

# Is corporatism clean or dirty? Examining the effects of corporatism on climate policy

Summative assessment for *Comparative Political Economy of Advanced Democracies*

Candidate number: 1050713\*

03 June 2024

## Abstract

TBD. Use Gillardi's abstract template.

Theoretically, I will defend two sets of claims. First, I argue that corporatism is, *ceteris paribus*, conducive to stringent climate policy when pro-climate public opinion is high, while the reverse holds in countries, where carbon-intensive manufacturing accounts for a large share of overall GDP or value added. Second, corporatism, I submit, has a tendency to impose a relatively greater share of costs on consumers than producers, especially when the economy is highly open. Yet, high electoral competitiveness, especially when driven by green parties, counteracts this tendency.

---

\*Word count: XXX (excluding bibliography and appendix)

# 1 Introduction

- Start with climate policy being a long-term Olsonian setting. One or two additional sentences. Most of the literature has focused on the welfare economics and political economy of instrument choice to meet this problem. More recently, however, interest has shifted to the role of political and economic institutions ([Finnegan, 2022](#); [Meckling and Nahm, 2022](#); [Meckling et al., 2022](#); [Meckling and Karplus, 2023](#); [Srivastav and Rafaty, 2023](#); [Zwar et al., 2023](#)). Among these institutions is corporatism. In doing so, the lit has revived an older debate.
- Define corporatism and concertation.
- Two developments motivate this broader interest: The reduced-form correlation (figure here, probably better to start with qualitative stuff) and qualitative case studies. Then, point out increasing interest by corporatist actors in climate policy, DGB's comment on KSG and climate framework legislation more generally ([Zwar et al., 2023](#); [Flachsland et al., 2024](#)) and BDI's role; Sweden as well ([Karlsson, 2021](#); [Matti et al., 2021](#))
- Briefly outline two perspectives and conflicting findings. Point to gaps.
- Then outline your contributions: theoretical argument and empirical findings.

Refer to Table [A1](#).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section [2](#), I will survey the relevant literature. Doing so will pave the way for setting out my theoretical contribution in Section [3](#). Section [4](#) is devoted to testing my theoretical hypotheses empirically. In Section [5](#), I summarise this paper's overall contribution and reflect on potentially promising avenues for future research.




Figure 1: Adoption and stringency of policies by corporatism grouping, 1990 – 2018

Notes: The Figure is based on the OECD's CAPMF (OECD, 2023; Nachtigall et al., 2024) data, with the time-varying corporatism measure taken from Jahn (2016a). The theoretical range for the stringency variable (here averaged over all countries, sectors, and instrument types) is 0-10.

## 2 Situating the argument in the literature: Mixed empirical results and two contrasting theoretical perspectives

There is a considerable body of work on the link between corporatism and climate policy. The early contributions to the literature were almost entirely empirical, focused on estimating the reduced-form<sup>1</sup> relationship between corporatism and carbon emissions (Scruggs, 1999, 2001, 2003; Jahn, 1998, 2016b). While these cross-country regressions yielded mostly, albeit not unambiguously, positive results, two factors cast doubt on the causal nature of this positive correlation – the likely presence of unobserved confounders and the under-theorised link between corporatism and emissions, or, more broadly, the stringency of climate policy. Overall, the empirical evidence on the reduced-form link is rather inconclusive, with results varying substantially from study to study.

More recent work has tried to address these theoretical and empirical shortcomings. Before summarising this work, however, two caveats are in order. First, despite (marked) differences in the theoretical approaches and empirical findings of works in that newer literature, they all exhibit one commonality – they focus on the stringency of climate policies, rather than emissions, as their dependent variable of interest. Stringency refers, roughly speaking, to the level of ambition of some climate policy (Nachtigall et al., 2024). For instance, a carbon tax of £20 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub> is less stringent than a tax rate of £100 per tonne.

Second, the more recent literature (implicitly) assumes governments' interests *for*<sup>2</sup> climate policy to be given exogenously. Given some exogenous pressure to ramp up the stringency of climate policy, this body of scholarship seeks to theorise how corporatist structures – institutionalised fora where labour, business, and the government bargain with one another – moderate<sup>3</sup> that pressure, whether they hinder or help governments with (temporarily) pro-climate objectives. Although not discussed explicitly in the literature, one important rationale for this assumption is that governments are bound by international obligations, notably climate treaties, such as the 2015 Paris Agreement, and/or affected by decisions taken at the inter- or even supra-national levels, particularly the EU one. The

---

<sup>1</sup>I use this term to indicate that these works do not explore the mechanisms through which corporatism affects emissions (Haile, 2018).

<sup>2</sup>Conversely, the assumption is that those whose material interests are threatened by decarbonisation oppose it, at least initially, i.e. need to be compensated in some way.

<sup>3</sup>Following the causal inference literature, I distinguish between *mediated* and *moderated*. An effect is mediated by some variable if this variable is the mechanism through which the effect engenders a certain outcome, whereas it is moderated when some intervening variable changes the marginal effect of an explanatory variable on the outcome of interest (Zwar et al., 2023, footnote 17).

