

Balistreri, Edward J.; Hillberry, Russell H.; Rutherford, Thomas F.

**Working Paper**

## Trade and Welfare: Does Industrial Organization Matter?

Economics Working Paper Series, No. 09/119

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

ETH Zurich, CER-ETH – Center of Economic Research

*Suggested Citation:* Balistreri, Edward J.; Hillberry, Russell H.; Rutherford, Thomas F. (2009) : Trade and Welfare: Does Industrial Organization Matter?, Economics Working Paper Series, No. 09/119, ETH Zurich, CER-ETH - Center of Economic Research, Zurich, <https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-a-005888527>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/171562>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.


Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



CER-ETH – Center of Economic Research at ETH Zurich

## Trade and Welfare: Does Industrial Organization Matter?

Edward J. Balistreri, Russell H. Hillberry and Thomas F. Rutherford

Working Paper 09/119  
September 2009

Economics Working Paper Series



Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich  
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

# Trade and Welfare: Does industrial organization matter?

Edward J. Balistreri\*  
Colorado School of Mines

Russell H. Hillberry  
University of Melbourne

Thomas F. Rutherford  
ETH Zürich

September 2009

## Abstract

Many contemporary theoretic studies of trade over geography reduce to an examination of constant-elasticity reactions to changes in *iceberg* trade costs. These impacts are readily analyzed in simple constant-returns models based on the Armington (1969) assumption of regionally differentiated goods. Following the line of reasoning suggested by Arkolakis et al. (2008) one can reach the surprising conclusion that industrial organization does not matter. In the present paper, we show that this finding is fragile, and with a minor elaboration of their model, the rich industrial-organization features of the popular Melitz (2003) model do, in fact, generate important differences for trade and welfare.

*Keywords:* Variety effects; Heterogeneous firms; Gains from trade

*JEL classification:* F1

## 1 Introduction

Arkolakis et al. (2008) show that, given appropriate parameterization to match trade responses, many contemporary theoretic models of trade over geography generate equivalent gains from trade. We can push this result further to show equivalence between a

---

\*Corresponding author: Engineering Hall 311, Division of Economics and Business, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, CO 80401-1887, USA; email: [ebalistr@mines.edu](mailto:ebalistr@mines.edu); voice: (303) 384-2156; fax: (303) 273-3416.

model based on the Melitz (2003) theory of heterogeneous firms and a simple constant-returns model based on the Armington (1969) assumption of trade in regional aggregates. We show, however, that this result is fragile. Addition of a second sector which competes for factor services breaks the equivalence. That is, if the elasticity of factor supply to the traded sector is larger than zero the models will produce divergent assessments of the impact of commercial policy on trade and welfare.

## 2 Models

Our analysis begins with two models calibrated to a common benchmark dataset, one model based on Melitz (2003) and another based on Armington (1969) as elaborated by Devarajan et al. (1993). In our simulations we include three regions (indexed by  $r$  or  $s$ ). Each region is endowed with a primary factor (labor) which can be used in a traded sector or directly consumed as leisure. Trade theories concerning these models are well developed in the literature, so we simply present our notation and the equilibrium conditions for each model. The theoretical setup employed by Arkolakis et al. (2008) is a special case of the Melitz model when we parameterize it such that the implied factor-supply elasticity to the traded sector is zero.<sup>1</sup>

Tables 1 and 2 define our notation, and the algebraic formulation of the alternative models is presented in Table 3.

Given the initial conditions and values of the fixed parameters, the calibrated parameters of the Melitz model are found by inverting the equilibrium conditions. The Armington distribution parameters (the  $\xi_{rs}$ ) are calculated such that the Armington and Melitz models have identical benchmark trade flows.

In the calibration we choose labor and welfare units such that the initial wages and true-cost-of-living indexes are one;  $w_r^0 = e_r^0 = 1$ . This is a convenient choice because it

---

<sup>1</sup>Our setup is equivalent to having a second constant-returns sector which uses only labor. The labor supply elasticity to the traded sector is zero either when the value share of the non-traded sector is zero or when preferences are Cobb-Douglas.

