

---

# Demand for Green Bond among Individual Investors

## -Larger and Smaller Returns and Role of Social Responsibility-

Kentaka Aruga

Natsuya Shinomura

Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Saitama University, Saitama-shi, Saitama

Email: natsuya.shinomura@gmail.com

2026-01-15 21:34:26 (JST)

### Abstract

This study examines how retail investors' demand for green bonds responds to different magnitudes of return variation and whether pro-social orientation amplifies return sensitivity. Using an online survey of Japanese retail investors, we elicit minimum acceptable greenium through a double-bounded dichotomous choice design with interest rates randomly varied around sovereign bond yields in JPY or USD. We find that sovereign bond yield (SBY) exhibits a non-monotonic inverted U-shaped effect: the contemporaneous yield level requires the highest greenium, while deviations in either direction—higher or lower—reduce required greenium, consistent with reference-dependent preferences. USD denomination also reduces greenium but selectively, with stronger effects among return-oriented investors who require positive premiums. Notably, SBY has broader impact than USD despite offering smaller absolute return differences. GB knowledge creates significant heterogeneity: high-knowledge investors respond primarily to SBY variation, while low-knowledge investors respond to USD denomination, extending the financial literacy literature to sustainable investment. By contrast, social awareness (altruistic orientation, environmental concern) does not amplify return sensitivity, supporting pure rather than impure altruism—pro-social motivation operates independently of financial incentives in green bond investment.

**Keywords:** socially responsible investment; green bond; investment motivation; currency; attitudinal variables

**Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) grant number JP23K25062.

**Statements and Declarations:** We hereby declare that we have no relevant financial interests related to this research.

## 1 Introduction

Recent inflationary episodes have increased the opportunity cost of holding assets in savings accounts, stimulating investors to diversify their portfolio balance. In this context, green bonds (GBs) may attract distinctive demand for their low risk and socially responsible investment (SRI) characteristics. Beyond financial returns, GBs provide non-pecuniary value through their contribution to sustainability, while their yields remain closely tied to sovereign bond benchmarks. Changes in baseline sovereign bond yield (SBY) may fundamentally reshape the trade-off between financial returns and non-financial motives in GB investment. Yet it remains unclear how retail investors adjust their demand for green bonds when SBY changes—whether higher baseline returns crowd out pro-social preferences by increasing the opportunity cost of return sacrifice, or instead relax return constraints and enable greater expression of non-financial values.

We estimate the demand for GB with respect to sovereign bond yield to evaluate how investors’ minimum required return for GB changes in the form of premium compared to the sovereign bond yield (SBY). We take the current SBY as the standard to see how the deviation may change their minimum premium for GB investment as hypothetical settings to value the role of inflation. We evaluate the premium for GB denominated by JPY and USD for possible differentiated premium compared to the respective current SBY due to the gap in nominal yield. These two sources of variations (SBY and currency) reveal how investors may change their premium in response to the different degree of yield changes.

This question addresses how financial returns motivate retail investors to choose SRI. Døskeland and Pedersen (2016) find that investors are return-seeking rather than purely impact-seeking in SRI decisions. Yet Gutsche et al. (2021) show that investors who value sustainability persist in SRI holdings despite declining returns. These findings raise the question of how pro-social values create heterogeneity in return-seeking behaviour—whether such values amplify or operate independently of return sensitivity. We examine this question through the decision on GB investment when two different magnitudes of variation in return simultaneously.

We furthermore examine how the role of financial incentives may vary with individual characteristics. We test whether social awareness amplifies return sensitivity—a prediction of impure altruism (Andreoni, 1990)—or operates independently of financial incentives. We also examine whether GB knowledge (environmental finance knowledge) moderates which return signals investors respond to, extending the financial literacy literature (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2014) to sustainable investment.

We investigate this to understand the mechanism of non-pecuniary motivation for SRI. Previous studies find that social awareness is associated with higher share of SRI in their portfolio and future SRI (Lau et al., 2022; Bauer et al., 2021; Luz et al., 2024). However, it remains unclear if they are willing for SRI for pecuniary reason (i.e. impure altruism) or not. We evaluate how such attitudinal variables associate with return in their SRI decision making.

We collect data through an online survey asking respondents about their investment choice for hypothetical corporate GB. The survey asks one whether to invest in the GB whose interest rate is equivalent to SBY randomly deviated from the current level. We obtain stated preferences as categorical form that classifies one’s minimum premium for GB as lower or higher than the presented SBY.

We find that higher returns play a role in lowering the premium for GB but the role differs depending on the sources of the return change. SBY exhibits a non-monotonic (inverse U-shaped) effect: deviations from the contemporaneous yield—both higher and lower—reduce the required greenium, with the highest greenium observed at the current SBY level. This pattern is consistent with reference-dependent preferences (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Koszegi and Rabin, 2006) and salience theory (Bordalo et al., 2012). The denomination by USD (compared to JPY) lowers the premium significantly but the degree shrinks as one has lower premium. Comparatively, the SBY has a larger effect on the premium than USD does, even though USD (compared to JPY) creates a larger return variation.

About heterogeneity by social awareness, we find little evidence of impure altruism (Andreoni, 1990) in either altruistic devotion or environmental awareness. Therefore, having higher social awareness does not amplify the sensitivity to pecuniary return in GB investment choice. The results suggest that social awareness is purely altruistic rather than a return-seeking quality of personal characteristics.

We also turn to examine the role of GB knowledge as an indicator of environmental finance knowledge by dividing the sample into two. We find it creates significant heterogeneity in the financial incentive, extending the financial literacy literature (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2014). SBY has a stronger effect among those with high GB knowledge, while USD denomination has a stronger effect among those with low GB knowledge. Still, social awareness does not amplify the financial incentives in either subsample. These results distinguish the role of individual awareness in economy, environment, and altruism.

This study contributes to literature on pecuniary motivation in SRI. While the literature finds the association between return expectation from SRI and SRI decisions, the causal inferences remain unclear (Brodback et al., 2019; Døskeland and Pedersen, 2016; Gutsche et al., 2023). Our results show how retail investors respond positively to SRI when facing return variation. The return variation stimulates one to want SRI through the case of GB. Still, we find that the reduction does not follow the magnitude of the return variation and the effect depends on one’s desired minimum premium. This contributes to the studies

about non-pecuniary motivations in SRI (Bauer et al., 2021; Bonnefon et al., 2025) by demonstrating how SRI may only partially be encouraged by financial returns. Compared to these studies, we demonstrate differentiated response to the return depending on one’s minimum premium.

This study also contributes to research on impure altruism and social preferences in sustainable investment decision-making. Several papers highlight the importance of social awareness and sustainability beliefs in driving participation (Bauer and Smeets, 2015; Riedl and Smeets, 2017), but leave open whether such motivations interact with financial incentives. Our findings show that general social awareness (environmental concern, altruism) does not amplify return sensitivity, consistent with pure altruism theory. However, investment-specific awareness (GB knowledge) creates significant heterogeneity in responses to financial incentives. We also find limited evidence of motivation crowding-out (Frey and Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Bénabou and Tirole, 2006) among knowledgeable investors when environmental investment is framed in financial terms.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our theoretical framework. Section 3 describes the empirical methodology using a generalized ordered probit specification. Section 4 describes the survey design, sample characteristics, and variable definitions. Section 5 reports our main findings on the effects of SBY and USD denomination on greenium, heterogeneity analysis by GB knowledge, and tests for impure altruism. Section 6 concludes with a discussion of implications and directions for future research. Appendix A provides a supplementary empirical framework using a double-bounded CVM model.

