinaldo BRAU and Matteo LIPPI BRUNI</i> : <u>Eliciting the Demand for Long Term Care Coverage: A Discrete Choice Modelling Analysis</u>
CTN	72.2006	<i>Dinko DIMITROV and Claus-JOCHEN HAAKE</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Simple Games: The Semistrict Core</u>
CTN	73.2006	<i>Ottorino CHILLEM, Benedetto GUI and Lorenzo ROCCO</i> : <u>On The Economic Value of Repeated Interactions Under Adverse Selection</u>
CTN	74.2006	<i>Sylvain BEAL and Nicolas QUÉROU</i> : <u>Bounded Rationality and Repeated Network Formation</u>
CTN	75.2006	<i>Sophie BADE, Guillaume HAERINGER and Ludovic RENO</i> : <u>Bilateral Commitment</u>
CTN	76.2006	<i>Andranik TANGIAN</i> : <u>Evaluation of Parties and Coalitions After Parliamentary Elections</u>
CTN	77.2006	<i>Rudolf BERGHAMMER, Agnieszka RUSINOWSKA and Harrie de SWART</i> : <u>Applications of Relations and Graphs to Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	78.2006	<i>Paolo PIN</i> : <u>Eight Degrees of Separation</u>
CTN	79.2006	<i>Roland AMANN and Thomas GALL</i> : <u>How (not) to Choose Peers in Studying Groups</u>

CTN	80.2006	<i>Maria MONTERO</i> : <u>Inequity Aversion May Increase Inequity</u>
CCMP	81.2006	<i>Vincent M. OTTO, Andreas LÖSCHEL and John REILLY</i> : <u>Directed Technical Change and Climate Policy</u>
CSRM	82.2006	<i>Nicoletta FERRO</i> : <u>Riding the Waves of Reforms in Corporate Law, an Overview of Recent Improvements in Italian Corporate Codes of Conduct</u>
CTN	83.2006	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK</i> : <u>Coalition Governments in a Model of Parliamentary Democracy</u>
PRCG	84.2006	<i>Raphaël SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>Valence Advantages and Public Goods Consumption: Does a Disadvantaged Candidate Choose an Extremist Position?</u>
CCMP	85.2006	<i>Eduardo L. GIMÉNEZ and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ</i> : <u>Pigou's Dividend versus Ramsey's Dividend in the Double Dividend Literature</u>
CCMP	86.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>The Impact of Climate Change on Domestic and International Tourism: A Simulation Study</u>
KTHC	87.2006	<i>Fabio SABATINI</i> : <u>Educational Qualification, Work Status and Entrepreneurship in Italy an Exploratory Analysis</u>
CCMP	88.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>The Polluter Pays Principle and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Climate Change: An Application of Fund</u>
CCMP	89.2006	<i>Philippe TULKENS and Henry TULKENS</i> : <u>The White House and The Kyoto Protocol: Double Standards on Uncertainties and Their Consequences</u>
SIEV	90.2006	<i>Andrea M. LEITER and Gerald J. PRUCKNER</i> : <u>Proportionality of Willingness to Pay to Small Risk Changes – The Impact of Attitudinal Factors in Scope Tests</u>
PRCG	91.2006	<i>Raphaël SOUBEYRAN</i> : <u>When Inertia Generates Political Cycles</u>
CCMP	92.2006	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Can R&D-Inducing Green Tariffs Replace International Environmental Regulations?</u>
CCMP	93.2006	<i>Xavier PAUTREL</i> : <u>Reconsidering The Impact of Environment on Long-Run Growth When Pollution Influences Health and Agents Have Finite-Lifetime</u>
CCMP	94.2006	<i>Corrado Di MARIA and Edwin van der WERF</i> : <u>Carbon Leakage Revisited: Unilateral Climate Policy with Directed Technical Change</u>
CCMP	95.2006	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Chiara M. TRAVISI</i> : <u>Comparing Tax and Tax Reallocations Payments in Financing Rail Noise Abatement Programs: Results from a CE valuation study in Italy</u>
