**RESEARCH ARTICLE** 



# Mitigating human-induced emissions in Argentina: role of renewables, income, globalization, and financial development

Tomiwa Sunday Adebayo<sup>1</sup> · Gbenga Daniel Akinsola<sup>2</sup> · Festus Victor Bekun<sup>3</sup> · Oseyenbhin Sunday Osemeahon<sup>4</sup> · Samuel Asumadu SARKODIE<sup>5</sup>

Received: 25 February 2021 / Accepted: 7 June 2021 / Published online: 15 July 2021 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2021

#### Abstract

Achieving environmental sustainability has become a global initiative while addressing climate change and its effects. However, the role of energy production and consumption in economic development remains critical amidst environmental pollution. Thus, the need for innovation and clean energy alternatives is critical while pursuing sustainable development. This country-specific study focuses on Argentina, where economic growth trajectory is embedded with high  $CO_2$  emissions. This study assesses the long-term and causal impact of financial development and renewables on environmental pollution while accounting for the role of economic development and globalization using yearly data spanning 1980 to 2017. A battery of econometric methods is applied to underscore the interaction between the parameters of interest. The findings of Maki and ARDL tests of cointegration alongside Kripfganz and Schneider critical approximation *p-values* affirm long-run equilibrium interaction between variables. The outcomes of autoregressive distributed lag, fully modified, and dynamic ordinary least squares demonstrate that while economic expansion dampens environmental quality—globalization and renewables improve the environment. This finding suggests pollution-driven economic growth trajectory in Argentina with high dependence on fossil fuels. Besides, the gradual shift causality test finds evidence of one-way causality from renewable energy consumption, economic growth, and globalization to  $CO_2$  emissions. Argentina's pathway in achieving sustainable development requires gradual and inclusive economic shift towards green growth.

Keywords  $CO_2$  emissions  $\cdot$  Environmental sustainability  $\cdot$  Economic growth  $\cdot$  Financial development  $\cdot$  Renewable energy  $\cdot$  Argentina

Responsible Editor: Ilhan Ozturk

Festus Victor Bekun fbekun@gelisim.edu.tr

Tomiwa Sunday Adebayo twaikline@gmail.com

Gbenga Daniel Akinsola gbengadan@yahoo.com

Oseyenbhin Sunday Osemeahon ose.sunday@gmail.com

Samuel Asumadu SARKODIE asumadusarkodiesamuel@yahoo.com

- <sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Administrative Science, Department of Business Administration, Cyprus International University, Turkey, 99258, Nicosia, North Cyprus, via Mersin 10, Turkey
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Business Management, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Girne American University, Kyrenia, North Cyprus, Mersin 10, Turkey
- <sup>3</sup> Department of International Logistics and Transportation, Faculty of Economics Administrative and Social sciences, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul, Turkey
- <sup>4</sup> School of Applied Sciences, Management Information Systems, Cyprus International University, Nicosia, North Cyprus, Mersin 10, Turkey
- <sup>5</sup> Nord University Business School, Bodo, Norway

#### Introduction

Table 1 N

Environmental issues including climate change and its longterm effects are widespread-especially among industrialized and emerging economies. Both human (anthropogenic) and natural economic expansion practices triggered these environmental issues. Argentina's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per capita in 2019 were 4.42 tons of  $CO_2$  per capita (BP, 2021). Argentina is ranked 31st and 3rd biggest economy in the world and Latin America, respectively, with GDP amounting to US\$ 445.445 billion in 2019 (World Bank, 2020). Argentina signed the COP21 agreement in 2016 and agreed to mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions substantially with its pledges and targets presented in Table 1. Argentina was the largest dry gas producer in 2016 and the fourth biggest producer of other liquids and petroleum in South America. In 2015, natural gas, which is extensively utilized in manufacturing, residential sectors, and electricity generation accounted for 52% of total primary energy utilization. Oil is the main fuel utilized in the transport industry, accounting for 36% of overall primary energy demand; however, hydropower is the 3rd largest primary source of energy. A lower proportion of the nation's overall energy use to generate electricity can be traced to the utilization of coal, hydroelectric power, and nuclear, whereas other renewable options are utilized in the production of biofuels for transportation.

Economic expansion is reliant on energy production and consumption-due to its role in improving income generation and development, stimulating employment, and accelerating productivity. Likewise, literature on energy economics shows economic growth and energy use are the two major factors with long-term impact on climate change. For instance, Kirikkaleli et al. (2020), Ayobamiji and Demet (2020), Adebayo and Kirikkaleli (2021), Olanrewaju et al. (2021), Odugbesan and Rjoub (2020), and Akinsola and Adebayo (2021) establish energy usage and economic growth as the main cause of environmental degradation across countries and regions. Previous studies [Adebayo (2021), Adedoyin et al. (2020a), Adedoyin et al. (2020b), Dogan et al. (2020),

and Alola et al. (2019)] establish conventional energy sources as critical to increasing CO<sub>2</sub> levels which in turn decrease environmental sustainability. This stance is reinforced by the optimistic association between consumption of fossil fuels and economic growth-which implies that GDP growth contributes to higher utilization of energy and higher CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, respectively (Asongu et al. 2020; Umar et al. 2020; Adebayo et al. 2021; Dogan et al. 2020). The dependence on fossil fuels has caused significant environmental harm, triggering the necessity for green energy innovations and a switch to environmentally friendly and sustainable options (renewables) that can guarantee energy efficiency (Owusu and Asumadu, 2016; Sarkodie and Owusu, 2021; Sharif et al. 2019; Ramzan et al. 2021; Azam et al., 2019; Sun et al. 2021). This stance is buttressed by the studies of Kalmaz and Adebayo (2021), Bekun et al. (2019), Adedoyin et al. (2021), and Kirikkaleli and Adebayo (2020) that disclose the role of green energy in mitigating environmental degradation. The key policy for maintaining a sustainable environment is to implement a decarbonization plan in line with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2011) which includes replacing fossil fuels with renewable energy sources.

Moreover, several studies have highlighted the significant role of financial development (FD) in attaining environmental quality. These studies used measures of FD in modeling the connection between growth, environment, and energy (see Odugbesan and Adebayo 2020; Kirikkaleli and Adebayo 2020; Charfeddine and Khediri 2016). Effective and efficient financial sector stimulates environmental sustainability by providing cheap loans for environmentally sustainable projects, supplying businesses with renewable technology, and offering incentives for firms that conform to environmental regulations and rules (Iorember et al. 2020). By increasing the stock of capital accessible for investment in sustainable energy resources intended to decrease CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, financial development can influence the efficiency of the ecosystem. Financial development, as established by the supply-

Table 1         Main pledge and targets           of Argentina         Image: Comparison of Argentina		Ratified	Yes
-	Paris agreement	2030 Unconditional target(s)	483 MtCO2e by 2030 (SAR GWP)
			[422 MtCO2e by 2030 excl. LULUCF (AR4 GWP)
			[81% above levels of 1990 by 2030 excl LULUCF]
			[32% above levels of 2020 by 2030, LULUCF]
		2030 Conditional target(s)	369 MtCO2e by 2030 (SAR GWP)
			[322 MtCO2e by 2030 excl. LULUCF (AR4 GWP)]
			[39% above levels 1990 by 2030, excl. LULUCF]
			[1% above levels of 2010 by 2030, excl. LULUCF]
		Coverage	Economy-wide, incl. LULUCF
	Long-term goals	Long-term goals	None

Source: Our World in Data. https://buff.ly/331B6XE

leading hypothesis, can also impact environmental sustainability via its positive effects on economic growth (Iorember et al. 2021). Besides, more energy consumption is needed for higher economic development; hence, energy and carbonintensive economic pathway leads to  $CO_2$  emissions. Consequently, this has become an active concern to consider the role of financial development in the growth-energyenvironment connection.

