

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
<a href="http://ageconsearch.umn.edu">http://ageconsearch.umn.edu</a>
<a href="mailto:aesearch@umn.edu">aesearch@umn.edu</a>

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.

# Use of Seemingly Unrelated Parametric and Semiparametric Panel Models in the Environmental Kuznets Curve Estimation

Hector O.	Zapata
Krishna P.	. Paudel

Selected paper prepared for presentation at the Southern Agricultural Economics Association annual meeting, February, 2005

The authors are Assistant Professor and Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Copyright 2005 by Hector O Zapata and Krishna P. Paudel. All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

# Use of Seemingly Unrelated Parametric and Semiparametric Panel Models in the Environmental Kuznets Curve Estimation

We estimated the environmental Kuznets curve for point (mercury) and nonpoint (nitrogen, phosphorus, and dissolved oxygen) source water pollutants as a function of income in parametric and semiparametric functional forms of the Panel data model. Seemingly unrelated panel formulation did not provide gain in efficiency over the single equation panel data model.

## Use of Seemingly Unrelated Parametric and Semiparametric Panel Models in the Environmental Kuznets Curve Estimation

There have been numerous theoretical and empirical studies of an income-pollution relationship, which is usually referred to as the EKC. The hypothesis underlying the EKC is that the level of environmental degradation will increase as per capita income increases up to a threshold. Beyond this income threshold, or the turning point, it is assumed that further growth in income would be beneficial to the environment. Hence, the EKC curve is assumed to take an inverted U-shape.

It has been the general tendency to estimate each pollution-income equation separately in the EKC framework to find the income turning point while it is known that several of these pollutants are inherently related to each other. For example, nitrogen and phophorus pollutant primarily come from agriculture sources in most of the water bodies. Yet, when estimating EKC model for these two pollutants, researchers tend to estimate them as if the error terms in between these two equations are uncorrelated. We want to compare the results from single equation parametric panel model to those of the parametric seemingly unrelated regression fixed effects model. An additional issue of econometric interest in this and other applications of panel data analysis is model specification. The true model is never known, thus, plausible alternative specifications should be tested in empirical work. The results from the SUR parametric analysis will be compared to semiparametric seemingly unrelated regression models to see if efficiency of the parameter estimated as well as forecasting ability of the model can be improved in latter specification.

The paper proceeds as follows. The next section briefly reviews recent works on the estimation of the environmental Kuznets curve. Subsequently, the econometric methodology is

presented along with a description of the data. The results section emphasizes findings with the parametric specification of a panel data fixed effects model and argues why a seemingly unrelated approach may be reasonable; this discussion is expanded to pave the way to the econometric analysis of a semiparametric seemingly unrelated regression model. The last section of the paper outlines future research opportunities with these emerging semiparametric methods. The paper is rich in citations on recent and forthcoming literature.

### **Previous Work**

Author(s)	Title	Issue	Model Used	Conclusions
Millimet, D;	The	The importance	Two models used:	Formal statistical
List, J.;	Environmental	of modeling	Parametric model	comparisons of the
Stengos, T.	Kuznets	strategies when	using a two-way fixed	results reject the
	Curve: Real	estimating the	effect panel data using	parametric approach.
The Review of	Progress or	emissions-	a cubic specification.	
Economics	Misspecified	income	Pit = ai + ft + Yitd + eit	In the semi -
and Statistics	Models?	relationship. A	Where:	parametric model, the
85, no. 4		comparison of	Pit= Emissions of	data presented an
(2003)		the traditional	NO2 and SO2.	inverted-U shape
		parametric	f t= Time effect	between pollutant
		regression	Yit= Per capita Income	emissions and
		against the semi	d= A vector of slope	income.
		parametric	coefficients	
		partially linear	<i>eit</i> = Contemporaneous	Parametric EKC
		regression model	error term.	modeling is
		is presented in		especially
		the paper.	Semi -parametric	problematic for sulfur
			model:	dioxide emissions.
			Pit = ai + ft +	
			g(Yit)+µit	
			Where:	
			g (.)= is an unknown fx	
			μit= is a mean zero	
			residual assumed to be	
			uncorrelated with g(.).	

