ECONSTOR
Make Your Publication Visible

A Service of

ZBW Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Kalchev, Georgi

Conference Paper

Environmental Kuznets Curve in Bulgaria

Suggested Citation: Kalchev, Georgi (2016) : Environmental Kuznets Curve in Bulgaria, In: International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Science Studies ICISSS 2016 (Oxford) Conference Proceedings, ISBN 978-1-911185-02-4, FLE Learning, London, pp. 66-71

This Version is available at:
http://hdl.handle.net/10419/148324

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.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Environmental Kuznets Curve in Bulgaria

Georgi Kalchev

American University in Bulgaria

Corresponding author: gdkaltchev@yahoo.com

Keywords: environment, Environmental Kuznets Curve, pollution, GDP-per-capita

Abstract

This paper carries out an empirical test of the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis with Bulgarian data on pollution and GDP per capita for the years 1970-2008. The existence of such a curve is confirmed in most cases.

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Kuznets Curve represents an inverted-U relationship between a certain pollution indicator and GDP per capita. The idea is that at low levels of income, pollution will be increasing, while at high levels of income pollution will be decreasing. A turning point will be reached, after which pollution is diminishing.

Grossman and Krueger (1991) first introduced the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) hypothesis for different environmental indicators such as CO2 emissions. It was well received, especially by international organizations responsible for public policy. The idea is indeed very appealing that economic growth resolves environmental problems. 'The idea that economic growth is necessary in order for environmental quality to be maintained or improved is an essential part of the sustainable development argument promulgated by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) in *Our Common Future.* It is believed that as society becomes more developed, more resources will be devoted to environmental improvement. Society can and will invest in the environment. Beckerman (1992, p 482) maintains that "there is clear evidence that, although economic growth usually leads to environmental degradation in the early stages of the process, in the end the best – and probably the only – way to attain a decent environment in most countries is to become rich."

David Stern (2000), though, believes that EKC is mostly an empirical phenomenon backed by not very good econometrics: "The EKC idea rose to prominence because few paid sufficient attention to econometric diagnostic statistics. Little or no attention has been paid to the statistical properties of the data used such as serial dependence or stochastic trends in time series and few tests of model adequacy have been carried out or presented. However, one of the main purposes of doing econometrics is to test which apparent relationships, or "stylized facts", are valid and which are spurious correlations." Studies have been done with panel and time series data. The panel studies may not be very useful in the sense that there is no global EKC valid for all countries. In fact, evidence suggests that the turning point is different for different countries. Single country studies have been employing unit root and cointegration testing to uncover the true relationship between pollution and income series and to avoid spurious regressions.

Empirical studies have produced mixed results. Multiple country studies employ panel data econometrics, while single country studies employ time series analysis. However, in recent time there has been a concern about unit roots in panel data too with large datasets. Grossman and Krueger (1995) used panel data analysis to confirm the existence of the Environmental Kuznets Curve. Panel data analysis is subject to criticisms in favor of time series analysis of one country. The panel data approach suggests that all countries will follow the same pollution trajectory and there will be a common EKC among countries, which does not appear to be the case. In addition, panels use a short time span typically. The EKC is essentially a long term phenomenon, since the economy needs time to reach the turning point of the EKC.

Among the time-series studies, Perman and Stern (2003) consider sulphur emissions for many countries both at an individual level, and then at a panel level. Using the Engle-Granger (1987) method they find that a long-run cointegrating relationship only exists in 35 out of 74 countries. Other studies employ the Pesaran et al. (2001) Autoregressive Distributed Lag bounds testing approach to cointegration allowing both I(1) and I(0) variables in the relationship. Ang (2007) confirms the EKC hypothesis with French CO2 emissions over 1960-2000. He (2003) reports that there is no one-fit-for-all EKC. The turning points found in different studies are strikingly different, even where EKC is confirmed to exist. That implies that individual country studies are worthwhile. Jalil et al. (2010) suggest that a time series analysis for a single country may provide better framework to study the relationship.

The unit roots tests typically performed are ones that do not account for structural breaks in the data. In the case of Bulgaria, it is particularly reasonable to expect a structural break, given the change from communism to democracy and dynamic change of the economic system. Therefore the Zivot-Andrews unit root test will be employed here, which allows for unknown one-time structural break in the slope, intercept or both. Bulgaria is also a low-income transition economy.

Regressing lnCO2percapita on lnGDPpercapita and its square, it turns out that the residuals have a unit root with a structural break. The variables are not cointegrated in levels and in logs.

DATA AND VARIABLES

In this study on Bulgaria, we focus on five pollutants: carbon dioxide (CO2), sulphur dixide (SO2), methane (CH4), ammonia (NH3), nitrous oxide (N2O). The time-series data cover the span 1970-2008. GDP per capita is measured in International Geary Khamis dollars

Many of the reported turning points for different environmental degradation indicators were at a level greater than the current per capita income of most countries (e.g. $4000-$5000 in Grossman and Krueger (1991), $8709 in Selden and Song (1994)).