## 2 Theoretical Framework

To examine how retail investors respond to return variations in green bonds, we develop a utility-based framework that captures both financial and non-financial motivations. The framework derives the minimum acceptable return—and hence greenium—as a function of individual characteristics, allowing us to test how SBY levels and GB knowledge shape investment decisions.

Investors derive utility from green bond investment through two channels: financial returns and environmental contribution (Andreoni, 1990; Barreda-Tarrazona et al., 2011; Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). We define  $\underline{r}$  as the minimum interest rate at which an investor is indifferent between investing in a green bond and a sovereign bond. This indifference condition can be expressed as:

$$V(q, \underline{r}, y; \theta) = V(0, r_0, y; \theta) \quad (1)$$

where  $V(q, r, y; \theta)$  is the indirect utility function with arguments:  $q$  denotes the environmental contribution

from green bond investment (assumed constant across green bonds),  $r$  is the bond yield,  $y$  is income, and  $\theta$  represents individual characteristics. We define the greenium as  $(\underline{r} - r_0)/r_0$ , representing the proportional return sacrifice relative to SBY. The greenium is determined when the utility from holding a green bond (with yield  $\underline{r}$  and environmental benefit  $q$ ) equals the utility from holding a sovereign bond (with SBY  $r_0$  and no environmental benefit). This normalization allows comparison across different yield environments and motivates our empirical design, which varies SBY to identify how return variation affects green bond demand.

Since retail investors find it difficult to differentiate sustainability impact across green bonds (Hartzmark and Sussman, 2019; Heeb et al., 2022), we perceive  $q$  as constant. The minimum acceptable return  $\underline{r}$  varies across individuals based on their financial situation, environmental attitudes, and demographic characteristics. Our empirical approach elicits how greenium is formed depending on the size of SBY and the denominating currency.

### 3 Empirical Framework

To examine how financial variables affect greenium across different investor types, we employ a generalized ordered probit model (Pudney and Shields, 2000). This approach directly models categorical responses from the double-bounded dichotomous choice (DBDC) design, allowing the effects of covariates to vary across greenium acceptance thresholds. As a supplementary analysis, we also estimate a double-bounded CVM model that recovers continuous minimum interest rates; these results are reported in Appendix A.

Respondents are randomly assigned an SBY  $B_k$  from five levels ( $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ ) spanning 60% to 140% of a baseline ( $B_3 = 0.5\%$  for Japanese GB,  $B_3 = 4.0\%$  for US GB). If they accept the initial offer, the second question offers  $0.85B_k$ ; if they reject, it offers  $1.15B_k$ . This generates four response patterns revealing the investor's "greenium"—defined as  $(\text{GB yield} / \text{SBY}) - 1$ , representing willingness to accept lower returns for green bonds:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} response_{i,\text{USD}} = 4 \text{ (no, no):} & \quad \text{Large positive greenium} \\ response_{i,\text{USD}} = 3 \text{ (no, yes):} & \quad \text{Moderate positive greenium} \\ response_{i,\text{USD}} = 2 \text{ (yes, no):} & \quad \text{Moderately negative greenium} \\ response_{i,\text{USD}} = 1 \text{ (yes, yes):} & \quad \text{Largely negative greenium} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

Lower response values indicate higher greenium.

We model responses as determined by a latent variable  $y_{i,\text{USD}}^*$  and covariate-dependent thresholds  $\lambda_j$ .

Let  $Z_i$  denote the vector of all covariates (including USD, SRAS, ENV, SBY, and controls). The latent propensity is:

$$y_{i,\text{USD}}^* = \beta' Z_i + \epsilon_{i,\text{USD}}, \quad \epsilon_{i,\text{USD}} \sim N(0, \omega_{\text{USD}}^2) \quad (3)$$

The observed response is determined by which threshold interval contains  $y_{i,\text{USD}}^*$ :

$$response_{i,\text{USD}} = j \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda_{j-1,i} < y_{i,\text{USD}}^* \leq \lambda_{j,i} \quad (4)$$

where thresholds depend on covariates:

$$\lambda_{j,i} = q_j + \delta_j' Z_i, \quad j = 1, 2, 3 \quad (5)$$

This specification allows variable effects to differ across response categories. The probability of observing response greater than category  $k$  is:

$$\Pr(response_{i,\text{USD}} > k) = \Pr(y_{i,\text{USD}}^* > \lambda_{k,i}) = \Pr(\epsilon_{i,\text{USD}} > \lambda_{k,i} - \beta' Z_i) = 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{q_k + (\delta_k - \beta)' Z_i}{\omega_{\text{USD}}}\right) \quad (6)$$

The probability of each response category is:

$$\Pr(response_{i,\text{USD}} = j) = \Phi\left(\frac{q_j + (\delta_j - \beta)' Z_i}{\omega_{\text{USD}}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{q_{j-1} + (\delta_{j-1} - \beta)' Z_i}{\omega_{\text{USD}}}\right) \quad (7)$$

where  $\Phi$  is the standard normal CDF. We estimate  $\beta - \delta_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) by maximum likelihood:<sup>1</sup>

$$\ln L(\beta, \delta) = \sum_{\text{USD}=0}^1 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^4 d_{i,\text{USD}}^j \ln \Pr(response_{i,\text{USD}} = j) \quad (8)$$

where  $d_{i,\text{USD}}^j$  equals 1 if  $i$  has  $response_{i,\text{USD}} = j$ , and 0 otherwise.

The key advantage of this generalized specification is that it allows the marginal effects of covariates to vary across thresholds. We test whether coefficients are constant across thresholds using Brant's Wald test:

$$H_0 : \beta - \delta_1 = \beta - \delta_2 = \beta - \delta_3$$

Rejection indicates that some variables have heterogeneous effects across the  $response_{i,\text{USD}}$  distribution (Pudney and Shields, 2000).

---

<sup>1</sup>Individual identification of  $\beta$  and  $\delta_j$  is not possible (Pudney and Shields, 2000).

## 4 Survey Design and Variable Descriptions


### 4.1 Survey Design

Data was collected via an online survey conducted by Rakuten Insight Inc., a private survey agent. The sample was randomly drawn from individuals registered on their platform and living in two metropolitan areas (Kanto and Kansai) in Japan. Respondents proceeded to a questionnaire about GB if they were not excluded by two screening questions.<sup>2</sup> In total, data were collected from 1400 respondents between August 31 and September 1, 2023. As with DBDC questions, investors were asked if they would like to buy GB at various yearly interest rates in a double-bounded setting.

There are several notes on this sampling. Firstly, a respondent is excluded if they indicate that they will never be interested in GB investment. Additionally, each GB for this survey were presumed to be 10-year bonds with each fixed interest rate and given the same rank of credit as the corresponding sovereign bond. The baseline *SBY* for each GB was set to the contemporaneous 10-year sovereign bond yield as of August 2023 (0.5% for Japan, 4.0% for US), as shown in Figure 1. This middle level ( $k = 3$ ) serves as the reference point against which deviations are measured. Based on this, each respondent was offered both JPY-GB and USD-GB with a assigned level of interest rate level out of the five levels. For example, if a respondent was offered the highest level of SBY, the *SBY* is 0.7% for JPY-GB and 5.6% for USD-GB.

