



**HAL**  
open science

# Unpacking the green box: Determinants of Environmental Policy Stringency in European countries

Donatella Gatti, Gaye del Lo, Francisco Serranito

► **To cite this version:**

Donatella Gatti, Gaye del Lo, Francisco Serranito. Unpacking the green box: Determinants of Environmental Policy Stringency in European countries. 2023. hal-04208688

**HAL Id: hal-04208688**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04208688v1>**

Preprint submitted on 18 Sep 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Unpacking the green box: Determinants of Environmental Policy Stringency in European countries

Donatella Gatti

Gaye-Del Lo

Francisco Serranito

2023-25 Document de Travail/ Working Paper



Economix - UMR 7235 Bâtiment Maurice Allais  
Université Paris Nanterre 200, Avenue de la République  
92001 Nanterre Cedex

Site Web : [economix.fr](http://economix.fr)  
Contact : [secreteriat@economix.fr](mailto:secreteriat@economix.fr)  
Twitter : @EconomixU



# Unpacking the green box: Determinants of Environmental Policy Stringency in European countries

**Donatella GATTI<sup>1</sup>**

University Sorbonne Paris Nord, CEPN UMR-CNRS 7234

**Gaye-Del Lo<sup>2</sup>**

University Sorbonne Paris Nord, CEPN UMR-CNRS 7234

**Francisco SERRANITO<sup>3</sup>**

University Paris Nanterre, EconomiX UMR-CNRS 7235

---

<sup>1</sup>gatti@univ-paris13.fr

<sup>2</sup>gayedel.lo@univ-paris13.fr

<sup>3</sup>francisco.serranito@parisnanterre.fr

The authors would like to thank an anonymous referee and the editor of the FAERE working papers series. The authors also thank E. Botta and T. Kruse (OECD) for kindly providing advance access to the EPS newly released and revised dataset (cf. Kruse *et al.* 2022 [54] .)

### **Abstract**

This paper identifies the determinants of OECD Environmental Policy Stringency (EPS) index using a panel of 21 European countries for the period 2009-2019. If there is a large literature on the macroeconomic, political, and social determinants of EPS, the people's attitudes or preferences toward environmental policies is still burgeoning. Thus, the main goal of this paper is to estimate the effects of people's awareness regarding environmental issues on the EPS indicator. Due to the endogeneity of preferences, we have applied an instrumental variable framework to estimate our empirical model. Our most important result is to show that individual environmental preferences have a positive and significant effect on the level of EPS indicator : on average, a rise in individual preferences of 10% in a country will increase its EPS indicator by 2.30%. Our results have important policy implications.

**Keywords:** Environmental policy stringency; Environmental attitudes/concerns, inequality; environmental Kuznets curve; EU

**JEL Codes:** Q0; Q1; Q3; Q50; Q54; Q56

# 1 Introduction

Climate change is one of the most pressing issues of our time. The Paris Agreement 2015 and other conferences showcase the universal acceptance of this climate outlook. In addition, the global warming phenomenon postulates a severe risk, leading to extreme climatic conditions, including severe cold, heat, drought, flooding, wildfire, hurricanes, and rising sea levels (IPCC, 2022 [48]). Fire, land utilization modifications, mainly deforestation, and climate fluctuation directly affect human well-being, ecosystem performance, forestry arrangement, sustenance security, and subsistence for resource-dependent societies. Addressing these difficulties necessitates worldwide plans and regulations, particularly environmental (restricting global warming below 2 degrees C, increasing the contribution of renewable energy to 32% by 2030 for EU countries, increasing carbon taxes and administrative standards, Etc.), and diminishing societal and ecological repercussions. Consequently, decision-makers must use established tools to determine policies to support their actions. Introducing the OECD Environmental Policy Stringency Index (EPS) heads in that direction. The EPS groups the market-based, including taxes, permits, and certificates, the non-market-based subindex (performance standards). The revised EPS index takes into account in addition to market-based and non-market-based policies, technological support policies, comprising research and development expenditure (R&D) and support policies to promote renewable energy deployment (feed-in-tariffs, and auctions)<sup>4</sup>. The structure of the index clearly shows that it focuses on climate change and air pollution policies. The relationship between EPS and greenhouse gas emissions appears to be negative (Figure 1). This suggests that a high EPS score is associated with a low level of greenhouse gas emissions<sup>5</sup>. Thus, identifying the factors that affect EPS dynamics is crucial for policymaker and provide them with the means to improve environmental policy and aid in transitioning to a sustainable low-carbon economy. This paper aims to investigate the determinants of EPS across OECD European countries empirically.

The existing research emphasizes the influence of EPS on productivity growth (Albrizio et al., 2017 [4]; Albrizio et al., 2014 [5]; Feng et al., 2021 [33]; Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips (2020, [59]), air quality (Wang et al., 2020 [80]), CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Albulescu and al., 2022 [6]), and environmental innovation (Hassan and Rousselire, 2022 [45]).

The studies focusing on the determinants of EPS (Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips, 2020, [60]) seek to link environmental policy and economic performance (GDP per capita), income inequality, and freedom of the press when considering EPS. In contrast to what these authors have proposed, our paper aims to investigate the role of public sentiment in climate change in forming EPS. Public awareness of climate change has been recognized since the 1992 Kyoto Protocol (Baiardi, 2022 [11]). But its consideration at the academic level is very recent. Furthermore, in democratic systems, public opinion support legitimizes political decisions on climate change mitigation actions (Baiardi and Morana, 2021 [12]). Moreover, there is an increasing recognition of global warming and its repercussions on society. This heightened worry may account for a major portion of the variety of climate policies, shown in the increased demand for more accountability to reduce climate change or increase environmental quality and the other measures taken to combat global warming. Consequently, it is important to document the association between public opinion on climate change and environmental policy.

Chen *et al.*'s (2019 [19]) research regarding the effects of environmental consciousness on environmental quality and the correlation between income and pollution is the most similar to ours. Nevertheless, our examination differs from Chen *et al.* (2019 [19]) in several ways. Initially, these authors use the government expenditure on environmental protection to quantify environmental policy. In comparison, we use the revised EPS index (cf. Kruse *et al.* 2022 [54]) as an environmental policy variable. More studies in the literature need to focus on more recent EPS data. Subsequently, Chen *et al.* (2019 [19]) employed "Google Trends" to gauge the public's sentiment towards environmental quality, quantifying the number of searches on Google for topics associated with the environment. Chen *et al.* (2019 [19]) used "air pollution" and "pollution" in the setup of environmental sensitivity indices, while we employed the public perceptions of climate change variable from Eurobarometer surveys - which is a more innovative approach - that was recently adopted by Baiardi and Morana (2021 [12]) in their research of the catalysts of public sentiment on climate change across Europe in the last decade. Although the Special Eurobarometer surveys provide an accurate view of climate change attitudes, they have been neglected in the literature so far (Baiardi and Morana (2021 [12])).


The rest of the paper is partitioned as follows. Section 2 presents the literature review. Section 3 discusses the

---

<sup>4</sup>see section 4 for more information

<sup>5</sup>Estimating a two way fixed effect model explaining the log of the intensity of the greenhouse gas emission with the log of the lag value of EPS produces a coefficient estimate of -0.187 with a p-value equal to 0.000

Figure 1: Correlation between the Greenhouse gas emission intensity and the EPS index



We considered the logarithm of the intensity of greenhouse gas emissions per energy consumption and the lagged value of the logarithm of EPS.

Source : OCDE & EUROSTAT

potential link between social attitudes and EPS. Section 4 describes the methodology and the data. Section 5 presents the results from the econometric analysis. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Related literature

Environmental policies are needed to counter the degradation of environmental conditions and performances, which puts human lives in danger. In this respect, a recent contribution by Farhidi *et al.* (2022 [34]) has indeed provided evidence of policy-makers being more willing to implement stricter environmental policies in response to a rise in human deaths. Nevertheless, all over the world, environmental policy responses have failed so far to meet the ambitious objectives ahead.

According to recent surveys of the literature, such as Hu *et al.* (2021 [47]) and Dasgupta and De Cian (2018, [23]), public opinion and people's attitudes, as well as macroeconomic, institutional and political factors, should be acknowledged as driving forces explaining the degree and the effectiveness of environmental regulations.

More precisely, contributions in economics have been investigating the macroeconomic determinants of environmental damages, and the related policy responses, by focusing on a number of macroeconomic variables, among which growth, inequality, trade, and the business cycle. On the other hand, the political science literature has stressed the role of political factors, i.e., types of government, ideology, and also lobbying and corruption, in the making of environmental policies. Finally, by drawing on political science, sociology and environmental psychology, we aim to stress the importance of individuals' attitudes and preferences, which crucially relate to public demands for environmental policies (see section 3).

## 2.1 Macroeconomic determinants of environmental performance

The crucial role of environmental policies to sustain and promote the ecological transition has been acknowledged since a long time in the economic literature. In their contribution, Acemoglu *et al.* (2016[1]) have relied upon the directed technical change theoretical framework to show how subsidies, even more than taxes, are crucial in fostering large-scale adoption of green technologies ensuring sustainable growth. At a time in which transition is still far from achieved, questioning the determinants of environmental policies appear as an important task to accomplish.

Indeed, the economic literature has not yet thoroughly investigated, from an empirical point of view, the macroeconomic factors which are likely to impact on the levels, and the evolution, of the environmental policy stringency. In particular, evidence is needed to better understand the causes of changes in the components of the OECD indicator of policy stringency, i.e., market, non-market and technology based mechanisms. In particular, the technology support dimension seems to be crucial to the achievement of global sustainable growth.

In this respect, Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips (2020, [60]) have provided the key contribution up to now. The authors have investigated the role of inequality and lack of freedom of the press as explanatory variables in regressions explaining the stringency of environmental policies, as well as the level of environmentally-related tax revenues, in a sample of OECD and BRIICS countries over the period 1994–2015. In this case, the empirical findings suggest that the EKC argument could concern not only pollution but also the implementation of environmental policies. The authors documented a linear positive impact of per capita GDP on EPS, and a weakly non-linear impact of Gini index namely for non-high income countries.

Indeed, according to Cassin *et al.* (2021 [17]), a non-linear relationship exists between inequality and environmental policy. According to the authors, this linkage can be interpreted in the light of the theoretical literature on green consumerism. More precisely, they argued that for low levels of environmental protection, increasing social equality allows consumption and production habits to become greener, while environmental policy becomes stricter. Nevertheless, the contrary happens when the levels of environmental protection is higher than a certain threshold. In this case, increased inequality indeed favors stricter environmental policies.

Needless to say, the empirical analysis of EPS determinants is closely related to the economic literature on the growth-pollution nexus. Indeed, the stringency of environmental policies can be expected to adapt and change, in response to the environmental impact of growth and inequality. A rich strand of the economic literature has explored the linkages between growth, inequalities and the environment, i.e., pollution and carbon emissions. This literature has reached out to the debate on the so-called environmental Kuznets curve (EKC). Moreover, the linkages between international trade, energy consumption and environmental damages have been investigated in the literature, too. Finally, and more recently, economists have turned to analyze the interplay between, on the one hand, business cycles and stabilization policies and, on the other hand, environmental risks and policies.

Concerning the empirical literature on the inequality-growth-pollution nexus, the recent contribution by Wan *et al.* (2022, [79]) has provided evidence of a robust trade-off between inequality and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for 217 countries over a period starting from 1960. The authors make use of IV methods in order to cope with endogeneity issues. Rojas Vallejos and Lastuka (2020, [72]) have provided evidence showing that faster growth and lower income inequality entail more emissions and pollution. On the other hand, results from the EKC literature have also stressed that the negative environmental consequences of increasing GDP, and lowering inequality, become weaker as the level of development improves (Chen *et al.*, 2019 [19], Rojas Vallejos and Lastuka, 2020[72]), McGee *et al.*, 2018 [63], and Grunewald *et al.*, 2017 [44]). Indeed, countries such as Norway has exhibited a negative correlation between air pollution and per capita GDP growth since several decades, while for China this has only occurred very recently (Dang and Serajuddin, 2020 [22]). However, in recent contributions by the OECD, analysts have stated concerns with respect to the last decade decrease in the technology based component of environmental policy stringency (Kruse *et al.*, 2022 [54]). This points to an unwelcome reduction in public support to green R&D activities, and/or a slowdown in the path of renewable energies adoption.

