# Studying the Effects of Economic and Financial Development as well as Institutional Quality on Environmental Destruction in the Upper-Middle Income Countries

Morteza Raei Dehaghi, Seyed Mohammad Mirhashemi

Abstract—The current study explored the effect of economic development, financial development and institutional quality on environmental destruction in uppe r-middle income countries during the time period of 1999-2011. The dependent variable is logarithm of carbon dioxide emis sions that can be considered as an index for destruction or quality of the environment given to its effects on the environment. Financial development and institutional development variables as well as some control variables were considered. In order to study cross-sectional correlation among the countries under study, Pesaran and Friz test was used. Since the results of both tests show cross-sectional correlation in the countries under study, seemingly unrelated regression method was utilized for model estim ation. The results disclosed that Kuznets' environmental curve hy pothesis is confirmed in upper-m iddle income countries and also, financial development and institutional quality have a significant effect on environmental quality. The results of this study can be considered by policy makers in countries with different incom e groups to have access to a growth accompanied by improved environmental quality.

*Keywords*—Economic Development, Environmental Destruction, Financial Development, Institutional Development, Seemingly Unrelated Regression.

JEL classification: Q5, O17, O13, F18, C23

## I. INTRODUCTION

**P**AYING attention to the environment and trying to decrease environmental pollutions is one of the policies that has been considered across the world in recent years. Given to the 2007 World Bank's report, in the year 1990, the biggest producers of carbon dioxide in the world were America with 23%, Japan with 5.75%, OECD countries with 24%, China with 11%, India with 3%, Brazil with 0.94%, and Russia with 3.80%. However, the figures for America and Japan were decreased to 22% and 5% respectively in 2 007 and those of China, India, Brazil and Russia were increased to 16%, 5%, 1.15%, and 6% respectively. While evidences show that energy consumption has been reduced along with economic development, the fact that increasing the production

in the economy, increases or decreases in the pollution in some of these countries is uncertain [1].

The relation between environmental pollution and economic development has been explored in numerous studies. Some studies have confirmed environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis for a number of pollutants so that pollution is increased by increasing income per capita and then it is decreased [2]-[4]. These authors showed that testing of Kuznets's environmental curve hypothesis for different explanations does not led to similar results. Stern provided the brief history of Kuznets's environmental curve hypothesis in his paper and asserted that some other deficiency measurement like dependence correlation, bias of omitted variables and the issues related to co-integration analysis have to be considered except those issues that are related to model explanation. Therefore, policy makers should pay attention to the opinions of those who agree and disagree with Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis; because this curve has been converted into one of the important national and international issues [5].

It is noteworthy that the relationship between economic growth and environmental pollution has been explored in most of the studies. The present study explores the effect of financial and institutional development as two most important and effective factors on environmental pollution. The most important reason to explore financial development is that it causes to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) which can accelerate economic growth [6]. The second reason is that financial development provides a motivation and an opportunity to use modern technologies with less pollution [7]. The third reason is that financial development leads to economic growth which may create more industrial pollutions [8].

On the other hand, a stro ng organizational system is important for financial and economic development. Also, countries with strong organizational structure can control greenhouse gas emissions [9].

Thus, economic, financial and institutional development can affect the environment; so, it seems necessary to explore their effects on the environment. In this study, it has been answered to the following questions in upper-middle income countries:

1. Does financial development affect the environment?

Morteza Raei Dehaghi is an Assistant Professor of Department of Industrial Management, College of Management and Accounting, Mobarakeh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mobarakeh, Isfahan, Iran Phone: +98-313-4425161; Fax: +98-31-34393852; e-mail: dr\_mraeidehaghi@yahoo.com.ph.

Seyed Mohammad Mirhashemi is a PhD Student of Economic Science, University of Shiraz.

- 2. Can institutional development improve environmental quality?
- 3. Is Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis confirmed?

This paper contains five section s. First section is introduction. Theoretical principles and some previous studies presented in Section II. Methods of data analysis are mentioned and interpreted in Section III. The results are presented in Section IV and summary of the study as well as general results are proposed in the last section.

## II. THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES

The relation between environment pollution and economic growth has been explored in numerous studies. According to Meadow et al., studies, despite that economic growth is a threat for the environment in long-term, it is necessary to improve the environmental quality. But what is certain is that concern about reverse effects of economic growth on environmental pollution is incr easing every day [1 0]. Anderson explored the relation between economic growth and environmental pollution. According to him, what causes one overcomes the other in the relation between economic growth and environmental pollution is not similar in various policies and this relation can be affected by adopting special policies [11]-[14]. This is very important for countries that want to achieve a high economic growth and also be consistent with the environment. Researchers [15] suggested that there is a dynamic relationship between the environment, utilization of natural resources and economic activities. They pointed out that while using the resources, especially energy that leads to economic growth, has negative effects on the environment in long-term.

