

Income Distribution, Welfare, and the Patterns of Trade

Reto Föllmi¹ Björn Hartmann¹ Josef Zweimüller²

¹University of St.Gallen

²University of Zürich

SSES

June 2025

Introduction

- ▶ Global trends of inequality (Pinkovskiy et al., 2024):
 - ▶ constant / increasing income inequality within countries
 - ▶ declining income inequality between countries
- ▶ Research question: How does income inequality (within and between countries) affect trade and welfare in open economies when market power is relevant?
- ▶ Approach: Two-country trade model with non-homothetic preferences, varying income distributions and pricing-to-market behaviour by firms.

Results Overview

- ▶ Consumer demand as extensive-margin consumption choice → trade-off between price and market size
- ▶ Income-dependent consumption baskets & price schedules
- ▶ Key mechanism for PtM: Firms with market power choose how to split their fixed costs across markets
⇒ (Average) willingness-to-pay determines fixed cost splitting
- ▶ In open economy, more people lose out from increased inequality

Related Literature

► Pricing-to-Market

[Alessandria and Kaboski (2011); Behrens and Murata (2012); Bertoletti and Etro (2017); Feenstra and Romalis (2014); Fieler and Eaton (2025); Kichko and Picard (2023); Simonovska (2015)]

► Inequality & Trade

[Bekkers et al. (2012); Choi et al. (2009); Dalgin et al. (2008); Hummels and Klenow (2005); Fieler (2011); Kichko and Picard (2023)]

Model – Demand Side

- ▶ Mass $\mathcal{P}$ of consumers
- ▶ Consumers endowed with units of labour $\theta \in [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$, with CDF $G(\theta)$
- ▶ Preferences are non-homothetic 0/1 consumption of differentiated goods
[Falkinger (1994); Föllmi and Zweimüller (2006); Matsuyama (2000); Murphy et al. (1989)]
- ▶ Goods are indivisible, only yield utility on first unit
→ pure extensive-margin of consumption

Model – Demand Side II

► Utility

$$U = \int_0^{\infty} c(j) dj, \quad \text{with } c(j) \in \{0, 1\}$$

► Budget constraint given labour endowment $\tilde{\theta}$:

$$\int_0^N p(j) c(j) \leq \tilde{\theta} W$$

► Normalise wage rate $W \Rightarrow$ labour endowment = income

► Consumption decision rule: A consumer buys variety j if and only if the price is below their willingness-to-pay:

$$c(j) = 1 \text{ if } p(j) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)}, \quad c(j) = 0 \text{ if } p(j) > \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)},$$

Model – Demand Side III




Figure 1: Individual demand function

Model – Supply Side

- ▶ Monopolistic competition with homogeneous firms
- ▶ Fixed costs F and marginal costs $1/a$.
⇒ Labour demand function $L(j) = F + q(j)/a$
- ▶ Firms choose a price for their variety. Due to 0/1 demand, a higher price means fewer buyers
 - ▶ trade-off between price vs. market size
 - ▶ Only fraction $(1 - G(\tilde{\theta}))$ of consumer can afford good at price $p(\tilde{\theta})$
 - ▶ "Marginal consumer" who is indifferent between buying and not buying

Autarky Equilibrium I

- ▶ Free market entry
- ▶ Firms sort along income distribution such that zero profit & no deviation incentives
- ▶ Zero-profit condition:

$$\underbrace{\mathcal{P}(1 - G(\theta))}_{\text{market size}} \underbrace{\left(p(\theta) - \frac{1}{a}\right)}_{\text{contribution margin}} = \underbrace{F}_{\text{fixed costs}}, \quad \forall \theta$$

- ▶ ZPC solves for price schedule:

$$p(\theta) = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{F}{(1 - G(\theta))\mathcal{P}} \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Prices & markups increasing in θ . **Intuition:** market size determines fixed costs per unit sold → small market size implies larger fixed cost share per unit

Autarky Equilibrium II

- ▶ Given prices & income, welfare follows from the budget constraint:

$$N(\tilde{\theta}) = \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\tilde{\theta}} \frac{1}{p(\theta)} d\theta \quad (2)$$

- ▶ Following mean-preserving spread (MPS) in income:
 - ▶ Total product variety $N(\bar{\theta})$ increases
⇒ average price level falls (because $\bar{\theta}$ constant)
 - ▶ Prices of luxuries fall, prices of basic goods rise ⇒ rising welfare inequality

Trade – Overview

- ▶ Two Countries "Home" and "Foreign"
- ▶ All variables of "Foreign" denoted with asterisk
- ▶ Income distributions $G(\cdot)$ and $G^*(\cdot)$, with same support $[\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$
- ▶ Zero trade costs, i.e. $\tau = 1$
 - ⇒ Firms of Home and Foreign will choose same price per marginal consumer within same market
 - ⇒ Factor Price Equalisation holds
- ▶ Assumption: Markets are segmented → firms may pursue pricing-to-market