Hence, one could fear that improving emissions and pollution indicators could lead countries to reduce their efforts toward fully ecological transition.

To summarize, based on the evidence drawn from the above literature, one should expect faster growth to call for stricter environmental policies, in order to curb emissions. However, for given thresholds, the nexus can be expected to become more virtuous, and per capita GDP growth could even result in less stringent environmental policies. Finally,

this could entail negative consequences, i.e., the decrease in green technologies support and adoption. Hence, a non-linear relationship between per capita GDP and EPS is indeed expected, in the same vein as the previously cited evidence on the impact of the Gini index on EPS (Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips, 2020[60]).

In addition to previous contributions, Arminen and Menegaki (2019 [7]) provided a comprehensive presentation of issues related to the growth-environment-energy nexus. The authors also presented original evidence based on estimations of a system of three simultaneous equations for real gross domestic product, energy consumption, and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This contribution also included a corruption indicator, as a control variable for institutional quality. The interesting point to us, and the originality of this contribution with respect to the EKC literature, is that two authors stressed the key importance of the energy channel in explaining the bidirectional relationship between growth and pollution.

In a different vein, the literature has also analyzed, both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view, the linkages between international trade and the environment. According to short survey presented by Kim and Lin (2022 [53]), these issues have mainly been investigated from a political economy perspective. Regarding the available empirical evidence, the authors considered that this is actually weak and inconclusive. Their own contribution added to the literature by studying a sample of OECD countries, and showing that the stringency of environmental policies (measured by EPS) indeed depends on trade openness. The underlying relationship appears to be non-linear, as it is influenced by both the levels of stringency and the nature of trade, i.e., North- or South-oriented.

Finally, a different and growing body of the economic literature has theoretically and empirically investigated the linkages between business cycles, macroeconomic policy and the environment. Annicchiarico *et al.* (2021 [3]) provided an interesting review of this literature. Specifically, it is argued that expansionary monetary policies yield higher CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, as suggested by Qingquan *et al.* (2020 [69]). Hence, if interest rates decrease, the environmental legislation is expected to be strengthened, in order to limit the adverse effects on the environment. On the other hand, Dennis (2022 [26]) highlighted the importance of linkages between climate change and financial policy. In this case, environmental unbalances yield new risks that, beside urging stricter environmental policies, also fuel individual and social risk aversion (Carney, 2015 [16]). Hence, a positive correlation between the risk premium and EPS should be expected. In a different vein, Auerbach and Gale (2021) provided evidence concerning the macroeconomic impact of low interest rates on the valuation of benefits from environmental policies. They documented sizeable effects of lowering interest rate on the benefits associated to carbon abatement taxes relative to their costs, which could justify a sharp rise in those taxes.

## 2.2 Political determinants of environmental performance

Based on Hu *et al.* (2021 [47]) as well as Dasgupta and De Cian (2018, [23]), environmental policy making is related to a large set of political dimensions, among which levels of decentralization, federalism, corruption, quality of governance, and democracy. This last dimension itself includes several aspects, going from political institutions (i.e., electoral system, type of government, etc.) to partisan activities. In this respect, empirical and theoretical contributions have come from different fields, i.e., political science, political economy, and economics.

More precisely, many contributions have focused on the issue of governance (Muhammad and Long, 2021 [65]). Among others, López and Mitra (2000 [55]) have proposed a theoretical model and shown that rent-seeking by the government modifies the shape of the EKC. In this case, the turning point takes place at levels of income and pollution that are above the social optimum. Concerning the empirical literature on the subject, Rafati (2018 [70]) provided very interesting results based on a time-series-cross-sectional analysis of twenty industrialized democracies from 1990-2012. The author has shown that stronger perceptions of corruption are associated with weaker environmental policies. The transition from strong to mild perceptions of corruption would significantly strengthen non-market environmental policies, with an impact that would be comparable to switching from the Greek to the Swedish levels of climate protection. Also, Oguzhan and Fredriksson (2018 [66]) have studied the link between trust and corruption in the United States, and shown that the effect of corruption on environmental policies declines when trust increases. However, according to Arminen and Menegaki (2019 [7]) one should consider that the impact of corruption could be less important than the energy channel. This is indeed coherent with results by the aforementioned paper by Rafati (2018 [70]), namely regarding market policies to protect the environment. Finally, a few contributions have stressed the importance of taking into account the effects of corruption in specific contexts, such as developing countries (Masron and Subramaniam,



2018 [61]).

Turning to the literature on democracy, environmental policies and performances, the empirical contributions have stressed the role of several factors, and namely: civil and political freedom has been shown to entail positive effects on environmental policy stringency in a sample of 82 OECD and BRIICS countries (Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips, 2020 [60]); parliamentary systems, and in particular proportional vs. majority systems, as well as political ideology, i.e., left-right and green divide, and party manifestos have been shown to positively contribute to the rise of environmental policies (Lundquist, 2022 [56], and Folke, 2014 [35]); finally, the impact of government type, and namely political coalitions, has also been investigated. In this respect, empirical evidence has been provided in the literature regarding the effect of coalitions prospects on environmental stringency (i.e., the EPS indicator) for nine European countries, in the period from 1990 to 2012/2015 (Kayser and Rehmert, 2021 [51] and Kayser *et al.*, 2022 [50]). The authors have developed an original indicator of coalition prospects (Kayser and Rehmert, 2019 [52] and Rehmert, 2021 [71]) and tested it to explain the determinants of EPS. They showed that

”an increase in green coalition-inclusion probability does [*predict more environmentally friendly policies*].” (Kayser and Rehmert, 2021 [51], p.240).

A recent theoretical contribution by Gatti (2022 [38]) presented a political economy model in which coalitions emerged as political equilibria. She studied the environmental and redistributive policies associated with the political equilibria and found that two-party coalitions delivered stricter environmental policies, and higher incentives for the ecological transition. Nevertheless, the author also pointed out the surge of new alliances in response to green transition, which could drive societies toward unequal ecological configurations. Hence, one could expect a non-linear effect of coalition governments on EPS, according to countries’ levels of development and/or inequality.

Finally, a recent empirical contribution by Otteni and Weisskircher (2022, [67]) has empirically addressed the interplay between electorate polarization and the building of wind turbines, in Germany. The authors have shown that both Green and radical right parties have gained electoral consensus out of this contested environmental project. Based on this result, a form of endogeneity exists, as the implementation of environmental policies indeed affects people’s attitudes and preferences.

### 3 Social attitudes and environmental performance

Among the determinants of environmental policies, people’s attitudes and preferences are crucial. In fact, parties’ political platforms and governments’ policies are expected to be driven by citizens’ demands, namely regarding the protection of natural resources. At the same time, one should also acknowledge that citizens’ demands might, at least partly, react to already implemented policies, institutional rules, and regulations. Hence, assessing the determinants of environmental preferences is equally important.

Concerning the impact of people’s ecological attitudes on legislation and on rules-making, the literature has provided interesting, although rare, evidence so far. More specifically, to the best of our knowledge, there are no empirical contributions analyzing the impact of ecological awareness on policy stringency, i.e. on the EPS indicator, which is the focus of our paper.

In the economic literature, the contribution by Chen *et al.* (2019[19]) has provided large-scale cross-country econometric evidence regarding the impact of ecological awareness, measured by Google Trend, which the authors consider as an endogenous variable. The authors stressed the positive impact of ecological awareness on environmental policies and on environmental performances, but not on EPS. Moreover, they documented a significant effect of awareness on the shape of the environmental Kuznets curve. In a similar vein, Marra and Colantonio (2022 [58]) studied the role of public awareness regarding environmental damages, as well as a series of technical and institutional variables, to investigate the determinants of renewable energy production. The results pointed to a significant impact of awareness, which is nevertheless not sufficient by itself to foster transition. In a series of papers, Douenne and Fabre (Douenne and Fabre, 2022 [27] and Douenne and Fabre, 2020 [28]) have thoroughly studied the French situation. In particular, they have stressed the importance of the interplay between attitudes and beliefs in the shaping of French environmental policies, i.e., the carbon tax.

Turning to the theoretical literature, a recent contribution by Gatti (2022 [38]) proposed a voting model in which class-based ecological attitudes are crucial. Indeed, environmental preferences are specified with respect to social groups' features, namely the socioeconomic status of individual members, i.e., the levels of education and income. This allows to understand the surge of political coalitions shaping governments and favoring (or not) the rise of policies to protect the environment. It is also important to take into account the emergence of environmentalist lobbies in the implementation of these policies as in Gatti and Vauday (2023 [41]).

Interesting insights on the subject can also be gathered by contributions in political science and in sociology. According to a review of the literature by Dasgupta and De Cian (2018 [23]), most of these contributions have narrowly focused on the specific case of the USA. Only a few of them have provided evidence for larger samples of countries. Among the latter, Shum (2009, [74]) studied the way in which public opinion interacts with democratic political institutions to yield an impact on a country's environmental performance, as measured by the EPI indicator.<sup>6</sup> More recently, Anderson *et al.* (2017, [2]) analyzed the effects of public opinion on the implementation of environmental policies in European countries since 1970. To do so, the authors built a time-series public opinion variable relying on several questions asked within Eurobarometer surveys over time, as well as on Google Trend search items. They documented a sizeable effect of a change in public opinion (more favorable to the environment) on the number of renewable energy policies per year in Europe, between 1974 and 2015.

In a similar vein, a recent contribution by Schaffer *et al.* (2022, [73]) provided evidence regarding the impact of public demands on the responsiveness of policy-makers, in the field of environmental policies. The authors proposed their own indicator to approximate public demand for environmental policies, and they coded policy responses by policy-makers for six OECD countries from 1995 to 2010. Once again, they found a sizable effect of public demands on the number of environmental policies provided per year in sample countries. Finally, the literature has also underlined the importance of the phenomenon known as "climate change skepticism". In this respect, Kammermann and Dermont (2018, [49]) have provided evidence for Switzerland by focusing on survey data collected by the authors. Their results prove that climate change skepticism is an important factor preventing the implementation of environmental policies.

Based of this analysis of the literature, we can formulate the following conjecture.

*Environmental preferences and citizens' demands have a significant impact on the stringency of environmental regulations, which can be measured by appropriate policy indicators.*

Let us now turn to the opposite channel going from policies to people's attitudes and to public demands. To do that, we now consider a different, but related, strand of the literature that deals with the determinants of people's attitudes regarding the environment.

A rich literature in social sciences, i.e., economics, political science, sociology, and psychology, has provided cross-country analyses of the determinants of individuals' social preferences regarding the environment (see, for instance, Grandin *et al.*, 2022 [43]; Drews and van den Bergh, 2016 [30]; Whitmarsh and Capstick 2018 [81]). According to recent surveys by Baiardi (2022 [11]) as well as Dasgupta and De Cian (2018 [23]), the determinants of environmental preferences encompass an important amount of factors. Among others, we can underline the following ones:

- Education and socioeconomic status : individuals with higher educational achievements have been shown to be more aware of environmental issues, to consider those issues as more urgent, and to be more willing to pay for environmental protection (Grandin *et al.*, 2022 [43]; Dechezleprêtre *et al.*, 2022 [25]; for France, see also Douenne and Fabre, 2020 [28]). Baiardi and Morana (2021 [12]), based on European data, have documented a positive effect of secondary education on ecological attitudes, but a surprisingly negative effect of tertiary education. Moreover, Gatti (2022a [38]) has proposed a voting model in which group-based ecological preferences depended on socioeconomic status, while Constant and Davin (2019 [20]) have elaborated a growth model in which green preferences are endogenous with respect to human capital and pollution. A recent contribution by Dechezleprêtre *et al.* (2022 [25]) has provided a statistical cross-country analysis of socioeconomic determinants of environmental attitudes. In a similar vein, a few papers have studied the level of emissions in relation to people's behaviors according to their socioeconomic features as well as constraints, for instance, one can refer to Pottier *et al.* (2020 [68]) concerning the French case. Finally, Grandin *et al.* (2022 [43]) have shown,

---

<sup>6</sup>See <https://epi.yale.edu/>

through experimental evidence, that pro-environmental preferences were related to the way in which people discount the future. In particular, the authors documented that more future-oriented individuals also had stronger environmental preferences.