What has been stated in various studies is that net effects of economic growth on environmental quality depend on the kind of pollution [16]-[18]. For instance, there is a reverse Ushape relation between economic growth and environmental pollution for some pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide [7]. Selden and Song studied Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis for pollutants such as sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide and found similar results. [13].

Financial development can play a significant role in improvement of the environment. A more developed financial sector can facilitate investment in environmental projects. Financing environmental protection projects by public sectors, as part of their activities, is very important for the local, state and national government. Financial development is very important for the private sector too, for instance, the energy sector in CIS (Co mmonwealth of Independent States) countries has attracted a considerable portion of FDI. About 28 million dollars that are al located, relatively 60% of the Russian FDI, was in vested in the electric and gas industry in Russia in 2007. In previous years, almost 10 to 25 percent of FDI was invested in the energy sector [19].

Cleassens and Feijen pointed out that the development of the financial sector can improve environmental quality by improving the g overnance method [20]. Kumbaroglu et al. stated that financial system development stimulates investment in the energy supply sector leading to decrease pollution rate [21]. Also, the governments in developing countries can control financial markets by introducing the organized plans in order to improve environmental performance of firms [22]. Similarly, Desgupta et al. investigated reaction of investors of com panies under study that refrain from accepting national environmental rules and regulations of Korea. They found out that market value of these firms has decreased significantly. Their general results revealed that a d eveloped financial system may create a motivation to decrease carbon dioxide emissions [23].

A strong institutional system is important for success in economic and financial development [9], [24]. Countries with strong institutional framework are usually more successful in implementing the pollution rules. Pollution in poor countries with weak financial institutions is increased when economic growth is enhanced but it is decreased in poor countries which have strong financial institutions. Stokey and John and Pecchenino proposed a model in which the relation between pollution and income was considered as a reverse U-shaped curve. Maximum of this diagram is where the corner-point solution is changed into the optimal internal point despite the positive investment in pollution control [25], [26]. Lowincome countries use the most pollutant-intensive technologies; thus, pollution is increased by increasing income or consumption. When income or consumption are increased, marginal utility of consumption is decreased and it finally continuous towards the point where clean techn ologies are optimal. Therefore, pollution is decr eased if preferences towards the environmental quality are adequately high.

Congleton claimed that authoritarian countries should have lower environmental standards, because dictatorial rules have a shorter temporal durability. Therefore, a dictator maintains a more portion of national incomes but it has to cover more expenses to support the environment. In his article, Congleton suggested that a higher degree of investment increases personal income and thus consumption such as the environmental protection. On the other hand, higher income increases the cost of environmental regulations [27].

Torras and Boyce showed that with the addition of institutional factors can be a determinant in Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis. They found out that a more suitable power distribution has a positive effect on environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis. According to the stated reasons, they maintained that these factors are due to the effects of executing the rules whose purpose is to internalize external expenses arising from pollutiongenerating activities. They per ceived that literacy, political rights and freedom of citizens are effective on environmental quality in low-income countries [28]. Also, in the study of Panayotou indicated that the quality of policy-makings and institutions can d ecrease environmental destruction in lowincome countries significantly, thus increasing the environmental quality improvement in high-income countries.

Thus, Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis can become flatter through better policies. [29].

There are various studies including [30]-[36], that each one has explored the effective factors on the environmental quality in different regions and countries using different methods.

## III. METHODOLOGY AND DESCIPTION OF DATA

Levin, Lin and Chu unit root test (2002), known as LLC test and Im, Pesaran and Shin test (2003), known as IPS test were used in this study. Also, Frees test (2004) was used to test cross-sectional dependence correlation [37], [38], [39].

With regards to the current theoretical principles and conducted studies, such as [7] and [1] as well as limited access to the information, annual data of variables of carbon dioxide emissions logarithm were used as the dependent variable that can be regarded as an index for environmental destruction or quality considering its effects on the environment. Similarly, income per capita logarithm and inflation rate were considered as economic development variables; bank debt, ratio of demand deposit to total assets of bank, ratio of demand deposit to gross domestic product, total value of shares traded and foreign direct investment were considered as financial development variables; and institutional development index, the Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and the Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption were considered as institutional development variables. In order to obtain better results, two variables of energy consumption and first lag of carbon dioxide emissions were entered the m odel as control variables. The countries under study included Albania, Algeria, Ecuador, Thailand, Tunisia, Argentina, Dominican, Gabon, Russia, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Costa Rica, Ir an, Romania, Uruguay, Bulgaria, Colombia, Jamaica, Peru, Venezuela, Bosnia, China, Kazakhstan, Panama, South Africa, Belarus, Chile, Lebanon, Latvia, Brazil, Botswana, Libva, and Lithuania during the time period 1999-2011. Reviews 6 software was used to test unit root of variables and Stata 11 software was utilized to test cross-sectional correlation and estimation via seemingly unrelated regression method (SUR).

#### IV. RESULTS

As Table I shows, all variables considered for upper-middle income countries are at a stable level based on ILP and LLC tests.

