

# Economics and Business Review

Volume 8 (22) Number 1 2022

## CONTENTS

### **Editorial introduction**

*Monika Banaszewska*

## ARTICLES

### **An analysis of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis in the context of Turkey: A nonlinear approach**

*M. Sinan Temurlenk, Anıl Lögün*

### **Capital structure and its determinants in companies originating from two opposite sides of the European Union: Poland and Portugal**

*Leszek Czerwonka, Jacek Jaworski*

### **Political alignment and the allocation of the COVID-19 response funds— evidence from municipalities in Poland**

*Piotr Matuszak, Bartosz Totleben, Dawid Piątek*

### **Special state aid measures during COVID-19 and corporate dividend policy: Early evidence from Polish public companies**

*Marta Kluzek, Katarzyna Schmidt-Jessa*

### **Consumer perceived ethicality of banks in the era of digitalisation: The case of Poland**

*Dariusz Piotrowski*

## Editorial Board

*Monika Banaszewska, Ivo Bischoff, Horst Brezinski, Gary L. Evans, Niels Hermes, Witold Jurek, Tadeusz Kowalski (Editor-in-Chief), Joanna Lizińska, Ida Musiałkowska, Paweł Niszczota, Michał Pilc, Konrad Sobański*

## International Editorial Advisory Board

*Edward I. Altman* – NYU Stern School of Business  
*Udo Broll* – School of International Studies (ZIS), Technische Universität, Dresden  
*Conrad Ciccotello* – University of Denver, Denver  
*Wojciech Florkowski* – University of Georgia, Griffin  
*Oded Galor* – Brown University, Providence  
*Binam Ghimire* – Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne  
*Christopher J. Green* – Loughborough University  
*Mark J. Holmes* – University of Waikato, Hamilton  
*Andreas Irmen* – University of Luxembourg  
*Bruce E. Kaufman* – Georgia State University, Atlanta  
*Robert Lensink* – University of Groningen  
*Steve Letza* – The European Centre for Corporate Governance  
*Robert McMaster* – University of Glasgow  
*Victor Murinde* – SOAS University of London  
*Hugh Scullion* – National University of Ireland, Galway  
*Yochanan Shachmurove* – The City College, City University of New York  
*Richard Sweeney* – The McDonough School of Business, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.  
*Thomas Taylor* – School of Business and Accountancy, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem  
*Linda Gonçalves Veiga* – University of Minho, Braga  
*Habte G. Woldu* – School of Management, The University of Texas at Dallas

## Thematic Editors

**Economics:** *Monika Banaszewska, Ivo Bischoff, Horst Brezinski, Niels Hermes, Witold Jurek, Tadeusz Kowalski, Ida Musiałkowska, Michał Pilc, Konrad Sobański* • **Finance:** *Monika Banaszewska, Gary Evans, Witold Jurek, Joanna Lizińska, Paweł Niszczota, Konrad Sobański* • **Statistics:** *Marcin Anholcer, Maciej Beręszewicz, Elżbieta Gołata*

**Language Editor:** *Owen Easteal* • **IT Editor:** *Marcin Reguła*

© Copyright by Poznań University of Economics and Business, Poznań 2022

Paper based publication

**ISSN 2392-1641**  
**e-ISSN 2450-0097**

POZNAŃ UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS PRESS  
ul. Powstańców Wielkopolskich 16, 61-895 Poznań, Poland  
phone +48 61 854 31 54, +48 61 854 31 55  
www.wydawnictwo.ue.poznan.pl, e-mail: wydawnictwo@ue.poznan.pl  
postal address: al. Niepodległości 10, 61-875 Poznań, Poland

Printed and bound in Poland by:  
Poznań University of Economics and Business Print Shop

Circulation: 200 copies



# An analysis of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis in the context of Turkey: A nonlinear approach<sup>1</sup>

*M. Sinan Temurlenk<sup>2</sup>, Anıl Lögün<sup>3</sup>*

**Abstract:** Foreign direct investment (FDI) is an important driver of countries' economic development. Factors such as looser environmental regulations may cause dirty FDI to flow mainly to developing countries. This is explained by the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. The paper aims to investigate whether the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid in Turkey using the nonlinear autoregressive distributed lag (NARDL) approach for the period 1974–2017. The results show that FDI inflows and carbon emissions have asymmetric effects in both the short and long term for Turkey, supporting the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. Furthermore, there is a link between carbon emissions and trade openness, manufacturing and economic growth. Policymakers should develop the policies necessary to transfer clean technologies to Turkey by providing improvements and technical advances for a more efficient energy use.

**Keywords:** Pollution Haven Hypothesis, foreign direct investments (FDI), emissions, nonlinear autoregressive distributed lag model, Turkey.

**JEL codes:** C33, E1, Q52.

## Introduction

The environmental impact of international trade is one of the critical issues of trade policy. The Pollution Haven Hypothesis is an important issue examined in the literature on countries' international trade policies and their effects on the environment. The hypothesis links environmental regulations to country differences in international trade flows. The Pollution Haven Hypothesis suggests that pollution-intensive production will move from countries with high income

---

<sup>1</sup> Article received 3 December 2020, accepted 28 February 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Atatürk University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Econometrics, 25240, Erzurum, Turkey, msinan@atauni.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7910-0885>.

<sup>3</sup> Atatürk University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Econometrics, 25240, Erzurum, Turkey, corresponding author: logunanil@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2543-3964>.

and stricter environmental regulations to low-income countries that place little emphasis on environmental regulation. The hypothesis states that this international movement depends on the absence of trade barriers (Taylor, 2004). The Pollution Haven Hypothesis implies that the pollution-intensive industries of developed countries move to developing countries through foreign direct investment. Thus these countries will be in a worse environmental situation (Gill, Viswanathan, & Abdul Karim, 2018). The main point of the hypothesis is that dirty industries damage the environment and its valuable resources that need to be protected by environmental policies (Zaman & Abd-el Moemen, 2017).

Foreign direct investments play an essential role in developing economies that do not have sufficient capital for investment (Gokmenoglu & Taspinar, 2016). Foreign direct investment inflows are an essential tool for developing countries with resource problems to finance high-cost investments (Destek & Okumus, 2019). Foreign direct investments contribute to capital formation in developed and developing countries that aim for long-term growth (Iamsiraroj, 2016; Ben-Salha & Zmami, 2020). They have an important impact on many factors such as providing financial resources, human capital formation, the development of markets, international trade integration, research and development, labour force and macroeconomic indicators (Bayraktar, 2013; Opoku & Boachie, 2020). In addition to economic development benefits environmental problems can also be created in countries with low environmental regulations that attract foreign investments with cheap resources (Zheng & Sheng, 2017). Industrialisation and foreign direct investments can increase carbon emissions and thus have a negative impact on the environment. The Pollution Haven Hypothesis partially explains why foreign direct investment flows from developed countries to developing countries. Environmental regulations in developing countries may be looser, leading to dirty production in these countries (Balsalobre-Lorente, Gokmenoglu, Taspinar, & Cantos-Cantos, 2019; Akbostanci, Ipek Tunc, & Turut-Asik, 2007).