- Egalitarian values: more egalitarian individuals (and societies) have been shown to provide stronger adhesion to environmental policies (Sivonen and Kukkonen, 2021 [75]; Fritz and Koch, 2019 [36]; Cherry *et al.*, 2017 [18]), although this issue is still debatable in the literature; people would tend to oppose corrective policies (for instance, carbon taxes) if these appear as unequal and negatively affecting the poor (Maestre-Andrés *et al.*, 2019 [57]).
- Political views: by ranking individuals in a linear left-right space, left wing preferences have been shown to yield more positive attitudes towards environmental issues (Douenne and Fabre, 2020 [28], for the French case); Ziegler (2017 [78]) has provided evidence for Germany, the USA and China regarding the impact of ideology and values. More precisely, the author has found values to be key determinants of climate change beliefs. Nevertheless, political ideology also mattered. More precisely, the left-right partisan divide was shown to be stronger in the USA, while in Germany respondents with social-green identification were more willing to pay for climate policies. A similar result was found for Chinese respondents belonging to the Communist Party.
- Climate disasters: a growing body of the literature investigates the impact of natural disasters on ecological awareness. The empirical results so far are at best mixed. According to a recent contribution by Corbi and Falco (2022 [21]) the experience of climate related disaster in the young impressionable years could indeed help shaping environmental preferences and increase awareness. However, Garside and Zhai (2022 [37]) have provided an empirical analysis of the consequences of German 2021 Floods on voters' support for the Green Party. The authors have shown little to no substantial change in support for directly affected areas. However, persuasions effects have been identified in less concerned areas. All in all, the effects of the exposure to climate disasters do not seem to be strong enough to sustain a durable rise in ecological awareness.
- Policies, the perception of policies (among which effectiveness, costs and fairness), and other contextual factors: few contributions in economics have taken into account the bidirectional relationship between actual policies and preferences. To our knowledge, only Chen *et al.* (2019 [19]) have provided cross-country evidence about the impact of ecological awareness on environmental policies, by considering the former endogenous. The literature also stressed the importance of a distinction between price and non-price policies (Stiglitz, 2019 [77]). Moreover, Drews and van den Bergh (2016 [30]) have suggested that individuals would show stronger support to more effective policies; these authors also stressed the impact of political discourses regarding climate change issues.

Douenne and Fabre (2022 [27]) provided experimental evidence regarding the interplay between preferences and beliefs (i.e., regarding the policy impacts etc.) to understand the opponents to the French carbon tax. Finally, several contextual factors have been acknowledged in the literature, such as economic conditions (among which, growth and unemployment, sectorial composition of the workforce) as well as natural disasters (Sloggy *et al.*, 2021 [76]), institutions, social norms, and media influence (Baiardi and Morana, 2021 [12]; see also the survey by Dasgupta and De Cian, 2018 [23]).

More precisely, Baiardi and Morana (2021 [12]) have presented a careful econometric study of ecological preferences' determinants, in European countries, over a decade from 2009 to 2019. The authors have made available their database allowing to analyze climate change awareness in Europe (Morana, 2021 [64]). The relevant subjective variable in this contribution was taken from Eurobarometer surveys, which provide evidence about people's attitudes toward natural resources, over time, and across a large sample of individuals and countries. In this respect, Eurobarometer surveys also provide rich contextual information about the socioeconomic profiles of respondents that can readily be used in order to better understand the determinants of environmental attitudes (see, for instance, Eurobarometer, 2021 [31] and Eurobarometer, 2020 [32]).

By building on the two strands of the literature that we have presented in this section, i.e., on environmental policies' and preferences' determinants, our paper aims to bridge the gap and study the bidirectional relationship

between ecological awareness (measured by the Eurobarometer subjective variables) and the environmental policy stringency, i.e., the EPS indicator by the OECD. Because implemented policies are among the key factors determining environmental preferences, a feedback exists which runs from policies to social preferences. Coherently, the latter can not be treated as an exogenous determinant of environmental policies. This leads us to posit the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 1** *People's preferences regarding the environment depend on individuals' socioeconomic features and values, while also being affected by existing laws and institutions, and namely by the actual stringency of environmental policies.*

Indeed, the endogeneity of social and political preferences has long been recognized in the political science literature. One can refer, for instance, to the paper by Gerber and Jackson (1993 [42]). In this contribution, the authors investigated, both from a theoretical and an empirical point of view, the consequences of evolving preferences in response to changing parties' political platforms. Besides proving that endogeneity is a crucial issue, the authors also documented its effects on people's attitudes regarding key policies such as "Federal Guarantees of Equal Access to Jobs and Housing" or "Vietnam War Policy". Finally, the main set of exogenous determinants of preferences that are considered in the paper are the socioeconomic features characterizing respondents.

In the economic literature, the issue of endogenous preferences is also crucial. In his seminal contribution, Bowles (1998 [15]) stated:

*"the effectiveness of policies and their political viability may depend on the preferences they induce or evoke"* (Bowles, 1998 [15], p. 104).

More specifically, the author explicitly referred to the importance of acknowledging such an endogeneity regarding the linkages between implemented environmental policies and people's ecological awareness.

In recent contributions, Besley and Persson (2022 [13] and 2019 [14]) strongly argued for economists to acknowledge the coevolution of environmental policies and social values. The authors proposed a theoretical model in which the ratio of environmentalists, within the society, could either shrink or increase in response to environmental policy changes. More precisely, they showed that a higher tax on polluting consumption goods favors convergence towards an ecological society, i.e., a society where environmentalism is a widely shared value. In a similar vein, Mattauch *et al.* (2022) theoretically investigated the effects of environmental policies, such as carbon pricing, on consumers' preferences.

The authors provided several real-world examples such as, for instance, tobacco consumption, in which people's preferences significantly evolved following changes in laws and regulation. Their analysis showed that taking preferences' endogeneity into account matters a lot with respect to the assessment of the social value, as well as the effects, of environmental policies.

To conclude, we believe that accounting for endogeneity is crucial to understand the way in which pro-environmental social attitudes may help favoring the rise of much-needed environmental policies. Based on the aforementioned literature, in order to properly disentangle the bidirectional relationship between preferences and policies, both micro and meso information regarding individuals' educational achievements and socioeconomic status can be helpful. Indeed, as we have seen, these features impact on ecological preferences, but are not acknowledged as determinants of legislation and policy making. Hence, they should possibly be used as instruments to treat endogeneity issues.

In order to be able to cope with these concerns, we consider that Eurobarometer survey data offer interesting solutions, from an empirical point of view. Although limited to European countries, these data allow to consistently measure individuals' environmental preferences, from cross-country representative samples, over a period stemming from 2009 up to 2019. Over this time period, Eurobarometer data also provide a large, and consistent, set of indicators which are in connection with socioeconomic features of surveys' respondents, such as: educational levels, social classes, and professional status. These variables are all interesting candidate instruments for environmental preferences in our econometric study. In our view, this is indeed a major advantage with respect to Google Trend variables that have been previously used in the literature, i.e., Chen *et al.* (2019 [19]).

## 4 Data and methodology

### 4.1 Data and descriptive statistics

To assess the determinants of environmental policy across twenty countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), we emphasize climate change and air pollution policies and exploit the revised Environmental Policy Stringency Index (EPS), tabulated by the OECD. The EPS groups three equally-weighted sub-indices (market-based, non-market-based sub-indices and technologies support policies, see Fig 3).

The market-based (Meps) includes taxes, permits, and certificates such as CO<sub>2</sub> trading schemes, measured using the average annual permit price. The higher the price, the stricter the policy. It also takes into account incentives based on the obligation to procure a mandated percentage of electricity from green sources (Green Trading Schemes) and taxes aimed at stimulating green innovation. The latter includes taxes on CO<sub>2</sub> measured by the tax rate on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the tax on nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), the tax on sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>) and the tax on fuels (diesel). In our sample, the stringency of market based policy instruments is valued at 1.59 and 1.99 on average in 2009 and 2019, respectively, an increase on average in absolute values of +0.49. This increase can be explained by the stringency of the diesel tax, which is the dominant instruments of market-based policy until the mid-2000s (Kruse *et al.*, 2022 [54]) and which has been relatively constant over time. However, the importance and rigor of this instrument noted in most countries is due to the establishment of the emissions trading system in the European Union in the mid-2000s.


The non-market-based subindex (NMeps) aims to impose emission limits and standards. Indeed, this instrument defines limit values for emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), particles (PM) and for the sulfur content for diesel. It sets up a battery of indicators representing the maximum concentration of emissions of these gases and particles, as an indicator of emission standards in the energy production and automobiles sector. For all these indicators, a low value indicates a stricter policy. In the European countries included in our sample, the stringency of non-market based policy instruments has on average increased the most in absolute values (+0.60) between 2009 and 2019 (see Figure 8). The non-market based environmental policies contribute the most to the EPS score but has remained constant since 2013 in 17 of the 21 countries in our sample (see Figure 6). Except Greece, which grew by 29% between 2013 and 2019, this instrument only grew by around 10% for Portugal, Luxembourg and Finland. A more detailed analysis shows that each of the four policies (regulating NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, PM, sulfur) included in the non-market based sub-index, increased in a similar way (Kruse *et al.*, 2022 [54]).

Technology Support policies (Teps) concern policies that support innovation in low-carbon technologies. In this section, we have public research and development expenditure (R&D) and support policies to promote solar and wind deployment. R&D expenditure represents the amount spent by the government on R&D on technologies using green energy. Incentives for solar and wind deployment are assessed by considering the average price awarded from a wind or solar auction (divided by the overall LCOE) for country-year observations that replaced feed-in tariffs with energy designs. The technological support policy has a generally downward trend with an average drop estimated at 11.3% between 2009 and 2019 in our sample. The countries which make more effort on this instrument in 2019 are France, Luxembourg, Finland and Netherlands. The downward trend in technology support policies is attributed on the one hand to the decline in subsidies for R&D in low-carbon energy technologies. On the other hand, the replacement of feed-in tariffs by auctions considered to be more flexible and efficient (OECD, 2021).

Factors that motivate states to implement environmental protection policies can be climate, socioeconomic, and political. We employ government type, government coalition and control of corruption as proxies for political variables, the number of heating days as a climate change variable, and public attitude on climate change (EnvPref). We also employ per capita GDP, the Gini index, trade open for the socioeconomic indicators.

We obtain information on EnvPref from Eurobarometer surveys conducted every two years, from 2009 to 2019. This survey has a special section devoted to climate change and aims to capture the perception of European citizens on climate problems to support several issues related to climate change (see Baiardi and Morana, 2021 [12]) for a detailed discussion). We are particularly interested in the question: Which of the following do you consider to be the single most serious problem for the world? Respondents can choose from several items, including terrorism, poverty, hunger, lack of drinking water, the spread of infectious diseases, the economic situation, proliferation of nuclear weapons, conflicts, climate change, and increasing global population. We consider the share of respondents who identify climate change as the most severe global challenge in each country. In most of the sampled countries,

Figure 2: EnvPref



Note : AUT : Austria, BEL : Belgium, BGR : Bulgaria, CZE : Czech Republic, DNK : Denmark, EST : Estonia, FIN : Finland, FRA : France, DEU : Germany, GRC : Greece, HUN : Hungary, ITA : Italy, LUX : Luxembourg, NLD : Netherlands, PRT : Portugal, SVK : Slovakia, SVN : Slovenia, ESP : Spain, SWE :Sweden, GBR : United Kingdom

Source : OCDE & Eurobarometer

the share of individuals who believe climate change is the severest problem in the world has increased considerably between 2009 and 2019, from 18% and 24%, respectively, an increase of 6 points (Fig 2).

Two Nordic countries witnessed the highest increase between 2009 and 2019, i.e., 68% for Denmark, followed by Sweden, with a score increase from 36% to 50%, a 39% growth rate. In 2009, Portugal recorded the lowest growth rate of 9%, which expanded sharply in 2019 to 19%. The trend has reversed in some countries, such as Greece, Luxembourg, Slovakia, and Slovenia. The proportion of individuals sensitive to environmental problems has fallen relatively in these countries. This trend is worrisome because of recent conclusions from the latest IPCC report forewarning the threat of climate change to human health and survival human and the sustainability of natural systems. Alternatively, environmental policy reflects the current state of the environment, and policy-makers' motivation to manage environmental issues concerns their constituents. A greater collective awareness of citizens is necessary since it is decisive in the decision-making of governments and, therefore, could promote the implementation of legislation on environmental protection.

