

Martínez-Zarzoso, Inmaculada

**Working Paper**

## The impact of urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: evidence from developing countries

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2377

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

*Suggested Citation:* Martínez-Zarzoso, Inmaculada (2008) : The impact of urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: evidence from developing countries, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2377, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/26422>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# The Impact of Urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: Evidence from Developing Countries

INMACULADA MARTÍNEZ-ZARZOSO

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2377  
CATEGORY 8: RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT  
AUGUST 2008

PRESENTED AT CESIFO VENICE SUMMER INSTITUTE 2008, WORKSHOP ON  
'EUROPE AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES'

*An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded*

- *from the SSRN website:* [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- *from the RePEc website:* [www.RePEc.org](http://www.RePEc.org)
- *from the CESifo website:* [www.CESifo-group.org/wp](http://www.CESifo-group.org/wp)

# The Impact of Urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: Evidence from Developing Countries

## Abstract

This paper analyzes the impact of urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in developing countries, taking into account the presence of heterogeneity in the sample of countries and testing for the stability of the estimated elasticities over time. The sample covers the period from 1975 through 2003 for different groups of countries, classified according to their income levels. Our results show that, whereas the impact of population growth on emissions is above unity and only slightly different for upper, middle, and low- income countries, urbanization, demonstrate a very different impact on emissions for low and lower-middle-income countries and upper-middle income countries.

JEL Code: Q25, Q4, Q54.

Keywords: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, developing countries, panel data, population growth, urbanization.

*Inmaculada Martínez-Zarzoso*  
*Ibero America Institute for Economic Research*  
*University of Göttingen*  
*37077 Göttingen*  
*Germany*  
*martinei@eco.uji.es*

Abbreviations: IPAT, STIRPAT, EKC, WDI, GDP, IND, EI, FGLS, PPP

# **THE IMPACT OF URBANIZATION ON CO<sub>2</sub> EMISSIONS: EVIDENCE FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

## **1. Introduction**


Climate change, with the attendant need to stabilize contributing global emissions, is one of the most challenging problems of our times and a matter of great concern among policy makers. Some aspects of the projected impact, such as global warming, increasing desertification, rising sea levels and rising average temperatures, might have a disproportionate impact on developing countries, which least contributed to the cause of climate change.

While many factors have been adduced for climate change, energy consumption, as affluence grows, is singled out as having the most adverse impact on the environment. However, this impact is more severe when accompanied by demographic growth, given that population increases lead to increases in energy consumption and, consequently, to greater atmospheric pollution. A number of factors, namely, the increase in life expectancy, reduced child mortality, and improved farming methods, have resulted in rapid and exponential growth of world population over the last 150 years. World population is currently growing by approximately 1.5 percent, or 80 to 85 million per year. But this trend will not continue indefinitely. The latest UN world population projections to 2150 suggest that a slowing down of population growth may already be occurring with a median projection of 9.4 billion by 2050. The population growth is expected to be concentrated in the developing regions of the world, mainly Africa and Asia, while in the developed countries, growth will be very slow.

The main greenhouse gas in terms of quantity is CO<sub>2</sub>, which, according to IPCC (2007), accounts for about 76.7 percent of total anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions in 2004. Although the reduction commitments of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were seen as a task predominantly for developed countries (UNFCCC, 1997), based on the consensus that they are the largest

contributors to global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, there have been recent calls for the developing countries to play an active role in global emissions reduction (Winkler et al., 2002). The level of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from developing countries has been rapidly exceeding that of the developed countries, and at present accounts for almost 50 percent of the world's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Figure 1). This trend is expected to grow if the current path, in terms of energy consumption, is maintained.

Figure 1. Carbon dioxide emissions in 2003



Source: World Development Indicators 2007

Since CO<sub>2</sub> is one of the main contributors to global emissions, it is of great interest to determine which policy measures will be more effective in curbing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

In the last two decades, a number of researchers have investigated the determinants of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within the framework of the Kuznets Curve hypothesis without reaching conclusive evidence in favor of the hypothesis (See Perman and Stern, 2003, for a survey). More recent developments use decomposition analysis and efficient frontier methods, taking into account not only affluence, but also energy intensity, technical change, and structural change as explanatory variables. In most cases changes in per-capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are explained with changes in income per capita, energy intensity, and structural change in the economy, assuming implicitly that population has a unitary elasticity with respect to emissions. Relatively little effort has been devoted to investigating the impact of demographic factors on the evolution of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and most of the existing studies assume that this impact is comparable for all countries and constant over time (Cole and Newmayer, 2004). Two exceptions to this general assumption are the studies of Shi (2001), who grouped countries according to income levels, and Martínez-Zarzoso et al. (2007), who studied the impact of population growth for old and new European Union members.

The primary objective of this research is to investigate the differential impact of demographic factors on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by using an econometric model to decompose emissions data into the scale, composition, and technique effects. The study focuses on different groups of developing countries, and considers the heterogeneity present in the sample in terms of variability of the estimated coefficients over time and across different groups of countries. We specify a model in which CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are related to the level of income per capita, the population size, the percent of urban versus rural population, the industrial structure, and the energy intensity of each country. The study involves three groups of countries classified by the World Bank as upper, middle, and low-income countries and analyzes the behavior of each group separately. The results show important disparities among groups. For low-income

countries the elasticity emission-urbanization is higher than unity, whereas for lower-middle-income the elasticity is 0.72, which is in accordance with the higher environmental impact observed in less developed regions. However, in upper and highly developed countries, the elasticity, emission-urbanization, is negative.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 presents the theoretical framework and specifies the model. Section 4 describes the empirical analysis and discusses the main results and Section 5 concludes.

## **2. Literature Review**

The first studies that considered demographic factors to explain the sources of air pollution were based on cross-sectional data for only one time period. In this line, Cramer (1998, 2002) and Cramer and Cheney (2000) evaluated the effects of population growth on air pollution in California and found a positive relationship only for some sources of emissions but not for others. Dietz and Rosa (1997) and York, Rosa, and Dietz (2003) studied the impact of population on carbon dioxide emissions and energy use within the framework of the IPAT<sup>1</sup> model. The results from these studies indicate that the elasticity of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and energy use with respect to population are close to unity. The unity assumption for the population elasticity is embedded in the original IPAT formulation of Ehrlich and Holdren (1971) but not in the stochastic version of the IPAT (STIRPAT) formulated by Dietz and Rosa (1997).