Table 1: Variables

|                                      |                        | Melitz | Armington |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|-----------|
| Welfare:                             | $W_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |
| Unit expenditure index:              | $e_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |
| Price index on traded composite:     | $P_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |
| Nominal demand for traded composite: | $V_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |
| Number of entered firms:             | $M_r$                  | ✓      |           |
| Number of operating firms:           | $N_{rs}$               | ✓      |           |
| Average-firm revenues:               | $\tilde{r}_{rs}$       | ✓      |           |
| Average-firm price:                  | $\tilde{p}_{rs}$       | ✓      |           |
| Average-firm productivity:           | $\tilde{\varphi}_{rs}$ | ✓      |           |
| Wage:                                | $w_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |
| Nominal income:                      | $Y_r$                  | ✓      | ✓         |

Table 2: Parameters

**Fixed parameters:**

|  |            |   |                   |
|--|------------|---|-------------------|
| Pareto shape parameter:                      | $a$        | = | 3.4               |
| Pareto lower support:                        | $b$        | = | 0.2               |
| Substitution elasticity Melitz varieties:    | $\sigma_M$ | = | 3.8               |
| Substitution elasticity Armington varieties: | $\sigma_A$ | = | 4.4 ( $= a + 1$ ) |
| Probability of firm death:                   | $\delta$   | = | 0.05              |
| Value share of traded sector:                | $\gamma$   | = | 0.5               |
| Labor endowment                              | $\bar{L}$  | = | 2/3               |

**Instruments:**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Iceberg trade-cost factor:  | $\tau_{rs}$ |
| Top-level substitution elasticity<br>between traded and non-traded goods: | $\alpha$    |

**Assumed initial conditions:**

|  |               |   |                            |
|--|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| Benchmark home-market trade cost factor:     | $\tau_{rr}^0$ | = | 1.0                        |
| Benchmark external-market trade cost factor: | $\tau_{rs}^0$ | = | 2.0 ( $\forall r \neq s$ ) |
| Benchmark number of entered firms:           | $m_r^0$       | = | 10                         |
| Benchmark number of operating home firms:    | $n_{rr}^0$    | = | 9.5                        |
| Benchmark number of operating export firms:  | $n_{rs}^0$    | = | 0.6 ( $\forall r \neq s$ ) |

**Calibrated parameters:**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Fixed operating-cost on $r$ to $s$ link: | $f_{rs}$   |
| Fixed cost of productivity draw:         | $f_r^e$    |
| Preference weight on traded sector:      | $\psi_T$   |
| Preference weight on non-traded sector:  | $\psi_L$   |
| Armington bilateral CES weights:         | $\xi_{rs}$ |