Perman, R,	Evidence from	The	The model applied:	Individual and panel
and D. Stern.	Panel Unit	Environmental	$Ln[M/P]_{it} = a_i + ?_t + d_i t$	cointegration tests
	Root and	Kuznets Curve	$+\beta_{I,i} ln[Y/P]_{it} +\beta_{2,i}$	cast doubt on the
Australian	Cointegration	(EKC)	$[ln(Y/P)]_{it}^2 + e_{it}$	general applicability
Journal of	Tests that The	hypothesis is		of the hypothesized
Agriculture	Environmental	despite	Where:	relationship between
and Resource	Kuznets Curve	considerable	<i>M</i> = Sulfur Dioxide	environmental quality
Economics 47,	does not Exist.	criticism on both	emissions per year.	and per capita
no.3		theoretical and	Y= Constant price PPP,	income.
(2003)		empirical	GDP.	
		grounds.	P= Country's	The results show that
		Cointegration	population.	the EKC is a
		analysis can be	t = A deterministic time	problematic concept,
		used to test the	trend.	at least in the case of
		validity of such		sulfur emissions.
		stylized facts		
		when the data		
		involved contain		
		stochastic trends.		
		stochastic tierius.		

Van, Phu. N.	A Semi	A semi parametric	The model used:	The results show the	
	parametric	additive model is	Y = a + Sfj(Xj) + Z'? +	nonexistence of an	
Applied	Analysis of	used to study the	e	environmental	
Economics	Determinants	relationship	Where:	Kuznets curve in the	
Letters 10,	of a Protected	between protected	<i>Y</i> = Environmental	data sample.	
no.10 (2003)	Area.	area, income,	Indicator.		
		trade, population,	<i>Xj</i> = Represents real	The study also points	
		education, and	GDP per capita,	out the existence of	
		political	trade, population	nonlinearity in the	
		institutions in a	density, and rate of	relationship between	
		sample of 89	secondary	protected area and the	
		countries.	enrollment. These	ratio of net secondary	
			variables are	school enrolment.	
			continuous.		
			Z= Discrete		
			variables: Political		
			institutions and		
			regional dummies		

Barbier, E.  Australian Economic Papers 42, no.2 (2003)	The Role of Natural Resources in Economic Development	Does the existence of EKC relationships suggest that environmental degradation will eventually decline with growth?	No Model used in this journal. The author presents several examples about different pollutants and its relationship with economic growth.	EKC analysis for air pollutants fit better for short term and selected countries.  Economic growth does not necessarily lead to improved environment conditions.  EKC model can differ from developed to developing countries.
Raghbendra, J and K.V. Bhanu New Economic Papers (2003)	A consumption Based Human Development Index and The Global Environmental Kuznets Curve	Construct an Environmental Degradation Index (EDI) for each country and global environmental degradation (GED) as the sum of the EDI's to identify outliers and influential observations among both the environmental and consumption related variables.	Canonical Discriminant analysis is used to classify development classes along environmental lines. They then estimate a simultaneous equation model to analyze the pattern of causation between per capita income, consumption and environmental degradation.	A. A cubic representation is most appropriate with high-consumption countries contributing excessively to GED and middle-consumption countries slightly less.  B. Low-consumption countries are contributing insignificantly to Global Environmental Degradation.
Harbaugh, W; Levinson, A; Wilson, D. The Review of Economics and Statistics 84 no.3 (2002)	Reexamining the Empirical Evidence for An Environmental Kuznets Curve	This paper examines the robustness of the evidence for the existence of an inverted U-shaped relationship between national income and pollution.	The model used: $Y_{it} = G_{it}\beta_1 + G^2_{it}\beta_2$ $+ G^3_{it}\beta_3 + L_{it}\beta_4 + L^2_{it}\beta_5$ $+ L^3_{it}\beta_6 + X'_{it} + \mu_i + ?_{it}$ Where: $Y = \text{Sulfur dioxide}$ emissions. $G = \text{Per capita GDP}$ . $L = \text{is a three year}$ average of lagged per capita GDP. $X = \text{are country-site}$ specific descriptors. $\mu = \text{a site specific}$ effect uncorrelated with the independent variables.  ?= normally distributed normal error.	The results conclude that there is little empirical support for an inverted U-shaped relationship between several important air pollutants and national income in these data.