TABLE I UNIT ROOT TEST OF VARIABLES IN MIDDLE TO HIGH-INCOME COUNTRIES

Ratio of bank deposit to   IPS $-5.015 (0.000)^*$ total assets   LLC $-25.086 (0.73)$ Carbon dioxide emissions   IPS $-0.190 (0.424)$ logarithm   LLC $-7.819 (0.00)$ Ratio of bank deposit to   IPS $-0.335 (0.349)$ gross domestic product   LLC $-10.330 (0.000)$ Energy consumption   IPS $-1.719 (0.042)$ logarithm   LLC $-6.94 (0.000)$ Income per capita   IPS $-1.752 (0.045)$ logarithm   LLC $-3.89 (0.000)^*$ Bank debt   IPS $-5.015 (0.000)^*$ LLC $-25.086 (0.73)$ Foreign direct investment     IPS $-0.840 (0.799)$ LLC     LLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Institutional development     IPS $-0.427 (0.334)$ ILC     index   LLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of Corruption   IPS $-5.464 (0.000)$ LLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of Corruption     LLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of Corruption     LLC $-0.681 (0.247)$ ILC  <	Variable	Unit root test	Test statistic (probability level)		
LikeL	Ratio of bank deposit to	IPS			
logarithmLLC $-7.819 (0.00)$ Ratio of bank deposit toIPS $-0.385 (0.349)$ gross domestic productLLC $-10.330 (0.000)$ Energy consumptionIPS $-1.719 (0.042)$ logarithmLLC $-6.94 (0.000)$ Income per capitaIPS $-1.752 (0.045)$ logarithmLLC $-3.89 (0.000)$ Bank debtIPS $-5.015 (0.000)^*$ LLC $-25.086 (0.73)$ Foreign direct investmentIPS $-0.840 (0.799)$ LLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Institutional developmentIPS $-0.427 (0.334)$ indexLLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of CorruptionIPS $-5.464 (0.000)$ LLC $-1.125 (0.105)$ Government EffectivenessIPS $-5.116 (0.000)$ LLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Regulatory QualityIPS $-1.220 (0.111)$ Absence of ViolenceLLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Regulatory QualityIPS $-1.430 (0.076)$ LLC $-6.845 (0.000)$ Rule of LawIPS $-2.795 (0.002)$ LLC $-6.295 (0.000)$ Voice and AccountabilityIPS $-1.207 (0.113)$ LLC $-6.295 (0.000)$ Inflation rateIPS $-3.207 (0.000)$	total assets	LLC	-25.086 (0.73)		
Ratio of bank deposit to gross domestic productIPS $-0.385 (0.349)$ $= 1.719 (0.000)$ Energy consumptionIPS $-1.719 (0.042)$ $= 1.719 (0.042)$ logarithmLLC $-6.94 (0.000)$ Income per capitaIPS $-1.752 (0.045)$ $= 1.752 (0.045)$ logarithmLLC $-3.89 (0.000)^*$ 		IPS	-0.190 (0.424)		
gross domestic productLLC $-10.330 (0.000)$ Energy consumptionIPS $-1.719 (0.042)$ logarithmLLC $-6.94 (0.000)$ Income per capitaIPS $-1.752 (0.045)$ logarithmLLC $-3.89 (0.000)$ Bank debtIPS $-5.015 (0.000)^*$ LLC $-25.086 (0.73)$ Foreign direct investmentIPS $-0.840 (0.799)$ LLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Institutional developmentIPS $-0.427 (0.334)$ indexLLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of CorruptionIPS $-5.464 (0.000)$ LLC $-1.125 (0.105)$ Government EffectivenessGovernment EffectivenessIPS $-5.116 (0.000)$ LLC $-0.681 (0.247)$ Political Stability and theIPS $-1.220 (0.111)$ Absence of ViolenceLLC $-2.189 (0.004)$ Regulatory QualityIPS $-1.430 (0.076)$ LLC $-6.845 (0.000)$ LLCLLC $-6.845 (0.000)$ Rule of LawIPS $-2.795 (0.002)$ LLC $-1.0122 (0.000)$ Voice and AccountabilityIPS $-1.207 (0.113)$ LLC $-6.295 (0.000)$ Inflation rateIPS $-3.207 (0.000)$		LLC	-7.819 (0.00)		
Energy consumptionIPS $-1.719 (0.042)$ logarithmLLC $-6.94 (0.000)$ Income per capitaIPS $-1.752 (0.045)$ logarithmLLC $-3.89 (0.000)$ Bank debtIPS $-5.015 (0.000)^*$ LLC $-25.086 (0.73)$ Foreign direct investmentIPS $-0.840 (0.799)$ LLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Institutional developmentIPS $-0.427 (0.334)$ indexLLC $-0.840 (0.799)$ Control of CorruptionIPS $-5.464 (0.000)$ LLC $-1.125 (0.105)$ Government EffectivenessIPS $-5.116 (0.000)$ LLC $-0.681 (0.247)$ Political Stability and theIPS $-1.220 (0.111)$ Absence of ViolenceLLC $-2.189 (0.014)$ Regulatory QualityIPS $-1.430 (0.076)$ LLC $-6.845 (0.000)$ Rule of LawIPS $-2.795 (0.002)$ LLC $-1.0122 (0.000)$ Voice and AccountabilityIPS $-1.207 (0.113)$ LLC $-6.295 (0.000)$ Inflation rateIPS $-3.207 (0.000)$		IPS	-0.385 (0.349)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		LLC	-10.330 (0.000)		
