Air Quality and Economic Growth: An Empirical Study

Dinda, Soumyananda and Coondoo, Dipankor and Pal, Manoranjan

Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta-35

March 1999

Air Quality and Economic Growth: An Empirical Study*

Soumyananda Dinda, Dipankor Coondoo, Manoranjan Pal,

Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B.T.Road, Kolkata-108, India.

1st Draft March 1999
1st Revision May 1999

Abstract

This study has been observed an inverse (and sometimes U-shaped) relationship between environmental degradation and per capita real income as opposed to the inverted U-shaped environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) found in many earlier studies. It was felt that a possible explanation of the observed pattern of relationship might be sought in the dynamics of the process of economic growth experienced by the countries concerned. Economic development may strengthen the market mechanism as a result of which the economy may gradually shift from non-market to marketed energy resources that are less polluting. This phenomenon may show up in the form of an inverse relationship, as mentioned above. Also, due to the global technical progress the production techniques available to the countries all over the world are becoming more and more capital intensive and at the same time less polluting. This may mean that, given the income level, the pollution level decreases as the capital intensity of an economy rises. In the present study, it is indeed observed that as capital intensity increases the level of suspended particulate matter (spm) in the atmosphere decreases. Per capita real income is also found to be inversely related to spm partially, but the interaction effect of per capita income and capital-intensity on spm is observed to be positive. This suggests that, given the level of per capita income (capital intensity), a more capital-intensive production technique (a higher per capita income level) would cause less pollution. For spm a surprising result is also obtained, i.e. a U-turn is observed at a very high level of per capita real income (i.e. ~US$12 500 at 1985 US prices). This is possibly indicative of the fact that there are technological limits to industrial pollution control such that beyond a threshold level of income further rise in income cannot be achieved without environmental degradation.

JEL *Classification Number*: C20, O40, Q20.

Keywords: EKC, Environmental degradation, SPM, SO_2, Capital intensity, Market mechanism, Sectoral composition of GDP, GDP, Technological Limitation, Threshold level, U-shaped, U-tern.

----

*Address for Correspondence: Soumyananda Dinda, c/o, Dipankor Coondoo, Economic Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata-108. Phone (res) +91-33 2544 1269, Fax Number: 0091-33-2577-8893. E-mail: res9711@isical.ac.in , s_dinda@hotmail.com or s.dinda@rediffmail.com

1. Introduction

Worldwide deterioration of environmental quality made many feels concerned about the issue and a sizeable literature on the pollution-income growth relationship has grown in the recent period. The World Development Report-1992 presents cross sectional evidences on the relationship between different indicators of environmental quality and per capita national income across countries. Other studies (e.g., Selden and Song (1994), Shafik (1994), Grossman and Krueger (1995), McConnell (1997), Carson et al. (1997), Suri and Chapman (1998), and Rothman (1998)) have found inverted U-shaped relationship between environmental degradation and income. The common point of all these papers is the assertion that the environmental quality deteriorates initially and then improves as an economy develops. This inverted U-shaped relationship between environmental deterioration and economic growth has been called the Environmental Kuznets curve (EKC). Explanation of the EKC has been pursued on many lines. Two major explanations are as follows: (i) use of environment as a major source of inputs and a pool for waste assimilation increases at the initial stage of economic growth, but as a country grows richer, structural changes take place which results in greater environment protection; and (ii) viewed as a consumption good, the status of environmental quality changes from a luxury to a necessary good as an economy develops. Phenomena like structural economic change and transition, technological improvements and rise in public spending on environmental R & D with rising per capita income level are considered to be important in determining the nature of relationship between economic growth and environmental quality. Grossman and Krueger (1995), using cross-country city level data on environmental quality, found support for the EKC hypothesis with peaks at a relatively early stage of development[1]. However, no such peak was observed for the heavier particles. Shafik (1994) also estimated the *turning point* for suspended particulate matter (SPM) to be at per capita GDP $ 3,280. Selden and Song (1994) used aggregate emission data (rather than the data on concentration of pollutant in the atmosphere, as used in many studies including the present one) and estimated peaks for air pollutants at per capita GDP levels greater than $ 8,000. The results of Cole et al. (1997) tend to suggest that meaningful EKC's exist only for local air pollutants. Vincent (1997) analysed the relationship between pollution and income level using time series data for Malaysia. His results, which contradict the findings obtained from the cross-country panel data, were thought to reflect the consequences of non-environmental policy decision. Carson et al. (1997) also obtained inverse relationship between per capita income and emission for seven major types of air pollutant in 50 US states. Further, they observed greater variability of per capita emission for the lower income states (which possibly suggests that the individual US states follow widely divergent development paths). Kaufmann et al. (1998) found a U-shaped relation between income and atmospheric concentration of SO_2, and an inverted U-shaped relation between spatial intensity of economic activity and SO_2 concentration. Socio-political conditions (Torras and Boyce (1998), Panayotou (1997)) are also found to have significant effects on environmental quality. Thus, while a faster economic growth may involve a higher environmental cost, a better institutional set up characterised by good governance, credible property rights, defined political rights, literacy, regulations etc. can create strong public awareness against environmental degradation and help protect the environment. Rothman (1998) and Suri and Chapman (1998) tried to explain the EKC phenomenon in terms of trade and consumption pattern differences of the developing and the developed countries. Their observation is as follows: Manufacturing industries (which are often

[1] Namely, for lighter particles (i.e., smoke) and sulphur dioxide (SO_2) the observed peak corresponded to per capita GDP level of US$6,151 and 4,053, respectively. It may be noted that the per capita GDP values reported here and elsewhere in this chapter are measured at 1985 US prices.

more polluting) concentrate mostly in the less developed countries, whereas the less polluting high-tech industries (which are far less polluting) concentrate in the rich already industrialised countries due to the nature of the established pattern of international trade. Therefore, the rising portion of the EKC could be due to the concentration of manufacturing industrial activities in the developing countries and the declining portion of the EKC could be due to the concentration of less polluting high-tech industries in the developed world. Finally, household preferences and demand for environmental quality are also regarded as possible explanatory factors for the EKC phenomenon (McConnell (1997), Komen et al. (1997)). As the demand for environmental quality is income elastic, a strong private and social demand for a high-quality environment in the developed countries would induce considerable private and public expenditures on environmental protection. Thus, whereas the rising portion of the EKC may be a manifestation of the substitution relationship between the demands for material consumption and environmental quality, the declining portion of the EKC may result as the substitution relationship turns to one of complementarity between the two kinds of demand.