In a panel data context, Shi (2003) found a direct relationship between population changes and carbon dioxide emissions in 93 countries over the period from 1975 to 1996. He found that the impact of population on emissions varies with the levels of affluence and has been more pronounced in lower-income countries than in higher-income countries. Also using panel data, Cole and Neumayer (2004) considered 86 countries during the period from 1975 to 1998 and found a positive link between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and a set of explanatory variables

---

<sup>1</sup> Impact=Population .Affluence.Technology (IPAT).

including population, urbanization rate, energy intensity, and smaller household sizes. However, the authors assumed that the effect of population and urbanization is equal for all income levels. Previous research also outlined the negative environmental impact caused by demographic pressure (Daily and Ehrlich, 1992; Zaba and Clarke, 1994), but they failed to analyze this impact within an appropriate quantitative framework.

In addition, several studies have discussed and tested the existence of an Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) where the relationship between pollution and income is considered to have an inverted U-shape. These models frequently take emissions per capita for different pollutants as an endogenous variable, assuming implicitly that the elasticity, emission-population, is unitary. A few of them considered population density as an additional explanatory variable (e.g., Cole et al., 1997; Panayotou et al., 2000). However, their tests are not based on an underlying theory, and testing variables individually is subject to the problem of omitted-variables bias. The results obtained within this framework are far from homogeneous and their validity has been questioned in recent surveys of the EKC literature (e.g., Stern, 1998 and 2004). Most of the criticisms are related to the use of inappropriate techniques and the presence of omitted-variables bias. In fact, Perman and Stern (2003) state that when diagnostic statistics and specification tests are taken into account and the proper techniques are used, the results indicate that the EKC does not exist. Borghesi and Vercelli (2003) consider that the studies based on local emissions present acceptable results, whereas those concerning global emissions do not offer the expected outcomes, and therefore the EKC hypothesis cannot be generally accepted.

There are two new approaches that go beyond the EKC literature. They are based on decomposition analysis and are known as *index number decompositions* and *efficient frontier methods*. The first approach requires detailed sectoral data and does not allow for stochasticity, whereas the second (frontier models) is based on the estimation of econometric models, allows for random errors, and estimates factors common to all countries.



Decomposition methods have been applied to an increasing number of pollutants in developed and developing countries (e.g., Hamilton and Turton, 2002; Bruvoll and Medin, 2003; Lise, 2005). Emissions are typically decomposed into scale, composition, and technique effects. Scale effects are measured with income and population variables, composition effects refer to changes in the input or output mix, and technique effects are proxied by energy intensity (the effect of productivity on emissions) and global technical progress. Hamilton and Turton (2002) concluded that income per capita and population growth are the two main factors increasing carbon emissions in OECD countries, whereas the decrease in energy intensity is the main factor reducing them. Bruvoll and Medin (2003) covered 10 pollutants and determined that in all cases, technique effects were dominant in offsetting the increase in scale. The authors concluded that, whereas structural change explains the increase in energy intensity during the period from 1913 through 1970, technical change is the main factor reducing energy intensity after 1970. Shifts in the fuel mix are the main factor explaining carbon emissions per unit of energy used. Stern (2002) used an econometric model to decompose sulphur emissions in 64 countries during the period 1973 to 1990 and found that the contribution of input and output effects on changes in global emissions is very modest, whereas technological change considerably reduces the increase in emissions.

### **3. Basic Framework of Analysis**

Erlich and Holdren (1971) suggested a suitable framework for analyzing the determinants of environmental impact known as the equation, IPAT:  $I=PAT$  where  $I$  represents environmental impact,  $P$  is the population size,  $A$  is the level of population affluence, and  $T$  denotes the level of environmentally damaging technology. The impact of human activity in the environment is viewed as the product of these three factors. Initially, this formulation was purely conceptual and could not be used directly to test hypotheses on the impact of each one of the above-mentioned factors on emissions.

The IPAT model can be expressed as an identity where  $A$  could be defined as consumption per capita and  $T$  as pollution per unit of consumption. As stated by MacKellar et al. (1995), the IPAT identity is a suggestive approach that shows how environmental impact is not due to a single factor. However, these authors outline the limitations of testing this identity related to the choice of variables and the interactions between them. They compare households ( $H$ ) with total population levels, as the demographic unit used to forecast future world CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and they show how each choice leads to different predictions in all the regions of the world, always increasing the impact on emissions for the  $I=HAT$  model, where the term, households, replaces the term, population.

Cole and Neumayer (2004) refer to the utility of the tautological version of the IPAT model for decomposition purposes but also highlight its limitations in estimating population elasticities. For such estimation they used the model proposed by Dietz and Rosa (1997). Starting from Ehrlich and Holdren's (1971) basic foundation, Dietz and Rosa (1997) formulated a stochastic version of the IPAT equation with quantitative variables containing population size ( $P$ ), affluence per capita ( $A$ ), and the weight of industry in economic activity as a proxy for the level of environmentally damaging technology ( $T$ ). These authors designated their model with the term, STIRPAT (Stochastic Impacts by Regression on Population, Affluence, and Technology). The initial specification is given by the following equation:

$$I_i = \alpha P_i^\beta A_i^\gamma T_i^\delta e_i \quad [1]$$

where  $I_i$ ,  $P_i$ ,  $A_i$ , and  $T_i$  are the variables defined above;  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ , and  $\delta$  are parameters to be estimated, and  $e_i$  is the random error. Their results corroborated the Malthusian thesis in the sense that population growth has a greater-than-proportional impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. On the other hand, the study conducted by Cramer (1998), based on a similar model, showed a

contamination-population elasticity less than unity for the five pollutants analyzed in several areas of the USA. This discrepancy could be explained by the exclusion of carbon dioxide among the pollutants considered by this author.


Similar to Cole and Neumayer (2004), we have also taken the STIRPAT model as the reference theoretical and analytical framework.  $P$  is measured with total population and with the percentage of urban population. The affluence variable,  $A$ , is measured by the gross domestic product per capita and, as a proxy for measuring  $T$ , we have considered the percentage of industrial activity with respect to total production and energy efficiency. Our empirical analysis is also in line with the latest emerging approaches based on decomposition methods described in the introduction. We think that the factors driving changes in pollution should be analyzed in a single model and under the appropriate quantitative framework, hence allowing for a more flexible model with variable coefficients across groups with different behavior and over time.

#### **4. Econometric estimation**

Following the empirical model formulated by Dietz and Rosa (1997), I have estimated a linear version of the STIRPAT model for a sample of 95 countries during the period from 1975 to 2003. The countries under analysis are classified into three income groups according to data from the World Development Indicators (WDI) 2007. Low-income economies are those in which 2005 GNI per capita was \$875 US or less (54 countries). Lower-middle-income economies are those in which 2005 GNI per capita was between \$876 and \$3,466 (58 countries), upper-middle-income economies are those in which 2005 GNI per capita was between \$3,466 and \$10,725 (40 countries). The sample of countries is considerably reduced when energy efficiency is included as an explanatory variable since data for this variable are


not available for many developing countries<sup>2</sup>. There are also some countries for which income data are missing and transition economies only report data since the early 1990s, when their economies began the opening-up process. Countries considered in each group are listed in Table A.7 in the appendix (WDI, World Bank, 2007). A summary of the data for each group of countries, as well as the simple correlation coefficients between the variables in the model, is shown in Tables A1 to A3 in the appendix. In addition, Figures 2 and 3 report two scatter plots.

