

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY:

SYMBOLIC AND SUBSTANTIVE COOPERATION

Magali Delmas*
Institute of the Environment & Anderson School of Management
University of California,
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1496
Tel: 310-825-9310
Fax: 310-825-9310
Email: delmas@ucla.edu

Maria J. Montes-Sancho
Department of Business Administration
Carlos III University
Madrid (Spain)
Tel: (+34) 91 624 8639
Fax: (+34) 91 624 96 07
Email: mmontes@emp.uc3m.es

Forthcoming *Strategic Management Journal*

* Corresponding author. We appreciate many insightful comments from Maria Alvarez-Gil, Manuel Bagues, Nicole Darnall, William Freudenburg, Andrew Hoffman, Madhu Khanna, Gary Libecap, Tom Lyon, Janice Mazurek, John Meyer, Charles Perrow, Woody Powell, Hayagreeva Rao, Jorge Rivera, Michael Russo, Jay Shimshack, James Westphal, Oran Young, our two anonymous reviewers, and our co-editor Edward Zajac. The authors acknowledge financial support from the following three sources: US Environmental Protection Agency Star Program grant #GR829687-01-0; the University of California, Santa Barbara; and the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science grant # SEJ2007-63996.

**VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS TO IMPROVE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY:
SYMBOLIC AND SUBSTANTIVE COOPERATION**

Abstract

Within the context of environmental voluntary agreements (VAs), this paper analyzes the determinants of the degree of participation by firms in collective corporate political strategies that aim to shape government policy. We demonstrate that substantive cooperative strategies are more likely to be pursued by firms that enter a VA close to its initiation, while symbolic cooperation is more likely behavior by late joiners. We show that late joiners and early joiners within VAs adopt different cooperative strategies because they face different institutional pressures. Our analysis is based on the strategies of firms participating in the Climate Challenge Program (1995-2000) established by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and representatives of the national electric utilities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Our results show that early joiners were subjected to higher levels of political pressure at the state level and were more dependent on local and federal regulatory agencies. They were also better connected to the trade association and more visible. Late joiners had undertaken significantly less investment in environmental improvements than early joiners. Our paper also illustrates the difficulty involved in using VAs to try to induce improved environmental outcomes when there are no sanctioning mechanisms. Although early entrants reduced their emissions more than non-participants, our results show no significant difference overall between participants and non-participants in the reduction of their emissions.

Keywords: Collective Action, Institutional Theory, Environmental Voluntary Agreements, Political Strategies, Non-Market Strategy, Climate Change.

INTRODUCTION

The corporate political strategy literature focuses on the strategies firms use to shape government policy (Baron, 1995; Baysinger, 1984; Hillman, Keim, and Schuler, 2004; Keim and Baysinger, 1988; Keim and Zeithaml, 1986). This line of research makes important strides toward explaining firms' rationales for developing political strategies (Baron, 2005; Hillman and Hitt, 1999). Scholars and practitioners take on the major task of determining the degree of participation of firms in corporate political strategies. Corporate political activity represents a classic problem of collective action because legislative and regulatory decisions affect all firms within the pertinent jurisdiction, even if they do so unevenly (Olson, 1965). Therefore, the benefits that firms seek from their corporate political activity will accrue, to some degree, to other firms regardless of each firm's contribution. Firms may be tempted because of this to behave opportunistically and free ride on the corporate political activity of others (Yoffie, 1987). This is particularly true for collective strategies that engage several firms (Hillman and Hitt, 1999). Due to this potential for opportunistic behavior, collective political strategies are risky. If too many firms free ride, the effectiveness of such a strategy might be undermined. It is important for both firms and policy-makers to assess the risks and to understand under what conditions collective strategies could be attractive options.

However, this has proven to be a difficult problem both theoretically and empirically (Schuler, 2002). One of the research challenges arises in assessing the degree of firms' contributions to political strategies when the strategies are carried out collectively via coalitions, partnerships, or through trade associations. Collective political action complicates the analysis of a single firm's political action because it is often difficult to identify each firm's contribution (King and Lenox, 2000; Schuler, 2002). Another complicating factor is the possible variation of individual contributions in substance and over time (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991). This paper helps to address these challenges with an analysis of the determinants of the

timing and the degree of firms' participation in collective political strategies related to the natural environment.

Our study focuses on collective corporate political strategies through environmental voluntary agreements (VAs) between firms and regulatory agencies. We examine the cooperative strategies of firms within the Climate Challenge Program, a VA established in 1995 by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and representatives of the national electric utilities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. VAs are designed to link private benefits with the voluntary provision of public goods. They provide an interesting case for the study of collective action mechanisms (Delmas and Terlaak, 2001). Participation in VAs, for example, can reduce the burden of regulation on firms in exchange for higher environmental performance (Lyon and Maxwell, 2004). The last decade has seen an increase in the use of these agreements as supplements to and sometimes replacements for traditional command-and-control regulation. More than 300 VAs are in place in the European Union (Borkey and Leveque, 1998), and around 200 have been launched in the United States (Darnall and Carmin, 2005). Concerns exist, however, that firms may enter these agreements and cooperate only symbolically rather than undertake substantive actions to reduce their impact on the environment (King and Lenox, 2000; Rivera and DeLeon, 2004). Because most VAs lack explicit measures to sanction firms that pursue only symbolic cooperative strategies or sometimes even to identify such firms, under what conditions would firms undertake substantive cooperation rather than symbolic cooperation?

The collective action literature suggests that selective private incentives are necessary to induce firms to participate voluntarily in cooperative arrangements that provide public goods (Olson, 1965). According to the collective action theory, however, members of groups or organizations face only two options: to free

ride or participate in cooperative arrangements (Olson, 1965). These options stem from the view of the larger dichotomous choice between “cooperation” and “no cooperation” as the only possibility when in reality cooperative behavior is more nuanced. This is because firms can adopt various levels of participation within collective action and also because behavior may change over time (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991; Yoffie, 1987). For example, firms may decide to participate in a collective strategy and undertake the full cost of participation, or they may decide to participate only symbolically, thereby incurring only part of the costs associated with cooperation. The collective action literature is therefore limited in its ability to identify the factors that trigger different types of collective cooperative behavior and how these evolve over time.

The institutional sociology literature provides a useful framework to complement collective action theory in order to understand the drivers of symbolic cooperative behavior. The institutional perspective has gained prominence in explaining the importance of social and cultural influences on strategic decisions (Ingram and Silverman, 2002). The institutional approach suggests that firms obtain legitimacy by conforming to the dominant practices within their organizational field (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott, 1992). In this area of research, studies consider symbolic management as a mechanism to enhance organizational legitimacy while leaving the internal organization largely unchanged (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). Legitimacy can thus be achieved by actions that appear to demonstrate compliance while they actually fail to comply with the stipulations of constituents of the institutional environment (Edelman, 1992; Elsbach and Sutton, 1992). Institutionalists contend that symbolic adoption, or decoupling of formal organizational structures from actual practices in the organization, is more likely in the presence of institutional pressures and when a practice is adopted for legitimacy rather than efficiency reasons (Fiss and Zajac, 2006; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Westphal and

Zajac, 2001). Such pressures can emanate from various constituents of the organizational field such as regulatory agencies or other firms that produce similar services or products (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Furthermore, the institutional theory literature links institutional pressures to symbolic behavior by showing that early and late adopters of technological and administrative innovations face differing levels of institutional pressure and that late adopters may be more prone to adopt symbolic behavior (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Tolbert and Zucker, 1983; Westphal and Zajac, 1994; Zajac and Westphal, 1995).

In this paper, we argue further that because early and late participants in collective political strategies face different institutional pressures and incentives, they are likely to adopt different types of cooperative behavior. Our study bridges the literature on corporate political strategies to the institutional literature. By focusing on how institutional mechanisms work to frame selective incentives, our study combines previously separate theoretical perspectives to provide an explanation of various firm behaviors within collective corporate actions, as well as how these vary over time. Our approach differs significantly from previous analyses and yields new findings on the effects of institutional pressures on corporate political strategies.

In our study, we find that substantive cooperation was more likely to be pursued by firms that entered the Climate Challenge Program close to its initiation while symbolic cooperation was more likely to be adopted by late joiners. Early joiners of the Climate Challenge Program reduced their emissions significantly more than non-participants while there was no significant difference between late joiners and non-participants. We argue that these differences in cooperative behavior can be explained by differences in levels of institutional pressures and by firms' ability to sustain collective action. Early joiners were subjected to stronger political, peer, and social pressures than late joiners, and they also had undertaken environmental efforts prior to their participation in the program. Through an analysis of levels of

cooperation within the Program, this study contributes to the corporate political strategy literature by expanding the understanding of symbolic participation within collective political strategies. Our analysis also shows how differences in firms' social context can explain differences in cooperative behavior within corporate political strategies.

The corporate political strategy literature provides many insights into the drivers of corporations' proactive political strategies such as the provision of financial support to political decision makers or political parties, information strategies toward government officials, and constituency-building strategies (Baron, 2005; Hillman and Hitt, 1999). The literature has barely begun, however, to investigate collective strategies such as cooperative arrangements that engage firms and regulatory agencies, and the pros and cons of such arrangements (Hillman et al., 2004). Voluntary corporate initiatives in the environmental arena in particular have become an important element in the mix of public policies and corporate strategies for managing industrial impacts on the environment, but considerable uncertainty exists concerning the effectiveness of voluntary programs relative to other policy instruments (Khanna and Brouhle, 2009). Because VAs are a relatively recent phenomenon, "there are relatively few empirical studies assessing the specific impacts of VAs on emissions reductions, compared to business-as-usual emissions abatement" (Baranzini and Thalmann, 2004: 28). Indeed, the analyses investigating whether firms participating in these programs actually meet the requirements of the programs are rare (Arora and Cason, 1996; Bjorner and Jensen, 2002; Khanna and Damon, 1999; King and Lenox, 2000; Rivera, 2002; Welch, Mazur, and Bretschneider, 2000). Most importantly, these studies seldom investigate differences in cooperative behavior within VAs, making it difficult to design VAs that maximize their potential for success.

In the section below, we review the institutional literature on symbolic management and institutional pressures. We follow with a review of environmental voluntary agreements and particularly the Climate

Challenge Program. We then develop our hypotheses concerning the factors that trigger differences in cooperative behaviors between early and late joiners. The third section explains the methodology and the results. A concluding discussion follows.

INSTITUTIONAL THEORY AND COLLECTIVE POLITICAL STRATEGIES

Building on collective action theory, the corporate political strategy literature argues that firms participate in collective corporate strategies primarily for material rewards rather than for the collective or public goods that are at issue (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991; Yoffie, 1987). For example, Lenway and Rehbein use a cost benefit framework to predict a firm's involvement (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991). Research of this kind has shown the primary motive for participation to be economic. The corporate political strategy literature has also identified how differences in national institutional environments across countries drive differences in firms' political action. This stream of research, however, still pays little attention to the social context in which firms operate and to the importance of changes over time (Bonardi and Keim, 2005; Hillman, 2003).

Other scholars have identified additional types of rewards for acting collectively. These can include social rewards (such as enhanced reputation) and purposive rewards (doing the right thing) (Wilson, 1973). For instance, firms acting collectively in the context of the natural environment want to convince regulators that their voluntary practices can be legitimately considered within a "generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definition" (Suchman, 1995: 574). Therefore, the rewards that firms are seeking may be influenced by the social context in which the collective action initiative is implemented, a context that may vary geographically and also over time. For example, regulators and

other organizations may consider voluntary activities more legitimate once they have diffused among a larger set of firms.