Hill, R;	An	Examine the	The model used:	Highly sensitive
Magnani, E.	Exploration	conceptual and	$M_{it} = a + f(\beta, Y_{it}) + \mu_{it}$	conditions suggest
	of the	empirical basis of	i= 1152	that there is a
Australian	Conceptual	the environmental	t=1T	problem of omitted
Economic	and	Kuznets curve.		variables.
Papers 41 no.2	Empirical	The empirical	Where:	
(2002)	Basis of the	relationship is	M= per capita	Two important
	Environmental	highly sensitive to	emissions of a	omitted variables in
	Kuznets Curve	the choice of	pollutant.	the model are
		pollutant, sample	Y= per capita income	education and
		of countries and	f(.) = is a polynomial	inequality.
		time period.	of degree n(n=2 or 3)	
			in per capita income,	Observed relationship
			$Y_{it}$ , with parameters	is sensitive to the
			$\beta_1\beta_n$	measure of
				income/welfare used.
				It is important to
				It is important to remember the
				differences cross-
				countries because the
				EKC curve
				hypothesis is very
				sensitive to the data
				characteristics.
Lekakis, J;	Demand for	Demand for and	The model presented	The findings indicate
Konsis, M.	and Supply of	supply of	in the paper is:	that rising GDP per
Konsis, wi.	Environmental	environmental	$Ln(Act)_t = a + \beta Y_t +$	capita leads to higher
Applied	Quality in the	quality, which	$?Ln(Act)_{t-1} + \mu_t$	environmental actions
Economics	Environmental	constitute the	$\mathcal{L}_{II}(IICI)_{I-I} + \mu_I$	per capita.
Letters 8, no.3	Kuznets Curve	underlying forces	Where	per cupita.
(2001)	Hypothesis	that lead to turning	$Act_t$ = Environmental	The implications of
(2001)	11) poinesis	points of	actions per 100,000	the results suggest
		Environmental	persons.	that these three
		Kuznets Curves	$Y_t$ = GDP/head and	countries are on the
		(EKCs), are only	measured in dollars	rising segment of an
		implicitly referred		EKC or that the
		to in the fast		Environmental
		growing literature.		Kuznets curves do
		The author		not exist.
		estimates the		
		impact of GDP per		
		capita on all		
		actions per capita		
		seeking		
		environmental		
		quality in Greece,		
		Spain and Portugal		
		during the period		
		1974-1994.		
		177.177.1		

Panayotou, T.	Economic Growth and	Will the world be able to sustain	This paper does not present a specific	The author concludes that the
Environment	the	economic growth	model to analyze the	macroeconomic
and	Environment	indefinitely	relationship between	models generally
Development	Liiviioiiiiciit	without running	economic growth and	support the empirical
		into resource	_	
Paper no.4			the environment. Its	findings of the
(2000)		constraints or	main objective is to	Environmental
		despoiling the	critically review,	Kuznets Curve
		environment	synthesize and	literature.
		beyond repair?	interpret the literature	
		What is the	on the relationship	He suggests further
		relationship	between economic	empirical
		between steadily	growth and	investigation related
		increasing incomes	environment. The	to the assumption of
		and environmental	literature has	additive separability,
		quality?	followed two distinct	as well as
			but related strands of	development of
			research: an	additional
			empirical strand of ad	macroeconomic
			hoc specifications	models that allow for
			and estimations of a	a more realistic role
			reduced form	for government.
			equation, relating an	
			environmental impact	
			indicator to income	
			per capita; and a	
			theoretical strand of	
			macroeconomic	
			models of interaction	
			between	
			environmental	
			degradation and	
			economic growth,	
			including optimal	
			growth, endogenous	
			growth and	
			overlapping	
			generation's models.	
Galleoti, M	Desperately	The number of	The article utilizes	Non-nested tests have
and A. Lanza	Seeking	studies seeking to	two models. A linear	produced the result
	Environmental	empirically	and a log model are	that essentially
Journal of	Kuznets Curve	characterize the	presented to analyze	Gamma and Weibull
Environmental		reduced-form	which one explains	are to be preferred to
Economics		relationship	better the relations	the usual log-linear
and		between a	among pollution and	functional form.
Management		country's	economic growth.	
(1999)		economic growth	Both models use the	When alternative
(-2/2)		and the quantity of	same variable.	functional forms are
		various pollutants	$CO2_{it} = i + t + GDP_{it} +$	employed, the
		has increased	$GDP^{2}_{it} + GDP^{3}_{it} +$	emergence of a bell-
		lately, but in the		shaped
		case of CO2	μ <sub>it</sub> Where:	Environmental
		emissions the	CO2= is carbon	Kuznets Curve with
		evidence is at best	dioxide emissions	
			1	reasonable turning
		mixed.	GDP= Real GDP	points is a possibility.