There is an increasing trend in industrialisation and economic growth among developing countries with foreign direct investment increasing towards the 1990s (Akbostanci et al., 2007). After the 1980s the liberalisation of financial markets and international trade policies played an important role in economic growth in Turkey. After the Customs Union agreement signed by Turkey in 1995 and implemented in 1996 it can be said that relatively clean exports have tended to increase compared to dirty exports (Akbostanci, Ipek Tunc, & Turut-Asik, 2008). Multinational companies also have a significant share in the increase in investments in dirty industries in Turkey (Sat, 2016).

The increase in energy demand caused by fossil fuels in the last five years constituted the highest share of energy demand in 2018. The world's carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions have increased by 2% in the last seven years. When the period between 2007 and 2017 is studied it can be seen that the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions averaged 3.6% in Turkey. This is above the world average of 1% (BP

Statistical Review of World Energy, 2019). With Turkey's increase in gross domestic product from 2000 to 2018, its population increase of 27% an increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions has arisen (IEA, 2021). Compared to 2008 emissions from the manufacturing and the trade and services sectors had increased by approximately 19% and 6%, respectively, in 2016 (IEA, 2016).

A carbon tax can be applied according to the carbon produced by products or the content of fossil fuels. The purpose of this tax is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions (Assuncao & Zhang, 2002). Governments must take measures at the national level so that businesses and consumers demand products that are not harmful to the environment. Financing and technological cooperation between developing and developed countries are essential factors in reducing emissions (WTO/UNEP, 2009; Chmielewska & Sławiński, 2021). Although Turkey is taking steps to reduce emissions it has no carbon tax as yet. The National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan 2011–2023 emphasises the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the industrial sector in Turkey. It does so through various activities, such as access to financial tools, supporting low carbon intensity, developing financing models for the transition to low-carbon development and R&D activities (Çevre ve Şehircilik Bakanlığı, 2012).

This paper investigates the relationship between foreign direct investments and carbon dioxide emissions in Turkey in the years 1974–2017. The effects of negative and positive shocks of foreign direct investments on carbon dioxide emissions are investigated using the NARDL approach. Thus whether foreign direct investments are responsible for environmental pollution will be revealed within the framework of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. This study contributes to the empirical literature by focusing on Turkey within developing countries and using the NARDL model that accounts for asymmetric effects. Foreign direct investments and international trade can indirectly affect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by promoting economic growth (Huang, Chen, Zhu, Huang, & Tian, 2019). At the same time this study is important for Turkey in terms of revealing the impact of manufacturing and trade openness on carbon dioxide emissions. The study also contributes to the empirical literature by including these factors in the analysis.

The paper is structured as follows. The first section presents the literature review. The second section depicts data and methodology. The third section discusses results of the study. The last section presents concluding remarks.

## **1. Literature review**

There are many studies in the literature examining the relationship between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Table 1 presents brief literature on the relationship between foreign direct investments and carbon emissions. Some of these studies have suggested that the relationship between foreign di-

rect investment and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is positive (Lee, 2013; Kiviyiro & Arminen, 2014; Solarin, Al-Mulali, Musah, & Ozturk, 2017; Sun, Zhang, & Xu, 2017; Gür, 2019; Isiksal, Samour, & Resatoglu, 2019; Shao, Wang, Zhou, & Balogh, 2019; Huang et al., 2019; Ozturk & Saygin, 2020). However, other studies have shown a negative relationship between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Pao & Tsai, 2011; Sbia, Shahbaz, & Helmi, 2014; Akin, 2014; Tang & Tan, 2015; Neequaye & Oladi, 2015; Doytch & Uctum, 2016; Zhu, Duan, Guo, & Yu, 2016; Sung, Song, & Park, 2018). The other group of studies have obtained mixed results (Ur Rahman, Chongbo, & Ahmad, 2019; Ansari, Khan, & Ganaie, 2019; Dhrifi, Jaziri, & Alnahdi, 2020).

Panel data approaches are mostly preferred in studies where different country groups are examined within the Pollution Haven Hypothesis's scope in the literature. Al-Mulali and Tang (2013) examine whether the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid within the Gulf Cooperation Council's scope from 1980 to 2009. The Granger causality analysis results conclude that there is no causality between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> or energy consumption in the short term. On the contrary they find that energy consumption and gross domestic product growth positively correlate with CO<sub>2</sub>. Sapkota and Bastola (2017) examine the impact of foreign direct investment on pollution for Latin American countries within the scope of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis and the Environmental Kuznets Curve hypothesis. As a result of the panel fixed and random effects models it is seen that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid for Latin American countries. The results of the panel VAR model and causality approaches used by Bakirtas and Cetin (2017) for MIKTA countries (Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey and Australia) within the period of 1982–2011 show one-way causality from foreign direct investments to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Kathuria (2018) tests whether the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid for India's different regions between 2002 and 2010. The results of the pooled ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates do not support the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. Ayadi, Mlanga, Ikpor and Nnachi (2019) conclude that past periods of foreign direct investments are a determinant of current foreign direct investments in the short and long term for Nigeria. The results support the validity of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis for Nigeria.

In studies examining countries in different income groups, there are differences in the results. Hoffmann, Lee, Ramasamy, and Yeung (2005) state that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is not valid for middle- and high-income countries. They conclude that CO<sub>2</sub> causes foreign direct investments for low-income countries; on the other hand they conclude that foreign direct investments cause CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for middle-income countries. There is no evidence of Granger causality between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for high-income countries. Shahbaz, Nasreen, Abbas, and Anis (2015) state a long-term relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, foreign direct investments, economic growth and energy consumption as the results of Pedroni and Johansen Fisher

panel cointegration tests. They emphasise that foreign direct investments reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for high-income countries due to fully modified ordinary least squares (FMOLS); their results for low-income countries do not support these findings. For middle-income countries there is an inverse U-shaped relationship between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Many studies using panel data approaches for ASEAN countries have reached different findings. Rasit and Aralaz (2017) examine OECD and ASEAN countries in the period 2000–2010 in their study. Pooled OLS estimates show that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is not valid in the study. There are studies in the literature for MINT countries, and these studies find the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is invalid (Balsalobre-Lorente et al., 2019). Shao and others (2019) examine BRICS as well as MINT with Johansen Fisher, Pedroni and Kao panel cointegration tests and obtain similar findings. Furthermore they conclude that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions affects foreign direct investments in the short term.