Table 3: Algebraic Conditions

|  | Melitz | Armington | (eq.) |
|--|--------|-----------|-------|
| Top-level unit expenditure function: <sup>a</sup>  |        |           |       |
| $e_r = (\psi_T P_r^{1-\alpha} + \psi_L w_r^{1-\alpha})^{1/(1-\alpha)}$   | ✓      | ✓         | (1)   |
| Price index on traded aggregate:   |        |           |       |
| $P_r = (\sum_s N_{sr} \tilde{p}_{sr}^{1-\sigma_M})^{1/(1-\sigma_M)}$   | ✓      |           | (2a)  |
| $P_r = (\sum_s \xi_{sr} (\tau_{sr} w_s)^{1-\sigma_A})^{1/(1-\sigma_A)}$  |        | ✓         | (2b)  |
| Nominal demand for traded aggregate:   |        |           |       |
| $V_r = \psi_T Y_r \left( \frac{e_r}{P_r} \right)^{\alpha-1}$   | ✓      | ✓         | (3)   |
| Firm-level nominal demand:   |        |           |       |
| $\tilde{r}_{rs} = V_s \left( \frac{P_s}{\tilde{p}_{rs}} \right)^{\sigma_M-1}$  | ✓      |           | (4)   |
| Optimal pricing:   |        |           |       |
| $\tilde{p}_{rs} = \frac{w_r \tau_{rs}}{\tilde{\varphi}_{rs} (1-1/\sigma_M)}$   | ✓      |           | (5)   |
| Free entry:  |        |           |       |
| $w_r \delta f_r^e = \sum_s \frac{N_{rs}}{M_r} \frac{\tilde{r}_{rs} (\sigma_M-1)}{a \sigma_M}$  | ✓      |           | (6)   |
| Zero cutoff profits:   |        |           |       |
| $w_r f_{rs} = \frac{\tilde{r}_{rs} (a+1-\sigma_M)}{a \sigma_M}$  | ✓      |           | (7)   |
| Average productivity:  |        |           |       |
| $\tilde{\varphi}_{rs} = b \left( \frac{a}{a+1-\sigma_M} \right)^{1/(\sigma_M-1)} \left( \frac{N_{rs}}{M_r} \right)^{-1/a}$   | ✓      |           | (8)   |
| Labor market clearance:  |        |           |       |
| $\bar{L}_r = \psi_L \frac{Y_r}{e_r} \left( \frac{e_r}{w_r} \right)^\alpha + \delta f_r^e M_r + \sum_s N_{rs} \left( f_{rs} + \frac{\tau_{rs} \tilde{r}_{rs}}{\tilde{\varphi}_{rs} \tilde{p}_{rs}} \right)$ | ✓      |           | (9a)  |
| $\bar{L}_r = \psi_L \frac{Y_r}{e_r} \left( \frac{e_r}{w_r} \right)^\alpha + \sum_s \frac{\xi_{rs} \tau_{rs} V_s}{P_s} \left( \frac{P_s}{\tau_{rs} w_r} \right)^{\sigma_A}$                                 |        | ✓         | (9b)  |
| Nominal Income:  |        |           |       |
| $Y_r = w_r \bar{L}$  | ✓      | ✓         | (10)  |
| Welfare:   |        |           |       |
| $W_r = Y_r / e_r$  | ✓      | ✓         | (11)  |

<sup>a</sup> If  $\alpha = 1$  this reverts to the familiar Cobb-Douglas form.

simplifies our calculation of the elasticity of labor supply available to the traded sector of the economy. The relevant residual labor supply function is given by

$$g(w_r) = \bar{L}_r - \psi_L \frac{Y_r}{e_r(w_r)} \left( \frac{e_r(w_r)}{w_r} \right)^\alpha, \quad (12)$$

which is derived from equation (9a). Substituting in the unit expenditure function and  $Y_r = w_r \bar{L}_r$ , and then calculating the elasticity evaluated at the benchmark ( $w = e(w) = 1$ ), yields

$$\eta = (1 - \gamma)(\alpha - 1) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{2}. \quad (13)$$

So, we use the instrument,  $\alpha$ , to control the implied labor supply elasticity. If we set  $\alpha = 1$  then the elasticity is zero and we have a model that is consistent with Arkolakis et al. (2008).<sup>2</sup>

### 3 Experiment and Results


In order to compare the Armington versus Melitz models we compute a simple experiment where we eliminate iceberg trade costs between regions one and two. Using the instrument  $\alpha$ , we control the implied labor-supply elasticity ( $\eta$ ) faced by the trade sectors. Setting the Armington elasticity as suggested by Arkolakis et al. (2008) ( $\sigma_A = a + 1$ ), we find that the welfare impacts of removing the iceberg costs are different across the models, except in the special case that the implied labor-supply elasticity is exactly zero.