The institutional literature provides a complementary approach to collective action theory. It contributes to understanding how the social context shapes organizations' behavior and the dynamics of collective relationships. Institutional studies have found that firms might engage in symbolic management as a means of responding to social pressure and to improve their legitimacy (e.g., Edelman, 1992; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Westphal and Zajac, 1998, 2001). As Oliver (1991: 155) notes, "from an institutional perspective...the appearance rather than the fact of conformity is often presumed to be sufficient for the attainment of legitimacy." The institutional literature explains that the use of symbolic management increases with the strength of institutional pressures. Institutionalists have argued that early adopters and late adopters of management practices and technologies face different pressures from their institutional environment and therefore may implement the same practice for different reasons (Tolbert and Zucker, 1983; Westphal, Gulati, and Shortell, 1997). Using the case of the diffusion of civil service reform, Tolbert and Zucker demonstrate that first movers are mainly interested in the technical efficiency of a practice while followers are more subject to institutional pressure. They argue that first movers adopt management practices because "of real needs," while followers, in contrast, do not implement a practice because of its merits but because other organizations do. Westphal et al. also show that early adopters of total quality management practices in hospitals seek efficiency gains while later adopters aim at increasing their legitimacy (Westphal et al., 1997). Since institutionalists contend that decoupling is more likely when institutional forces are present and when a practice is adopted for legitimation reasons (Meyer and Rowan, 1977), it follows that late joiners may be more prone to symbolic cooperation (Westphal and Zajac, 1994; Zajac and Westphal, 1995). In the case of the adoption of the international total quality management

standard ISO 9000, it was found (Naveh, Marcus, and Moon, 2004) that first movers outperformed second movers because ISO 9000 conformed to the first movers' need for performance enhancement, while the second movers adopted ISO 9000 because of external pressure. From the evidence of our own study, we would clarify that early adopters are also motivated by social pressures since measures that improve performance and that are covered by a publicly promoted voluntary agreement could be adopted without participation in the agreement.

This paper combines corporate political strategy theory with institutional theory to test an empirical model of collective corporate political activity where private incentives are institutionally shaped. We argue that private incentives vary with the timing of joining collective corporate activity and that symbolic cooperation is more likely with late joiners than with early joiners of collective corporate political activity.

CORPORATE POLITICAL ACTIVITY THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

Environmental VAs are “collaborative arrangements between firms and regulators in which firms voluntarily commit to actions that improve the natural environment” (Delmas and Terlaak, 2001: 44). VAs vary in objectives and design and, as a result, offer different kinds of strategic opportunities for participating firms to influence political outcomes (Lyon and Maxwell, 2004). VAs can be designed to preempt regulation as a response to a regulatory threat, to provide flexibility in the implementation of existing regulation, and/or to influence the form of future regulation (Delmas and Marcus, 2004; Delmas and Terlaak, 2001; Maxwell and Decker, 1998; Segerson and Miceli, 1998). The Climate Challenge Program, created by the electric utility industry to pre-empt legislation relating to climate change, was a form of VA also known as a “negotiated agreement,” one typically negotiated by an industry trade association (Delmas and Terlaak, 2002; Maxwell, Lyon, and Hackett, 2000), and was therefore a type of

collective corporate political strategy. Another prominent example of a negotiated agreement, one outside the United States, is the German Declaration on Global Warming Prevention. In 1995, the major industry associations in Germany agreed to reduce CO₂ emissions as at 1990 levels by 20% by the year 2005. In return, the German government signaled that it would refrain from implementing an energy tax (BDI, 1996). Negotiated agreements have been adopted widely in Europe and Japan but to a lesser extent in the United States, where they represent an institutional change away from traditional command-and-control regulation, which has dominated U.S. environmental policy (Lyon and Maxwell, 2004; Delmas and Terlaak, 2002).¹

VAs represent proactive political strategies that are undertaken to shape and control the way that norms and public policies are defined (Oliver and Holzinger, 2008). They differ from other political strategies identified in the literature, such as information-based strategies, financial-incentives strategies, and constituency-building strategies (Hillman and Hitt, 1999). For example, although VAs might include an exchange of information between firms and regulators, this is not their main objective. VAs represent a quid pro quo where firms commit to provide a public good voluntarily in return for a potential private benefit. VAs also differ from self-regulation strategies in that the latter represent collective political strategies undertaken without government involvement (Bonardi and Keim, 2005; Delmas and Terlaak, 2001; King and Lenox, 2000). There are two different forms of cooperation at work concerning the formation and structure of VAs, the first of these forms among firms within the industry that jointly decide to reduce their environmental impact voluntarily. This type of cooperation is usually orchestrated by the

¹ For a literature review on voluntary agreements in Europe and in the United States see Delmas and Terlaak, 2002. See also Delmas and Marcus, 2004, for a comparison of the characteristics of voluntary agreements to those of command-and-control regulation.

trade association. The second form of cooperation occurs between firms and government where they agree on a mutually acceptable arrangement.

While all types of participation through a VA might have symbolic value, we argue that there are three main types of cooperation related to participation and VAs. First, firms participate and cooperate by improving their environmental performance. In undertaking actions to improve their environmental performance, these participating firms must accomplish organizational or technological changes that could lead to such improvement. Thus, for these firms, participation in a VA is coupled with practical changes at the operational level. We refer to this type of participation as substantive cooperation. Second, firms can refuse to participate in the collective activity and free ride on the behavior of other members of the industry who participate fully in the VA. Although the literature has focused mostly on these two options, we argue that there is a third: participation in a VA without substantive implementation of the VA's requirements. Firms might in this way enter into the agreement but not actually improve their environmental performance. In this sense, participation in VAs may be *only* symbolic as firms decouple their practical actions from formal organizational structures in which they participate (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). Consequently, we refer to participation in a VA without performance improvement as symbolic cooperation.

THE CLIMATE CHALLENGE PROGRAM

The Climate Challenge Program was a VA between the U.S. DOE and electric utility industry representatives to reduce, avoid, or sequester greenhouse gas emissions through voluntary commitment.² The Program was initiated just after President Clinton's 1993 launch of the Climate Change Action Plan in

² The industry representatives were Edison Electric Institute, American Public Power Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Large Public Power Council and Tennessee Valley Authority.

which he announced the nation's commitment to reducing U.S. emissions of greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by the year 2000. At the time, the Clinton Administration was investigating the possibility of implementing a "tradable credit" system in which firms that exceeded the limits, or "caps," on emissions could buy emissions credits from entities that were able to stay below their designated limits. As they were among the leading generators of greenhouse gases in the United States, electric utilities were particularly worried about the possibility of new regulations being implemented.³ The Climate Challenge Program was clearly an attempt by the industry to promote voluntary approaches and negate the need for future greenhouse gas regulations. The Edison Electric Institute, the trade association for U.S. shareholder-owned electric companies, was instrumental in the creation of the Program, aiming to demonstrate that emissions reductions could be achieved voluntarily rather than through mandated regulation. Tom Kuhn, president of the Edison Electric Institute, made this clear in a statement to the press one year after the start of the Program:

"Our industry has demonstrated that a vigorous, voluntary approach toward curbing greenhouse gas emissions is the way to go. We will continue to put these programs in place while opposing government and international mandates that would cost the U.S. economy thousands of jobs. Utilities have met the challenge and are continuing their leadership role in working with the Government to find creative and effective ways to improve the environment."⁴

The U.S. DOE also explicitly stated on the Climate Challenge website that "an effective voluntary effort may negate the need for legislation or regulation" and that "emission reductions could possibly be used for

³ About 40.5% of the U.S. CO₂ emissions were attributed to the combustion of fossil fuels for the generation of electricity in 1998 (DOE/EIA-0573[98], 1999).

⁴ Newswire Association, 1996, "U.S. Electric Utility companies are not waiting to reduce greenhouse gas emissions," April 12, 1996, Financial News.

‘credit’ against future mandatory requirements.”⁵ It was clear, then, that the primary goal of utilities that participated in the establishment of the Program was to legitimize voluntary practices in order to avoid regulation.

The Climate Challenge Program consisted of a general Memorandum of Understanding signed by the national electric trade organizations and the DOE on Earth Day 1994, and individual agreements signed by the utilities between 1995 and 1999. In these agreements, each participating firm committed to (a) reduce, avoid, or sequester greenhouse gas emissions; (b) report annually its achievement and activities; and (c) confer periodically with the DOE over evaluations of its progress and discussions of the adjustment. Each participating firm had to establish the level and detail of its commitment to be reached by the year 2000. Such commitments included improving generation efficiency, switching fuels to lessen the use of carbon fuels such as natural gas, and increasing generation using non-carbon sources such as renewable energy and nuclear power. By 2000, at the end of the Program, 124 participation agreements had been signed. The signatories represented approximately 60% of the 1990 U.S. electric utility generation and utility carbon emissions (DOE/FE0355, 1996).

There were no direct sanctions for firms that did not participate in the Program or that participated only symbolically. Even though each participating utility was subject to requirements to provide information about its greenhouse gas emissions, no limits were set on such emissions. Although the DOE reviewed the participants’ annual self-reported information during the course of the Program, no penalties were imposed on firms that did not meet their commitments. Furthermore, the initial Memorandum of Understanding

⁵ See http://www.climatevision.gov/climate_challenge/factsheet.htm last accessed in March 2006.

stated that utilities would be allowed to quit the Program whenever they chose “without penalty and without being subject to remedies at law or equity.”⁶

The Climate Challenge Program exhibits features that make it particularly appealing in the study of differences over time in cooperative strategies among participants and between participants and non-participants. The Program permitted firms to enter the VA at various dates during its operation. Early joiners enrolled in the Program during the official ceremony organized in March 1995 by the DOE. These firms participated in the design of the program. Late participants enrolled in the Program at a later date, after the official ceremony. This was a high visibility event involving high level officials such as Al Gore that concluded more than a year of active negotiations between the industry and the DOE concerning the rules of the Climate Challenge Program. Utilities that signed the agreement after the official ceremony did not participate in the initial setting up and configuration of the Program. This allows us to compare the cooperative behavior of early and late joiners. Furthermore, approximately half of the investor-owned electric utilities joined the Program. This enables a comparison of cooperative behavior between participants and non-participants. Finally, because no clear sanctions were associated with partial or no implementation of the requirements of the program, this particular setting did not encourage tight coupling between firms’ participation and the reduction of their emissions. As a result, this program was likely to exhibit symbolic cooperation. Joining without actual implementation could thus be seen as a relatively inexpensive way to acquire legitimacy in the environmental arena.

Welch et al. (2000) evaluated the effectiveness of the Climate Challenge Program during its early years. According to their results, participating firms did not reduce their emissions significantly more than non-participants during the 1995-1997 period. The authors warn that these results have to be viewed with

⁶ See http://www.climatevision.gov/climate_challenge/cc_accordxNSTATESP.htm

caution because they are based on a study of only the first two years of the Program and include only the top 50 utilities east of the Rocky Mountains. In contrast, our study focuses on the entire life of the Program, through the year 2000, allowing us not only to assess differences between late and early joiners, but also to consider a longer time period when evaluating the results of firms' CO₂ reduction efforts. In addition, we include a larger and more representative sample of firms (132 utilities), incorporating more variability in firm characteristics. The firms in our sample produced 61% of the U.S. electricity generated from 1995 to 2000. Moreover, we reviewed the overall effectiveness of the Climate Challenge Program and aimed to understand which firms within the Program behaved symbolically and which ones undertook substantive cooperation.