Wang, P;	A risk-Based	The Environmental	A tobit model was	The EKC holds using
Bohara, A;	Environmental	Kuznets Curve	used in this journal.	assessed risk to toxic
Berrens, R;	Kuznets Curve	(EKC) hypothesis	The model was only	hazardous waste
Gawande, K.	for US	is investigated for	described in the	exposure.
	Hazardous	US hazardous	paper. The authors	
Applied	Waste Sites	waste sites.	included Aggregated	They also urge
Economics		US county level	Hazard Ranking	caution in
Letters 5,		data and assessed	Scores as the	generalizing and
no.12		risk is used as the	dependent variable.	interpreting the
(1998)		measure of	Per capita income	results.
		environmental	and per capita income	
		degradation.	square were the right	
			hand side variables.	
			The EPA calculates	
			and evaluates four	
			threat pathways to	
			measure Hazard	
			Ranking Scores	
			including: ground	
			water migration,	
			surface water	
			migration, soil	
			exposure, and air	
			migration.	
			An extended model	
			was also used in the	
			analysis of this paper. The authors include	
			the above variables	
			plus %or rural	
			population, % of	
			white people, % of	
			homeowners, and %	
			of college graduates.	
Laszlo, M;	The Kuznets	In this paper	The model	It is shown that there
Laszlo, K;	U-Curve	Kuznets' U-curve	formulated in the	is no hard empirical
Lachlan, M.	Hypothesis:	hypothesis is	paper was:	evidence to support
	Some Panel	tested on two	$INQ_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Y_{it} +$	the usual econometric
Applied	Data Evidence	unbalanced panel	$\beta_2 Y_{it}^2 + a_i + ?_t + \mu_{it}$	model formulations
Economics		data sets of 47 and	****	and the U-curve
Letters 5,		62 countries, for	Where:	hypothesis.
no.11		the period 1970-	$INQ_{it}$ = Measure of	T
(1998)		93, using two-way	income inequality.	Income inequalities
		fixed and random	$Y_{it}$ = Per capita GDP.	are more likely to be
		effects models.	$a_i$ = Country effects.	explained by complex
			$?_t$ = Time effects	country specific
				factors, and they
				essentially do not depend on the level
				of development.
				or development.

Kahn, M.  Public Economics Papers (1995)	Micro Evidence on the Environmental Kuznets Curve	It is important to quantify how vehicle pollution varies with individual income when considering	The model used assumes a log-linear relationship among vehicle's emissions in California and car model, year, mileage,	Richer people in California pollute less than poor people at least than richer people drive a lot of miles.
		the equity and efficiency of stringent vehicle emissions testing or vehicle scrap page programs.	engine type, and owner income	It is obvious that if richer people are polluting more the environment in California, then public policy should target the wealthy people because they have the resources to pay for better environment conditions.

### **Data and Methods**

Environmental Kuznets curve models have been estimated either in quadratic or in cubic specifications between pollutant concentration and per capita income. We adopt both of these specifications in our analysis. The general form of the panel data model used to describe the relationship between pollution and income in this study is given in equation (1).

$$p_{it} = \mathbf{a} + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \mathbf{b}_{k} y_{it}^{k} + \mathbf{b}_{m+1} W_{it} + \mathbf{b}_{m+2} D_{it} + u_{it}$$
 (1)

Here, p is a water pollutant (nitrogen, phosphorus or dissolved oxygen), y is per capita income, i and t represent indices of parish and time, respectively. Population density (persons per square mile) is accounted by D, and W represents a weighted income variable used to represent the spillover effect of pollution. For example, equation 1 has been traditionally estimated for each pollutant although a clear correlation seems to exist between error terms in different pollutant equation. We incorporate this fact in this paper.