*European Effort Sharing Regulation*<sup>4</sup> (ESR) was, for example, a major reason why the German government introduced an emissions trading scheme for the transport and heating sectors in 2019, as, *inter alia*, [Fesenfeld et al. \(2024\)](#) argue.<sup>5</sup>

Bearing these two caveats in mind, let me turn to the two dominant approaches – most prominently articulated by [Finnegan \(2022\)](#) and [Mildenberger \(2020\)](#) respectively – in the more recent literature on the link between corporatism and climate policy. Theoretically, Finnegan-type approaches draw on two literatures: the comparative political economy literature on corporatism ([Olson, 1982](#); [Landesmann and Vartiainen, 1992](#); [Landesmann, 1992](#); [Hicks and Kenworthy, 1998](#); [Iversen, 1999](#); [Iversen et al., 2000](#); [Swank, 2002](#); [Wallerstein, 2008](#); [Seidl, 2023](#)) and that on long-term<sup>6</sup> policymaking ([Jacobs, 2011, 2016](#); [Jacobs and Matthews, 2012, 2017](#); [Lindvall, 2010, 2017](#); [Andersson and Lindvall, 2018](#); [Jacques, 2022](#); [Birch, 2023](#); [Sheffer et al., 2024](#); [Hale, 2024](#)).

Accordingly, these authors argue that corporatism is conducive to more stringent climate policy because it allows politicians to credibly promise to compensate the losers of the structural transformation associated with decarbonisation ([Finnegan, 2022](#)). This follows from corporatism providing labour and capital with institutionalised access to policymaking (see Section 1) and the folk-theorem logic of repeated games.<sup>7</sup> That is, concertation in corporatist systems means that capital, labour, and the government interact repeatedly with one another in formally institutionalised settings. Adversely affected segments of the economy, notably workers and businesses in carbon-intensive industries, can then credibly threaten to punish governments for reneging on their promise to compensate them by (effectively) vetoing any government’s proposals in the ‘next round’. This logic is powerfully illustrated by free allocations or allowances in emissions trading systems, which effectively exempt some emitters from that form of carbon pricing. If governments rescinded these exemptions after promising them to certain producers, those with access to corporatist concertation fora could then ‘punish’ the government by blocking future increases of the carbon price.<sup>8</sup> If, as is the case with EU governments because of the ESR, the failure to let carbon

---

<sup>4</sup>The [ESR](#), adopted in 2018, stipulates emission reduction targets for all EU member states in sectors not covered by the EU emissions trading system (domestic transport (excluding aviation), buildings, agriculture, small industry, and waste). Crucially, non-compliance entails hefty financial sanctions.

<sup>5</sup>Specifically, the German government realised that without additional measures it would violate its obligations under the ESR and have to pay considerable fines, which it wanted to avoid.

<sup>6</sup>I summarise these arguments [here](#) and [here](#).

<sup>7</sup>The ‘folk theorems’ of repeated games show that, with sufficiently low discount rates, any feasible outcome can be supported as a subgame-perfect equilibrium ([Tadelis, 2013, 211](#)).

<sup>8</sup>As [Sato et al. \(2022, 3\)](#) write: “Today, all emissions trading systems covering industry offer some form of

prices rise increases the risk of failing to meet emissions reduction targets and thus hefty financial sanctions, this kind of punishment is particularly credible. In sum, because corporatist structures increase the credibility of compensation, the argument goes (Finnegan, 2022), they enable governments to impose short-term costs in pursuit of the long-term gains generated by climate policy.

Empirically, the literature provides some qualitative and quantitative evidence for the stringency-enhancing effect of corporatism. On the quantitative side, Finnegan (2022), for instance, improves on the early ‘reduced-form’ studies by employing more fine-grained and longer-term data as well as more demanding fixed-effects models. As a result, we have somewhat more robust evidence for a positive reduced-form link between corporatism and climate policy. That said, the case for causal identification remains relatively weak and none of the large-N analyses extend beyond 2009.<sup>9</sup> By contrast, the qualitative (comparative) case studies (Gronow et al., 2019; Kronsell et al., 2019) shed light on the causal mechanisms through which corporatism boosts the stringency of climate policy and thus rectify the lack of attention to mechanisms in ‘reduced-form’ quantitative work. These studies highlight the importance of repeated and institutionalised interactions between the government and potential losers of climate policy – in the form of trade unions and peak business or employers associations – for introducing and sustaining ambitious climate policy.

As part of this renewed interest in the corporatism-climate-policy nexus, however, a competing perspective has emerged, which sees corporatism as impeding stringent climate policy. Mildenberger (2020), the best-known proponent of this view, argues that concertation gives both ‘dirty’ capital and labour – workers and businesses in carbon-intensive sectors – guaranteed access to policymaking (‘double representation’), which, in turn, allows them to either block the adoption of climate policy or reduce its stringency. On this account, then, corporatist structures enable carbon-intensive producers to pursue their interests more effectively (than they could in pluralist interest group systems) by virtue of granting these actors a great deal of veto power. Unlike proponents of the corporatism-as-credible-compensation view, however, Mildenberger (2020) does not offer any large-N empirical evidence for his hypothesis, instead relying on a series of qualitative case studies.

---

exemption or “compensation” in the form of free allocation, which to varying degrees enable emitters to carry on with limited adjustment.” See also Belausteguigoitia et al. (2022) on the Mexican emissions trading system.

<sup>9</sup>This is because the data on shadow carbon prices, compiled by Althammer and Hille (2016) and used by Finnegan (2022) as a proxy for the stringency of climate policy, are only available for the period from 1995 to 2009.

The preceding shows that at least two gaps remain in the literature: one theoretical and the other empirical. Theoretically, there is a need for a more nuanced framework, in particular one that can integrate both the compensation and double-representation logics. Achieving this objective requires us to relax the assumption that governments' preferences for climate policy are exogenous to the political system and more carefully theorise how corporatist actors' interests are aggregated into overall policies. Doing so is necessary for specifying when the anti-climate preferences of carbon-intensive producers are likely to prevail and what that means, i.e. whether this manifests itself in less stringent climate policy or producer being shielded of the costs of climate policy.