HYPOTHESES

Building on the literature of institutional theory and of corporate political strategy, we develop hypotheses to explain substantive and symbolic collective corporate political strategy. We argue that first movers and late joiners face different institutional pressures that influence the type of cooperative behavior they will pursue within VAs. We first develop hypotheses on the institutional pressures that drove a firm's decision to participate early in the Climate Change Program, to participate late, or to remain a non-participant. We focus on the two major constituents of the institutional environment of utilities, namely the government and the industry association, and on how the utilities' relationship with these prior to the Program can explain collective cooperative behavior. We subsequently develop hypotheses based on firms' visibility, their resources and their ability to sustain collective action. Finally, we examine the potential for positive findings on our hypotheses to predict when substantive participation and symbolic participation may occur during the life of a VA.

Political pressure

Even though the creation of a VA might help an entire industry avoid potential future regulations, not all firms will experience the same level of threat from such potential regulations and therefore nor will they experience the same benefits from pre-empting regulation. The corporate political activity literature shows that firms' incentives to undertake corporate political activity vary according to the national regulatory environment in which they operate (Hillman, 2003; Hillman and Wan, 2005; Murtha and Lenway, 1994). Within a single country, states and smaller areas with governmental authority issue different rules and regulations. We argue that differences in sub-national politics will affect the likelihood that firms will undertake corporate political activity at the national level. In the U.S. context, environmental legislation at the federal level is usually implemented by states. For example, the Federal Clean Air Act enacted in 1963 is a federal law covering the entire country. However, state and local governments play an important role in its implementation through their own regulations and standards.⁷ As a result, firms face a complex set of regulations, which vary state by state. Firms located in states with more stringent regulations will thus be under more pressure to undertake reductions in emissions, and will have more incentive to participate in corporate political strategies. A program that demonstrates the effectiveness of voluntary practices at the national level could also help influence future regulation at the state level.

Furthermore, in a federal context, firms may try to influence state congressional representatives by participating in VAs. These representatives may pay more attention to strategies undertaken by companies in their district. When congressional representatives are more prone to vote positively on more stringent environmental regulation, firms have more incentives to show them that improved environmental performance can be achieved voluntarily.

⁷ States must develop implementation plans to enforce the Clean Air Act. A state implementation plan is a collection of the regulations used by a state in cleaning up polluted areas.

We argue that firms subjected to greater institutional pressure through political mechanisms were more likely to have participated in the early stages of the Climate Challenge Program. Timing is important for firms subjected to a great deal of political pressure. They need to move as early as possible to pre-empt the evolution of the political issue at stake into a potentially more costly regulation (Baron, 2003; Bonardi and Keim, 2005). This is because it is usually more difficult for firms to advance their agendas once issues have become widely salient (Bonardi and Keim, 2005). In summary, firms subjected to greater levels of political pressure within the state in which they operated were more likely to be early joiners of the Climate Challenge Program than firms that did not face such levels of pressure. It follows that firms operating in states with lower levels of political pressure would not have experienced the same desire to participate in a program at its initiation, and would have been more likely to wait and see what others did.

We therefore hypothesize as follows:

Hypothesis 1. Political pressure had a significant positive impact on the participation of early joiners in the Climate Challenge Program in comparison with non-participants and late joiners.

Links with the industry association

Scholars have shown that the structure of communication networks influences the order in which potential adopters receive information about innovations and therefore the order in which they adopt them (Abrahamson and Rosenkopf, 1997; Westphal et al., 1997). For example, Westphal et al. (1997) show that in the earlier stages of the diffusion process, communication ties may help match innovations to organizations' unique efficiency needs. Trade associations have been shown to play a central role in facilitating the emergence of corporate political strategies (King and Lenox, 2000), since they constitute industry networks that provide a central forum for communication about political issues at stake (Gupta and Lad, 1983; Rees, 1997). For example, Gupta and Lad showed how trade associations can play a

fundamental role in the collection and diffusion of information about the industry and its economic and regulatory environment (Gupta and Lad, 1983). Firms participating in a trade association are therefore more informed about the impact of potential regulations on their activities than firms that do not participate in the association. They are also more likely to be informed about the negotiations that lead to the creation of a VA.

Firms participating in a trade association are also more likely to be exposed to normative pressure exerted by their peers as divergence of opinion may be more difficult in a context of continuous relations. Trade associations employ a variety of informal mechanisms to encourage compliance with their own program requirements (Lenox and Nash, 2003). Lenox and Nash describe how a number of trade associations convene meetings to share implementation experiences among members and how such meetings impose pressure on managers of firms that are falling behind (Lenox and Nash, 2003).

Furthermore, because firms pay significant fees to join a trade association, firms that choose to join may do so because they agree with the policy of the association. Firms that are part of a trade association are therefore more likely to be the first participants in an action initiated by the association. We therefore propose the following:

Hypothesis 2. Early participants in the Climate Challenge Program were more likely to be members of the industry trade association than were late joiners and non-participants.

Firm's visibility

Visibility affects the level of social pressure to which a firm is subjected (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). Constituents of an institutional environment are more likely to take interest in an organization of which they are aware. For example, a dominant firm with a large market share will most likely be under the spotlight of environmental activists and the community where it operates concerning its environmental

efforts. Such exposure to a higher level of scrutiny from external constituents of firms' institutional environment explains why visibility has been shown to be an antecedent of organizational behavior (Fiss and Zajac, 2006; Oliver, 1991). Research has noted also that more visible firms are more likely to be the target of activism (Meznar and Nigh, 1995) and to participate in collective action (King and Lenox, 2000). These firms, therefore, have more to gain from participating in a VA than less visible firms, and it is likely that they participate in the creation of the VA to increase their legitimacy with constituents of the institutional environment.

Hypothesis 3: The greater the firm's visibility, the more likely is the firm to join the Climate Challenge Program early.

Firms' resources - previous environmental investment

Firms' resources and the ability of a firm to sustain the cost of collective action have been shown to be important explanatory factors in firms' involvement in such action (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991; Meznar and Nigh, 1995; Schuler and Rehbein, 1997). There are two competing arguments about the relationship between resources and firms' involvement in collective corporate political actions such as VAs: first, that firms with a high level of resources or slack resources will be able to afford political action; second, that firms with fewer resources will seek a political solution to their limited resources.

In the case of the Climate Challenge Program, the levels of investment in environmental performance improvements prior to the initiation of the VA may have affected the potential benefits of participating in a voluntary program. "Greener" firms, ones that have already invested in reducing their environmental impact before the initiation of a related VA, could be more likely to join one provided that it gave credit for their earlier efforts. On the other hand, "brownier" firms, those that have not invested in reducing their environmental impact prior to a VA, may use the agreement to improve their reputation as they need such

improvement more than the others. Because there are rationales for both greener and browner firms to join a VA, the empirical evidence is mixed. One set of empirical studies shows that firms with larger percentages of emission reductions prior to making their participation decisions were more likely to participate in voluntary activities, mainly to publicize their efforts (Arora and Cason, 1996; Bansal and Hunter, 2003; Khanna and Damon, 1999). In contrast, other studies show that firms with a lower environmental performance are more likely to undertake voluntary activities, largely because they are under more pressure to do so (Konar and Cohen, 1997; Videras and Alberini, 2000). We argue below that both greener and browner firms had incentives to participate in the Climate Change Program but as affected by circumstances that varied over time.

Companies that have taken early steps on voluntary reductions of their emissions may find it advantageous to compel other, less committed competitors to follow suit (Hoffman, 2005). Scholars have suggested that chemical companies that had undertaken investments in safety and environmental improvements were behind the origin of the industry program Responsible Care, and that these companies, among other things, hoped to impose a cost on their competitors (King and Lenox, 2000; Reinhardt, 2000). In addition, in the case of the Climate Challenge Program, the DOE suggested that participating firms could potentially get future “credits” for their emissions reductions in the event that a tradable permit system were put into place. This provided an incentive for greener firms to participate, and to put their efforts on the record as soon as possible. Assuming that a future regulatory target would require a firm to reduce its emissions by a percentage from some base year, firms that acted early to reduce CO₂ yet failed to register those reductions early under a voluntary scheme were in danger of being penalized.⁸ In summary, firms that have already

⁸ “Baseline protection” is the term of used by firms and regulators to describe this phenomenon.

started efforts to reduce their emissions are more likely to benefit from a program that gives them credit for their past experience, regardless of what other firms contribute.

In such a context, it seems logical that firms that have not yet undertaken efforts to reduce their emissions would resist the costs associated with initiating such a program. However, such firms could still benefit from participating in a program if it allowed them to be associated with greener firms. Researchers have highlighted how the nature of early adopters of a technology or a management practice can impact future adoption (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Rosenkopf and Abrahamson, 1999). In particular, Rosenkopf and Abrahamson show that initial adopters with good reputations can pressure other organizations to adopt a practice (Rosenkopf and Abrahamson, 1999). Pressure may not be needed, however, because followers might want to be associated with “high-quality” first adopters to increase their external legitimacy. While late joiners may not have been subjected to the same political pressure to participate in a VA as early joiners, as time passes non-participants could become singled out as the black sheep of the industry, especially if their environmental performance is poorer. This situation arose with the Climate Challenge Program when non-participant firms were identified by some NGOs as bad performers. For example, nine months after the creation of the Program and the main meeting where the majority of participants agreed to participate, a report by the Council on Economic Priorities, a non-profit organization, put the utility Virginia Power on a list of the nation's worst polluters for “failing to participate in the U.S. Dept. of Energy's Climate Challenge Program for reducing greenhouse gases, and for Virginia Power's lack of a formal environmental policy.”⁹

⁹ Southeast Power Report (1995): “Southern Company, Dominion Resources Dismiss ‘Worst Polluter Allegations’” Dec. McGraw-Hill, Inc: 13.

We hypothesize, therefore, that the level of environmental effort undertaken by a firm prior to the start of the Climate Challenge Program influenced not only the firm's participation decision but also the timing of its participation. While firms that undertook environmental efforts prior to the creation of the Program had incentives to participate early to influence competition, the incentives for firms that had not yet undertaken such efforts became stronger for late joiners after a "critical mass" of participants had joined. This leads us to propose:

Hypothesis 4. Early joiners of the Climate Challenge Program were more likely than late joiners and non-participants to have undertaken efforts to reduce their emissions prior to the start of the Program.

Substantive versus symbolic cooperation

Because early and late joiners' incentives are shaped by different institutional pressures, we argue that early joiners are more likely to undertake substantive actions to reduce their environmental impact and that late joiners are more likely to participate only symbolically in a program.

First, greater political pressure, strong trade association connections, and higher visibility put early joiners under more scrutiny than late joiners. As research shows, firms with different levels of visibility are likely to frame strategic change differently and to adopt different levels of implementation of management practices (Fiss and Zajac, 2006). Such scrutiny increases the likelihood that performance might be checked by regulators or environmental NGOs. Additionally, if early joiners wish to bring others into their collective action, they need to provide evidence to their competitors that they are undertaking substantive action in order for their claim of reducing their emissions to be credible.

Second, late joiners, because they don't feel as much pressure as early joiners, may just continue their course without making much change to their practices. Because they have not yet begun the process of emissions reductions, late joiners have to undertake more drastic transformations since initial steps

typically require the most investment, changes in procedures, etc. (Darnall and Edwards, 2006). This can lead to path dependency in a continuation of established practices that avoid the costs and changes that would arise with full commitment to the collective strategy. Similar behavior was observed in other VAs where firms that joined late did not follow up with actions related to the agreement (Delmas and Keller, 2004).

Of course this is possible in a context that facilitates decoupling where late joiners perceive that the risks associated with symbolic participation are small. Joining after the announced success of a program, a firm may not fear damaging the reputation of the program or being singled out. In the case of the Climate Challenge Program, for example, the DOE announced in October 1996 that the electric utilities participating in the Program had committed to reduce, avoid, or sequester more than 44 million metric tons of carbon equivalent by the year 2000. This represented almost half (45%) of the total cuts that the United States pledged at the world environmental summit in 1992 (DOE/FE0355, 1996). It is therefore possible that companies joining a program after such a point might have believed the program was already successful and that their lack of contribution would not endanger the program's perceived effectiveness. In addition, media attention to a VA may decline over time to focus on other issues (Hoffman, 1999). Later joiners may therefore be under less scrutiny than early joiners.