**Table 1. Summary of studies examining the effect of Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) on CO<sub>2</sub>**

Author(s)	Period	Country/group	Method	Relationship
<b>FDI—CO<sub>2</sub> (Positive)</b>				
Ozturk & Saygin (2020)	1974–2016	Turkey	ARDL, Toda Yamamoto causality	Positive
Gür (2019)	1990–2017	Turkey	Fully ordinary least square (FMOLS)	Positive
Isiksal et al. (2019)	1980–2014	Turkey	ARDL, Hatemi J cointegration, Granger causality	Positive
Shao et al. (2019)	1982–2014	BRICS, MINT	Johansen Fisher panel cointegration, Granger causality	Positive
Huang et al. (2019)	1997–2014	China	Panel quantile regression	Positive
Sun et al. (2017)	1980–2012	China	ARDL	Positive
Solarin et al. (2017)	1980–2012	Ghana	ARDL	Positive
Kiviyro & Arminen (2014)	1971–2009	6 sub-Saharan Africa countries	ARDL, Granger causality	Positive
Lee (2013)	1971–2009	G20 countries	Johansen Fisher cointegration,	Positive

Author(s)	Period	Country/group	Method	Relationship
<b>FDI—CO<sub>2</sub> (Negative)</b>				
Sung et al. (2018)	2002–2015	China	System GMM estimation	Negative
Zhu et al. (2016)	1981–2011	ASEAN-5	Fixed effect panel quantile regression	Negative
Doytch & Uctum (2016)	1984–2011	148 countries	Panel GMM	Negative
Neequaye & Oladi (2015)	2002–2008	27 countries	Panel fixed effect model	Negative
Tang & Tan (2015)	1976–2009	Vietnam	Johansen cointegration, Granger causality	Negative
Sbia et al. (2014)	1975–2011	United Arab Emirates	Vector error correction model (VECM)	Negative
Pao & Tsai (2011)	1992–2007	BRIC	Panel VECM	Negative
<b>FDI—CO<sub>2</sub> (Mixed)</b>				
Ansari et al. (2019)	1994–2014	29 countries	Pedroni cointegration, fully modified OLS	East Asia (positive) Southeast Asia (negative)
Ur Rahman et al. (2019)	1975–2016	Pakistan	NARDL	Positive (FDI positive) Negative (FDI negative)

Source: Authors' preparation.

### Foreign direct investment—CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Turkey

The studies in the literature that examine the relationship between foreign direct investment inflows and carbon emissions in Turkey generally assume that this relationship is linear. In these studies approaches such as the autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL), Johansen cointegration, Maki cointegration, Granger causality and Toda-Yamamoto causality are used, and they show that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid (Mutafoglu, 2012; Balibey, 2015; Gokmenoglu & Taspinar, 2016; Kaya, Kayalica, Kumaş, & Ulengin, 2017; Kılıçarslan & Dumrul, 2017; Kocak & Sarıgünesi, 2018; Terzi & Pata, 2019; Udemba, 2020).

Kaya and others (2017) find that foreign direct investments and trade openness positively affect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the long run. Yıldırım, Destek and Özsoy (2017) examine the validity of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis for Turkey with ARDL and Granger causality approaches in the 1974–2013 period. They conclude that increasing real national income reduces CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, while energy

consumption and foreign direct investments increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. According to the results of the causality approach, it is seen that there is bidirectional causality between energy consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Ozatac, Gokmenoglu and Taspinar (2017) conclude that trade openness positively affects CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for Turkey covering the period 1960–2013. Gür (2019) suggests that foreign direct investments positively affect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the long run. In addition, the results show that the short run effect is also positive and is greater than in the long run. Ozturk and Saygin (2020) reach a conclusion that foreign direct investments have a positive effect on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Şahin, Gökdemir and Ayyıldız (2019) examine the Pollution Haven and Pollution Halo hypotheses for Turkey between 1990 and 2015. The findings of their study support the Pollution Haven Hypothesis.

However, some of the studies using the linear ARDL approach to examine the relationship between foreign direct investments in Turkey and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have concluded that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is not valid (Üzar, 2019; Bulut, 2021). Likewise, Mert and Caglar (2020) also concluded that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is not valid in Turkey. As a result of the hidden cointegration approach the authors show an asymmetric causality relationship between positive shocks of foreign direct investments and positive movements in emissions in the short run as well as an asymmetric causality relationship between positive and negative shocks of foreign direct investments and positive emissions in the long run.

## **2. Data and methodology**

In this study carbon dioxide emission (CO<sub>2</sub>), gross domestic product (GDP), the ratio of the total exports and imports to the gross domestic product (TRADE), the ratio of manufacturing to gross domestic product (MANUFACTURING) and foreign direct investments, net inflows % of gdp (FDI) variables are used. Positive and negative shocks of the foreign direct investment variable are included as two additional variables in the model. The data are determined as the period between 1974 and 2017 for Turkey. The study's data are obtained from the World Bank and International Energy Agency databases. The natural logarithms of all variables were considered.

### **2.1. Nonlinearity ARDL approach**

The ARDL approach allows testing of short- and long-term asymmetries between variables. Nonlinear models can be examined by NARDL analysis. Shin, Yu and Greenwood-Nimmo (2014) introduce the NARDL approach to examine the explanatory variables' positive and negative shocks. The NARDL approach, based on the linear ARDL model, can be applied regardless of whether

the series examines I(0) or I(1). However if the unit root test results are I(2), the NARDL approach cannot be applied (Ibrahim, 2015; Bahmani-Oskooee & Saha, 2018). The NARDL model is estimated with the ordinary least squares (OLS) approach (Bildirici & Türkmen, 2015; Yacouba & Altintas, 2019). The asymmetric long-run regression is formed as follows in order to examine the effects of negative and positive changes in foreign direct investments on carbon emissions.

$$LCO2_t = \alpha + \delta_1 LFDI_t^- + \delta_2 LFDI_t^+ + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

$\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are the long-run parameters, and  $LFDI_t^-$  and  $LFDI_t^+$  express negative and positive shocks in equation (1). The asymmetric cointegration model, which has all variables, is shown below.

$$LCO2_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 LFDI_t^- + \alpha_2 LFDI_t^+ + \alpha_3 LMANUFACTURING_t + \alpha_4 LTRADE_t + \alpha_5 LGDP_t + \mu_t \quad (2)$$

