

**The Environmental Consequences of Globalization:
A Country-Specific Time Series Analysis**

**Jungho Baek
Yong Sung Cho
Won W. Koo**



**Center for Agricultural Policy and Trade Studies
Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5636**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors extend appreciation to Mr. Richard D. Taylor and Dr. Robert Hearne for their constructive comments and suggestions. Special thanks go to Ms. Judy Normann, who helped to prepare the manuscript.

The research was conducted under the U.S. agricultural policy and trade research program funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security/U.S. Customs and Border Protection Service (Grant No. TC-03-003G, ND1301).

We would be happy to provide a single copy of this publication free of charge. This publication is also available electronically at this web site: <http://agecon.lib.umn.edu/>. You can address your inquiry to: Judy Normann, Center for Agricultural Policy and Trade Studies, Department of Agribusiness & Applied Economics, North Dakota State University, P.O. Box 5636, Morrill 209, Fargo, ND, 58105-5636, Ph. 701-231-7334, Fax 701-231-7400, e-mail ndsucapts@ndsu.edu.

NDSU is an equal opportunity institution.

Copyright © 2008 by Jungho Baek, Yong Sung Cho, and Won W. Koo. 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ii
List of Figures.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Highlights.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Framework.....	3
Empirical Methodology	5
Data Choice for Environmental Quality	5
Data Sources	8
Econometric Procedure.....	8
Empirical Results	9
Analyzing Long-Run Relationships.....	11
Identifying the Causal Effects.....	17
Conclusions.....	20
Appendix: Development of Empirical Time-Series Model	21
References.....	22

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Results of Johansen Cointegration Tests and Long-run Relationship Between SO ₂ Emissions, Income and Openness for Developed Countries	10
2	Results of Johansen Cointegration Test and Long-run Relationship Between SO ₂ Emissions, Income and Openness for Developing Countries	11
3	Results of Weak Exogeneity Tests for Developing and Developed Countries	19

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Effect of Trade Openness on Income and the Environment	4
2	Share of Global SO ₂ Emissions	6
3	Regional Trend of SO ₂ Emissions (Eastern Europe, North America, Western Europe and Oceania)	7
4	Regional Trend of SO ₂ Emissions (Asia, South American, Middle East and Africa)	7
5	Plots of Per Capita SO ₂ Emissions and Per Capita Income for US, Japan and the UK.....	13
6	Emissions Intensities for Developed Countries	14
7	Plots of Per Capita SO ₂ Emissions and Per Capita Income for Greece, Portugal and Israel	15
8	Plots of Per Capita SO ₂ Emissions and Per Capita Income for China, Mexico and Peru	16
9	Emissions Intensities for Developing Countries.....	17

ABSTRACT

The dynamic relationships among trade, income and the environment for developed and developing countries are examined using a cointegration analysis. Results suggest that trade and income growth tend to increase environmental quality in developed countries, whereas they have detrimental effects on environmental quality in most developing countries. It is also found that for developed countries, the causal relationship appears to run from trade and income to the environment — a change in trade and income growth causes a consequent change in environmental quality, and the opposite relationship holds for developing countries.

Keywords: Developed countries, Developing countries, Environmental quality, Globalization, Time-series analysis, Trade

HIGHLIGHTS

The environmental consequences of trade liberalization have been vigorously debated during the past decade. Proponents of trade liberalization argue that, because environmental quality is a normal good, trade-induced income growth causes people to increase their demand for a clean environment, which in turn encourages firms to shift towards cleaner techniques of production. Thus, free trade provides a win-win situation in the sense that it improves both environment and economy. Opponents of globalization, on the other hand, fear that if production techniques do not change, then environmental quality must deteriorate as trade increases the scale of economic activity. Moreover, if environmental quality is a normal good, then developing economies tend to adopt looser standards of environmental regulations. Given inequalities in the world distribution of income, trade liberalization may lead to more growth of pollution-intensive industries in developing countries as developed countries enforce strict environmental regulations, thereby having a significant adverse effect on environmental quality.

The main objective of this study is to examine the dynamic effect of trade liberalization on the environment using a time-series dataset of sulfur emissions (SO_2), income and trade openness for 50 individual countries (25 developed and 25 developing countries) over the last five decades. For this purpose, the cointegrated vector autoregression (CVAR) model is adopted.

The results show that trade and income growth tend to increase environmental quality in developed countries, whereas they have detrimental effects on environmental quality in most developing countries. We also find that for developed countries, the causal relationship appears to run from trade and income to the environment — a change in trade and income growth causes a consequent change in environmental quality. For developing countries, on the other hand, the causality is found to run in the opposite direction — from environmental quality to trade and/or income.

The Environmental consequences of globalization: A country-specific time-series analysis

Jungho Baek, Yong Sung Cho, and Won W. Koo¹

INTRODUCTION

Economists have vigorously debated the environmental consequences of trade liberalization (Copeland and Taylor 1994 and 2004, Copeland 2005). Proponents of trade liberalization argue that, because environmental quality is a normal good, trade-induced income growth causes people to increase their demand for a clean environment, which in turn encourages firms to shift towards cleaner techniques of production. Thus, free trade provides a win-win situation in the sense that it improves both environment and economy. Opponents of globalization, on the other hand, fear that if production techniques do not change, then environmental quality must deteriorate as trade increases the scale of economic activity. Moreover, if environmental quality is a normal good, then developing economies tend to adopt looser standards of environmental regulations. Given inequalities in the world distribution of income, trade liberalization may lead to more growth of pollution-intensive industries in developing countries as developed countries enforce strict environmental regulations, thereby having a significant adverse effect on environmental quality.