Globalization is a global phenomenon that impacts human lives politically and socially (Bekun et al. 2021)-with its positive effects more pronounced than negative impacts-especially in reducing poverty and income disparity in developing nations. Recently, several scholars have assessed the association between environmental degradation and globalization; however, outcomes are mixed, making it difficult to determine the exact effect of globalization on environmental degradation. For instance, studies like Kirikkaleli et al. (2020), Koengkan et al. (2020), and Rahman (2020) established the role of globalization in escalating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which in turn decreases environmental quality. In contrast, other studies (Saint Akadiri et al. 2020; Asongu et al. 2020; Umar et al. 2020; Haseeb et al. 2018; Zaidi et al. 2019) found the effect of globalization in mitigating CO<sub>2</sub> emission sc., improves environmental quality. This infers that globalization may eliminate tariffs and taxation and free up financial development and trade, which may stimulate economic growth (Kirikkaleli et al. 2020). Nonetheless, economic expansion may reduce environmental sustainability (Adedovin et al. 2020a, b).

The varying environmental effects of renewable energy, globalization, financial, and economic development require more scientific studies—owing to the mixed results of prior studies and lack of research consensus. The choice of Argentina as a case study is because of its ranking as third-biggest emitter in Latin America behind Mexico and Brazil, and limited jurisdictional and empirical studies on the theme. Thus, this research provides valuable policy suggestions on mitigating  $CO_2$  emissions in Argentina. This study evaluates the interaction and causal impacts of globalization, renewables, and economic development on Argentina's environmental sustainability.

The primary additions of this research include (i) the introduction of financial development index into the framework for Argentina and utilization of green energy resources rather than traditional energy utilization in existing studies (see Zhang et al. 2021; Dogan et al. 2020; Kirikkaleli et al. 2020; Adebayo, 2021; Olanrewaju et al. 2021). The incorporation of financial development index in the research of energy– growth–globalization–environment association is a significant addition to existing studies, particularly in Argentina; (ii) due to potential breaks in series, employing the conventional cointegration test will yield misleading outcomes. Therefore, this study adopts Maki's cointegration test to capture cointegration among the series in the presence of five breaks. Besides, this study utilizes Bounds test with Kripfganz and Schneider (2018) critical values for model robustness and validation. The advantage of this approach is the consideration of both T-statistic and F-statistics in deciding the cointegration between the parameters; (iii) the long-run association between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and regressors are captured using the ARDL, FMOLS, and DOLS; (iv) unlike prior studies (Ayobamiji and Kalmaz, 2020; Kirikkaleli et al. 2020; Rahman 2020; Adedoyin et al. 2021) based on time-domain causality test, this study employs the gradual shift causality test that controls for the effect of structural break in exploring the causal linkage between sampled variables.

Table 2 shows the summary of related studies. Subsequent sections of this study include data and methodology presented in Section 3. The findings and discussions are highlighted in Section 3, whereas Section 4 presents conclusion and policy directions.

# Materials and method

### Data

In this research, the 8th, 9th, 13th, 15th, and 17th Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations lay the foundation for selecting variables. Our data series comprises  $CO_2$  emissions ( $CO_2$ ), economic growth (GDP), globalization (GLO), renewable energy (REN), and financial development (FD).

 $CO_2$  emissions: SDG 13 seeks to enhance atmospheric and habitat quality by lowering GHG emissions to optimal levels, thus illustrating the unparallel danger of global warming to human lives due to upsurge in  $CO_2$  emissions.

Economic growth: Decent employment and productivity with aim of encouraging the vast unemployed to build work and entrepreneurship. SDG 8 seeks to guarantee that all employees that are qualified have full employment and good jobs.

Globalization: The aim of SDG 17 is to enhance global cooperation in all related areas and to utilize tactical alliances to achieve sustainability objectives. The overall aim will result in open access to technology and information for sustainable growth and development.

Renewable energy: SDG 17 seeks to improve capacity and update technologies including renewable energy sources which is a vital objective to foster both growth and clean environment.

Financial development: Industrialization cannot occur without innovation and technology, whereas growth cannot take place without industrialization. SDG 9 aims at achieving sustainable development through the positive effects of financial development. This aims to enhance sustainability targets

# Table 2 Summary of related studies

Investigator(s)	Period	Country	Variables	Method(s)	Outcomes
Magazzino, (2016)	1970–2006	Italy	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, EN	TY Granger	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \leftrightarrow \text{CO}_2 \\ \text{EN} \leftrightarrow \text{CO}_2 \end{array}$
Dogan and Aslan (2017)	1995–2011	EU and candidate countries	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, TOR	Panel FMOLS, the DOLS, causality	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (\text{-}) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (\text{-}) \\ \text{TOR} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (\text{-}) \end{array}$
Magazzino, (2017)	1960–2013	19 APEC countries	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, EN	VAR	EN≠GDP
Zaidi et al. (2019)	1990–2016,	APEC countries	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, GDP <sup>2</sup> , FD, GLO	CUP-BC, CUP-FM,DH causality	$GDP^{2} \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $GLO \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $FD \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $GLO \rightarrow CO_{2}$
Haseeb et al. (2018)	1995–2014	BRICS countries	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, EN, URB, FD	FMOLS, DSUR, DH causality	$GDP^{2} \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $GLO \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $URB \rightarrow CO_{2} (-)$ $FD \rightarrow CO_{2} (+)$ $EN \rightarrow CO_{2} (+)$ $EN \leftrightarrow CO_{2}$ $FD \leftrightarrow CO_{2}$ $GLO \leftrightarrow CO_{2}$
Saint Akadiri et al. (2019)	1973–2014	South Africa	EFP GDP, EN,	ARDL, Granger causality	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (+) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (+) \end{array}$
Alola et al. (2019)	1997–2014	Europe	EFP GDP, REN, EN, FR	PMG-ARDL	$GDP \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ REN $\rightarrow CO_2 (-)$ EN $\rightarrow CO_2 (+)$
Bekun et al. (2019)	1996–2014	16-EU countries	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, REN, EN, RENT	PMG-ARDL	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{REN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (-) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{RENT} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \end{array}$
Le and Ozturk, (2020)	1990–2014	7 Emerging Market and Developing Economies (EMDEs)	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, GLO, FD	CCEMG, AMG, and DCCE	$FD \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $GDP \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $GLO \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$
Dogan et al. (2020)	1980–2014	BRICST Nations	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, GDP <sup>2</sup> , EN	Panel ARDL	$EN \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $GDP^2 \rightarrow CO_2$
Kirikkaleli et al. (2020)	1980–2016	Turkey	EFP, GDP, GLO, TO	FMOLS, DOLS, dual adjustment	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (+) \\ \text{GLO} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (+) \\ \text{TO} \rightarrow \text{EFP}(-) \end{array}$
Asongu et al. (2020)	1980–2014	Africa	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, ELE, URB, EN	ARDL-PMG, D-H causali- ty	$EN \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $GDP \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $URB \rightarrow CO_2$ $URB \leftrightarrow CO_2$ $GDP \leftrightarrow CO_2$
Khan and Ozturk (2020)	1980–2014	17 countries from Asia	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, FDI, TO	FMOLS	FDI→ CO <sub>2</sub> (+) FDI↔CO <sub>2</sub>
Adebayo et al. (2020)	1980–2018	MINT Nations	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, URB, TO, EN	ARDL, panel causality	$GDP \neq CO_2$ EN $\rightarrow CO_2$ (+) URB CO <sub>2</sub> (+) TO $\rightarrow CO_2$ (+) URB $\rightarrow CO_2$ TO $\rightarrow CO_2$
Odugbesan and Adebayo (2020)	1980–2016	Nigeria	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, FDI, FD	ARDL, NARDL	$FD^{P}$ → $CO_{2}$ (-) $FD^{n} \neq CO_{2}$ $FDi^{P} \rightarrow CO_{2}$ (-)
Adebayo & Odugbesan, (2020)	1971–2016	South-Africa	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, URB, FD	ARDL, FMOLS, DOLS, CCR, wavelet	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{FD} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{URB} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (-) \end{array}$
Olanrewaju et al. (2021)	1971–2016	Thailand	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, EN, GCF, FD	ARDL, FMOLS, DOLS, CCR, wavelet	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{GCF} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \end{array}$