Figure 2. Scatter plot: CO<sub>2</sub> and population



<sup>2</sup> Energy Efficiency is available for 31 Low-income countries, 38 Lower-middle-income countries, 26 upper-middle-income countries and 35.

Figure 3. Scatter plot: CO<sub>2</sub> and urbanization



Note:  $lp$  denotes population in natural logs,  $pupc$  is the percentage of urban population over total population and  $lco2$  denotes logged CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The first one shows a clear positive linear relationship between population and emissions, whereas the second shows a positive relationship between urbanization and emissions for low urbanization levels and a negative one for higher levels (more than 60 percent of urban population). We proceed now with a more sophisticated analysis to investigate this relationship in depth.

In order to test whether the evolution of the factors considered in the STIRPAT model influences the level of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions through time and across countries, I have derived the empirical model by taking logarithms of Equation 1 as follows:

$$\ln I_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta \ln P_{it} + \gamma \ln A_{it} + \delta_i \ln T_{it} + \phi_t + e_{it}, \quad [2]$$

where the sub-index  $i$  refers to countries and  $t$  refers to the different years.  $I_{it}$  is the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in tons,  $P_{it}$  is the population,  $A_{it}$  is the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita expressed in constant PPP (purchasing parity prices) (2000 US\$), and  $T_{it}$  is proxied with two variables: the percentage of the industrial activity with respect to the total production measured by the GDP (IND) and energy efficiency (EI) measured as GDP at constant PPP prices divided by energy use, where *energy use* refers to apparent consumption (production+imports-exports). Finally,  $\delta_i$  and  $\phi_t$  capture the country and time effects, respectively, of each country, and  $e_{it}$  is the error term. Since the model is specified in natural logarithms, the coefficients of the explanatory variables can be directly interpreted as elasticities. The time effects,  $\phi_t$ , can be considered as a proxy for all the variables that are common across countries but which vary over time. Within the context of decomposition analysis, these effects are sometimes interpreted as the effects of emissions-specific technical progress over time (Stern, 2002).

Equation 2 was first estimated for the whole set of countries under analysis (an unbalanced panel with 1971 observations). Table 1 shows the results obtained by using different estimation methods. The model was first estimated using random effects (Model 1) and fixed effects (Model 2). Since the country and time-specific effects are statistically significant (as indicated by the respective LM tests) the OLS results with a common intercept are not reported. The result of the Hausman test indicates that the country effects are correlated with the residuals and therefore only the fixed-effects estimates are consistent. Since the time dimension of the panel is relatively large (31 years), serial correlation is almost certainly present in our data. I confirm this hypothesis by performing the Wooldridge autocorrelation test for panel data. In order to get consistent estimates, feasible generalized least squares (FGLS) techniques can be used. A second problem to be accounted for is the presence of heteroskedasticity, as indicated by the result of the LR test reported in the last row of Table 1.

Table 1. Regression results for all countries in the sample (1975-2003)

<b>Method:</b>	<b>RE</b>	<b>FE</b>	<b>FE AR(1)</b>	<b>GLS ARC</b>	<b>GLS HET</b>	<b>GLS HET ARC</b>	<b>GLS HET ARSP</b>
<b>Model</b>	<b><u>1</u></b>	<b><u>2</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>	<b><u>5</u></b>	<b><u>6</u></b>	<b><u>7</u></b>
<b>Variables</b>	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.	Coeff.
<b>lyh</b>	2.503*** (11.73)	2.188*** (9.84)	1.233*** (16.11)	1.521*** (71.57)	1.493*** (143.86)	1.358*** (56.23)	1.418*** (62.69)
<b>lp</b>	1.012*** (31.18)	1.123*** (9.37)	1.174 (1.04)	1.053*** (119.16)	1.068*** (244.29)	1.057*** (102.14)	1.069*** (91.48)
<b>pupc</b>	-0.106 (-0.582)	-1.129*** (-4.58)	-0.257 (-0.47)	0.523*** (5.64)	0.321*** (7.27)	0.486*** (4.77)	0.677*** (6.62)
<b>lei1</b>	-0.899*** (-22.64)	-0.788*** (-16.53)	-0.786*** (-12.03)	-0.968*** (-39.09)	-1.012*** (-84.15)	-1.013*** (-44.46)	-1.091*** (-54.68)
<b>lia</b>	0.313*** (7.81)	0.288*** (6.84)	0.144*** (3.44)	0.688*** (17.24)	0.561*** (22.68)	0.146*** (5.45)	0.170*** (7.01)
<b>cons</b>	-8.849*** (-9.68)	-10.64*** (-5.01)	0.790*** (-9.95)	-6.812*** (-17.75)	-5.849*** (-28.05)	-3.377*** (-8.67)	-3.128*** (-8.65)
<b>Time dummies</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Lm test</b>	4565	Prob=0.00					
<b>Hausman test</b>	548	Prob= 0.00					
<b>N</b>	1971	1971	1883	1971	1971	1971	1971
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>		0.588	0.487				
<b>RMSE</b>	0.278	0.274	0.16				
<b>Log Likl.</b>		-179	791.6	-1616.3	-752.8	1591.4	1864.5
<b>Wooldridge test for autocorrelation</b>				F(1.87)=33.18			
<b>LR test for Heteroskedasticity</b>				Chi(87)=2542			

Note: *lyh* denotes per- capita income, *lp* denotes population, *pupc* is the percentage of urban population over total population, *lei1* is energy efficiency, and *lia* is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP. *t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively.

In order to deal with both problems simultaneously, autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity in the error term, the model is estimated using FGLS assuming heteroskedasticity and panel-specific AR1 correlation (Model 7). To see the effects on the estimated parameters of each problem separately, Models 4 and 5 assume respectively autocorrelation<sup>3</sup> and heteroskedasticity and Model 6 assumes heteroskedasticity and panel-common AR1. The model that shows a higher log-likelihood is Model 7 and this is going to be utilized to estimate regressions for different income groups.

<sup>3</sup> We also estimated the model taking first differences of the series as an alternative to account for autocorrelation, and the results were similar.

The results indicate that all of the variables included are statistically significant and show the expected signs. With respect to the estimated elasticities, the population elasticity is slightly higher than one, in line with previous research, and the percentage of urban population also has a positive effect on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The estimated coefficient for income per capita indicates a higher-than-proportional effect on emissions, and an increase in energy efficiency decreases emissions proportionally. Finally, the effect of the percentage of industrial activity is positive and small, and the time effects show a negative sign and an increasing magnitude over time; this could be indicative of global technical progress over time that is reducing emissions.