---

<sup>2</sup>The first screening excludes those who do not invest, and the second excludes those who have no interest in GB.



**Figure 1:** Historical 10-Year Sovereign Bond Yields: Japan and United States (2015–2025)

*Notes:* The vertical dashed line marks the survey date (August 2023). The shaded area indicates the SBY range used in the survey (60%–140% of the baseline). The horizontal dotted line shows the baseline yield (0.5% for Japan, 4.0% for US). Data sources: FRED (2026a) for Japan; FRED (2026b) for US.



**Table 1:** DBDC responses for JPY-GB and USD-GB

<i>SBY</i>	<i>response<sub>i,0</sub></i>				<i>response<sub>i,1</sub></i>			
	<i>j</i> = 1 (yes, yes)	<i>j</i> = 2 (yes, no)	<i>j</i> = 3 (no, yes)	<i>j</i> = 4 (no, no)	<i>j</i> = 1 (yes, yes)	<i>j</i> = 2 (yes, no)	<i>j</i> = 3 (no, yes)	<i>j</i> = 4 (no, no)
Highest( <i>k</i> = 5)	53 18.93%	35 12.50%	20 7.14%	172 61.43%	46 16.43%	58 20.71%	23 8.21%	153 54.64%
Higher( <i>k</i> = 4)	43 15.36%	43 15.36%	14 5%	180 64.29%	43 15.36%	44 15.71%	27 9.64%	166 59.29%
Baseline( <i>k</i> = 3)	30 10.71%	37 13.21%	18 6.43%	195 69.64%	35 12.50%	45 16.07%	24 8.57%	176 62.86%
Lower( <i>k</i> = 2)	39 13.93%	31 11.07%	30 10.71%	180 64.29%	35 12.50%	34 12.14%	30 10.71%	181 64.64%
Lowest( <i>k</i> = 1)	43 15.36%	43 15.36%	14 5%	180 64.29%	49 17.50%	40 14.29%	25 8.93%	166 59.29%
Total	208	189	96	907	208	221	129	842

Notes: The same *k* is assigned for JPY-GB and USD-GB randomly for each respondent. The number of respondents assigned to each *k* is equal (at 280) across *k* = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Table 1 shows the distribution of *response<sub>i</sub>* created by the DBDC responses for JPY-GB and USD-GB. It shows that the order of frequency in *response<sub>i</sub>* is the same between the two tables. The (no, no) category is by far the most dominant, occupying the majority of responses. More than half of the respondents did not want to invest in GB under either setting. The second-largest group includes both the (yes, yes) and (yes, no) categories, each amounting to 10-20%. These groups consist of investors who chose to invest in the first round, with roughly equal proportions of respondents answering no or yes in the follow-up round. Lastly, the (no, yes) category is clearly the smallest. Most investors who answered no in the first round persisted with a no in the follow-up question.

A higher *SBY* does not encourage more positive responses for either bond. This suggests that the interest rate may not be a highly determining factor in their responses. There are slight differences in distribution between JPY-GB and USD-GB. The (no, no) category is more frequent in JPY-GB, and more respondents answered yes to the first question for USD-GB. This indicates that USD-GB promotes more positive responses. However, the number of (yes, yes) responses is equal between the bonds. This implies that USD-GB is not a strong enough factor for relatively JPY-GB investors with higher *response<sub>i</sub>* to shift to the (yes, yes) category for USD-GB. The equal number of (yes, yes) responses suggests that respondents who shifted from (yes, yes) to other categories (such as (no, yes) and (yes, no)) balance out the totals.

## 4.2 Variable Descriptions

This study classifies explanatory variables into 3 groups of variables based on Gutsche et al. (2021). Namely, they are (1) financial attributes, (2) economic variables, (3) pro-social variables and (4) demographic variables. Full variable descriptions are provided in Appendix 3. The financial category represents 2 attributes

attached to the offered GB in the DBDC questions; *SBY* and *USD*. *SBY* determines the level of interest rate that each respondent was offered out of 5 different ones. *USD* is a dummy variable that takes on 1 when the respondent is offered USD-GB. Importantly, this variable represents a bundled treatment: the USD-denominated bond differs from the JPY-denominated bond not only in its higher absolute yield level but also in currency denomination, which introduces exchange rate risk and potential home currency bias. These effects cannot be fully disentangled in our design, so the *USD* coefficient should be interpreted as capturing the combined effect of higher return magnitude and cross-currency factors. The two financial attributes thus allow us to examine how investors respond differently when return varies moderately (via *SBY* within currency) versus substantially with additional currency-related considerations (via *USD*).<sup>3</sup>

The economic category covers variables that capture preferences on investment such as risk tolerance and investment resources such as investment risk aversion and investment knowledge. Specifically, knowledge on GB, investment frequency, volatility risk aversion, wealth, and information preference are adopted. Knowledge on GB, labeled as *GB knowledge*, measures how much the respondent knows about GB. Environmental knowledge is often positively significantly associated with  $response_i$  for environmental goods and SRI Aruga and Bolt (2023); Aruga and Bolt (2023). *investment frequency*, *volatility risk aversion*, and *currency risk aversion* capture their experience and preference on investment. *investment frequency* is included to capture more generic investment knowledge than GB knowledge, which is reported as rather significant on SRI investment than insignificant (although quite heterogeneous) among Riedl and Smeets (2017), Gutsche et al. (2021) and Aruga (2024). Still, this inclusion would play an important role in differentiating the impact of GB knowledge from that of general investment knowledge Gutsche and Ziegler (2019).

*volatility risk aversion* and *currency risk aversion* are included to measure investment risk tolerance as studies show factors such as volatility and currency affect GB investment decisions (Lau et al. (2022); Ando et al. (2024)). So these variables measure how much one is averse to price changes and currency risk in investment. Lastly, *information certainty* measures how much one values information provided by authoritative source when buying something.<sup>4</sup> This inclusion helps to associate GB investment with investors' preference over certainty on information as the demand for GB varies whether the issuer has a certification for GB or discloses relevant information (Caramichael and Rapp, 2024; Jankovic et al., 2022; Tang et al., 2023)

The pro-social group of variables is included to control for investors pro-social aspects as these encourage people to pay significantly more for socially-responsible goods. This study includes two variables for this

<sup>3</sup>Maturity is fixed with 10 years as 10-year GB were offered. Other attributional factors as rating and certifications are included in this study as the main focus in this aspect is interest rate

<sup>4</sup>This variable is a "nudge" indicator used in behavioral economics. The variable for information respect known as "messenger" in that area is adopted from a series of indicators called "mindspace" Gutsche et al. (2021)

category. Firstly, *alt* captures how much each respondent are committed to helping other people using an indicator based on Aruga and Bolt (2023). Positive association between GB investment is expected based on Aruga and Bolt (2023) and Brodback et al. (2019). The second variable is *env*, which captures the awareness of global and local environmental issues. This variable is formed by averaging 4 questions' answer, each of which is on the scale from 1 to 5 (See Appendix 2). Both the pro-social variables are expected to be positively associated with the  $response_i$  as are often statistically significant in estimating determinants for buying environmental goods (Apostolakis et al., 2018; Gutsche et al., 2021).

