Extensive and Intensive Trade: What Role does Currency Invoicing Play?

Sabbatical Project

Luigi Ventura (Universita di Roma – La Sapienza) Mark David Witte (College of Charleston)

Background Information

- Exporting firms must choose a currency in which to denominate their price.
 - Importing country's currency = Local Currency Pricing (LCP) or Pricing-to-Market
 - Exporting country's currency = Producer Currency Pricing (PCP)
 - A third country's currency = Vehicle Currency Pricing (VCP)
- Margin of Trade
 - Extensive: Does you export product k to country y?
 - Intensive: How many exports of product *k* to country *y*?

Data Description

- Universe of Italian imports and exports external to the European Union in 2003-2013 disaggregated at the 10-digit Harmonized Service level
- Country of origin or destination, respectively for imports and exports, value, weight, invoicing currency and reference exchange rate
- Aggregated if occurring within same bi-monthly period, same 10 digit HS code, same reference exchange rate, same trading partner, same invoicing currency
- 14+ million observations

Two Stages

- Stage 1
 - Estimating the currency denomination of trade by Country/Good/Year Pairs
 - Using actual observations of trade to predict possible trade currency invoicing
 - If there's no extensive trade, we need to predict currency invoicing
- Stage 2 (been done, newish to literature)
 - Estimating Intensive with **Total Value** (if trade actually occurs)
 - Estimating Extensive as Dichotomous variable
 - Estimating Extensive and Intensive? with <u>Transactions</u> (regardless if trade occurs)
- Focus on PCP (Euro-denominated Exports)
 - Italian exports are usually either PCP (Euro) or VCP (USD)
 - Correlation coefficient between PCP% and VCP% = -.9635

Stage 1

- More than 90% of trade in a single invoicing currency?
 - 71.7% are more than 90% PCP
 - 85% are majority PCP
 - 6.6% are more than 90% VCP
 - 0.2% are more than 90% LCP
- Is the invoicing currency a dichotomous or continuous decision?
 - Individual transactions are dichotomous
 - Trade flows could be continuous
 - Data suggests a binary approach: either Mostly PCP OR other

| | OLS | Probit | Probit |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | PCP % | Mostly PCP | Mostly PCP |
| Dauch | 0.0112*** | 0.0240*** | 0.0260*** |
| Raucii. Deference Drice | (0.0113^{+++}) | $(0.0349^{4.4})$ | (0.0300^{+++}) |
| Deuch | (0.00220) | (0.0152) 0.120*** | (0.0152) 0.129*** |
| Raucii. | (0.0202^{4444}) | (0.00602) | (0.00602) |
| Differentiated | (0.00114) | (0.00092) | (0.00092) |
| Distance | -7.51e-07 | $-9.43e-00^{++++}$ | |
| | (2.09e-07) | (1.0/e-00) | |
| GDP | -1.986-15*** | 2.55e-14*** | |
| | (6.986-16) | (4.08e-15) | 0.000205** |
| GDP growth | -6.17e-05** | -0.000497** | -0.000395** |
| | (2.44e-05) | (0.000202) | (0.000198) |
| GDP per capita | -3.23e-07*** | -4.26e-07** | -7.85e-07*** |
| | (3.15e-08) | (2.15e-07) | (2.10e-07) |
| Herfindhal-Hirschman | -0.0696*** | -0.314*** | -0.307*** |
| Index | (0.00371) | (0.0214) | (0.0214) |
| Import Market | -0.000697*** | -0.00323*** | -0.00156*** |
| Penetration Index | (5.54e-05) | (0.000347) | (0.000278) |
| Insurance/Financial | -0.000101 | -0.00139** | -0.00135** |
| Service Imports | (9.93e-05) | (0.000613) | (0.000613) |
| Constant | 0.999*** | 2.132*** | 2.127*** |
| | (0.0125) | (0.0717) | (0.0717) |
| Region Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Good Dummies | 2-digit | 2-digit | 2-digit |
| Year Dummies | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 444,496 | 444,496 | 444,496 |
| R-squared | 0.165 | 0.1497 | 0.1495 |

PCP

OLS v Probit

First Stage:

- XB Correlation with PCP %?
 - .4059 for OLS
 - .4174 for Probit
- XB Correlation with Mostly PCP?
 - .3472 for OLS
 - .3697 for Probit
- Using PCP Probability estimate without Distance and GDP
 - Little loss in R-sq
 - Avoids potential issues with 2nd stage

| Second Stage | PCI |
|---------------|-----|
| | Dis |
| Intoncivo and | GD |
| intensive and | GD |
| Extensive | GD |

10% increase in PCP probability?

- 15% decrease in Total Value
- 17% decrease in Transactions
- Decreased likelihood of exporting

| | Intensive | Intensive & | Extensive | Extensive |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| | | Extensive | | |
| | Log | Log | OLS | Logit |
| | (Total Value) | (Transactions) | Exported Good? | Exported Good |
| | | | | |
| PCP Probability | -1.498*** | -1.765*** | -0.455*** | -0.420*** |
| | (0.116) | (0.0616) | (0.0126) | (0.123) |
| Distance | -0.00122*** | -0.000334*** | -0.000112*** | -0.000420*** |
| | (0.000118) | (6.12e-05) | (1.11e-05) | (8.49e-05) |
| GDP | 1.53e-13*** | 8.76e-14*** | 8.08e-15*** | 9.26e-14*** |
| | (1.96e-14) | (1.11e-14) | (2.49e-15) | (3.41e-14) |
| GDP growth | 0.00618*** | 0.00214*** | 7.26e-05 | 0.00153 |
| | (0.00141) | (0.000760) | (0.000150) | (0.00131) |
| GDP per capita | 1.45e-05*** | 5.69e-06*** | 1.36e-06*** | 6.01e-06** |
| | (3.03e-06) | (1.65e-06) | (3.05e-07) | (2.61e-06) |
| Herfindahl-Hirschman | 0.0588 | 0.0103 | -0.0392*** | -0.0556 |
| Index | (0.0642) | (0.0340) | (0.00490) | (0.0519) |
| Import Market | 0.00267* | -0.00223*** | -0.000481*** | -0.00458*** |
| Penetration Index | (0.00157) | (0.000843) | (0.000142) | (0.00157) |
| Insurance/Financial | 0.00211 | 0.00213*** | 0.000669*** | 0.00278* |
| Service Imports | (0.00141) | (0.000708) | (0.000149) | (0.00145) |
| Lagged Transactions | 0.000143*** | 0.000164*** | -1.75e-05*** | 0.531*** |
| | (7.79e-06) | (8.14e-06) | (7.80e-07) | (0.0140) |
| Country Dummies? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Year Dummies? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Good Dummies? | 4 digit | 4 digit | 4 digit | 3 digit |
| Observations | 358,253 | 358,253 | 766,920 | 766,920 |
| R-squared | 0.586 | 0.713 | 0.553 | 0.594 |

Results

- Euro denominated Italian exports appears to reduce both the extensive and intensive margin of trade.
- Why?
 - Does invoicing currency really impact trade flows so heavily?
 - Is this a trade diversion effect?
 - How much of the effect is hysteresis?