# Chapter 11: The Gravity Equation

International Trade Theory

ITAM

#### Objective

Discuss some systematic patterns related to who trades with whom, revealed in the data.

• Specifically, to analyze the effect of distance and size on trade volumes.

<ロ> <問> <問> < 回> < 回> < □> < □> <

#### Main U.S. Trading Partners

Geography and size are important determinants of bilateral trade flows.

- 5 largest U.S. trading partners in 2003: Canada, Mexico, China, Japan and Germany.
- The largest 10 trading partners with the US accounted for 68% of the value of U.S. trade in 2003.



The size of an economy is positively related to the volume of imports and exports.

- Larger economies produce more goods and services, so they have more to sell in the export market.
- Larger economies generate more income from the goods and services sold, so people are able to buy more imports.

く 戸 とう きょう とう とう

#### Size Matters: U.S. - EU Trade



æ

#### Size Matters: Imports and Market Size



#### Market Penetration and Size



4 A N 4 E

#### **Role of Distance**

Distance between markets will reduce trade flows:

- Directly through higher costs of transports.
- Indirectly through less personal contact and communication.



(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

# **Geography Matters**



# The Gravity Equation

In its basic form, the gravity model assumes that only size and distance are important for trade in the following way:

$$T_{ij} = A rac{\mathbf{Y}_i \, \mathbf{Y}_j}{D_{ij}}$$

- *T<sub>ij</sub>* is the value of trade between country i and country j,
- A is a constant,
- Y<sub>i</sub> the GDP of country i,
- Y<sub>j</sub> is the GDP of country j,
- *D<sub>ij</sub>* is the distance between country i and country j,

Reminds us of Newton's law of gravitation: gravitational attraction is proportional to product of masses and inversely proportional to square of distance.

## The Gravity Equation

- The assumptions needed to get proportionality of GDPs are strong.
- A more general form is

$$T_{ij} = A rac{\mathsf{Y}^a_i \mathsf{Y}^b_j}{D^c_{ij}}$$

where *a*, *b*, and *c* are allowed to differ from 1.

- The gravity equation is very easy to run (widely available data online e.g., Andrew K. Rose's website)
- Perhaps surprisingly, the gravity model works fairly well in predicting actual trade flows.
- Coefficients *a*, *b* and *c* are all close to 1.

# **Geography Beyond Distance**

There are many other determinants of bilateral trade flows.

- The evidence confirms the "statistical significance" of:
  - sharing a common border (beyond the effect of distance);
  - sharing a common language or colonial links;
  - having signed a free trade agreement;
  - having cultural ties.

A (10) A (10)

# Estimating the Role of Geography

#### Table: Geographic Barriers for OECD Countries (1996)

				Implied %
Variable	Denoted by	Coefficient	Std. Error	Effect on Cost
Distance [0,375)	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ dist <sub>1</sub>	-3.76	0.16	75.85
Distance [375,750)	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ dist <sub>2</sub>	-3.91	0.13	79.80
Distance [750,1500)	- <sup>1</sup> / <sub>a</sub> dist <sub>3</sub>	-4.25	0.12	89.09
Distance [1500,3000)	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ dist <sub>4</sub>	-4.47	0.17	95.43
Distance [3000,6000)	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ dist <sub>5</sub>	-6.26	0.08	155.67
Distance [6000,maximum]	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ dist <sub>6</sub>	-6.65	0.09	171.15
Shared Border	- <sup>1</sup> / <sub>a</sub> brdr	0.65	0.13	-9.34
Shared Language	- <u>1</u> ang	0.30	0.10	-4.41
EU	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ tblk <sub>1</sub>	0.19	0.14	-2.88
NAFTA	$-\frac{1}{\theta}$ tblk <sub>2</sub>	-0.39	0.35	6.01

Note: Given an estimated coefficient, b, the implied percentage effect on cost is estimated as  $100(e^{-\theta b} - 1)$ .

# How Wide is The Border?: Intra versus Inter-National Trade

- Other things equal, countries trade more with their neighbors.
- But borders significantly impede inter-national trade flows relative to intra-national trade flows.

Canadian Province	Trade as Percent of GDP	Trade as Percent of GDP	U.S. State at Similar Distance from British Columbia
Alberta	6.9	2.6	Washington
Saskatchewan	2.4	1.0	Montana
Manitoba	2.0	0.3	California
Ontario	1.9	0.2	Ohio
Quebec	1.4	0.1	New York
New Brunswick	2.3	0.2	Maine

Source: Howard J. Wall, "Gravity Model Specification and the Effects of the U.S.-Canadian Border," Fede al Reserve Bank of St. Louis Working Paper 2000-024A, 2000.

< 回 > < 三 > < 三 >