Lastly, the demographic category contains individual fundamental variables that would be expected to be less deterministic but conventionally included in similar papers such as Apostolakis et al. (2018). This study accounts for the following six variables: income, having a dependent family no older than 40 years old, marital status, age, gender, income, and university degree.

Summary statistics for all the explanatory variables are shown in Table 3, which combines whole sample statistics (left) with subsample comparisons by GB knowledge level (right).

**Table 2:** Summary Statistics

	Whole Sample		GB Knowledge				Diff
	(N = 1,400)		Low (N = 1,080)		High (N = 320)		
Variable	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	
<b>Financial</b>							
<i>SBY</i>	3.00	1.41	3.00	1.42	2.98	1.40	0.02
<i>USD</i>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Social awareness</b>							
<i>GB knowledge</i>	1.81	1.03	1.33	0.47	3.46	0.64	-2.13***
<i>env</i>	3.32	0.88	3.26	0.87	3.52	0.89	-0.26***
<i>sras</i>	2.63	0.67	2.57	0.64	2.84	0.70	-0.27***
<b>Economic</b>							
<i>investment frequency</i>	1.73	0.71	1.68	0.69	1.88	0.76	-0.20***
<i>volatility risk aversion</i>	3.57	0.99	3.56	0.98	3.58	1.01	-0.02
<i>currency risk aversion</i>	3.53	1.00	3.49	1.01	3.67	0.98	-0.18***
<i>messenger</i>	2.65	0.91	2.60	0.91	2.81	0.89	-0.20***
<b>Demographic</b>							
<i>child</i>	1.92	1.15	1.89	1.15	2.04	1.13	-0.15**
<i>married</i>	0.68	0.47	0.68	0.47	0.70	0.46	-0.02
<i>age tier</i>	3.83	1.47	3.92	1.44	3.53	1.54	0.39***
<i>male</i>	0.70	0.46	0.69	0.46	0.76	0.43	-0.07***
<i>wealthy</i>	0.17	0.37	0.16	0.36	0.21	0.41	-0.05**
<i>uni</i>	0.66	0.47	0.65	0.48	0.72	0.45	-0.08***
<b>Choice shares (%)</b>							
<i>JGB choice = 1</i>	14.9		10.9		28.1		-17.2
<i>USGB choice = 1</i>	14.9		11.7		25.6		-14.0
<i>JGB choice = 2</i>	13.5		12.1		18.1		-6.0
<i>USGB choice = 2</i>	15.8		14.3		20.9		-6.7

Variable	Whole Sample		GB Knowledge				Diff
	(N = 1,400)		Low (N = 1,080)		High (N = 320)		
	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	
<i>JGB choice = 3</i>	6.9		6.5		8.1		-1.6
<i>USGB choice = 3</i>	9.2		8.1		13.1		-5.1
<i>JGB choice = 4</i>	64.8		70.5		45.6		24.8
<i>USGB choice = 4</i>	60.1		66.0		40.3		25.7

Notes: Whole sample:  $N = 1,400$ ; Low GB Knowledge:  $gb\_know < 3$  ( $N = 1,080$ ); High GB Knowledge:  $gb\_know \geq 3$  ( $N = 320$ ). Difference column shows mean differences (Low GB Knowledge - High GB Knowledge) with significance stars: \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . *USD* is dummy (1=US bond, 0=Japan bond). *env* is environmental concern (1-5). *sras* is social responsibility scale. *GB knowledge* is green bond knowledge. *investment frequency* measures investment activity. *volatility risk aversion* and *currency risk aversion* measure risk preferences. *messenger* is messenger treatment. *child*, *married*, *male*, *wealthy*, *uni* are binary. *age tier* is categorical age. *JGB choice* (g4 when  $USD = 0$ ) and *USGB choice* (g4 when  $USD = 1$ ) are ordered outcomes (1-4). Choice shares show percentage distribution across choice categories.

## 5 Results

We present results in three parts. First, we examine how financial variables affect greenium across response categories using a generalized ordered probit model, testing for non-monotonic effects and interactions with social awareness (Section 5.1). Second, we conduct subsample analyses by GB knowledge to identify heterogeneous responses to financial incentives (Section 5.2). Third, we validate our findings using binary SBY indicators and marginal effects (Section 5.3). Additional results from double-bounded CVM estimation are provided in Appendix A.

### 5.1 Whole Sample Analysis


We allow SBY to enter as an explanatory variable and permit the effects of financial variables to vary across different greenium acceptance thresholds. Table 3 displays the impact of return variables on individual minimum greenium. The model estimates coefficients  $\beta - \delta_j$  for each threshold  $j$ , representing how each variable shifts the latent greenium relative to threshold  $j$ . A negative coefficient ( $\beta - \delta_j < 0$ ) indicates that the variable reduces required greenium below the threshold, making investors more willing to accept lower premiums. When parallel restrictions are imposed,  $\beta - \delta_j$  remains constant across all response categories  $response_i$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ); otherwise, the effect varies by greenium acceptance level.

Column (1) of Table 3 includes SBY linearly, showing insignificant effects, while column (2) includes both linear and quadratic terms, which are jointly significant. The financial impact of SBY on greenium is therefore non-monotonic, following an inverted U-shape as visualized in the left panel of Figure 2. This shows that contemporaneous SBY represents the least preferred yield level, while deviations in either direction—higher or lower yields—reduce required greenium. This pattern is consistent with reference-dependent preferences (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Koszegi and Rabin, 2006), where investors evaluate yields relative to a familiar benchmark rather than in absolute terms, and salience theory (Bordalo et al., 2012), which implies that unusual yield levels draw attention to alternative investments. These effects are constant across all response categories as the coefficients satisfy parallel restrictions across  $j = 1, 2, 3$ .

By contrast, USD has varying coefficients across  $response_i$ , indicating that its effects differ by the range of greenium. Its coefficient is more strongly negative for those who need more positive greenium; in other words, its effect decays as one holds lower greenium. This is illustrated in the right panel of Figure 2 with a less steep slope to hold lower  $response_i$ . This indicates that USD denomination more strongly encourages those who expect higher return from GB investment compared to the sovereign bond.

Lastly, social awareness variables (SRAS and ENV) are negatively associated with acceptable greenium, meaning investors with higher altruism and environmental concern accept lower premium in investing in GB.

Columns (3) and (4) examine the heterogeneity of return variable effects with respect to social awareness (SRAS and ENV). These columns include interaction terms between financial variables and social awareness measures. The results reveal that social awareness does not significantly amplify the impact of financial variables for either SBY or USD. This indicates that investors with higher social awareness respond to financial incentives similarly to those with lower social awareness. In other words, their return sensitivity does not differ based on pro-social orientation.