This bidirectional causality between the public attitude towards the climate change and the environmental policy induces an endogeneity bias. We employ an instrumental variable (IV) technique to resolve this endogeneity problem. We instrument the EnvPref variable by the share of students in the population, the percentage of people using internet every day, the media Freedom Index and the number of unemployed in the country.

As a climate variable, we also use the number of heating degree days provided by Eurostat which is weather-based indicator (considered as a proxy of energy consumption). Warmer climate lead to a decrease in heating demand and an increase in cooling demand.

Regarding socioeconomic indicators, almost all empirical studies on environmental policy mention gross domestic product per capita (see Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips, 2020 [60]) which seems to be an important determinant. Our database also includes the Gini coefficient (Gini) used as a measure of inequality. In our sample, the average score for

Table 1: Statistics descriptive

| Statistic                | Unit        | N   | Mean    | St. Dev.                  | Min    | Max     |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----|---------|---------------------------|--------|---------|
| EPS                      | index       | 126 | 3.196   | 0.512                     | 2.170  | 4.720   |
| Market based EPS         | index       | 126 | 1.669   | 0.878                     | 0.500  | 4.170   |
| Non-market based EPS     | index       | 126 | 5.304   | 0.435                     | 3.000  | 6.000   |
| Technology support EPS   | index       | 126 | 2.613   | 1.255                     | 0.500  | 6.000   |
| EnvPref                  | in %        | 126 | 0.184   | 0.087                     | 0.040  | 0.500   |
| GDP per capita           | in €1000    | 126 | 29.850  | 16.590                    | 9.070  | 85.030  |
| Gini index               | %           | 125 | 28.813  | 3.281                     | 22.700 | 35.400  |
| Control of corruption    | index       | 126 | 1.234   | 0.747                     | -0.090 | 2.450   |
| Media free               | index       | 126 | 20.667  | 8.469                     | 10     | 48      |
| Number of heating days   | in 1000     | 126 | 2.967   | 1.078                     | 1.055  | 5.608   |
| Gov_coal                 | dummy       | 126 | 0.611   | 0.489                     | 0      | 1       |
| Trade open               | % in GDP    | 126 | 120.187 | 65.594                    | 45.419 | 380.104 |
| Share of unemployment    | %           | 126 | 0.068   | 0.033                     | 0.022  | 0.209   |
| Share of student         | %           | 126 | 0.099   | 0.022                     | 0.0427 | 0.147   |
| Internet                 | %           | 126 | 0.636   | 0.165                     | 0.191  | 0.934   |
| Importation              | % GDP       | 126 | 57.722  | 29.664                    | 23.020 | 174.622 |
| Exportation              | % GDP       | 126 | 62.465  | 36.086                    | 18.982 | 205.482 |
| GIPSI                    | dummy       | 126 | 0.238   | 0.428                     | 0      | 1       |
|                          |             |     |         | Category                  | Value  | %       |
| Gov.typex                | categorical | 126 |         | Single-party majority     | 1      | 15.079  |
|                          |             |     |         | Minimal winning coalition | 2      | 49.206  |
|                          |             |     |         | Surplus coalition         | 3      | 11.905  |
|                          |             |     |         | Single-party minority     | 4      | 10.317  |
|                          |             |     |         | Multi-party minority      | 5      | 10.317  |
|                          |             |     |         | Caretaker government      | 6      | 2.381   |
|                          |             |     |         | Technocratic government   | 7      | 0.794   |
| Non Parliamentary system | dummy       | 126 |         | Parliamentary sytem       | 0      | 58.730  |
|                          |             |     |         | Otherwise                 | 1      | 41.270  |
| Federal country          | dummy       | 126 |         | Strong or Weak            | 1      | 80.950% |
|                          |             |     |         | No                        | 0      | 19.050% |
| Gov_leftist_coal         | dummy       | 126 |         | Coalition                 | 1      | 14.3    |

the index is estimated at around 28.81% and is associated with a standard deviation of 3.28%. Slovenia registers the lowest value in this sample while Portugal has the highest score. The GDP per capita and Gini variables come from the Eurostat database.

Individual characteristics like age, gender, education, political values, media coverage of climate, appear to be crucial for understanding climate change, as does the stage of development of the country where people live (Baiardi, 2022 [11]). In this study, the role of education and the use of internet on environmental considerations is taken into account through the share of students in the population and the percentage of people using internet every day.

As political variables, we use indicator of political institutions (control of corruption) from the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) and Type of government described in table 1 (Gov.type) and government coalition. The corruption control is highly important in lowering carbon emissions and improving environmental quality (Muham-

mad and Long, 2021 [65]). Indeed, low levels of corruption are associated with greater individual support for climate action, suggesting that poor socioeconomic conditions and weaknesses in institutional frameworks, administrative capacity and regulation are serious shortcomings for implementation. implementation of mitigation and adaptation policies (Baiardi, 2022 [11]). As a measure of government coalition, we constructed from the Comparative Political Database a variable called "government coalition" which is a dummy variable taking the value 1 if there is a coalition government and 0 otherwise.

Other variables like the Media free, GIPSI variables which equal to 1 for countries such as Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy after the year 2011, Pres (political system), Prop (electoral system), Fed (federalism) and the Press Freedom Index are used as control variable (Table 1). The Press Freedom Index comes from Freedom House and ranges from 0 (total freedom) to 100 (no freedom).






Figure 3: Environmental Policy Stringency and sub-indices

## 4.2 Empirical methodology

The specification is based on the empirical model advocated by Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips (2020, [60]). The environmental policy stringency variable (EPS) will be explained by individuals' environmental attitudes and preferences (*EnvPref*) and a set of control variables on a panel data of European countries:

$$\ln(EPS)_{it} = \alpha_i + \alpha_t + \beta_1 \ln(EnvPref)_{it} + \sum_{k=2}^K \beta_k X_{it}^k + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  is an individual effect (either fixed or random),  $\alpha_t$  a temporal effect and  $\epsilon_{it}$  is a random variable.

$\ln(EPS)_{it}$  stand for the log of the measure of environmental policy stringency calculated by the OECD for country  $i$  at time  $t$ . The variable  $EnvPref_{it}$  is a measure of the average population attitude towards environmental issues for country  $i$  at time  $t$  (see below for a detailed description of this variable).  $X_{it}^k$  stands for control variable  $k$  for country  $i$  at time  $t$ . The list of the control variables is selected according to the main determinants of the *EPS* factor reviewed in section 2. We have included GDP per capita, the Gini index and the level of corruption as the main economic determinants; political factors are modelled with the dummy *Gov\_coal* measuring if the government running the economy is composed of a coalition. Finally, climatic factors are proxied by the number of heating days in the country. Unobserved heterogeneity is modelled by including individual effects in the model whereas common factors affecting environmental policy decision are proxied by the temporal effects. It is worth noting that we do not impose that the random variable  $\epsilon_{it}$  follows a white noise process.

We apply both Hausman (Hausman, 1978 [46]) and robust Hausman tests (Wooldrige, 2010 [82]) in order to disentangle between fixed or random effects. We test for serial correlation and heteroscedasticity in the residuals  $\epsilon_{it}$ . If the observations are serially correlated and/or heteroscedasticity, then robust standard errors of estimates are computed. Finally, we test for endogeneity of the *EnvPref* variable by running the Durwin-Wu-Hausman test.

## 5 Results

In this section, we will first describe the results of the specification tests. We will then comment on the results assuming that the individual attitude towards the environment policy variable is exogenous. Finally, we will discuss the econometric results of the IV estimates assuming that the *EnvPref* variable is endogenous.

### 5.1 Specification tests

The baseline linear model will include GDP per capita, the Gini coefficients, a climate variable, an index measuring corruption and the presence of coalitions within the government as the main control variables. Following Martínez-Zarzoso and Phillips (2020, [60]), a non-linear model is also estimated by introducing the GDP and the Gini variables in squared terms. We test whether the impact of GDP per capita on *EPS* does also depend on political variables by introducing an interaction term between the dummy *Gov\_coal* variable and GDP per capita. We also introduce an interaction term between the Gini variable and the presence of a coalition government. The results of all the specification tests are reported in Table 2. The baseline results are reported in column (1). In column (2) we add a dummy variable denoted *GIPSI* and equal to 1 for countries such as Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy after the year 2011. Indeed, these countries were at the centre of the European sovereign debt crisis and were the hardest hit. This may have led their governments to change their long-term policies, including their investment spending to combat climate change. In column (3), we test whether all types of government coalition have the same effect on the *EPS* variable. We introduce a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the coalition is made up of left-wing parties (*Gov\_leftist\_coal*). In column (4), the *GIPSI* and *Gov\_leftist\_coal* are introduced together. Finally, in the last column, we desegregate the coalition variable by its main items as we introduced the *Gov\_type* variable with all the other determinants. The *Gov\_type* variable has 7 different factors according to the type of the government ruling the economy<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup>The value 1 corresponds to Single-party majority government; 2 to Minimal winning coalition (all participating parties are necessary to form a majority government [ $>50.0\%$ ]); 3 to Surplus coalition (coalition governments which exceed the minimal-winning criterion [ $>50.0\%$ ]), 4 to Single-

In the last part of Table 2, we have reported the four specification tests applied. As the conclusions are the same for all specifications, we will only comment the baseline model (1) results. To test for fixed versus random individual effects, we perform the Hausman test (see Table 2 column 1). The null hypothesis of no correlation between the individual effect and the residuals is accepted at the 5% level (a statistic of 17.89 with a p-value equal to 0.084). So the model should be estimated with random effects. However, it is well-known that the Hausman test requires that the residual be i.i.d. random variables, otherwise it will be biased. We then apply the "robust" Hausman test advocated by Wooldridge which is robust to non i.i.d. errors. The null hypothesis of random effects is now rejected at the 1% level (a statistic of 63.209 with a p-value equal to 0.000). The null hypothesis of no serial correlation is rejected (a statistic of 13.292 with a p-value equal to 0.002) as it is rejected the null hypothesis of homoscedasticity of the error term (a statistic of 128.35 with a p-value equal to 0.000). To conclude, all five specifications should be estimated with a fixed effect model and serial correlation and heteroskedasticity should be taken into account with robust standard errors.

## 5.2 Fixed effects (FE) model

Two-way fixed effects estimates are presented in the first part of Table 2. In the baseline model, all the main control variables but the Gini are significant: the GDP per capita, the Gov\_coal variables and the climate variable are significant at the 1% level, the corruption is significant at the 5% level. The GINI estimate is negative but not significant (see Table 2 column 1). GDP per capita has a negative effect on EPS. As expected GDP per capita has a non-linear impact on EPS. It is worth noting that the effect of GDP per capita and GINI depends also on the nature of the government. Indeed, the interaction variables GDP with Gov\_coal and GINI with gov\_coal are positive and significant at the 1% level. Finally, the climate variable is positive and significant at the 1% level. These findings are not altered by the introduction of the other control variables (see columns 2 to 5), namely GIPSI, Gov\_leftist\_coal and Gov\_type. The GIPSI and Gov\_leftist\_coal are never significant whereas the Gov\_type variable is globally significant.

The most striking findings concerns the effect of the individual attitude towards environmental. In all specification the estimates are positive. So, increasing individual preferences toward environment will force governments to implement policies addressing the climate change which improve the environmental policy stringency indicator. However, although positive, the *EnvPref* estimates are significant at the 10% level only in four out of the five specifications. If the Gov\_type variable is introduced then the *EnvPref* variable is no more significant (see Table 2 column 5). As already mentioned, the individual attitude towards environmental cannot be considered as an exogenous variable. Indeed, if the *EnvPref* variable should impact the EPS indicator, the opposite is also true. A very active government in the fight against climate change will certainly change people's preferences. Hence ignoring this simultaneity issue could bias downward the estimates. This bias will be addressed in the next section.