In Bulgaria, a graph of CO2 per capita pollution looks like this:



A graph of GDP per capita looks like that:



The basic model is

- $(ln(CO2/pop)_t = \alpha + \delta_t + \beta_1 ln(GDP/pop)_t + \beta_2 (ln\ (GDP/pop)_t)^2 + \varepsilon_t$
-

Where we have CO2 pollution per capita regressed on GDP per capita, (GDP per capita) squared in logarithms and a time trend. To obtain the predicted inverse-U relationship, we need $\beta_1 > 0$ *and* $\beta_2 < 0$.Breusch-Godfrey test reveals serial correlation. For that reason, we use Newey-West standard errors.

RESULTS

Here are the results from the Newey-West regression using ln(CO2/pop) as a dependent variable:

N=39, F(3,35)=20.58

Ln(CO2capita)	Coefficient	Newey-West std. error	t	P>|t|
Ln(GDPcapita)	29.098	13.159	2.21	0.034
Ln(GDPcapita) squared	-1.635	.750	-2.18	0.036
T	-.008	.002	-3.5	0.001
constant	-126.979	57.741	-2.2	0.035

For this pollutant, we obtain the desired signs on Ln(GDPcapita) and Ln(GDPcapita) squared, thus we get the inverse-U relationship between pollution per capita and development. The partial effect of Ln(GDPcapita) on Ln(CO2capita) is equal to 29.098-3.27ln(GDPcapita). Thus the turning point is equal to 7,259.

The results with sulphur dioxide are the following:

N=32, F(3, 28)=43.77

Ln(SO2capita)	Coefficient	Newey-West std. error	t	P>|t|
Ln(GDPcapita)	-149.192	67.216	-2.22	0.035
Ln(GDPcapita) squared	8.722	3.893	2.24	0.033
T	-012	.004	-3.19	0.003
constant	635.699	290.149	2.19	0.037

Now instead of an inverse-U relationship, we obtain a U-relationship between pollution per capita and GDP per capita. There is increasing SO2 pollution, as income increases. That is contrary to the Kuznets environmental curve theory.

Next, we have the results with methane:

N=39, F(3,35=8.42

Ln(CH4capita)	Coefficient	Newey-West std. error	t	P>|t|
Ln(GDPcapita)	24.401	11.092	2.20	0.035
Ln(GDPcapita) squared	-1.3995	0.634	-2.21	0.034
T	.01	.002	4.49	0.000
constant	-109.106	48.557	-2.25	0.031

Here the existence of inverse-U relationship is confirmed with β_1 being positive and β_2 being negative. The turning point seems to occur at 6063.

The results with ammonia are the following:

Ln(NH3capita)	Coefficient	Newey-West std. error	t	P>|t|
Ln(GDPcapita)	63.026	30.38	2.07	0.045
Ln(GDPcapita) squared	-3.575	1.74	-2.05	0.047
T	-0.03	.007	-4.56	0
constant	-281.399	132.66	-2.12	0.041

Here the existence of EKC is confirmed. The turning point occurs at GDP per capita of 6634.

The results with nitrous oxide look like that:

Ln(N2Ocapita)	Coefficient	Newey-West std. error	t	P>|t|
Ln(GDPcapita)	43.047	30.56	1.41	0.168
Ln(GDPcapita) squared	-2.443	1.74	-1.4	0.169
T	-.028	.005	-5.5	0
constant	-194.73	134.17	-1.45	0.156

EKC is confirmed once again. The turning point is around 6634.

Conclusion

We observe that for most pollutants we obtain a relationship resembling an Environmental Kuznets Curve. The only exception is sulphur dioxide. The turning points seems to be rather high, though, at GDP per capira of above 6000. The evidence points towards an inverse-U shaped relationship between pollution per capita and income per capita.

REFERENCES

Ang, J., 2007. "A Survey Of Recent Developments In The Literature Of Finance And Growth," Monash Economics Working Papers 03-07, Monash University, Department of Economics.

Beckerman, W. 1992. Economic Growth and the Environment: Whose Growth? Whose Environment? *World Development*, 20(4): 481-496.

Grossman, G. and A. Krueger. 1991. “Environmental Impacts of a North American Free Trade Agreement.” NBER Working paper No. 3914.

Grossman, G. M., & Krueger, A. B. 1995. “Economic Growth and the Environment.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 110(2): 353-377.

Perman, R., & Stern, D. I. 2003. “Evidence from panel unit root and cointegration tests that the environmental Kuznets curve does not exist.” *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 47(325-347).

M. Hashem Pesaran & Yongcheol Shin & Richard J. Smith, 2001. "Bounds testing approaches to the analysis of level relationships," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., vol. 16(3), pages 289-326.

Shahbaz, Muhammad and Jalil, Abdul and Dube, Smile (2010): *Environmental Kuznets curve (EKC): Times series evidence from Portugal.* Munich Personal RePEc Archive.

Selden, T. M., & Song, D. 1994. Environmental Quality and Development: Is there a Kuznets Curve for Air Pollution Emissions? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 27(147-162).

Stern, D. I. 2000. Applying recent developments in time series econometrics to the spatial domain. *Professional Geographer*, 52: 37-49.

World Commission on Environment and Development 1987. *Our Common Future*