**Figure 2:** Threshold Effects: SBY and USD Denomination

*Notes:* Panel (a) shows the inverted U-shaped relationship between SBY and required greenium thresholds across four investor types. Panel (b) shows that USD denomination uniformly lowers required greenium across all investor types. Thresholds are estimated from generalized ordered logit model (Table 3, Column 2). Panel (a):  $y_k^* = c_k + 0.296 \times SBY - 0.051 \times SBY^2$  where  $c_3 = 1.921$ ,  $c_2 = 1.393$ ,  $c_1 = 1.185$ . Panel (b):  $y_k^* = c_k + \delta_k \times USD$  where  $\delta_3 = -0.126$ ,  $\delta_2 = -0.064$ ,  $\delta_1 = -0.004$ . All other variables held at means.

**Table 3:** Generalized Ordered Probit: Whole Sample

	Base		Heterogeneity	
	(1) Linear	(2) Quadratic	(3) SRAS	(4) ENV
SBY	-0.011 (0.021)	0.296*** (0.110)	-0.146 (0.472)	0.415 (0.471)
SBY <sup>2</sup>		-0.051*** (0.018)	0.001 (0.076)	-0.044 (0.075)
USD (3)	-0.125*** (0.030)	-0.126*** (0.031)	-0.154 (0.112)	-0.125 (0.102)
USD (2)	-0.065** (0.033)	-0.064** (0.033)	-0.154 (0.112)	-0.125 (0.102)
USD (1)	-0.005 (0.042)	-0.004 (0.042)	-0.154 (0.112)	-0.125 (0.102)
SRAS	-0.220*** (0.049)	-0.224*** (0.049)	-0.519** (0.230)	-0.229*** (0.049)
ENV	-0.057 (0.039)	-0.053 (0.039)	-0.054 (0.039)	0.081 (0.182)
SBY × SRAS			0.168 (0.169)	
SBY <sup>2</sup> × SRAS			-0.020 (0.027)	
USD × SRAS (3)			0.009 (0.040)	
USD × SRAS (2)			0.033 (0.040)	
USD × SRAS (1)			0.057 (0.040)	
SBY × ENV				-0.039 (0.136)
SBY <sup>2</sup> × ENV				-0.002 (0.022)
USD × ENV (3)				0.001 (0.030)
USD × ENV (2)				0.017 (0.030)
USD × ENV (1)				0.033 (0.031)
Constant (3)	2.270*** (0.265)	1.921*** (0.295)	2.695*** (0.696)	1.362** (0.664)
Constant (2)	1.743*** (0.255)	1.393*** (0.287)	2.166*** (0.687)	1.012 (0.657)
Constant (1)	1.536*** (0.252)	1.185*** (0.284)	1.961*** (0.685)	0.844 (0.653)
<i>N</i>	2800	2800	2800	2800
Brant-Wald $\chi^2$	19.81	21.12		
p-value	0.4697	0.5136		

Standard errors clustered at individual level in parentheses.

Parallel variables shown once; non-parallel stacked as Var(1), Var(2), Var(3).

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

## 5.2 Subsample Analyses by GB Knowledge

In contrast to social awareness, GB knowledge creates significant heterogeneity in financial return sensitivity. Table 4 decomposes the sample by GB knowledge level. Columns (1) and (4) contrast the effects of the two types of financial incentive between subsamples. The low-GB-knowledge subsample shows that USD denomination more strongly reduces greenium, while the high-GB-knowledge subsample finds SBY more impactful. SBY remains quadratically significant in both subsamples, but the high-GB-knowledge group exhibits steeper curvature, indicating greater sensitivity to yield spreads. USD is consistently significant across all response categories in the low-knowledge subsample, but only significant for  $response_i = 4$  (reject both offers) in the high-knowledge subsample.

Columns (2), (3), (5), and (6) examine heterogeneity by social awareness within each GB knowledge subsample, testing interactions with SRAS and ENV respectively. The results confirm that social awareness remains statistically insignificant in amplifying financial incentives even when conditioning on GB knowledge level. Social awareness does not amplify return-seeking sensitivity in either subsample. However, the high-GB-knowledge subsample reveals that investors with environmental concerns are less likely to invest in GB denominated by USD despite it returning a higher yield.

## 5.3 Robustness: SBY Dummies and Marginal Effects

To further validate the non-monotonic SBY effect and compare it directly with USD denomination, we re-estimate the model using binary SBY indicators. This specification confirms that both high and low SBY reduce greenium relative to the baseline, and allows direct comparison of effect magnitudes across financial variables.

Table 5 presents results where both SBY and USD are dummy-coded. Both high SBY and low SBY significantly reduce investors' minimum required greenium compared to the contemporaneous baseline, with the high SBY dummy showing a larger effect. This pattern holds across GB knowledge subsamples, confirming that deviations from the current yield level—particularly upward deviations—reduce greenium requirements most strongly. Columns (2), (4), and (6) test whether USD denomination amplifies the SBY effect. We find no such interaction in the full sample, while the low-GB-knowledge subsample shows that the SBY effect attenuates under USD denomination (compared to JPY). Overall, SBY has a broader and stronger impact on greenium than USD denomination, despite USD offering larger absolute return differences.

Marginal effects reveal that financial incentives operate differently across GB knowledge levels. Table 6 presents discrete probability changes for three treatment variables: high SBY, low SBY, and USD denomination. Panel A shows  $\Delta Pr(\text{response} \leq 3)$ , the change in probability of accepting mildly positive greenium or less. Panel B shows  $\Delta Pr(\text{response} \leq 2)$ , the change in probability of accepting negative greenium. Column (1) reports full-sample estimates: both high SBY and USD significantly increase acceptance probabilities. However, subsample analyses reveal heterogeneous effects. Among low-GB-knowledge investors (Column 2), the high SBY effect disappears. Among high-GB-knowledge investors (Column 3), the USD effect becomes insignificant. This contrast indicates that financial incentives operate through different mechanisms depending on investors' familiarity with green bonds.

# 6 Discussion

## 6.1 Do investors want return from SRI?

Yes, investors respond to financial returns in GB investment, but the relationship is non-monotonic and depends on return magnitude. We find that both SBY and USD reduce required greenium, but through different mechanisms.

