Waseda University Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
早稲田大学 アジア太平洋研究センター

WIAPS Discussion Paper

Series No.2018-E-2

Quantitative Assessment of the Impact of EMS Standards on the Firms' Attitude toward Product Safety

Duong Lan Huong
Osaka University
Tsunehiro Otsuki
Osaka University
Etsuyo Michida
Institute of Development Economies, Japan External Trade Organization

01/2019

Quantitative Assessment of the Impact of EMS Standards on the Firms' Attitude toward Product Safety

Duong Lan Huong[1] Tsunehiro Otsuki[2] Etsuyo Michida[3]

[1] Doctoral candidate, Osaka school of Public Policy (OSIPP), Osaka University
[2] Professor, Osaka School of Public Policy (OSIPP), Osaka University
[3] Senior Researcher, Institute of Development Economies, Japan External Trade Organization

Abstract: In response to regulatory policies on environmental and consumer safety, firms implement various initiatives to enhance their environmental compliance in order to stay in or to enter the markets where those regulatory policies are present. Using firm-level cross section data in Japan, this paper examines the impact of ISO14001 adoption and internationalization status of firms on their compliance with product related environment regulations (PRERs) imposed by the EU. This paper applies a bivariate probit model to estimate the relationship between an adoption of ISO14001 and compliance with the EU RoHS Directive and the REACH Regulation taking into account the potential simultaneity between ISO adoption and PRER compliance. Also, the effect of internationalization status such as participation to the global value chains (GVC) the position of the on PRER compliance is examined. The result indicates that the effectiveness of ISO14001 on those EU PRERs might take place only when firms operate in a stringent regulatory environment.

Keywords: ISO14001, PRERs, Product safety standards, NTMs, Regulatory compliance, Japan

1. INTRODUCTION

The government lays down various regulations on environmental and consumer safety in order primarily to protect their consumers and environment especially. Most environmental regulations focus directly on firms' activities at production sites such as pollution and waste management, but recently, a growing attention has been given to product related to environment regulations (PRERs) as an indirect type of environmental regulations. PRERs aim to protect the environmental and consumer safety through requirements on product attributes such as maximum limits to or ban on harmful substances contained in the products. Their targeting of regulations to product attributes makes international trade of those products more complicated when trading countries apply different PRERs. Compliance with PRERs as mandatory standards is often a prerequisite for the entry to foreign markets, and therefore, PRERs may constitute technical barriers to trade for exporters.

However, firms may consider this growing public attention to the environment as a business opportunity. The expansion of laws and enforcement on environmental protection in recent years also has stimulated firms to adopt an environment management system (EMS). An EMS is a set of processes and practices of a firm which contribute to a reduction of its environmental impacts, mostly in line with existing environmental regulations. The EMS is likely to be adopted by firms spontaneously. In practice, ISO14001 is the most widely recognized EMS and is the only "certifiable and procedural standard for an EMS." Voluntary adoption of ISO14001 is expected to help the producers gain more confidence in winning acceptance from cosumers in "environmentally conscious markets" (Bellesi et al. 2005; Delmas 2002). An active commitment of firms to ISO14001 also may guide firms to make compliance with PRERs for the purpose to appeal to the environmentally conscious costumers. ISO14001 "becomes a vital supplement to mandatory environmental policies on regulation and legislation" (Frondel et al. 2008). Thus, a country or an industry is eager to promote firms' commitment to environmentally responsible behavior in order to enhance international competitiveness. Such a strategic approach to use ISO14001 to trigger firms' compliance with PRERs opens up possibilities to reduce time and effort in achieving the environmental goals compared to the use of traditional regulatory instruments (Hibiki and Arimura 2004).

Thus, adoption of an EMS can raise firms' self-awareness of maintaining healthy environment and to assure themselves of conformity with environmental and consumer safety regulations. However, the efficacy of an EMS to trigger compliance with PRERs is still an open question, and only few studies have explored the relationship between these measures. The scope and objectives of ISO14001

and PRERs differ in many aspects. PRERs aim to protect the safety of consumer's health in their use of the products, and safety of the local environment in the sites where the production takes place through requirement on the harmful product attributes, and the use of particular harmful inputs. On the other hand, ISO14001 focuses on management and elimination of pollutions involving the processes of the production instead of the environmental effects of particular products. It is not certain whether the firms tend to be more active in enhancing product safety if the firms satisfy more health-related regulations for products. Thus, it is worthwhile to examine the interaction between ISO14001 and PRERs in firms' decision making. Furthermore, such a research should disclose the underlying complex mechanism in firms' behavior regarding ISO14001 and PRERs taking the potential simultaneity of the decisions on adoption of these measures.

Given this context, this study attempts to examine the effect of ISO14001 on the firms' compliance with PRERs by using a unique firm-level dataset from the IDE-JETRO survey in 2013 for Japanese manufacturing firms. This study mainly focuses on the determinant factors of Japanese firms' compliance with the RoHS (Restriction of Hazardous Substances) Directive and the REACH (Registration, Evaluation, and Authorization of Chemical Substances) Regulation of the EU as they are one of the most widely known PRERs in the world. In Japan, many firms incorporate environmental goals in their decision making. Firms that adopted ISO14001 are expected to be more active in RoHS/REACH compliance and also capable of compliance. This study applies a bivariate probit model to address the possible simultaneity that arises from the existence of unobservable common determinant factors between ISO14001 adoption and PRERs compliance. Furthermore, this study aims to clarify the difference in the impacts of ISO14001 adoption over firms' positions in the supply chains, i.e. intermediate or final product suppliers. We also analyze the importance of the roles of firms' internationalization status for ISO adoption and PRERs compliance.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the background of the RoHS Directive (RoHS, hereafter) and the REACH Regulation (REACH, hereafter), and the overviews of international trade activities of Japan. Section 3 reviews the related literature. Section 4 describes the data and the econometric methodologies used in our analysis. Section 4 interprets the estimation results. Section 5 provides conclusions and further discussion.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The RoHS Directive and the REACH Regulations in the EU and the world

The use of an increasing variety of material inputs in production and the mass consumption society today have resulted in a disposal of a numerous variety of hazardous wastes which threaten the environmental safety. With the aim of protecting environmental and consumer safety in the region, the EU launched two major PRERs to regulate the products traded in its market—RoHS and REACH. RoHS that prohibits "electrical and electronic equipment containing six banned substances from entering the EU market," was first launched in 2003. If the firms comply with RoHS, the designated harmful substances contained in products must not exceed the limit. The REACH which came into effect in 2007 states the responsibility of the industries to provide "better information, including risk assessment," and covers "both environmental and product regulation" (Naiki, 2010).