Since the seminal work by Grossman and Krueger (1991), many scholars have attempted to examine the effect of trade openness on the environment. For example, Lucas et al. (1992) investigate the influence of trade openness on the growth rate of the toxic intensity of output; they find that among rapidly growing economies, increased trade openness reduces the growth rate of toxic intensity of output. Gale and Mendez (1998) analyze the relationship between trade, income growth and the environment; they find that an increase in income has a detrimental effect on environmental quality, but effect of trade liberalization on pollution is not significant. Dean (2002) examines the effect of trade liberalization on environmental damage; she finds that increased openness to international markets aggravates environmental damage through the terms of trade, but mitigates it through income growth. More recently, Frankel and Rose (2005) estimate the effect of trade on the environment for a given level of income per capita; they conclude that there is little evidence that trade openness causes significant environmental degradation.

Previous studies have undoubtedly expanded our understanding of the environmental consequences of economic growth and international trade. However, earlier studies have mostly adopted a reduced-form model to examine the presence of significant statistical associations for trade openness and income growth with environmental quality. Specifically, with the treatment

¹Baek is a Research Assistant Professor, and Koo is Professor and Director, in the Center for Agricultural Policy and Trade Studies, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND. Cho is a Professor in the Department of Food and Resource Economics, Korea University.

of trade and income as being exogenous variables in a reduced-form model, past studies specify measures of environmental quality/damage (e.g., sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide emissions) as a function of trade openness (usually defined as the sum of exports and imports divided by GDP) and income (usually per capita GDP). This approach implicitly assumes a unidirectional causal relationship; that is, a change in the level of trade openness and income causes a consequent change in the environmental quality, but the reverse does not hold. Accordingly, this presumption neglects the possibility of endogeneity of trade and income in the model. Because environmental quality and income may jointly (simultaneously) affect trade, causality could run in other directions (Coondoo and Dinda 2002, Frankel and Rose 2005, Chintrakarn and Millimet 2006). For example, trade can improve environmental quality via income growth, whereas strict environmental regulations can induce efficiency and encourage innovations, which may eventually positively affect a firm's competitiveness and thus trade volume, which is known as the Porter hypothesis (Porter and van der Linde 1995). In addition, previous studies have typically used cross-section or panel data of a group of countries for their analyses. This approach assumes that a single country's experience (for example, economic development trajectory) over time would mirror the pattern revealed by a group of countries at different stages of development at a point in time (Dean 2002, Coondoo and Dinda 2002). However, considering wide cross-country variations observed in social, economical and political factors, the time path for individual countries may not follow a pattern of a group of countries.

Given the time-series properties of datasets on measures of economic activity, such as income and trade, and corresponding environmental change, a multivariate time-series analysis such as a vector autoregression (VAR) model is well suited to deal with the issue of endogeneity problem and/or causal mechanisms. More specifically, the VAR approach can determine both the short- and long-run dynamic effects of selected variables and test the endogeneity of them. One can interpret the results of this procedure as indicating potential impacts of shocks in a variable on all other variables. Compared to a reduced-form equation, therefore, the VAR approach allows us to address the endogeneity of income and trade, as well as to identify presence and direction of causality among variables without a *priori* theoretical structure. No previous study has attempted to directly address the potential endogeneity of income, trade and the environment with individual country-specific data and time-series models.

The objective of this study is to examine the dynamic effect of trade liberalization on the environment using a time-series dataset of sulfur emissions (SO₂), income and trade openness for 50 individual countries over the last five decades. For this purpose, we adopt the cointegrated vector autoregression (CVAR) model developed by Johansen (1988). The approach features multivariate autoregression and maximum likelihood estimation; it is a convenient tool to examine dynamic interactions when variables used in the model are non-stationary and cointegrated. In addition, the cointegration approach is used to find the long-run equilibrium relationships among the selected variables. Given that the environmental consequences of income growth and liberalized trade are essentially a long-run concept (Dinda and Coondoo 2006), using the cointegration method is indeed desirable to examine the true relationship among the environment, trade and income. Moreover, coefficients of the long-run relationships can be tested to determine whether any variable can be treated as a weakly exogenous variable, which is thus interpreted as a driving variable that influences the long-run movements of the other variables but is not affected by the other variables in the model. Hence, these dynamic

interactions will provide an explanation for the causal mechanism among the selected variables. The remaining sections present the theoretical framework, empirical methodology, empirical findings, and conclusions. Development of empirical time-series models used for this study is placed in an appendix.