Trade – Pricing I

- ▶ Due to free entry, firms must earn same profits within each market
- ▶ Profits may be unevenly distributed between Home and Foreign
- ▶ A firm from Home can set a price $p(\theta)$ for its good in Home (marginal consumer θ) and price $p^*(\theta^*)$ in Foreign (marginal consumer θ^*)
- ▶ Total profits must equal fixed costs:

$$\Pi_H + \Pi_F = F \quad (3)$$

where Π_i is profit share earned in market i .

- ▶ Prices in Home and Foreign are then given by:

$$p(\theta) = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{\Pi_H}{\mathcal{P}(1 - G(\theta))} \quad p^*(\theta^*) = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{\Pi_F}{\mathcal{P}^*(1 - G^*(\theta^*))}$$

Trade – Pricing II

- ▶ How to determine Π_H and Π_F ?
- ▶ Because all firms export, zero trade costs & identical bounds on income distributions
 - ⇒ the richest consumers $\bar{\theta}$ consume the same in both countries
 - ⇒ welfare should be identical
 - ⇒ Solves for profit shares Π_H & Π_F
- ▶ Why not income-dependent profit shares $\Pi_i(\theta)$? Firms wouldn't earn same profits within each market → deviation incentives

Profit Split Equation

Trade Case 1: Identical Countries

- ▶ Suppose Home and Foreign have identical income distributions $G(\cdot) = G^*(\cdot)$ and equal population $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^*$
- ▶ Symmetry implies $\Pi_H = \Pi_F = F/2$, fixed costs shared equally across countries
- ▶ With each market covering half the fixed cost, the price schedule in each country becomes:

$$p(\theta) = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{F/2}{(1 - G(\theta))P},$$

which is analogous to doubling market size in autarky

Trade Case 1: Identical Countries II

- ▶ Trade liberalisation lowers all prices due to market size effect: fixed costs are spread across more consumers. However, the price drop is not uniform:
 - ▶ Necessities (low θ goods) already had many buyers; doubling market further reduces their price modestly.
 - ▶ Luxuries (high θ goods) had few buyers; doubling market size significantly reduces their markup.
- ▶ **Pro-rich gains from trade:** Rich consumers benefit more, in both absolute and relative terms, because of larger price changes
[Adao et al. (2022); Borusyak and Jaravel (2021); Galle et al. (2023); Helpman et al. (2010)]

Trade Case 1: Identical Countries III




Figure 2: Gains from Trade with Identical Countries

Notes: The log-normal distribution is truncated from above. The distribution is determined by $\theta \sim LN(\mu = 0.3, \sigma = 0.7)$, with $1 \leq \theta \leq 5$. To calculate prices, we set $\mathcal{P} = 1$, $F = 2$, and $a = 0.5$ for simplicity. Welfare is then given by integrating the inverse of prices. Due to the assumption of $G = G^*$, profit shares are identical and opening up to trade is equivalent to half the fixed costs, so trade uses $F = 1$. The gains from trade are calculated as the ratio of welfare under trade to welfare under autarky.

Trade Case 2: Mean-Preserving Redistribution

- ▶ Suppose that Foreign becomes more unequal country. Specifically, Foreign's income distribution is a mean-preserving spread of Home's
- ▶ From autarky: MPS lowers average price level
 - ⇒ Richest consumer $\bar{\theta}$ in Foreign better off
 - ⇒ We require that $\Pi_F > \Pi_H$ for equality
- ▶ Firms shift more fixed costs onto Foreign consumers

Trade Case 2: Mean-Preserving Redistribution II

- ▶ Home: Price schedule shifts downwards, because lower fixed cost share & income distribution $G(\cdot)$ unchanged
⇒ every consumer benefits
- ▶ Foreign: price schedule rotates
 - ▶ **Pricing-to-market effect** shifts price schedule upwards (larger fixed cost share Π_H)
 - ▶ **Market size effect:** fewer middle income consumers & more rich consumers
 - ▶ At upper end of income distribution, market size effect dominates pricing-to-market effect and prices fall
 - ▶ At lower end, negative market size effect (fewer consumers) + pricing-to-market effect (higher fixed cost share)
⇒ large price increases & most consumers lose out
 - ▶ Compared to autarky: even more consumers lose, because additional pricing-to-market effect of increased inequality

Trade Case 2: Mean-Preserving Redistribution III




Figure 3: Prices and Welfare in Unequal Countries

Other Things We Do

Things not in the presentation (but in the paper)