Both final and intermediate products exported to the EU market must meet these requirements. Due to the importance of the EU market in the global economy, the impacts of RoHS and REACH should extend across countries and industries. In line with the rule of "no data, no market," these PRERs stipulate the requirements concerning the entire process of production. The firms that are either directly exporting to the EU or participating in the supply chains whose final or intermediate products are exported to the EU must comply with these regulations. Since chemicals are used in a wide range of products, PRERs are expected to influence a variety of industries, for example chemical, garments, plastic and rubber, machinery, electrical and electronic products industries among others. For example, Technology Forecasters Inc. reported that the average cost of making an initial RoHS compliance is approximately 2.6 million USD per firm. In the global scale, the electronic sector spends approximately 32 billion USD for its initial RoHS compliance, and it spends one tenth of that for maintaining the compliance status every year. Since the EU is one of the important export destinations in the world, firms in the outside countries would lose a substantial market share and reputation in business when non-compliant RoHS products are detected.

The number of the firms complying with RoHS and REACH are increasing worldwide in recent years in response to the growing number of countries adapting their PRER standards to RoHS and REACH, and to the widening of the scope of products and additional substances. This leads to a coexistence of different RoHS and REACH type regulations. Some countries have developed their own PRERs on chemicals, and the others harmonized their chemical-related PRER standards with the international standards. In addition, the country policies might vary across countries from mandatory regulations or non-binding standards (Michida, 2014). According to Michida (2014), chemical-related PRER standards in East Asian countries are similar to the EU RoHS in a sense that firms are also

required to apply the chemical-related PRERs on their entire supply chain. Moreover, the different authorities choose approaches that are different in scope and way of implementation "to model the law on RoHS". South Korea and China changed their policies by mirroring the EU RoHS, which "banned the use of six hazardous substances." The Vietnamese RoHS restricts the same original six substances in line with the EU RoHS, but it also requires a disclosure of compliance status of products sold inside the country. Japan introduced its own version of RoHS in 2006, called "J-Moss," which applies "a labelling measure in order to control the provision of and information flow surrounding products hazardous substances." (Naiki, 2010).

As trade is liberalized, the impact of RoHS and REACH on international trade also becomes the matter of policy importance. RoHS and REACH might constitute a technical trade barrier for exporters to the EU market as they impose additional costs on the firms. Firms face the need to change production methods or seek for alternative inputs satisfying the requirements related to these regulations.

2.2 ISO14001 adoption in Japan

ISO14001 is considered as the only "certifiable and procedural standard for an EMS" and the most widely recognized voluntary standard in the world. Adoption of ISO14001 is expected to help firms gain in a repulation from their business partners, especially, from those in "environmentally conscious markets" (Bellesi et al. 2005; Delmas 2002). ISO14001 may be rewarded by decreasing oversight from regulatory agencies (Lyon and Maxwell 1999). Also, ISO 14001 focuses on firms' internal process which can help them reduce inefficiency in their operations and their resource waste (Lim and Prakash 2014).

In Japan, the government has paid attention to enforcement of environmental regulations regarding air pollution, and climate change, among others. Since the mid-1960s, in order to deal with "serious industrial pollution," Japan began to introduce environmental regulations by tightening the emission standard in Japanese industries (OECD 1977; Hamamoto 2006). Japan is one of the countries with most stringent environmental regulations in the world. For example, Japanese firms must pay considerably high cost for their energy use due to the notably high in contrast to the U.S. which applies reasonably low tax for domestic natural resources (Arimura et al. 2016).

Implementing an EMS signals the firm's attitude towards environmental conservation. The surveys conducted by the OECD in 2003 revealed that the percentage of firms which consider environmental issues like health, safety and quality management is higher for EMS acquired firms than

non-EMS acquired firms. The surveys also revealed that "firms which introduced EMS take various other managerial actions in environmental conservation. There is no legal obligation for firms to adopt ISO14001 in most countries, but the external pressure makes firms consider adoption of ISO14001 seriously. Thus, firms tend to make an effort to acquire ISO14001 by taking environmental practices. For many developing countries, export plays an important role in economic growth, and hence, ISO14001 will become an important element for exporters when the use of ISO standards as condition for import requirement is permitted by the WTO (Tambunlertchai et al. 2013).

ISO14001 has become more popular in Japan than any other countries. The number of ISO14001 certified plants in Japan was 2,400, surpassed Germany, the UK and the U.S. in 1999 (Nakamura et al. 2001). Welch et al. (2013) stated that "around the world, adoption rates differ significantly among nations, with Japan, as a world leader, and the U.S., as a world laggard"; nearly 25% of certified firms in worldwide at that time were Japanese firms (Arimura et al. 2016). In 2015, the number of adopters in Japan increased to over ten times higher than that of 1999.[1]

2.4 Linkage between RoHS/REACH and ISO14001 standards

The distinction between RoHS/REACH and ISO14001 lies in the nature of compliance. PRERs are a mandatory regulation whereas ISO14001 is a voluntary certification. RoHS and REACH are more specific than ISO14001 in terms of their objectives. RoHS and REACH aim to protect the consumers' health and their environment through their use of the products, and safety of the environment around the sites where the production takes place. In contrast, ISO14001 does not lay down rules on the environmental impacts of the production or consumption of particular products, but, on management and elimination of pollutions involving the processes of the production.

Both RoHS/REACH and ISO14001 might influence the firms' production and sales, but in different ways. Compliance with RoHS/REACH is a prerequisite for manufacturers before they enter the EU market whereas ISO 14001 is optional. However, adoption of ISO standards is often preferred by firms as they are often asked to comply with it by their downstream suppliers in the global supply chains. Firms are usually driven to adopt environmental practices responding to such external pressures (Tambunlertchai et al. 2013).

Despite the differences between RoHS/REACH and ISO14001 in the nature and the impacts, the role of ISO standards in facilitating the producers' compliance to RoHS and REACH should not be ignored. Firm's voluntary commitment to ISO14001 is believed to save time and effort in achieving the

[1] ISO (https://www.iso.org).

environmental goals compared to the usual instruments such as regulations and taxes (Hibiki and Arimura 2004). Thus, adoption of an EMS can help compliance with RoHS and REACH as long as there are objectives in common. Adoption of an EMS is audited and accredited by the third party institutions, and such an arrangement is expected to overcome the weaknesses of traditional regulations by allowing firms more flexibility in the way to achieve the environment goals (McGuire 2014). Thus, a voluntary commitment tends to reduce the cost of environmental compliance.