Table 2 (continued)

Investigator(s)	Period	Country	Variables	Method(s)	Outcomes
					$FN \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ URB $\rightarrow CO_2$
Adedoyin et al. (2020a)	1990–2014	BRICS economies	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, CR, CC	PMG-ARDL	$GDP \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $CC \rightarrow CO_2 (+)$ $CR \neq CO_2$
Zhang et al. (2021)	1970–2016	Malaysia	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, URB, TO, GCF	Maki cointegration, ARDL, wavelet, gradual shift causality	$GDP \rightarrow CO_{2} (+)$ $URB \rightarrow CO_{2} (+)$ $GCF \rightarrow CO_{2} (+)$ $URB \rightarrow CO_{2}$ $URB \rightarrow CO_{2}$
Ahmed et al. (2021)	1980–2017	Japan	EFP, GDP, GLO, FD	ARDL	$GLO^+ \rightarrow EFP (-)$ $GLO^- \rightarrow EFP (-)$ $FD \rightarrow EFP(+)$
Ullah et al. (2020)	1980–2018	Pakistan	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, URB, HC, IND	ARDL, NARDL	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{HC} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \end{array}$
Usman et al. (2021)	1990-2017	15 highest emitting countries	EFP GDP,FD,RE- N, NON	Panel ARDL	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GLO}^{+} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (-) \\ \text{REN}^{-} \rightarrow \text{EFP} (-) \\ \text{FD} \rightarrow \text{EFP}(-) \end{array}$
Alam et al. (2020)	1996–2013	30 OECD Nations	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, SM, R&D, FDI	Panel ARDL	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{R} \& \text{D} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{FDI} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{SM} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \end{array}$
Anser et al. (2021)	1990-2015.	top ten carbon emitter nations	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, GDP <sup>2</sup> , POP, EN	PMG-ARDL	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{GDP}^2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (-) \\ \text{POP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \end{array}$
Assi et al. (2021)	1998–2018.	ASEAN +3 economies	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP, REN, FD	panel ARDL, D-H causality	FD≠ REN CO2 <b>→</b> REN (-)
Adebayo (2021)	1981–2016	Indonesia	CO <sub>2</sub> , GDP <sup>2</sup> , GDP, TO, EN	ARDL, wavelet	$\begin{array}{l} \text{GDP} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{GDP}^2 \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (-) \\ \text{EN} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (+) \\ \text{TO} \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 (-) \end{array}$

Notes: *GDP* gross domestic production, *CO*<sub>2</sub> carbon emissions, *EN* energy use, *TO* trade openness, *FD* financial development, *GLO* globalization, *CC* coal consumption, *CR* coal rent, *URB* urbanization, *R&D* research and development, *GCF* gross capital formation, *EFP* ecological footprint, *HC* human capital, *REN* renewable energy, *SM* stock market, *FDI* foreign direct investment, *TOR* tourism

through technological innovations including growing efficient resources and achieving energy efficiency.

Based on this, we assess the impact of financial development and renewable energy on environmental degradation by accounting for the role of GDP and globalization in Argentina using yearly data from 1980 and 2017. This study utilizes the following economic function:

$$CO_2 = f(GDP, FD, REN, GLO)$$
 (1)

In Eq. 1,  $CO_2$  denotes carbon emissions, FD signifies financial development index, GLO stands for globalization, and REN illustrates renewable energy.

The unit of measurement, description, and source of data are presented in Table 3. Figure 1 depicts the flow chart of the econometric procedure used in this study.

#### Theoretical rationale and specification of model

In line with Adebayo and Odugbesan (2020) for South Africa and Kirikkaleli et al. (2020) for Turkey, the specification of the model can be expressed as:

$$CO_{2t} = \beta_1 GDP_t + \beta_2 FD_t + \beta_3 REN_t + \beta_4 GLO_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

In Eq. 1, CO<sub>2</sub>, FD, REN, GDP, and GLO depict environmental degradation, financial development, renewable energy, economic growth, and globalization, respectively. Also, *t* illustrates the period of study (1980–2017);  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$ ,  $\beta_3$ ,  $\beta_4$ , and  $\beta_5$  are parameters while  $\varepsilon$  is the error term.

Constant expansion of the economy has contributed to an upsurge in GDP, leading to higher energy demand, which contributes more to emissions (Kirikkaleli et al. 2020;

Adebayo, 2021; Olanrewaju et al. 2021). Thus, GDP is projected to increase CO<sub>2</sub> emissions  $(\beta_1 = \frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta CDP} > 0)$ . Financial development is expected to negatively impact CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Kirikkaleli and Adebayo 2020; Charfeddine and Khediri 2016). Thus, an increase in financial development would also increase environmental degradation, i.e.,  $(\beta_2 = \frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta FD} < 0)$  otherwise  $(\beta_2 = \frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta FD} > 0)$  if not ecofriendly. Following Kirikkaleli and Adebayo (2020) and Kirikkaleli et al. (2020), we incorporate renewable energy into the model. Renewable energy is anticipated to decrease CO2 emissions (Kirikkaleli and Adebayo 2021). Thus, the expected sign of REN coefficient is negative  $(\beta_3 = \frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta REN} < 0)$ . It is predicted that the interaction between globalization and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is negative (Asongu et al. 2020; Kirikkaleli et al. 2020). Thus, a rise in GLO would decrease CO<sub>2</sub> emissions  $\left(\beta_4=\frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta GLO}<0\right)$  otherwise  $\left(\beta_4=\frac{\delta CO_2}{\delta GLO}>0\right)$  if globalization is not eco-friendly.

#### Methodology

#### Unit root tests

Using non-stationary data for model estimation will produce spurious regression, hence affects statistical inferences (Granger et al. 1974). To investigate the stationarity properties of sampled series, this study employs ADF and PP unit root tests.

The equation of ADF is expressed as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \beta_1 Y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p b_1 \Delta Y_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$$
(3)

Equation 4 explains the PP unit root expressed as:

$$\Delta Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 Y_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \tag{4}$$

where  $\Delta$  denotes the first difference,  $Y_t$  denotes the target variable used, t denotes the time trend of the variable, p denotes lags used, and  $\varepsilon$  represents error term. PP unit root is a modified version of ADF because the residual of the serial correlation and heteroscedasticity were been taken into but PP employs statistical methods that are non-parametric to solve the heteroscedasticity and serial correlation problem. This study used the Zivot and Andrews (2002) unit root test in detecting a single structural break and stationarity features of the parameters.

Model A: 
$$\Delta \mathbf{y} = \sigma + \hat{u} y_{t-1} + \beta \mathbf{t} + \gamma \mathrm{DU}_t$$
  
  $+ \sum_{j=i}^t d_j \Delta y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t$  (5)

Model B :  $\Delta \mathbf{y} = \sigma + \hat{u} y_{t-1} + \beta \mathbf{t} + \mathbf{DT}_t + \sum_{j=i}^t d_j \Delta y_{t-j}$ 

$$+ \varepsilon_t$$
 (6)

Model C : 
$$\Delta y = \sigma + \hat{u}y_{t-1} + \beta t + DT_t + \gamma DU$$

$$+\sum_{j=i}^{t} d_j \Delta y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t \tag{7}$$

where Tb is the possible breakpoint, and r is the upper limit of the lag length of the explanatory variables. Also,  $DU_t = 1$  and  $DT_t$ will be equivalent to  $t - T_b$  if  $t > T_b$  and it will be 0 if otherwise

$$DUt = \begin{cases} 1....if \ t > TB \\ 0....otherwise \end{cases} \text{ and } DUt$$
$$= \begin{cases} t - TB \dots if \ t > TB \\ 0....otherwise \end{cases}$$
(8)