Since the time span is large, another matter of concern is the stationarity of the series. If the series are non-stationary, the results could be showing spurious relationships. Although this problem is greatly reduced with the use of panel data, I consider two possible ways of approaching this issue. The first is to test for unit roots using panel unit root tests and if all the series are non-stationary and integrated of order one, to then search for a long-run equilibrium relationship. The second approach is to estimate the model for a cross-section of countries in each year and see whether the results hold. Since I also wanted to explore the changing role of affluence, increasing population, urbanization, and industrialization along countries' development paths, the second approach is followed. The yearly regressions are also estimated using feasible generalized least squares, since heteroskedasticity is present in the data. The results are reported in Table 2.

The estimated coefficients indicate that population size contributes to emissions at an almost constant rate, whereas income per capita contributes to emissions at an increasing rate over the whole period. Industrialization contributes to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but at a decreasing rate as income increases and energy efficiency make negative contributions to emissions at a slightly decreasing rate. It is worth noting the fall in the contribution of urbanization over time and the change from a positive to a negative contribution in the Eighties.



Table 2. Feasible generalized least squares estimation results for all countries with population weights (various years)

<b>Year</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2003</b>
<b>Variables</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>	<b>Coeff.</b>
<b>lyh</b>	1.032*** (3.47)	1.339*** (6.34)	1.481*** (6.74)	1.637*** (7.97)	1.764*** (7.49)	1.794*** (13.23)	1.810*** (13.92)
<b>lp</b>	1.072*** (24.18)	1.138*** (23.97)	1.162*** (28.42)	1.194*** (25.26)	1.082*** (23.65)	1.050*** (22.71)	1.053*** (26.42)
<b>pupc</b>	0.722 (0.70)	0.0190 (0.02)	-0.576 (-0.55)	-0.639 (-0.66)	-1.088 (-1.30)	-1.083** (-2.06)	-1.201** (-2.17)
<b>lia</b>	0.975*** (4.17)	0.731*** (3.37)	0.944** (3.21)	0.775** (2.56)	0.650** (1.99)	0.260 (1.04)	0.193 (1.08)
<b>lei1</b>	-0.952*** (-4.10)	-1.056*** (-6.07)	-1.052*** (-5.98)	-0.916*** (-5.16)	-0.919*** (-6.63)	-0.869*** (-7.93)	-0.834*** (-7.99)
<b>Constant</b>	-5.310* (-1.95)	-6.144** (-2.08)	-8.301*** (-2.99)	-11.620*** (-3.98)	-9.942*** (-3.80)	-9.187*** (-4.36)	-9.718*** (-5.01)
<b>Observations</b>	46	51	59	67	87	88	87
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.969	0.972	0.968	0.968	0.970	0.971	0.976

Note: *lyh* denotes per- capita income, *lp* denotes population, *pupc* is the percentage of urban population over total population, *lei1* is energy efficiency, and *lia* is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP. *t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively.

That lends support to the existence of structural change. To explore further the apparently changing role of the variables explaining emissions, I divided our panel data into three groups of countries: low, lower-middle, and upper-middle income. Table 3 shows the results.

The main differences between the three sets of results concern urbanization. The elasticity emissions-urbanization, is negative and significant for the upper-middle-income group, whereas for lower-middle and low-income countries, it is positive and significant. It is much higher than unity (2.82) for low-income countries and it has a less-than-proportional effect for lower-middle-income countries. The inclusion of urbanization in the model does not change the estimated coefficients of the other explanatory variables. The model was also estimated without this variable and the only difference was that the Log-Likelihood was lower in magnitude.

Table 3. Estimation results for each income group (1975-2003)

Model Variables	GLS with HET and AR(1) Specific terms		
	Up-Mid	L-Mid	Low
<b>lyh</b>	1.118*** (30.76)	1.316*** (30.49)	1.883*** (24.6)
<b>lp</b>	1.016*** (64.3)	1.106*** (58.07)	1.207*** (49.17)
<b>pupc</b>	-0.246** (-2.53)	0.729*** (3.81)	2.828*** (5.67)
<b>lei1</b>	-1.013*** (-27.97)	-1.137*** (-35.09)	-1.206*** (-17.02)
<b>lia</b>	0.122*** (2.86)	0.145*** (3.75)	0.126** (2.51)
<b>cons</b>	-0.232 (-0.35)	-2.437*** (-4.95)	-7.282*** (-7.80)
<b>Time dummies</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>N countries</b>	25	39	24
<b>Log. Likl</b>	714.9	804.1	387.7

Note: *t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively. Note: *lyh* denotes per-capita income, *lp* denotes population, *pupc* is the percentage of urban population over total population, *lei1* is energy efficiency, and *lia* is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP.

The results are also confirmed when I examine the evolution over time of the emissions-urbanization elasticity. I obtained a positive and decreasing elasticity for low-income countries and a negative and increasing elasticity for upper-middle-income countries (See Tables A.4 to A.6 in the appendix<sup>4</sup>).

Concerning population, higher emissions-population elasticity is obtained for low and lower-middle-income countries (1.21 and 1.11, respectively) than for upper-middle-income countries (1.016). The elasticity for high-income countries (not reported, available upon request) was very similar to the one obtained for the upper-middle group (1.014). A great number of studies confirm an overall upward trend in global emissions over the last decades that share two characteristics. First, emissions have grown faster than population, and second, this relationship is more pronounced for developing countries than for developed countries.


Similar to other studies, I find that for developed countries, the emissions-population elasticity presents a lower coefficient. Shi (2003) calculated an elasticity of 1.58 for

<sup>4</sup> Equation 3 was estimated without energy efficiency because data for this variable were not available for a number of countries as indicated in A.7.

developing countries and 0.83 for developed ones. Also, MacKellar et al. (1995) found that population growth had more influence regarding energy consumption in less developed regions (2.2 in developing and 0.7 in developed regions). This disparity holds also when considering households instead of individuals.

Figure 4 presents the time effects of four groups of countries. I observe an overall decreasing trend in the magnitude of the estimated coefficients for upper-middle-income and high-income countries over the whole period. However, for low and lower-middle-income countries, this decreasing trend is only observed in the 1980s and from 1995 to 2003. In fact, since 1995 this decreasing trend is much more pronounced for these two groups of countries.

Figure 4. Time effects for different income-groups



Note: Estimates based on the results shown in Table 3.

Assuming that these effects can represent specific technical progress over time, the results indicate that technical progress has contributed to the decrease in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, especially in developing countries in the latest years of the sample.