Empirically, it is important not only to conduct large-N tests of the predictions yielded by such a framework, but also to do so using more granular (i.e. disaggregated by sector and instrument type) data covering the past 15 years or so. After all, this was the period when most climate policies were adopted, as Figure A1 bears out. Figure A2 reinforces that point. It also shows that cross-sectoral climate policies, notably the adoption of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets (column three in Figure A3), only became widespread after 2009 and are thus excluded from previous analyses. Finally, Figure A4 brings home that there exists considerable variation in the number and stringency of climate policies between sectors and instrument types (market-based vs. non-market-based ones). To reduce the likelihood of the positive corporatism-climate-policy correlation being spurious, i.e. being driven by sectoral or instrument-specific characteristics, disaggregated data are crucial because they allow us to net out time-invariant (un)observed confounders at the sectoral and/or instrument-type level.

### 3 Theoretical framework

In this section, I take the first step towards filling these gaps by, first, dwelling on the conceptualisation of my independent and dependent variables, respectively, (Section 3.1) and then outlining my theoretical framework (Section 3.2).

#### 3.1 Preliminaries: Defining the dependent and independent variables

My key independent variable, corporatism, is, as [Siaroff \(1999\)](#) and [Jahn \(2016a\)](#) point out, a complex concept. Given that, it is crucial to specify what aspects of corporatism constitute the theoretical quantity of interest – which, incidentally, the literature (largely) fails to

do. I will, as hinted at above, mainly focus on the (tripartite) concertation dimension of corporatism, as opposed to other important dimensions, such as the coverage of wage bargaining agreements. By concertation, I mean, following [Munk Christiansen \(2020, 161\)](#), (formal) structures that institutionalise the integration of representatives of labour (e.g. trade unions) and capital (e.g. peak business associations) in the formulation and, potentially, implementation of the government's (economic) policy. While some conceptual fuzziness remains,<sup>10</sup> this definition of concertation is sufficient to bring out its central characteristic – the granting of institutionalised access to government policymaking to organised labour and capital. A case in point is, as [Nasiritousi and Grimm \(2022\)](#) and [Zwar et al. \(2023, p. 28 and footnote 28\)](#) note, the *Fossil Free Sweden* initiative – a government-led forum, where trade unions and business associations come together to develop transition plans for the different sectors of the economy.

The reason for zeroing in on concertation is twofold. First, concertation is a feature shared by all corporatist systems, which maximises the scope of my theoretical claims, at least within the group of corporatist countries. Second, concertation captures the structure and frequency of interactions between representatives of capital and labour, on the one hand, and governments, on the other. It is with these patterns of interactions that the two contrasting perspectives in the literature are concerned.

As for my dependent variables, I am interested in two distinct climate policy outcomes. On the one hand, I will analyse the overall (relative) stringency of climate policy (see Section 2), which [Nachtigall et al. \(2024\)](#) define as the ambition of a given policy, relative to the ambition level of the same type of policy in all other countries in the same year. Relying on overall stringency importantly implies that I theoretically ignore instrument choice (standards vs. subsidies vs. taxes) and focus on the ambitiousness of the overall policy mix. This is mainly because the corporatism-climate literature focuses on overall stringency. While extending the theoretical framework below to account for instrument choice might well be an interesting avenue for further research, it is beyond the scope of this paper.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, I will examine the distribution of the costs of climate policy between consumers and producers. These are conceptually distinct because similarly stringent or ambitious climate policies can entail a very different distribution of costs and benefits.

---

<sup>10</sup>If the objective was to develop easily replicable coding rules – rules implying a high probability that different coders classify the same institutional structures as corporatist ([Clark et al., 2017, 166](#)) – one would have to specify more carefully which policy domains fall within the remit of corporatist policymaking.

<sup>11</sup>See also [Fetzer et al. \(2024\)](#).



### 3.2 Hypotheses

With these conceptual preliminaries in place, let me now turn to my theoretical hypotheses. To explain these, it is helpful to consider Figure 2, which offers an overview of my argument. The top and bottom rows, respectively, explicate the two theoretical perspectives – the Finnegan- and Mildenberger-type arguments – I discussed in Section 2. Integrating both perspectives yields the hypotheses that, as Figure 2 shows, the main<sup>12</sup> effect of corporatism on climate policy stringency is theoretically ambiguous (H0): it depends on the relative strength of the credible-compensation effect à la Finnegan vis-à-vis the double-representation effect à la Mildenberger. If the former dominates the latter, corporatism will result in more stringent climate policy, and vice versa. These two countervailing effects also help us make sense of the fact that, as noted in Section 2, the empirical findings regarding the corporatism-climate-policy link are inconclusive and variable. For if the sign of corporatism’s overall effect depends on the relative strength of the Mildenberger- and Finnegan-type effects, then it is possible that for some sample of countries and certain time periods one dominates the other, while the reverse is true for other samples and time periods.

The reason for the main effect’s theoretical ambiguity is that, in developing an integrated framework, I depart in two ways from the way in which the two theoretical perspectives conceptualise the aggregation of interests in corporatist systems. First, unlike Mildenberger (see Section 2), I do not assume that carbon-intensive interests will invariably block the adoption of more stringent policies – nor that doing so is necessarily their best response. They will do so only if the value of blocking climate policies outweighs the value of the concessions they can extract from the government. Second, unlike Finnegan, I do not assume that just because governments *can* credibly compensate the prospective losers of climate policy they will do so. This is because compensation is costly – in terms of time and fiscal means. When the pressure to act is sufficiently low, the gains from ratcheting up stringency are lower than the costs of making compensation work. Only when the pressure is sufficiently high for the governments is the reverse true. Put differently, I do not treat the government as a passive actor in corporatist bargaining whose interests are (entirely) exogenous (see Section 2).