- ▶ North-South Model with a rich and one poor country (on average)
- ▶ What if no market segmentation, i.e. no pricing-to-market possible?
- ▶ Implications for trade volumes

Conclusion

- ▶ We develop a two-country trade model with non-homothetic preferences and study effects of income inequality scenarios on prices and welfare
- ▶ Firms pursue pricing-to-market by shifting fixed costs across markets
- ▶ Extensive margin consumption generates price schedules and varying consumption bundles
- ▶ Increased income inequality hurts poor consumers and benefit the rich
⇒ even more people lose in open economy setting due to pricing-to-market effect

Adao, Rodrigo, Paul Carrillo, Arnaud Costinot, Dave Donaldson, and Dina Pomeranz, “Imports, Exports, and Earnings Inequality: Measures of Exposure and Estimates of Incidence,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2022, 137 (3).

Alessandria, George and Joseph P Kaboski, “Pricing-to-Market and the Failure of Absolute PPP,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2011, 3 (1).

Behrens, Kristian and Yasusada Murata, “Globalization and Individual Gains from Trade,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2012, 59 (8).

Bekkers, Eddy, Joseph Francois, and Miriam Manchin, “Import Prices, Income, and Inequality,” *European Economic Review*, 2012, 56 (4).

Bertoletti, Paolo and Federico Etro, “Monopolistic Competition when Income Matters,” *The Economic Journal*, 2017, 127 (603).

Borusyak, Kirill and Xavier Jaravel, “The Distributional Effects of Trade: Theory and Evidence from the United States,” *NBER Working Paper No. 28957*, 2021.

Choi, Yo Chul, David Hummels, and Chong Xiang, “Explaining Import Quality: The Role of the Income Distribution,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2009, 77 (2).

Dalgin, Muhammed, Devashish Mitra, and Vitor Trindade, “Inequality, Nonhomothetic Preferences, and Trade: A Gravity Approach,” *Southern Economic Journal*, 2008, 74 (3)

Falkinger, Josef, “An Engelian model of growth and innovation with hierarchic consumer demand and unequal incomes,” *Ricerche Economiche*, 1994, 48 (2).

Feenstra, Robert C and John Romalis, “International Prices and Endogenous Quality,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2014, 129 (2).

Fieler, Ana Cecilia, “Nonhomotheticity and Bilateral Trade: Evidence and a Quantitative Explanation,” *Econometrica*, 2011, 79 (4).

— and **Jonathan Eaton**, “The Margins of Trade,” *Econometrica*, 2025, 93 (1).

Föllmi, Reto and Josef Zweimüller, “Income Distribution and Demand-Induced Innovations,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2006, 73 (4).

Galle, Simon, Andrés Rodríguez-Clare, and Moises Yi, “Slicing the Pie: Quantifying the Aggregate and Distributional Effects of Trade,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2023, 90 (1).

Helpman, Elhanan, Oleg Itskhoki, and Stephen Redding, “Inequality and Unemployment in a Global Economy,” *Econometrica*, 2010, 78 (4).

Hummels, David and Peter J Klenow, “The Variety and Quality of a Nation’s Exports,” *American Economic Review*, 2005, 95 (3).

Kichko, Sergei and Pierre M Picard, “On the Effects of Income Heterogeneity in Monopolistically Competitive Markets,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2023, 143.

Matsuyama, Kiminori, “A Ricardian Model with a Continuum of Goods under Nonhomothetic Preferences: Demand Complementarities, Income Distribution, and North-South Trade,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2000, 108 (6).

Murphy, Kevin M, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert Vishny, “Income Distribution, Market Size, and Industrialization,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1989, 104 (3).

Pinkovskiy, Maxim, Xavier Sala i Martin, Kasey Chatterji-Len, and William H Nober, “Inequality Within Countries is Falling: Underreporting-robust Estimates of World Poverty, Inequality and the Global Distribution of Income,” *NBER Working Paper No. 32203*, 2024.

Simonovska, Ina, “Income Differences and Prices of Tradables: Insights from an Online Retailer,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2015, 82 (4).

Profit Split Equation

$$\int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \frac{a\mathcal{P}(1 - G(\theta))}{a\Pi_H + (1 - G(\theta))\mathcal{P}} d\theta + \frac{a\mathcal{P}}{a\Pi_H + \mathcal{P}} \underline{\theta} = \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \frac{a\mathcal{P}^*(1 - G^*(\theta^*))}{a\Pi_F + (1 - G^*(\theta^*))\mathcal{P}^*} d\theta^* + \frac{a\mathcal{P}^*}{a\Pi_F + \mathcal{P}^*} \underline{\theta} \quad (4)$$

back