In summary, because early and late joiners faced different incentives and pressures, and because the Climate Challenge Program did not encourage tight coupling, it could be expected that they would adopt different cooperative behaviors within the VA. Specifically in relation to the Climate Change Program, we hypothesize as follows:

Hypothesis 5. Late joiners were more likely to cooperate only symbolically while early joiners were more likely to cooperate substantively within the Climate Change Program.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

To test our hypotheses, we collected data from a number of sources. From the DOE, we used the Climate Challenge “participation accords” and “letters of commitment” to identify participating firms.¹⁰ We also used data on utilities’ characteristics and environmental performance from the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Form Number 1 (U.S. DOE, FERC Form 1),¹¹ from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (Forms EIA-860, EIA-861, and EIA-906), and from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Market Program’s website.¹² After merging the related databases, we retained 132 major investor-owned electric utilities representing 61% of the total U.S. electricity production by utilities from 1995-2000 and 75% of the CO₂ emitted by the electricity sector during that period. We focus on large investor-owned firms because these companies represent the majority of industry electricity and pollution generation. These are the biggest and more visible electric utilities. The results of our analysis should be extrapolated to smaller firms with a degree of caution.

Estimated model and dependent variables

Our goal was to understand the factors that explain utilities’ participation in the Program and to assess their performance outcomes. The decision to participate in the Climate Challenge Program and the performance results were likely to be influenced by the same factors (Anton, Deltas, and Khanna, 2004; Khanna and Damon, 1999). To compare emissions outcomes between participants and non-participants of the

¹⁰ Utilities with more than 50,000 customers developed individual participation accords while those with fewer than 50,000 customers submitted letters of commitment. See http://www.climatevision.gov/climate_challenge/cc_accords.htm

¹¹ The Form No. 1 is a comprehensive operating Report for Electric Rate regulation and financial audits. Major is defined as (a) one million megawatt hours or more; (b) 100 megawatt hours of annual sales for resale; (c) 500 megawatt hours of annual power exchange delivered; or (d) 500 megawatt hours of annual wheeling for others (deliveries plus losses).

¹² Utilities that report to the Clean Air Market are those that have power generating units with nameplate capacity 25 megawatt or more and those with new units that began commercial operation on or after November 15, 1990.

Program, and thus to isolate the effect of participation in a VA on environmental performance, we needed to correct for a potential endogeneity problem (Hartman, 1988; Heckman, 1978, 1979; Maddala, 1983). We therefore used a two-stage estimation model that identifies simultaneously the outcome of program participation (here, CO₂ emission per unit of electricity produced) and the determinants of a firm's participation decision to address this issue (Khanna and Damon, 1999; King and Lenox, 2000; Rivera, 2002; Welch et al., 2000).

The other empirical challenge that we took on and that differed from previous studies concerned our desire, using the first-stage equation, to explain not only the probability of participation in the VA, but also to differentiate between early and late joiners. Because we wanted to understand differences among various types of participants, we modified the traditional first-stage equation to predict the likelihood that a firm would be a non-participant, a late joiner, or an early joiner. In the second stage, we used the predicted values of these various types of participants to test how voluntary cooperative strategies contributed to pollution reduction.

In the *first stage regression*, we predict participation in the VA using two models. First a binary logit model predicts participation in the Climate Challenge Program and second a multinomial logit model predicts the types of participant representing three groups: (1) non-participant, (2) late joiner and (3) early joiner. Both models are estimated by maximum likelihood (Greene, 2008).

Participation. This binary variable represents the decision of a firm to participate in the Climate Challenge Program. It takes a value equal to 1 the year of enrollment and the following years and 0 otherwise. The Climate Challenge participation agreements were used to identify participants and non-participants and the year of enrollment in the Program. These were accessed through the DOE's website. We use this measure as a dependent variable in the binary logit model for the first stage regression (Model

1a). The binary logit model provides an estimation of the likelihood that a given electric utility would participate in the Program. This model allows us to analyze the aggregate effectiveness of the Program in the second stage regression.

The participation model in the binary logit model is specified as follows (first stage):

$$\text{Pr ob}(\text{Participation}_{i,t} = 1) = F(Z_{i,t-1}'\beta) \quad (\text{Model 1a})$$

where *Participation* is the binary dependent variable of this first stage, $Z_{i,t-1}$ is the set of exogenous independent variables, and F is the cumulative logistic distribution $F(x) = e^x / (1 + e^x) = 1 / (1 + e^{-x})$.

Type of participant. This categorical variable represents the type of participant within the Climate Challenge Program. Early participants were those that enrolled in the Program during the official ceremony organized in March 1995 by the DOE, and late participants were those that enrolled in the Program at a later date (end of 1995 to end of 1998). The official ceremony of March 1995 was a high-visibility event involving high-level officials, such as the U.S. Vice President, Al Gore. It marked the conclusion of more than a year of active negotiations between the industry and the DOE concerning the general “rules” of the Climate Challenge Memorandum of Understanding as well as the specific items included in each signed agreement. The utilities that we designate early adopters were active agents in these negotiations. After the Memorandum was agreed, the DOE and each participant began work on the corresponding individual agreements. The DOE and the utilities that we identify as early adopters signed the agreements in the March 1995 official ceremony. Utilities that signed the agreement after the official ceremony, when the program was established and publicized outside of the industry, did not participate in the initial setting and configuration of the program. We created a categorical variable and coded non-

participants as 1, late joiners as 2, and early joiners as 3.¹³ This measure is used as a dependent variable in the multinomial logit model for the first stage regression (Model 2a). The multinomial logit model provides an estimation of the likelihood that a given electric utility would join the Program late or early. This model allows us to compare the effectiveness of different types of participants. Multinomial logit handles non-independence of these groups by estimating the models for all outcomes simultaneously, using one group as a baseline.

The participation model in the multinomial logit model is specified as follows (first stage):

$$\text{Pr ob (Types of Participant}_{i,t} = j) = \frac{e^{Z_{i,t-1}'\beta^{(j)}}}{\sum_{j=1}^J e^{Z_{i,t-1}'\beta^{(j)}}} \quad (\text{Model 2a})$$

where *Type of Participant* is the categorical dependent variable of this first stage and takes a value of 1 to 3 (i.e. $j = 1, \dots, 3$), depending on the firm's group and $Z_{i,t-1}$ is the set of exogenous independent variables.

In the *second stage regression*, we use the predicted values of participation and the types of participant to test whether they explained reductions in emissions.

CO₂ emission per unit of electricity produced. We assess the outcome of the Climate Challenge Program in terms of utilities' emissions from 1996 through 2000. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reports under the Clean Air Market Program the amount of CO₂ emissions for each utility. We divide this by the amount of net generation in MWh reported on Form EIA-906.

$$\text{CO2 rate}_{i,t} = \left(\frac{\text{CO2 emissions}_{i,t}}{\text{Generation}_{i,t}} \right)$$

¹³ Of the 124 agreements signed with the DOE, seven agreements were signed at the end of 1995, one agreement in 1996, eight in 1997, and two in 1998. One agreement can represent several firms because they can be signed at the holding company level.

This variable is normally distributed; we therefore use pooled regression (Model 1b and Model 2b) and random-effect general least squares (GLS) panel regression (Model 1c and Model 2c).

The formulations using this variable are the following (second stage):

$$\text{CO2 rate}_i = \delta \text{ Participation}_i + X_i' \gamma + \varepsilon_i \quad (\text{Model 1b and Model 1c})$$

$$\text{CO2 rate}_i = \alpha \text{ Late joiners} + \eta \text{ Early joiners} + X_i' \gamma + \varepsilon_i \quad (\text{Model 2b and Model 2c})$$

where the variable CO₂ rate is the dependent variable that we use to measure the outcome of the Climate Challenge Program. *Participation_i* is the predicted probability of participation in the Program obtained in the first stage using binary logit, and *X_i* is a set of control variables that could also explain reduction in CO₂ emission. The predicted probabilities for each group defined in the type of participant from the multinomial logit are *late joiners* and *early joiners*. The category of *non-participant* is the baseline.

Independent and control variables in the first stage

The Climate Challenge Program started in 1995 and ended in 2000 but firms could only enroll until 1999. In the first stage, we examine the factors that explain the utilities' participation in the Program using the independent variables with 1 year lagged to avoid reverse causality. Therefore, the independent variables used in the first stage are data from 1994 until 1998. We use several measures as proxy for political pressure. The first is a measure stemming from political/legislative actors in the form of the voting record of the congressional delegation (members of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives) of the state in which each firm operates. The second measure represents a proxy of the state resources allocated to the environment as measured by the environmental agency employment relative to the total number of the state's employees. The third represents the regulatory expenses of the utility.

League of Conservation Voters. Several researchers have used the scores of the League of Conservation Voters as a measure of the elected representatives' preferences of a state (Delmas, Russo and Montes-Sancho, 2007; Hamilton, 1997; Kassinis and Vafeas, 2002, 2006; Lubell, Schneider, Scholz, and Mete, 2002; Viscusi and Hamilton, 1999). Each year, the League of Conservative Voters selects environmental issues to constitute an "environmental agenda" with a panel comprising the main U.S. environmental groups. The organization then creates an index by counting the number of times each representative or senator in Congress votes favorably on the environmental agenda (e.g., on the global warning gag rule, tropical forest conservation, or global climate change). The index ranges from 0 to 100, with 100 representing a record of voting for the environmental agenda in all cases. The variable is the average of the environmental scores of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. senators of the states where each utility operated (Kahn, 2002), weighted by the percentage of generation of each firm in each state for multi-state utilities.

State environmental employees. Following Kassinis and Vafeas (2006), we measure a state's long-term commitment to the environment through its investment in people as a ratio of the state's environmental agency employment to the total number of the state's employees. This method approximates the state's commitment to environmental protection and its institutional capacity to support its commitment. We collected the data on states' environmental agency employees from the Environmental Council of the States, a national, nonprofit, nonpartisan association of states and territorial environmental commissioners, and obtained the total number of state employees from the U.S. Census Bureau.

Regulatory expenses. Firm-specific characteristics might tend to make a firm subject to greater levels of political pressure (Bansal, 2005). For example, some firms may be temporarily or permanently more dependent than others on governments to obtain licenses to operate. In the electric utility sector, this may

happen when firms are undergoing rate changes or when they want to bring new plants online (Bonardi, Holburn, and Vanden Bergh, 2006). Following Welch et al. (2000), we include the annual amount of regulatory expenses paid by the firm as a proxy of regulatory agency pressure. The data came from the FERC Form Number 1, and report particulars of regulatory commission expenses incurred relating to prepared cases that were submitted to a regulatory body, or cases to which such a body was party. It includes, for example, fees paid to the FERC or the costs of dockets.

Trade association membership. We measure the links between utilities and their trade association using membership of the Edison Electric Institute. Created in 1933, the Edison Electric Institute is the association of U.S. shareholder-owned electric companies. Its members serve 71% of end-use customers in the United States, and generate almost 60% of the electricity produced by U.S. electric generators. The Edison Electric Institute works closely with all its members, representing their interests and advocating equitable policies in legislative and regulatory arenas. We created an indicator in which a utility that is a member of the trade association takes the value 1 and 0 otherwise.

