

**European Research Workshop in International Trade
held jointly with the
3rd EFIGE Scientific Workshop and Policy Conference
Nottingham, 6-8 June 2011**

This conference is funded in part by the University of Nottingham "Integrating Global Society" Research Priority Group, the Nottingham School of Economics, the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement n° 225551 (EFIGE), and The British Academy

***Is New Economic Geography Right?
Evidence from Price Data***

David E. Weinstein, Columbia University
(with Jessie Handbury)

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of the funding organisation(s), nor of CEPR, which take no institutional policy positions.

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

IS NEW ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY RIGHT? EVIDENCE FROM PRICE DATA

Jessie Handbury
David E. Weinstein

Working Paper 17067
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w17067>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
May 2011

We wish to thank Donald Davis, Mine Senses, Jonathan Vogel, and Joan Monras for excellent comments. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

© 2011 by Jessie Handbury and David E. Weinstein. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Is New Economic Geography Right? Evidence from Price Data
Jessie Handbury and David E. Weinstein
NBER Working Paper No. 17067
May 2011
JEL No. L81,R12,R13

ABSTRACT

The agglomeration force behind the New Economic Geography literature initiated by Krugman is based on the notion that larger markets should have a lower variety adjusted price index. Despite his Nobel Prize, there have been no tests of this idea. This paper represents the first such test. Using a rich dataset covering 10-20 million purchases of grocery items, we find that after controlling for store and shopping effects: 1) Aggregate grocery prices are lower in larger cities; 2) Residents of larger cities have access to substantially more varieties than residents of smaller cities; and 3) These forces combine to substantially lower variety adjusted prices in large cities. In short, Krugman was right.

Jessie Handbury
Columbia University, Department of Economics
420 W. 118th Street
MC 3308
New York, NY 10027
jhh2002@columbia.edu

David E. Weinstein
Columbia University, Department of Economics
420 W. 118th Street
MC 3308
New York, NY 10027
and NBER
dew35@columbia.edu

1. Introduction

In awarding Paul R. Krugman the Nobel Prize in economics for his work for international trade and economic geography, the committee characterized his contribution to economic geography as follows: “The new economic geography initiated by Krugman broke with ... tradition by assuming *internal* economies of scale and imperfect competition. Agglomeration is then driven by *pecuniary externalities* mediated through market prices as a large market allows greater product variety and lower costs [emphasis in original].”¹ It is interesting to note, however, that, despite this award, there have been no tests of whether larger markets actually do have greater product variety and whether differences in the number of available varieties are sufficient to lower costs. This paper is the first to fill this gap by testing empirically whether large markets are actually characterized by lower prices of traded goods, and more importantly, whether this, in conjunction with greater product variety, lowers costs for consumers. In other words, is the fundamental mechanism underlying new economic geography models correct?

Over the last two decades, there has been a burgeoning literature that has aimed to test the implications of New Economic Geography (NEG) models (see the recent excellent surveys by Brakman, Garretsen, and van Marrewijk [2009], Fujita and Mori [2005], and Combes, Mayer, and Thisse [2008]). Similarly, in an important paper, Combes, Duranton, Gobillon, Puga, and Roux (2010) have developed models and empirical tests that underscore the importance of agglomeration economies relative to firm selection. A common theme of these tests has been that they have examined predictions of the theory – *e.g.*, home market effects, multiple equilibria, patterns of spatial agglomeration, and wage distribution – but they left untouched the question of whether the precise agglomeration mechanism Krugman postulated to be important was at work.

¹ Prize Committee of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (2008).

This paper deviates from prior work by using highly disaggregated barcode data covering hundreds of thousands of goods purchased by 33,000 households in 49 cities in the US to measure product variety and the variety-adjusted costs faced by consumers in different locations. This permits the precise estimation of the pecuniary externalities hypothesized by Krugman.

NEG models generate externalities from a very simple structure. Trade costs are positive between cities, so locally produced goods must be cheaper than goods produced elsewhere. Further, if trade costs are prohibitive, larger cities will have more varieties than smaller ones. These two forces will combine to generate a lower price index in larger cities because more goods are produced locally in production centers². This lower price index induces people to move into cities enhancing the scale economy.