$\mu_t$  denotes the error term and  $\alpha_0$  is the constant term in equation (2).  $LFDI_t$  is included as two separate variables to indicate the negative shocks ( $LFDI_t^-$ ) and positive shocks ( $LFDI_t^+$ ) of foreign direct investments in the model.  $LFDI_t^-$  and  $LFDI_t^+$  can be obtained to take negative and positive partial sums as in equations (3) and (4), respectively.

$$LFDI_t^- = \sum_{j=1}^t \Delta LFDI_j^- = \sum_{j=1}^t \min(\Delta LFDI_j^-, 0) \quad (3)$$

$$LFDI_t^+ = \sum_{j=1}^t \Delta LFDI_j^+ = \sum_{j=1}^t \max(\Delta LFDI_j^+, 0) \quad (4)$$

The NARDL model is constructed using equation (2) and shown in equation (5). This model aims to examine the effect of foreign direct investments symmetrically or asymmetrically on carbon dioxide emissions.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LCO2_t = & \omega_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \Delta LCO2_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \delta_i \Delta LTRADE_{t-i} + \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^p \gamma_i \Delta LMANUFACTURING_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \delta_i \Delta LGDP_{t-i} + \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^p (\theta_i^- \Delta LFDI_{t-i}^- + \theta_i^+ \Delta LFDI_{t-i}^+) + \\ & + \varphi_1 LCO2_{t-1} + \varphi_2 LFDI_{t-1}^- + \varphi_3 LFDI_{t-1}^+ + \\ & + \varphi_4 LMANUFACTURING_{t-1} + \varphi_5 LTRADE_{t-1} + \varphi_6 LGDP_{t-1} + e_t \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$\beta_p$ ,  $\partial_t$ ,  $\gamma_p$ , and  $\delta_i$  are short term coefficients;  $\varphi_1$ ,  $\varphi_2$ ,  $\varphi_3$ ,  $\varphi_4$ ,  $\varphi_5$ , and  $\varphi_6$  represent long term coefficients in the NARDL model. The cointegration relationship between the variables is examined with the F test using this equation. The error correction model with short dynamics is shown in equation (6).

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta LCO2_t = & \beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \Delta LCO2_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \partial_i \Delta LTRADE_{t-i} + \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^p \gamma_i \Delta LMANUFACTURING_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^p \delta_i \Delta LGDP_{t-i} + \\ & + \sum_{i=0}^p (\theta_i^- \Delta LFDI_{t-i}^- + \theta_i^+ \Delta LFDI_{t-i}^+) + v_t \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

After estimating equation (5) with the OLS method, the asymmetric effect of foreign direct investments on carbon dioxide emissions is tested for the short and long term using the Wald test. The null hypothesis  $H_0 : \frac{-\theta_i^-}{\beta_i} = \frac{-\theta_i^+}{\beta_i}$  states an asymmetrical relationship between foreign direct investments and carbon dioxide emissions in the short term. In the long term, the null hypothesis is established as  $H_0 : \frac{-\varphi_2}{\varphi_1} = \frac{-\varphi_3}{\varphi_1}$  to test this relationship between variables.  $\sum_{i=0}^p \theta_i^+$  indicates the short-run effects of increases in foreign direct investment on carbon emissions, while  $\sum_{i=0}^p \theta_i^-$  measures the short-term effects of decreases in foreign direct investment on carbon emissions.

## 2.2. Brock, Dechert, and Scheinkman (BDS) test

The BDS test is one of the most commonly preferred tests in nonlinearity. The test statistics developed by Brock, Dechert, and Scheinkman (1987) is as follows:

$$V_{m,\varepsilon} = \sqrt{T} \frac{C_{m,\varepsilon} - C(\varepsilon)^m}{S_{m,\varepsilon}} \quad (7)$$

$S_{m,\varepsilon}$  is expressed as the standard error of  $\sqrt{T} C_{m,\varepsilon} - C(\varepsilon)^m$  and is also a consistent estimator (Caporale, Ntantamis, Pantelidis, & Pittis, 2005). In the BDS test, which is considered a nonlinearity test,  $x_t$  means that a  $T$ -length observation sequence is independently and identically distributed. The correlation dimension  $C_{m,T}(\varepsilon)$  at dimension  $m$  is defined as in equation (7) (De Graaff, Florax, & Nijkamp, 2001).

$$C_{m,T}(\varepsilon) = \sum_{t < s} I_\varepsilon(x_t^m, x_s^m) \left[ \frac{2}{T_m(T_m - 1)} \right] \quad (8)$$

If the significance level is smaller than the test statistics, the null hypothesis based on the linearity of the series will be rejected. In other words it means the series is not linear (Weng, Chang, & Lee, 2008). The BDS test statistics converge to the  $N(0,1)$  distribution. The test statistics have a significant advantage because they do not have any distribution assumptions. Detailed information about the test can be found in the study of Brock, Scheinkman, Dechert and LeBaron (1996).

### 3. Results

It is necessary to test whether the series contains a unit root before analyzing the time series and unit root tests are important for the true analysis. The study examines the series' unit root tests through Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF), Phillips-Perron (PP) unit root tests and Kwiatkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin (KPSS) stationary test. ADF and PP unit root test results show that the null hypothesis is not rejected, which means that the variables' levels have a unit root. The null hypothesis which means that the series is stationary is rejected at the 5% and 10% significance levels in the KPSS tests. The first differences of all variables are stationary at a 1% significance level according to the ADF and PP unit root tests in Table 2. The test results also show that the series is stationary when the first difference is taken.

**Table 2. Results of ADF, PP and KPSS Unit Root Tests**

Variables	Level			First difference		
	ADF	PP	KPSS	ADF	PP	KPSS
LC02	-0.69	-0.80	0.84***	-7.01***	-7.61***	0.12
LFDI	-1.76	-1.47	0.74***	-9.23***	-10.23***	0.08
LGDP	0.47	0.51	0.84***	-6.28***	-6.27***	0.09
LMANUFACTURING	-1.64	-1.61	0.18**	-7.32***	-7.35***	0.22
LTRADE	-1.43	1.44	0.68**	-4.78***	-5.61***	0.08

Note: \*\*\*, \*\* significance at the 1%, 5% level. In the ADF and PP unit root tests, the null hypothesis expresses the existence of a unit root, that is, it is not stationary, while in the KPSS test, the null hypothesis expresses that there is no unit root, that is, stationary.

Source: Authors' estimation.

Tests such as BDS can be used to determine whether a series is linear. The series' BDS test results are given in Table 3. According to the results, all variables are nonlinear at a 1% significance level. A nonlinear ARDL approach is used because the series is not linear.