The relationship between the Worldwide deterioration of environmental quality and economic growth is one of the major concerns in policy making, and the paper focuses on this aspect. The World Development Report (World Bank (1992)) also presents cross sectional evidences on the relationship between different indicators of environmental quality and per capita national income across countries. Other studies (Selden and Song (1994), Grossman and Krueger (1995), Kahn (1998)) have found inverted U-shaped relationship between environmental degradation and income.

This paper re-examines the *EKC* hypothesis using the World Bank data on environmental quality and per capita real GDP data of Penn World Table of Summers and Heston for the period 1979-90 (See, Appendix A for a detailed description of data). In this paper, we shall apply the ordinary least squares (OLS) and least absolute error (LAE) techniques to examine the *EKC* hypothesis. The LAE estimates are regarded as robust estimates (See Judge et al. (1985) chapter 20). We have also attempted to examine, in addition to the effect of per capita GDP level, the effect of the production technique (i.e., capital-labour ratio) and the sectoral composition of GDP on the pollution level.

This paper is organised as follows: Section 2 briefly explains the nature of data used in the study, section 3 set up the regression models used in the study and the regression results are described in Section 4 and finally, Section 5 concludes.

2. Description of the Data

The basic air pollution data on SPM and SO_2 used in the present study were obtained from World Development Report–1992. This report gives city-wise annual data on mean atmospheric concentration (microgram per cubic meter) of SPM and SO_2 separately for three time periods (viz., 1979-82, 1983-86 and 1987-90) for 33 countries classified into low, middle, and high income groups. For each city in the sample, the data relate to the level of pollution either at the city centre or at the neighbourhood suburb. Further, the sites from where data were recorded in a city centre/suburb were classified as residential, commercial or industrial, as the case might be. The countries covered in the low income group were China, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia and Pakistan; those covered in the middle income group include Brazil, Chile, Greece, Iran, Malaysia, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Thailand, Venezuela and Yugoslavia, and finally, the high income group includes Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hong Kong, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, the U.K. and the U.S.A. For the purpose of the present analysis, we have calculated country-wise annual mean concentration of SPM and SO_2 separately for residential and commercial centres for each of the three time periods mentioned above. The data thus constructed relate to 42 cities for SPM and 39 cities for SO_2 in 26 countries.

As regards the country-wise per capita income data, we have used the Summers and Heston country-wise real per capita GDP (measured at a common set of international prices) available from the Penn World Tables (Summers and Heston (1994)). Since the pollution data are available city-wise for individual countries, ideally, we should have some measure of city-wise per capita income. However, such income data being unavailable, we have used the real per capita GDP of the country (to which a specific city belongs) as a proxy for the per capita income of a city. Thus, for all the cities belonging to a country, the same country level per capita income has been used. As the city-wise pollution data are available separately for three time periods as already mentioned, we have used the average of yearly per capita incomes for a specific time-period as the measure of per capita income of that time period. Thus, the data set we have used in the present study is essentially of the nature of a panel data consisting of 42 cities in 26 countries and 3 time-periods[2]. Note that of the 26 countries represented in our data set, 15 belong to the high-income group. Thus, the present data set has a somewhat biased representation of countries with high income. Table 1 presents a two-way summary of the distribution of the countries and the cities by per capita income level (PCGDP) and pollutant type.

Table 1: Distribution of sample by PCGDP level.

Group**		Low PCGDP	Middle PCGDP	High PCGDP	All
SPM	No. of Countries	4	7	15	26
	No. of Cities	11	8	23	42
SO_2	No. of Countries	4	7	15	26
	No. of Cities	10	8	21	39

** As per World Bank guideline.

In our empirical analysis reported in this chapter we have tried to explain the level of pollution in terms of production technique (as reflected by the capital-labour ratio for the economy as a whole) and sectoral composition of GDP of individual countries, in addition to PCGDP. Country-wise capital-labour ratios have been calculated on the basis of country-wise data on

[2] To be precise, for SPM we have data for 42 cities in 26 countries, where as for SO_2 data for 39 cities in 26 countries.

gross capital and employed labour force available in UN's National Accounts Statistics and ILO's Yearbook of Labour Statistics, respectively. Finally, country-wise data on sectoral composition of GDP have been obtained from the World Bank reports.

3. Model set up

As already mentioned, the primary focus of the present study is on the relationship between ambient air quality and real per capita GDP (*PCGDP)*. To examine the nature of this basic relationship, a number of alternative functional forms of the regression model have been tried, viz.,

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{it} + \beta_2 x_{it}^2 \qquad (3.1)$$

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln x_{it} + \beta_2 (\ln x_{it})^2 \qquad (3.2)$$

$$\ln y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{it} + \beta_2 x_{it}^2 \qquad (3.3)$$

$$\ln y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln x_{it} + \beta_2 (\ln x_{it})^2 \qquad (3.4)$$

Where y_{it} and x_{it} denote levels of air pollutant and real *PCGDP* for ith country at tth time period, respectively. These equations have been estimated for *SPM* and SO_2 separately for residential and commercial locations at three different time periods and also for the two types of locations combined and the three time periods combined.