Big player. To provide a proxy for visibility we follow Delmas and Tokat (2005), and note whether a firm was among the top four sellers in a state in any of the residential, commercial, or industrial markets. For each year and state, we identify which firms were among the four big players in their states using the retail sales reported on Form EIA-861, assigning the value 1 when the firm was a big player and 0 otherwise.

Air pollution controls. We include a measure of a firm's environmental efforts related to air pollution. The variable air pollution controls reflects the investments undertaken for the reduction, prevention, or abatement of any adverse impact of an activity on the environment reported under the category of "air pollution control facility." Data were obtained from the FERC Form Number 1 and include the following categories: (a) scrubbers, precipitators, tall smokestacks, etc.; (b) changes necessary to accommodate use

of environmentally clean fuels such as low-ash or low-sulfur fuels, including storage and handling equipment; (c) monitoring equipment; and (d) other.

In the first stage, we also control for variables that may affect the probability of a firm being an early or late joiner. These include the level of pollution in the state, a proxy for the environmental preference in the state, the percentage of generation from fossil fuel, the productive efficiency of the firm, the size of the firm as measured by its number of subsidiaries, and year effects.

State pollution. Firms located in states with higher levels of pollution might be subjected to greater scrutiny by and pressure from environmental NGOs to undertake some action to reduce CO₂ emissions and to participate in the Program. We base the measure of pollution on a state's toxic emissions (the total amount of on- and off-site toxic release) for all sectors (Delmas *et al.*, 2007; Kassinis and Vafeas, 2002; King and Lenox, 2000). We collected this information from the EPA's Toxics Release Inventory database. The figure for total emissions is divided by the state's land area. We construct a firm-level measure weighting this ratio by the percent of electricity generated by the utility in each state and year.

Sierra Club. In line with previous studies (e.g., Helland, 1998; Kassinis and Vafeas, 2002; Maxwell *et al.*, 2000; Riddell, 2003), we measure the environmental preferences of the population of the state in which a firm operates based on membership figures for one of the major environmental non-governmental organizations, the Sierra Club. The measure itself is the number of dues-paying Sierra Club members per 1,000 state residents.

Productive efficiency. The ability to produce electricity efficiently has an important impact on a utility's profitability and environmental performance (Delmas and Tokat, 2005; Delmas *et al.*, 2007). We estimate productive efficiency using Data Envelopment Analysis (Banker, Charnes, and Cooper, 1984; Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes, 1978). The Data Envelopment Analysis technique uses linear programming to

convert multiple input and output measures into a single measure of relative efficiency for each observation. Our construction of the measure of productive efficiency is derived from the work of Delmas and Tokat (2005). Data came from the FERC Form Number 1 (U.S. DOE, FERC Form 1, 1994-1998). The productive efficiency of a firm in a specific year is computed by comparing it with all other firms in the same year, using a program written by Coelli (1996). We use the following items as *inputs*: labor cost; plant value; production expenses; transmission expenses; distribution expenses; sales, administrative, and general expenses; and electricity purchased from other sources in megawatt hours (MWh) (Majumdar and Marcus, 2001). We consider the following *outputs*: quantities of low-voltage sales (residential and commercial); high-voltage sales (industrial, interchanges out, and wheeling delivered); and electricity for resale to other utilities in MWh (Roberts, 1986; Thompson, 1997).

Percentage of generation from fossil fuel. The type of technology a firm uses for generating electricity might explain its environmental strategies and emission levels (Delmas *et al.*, 2007). Firms that generate electricity from fossil fuels, especially coal, are exposed to a higher level of pressure and scrutiny due their emissions than those that use renewable resources. To account for these differences, and following Welch *et al.* (2000), we utilize the percentage of generation from fossil fuel using data from Form EIA-906.

Number of subsidiaries. The size of a company has been used as one of the main predictors of participation in political activity (Hillman *et al.*, 2004). Size is often a proxy for the availability of resources within a firm but also of the ability of a firm to affect the results of collective action. As a proxy for the size of a utility, we include the number of subsidiaries that belong to a firm as taken from the FERC Form Number 1.

Year effects. We include dummy variables for the years 1996 to 1999 in the first stage model. We omitted the 1995 dummy to avoid overdetermination.

Independent and control variables in the second stage

In the second stage, in addition to the predicted probability of participation in the Climate Challenge Program, we include variables that could also explain changes in CO₂ emission during the 1996-2000 timeframe. This includes the variables *Air pollution controls* and *Percentage of generation from fossil fuel* from the first stage.

Year of installation of the generating units. The age of generating units could have an impact on CO₂ emission as it is associated with technology and the capacity to be clean. We compute the average of the years of the installation of all the generating units that belong to a utility. Form EIA-860 reports the year of installation at the facility level. We aggregate this information at the firm level based on the percentage of ownership reported in the same database.

Number of plants. The amount of a firm's emission might be related to the number of plants under its operation. We compute the number of plants under the ownership of a firm using data from Form EIA 906.

Merger process with gas or electric utilities. We also control for the effects of merger activity that occurred during the course of the Climate Challenge Program. From 1995 to 2000, 36 mergers or acquisitions were completed between investor-owned electric utilities or between investor-owned electric utilities and independent power producers (U.S. DOE, 2000). We take into account whether an electric utility was merging with one or more other electric power producers or gas producers (Delmas and Tokat, 2005; Delmas *et al.*, 2007). During the merger process, there can be changes in the structure of a firm. For example, firms could decide to downsize the labor force, adopt similar technologies in the merged facilities, or retire some facilities. During this adjustment period, it is possible a firm will pay less attention to environmental performance, and pollute more. If the utility or its holding company went through a

merger process, then the indicator is 1 for the year before and continuing until the year after the merger is completed.

Information disclosure. The level of environmental information that firms are required to disclose in each state might affect their corresponding emissions (Delmas, Montes-Sancho and Shimshack, *forthcoming*). Some states require electricity suppliers to provide information regarding fuel sources and emissions associated with electricity generation. In our study, if the firm generated in a state that required a full or partial environmental disclosure, the information disclosure variable takes the value 1, and 0 otherwise. We use information from the Database of States Incentives for Renewable Energy.¹⁴ For multi-state utilities, this variable is weighted based on the percentage of production within each state by the utility. Information disclosure was not required in the period prior to the creation of the Climate Challenge Program.

Renewable Portfolio Standard. This variable captures the effect of operating in a state with an established Renewable Portfolio Standard (Delmas *et al.*, 2007). These standards mandate that utilities generate a specified proportion of their energy from renewable sources. We first create a variable that takes the value 1 if the state had a Renewable Portfolio Standard in place and 0 if not, using the Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy. For multi-state utilities, this variable is weighted based on the percentage of electricity produced within each state by the utility. Renewable Portfolio Standards did not exist in the period prior to the creation of the Climate Challenge Program.

Year effects: We incorporate dummy variables for the years 1997 to 2000 in the second stage model.

RESULTS

¹⁴ Interstate Renewable Energy Council, <http://www.dsireusa.org/>.

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for the first and the second stage regression.

First stage: participation model

Table 2 presents the results for the participation decision model using the binary logit and multinomial logit specification. As discussed earlier, this methodology allows us to compare the effectiveness of the participation and the different types of participants. The first column (Model 1a) contains the results using the binary logit analysis explaining the probability of participation in the VA. The second column (Model 2a1) shows the results of the multinomial logit explaining the probability of being a late joiner (as compared with being a non-participant). The third column (Model 2a2) displays the results of the multinomial logit explaining the probability of being an early joiner as compared with being a non-participant. The fourth column (Model 2a3) includes the results of the multinomial logit explaining the probability of being an early joiner as compared with being a late joiner. Models 1 and 2 correctly classify 76.12% and 77.95% of the observations, respectively.

The multinomial logit model makes the assumption that categories are independent. This is called the independence of irrelevant alternatives assumption. We use a formal Hausman, McFadden, and Small Hsiao test, which confirmed the independence of our categories (Small and Hsiao, 1985).¹⁵

In the first model (Model 1a), the variables *League of Conservation Voters* and *Regulatory expenses* are positive and significant at the 5 and 10 percent level, respectively. Firms that had a higher level of pressure from elected legislatures were more likely to enroll in the Program. Firms that paid a higher amount of regulatory expenses were also more likely to enroll in the Program. Looking at the same variables in the multinomial logit models (Models 2a1, 2a2 and 2a3), we find that early joiners differed from late joiners

¹⁵ Results available upon request from the authors.

and non-participants. The variables *League of Conservation Voters* and *Regulatory expenses* are both significant for early joiners as compared with non-participants and with late joiners. However, these two variables do not significantly differentiate late joiners from non-participants. We therefore find evidence that firms that incurred high regulatory expenses and a greater pressure from elected legislatures were more likely to be early joiners in the Program. This confirms Hypothesis 1 concerning the role of political pressure in predicting early participation in the VA. The variable representing the number of state environmental employees divided by the total number of employees did not significantly influence the probability of a utility's participation in the Climate Challenge Program. This could be explained by the fact that this variable may not represent the type of regulations or programs that impact an electric utility, and may relate more, for example, to the maintenance of parks and connected activities.

The variable *Trade association membership* is a significant predictor of participation at the 5 percent level. It is important to note that this variable is significant for early joiners as compared with non-participants and late joiners. We therefore find evidence that firms that belonged to the trade association were more likely to enroll in the Program and to join it early. This confirms Hypothesis 2 concerning participation in the trade association as a predictor of early participation in the VA.

The variable *Big player* shows a positive and significant sign at the 1 percent level in Models 2a2 and 2a3. Big player firms were more likely to enroll early in the Program. This confirms Hypothesis 3 regarding the positive impact of visibility on early participation.

With respect to the effect of existing resources, the variable *Air pollution controls* is positive and significant at the 1 percent level in predicting participation and in differentiating early joiners from both late joiners and non-participants. This indicates that the variable *Air pollution controls* has a positive and significant effect on the odds of participating in the program and on being an early joiner as compared to a

late joiner. However, this variable also differentiates late joiners from non-participants with a negative and significant sign at the 1 percent level. This means that *Air pollution controls* has a negative and significant effect on the probability of being a late joiner as compared to a non-participant. This confirms Hypothesis 4 on the role of environmental efforts in distinguishing between early and late participants in the Program.

Turning to the control variables, we find that size matters in explaining participation and differentiating among early and late joiners. The variable *Number of subsidiaries* exhibits a positive and significant sign at the 1 percent level in all models. The bigger firms, measured using the number of subsidiaries owned by a firm, were more likely to join the Program. The variable *Productive efficiency* of a firm is also significant and positive. This shows that the more efficient the firm, the more likely it was to join the Program. However, we note that early joiners and late joiners did not exhibit significant differences in levels of efficiency. This is consistent with the literature predicting that slack resources are a predictor of collective action (Lenway and Rehbein, 1991). The variable *Percentage of generation from fossil fuel* is positive and significant to explain early joiners as compared to late joiners and negative and significant to explain late joiners as compared to non-participants. This indicates that early joiners were more heavily relying on fossil fuel than late joiners and therefore probably more under scrutiny and pressure to change their behavior than late joiners. Utilities with a major part of their income from fossil fuel might also have more at stake than more diversified utilities and therefore be more likely to participate in collective action strategies (Ostrom, 1990).

In both analyses, our findings do not support the claim that the environmental preferences of the population measured by the number of Sierra Club memberships per 1,000 residents affected the behavior of utilities in regard to the Program. This result differs from previous studies showing the effect of such a variable on environmental voluntary activities (Maxwell et al., 2000). This could be explained by the fact

that the Climate Challenge Program is mostly an effort to pre-empt regulation and less to appease environmental NGOs, which may in general have looked at this particular environmental practice with suspicion. In addition, the level of pollution in the state in which the electric utility produced did not have a significant effect on the decision to enroll in the Program.