2.4 Export performance of Japan

Lately, the trade value from Japan accounts for nearly 2% of the total manufactured goods trade of the EU. Since the EU market ranks the third among Japan's export destinations following the two leading markets—the U.S. and China, Japanese exporting firms face the pressure to comply with RoHS and REACH when the regulations come into effect in order to avoid rejection in within Japan (Naiki 2010). The importance of trade in the Japanese economy is not very high in comparison to the EU and the other East Asian countries. Japan's presence in the world trade is significant as it ranks the fourth in world export with 6% of the world total export value during 1960-2014.[2] In 2016, both export and import accounted for 16% of Japan's GDP. It is interesting to note that only 11% of the employment in Japan was directly linked to international trade whereas that ratio was approximately 30% in other OECD countries. Moreover, only about 15% of gross exports in Japan were from foreign sectoral contribution while their ratios were more than 30% in the EU, Korea and China as shown in Table 1. The export value in the GDP was only 10% on average in Japan whereas it was nearly 40% in Thailand in 2015 as shown in Table 2.

However, Japanese firms have come to realize that international trade is becoming increasingly important as the domestic market has been saturated. According to the JETRO, the annual survey in 2016 on the international operations of Japanese firms revealed that 75% of the sampled firms expressed their desire of export expansion. The most popular export destination among the surveyed firms was China which accounted for over 60% of the response. The leading manufacturing industries such as cars, vehicle parts, and industrial printers represented 10% of the world exports. The value added of the manufacturing sector accounted for more than 20% in Japan's total GDP.[3] Japan has

[2] The Economic Complexity Index.

[3] International Trade Statistics 2015.

become increasingly integrated into the GVCs. Japan ranked the world fourth in terms of exports and imports in intermediate products in the global trade as shown in Figures 1a and 1b.

Japanese firms have expanded M&A activities to take advantage of their expert knowledge and management experience in GVCs. Japanese manufacturing exports is considered to be affected primarily by the need for components and parts from large markets such as China and other emerging economies such as Russia, India and the ASEAN countries.

3. RELATED STUDIES

As ISO14001 requires registered firms "to comply with domestic environmental laws, regulations and other detailed documentations," the previous studies on firms' compliance to ISO14001 provided mixed results. Some studies showed that adoption of ISO14001 encourages compliance with environmental regulations and improves environmental performance in Japan (Arimura et al. 2016), in China (McGuire 2014), in the U.S. (Potoski and Prakash 2005b) and in Mexico (Dasgupta et al. 2000). Other studies showed the neutral relationship between ISO14001 and environmental outcomes in Mexico (Blackman 2012), the U.S. (King et al. 2005), and the UK (Dahlstrom et al. 2003). Those studies merely focus on the link between adoption of voluntary environmental standards and compliance with domestic environmental policies. Empirical evidence on the impact of ISO14001 adoption on PRERs or non-tariff measures (NTMs) is limited. One of the few such studies is Potoski and Prakash (2005a), which showed that PRERs can induce firms to adopt ISO14001 in order to help them to improve their performance in various environmental aspects including their chemical substance emission. Another is Arimura et al. (2014), which showed that PRERs may indirectly contribute to a diffusion of ISO14001 in developing countries.

The effect of firm's internationalization status on voluntary standards and regulations also have been examined in previous studies. Firms are obliged to bear the cost of improving their products and production processes to achieve the criteria in order to maintain access to the export market. Therefore, export status and revenue are considered as an incentive for complying with foreign countries' environmental regulations. In addition, several studies showed that adoption of ISO14001 can be associated with export participation and the amount of export (Nakamura et al. 2001; Hibiki et al. 2003). Also, Hibiki and Arimura (2004) showed that firms having a high propensity to acquire ISO14001 include those being listed, those facing a large number of competitors, and those making R&D in the field of the environment.

Also, several studies showed that participation in GVCs may promote voluntary adoption of ISO14001 in both developed and developing countries (Nishitani 2010; Arimura et al. 2014). Moreover, Michida and Ueki (2014) and Michida et al. (2014) showed that participation in GVCs promotes developing country firms to comply with developed countries' PRER regulations because compliance with these regulations may be mandated to firms participating in GVCs whether or not they directly export to the regulating countries. Thus, GVC may facilitate firms to adopt ISO14001 and to comply with PRERs.

Also, there are studies that investigated other determinants of ISO14001 adoption such as FDI and trade. Some investigated foreign direct investment (FDI) in ISO14001 adoption (Ni et al. 2015; Arimura et al. 2014; Cole et al. 2008). The role of export status in adoption of ISO14001 is also investigated in Tambunlertchai et al. (2013) and Arimura et al. (2014). Compliance with PRERs may require a change in intermediate inputs if they are necessary for meeting their requirements. While there is no study to assess the effect of the use of imported inputs on firms' capacity of regulatory compliance, Bas and Strauss-Kahn (2014) showed that inputs imported from developed countries tend to enhance firms' ability to export.

Firms' objectives regarding regulatory compliance is clearer than those regarding voluntary standards adoption because regulatory compliance directly affects firms' profit. These regulations may raise concern for producers. Maskus et al. (2013) indicated that an increase in direct cost of complying with importing countries' PRERs leads to an increase in the production cost of the firm. Cheng et al. (2008) provided an evidence that China's export of agricultural products is strongly constrained by the impacts of the pesticide residue limits as a PRER. Xiong and Beghin (2014) found that compliance with the pesticide residue limits on plant products in the importing countries increases both trade-related cost and export demand. Otsuki et al. (2014) on manufacturing firms from developing countries suggested that PRER regulations do not necessarily impede trade if the benefit of compliance outweighs the trade cost generated by PRER compliance. Honda (2012) showed an empirical evidence that the exporting countries, if harmonized their standards with the EU RoHS, can gain in access to the EU market although they tend to experience a decline in trade volume otherwise. Otsuki et al. (2014) showed that Vietnamese and Malaysian firms complying with the EU RoHS and REACH tend to increase export volume and the likelihood to enter a greater number of markets (Otsuki et al. 2014).

4. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Overview on data

This study employs a firm-level dataset of Japanese manufacturing firms obtained through the research project of IDE-JETRO in 2012-2013 titled "Impact of product-related environmental regulations on international trade and technological spillovers through supply chains in Asia". The major interest of this project is to study how Japanese manufacturing firms manage chemical substances in products. The questionnaires include basic information of key products, markets, regulations, and conditions such as firm adoption status with ISO14001, RoHS, and REACH in line with their performance. Due to the lack of information related to FDI, this study does not address the implication of FDI on the firm's regulatory compliance. We use total salary payment as a measure of firm size instead of the number of employment in order to incorporate heterogeneous skills of workers. We use the average wage rate based on the labor classification of the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan (METI) in 2012 and 2013.

After eliminating samples with missing data, there are 471 remaining samples of Japanese manufacturing firms in 22 industry categories. Among the industry categories, the category of textile, plastic product, and metal products manufacturing constitute the largest proportion, followed by the categories of machinery and equipment production, electronic equipment device and electrical machinery industries.