4 Results

4.1 Preliminary Results

As a part of the preliminary data analysis, we examined the summary statistics relating to the pollution data (viz., mean, variance and correlation coefficient with *PCGDP*), which are reported in Table 2. It should be noted that the average *SPM* level for residential areas is higher than that for commercial areas, but the mean *PCGDP* level is higher for commercial areas than that for residential areas. This is possibly because of the fact that the residential areas in the present data set are mostly located in the less developed and developing countries.

The correlation coefficient between *SPM* and real *PCGDP* was found to be negative and large separately for each data set and also for the combined data sets. The smallest absolute value of this correlation is 0.79 (See Table 2). This finding contradicts the *EKC* hypothesis. However, such contradictory empirical results have been obtained earlier also. Grossman and Krueger (1993, 1995) and Torras and Boyce (1998) reported results not supporting the *EKC* hypothesis for ambient *SPM*, and heavier particles respectively[3]. This is confirmed if we look at the scatter diagrams, all of which show the same decreasing pattern (See Figure 3.1). A possible explanation of this may be the fact that the present data set contains observations relating to mostly developed countries (which may have crossed the so-called turning point of the *EKC*). Table 3, which gives the distribution of countries by selected level of *PCGDP* (assumed to correspond to the possible turning point of the *EKC*), may corroborate this. Thus, e.g., if the level of *PCGDP* corresponding to the turning point of the *EKC* for *SPM* is taken to be $8,000, then 20 out of the 34 sample observations would belong to the declining portion of an inverted U-shaped *EKC* for *SPM*.

3.2 Regression Results

Tables 3.3 – 3.5 present our regression results for *SPM*. The scatter diagrams in Figure 3.1A suggest that the shape of the underlying relationship between *PCGDP* and *SPM* is U-shaped. The ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates of corresponding quadratic relationship between *PCGDP* and *SPM* for different periods and areas are reported in Table 4. All these results show a negative value of β_1 and a positive value of β_2, both of which are statistically significant[4]. Thus, for *SPM* our results suggest a U-shaped relationship between *SPM* and *PCGDP*, which

---

[3] Grossman and Krueger (1995), however, did not find a minimum point of the estimated curve for heavy particles.

[4] β_1 and β_2 are the coefficients of equation (3.1).

implies that beyond a certain level of *PCGDP* (around \$12,500), a further rise of *PCGDP* can be achieved at the cost of environmental degradation[5]. Clearly, this result contradicts the usual *EKC* hypothesis, but supports some earlier findings. For example, Kaufmann et. al (1998) found a U-shaped relationship between income and atmospheric concentration of SO_2 with a turning point around the *PCGDP* level of \$12,000; Sengupta (1997) noted that beyond the per capita income \$15,300, the environmental base (particularly CO_2 emission) *relinks with* economic growth; and Shafik (1994) obtained upward rising curves by fitting cubic relationships.

It may be mentioned that our OLS diagnostics indicated presence of heteroscedasticity in the present data set. We, therefore, re-estimated all the regression specifications using the Least Absolute Error (LAE) method[6]. The estimated LAE and OLS results are presented in Table 5. As is to be expected, the estimated LAE results are similar to the corresponding OLS results. Perhaps the most interesting findings for *SPM* again are the U-shaped relationship with rather high *PCGDP* values corresponding to the turning point (*vide* last columns of Tables 3 and 4). This is in contrast to the results of Selden and Song (1994) and Grossman and Krueger (1995), who observed turning point for *SPM* around *PCGDP* levels of \$8,000 and \$5,000, respectively. To be precise, our turning point estimates for *SPM* vary between \$ 9,500 and \$ 14,000.

Table 5 presents the estimated OLS and LAE results for commercial, residential areas separately and also for the combined data for the two types of areas. So far as these estimates are concerned, it should be noted that the OLS and the corresponding LAE estimates are

---

[5] An alternative measurement also reveals the same result. Instead of PCGDP, we took Gross City Product Per Capita (GCPPC) from World Resources 1998 – 99 (World Resources Institute et al. (1998)). Using GCPPC and *SPM* (mg/m^3) for the year 1993, we found the same result,viz., U- shaped relationship between spm and GCPPC. This later data set covered 22 cities across the world. The estimated relationship is :

SPM = 215.4 – 0.01906(GCPPC) +0.416E-6 $(GCPCDP)^2$.
(7.5) (-2.755) (2.001)

and the coefficients of GCPPC and square of GCPPC are significant at 5% and 10% level, respectively. In case of SO_2, after removing an outlier, we obtained negatively sloped linear relationship.

[6] In Econometric theory, LAE estimates are regarded as robust estimates. See Judge et al (1985) chapter 20 for the LAE estimation method and the properties of the LAE estimator.

broadly similar, both in terms of goodness of fit and magnitude of the estimated parameters (however, unique LAE estimate could not be obtained in specific cases). A closer look at Table 5 may suggest the following results. First, the values of R^2 and the *PCGDP* corresponding to the turning point for residential areas are smaller than those estimated for commercial areas. Next, while the estimated coefficients of *PCGDP* (i.e., β_1) are negative and those of square of *PCGDP* (i.e., β_2) are positive in all the cases, the estimated β_2 coefficients for residential areas are not highly significant. Thus, statistically speaking, the U-shape of the Pollution-PCGDP relationship is weaker for the data relating to the residential areas, but is rather strong for the data relating to the commercial areas. The estimated values of *PCGDP* corresponding to the turning point are estimated to be around \$ 9,500 and \$ 12,500 for residential and commercial areas, respectively[7]. Interestingly, the high-income countries observed to lie beyond the turning point in the present exercise included the USA, Canada, Japan, Finland and Germany. One might seek an explanation of difference in the results for the two types of areas in terms of how the relative density of population in these two types of areas changes with economic growth.

