

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

東亞區域經濟整合的研究

計畫類別：個別型計畫

計畫編號：NSC94-2415-H-032-003-

執行期間：94年08月01日至95年07月31日

執行單位：淡江大學產業經濟學系

計畫主持人：麥朝成

報告類型：精簡報告

報告附件：出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：本計畫可公開查詢

中 華 民 國 95 年 10 月 25 日

# 行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫成果報告

## 東亞區域經濟整合的研究

### Regional Integration in East Asia

計畫編號：NSC 94—2415—H—032—003

執行期限：94年8月1日至95年7月31日

主持人：麥朝成 淡江大學產經系講座教授

#### 一、中文摘要

本文爲了評估東亞區域經濟整合，利用貿易指標來分析東亞各國的貿易集中度及使用地理資訊系統技術來決定東亞貿易集團是否已經形成；然後應用引力模型去認定東亞各國雙邊貿易流量的關鍵因素。實證分析涵蓋 1990-2002 其間的資料。實証結果顯示東亞已經逐漸演變成一個貿易集團。預期未來在東亞的經濟發展的過程中，中國大陸將扮演引導的角色，而隨著時間的經過，東亞將形成世界三大貿易集團之一，支配全球經濟。

#### Abstract

The aim of this study is to evaluate regional economic integration in East Asia, using trade indicators to analyze the degree of trade concentration among the nations of East Asia, and employing geographic information systems (GIS) techniques to determine whether a trading block is taking shape in East Asia. Finally, the gravity model is used to identify the key factors that influence bilateral trade flows among the East Asian nations. The results of empirical analysis covering the

period 1990 – 2002 show that East Asia has already evolved into a trading block. It is anticipated that, in the future, China will play a key role in directing the course of economic development in East Asia, and that, over time, East Asia will come to constitute one of three large trading blocks that dominate the global economy.

#### 二、緣由與目的

Most of the literature in this area focuses on the distribution of global trading blocks, while the bulk of the work that has been done on individual trading blocks has targeted the Americas or Europe; so far, comprehensive empirical research on regional trade integration within East Asia has been very limited. What research has been done in this area has generally involved using the gravity model to

explore trade effects within the region. The utilization of this type of analytical framework cannot shed much light on whether regional concentration is taking place; the intention of the present study is to fill this gap in the literature. This study attempts a comprehensive appraisal of regional economic integration in East Asia, using trade indicators to explore the changes in the patterns of trade between East Asian nations in recent years, and employing GIS methods to gauge whether East Asia is evolving into a trading bloc (within the core-periphery framework). Finally, the gravity model is employed to explore the key factors affecting the flow of bilateral trade within the East Asia region.

### 三、結果與討論

#### 1. Trade Concentration Within the East Asia Region

This study uses the trade indicators first proposed in Anderson and Norheim (1993) – intensity of trade and propensity to trade – to undertake empirical analysis of trade concentration. The following definitions were adopted:

Intensity of Trade,  $I_{ij}$

$$I_{ij} = x_{ij} / m_j$$

where  $x_{ij}$  = the share of country  $i$ 's exports going to region  $j$

$m_j$  = the share of world imports held by region  $j$

Propensity to Trade,  $P_{ij}$

$$P_{ij} = t_i * I_{ij}$$

where  $t_i$  = the ratio of  $i$ 's total exports to  $i$ 's GDP

$I_{ij}$  = intensity of trade

First of all, in order to examine whether there is a tendency towards regional concentration in the trading activity of the individual East Asian nations, we look at intensity of trade and propensity to trade for nine groups: the 10 East Asian nations as a whole; 5 key East Asian nations (China, Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea and Taiwan); China, Hong Kong and Taiwan; the ASEAN member nations; ASEAN plus China; ASEAN plus Japan; ASEAN plus South Korea; ASEAN plus Taiwan; and ASEAN + 3. Doubts have often been raised about the practical usefulness of AFTA; examination of the intensity of trade

and propensity to trade indicators can help to clarify this issue too. The data sources used included Taiwan's Bureau of Foreign Trade and Directorate General of Accounting, Budget and Statistics, and the International Monetary Fund's International Financial Statistics (IFS) and Direction of Trade (DOT) databases.

The analysis presented above supports the view that East Asia is developing into a single regional trading bloc, with China and Japan at its center.

## 2. The Formation of an East Asian Trading Bloc

Besides employing trade indicators to analyze the pattern of regional trade, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can be used to examine the level of trade concentration within the East Asia region.