Seventeen percent of the sampled firms adopt ISO14001 including those which have already adopted ISO14001 as well as those which plan to adopt it. The most important reasons to motivate ISO14001 adoption of firms are their own initiative and customer requirement. Among the firms complying with RoHS or REACH, a large number of firm are in plastic, metal, electronic, and electrical industries. In addition, the samples show that many firms do not directly export to the EU or do not consider the EU as one of the top three markets. They are still in process of complying with the regulations of hazardous substances such as RoHS and REACH.

4.2 Description of the variables used in the analysis

The description of the variables used in our analysis is provided in Table 3. In our econometric model, the compliance status of Japanese firms is captured by a binary variable; it equals one if firm reported its compliance with the PRERs (RoHS and REACH), and zero otherwise. Also, a firm's

decision to adopt ISO14001 certification is measured by a binary variable. Variables for firms' characteristics, GVC and export status are included in the model as regressors.

The GVC variable captures whether or not firms sell their products to multinational enterprises. According to RoHS/REACH, firms that sell products in the EU market need to meet the requirements of RoHS and REACH regulations throughout the sequence of production in the GVC. Firm's export status is also a dummy variable reflecting whether a firm export its products to the international market. The "imported inputs" variable is also a dummy variable reflecting whether a firm imported inputs from developed countries. The EU, Korea, Taiwan, the U.S. and Japan are considered as "developed countries" in this dataset. We believe that the requirement of PRER compliance from upstream firms can be transmitted to downstream firms through the choice of the origin of their inputs. Hence, if a country of origin of the imported input has environmental regulation that is equal to or more stringent than Japan, the firm is said to have the capacity to comply with PRERs.

The variables for firm characteristics such as firm size and the age of firm are also included as regressors. The age of firm is measured by the number of years since it was established as of 2013. This variable is expected to have a positive effect on ISO certification because the owner of an older firm might be engaged in environmental protection in a longer period. The "type of product" variable is a dummy variable whose value is equal to one if the product of the firm is a final product. The "product required CSM" variable is a dummy variable reflecting whether or not the firm's product has been required chemical substance management (CSM). The "chemical measurement" variable is also a dummy variable reflecting whether the product has measurement for chemical contained in it. The "R&D investment" variable is the ratio of R&D in sales in terms of percentage. More innovative firms are more likely to adopt ISO14001 and to comply with environmental regulations although empirical evidence is weak at best.[4]

4.3 Model specification

This study investigates the question whether such adoption of EMS can enhance the capacity of firms to comply with overseas PRER regulations. The challenge in the estimation of this decision process is that there is possibility of reverse causality where compliance with PRER regulation also may affect the decision of EMS adoption. Thus we explicitly incorporate this potential simultaneity of

[4] A previous study using firm-level data in 7 OECD countries in 2003 showed that R&D does not affect adoption of EMS such as ISO14001 (Frondel et al. 2008).

the ISO and PRER variables by employing a recursive probit model along with Maddala (1983). In this model the equations to account for the process of PRER compliance and the process of ISO adoption are estimated simultaneously using a system of equations.

Our recursive bivariate probit model takes into account the fact that firms' compliance with RoHS or REACH and ISO14001 may be simultaneously determined. The model is expressed in a system of latent variable equations for decision of firms to comply with RoHS or REACH and ISO14001. Firms are assumed to adopt ISO14001 only when the benefit of the adoption is greater than the case in which they do not adopt. The same can be said for RoHS/REACH compliance. By including the ISO14001 variable (ISO14) as a main regressor in the PRER compliance equation, we allow for a direct causality between voluntary adoption and regulatory compliance. Also, the recursive bivariate probit allows correlation between the error terms of the two equations in the system. Consequently, our specification is as follows:

$$Y_i = 1, \text{ if } Y_i^* = \psi ISO14 + x_i\alpha + \eta_i > 0\,,\ Y_i = 0 \text{ otherwise} \qquad (1)$$

$$ISO14_i = 1, \text{ if } ISO14_i^* = v_i\gamma + \varphi_i > 0,\ ISO14_i = 0 \text{ otherwise,} \qquad (2)$$

where the latent variable Y_i^* in Eq (1) denotes either RoHS or REACH compliance. The latent variable $ISO14_i^*$ in Eq (2) denotes ISO14001 adoption. x_i and v_i denote the vectors of exogenous regressors in each equation, and α and γ are the corresponding vectors of the coefficient parameters. These latent variables are associated with the observed binary responses, Y_i and $ISO14_i$. A firm chooses to comply with RoHS/REACH when $Y_i^* > 0$, and it chooses to adopt ISO14001 if $ISO14_i^* > 0$. The error terms η and φ are assumed to be normally distributed with zero mean and may be correlated, Cov(η, φ) = $\rho I \neq 0$, where ρ presents a non-idiosyncratic correlation between both RoHS/REACH and ISO adoption. In this paper, we also follow the methodology used by Frondel et al. (2008) who estimate the relationship between firm's environmental management and innovation. If $\rho \neq 0$, the error terms η and φ are not independent. If these error terms are correlated, the specification of the bivariate probit model is appropriate. The exclusion restriction for the specification of x_i and v_i is that at least one variable should be different in order for the coefficient parameters of both equations to be identified.

5. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

After the recursive probit model for the system of the equations (1) and (2) is estimated using the full information maximum likelihood (FIML) method, we conduct the Hausman test to examine whether our specification of the interdependency of the equations is correct. The instrumental variable probit (IV probit) model serves as the case of consistent estimation. We use the age of firm as the instrumental variable for ISO14001. This variable satisfies the condition for instrumental variable because it is significantly correlated with ISO14001 but not with RoHS/REACH. The result of the Hausman test in Table 4 shows that the null hypothesis H0: $\hat{\theta}_{IV} = \hat{\theta}_{FIML}$ cannot be rejected in both cases of RoHS and REACH. Thus, the recursive probit model can be said to yield consistent and efficient estimators. For ISO14001, we use the input origin variable as the exclusion restriction. Since these PRER regulations require that "the entire process must be obliged with the regulation," this variable seems to have an important role in PRER compliance decision such as the country of the origin of the inputs.

The estimation results for RoHS/REACH compliance are reported in Tables 5 and 6 for four cases "with/without industries dummies" and "with/without interaction terms." Since ISO14001 adoption is highly significant at the 1% level for RoHS and REACH compliance across all the casses, the results provide a robust evidence of a causal relationship between ISO adoption and PRER compliance. In these recursive bivariate probit models, the null hypothesis H0: $\rho = 0$ is rejected in all for RoHS specification and only in the case "without industry dummies and interaction terms" in the REACH equation in column (1) of Table 7. Thus, it can be generally said that the unobservable factors are correlated across RoHS/REACH compliance in Eq (1) and ISO adoption in Eq (2).