**Table 3. BDS non-linearity test results**

Variables	$m = 2$	$m = 3$	$m = 4$	$m = 5$	$m = 6$
LCO2	28.70***	29.95***	31.83***	34.93***	39.50***
LFDI	13.11***	13.76***	14.92***	16.19***	17.46***
LGDP	27.07***	28.65***	30.50***	33.35***	37.48***
LMANUFACTURING	17.55***	18.07***	18.21***	18.50***	18.65***
LTRADE	11.82***	12.58***	13.30***	14.35***	15.77***

Note: \*\*\* significance at the 1% level.

Source: Authors' estimation.

Cointegration analysis and Wald test statistics results are given in Table 4. According to the F test result, the null hypothesis, which means no cointegration among the CO<sub>2</sub>, FDI, GDP, MANUFACTURING and TRADE variables, is rejected at the 1% significance level. The  $W_L$  and  $W_S$  test results show that the null hypothesis stating that there is symmetrical relationship among the variables in the short and long term is rejected at 5% and 10% significance levels, respectively. As a result it is determined that there is a cointegration relationship among the variables and an asymmetric relationship among the variables in the short and long term.

Seker, Ertugrul and Cetin (2015) concluded a long-term relationship between the variables of gross domestic product, square of gross domestic product, energy consumption, foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for Turkey. Besides which they concluded that foreign direct investments positively impact environmental pollution in their long-term estimation. These results support this study's findings.

The NARDL approach is used because the series is not linear. These test statistics show whether there is symmetry or asymmetry between the short- and long-term variables.  $W_L$  test statistics provide information about the long-term relationship between variables. According to the test statistics results if the null hypothesis is rejected then the existence of an asymmetrical relationship between the variables is reached in the long term.  $W_S$  test statistics provide explanations about the short-term relationships of variables. The null hypothesis means a symmetrical relationship between variables in the short term for the test statistics. According to the results in Table 4, there is an asymmetrical relationship between foreign direct investments and carbon dioxide emissions at the 10% significance level in the long term.

Table 5 shows the short- and long-term coefficients obtained from the estimation of the NARDL model. According to the results all the coefficients are statistically significant except for the lmanufacturing coefficient obtained by long-term estimation. The long-term results show that a 1% increase in

**Table 4. Short-term and long-term asymmetry results**

Test	F statistic	Probability	Null hypothesis
F	1732.57	0.00***	there is no cointegration relationship among the variables
$W_s$	9.36	0.01**	there is symmetry relationship in the short term
$W_L$	3.39	0.08*	there is symmetry relationship in the long term

Note: \*\*\*, \*\*, \* signify 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels, respectively.  $W_L$  is the Wald test that examines the presence of asymmetry for the long term.  $W_s$  is the Wald test that examines the presence of asymmetry for the short term.

Source: Authors' estimation.

**Table 5. Results of NARDL model estimation**

Variables	Coefficients	t statistic	Probability
Constant	-13.00***	-5.14	0.00
LCO2(-1)	0.38***	3.41	0.00
LFDI(-1)	0.07**	2.82	0.01
LFDI+(-1)	0.02*	1.79	0.09
LTRADE(-1)	0.24***	4.99	0.00
LGDP(-1)	0.59***	5.26	0.00
LMANUFACTURING(-1)	-0.11	-1.51	0.15
$\Delta$ LGDP	0.51***	4.06	0.00
$\Delta$ LFDI-	0.07**	2.91	0.01
$\Delta$ LFDI-(-1)	-0.04***	-3.35	0.00
$\Delta$ LFDI+	-0.04**	-2.76	0.01
$\Delta$ LFDI+(-1)	0.04**	2.85	0.01
$\Delta$ LGDP(-1)	-0.37**	-2.66	0.01
$\Delta$ LGDP(-2)	-0.47***	-3.48	0.00
$\Delta$ LTRADE	0.13***	3.35	0.00
$\Delta$ LTRADE(-1)	-0.09**	-2.38	0.03
$\Delta$ LTRADE(-2)	-0.15***	-3.66	0.00
$\Delta$ LMANUFACTURING(-1)	0.18*	1.82	0.08
N		41	
$R^2$		0.99	
F		893.000	

Note: \*\*\*, \*\*, \* signify 1%, 5% and 10% significance levels, respectively.  $\Delta$  denotes the first difference of the series.

Source: Authors' estimation.

GDP increases  $\text{CO}_2$  by 0.51%. These results are in line with the results of Üzar (2019) and Ozturk and Saygin (2020) for Turkey. In contrast the short-term results show that  $\text{GDP}(-1)$  and  $\text{GDP}(-2)$  negatively affect  $\text{CO}_2$ . While a 1% increase in trade causes a 0.24% increase in  $\text{CO}_2$  in the long term it also increases it by 0.13% in the short term. However, it is observed that  $\text{TRADE}(-1)$  and  $\text{TRADE}(-2)$  negatively affect  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions in the short term. Foreign direct investments for Turkey are seen as damaging to the environment. As foreign direct investments increase the amount of carbon dioxide emissions increases in Turkey. These findings reveal that the Pollution Haven Hypothesis is valid in Turkey for the period 1974–2017.

The results also show similarities with many studies covering the period up to 2010 which show that the hypothesis is valid (Mutafoglu, 2012; Gokmenoglu & Taspinar, 2016; Kaya et al., 2017). This situation shows that foreign direct investment inflows to Turkey increase  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions as seen in previous studies. In this context foreign direct investments to Turkey can be evaluated within the scope of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. In parallel with this situation if foreign direct investments are clean and substituted for existing dirtier domestic industries, it is expected to reduce pollution. However the study shows that foreign industries (this needs more elaboration/definition) do not replace more polluting industries. In this context it can be said that foreign direct investments do not reduce carbon emissions. In addition the results of prior studies which examine the relationship between foreign direct investments and  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions and consider the asymmetric effects are in line with the findings of this study (Haug & Ucal, 2019; Ur Rahman et al., 2019).

In addition, analysis results in the short-run reveal that if foreign direct inflows increase at lag 1 ( $\text{FDI}^+(-1)$ ), carbon emissions will increase, while a decrease in foreign direct investment inflows at lag 1 ( $\text{FDI}^-(-1)$ ) will reduce carbon emissions. In this context, it is considered that it may be suitable for Turkey to pay attention to the pollution effect of investments when deciding on foreign direct investment inflows.

**Table 6. Results of normality, heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation tests**

	Statistics	Probability
Jarque-Bera Test	0.82	0.66
Breusch-Pagan Test	14.78	0.61
ARCH(1)	2.24	0.13
ARCH(6)	6.68	0.35
LM(1)	1.86	0.17
LM(6)	8.42	0.21

Source: Authors' estimation.