3.3 Interpretation of the Results

In the next part of the exercise an attempt was made to have a causal explanation of the observed U-shaped/ inverse Pollution-PCGDP relationships. *A priori*, one should expect the pollution level in an economy to depend not only on the level of *PCGDP*, but also on the sectoral composition of GDP, how the *PCGDP* level is being achieved, and the time rate of growth of *PCGDP*. The sectoral composition is important, because *ceteris paribus* an economy with a larger industrial production is likely to have more pollution. The nature of the production technique used may be relevant, because often a more capital-intensive production technique

[7] These figures are higher than those found in the studies of Selden and Song (1994), Grossman and Krueger (1995), Shafik (1994), World Bank (1992). Kaufmann et al. (1998), on the other hand, found a U-turn for the atmospheric concentration of SO_2 at *PCGDP* level around \$ 12,000. Grossman and Krueger (1995) also observed an upswing of the pollution level at about a *PCGDP* level of \$ 16,000. However, since there were only two observations beyond these levels, existence of such a reverse upswing at high level of *PCGDP* was not claimed.

is likely to be more non-human energy-intensive and hence more polluting. Finally, the rate of growth of *PCGDP* may be a determining factor since *ceteris paribus* a faster growth may commonly be achieved by exercising the softer option of using more polluting production practices. In other words, a strong urge to grow faster, given the level of *PCGDP*, may induce a less developed economy to adopt a less clean production technique. Coming to the possible partial effect of production technique (as represented by the capital-labour ratio) of an economy, say, it may be argued that between two countries with the same level of *PCGDP*, one having a greater concern for pollution would have a higher capital-labour ratio, if a cleaner technology is more capital intensive[8]. Thus, we tried to examine the validity of the following hypotheses - (i) the marginal change in pollution level with respect to *PCGDP* is increasing in the rate of growth of *PCGDP* and decreasing in time; and (ii) the marginal change in pollution level with respect to *PCGDP* is decreasing in both the capital- labour ratio and the sectoral composition of GDP. To examine the possible partial effects of production technique[9] and sectoral composition of GDP on pollution, the following regression set up was used:

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{it} + \gamma_1 p_1 + \gamma_2 p_2 + \delta_1 z_1 + \delta_2 z_2 + \eta_1 d_1 + \eta_2 d_2 + \theta_1 w_1 + \theta_2 w_2 + e_{it} \qquad (3.5)$$

where y_{it} and x_{it} are as already defined, p_j : dummy variable representing time period (viz., $p_1 = 1$ for the period 1979-1982 and zero otherwise, $p_2 = 1$ for the period 1983-1986 and zero otherwise) ; d_1 : dummy variable for capital intensity (viz., $d_1 = 1$ for a country having capital-labour ratio greater than or equal to 1 and zero otherwise); d_2 : dummy variable for share of non-agricultural sector in GDP (viz., $d_2 = 1$ for a country for which the non-agricultural sector

[8]A cleaner industrial technology would frequently be more expensive and hence more capital intensive because of the technical sophistications involved – take, e.g., the catalytic converters used to reduce lead emission from automobiles. There may however be innovation leading to less polluting and at the same time less expensive production techniques, but such innovation is infrequent.

[9] In our empirical analysis reported in this paper we have tried to explain the level of pollution in terms of production technique (as reflected by the capital-labour ratio for the economy as a whole) and sectoral composition of GDP of individual countries, in addition to *PCGDP*. Country-wise capital-labour ratios have been calculated on the basis of country-wise data on gross capital and employed labour force available in UN's National Accounts Statistics and ILO's Yearbook of Labour Statistics, respectively. Finally, country-wise data on sectoral composition of GDP have been obtained from the World Bank reports.

accounts for 90 per cent or more of GDP and zero otherwise); $z_j = x^*p_j$, j=1,2 are the income-time period interaction terms; $w_1 = x^*d_1$ is the income-capital intensity interaction term; $w_2 = x^*d_2$ is the income-share of non-agricultural sector interaction term; and e_{it} is the equation disturbance term.

Let us first discuss the results relating to the effects of capital intensity and sectoral composition of GDP on the pollution level. Table 6 presents these results for *SPM*. So far as the level of *SPM* (i.e., the intercept term of the regression of *SPM* level on *PCGDP*) is concerned, in none of the equations the coefficients of the time dummy variables were statistically significant implying thereby that the level of *SPM* did not shift perceptibly over time. As regards the effect of capital intensity on the *SPM* level (i.e., the intercept dummies for this variable), this was observed to be negative and highly significant for the data relating to the residential areas and the combined data, but non-significant for the data relating to the commercial areas. A similar significant negative level effect of the sectoral composition variable was also observed for all the three data sets.

Let us next describe the results showing how the marginal change in pollution in response to a change in the level of *PCGDP* (i.e., the slope term of the regression of *SPM* level on *PCGDP*) are affected by the time dummy, capital intensity and the sectoral composition variables. These are given by the estimated values of the parameters associated with the interaction terms of *PCGDP* and these variables (viz., the values of the parameters δ_1 and δ_2 measuring the effect of interaction between time and *PCGDP*, θ_1 measuring the effect of interaction between capital intensity and *PCGDP*, and θ_2 measuring the effect of interaction between sectoral composition of GDP and *PCGDP*, respectively in equation (3.5)). The interaction effect between time and *PCGDP* is negative and significant only for the data relating to the commercial areas. This implies that compared to 1979-82 in latter periods the decrease in pollution in response to a marginal increase in *PCGDP* was greater. Next, the interaction effect between capital intensity and *PCGDP* is positive and highly significant for the data relating to the commercial areas and also for the combined data. For the data relating to the residential areas this effect is however negative and significant at 10 per cent level. The positive interaction effect suggests that, *ceteris paribus*, a country with a higher capital intensity would have a lower, but flatter, Pollution- *PCGDP* curve compared to one with a lower capital intensity.