Figure 1 plots the region-1 welfare impact of reductions in trade-costs as a function of the implied labor-supply elasticity. Notice that the welfare impacts are only equivalent at  $\eta = 0$ . The results for region 2 are identical to region 1, because of the symmetry built into our illustrative model. Figure 2 shows the welfare impacts on the third region for the same set of experiments. Although the curves in Figure 2 intersect twice, it is only

---

<sup>2</sup>We also ran experiments where we fixed  $\alpha = 3$  and calibrated  $\gamma$  to the assumed labor-supply elasticity. Again, at values of  $\eta$  above zero the models did not generate the same results. It is only in the special case that  $\gamma = 1$  is equivalence between the Armington and Melitz models is obtained.

Figure 1: Region-1 welfare comparison ( $\sigma_A = a + 1$ )



at  $\eta = 0$  that we have equivalence in the models across the multiregion equilibrium.

One key feature of the environment set up by Arkolakis et al. (2008) is that the number of entered firms is unaffected by changes in iceberg costs. Labor supply is perfectly inelastic so all of the adjustments in firm revenues and number of operating firms shows up in the wage. Changes in nominal entry costs are mirrored by changes in expected profits, so equation (6) is satisfied with no changes in  $M_r$ . At  $\eta \neq 0$ , however, the wage only partially absorbs the adjustments in the industrial organization and  $M_r$  changes. In Table 4 we present the basic industrial organization in the Melitz model in the benchmark and in scenarios with different labor supply responses. At  $\eta = 1$  we have entry as labor is drawn into the Melitz sector.

At  $\eta = 0$  Table 4 shows the “anti-variety effect” emphasized by Baldwin and Forslid (forthcoming) where the new import varieties generated by trade liberalization are more than offset by lost domestic varieties. Notice, however, that the total number of varieties consumed in region 1 goes from 10.69 in the benchmark to 11.77 in the scenario, when  $\eta = 1$ . The anti-variety effect is dominated when there is enough response in factor



Figure 2: Region-3 welfare comparison ( $\sigma_A = a + 1$ )




Table 4: Heterogeneous-firms model region-1 entry and consumption of varieties

|                     |   | Benchmark | Scenario<br>$\eta = 0$ | Scenario<br>$\eta = 1$ |
|---------------------|---|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Entered Firms:      | $M_1$   | 10.00     | 10.00                  | 12.30                  |
| Varieties Consumed: | $N_{1,1}$                                     | 9.50      | 5.47                   | 6.77                   |
|                     | $N_{2,1}$                                     | 0.59      | 3.61                   | 4.47                   |
|                     | $N_{3,1}$                                     | 0.59      | 0.48                   | 0.53                   |
| Total Varieties:    | $\sum_r N_{r,1}$                              | 10.69     | 9.55                   | 11.77                  |
| Feenstra Ratio:     | $(\lambda_1^1/\lambda_1^0)^{-1/(\sigma_M-1)}$ |           | 1.00                   | 1.08                   |

supplies. Feenstra (forthcoming) emphasizes, however, that because these varieties enter the expenditure system at different prices we cannot simply count up varieties and infer variety gains or losses. Feenstra shows that variety gains, when comparing equilibria  $t$  versus  $t - 1$ , are given by deviations in the ratio  $(\lambda_r^t / \lambda_r^{t-1})^{-1/(\sigma_M - 1)}$  from unity, where  $\lambda_r^z$  represents region- $r$ 's share of expenditures at equilibrium  $z$  on goods available in both equilibria to the total expenditures at  $z$ . We confirm the Feenstra (forthcoming) analytical result that there are no *import*-variety gains or losses in the Melitz structure (for the case that  $\eta = 0$ ), but we find that the variety gains reemerge when we allow resources to be drawn into the Melitz sector.

To emphasize fundamental differences between the Armington and Melitz models we look at trade flows. In the case that  $\eta = 0$  the trade patterns before and after the removal of trade costs are identical. One might think that  $\sigma_A$  parameter can be set to match the trade reactions in the Melitz model when  $\eta \neq 0$ , but this is not the case. If we adjust  $\sigma_A$  to match some of the Melitz-model trade flows the errors on other flows in the bilateral matrix become larger. (Norman (1990) reached a similar conclusion nearly 20 years ago.)