Diagnostic tests are applied to the NARDL model. Table 6 shows the Jarque-Bera normality test results, heteroscedasticity results from the Breusch-Pagan and ARCH tests and autocorrelation results from the Breusch-Godfrey LM test. According to the test statistics the model's error terms have a normal distribution and there is no heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation.

## Conclusions

This study examines the asymmetrical effects of foreign direct investment on carbon emissions in Turkey. In this context, the NARDL approach is used to investigate the effect of negative and positive shocks of foreign direct investments on carbon emissions for the period 1974–2017. As a result of the diagnostic tests it is found that the NARDL model met the necessary conditions.

Both short- and long-run NARDL model estimation results show that negative and positive shocks of foreign direct investments have significant effects on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Turkey. This shows that there is an asymmetrical relationship between foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the country. These results reveal that the increase in foreign direct investment inflows to Turkey and the policies in this direction may have an impact on the environment. When evaluated within the scope of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis for Turkey, it is concluded that foreign direct investments have an increasing effect on carbon emissions.

In international trade the Pollution Haven Hypothesis assumes a negative relationship between environmental regulation and trade openness. Analysis results indicate that trade openness positively affects CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the long run. These results are similar to Rasit and Aralas' (2017) results. On the contrary it has been determined that this situation is valid for trade openness lagged values in the short run. This may indicate that trade openness may cause dirty industries to move from developed countries due to the deficiencies in environmental regulations in developing countries (Ozatac et al., 2017). As Turkey is a developing country where environmental regulations are more flexible attracting foreign investments to the country may affect trade openness.

The NARDL model estimation results indicate that there is a relationship between economic growth and carbon emissions. According to the findings economic growth increases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 0.59% and 0.51% in the short and long run respectively. This may be because an increase in economic activities will require more energy use which may lead to an increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In the short-run estimation results manufacturing is found to increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It can be concluded that industrialisation and growth can also increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

The findings of the study can provide important information for developing countries, including Turkey. Foreign direct investments are important for de-

veloping countries targeting industrialisation and economic growth. However, since these countries lack environmentally friendly policies, such investment may cause an increase in carbon emissions. The study results can provide information on reducing carbon emissions as developing countries make their environmental policies more stringent.

The findings show that international trade increases environmental pollution in general. In this context the government should follow stricter environmental policies and require more environmentally friendly production by foreign direct investments. Investors from other countries can be encouraged to make foreign direct investments in activities that are less harmful to the environment. The Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation of Turkey, in the National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan 2011–2023, has set important targets for developing new technologies and information infrastructure to reduce emissions. Encouraging more environmentally friendly production in foreign direct investments within the scope of these policies can play a significant role in reducing carbon emissions. In this direction incentives for investments in sectors such as services and renewable energy can be increased to prevent a decrease in foreign direct investment inflows. The production and development of green technology through research and development at the national level and the realisation of the national action plan can also reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

## References

- Akbostanci, E., Ipek Tunc, G., & Turut-Asik, S. (2007). Pollution Haven Hypothesis and the role of dirty industries in Turkey's exports. *Environment and Development Economics*, 12(2), 297–322.
- Akbostanci, E., Ipek Tunc, G., & Turut-Asik, S. (2008). Environmental impact of customs union agreement with EU on Turkey's trade in manufacturing industry. *Applied Economics*, 40(17), 2295–2304.
- Akın, C. S. (2014). Yabancı sermaye yatırımlarının CO<sub>2</sub> emisyonu üzerine olan etkisi: Dinamik panel veri analiz. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 44, 1–15.
- Al-Mulali, U., & Tang, C. F. (2013). Investigating the validity of Pollution Haven Hypothesis in the gulf cooperation council (GCC) countries. *Energy Policy*, 60, 813–819.
- Ansari, M. A., Khan, N. A., & Ganaie, A. A. (2019). Does foreign direct investment impede environmental quality in Asian countries? A panel data analysis. *OPEC Energy Review*, 43(2), 109–135.
- Assuncao, L., & Zhang, Z. (2002). *Domestic climate change policies and the WTO*. (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). Retrieved from [https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/osgdp164\\_en.pdf](https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/osgdp164_en.pdf)
- Ayadi, F. S., Mlanga, S., Ikpör, M. I., & Nnachi, R. A. (2019). Empirical test of Pollution Haven Hypothesis in Nigeria using autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) model. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(3), 48–58.

- Bahmani-Oskooee, M., & Saha, S. (2018). On the relation between exchange rates and stock prices: A nonlinear ARDL approach and asymmetry analysis. *Journal of Economics and Finance*, 42(1), 112-137.
- Bakirtas, I., & Cetin, M. A. (2017). Revisiting the environmental Kuznets curve and pollution haven hypotheses: MIKTA sample. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 24(22), 18273-18283.
- Balibey, M. (2015). Relationships among CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, economic growth and foreign direct investment and the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis in Turkey. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 5(4), 1042-1049.
- Balsalobre-Lorente, D., Gokmenoglu, K. K., Taspinar, N., & Cantos-Cantos, J. M. (2019). An approach to the pollution haven and pollution halo hypotheses in MINT countries. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26, 23010-23026.
- Bayraktar, N. (2013). Foreign direct investment and investment climate. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 5, 83-92.
- Ben-Salha, O., & Zmami, M. (2020). The impact of private capital flows on economic growth in the MENA region. *Economics and Business Review*, 6(3), 45-67.
- Bildirici, M., & Türkmen, C. (2015). The chaotic relationship between oil return, gold, silver and copper returns in Turkey: Nonlinear ARDL and augmented nonlinear Granger causality. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210, 397-407.
- BP. (2019). *BP statistical review of world energy*. London: BP. Retrieved from <https://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/business-sites/en/global/corporate/pdfs/energy-economics/statistical-review/bp-stats-review-2019-full-report.pdf>
- Brock, W. A., Dechert, W. D., & Scheinkman, J. A. (1987). A test for independence based on the correlation dimension. *Econometric Reviews*, 15(3), 197-235.
- Brock, W. A., Scheinkman, J. A., Dechert, W. D., & LeBaron, B. (1996). A test for independence based on the correlation dimension. *Econometric Reviews*, 15(3), 197-235.
- Bulut, U. (2021). Environmental sustainability in Turkey: An environmental Kuznets curve estimation for ecological footprint. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 28(3), 227-237.
- Caporale, G. M., Ntantamis, C., Pantelidis, T., & Pittis, N. (2005). The BDS test as a test for the adequacy of a GARCH (1, 1) specification: A Monte Carlo study. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 3(2), 282-309.
- Çevre ve Şehircilik Bakanlığı. (2012). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti İklim Değişikliği Eylem Planı 2011-2023*. Retrieved April 7, 2021 from <https://www.csb.gov.tr/db/iklim/banner/banner591>
- Chmielewska, A., & Sławiński, A. (2021). Climate crisis, central banks and the IMF reform. *Economics and Business Review*, 7(4), 7-27.
- De Graaff, T., Florax, R. J., Nijkamp, P., & Reggiani, A. (2001). A general misspecification test for spatial regression models: Dependence, heterogeneity, and nonlinearity. *Journal of Regional Science*, 41(2), 255-276.
- Destek, M. A., & Okumus, I. (2019). Does Pollution Haven Hypothesis hold in newly industrialized countries? Evidence from ecological footprint. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(23), 23689-23695.
- Dhrifi, A., Jaziri, R., & Alnahdi, S. (2020). Does foreign direct investment and environmental degradation matter for poverty? Evidence from developing countries. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 52, 13-21.