Finally, the interaction effect between sectoral composition of GDP and *PCGDP* was estimated to positive and significant for all the three data sets. This, together with the fact that the coefficient of the corresponding intercept dummy is negative and significant, suggests that, *ceteris paribus*, more industrialised countries have a lower, but flatter, Pollution-PCGDP curve.

In this context it may be mentioned that for all the data sets the goodness of fit of the quadratic Pollution-PCGDP equation is more or less similar to those of the corresponding regression equation in which *PCGDP*, capital intensity (sectoral composition of GDP) and interaction between *PCGDP* and capital intensity (sectoral composition of GDP) are used as separate regressors. This possibly means that in association with *PCGDP* structural factors like production technique and sectoral composition may help explain observed changes in pollution level over time or across region. In other words, the quadratic term on the r.h.s. of equation (3.1) is in fact replaced by $(\gamma_1 p_1 + \gamma_2 p_2 + \delta_1 z_1 + \delta_2 z_2 + \eta_1 d_1 + \eta_2 d_2 + \theta_1 w_1 + \theta_2 w_2)$ to yield equation (3.5), because *a priori* rate of change of marginal pollution due to *PCGDP* level may be due to total effects of technology, sectoral composition of GDP, time and their interaction with income level.

Next, to examine the partial effect of growth rate of *PCGDP* on pollution the following regression set up was used:

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{it} + \beta_2 x_{it}^2 + \alpha_1 g_{it} + \alpha_2 g_{it}^2 + \psi (x_{it} * g_{it}) + e_{it} \qquad (3.6)$$

where y_{it}, x_{it} and e_{it} are as already defined and g_{it} denotes the rate of growth of *PCGDP* for the i[th] country at time t. It should be mentioned that for each individual country in the sample average growth rate of *PCGDP* for the three sub-periods, viz., 1979-82, 1983-86 and 1987-90, were computed so that the value of g_{it} would be the average growth rate for the period to which the year t belonged.

The regression equation specified above was estimated for the combined data set alone. The estimated equation is presented in Table 8. As may be seen from the Table 8, the overall fit of the regression equation is fairly satisfactory. The estimated coefficients, except the one associated with the growth rate variable g_{it}, are all statistically significant. The quadratic form of this relationship suggests that, given a rate of growth, the Pollution-PCGDP relationship is inverse or even U-shaped. On the other hand, given a *PCGDP* level, the quadratic Pollution-Growth relationship suggests a U-shaped relationship between the two variables. To be more specific, at a relatively high level of *PCGDP* the level of pollution falls initially as the rate of growth rises from a negative level towards zero, and subsequently rises when the rate of growth crosses a threshold level. At a relatively low level of *PCGDP*, however, pollution increases much faster with growth beyond a threshold level. A diagrammatic representation of the estimated Pollution-PCGDP-Growth equation is presented in Figure 3.3.

The results of the analysis of our SO_2 pollution data are summarised in Table 7. Compared to the analysis of the *SPM* data, fewer interesting findings are obtained in this case. To be precise, while the correlation coefficients between SO_2 and *PCGDP* were observed to be negative for data sets relating to commercial areas, the corresponding correlation coefficients for residential areas were observed to be positive. This may be due to the fact that the data set for residential areas included data for only three developed countries, viz., USA, Canada and the New Zealand, whereas the data set for commercial areas covered, in addition to these three countries, a number of other developed countries. Examination of the scattered diagrams suggested wide variation of the SO_2 level at low level of *PCGDP* that gradually narrowed down as the *PCGDP* level increased. Further probe suggested presence of some outliers (viz., data relating to Iran and Italy) in the data set, which were dropped in subsequent analyses[10]. Removal of these outliers resulted in a linear relationship with a negative slope (not an inverted U-shaped relationship) between SO_2 level and *PCGDP* (figure 3.2b). These results thus suggest absence of any clear relationship between the level of SO_2 and *PCGDP* for data relating to the residential areas. A possible explanation of the observed relationship for commercial areas could be that the extent and the quality of automobile emission[11] improved considerably with rise in *PCGDP*. In addition, the type of fuel used for domestic and commercial purposes in low income developing countries might contribute to the relatively high level of atmospheric SO_2 in them. With economic growth a transitional force strengthens the market mechanism and as a result the economy gradually shifts from non-commercial to commercial energy resources. There may also be other reason – viz., high-income countries tend to spend more on defensive expenditure, enforce a stricter environmental regulation and use cleaner technology which others cannot afford.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper examined the hypothesis of *EKC* using cross-country time series data on ambient two air pollutants, viz., *SPM* and SO_2. We found no support for the *EKC* relation. In contrast, for SO_2 we obtained an inverse relationship with *PCGDP*, while for *SPM* a U-shaped, rather than an inverted U-shaped, relationship with *PCGDP* is observed with an upward turn of the curve around a *PCGDP* level of $ 12,500 which represents a rather high level of material consumption. To the extent the level of currently available technology is unable to ensure

[10] The data for Iran was unusual possibly because of the Iraq-Iran war during 1977-88, whereas Italy experienced a series of volcanic eruptions during the early 1980s.

[11] See, Kahn (1998).

sustainability of such a high consumption level, a further rise of *PCGDP* beyond the threshold level can support consumption only at the cost of a slow but steady deterioration of the environmental quality.