Some differences have also been observed in the other explanatory variables. An increase of 1 percent in the GDP per head causes a 1.17 percent increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of upper-middle-income countries and a 1.88 percent low-income countries. The negative contribution of energy efficiency to emissions is also different: in the first group, the impact is also lower than that obtained for the second (the elasticities are -1.01 and -1.20, respectively). To sum up, the environmental impact caused by population, urbanization, and affluence variables (scale effect) seems to be higher in low-income countries, whereas the contribution of the industrial sector to emissions is similar for all countries.

## **5. Conclusions**

In this paper a multivariate analysis of the determinants of carbon dioxide emissions in developing countries during the period 1975 to 2003 has been conducted. I have taken the Dietz and Rosa (1997) formulation as our theoretical framework. In their model, population is introduced as a predictor, together with affluence per capita and the level of environmentally damaging technology, proxied with the weight of the industrial sector in the GDP and with energy intensity. Affluence was measured by the GDP per capita in PPP. I have added urbanization as a predictor and used several estimation methods in a panel data framework.

The results show different patterns for low-income and lower-middle-income countries and the rest. For the first set of countries, the elasticity emission-urbanization is higher than unity, whereas in the second group, the elasticity is 0.72, which is in accordance with the higher environmental impact observed in less developed regions. However, in upper and highly developed countries, the elasticity, emission-urbanization, is negative.

This result has a very important policy implication: once urbanization reaches a certain level, the effect on emissions turn out to be negative, contributing to reduced environmental damage. This result is also confirmed when I observe the evolution over time of the emissions-urbanization elasticity. I obtained a positive and decreasing elasticity for low-income countries and a negative and increasing elasticity for upper-middle-income countries. In 2008 more than half of the world's human population (3.3 billion people) is living in urban areas. By 2030, this is expected to increase to almost 5 billion. Although many of these cities will be poor, no country in the industrial age has ever achieved significant economic growth without urbanization. Cities may concentrate poverty, but they also represent the best hope of escaping it. Although cities embody the environmental damage, namely, increasing emissions due to transportation, energy consumption and other factors, policymakers and experts increasingly recognize the potential value of cities to long-term sustainability. It could be that these potential benefits of urbanization outweigh the disadvantages. This is the main message of this paper.

### **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank Tom Brewer, Stephan Klasen, Karsten Neuhoff, Ray Riezman, John Whalley and all the participants in the Leibniz Workshop "Europe and Global Environmental Issues" (Venice 2008). Financial support from CESifo is gratefully acknowledged.

## References

- Borghesi S, Vercelli A (2003) Sustainable globalisation. *Ecol Economics* 44:77-89
- Bruvoll A, Medin H (2003) Factors behind the Environmental Kuznets Curve: a decomposition of the changes in air pollution. *Env and Res Economics* 24(1): 27-48
- Cole MA, Rayner AJ, Bates J M (1997) The Environmental Kuznets Curve: an empirical analysis. *Env and Dev Economics* 2(4):401-416
- Cole MA, Neumayer E (2004) Examining the impact of demographic factors on air pollution. *Pop and Dev Review* 2(1):5-21
- Cramer C J (2002) Population growth and local air pollution: methods, models and results. In Lutz W, Prkawetz A, Sanderson WC (eds.) *Pop and Env. Suppl to Pop and Dev Review*, vol. 28: Population Council, New York, 53-88
- Cramer CJ (1998) Population growth and air quality in California. *Demography* 35(1): 45-56
- Cramer CJ, Cheney RP (2000) Lost in the ozone: Population growth and ozone in California. *Pop and Env* 21(3):315-337
- Daily GC, Ehrlich PR (1992) Population, sustainability and earth's carrying capacity. *Biosciences* 42:761-771
- Dietz T, Rosa EA (1997) Effects of population and affluence on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In: *Proceedings of the Natl Acad of Sciences USA* vol 94(1):175-179
- Ehrlich PR, Holdren JP (1971) Impact of population growth. *Science* 171:1212-1217
- Galeotti M, Lanza A (1999) Richer and cleaner? A study on carbon dioxide emissions in developing countries. FEEM Working Paper 87
- Hamilton C, Turton H (2002) Determinants of emissions growth in OECD countries. *En Pol* 30:63-71
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Working Group III Report: Mitigation of Climate Change (2007), [Http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/Ar4-Wg3](http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/Ar4-Wg3)

Lise W (2005) Decomposition of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over 1980-2003 in Turkey. FEEM Working Paper No. 24:05

MacKellar L, Lutz W, Prinz C, et al (1995) Population, households and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. *Pop and Dev Review* 21(4):849-865

Martínez-Zarzoso I, Bengochea-Morancho A, Morales-Lage, R (2007). The Impact of Population on CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: Evidence from European Countries. *Env and Res Economics* 38: 497-512

Panayotou T, Peterson A, Sachs J (2000) Is the Environmental Kuznets Curve driven by structural change? What extended time series may imply for developing countries?. CAER II Discussion Paper 80

Perman R, Stern DI (2003) Evidence from panel unit root and cointegration tests that the Environmental Kuznets Curve does not exist. *Aus J Agr and Res Economics* 47:325-347

Roberts JT, Grimes PE (1997) Carbon intensity and economic development 1962-91: a brief exploration of the Environmental Kuznets Curve. *World Dev* 25(2):191-198

Shafik N, Bandyopadhyay S (1992) Economic growth and environmental quality: time series and cross-country evidence. Background paper for the World Dev Rep 1992, Working Paper No 904, The World Bank, Washington DC

Shi A (2003) The impact of population pressure on global carbon dioxide emissions, 1975-1996: evidence from pooled cross-country data. *Ecol Economics* 44:29-42

Stern DI (1998) Progress on the environmental Kuznets Curve?. *Env and Dev Economics* 3:173-196

Stern DI (2002) Explaining changes in global sulphur emissions: an econometric decomposition approach. *Ecol Economics* 42:201-220

Stern DI (2004) The rise and fall of the Environmental Kuznets Curve. *World Dev* 32(8):1419-1439

Winkler H, Spalding-Fecher R, Mwakasonda S, Davidson O (2002) Sustainable Development Policies and Measures: Starting From Development to Tackle Climate Change, in Baumert K, Blanchard O, Llosa S, Perkaus J eds. Building a Climate of Trust: The Kyoto Protocol and Beyond (61-87). Washington D.C.:World Resources Institute

World Bank (2007), World Development Indicators 2001 CD-ROM, Washington, DC

York R, Rosa EA, Dietz T (2003) STIRPAT, IPAT and ImPACT: analytic tools for unpacking the driving forces of environmental impacts. *Ecol Economics* 46(3):351-365