Income per capita   IPS   -1.752 (0.045)     logarithm   LLC   -3.89 (0.000)     Bank debt   IPS   -5.015 (0.000)*     LLC   -25.086 (0.73)     Foreign direct investment   IPS   -0.840 (0.799)     LLC   -25.086 (0.73)     Foreign direct investment   IPS   -0.840 (0.799)     LLC   -2.189 (0.014)     Institutional development   IPS   -0.427 (0.334)     index   LLC   -0.840 (0.799)     Control of Corruption   IPS   -5.464 (0.000)     LLC   -1.125 (0.105)   Government Effectiveness     Government Effectiveness   IPS   -5.116 (0.000)     LLC   -0.681 (0.247)   Political Stability and the     PS   -1.220 (0.111)   Absence of Violence     LLC   -6.845 (0.000)   LLC     Regulatory Quality   IPS   -1.430 (0.076)     LLC   -6.845 (0.000)   LLC     Kule of Law   IPS   -2.795 (0.002)     LLC   -10.122 (0.000)   LLC     Voice and Accountability   IPS   -1.207 (0.113)     LLC <td>Energy consumption</td> <td>IPS</td> <td>-1.719 (0.042)</td>	Energy consumption	IPS	-1.719 (0.042)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	logarithm	LLC	-6.94 (0.000)		
Bank debt     IPS     -5.015 (0.000)*       LLC     -25.086 (0.73)       Foreign direct investment     IPS     -0.840 (0.799)       LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Institutional development     IPS     -0.427 (0.334)       index     LLC     -0.840 (0.799)       Control of Corruption     IPS     -0.427 (0.334)       ILC     -0.840 (0.799)     Control of Corruption       IPS     -5.464 (0.000)     LLC       Control of Corruption     IPS     -5.464 (0.000)       LLC     -1.125 (0.105)     Government Effectiveness       Government Effectiveness     IPS     -5.116 (0.000)       LLC     -0.681 (0.247)     Political Stability and the     IPS       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)     LLC       Kule of Law     IPS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)     LLC       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)		IPS	-1.752 (0.045)		
$ \begin{array}{cccc} LLC & -25.086 (0.73) \\ -25.086 (0.73) \\ IPS & -0.840 (0.799) \\ LLC & -2.189 (0.014) \\ Institutional development & IPS & -0.427 (0.334) \\ index & LLC & -0.840 (0.799) \\ Control of Corruption & IPS & -5.464 (0.000) \\ LLC & -1.125 (0.105) \\ Government Effectiveness & IPS & -5.116 (0.000) \\ LLC & -0.681 (0.247) \\ Political Stability and the & IPS & -1.220 (0.111) \\ Absence of Violence & LLC & -2.189 (0.014) \\ Regulatory Quality & IPS & -1.430 (0.076) \\ LLC & -6.845 (0.000) \\ Rule of Law & IPS & -2.795 (0.002) \\ LLC & -10.122 (0.000) \\ Voice and Accountability & IPS & -1.207 (0.113) \\ LLC & -6.295 (0.000) \\ Inflation rate & IPS & -3.207 (0.000) \\ \end{array} $		LLC	-3.89 (0.000)		
$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mbox{Foreign direct investment} & IPS & -0.840 (0.799) \\ & LLC & -2.189 (0.014) \\ \mbox{Institutional development} & IPS & -0.427 (0.334) \\ \mbox{index} & LLC & -0.840 (0.799) \\ \mbox{Control of Corruption} & IPS & -5.464 (0.000) \\ & LLC & -1.125 (0.105) \\ \mbox{Government Effectiveness} & IPS & -5.116 (0.000) \\ & LLC & -0.681 (0.247) \\ \mbox{Political Stability and the} & IPS & -1.220 (0.111) \\ \mbox{Absence of Violence} & LLC & -2.189 (0.014) \\ \mbox{Regulatory Quality} & IPS & -1.430 (0.076) \\ & LLC & -6.845 (0.000) \\ \mbox{Rule of Law} & IPS & -2.795 (0.002) \\ & LLC & -10.122 (0.000) \\ \mbox{Voice and Accountability} & IPS & -1.207 (0.113) \\ & LLC & -6.295 (0.000) \\ \mbox{Inflation rate} & IPS & -3.207 (0.000) \\ \end{array}$	Bank debt	IPS	-5.015 (0.000)*		
LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Institutional development     IPS     -0.427 (0.334)       index     LLC     -0.840 (0.799)       Control of Corruption     IPS     -5.464 (0.000)       LLC     -1.125 (0.105)       Government Effectiveness     IPS     -5.116 (0.000)       LLC     -0.681 (0.247)       Political Stability and the     IPS     -1.220 (0.111)       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)     LLC       Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)     Voice and Accountability       IPS     -1.207 (0.113)     LLC       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)     Inflation rate		LLC	-25.086 (0.73)		