**Table 4:** Generalized Ordered Probit: GB Knowledge Subsample

	Low GB Knowledge			High GB Knowledge		
	(1) Base	(2) SRAS	(3) ENV	(4) Base	(5) SRAS	(6) ENV
SBY	0.221*	0.032	0.400	0.552**	-0.350	1.328
	(0.128)	(0.557)	(0.553)	(0.220)	(0.878)	(0.939)
SBY <sup>2</sup>	-0.036*	-0.010	-0.054	-0.097***	-0.026	-0.113
	(0.021)	(0.090)	(0.088)	(0.035)	(0.145)	(0.148)
USD (3)	-0.103***	-0.171	-0.056	-0.147**	-0.164	0.167
	(0.033)	(0.127)	(0.120)	(0.067)	(0.255)	(0.272)
USD (2)	-0.103***	-0.171	-0.056	0.046	-0.164	-0.965***
	(0.033)	(0.127)	(0.120)	(0.070)	(0.255)	(0.340)
USD (1)	-0.103***	-0.171	-0.056	0.078	-0.164	-1.053***
	(0.033)	(0.127)	(0.120)	(0.066)	(0.255)	(0.333)
SRAS	-0.217***	-0.334	-0.219***	-0.337***	-1.044**	-0.364***
	(0.058)	(0.271)	(0.057)	(0.094)	(0.412)	(0.096)
ENV	-0.067	-0.068	0.050	-0.061	-0.080	0.367
	(0.044)	(0.044)	(0.222)	(0.101)	(0.102)	(0.331)
SBY $\times$ SRAS		0.073			0.331	
		(0.205)			(0.301)	
SBY <sup>2</sup> $\times$ SRAS		-0.010			-0.028	
		(0.033)			(0.049)	
USD $\times$ SRAS (3)		0.026			0.001	
		(0.046)			(0.089)	
USD $\times$ SRAS (2)		0.026			0.077	
		(0.046)			(0.087)	
USD $\times$ SRAS (1)		0.026			0.084	
		(0.046)			(0.086)	
SBY $\times$ ENV			-0.055			-0.217
			(0.162)			(0.260)
SBY <sup>2</sup> $\times$ ENV			0.005			0.005
			(0.026)			(0.041)
USD $\times$ ENV (3)			-0.014			-0.107
			(0.036)			(0.076)
USD $\times$ ENV (2)			-0.014			0.297***
			(0.036)			(0.092)
USD $\times$ ENV (1)			-0.014			0.330***
			(0.036)			(0.092)
Constant (3)	1.373***	1.672**	1.010	1.807***	3.842***	0.136
	(0.362)	(0.812)	(0.795)	(0.624)	(1.286)	(1.292)
Constant (2)	0.899***	1.200	0.533	1.943***	3.746***	0.292
	(0.333)	(0.795)	(0.781)	(0.580)	(1.248)	(1.275)
Constant (1)	0.853***	1.154	0.487	0.957*	2.785**	0.224
	(0.327)	(0.793)	(0.779)	(0.574)	(1.237)	(1.259)
<i>N</i>	2160	2160	2160	640	640	640

Standard errors clustered at individual level in parentheses.

Parallel variables shown once; non-parallel stacked as Var(1), Var(2), Var(3).

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$



**Table 5:** Generalized Ordered Probit: SBY Dummies by GB Knowledge

	Full Sample		Low GB Knowledge		High GB Knowledge	
	(1) Base	(2) +Int	(3) Base	(4) +Int	(5) Base	(6) +Int
1[SBY>3]	−0.198** (0.080)	−0.244*** (0.093)	−0.159* (0.095)	−0.246** (0.112)	−0.420*** (0.152)	−0.349** (0.167)
1[SBY<3]	−0.162** (0.081)	−0.224** (0.092)	−0.148 (0.096)	−0.242** (0.111)	−0.328* (0.181)	−0.224 (0.198)
1[SBY>3] × USD		0.087 (0.081)		0.166* (0.096)		0.103 (0.174)
1[SBY<3] × USD		0.118 (0.077)		0.179* (0.094)		−0.017 (0.144)
USD (3)	−0.124*** (0.030)	−0.165** (0.066)	−0.103*** (0.033)	−0.244*** (0.080)	−0.172*** (0.066)	0.018 (0.123)
USD (2)	−0.065** (0.032)	−0.165** (0.066)	−0.103*** (0.033)	−0.244*** (0.080)	0.068 (0.069)	0.018 (0.123)
USD (1)	−0.005 (0.041)	−0.165** (0.066)	−0.103*** (0.033)	−0.244*** (0.080)	0.089 (0.067)	0.018 (0.123)
<i>N</i>	2800	2800	2160	2160	640	640

Generalized ordered probit (gologit2) with autofit and probit link.

Spread dummies: parallel. USD: non-parallel (except Low GB Know). Clustered SEs.

Reference: SBY = 3 (no spread). \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ **Table 6:** Marginal Effects on Cumulative Probabilities by GB Knowledge

	(1) Whole Sample	(2) Low GB Knowledge	(3) High GB Knowledge
<i>Panel A: Pr(response ≤ 3) — Accept Mildly Positive Greenium or Less</i>			
1(SBY > 3)	0.070** (0.030)	0.046 (0.033)	0.170*** (0.057)
1(SBY < 3)	0.036 (0.031)	0.030 (0.034)	0.076 (0.060)
USD	0.031*** (0.010)	0.036*** (0.011)	0.012 (0.020)
<i>Panel B: Pr(response ≤ 2) — Accept Negative Greenium</i>			
1(SBY > 3)	0.063** (0.027)	0.040 (0.030)	0.172*** (0.058)
1(SBY < 3)	0.033 (0.028)	0.026 (0.030)	0.077 (0.061)
USD	0.028*** (0.009)	0.031*** (0.010)	0.012 (0.020)
<i>N</i>	2800	2160	640

Standard errors in parentheses

Average marginal effects from ordered probit. Standard errors clustered at individual level.

Reference: SBY = 3, JPY bond. Low GB Knowledge: gb\_know &lt; 3; High: gb\_know ≥ 3.

Pr(response ≤ 3) = 1 - Pr(no,no): Accept mildly positive greenium or less.

Pr(response ≤ 2) = Pr(yes,yes) + Pr(yes,no): Accept negative greenium.

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

The effect of SBY follows an inverted U-shape: the contemporaneous yield level requires the highest greenium, while deviations in either direction—higher or lower—reduce required greenium. To further examine this non-monotonic pattern, we convert SBY into binary indicators (high/low relative to baseline) in Tables 5 and 6. Both high and low SBY significantly reduce greenium compared to the baseline, with the high SBY dummy showing a larger effect. This confirms that deviations from the contemporaneous yield—particularly upward deviations—reduce greenium requirements. This effect is broadly significant across all investor types regardless of their greenium acceptance level.

Several mechanisms may explain this pattern. Reference-dependent preferences (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Koszegi and Rabin, 2006) suggest that the contemporaneous yield may serve as a psychological anchor; deviations from this anchor may increase willingness to consider alternative investments. Alternatively, salience theory (Bordalo et al., 2012) suggests that unusual yield levels may draw attention to the investment decision, prompting reconsideration of GB as an option. A third possibility is that higher yields relax financial constraints while lower yields reduce the opportunity cost of choosing GB—both effects would reduce required greenium relative to the baseline. We cannot definitively distinguish between these mechanisms, but all are consistent with the observed inverted U-shape.

By contrast, USD denomination has heterogeneous effects: it significantly reduces greenium for return-oriented investors who require positive or mildly negative greenium, but becomes insignificant for investors who accept largely negative greenium. Practically, this means that higher USD yields (3–5% vs. 0.3–0.7% for JPY) attract investors who are seeking returns, but do not sway investors who are already willing to sacrifice returns for environmental impact.

Comparing the two sources of return variation, SBY has a broader and stronger impact on greenium than USD denomination, despite USD offering larger absolute return differences. This suggests that investors respond more consistently to yield variations around familiar benchmarks than to larger but less comparable cross-currency differences. These findings align with Døskeland and Pedersen (2016) that financial returns matter for SRI decisions, but extend this by demonstrating that the relationship is non-linear and that the magnitude of return variation shapes who responds, not just whether investors respond.

## 6.2 Role of GB Knowledge

GB knowledge (environmental finance knowledge) creates significant heterogeneity in how investors respond to financial incentives, in contrast to social awareness (pro-social orientation) which does not amplify return sensitivity. Table 4 reveals distinct response patterns between knowledge subsamples.