## 5.3 IV estimations

In this section we will address the potential endogeneity of the *EnvPref* variable by applying an IV framework: we will estimate the model with a 2SLS regression. We need to instrument the *EnvPref* variable. The instruments in order to be valid should fill full the two-following hypothesis: (i) they should be relevant and (ii) exogeneous. The first condition can be tested with the weak instrument test developed by Stock and Yogo (2005) and the second one can be examined with the Hansen J-test of overidentifying restrictions.

Choosing valid instruments is the tricky point in IV estimations. We used two types of exogenous factors to instrument the *EnvPref* variable: demographic and business cyclical variables. There is now a large body of literature showing that young people are becoming more involved in climate change organizations. Furthermore, the dramatic development of social networks is having an increasing impact on people's thinking. So, we have chosen two different variables to proxy for these phenomena: the share of students in the population and the percentage of people using internet every day. As shown by the public's opposition to the introduction of certain carbon taxes (e.g. the Yellow Vests protests in France), people's economic situation affects the way they see the future and the policies to be put in

---

party minority government (The party in government does not possess a majority in Parliament [50.0%]); 5 to Multi-party minority government (the parties in government do not possess a majority in Parliament [ 50.0%]), 6 to Caretaker government (governments which should simply maintain the status quo) and 7 to Technocratic government (government is led by technocratic prime minister and consists of a majority of technocratic ministers who are in possession of a mandate to change the status quo)

place to combat global warming. We have therefore chosen the number of unemployed in the country as a variable measuring the economic cycle. An increase in unemployment worsens people's incomes and increases uncertainty about their future situation, which could make them less likely to support policies to increase taxes to reduce the effects of climate change. Results of the different IV estimations are reported in Table 3.

Firstly, we apply the Wu-Hausman test in order to test for the endogeneity of the *EnvPref* variable. This test compares the OLS and IV estimates with a Hausman specification test: if they are similar then *EnvPref* can be considered as exogenous. In the case of the baseline model, with a test statistic equal to 5.278 and a p-value equal to 0.024, the null hypothesis of exogeneity is rejected at the 5% level (see Table 3 column 1). We get similar findings for the other four specifications (see columns 2 to 5). Secondly, we check for the instrument relevance with the weak instruments test. In the case of the baseline specification the first regression F-test is equal to 12.23 larger than the 10% critical value (9.08) computed by Stock and Yogo (2005). So, the null hypothesis is rejected at least at the 10% level and there is no weak instrument issue in our model. It is worth noting that if the GIPSI variable is included in the specification then the null hypothesis is rejected at the 5% level (see columns 2 to 5 in Table 3). Thirdly, with the Hansen J-test we examined the issue of the exogeneity of the selected instruments. As regards the baseline specification, the null hypothesis of instruments exogeneity is not rejected (we have a statistic of 3.605 with a p-value of 0.165). Accordingly, our selected instruments can be considered as valid <sup>8</sup>.

We will now comment on the econometric estimates in further detail. Once the endogeneity issue has been addressed with an IV regression, the most striking finding is that the *EnvPref* variable turns now to be significant at the 1% level in most cases. The estimate increases drastically from 0.056 (the OLS estimate) to 0.235 in the baseline specification (see column 1 Table 3). So, this confirms that endogeneity is a serious issue in our dataset. The estimated value is robust to change in the list of the control variables: depending on the specification chosen, the estimated value of the coefficient varies from 0.225 to 0.235. On average a rise in the individual preference towards environment of 10% in a country will increase its EPS indicator by 2.30%. The findings for the all other control variables but the GINI variable are only marginally changed in the case of an IV regression. Again, GDP has a significant non-linear effect on GDP per capita. This effect depends also on the nature of the government as the interaction term between GDP per capita and *Gov\_coal* is positive and significant (see column 1 Table 3). To better comment on the impact of GDP per capita on EPS, we have calculated the estimated threshold and the average marginal effect. In the case of the baseline model, the average marginal effect is negative and significant at the 1% level. The nature of government has an important impact on how GDP per capita influences the EPS policy variable. Without a coalition of parties ruling the government, the estimated coefficient is equal to -0.027 (with a p-value equal to 0.000), while it is only -0.019 (with a p-value equal to 0.002) in the opposite case. The estimated threshold for GDP is equal to 52 766 euros (46 235) if *Gov\_coal* = 0 (*Gov\_coal* = 1). So, GDP per capita has a negative and significant impact on EPS for countries with GDP per capita lower than that threshold and a positive and significant one for countries with GDP above that threshold. It is worth noting that most countries in the panel are below the estimated threshold <sup>9</sup>. For example, if *Gov\_coal* = 1 (*Gov\_coal* = 0), a country whose GDP per capita moves from the first decile of the distribution to the ninth decile of the distribution, will experience a decrease in the EPS variable (in log) from 1.481 (1.650) to 0.853 (0.681), all else being equal.

The significance of the Gini variable depends on the nature of the government. It is worth noting that if *Gov\_coal* = 1, then the estimated marginal effect is non-significant (the estimated marginal effect is equal to 0.003 with a p-value of 0.635) whereas it is negative and significant at the 10% level only in the opposite case (the estimated marginal effect is equal to -0.016 with a p-value of 0.055). So, inequality seems not to be a major determinant of EPS in European countries <sup>10</sup>. The *Gov\_coal* variable per se is significant at the 1% level: countries with coalition of different political parties ruling their government experience on average a lower value of the log of the EPS variable by 0.78 (column 1 Table 3). Left-wing coalitions are not different from right-wing coalition as the estimate of the dummy variable is non-significant (see columns 3 and 4 Table 3). If the *Gov\_coal* variable is disaggregated by the type of government, then we get some interesting results. The negative effect of coalitions on EPS is mainly explained by Minimal winning coalition (type 2 government) and Surplus coalition (type 3 government) compared to a Single-party majority govern-

<sup>8</sup> Again, this finding is also true for the other specifications estimated: see column 2 to 5 in Table 3

<sup>9</sup> Only Ireland after 2017 and Luxembourg after 2009 are above the estimated threshold

<sup>10</sup> The estimated threshold of the GINI variable is equal to 31.79 % for the case *Gov\_coal* = 0. This value corresponds to the third decile of the GINI variable.

ment. It is worth noting however that Caretaker governments (type 6 government) have a positive and significant effect on EPS (see column 5 Table 3). Again, the effect of the average temperature in the country is positive and significant at the 5% level: an increase in the number of heating days by 1% will rise the (log of) EPS variable by 0.12% on average. Climate variables are then a major determinant of EPS as it is the case of corruption (see columns 1 to 5 Table 3). The coefficient on the GIPSI variable although negative (as expected) is never significant (see columns 2, 3 and in Table 3). Therefore, the European debt crisis has not changed the environmental policies implemented by the most affected countries.

In a nutshell, in the case of European countries the most important determinants of the EPS variable are the individual attitude towards environment, GDP per capita, the climate variable, the level of corruption, the nature of the government and to a lesser extend inequality.

## 6 Robustness checks

Our main finding is to demonstrate that individual preferences towards environment is a major determinant of the EPS variable. In this section we will run a number of robustness checks in order to confirm this conclusion. We will first modify the list of explanatory variables (Table 4) and then study the determinants of the disaggregated EPS indicators (table 5).

### 6.1 Introducing new control variables

Our first robustness check is to introduce dynamics in the baseline model. We will then estimate a dynamic panel data model where the EPS variable is explained by its lag value and some control variables. This model is now estimate with a GMM framework in order to deal with the endogeneity of both the lag of EPS (the Nickel bias) and the *EnvPref* variables (see Table 4). The instruments for the attitude towards environment are the same as in the previous section. The estimate of the lag dependant variable is significant (at the 1% level) and it is equal to 0.815 (see column 1 Table 4)<sup>11</sup>. Most importantly, the *EnvPref* variable remains significant (at the 5% level): the short-run estimate is 0.051 which implies a long-run estimate of around 0.274 ( $= 0.051/(1 - 0.815)$ ). This implied long-run estimate is qualitatively similar to the estimate coefficient obtained with the static model of the previous section.

In column 2, we have introduced more political variables describing the nature of the state and the election system. The "Non Federalist country" variable is a dummy variable equal to 0 if the state is not federalist and equal to 1 if it is a weak or strong federalist state. We have also introduce a variable measuring the executive-legislative relations. The dummy variable is equal to 0 if there is a parliamentary system in the country and 1 for all the others systems (namely the semi-presidential dominated by parliament and the semi-presidential dominated by president). Again, the model does not suffer from a weak instrument issue (first regression *F - test* is equal to 14.81), and the null hypothesis of exogeneity of the selected instruments is not rejected with the Hansen J-test (at the 5% level). Only the "non federalist" dummy variable is significant but at only the 10% level: on average federal countries have a higher (log) EPS indicator of around 0.129. As regards the *EnvPref* variable, it remains positive and significant with an estimated value equal to 0.209 (see column 2 Table 4). We also introduce a measure of openness to trade in the regression: its estimated coefficient is positive but not significant (see column 3 Table 4). It is worth noting that if we split up openness to trade between imports or exports as a share of GDP, then only the estimated effect of imports is positive and significant at the 5% level. Again, the findings regarding the *EnvPref* variable are not modified. Finally, in column 5, we introduce a measure of the level of freedom of the media. This variable turns out to be not significant. The last model estimated introduced all the new control variables in the same specification. It is worth noting that introducing these variables do not change our main findings regarding the impact of the *EnvPref* variable on EPS: we estimate a positive and significant coefficient of around 0.185<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup>As the estimate is far from one, unit roots seems not to be an issue in our dataset

<sup>12</sup>Findings for the other control variables (GDP per capita, GINI, the climate variable, the presence of coalitions, imports and the federal country dummy) are also similar.

## 6.2 Modelling disaggregated EPS indicators

We will now disaggregate the EPS variable into its three components: non-market, market and technological EPS. Results are reported in Table 5. In the case of the technological EPS to full fill the Hansen exogeneity condition we have to change the set of instruments. We have introduced a new instrument to the list of instruments applied : namely, the growth rate of the population. It is worth noting that at the 5% level the null hypothesis of weak instruments is rejected for the non-market and market EPS specification and at the 10% level for the technological EPS specification. In all three specification the null hypothesis of exogeneity is not rejected at the 5% level.

The most striking result is that the determinants of the non-market component seem to be different from those of the market and technological components. Indeed, the *EnvPref* variable is not significant when the dependant variable is the non-market EPS (see column 1 Table 5). However, the attitude towards environment impacts positively and significantly the other two components. Furthermore, the estimates are almost four times larger than with the global EPS variable: respectively 0.952 and 0.850 for market and technological EPS (see columns 2 and 3 Table 5) against 0.230 for the overall EPS indicator.

As regards the other control variables, none are significant in the case of the non-market EPS, and only the GDP per capita in the case of the market EPS indicator. When modelling the technological EPS component most of the control variables are significant and have the expected sign. It is worth noting that when modelling the technological EPS component then the GIPSI dummy turns out to be negative and significant at the 5% level (see column 3 Table 5). So financial crisis such as the European debt crisis do impact environmental policy implemented by governments but not at the global level only at the technological level. The rationale behind these findings is quite obvious, as the main determinant of the technological EPS is public research and development expenditures which support innovation in low-carbon technologies. So, during difficult times when governments have to reduce their debt and their fiscal deficit, these expenses are the first ones to cut.

## 7 Conclusion and Policy implications

Fighting climate change should be one of the top priorities of government nowadays. In this paper we will use OECD Environmental Policy Stringency (EPS) index to analyze and to compare the stricter environmental policies implement by a panel of 21 European countries for the period 2009-2019. If there is a large literature on the macroeconomic, political, and social determinants of EPS, the question of the people's attitudes or preferences toward environmental policies is still burgeoning. Recently, in a series of papers, Douenne and Fabre (2020 [28], and 2022 [27]) have stressed the importance of the interplay between attitudes and beliefs in implementing a carbon tax in France. So, the goal of this paper is to estimate the effect of people's awareness regarding environmental policies on the EPS indicator on a broader scale, namely a panel of European countries. To our knowledge, only Chen et al. (2019 [20]) have provided cross-country evidence about the impact of ecological awareness on environmental policies. They measured people's ecological preferences with a Google Trend variable. In our paper, we rely on the variable computed by Baiardi and Morana (2021 [12]) taken from Eurobarometer surveys, which provide evidence about people's attitudes toward natural resources.