#### Maki cointegration test

Bearing in mind the structural break(s) in series, the current paper applied Maki cointegration test to explore the cointegration features between CO<sub>2</sub>, REN, GDP, FD, and GLO in Argentina. We applied this test in contrast to both Hatemi-j's (2008) and Gregory and Hansen's (1996) cointegration tests, which can capture two and more potential break dates. The Maki cointegration test can capture cointegration in series with almost five breaks simultaneously. The four regression models of Maki (2012) are illustrated as:

Level shift

$$Y_t = \rho + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_i D_{i,t} + \theta^t Z_t + \varepsilon_t$$
(9)

Level shift with trend

$$Y_t = \rho + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_i D_{i,t} + \theta^t Z_t + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta^t Z_t D_{i,t} + \varepsilon_t$$
(10)

Regime shifts

$$Y_t = \rho + \sum_{i=1}^k \rho_i D_{i,t} + \theta^t Z_t + \sigma t + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta^t Z_t D_{i,t} + \varepsilon_t$$
(11)

Trend and regime shifts

$$Y_{t} = \rho + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \rho_{i} D_{i,t} + \theta^{\iota} Z_{t} + \sigma t + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma^{\iota} D_{i,t}$$
  
+ 
$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \theta^{\iota} Z_{t} D_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{t}$$
(12)

In Eqs. 9, 10, 11, and 12, t stands for time.  $Y_t$  and  $Z_t$  depict dependent and independent variables, while the error term is depicted by  $\varepsilon_t$ .

#### ARDL approach

Bounds testing based on autoregressive distribution lag (ARDL) is used to capture the long-run association between

Table 3	Variables, units, and sources		
Variable	Description	Units	Sources
CO <sub>2</sub>	Environmental degradation	Metric tons per capita	BP
GDP	Economic growth	GDP per capita constant \$US, 2010	WDI
FDI	Financial development index	A broad measure for financial development by taking into account its efficiency, accessibility, and depth	IMF
REN	Renewable energy consumption	% of total final energy consumption	BP
GLO	Economic globalization	Index based on FDI, trade, and portfolio investment	Gygli et al., (2019): Revised KOF Globalization Index

the dependent and independent variables (Pesaran and Timmermann 2005). The benefits of the ARDL bounds model over other traditional cointegration techniques are the following: (i) it can be used when there is mixed integration order; (ii) it incorporates both short and long-run coefficients concurrently; (iii) it perfectly fits small sample size (BetonKalmaz and Adebayo 2020); (iv) accommodate different lag-length (Mwamba et al. 2021; Olanrewaju et al. 2021); and (v) autocorrelation problem is removed. The estimated Fstatistic is compared to the lower and upper bound critical values. When the calculated F-statistics is below the critical value, the null hypothesis can not be rejected; however, the null hypothesis is rejected when the estimated F-statistics is greater-which shows evidence of long-run relationship among variables. Equation 13 explains the ARDL bounds model, expressed as:

$$\Delta CO_{2t} = C_0 + \beta_1 CO_{2t-1} + \beta_2 GDP_{t-1} + \beta_3 FD_{t-1}$$
$$+ \beta_4 REN_{t-1} + \beta_5 GLO_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^t \pi_{1,I} \Delta CO_{2t-i}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^t \pi_{2,I} \Delta GDP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^t \pi_{3,I} \Delta FD_{t-i}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^t \pi_{4,I} \Delta REN_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^t \theta_5 \Delta REN_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (13)$$

where  $\Delta$  is the first difference operator of the variables. The first part of equation (10) estimates the long-run coefficients whereas the second part estimates the short-run

Fig. 1 A graphical flow of analysis



coefficients of the variables. The speed at which the shortrun disequilibrium adjusts to its long-run equilibrium path is determined by the error correction mechanism (ECM). The ECM equation is based on:

$$\Delta CO_{2t} = \psi_0 + \sum_{i=0}^{p} \theta_{1,i} \Delta CO_{2t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{q} \theta_{2,1} \Delta GDP_{t-i}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=0}^{q} \theta_{3,i} \Delta FD_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{q} \theta_4 \Delta REN_{t-i}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=0}^{q} \theta_{5,i} \Delta GLO_{t-i} + \omega ECT_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$
(14)

where the adjustment speed to the long-run equilibrium level is captured by the error correction term (ECT). The short-run parameters are given by  $\varphi_1$ ,  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$ ,  $\theta_3$ ,  $\theta_4$ , and  $\theta_5$ . The choice of this method is based on its numerous advantages. Among these advantages, it can be applied whether the variables are I(0), I(1), or integrated fractionally. More so, the performance of this test in small sample size is better compared to other cointegration tests. To determine cointegration among variables, Pesaran and Timmermann (2005) proposed an F-test. The null hypothesis for cointegration test is that H<sub>o</sub>:  $\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = \alpha_5 = 0$ , whereas H<sub>1</sub>:  $\alpha_0 \neq \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \neq$  $\alpha_3 \neq \alpha_4 \neq \alpha_5 = 0$  represents the alternative hypothesis.

#### **FMOLS and DOLS**

If the long-run relationship is established among the variables, the need to estimate the long-run coefficients for the various



variables is germane. For this purpose, the fully modified ordinary least square (FMOLS) of Phillips and Hansen (1990) and the dynamic ordinary least square (DOLS) were used. Therefore, long-term elasticity with FMOLS and DOLS estimators is used in this study. The FMOLS estimator is depicted by Eq. 15 as:

$$CO_{2t} = \vartheta_0 + \vartheta_1 GDP_t + \vartheta_2 FD_t + \vartheta_3 REN_t + \vartheta_4 GLO_t + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_1 \Delta GDP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_2 \Delta FD_{t-i} + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_3 \Delta REN_{t-i} + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_3 \Delta GLO_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t$$
(15)

The FMOLS estimator has the advantage of correcting autoregression and endogeneity problems, as well as error emerging from sample bias (Narayan & Narayan, 2005).

The dynamic ordinary least squares (DOLS) estimation test is utilized to ascertain the magnitude of long-run equilibrium. The advantages of DOLS include the following: (i) it can be estimated irrespective of the order of integration of series, but the dependent variable is expected to be integrated of order one and (ii) it eliminates serial correlation issues arising from the model estimation and other internalities (Esteve and Requena 2006). The DOLS long-run equation is illustrated in Eq. 16 as:

$$CO_{2t} = \vartheta_0 + \vartheta_1 GDP_t + \vartheta_2 FD_t + \vartheta_3 REN_t + \vartheta_4 GLO_t$$
$$+ \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_1 \Delta GDP_{t-i} + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_2 \Delta FD_{t-i}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_3 \Delta REN_{t-i} + \sum_{i=q}^{q} \beta_3 \Delta GLO_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t$$
(16)

Here, q represents the optimum lag level suggested by Schwarz information criterion.