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} \mbox{IPS} & -0.427 & (0.334) \\ \mbox{index} & LLC & -0.840 & (0.799) \\ \mbox{Control of Corruption} & IPS & -5.464 & (0.000) \\ & LLC & -1.125 & (0.105) \\ \mbox{Government Effectiveness} & IPS & -5.116 & (0.000) \\ & LLC & -0.681 & (0.247) \\ \mbox{Political Stability and the} & IPS & -1.220 & (0.111) \\ \mbox{Absence of Violence} & LLC & -2.189 & (0.014) \\ \mbox{Regulatory Quality} & IPS & -1.430 & (0.076) \\ & LLC & -6.845 & (0.000) \\ \mbox{Rule of Law} & IPS & -2.795 & (0.002) \\ & LLC & -10.122 & (0.000) \\ \mbox{Voice and Accountability} & IPS & -1.207 & (0.113) \\ & LLC & -6.295 & (0.000) \\ \mbox{Inflation rate} & IPS & -3.207 & (0.000) \\ \end{array}$	Foreign direct investment	IPS	-0.840 (0.799)		
index     LLC     -0.840 (0.799)       Control of Corruption     IPS     -5.464 (0.000)       LLC     -1.125 (0.105)       Government Effectiveness     IPS     -5.116 (0.000)       LLC     -0.681 (0.247)       Political Stability and the     IPS     -1.220 (0.111)       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)     LLC       Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)     Voice and Accountability       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)     Inflation rate		LLC	-2.189 (0.014)		
Interf     ILC     -0.340 (0.799)       Control of Corruption     IPS     -5.464 (0.000)       LLC     -1.125 (0.105)       Government Effectiveness     IPS     -5.116 (0.000)       LLC     -0.681 (0.247)       Political Stability and the     IPS     -1.220 (0.111)       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)     LLC       Rule of Law     IPS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)     Voice and Accountability       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)     Inflation rate	1	IPS	-0.427 (0.334)		
$\begin{array}{c c} LLC & -1.125 \ (0.105) \\ \hline \mbox{Government Effectiveness} & IPS & -5.116 \ (0.000) \\ LLC & -0.681 \ (0.247) \\ \hline \mbox{Political Stability and the} & IPS & -1.220 \ (0.111) \\ \hline \mbox{Absence of Violence} & LLC & -2.189 \ (0.014) \\ \hline \mbox{Regulatory Quality} & IPS & -1.430 \ (0.076) \\ LLC & -6.845 \ (0.000) \\ \hline \mbox{Rule of Law} & IPS & -2.795 \ (0.002) \\ LLC & -10.122 \ (0.000) \\ \hline \mbox{Voice and Accountability} & IPS & -1.207 \ (0.113) \\ LLC & -6.295 \ (0.000) \\ \hline \mbox{Inflation rate} & IPS & -3.207 \ (0.000) \\ \end{array}$		LLC	-0.840 (0.799)		
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} Government Effectiveness & IPS & -5.116 (0.000) \\ & LLC & -0.681 (0.247) \\ Political Stability and the & IPS & -1.220 (0.111) \\ Absence of Violence & LLC & -2.189 (0.014) \\ Regulatory Quality & IPS & -1.430 (0.076) \\ & LLC & -6.845 (0.000) \\ Rule of Law & I PS & -2.795 (0.002) \\ & LLC & -10.122 (0.000) \\ Voice and Accountability & IPS & -1.207 (0.113) \\ & LLC & -6.295 (0.000) \\ Inflation rate & IPS & -3.207 (0.000) \\ \end{array} $	Control of Corruption	IPS	-5.464 (0.000)		
LLC     -0.681 (0.247)       Political Stability and the Absence of Violence     IPS     -1.220 (0.111)       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)       Rule of Law     IPS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)	-	LLC	-1.125 (0.105)		
Political Stability and the Absence of Violence     IPS     -1.220 (0.11)       Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)       Rule of Law     IPS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)	Government Effectiveness	IPS	-5.116 (0.000)		
Absence of Violence     LLC     -2.189 (0.014)       Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)       Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)		LLC	-0.681 (0.247)		
Regulatory Quality     IPS     -1.430 (0.076)       LLC     -6.845 (0.000)       Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)		IPS	-1.220 (0.111)		
LLC     -6.845 (0.000)       Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)		LLC	-2.189 (0.014)		
Rule of Law     I PS     -2.795 (0.002)       LLC     -10.122 (0.000)       Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)	Regulatory Quality	IPS	-1.430 (0.076)		
LLC -10.122 (0.000) Voice and Accountability IPS -1.207 (0.113) LLC -6.295 (0.000) Inflation rate IPS -3.207 (0.000)		LLC	-6.845 (0.000)		
Voice and Accountability     IPS     -1.207 (0.113)       LLC     -6.295 (0.000)       Inflation rate     IPS     -3.207 (0.000)	Rule of Law	I PS	-2.795 (0.002)		
LLC -6.295 (0.000) Inflation rate IPS -3.207 (0.000)		LLC	-10.122 (0.000)		
Inflation rate IPS -3.207 (0.000)	Voice and Accountability	IPS	-1.207 (0.113)		
		LLC	-6.295 (0.000)		
LLC _9 /92 (0 000)	Inflation rate	IPS	-3.207 (0.000)		
ELC -9.492 (0.000)		LLC	-9.492 (0.000)		