CCMP	96.2006	<i>Timo KUOSMANEN and Mika KORTELAJINEN</i> : <u>Valuing Environmental Factors in Cost-Benefit Analysis Using Data Envelopment Analysis</u>
KTHC	97.2006	<i>Dermot LEAHY and Alireza NAGHAVI</i> : <u>Intellectual Property Rights and Entry into a Foreign Market: FDI vs. Joint Ventures</u>
CCMP	98.2006	<i>Inmaculada MARTÍNEZ-ZARZOSO, Aurelia BENGOCHEA-MORANCHO and Rafael MORALES LAGE</i> : <u>The Impact of Population on CO2 Emissions: Evidence from European Countries</u>
PRCG	99.2006	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE and Simona SCABROSETTI</i> : <u>Privatization and Efficiency: From Principals and Agents to Political Economy</u>
NRM	100.2006	<i>Khaled ABU-ZEID and Sameh AFIFI</i> : <u>Multi-Sectoral Uses of Water & Approaches to DSS in Water Management in the NOSTRUM Partner Countries of the Mediterranean</u>
NRM	101.2006	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslav MYSLAK and Jacopo CRIMI</i> : <u>Participatory Approach in Decision Making Processes for Water Resources Management in the Mediterranean Basin</u>
CCMP	102.2006	<i>Kerstin RONNEBERGER, Maria BERRITTELLA, Francesco BOSELLO and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Klum@Gtap: Introducing Biophysical Aspects of Land-Use Decisions Into a General Equilibrium Model A Coupling Experiment</u>
KTHC	103.2006	<i>Avner BEN-NER, Brian P. McCALL, Massoud STEPHANE, and Hua WANG</i> : <u>Identity and Self-Other Differentiation in Work and Giving Behaviors: Experimental Evidence</u>
SIEV	104.2006	<i>Aline CHIABAI and Paulo A.L.D. NUNES</i> : <u>Economic Valuation of Oceanographic Forecasting Services: A Cost-Benefit Exercise</u>
NRM	105.2006	<i>Paola MINOIA and Anna BRUSAROSCO</i> : <u>Water Infrastructures Facing Sustainable Development Challenges: Integrated Evaluation of Impacts of Dams on Regional Development in Morocco</u>
PRCG	106.2006	<i>Carmine GUERRIERO</i> : <u>Endogenous Price Mechanisms, Capture and Accountability Rules: Theory and Evidence</u>
CCMP	107.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL, Stephen W. PACALA and Robert SOCOLOW</i> : <u>Understanding Long-Term Energy Use and Carbon Dioxide Emissions in the Usa</u>
NRM	108.2006	<i>Carles MANERA and Jaume GARAU TABERNER</i> : <u>The Recent Evolution and Impact of Tourism in the Mediterranean: The Case of Island Regions, 1990-2002</u>
PRCG	109.2006	<i>Carmine GUERRIERO</i> : <u>Dependent Controllers and Regulation Policies: Theory and Evidence</u>
KTHC	110.2006	<i>John FOOT (lxxx)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Milan. Historical Approaches to Urban Immigration</u>
KTHC	111.2006	<i>Donatella CALABI</i> : <u>Foreigners and the City: An Historiographical Exploration for the Early Modern Period</u>
IEM	112.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Francesco BOSELLO and Giuseppe MARANO</i> : <u>Energy Demand and Temperature: A Dynamic Panel Analysis</u>
SIEV	113.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Stefania TONIN, Margherita TURVANI and Aline CHIABAI</i> : <u>Paying for Permanence: Public Preferences for Contaminated Site Cleanup</u>
CCMP	114.2006	<i>Vivekananda MUKHERJEE and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE</i> : <u>Global Climate Change, Technology Transfer and Trade with Complete Specialization</u>
NRM	115.2006	<i>Clive LIPCHIN</i> : <u>A Future for the Dead Sea Basin: Water Culture among Israelis, Palestinians and Jordanians</u>
CCMP	116.2006	<i>Barbara BUCHNER, Carlo CARRARO and A. Denny ELLERMAN</i> : <u>The Allocation of European Union Allowances: Lessons, Unifying Themes and General Principles</u>
CCMP	117.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Carbon Dioxide Emission Scenarios for the Usa</u>