The  $G_i^*$  statistic is computed as below:

$$G_i^*(d) = \frac{\sum_j W_{ij}(d)x_j}{\sum_j x_j}; i = j$$

$W_{ij}(d)$  = the binary contiguity matrix for spatial unit  $i$  and spatial unit  $j$ . If spatial unit  $i$  is within distance  $d$  of spatial unit  $j$ , this value is 1, otherwise it is 0.

$x_j$  = the observed value within spatial unit  $j$ .

GIS analysis reveals how an East Asian trading bloc is gradually taking shape; it is anticipated that, over time, this bloc will solidify. By the same token, a similar research method is used to identify where the core area of trading activity is located within the East Asia region, it can be seen that this core area lies in Northeast Asia, embracing China and Japan. To summarize, the trading activity of the East Asian nations will come to be centered around the enormous Chinese market, while the intensity of trade within the region increases steadily, causing the nascent trading bloc to solidify.

## 3. Analysis of Bilateral Trade Flows Between East Asian Nations

The gravity model can be described as follows:

$$\ln TR_{ij} = a + b_0 \ln GDP_i + b_1 \ln GDP_j + b_2 \ln POP_i + b_3 \ln + b_4 \ln DIST_{ij} + b_5 \ln AVE\_D_i + b_6 ASEAN + \varepsilon_{ij}$$

$TR_{ij}$  = country  $i$ 's exports to country  $j$  (in US\$ millions)

$GDP_i$  = country  $i$ 's GDP (in US\$ millions)

$GDP_j$  = country  $j$ 's GDP (in US\$ millions)

$POP_i$  = country i's population

$POP_j$  = country j's population

$DIST_{ij}$  = distance between country i and country j (unit: 111.12 km)

$AVE\_D_i$  = average distance between country i and its export markets in other countries

ASEAN = dummy variable (1 if j is a member of ASEAN, otherwise 0)

$\varepsilon_{ij}$  = error term

For the most part, the coefficients obtained conform to the theoretical expectations and show statistical significance.

(1) With regard to income elasticity of mutual trade, the values obtained were positive for both the importer nation and the exporter nation, with little difference in the degree of elasticity. The values for population elasticity were negative for both the importer nation and the exporter nation. In the case of the exporter nation, the larger the domestic market, the greater the extent to which products circulate within that domestic market, and the lower the level of exports. For the importer nation, although our research did

not show any sign of a trend towards positive population elasticity, it was clear that importer nation population elasticity had been gradually falling over the period 1992 – 2002; we believe that extending the period under study beyond 2002 would have shown a positive correlation. In this respect, the results obtained are not consistent with our original expectations that there would be positive population elasticity for the importer nation. It appears that, although under normal circumstances a large population implies a large market and would display a positive correlation with the volume of trade, if the population is excessively high, then the correlation can become a negative one due to a high dependency ratio. Given the high levels of population density in East Asia (by global standards), this result is relatively easy to explain.

(2) Distance elasticity was found to be negative, indicating that higher transportation cost can indeed lead to a reduction in exports; this result was thus

in conformity with our expectations.

- (3) With respect to the regional variable (where regression analysis was performed at five-year intervals), the value obtained with this dummy variable fell from 0.2779 in 1992 to 0.1307 in 1997, to 0.0009 in 2002; what had at first been a significant correlation ceased to be significant over.

#### 四、計劃成果自評

Our study not only contributes to the literature, but also provides some policy implications for decision-makers. We wish to publish our work in international journal.

#### 五、參考文獻

##### References

Anderson, J.E. (1979), "A Theoretical Foundation for the Gravity Model", *American Economic Review*, 69 (1), 106-116.

Anderson, J.E. and E. van Wincoop (2003), "Gravity with Gravitas: A Solution to the Border Puzzle", *American Economic Review*, 93 (1), 170-192.

Anderson, K. and H. Norheim (1993), "From

Imperial to Regional Trade Preferences: Its Effects on Europe's Intra- and Extra-Regional Trade",

*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 129, 78-101.

Anselin, L. (1995), "Local Indicators of Spatial Association-LISA", *Geographical Analysis*, 27 (2), 93-115.

Bayoumi, T. and B. Echengreen (1995), "Is Regionalism Simply a Diversion? Evidence from the Evolution of the EC and EFTA", NBER Working Paper No. 5283, National Bureau of Economic research, Cambridge, MA.

Bergstrand, J.H. (1985), "The Gravity Equation in International Trade: Some Microeconomic Foundations and Empirical Evidence", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67 (3), 474-481.

Bergstrand, J.H. (1989), "The Generalized Gravity Equation, Monopolistic Competition, and the Factor-Proportions Theory in International Trade", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71 (1), 143-153.