To explain the observed Pollution-PCGDP relationship, three economic variables other than PCGDP were brought into the analysis - viz., the economy-level capital intensity, the sectoral composition of GDP, and the rate of growth of GDP. It was thought that given the PCGDP level of an economy, these three aspects would determine the exact nature of relationship that might exist between pollution and income level. In other words, it is not only the level of income but also the characteristics of an economy which together determine the rate of environmental degradation that an economy will experience as it moves along the trajectory of development. Although the way these variables have been used in the present study leaves scope for improvement, their inclusion does give meaningful and statistically significant results so far as the explanation of the phenomenon of pollution is concerned. Briefly, our results suggest that the partial effect of capital intensity on pollution is generally negative (which may not be unreasonable, if the trend of technological progress is such that more capital-intensive techniques are more environment-friendly and vice versa). The observed negative partial effect of the sectoral composition variable on pollution perhaps suggests that, given the PCGDP level, the more industrialised an economy is the lower and flatter would be its Pollution-PCGDP curve. Finally, PCGDP and the rate of growth variable seem to be jointly important in explaining observed pollution level of an economy.

Acknowledgement: We are grateful to the participants at ISI Delhi Annual Conference, March 1999, for their comments and suggestions.

References

- Agras, J. and D. Chapman (1999): “A dynamic approach to the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis”, *Ecological Economics* 28(2), 267 - 277.
- Beckerman, W. (1992): “Economic growth and the environment: Whose growth? Whose environment?”, *World Development* 20, 481 - 496.
- Berrens, R., A. Bohara, K. Gawande and P. Wang (1997): “Testing the inverted U - hypothesis for U.S. hazardous waste: An application of the generalized gamma model”, *Economic Letters* 55(3), 435 - 440.
- Carson, R. T., Y. Jeon, and D. R. McCubbin (1997): “The relationship between air pollution emissions and income: US data”, *Environment and developmental Economics* 2, 433 - 450.
- Cole, M. A., A. J. Rayner, and J. M. Bates (1997): “The Environmental Kuznets Curve: An empirical analysis”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 401 - 416.
- de bruyn, S. M., J. C. J. M. van den bergh, and J. B. Opschoor (1998): “Economic growth and emissions: reconsidering the empirical basis of Environmental Kuznets Curves”, *Ecological Economics* 25, 161 - 175.
- de bruyn, S. M., and J. B. Opschoor (1997): “Developments in the throughput -income relationship: theoretical and empirical observations”, *Ecological Economics* 20, 255 - 268.
- de Bruyn, S. M. (1997): “Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve: structural change and international agreements in reducing sulphur emissions”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 485 – 503.
- Grossman, G. M. and A. B. Krueger (1995): “Economic growth and the Environment”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110(2), 353 - 377.
- Grossman, G. M. and A. B. Krueger (1993): “Environmental impacts of the North American Free Trade Agreement”, in P. Garber, (ed.) *The U.S.-Mexico Free Trade Agreement*., Cambridge: MIT Press, 13 –56.
- Grossman, G. M. and A. B. Krueger (1991): “Environmental impacts of the North American Free Trade Agreement”, *NBER working paper* 3914.
- Hilton, F. G. H. and A. Levinson (1998): “Factoring the Environmental Kuznets Curve: Evidence from Automotive Lead Emissions”, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 35, 126 - 141.
- Holtz-Eakin, D. and T. M. Selden (1995): “Stoking the fires?: CO_2 emissions and economic growth”, *Journal of Public Economics* 57, 85 - 101.
- Judge, G., K. C. Hill, W.G. Griffiths, H. Lutkepohl and T.C. Lee (1985): *The Theory and Practice of Econometrics*, 2nd Edn, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York.

- Kahn, M.E. (1998): “A household level environmental Kuznets curve”, *Economics Letters* 59, 269 - 273.
- Kaufmann, R. K., B. Davidsdottir, S. Garnham and P. Pauly (1998): “The determinants of atmospheric SO_2 concentrations: reconsidering the environmental Kuznets curve”, *Ecological Economics* 25, 209 - 220.
- Komen, R., S. Gerking and H. Folmer (1997): “Income and Environmental R & D: empirical evidence from OECD countries”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 505 - 515.
- Koop, G. and L. Tole (1999): “Is there an environmental Kuznets curve for deforestation?” *Journal of Development Economics* 58, 231 - 244.
- Kristrom, B. and P. Riera (1996): “Is the income elasticity of environmental improvements less than one?”, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 7, 45-55.
- Kuznets, Simon (1955): “Economic Growth and income inequality”, *American Economic Review* 45, 1 - 28.
- Lopez, R. (1994): “The environment as a factor of production: the effects of economic growth and trade liberalization”, *Journal of Environmental Economics and management* 27, 163 - 184.
- Low, P. and A. Yeats (1992): “Do ‘dirty’ industries migrate?” In P. Low (ed.), *International Trade and environment*., World Bank., Washington, D.C.
- Mani, M. and D. Wheeler (1998): “In search of pollution havens? Dirty industry in the world economy: 1960 – 1995”., *Journal of Environment and Development* 7(3), 215 - 247.
- McConnell, K.E. (1997): “Income and the demand for environmental quality”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 383 - 399.
- McCoskey, S. and C. Kao (1998): “A residual-based test of the null of cointegration in panel data”, *Econometric Reviews* 17, 57-84.
- Moomaw, W. R. and G. C. Unruh (1997): “Are Environmental Kuznets Curve misleading us? The case of CO_2 emissions”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 451 – 463.
- Munasinghe, M. (1999): “Is environmental degradation an inevitable consequence of economic growth: tunneling through the environmental Kuznets curve”, *Ecological Economics* 29, 89 - 109.
- Panayotou, T. (1997): “Demystifying the environmental Kuznets curve: turning a black box into a policy tool”, *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 465-484.