If the main effect of corporatism on climate policy is indeed ambiguous, then answering

---

<sup>12</sup>In a regression set-up, this would be the coefficient on the corporatism measure without any interaction terms.

the following question becomes all the more<sup>13</sup> important: what does the effect of corporatism depend on? Hypotheses H1 to H3 aim to answer that question, with the first<sup>14</sup> two focusing on important determinants of the relative bargaining power of anti-climate-policy interests (holding the government's preference for climate policy constant).




Figure 2: Overview of the theoretical framework

Notes: Purple boxes represent moderating variables, whilst grey boxes refer to my dependent variables of interest. The other boxes are merely coloured for emphasis. Finally, note that indirect effects are not visualised here for simplicity's sake.

H1 has two parts. The first part holds that – all else, particularly the government's preference for climate policy, constant – corporatism's effect on climate policy stringency declines as the economic importance of carbon-intensive manufacturing increases. This hypothesis rests on the assumption that the relative bargaining power of the carbon-intensive industry is proportional to its economic potency. If so, then the strength of the double-representation effect grows (Figure 2), relative to the compensation one, as the carbon-intensive industry accounts for a greater share of GDP or value added, all else equal. The second part of H1 is that, when climate policies are adopted for whatever reason (e.g. supra- or international pressure), the distribution of its costs will be more favourable to producers (relative to consumers), the greater the economic heft of 'dirty' manufacturing.

<sup>13</sup>This question is important, even if one disagrees that the main effect is unambiguously signed.

<sup>14</sup>In an earlier version, I argued that corporatism's effect is moderated by pro-climate public opinion – the degree to which the population or electorate is in favour of climate policy. I omit this hypothesis here because I was persuaded by the criticism, articulated by several people, that a key aspect of corporatism is the fact that (policy) outcomes are determined largely by tripartite bargaining at the elite level, rather than by public opinion. I will leave it to future research to examine this further.

This expectation reflects the discussion above – that, as their relative bargaining power rises, carbon-intensive interests can extract more valuable concessions, which in this context come (at least<sup>15</sup> partially) in the form of shifting the costs of climate policy to consumers.

Before proceeding to H2, it is worth pausing to explain why the two grey boxes are connected by a bi-directional arrow. For one, any level of climate policy stringency entails costs, which are then split (either deliberately or de facto) in some way between consumers and producers. This explains the left-to-right direction of the arrow. Its right-to-left direction indicates that factors affecting the distribution of costs can also impact stringency.<sup>16</sup> If politicians find it difficult for some reason (e.g. next election looms large) to shift costs to consumers and there is no way to avoid a significant share of the costs of climate falling on consumers, this will reduce the level of stringency – in the extreme case to zero, meaning that the policy will not be adopted.

H2 has a Katzensteinian flavour and, like H1, two parts. First, in more open economies, competitiveness is an important political consideration (Katzenstein, 1985). Unilateral climate policies tend to hurt competitiveness (Böhringer et al., 2012; Egger et al., 2021; Weisbach et al., 2023; Ambec et al., 2024; Richter et al., 2024), and this is bad for both capital and labour in carbon-intensive industries. As a result, they will use corporatist structures to lobby governments (i.e. extract concessions) to let consumers bear the brunt of the costs of decarbonisation. Greater openness, therefore, should, *ceteris paribus*, result in a distribution of costs more favourable to producers. Second, I expect climate policy stringency to be, all else equal, lower as openness increases. This is because of the collective action problem associated with climate policy. Even pro-climate governments have incentives to avoid saddling their domestic industry with the costs of decarbonisation if other countries do not follow suit. Lower stringency thus reflects uncertainty about the cooperation of other countries.

My third hypothesis, H3, addresses the gap that governments' preferences for climate policy are treated as completely exogenous (see Section 2) by theorising the effect of electoral competitiveness. The first part of H3 draws on work in international political economy (Rogowski and Kayser, 2002; Chang et al., 2010) and argues that increased electoral competitiveness reduces the willingness of politicians to impose costs on consumers because doing so would harm their electoral prospects. As a result, they will use their clout in corporatist

---

<sup>15</sup>Concessions can also relate to different policy domains, such as employment protection.

<sup>16</sup>In a two-stage (extensive-form) game, this is the logic backward induction would require players to apply.

structures to reduce the burden climate policies place on consumers, thus resulting in a distribution of costs more favourable to consumers.

The second part of H3 concerns the stringency of climate policy, which the first part holds constant. As discussed above, for climate policy the stringency to increase, two conditions have to be met: the value of the concessions carbon-intensive interests can extract from the government must exceed the value of vetoing policy change and the cost of these concessions for the government must be lower than the value of ratcheting up stringency. H3 states that these conditions are more likely to obtain when the degree of degree of electoral competition by pro-climate green parties is high and vice versa. This hypothesis implicitly assumes that government parties follow an accommodationist logic, i.e. respond to the growing popularity of green parties by doing more on climate.<sup>17</sup>

## 4 Empirical analysis

Next, I turn to testing<sup>18</sup> these hypotheses empirically, i.e. addressing the second gap in the literature. I do so by discussing the measures and data on which my analysis is based (Section 4.1), then setting out my methodology and results (Section 4.2), and finally dwelling on their robustness and limitations (Section 4.3).

### 4.1 Data and variables

Table 1 summarises how I operationalise the dependent and independent variables of the hypotheses derived in the previous section. The final column indicates the sources from which the respective variables are drawn.