High-GB-knowledge investors are more responsive to SBY variation, exhibiting steeper quadratic curvature that indicates greater sensitivity to yield spreads around the benchmark. However, they are less responsive to USD denomination—the USD effect is only significant for investors who reject both offers ( $response_i = 4$ ). By contrast, low-GB-knowledge investors show stronger response to USD denomination, with consistently significant effects across all response categories, while their SBY response attenuates.

This pattern suggests that environmental finance knowledge enables investors to differentiate between types of return variation. Knowledgeable investors can evaluate nuanced yield differences around sovereign benchmarks—a task requiring understanding of bond pricing and yield curves. Less knowledgeable investors lack this capacity and instead respond to larger, simpler return signals like currency denomination, which requires only basic comparison of interest rates across currencies. This extends the financial literacy literature (Lusardi and Mitchell, 2014) by demonstrating that environmental finance knowledge—not just general financial literacy—shapes investment behavior. While Riedl and Smeets (2017) examine how investor characteristics affect SRI participation, our finding reveals that knowledge determines *which* financial signals investors respond to, not merely *whether* they respond to returns.

### 6.3 Social Awareness and (Im)pure Altruism

This study demonstrates that social awareness operates independently of financial incentives in GB investment, supporting pure rather than impure altruism. Neither altruistic devotion (SRAS) nor environmental concerns (ENV) significantly amplifies the effects of SBY or USD on greenium acceptance. The interaction terms between financial variables and social awareness measures are statistically insignificant in both whole-sample and subsample analyses.

This finding speaks directly to the theoretical debate between pure and impure altruism in charitable giving (Andreoni, 1990). Under impure altruism (warm-glow giving), pro-social investors would derive utility from both the environmental impact *and* the act of sacrificing returns, implying that higher social awareness should amplify return sensitivity. Our null interaction effects reject this prediction: social awareness does not make investors more responsive to financial incentives. Instead, our results support pure altruism, where social and financial motives operate in separate utility channels.

This finding aligns with Bauer et al. (2021), who show that retail investors concerned with SDGs do not withdraw from sustainable mutual funds when yields decline. Similarly, Luz et al. (2024) find that sustainability beliefs drive SRI participation independently of return expectations. Our results extend these findings by demonstrating that social awareness does not amplify return-seeking behavior—investors with higher pro-social orientation respond to financial incentives similarly to those with lower social awareness.

One notable exception emerges in the high-GB-knowledge subsample: investors with environmental concerns are less likely to invest in USD-denominated GB despite the higher yields. This pattern is consistent with motivation crowding-out (Frey and Oberholzer-Gee, 1997; Bénabou and Tirole, 2006): when environmental investment is framed in terms of foreign currency returns, the financial framing may undermine the intrinsic pro-environmental motivation for knowledgeable investors who recognize the tension. However, this effect does not generalize to the broader sample.

The key contribution is demonstrating that while financial returns affect SRI demand, social preferences do not amplify this effect. Pro-social motivation in GB investment operates as pure altruism—orthogonal to financial incentives—rather than impure altruism that would interact with return considerations.

### 6.4 Limitations

This study holds several limitations. First, USD denomination does not purely represent return variation—it also involves home currency bias and exchange rate expectations. Investors may respond differently to foreign currency bonds for reasons unrelated to yield differences. Second, the contingent valuation method captures hypothetical willingness-to-pay rather than actual investment behavior; real investment decisions with financial consequences may differ from stated preferences. Third, the sample is limited to Japanese investors in the Kanto and Kansai metropolitan areas, which may not generalize to rural populations or investors in other countries. Fourth, the findings pertain specifically to bonds as fixed income securities; generalizability to other SRI products such as mutual funds or ESG stocks may be limited given the distinct characteristics of equity investments.

### 6.5 Conclusion

This study examines how retail investors’ demand for green bonds responds to different magnitudes of return variation. Using an online survey of Japanese retail investors, we elicit minimum acceptable greenium through a double-bounded dichotomous choice design. Respondents were asked whether to invest in hypothetical green bonds with interest rates randomly deviated from sovereign bond yields, denominated in either JPY or USD. SBY deviation represents smaller return variation around a familiar benchmark, while USD denomination creates larger return variation through absolute yield differences.

We find that both types of return variation encourage GB investment, but through distinct mechanisms. SBY exhibits a non-monotonic inverted U-shaped effect: contemporaneous yields are least preferred, while deviations in either direction reduce required greenium. This effect is broadly significant across all investor types. USD denomination has more selective effects, primarily reducing greenium among return-oriented investors who require positive or mildly negative premiums. Notably, SBY has broader impact than USD despite offering smaller absolute return differences, suggesting investors respond more consistently to benchmark-referenced variations than to cross-currency comparisons.

GB knowledge (environmental finance knowledge) emerges as a key source of heterogeneity. High-knowledge investors are more sensitive to SBY variation but less responsive to USD denomination, while low-knowledge investors show the opposite pattern. This indicates that environmental finance knowledge shapes which return variation investors respond to.

Finally, we find no evidence that social awareness (pro-social orientation) amplifies return sensitivity. Neither altruistic orientation nor environmental concern amplifies the effects of financial variables, indicating that pro-social motivation operates independently of financial incentives. This supports pure rather than impure altruism in sustainable investment: investors with pro-social preferences do not become more return-seeking, and their social motivation remains orthogonal to financial considerations.

# A Supplementary Empirical Framework: Double-Bounded CVM Model

## A.1 Methodology

The double-bounded CVM approach models the minimum interest rate  $r_{i,\text{USD}}$  directly as a continuous variable, rather than treating responses categorically as in the generalized ordered probit. Using the same DBDC design described in Section 3, we model the minimum interest rate as:

$$r_{i,\text{USD}} = \beta' X_i + \gamma \cdot \text{USD} + e_{i,\text{USD}} \quad (9)$$

where  $X_i$  includes financial variables (SBY, bond origin) and prosocial attitudes (environmental concern, social responsibility, GB knowledge),  $\theta_i$  contains demographic controls, and  $e_{i,\text{USD}} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\text{USD}}^2)$ . Standardizing  $B_k = 1$  allows estimation on the same scale across bond types. The probability of observing each response is:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \Pr(\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = 1) &= 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{0.85 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) \\ \Pr(\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = 2) &= \Phi\left(\frac{0.85 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{1 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) \\ \Pr(\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = 3) &= \Phi\left(\frac{1 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{1.15 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) \\ \Pr(\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = 4) &= \Phi\left(\frac{1.15 - \beta' X_i - \tau' \theta_i}{\sigma_{\text{USD}}}\right) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (10)$$

where  $\Phi$  denotes the standard normal CDF. We estimate  $\beta$  and  $\tau$  by maximum likelihood:

$$\ln L(\beta, \tau) = \sum_{\text{USD}=0}^1 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^4 d_{i,\text{USD}}^j \ln \Pr(\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = j) \quad (11)$$

where  $d_{i,\text{USD}}^j$  equals 1 if  $i$  has  $\text{response}_{i,\text{USD}} = j$ , and 0 otherwise.