WRI (1997) Annual carbon dioxide inventory report. <http://www.wri.org/>

Zaba B, Clarke, JI (1994) Introduction: current directions in population-environment research. In: Zaba B, Clarke JI (eds) Environment and population change. Derouaux Ordina Editions, Liège



## Appendix

### A1. Summary statistics and correlations for low-income countries

#### Least Developed countries

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Obs.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>	
<b>lco2</b>	1512	7.468	2.116	1.298	14.057	
<b>Lyh</b>	1292	6.855	0.498	5.393	8.147	
<b>Lp</b>	1653	15.869	1.576	11.316	20.814	
<b>Pupc</b>	1653	0.260	0.125	0.032	0.616	
<b>lei1</b>	621	14.689	0.641	13.147	16.276	
<b>Lia</b>	1307	2.994	0.404	0.632	4.072	
<u>Correlations</u>	<u>lco2</u>	<u>lyh</u>	<u>lp</u>	<u>pupc</u>	<u>lei1</u>	<u>lia</u>
<b>lco2</b>	1.000					
<b>Lyh</b>	0.347	1.000				
<b>Lp</b>	0.794	0.076	1.000			
<b>Pupc</b>	0.107	0.441	-0.234	1.000		
<b>lei1</b>	0.026	0.634	0.136	0.104	1.000	
<b>Lia</b>	0.435	0.244	0.140	0.336	-0.146	1.000

### A2. Summary statistics and correlations for lower-middle-income countries

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Obs.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>	
<b>lco2</b>	2330	8.694	2.528	1.298	15.237	
<b>Lyh</b>	1401	7.931	0.580	5.435	9.109	
<b>Lp</b>	2632	15.168	2.086	9.616	20.989	
<b>Pupc</b>	2632	0.433	0.170	0.034	0.861	
<b>lei1</b>	986	15.109	0.582	12.981	16.315	
<b>Lia</b>	1653	3.365	0.409	0.929	4.435	
<u>Correlations</u>	<u>lco2</u>	<u>lyh</u>	<u>lp</u>	<u>pupc</u>	<u>lei1</u>	<u>lia</u>
<b>lco2</b>	1					
<b>Lyh</b>	0.2535	1				
<b>Lp</b>	0.8526	-0.001	1			
<b>Pupc</b>	0.1067	0.543	-0.173	1		
<b>lei1</b>	-0.173	0.509	0.004	0.118	1	
<b>Lia</b>	0.42	-0.001	0.311	0.062	-0.257	1

### A3. Summary statistics and correlations for upper-middle-income countries

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Obs.</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>	
<b>lco2</b>	1590	8.655	3.012	1.991	14.719	
<b>Lyh</b>	916	8.586	0.605	6.538	9.930	
<b>Lp</b>	1668	14.611	2.182	9.888	18.817	
<b>Pupc</b>	1656	0.5278	0.196	0.031	0.934	
<b>lei1</b>	602	15.071	0.520	13.937	16.211	
<b>Lia</b>	1075	3.454	0.414	2.043	4.4878	
<u>Correlations</u>	<u>lco2</u>	<u>lyh</u>	<u>lp</u>	<u>pupc</u>	<u>lei1</u>	<u>lia</u>
<b>lco2</b>	1					
<b>Lyh</b>	0.2419	1				
<b>Lp</b>	0.8961	0.0407	1			
<b>Pupc</b>	0.2124	0.2426	0.309	1		
<b>lei1</b>	-0.3570	0.2246	-0.0741	0.3082	1	
<b>Lia</b>	0.0200	0.009	-0.1720	-0.1527	-0.3687	1

Table A.4. Generalized least squares estimation results with population weights (various years/ low-income countries)

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2003</b>
<b>lyh</b>	-0.388 (-0.40)	-0.202 (-0.20)	-0.133 (-0.29)	1.156*** -3.89	1.402*** -3.9	1.468*** -5.24	1.444*** -4.69
<b>lp</b>	1.159*** (19.7)	1.188*** (22.66)	1.229*** (13.76)	1.159*** (15.68)	1.145*** (17.14)	1.149*** (16.55)	1.148*** (14.29)
<b>pupc</b>	6.277* (1.89)	6.689** (2.50)	7.747*** (5.15)	4.596** (3.12)	3.983** (2.52)	3.198** (2.11)	3.526** (2.63)
<b>lia</b>	0.780 (1.14)	0.934** (2.19)	1.158** (2.22)	1.011*** (2.97)	0.670* (1.81)	0.496 (1.44)	0.207 (0.54)
<b>Constant</b>	-12.42** (-2.11)	-14.69** (-2.30)	-16.84*** (-6.87)	-23.29*** (-16.43)	-23.78*** (-13.38)	-23.81*** (-15.65)	-22.96*** (-14.93)
<b>Observations</b>	27	30	35	41	44	46	46
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.953	0.963	0.972	0.964	0.963	0.959	0.956

Note: *lyh* denotes per-capita income, *lp* denotes population, *pupc* is the percentage of urban population over total population and *lia* is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP.  
*t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively.

Table A.5. Generalized least squares estimation results with population weights (various years/ lower-middle-income countries)

	1975	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2003
<b>lyh</b>	-0.323 (-0.99)	-0.209 (-0.49)	-0.067 (-0.12)	0.667 (1.41)	0.325 (1.15)	1.159*** (4.14)	0.921** (2.27)
<b>lp</b>	0.882*** (7.78)	1.046*** (7.46)	1.139*** (8.52)	1.145*** (9.34)	0.988*** (11.42)	0.926*** (23.19)	0.861*** (11.55)
<b>pupc</b>	2.495* (1.75)	2.195 (1.26)	1.055 (0.65)	-0.227 (-0.15)	0.280 (0.28)	-0.028 (-0.04)	-0.993 (-1.02)
<b>lia</b>	2.549*** (3.70)	1.072 (1.13)	0.532 (0.56)	1.500 (1.48)	1.728** (2.39)	1.610*** (4.01)	1.137*** (3.16)
<b>Constant</b>	-12.70*** (-5.92)	-10.84** (-2.89)	-11.05** (-2.41)	-19.62*** (-3.66)	-15.05*** (-5.30)	-20.34*** (-9.94)	-32.58*** (-5.05)
<b>Observations</b>	26	30	33	44	49	49	47
<b>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.980	0.958	0.947	0.913	0.941	0.963	0.969

Note: *lyh* denotes per-capita income, *lp* denotes population, *pupc* is the percentage of urban population over total population and *lia* is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP. *t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively.