- Doytch, N., & Uctum, M. (2016). Globalization and the environmental impact of sectoral FDI. *Economic Systems*, 40(4), 582-594.
- Gill, F. L., Viswanathan, K. K., & Abdul Karim, M. Z. (2018). The critical review of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 8(1), 167-174.
- Gokmenoglu, K., & Taspinar, N. (2016). The relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, energy consumption, economic growth and FDI: The case of Turkey. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 25(5), 706-723.
- Gür, B. (2019). Relationship between foreign direct investment and carbon dioxide emissions: Evaluation of the hypothesis of pollution haven for Turkey. *Eurasian Econometrics, Statistics & Empirical Economics Journal*, 13, 1-13.
- Haug, A. A., & Ucal, M. (2019). The role of trade and FDI for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Turkey: Nonlinear relationships. *Energy Economics*, 81, 297-307.
- Hoffmann, R., Lee, C. G., Ramasamy, B., & Yeung, M. (2005). FDI and pollution: A granger causality test using panel data. *Journal of International Development: The Journal of the Development Studies Association*, 17(3), 311-317.
- Huang, Y., Chen, X., Zhu, H., Huang, C., & Tian, Z. (2019). The heterogeneous effects of FDI and foreign trade on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: Evidence from China. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2019, 1-14.
- Iamsiraroj, S. (2016). The foreign direct investment-economic growth nexus. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 42, 116-133.
- Ibrahim, M. H. (2015). Oil and food prices in Malaysia: A nonlinear ARDL analysis. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 3(1), 1-14.
- IEA. (2016). *Energy Policies of IEA Countries: Turkey 2016 Review*. Paris: The International Energy Agency.
- IEA. (2021). *Energy Policies of IEA Countries: Turkey 2021 Review*. Paris: The International Energy Agency.
- Isiksal, A. Z., Samour, A., & Resatoglu, N. G. (2019). Testing the impact of real interest rate, income, and energy consumption on Turkey's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26(20), 20219-20231.
- Kathuria, V. (2018). Does environmental governance matter for foreign direct investment? Testing the Pollution Haven Hypothesis for Indian States. *Asian Development Review*, 35(1), 81-107.
- Kaya, G., Kayalica, M. Ö., Kumaş, M., & Ulengin, B. (2017). The role of foreign direct investment and trade on carbon emissions in Turkey. *Environmental Economics*, 8(1), 8-17.
- Kılıçarslan, Z., & Dumrul, Y. (2017). Foreign direct investments and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions relationship: The case of Turkey. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 8(4), 647-660.
- Kiviyiro, P., & Arminen, H. (2014). Carbon dioxide emissions, energy consumption, economic growth, and foreign direct investment: Causality analysis for Sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy*, 74(1), 595-606.
- Koçak, E., & Şarkgüneşi, A. (2018). The impact of foreign direct investment on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Turkey: New evidence from cointegration and bootstrap causality analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(1), 790-804.
- Lee, J. W. (2013). The contribution of foreign direct investment to clean energy use, carbon emissions and economic growth. *Energy Policy*, 55, 483-489.

- Mert, M., & Caglar, A. E. (2020). Testing pollution haven and pollution halo hypotheses for Turkey: A new perspective. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(26), 32933-32943.
- Mutafoglu, T. H. (2012). Foreign direct investment, pollution, and economic growth: Evidence from Turkey. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 28(3), 281-297.
- Neequaye, N. A., & Oladi, R. (2015). Environment, growth, and FDI revisited. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 39, 47-56.
- Opoku, E. E. O., & Boachie, M. K. (2020). The environmental impact of industrialization and foreign direct investment. *Energy Policy*, 137(C).
- Ozatac, N., Gokmenoglu, K. K., & Taspinar, N. (2017). Testing the EKC hypothesis by considering trade openness, urbanization, and financial development: The case of Turkey. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 24(20), 16690-16701.
- Ozturk, S., & Saygin, S. (2020). Türkiye'de 1974-2016 Döneminde Yapısal Kırılma Altında Kişi Başına Reel Gelir, Doğrudan Yabancı Yatırımlar, Ticari Açıklık ve Karbon Emisyonları Arasındaki İlişki. *Sosyoekonomi*, 28(44), 69-90.
- Pao, H. T., & Tsai, C. M. (2011). Multivariate Granger causality between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, energy consumption, FDI (foreign direct investment) and GDP (gross domestic product): Evidence from a panel of BRIC (Brazil, Russian Federation, India, and China) countries. *Energy*, 36(1), 685-693.
- Rasit, N. B., & Aral, S. B. (2017). *The Pollution Haven Hypothesis: An analysis of ASEAN and OECD countries*. (Proceedings of International Conference on Economics 2017), 96-109.
- Şahin, G., Gökdemir, L., & Ayyıldız, F. V. (2019). Türkiye Örneğinde Kirlilik Sığınağı Ve Kirlenme Hale Hipotezleri Üzerine Ampirik Bir Araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(33), 104-140.
- Sapkota, P., & Bastola, U. (2017). Foreign direct investment, income, and environmental pollution in developing countries: Panel data analysis of Latin America. *Energy Economics*, 64, 206-212.
- Sat, N. A. (2016). Multinational corporations and their effects on environment: Pollution Haven Hypothesis testing in the case of Turkey. *Gazi University Journal of Science Part B: Art, Humanities, Design and Planning*, 4(2), 25-36.
- Sbia, R., Shahbaz, M., & Helmi, H. (2014). A contribution of foreign direct investment, clean energy, trade openness, carbon emissions and economic growth to energy demand in UAE. *Economic Modelling*, 36, 191-197.
- Seker, F., Ertugrul, H. M., & Cetin, M. (2015). The impact of foreign direct investment on environmental quality: A bounds testing and causality analysis for Turkey. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 52, 347-356.
- Shahbaz, M., Nasreen, S., Abbas, F., & Anis, O. (2015). Does foreign direct investment impede environmental quality in high-, middle-, and low-income countries?. *Energy Economics*, 51, 275-287.
- Shao, Q., Wang, X., Zhou, Q., & Balogh, L. (2019). Pollution Haven Hypothesis revisited: A comparison of the BRICS and MINT countries based on VECM approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 227, 724-738.
- Shin, Y., Yu, B., & Greenwood-Nimmo, M. (2014). Modelling asymmetric cointegration and dynamic multipliers in a nonlinear ARDL framework. In W. C. Horrace &