Three brief comments about Table 1 are in order. First, I use the climate policy stringency measure by [Nachtigall et al. \(2024\)](#) because it covers both the longest time period (1990-2022) of available measures – which increases statistical power – and disaggregates

---

<sup>17</sup>[Abou-Chadi \(2016\)](#) argues against the logic, noting that the incentives for mainstream parties to accommodate green parties are blunted by (i) climate being a valence issue and (ii) green parties being issue owners. Recently, however, [he](#) pointed out that this has changed in the past decade or so. My argument is that the non-accommodationist issue ownership logic is only plausible in a world where the climate targets government committed themselves to can be achieved at relatively low cost and entail few trade-offs. Only then can mainstream parties afford to de-emphasise climate policy. When that is not the case, however, the incentives for accommodation, i.e. proposing some bundle of climate policies, will rise – at least for all party families other than the radical right. Theorising the temporal and party-family-specific aspects of H3 definitely merits further research, but is beyond the scope of this paper.

<sup>18</sup>The replication files are available at: <https://github.com/jacob-edenhofer/Research-paper-CPEAD>.

Variable	Operationalisation	Data source(s)
<b>Dependent variables</b>		
Climate policy stringency	Ambition level, relative to all other countries in a given year	Stringency variable, OECD CAPMF database (Nachtigall et al., 2024)
Distribution of costs between consumers and producers	Shadow carbon prices for consumers and producers	Althammer and Hille (2016), Finnegan (2022)
<b>Independent variable</b>		
Corporatism	(Smoothed) corporatism index	Jahn's time-varying index (Jahn, 2016a,b)
	Concertation dummy	ICTWSS database
<b>Moderating variables</b>		
Economic importance of carbon-intensive manufacturing sector	% of GDP	CPDS (Armingeon et al., 2023), WDI
	% of value added	
Electoral competitiveness	Probability of losing/winning office	Kayser and Lindstädt (2015)
	Coalition inclusion probability by green party/parties	Kayser and Rehmert (2021), Kayser et al. (2023)
	Surprise election results	Fetzer and Yotzo (2023)
Openness of the economy	Total trade as % of GDP	CPDS (Armingeon et al., 2023), WDI
	Trade CO <sub>2</sub> share	

\* CAPMF = Climate Actions and Policies Measurement Framework, CPDS = Comparative Political Dataset, ICTWSS = Institutional Characteristics of Trade Unions, Wage Setting, State Intervention and Social Pacts, WDI = World Development Indicators, OWID = Our World in Data

Table 1: Summary of variables and their operationalisation

stringency scores by instrument type and sector (see Figures A2 and A4). This enables me to mitigate the legitimate worry that composite stringency scores (e.g. *Environmental Policy Stringency Index*) have a low degree of reproducibility, i.e. assigning and aggregating these scores across sectors and instrument types involves a number of judgement calls (Lieberman and Ross, 2024). Given the CAPMF's greater granularity, I can, unlike previous studies (Furceri et al., 2023), eliminate measurement errors that arises from aggregation. Similarly, following Finnegan (2022) by using the shadow carbon prices for consumers and producers by Althammer and Hille (2016) as a measure for the costs of climate policy borne by these two respective groups entails two major drawbacks. On the one hand, the data only extend from 1995 to 2009, i.e. they end before the 'great' ratcheting up in climate policy after 2009 (see Figure A2). On the other hand, the measure mainly captures variation in energy prices and policies, which, albeit important for climate policy, ignore a considerable amount of variation. Despite these limitations, both measures are suitable second-best substitutes for

the exploratory analysis below.

Second, the operationalisation of the corporatism variable also comes with a trade-off. Employing Jahn’s time-varying (annual basis) corporatism measure boosts statistical power, while potentially impinging on my concept validity. As noted in Section 3.1, I am mainly interested in the concertation dimension of corporatism, but it could be that the variation in Jahn’s measure is driven mainly by other dimensions, such as the nature of wage bargaining. To mitigate this concern, I demonstrate that my results are robust to using the concertation dummy from the ICTWSS database, which varies less frequently. That withstanding, the ideal way to operationalise this variable would be a time-varying measure of concertation.

Third, I draw on a set of recent papers ([Kayser and Lindstädt, 2015](#); [Kayser and Rehmert, 2021](#); [Kayser et al., 2023](#); [Fetzer and Yotzo, 2023](#)) to operationalise electoral competitiveness. Specifically, I rely on the coalition inclusion probability of green parties ([Kayser et al., 2023](#)) to capture times when incumbent governments face intense pro-climate competition. While it is beyond this paper’s scope to discuss the drawbacks of these measures<sup>19</sup>, I readily acknowledge that they rest on several potentially contentious methodological decisions. As a second-best substitute, however, they are eminently suitable. Finally, let me note that the other moderating variables are operationalised via conventionally used measures.

## 4.2 Estimation and results

### 4.2.1 Extending Finnegan’s results

### 4.2.2 Testing the theory on more fine-grained data

## 4.3 Robustness and limitations

# 5 Conclusion

- Re-state RQ and objectives
- Emphasise contributions and argument.
- Limitations

---

<sup>19</sup>See, for instance, [Cox et al. \(2020\)](#).

- Directions for future research (perhaps point to [Shapiro \(2021\)](#) here and discuss that this might be an interesting outcome variable). Formalisation of theory (bargaining model).
- Return to broader relevance.