Table 4 Descriptive statistics

Statistics	$CO_2$	GDP	EG	FD	REN
Mean	3.9646	8403.0	42.552	0.3089	1.822667
Median	3.8453	7975.5	41.931	0.3204	1.935492
Maximum	4.7182	10883.	53.604	0.4267	3.1599187
Minimum	3.3096	6245.7	33.832	0.1894	0.1500846
Std. Dev.	0.4690	1412.8	6.3524	0.0641	2.295481
Skewness	0.3903	0.4678	0.1881	-0.3362	0.114931
Kurtosis	1.6161	1.8360	1.6326	2.12182	3.548128
Jarque-Bera	3.9968	3.5313	3.1847	1.936	0.559361
Probability	0.1355	0.1710	0.2034	0.3796	0.756025
Observations	38	38	38	38	38

Table 5 ADF and PP unit root results

	ADF		РР	
	I(0)	I(1)	I(0)	I(1)
$CO_2$	-3.081	-5.279*	-2.977	-9.409*
EG	-1.632	-5.147*	-1.632	-5.146*
FD	-2.028	-4.533*	-2.418	-9.634*
GDP	-2.798	-4.698*	-2.754	-4.644*
REN	-2.651	-5.694*	-2.740	-6.120*

Note: \* stands for 1% significance level. PP and ADF denotes Phillip-Perron and Augmented Dickey fuller tests correspondingly

#### Gradual shift causality

The gradual-shift model developed by Toda and Yamamoto (1995) depends on vector autoregressive (VAR) built by Sims (1980). The optimal lag length,  $p + d_{max}$  is added to the lag of  $d_{max}$ , determined by the maximum-order of integration of the series in the VAR model. However, the outcome of the VAR model can produce inaccurate and inconsistent results because structural shifts are ignored (Enders and Lee 2012; Enders and Jones 2016). We utilized the Fourier Toda-Yamamoto causality test developed by Nazlioglu et al. (2016) to capture structural shifts in Granger causality analysis-including gradual and smooth shift termed the "gradual shift causality test." Fourier approximation comprises single-frequency (SF) and cumulative-frequencies (CF). Thus, by adding the TY-VAR analysis and Fourier approximation, the modified Wald test statistic (MWALT) is generated. Assuming the coefficients of the intercept is constant over time, the VAR model can be modified as:

$$y_t = \sigma(t) + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_{p+dmax} y_{t-(p+dmax)} + \varepsilon_t$$
(17)

where  $y_t$  denotes CO<sub>2</sub>, GDP, CC, GLO, and FD;  $\sigma$  denotes intercept;  $\beta$  denotes coefficient matrices;  $\varepsilon$  denotes the error term; *t* denotes time function. To capture the structural change, the Fourier expansion is introduced and explained in Eq. 18.

Table 6ZA (intercept and trend)

	t- statistic	BD	t-statistic	BD
CO <sub>2</sub>	-3.978	1994	-6.645*	2009
EG	-2.778	1999	-6.403*	1990
FD	-3.978	1994	-7.602*	1989
GDP	-3.458	1990	-5.804**	2008
REN	-3.149	2002	-5.748**	1995

Note: \* and \*\* represent 1% and 5% significance level. BD denotes break date

#### Table 7 Maki (2012) outcomes

	T-statistics	Critical values	
Model		5%	BD
Trend and regime shifts			
CO <sub>2</sub> =f(GDP, REN, FD, EG)	-7.967*	-6.911	1995
CO <sub>2</sub> =f(GDP, REN, FD, EG)	-8.555 *	-7.638	1995, 1988
CO <sub>2</sub> =f(GDP, REN, FD, EG)	-8.555 *	-8.254	1995, 1988, 2004
CO <sub>2</sub> =f(GDP, REN, FD, EG)	-10.096*	-8.871	1995, 1988, 2004, 2010
CO <sub>2</sub> =f(GDP, REN, FD, EG)	-10.096*	-9.482	1995, 1988, 2004, 2010, 1985

Note: \* represents 1% significance level. BD stands for the break date

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_{1k} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^n \gamma_{2k} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) \quad (18)$$

where  $\gamma_{1k}$  and  $\gamma_{2k}$  measures the frequency amplitude and displacement respectively; n denotes the number of frequency.

Substituting Eq. (18) into Eq. (17), the structural shift is considered by defining Fourier Toda-Yamamoto causality with cumulative frequencies (CF), expressed as:

$$y_{t} = \sigma_{0} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \gamma_{1k} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \gamma_{2k} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \beta_{1} y_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_{p+dmax} y_{t-(p+dmax)} + \varepsilon_{t}$$
(19)

where k denotes approximation frequency. The singlefrequency components are defined in Eq. 20 as:

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma_0 + \gamma_1 \sin\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \gamma_2 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right)$$
(20)

The Fourier Toda-Yamamoto causality with single frequencies (SF) is illustrated in Eq. (21) as:

$$y_{t} = \sigma_{0} + \gamma_{1} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \gamma_{2} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi kt}{T}\right) + \beta_{1} y_{t-1} + \dots + \beta_{p+d} y_{t-(p+d)} + \varepsilon_{t}$$
(21)

Here, the Wald statistic can be used for testing the null hypothesis that non-causality is zero (H<sub>0</sub>:  $\beta_1 = \beta = 0$ ).

# **Findings and discussion**

The description of the sample following the empirical results is presented in Table 4. The outcome of the Jarque-Bera test shows parameters conform to the normality assumption since the probability fails to reject the null hypothesis of normal distribution. The unit root features of the series presented in Tables 5 and 6 show the order of integration of  $CO_2$ , GDP, REN, EG, and FD is I(1) process. Moreover, we apply both Maki (2012) and bounds test cointegration tests to explore the long-run equilibrium interaction among time series variables presented in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. The results of the Maki (2012) cointegration in Table 7 reveal long-run association between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, financial development, globalization, renewable energy consumption, and economic growth. To ensure robustness of Maki (2012) cointegration test, we applied bounds test. The bounds test depicted in Table 8 confirms evidence of long-run association among the economic variables. Therefore, both Maki and bounds tests affirm cointegration among the parameters-indicative that the independent variables converge to the dependent variable. In other words, the combination of CO<sub>2</sub>, GDP, REN, EG, and FD is significant in the long-run.

After confirming the cointegration among the parameters, we utilized ARDL test to capture the association between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and regressors in both long-run and short-run presented in Table 9. Appropriate lag selection is essential when applying the ARDL. Thus, we utilized the AIC criteria proposed by Akaike (1987). As stated in Udemba et al. (2021) and Zhang e al. (2021), AIC is preferred for lag selection due

Table 8         Bound test with           Kripfganz and Schneider critical         and P values		F-statistics	3	6.76		T-statistic	28	-5.98
		10%		5%		1%		PV
	F-statistics CV	2.204	3.320	2.615	3.891	3.572	5.112	0.00*
	T-statistics CV	-2.495	-3.798	-2.843	-4.207	-3.54	-5.021	0.00*

Note: Note \* represents 1% significance level, and PV denotes probability value. Both F-stat and T-stat are greater than critical values

#### Table 9 ARDL results

Regressors	Coefficient	t- statistic	Prob
Long-run outcomes			
GDP	0.4614*	4.7558	0.0001
EG	-0.1944**	2.3458	0.0411
FD	0.0409	1.2134	0.2368
REN	-0.1260**	-3.2309	0.0036
BD(GDP)2008	0.0282***	1.9733	0.0601
BD(EG)1990	-0.0149	-1.1076	0.2790
BD(FD)1989	0.0111	0.8357	0.4115
BD(REN)1995	-0.0082	-0.5146	0.6115
Short-run outcomes			
GDP	0.0282*	3.2637	0.0033
EG	-0.1944*	-3.6336	0.0013
FD	0.0226	1.6037	0.1219
REN	-0.0149***	-1.9212	0.0667
ECT(-)	-0.5744*	-10.346	0.0000
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0.96		
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.95		
Post-estimation tests			
χ2 ARCH	0.98 (0.30)		
$\chi 2$ RESET	0.27 (0.78)		
$\chi 2$ Normality	0.92 (0.63)		
χ2 LM	1.09 (0.80)		
CUSUM	Stable at 5% signific	cance level	
CUSUM of Sq	Stable at 5% signific	cance level	

Note: \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* stand for 1%, 5%, and 10% significance level, respectively. BD represents break date

to its superior characteristics. The model's goodness-of-fit is depicted by the R<sup>2</sup> (0.98) and Adj R<sup>2</sup> (0.97), respectively. The results of the R<sup>2</sup> and Adj R<sup>2</sup> illustrate 98% and 97% variations in CO<sub>2</sub> can be explained by GDP, REN, FD, and GLO, while the remaining percentage can be attributed to error. The speed of adjustment is observed to facilitate long-term convergence between the parameters with significant negative error correction (ECT) coefficient. The outcome of the ECT is -0.70, which illustrates evidence of cointegration among the parameters, and further signifies the capability of CO<sub>2</sub> to witness 70% speed of adjustment to verify the alignment to equilibrium in the long-run due to the effect of GDP, REN, FD, and GLO.