In all the cases, characteristics of a product act as a strong predictor for PRER compliance as the variable for CSM has a positive and significant effect on PRER compliance as well as on ISO adoption across all cases. Firms producing these types of products may tend to prioritize environmental protection in their business strategy. Investment in R&D activity is only significant in the REACH specification. Firms with higher spending in R&D are more capable of complying with REACH.

We now turn to the result regarding internationalization status. GVC participation is positive and significant for RoHS and REACH compliance. GVC itself is not significant in RoHS compliance when an interaction term between GVC and firm's product type are included as shown in columns (3) and (4) in Table 6. In this case, however, this interaction term is positive significant at a 1% level when the main product of firm is a final product. This implies that GVC has a positive and significant effect

when the firm produces a final product. This may be because production practices that are compatible with the requirements of RoHS are required throughout the supply chain. Ramungul et al. (2013) argued that firms can "manage certain chemical substances incorporated into the final products." Export is positive and significant in RoHS compliance when the regression includes the interaction term between export and product type. However, that coefficient turns negative and significant if firms produce final products. Thus, firms which directly export or purchase intermediate products are more active in complying with RoHS more seriously.

The effect of export and input origin is not significant in REACH compliance across all full-sample cases. Since developed markets are supposed to launch more stringent requirements for firms in terms of customer health and environmental protection, this variable is positive and significant at the 5% to 10% level regarding RoHS compliance, which is consistent with our prior expectation that firms choosing upstream partners from developed countries are more likely to comply with RoHS.

The results also indicate that GVC participation is highly positive and significant in all cases in the ISO equation. However, in simultaneous estimation with the RoHS/REACH equation, in columns (3) and (4) in Tables 5 and 6, the interaction term of GVC and final product is negative and significant, perhaps reflecting the influence of GVC participation on ISO adoption. Therefore, the coefficient for GVC is now interpreted as the unique effect of the GVC on ISO14001 only when the firm's main product is an intermediate product. The effect of the GVC becomes negative in the case of final product. The export status is positive and significant at the 10% level only in the case "without the IDP variable and the interaction term" (Table 6, column 1). With the industry dummies, export status becomes insignificant in the ISO equation.

As to the firm characteristics, the signs of the coefficients for the age of firm, firm size and product required CSM are significant across all cases in the RoHS equation. Firm size has a positive and significant impact on ISO adoption which is consistent with the findings in Frondel et al. (2008) and McGuire (2014). The age of firm is significant at the 1% level in all cases. It may be because larger and longer-lasting firms tend to be able to fulfill environmental responsibility.

The results may change when firms do not export or when they produce non-exported intermediate product. Thus, we split the sample into groups of firms producing final products and intermediate products. Furthermore, the case of firms producing non-exported intermediate products might reflect the fact that most of the Japanese firms participate in GVCs. The Wald test for $\rho\ (=0)$ is

significant for the final and intermediate product groups in the RoHS specification (columns (1) and (2) in Table 7), which supports the choice of the recursive bivariate probit model for the estimation.

The implication of the position of a firm in the GVC is also investigated by using those sub-samples. Throughout the four sub-samples, ISO14001 adoption is positive and significant for RoHS compliance as expected. CSM is also positive and significant in all cases. The larger a firm size is, the more likely a firm complies with RoHS. The input origin has a positive and significant effect only on "non-exporting" samples. There is no impact of export on RoHS compliance in any sub-sample group. The role of GVC participation is positive and significant only for firms producing final products while the prior expectation is that intermediate product firms participating in the GVC should seriously consider complying with RoHS. It may be because the intermediate product firms feel obliged to meet the request from the final product firms. In Eq (2), ISO14001 adoption is significantly affected by GVC, but, interestingly, the coefficient turns negative when they are final product producers (Table 7, column (1)). It is perhaps due to the sample selection, and this tendency is consistent with the result for the interaction term in the full sample regression. Throughout the sub-sample analyses, we can further confirm that product-type which firms produce matters to PRER compliance.

We also use the recursive bivariate probit model for simultaneously regressing voluntary standard and regulatory compliance for the sub-sample analyses.[5] ISO14001 is only significant in the REACH equation when firms do not export or main product is intermediate products. The input origin variable is significant in the REACH equation even when firms do not export. It should be noted that we are forced to omit the GVC and CSM variables because inclusion of these variables causes non-convergence in the sub-sample analyses. If firms measuring chemical in products are found to be more capable of complying with REACH.

The results regarding firms' characteristics in the sub-sample analyses are also worth while noting. Export has a significant effect on PRER compliance among firms producing intermediate products whereas participation in the GVC has a significant effect on PRER compliance among firms producing final products. The effect of the GVC turns negative when the main product is a final product. A possible explanation might be attributed to the sample selection. The story of Japanese firms also reveals an interesting fact that many of them neither directly export nor belong to GVCs which aim to supply final products in compliant with RoHS requirements.

[5] The Wald test ρ indicates no significance. This implies that the system estimation for the two equations is not necessary. However, we continue to use the bivariate probit model in order to make the results comparable.

Our result is based on the specification of the hypothesized causal relationship, and hence, it does not rule out the possibility of the reverse causality that PRERs compliance promotes ISO14001 adoption. Thus, we test the alternative model with the reverse causal relationship then compare the original and alternative models in line with Akaike and Baysian information criteria. The scores in face are very close, which implies that we should accept the presence of the reverse causality. Although the data does not allow us, it would be ideal to use external events such as a change in policies regarding ISO14001 certification in Japan to examine the causality. Therefore, we may rather interpret the relationship between voluntary adoption and regulatory compliance is correlation. While bearing in mind the possibility of the two-way causality, we still interpret the result according to our original specification in order to keep the story simple.

6. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This paper evaluates the impact of firms' adoption of EMS such as ISO14001 and internationalization status on their compliance with the EU RoHS and REACH as PRERs. It applies a recursive bivariate probit model to the firm-level data in Japan to estimate their relationship taking their possible simultaneity into account.

The results of the recursive bivariate probit model estimation indicate a positive impact of ISO14001 on firm's compliance with PRERs, implying that their active commitment on environmental and consumer safety. It also implies that ISO adoption can accelerate the capacity of firms in coping with NTMs. In terms of firms' internationalization status, their participation in GVCs is important, but the role of export is not in both ISO14001 adoption and PRERs compliance. The input of origin (from developed countries) is also found to be important for the compliance. Interestingly, in developed countries like Japan, firms' export status does not play a critical role in firms' compliance with PRER regulations. It can be accounted for by the characteristics of Japanese business environment. The local market often contributes to the large proportion of revenue in most of Japanese firms. Also, environmental and consumer safety regulations are already enforced strictly in Japan.