## References

- Abou-Chadi, Tarik**, “Niche Party Success and Mainstream Party Policy Shifts – How Green and Radical Right Parties Differ in Their Impact,” *British Journal of Political Science*, April 2016, 46 (2), 417–436. (Cited on [12](#))
- Althammer, Wilhelm and Erik Hille**, “Measuring climate policy stringency: a shadow price approach,” *International Tax and Public Finance*, 2016, 23, 607–639. (Cited on [6](#), [13](#))
- Ambec, Stefan, Federico Esposito, and Antonia Pacelli**, “The economics of carbon leakage mitigation policies,” *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, May 2024, 125, 102973. (Cited on [11](#))
- Andersson, Per F. and Johannes Lindvall**, “Crises, investments, and political institutions,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, October 2018, 30 (4), 410–430. (Cited on [5](#))
- Armingeon, Klaus, Sarah Engler, Lucas Leeman, and David Weisstanner**, “Comparative Political Data Set, 1960-2021,” 2023. (Cited on [13](#))
- Belausteguigoitia, Juan Carlos, Vidal Romero, and Alberto Simpser**, “The Political Economy of Carbon Pricing: Lessons from the Mexican Carbon Tax Experience for the Mexican Cap-and-Trade System,” in Simone Lucatello, ed., *Towards an Emissions Trading System in Mexico: Rationale, Design and Connections with the Global Climate Agenda: Outlook on the first ETS in Latin-America and Exploration of the Way Forward*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2022, pp. 133–150. (Cited on [6](#))
- Birch, Sarah**, “Voting for the Future: Electoral Institutions and the Time Horizons of Democracy,” *Political Studies Review*, October 2023. (Cited on [5](#))
- Böhringer, Christoph, Jared C. Carbone, and Thomas F. Rutherford**, “Unilateral climate policy design: Efficiency and equity implications of alternative instruments to reduce carbon leakage,” *Energy Economics*, December 2012, 34, S208–S217. (Cited on [11](#))
- Chang, Eric C.C., Mark Andreas Kayser, Drew A Linzer, and Ronald Rogowski**, *Electoral Systems and the Balance of Consumer-Producer Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. (Cited on [11](#))
- Christiansen, Peter Munk**, “Corporatism: Exaggerated Death Rumours?,” in Peter Munk Christiansen, Jørgen Elklit, and Peter Nedergaard, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Danish Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, June 2020, pp. 160–176. (Cited on [8](#))
- Clark, William Roberts, Matt Golder, and Sona N. Golder**, *Principles of Comparative Politics*,



- Washington DC: CQ Press, 2017. (Cited on 8)
- Cox, Gary W., Jon H. Fiva, and Daniel M. Smith**, “Measuring the Competitiveness of Elections,” *Political Analysis*, April 2020, 28 (2), 168–185. (Cited on 14)
- Egger, Hartmut, Udo Kreickemeier, and Philipp M. Richter**, “Environmental Policy and Firm Selection in the Open Economy,” *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, July 2021, 8 (4), 655–690. (Cited on 11)
- Fesenfeld, Lukas, Karin Ingold, Sebastian Levi, Simon Montfort, Maiken Maier, and Christian Flachsland**, “How science-policy entrepreneurs can enable climate policy change,” in “SPSA Conference 2024 Proceedings” 2024. (Cited on 5)
- Fetzer, Thiemo and Ivan Yotzo**, “Do electoral surprises drive business cycles? Evidence from a new dataset,” *CEPR Discussion Paper*, 2023, 18306. (Cited on 13, 14)
- , **Callum Shaw, and Jacob Edenhofer**, “Informational Boundaries of the State,” *CEPR Discussion Paper*, 2024, 18773. (Cited on 8)
- Finnegan, Jared J.**, “Institutions, climate change, and the foundations of long-term policy-making,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 2022, 55 (7), 1198–1235. (Cited on 2, 5, 6, 13)
- Flachsland, Christian, Jacob Edenhofer, and Claudia Zwar**, “Not a Disaster, but a Missed Opportunity: The Amendment to the Federal Climate Protection Act,” *Verfassungsblog*, May 2024. (Cited on 2)
- Furceri, Davide, Michael Ganslmeier, and Jonathan Ostry**, “Are climate change policies politically costly?,” *Energy Policy*, July 2023, 178, 113575. (Cited on 13)
- Gronow, Antti, Tuomas Ylä-Anttila, Marcus Carson, and Christofer Edling**, “Divergent neighbors: corporatism and climate policy networks in Finland and Sweden,” *Environmental Politics*, June 2019, 28 (6), 1061–1083. (Cited on 6)
- Haile, Phil**, “Theory and Measurement: A Perspective on Empirical Economics,” 2018. (Cited on 4)
- Hale, Thomas**, *Long Problems: Climate Change and the Challenge of Governing across Time*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, April 2024. (Cited on 5)
- Hicks, Alexander and Lane Kenworthy**, “Cooperation and Political Economic Performance in Affluent Democratic Capitalism,” *American Journal of Sociology*, May 1998, 103 (6), 1631–1672. (Cited on 5)
- Iversen, Torben**, *Contested Economic Institutions: The Politics of Macroeconomics and Wage Bargaining in Advanced Democracies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. (Cited