The notion that prices are lower in larger cities has not been supported by data examined in previous work. In a seminal paper estimating a general equilibrium model of city size, Roback (1982) identified a cost-of-living premium using U.S. housing prices and, more recently, DuMond *et al.* (1999) confirmed this result using aggregate U.S. cost-of-living indices. Similarly, Tabuchi (2001) finds that aggregate consumer price indices, land values, and housing costs are all higher in larger Japanese cities.

One reason that these studies have not been deemed fatal for the theory is that it is easy to modify NEG models to generate higher housing prices in cities. Helpman (1998), for example, presents an NEG model in which prices of tradable goods are lower in cities drawing residents in but as enough people move into the city the price of housing rises, causing the aggregate price

² In the original Krugman (1991) paper more varieties are produced in a large market but with non-infinite trade costs all varieties are available to consumers in both large and small markets. We will specifically refer to the fact that more varieties are available to consumers in large markets as “the variety effect.” This can arise in the original Krugman (1991) paper if some goods are traded at infinite cost, as in Helpman (1998), or if there is quadratic linear demand and/or a fixed cost associated with distributing each good to each city, as in Ottaviano, Tabuchi, and Thisse (2002).

level to equilibrate across locations. Thus, his model features higher land prices in cities, lower traded goods prices, but equal aggregate prices. NEG models can also generate higher aggregate consumer price indices in cities. Suedekum (2006), for example, shows how the Krugman (1991) model can generate higher non-traded goods prices by including a non-traded home goods sector in every city.

Secondly, prior empirical studies suffer from the problem of not carefully comparing identical goods, which raises the question of whether there may be biases in the data. Bils and Klenow (2001), for example, find that wealthier households purchase substantially more expensive varieties of the same narrowly defined good – *e.g.*

that if one controls for the household making the purchase and the amenities of the store in which the purchase is made this result is not robust. In fact, we find that prices for the same good purchased are actually *lower* in larger cities once we control for these forces. This is the first empirical confirmation of Krugman's conjecture about how the prices of traded goods vary with city size. Moreover, if we control for the fact that prices in larger cities embody land prices, we find that prices net of land costs are even more negatively correlated with city size as Helpman (1998) hypothesized.

Second, our study is the first to document that the variety of traded goods available for consumption is substantially higher in larger cities. The elasticity of the number of products with respect to city size is a whopping 0.2-0.3 (depending on the specification) which means that there is enormous variation in the number of available varieties across cities. For example, we estimate residents of New York (population 9.3 million) can choose between 97,000 different types of groceries, whereas residents of Des Moines (population 456,000) only have access to 32,000 varieties. This greater availability of varieties in larger cities means that variety-adjusted costs are likely to be substantially lower in large cities, as NEG models predict, setting the stage for our econometric exercise seeking to quantify the importance of the availability of varieties for welfare.

To do this estimation, we construct a variety-adjusted exact price index for each city in our sample. Our results show that while the prices of identical goods are higher in larger cities, the variety effect offsets this price effect resulting in similar variety-adjusted costs across cities. Since the prices of identical goods are actually lower in larger cities when we control for purchaser characteristics and store amenities, the variety-adjusted costs are substantially lower for a consumer in a large city than for a consumer sharing the same characteristics in a small city.

For example, a household that moved from Des Moines to New York and purchased goods from the same type of stores in the two cities would realize a 10 percent drop in the overall cost of its grocery purchases. This suggests that the price effects hypothesized by Krugman are economically significant.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section II describes the data we use and develops some stylized facts about purchasing behavior and variety availability that motivates our modeling choices. Section III develops the price index theory and econometrics underlying our estimation strategy. We present our results in Section IV, and Section V concludes.