Second stage: outcome of Climate Challenge Program model

Table 3 presents the regression results for the outcome of the Climate Challenge Program with CO₂ emission per unit as the dependent variable (second stage). Models 1b and 1c display the regression results when the probability of participation from the first stage is introduced into the equation. Model 1b is the pooled regression while Model 1c presents the random-effects general least square (GLS) panel model. Models 2b and 2c contain the results for the multinomial probabilities predicting late and early joiners. Model 2b is the pooled regression while Model 2c includes the random-effects GLS regression. The Lagrangian Multiplier (Breusch and Pagan, 1980) suggested the use of panel rather than pooled estimation. The Hausman test (Hausman, 1978) showed that a random-effects model is more appropriate than a fixed-effects model.¹⁶

In the first models (1b and 1c), the probability of participation is not significant. This means that there is no significant difference between participants in the Climate Challenge Program and non-participants in terms of the reduction of their CO₂ emissions. In the second set of models (2b and 2c), the probability of participation for early joiners is negative and significant at the 1 percent level. This shows that, among participants, only early entrants reduced their emissions significantly more than non-participating firms. If a utility with average CO₂ emissions equal to 0.69 tons per MWh in 1996 (the U.S. average of CO₂

¹⁶ Results available from the authors upon request.

emissions in the electric industry in that year) decided to participate early in the Climate Challenge Program, it would exhibit CO₂ emissions of 0.204 tons per MWh in 2000 (the other variables being held constant). This means a relative decrease of 14.1% for early joiners as compared to a relative reduction of 1.6% for all participants (early and late joiners together). This confirms Hypothesis 5, which states that early joiners were more likely to undertake substantive cooperation than late joiners.

Turning to the control variables, the variables *Percentage of generation from fossil fuel* and *Air pollution controls* are positive and significant at the 5 percent level in Model 2c and at the 1 percent level and the 10 percent level respectively in Model 2b. Firms with a higher percentage of their generation from fossil fuel increased their emissions. Firms with higher levels of pollution decreased their emissions. The variable year of installation is negative and significant at the 5 percent level in Model 2b, indicating that older plants were more likely to increase their emissions over time. The variables representing mergers with electric and gas utilities are not significant. Firms undertaking mergers did not seem to be paying less attention to environmental performance than other firms. Likewise, the variables representing disclosure and Renewable Standard Portfolio policies in the states where a firm operated are not significant. The explanation could be that these policies were implemented toward the end of our study period and more time may be needed to show some effect on performance. The variable associated with the year 2000 is significant, implying an incremental change in CO₂ emissions in the year 2000, compared with the reference year 1996.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We have identified key factors that explain firms' cooperative behavior within VAs. We analyzed three types of cooperative behavior: non-cooperation, symbolic cooperation, and substantive cooperation. Non-cooperation represents the behavior of firms that did not participate in the VA. Substantive cooperation

includes participation in the VA associated with improvements in environmental performance. Symbolic cooperation signifies firms that participated in the VA but did not improve their environmental performance significantly more than non-participants. Our results show that early joiners and late joiners of the Climate Challenge Program adopted different types of cooperative behavior. Substantive cooperation resulting in reductions in emissions was more likely with early entrants than with non-participants. However, we find no significant relationship between late entrant participation in the program and reduction in emissions.

We found that these differences in cooperative behavior are explained by the different institutional pressures experienced by early and late entrants and by their previous levels of investment in environmental improvements. Early entrants were subjected to a higher level of political pressure at the state level, and were more dependent on local and federal regulatory agencies. They were also better connected to the trade association and more visible. When considering investments in environmental improvements, late joiners were also significantly different from early joiners and non-participants. In particular, they had undertaken less investment in air pollution controls than early joiners and non-participants prior to the creation of the Program. Late joiners might have had less at stake than early joiners. Although they may have found some advantage to participation, they did not undertake substantive change to their operations.

We also assessed the overall effectiveness of the Program at reducing firms' emissions and found no significant difference between participants overall and non-participants in the reduction of their emissions. Even though early entrants reduced their emissions significantly more than non-participants, when late joiners are included in the analysis, the Program overall does not seem to have been effective at reducing emissions. An important question remains: why would early joiners

tolerate symbolic participants? As Lenox (2006) suggests, it is possible that some members are willing to tolerate symbolic behavior rather than quit because their continued participation is necessary to maintain the institution. The participation of all, regardless of their actual level, is better than the participation of fewer firms undertaking substantive action. As we show, early joiners have more at stake than late joiners. They are under more political pressure and are also more visible. Defection by substantive contributors to the program would attract attention and conceivably even lead to the collapse of the agreement. Another puzzling factor is the inattention of stakeholders to the actual performance of participants. This phenomenon seems consistent with studies of other voluntary agreements where the appearance of performance rather than actual performance was sufficient to attain legitimacy (King and Lenox, 2000; Rivera and DeLeon, 2004). Research in other sectors, such as corporate governance, has also shown that symbolic action could be positively received by stakeholders (Westphal and Zajac, 1998; Fiss and Zajac, 2006).¹⁷

Our research advances theory in several ways. We started by pointing out that the corporate political strategy literature was limited in its ability to explain differing collective action behavior because it treated cooperation as static and dichotomous. Helping to respond to the call by several scholars to study the issue of timing in corporate political strategies in more detail (Bonardi, Hillman, and Keim, 2005), our study teases out the institutional pressures that explain different types of cooperation over time. Our findings show that it is very important to analyze various modes of cooperation and to understand their temporal variation. In particular, we highlight some of the dynamics at stake that may encourage symbolic cooperation in a VA and reduce its credibility. We were also able to demonstrate how the social context in

¹⁷ For example, Westphal and Zajac (1998) showed that the stock market reacted favorably to the symbolic adoption of long-term incentive plans even if such plans were not implemented.

which a firm operates affects its level of engagement in collective corporate strategy. Early joiners and late joiners of the Climate Change Program operated in very different institutional fields. Early joiners were more connected than late joiners to the industry and more dependent on regulators. The analysis of VAs as a form of corporate political strategy proves to be particularly interesting because these arrangements include cooperation between firms and the government and also cooperation among firms. We show the importance of analyzing pre-existing relationships among these actors to predict the level of cooperation within VAs.

Our study also makes contributions to the institutional theory literature. This literature argues that early joiners are mostly interested in the technical efficiency of a practice while followers are subjected to more institutional pressures. In this stream of research, early joiners are considered to function outside of their institutional context. As Westphal et al. (1997) noted, earlier adopters are “motivated by the opportunity for efficiency gains and free from the ‘iron cage’ of isomorphic pressures” (374). In our study, we challenge these assumptions. We find that early joiners respond to political pressures at the state level, as well as to peer pressure exerted by their trade association. We also find that early joiners were more visible. This is consistent with the findings of Bansal (2005), who identifies the presence of media pressure, to be associated with early disclosure of environmental management practices. However, Bansal’s study did not relate media pressure to the timing of participation in collective action nor did it analyze differences in actual environmental performance between firms that did disclose information and those that did not.

In addition, we advance the institutional literature by describing key pressures faced by early joiners, and by linking them to performance. In contrast to the trend in institutional literature to explain convergence toward similar behavior or isomorphism, our study links institutional pressures and incentives to

divergence of behavior over time. Furthermore, while previous studies have shown a positive relationship between the number and the quality of initial adopters and subsequent adoptions of technological and administrative innovations, we show that this may not always occur. For example, Rosenkopf and Abrahamson suggest that initial adopters with strong reputations could intensify pressure on other organizations to imitate by adopting the practices of initial joiners (Rosenkopf and Abrahamson, 1999). Our results show that even if firms decided to join the Program to be associated with “high quality” early joiners—here firms that have undertaken efforts to reduce their emissions—this does not mean they committed to the same type of actions within the Program. We conclude, therefore, that the quality of performance by early adopters does not guarantee the quality of that by later adopters. Other factors need to be examined to reveal and explain the different types of cooperative behavior. We find that institutional pressures and previous investments are the most important predictors of the type of cooperative behavior. The electric utility sector constituted an opportune field for analysis of the issue of the effectiveness of collective political strategies within the context of the natural environment for several reasons. Because the electric utility sector is highly regulated and also because electric utilities are among the leading polluters in the United States, this is a sector where non-market strategies may be more prominent than in other sectors. However, collective political strategies in the context of the environment are coming to the forefront for many other industries facing increasing environmental regulatory oversight. This study can therefore help to illuminate collective corporate strategies, such as VAs, that are emerging in other sectors. As the focus of analysis, the Climate Challenge Program is representative of most of the VAs currently implemented, the majority without sanctioning mechanisms. Our model identifies conditions that trigger different types of behavior within VAs and points to the limits of VAs lacking sanctions to promote cooperative behavior. Such findings are particularly relevant for policymakers. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has typically encouraged a group of very well known and successful organizations to

take the lead in participating in voluntary programs, hoping that these firms would set an example. Our findings suggest that this strategy might not always be effective because followers may only collaborate symbolically and jeopardize the overall effectiveness of the program. We suggest that policymakers who wish to design effective environmental agreements need to adjust the design of VAs for factors that trigger substantive or symbolic cooperation. Our study also suggests that ‘one-size-fits-all’ VAs might not be the most effective way to entice substantive participation from corporations. As Olson (1965) showed, larger group size tends to discourage individual participation in several ways. In this case, the large group size means that non-participation involves little social cost, whereas in a small group, a firm would be risking social censure and possibly retaliation. Policymakers could therefore design VAs with various levels of membership according to their performance level. This type of approach was implemented in the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification system (Corbett and Muthulingam, 2007).

Our study has several limitations. First, we studied the factors that could reduce the effectiveness of a VA in terms of its ability to get its members to cooperate substantively. However, we did not assess whether the Climate Challenge Program specifically was successful at changing political outcomes. This is beyond our study, and would necessitate identifying whether changes in the political landscape, independent of the Climate Change Program, reduced the level of threat that more stringent regulation would be put in place. Second, our study does not take into consideration the other strategic choices that firms could or did pursue outside their participation in the VA. Such choices could include lobbying, for example (de Figueiredo and Tiller, 2001). Further research is needed to look at the interaction of various strategies and how they influence the likelihood that a firm will undertake substantive or symbolic cooperation within a VA. Third, while we analyzed firms’ regulatory expenses, we did not obtain information on utilities’

managerial style or organizational structure. For example, further research could survey electric utilities to identify how the size or the organizational influence of electric utilities' legal departments impact cooperative behavior (Edelman, 1992; Delmas and Toffel, 2008). Finally, we focused on cooperative strategies in the United States, showing that variations in political pressure exerted by regulators at the state level are important predictors of such strategies. In other contexts, scholars have shown that national regulatory environments impact corporate political activity (Hillman and Wan, 2005; Murtha and Lenway, 1994). For example, Delmas and Terlaak (2002) have shown that participation in voluntary programs differs across nations. It would be useful to analyze the effect of differing national regulatory settings on the willingness of firms to cooperate within VAs. This is particularly important in the case of climate change as the major transboundary issue of our time where the potential of VAs could be significant – either negatively or positively.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson E, Rosenkopf L. 1997. Social Network Effects on the Extent of Innovation Diffusion: A Computer Simulation. *Organization Science* **8**(3): 289-309.
- Anton WRQ, Deltas G, Khanna M. 2004. Incentives for environmental self-regulation and implications for environmental performance. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **48**(1): 632-654.
- Arora S, Cason TN. 1996. Why do firms volunteer to exceed environmental regulations? Understanding participation in EPA's 33/50 program. *Land Economics* **72**(4): 413-432.
- Banker R, Charnes A, Cooper WW. 1984. Some Models for Estimating Technical and Scale Inefficiencies in Data Envelopment Analysis. *Management Science* **30**(9): 1078-1092.
- Bansal, P. 2005. Evolving sustainably: a longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal* **26**(3): 197-218.
- Bansal P, Hunter T. 2003. Strategic explanations for the early adoption of ISO 14001. *Journal of Business Ethics* **46**(3): 289-299.
- Baranzini A, Thalmann P. 2004. *Voluntary Approaches in Climate Policy*. Edward Elgar Publishing: Northampton, MA.
- Baron, D. P. 1995. The Nonmarket Strategy System. *Sloan Management Review* **37**(1): 73-85.
- Baron, DP. 2003. *Business and Its Environment, 4th Edition*. Prentice Hall: New York.
- Baron, DP. 2005. Competing for the Public Through the News Media. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **14**(2): 339-376.