Table A.6. Generalized least squares estimation results with population weights (various years/ upper-middle-income countries)

	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2003</b>
lyh	0.817* (1.79)	0.628 (1.66)	0.796** (2.33)	1.410*** (9.28)	0.693* (1.82)	0.479 (1.5)	0.585* (1.82)
lp	1.066*** (5.04)	1.160*** (13.69)	1.176*** (20.45)	1.230*** (30.95)	1.231*** (18.46)	1.231*** (16.19)	1.271*** (13.76)
pupc	-1.157 (-0.90)	-0.393 (-0.74)	-1.430*** (-2.77)	-1.063** (-2.08)	-0.258 (-0.39)	-0.88 (-1.60)	-1.760** (-2.20)
lia	0.894 (1.44)	1.234** (2.66)	1.688*** (3.16)	1.387*** (7.57)	2.520*** (4.98)	1.466*** (3.46)	1.289*** (3.49)
Constant	-15.82*** (-3.63)	-17.70*** (-12.90)	-20.56*** (-12.97)	-25.89*** (-20.57)	-24.04*** (-4.82)	-18.10*** (-4.55)	-18.51*** (-4.54)
Observations	11	21	26	33	34	34	34
Adjusted $R^2$	0.842	0.946	0.946	0.978	0.942	0.934	0.926

Note: lyh denotes per capita income, lp denotes population, pupc is the percentage of urban population over total population and lia is the percentage of industrial activity over total GDP. *t*-statistics are in brackets. \*, \*\*, \*\*\* denote significance at the 10, 5, and 1% level, respectively.

## A.7. Lists of countries in each group

<b><u>Low income</u></b>	<b><u>Lower-middle income</u></b>	<b><u>Upper-middle income</u></b>
Bangladesh	Albania	Argentina
Benin	Algeria	<b>Belize</b>
Burkina Faso	Angola	Botswana
Burundi	Armenia	Chile
Cambodia	Azerbaijan	Costa Rica
Central African Republic	Belarus	Croatia
<b>Chad</b>	Bolivia	Czech Republic
<b>Comoros</b>	Brazil	Dominica
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Bulgaria	<b>Equatorial Guinea</b>
Cote d'Ivoire	Cameroon	Estonia
<b>Eritrea</b>	<b>Cape Verde</b>	Gabon
Ethiopia	China	<b>Grenada</b>
Gambia, The	Colombia	Hungary
Ghana	Congo, Rep.	Latvia
<b>Guinea</b>	<b>Djibouti</b>	Lebanon
<b>Guinea-Bissau</b>	<b>Dominican Republic</b>	Lithuania
Haiti	Ecuador	Malaysia
India	Egypt, Arab Rep.	<b>Mauritius</b>
Kenya	El Salvador	Mexico
Kyrgyz Republic	Fiji	Oman
<b>Lao PDR</b>	Georgia	Panama
<b>Madagascar</b>	Guatemala	Poland
<b>Malawi</b>	<b>Guyana</b>	Romania
<b>Mali</b>	Honduras	Russian Federation
<b>Mauritania</b>	Indonesia	<b>Seychelles</b>
<b>Mongolia</b>	Iran, Islamic Rep.	Slovak Republic
Mozambique	Jamaica	South Africa
Nepal	Jordan	
<b>Niger</b>	Kazakhstan	<b>St. Lucia</b>
Nigeria	<b>Kiribati</b>	
Pakistan	<b>Lesotho</b>	
Papua New Guinea	Macedonia, FYR	Turkey
<b>Rwanda</b>	<b>Micronesia, Fed. Sts.</b>	Uruguay
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>		
Senegal	Moldova	Venezuela, RB
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	Morocco	
Solomon Islands	Namibia	
Sudan	Nicaragua	
Tajikistan	Paraguay	
Tanzania	Peru	
Togo	Philippines	
<b>Uganda</b>	<b>Samoa</b>	
Uzbekistan	Sri Lanka	
Vietnam	<b>Suriname</b>	
	<b>Swaziland</b>	
Yemen, Rep.	Syrian Arab Republic	
Zambia	Thailand	
	<b>Tonga</b>	
	Tunisia	
	Ukraine	

Source: World Development Indicators 2007. For countries in **bold** energy efficiency was not available.

# CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see [www.cesifo-group.org/wp](http://www.cesifo-group.org/wp)

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, [office@cesifo.de](mailto:office@cesifo.de))

---

- 2313 Ronel Elul and Piero Gottardi, Bankruptcy: Is it enough to Forgive or must we also Forget?, May 2008
- 2314 Andreas Irmen and Johanna Kuehnel, Productive Government Expenditure and Economic Growth, May 2008
- 2315 Beate Henschel, Carsten Pohl and Marcel Thum, Demographic Change and Regional Labour Markets: The Case of Eastern Germany, May 2008
- 2316 Gabriel Felbermayr, Wido Geis and Wilhelm Kohler, Restrictive Immigration Policy in Germany: Pains and Gains Foregone?, May 2008
- 2317 Michael Hofmann, Gerhard Kempkes and Helmut Seitz, Demographic Change and Public Sector Budgets in a Federal System, May 2008
- 2318 Paul De Grauwe, Macroeconomic Modeling when Agents are Imperfectly Informed, June 2008
- 2319 Johann K. Brunner and Susanne Pech, Optimum Taxation of Inheritances, June 2008
- 2320 Thomas Eichner and Marco Runkel, Corporate Income Taxation of Multinationals in a General Equilibrium Model, June 2008
- 2321 Rainald Borck and Matthias Wrede, Subsidies for Intracity and Intercity Commuting, June 2008
- 2322 Patricia Apps and Ray Rees, Testing the Pareto Efficiency of Household Resource Allocations, June 2008
- 2323 Amihai Glazer, Vesa Kannianen and Panu Poutvaara, Firms' Ethics, Consumer Boycotts, and Signalling, June 2008
- 2324 Claudia M. Buch, Jörg Döpke and Kerstin Stahn, Great Moderation at the Firm Level? Unconditional vs. Conditional Output Volatility, June 2008
- 2325 Helmuth Cremer, Philippe De Donder, Dario Maldonado and Pierre Pestieau, Forced Saving, Redistribution and Nonlinear Social Security Schemes, June 2008
- 2326 M. Hashem Pesaran and Paolo Zaffaroni, Optimal Asset Allocation with Factor Models for Large Portfolios, June 2008
- 2327 Harald Badinger and Peter Egger, Horizontal versus Vertical Interdependence in Multinational Activity, June 2008