- on 5)
- , **Jonas Pontusson, and David Soskice**, *Unions, Employers, and Central Banks: Macroeconomic Coordination and Institutional Change in Social Market Economies*, Cambridge University Press, April 2000. (Cited on 5)
  - Jacobs, Alan M.**, *Governing for the Long Term: Democracy and the Politics of Investment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, June 2011. (Cited on 5)
  - , “Policy Making for the Long Term in Advanced Democracies,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, May 2016, 19 (Volume 19, 2016), 433–454. (Cited on 5)
  - **and J. Scott Matthews**, “Why Do Citizens Discount the Future? Public Opinion and the Timing of Policy Consequences,” *British Journal of Political Science*, October 2012, 42 (4), 903–935. (Cited on 5)
  - **and** – , “Policy Attitudes in Institutional Context: Rules, Uncertainty, and the Mass Politics of Public Investment,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2017, 61 (1), 194–207. (Cited on 5)
  - Jacques, Olivier**, “Electoral competition and the party politics of public investments,” *Party Politics*, November 2022, 28 (6), 1029–1040. (Cited on 5)
  - Jahn, Detlef**, “Environmental performance and policy regimes: Explaining variations in 18 OECD-countries,” *Policy Sciences*, 1998, 31 (2), 107–131. (Cited on 4)
  - , “Changing of the guard: trends in corporatist arrangements in 42 highly industrialized societies from 1960 to 2010,” *Socio-economic Review*, January 2016, 14 (1), 47–71. (Cited on 3, 7, 13, 1)
  - , *The Politics of Environmental Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. (Cited on 4, 13)
  - Karlsson, Mikael**, “Sweden’s Climate Act – Its Origin and Emergence,” *Climate Policy*, October 2021, 21 (9), 1132–1145. (Cited on 2)
  - Katzenstein, Peter J.**, *Small States in World Markets: Industrial Policy in Europe*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. (Cited on 11)
  - Kayser, Mark A. and Jochen Rehmert**, “Coalition Prospects and Policy Change: An Application to the Environment,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 2021, 46 (1), 219–246. (Cited on 13, 14)
  - , **Matthias Orłowski, and Jochen Rehmert**, “Coalition inclusion probabilities: a party-strategic measure for predicting policy and politics,” *Political Science Research and Methods*,

- April 2023, 11 (2), 328–346. (Cited on [13](#), [14](#))
- Kayser, Mark Andreas and René Lindstädt**, “A cross-national measure of electoral competitiveness,” *Political Analysis*, 2015, 23 (2), 242–253. (Cited on [13](#), [14](#))
- Kronsell, Annica, Jamil Khan, and Roger Hildingsson**, “Actor relations in climate policymaking: Governing decarbonisation in a corporatist green state,” *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 2019, 29 (6), 399–408. (Cited on [6](#))
- Landesmann, Michael**, “Industrial Policies and Social Corporatism,” in Jukka Pekkarinen, Matti Pohjola, and Bob Rowthorn, eds., *Social Corporatism: A Superior Economic System?*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, pp. 242–279. (Cited on [5](#))
- **and Juhana Vartiainen**, “Social Corporatism and Long-Term Economic Performance,” in Jukka Pekkarinen, Matti Pohjola, and Bob Rowthorn, eds., *Social Corporatism: A Superior Economic System?*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992, pp. 210–241. (Cited on [5](#))
- Lieberman, Evan and Michael Ross**, “Government Responses to Climate Change,” *World Politics*, 2024, *Forthcoming*. (Cited on [13](#))
- Lindvall, Johannes**, “Power Sharing and Reform Capacity,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, July 2010, 22 (3), 359–376. (Cited on [5](#))
- , *Reform Capacity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, July 2017. (Cited on [5](#))
- Matti, Simon, Christer Petersson, and Charlotta Söderberg**, “The Swedish Climate Policy Framework as a Means for Climate Policy Integration: An Assessment,” *Climate Policy*, October 2021, 21 (9), 1146–1158. (Cited on [2](#))
- Meckling, Jonas and Jonas Nahm**, “Strategic State Capacity: How States Counter Opposition to Climate Policy,” *Comparative Political Studies*, March 2022, 55 (3), 493–523. (Cited on [2](#))
- **and Valerie J. Karplus**, “Political strategies for climate and environmental solutions,” *Nature Sustainability*, May 2023, pp. 1–10. (Cited on [2](#))
- , **Phillip Y. Lipsy, Jared J. Finnegan, and Florence Metz**, “Why Nations Lead or Lag in Energy Transitions,” *Science*, October 2022, 378 (6615), 31–33. (Cited on [2](#))
- Mildenberger, Matto**, *Carbon Captured: How Business and Labor Control Climate Politics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020. (Cited on [5](#), [6](#))
- Nachtigall, Daniel, Luisa Lutz, Miguel Cárdenas Rodríguez, Filippo Maria D’Arcangelo, Ivan Hašič, Tobias Kruse, and Rodrigo Pizarro**, “The Climate Actions and Policies Measurement Framework: A Database to Monitor and Assess Countries’ Mitigation Action,”