A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To illustrate theoretical relationships among trade openness, income growth and environmental quality, we first define income growth (I) as a function of trade openness (T) and other exogenous variables (Z_1) as follows:

$$I = f(T, Z_1) \tag{1}$$

Trade openness leads to an increase in the scale of economic activity and, consequently, an increase in income in a country. Trade openness thus shows a positive monotonic relation with income ($\partial I / \partial T > 0$) as shown in the first-quadrant of Figure 1. If trade openness does not positively affect income growth, it is hypothesized that the country may not involve in globalization via the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other regional and/or bilateral trade treaties. We then define pollution (E) as a function of income growth (I) and production technology (Z_2) as follows:

$$E = f(I, Z_2) \tag{2}$$

Pollution levels increase with growing income up to a threshold level (turning point) beyond which pollution levels decrease with higher income levels. The combination of these two effects ($\partial E / \partial I > 0$ and $\partial E / \partial I < 0$) creates the inverted U-shaped relationship between income and pollution levels as shown in the second-quadrant of Figure 1; economists call this relationship as the *Environmental Kuznets Curve* (EKC). Finally, we substitute equation (1) into equation (2), which yields the following relationship:

$$E = g(T, Z_1, Z_2) \tag{3}$$

The relationship between pollution and trade openness depends on the relationships derived from equations (1) and (2). For example, trade openness leads to an increase in real income and brings about a proportionate increase in pollution levels in early stages of economic development. However, because environmental quality is a normal good, trade-induced income growth causes people to increase their demand for a clean environment and eventually improves environmental quality. Consequently, a country tends to follow a pattern of rising pollution levels as trade openness proceeds ($\partial E / \partial T > 0$), followed by declining pollution levels at more advanced stages of trade liberalization ($\partial E / \partial T < 0$) (fourth-quadrant of Figure 1). Therefore, the observed correlation between pollution and openness is a U-shaped curve as shown in the fourth-quadrant of Figure 1.

Because individual countries experience different levels of income and openness corresponding to their process of development, the true form of the pollution-income-openness relationship mainly depends on where an economy is currently placed in a development

trajectory. For example, as for individual countries that move beyond the EKC curve turning points and have higher degrees of openness, trade-induced income growth may result in




Figure 1. Effect of Trade Openness of Income and the Environment.

structural change towards less polluting industries, increased environmental awareness, and enforcement of environmental regulations, thereby improving environmental quality. On the other hand, if individual countries have not reached income levels high enough to be able to reach their turning points, trade liberalization may lead to more rapid growth of pollution-intensive industries in those countries and deterioration of environmental quality. As a result, the effect of trade liberalization on income and the environment is essentially an empirical question and varies according to circumstances such as individual countries' stages of development and openness levels.

EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY

Data Choice for Environmental Quality

This study examines the dynamic relationship among trade openness, income and environmental quality for each of 50 developing and developed countries. There are two emission variables that have been widely used in the literature: sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and carbon dioxide (CO₂). Of these, SO₂ represents the measure of local air pollution, whereas CO₂ represents a global pollutant (externality), which individual countries are unable to regulate without international cooperation (Dinda 2004, Frankel and Rose 2005). It is thus more appropriate to use SO₂ as a proxy for the measure of environmental quality in our individual country-specific analysis.

Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) belongs to the family of sulfur oxide gases (SO_x) and is formed when fuel containing sulfur such as coal and oil is burned. Most of SO₂ released to the air come from the burning of coal and oil at electric utilities and plants. Other sources of SO₂ include industrial facilities that use coal and crude oil, petroleum refineries, cement manufacturing, and metal processing facilities. Non-road engines and vehicles such as train and large ships also burn high sulfur fuel and release SO₂ emissions to the air. SO₂ causes a wide variety of health and environmental impacts because of the way it reacts with other substances in the air. For example, SO₂ and nitrogen oxides react with other substances in the air to form acid rain, fog, snow, or dry particles, which damages forests and crop and changes the makeup of soil (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) (see <http://www.epa.gov/oar/urbanair/so2> for more details).

Figure 2 shows SO₂ emissions shares in each region over for the period 1960-2000. The four major regions – Asia, Eastern Europe, North America and Western Europe account for more than 75% of global SO₂ emissions; Asia has been the largest emitter since 1993. Figures 3-4 represents regional SO₂ emissions for the same period to show more detailed of the regional changes. For example, emissions from North America and Western Europe, the most developed regions of the world, have been declining since the early 1970s (Figure 3). On the other hand, Asia has seen a heavy increase in SO₂ emissions over the last three decades. As a result, Asia has become the largest source region since the 1990s (Figure 4). The major reason for Asia's being the largest emitter is due mainly to rapid economic growth and industrialization in China. In fact, Chinese SO₂ emissions overtook U.S. emissions in 1987 to make China the largest single emitter in the world.




Figure 2. Share of global SO₂ emissions.

Note: Other regions include Oceania, Middle East and Shipping.




Figure 3. Regional trend of SO₂ emissions (Eastern Europe, North America, Western Europe and Oceania).




Figure 4. Regional trend of SO₂ emissions (Asia, South America, Middle East and Africa).

Data Sources

We compiled annual time-series data on sulfur emission (SO₂), income and trade openness for 50 countries for the period 1960-2000. The estimated sulfur emissions for 50 countries are obtained from a large database constructed by David Stern (Stern 2005 and 2006), which is known as the David Stern's Datasite (available at the web site <http://www.rpi.edu/~sternd/datasite.html>). To ensure comparability with per capita real GDP in the model, per capita SO₂ emissions for individual countries (measured in kg) are calculated using their population sizes. The per capita real GDP (measured in real PPP-adjusted dollars) is used as a proxy for income and is taken from the Penn World Table (PWT 6.2) (available at the web site http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt62/pwt62_form.php). The degree of openness of an economy (defined as the ratio of the value of total trade to real GDP) is used as a proxy for trade openness and is obtained from the Penn World Table.