The figures in parentheses show significance level.

Source: Research calculations

Six models were sele cted for countries under study and Table II shows the r esults of cross-sectional dependence correlation test and model estimation. As shown in Table II, it is clear that among the economic development variables considered in upper-middle income countries, inflation does not have a significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions. But, income per capita has a positive and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions in all six esti mated models. Its coefficient changes from 0.270 to 0.396 which are stable coefficients. To test Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis, square root of income per capita was considered in models 2 to 6.

## World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Economics and Management Engineering Vol:8, No:10, 2014

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Economic development variables						
Income per capita	0/270	0/270	0/353	0/278	0/370	0/396
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	$(0/000)^{*}$	(0/069)	(0/097)	(0/097)	(0/028)	(0/030)
Square root of income per capita	-	-0/006	-0/018	-0/122	-0/170	-0/165
I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		(0/046)	(0/042)	(0/032)	(0/041)	(0/047)
Inflation	-	-	-	-	-	-0/0007
						(0/738)
Financial development variables						· /
Foreign direct investment	-0/080	-0/078	-0/073	-0/076	-0/055	-0/058
e	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/008)	(0/005)
Ratio of bank deposit to total assets	0/070	0/270	-	-	-	-
·····	(0/082)	(0/186)				
Ratio of bank deposit to gross domestic product	-	-	-0/002	-0/002	-0/002	-0/002
1 0 1			(0/036)	(0/028)	(0/026)	(0/031)
Bank debt	0/328	0/335	-0/080	-0/082	-0/087	-0/087
	(0/082)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)
Institutional development variables	( )		( )	· /	· /	· · · ·
Institutional development index	-0/113	-0/114	-	-	-	-
	(0/045)	(0/044)				
Voice and Accountability	-	-	-	-	0/040	-
5					(0/463)	
Political Stability and the Absence of Violence	-	-	-	0/075	-	-
				(0/120)		
Government Effectiveness	-	-	-0/031	-	-	-
			(0/729)			
Regulatory Quality	-	-	-	-	-0/161	-0/127
					(0/014)	(0/005)
Rule of Law Rule of law	-	-	-	-0/100	-	-
				(0/111)		
Control of Corruption	-	-	-0/112	-	-	-
			(0/174)			
Control variable						
Energy consumption	0/294	0/298	0/306	0/320	0/314	0/301
	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/063)	(0/000)
Constant	-2/936	-6/708	-9/194	-9/136	` '	-12/255
	(0/008)	(0/218)	(0/081)	(0/000)		(0/025)
Pesaran test	1/724	2/124	2/509	2/934	1/861	2/340
	$(0/084)^{**}$	(0/033)	(0/012)	(0/000)	(0/089)	(0/003)
Friz test	3/422	3/166	3/028	3/012	3/044	3/180
	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)	(0/000)
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0/340	0/341	0/353	0/345	0/353	0/353

TABLE II

\* The figures in parentheses show significance level of coefficients.

\*\* The figures show test statistic and those in parentheses show significance level.

Since income per capita has a positive and significant effect and square root of income per capita has a negative and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions, environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis is confirmed in countries under study. Among financial development variables, foreign direct investment and ratio of bank deposit to gross domestic product have a negative and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions. These results confirm those of [1], [7], [20], [21]. But, significance of bank debt on carbon dioxide emissions is not confirmed.

The results of model 1 and 2 show that institutional development index has a negative and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions. Models 3 to 6 were estimated to explore the effect of variables of institutional quality. As the results indicate, among six variables of institutional quality, only Control of C orruption has a negative and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions in these countries and significance of other variables of institutional quality is not

statistically confirmed. Generally, it can b e stated that institutional quality has had a negative and significant effect on carbon dioxide emissions in upper-middle income countries according to theories. These results are similar to [7] results.

## V.CONCLUSION

The present study explored the effects of economic development, financial development and institutional development on e nvironmental destruction in upper-middle income countries during the time period 1999-2011. To this end, annual data of variables of c arbon dioxide emissions logarithm, income per capita logarithm, square root of income per capita logarithm, bank debt logarithm, ratio of demand deposit to total assets of bank, ratio of demand deposit to gross domestic product, logarithm of total value of shares traded and foreign direct investment, institutional development index, the Voice and Accountability, Political

Stability and the Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, and energy consumption logarithm were employed. The tests of [38], [39] were used to investigate cross-sectional correlation among the countries under study. Because the results of these two tests showed cross-sectional correlation, seemingly unrelated regression was u sed for estimation.