Given that ISO14001 does play a non-trivial role in enhancing firms' attitude toward environmental and consumer safety as well as NTMs, we should further investigate whether or not the same mechanism exists in the context of other countries, particularly developing countries. Yet, to some extent, by using the data from Japanese firms this paper fills the gap in the literature on overseas

regulatory compliances by exploring the firms' behaviors and characteristics in the context of developed countries.

REFERENCES

Arimura, T. H., H. Iguchi, and E. Michida. 2014. "Product-Related Environmental Regulation and Voluntary Environmental Actions: Impacts of RoHS and REACH in Malaysia." I*DE Discussion Paper* 454.

Arimura, T. H., N. Darnall, R. Ganguli, and H. Katayama. 2016. "The Effect of ISO 14001 on Environmental Performance: Resolving Equivocal Findings." *Journal of Environmental Management* 166. Elsevier: 556–566.

Arimura, T. H., A. Hibiki, and H. Katayama. 2008. "Is a Voluntary Approach an Effective Environmental Policy Instrument?. A Case for Environmental Management Systems." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 55 (3): 281–295.

Bas, M., and V. Strauss-Kahn. 2014. "Does Importing More Inputs Raise Exports? Firm-Level Evidence from France." *Review of World Economics* 150 (2): 241–275.

Bellesi, F., D. Lehrer, and A. Tal. 2005. "Comparative Advantage: The Impact of ISO 14001 Environmental Certification on Exports." *Environmental Science and Technology* 39 (7): 1943–1953.

Blackman, A. 2012. "Does Eco-Certification Boost Regulatory Compliance in Developing Countries? ISO 14001 in Mexico." *Journal of Regulatory Economics* 42 (3): 242–263.

Chen, C., J. Yang, and C. Findlay. 2008. "Measuring the Effect of Food Safety Standards on China's Agricultural Exports." *Review of World Economics* 144 (1): 83–106.

Cole, M. A., R. JR Elliott, and K. Shimamoto. 2006. "Globalization, Firm-Level Characteristics and Environmental Management: A Study of Japan." *Ecological Economics* 59 (3): 312–323.

Cole, M. A., R. JR Elliott, and E. Strobl. 2008. "The Environmental Performance of Firms: The Role of Foreign Ownership, Training, and Experience." *Ecological Economics* 65 (3): 538–546.

Dahlstrom, K., C. Howes, P. Leinster, and J. Skea. 2003. "Environmental Management Systems and Company Performance: Assessing the Case for Extending Risk-Based Regulation." *European Environment* 13 (4):187–203. Dasgupta, S., H. Hettige, and D. Wheeler. 2000. "What Improves Environmental Compliance? Evidence from Mexican Industry." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 39: 39–66.

Delmas, M. A. 2002. "The Diffusion of Environmental Management Standards in Europe and in the United States: An Institutional Perspective." *Policy Sciences* 35 (1): 91–119.

Frondel, M., J. Horbach, and K. Rennings. 2008. "What Triggers Environmental Management and Innovation? Empirical Evidence for Germany." *Ecological Economics* 66 (1): 153–160.

Hamamoto, M.. 2006. "Environmental Regulation and the Productivity of Japanese Manufacturing Industries." *Resource and Energy Economics* 28 (4): 299–312.

Hibiki, A., and T. H. Arimura. 2004. "Environmental Policies and Firm-Level Management Practices in Japan." *OECD*.

Hibiki, A., M. Higashi, and A. Matsuda. 2003. "Determinants of the Firm to Acquire ISO14001 Certificate and Market Valuation of the Certified Firm." *Discussion Paper Department of Social Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology* 03-06

King, A. A., M. J. Lenox, and A. Terlaak. 2005. "The Strategic Use of Decentralized Institutions: Exploring Certification with the ISO 14001 Management Standard." *Academy of Management Journal* 48 (6): 1091–1106.

Lim, S., and A. Prakash. 2014. "Voluntary Regulations and Innovation: The Case of ISO 14001." *Public Administration Review* 74 (2): 233–244.

Lyon, T. P., and J. W. Maxwell. 1999. "'Voluntary' Approaches to Environmental Regulation: A Survey." *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Maskus, K.E.a, T.b Otsuki, and J.S.c Wilson. 2013. "Do Foreign Product Standards Matter? Impacts on Costs for Developing Country Exporters." *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting and Economics* 20 (1): 37–57.

McGuire, W.. 2014. "The Effect of ISO 14001 on Environmental Regulatory Compliance in China." *Ecological Economics* 105. Elsevier: 254–264.

Melnyk, S. A., R. P. Sroufe, and R. Calantone. 2003. "Assessing the Impact of Environmental Management Systems on Corporate and Environmental Performance." *Journal of Operations Management* 21 (3): 329–351. Michida, E.. 2014. "The Policy Impact of Product-Related Environmental Regulations in Asia." *IDE Discussion Paper* No. 451.

Michida (a), E., and Y. Ueki. 2014. "Impact of Product-Related Environmental Regulations in Asia : Descriptive Statistics from a Survey of Firms in Penang , Malaysia." *IDE Discussion Paper* No. 457.

Michida (b), E., K. Nabeshima, and Y. Ueki. 2014. "Impact of Product-Related Environmental Regulations in Asia : Descriptive Statistics from a Survey of Firms in Vietnam." *IDE Discussion Paper* No. 466.

Naiki, Y. 2010. "Assessing Policy Reach: Japan's Chemical Policy Reform in Response to the EU's REACH Regulation." *Journal of Environmental Law* 22 (2): 171–195.

Nakamura, M., T. Takahashi, and I. Vertinsky. 2001. "Why Japanese Firms Choose to Certify: A Study of Managerial Responses to Environmental Issues." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 42: 23–52.

Ni, B., H. Tamechika, T. Otsuki, and K. Honda. 2015. "Does ISO14001 Raise Firms' Awareness of Environmental Protection?— Case from Vietnam." *OSIPP Discussion Paper*, 1–19.

Nishitani, K. 2010. "Demand for ISO 14001 Adoption in the Global Supply Chain: An Empirical Analysis Focusing on Environmentally Conscious Markets." *Resource and Energy Economics* 32 (3). Elsevier: 395–407. Otsuki, T., K. Honda, E. Michida, K. Nabeshima, N.Kaoru, and Y. Ueki. 2014. "Estimating the Effect of Chemical Safety Standards on Firm Performance in Malaysia and Vietnam." *IDE Discussion Papers*. Vol. No. 455.

Potoski, M., and A. Prakash. 2005a. "Covenants with Weak Swords: ISO 14001 and Facilities' Environmental Performance." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 24 (4): 745–769.

———. 2005b. "Green Clubs and Voluntary Governance: ISO 14001 and Firms' Regulatory Compliance." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 235–248.