The data on sulfur emissions (SO₂) used in empirical studies have almost invariably come from a single source, the ASL and Associates database (ASL and Associate 1997, Lefohn et al. 1999), which compiles annual time-series data on SO₂ for individual countries from 1850 to 1990. However, the unavailability of data after 1990 has limited continued use of these estimates for further research. Hence, David Stern has developed global and individual country estimates of sulfur emissions from 1991 to 2000 or 2002 (most OECD countries) combined with estimates from existing published and reported sources for 1850-1990 (see Stern 2005 for more details). In addition, following the World Bank's country classification, 50 countries used in our analysis are divided into two groups on the basis of 2005 gross national income per capita: (1) 25 developing economies, \$876- \$10,725; and (2) 25 developed economies, \$10,726 or more.

Econometric Procedure

When dealing with time-series data, the possibility of nonstationarity (or unit roots) in a series raises issues about parameter inference and spurious regression (Wooldridge 2000). A stationary series is defined as a series that tends to return to its mean value and fluctuate around it within a more or less constant range, whereas a non-stationary series is defined as a series that has a different mean at different points in time and its variance increases with the sample size (Harris and Sollis 2003). OLS regression involving non-stationary series no longer provides the valid interpretations of the standard statistics such as *t*-statistics, *F*-statistics and confidence intervals. To avoid this problem, non-stationary variables should be differentiated to make them stationary. However, Engle and Granger (1987) show that, even in the case that all the variables in a model are non-stationary, it is possible for a linear combination of integrated variables to be stationary. In this case, the variables are said to be cointegrated and the problem of spurious regression does not arise. Hence, the first requirement for cointegration analysis is that the selected variables must be non-stationary.

The presence of a unit root in three variables (Openness, income and emissions) for 50 countries is tested using the Dickey-Fuller generalized least squares (DF-GLS) test (Elliot et al. 1996). This test optimizes the power of the conventional augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test by detrending. The DF-GLS test works well in small samples and has substantially improved power when an unknown mean or trend is present (Elliot et al. 1996). The results show that the levels of

all the series (150 series) are non-stationary, while the first differences are stationary. From these findings, we conclude that all the series are non-stationary and integrated of order 1, or $I(1)$; therefore, cointegration analysis can be pursued on them.

It should be noted that, before implementing the cointegration test, the important specification issue to be addressed is the determination of the lag length for the VAR model, because the Johansen procedure is quite sensitive to changes in lag structure (Maddala and Kim 1998). The lag length (k) of the VAR model is determined based on the likelihood ratio (LR) tests. This method compares the models of different lag lengths sequentially to see if there is a significant difference in results (Doornik and Hendry 1994). Of the 50 countries, for example, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between a two- and a three-lag model cannot be rejected for 19 countries. Thus, two lags ($k=2$) are used for those countries in our cointegration analysis. Diagnostic tests on the residuals of each equation and corresponding vector test statistics support the VAR model with two lags as a sufficient description of the data. For the remaining 31 countries, on the other hand, both the VAR lag selection criterion and diagnostic tests consistently support $k=1$ as the most appropriate lag length for the VAR model.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

With the selected lag lengths ($k=1$ or $k=2$) in non-stationary VAR models, the Johansen cointegration procedure is used to determine the number of cointegrating vectors among the variables. The results indicate that one cointegration vector is found for 24 countries at the 5% significance level, whereas no cointegration is found for 26 countries (Tables 1-2). More specifically, of the 25 developed countries, the trace tests show that the hypothesis of no cointegration ($r=0$) is rejected and that of one cointegration vector ($r=1$) is accepted at the 5% level for 17 countries. For the remaining 8 countries, on the other hand, the trace statistics are well below the critical value and $r=0$ cannot be rejected at the 5% level, indicating that the three variables are not cointegrated. The results thus, by and large, support the hypothesis that cointegration between SO_2 emissions, income and openness is pervasive across developed countries and a long-run equilibrium relationship among these variables also exists. In contrast, of the 25 developing countries, the trace tests show that only 7 countries have a cointegration rank of one ($r=1$), while the remaining 18 countries have $r=0$. This finding provides relatively weak support for the contention that the presence of long-run relationship among the three variables is pervasive across developing countries.

When determining the existence of cointegration relationship, the cointegration vectors (β_j) estimated from equation (5) represent the long-run relationship among the selected variables (see Appendix for more details). More specifically, having obtained only one cointegration relationship between SO_2 emissions, income and openness in the 24 countries that include developed and developing economies, the first eigenvector (β_1) of the three eigenvectors is most highly correlated with the stationary part of the process Δy_t when corrected for the lagged values of the differences. Thus, β_1 represents the cointegration vector determined by the CVAR model (Johansen 1988). After normalizing the coefficient of SO_2 emissions, for example, the long-run equilibrium relation (β_1) between the three variables in the United States can be

represented as the following reduced form: $Emmission_t = -0.98Income_t - 0.11Openness_t$. In this equation, a negative coefficient of income on sulfur emissions suggests that environmental quality improves as the U.S. income increases. Similarly, a negative coefficient of openness on SO₂ implies that trade liberalization tends to reduce SO₂ emissions in the United States. Note that, in this study, we do not interpret the coefficients of the long-run relationship as long-run elasticities because such an interpretation may ignore the dynamics of the system (Lütkepohl 2005). A 1% increase in the U.S. real income, for example, may not cause a long-term decline in SO₂ emissions by 0.98% because an increase in the U.S. income is likely to have an effect on trade openness as well that may interact in the long-run.