As expected, the people's attitude regarding environment is an endogenous variable. So, we have applied an instrumental variable framework to estimate our empirical model. Our most important result is to show that individual environmental preferences have a positive and significant effect on the level of the Environmental Policy Stringency indicator: on average a rise in the individual preference of 10% in a country will increase its EPS indicator by 2.30%. This estimate is robust to changes in the set of control variables or in the econometrics framework applied. GDP per capita, a climate variable, the level of corruption, the nature of the government and to a lesser extend inequality are the other main determinants of EPS. Analyzing the disaggregated components of EPS, we obtain some new results. Individual environmental preferences do not explain the non-market component of EPS but it has a strong, positive and significant effect on the market and on the technological components. It is worth noting that it is these last two sub-indicators that explain the larger part of cross-country changes in the EPS index.

The policy implications of our results are important. As shown by Figure 2, changes in the stringency of environmental policy (namely an increase in the EPS indicator) reduce significantly the intensity of greenhouse gas emissions across European countries. Therefore, a government that wants to effectively fight global warming must not only put in place

binding environmental policies, but must also be concerned about how these policies will be valued by the population. As our empirical results show, an environmental policy will be more effective if it has the support of the population. Therefore, two main insights emerge from our empirical research. Firstly, governments must make significant communication efforts to explain the rationale for their environmental decisions. Secondly, they must ensure that the negative effects of environmental policies are distributed fairly between winners and losers by, for instance, providing subsidies to the most fragile part of their population who would see their income decrease because of the implementation of these environmental policies.

## References

- [1] Acemoglu, D., U. Akcigit, D. Hanley, and W. Kerr (2016) Transition to Clean Technology, *Journal of Political Economy*, 124:1, 52-104. doi.org/10.1086/684511
- [2] Anderson, B., T. Böhmelt, and H. Ward (2017) Public opinion and environmental policy output: a cross-national analysis of energy policies in Europe, *Environmental Research Letters* 12:1, 114011. doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa8f80
- [3] Annicchiarico, B., S. Carattini, C. Fischer, and G. Heutel (2021) Business cycles and environmental policy: Literature review and policy implications, NBER Working Paper 29032. doi.org/10.3386/w29032
- [4] Albrizio, S., T. Kozluk, V. Zipperer (2017) productivity growth: Evidence across industries and firms, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 81, 209-226. doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2016.06.002
- [5] Albrizio, S., E. Botta, T. Kozluk, V. Zipperer (2017) Do environmental policies matter for productivity growth? Insights from new cross country measures of environmental policies. Economics Department working papers No 1176.
- [6] C. T. Albuлесcu, M. Boatca-Barabas and A. Diaconescu The asymmetric effect of environmental policy stringency on CO2 emissions in OECD countries, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29, 27311â€“27327. doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2019.02.009.
- [7] Arminen, H. and A. N. Menegaki (2019) Corruption, climate and the energy-environment-growth nexus, *Energy Economics*, 80, 621-634. doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2019.02.009.
- [8] Armingeon, K., S. Engler, and L. Leemann (2022) Comparative Political Data Set 1960-2020, Zurich: Department of Political Science, University of Zurich. www.cps-data.org
- [9] Aziz, N., B. Hossain, and L. Lamb (2022) Does green policy pay dividends? *Environ Econ Policy Stud*, 24, 147–172. doi.org/10.1007/s10018-021-00317-7
- [10] Auerbach, A. J. and W. G. Gale (2021) Implications of low interest rates for the design of tax policy, Tax Policy Center, Urban Institute & Brookings Institution. www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Brief-Implications-of-Low-Interest-Rates-for-the-Design-of-Tax-Policy.pdf
- [11] Baiardi, D. (2022) What do you think about climate change? *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 00, 1– 59. doi.org/10.1111/joes.12535
- [12] Baiardi, D and Morana, C. (2021) Climate change awareness: Empirical evidence for the European Union, *Energy Economics*, Volume 96. doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105163.
- [13] Besley, T and T. Persson (2022) The Political Economics of Green Transitions, *CEPR Discussion Paper* No. DP17242. ssn.com/abstract=4121425
- [14] Besley, T. and T. Persson (2019) JEEA-FBBVA LECTURE 2017: The Dynamics of Environmental Politics and Values, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17(4), 993–1024. doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvz040
- [15] Bowles, S. (1998) Endogenous Preferences: The Cultural Consequences of Markets and Other Economic Institutions, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36(1), 75–111. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2564952
- [16] Carney, M. (2015) Breaking the Tragedy of the Horizon – Climate Change and Financial Stability, speech delivered at Lloyd’s of London, London, UK, September 29. https://www.bis.org/review/r151009a.pdf.
- [17] Cassin, L., P. Melindi-Ghidi, and F. Prieur (2021) The impact of income inequality on public environmental expenditure with green consumerism, *CEE-M WorkingPaper* 2021-03. https://www.cee-m.fr/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/WP-2021-03.pdf



- [18] Cherry, T. L., S. Kallbekken, and S. Kroll (2017) Accepting market failure: Cultural worldviews and the opposition to corrective environmental policies, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 85, 193–204.
- [19] Chen, X., Huang, B., and C.-T. Lin (2019) Environmental awareness and environmental Kuznets curve, *Economic Modelling* 77, 2–11. doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2019.02.003.
- [20] Constant, K. and M. Davin (2019) Environmental policy and growth when environmental awareness is endogenous, *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 23(3), 1102-1136. doi:10.1017/S1365100517000189
- [21] Corbi, R. and C. Falco (2022) Natural Disasters and Preferences for the Environment: Evidence from the Impressionable Years, *Working Papers 2022\_07*, Department of Economics, University of São Paulo (FEA-USP).
- [22] Dang, H.-A. H. and U. Serajuddin (2020) Tracking the sustainable development goals: Emerging measurement challenges and further reflections, *World Development*, 127. doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.05.024.
- [23] Dasgupta, S. and De Cian, E. (2018) The influence of institutions, governance, and public opinion on the environment: Synthesized findings from applied econometrics studies, *Energy Research & Social Science* 43, 77–95. doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.05.023
- [24] de Angelis, E. M., M. Di Giacomo, and D. Vannoni (2019) Climate Change and Economic Growth: The Role of Environmental Policy Stringency, *Sustainability*, 11(8): 2273. doi.org/10.3390/su11082273
- [25] Dechezleprêtre, A., A. Fabre, T. Kruse, B. Planterose, A. Sanchez Chico, and S. Stantcheva (2022) Fighting Climate Change: International Attitudes Toward Climate Policies, *NBER Working Paper* No. 30265.
- [26] Dennis, B.N. (2022) Climate Change and Financial Policy: A Literature Review, *Finance and Economics Discussion Series*, 2022-048, Washington: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2022.048.
- [27] Douenne, T. and A. Fabre (2022) Yellow Vests, Pessimistic Beliefs, and Carbon Tax Aversion, *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 14(1): 81–110. doi.org/10.1257/pol.20200092
- [28] Douenne, T. and A. Fabre (2020) French attitudes on climate change, carbon taxation and other climate policies, *Ecological Economics*, Volume 169. doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106496
- [29] Downey, L. (2015) *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*, NYU Press.
- [30] Drews, S. and J. C.J.M. van den Bergh (2016) What explains public support for climate policies? A review of empirical and experimental studies, *Climate Policy*, 16:7, 855-876. doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2015.1058240
- [31] Eurobarometer (2021), *Climate Change. Report*, European Commission. <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2273>
- [32] Eurobarometer (2020), *Climate Change. Report*, European Commission. <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2257>
- [33] G. Feng, K. R. McLaren, O. Yang, X. Zhang, X. Zhao (2021) The impact of environmental policy stringency on industrial productivity growth: A semi-parametric study of OECD countries, *Energy Economics*, 100, 105320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2021.105320>
- [34] Farhidi, F., K. Madani, and R. Crichton (2022) Have Extreme Events Awakened Us?, *Sustainability*, 14(12): 7417. doi.org/10.3390/su14127417
- [35] Folke, O. (2014) Shades of Brown and Green: Party Effects in Proportional Election Systems, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 12:5, 1361–1395. doi.org/10.1111/jeea.12103
- [36] Fritz, M. and M. Koch (2019) Public Support for Sustainable Welfare Compared: Links between Attitudes towards Climate and Welfare Policies, *Sustainability*, 11(15):4146, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11154146>

- [37] Garside, S. and H. Zhai (2022) If not now when? Climate disaster and the Green vote following the 2021 Germany Floods, *Research & Politics*, forthcoming.
- [38] Gatti, D. (2022a) Going green and (un)equal ? Political coalitions, redistribution, and the environment, *Economic Modelling*, 116. doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2022.105996.
- [39] Gatti, D. (2022b) What's behind the Political Support for Green Welfare State Institutions ?, *INFER Brief Series* No. 01 [https://infer-research.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/INFER-BRIEF-2022\\_01.pdf](https://infer-research.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/INFER-BRIEF-2022_01.pdf)
- [40] Gatti, D. (2021) Protecting natural and social resources. A political economy approach, *INFER Working Papers Series*, No 10-2021. <https://infer-research.eu/publication/protecting-natural-and-social-resources-a-political-economy-approach>
- [41] Gatti, D. and Vauday Julien (2023) Environmental transition through social change and lobbying by citizens, *FAERE Working Papers Series*, mimeo.
- [42] Gerber, E. R., and J. E. Jackson (1993) Endogenous Preferences and the Study of Institutions, *The American Political Science Review*, 87(3), 639–656. doi.org/10.2307/2938741
- [43] Grandin, A., L. Guillou, R. Abdel Sater, M. Foucault and C. Chevallier (2022) Socioeconomic status, time preferences and pro-environmentalism, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 79. doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101720.
- [44] Grunewald, N., S. Klasen, I. Martinez-Zarzoso, and C. Muris (2017) The Trade-off between Income Inequality and Carbon Dioxide Emissions, *Ecological Economics* 142, 249-256. doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.06.034
- [45] M. Hassan, D. Rousselière (2022) Does increasing environmental policy stringency lead to accelerated environmental innovation? A research note, *Applied Economics*, 54, 1989–1998. doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1983146
- [46] Hausman, J. A. (1978) Specification Tests in Econometrics, *Econometrica*, 46:6, 1251–1271. doi.org/10.2307/1913827
- [47] Hu, H., D. Chen, C.-P. Chang, and Y. Chu (2021) The political economy of environmental consequences: a review of the empirical literature, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 35: 250-306. doi.org/10.1111/joes.12396
- [48] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2022) Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, Summary for Policymakers, report of Working Group II of the IPCC.
- [49] Kammermann, L. and C. Dermont (2018) How beliefs of the political elite and citizens on climate change influence support for Swiss energy transition policy, *Energy Research & Social Science*, 43, 48-60. doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.05.010.
- [50] Kayser, M., Orlowski, M. and Rehmert, J. (2022) Coalition inclusion probabilities: A party-strategic measure for predicting policy and politics, *Political Science Research and Methods*, 1-19. doi:10.1017/psrm.2021.75
- [51] Kayser, M.A. and Rehmert, J. (2021), Coalition Prospects and Policy Change: An Application to the Environment. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 46: 219-246. doi.org/10.1111/lsq.12273
- [52] Kayser, M. A. and Rehmert, J. (2019), Replication Data for: Coalition Prospects and Policy Change: an Application to the Environment. doi.org/10.7910/DVN/QTWTF, Harvard Dataverse, V1
- [53] Kim, D.-H., and S.-C. Lin (2022) Trade Openness and Environmental Policy Stringency: Quantile Evidence, *Sustainability*, 14(6): 3590. doi.org/10.3390/su14063590
- [54] Kruse, T., Dechezleprêtre, A., Saffar, R. and Robert, L. (2022), Measuring environmental policy stringency in OECD countries : An update of the OECD composite EPS indicator, *Documents de travail du D épartement des Affaires économiques de l'OCDE*. 1703. doi.org/10.1787/90ab82e8-en