- Panayotou, T. (1993): "Empirical tests and policy analysis of environmental degradation at different stages of economic development", ILO*, Technology and Employment Programme*, Geneva.
- Rothman, D. S. (1998): "Environmental Kuznets curve - real progress or passing the buck?: A case for consumption-base approaches", *Ecological Economics* 25, 177-194.
- Selden, T. M. and D. Song (1994): "Environmental Quality and Development: Is There a Kuznets Curve for Air Pollution Emissions?", *Journal of Environmental Economics and management* 27, 147 - 162.
- Sengupta, R. P. (1997): "CO_2 emission - income relationship: policy approach for climate control", *Pacific Asia Journal of Energy* 7(2), 207 - 229.
- Shafik, N. (1994): "Economic development and environmental quality: an econometric analysis", *Oxford Economic Papers* 46, 757 - 773.
- Torras, M. and J. K. Boyce (1998): "Income, inequality, and pollution: a reassessment of the environmental Kuznets Curve," *Ecological Economics* 25, 147-160.
- Unruh, G. C. and W. R. Moomaw (1998): "An alternative analysis of apparent EKC -type transitions", *Ecological Economics* 25, 221 - 229.
- Vincent, J. R. (1997): "Testing for environmental Kuznets curves within a developing country", *Environment and Development Economics* 2, 417 - 431.
- World Bank (1992): *World Development Report 1992*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Table 2 : Summary statistics of the suspended particulate matter for different groups and their combinations.

Group	Variables	Mean	Variance	Correlation coeffi. between SPM & GDP	No. of Countries

c_1	SPM GDP	127.97 7034.6	12448	-0.91	14
c_2	SPM GDP	133.57 7537.7	13572	-0.90	13
c_3	SPM GDP	141.15 10226	15554	-0.87	7
c	SPM GDP	132.82 7884.1	12692	-0.82	34
r_1	SPM GDP	186.17 4960.8	16453	-0.87	6
r_2	SPM GDP	187.67 5484.3	18966	-0.84	6
r	SPM GDP	194.99 4912.1	17252	-0.79	14
All	SPM GDP	150.96 7017.2	14499	-0.82	48

Note : c_t is the group of countries with data from commercial areas of cities at time t, r_r is the same from residential areas. r_3 is not reported here because it contains only two countries with high level of spm such that grand mean spm exceed that of r_1 and r_2.

Table 3: Distribution of countries by the level of *PCGDP* corresponding to turning point of *EKC*.

Pollutants	Group	0 - $ 3000	$3000- $6000	$6000-$8000	$8000 &more
SPM	c	6	7	1	20
	r	8	2	0	4
	All	14	9	1	24
SO_2	c	8	14	7	20
	r	5	10	2	3
	All	13	24	9	23

Table 4 : Groupwise results of OLS regression for SPM data.

Group	Estimated Coefficients of Explanatory Variable (income)			R^2 (d.f.)	$\sqrt{\sum e^2 / n}$	$\sum \lvert e \rvert / n$	Turning points
	Intercept	x	x^2				

c_1	419.43*** (14.15)	-0.073*** (-6.54)	.36E-5*** (4.08)	0.93 (11)	32.30	25.37	10033
c_2	437.00*** (10.4)	-0.067*** (-4.81)	.29E-5** (2.91)	0.89 (10)	41.31	27.70	11538
c_3	466.76*** (7.38)	-0.065** (-3.75)	.25E-5** (2.79)	0.91 (4)	44.13	26.70	13238
c	418.68*** (20.6)	-0.060*** (-11.57)	.24E-5*** (7.84)	0.89 (31)	38.17	29.78	12618
r_1	382.06*** (6.72)	-0.090* (-2.48)	.5E-5 (1.9)	0.89 (3)	55.50	28.42	8374
r_2	375.59** (3.75)	-0.067 (-1.22)	.33E-5 (0.84)	0.76 (3)	87.16	44.92	10225
r	371.37*** (8.13)	-0.070** (-2.74)	.37E-5* (1.9)	0.80 (11)	61.93	39.60	9529
All	382.07*** (19.37)	-0.055*** (-9.11)	.22E-5*** (5.75)	0.81 (45)	52.89	37.92	12500

Note : Figures in parentheses are the t-ratios. Pollution is measured in mg/m^3 . Income is measured in terms of 1985 US dollars. One, two and three asterisks indicate that a coefficient estimate is significantly different from zero at 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively.

Table 5 : OLS & LAE regrassion results of SPM on *PCGDP* for different forms separately for commercial and residential areas.

Class	OLS LAE	Estimated Coefficients of Explanatory Variable					R^2 (d.f.)	Turning points
		Intercept	x	x^2	P_1	P_2		
C	OLS	418.68*** (20.62)	-0.06*** (-11.57)	0.24E-5*** (7.84)			0.89 (31)	12618
	LAE	373.17	-0.053	0.21E-5			0.87	12604
	OLS	430.42*** (18.66)	-.058*** (-10.17)	0.22E-5*** (6.31)	-27.24 (-1.31)	-12.22 (-0.59)	0.90 (29)	13122
	LAE	405.59	-0.05	0.17E-5	-34.07	-25.44	0.89	14504
R	OLS	371.37*** (8.13)	-0.07** (-2.74)	0.37E-5* (1.94)			0.80 (11)	9529
	OLS	374.43*** (7.32)	-0.07** (-2.56)	0.37E-5 (1.8)	-6.94 (-0.18)		0.80 (10)	9559
	OLS	395.02*** (6.06)	-0.079** (-2.44)	0.42E-5 (1.8)	-31.63 (-0.53)	0.005 (0.55)	0.81 (9)	9524
All	OLS	382.07*** (19.37)	-.055*** (-9.11)	0.22E-5*** (5.75)			0.81 (45)	12500
	LAE	368.75	-0.052	0.2E-5			0.81	12667
	OLS	387.77*** (18.98)	-.054*** (-8.88)	0.21E-5*** (5.47)	-16.67 (-1.05)		0.82 (44)	12717
	OLS	395.77*** (16.28)	-.053*** (-8.26)	0.2E-5*** (4.9)	-27.13 (-1.17)	-14.25 (0.62)	0.82 (43)	12998

Note : Figures in parentheses are the t- ratios. Pollution is measured in mg/m^3. Income is measured in terms of 1985 US dollars. One, two and three asterisks indicate that a coefficient estimate is significantly different from zero at 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively.