Ramungul, N., E. Michida, and K. Nabeshima. 2013. "Impact of Product-Related Environmental Regulations/Voluntary Requirements on Thai Firms." *IDE Discussion Papers* No. 383: 1–43.

Tambunlertchai, K., A. Kontoleon, and M. Khanna. 2013. "Assessing Participation in Voluntary Environmental Programmes in the Developing World: The Role of FDI and Export Orientation on ISO14001 Adoption in Thailand." *Applied Economics* 45 (15): 2039–2048.

Welch, E. W., A. Rana, and Y. Mori. 2003. "The Promises and Pitfalls of ISO 14001 for Competitiveness and Sustainability: A Comparison of Japan and the United States*." *Greener Management International*, no. 44: 59–73.

Xiong, B., and J. Beghin. 2014. "Disentangling Demand-Enhancing and Trade-Cost Effects of Maximum Residue Regulations." *Economic Inquiry* 52 (3): 1190–1203.

Figure 1a. Leading exporters of intermediate products



Figure 1b. Leading importers of intermediate products



Source: International Trade Statistics 2015.

Table 1. Shares of domestic and foreign sectoral contributions in gross exports

Countries	Origin	Share (%)	Primary products (%)	Manufactures (%)	Services (%)	Total
Japan	Domestic	85.3	0.8	38.4	46.1	100
	Foreign	14.7	4.9	4.1	5.7	
China	Domestic	67.9	8.1	30.7	29.1	100
	Foreign	32.1	6.1	11.3	14.7	
Korea	Domestic	58.4	0.7	31.3	26.4	100
	Foreign	41.6	14.6	11.5	15.5	
EU (28)	Domestic	71.4	2.8	23.4	45.2	100
	Foreign	28.6	5	8	15.6	
US	Domestic	85	5.8	28.7	50.5	100
	Foreign	15	4.1	4.8	6.1	

Source: International Trade Statistics 2015.

Table 2. Export shares in GDP in selected economies, 1960-2014

Countries	Average (%)	Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)	2014
Japan	12.02	9	17.9	17.74
China	13.92	35.65	2.52	23.92
Korea	28.6	3.16	56.34	50.28
Thailand	37.13	15.02	71.42	69.28
Germany	27.16	14.59	45.73	45.73
France	21.37	12.6	29.99	29.05

Source: Authors' calculation based on the World Development Indicators, the World Bank.

Note: If the export share is less than 15 percent of GDP, the economy is considered to be relatively closed.

Table 3. Description of the main variables

Variable	Description	Mean	Std. Dev.
Environmental standards and regulation			
RoHS compliance	Regulatory compliance with the RoHS Directive	0.193	0.395
REACH compliance	Regulatory compliance with the REACH Regulation	0.125	0.331
ISO14001 certification	Voluntary standard adoption	0.132	0.338
Internationalization status			
Global value chain	Participation status in global value chain	0.272	0.445
Export	Firm's export status	0.176	0.381
Input origin	The use of inputs imported from developed countries	0.830	0.376

Other firms characteristics			
Firm size	Employment size adjusted by the wage rates	31.099	2.103
Firm age	Age of firm since established year to 2013	35.552	18.445
Product required CSM	Product required chemical substance management & information contained	0.297	0.458
Type of product	Main product is final product	0.490	0.500
Chemical measurement	Have measurement for chemical in products	0.142	0.350
R&D investment ratio	Average R&D ratio in sales	6.790	14.62

Table 4. Hausman test for specification of the recursive bivariate probit model

Recursive bivariate probit model v.s. IV probit model	RoHS	REACH
Chi2	5.08	1.02
Prob>chi2	0.7485	0.9981
H_0: difference in coefficients not systematic	Recursive probit model supported	Recursive probit model supported

Table 5. Recursive bivariate probit estimation results for RoHS compliance with all samples

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
VARIABLES	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS
ISO14001		1.783***		1.602***		1.805***		1.631***
		-0.333		-0.403		(0.329)		(0.423)
Internationalization status								
Global value chain (GVC)	0.532***	0.418**	0.455**	0.407*	0.643***	0.176	0.568***	0.119
	-0.172	-0.191	-0.183	-0.214	(0.181)	(0.239)	(0.192)	(0.271)
Export (EXP)	0.364*	0.06	0.34	-0.035	0.273	0.476*	0.257	0.447*
	-0.202	-0.198	-0.21	-0.206	(0.241)	(0.282)	(0.250)	(0.271)
Input from developed countries (IPD)		0.566**		0.562*		0.559*		0.533
		-0.279		-0.307		(0.330)		(0.340)
GVC_final product					-7.775***	1.909***	-8.231***	2.022***
					(0.504)	(0.654)	(0.516)	(0.702)
EXP_final product					0.263	-0.841**	0.250	-0.968**
					(0.331)	(0.423)	(0.335)	(0.435)
IPD_final product						-0.089		-0.110
						(0.306)		(0.314)
Other firms characteristic								
Age of firm	0.012***		0.013***		0.013***		0.015***	
	-0.004		-0.005		(0.005)		(0.005)	
Firm size	0.203*	-0.024	0.204*	-0.027	0.195*	-0.009	0.194*	-0.015
	-0.104	-0.058	-0.106	-0.059	(0.106)	(0.061)	(0.107)	(0.063)
Product required CSM	0.525***	1.904***	0.488**	1.984***	0.510**	2.047***	0.472**	2.154***
	-0.198	-0.257	-0.204	-0.27	(0.200)	(0.278)	(0.207)	(0.297)
Chemical measurement	-0.071	0.381	-0.051	0.447*	-0.080	0.359	-0.058	0.417
	-0.254	-0.245	-0.26	-0.268	(0.262)	(0.256)	(0.266)	(0.275)
R&D investment	0.002	0.007	0.003	0.006	0.002	0.009	0.003	0.009
	-0.008	-0.007	-0.008	-0.009	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)
Industry dummies	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Constant	-8.421***	-2.208	-8.453***	-2.499	-8.242***	-2.674	-8.223***	-2.918
	-3.139	-1.915	-3.16	-1.997	(3.177)	(2.019)	(3.163)	(2.104)
Athrho		-1.157***		-0.824**		-1.190**		-0.832**
		-0.408		-0.351		(0.514)		(0.403)
Observations	471	471	471	471	471	471	471	471

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 6. Recursive bivariate probit estimation results for REACH compliance with all samples