- R. C. Sickles (Eds.), *Festschrift in honor of Peter Schmidt: Econometric methods and applications* (pp. 281-314). New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Solarin, S. A., Al-Mulali, U., Musah, I., & Ozturk, I. (2017). Investigating the Pollution Haven Hypothesis in Ghana: An empirical investigation. *Energy*, 124, 706-719.
- Sun, C., Zhang, F., & Xu, M. (2017). Investigation of Pollution Haven Hypothesis for China: An ARDL approach with breakpoint unit root tests. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 161, 153-164.
- Sung, B., Song, W. Y., & Park, S. D. (2018). How foreign direct investment affects CO<sub>2</sub> emission levels in the Chinese manufacturing industry: Evidence from panel data. *Economic Systems*, 42(2), 320-331.
- Tang, C. F., & Tan, B. W. (2015). The impact of energy consumption, income and foreign direct investment on carbon dioxide emissions in Vietnam. *Energy*, 79, 447-454.
- Taylor, M. S. (2004). Unbundling the Pollution Haven Hypothesis. *Advances in Economic Analysis & Policy*, 4(2), 1-26.
- Terzi, H., & Pata, U. K. (2019). Is the Pollution Haven Hypothesis (PHH) valid for Turkey?. *Panoeconomicus*, 67(1), 93-109.
- Udemba, E. N. (2020). Ecological implication of offshored economic activities in Turkey: Foreign direct investment perspective. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(30), 38015-38028.
- Ur Rahman, Z., Chongbo, W., & Ahmad, M. (2019). An (a)symmetric analysis of the Pollution Haven Hypothesis in the context of Pakistan: A nonlinear approach. *Carbon Management*, 10(3), 227-239.
- Üzar, U. (2019). Doğrudan Yabancı Yatırım, Büyüme ve Çevresel Kalite İlişkisi: Türkiye "Dibe Yarışan" Bir Ülke Mi?. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 439-451.
- Weng, Y. C., Chang, N. B., & Lee, T. Y. (2008). Nonlinear time series analysis of ground-level ozone dynamics in Southern Taiwan. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 87(3), 405-414.
- WTO/UNEP. (2009). *Trade and climate change: A report by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Trade Organization*. Geneva: World Trade Organization.
- Yacouba, K., & Altıntaş, H. (2019). The asymmetric impact of macroeconomic shocks on stock returns in Turkey: A nonlinear ARDL approach. *Journal for Economic Forecasting*, 22, 98-116.
- Yıldırım, M., Destek, M. A., & Özsoy, F. N. (2017). Doğrudan Yabancı Yatırımlar Ve Kirlilik Sığınağı Hipotezi. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(2), 99-111.
- Zaman, K., & Abd-el Moemen, M. (2017). Energy consumption, carbon dioxide emissions and economic development: Evaluating alternative and plausible environmental hypothesis for sustainable growth. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 74, 1119-1130.
- Zheng, J., & Sheng, P. (2017). The impact of foreign direct investment (FDI) on the environment: Market perspectives and evidence from China. *Economies*, 5(1), 8.
- Zhu, H., Duan, L., Guo, Y., & Yu, K. (2016). The effects of FDI, economic growth and energy consumption on carbon emissions in ASEAN-5: Evidence from panel quantile regression. *Economic Modelling*, 58, 237-248.

## Aims and Scope

The **Economics and Business Review** is a quarterly journal focusing on theoretical, empirical and applied research in the fields of Economics and Corporate and Public Finance. The Journal welcomes the submission of high quality articles dealing with micro, mezzo and macro issues well founded in modern theories and relevant to an international audience. The EBR's goal is to provide a platform for academicians all over the world to share, discuss and integrate state-of-the-art Economics and Finance thinking with special focus on new market economies.

## The manuscript

1. Articles submitted for publication in the **Economics and Business Review** should contain original, unpublished work not submitted for publication elsewhere.
2. Manuscripts intended for publication should be written in English, edited in Word in accordance with the **APA editorial** guidelines and sent to: secretary@ebr.edu.pl. Authors should upload two versions of their manuscript. One should be a complete text, while in the second all document information identifying the author(s) should be removed from papers to allow them to be sent to anonymous referees.
3. Manuscripts are to be typewritten in **12' font in A4 paper** format, one and half spaced and be aligned. Pages should be numbered. Maximum size of the paper should be up to 20 pages.
4. Papers should have an abstract of about 100-150 words, keywords and the Journal of Economic Literature classification code (**JEL Codes**).
5. Authors should clearly declare the aim(s) of the paper. Papers should be divided into numbered (in Arabic numerals) sections.
6. **Acknowledgements** and references to grants, affiliations, postal and e-mail addresses, etc. should appear as a separate footnote to the author's name a, b, etc and should not be included in the main list of footnotes.
7. **Footnotes** should be listed consecutively throughout the text in Arabic numerals. Cross-references should refer to particular section numbers: e.g.: See Section 1.4.
8. **Quoted texts** of more than 40 words should be separated from the main body by a four-spaced indentation of the margin as a block.
9. **References** The EBR 2017 editorial style is based on the **6th edition** of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (**APA**). For more information see APA Style used in EBR guidelines.
10. **Copyrights** will be established in the name of the **E&BR publisher**, namely the Poznań University of Economics and Business Press.

More information and advice on the suitability and formats of manuscripts can be obtained from:

### **Economics and Business Review**

al. Niepodległości 10

61-875 Poznań

Poland

e-mail: secretary@ebr.edu.pl

www.ebr.edu.pl

## **Subscription**

Economics and Business Review (E&BR) is published quarterly and is the successor to the Poznań University of Economics Review. The E&BR is published by the Poznań University of Economics and Business Press.

Economics and Business Review is indexed and distributed in Scopus, Clarivate Analytics, DOAJ, ERIH plus, ProQuest, EBSCO, CEJSH, BazEcon, Index Copernicus and De Gruyter Open (Sciendo).

Subscription rates for the print version of the E&BR: institutions: 1 year – €50.00; individuals: 1 year – €25.00. Single copies: institutions – €15.00; individuals – €10.00. The E&BR on-line edition is free of charge.