A set of M equations each describing pollutant j (N, P, DO, Mercury) can be shown in SUR Panel model as follow:

$$\begin{split} P_j &= Z_j \pmb{d}_j + u_j & j = 1, \dots, M \\ u_j &= Z_{\mathbf{m}} \pmb{m}_j + v_j \end{split}$$

Here  $v_j$  are random vectors with zero mean and  $\sum_{v} \otimes I_{NT}$  variance. Each error component follows the SUR assumptions imposed on classical disturbances.

Because the cross-section represents individual states (which are fixed in a sample size context) and t represents the time series, a reasonable approximation to estimate the above model is the fixed effects model whereby the individual states have their intercept value (this model is typically known as a dummy variable model). Empirically, it is possible that a pooled regression model (estimating an OLS model on the entire sample) works as well if the fixed effects are not significant. Therefore, Hausman test is used to test whether FE are significant. Because environmental regulations and quality standards for collecting environmental data may be similar from state to state, if may be possible to improve on single equation estimates of the FE panel data model via a seemingly unrelated regression model for various pollutants. A Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test for diagonal residual covariance matrix for pairs of equations (N,M), (P,M) and (DO,M) can be carried out (Greene, p.621). The LM test is distributed Chi-squared with

M(M-1)/2 degrees of freedom; since there are two equations in each system, the degrees of freedom equals 1 in this application. If the null hypothesis of zero covariance is rejected, then SUR estimation of the fixed effects model is appropriate.

The true model specification is never known. Therefore, alternative model specifications should be considered in practice. Recent contributions on semiparametric modeling of the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis (Paudel *et al.* 2005; Millimet *et al.* 2003) suggest the specification of a semiparametric partial linear regression (PLR) model such as that in Engel *et al.* (1986) and Robinson (1988). The model is flexible in capturing non-linearities between environmental quality and per capita income, and it minimizes the tradeoff between variance and bias (Hardle, 1990). Consistent with preliminary parametric diagnostics, the panel data model is specified as a fixed effects error-components model (also referred to as a dummy variable model), which can be rewritten as:

$$p_{it} = \mathbf{v}_i + X_{it} \mathbf{b} + g(Y_{it}) + Z_{it} \tag{2}$$

Here,  $X_{it}$  is a set of parametric variables of state characteristics such as population density and weighted income,  $v_i$  measures individual (state) effects,  $g(Y_{it})$  is an unknown, assumed to be relatively smooth, function of powers of income (the smoothing variables) and is assumed that  $g(Y_{it})=E(p_{it}/Y_{it})$ ,  $E(Z_{it}/Y_{it})=0$ , and variance  $V(Z_{it}/Y_{it})=\sigma^2(Y_{it})$ , and  $(p_{it}, Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The nonparametric estimate of  $g(Y_{it})$  is the smoothed average of the  $p_{it}$  which correspond to the  $Y_{it}$  values in a small interval of Y with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$ , and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$ , and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$ , and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$ , and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$  and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$  and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The values in a small interval of  $Y_{it}$  with interval width (window)  $P(Y_{it})$  and  $P(Y_{it})$  are i.i.d. The

and goodness of fit. For this study, the smoothness parameter was chosen by minimizing the generalized cross-validation (GCV) function (Yatchew, 2003), and plots of the GCV function were obtained to ascertain that this function achieved a minimum for the data at hand.

The question of how to best test the parametric model in equation (1) versus the semiparametric specification in equation (2) has been the subject of much recent research (e.g., Ullah and Roy, 1998). We use Hong and White's test for the purpose. We used disaggregated nature of the data on nitrogen, phosphorus (primarily nonpoint source), and mercury (primarily point source) concentration in water from each watershed collected by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. The pooled data consisted of observations from 1985 to 1999 for 53 parishes in Louisiana.

### Results

Three parametric models were estimated: the pooled OLS, a fixed effects model, and a SUR of the dummy variable version of the fixed effects. The results are presented in Table 1. The first column in table 1 corresponds to the dependent variable (nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen, and mercury) often used in the estimation of the EKC. The independent variables for the first three pollutants (nitrogen, phosphorus and dissolved oxygen) are the same. The specification of the mercury model, however, differs from the others by the inclusion of the *permit* variable instead of cropland acreage. Therefore, bivariate SURE models for the FE dummy variable model are estimated for nitrogen and mercury, phosphorus and mercury, and dissolved oxygen and mercury. For example, the nitrogen block in table 1 provides estimates for single equation pooled OLS (labeled OLS), fixed effects (FE) and SURE between nitrogen and mercury for nitrogen; the mercury equation estimates from the above bivariate SURE are provide