NRM	118.2006	<i>Isabel CORTÉS-JIMÉNEZ and Manuela PULINA: <u>A further step into the ELGH and TLGH for Spain and Italy</u></i>
SIEV	119.2006	<i>Beat HINTERMANN, Anna ALBERINI and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Estimating the Value of Safety with Labor Market Data: Are the Results Trustworthy?</u></i>
SIEV	120.2006	<i>Elena STRUKOVA, Alexander GOLUB and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Air Pollution Costs in Ukraine</u></i>
CCMP	121.2006	<i>Massimiliano MAZZANTI, Antonio MUSOLESI and Roberto ZOBOLI: <u>A Bayesian Approach to the Estimation of Environmental Kuznets Curves for CO₂ Emissions</u></i>
ETA	122.2006	<i>Jean-Marie GREETHER, Nicole A. MATHYS, and Jaime DE MELO: <u>Unraveling the World-Wide Pollution Haven Effect</u></i>
KTHC	123.2006	<i>Sergio VERGALLI: <u>Entry and Exit Strategies in Migration Dynamics</u></i>
PRCG	124.2006	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Valentina MILELLA: <u>Privatization in Western Europe Stylized Facts, Outcomes and Open Issues</u></i>
SIEV	125.2006	<i>Pietro CARATTI, Ludovico FERRAGUTO and Chiara RIBOLDI: <u>Sustainable Development Data Availability on the Internet</u></i>
SIEV	126.2006	<i>S. SILVESTRI, M PELLIZZATO and V. BOATTO: <u>Fishing Across the Centuries: What Prospects for the Venice Lagoon?</u></i>
CTN	127.2006	<i>Alison WATTS: <u>Formation of Segregated and Integrated Groups</u></i>
SIEV	128.2006	<i>Danny CAMPBELL, W. George HUTCHINSON and Riccardo SCARPA: <u>Lexicographic Preferences in Discrete Choice Experiments: Consequences on Individual-Specific Willingness to Pay Estimates</u></i>
CCMP	129.2006	<i>Giovanni BELLA: <u>Transitional Dynamics Towards Sustainability: Reconsidering the EKC Hypothesis</u></i>
IEM	130.2006	<i>Elisa SCARPA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Pricing and Hedging Illiquid Energy Derivatives: an Application to the JCC Index</u></i>
PRCG	131.2006	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI and Bernardo BORTOLOTTI: <u>The Nontradable Share Reform in the Chinese Stock Market</u></i>
IEM	132.2006	<i>Alberto LONGO, Anil MARKANDYA and Marta PETRUCCI: <u>The Internalization of Externalities in The Production of Electricity: Willingness to Pay for the Attributes of a Policy for Renewable Energy</u></i>
ETA	133.2006	<i>Brighta BERCEA and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Quality of Available Mates, Education and Intra-Household Bargaining Power</u></i>
KTHC	134.2006	<i>Antonia R. GURRIERI and Luca PETRUZZELLIS: <u>Local Networks to Compete in the Global Era. The Italian SMEs Experience</u></i>
CCMP	135.2006	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Francesco BOSELLO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: A Joint Analysis for Sea Level Rise and Tourism</u></i>
CCMP	136.2006	<i>Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Why Worry About Climate Change? A Research Agenda</u></i>
SIEV	137.2006	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO and Patrizia RIGANTI: <u>Using Surveys to Compare the Public's and Decisionmakers' Preferences for Urban Regeneration: The Venice Arsenale</u></i>
ETA	138.2006	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO: <u>Environmental Quality in a Differentiated Duopoly</u></i>
CCMP	139.2006	<i>Denny ELLERMAN and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Over-Allocation or Abatement? A Preliminary Analysis of the Eu Ets Based on the 2005 Emissions Data</u></i>
CCMP	140.2006	<i>Horățiu A. RUS (lxxx): <u>Renewable Resources, Pollution and Trade in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
CCMP	141.2006	<i>Enrica DE CIAN (lxxx): <u>International Technology Spillovers in Climate-Economy Models: Two Possible Approaches</u></i>
CCMP	142.2006	<i>Tao WANG (lxxx): <u>Cost Effectiveness in River Management: Evaluation of Integrated River Policy System in Tidal Ouse</u></i>
CCMP	143.2006	<i>Gregory F. NEMET (lxxx): <u>How well does Learning-by-doing Explain Cost Reductions in a Carbon-free Energy Technology?</u></i>
CCMP	144.2006	<i>Anne BRIAND (lxxx): <u>Marginal Cost Versus Average Cost Pricing with Climatic Shocks in Senegal: A Dynamic Computable General Equilibrium Model Applied to Water</u></i>
CCMP	145.2006	<i>Thomas ARONSSON, Kenneth BACKLUND and Linda SAHLÉN (lxxx): <u>Technology Transfers and the Clean Development Mechanism in a North-South General Equilibrium Model</u></i>
IEM	146.2006	<i>Theocharis N. GRIGORIADIS and Benno TORGLER: <u>Energy Regulation, Roll Call Votes and Regional Resources: Evidence from Russia</u></i>
CCMP	147.2006	<i>Manish GUPTA: <u>Costs of Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions: A Case Study of India's Power Generation Sector</u></i>
CCMP	148.2006	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI: <u>A Modified Environmental Kuznets Curve for Sustainable Development Assessment Using Panel Data</u></i>

(lxxviii) This paper was presented at the Second International Conference on "Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development - Macro and Micro Economic Issues" jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari and Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, and supported by the World Bank, Chia, Italy, 16-17 September 2005.

(lxxix) This paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Economic Theory and Experimental Economics" jointly organised by SET (Center for advanced Studies in Economic Theory, University of Milano-Bicocca) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Italy, Milan, 20-23 November 2005. The Workshop was co-sponsored by CISEPS (Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Economics and Social Sciences, University of Milan-Bicocca).

(lxxx) This paper was presented at the First EURODIV Conference "Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring", held in Milan on 26-27 January 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "Cultural Diversity in Europe: a Series of Conferences.

(lxxxi) This paper was presented at the EAERE-FEEM-VIU Summer School on "Computable General Equilibrium Modeling in Environmental and Resource Economics", held in Venice from June 25th to July 1st, 2006 and supported by the Marie Curie Series of Conferences "European Summer School in Resource and Environmental Economics".

2006 SERIES

CCMP	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Matteo Manera)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Giulio Sapelli)
PRCG	<i>Privatisation Regulation Corporate Governance</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>