## 4 Conclusion

Arkolakis et al. (2008) analyze a single sector model with heterogeneous-firms and concluded that new theories “do not really offer new gains from trade, given observed trade levels.” We replicate this finding in comparing Armington and Melitz formulations with iceberg trade costs. Provided that the labor supply elasticity is zero and the Armington elasticity of substitution equal to one plus the Melitz Pareto-shape parameter, these models are identical. This result is, however, fragile. If the labor-supply elasticity is different than zero the industrial organization begins to matter. Firm entry and import variety effects become important if the labor-supply elasticity is not zero.

## References

- Arkolakis, Costas, Svetlana Demidova, Peter J. Klenow, and Andrés Rodríguez-Clare (2008) ‘Endogenous variety and the gains from trade.’ *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings* 98(2), 444–450
- Armington, Paul S. (1969) ‘A theory of demand for products distinguished by place of production.’ *Staff Papers - International Monetary Fund* 16(1), 159–178
- Baldwin, Richard, and Rikard Forslid (forthcoming) ‘Trade liberalization with heterogeneous firms.’ *Review of Development Economics*
- Devarajan, Shanta, Jeffrey D. Lewis, and Sherman Robinson (1993) ‘Policy lessons from trade-focused, two-sector models.’ *Journal of Policy Modeling* 12, 625–657
- Feenstra, Robert C. (forthcoming) ‘Measuring the gains from trade under monopolistic competition.’ *Canadian Journal of Economics*
- Melitz, Marc J. (2003) ‘The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity.’ *Econometrica* 71(6), 1695–1725
- Norman, Victor D. (1990) ‘Assessing trade and welfare effects of trade liberalization: A comparison of alternative approaches to CGE modelling with imperfect competition.’ *European Economic Review* 34, 725–745

## Working Papers of the Center of Economic Research at ETH Zurich

(PDF-files of the Working Papers can be downloaded at [www.cer.ethz.ch/research](http://www.cer.ethz.ch/research)).

- 09/119 E. J. Balistreri, R. H. Hillberry and T. F. Rutherford  
Trade and Welfare: Does Industrial Organization Matter?
- 09/118 H. Gersbach, G. Sorger and C. Amon  
Hierarchical Growth: Basic and Applied Research
- 09/117 C. N. Brunnschweiler  
Finance for Renewable Energy: An Empirical Analysis of Developing and Transition Economies
- 09/116 S. Valente  
Optimal Policy and Non-Scale Growth with R&D Externalities
- 09/115 T. Fahrenberger  
Short-term Deviations from Simple Majority Voting
- 09/114 M. Müller  
Vote-Share Contracts and Learning-by-Doing
- 09/113 C. Palmer, M. Ohndorf and I. A. MacKenzie  
Life's a Breach! Ensuring 'Permanence' in Forest Carbon Sinks under Incomplete Contract Enforcement
- 09/112 N. Hanley and I. A. MacKenzie  
The Effects of Rent Seeking over Tradable Pollution Permits
- 09/111 I. A. MacKenzie  
Controlling Externalities in the Presence of Rent Seeking
- 09/110 H. Gersbach and H. Haller  
Club Theory and Household Formation
- 09/109 H. Gersbach, V. Hahn and S. Imhof  
Constitutional Design: Separation of Financing and Project Decision
- 09/108 C. N. Brunnschweiler  
Oil and Growth in Transition Countries
- 09/107 H. Gersbach and V. Hahn  
Banking-on-the-Average Rules
- 09/106 K. Pittel and D.T.G. Rübbelke  
Decision Processes of a Suicide Bomber – Integrating Economics and Psychology
- 08/105 A. Ziegler, T. Busch and V.H. Hoffmann  
Corporate Responses to Climate Change and Financial Performance: The Impact of Climate Policy