Table 1. Results of Johansen cointegration tests and long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions, income and openness for developed countries

	<i>Country</i>	<i>Cointegration</i>	<i>Income</i>	<i>Openness</i>
Asia	Japan	Yes	—	—
	Korea	Yes	—	—
	Israel	Yes	+	—
	Singapore	Yes	+	—
North America	USA	Yes	—	—
	Canada	Yes	—	—
Western Europe	Austria	No		
	Belgium	No		
	Denmark	Yes	—	—
	Finland	Yes	—	—
	France	Yes	—	—
	Greece	Yes	+	—
	Iceland	No		
	Ireland	Yes	—	+
	Italy	Yes	—	—
	Luxembourg	No		
	Netherlands	Yes	—	—
	Norway	No		
	Portugal	Yes	+	—
	Spain	Yes	—	—
	Sweden	Yes	—	—
Switzerland	No			
UK	Yes	—	—	
Oceania	Australia	No		
	New Zealand	No		

Note: — and + denote negative and positive signs, respectively. The long-run equilibrium relation (β_1) is normalized to SO₂ emissions; for example, a negative(positive) sign for income (openness) presents a negative (positive) relationship between SO₂ emissions and income (openness).

Table 2. Results of Johansen cointegration tests and long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions, income and openness for developing countries

	<i>Country</i>	<i>Cointegration</i>	<i>Income</i>	<i>Openness</i>
Asia	China	Yes	—	—
	India	No		
	Indonesia	No		
	Jordan	No		
	Philippines	No		
	Sri Lanka	Yes	+	+
	Thailand	No		
	Turkey	Yes	+	+
Central America	Costa Rica	No		
	El Salvador	No		
	Guatemala	Yes	+	+
	Honduras	No		
	Mexico	Yes	+	+
	Nicaragua	No		
	Panama	No		
South America	Argentina	No		
	Bolivia	No		
	Brazil	No		
	Chile	No		
	Columbia	No		
	Ecuador	No		
	Paraguay	No		
	Peru	Yes	+	+
	Uruguay	Yes	+	+
	Venezuela	No		

Note: — and + denote negative and positive signs, respectively. The long-run equilibrium relation (β_1) is normalized to SO₂ emissions; for example, a negative(positive) sign for income (openness) presents a negative (positive) relationship between SO₂ emissions and income (openness).

Analyzing Long-Run Relationships

As noted earlier, the cointegration vector, β_1 , estimated from equation (5) (See Appendix) is used to describe the long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions, income and openness after normalizing the coefficients of SO₂ emissions and rearranging in reduced forms (Table 1). The results show that, of the 17 developed countries in which all three variables are cointegrated, 13 countries show a negative long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions and per capita income, suggesting that pollution levels tend to decrease as a country's economy grows. For the remaining 4 countries (Israel, Singapore, Greece and Portugal), on the other hand, SO₂ emissions have a positive long-run relationship with per capita income, indicating economic growth tends to worsen environmental quality. This phenomenon could be explained using what is known in

the literature as emissions intensity. More specifically, emissions intensity is generally defined as the ratio of a measure of environmental quality (e.g., sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide emissions) to a measure of economic output. In this study, emissions intensity thus can be expressed as the ratio of per capita SO₂ emissions to per capita income. Improvement of emissions intensity (a decrease in the ratio) implies that SO₂ emissions tend to decrease as income of an economy grows over time. This can be interpreted to mean that, under this circumstance, an economy generally moves beyond the EKC threshold level of income and SO₂ emissions decline with higher income per capita (see the second quadrant of Figure 1). SO₂ emissions thus have a negative relationship with income. Deterioration of emissions intensity (an increase in the ratio), on the other hand, suggests that SO₂ emissions tend to increase as income of an economy grows over time. This can also be interpreted to mean that SO₂ emissions have a positive relationship with income because an economy has not reached the EKC turning point. In fact, the 13 economies that have a negative emission-income relationship are shown to have crossed a wide range of the EKC turning points from approximately \$11,000 to \$19,000 per capita income (in 2000 U.S. dollars) between 1965 and 1975 (Figure 5). Accordingly, the emissions intensities of those countries have significantly improved over the last 50 years (Figure 6). It is shown, on the other hand, that the 4 economies indicating a positive emission-income relationship have not reached income levels high enough to be able to derive the EKC turning point so that emission level tends to increase with higher income growth (Figure 7). Accordingly, the emissions intensities of those countries have improved little (Israel and Singapore) or even have deteriorated (Greece and Portugal) over the last 50 years (Figure 5). Hence, these findings provide empirical evidence for the existence of the *Environmental Kuznets Curve* in the sense that as income of an economy grows, the emission level starts declining (rising) after (before) a threshold level of income has been crossed. Notice that Singapore and Israel have so-called N-shape curves, which exhibit the inverted-U curve initially, but beyond a certain income level, the relationship between SO₂ emissions and income turns positive again (Figure 7). For example, Israel (Singapore) has a secondary turning point between income levels of \$12,332 (\$13,163) and \$14,422 (\$15,883).