We observe in Table 9 that economic growth exerts positive impact on  $CO_2$  emissions—which implies economic expansion in Argentina deteriorates environmental quality. Thus, keeping all indicators constant, 1% increase in GDP growth increases  $CO_2$  by 0.48%. The probable reason behind this is that Argentina has been experiencing accelerated growth. Numerous studies document the positive link between economic growth and energy use. Meaning that economic growth increases with increasing levels of energy consumption, hence increasing  $CO_2$  emissions—which deteriorates environmental quality (Kalmaz and Adebayo 2021). This outcome concurs with Kirikkaleli et al. (2020) for Turkey, Olanrewaju et al. (2021) for Thailand, Adebayo and Odugbesan for South Africa, and Zhang et al. (2021) for Malaysia.

There is insignificant linkage between financial development and  $CO_2$  emissions. The reason for this insignificant linkage is that in emerging nations such as Argentina where structural transition of the financial sector is at an early stage, financial development may not improve environmental

# Table 10FMOLS and DOLSresults

	FMOLS			DOLS		
Variable	Coefficient	t- statistic	Prob.	Coefficient	t- statistic	Prob.
GDP	0.4376*	8.3522	0.0000	0.4614*	4.8981	0.0001
EG	-0.0423**	-2.1352	0.0436	-0.0409**	-2.2498	0.04223
FD	0.1878	1.07333	0.20011	0.1944	1.2236	0.30358
REN	-0.1119*	-5.0931	0.0000	-0.1260*	-3.3273	0.0028
BD(GDP)2008	0.0279*	3.6171	0.0014	0.0282*	2.0324	0.0533
BD(EG) <sub>1990</sub>	0.0075	1.0540	0.3028	0.0149	1.1408	0.2652
BD(FD)1989	-0.0149	-2.0576	0.0511	-0.0111	-0.8607	0.3979
BD(REN)1995	-0.0092	-1.0666	0.2972	-0.0082	-0.5300	0.6010
$\mathbb{R}^2$	0.96			0.96		
Adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.95			0.95		
S.E. of regression	0.0122			0.0123		

Note: \* and \*\* stand for 1% and 5% significance level, respectively. BD represents break date

 Table 11
 Gradual shift causality test

Causality Path	Wald-stat	No of Fourier	P- value	Decision
$CO_2 \rightarrow GDP$	9.0366	3	0.2500	Do not reject Ho
$GDP \rightarrow CO_2$	23.922*	3	0.0011	Reject Ho
$CO_2 \rightarrow FD$	7.8616	3	0.3449	Do not reject Ho
$FD \rightarrow CO_2$	4.6718	3	0.6999	Do not reject Ho
$CO_2 \rightarrow EG$	3.0876	1	0.8767	Do not reject Ho
$EG \rightarrow CO_2$	12.365***	1	0.0891	Reject Ho
CO₂→REN	10.356	2	0.1692	Do not reject Ho
$\operatorname{REN} \twoheadrightarrow \operatorname{CO}_2$	15.252**	2	0.0329	Reject Ho

Note: \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* stand for 1%, 5%, and 10% significance level, respectively

quality. This outcome corresponds with prior studies (Bekhet et al. 2017; Sekali and Bouzahzah 2019; Salahuddin et al. 2018) that found insignificant interconnection between financial development and  $CO_2$  emissions.

However, if fossil fuel energy consumption is substituted with renewables, environmental quality increases. This argument is reflected in our findings from the effect of renewables on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Our results show renewable energy consumption decreases environmental degradation in Argentina with a negative link between renewable energy utilization and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The results reveal 1% increase in renewable energy utilization decreases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 0.14%. This indicates the need to improve the energy consumption structure from conventional energy sources to renewables. This is consistent with the findings presented in Kirikkaleli and Adebayo, (2020) and Dogan and Seker (2016), confirming the stimulating role of renewables on environmental sustainability.

Evidence of negative linkage between globalization and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions illustrates that nations with higher globalization level/openness observe less environmental degradation. Therefore, keeping other indicators constant, 1% increase in globalization decreases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 0.19%. In each case, the technique effect is at work, as globalization introduces innovative goods and new techniques for production that enhance new activity. Globalization can boost economic expansion while minimizing environmental degradation (Zaidi et al. 2019). As businesses compete on a global scale, they strengthen their quality and service levels to stay competitive, which tends to solve environmental challenges in developing countries. This is consistent with the findings of Zaidi et al. (2019) and Shahbaz et al. (2013) who established negative and significant globalization-CO2 emissions interconnection but contradicts the results of Kirikkaleli et al. (2020), Koengkan et al. (2020), and Rahman (2020) who found a positive role of globalization in environmental deterioration.

Regarding the effects of identified structural breaks, the results show that the break date (i.e., 2008) for economic growth is significant in explaining  $CO_2$  emissions–economic growth relationship. The significance of the 2008 structural break can be attributed to the global financial crisis that affected the global economy.

The various post-estimation tests conducted are presented in Table 9. The results of the normality, serial correlation, Ramsey, and heteroscedasticity tests show that the model is well specified, normally distributed with no serial correlation and heteroscedasticity effects. The CUSUM and CUSUMSQ plots correspondingly exemplify the stability of the model parameters.

To affirm the ARDL long-run outcomes, we applied FMOLS and DOLS long-run estimators to capture the long-run interaction between  $CO_2$  emissions and the regressors



#### Fig. 2 Graphical findings

(GDP, FD, REN, and GLO). The results of FMOLS and DOLS as presented in Table 10, showing both renewable and globalization, improve environmental quality, whereas economic growth impedes environmental quality in Argentina. These outcomes support the findings from the ARDL long-run estimation.

Finally, we utilized the gradual shift causality test to capture the causal impact of financial development, renewable energy consumption, globalization, and economic growth on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Argentina between 1980 and 2017. The findings of the causality test presented in Table 11 show (a) unidirectional causality from economic growth to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This illustrates that GDP is an important predictor of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: (b) one-way causality from globalization to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This infers that globalization is a significant factor in predicting CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: (c) one-way causality from renewable energy consumption to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions—implying renewable energy consumption can predict CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. As a policy implication, the evidence of unidirectional causality highlights that economic growth-induced pollution is worthy of caution for environmental stakeholders. See Fig. 2 for causality scheme.

# **Conclusion and policy directions**

The constant need for energy production and consumption energy driven mostly by fossil fuels threatens the environment. This research explored the linkage between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and financial development in Argentina, while accounting for renewable energy utilization and economic development from 1980 to 2017. We utilized broad-based financial development index to accurately cover financial development, which measures access, efficiency, and financial depth contrary to conventional metrics. To achieve the hypothesized relationship between these variables, we applied a battery of second-generational econometric techniques comprising ARDL bounds test to cointegration in conjunction with Kripfganz and Schneider critical approximation p-values and Maki cointegration tests. We further leveraged the ARDL, FMOLS, DOLS regression estimators, and gradual shift based on Fourier approximation for testing causality. The empirical results show renewable energy mitigates environmental degradation by reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Thus, renewables are useful in mitigating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Argentina. Achieving environmental quality requires the transformation of current energy policies to encourage green and energy-efficient technologies. Moreover, this study demonstrates a negative relationship between globalization and emissions, showing the importance of global partnership on environmental sustainability. Openness to markets and new types of trading partners will help improve environmental quality. Environmental degradation can decline by creating opportunities and flexibility

for renewable technology imports, as well as clear laws and regulations for environmental protection. Argentina can also deepen relations with its international trading partners to alleviate poverty, raise the number of new work opportunities, and boost imports and exports. Unsurprisingly, financial development does not mitigate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in Argentina. Thus, the structural transition of the financial sector in emerging nations at the early stage may not improve environmental quality. This proposes the need to expand the financial base particularly public-private partnerships in clean and sustainable energy consumption to foster clean energy (SDG-7) and clean environment (SDG-13). Besides, economic growth decreases environmental degradation by increasing CO2 emissions. This suggests that policymakers in Argentina could formulate policies that increase economic growth while improving environmental sustainability. Thus, there is a need to arrive at a balance between Argentina's energy mix, environmental strategies, and macroeconomic objectives by designing robust energy conservative policies. This will foster sustainable economic growth without compromising energy-cut. Thus, a paradigm shift to renewables such as photovoltaic, hydro energy, wind, and thermal energy could be pursued.