in the SURE(N) line of the mercury block in table 1. The income effects are shown in columns 3-5, the weighted income effect in column 6, and the crop acreage for the nitrogen, phosphorus and dissolved oxygen equations or the permit variable for the mercury equation in column 7. Some goodness of fit statistics (R-squared and F-tests for model significance are shown in columns 8 and 9). The last column in table 1 is a Hausman specification tests for fixed effects, and the lower left-indented portion of this column is the LM statistics. The results in table 1 highlight the following main findings. Low R-squares are associated with the pooled least squares estimates for all pollutants, suggesting a lack of fit. The Hausman test values in the last column of table 1 indicate that fixed effects are significant and offer an improvement over the pooled the model. Note that all R-squares are significantly higher for the FE models, in fact these are the highest of models. SURE estimates of the dummy variable FE model do not seem to improve the model fit (R-squares are lower than those of the non-SURE FE but much higher than those of the OLS). Therefore, the tentative specification that seems to work best is that of the FE panel data model.

Recent work with panel data (Ullah and Roy) suggests that model misspecification can lead to inconsistent and inefficient estimates and suboptimal test statistics. It is argued that nonparametric and semiparametric estimation procedures of the fixed effects model could be more robust to misspecification. The contribution of this empirical study is to test whether a single equation semiparametric specification of the FE model is consistent with the data (relative to the parametric FE model). In turn, it is also tested whether efficiency gains can be achieved through seemingly unrelated regression estimation, similar to gains in the parametric counterpart (Greene). Table 2 reports the results of the semiparametric estimation of the kuznets curve.

Columns 2 and 3 report the Hong-White test statistics and its p-value for single equation FE

model estimates for nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen and mercury. The null model, therefore, is the parametric fixed effects model and the alternative model is the semiparametric FE model. In all cases, the null hypothesis of a parametric FE model is strongly rejected. Columns 4 and 5 in table 2 contain the Langrange Multiplier tests statistic for testing the null hypothesis of a diagonal covariance matrix from the residuals of the single-equation semiparametric estimates for nitrogen and mercury (N,M), phosphorus and mercury (P,M), and dissolved oxygen and mercury (DO,M). Similar to the parametric results, the hypothesis of zero correlation between equation residuals is not rejected.

### **Conclusions and Future Work**

This study reports a parametric and semiparametric evaluation of the environmental Kuznets curve using annual data (1985-2000) for 53 parishes in Louisiana. The following conclusions are derived. First, similar to other works, the parametric fixed effects model is a more adequate specification of the pollution-income relationship for Louisiana. Second, estimation efficiency gains through SUR estimation do not appear to be signification for the data at hand with a FE specification. Third, single-equation semiparametric estimates of the EKC works well for all four pollutants: nitrogen, phosphorus, dissolved oxygen and mercury. Lastly, no estimation efficiency gains can be achieved by estimating the EKC as a semiparametric seemingly unrelated regression specification. Work in progress studies the time series properties of the EKC data using panel data procedures and will reassess the validity of SUR findings in a more general model specification.

#### References

- Engle, R.F., C.W.J. Granger, J.Rice, and A. Weiss (1986), 'Semiparametric Estimates of the Relationship Between Weather and Electricity Sales.' *Journal of American Statistical Association* 87, 310--320.
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2000), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. 'Deposition of Air Pollutants to the Great Waters,' Third Report to Congress. Washington DC.
- Greene, W. H. Econometric Analysis. Fifth Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 2003. Page 171--173.
- Hardle, W. (1990), Applied Nonparametric Regression, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Hong, Y. and H. White (1995), 'Consistent specification testing via nonparametric series regression.' *Econometrica*, 63(5), 1133--1995.
- Millimet, D; List, J.; Stengos, T. 'The Environmental Kuznets Curve: Real Progress or Misspecified Models?' *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 85(2003):1038-1047.
- Paudel, K.P., H. Zapata, and D. Susanto. AAn Empirical Test of Environmental Kuznets Curve for Water Pollution.@ Forthcoming *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 2005.
- Robinson, P. (1988), 'Root N-Consistent Semiparametric Regression.' *Econometrica* 56 (4), 931--954.
- Ullah, A. and N. Roy (1998). "Parametric and Nonparametric Panel Data Models." Handbook of Applied Economic Statistics, A. Ullah and D.E.A. Giles eds., Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Yatchew, A. Semiparametric Regression for the Applied Econometrician, Cambridge University Press, NY, 2003.