In addition, of the 17 developed countries in which all three variables are cointegrated, 16 countries show a negative long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions and openness, indicating that air pollution tends to decrease as a country's exposure to international markets increases. The finding supports the so-called *gains-from-trade hypothesis* for developed countries; output growth induced by trade liberalization increases incomes, and wealthier countries tend to be more willing and able to channel resources into environmental protection through the enforcement of environmental standards and the investment on cleaner production technologies, thereby improving environmental quality.




Figure 5. Plots of per capita SO₂ emissions and per capita income for US, Japan and UK.




Figure 6. Emissions intensities for developed countries.

Of the 7 developing countries in which all three variables are cointegrated, on the other hand, 6 countries (Peru, Uruguay, Guatemala, Mexico, Sri Lanka and Turkey) show a positive long-run relationship between SO_2 emissions and income (Figure 8), indicating that economic growth worsens environmental quality (Table 2). In other words, those 6 countries show little improvement in the emissions intensities over the last 50 years (Figure 9). In addition, in these 6 countries, SO_2 emissions have a positive long-run relationship with openness, supporting the so-called *pollution haven hypothesis* for developing countries. More specifically, confronted with international competition, poor open economies have incentives to adopt excessively lax environmental standards in an effort to attract multinational corporations, particularly those engaged in highly polluting activities. As developed countries enforce strict environmental regulations, therefore, trade liberalization leads to more rapid growth of dirty industries in developing countries that export more pollution-intensive goods, thereby deteriorating environmental quality.




Figure 7. Plots of per capita SO₂ emissions and per capita income for Greece, Portugal and Israel.




Figure 8. Plots of per capita SO₂ emissions and per capita income for China, Mexico and Peru.




Figure 9. Emissions intensities for developing countries.

Notice that, in the case of China, SO₂ emissions have a negative long-run relationship with income and openness, suggesting that growth and trade liberalization seem to decrease SO₂ emissions. The finding may be peculiar in light of the fact that China has been the largest sulfur dioxide polluter over the last decade. However, emissions intensity can keep improving as the growth rate of per capita real income is faster than that of per capita SO₂ emissions. Indeed, China has witnessed much faster growth in real income than SO₂ emissions since the late 1970s when the reforms began and opening-up started. For example, SO₂ emissions of China have increased by an average of 2.7% annually since 1978, while real income has grown by an average of 8.5% annually over this period. As a result, the Chinese economy seems to have shown substantial improvement in the emissions intensity for 20 years (Figure 9).

Identifying the Causal Effects

In order to identify the causal effects of trade and income on the environment, the long-run weak exogeneity test is conducted by restricting the speed-of-adjustment parameter (α) to zero in the model. This test examines the absence of long-run levels of feedback due to exogeneity (Johansen and Juselius 1992). In other words, a weakly exogenous variable is a driving variable, which pushes the other variables adjusting to long-run equilibrium, but is not influenced by the other variables in the model. The results show that, of the 17 developed countries in which all three variables are cointegrated, the null hypothesis of weak exogeneity cannot be rejected for openness and/or income at the 5% level for 14 countries (Table 3), indicating that these two variables are weakly exogenous to the long-run relationships in the

model. For the remaining 3 countries, on the other hand, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for SO₂ emissions. These findings indicate that, for developed countries, openness and/or income are generally the driving variables in the system and significantly affect SO₂ emissions in the long-run, but are not influenced by SO₂ emissions. This implies that, since environmental quality is a normal good, economic growth induced by trade liberalization allows for the possibility that people in developed countries demand tougher environmental standards and cleaner production technologies, which can contribute to the improvement of environmental quality. This further suggests that, since economic growth in the industrialized countries tends to cause a shift in the structure of the economy from the more energy-intensive manufacturing sector toward the more environmentally-friendly service sector, those countries may be able to fulfill their aspirations for income growth and/or freer trade without environmental degradation.

Of the seven developing countries in which all three variables are cointegrated, on the other hand, the null hypothesis of weak exogeneity cannot be rejected for SO₂ emissions at the 5% level for 6 countries. For China, however, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected at the 5% level for openness and income. These results indicate that, for developing countries, the SO₂ emissions are generally weakly exogenous to the long-run parameters in the system; thus, the emission does not adjust to deviations from any equilibrium state defined by the cointegration relation. This suggests that with relatively low environmental standards, developing countries tend to attract pollution-intensive industries as developed economies enforce strict environmental regulations, and developing countries are likely to be net exporters of pollution-intensive goods, which in turn deteriorates environmental quality as openness proceeds. This further implies that, if developing countries attempt to introduce tougher environmental standards, there will be slowdowns in the income growth rate and/or trade openness. As such, the developing countries may have to sacrifice some current income growth through trade openness if they decide to reduce permanently the emission level from what it is at present.