## A.2 Results

Table 7 presents double-bounded panel CVM estimates of investors' minimum required greenium. Positive coefficients indicate higher greenium requirements. Column (1) includes only demographic controls, column (2) adds economic characteristics, and column (3) incorporates social awareness variables. The bottom row reports the estimated average greenium at sample means, approximately 1.48. This indicates that investors require yields 1.48 times the current 10-year SBY. For JPY bonds (the current SBY being 0.5%), this translates to a required premium of  $0.5\% \times 1.48 = 0.74\%$ . USD denomination significantly reduces greenium by 0.057 percentage points, resulting in a required yield of approximately  $4.0\% \times (1.48 - 0.057) = 5.69\%$ , which remains well above the current 10-year SBY in USD. GB knowledge and altruistic devotion (SRAS) are strongly negatively associated with required greenium—these investors accept lower premiums. Older investors require significantly higher greenium.

**Table 7:** Double-Bounded Panel CVM Estimation

	(1) Financial	(2) Purchasing	(3) Full Model
USD	−0.057* (0.033)	−0.057* (0.033)	−0.057* (0.033)
Child	−0.039** (0.017)	−0.034** (0.017)	−0.032* (0.017)
Married	−0.079* (0.044)	−0.040 (0.044)	−0.039 (0.044)
Age	0.087*** (0.013)	0.062*** (0.013)	0.068*** (0.013)
Male	0.025 (0.039)	0.035 (0.039)	0.009 (0.040)
University	−0.031 (0.037)	−0.001 (0.037)	0.004 (0.037)
Wealthy	−0.186*** (0.045)	−0.150*** (0.045)	−0.096** (0.048)
GB Knowledge		−0.174*** (0.016)	−0.154*** (0.017)
Inv. Frequency		−0.036 (0.024)	−0.030 (0.025)
Currency Risk Aversion		0.035** (0.017)	0.044** (0.017)
Info. Certainty		−0.079*** (0.019)	−0.064*** (0.019)
ENV			−0.030 (0.021)
SRAS			−0.125*** (0.028)
Constant	1.331*** (0.064)	1.825*** (0.113)	2.121*** (0.133)
Greenium	1.472*** [1.431, 1.513]	1.479*** [1.438, 1.520]	1.482*** [1.441, 1.523]
<i>N</i>	2800	2800	2800

Standard errors in parentheses. Greenium: 95% CI in brackets.

Double-bounded dichotomous choice with robust standard errors.

Positive coef = higher greenium required; Greenium = premium above baseline.

\*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$

## References

- Ando, S., Fu, C., Roch, F., and Wiriadinata, U. (2024). How large is the sovereign greenium? *Oxford bulletin of economics and statistics*.
- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure altruism and donations to public goods: A theory of warm-glow giving. *The Economic journal of Nepal*, 100(401):464–477.
- Apostolakis, G., van Dijk, G., Kraanen, F., and Blomme, R. J. (2018). Examining socially responsible investment preferences: A discrete choice conjoint experiment. *Journal of behavioral and experimental finance*, 17:83–96.
- Aruga, K. (2024). Comparing the willingness to invest returns among green, sustainability, and blue bonds. *Journal of environmental management*, 364(121458):121458.
- Aruga, K. and Bolt, T. (2023). Identifying factors affecting the preference for green bonds: a japanese case study. *Journal of Climate Finance*, 5(100021):100021.
- Barreda-Tarrazona, I., Matallín-Sáez, J. C., and Balaguer-Franch, M. R. (2011). Measuring investors’ socially responsible preferences in mutual funds. *Journal of business ethics*, 103(2):305–330.
- Bauer, R., Ruof, T., and Smeets, P. (2021). Get real! individuals prefer more sustainable investments. *The review of financial studies*, 34(8):3976–4043.
- Bauer, R. and Smeets, P. (2015). Social identification and investment decisions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 117:121–134.
- Bonnefon, J.-F., Landier, A., Sastry, P., and Thesmar, D. (2025). The moral preferences of investors: Experimental evidence. *Journal of financial economics*, 163(103955):103955.
- Bordalo, P., Gennaioli, N., and Shleifer, A. (2012). Salience theory of choice under risk. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(3):1243–1285.
- Brodback, D., Guenster, N., and Mezger, D. (2019). Altruism and egoism in investment decisions. *Review of financial economics*, 37(1):118–148.
- Bénabou, R. and Tirole, J. (2006). Incentives and prosocial behavior. *American Economic Review*.
- Caramichael, J. and Rapp, A. C. (2024). The green corporate bond issuance premium. *Journal of banking & finance*, 162(107126):107126.
- Døskeland, T. and Pedersen, L. J. T. (2016). Investing with brain or heart? a field experiment on responsible investment. *Management science*, 62(6):1632–1644.
- FRED (2026a). Interest rates: Long-term government bond yields: 10-year: Main (including benchmark) for japan. <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/IRLT01JPM156N>. Accessed: 2026-1-19.
- FRED (2026b). Market yield on U.S. treasury securities at 10-year constant maturity, quoted on an investment basis. <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DGS10>. Accessed: 2026-1-19.

- Frey, B. and Oberholzer-Gee, F. (1997). The cost of price incentives: An empirical analysis of motivation crowding-out. *American Economic Review*, 87:746–755.
- Gutsche, G., Nakai, M., and Arimura, T. H. (2021). Revisiting the determinants of individual sustainable investment—the case of japan. *Journal of behavioral and experimental finance*, 30(100497):100497.
- Gutsche, G., Wetzel, H., and Ziegler, A. (2023). Determinants of individual sustainable investment behavior - a framed field experiment. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 209:491–508.
- Gutsche, G. and Ziegler, A. (2019). Which private investors are willing to pay for sustainable investments? empirical evidence from stated choice experiments. *Journal of banking & finance*, 102:193–214.
- Hartzmark, S. M. and Sussman, A. B. (2019). Do investors value sustainability? a natural experiment examining ranking and fund flows. *The journal of finance*, 74(6):2789–2837.
- Heeb, F., Kölbel, J. F., Paetzold, F., and Zeisberger, S. (2022). Do investors care about impact? *The review of financial studies*, 36(5):1737–1787.
- Jankovic, I., Vasic, V., and Kovacevic, V. (2022). Does transparency matter? evidence from panel analysis of the EU government green bonds. *Energy economics*, 114(106325):106325.
- Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 183–214.
- Koszegi, B. and Rabin, M. (2006). A model of reference-dependent preferences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(4):1133–1165.
- Lau, P., Sze, A., Wan, W., and Wong, A. (2022). The economics of the greenium: How much is the world willing to pay to save the earth? *Environmental & resource economics*, 81(2):379–408.
- Lusardi, A. and Mitchell, O. S. (2014). The economic importance of financial literacy: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 52(1):5–44.
- Luz, V., Schauer, V., and Viehweger, M. (2024). Beyond preferences: Beliefs in sustainable investing. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 220:584–607.
- Pudney, S. and Shields, M. (2000). Gender, race, pay and promotion in the british nursing profession: estimation of a generalized ordered probit model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 15:367–399.
- Riedl, A. and Smeets, P. (2017). Why do investors hold socially responsible mutual funds?: Why do investors hold socially responsible mutual funds? *The journal of finance*, 72(6):2505–2550.
- Tang, Y., Wang, B., Pan, N., and Li, Z. (2023). The impact of environmental information disclosure on the cost of green bond: Evidence from china. *Energy economics*, 126(107008):107008.