- [55] López, R. and S. Mitra (2000) Corruption, Pollution, and the Kuznets Environment Curve, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 40, 137-150. doi.org/10.1006/jeem.1999.1107
- [56] Lundquist, S. (2022) Do Parties Matter for Environmental Policy Stringency? Exploring the Program-to-Policy Link for Environmental Issues in 28 Countries 1990–2015, *Political Studies*, 0(0). doi.org/10.1177/00323217221132072
- [57] Maestre-Andrés, S., Drews, S. and van den Bergh, J. (2019) Perceived fairness and public acceptability of carbon pricing: a review of the literature, *Climate Policy*, 19:9, 1186-1204. doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2019.1639490
- [58] Marra, A. and E. Colantonio (2022) The institutional and socio-technical determinants of renewable energy production in the EU: implications for policy. *J. Ind. Bus. Econ.* 49, 267–299. doi.org/10.1007/s40812-022-00212-6
- [59] Martínez-Zarzoso, I., A. Bengochea-Morancho, and R. Morales-Lage (2019) Does environmental policy stringency foster innovation and productivity in OECD countries?, *Energy Policy*, 134. doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.110982.
- [60] Martínez-Zarzoso, I. and J. Phillips (2020) Freedom of the press, inequality and environmental policy, *Environment and Development Economics*, 25(6). 537-560. doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X20000339
- [61] Masron, T.A., Subramaniam, Y (2018) The environmental Kuznets curve in the presence of corruption in developing countries, *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 25, 12491–12506. doi.org/10.1007/s11356-018-1473-9
- [62] Mattauch, L., Hepburn, C., Spuler, F., and N. Stern (2022) The economics of climate change with endogenous preferences, *Resource and Energy Economics*, 69. doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2022.101312.
- [63] McGee, J.A. and Greiner, P.T. (2018) Can Reducing Income Inequality Decouple Economic Growth from CO2 Emissions? *Socius*, Volume 4. doi:10.1177/2378023118772716
- [64] Morana, C. (2021), Data for: Climate change awareness: Empirical evidence for the European Union, *Mendeley Data*. V1. doi.org/10.17632/vsvvmsxn4g.1
- [65] Muhammad, S. and X. Long (2021) Rule of law and CO2 emissions: A comparative analysis across 65 belt and road initiative (BRI) countries, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 279. doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123539.
- [66] Oguzhan, C. D. and P. G. Fredriksson (2018) Corruption and environmental regulatory policy in the United States: Does trust matter?, *Resource and Energy Economics*, 54, 212-225. doi.org/10.1016/j.reseneeco.2018.10.001.
- [67] Otteni, C. and Weisskircher, M. (2022), Global warming and polarization. Wind turbines and the electoral success of the greens and the populist radical right, *European Journal of Political Research*. doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12487
- [68] Pottier, A., E. Combet, J. Cayla, S. de Lauretis, and F. Nadaud (2020) Qui émet du CO2 ? Panorama critique des inégalités écologiques en France, *Revue de l'OFCE*, 169, 73-132. doi.org/10.3917/reof.169.0073
- [69] Qingquan, J., Khattak, S.I., Ahmad, M., Ping, L. (2020) A new approach to environmental sustainability: Assessing the impact of monetary policy on CO2 emissions in Asian economies, *Sustainable Development*, 28, 1331–1346. doi.org/10.1002/sd.2087
- [70] Rafaty, R. (2018) Perceptions of Corruption, Political Distrust, and the Weakening of Climate Policy, *Global Environmental Politics* 18:3. doi.org/10.1162/glep\_a.00471
- [71] Rehmert, J. (2021) Replication Data for: White collar Inclusion Probabilities: A Party-Strategic Measure for Predicting Policy and Politics. doi.org/10.7910/DVN/GUKPZO, Harvard Dataverse, V1

- [72] Rojas-Vallejos, J. and Lastuka, A. (2020) The income inequality and carbon emissions trade-off revisited, *Energy Policy*, Volume 139. doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111302
- [73] Schaffer, L., Oehl, B., & Bernauer, T. (2022). Are policymakers responsive to public demand in climate politics? *Journal of Public Policy*, 42(1), 136-164. doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X21000088
- [74] Shum, R.Y. (2009), Can attitudes predict outcomes? Public opinion, democratic institutions and environmental policy. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19: 281-295. doi.org/10.1002/eet.518
- [75] Sivonen, J. and I. Kukkonen (2021) Is There a Link between Welfare Regime and Attitudes toward Climate Policy Instruments?, *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 64(6) 1145–1165, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121421990053>
- [76] Sloggy, M.R., J. F. Suter, M. R. Rad, D. T. Manning, and C. Goemans (2021) Changing opinions on a changing climate: the effects of natural disasters on public perceptions of climate change, *Climatic Change*, 168, 25. doi.org/10.1007/s10584-021-03242-6
- [77] Stiglitz, J.E. (2019) Addressing climate change through price and non-price interventions, *European Economic Review* 119, 594–612.
- [78] Ziegler, A. (2017) Political orientation, environmental values, and climate change beliefs and attitudes: An empirical cross country analysis, *Energy Economics* 63, 144–153.
- [79] Wan, G., Wang, C., Wang, J., and X. Zhang (2022) The income inequality-CO2 emissions nexus: Transmission mechanisms, *Ecological Economics*, 195:107360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2022.107360>.
- [80] Wang, K., M. Yan, Y. Wang, C. Chang (2020) The impact of environmental policy stringency on air quality, *Atmospheric Environment*, 231,117522 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2020.117522>
- [81] Whitmarsh, L. and Capstick, S. (2018) 2 - Perceptions of climate change, S. Clayton and C. Manning (Eds), *Psychology and Climate Change*, Academic Press, pages 13-33. doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813130-5.00002-3.
- [82] Wooldridge, J. M. (2010) *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, The MIT Press.

Table 2: OLS estimates

| VARIABLES                | (1)<br>EPS             | (2)<br>EPS              | (3)<br>EPS             | (4)<br>EPS             | (5)<br>EPS             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Env_Pref                 | 0.0564*<br>(0.0299)    | 0.0539*<br>(0.0289)     | 0.0560*<br>(0.0297)    | 0.0531*<br>(0.0289)    | 0.0477<br>(0.0311)     |
| GDP per capita           | -0.0504***<br>(0.0101) | -0.0537***<br>(0.00987) | -0.0479***<br>(0.0111) | -0.0511***<br>(0.0109) | -0.0504***<br>(0.0105) |
| Number of Heating days   | 0.127***<br>(0.0259)   | 0.125***<br>(0.0256)    | 0.126***<br>(0.0263)   | 0.124***<br>(0.0266)   | 0.131***<br>(0.0281)   |
| Corruption               | 0.170**<br>(0.0660)    | 0.154**<br>(0.0648)     | 0.169**<br>(0.0670)    | 0.149**<br>(0.0656)    | 0.158**<br>(0.0587)    |
| Gini                     | -0.136<br>(0.0825)     | -0.136<br>(0.0824)      | -0.136<br>(0.0829)     | -0.135<br>(0.0825)     | -0.137<br>(0.0847)     |
| GDP-square               | 0.0005***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)   | 0.0005***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0005***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0005***<br>(0.0001)  |
| Gini-square              | 0.0021<br>(0.0014)     | 0.0021<br>(0.0013)      | 0.0021<br>(0.0014)     | 0.0021<br>(0.0013)     | 0.0022<br>(0.0014)     |
| gov_coal_Gini            | 0.0152***<br>(0.00463) | 0.0158***<br>(0.00463)  | 0.0151***<br>(0.00474) | 0.0158***<br>(0.00468) | 0.0119*<br>(0.00643)   |
| gov_coal_GDP             | 0.0071***<br>(0.0012)  | 0.0069***<br>(0.0011)   | 0.0073***<br>(0.0012)  | 0.0071***<br>(0.0011)  | 0.0082***<br>(0.0012)  |
| GIPSI                    |                        | -0.0378<br>(0.0445)     |                        | -0.0438<br>(0.0413)    | -0.0343<br>(0.0434)    |
| Gov_coal                 | -0.631***<br>(0.147)   | -0.643***<br>(0.144)    | -0.635***<br>(0.153)   | -0.649***<br>(0.148)   |                        |
| Gov_leftist_coal         |                        |                         | 0.0260<br>(0.0389)     | 0.0322<br>(0.0398)     |                        |
| 2.gov_type               |                        |                         |                        |                        | -0.534**<br>(0.220)    |
| 3.gov_type               |                        |                         |                        |                        | -0.525**<br>(0.218)    |
| 4.gov_typex              |                        |                         |                        |                        | 0.0274<br>(0.0340)     |
| 5.gov_type               |                        |                         |                        |                        | 0.0309<br>(0.0282)     |
| 6.gov_type               |                        |                         |                        |                        | 0.104***<br>(0.0305)   |
| 7.gov_type               |                        |                         |                        |                        | 0.0960*<br>(0.0488)    |
| Constant                 | 2.967**<br>(1.292)     | 3.070**<br>(1.327)      | 2.915**<br>(1.305)     | 3.022**<br>(1.338)     | 2.866**<br>(1.321)     |
| R-squared                | 0.806                  | 0.806                   | 0.805                  | 0.806                  | 0.805                  |
| Hausman Test             | 17.89<br>(0.084)       | 20.86<br>(0.053)        | 27.15<br>(0.007)       | 36.14<br>(0.001)       | 36.27<br>(0.004)       |
| Robust Hausman Test      | 63.209<br>(0.000)      | 147.980<br>(0.000)      | 77.850<br>(0.000)      | 229.954<br>(0.000)     | 312.433<br>(0.000)     |
| Serial Correlation Test  | 13.292<br>(0.002)      | 12.451<br>(0.002)       | 16.171<br>(0.001)      | 15.392<br>(0.001)      | 13.551<br>(0.001)      |
| Heteroscedasticity. Test | 128.35<br>(0.000)      | 128.35<br>(0.000)       | 184.39<br>(0.000)      | 144.99<br>(0.000)      | 277.95<br>(0.000)      |
| Country FE               | yes                    | yes                     | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    |
| Temporal FE              | yes                    | yes                     | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    |
| Observations             | 125                    | 125                     | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    |
| N                        | 21                     | 21                      | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     |

All variables are in log but GDP per capita, Gini and corruption  
Robust standard errors in parentheses

Table 3: IV estimation

| VARIABLES               | (1)<br>EPS             | (2)<br>EPS             | (3)<br>EPS             | (4)<br>EPS             | (5)<br>EPS             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Env_Pref                | 0.235***<br>(0.0914)   | 0.231***<br>(0.0859)   | 0.236***<br>(0.0915)   | 0.225***<br>(0.0856)   | 0.228**<br>(0.0890)    |
| GDP per capita          | -0.0610***<br>(0.0138) | -0.0626***<br>(0.0139) | -0.0589***<br>(0.0142) | -0.0602***<br>(0.0141) | -0.0624***<br>(0.0147) |
| Number of Heating days  | 0.121**<br>(0.0476)    | 0.120**<br>(0.0481)    | 0.120**<br>(0.0477)    | 0.119**<br>(0.0482)    | 0.125***<br>(0.0468)   |
| Corruption              | 0.211***<br>(0.0725)   | 0.201***<br>(0.0710)   | 0.210***<br>(0.0736)   | 0.196***<br>(0.0712)   | 0.212***<br>(0.0712)   |
| Gini                    | -0.170**<br>(0.0795)   | -0.170**<br>(0.0777)   | -0.170**<br>(0.0809)   | -0.168**<br>(0.0781)   | -0.165**<br>(0.0779)   |
| GDP-square              | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0002)  |
| Gini-square             | 0.0027**<br>(0.0014)   | 0.0027**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0027*<br>(0.0014)    | 0.0026**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0026**<br>(0.0013)   |
| Gov_coal_gini           | 0.0196***<br>(0.00542) | 0.0198***<br>(0.00523) | 0.0196***<br>(0.00549) | 0.0197***<br>(0.00523) | 0.0177***<br>(0.00590) |
| Gov_coal_GDP            | 0.0076***<br>(0.0013)  | 0.0074***<br>(0.0012)  | 0.0077***<br>(0.0013)  | 0.0076***<br>(0.0012)  | 0.0084***<br>(0.0014)  |
| Gov_coal                | -0.776***<br>(0.161)   | -0.779***<br>(0.154)   | -0.780***<br>(0.164)   | -0.781***<br>(0.155)   |                        |
| GIPSI                   |                        | -0.0204<br>(0.0315)    |                        | -0.0258<br>(0.0294)    | -0.0173<br>(0.0307)    |
| Gov_leftist_coal        |                        |                        | 0.0230<br>(0.0354)     | 0.0268<br>(0.0342)     |                        |
| 2.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | -0.727***<br>(0.178)   |
| 3.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | -0.719***<br>(0.178)   |
| 4.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | -0.0129<br>(0.0347)    |
| 5.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | 0.0143<br>(0.0325)     |
| 6.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | 0.0858**<br>(0.0422)   |
| 7.gov_type              |                        |                        |                        |                        | 0.0192<br>(0.0624)     |
| Wu-Hausman Test         | 5.278**<br>(0.024)     | 5.127**<br>(0.026)     | 5.359**<br>(0.023)     | 4.839**<br>(0.031)     | 5.285**<br>(0.024)     |
| First regression F-test | 12.23                  | 19.63                  | 12.24                  | 18.25                  | 13.97                  |
| Hansen J Statistic      | 3.605<br>(0.165)       | 3.996<br>(0.136)       | 4.020<br>(0.134)       | 4.192<br>(0.129)       | 4.791<br>(0.091)       |
| Country FE              | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    |
| Temporal F              | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    | yes                    |
| R-squared               | 0.719                  | 0.721                  | 0.716                  | 0.725                  | 0.712                  |
| Observations            | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    |
| N                       | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     |