Table 3. Results of weak exogeneity tests for developing and developed countries

Developed countries				
Continent	Country	Weak exogeneity ($H_0 : \alpha_i = 0$)		
		$\ln(Emission_t)$	$\ln(Income_t)$	$Openness_t$
Asia	Japan	14.52**	0.05	3.93*
	Korea	8.31**	0.64	7.53**
	Israel	0.91	16.29**	0.69
	Singapore	13.01**	4.50*	2.14
North America	USA	12.65**	1.35	15.88**
	Canada	6.95**	0.73	8.19**
Western Europe	Denmark	20.36**	2.95	16.02**
	Finland	7.75**	1.35	6.31*
	France	18.79**	14.35**	3.62
	Greece	11.22**	1.32	4.82*
	Ireland	1.02	15.50**	15.97**
	Italy	34.27**	5.19*	1.92
	Netherlands	14.83**	7.21**	0.54
	Portugal	12.52**	8.78**	0.01
	Spain	1.48	0.77	11.34**
	Sweden	3.86*	9.91**	2.64
UK	14.06**	0.21	12.55**	
Developing countries				
Continent	Country	Weak exogeneity ($H_0 : \alpha_i = 0$)		
		$\ln(Emission_t)$	$\ln(Income_t)$	$Openness_t$
Asia	China	10.60**	0.91	1.48
	Sri Lanka	3.06	4.45*	0.09
	Turkey	2.85	2.45	20.83**
Central America	Guatemala	3.23	3.86*	0.61
	Mexico	0.01	0.19	42.45**
South America	Peru	0.59	5.00*	9.27**
	Uruguay	2.34	10.89**	7.34**

Note: ** and * denote rejection of the null hypothesis of weak exogeneity at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively. \ln represents natural logarithm. Values are the likelihood ratio (LR) test statistic based on the χ^2 distribution.

CONCLUSIONS

The environmental consequence of trade liberalization has been vigorously debated during the last decade. In this paper, we explore the dynamic effect of trade liberalization on the environment for both developed and developing countries over the last five decades. The primary contribution of this paper is to directly address the issue of potential endogeneity problems and the causal mechanism of trade, income and environmental quality (measured by SO₂ emissions) in the framework of individual country-specific data and the cointegrated VAR model. We use Johansen's maximum likelihood procedure to estimate the coefficients of the cointegrated VAR.

The empirical results generally indicate a negative long-run relationship between SO₂ emissions and income for developed countries and a positive long-run relationship between them for developing countries; that is, an increase in the level of income results in an improvement (deterioration) of environmental quality for developed countries (developing countries). We also find that, while trade liberalization appears to increase environmental quality in developed economies, it has a detrimental effect on environmental quality in most developing countries. The results further show that for developed countries, the causality seems to run from trade and/or income to SO₂ emissions. For developing countries, on the other hand, the causality is found to run in the opposite direction — from SO₂ emissions to trade and/or income. These results imply that for developed economies, a change in the level of trade openness and income causes a consequent change in environmental quality, and the opposite causal relationship holds for developing countries.

APPENDIX DEVELOPMENT OF EMPIRICAL TIME-SEREIS MODEL

The cointegrated vector autoregression (CVAR) model developed by Johansen is used to examine dynamic interrelationship between trade, income and SO₂ emissions (Johansen 1988 and Johansen and Juselius 1992). The Johansen method uses a statistical model involving up to k lags as follows:

$$y_t = \mu + A_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + A_k y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (4)$$

where y_t is a (3×1) vector of endogenous variables — in this analysis, for example, $y_t = [Openness_t, Income_t, Emission_t]$; A_k is a (3×3) matrix of parameters; μ is a vector of constant; and u_t is a vector of normally and independently distributed error terms, or white noise. Equation (4) is in reduced form with each variable y_t regressed on only lagged variables of both itself and all the other variables in the system.

If all variables in y_t are non-stationary, a test for cointegration is identical to a test of long-run equilibrium. Following Johansen (1988), equation (4) can be reformulated into a vector error-correction (VEC) form to impose the cointegration constraint as follows:

$$\Delta y_t = \mu + \Gamma_1 \Delta y_{t-1} + \dots + \Gamma_{k-1} \Delta y_{t-k+1} + \Pi y_{t-k} + u_t \quad (5)$$

where Δ is the difference operator; $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{k-1}$ are the coefficient matrices of short-term dynamics; and $\Pi = -(I - \Pi_1 + \dots + \Pi_k)$ are the matrix of long-run coefficients. If the coefficient matrix Π has reduced rank — i.e., there are $r \leq (n - 1)$ cointegration vectors present, then the Π can be decomposed into a matrix of loading vectors, α , and a matrix of cointegrating vectors, β , such as $\Pi = \alpha\beta'$. For three endogenous non-stationary variables in our analysis, for example, $\beta' y_{t-k}$ in equation (5) represents up to two linearly independent cointegrating relations in the system. The number of cointegration vectors, the rank of Π , in the model is determined by the likelihood ratio test (Johansen 1988).

When the number of cointegration vectors (r) has been determined, it is possible to test hypotheses under r by imposing linear restrictions on the matrix of cointegration vectors, β , and loadings, α (Johansen and Juselius 1992). The tests for these linear restrictions are asymptotically χ^2 distributed. For example, testing for weak exogeneity is formulated by establishing all zeros in row i of α_{ij} , $j = 1, \dots, r$, indicating that the cointegration vectors in β do not enter the equation determining Δy_{it} . This means that, when estimating the parameters of the model $(\Gamma_i, \Pi, \alpha, \beta)$, there is no loss of information from not modeling the determinants of Δy_{it} ; thus, this variable is weakly exogenous to the system and can enter on the right-hand side of the VAR model (Harris and Sollis 2003).