Table 1. OLS, Fixed Effects and SURE Estimates and Specification Tests, Environmental Kuznets Curve, Louisiana 1985-2000.

Equation	Method	Income	Income2	Income3	Weighted Income	Crop Acreage/point sources	R2	F p- value	H-Test (p- value)
Nitrogen	OLS	-0.84	0.0994	-0.0038	-0.000009	2.758e-7	0.01	0.03	varue)
- (101 ogen	328	0.01	(0.0584)	(0.0023)	(8.1e-6)	(1.319e-7)	0.01	0.02	
		(0.5495)	( , , , ,						
	FE	-0.7940	0.0943	-0.0035	-0.000008	5.9e-7	0.51		13.31
-		(0.4923)	(0.0569)	(0.0021)	(8.1e-6)	(2.27e-7)			(0.0001)
	SURE	-0.7936	0.0942	-0.0035	-0.00002	5.9e-7	0.37		
		(0.4923)	(0.0569)	(0.0021)	(8.1e-6)	(2.2e-7)			
Phosphorus	OLS	-0.2495	0.0288	-0.0011	-0.000007	1.8063e-7	0.02	0.001	
		(0.1930)	(0.0228)	(0.00087)	(0.000003)	(5.143e-8)			
	FE	-0.1613	0.0212	-0.0008	1.447e-6	4.073e-8	0.65		23.34
		(0.1635)	(0.0189)	(0.0007)	(2.695e-6)	(7.537e-8)			(0.0001)
	SURE	-0.1611	0.0212	-0.0008	1.441e-6	3.943e-8	0.50		
		(0.1635)	(0.0189)	(0.0007)	(2.695e-6)	(7.535e-8			
Dis. Oxygen	OLS	-8.0909	0.8723	-0.0298	-0.00002	9.752e-7	0.05	0.0001	
		(2.1054)	(0.2483)	(0.0096)	(0.00003)	(5.61e-7)			
	FE	-3.5960	0.3813	-0.0128	4.266e-6	1.011e-6	0.74		34.18
		(1.5658)	(0.1810)	(0.0068)	(0.000026)	(7.218e-7)			(0.0001)
	SURE	-3.5946	0.3812	-0.0128	4.205e-6	9.995e-7	0.60		
		(1.5946)	(0.1810)	(0.0068)	(0.000026)	(7.217e-7)			
Mercury	OLS	0.4134	-0.0469	0.00173	0.000005	-0.00094	0.04	0.68	
		(0.4764)	(0.0562)	(0.00216)	(0.000007)	(0.00084)			
	FE	0.0676	-0.0087	0.0004	0.000015	-0.0004	0.12		1.67
		(0.6327)	(0.0731)	(0.0027)	(0.00001)	(0.00001)			(0.0029)
	SURE(N)	0.0681	-0.0087	0.0004	0.000015	-0.0004	0.37		0.298 LM
		(0.6327)	(0.0731)	(0.0027)	(0.00001)	(0.0009)			(0.41)
	SURE(P)	0.0687	-0.0088	0.0004	0.000015	-0.0004	0.50		0.328 LM
		(0.6327)	(0.0731)	(0.0027)	(0.00001)	(0.0009)			(0.43)
	SURE(DO)	0.0653	-0.0084	0.00039	0.00015	-0.00034	0.60		<b>0.307 LM</b>
		(0.6327)	(0.0731)	(0.0027)	(0.00001)	(0.0009)			(0.42)

Table 2. Specification Tests of Parametric Fixed Effects (FE) versus Semiparametric FE, Environmental Kuznets Curve, Louisiana, 1985-2000.

Equation	Hong-W	hite Test	Semiparametric Test for SUR		
	Statistic	p-value	Statistic	p-value	
Nitrogen	100.827	<0.000	0.2693 (N,M)	0.40	
Phosphorus	128.699	<0.000	0.2868 (P,M)	0.41	
Disolved Oxygen	147.05	<0.000	0.2947 (DO,M)	0.41	
Mercury	21.540	<0.000			