- 2328 Jan K. Brueckner and Harris Selod, A Theory of Urban Squatting and Land-Tenure Formalization in Developing Countries, June 2008
- 2329 Paolo M. Panteghini, Corporate Debt, Hybrid Securities and the Effective Tax Rate, June 2008
- 2330 Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Juncal Cuñado and Luis A. Gil-Alana, Modelling Long-Run Trends and Cycles in Financial Time Series Data, June 2008
- 2331 Avi Ben-Bassat and Momi Dahan, Social Identity and Voter Turnout, June 2008
- 2332 Martin R. West and Ludger Wößmann, “Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School”: Historical Resistance to State Schooling, Contemporary Private Competition, and Student Achievement across Countries, June 2008
- 2333 Erkki Koskela and Panu Poutvaara, Outsourcing and Labor Taxation in Dual Labor Markets, June 2008
- 2334 Philippe Choné and Laurent Linnemer, Optimal Litigation Strategies with Signaling and Screening, June 2008
- 2335 Albert Solé-Ollé and Pilar Sorribas-Navarro, Does Partisan Alignment Affect the Electoral Reward of Intergovernmental Transfers?, June 2008
- 2336 Antonio Cabrales and Piero Gottardi, Markets for Information: Of Inefficient Firewalls and Efficient Monopolies, June 2008
- 2337 Sumon Majumdar and Sharun W. Mukand, The Leader as Catalyst – on Leadership and the Mechanics of Institutional Change, June 2008
- 2338 Ulrich Hange, Tax Competition, Elastic Labor Supply, and Growth, June 2008
- 2339 Guy Laroque and Bernard Salanié, Does Fertility Respond to Financial Incentives?, June 2008
- 2340 Adriano Paggiaro, Enrico Rettore and Ugo Trivellato, The Effect of Extending the Duration of Eligibility in an Italian Labour Market Programme for Dismissed Workers, June 2008
- 2341 Helmut Seitz, Minimum Standards, Fixed Costs and Taxing Autonomy of Subnational Governments, June 2008
- 2342 Robert S. Chirinko, Leo de Haan and Elmer Sterken, Asset Price Shocks, Real Expenditures, and Financial Structure: A Multi-Country Analysis, July 2008
- 2343 Wolfgang Leininger, Evolutionarily Stable Preferences in Contests, July 2008
- 2344 Hartmut Egger and Udo Kreickemeier, Fairness, Trade, and Inequality, July 2008

- 2345 Ngo Van Long and Bodhisattva Sengupta, Yardstick Competition, Corruption, and Electoral Incentives, July 2008
- 2346 Florian Baumann, Employment Protection: The Case of Limited Enforceability, July 2008
- 2347 Alessandro Balestrino, Cinzia Ciardi and Claudio Mammini, On the Causes and Consequences of Divorce, July 2008
- 2348 Dirk Schindler and Benjamin Weigert, Insuring Educational Risk: Opportunities versus Income, July 2008
- 2349 Lammertjan Dam and Ben J. Heijdra, The Environmental and Macroeconomic Effects of Socially Responsible Investment, July 2008
- 2350 Avner Greif, Contract Enforcement and Institutions among the Maghribi Traders: Refuting Edwards and Ogilvie, July 2008
- 2351 Helmuth Cremer, Philippe De Donder, Dario Maldonado and Pierre Pestieau, Habit Formation and Labor Supply, July 2008
- 2352 Francesco Menoncin and Paolo M. Panteghini, The Johansson-Samuelson Theorem in General Equilibrium: A Rebuttal, July 2008
- 2353 Michael Kaganovich and Itzhak Zilcha, Alternative Social Security Systems and Growth, July 2008
- 2354 Keith Blackburn, Kyriakos C. Neanidis and M. Emranul Haque, Corruption, Seigniorage and Growth: Theory and Evidence, July 2008
- 2355 Edward Castronova, A Test of the Law of Demand in a Virtual World: Exploring the Petri Dish Approach to Social Science, July 2008
- 2356 Harald Badinger and Peter Egger, GM Estimation of Higher-Order Spatial Autoregressive Processes in Cross-Section Models with Heteroskedastic Disturbances, July 2008
- 2357 Wolfgang Buchholz and Jan Schumacher, Discounting the Long-Distant Future: A Simple Explanation for the Weitzman-Gollier-Puzzle, July 2008
- 2358 Luca Anderlini, Leonardo Felli and Alessandro Riboni, Statute Law or Case Law?, July 2008
- 2359 Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Davide Ciferri and Alessandro Girardi, Are the Baltic Countries Ready to Adopt the Euro? A Generalised Purchasing Power Parity Approach, July 2008
- 2360 Erkki Koskela and Ronnie Schöb, Outsourcing of Unionized Firms and the Impacts of Labour Market Policy Reforms, July 2008



- 2361 Francisco Alvarez-Cuadrado and Ngo Van Long, A Permanent Income Version of the Relative Income Hypothesis, July 2008
- 2362 Gabrielle Demange, Robert Fenge and Silke Uebelmesser, Financing Higher Education and Labor Mobility, July 2008
- 2363 Alessandra Casarico and Alessandro Sommacal, Labor Income Taxation, Human Capital and Growth: The Role of Child Care, August 2008
- 2364 Antonis Adam, Manthos D. Delis and Pantelis Kammass, Fiscal Decentralization and Public Sector Efficiency: Evidence from OECD Countries, August 2008
- 2365 Stefan Voigt, The (Economic) Effects of Lay Participation in Courts – A Cross-Country Analysis, August 2008
- 2366 Tobias König and Andreas Wagener, (Post-)Materialist Attitudes and the Mix of Capital and Labour Taxation, August 2008
- 2367 Ximing Wu, Andreas Savvides and Thanasis Stengos, The Global Joint Distribution of Income and Health, August 2008
- 2368 Alejandro Donado and Klaus Wälde, Trade Unions Go Global!, August 2008
- 2369 Hans Gersbach and Hans Haller, Exit and Power in General Equilibrium August 2008
- 2370 Jan P.A.M. Jacobs and Jan-Egbert Sturm, The Information Content of KOF Indicators on Swiss Current Account Data Revisions, August 2008
- 2371 Oliver Hülsewig, Johannes Mayr and Timo Wollmershäuser, Forecasting Euro Area Real GDP: Optimal Pooling of Information, August 2008
- 2372 Tigran Poghosyan and Jakob de Haan, Determinants of Cross-Border Bank Acquisitions in Transition Economies: A Latent Class Analysis, August 2008
- 2373 David Anthoff and Richard S.J. Tol, On International Equity Weights and National Decision Making on Climate Change, August 2008
- 2374 Florian Englmaier and Arno Schmöller, Reserve Price Formation in Online Auctions, August 2008
- 2375 Karl Farmer, Birgit Friedl and Andreas Rainer, Effects of Unilateral Climate Policy on Terms of Trade, Capital Accumulation, and Welfare in a World Economy, August 2008
- 2376 Monika Bütler, Stefan Staubli and Maria Grazia Zito, The Role of the Annuity's Value on the Decision (Not) to Annuitize: Evidence from a Large Policy Change, August 2008
- 2377 Inmaculada Martínez-Zarzoso, The Impact of Urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions: Evidence from Developing Countries, August 2008