- Environmental and Resource Economics*, 2024, pp. 1–27. (Cited on [3](#), [4](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#), [2](#), [5](#))
- Nasiritousi, Naghmeh and Julia Grimm**, “Governing toward Decarbonization: The Legitimacy of National Orchestration,” *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 2022, 32 (5), 411–425. (Cited on [8](#))
- OECD**, “The Climate Action Monitor 2023: Providing Information to Monitor Progress towards Net-Zero,” Technical Report, OECD, Paris 2023. (Cited on [3](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#))
- Olson, Mancur**, *The Rise And Decline of Nations – Economic, Growth, Stagflation, And Social Rigidities*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982. (Cited on [5](#))
- Richter, Philipp M., Fabrice Naumann, and Simon J. Bolz**, “Unilateral Environmental Policy and Offshoring,” *CESifo Working Paper*, May 2024, 11096. (Cited on [11](#))
- Rogowski, Ronald and Mark Andreas Kayser**, “Majoritarian electoral systems and consumer power: price-level evidence from the OECD countries,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2002, pp. 526–539. (Cited on [11](#))
- Sato, Misato, Ryan Rafaty, Raphael Calel, and Michael Grubb**, “Allocation, allocation, allocation! The political economy of the development of the European Union Emissions Trading System,” *WIREs Climate Change*, 2022, 13 (5), e796. (Cited on [5](#))
- Scruggs, Lyle A.**, “Institutions and Environmental Performance in Seventeen Western Democracies,” *British Journal of Political Science*, January 1999, 29 (1), 1–31. (Cited on [4](#))
- , “Is There Really a Link Between Neo-Corporatism and Environmental Performance? Updated Evidence and New Data for the 1980s and 1990s,” *British Journal of Political Science*, October 2001, 31 (4), 686–692. (Cited on [4](#))
- , *Sustaining Abundance: Environmental Performance in Industrial Democracies*, Cambridge University Press, March 2003. (Cited on [4](#))
- Seidl, Timo**, “Investing in the knowledge economy: The comparative political economy of public investments in knowledge-based capital,” *European Journal of Political Research*, 2023, 62 (3), 924–944. (Cited on [5](#))
- Shapiro, Joseph S.**, “The environmental bias of trade policy,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2021, 136 (2), 831–886. (Cited on [15](#))
- Sheffer, Lior, Peter John Loewen, and Jack Lucas**, “Long-term policymaking and politicians’ beliefs about voters: Evidence from a 3-year panel study of politicians,” *Governance*, 2024, n/a (n/a). (Cited on [5](#))

- Siaroff, Alan**, “Corporatism in 24 industrial democracies: Meaning and measurement,” *European Journal of Political Research*, October 1999, 36 (2), 175–205. (Cited on [7](#))
- Srivastav, Sugandha and Ryan Rafaty**, “Political Strategies to Overcome Climate Policy Obstructionism,” *Perspectives on Politics*, June 2023, 21 (2), 640–650. (Cited on [2](#))
- Swank, Duane**, *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States*, Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, February 2002. (Cited on [5](#))
- Tadelis, Steven**, *Game Theory: An Introduction*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013. (Cited on [5](#))
- Wallerstein, Michael**, *Selected Works of Michael Wallerstein: The Political Economy of Inequality, Unions, and Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, March 2008. (Cited on [5](#))
- Weisbach, David A., Samuel Kortum, Michael Wang, and Yujia Yao**, “Trade, Leakage, and the Design of a Carbon Tax,” *Environmental and Energy Policy and the Economy*, January 2023, 4, 43–90. (Cited on [11](#))
- Zwar, Claudia, Jacob Edenhofer, Viktorija Ruzelyte, Duncan Edmondson, and Christian Flachsland**, “Mapping Variation in Institutions for Climate Policymaking - Climate Institutions in Germany, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Australia,” Technical Report, Ariadne October 2023. (Cited on [2](#), [4](#), [8](#))

# Appendix

## Additional tables

Variable	Corporatism score (Jahn, 2016a)				Diff in means	p.value
	Above median		Below median			
	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev		
Number of adopted policies	5.9	3.7	4.7	3.7	-1.2	<0.001
Stringency	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.1	-0.3	<0.001
Manufacturing value added (% of GDP)	15.5	4.5	16.4	5.0	0.9	0.003
Industry value added (% of GDP)	25.1	5.1	27.1	5.7	2.0	<0.001
CO2 emissions per capita	8.9	4.1	8.1	4.1	-0.8	<0.001
Fossil share electricity	51.7	31.0	64.3	24.7	12.7	<0.001
Fossil share energy	75.5	20.1	84.0	11.2	8.5	<0.001
Trade CO2 share	28.9	40.7	20.5	50.8	-8.4	0.002
Openness of economy	96.6	60.4	98.9	60.1	2.3	0.572
Gallagher's disproportionality index	5.1	4.6	8.0	4.7	3.0	<0.001

Table A1: Balance table for Figure 1

Notes: The Table and Figure 1 are based on the following sample of countries: The sample of countries is: Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Chile, Sweden, Norway, Croatia, Japan, Mexico, Türkiye, Slovak Republic, Greece, Latvia, France, Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Korea, Netherlands, Canada, Slovenia, Finland, Switzerland, South Africa, Argentina, Australia, Germany, Belgium, Austria, Israel, Malta, New Zealand, Romania, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Hungary, Denmark, United Kingdom, Lithuania, and Portugal. The p-values are generated via a two-sample (Welch) t-test.

TBD: Reproduce main effect findings here and robustness.

## Additional figures

Climate policy adoption and stringency, in levels and growth rates, 1990 - 2022




Figure A1: Number of climate policies adopted by country-year

Notes: The Figure is based on the OECD's recently released CAPMF database (OECD, 2023; Nachtigall et al., 2024). The grey shaded area represents the time period of Finnegan's analysis. The red dotted lines capture the actual values, while the blue solid lines represent results from bivariate loess regressions with span 0.5. The theoretical range for the stringency variable is 0-10.




Figure A2: Adoption and stringency of climate policies by type of policy and country, 1990 – 2022

Notes: The Figure is based on the OECD's CAPMF database (OECD, 2023; Nachtigall et al., 2024). The values for adoption are re-scaled to the empirical range of the stringency variable to ensure that the heatmaps are comparable.






Figure A3: Adoption and mean stringency of cross-sectoral climate policies, 1990 – 2022

Notes: The Figure is based on the OECD's CAPMF database (OECD, 2023; Nachtigall et al., 2024).




Figure A4: Adoption and stringency of climate policies by sector and instrument type, 1990 – 2022

Notes: The Figure is based on the OECD's CAPMF database (OECD, 2023; Nachtigall et al., 2024). The dotted lines trace out the actual values, whereas the solid ones represent the results from bivariate loess regressions with span 0.5.