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
VARIABLES	ISO14001	REACH	ISO14001	REACH	ISO14001	REACH	ISO14001	REACH
ISO14001		1.500***		1.501***		1.533***		1.534***
		(0.374)		(0.431)		(0.394)		(0.492)
Internationalization status								
Global value chain (GVC)	0.535***	0.508**	0.443**	0.515**	0.641***	0.495*	0.548***	0.491*
	(0.171)	(0.226)	(0.180)	(0.238)	(0.183)	(0.269)	(0.189)	(0.276)
Export (EXP)	0.253	-0.075	0.220	-0.128	0.147	-0.032	0.126	-0.131
	(0.221)	(0.278)	(0.254)	(0.318)	(0.271)	(0.348)	(0.311)	(0.395)
Input from developed countries (IDP)		0.316		0.371		0.253		0.316
		(0.312)		(0.309)		(0.345)		(0.336)
GVC_final product					-8.766***	1.141**	-7.689***	1.208**
					(0.484)	(0.529)	(0.510)	(0.555)
EXP_final product					0.281	-0.160	0.256	-0.082
					(0.356)	(0.484)	(0.351)	(0.510)
IPD_final product						0.135		0.105
						(0.341)		(0.370)
Other firms characteristic								
Age of firm	0.015***		0.016***		0.016***		0.017***	
	(0.004)		(0.004)		(0.004)		(0.004)	
Firm size	0.188**	-0.010	0.191**	-0.014	0.177**	-0.009	0.180**	-0.013
	(0.094)	(0.047)	(0.093)	(0.048)	(0.089)	(0.047)	(0.089)	(0.050)
Product required CSM	0.518***	2.143***	0.491**	2.256***	0.493**	2.231***	0.466**	2.350***
	(0.193)	(0.403)	(0.204)	(0.448)	(0.194)	(0.432)	(0.207)	(0.498)
Chemical measurement	-0.041	-0.130	-0.041	-0.129	-0.038	-0.143	-0.042	-0.138
	(0.254)	(0.222)	(0.261)	(0.225)	(0.257)	(0.224)	(0.263)	(0.228)
R&D investment	0.003	0.016**	0.005	0.016**	0.003	0.016**	0.005	0.016*
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Industry dummies	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Constant	-8.029***	-2.941*	-8.151***	-2.906*	-7.770***	-3.032*	-7.882***	-3.023*
	(2.839)	(1.617)	(2.805)	(1.693)	(2.693)	(1.650)	(2.678)	(1.789)
Athrho		-0.984*		-1.065		-1.025		-1.104
		(0.558)		(0.814)		(0.686)		(1.090)
Observations	471	471	471	471	471	471	471	471

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 7. Recursive bivariate probit estimation results for RoHS compliance with sub-samples

	Final product	Intermediate product	Intermediate product not exported	Non-exported product

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
VARIABLES	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS	ISO14001	RoHS
ISO14001		2.351***		1.608***		1.593***		1.379*
		(0.541)		(0.326)		(0.262)		(0.829)
Internationalization status								
Global value chain (GVC)	-8.834***	2.040***	0.772***	0.072	0.812***	0.079	0.552***	0.370
	(0.716)	(0.646)	(0.259)	(0.310)	(0.269)	(0.272)	(0.211)	(0.257)
Export (EXP)	0.373	-0.503	0.251	0.427				
	(0.314)	(0.325)	(0.277)	(0.390)				
Input from developed countries (IPD)		0.134		0.511		0.539		0.788**
		(0.410)		(0.392)		(0.401)		(0.362)
Other firms characteristic								
Age of firm	0.013		0.010**		0.008		0.015***	
	(0.008)		(0.005)		(0.005)		(0.005)	
Firm size	0.298**	-0.086	0.152	0.272***	0.124	0.264***	0.137	0.170*
	(0.119)	(0.075)	(0.103)	(0.099)	(0.099)	(0.097)	(0.094)	(0.101)
Product required CSM	0.435	1.699***	0.498**	2.463***	0.297	2.357***	0.557**	1.983***
	(0.386)	(0.449)	(0.248)	(0.500)	(0.272)	(0.517)	(0.236)	(0.318)
Chemical measurement	0.192	0.626	-0.112	0.290	0.018	0.339	-0.019	0.343
	(0.459)	(0.391)	(0.328)	(0.326)	(0.365)	(0.348)	(0.324)	(0.322)
R&D investment	0.005	0.014*	0.042	-0.037	0.031	-0.027	0.003	-0.005
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.008)	(0.024)
Industry dummies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Constant	-11.603***	-0.298	-6.808**	-11.720***	-5.623*	-11.334***	-6.498**	-8.703***
	(3.469)	(2.529)	(3.136)	(3.262)	(3.015)	(3.212)	(2.798)	(3.286)
Arthrho	-1.230***		-15.276***		-12.112		-0.682	
	(0.467)		(1.015)		(10.037)		(0.699)	
Observations	231	231	240	240	206	206	388	388

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 8. Recursive bivariate probit estimation results for REACH compliance with sub-samples

	Final product	Intermediate product	Intermediate product not exported	Non-exported product

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)	
VARIABLES	ISO14	REACH	ISO14	REACH	ISO14	REACH	ISO14	REACH
ISO14001		0.014		1.541*		1.136		1.555*
		(1.059)		(0.895)		(1.654)		(0.833)
Internationalization status								
Export (EXP)	0.357	0.152	0.267	-0.112				
	(0.327)	(0.382)	(0.288)	(0.294)				
Input from developed countries (IPD)		0.701*		0.546*		0.656		0.533*
		(0.417)		(0.326)		(0.405)		(0.307)
Other firms characteristic								
Age of firm	0.012		0.013**		0.009		0.015***	
	(0.008)		(0.006)		(0.007)		(0.005)	
Firm size	0.289**	0.155	0.180	-0.005	0.141	-0.022	0.163	0.023
	(0.131)	(0.110)	(0.111)	(0.080)	(0.155)	(0.131)	(0.107)	(0.097)
Chemical measurement	0.409	1.077***	0.421	0.894***	0.552	1.107**	0.567**	0.955***
	(0.398)	(0.392)	(0.321)	(0.345)	(0.346)	(0.482)	(0.252)	(0.281)
R&D investment	0.001	0.015**	0.063	-0.044	0.050	-0.018	0.003	-0.008
	(0.011)	(0.007)	(0.044)	(0.057)	(0.048)	(0.058)	(0.008)	(0.016)
Industry dummies	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Constant	-11.408***	-7.531**	-7.326**	-1.551	-5.956	-1.123	-7.112**	-2.753
	(3.899)	(3.520)	(3.366)	(2.494)	(4.673)	(3.994)	(3.220)	(3.032)
Arthrho		0.259		-0.496		-0.308		-0.386
		(0.529)		(0.568)		(0.926)		(0.467)
Observations	231	231	240	240	206	206	388	388

Notes: 1. Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

2. The "global value chain" and "product required CSM" variables are omitted because the inclusion of them make the subsample analysis intractable.