Results of this study revealed that Kuznets' environmental curve hypothesis is confirmed in upper-middle income countries. Since the effects of economic growth on the environment has been explored in most of the existing researches, it was showed in this stud y that financial and institutional development can have a determining role in the environment in countries under study where in m ost of them are developing countries. Therefore, policy makers can help improve the environment and decrease greenhouse gases in long-term by enacting strong policies and improving the structures. As a result, message of this study for policy makers is that improve the environment in developing countries in long-term.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors thank Dr. Josephine Laydia and Engr. Hossein Raei Dehaghi who assisted a lot to prepare this work.

#### REFERENCES

- A. Tamazian, J. Piñeiro, and K.C.Vadlamannati, "Does higher economic and financial development lead to environmental degradation: Evidence from BRIC countries", Energy Policy, vol. 37, pp. 246–253, 2009.
- [2] B. Copeland, and M.S. Taylor, "Trade, growth and the environment", J. of Eco. Lit., vol. 42, pp. 7–71, 2004.
- [3] S. Dasgupta, B. Laplante, H. Wang, and D. Wheeler, "Confronting the environmental Kuznets curve", The J. of Eco. Pers., vol. 16, pp. 147– 168, 2002.
- [4] S. Dinda, "Environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis: A s urvey. Ecological Eco., vol. 49, pp. 431–455, 2004.
- 5] D. Stern, "The rise and fall of the environmental Kuznets curve", World Dev., vol. 32, pp. 1419–1439, 2004.
- [6] J. Frankel, J. and D. Romer, "Does trade cause growth?" American Eco. Review, vol. 89, pp. 379–399, 1999.
- [7] A. Tamazian, and B. Bhaskara Rao, "Do economic, financial and institutional developments matter for environmental degradation? Evidence from Transitional Economies", Energy Economics, vol. 32, pp. 137–145, 2010.
- [8] V. Jensen, "The pollution haven hypothesis and the industrial flight hypothesis: Some perspectives on theory and empirics", Working Paper, Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, vol. 5, 1996.
- [9] L. Jones, and R. Manuelli, "Endogenous policy choice: The case of pollution and growth", Review of Economic Dynamics, vol. 4, pp. 369– 405, 2001.
- [10] D.H. Meadows, D.L. Meadows, J. Randers, and W. Behrens, "The Limits to Growth," New York: Universe Books, 1992.
- [11] J.M. Antle, and G. Heidebrink, "Environment and development: theory and international evidence", Ec onomic Development and Cultural Changes, vol. 43(3), pp. 603–625, 1995.
- [12] G. Grossman, and A. Krueger, "Economic growth and the environment. Quart. J. of Economics, vol. 110(2), pp. 352–377, 1995.
- [13] T.M. Selden, and D. Song, "Environmental quality and development: Is there a Kuznets curve for air pollution emission?" J. of Environ. Eco. & Manage., vol. 27(2), pp. 147-162, 1994.