- Baysinger, BD. 1984. Domain Maintenance as an Objective of Business Political Activity: An Expanded Typology. *Academy of Management Review* **9**(2): 248-258.
- BDI (Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie). 1996. *Updated and Extended Declaration by German Industry and Trade on Global Warming Prevention*. Cologne, Germany.
- Bonardi JP, Hillman AJ, Keim GD. 2005. The Attractiveness of Political Markets: Implications for firm strategy. *Academy of Management Review* **30**(2): 397-413.
- Bonardi JP. Keim GD. 2005. Corporate Political Strategies for widely salient issues. *Academy of Management Review* **30**(3): 555-576.
- Bonardi JP, Holburn G, Vanden Bergh R. 2006. NonMarket Strategy in Regulated Industries: Theory and Evidence from U.S. Electric Utilities. *Academy of Management Journal* **49**(6): 1209-1228.
- Borkey P, Leveque F. 1998. *Voluntary Approaches for Environmental Protection in the European Union*. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Paris.
- Breusch T, Pagan A. 1980. The Lagrange-multiplier test and its applications to model specification in econometrics. *Review of Economic Studies* **47**: 239-253.
- Coelli, T. 1996. *A Guide to DEAP Version 2.1: A Data Envelopment Analysis Computer Program*. Department of Econometrics. University of New England: Australia.
- Charnes A, Cooper WW, Rhodes E. 1978. Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units. *European Journal of Operational Research* **2**(6): 429-444.
- Corbett CJ, Muthulingam S. 2007. Adoption of Voluntary Environmental Standards: The Role of Signaling and Intrinsic Benefits in the Diffusion of the LEED Green Building Standards. UCLA

Anderson School of Management working paper. Available at:

<http://www.anderson.ucla.edu/x994.xml>

Darnall N, Carmin J. 2005. Greener and cleaner: The Signaling accuracy of US Voluntary Environmental Programs. *Policy Sciences* **38**(2-3): 71-90.

Darnall N, Edwards Jr D. 2006. Predicting the Cost of Environmental Management System Adoption: The Role of Capabilities, Resources and Ownership Structure. *Strategic Management Journal* **27**(4), 301-320.

de Figueiredo JMP, Tiller EH. 2001. The Structure and Conduct of Corporate Lobbying: How Firms Lobby the Federal Communications Commission. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **10**(1): 91-122.

Delmas M, Marcus A. 2004. Firms' choice of Regulatory Instruments to Reduce Pollution: a Transaction cost approach, *Business and Politics* **6**(3), Article 3.

Delmas M, Mazurek J. 2004. A Transaction Cost Perspective on Negotiated Agreements: The Case of the U.S. EPA XL Program. In *Voluntary Approaches to Climate Protection. An Economic assessment of Private-public Partnerships*, Baranzini A, Thalmann P (eds). Edward Elgar publishing: Boston, MA.

Delmas M, Montes M, Shimshack, J. *Forthcoming*. Mandatory information disclosure policy: Evidence from the electric utility industry. *Economic Inquiry*

Delmas M, Russo M, Montes M. 2007. Deregulation and environmental differentiation in the electric utility industry. *Strategic Management Journal* **28**(2):189-209.

- Delmas M, Terlaak A. 2001. A framework for analyzing environmental voluntary agreements. *California Management Review* **43**(3): 44-63.
- Delmas M, Terlaak A. 2002. Regulatory commitment to negotiated agreements: Evidence from the United States, Germany, the Netherlands and France. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* **4**: 5-29.
- Delmas M, Toffel M. 2008. Organizational Responses to Environmental Demands: Opening the Black Box, *Strategic Management Journal* **29**(10): 1027-1055.
- Delmas M, Tokat Y. 2005. Deregulation, governance structures, and efficiency: the U.S. electric utility sector. *Strategic Management Journal* **26**(5): 441-460.
- Delmas M, Keller A. 2005. Strategic Free Riding in Voluntary Programs: the case of the US EPA Wastewise Program, *Policy Sciences* **38**: 91-106.
- DiMaggio PJ, Powell WW. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* **48**(2): 147-160.
- Department of Energy (DOE). 1996. Climate Challenge Program Report. DOE/FE-0355. U.S. Department of Energy: Washington, D.C.
- Department of Energy (DOE). 2000. The Changing Structure of the Electric Power Industry 2000: An Update. Department of Energy. U.S. Department of Energy: Washington, D.C.
- Edelman, LB. 1992. Legal ambiguity and symbolic structures: Organizational mediation of civil rights law. *American Journal of Sociology* **97**(6): 1531-1576.
- Greene, W. 2008. *Econometric Analysis, 6th Edition*. Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

- Fiss PC, Zajac EJ. 2006. The Symbolic Management of Strategic Change: Sensegiving via Framing and Decoupling. *Academy of Management Journal* **49**: 1173-1193.
- Gupta, AK, Lad LJ. 1983. Industry Self-Regulation: An Economic, Organizational, and Political Analysis. *The Academy of Management Review* **8**(3):416-425
- Hamilton, JT. 1997. Taxes, torts, and the toxics release inventory: Congressional voting on instruments to control pollution. *Economic Inquiry* **35**(4): 745-762.
- Hartman, RS. 1988. Self-Selection Bias in the Evaluation of Voluntary Energy Conservation Programs. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **70**(3): 448-458.
- Hausman, JA. 1978. Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica* **46**: 1251-1271.
- Heckman, JJ. 1978. Dummy Endogenous Variables in a Simultaneous Equation System. *Econometrica* **46**(4): 931-959.
- Heckman, JJ. 1979. Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error. *Econometrica* **47**(1): 153-162.
- Helland, E. 1998. Environmental protection in the Federalist system: The political economy of NPDES inspections. *Economic Inquiry* **36**(2): 305-319.
- Hillman AJ, Hitt MA. 1999. Corporate Political Strategy Formulation: A Model of Approach, Participation, and Strategy Decisions. *Academy of Management Review* **24**(4): 825-842.
- Hillman, AJ. 2003. Determinants of Political Strategies in U.S. Multinationals. *Business Society* **42**(4): 455-484.
- Hillman AJ, Keim GD, Schuler D. 2004. Corporate Political Activity: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management* **30**(6): 837-857.

- Hillman AJ, Wan WP. 2005. The Determinants of MNE Subsidiaries' Political Strategies: Evidence of Institutional Duality. *Journal of International Business Studies* **36**(3): 322-340.
- Hoffman, AJ. 1999. Institutional evolution and change: Environmentalism and the U.S. chemical industry. *Academy of Management Journal* **42**(4):351-371
- Hoffman, AJ. 2005. Climate Change Strategy: The Business Logic behind Voluntary Greenhouse Gas Reductions. *California Management Review* **47**(3): 21-46.
- Kahn, ME. 2002. Demographic change and the demand for environmental regulation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **21**(1): 45-62.
- Kassinis G, Vafeas N. 2002. Corporate boards and outside stakeholders as determinants of environmental litigation. *Strategic Management Journal* **23**(5): 399-415.
- Kassinis G, Vafeas N. 2006. Stakeholder Pressures and Environmental Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* **49**(1): 145-159.
- Keim G, Baysinger B. 1988. The Efficacy of Business Political Activity: Competitive Considerations in a Principal-Agent Context. *Journal of Management* **14**(2): 163-180.
- Keim GD, Zeithaml CP. 1986. Corporate Political Strategy and Legislative Decision Making: A Review and Contingency Approach. *Academy of Management Review* **11**(4): 828-843.
- Khanna M, Brouhle K. 2009. The effectiveness of voluntary environmental initiatives. In *Governance for the Environment: New Perspectives*, Delmas M, Young, O (Ed). Cambridge University Press: 144-182.
- Khanna M, Damon LA. 1999. EPA's Voluntary 33/50 Program: Impact on Toxic Releases and Economic Performance of Firms. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **37**(1): 1-25.

- King AA, Lenox MJ. 2000. Industry self-regulation without sanctions: The chemical industry's responsible care program. *Academy of Management Journal* **43**(4): 698-716.
- Konar S, Cohen MA. 1997. Information as Regulation: The Effect of Community Right to Know Laws on Toxic Emissions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **32**(1): 109-124.
- Lenox, MJ. 2006. The role of private, decentralized institutions in sustaining industry self-regulation. *Organization Science* **17**(6): 677-690.
- Lenox MJ, Nash J. 2003. Industry self-regulation and adverse selection: a comparison across four trade association programs. *Business Strategy and the Environment* **12**(6): 343-356.
- Lenway SA, Rehbein K. 1991. Leaders, Followers, and Free Riders: An Empirical Test of Variation in Corporate Political Involvement. *Academy of Management Journal* **34**(4): 893-905.
- Lubell M, Schneider M, Scholz JT, Mete M. 2002. Watershed Partnerships and the Emergence of Collective Action Institutions. *American Journal of Political Science* **46**(1): 148-163.
- Lyon TP, Maxwell JW. 2004. *Corporate Environmentalism and Public Policy*. Cambridge University Press: UK.
- Maddala, GS. 1983. *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Economics*. Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Majumdar, S K, Marcus AA. 2001. Rules versus Discretion: The Productivity Consequences of Flexible Regulations. *Academy of Management Journal* **44**(1): 170-179.
- Marcus AA, Geffen DA, Sexton K. 2002. *Reinventing environmental regulation: lessons from Project XL*. Resources for the Future: Washington, DC.

- Maxwell JW, Decker CS. 1998. *Voluntary Environmental Investment and Regulatory Flexibility*. Working paper. Kelley School of Business, Indiana University: Bloomington, IN.
- Maxwell JW, Lyon TP, Hackett SC. 2000. Self-Regulation and Social Welfare: The Political Economy of Corporate Environmentalism. *Journal of Law and Economics* **43**(2): 583-617.
- Meyer JW, Rowan B. 1977. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology* **83**: 340-363.
- Meznar MB, Nigh D. 1995. Buffer or Bridge? Environmental and Organizational Determinants of Public Affairs Activities in American Firms. *The Academy of Management Journal* **38**(4): 975-996.
- Murtha TP, Lenway SA. 1994. Country Capabilities and the Strategic State: How National Political Institutions affect Multinational Corporations' Strategies. *Strategic Management Journal* **15**(5): 113-129.
- Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review* **16**(1): 145-179.
- Oliver C, Holzinger I. 2008. The effectiveness of strategic political management: A dynamic capabilities framework. *Academy of Management Review* **33**(2): 496-520.
- Olson, M. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge MA.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Pfeffer J, Salancik GR. 1978. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row: New York.