Acknowledgements Gratitude is extended to the prospective editor(s) and reviewers that will/have spared time to guide toward a successful publication.

The Authors of this article also assure that they follow the springer publishing procedures and agree to publish it as any form of access article confirming to subscribe to access standards and licensing.

Many thanks in advance look forward to your favorable response.

Availability of data and materials The data for this present study are sourced from the World Development Indicators (https://data.worldbank.org/). The current data specific data can be made available upon request but all available and downloadable at the earlier mentioned database and weblink.

#### List of Nomenclature

$CO_2$	Carbon dioxide		
ĀRDL	Autoregressive distributed lag		
BP	British petroleum		
GDP	Gross domestic production		
$CO_2$	Carbon emissions		
EN	Energy use		
ТО	Trade openness		
FD	Financial development		
GLO	Globalization		
CC	Coal consumption		
CR	Coal rent		
URB	Urbanization		
R&D	Research and development		
GCF	Gross capital formation		
EFP	Ecological footprint		
HC	Human capital		
REN	Renewable energy		

SM	Stock market
FDI	Foreign direct investment
TOR	Tourism

Author contribution The first author (Dr Tomiwa Sunday Adebayo) was responsible for the conceptual construction of the study's idea. The second author (Dr. Gbenga Daniel Akinsola) handled the literature section while the third author (Dr. Festus Victor Bekun) managed the data gathering and manuscript editing. Dr. Oseyenbhin Sunday Osemeahon managed the draft and SA Sarkodie, Ph.D. responsible for proofreading and supervision.

# Declarations

**Ethical approval** Authors mentioned in the manuscript have agreed for authorship, read and approved the manuscript, and given consent for submission and subsequent publication of the manuscript.

Consent to participate Note applicable.

Consent to publish Applicable.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

# References

- Adebayo TS (2021) Testing the EKC hypothesis in Indonesia: empirical evidence from the ARDL-based bounds and wavelet coherence approaches. *Appl Econ 28*(1)
- Adebayo TS, Kirikkaleli D (2021) Impact of renewable energy consumption, globalization, and technological innovation on environmental degradation in Japan: application of wavelet tools. Environ Dev Sustain. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01322-2
- Adebayo TS, Awosusi AA, Adeshola I (2020) Determinants of CO 2 Emissions in Emerging Markets: An Empirical Evidence from MINT Economies. Int J Renew Energy Dev 9(3):1–10
- Adebayo TS, Awosusi AA, Bekun FV, Altuntaş M (2021) Coal energy consumption beat renewable energy consumption in South Africa: Developing Policy framework for Sustainable Development. Renew Energy:1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.05.032
- Adedoyin FF, Gumede MI, Bekun FV, Etokakpan MU, Balsalobre-Lorente D (2020a) Modelling coal rent, economic growth and CO2 emissions: does regulatory quality matter in BRICS economies? *Sci Total Environ* 710:136284
- Adedoyin FF, Alola AA, Bekun FV (2020b) An assessment of environmental sustainability corridor: the role of economic expansion and research and development in EU countries. Sci Total Environ 713: 136726
- Adedoyin FF, Alola AA, Bekun FV (2021) The alternative energy utilization and common regional trade outlook in EU-27: evidence from common correlated effects. Renew Sust Energ Rev 145:111092
- Ahmed Z, Zhang B, Cary M (2021) Linking economic globalization, economic growth, financial development, and ecological footprint: evidence from symmetric and asymmetric ARDL. *Ecol Indic 121*: 107060
- Anser MK, Apergis N, Syed QR (2021) Impact of economic policy uncertainty on CO 2 emissions: evidence from top ten carbon emitter countries. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*:1–10
- Assi AF, Isiksal AZ, Tursoy T (2021) Renewable energy consumption, financial development, environmental pollution, and innovations in

the ASEAN+ 3 group: Evidence from (P-ARDL) model. *Renew Energy* 165:689–700

- Akaike H (1987) Factor analysis and AIC, In Selected papers of hirotuguakaike (pp. 371-386). Springer, New York, NY
- Alam MS, Apergis N, Paramati SR, Fang J (2020) The impacts of R&D investment and stock markets on clean-energy consumption and CO2 emissions in OECD economies. *Int J Financ Econ*
- Alola AA, Bekun FV, Sarkodie SA (2019) Dynamic impact of trade policy, economic growth, fertility rate, renewable and nonrenewable energy consumption on ecological footprint in Europe. *Sci Total Environ* 685:702–709
- Asongu SA, Agboola MO, Alola AA, Bekun FV (2020) The criticality of growth, urbanization, electricity and fossil fuel consumption to environment sustainability in Africa. *Sci Total Environ* 712:136376
- Ayobamiji AA, Kalmaz DB (2020) Reinvestigating the determinants of environmental degradation in Nigeria. Int J Econ Policy Emerg Econ 13(1):52–71
- Azam M, Khan AQ, Ozturk I (2019) The effects of energy on investment, human health, environment and economic growth: empirical evidence from China. Environ Sci Pollut Res 26(11):10816–10825
- Baloch MA, Ozturk I, Bekun FV, Khan D (2021) Modeling the dynamic linkage between financial development, energy innovation, and environmental quality: Does globalization matter? Bus Strategy Environ 30(1):176–184
- Bekun FV, Alola AA, Sarkodie SA (2019) Toward a sustainable environment: nexus between CO2 emissions, resource rent, renewable and nonrenewable energy in 16-EU countries. *Sci Total Environ* 657:1023–1029
- Bekun FV, Alola AA, Gyamfi BA, Yaw SS (2021) The relevance of EKC hypothesis in energy intensity real-output trade-off for sustainable environment in EU-27. Environ Sci Pollut R:1–12. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s11356-021-14251-4
- BetonKalmaz D, Adebayo TS (2020) Ongoing debate between foreign aid and economic growth in Nigeria: a wavelet analysis. *Soc Sci Q* 101(5):2032–2051
- Charfeddine L, Khediri KB (2016) Financial development and environmental quality in UAE: Cointegration with structural breaks. *Renew* Sust Energ Rev 55:1322–1335
- Dogan E, Ulucak R, Kocak E, Isik C (2020) The use of ecological footprint in estimating the environmental Kuznets curve hypothesis for BRICST by considering cross-section dependence and heterogeneity. *Sci Total Environ* 723:138063
- Dogan E, Aslan A (2017) Exploring the relationship among CO2 emissions, real GDP, energy consumption and tourism in the EU and candidate countries: evidence from panel models robust to heterogeneity and cross-sectional dependence. *Renew Sust Energ Rev* 77: 239–245
- Dogan E, Seker F (2016) Determinants of CO2 emissions in the European Union: the role of renewable and non-renewable energy. *Renew Energy* 94:429–439
- Esteve V, Requena F (2006) A cointegration analysis of car advertising and sales data in the presence of structural change. Int J Econ Bus 13(1):111–128
- Enders W, Lee J (2012) A unit root test using a Fourier series to approximate smooth breaks. Oxf Bull Econ Stat 74(4):574–599
- Enders W, Jones P (2016) Grain prices, oil prices, and multiple smooth breaks in a VAR. Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econo 20(4): 399–419
- Granger, C. W., Newbold, P., &Econom, J. (1974). Spurious regressions in econometrics. *Baltagi, Badi H. A Companion of Theoretical Econometrics*, 557-61.
- Phillips PC, Hansen BE (1990) Statistical inference in instrumental variables regression with I (1) processes. *Rev Econ Stud* 57(1):99–125
- Pesaran MH, Timmermann A (2005) Small sample properties of forecasts from autoregressive models under structural breaks. *J Econ 129*(1-2):183–217