Table 6 : OLS regression results of SPM on GDP and different dummy variables for different groups and their combination.

Group	Estimated Coefficient of Explanatory Variable										R^2 (d.f.)	$\bar{R}^2$
	Intercept	x	P_1	P_2	Z_1	Z_2	d_1	d_2	W_1	W_2		
c	318.4***	-0.018***	23.65	23.64	-0.012**	-0.01*					0.81 (28)	0.78
	(7.54)	(-4.68)	(0.45)	(o.43)	(-2.24)	(-1.77)						
	311.5***	-0.02***					-32.36				0.73 (31)	0.71
	(14.06)	(-5.82)					(-1.08)					
	356.2***	-0.03***					-209.4***		0.02***		0.82 (30)	0.80
	(16.5)	(-7.87)					(-4.07)		(3.92)			
	418.7***	-0.051***						-320***		0.047***	0.91 (30)	0.90
	(18.35)	(-7.38)						(-8.19)		(6.29)		
r	474.3**	-0.07*	-262.67	-227.5	0.054	0.053					0.51 (8)	0.21
	(2.7)	(-1.92)	(-1.3)	(-1.118)	(1.4)	(1.39)						
	340.2***	-0.0004					-282.7***				0.93 (11)	0.92
	(16.67)	(-0.14)					(-9.37)					
	281.5***	0.037*					-218.08***		-0.04*		0.95 (10)	0.93
	(7.77)	(1.84)					(-4.97)		(1.88)			
	377.9***	-0.057***						-296**		0.05**	0.68 (10)	0.59
	(6.4)	(-3.437)						(-2.96)		(2.92)		
All	288.1***	-0.017***	12.6	7.28	-0.008	-0.006					0.60 (42)	0.56
	(6.16)	(-3.47)	(0.21)	(0.12)	(-1.21)	(-0.83)						
	297.2***	-0.014***					-107.42***				0.69 (45)	0.67
	(15.3)	(-4.57)					(-4.12)					
	363.8***	-0.031***					-273.26***		0.03***		0.83 (44)	0.82
	(20.15)	(-8.62)					(-8.2)		(6.13)			
	406.8***	-0.054***						-317***		0.05***	0.81 (44)	0.80
	(16.23)	(-7.3)						(-7.39)		(6.28)		

Note : Pollution is measured in mg/m^3. Income is measured in terms of 1985 us dollars. Figures in parentheses are the t- ratios. One, two and three asterisks indicate that a coefficient estimate is significantly different from zero at 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively.

Table 7 : OLS & LAE regression results of SO_2 on GDP.

Group	OLS LAE	Estimated Coefficient of Explanatory Variable						R^2 (d.f.)	$\sqrt{\sum e^2/n}$	$\sum \lvert e \rvert / n$
		Intercept	x	x^2	P_1	P_2	c			
c	OLS	78.53***	-0.0039***					0.220 (47)	27.96	22.86
		(9.4)	(-3.65)							
	OLS	71.6***	-0.0038***		7.06	7.75		0.230 (45)	28.42	23.06
		(5.49)	(-3.43)		(0.61)	(0.67)				
	LAE	62.43	-0.0028					0.130	30.39	22.45
	OLS	80.64***	-0.0047	0.5E-7				0.220 (46)	28.25	22.72
		(6.3)	(-1.35)	(0.22)						
	LAE	81.9	-0.0063	0.14E-7				0.200	35.41	32.95
r	OLS	48.93***	0.0005					0.003 (18)	31.98	24.8
		(3.76)	(0.245)							
	OLS	50.72	-0.00025	0.6E-7				0.004 (17)	32.89	24.65
		(2.17)	(-0.03)	(0.09)						
All	OLS	68.7***	-0.0027***					0.100 (67)	29.63	24.65
		(9.75)	(-2.79)							
	OLS	59.15***	-0.0028***		5.9	9.86	4.95	0.122 (64)	29.99	24.65
		(5.14)	(-2.735)		(0.58)	(0.98)	(0.6)			
	LAE	56.09	-0.0023						32.88	23.25
	OLS	66.99***	-0.002	-0.4E-7	6.07	10.02		0.100 (64)	29.84	24.65
		(6.15)	(-0.65)	(-0.207)	(0.57)	(0.95)				
	OLS	59.5***	-0.003	0.13E-7			4.98	0.123 (65)	30.23	24.37
		(4.54)	(-0.88)	(0.06)			(0.6)			
	LAE	54.05	-0.002	-0.2E-7					28.31	23.24

Note : Pollution (SO_2) is measured in mg / m^3. Income is measured in terms of 1985 us dollars. Figures in parentheses are the t- ratios. One, two and three asterisks indicate that a coefficient estimate is significantly different from zero at 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively.

Table 8: Estimated coefficients of equation (3.6).

	Estimated Coefficients of Explanatory Variable						R^2(d.f.)	$\bar{R}^2$
	Intercep t	X	X^2	g	g^2	x *g		
Estimates t- ratio	365.3 (16.86)	-0.05374 (-8.09)	2.49E-6 (4.82)	-4.086 (-0.84)	1.2207 (2.8)	-0.0011 (2.507)	0.85(42)	0.84

Figure 3.1: Relationship between PCGDP and SPM



Figure 3.2: Relationship between PCGDP and SO_2



FIGURE 3.3

SPM Level Vs Per Capita GDP and Economic Growth