- [14] N.T. Shafik, "Economic development and environmental quality: An econometric analysis", Oxford Economic Papers, vol. 46(0), pp.757– 773, 1994.
- [15] C.D. Kolstad, and J. A. Krautkraemer, "Natural resource use and the environment," In: Kneese, A.V., Sweeney, J.L. (Eds.), Handbook of Natural Resources and Energy Economics, vol. 3, pp. 1219-1265, 1993. Elsevier Science Publishers.
- [16] H. Hettige, R.E.B. Lucas, and D. W heeler, "The toxic intensity of industrial production: Global patterns, trends, and trade policy American Economic Review, vol. 82(2), pp. 478–481, 1992.
- [17] N. Birdsall, and D. Wheeler, "Trade policy and industrial pollution in Latin America: Where are the pollution ha vens?" J. of Environ. and Dev., vol. 2(1), pp. 137–149, 1993.
- [18] I. Diwan, and N. Shafik, "Investment, technology and the global environment: Towards international agreement in a world of disparities" In: Low, P. (Ed.), International Trade and the Environment, World Bank, Washington, DC., 1992.
- [19] European Commission, "The economic aspects of the energy sector in CIS countries", Economic Papers N° 327, CASE (Centre for Social and Economic Research), Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, Brussels: Belgium, 2008.
- [20] S. Claessens, and E. Feijen, "Financial sector development and the millennium development goals", World Bank Working Paper, vol. 89. The World Bank, 2007.
- [21] G. Kumbaroglu, N. Karali, and Y. Arıkan, "CO2, GDP and RET: An aggregate economic equilibrium analysis for Turkey", Energy Policy, vol. 36, pp. 2694–2708, 2008.
- [22] S. Dasgupta, B. Laplante, and N. Mamingi, "Pollution and capital markets in developing countries", J. of Environ. Eco. & Manage. Vol. 42(3), pp. 310–335, 2001.
- [23] S. Dasgupta, J.H. Hong, B. Laplante, and N. Mamingi, "Disclosure of environmental violations and stock market in the Republic of Korea", Ecological Economics, vol. 58(4), pp. 759–777, 2004.
- [24] M. Cropper, and C. Griffiths, "The interaction of populations, growth, and environmental quality", American Economic Review, vol. 84(2), pp. 250–254, 1994.
- [25] N. Stokey, "Are ther e limits to growth?" International Econom ic Review, vol. 39(1), pp. 1–31, 1998.
- [26] A. John, and R. Pecchenino, "An overla pping generations model of growth and the environment", Economic Journal, vol. 104, pp. 1393– 1410, 1994.
- [27] R.D. Congleton, "Political regimes and pollution control", Review of Economics and Statistics, vol. 74, pp. 412-421, 1992.
- [28] M. Torras, and J.K. Boy ce, "Income, inequality, and pollu tion: A reassessment of the environmental Kuznets curve", Ecological Economics, vol. 25, pp.147–160, 1998.
- [29] T. Panayotou, "Demystifying the environmental Kuznets curve: Turning a black b ox into a policy tool", Environment and Dev elopment Economics, vol. 2, pp. 465–484, 1997.
- [30] Z. Nasrollahi, and M. Gh afari Gulak, "Economic development and environmental pollution in member states of the Kyoto protocol and the countries of southwest Asia", *J. of Eco. Sciences*, vol. 9(35), pp.105-126, 2010.
- [31] J. Pajavian, and B. Tabrizian, "Studying the relation between economic growth and environmental pollution using a dynamic simulation model", *J. of Eco. Studies*, vol. 10(3) pp. 175-203, 2011.
- [32] M. Salimifar, and J. Dehnavi, "Comparison of environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in OECD member countries and developing countries: Panel data analysis", *J. of Know. & Dev.*, 17(29), pp. 26-43, 2010.
- [33] R. Khoshakhlagh, R. Dalali Esfahani, and N. Yarmohammadian, "Analysis of environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis using the process of environmental quality with choosing of household's portfolio", J. of Eco. Modeling Res., vol. 6, pp. 85-104, 2012.
- [34] K. Sadeghi, Z. Heidari Dad, and S. Mamipour, "Studying the effect of economic and institutional development on environmental quality in MENA countries (dynamic panel approach)". The First International Conference on Ec onometrics: Methods and Applications, Sanandaj, Islamic Azad University, 2013.
- [35] D. Behboudi, M. Motafakerazad, and A. Razazadeh (2011) "Effects of oil prices instability on Iran's gross domestic product", J. of Eco. Energy Studies, pp. 1-33, 2011.
- [36] H. Jie, and W. Hua, "Economic structure, development policy and environmental quality: An empirical analysis of environmental Kuznets

3352

curves with Chinese municipal data", Ecological Economics, vol. 76, pp. 128-151, 2012.

- [37] A. Levin, C.F. Lin, and C.S.J. Chu, "Unit root tes ts in pane l data: Asymptotic and finite-sample properties," J. of Econometrics, vol. 108, pp. 1-24, 2002.
- [38] K. Im, M. Hashem Pesaran, and Y. Shin, "Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels", J. of Econometrics, vol. 115, pp. 53-74, 2003.
- [39] E.W. Frees, "Longitudinal and Panel Data: Analysis and Applications in the Social Sciences", Cambridge University Press, 2004.



Morteza Raei Dehaghi was born in Dehagh, a province of Najafabad, Isfahan, Iran on May 1, 1955. He finished Bachelor of Science in Electrical Eng ineering at Mapua Institute of Technology, Manila, Philippines, 1980, Master of Business Administration, major in Industrial Management and Doctor of Business Administration, at Manuel L. Quezon University, Manila, Philippines, 1991

and 1993 respectively.

He worked in Modhej Thermal Power Plant as an Operational Engineer; Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a Consular and Students Affairs Officer; Councilor in Dehagh province as a President and Islamic Azad University – Mobarakeh Branch as an Assistant Professor at M obarakeh, Isfahan. He published five books, and the last one is Specialized English for the Students of Accounting published by Khorasgan Azad University Publication, 2013. He wrote sever al articles and the last is "Comparing the Surveys of the Operation of Public Companies before and after Assignment in Stock Exchange in Iran, published in Journal of Financial Accounting vol. 5(17), 2013, Isfahan, Iran. He attended several world and international conferences and the last is WCLTA – 2013 in University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain and presented the article entitled, "Studying the Relationship between the Effective Factors on Em ployees' Performance in Iran's University and the Students' Satisfaction with regards to Employees' Performance".

His area of interest includes management, economics, energy and psychology.

He is a member of Iran Management Association (IMA); Isfahan Association of Professional Engineers and Management Scientific Association of Mobarakeh Azad University.