REFERENCES

- ASL and Associates. 1997. "Sulfur Emissions by Country and Year," U.S. Department of Energy report no. DE96014790.
- Chintrakarn, P., and D. Millimet. 2006. "The Environmental Consequences of Trade: Evidence from Subnational Trade Flows," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 52(1): 430-453.
- Coondoo, D., and S. Dinda. 2002. "Causality between Income and Emission: A Country Group-Specific Econometric Analysis," *Ecological Economics* 40(3): 351-367.
- Copeland, B. 2005. "Policy Endogeneity and the Effects of Trade on the Environment," *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 34(1): 1-15.
- Copeland, B., and M. S. Taylor. 1994. "North-South Trade and the Environment," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109(3): 755-787.
- Copeland, Brian, and M. Scott Taylor, "Trade, Growth, and the Environment," *Journal of Economic Literature* 42:1 (2004), 7-71.
- Dean, J. 2002. "Does Trade Liberalization Harm the Environment? A New Test," *Canadian Journal of Economics* 35(4): 819-842.
- Dinda, S. 2004. "Environmental Kuznets Curve Hypothesis: A Survey," *Ecological Economics* 49(4): 431-455.
- Dinda, S., and D. Coondoo. 2006. "Income and Emission: A Panel Data-based Cointegration Analysis," *Ecological Economics* 57(2): 167-181.
- Doornik, J., and D. Hendry. 1994. *Interactive Econometric Modeling of Dynamic System (PcFiml 8.0)* (London, UK: International Thomson Publishing).
- Elliot, G., T. Rothenberg, and J. Stock. 1996. "Efficient Tests for an Autoregressive Unit Root," *Econometrica* 64(4): 813-836.
- Engle, R., and C.W.J. Granger. 1987. "Cointegration and Error-Correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing," *Econometrica* 55: 251-276.
- Frankel, J., and A. Rose. 2005. "Is Trade Good or Bad for the Environment? Sorting Out the Causality," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 87(1): 85-91.
- Gale, L., and J. Mendez. 1998. "The Empirical Relationship between Trade, Growth and the Environment." *International Review of Economics and Finance* 7(1): 53-61.

- Gonzalo, J. 1994. "Five Alternative Methods of Estimating Long-Run Equilibrium Relationships," *Journal of Econometrics* 60(1-2): 203-233.
- Grossman, G., and A. Krueger. 1991. "Environmental Impacts of the North American Free Trade Agreement," NBER working paper no. 3914.
- Grossman, G. 1993. "Environmental Impacts of the North American Free Trade Agreement," in Peter Garber (Ed.), *The U.S.-Mexico Free Trade Agreement* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Hakkio, C., and M. Rush. 1991. "Cointegration: How Short is the Long Run?" *Journal of International Money and Finance* 10(4): 571-581.
- Harris, R., and R. Sollis. 2003. *Applied Time Series Modeling and Forecasting* (West Sussex, England: John Wiley and Sons Inc).
- Johansen, S. 1988. "Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vector," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 12: 231-254.
- Johansen, S., and K. Juselius. 1992. "Testing Structural Hypotheses in a Multivariate Cointegration Analysis of the PPP and the UIP for UK," *Journal of Econometrics* 53(1-3): 211-244.
- Johansen, S., R. Mosconi, and B. Nielsen. 2000. "Cointegration Analysis in the Presence of Structural Breaks in the Deterministic Trend," *Econometrics Journal* 3(2): 216-249.
- Lefohn, A., J. Husar, and R. Husar. 1999. "Estimating Historical Anthropogenic Global Sulfur Emission Patterns for the Period 1850-1990," *Atmospheric Environment* 33(21): 3435-3444.
- Leamer, E. 1988. "Measures of Openness," in R. Baldwin (Ed.), *Trade Policy Issues and Empirical Analysis*, National Bureau of Economic Research Conference Report.
- Lucas, R. E. B., D. Wheeler, and H. Hettige. 1992. "Economic Development, Environmental Regulation and the International Migration of Toxic Industrial Pollution: 1960-1988," in P. Low (Ed.), *International Trade and the Environment*, World Bank discussion paper no. 159.
- Lütkepohl, H. 2005. *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis* (New York, NY: Springer).
- Maddala, G. S., and I. M. Kim. 1998. *Unit Roots, Cointegration, and Structural Change* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press)
- Porter, M., and C. van der Linde. 1995. "Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9(4): 97-118.
- Pritchett, L. 1991. "Measuring Outward Orientation in Developing Countries: Can It Be Done?" PRE working paper no. 566.
- Stern, D. 2005. "Global Sulfur Emissions from 1850-2000," *Chemosphere* 58(2): 163-175.

Stern, D. 2006. "Reversal of the Trend in Global Anthropogenic Sulfur Emissions," *Global Environmental Change* 16(2): 207-220.

Wooldridge, J. 2000. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach* (Mason, OH: South-Western College Publishing).