All variables but GDP are in log  
Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Stock-Yogo (2005) weak instruments test critical values: 13.91 (9.08) for 5% maximal IV relative bias (for 10%)

Table 5: IV estimates on disaggregated EPS index

| VARIABLES               | (1)<br>Non Market EPS   | (2)<br>Market EPS       | (3)<br>Technological EPS |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Env_Pref                | -0.0953<br>(0.0624)     | 0.952***<br>(0.324)     | 0.850**<br>(0.364)       |
| Gov_coal                | -0.0496<br>(0.227)      | -0.700<br>(0.556)       | -3.780***<br>(0.650)     |
| GDP per capita          | 0.0112<br>(0.0119)      | -0.118**<br>(0.0557)    | -0.187***<br>(0.0626)    |
| Number of Heating days  | -0.0108<br>(0.0306)     | 0.166<br>(0.135)        | 0.470**<br>(0.234)       |
| Corruption              | -0.114<br>(0.0814)      | 0.488<br>(0.306)        | 0.851**<br>(0.334)       |
| Gini                    | -0.211*<br>(0.120)      | -0.320<br>(0.326)       | 0.119<br>(0.354)         |
| GDP-square              | -0.000164<br>(0.000120) | 0.00112**<br>(0.000557) | 0.00182***<br>(0.000661) |
| Gini-square             | 0.00331*<br>(0.00194)   | 0.00411<br>(0.00552)    | -0.00198<br>(0.00595)    |
| Gov_coal_Gini           | 0.000250<br>(0.00657)   | 0.0186<br>(0.0189)      | 0.108***<br>(0.0222)     |
| Gov_coal_GDP            | 0.000204<br>(0.00174)   | 0.00586<br>(0.00446)    | 0.0278***<br>(0.00630)   |
| GIPSI                   | 0.00271<br>(0.0302)     | 0.135<br>(0.119)        | -0.401***<br>(0.151)     |
| Gov_leftist_coal        | 0.000481<br>(0.0400)    | -0.0539<br>(0.127)      | 0.196<br>(0.141)         |
| Import share            | -0.0144<br>(0.0132)     | 0.0830<br>(0.0618)      | 0.110<br>(0.0763)        |
| Export share            | 0.00517<br>(0.00697)    | -0.0862*<br>(0.0451)    | 0.0186<br>(0.0420)       |
| First regression F-test | 20.85 $\mu$             | 20.85 $\mu$             | 16.21 $\eta$             |
| Hansen J Statistic      | 2.554<br>(0.2790)       | 1.012<br>(0.6030)       | 7.019<br>(0.0713)        |
| Country FE              | yes                     | yes                     | yes                      |
| Temporal FE             | yes                     | yes                     | yes                      |
| R-squared               | 0.430                   | 0.565                   | 0.679                    |
| N                       | 21                      | 21                      | 21                       |
| Observations            | 125                     | 125                     | 125                      |

All variables are in log but GDP per capita, Gini and corruption

All models include a constant which is not reported

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

$\mu$ : with 3 instruments: Stock-Yogo (2005) weak instruments test critical values: 13.81 for 5% maximal IV relative bias

$\eta$ : with 4 instruments: Stock-Yogo (2005) weak instruments test critical values: 16.85 for 5% maximal IV relative bias

$\eta$ : with 4 instruments: Stock-Yogo (2005) weak instruments test critical values: 10.27 for 10% maximal IV relative bias

Table 4 : Robustness Checks

| VARIABLES                | (1)<br>EPS              | (2)<br>EPS             | (3)<br>EPS             | (4)<br>EPS             | (5)<br>EPS             | (6)<br>EPS              |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Lag EPS                  | 0.815***<br>(0.0888)    |                        |                        |                        |                        |                         |
| Env_Pref                 | 0.0507**<br>(0.0206)    | 0.209**<br>(0.0875)    | 0.214**<br>(0.0905)    | 0.217**<br>(0.0844)    | 0.212**<br>(0.0914)    | 0.185**<br>(0.0927)     |
| Gov_coal                 | -0.320*<br>(0.172)      | -0.759***<br>(0.157)   | -0.769***<br>(0.150)   | -0.775***<br>(0.150)   | -0.770***<br>(0.158)   | -0.737***<br>(0.156)    |
| GDP per capita           | 0.000852<br>(0.00307)   | -0.0580***<br>(0.0140) | -0.0578***<br>(0.0126) | -0.0569***<br>(0.0126) | -0.0591***<br>(0.0144) | -0.0533***<br>(0.0129)  |
| Number of Heating days   | 0.0327<br>(0.0254)      | 0.114**<br>(0.0486)    | 0.122**<br>(0.0506)    | 0.129***<br>(0.0501)   | 0.121**<br>(0.0486)    | 0.128**<br>(0.0502)     |
| Corruption               | -0.00461<br>(0.0209)    | 0.199***<br>(0.0709)   | 0.194***<br>(0.0686)   | 0.180***<br>(0.0684)   | 0.192***<br>(0.0719)   | 0.179***<br>(0.0686)    |
| Gini                     | -0.0816<br>(0.0555)     | -0.174**<br>(0.0751)   | -0.165**<br>(0.0743)   | -0.169**<br>(0.0772)   | -0.164**<br>(0.0773)   | -0.169**<br>(0.0730)    |
| GDP-square               | -2.38e-05<br>(2.32e-05) | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)  | 0.0006***<br>(0.0001)   |
| Gini-square              | 0.0015<br>(0.0009)      | 0.0027**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0026**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0026**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0026**<br>(0.0013)   | 0.0026**<br>(0.0012)    |
| Gov_coal_Gini            | 0.00790<br>(0.0066)     | 0.0191***<br>(0.0052)  | 0.0194***<br>(0.0052)  | 0.0201***<br>(0.0051)  | 0.0194***<br>(0.0053)  | 0.0191***<br>(0.0052)   |
| Gov_coal_GDP             | 0.0032***<br>(0.000957) | 0.0074***<br>(0.00123) | 0.0074***<br>(0.00124) | 0.0069***<br>(0.00121) | 0.0075***<br>(0.00124) | 0.00662***<br>(0.00120) |
| GIPSI                    | -0.0480<br>(0.0399)     | -0.0307<br>(0.0295)    | -0.0314<br>(0.0333)    | -0.0323<br>(0.0302)    | -0.0267<br>(0.0292)    | -0.0379<br>(0.0302)     |
| Gov_leftist_coal         | 0.0764***<br>(0.0246)   | 0.0283<br>(0.0329)     | 0.0293<br>(0.0335)     | 0.0272<br>(0.0344)     | 0.0291<br>(0.0365)     | 0.0321<br>(0.0354)      |
| Non Parliamentary system |                         | -0.0749<br>(0.0531)    |                        |                        |                        | -0.0776<br>(0.0520)     |
| Federal country          |                         | 0.129*<br>(0.0704)     |                        |                        |                        | 0.149*<br>(0.0832)      |
| Trade Openness           |                         |                        | 0.0611<br>(0.208)      |                        |                        |                         |
| Import share             |                         |                        |                        | 0.0360**<br>(0.0171)   |                        | 0.0340**<br>(0.0166)    |
| Export share             |                         |                        |                        | 0.00175<br>(0.00774)   |                        | 0.00216<br>(0.00752)    |
| Media Freedom            |                         |                        |                        |                        | -0.0184<br>(0.0903)    | -0.0279<br>(0.0861)     |
| First regression F-test  |                         | 14.81                  | 12.94                  | 20.85                  | 16.14                  | 13.20                   |
| Hansen J Statistic       | 8.23<br>(0.961)         | 3.981<br>(0.137)       | 4.432<br>(0.110)       | 4.512<br>(0.105)       | 5.169<br>(0.075)       | 5.119<br>(0.077)        |
| R-squared                |                         | 0.740                  | 0.732                  | 0.732                  | 0.734                  | 0.756                   |
| Observations             | 104                     | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    | 125                    | 125                     |
| N                        | 21                      | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     | 21                     | 21                      |

Dynamic model (1) is estimated by a system GMM framework

In (1) Arellano-Bond test for AR(1) [AR(2)] in first differences  $z = -3.10[0.42]$  with a p-value = 0.002[0.673]

All models include a constant term which is not reported

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Stock-Yogo (2005) weak instruments test critical values: 13.91 (9.08) for 5% maximal IV relative bias (for 10%)








Figure 4: Environmental Policy Stringency and sub-indices




Figure 5: Evolution of Environmental Policy Stringency and sub-indices

Table 2: Variables description

| Variables               | Variables description                    | Scale  | Sources       |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------|
| EPS                     | Environmental Policy Stringency index    | Score in [0-6]   | OCDE          |
| NMeps                   | Non-market based EPS                     | Score in [0 - 6]   | OCDE          |
| Meps                    | Market based EPS                         | Score in [0 - 6]   | OCDE          |
| Teps                    | Technology Support Policy                | Score in [0 - 6]   | OCDE          |
| EnvPref                 | Public attitude on climate change        | %  | EUROBARMETER  |
| GDP                     | GDP per capita                           | Contant 2010 €   | EUROSTAT      |
| Gini                    | Gini index                               | Score in [0 - 100]   | EUROSTAT      |
| Unemployment            | Share of unemployed people               | %  | EUROBARMETER  |
| Student                 | Share of students                        | EUROBARMETER %   |               |
| Internet                | Share of people using internet every day | %  | EUROBARMETER  |
| Importation             | Importation                              | % GDP  | OCDE          |
| Exportation             | Exportation                              | % GDP  | OCDE          |
| Corruption              | Control of corruption                    | Score in [-2.45 - 2.45]  | WGI           |
| Mediafree               | Press Freedom Index                      | Score in [0 - 100]   | Freedom House |
| Heating days            | Number of heating days                   | Number   | EUROSTAT      |
| Trade open              | Share of (import + export) on GDP        | % in GDP   | OCDE          |
| Gov_leftist_coal        | Coalition government                     | 1=Coalition  | CPD           |
| Gov_type                | Government type                          | 1=Single-party majority<br>2=Minimal winning coalition<br>3 =Surplus coalition<br>4=Single-party minority<br>5=Multi-party minority<br>6=Caretaker government<br>7=Technocratic government | CPD           |
| No Parliamentary system |  | 1= No Parliamentary system   | CPD           |
| Federal country         | Federalism                               | 0= Otherwise<br>1= Strong or weak  | CPD           |
| Gov_coal                | Government type                          | 0= No coalition<br>1= Government coalition   | CPD           |
| GIPSI                   |  | 1 = for countries such as Greece, Ireland, Portugal<br>Spain and Italy after the year 2011<br>0 = Otherwise  | CPD           |