- Rees, J. 1997. Development of Communitarian Regulation in the Chemical Industry. *Law and Policy* **19**: 477-528.
- Reinhardt, FL. 2000. *Down to earth: Applying business principles to environmental management*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.
- Riddel, M. 2003. Candidate eco-labeling and senate campaign contributions. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **45**(2): 177-194.
- Ringquist EJ, Emmert CE. 1999. Judicial Policymaking in Published and Unpublished Decisions: The Case of Environmental Civil Litigation. *Political Research Quarterly* **52**(1): 7-37.
- Rivera, J. 2002. Assessing a voluntary environmental initiative in the developing world: The Costa Rican Certification for Sustainable Tourism. *Policy Sciences* **35**(4): 333-360.
- Rivera J, DeLeon P. 2004. Is greener whiter? The Sustainable Slopes Program and the Voluntary Environmental Performance of western ski areas. *Policy Studies Journal* **32**(3): 417-437.
- Roberts, MJ. 1986. Economies of Density and Size in the Production and Delivery of Electric Power. *Land Economics* **62**(4): 378-387.
- Rosenkopf L, Abrahamson E. 1999. Modeling Reputational and Informational Influences in Threshold Models of Bandwagon Innovation Diffusion. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory* **5**(4): 361-384.
- Schuler DA, Rehbein K. 1997. The filtering role of the firm in corporate political involvement. *Business and Society* **36**(2): 116-139.
- Schuler, DA. 2002. Public Affairs, Issues Management and Political Strategy: Methodological Approaches that Count. *Journal of Public Affairs* **2**(1): 336-355.

- Segerson K, Miceli TJ. 1998. Voluntary Environmental Agreements: Good or Bad News for Environmental Protection? *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **36**(2): 109-130.
- Small KA, Hsiao C. 1985. Multinomial Logit Specification Tests. *International Economic Review* **26**(3): 619-627.
- Suchman, MC. 1995. Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review* **20**(3): 571-610.
- Thompson, HGJ. 1997. Cost efficiency in Power Procurement and Delivery Service in the Electric Utility Industry. *Land Economics* **73**(3): 287-296.
- Tolbert PS, Zucker LG. 1983. Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The Diffusion of civil service reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **28**(1): 22-39.
- Videras J, Alberini A. 2000. The appeal of voluntary environmental programs: Which firms participate and why? *Contemporary Economic Policy* **18**(4): 449.
- Viscusi WK, Hamilton JT. 1999. Are Risk Regulators Rational? Evidence from Hazardous Waste Cleanup Decisions. *American Economic Review* **89**(4): 1010-1027.
- Welch EW, Mazur A, Bretschneider S. 2000. Voluntary behavior by electric utilities: Levels of adoption and contribution of the Climate Challenge Program to the reduction of carbon dioxide. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **19**(3): 407-424.
- Westphal JD, Zajac DJ. 1994. Substance and symbolism in CEOs' long-term incentive plans. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **39**: 367-390.

- Westphal JD, Gulati R, Shortell SM. 1997. Customization or Conformity? An Institutional and Network Perspective on the Content and Consequences of TQM Adoption. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **42**(2): 366-394.
- Westphal JD, Zajac EJ. 1998. Symbolic management of stockholders: Corporate governance reforms and shareholder reactions. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **43**: 127-153.
- Westphal JD, Zajac EJ. 2001. Decoupling policy from practice: The case of stock repurchase programs. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **46**: 202–228
- Wilson, J. 1973. *Political organizations*. Basic Books: New York.
- Yoffie, D. 1987. Corporate strategies for political action. In *Business strategy and public policy: Perspectives from industry and academia*, AKA. Marcus and D. Beam (Ed.). Quorum Books: New York; 43-60.
- Zajac EJ, Westphal JD. 1995. Accounting for the explanations of CEO compensation: Substance and symbolism. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **40**: 283-308.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF VARIABLES USED IN FIRST & SECOND STAGE REGRESSION ^a

	First stage Model	Mean	Sd.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.	Participation ^b	0.60	0.49											
2.	League of Conserv. Voters	45.98	22.45	0.08 *										
3.	State's environmental employees	3.86	1.45	0.00	-0.28 *									
4.	Sierra Club	1.89	3.28	-0.03	0.21 *	0.02								
5.	State's pollution	0.48	0.37	0.10 *	-0.15 *	0.21 *	-0.16 *							
6.	Regulatory expenses	2.64	3.09	0.10 *	0.03	-0.12 *	0.09 *	-0.10 *						
7.	Trade association's membership	0.78	0.42	0.08 *	-0.07	-0.06	-0.03	-0.10 *	0.12 *					
8.	Visibility / <i>Big player</i>	0.83	0.38	0.08 *	-0.07	0.27 *	0.09 *	0.12 *	0.25 *	0.20 *				
9.	Air pollution controls	16.63	5.15	0.09 *	0.03	0.11 *	-0.09 *	0.18 *	0.03	0.01	0.03			
10.	Productive efficiency	0.88	0.15	0.17 *	-0.25 *	0.12 *	-0.12 *	0.13 *	0.01	0.08 *	0.08 *	0.02		
11.	Number of subsidiaries	1.66	2.37	0.41 *	0.13 *	0.17 *	0.06	0.22 *	0.12 *	0.10 *	0.10 *	0.14 *	0.13 *	
12.	% of generation from fossil fuel	77.62	20.30	-0.08 *	-0.34 *	0.05	-0.22 *	0.12 *	-0.37 *	-0.14 *	-0.10 *	0.09 *	0.19 *	0.03

	Second Stage Model	Mean	Sd.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	CO ₂ emissions per generation	0.93	0.66								
2.	% of generation from fossil fuel	77.72	20.18	0.30 *							
3.	Air pollution controls	16.30	5.67	0.09 *	0.08 *						
4.	Year of installations (average)	1957.74	11.35	-0.01	0.29 *	0.05					
5.	Number of plants	5.21	3.57	-0.02	-0.04	0.06	0.03				
6.	Merger with electric utility	0.23	0.42	0.12 *	0.11 *	-0.01	0.01	0.11 *			
7.	Merger with gas utility	0.07	0.26	0.05	-0.06	0.03	-0.11 *	0.16 *	-0.05		
8.	Information disclosure	0.15	0.35	0.08 *	-0.09 *	-0.11 *	-0.15 *	0.01	0.09 *	0.06	
9.	Renewables Portfolio Standard	0.12	0.32	0.04	-0.04	-0.10 *	-0.16 *	0.05	0.09 *	0.04	0.38 *

^A N=638. CORRELATIONS WITH AN ABSOLUTE VALUE GREATER THAN 0.08 ARE SIGNIFICANT AT 5% LEVEL.

^b 83 participating firms are included with 62 early joiners and 21 late joiners. The number of non-participating firms included in the sample is 49.

TABLE 2
LOGIT ESTIMATES OF PARTICIPATION IN CLIMATE CHALLENGE PROGRAM^A

Model	Binary Logit	Multinomial Logit		
Dependent variable	Participants (Model 1a)	Late joiners (Model 2a1)	Early Joiners (Model 2a2)	Early Joiners (Model 2a3)
Reference group	Non- participants	Non- participants	Non-participants	Late Joiners
League of Conserv. Voters	0.011 (0.005)*	-0.004 (0.007)	0.015 (0.006)**	0.019 (0.007)**
State's environmental employees	0.055 (0.080)	0.005 (0.105)	0.007 (0.091)	0.002 (0.110)
Sierra Club	0.013 (0.027)	0.006 (0.032)	0.003 (0.034)	-0.004 (0.038)
State's pollution	0.172 (0.329)	-0.134 (0.453)	0.175 (0.359)	0.309 (0.454)
Regulatory Expenses	0.067 (0.037)+	-0.048 (0.053)	0.078 (0.040)+	0.126 (0.052)*
Trade association's membership	0.616 (0.257)*	0.090 (0.327)	0.881 (0.305)**	0.790 (0.364)*
Visibility / Big player	0.378 (0.309)	-0.189 (0.390)	1.045 (0.373)**	1.233 (0.430)**
Air pollution controls	0.063 (0.020)**	-0.072 (0.024)**	0.083 (0.027)**	0.155 (0.025)**
Productive efficiency	2.507 (0.728)**	2.007 (0.944)*	3.374 (0.843)**	1.367 (1.038)
Number of subsidiaries	0.706 (0.085)**	0.385 (0.115)**	0.885 (0.102)**	0.500 (0.087)**
Percentage of generation from fossil fuel	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.015 (0.006)*	-0.001 (0.005)	0.014 (0.006)*
Year 1996	0.123 (0.297)	0.030 (0.402)	0.126 (0.337)	0.096 (0.414)
Year 1997	0.493 (0.296)+	0.059 (0.396)	0.022 (0.335)	-0.037 (0.410)
Year 1998	0.408 (0.296)	-0.108 (0.404)	-0.093 (0.333)	0.015 (0.416)
Year 1999	0.353 (0.311)	0.013 (0.416)	-0.241 (0.354)	-0.255 (0.430)
Constant	-5.309 (0.997)**	-0.169 (1.286)	-7.551 (1.217)**	-7.382 (1.425)**
Observations	638	638	638	638
% correctly classified	76.12%	77.95%		
Pseudo R-squared	0.23	0.25		

^a Number of participating firms: 83 including 62 early joiners and 21 late joiners. Number of non-participating firms: 49.

Standard errors are in parentheses. + Significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

TABLE 3
REGRESSION ESTIMATES OF CHANGES IN CO2 EMISSIONS 1996-2000^A

Dependent variable: Co2 emission per unit (Co2 emissions / Generation)	Pooled	Random	Pooled	Random
	(Model 1b)	GSL (Model 1c)	(Model 2b)	GSL (Model 2c)
Probability of Participation	-0.132 (0.110)	-0.055 (0.152)		
Probability of Participation (late joiners)			0.056 (0.171)	0.194 (0.223)
Probability of Participation (early joiners)			-0.544 (0.127)**	-0.486 (0.180)**
Percentage of generation from fossil fuel	0.008 (0.001)**	0.005 (0.003)*	0.008 (0.001)**	0.005 (0.002)*
Air pollution controls	-0.000 (0.004)	-0.008 (0.005)	-0.006 (0.003)+	-0.012 (0.005)*
Year of installations (average)	-0.005 (0.003)*	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.003)*	-0.002 (0.004)
Number of plants	-0.005 (0.007)	-0.002 (0.010)	0.002 (0.006)	0.005 (0.010)
Merger process with electric utility	0.104 (0.086)	0.068 (0.089)	0.104 (0.085)	0.074 (0.088)
Merger process with gas utility	0.104 (0.155)	0.139 (0.151)	0.107 (0.154)	0.142 (0.151)
Information disclosure	0.105 (0.116)	0.056 (0.116)	0.046 (0.116)	0.030 (0.115)
Renewable standard portfolio	-0.016 (0.121)	-0.002 (0.136)	-0.025 (0.124)	-0.011 (0.138)
Year 1997	0.035 (0.043)	0.016 (0.043)	0.038 (0.043)	0.017 (0.043)
Year 1998	0.029 (0.051)	0.032 (0.045)	0.025 (0.049)	0.028 (0.042)
Year 1999	0.081 (0.082)	0.093 (0.075)	0.070 (0.085)	0.083 (0.077)
Year 2000	0.231 (0.113)*	0.244 (0.103)*	0.229 (0.111)*	0.237 (0.101)*
Constant	10.711 (5.157)*	4.090 (7.829)	10.888 (5.107)*	4.141 (7.774)
Observations	638	638	638	638
R-squared (adjusted model b / overall model c)	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.20
$\chi^2_{(Breusch-Pagan)}$		104.27 [0.0000]**		101.65 [0.0000]**
$\chi^2_{(Hausman)}$		13.57 [0.4045]		14.07 [0.4448]

^a The estimates values are unstandardized coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses. The corresponding p-values for Breusch and Pagan and Hausman tests are in bracket.

+ Significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.