- 09/104 S. Valente  
Endogenous Growth, Backstop Technology Adoption and Optimal Jumps
- 09/103 K. Pittel and D. Rübbelke  
Characteristics of Terrorism
- 09/102 J. Daubanes  
Taxation of Oil Products and GDP Dynamics of Oil-rich Countries
- 09/101 S. Valente  
Accumulation Regimes in Dynastic Economies with Resource Dependence and Habit Formation
- 08/100 A. Ziegler  
Disentangling Specific Subsets of Innovations: A Micro-Econometric Analysis of their Determinants
- 08/99 M. Bambi and A. Saïdi  
Increasing Returns to Scale and Welfare: Ranking the Multiple Deterministic Equilibria
- 08/98 M. Bambi  
Unifying time-to-build theory
- 08/97 H. Gersbach and R. Winkler  
International Emission Permit Markets with Refunding
- 08/96 K. Pittel and L. Bretschger  
Sectoral Heterogeneity, Resource Depletion, and Directed Technical Change: Theory and Policy
- 08/95 M. D. König, S. Battiston, M. Napoletano and F. Schweitzer  
The Efficiency and Evolution of R&D Networks
- 08/94 H. Gersbach and F. Mühe  
Vote-Buying and Growth
- 08/93 H. Gersbach  
Banking with Contingent Contracts, Macroeconomic Risks, and Banking Crises
- 08/92 J. Daubanes  
Optimal taxation of a monopolistic extractor: Are subsidies necessary?
- 08/91 R. Winkler  
Optimal control of pollutants with delayed stock accumulation
- 08/90 S. Rausch and T. F. Rutherford  
Computation of Equilibria in OLG Models with Many Heterogeneous Households
- 08/89 E. J. Balistreri, R. H. Hillberry and T. F. Rutherford  
Structural Estimation and Solution of International Trade Models with Heterogeneous Firms

- 08/88 E. Mayer and O. Grimm  
Countercyclical Taxation and Price Dispersion
- 08/87 L. Bretschger  
Population growth and natural resource scarcity: long-run development under seemingly unfavourable conditions
- 08/86 M. J. Baker, C. N. Brunnschweiler, and E. H. Bulte  
Did History Breed Inequality? Colonial Factor Endowments and Modern Income Distribution
- 08/85 U. von Arx and A. Ziegler  
The Effect of CSR on Stock Performance: New Evidence for the USA and Europe
- 08/84 H. Gersbach and V. Hahn  
Forward Guidance for Monetary Policy: Is It Desirable?
- 08/83 I. A. MacKenzie  
On the Sequential Choice of Tradable Permit Allocations
- 08/82 I. A. MacKenzie, N. Hanley and T. Kornienko  
A Permit Allocation Contest for a Tradable Pollution Permit Market
- 08/81 D. Schiess and R. Wehrli  
The Calm Before the Storm? - Anticipating the Arrival of General Purpose Technologies
- 08/80 D. S. Damianov and J. G. Becker  
Auctions with Variable Supply: Uniform Price versus Discriminatory
- 08/79 H. Gersbach, M. T. Schneider and O. Schneller  
On the Design of Basic-Research Policy
- 08/78 C. N. Brunnschweiler and E. H. Bulte  
Natural Resources and Violent Conflict: Resource Abundance, Dependence and the Onset of Civil Wars
- 07/77 A. Schäfer, S. Valente  
Habit Formation, Dynastic Altruism, and Population Dynamics
- 07/76 R. Winkler  
Why do ICDPs fail? The relationship between subsistence farming, poaching and ecotourism in wildlife and habitat conservation
- 07/75 S. Valente  
International Status Seeking, Trade, and Growth Leadership
- 07/74 J. Durieu, H. Haller, N. Querou and P. Solal  
Ordinal Games
- 07/73 V. Hahn  
Information Acquisition by Price-Setters and Monetary Policy