Clarete, R., C. Edmonds and J.S. Wallack (2003), "Asian Regionalism and Its

- Effects on Trade in the 1980s and 1990s”, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 14 (1), 91-129
- Das, D.K. (2004), *Regionalism in Global Trade*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Deardoff, A.V. (1997), “Determinants of Bilateral Trade: Does Gravity Work in a Neoclassic World?”, in J.A. Frankel, ed., *the Regionalization of the World Economy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 131-164.
- Fan, C. C. and A. J. Scott (2003), “Industrial Agglomeration and Development: A Survey of Spatial Economic Issues in East Asia and a Statistical Analysis of Chinese Regions”, *Economic Geography*, 79(3), 295-319.
- Fujita, M., P. Krugman and A. J. Venables (1999), *the Spatial Economy: Cities, Regions, and International Trade*, Cambridge: MA, MIT Press.
- Getis, A. and J.K. Ord (1992), “The Analysis of Spatial Association by Use of Distance Statistics”, *Geographical Analysis*, 24 (3), 189-206.
- Hassan, M.K. (2001), “Is SAARC a Viable Economic Block? Evidence from Gravity Model”, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 12 (2), 263-290.
- Helpman, E. (1987), “Imperfect competition and International Trade: Evidence from Fourteen Industrial Countries”, *Journal of the Japanese and International Economics*, 1(1), 62-81.
- Krugman, P. (1991a), “Increasing Returns and Economic Geography”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 99, 483-499.
- Krugman, P. (1991a), “Is Bilateralism Bad?”, in E. Helpman and A. Razin, eds., *International Trade and Trade Policy*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 9-24.
- Krugman, P. (1991b), “The Move Toward Free Trade Zones”, In the Symposium on Policy Implications of Trade and Currency Zones, sponsored by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, August 22-24.
- Krugman, P. and A. J. Venables. (1995), “Globalization and the Inequality of Nations”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110 (4), 857-880.

- Lall, S. and M. Albaladejo (2004), "China's Competitive Performance: A Threat to East Asian Manufactured Exports?", *World Development*, 32 (9), 1441-1466.
- Lee, J.W. and I. Park (2005), "Free Trade Areas in East Asia: Discriminatory or Non-discriminatory?", *World Economy*, 28 (1), pp.21-48.
- Martinez-Zarzoso, I. (2003), "Gravity Model: An Application to Trade Between Regional Blocs", *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 31 (2), 174-187.
- O'Loughlin, J. and L. Anselin (1996), "Geo-Economic Competition and Trade Bloc Formation: United States, German, and Japanese Exports, 1968-1992", *Economic Geography*, 72 (2), 131-160.
- Ord, J.K. and A. Getis (1995), "Local Spatial Autocorrelation Statistics: Distributional Issues and an Application", *Geographical Analysis*, 27 (4), 286-305.
- Ottaviano, G. I. P. and D. Puga (1998), "Agglomeration in the Global Economy: A Survey of 'the New Economic Geography'", *World Economy*, 21, 707-731.
- Poon, J.P. (1997), "The Cosmopolitanization of Trade Regions: Global Trends and Implications, 1965-1990", *Economic Geography*, 73 (4), 390-404.
- Pöyhönen, P. (1963), "A Tentative Model for the Volume of Trade between Countries", *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 90, 93-99.
- Roland-Holst, R. and J. Weiss (2004), "ASEAN and China: Export Rivals or Partners in Regional Growth?", *World Economy*, 27 (8), 1255-1274.
- Rose, A. (2004), "Do We Really Know That the WTO Increase Trade?", *American Economic Review*, 90 (1), 98-114.
- Sohn, B.H. (2002), "Regionalization of Trade and Investment in East Asia and Prospects for Further Regional Integration", *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 7 (2), 160-181.
- Soloaga, I. and L.A. Winters (2001), "Regionalism in the Nineties: What Effect on Trade?", *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 12 (1), 1-29.
- Stone, S.F. and B.N. Jeon (2000), "Foreign



Direct Investment and Trade in the Asian-Pacific Region: Complementarity, Distance and Regional Economic Integration”, *Journal of Economic Integration*, 15 (3), 460-485.

Tinbergen, J. (1962), *Shaping the World Economy: Suggestions for an International Economic Policy*, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.

Tongzon, J.L. (2005), “ASEAN-China Free Trade Area: A Bane or Boon for ASEAN Countries?”, *World Economy*, 28 (2), 191-210.

Venables, A. J. (1996), “Equilibrium Locations of Vertically Linked Industries”, *International Economic Review*, 37, 341-359.

Wu, H.L. and C.H. Chen (2004), “Changes in the Foreign Market Competitiveness of East Asian Exports”, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 34 (4), 503-522.