- Haseeb A, Xia E, Baloch MA, Abbas K (2018) Financial development, globalization, and CO 2 emission in the presence of EKC: evidence from BRICS countries. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 25(31):31283–31296
- Hatemi-j A (2008) Tests for cointegration with two unknown regime shifts with an application to financial market integration. *Empir Econ* 35(3):497–505
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2014) Available at AR5 synthesis report: climate change 2014. Retrieved from https:// www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/. (access date 10.05.2020)
- Iorember PT, Goshit GG, Dabwor DT (2020) Testing the nexus between renewable energy consumption and environmental quality in Nigeria: the role of broad-based financial development. *Afr Dev Rev* 32(2):163–175
- Iorember PT, Jelilov G, Usman O, Işık A, Celik B (2021) The influence of renewable energy use, human capital, and trade on environmental quality in South Africa: multiple structural breaks cointegration approach. Environ Sci Pollut R 28(11):13162–13174
- Kalmaz DB, Adebayo TS (2021) Determinants of CO 2 emissions: empirical evidence from Egypt. *Environ Ecol Stat*:1–24
- Kirikkaleli D, Adebayo TS, Khan Z, Ali S (2020) Does globalization matter for ecological footprint in Turkey? Evidence from dual adjustment approach. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*: 1–9
- Kirikkaleli D, Adebayo TS (2020) Do renewable energy consumption and financial development matter for environmental sustainability? New global evidence, *Sustainable Development*
- Kirikkaleli D, Adebayo TS, Khan Z, Ali S (2021) Does globalization matter for ecological footprint in Turkey? Evidence from dual adjustment approach. Environ Sci Pollut R 28(11):14009–14017
- Khan MA, Ozturk I (2020) Examining foreign direct investment and environmental pollution linkage in Asia. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 27(7):7244–7255
- Koengkan M, Fuinhas JA, Santiago R (2020) Asymmetric impacts of globalisation on CO 2 emissions of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Environ SysDecisions* 40(1):135–147
- Kripfganz, S., & Schneider, D. C. (2018, September). ardl: Estimating autoregressive distributed lag and equilibrium correction models. In *Proceedings of the 2018 London Stata Conference.*
- Le HP, Ozturk I (2020) The impacts of globalization, financial development, government expenditures, and institutional quality on CO 2 emissions in the presence of environmental Kuznets curve. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 27(18):22680–22697
- Magazzino C (2016) The relationship between CO2 emissions, energy consumption and economic growth in Italy. *Int J Sus Energy* 35(9): 844–857
- Magazzino C (2017) The relationship among economic growth, CO 2 emissions, and energy use in the APEC countries: a panel VAR approach. *Environ SysDecisions* 37(3):353–366
- Maki D (2012) Tests for cointegration allowing for an unknown number of breaks. *Econ Model 29*(5):2011–2015
- Mwamba MN, Awosusi AA, Kirikkaleli D, Adebayo TS, Akinsola GD (2021) Can CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and energy consumption determine the economic performance of South Korea? A time series analysis. Environ Sci Pollut Res. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13498-1
- Nazlioglu S, Gormus NA, Soytas U (2016) Oil prices and real estate investment trusts (REITs): Gradual-shift causality and volatility transmission analysis. *Energy Econ* 60:168–175
- Narayan S, Narayan PK (2005) An empirical analysis of Fiji's import demand function. *J Econ Stud*
- Odugbesan JA, Adebayo TS (2020) The symmetrical and asymmetrical effects of foreign direct investment and financial development on

carbon emission: evidence from Nigeria. *SN Applied Sciences 2*(12): 1–15

- Odugbesan JA, Rjoub H (2020) Relationship among economic growth, energy consumption, CO2 emission, and urbanization: evidence from MINT countries. Sage Open 10(2):2158244020914648
- Olanrewaju VO, Adebayo TS, Akinsola GD, Odugbesan JA (2021) Determinants of environmental degradation in Thailand: empirical evidence from ARDL and wavelet coherence approaches. *Pollution* 7(1):181–196
- Owusu PA, Asumadu SS (2016) A review of renewable energy sources, sustainability issues and climate change mitigation. Cogent Engineering 3(1):1167990. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311916. 2016.1167990
- Rahman MM (2020) Environmental degradation: the role of electricity consumption, economic growth and globalisation. *J Environ Manag* 253:109742
- Ramzan M, Iqbal HA, Adebayo TS, Awosusi AA, Akinsola GD (2021) The environmental sustainability effects of financial development and urbanization in Latin American countries. Environ Sci Pollut Res Int. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-14580-4
- Saint Akadiri S, Bekun FV, Sarkodie SA (2019) Contemporaneous interaction between energy consumption, economic growth and environmental sustainability in South Africa: what drives what. Sci Total Environ 686:468–475
- Sarkodie SA, Owusu PA (2021) Escalation effect of fossil-based CO2 emissions improves green energy innovation. Sci Total Environ 785:147257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147257
- Shahbaz M, Mushtaq Z, Andaz F, Masood A (2013) Does proline application ameliorate adverse effects of salt stress on growth, ions and photosynthetic ability of eggplant (Solanum melongena L.). Sci Hortic 164:507–511
- Sharif A, Raza SA, Ozturk I, Afshan S (2019) The dynamic relationship of renewable and nonrenewable energy consumption with carbon emission: a global study with the application of heterogeneous panel estimations. Renew Energy 133:685–691
- Saint Akadiri S, Alola AA, Bekun FV, Etokakpan MU (2020) Does electricity consumption and globalization increase pollutant emissions? Implications for environmental sustainability target for China. Environ Sci Pollut Res 27(20):25450–25460
- Sun H, Edziah BK, Kporsu AK, Sarkodie SA, Taghizadeh-Hesary F (2021) Energy efficiency: The role of technological innovation and knowledge spillover. Technol Forecast Soc Chang 167: 120659. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120659
- Toda HY, Yamamoto T (1995) Statistical inference in vector autoregressions with possibly integrated processes. *J Econ 66*(1-2):225–250
- Udemba EN, Güngör H, Bekun FV, Kirikkaleli D (2021) Economic performance of India amidst high CO2 emissions. *Sus Product Consump* 27:52–60
- Ullah S, Ozturk I, Usman A, Majeed MT, Akhtar P (2020) On the asymmetric effects of premature deindustrialization on CO2 emissions: evidence from Pakistan. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*:1–11
- Umar M, Ji X, Kirikkaleli D, Xu Q (2020) COP21 Roadmap: Do innovation, financial development, and transportation infrastructure matter for environmental sustainability in China? J Environ Manage 271:111026
- Usman M, Makhdum MSA, Kousar R (2021) Does financial inclusion, renewable and non-renewable energy utilization accelerate ecological footprints and economic growth? Fresh evidence from 15 highest emitting countries. *Sustain Cities Soc* 65:102590
- World Banks Development Indicator (2020) Available at https://data. worldbank.org/). Access date 10.01.2020
- Zhang L, Li Z, Kirikkaleli D, Adebayo TS, Adeshola I, Akinsola GD (2021) Modeling CO 2 emissions in Malaysia: an application of Maki cointegration and wavelet coherence tests. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*:1–15

- Zivot E, Andrews DWK (2002) Further evidence on the great crash, the oil-price shock, and the unit-root hypothesis. *J Bus Econ Stat 20*(1): 25–44
- Zaidi SAH, Zafar MW, Shahbaz M, Hou F (2019) Dynamic linkages between globalization, financial development and carbon emissions:

evidence from Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation countries. J Clean Prod 228:533–543

**Publisher's note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.