II. Data

The primary dataset that we use is taken from the ACNielsen HomeScan database. This data was collected by ACNielsen from a demographically representative sample of approximately 33,000 households in 52 markets across the U.S. in 2005. Households were provided with Universal Product Code (UPC) scanners to scan in every purchase they made regardless of whether these purchases were made in a store with scanner technology³. We have the purchase records for grocery items, which include purchase quantity, price, date, store name⁴, product “module” (*i.e.*, a detailed description of the type of good, e.g. diet carbonated beverages), as well as demographic information for each household making the purchase. For much of the

³ In cases where panelists shop at stores without scanner technology, they report the price paid manually. Since errors can be made in this reporting process, we discard any purchase records for which the price paid was greater than twice or less than half the median price paid for the same UPC, approximately 250,000 out of 16 million observations. Einav, Leibtag, and Nevo (2008) address other concerns with the credibility of the Homescan data and find that the overall accuracy of the data is in line with other surveys of this type.

⁴ We do not use store name dummies for the smallest stores in our dataset because all of the store’s average price differences in a city would be assigned to its amenities. We therefore included close to 100 store dummies for stores that had over 100,000 dollars in sales in our sample. The majority of these are located in 15 or more cities, and all in at least 2 cities. For smaller stores, we used “channel ID” dummies that corresponded to whether the store was grocery store, mass-merchandise, drug store, convenience store, or club store. Thus for small stores, we assume that stores within these types of categories are homogeneous across cities.

analysis, we will be working with “brand-modules” that correspond to all the UPCs within a module that are marketed under a particular brand, *e.g.*, “Fanta-diet carbonated beverages.” We will also use product “groups,” a more aggregate product categorization provided by ACNielsen. Each product “module” fits within a unique product “group” (*i.e.*, the “diet carbonated beverages” and the “regular carbonated beverages” product modules both fit within the “carbonated beverages” product group). Detailed descriptions of these data and the sampling methods used can be found in Broda and Weinstein (2010).

A major advantage of these data relative to the data used in previous studies comparing cost-of-living indices across cities is that we can compare prices of identical goods to directly test the prediction that traded goods are on average cheaper in agglomeration locations. We can further use the household level demographic data and store names to separate how much of the inter-city price differential arises from factors that are not considered in the NEG models, such as differences in demographics, shopping behavior, and/or store amenities.

Although the ACNielsen dataset contains data for 52 markets, we classify cities at the level of Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) where available, and the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) otherwise. For example, where ACNielsen classifies urban, suburban, and ex-urban New York separately, we group them all as New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island CMSA. There are two cases in which ACNielsen groups two MSAs into one market. In these cases, we count the two MSAs as one city, using the sum of the population and manufacturing output and the population-weighted mean land value. We use population, income distribution, and racial and birthplace diversity data from the 2000 U.S. Census, manufacturing output data from 2007 U.S. Economic Census⁵, and 2000 land values from Davis and Palumbo

⁵The main results reported below hold when we use either population or food manufacturing output as our measure of city size and both measures are highly correlated. The data for food manufacturing output contains only the

(2007). Matching the ACNielsen data with the Davis and Palumbo data reduces the number of cities in our analysis to 37.

Before turning to the theory and estimation, we characterize three stylized facts of the raw data that motivate our approach:

Stylized Fact 1: Grocery Unit Value Indexes Indicate Large Cities are More Expensive

A common method to compare price levels across cities within countries relies on unit value indices such as those published by the Council for Community and Economic Research (formerly the American Chamber of Commerce Research Association (ACCRA)). The ACCRA Cost of Living Index (COLI) is a unit value index calculated using prices for similar products collected in different cities. The product categories are narrowly defined, e.g. “price per pound of ground beef, lowest price, min 80% lean,” “12 oz. plain regular potato chips,” or a “two bedroom, unfurnished apartment, excluding all utilities except water, 1½ or 2 baths, 950 sq. ft.” These indexes have often been used to argue that prices are higher in larger cities. While we will deal with a host of problems arising from comparing prices of similar, as opposed to identical, products later, it is important to establish that the result that prices are higher in larger cities is not just driven by the land value component of these indexes but is also true when looking at groceries alone.

In order to establish this stylized fact, we obtained the ACCRA COLI data for 2005 and used it to build a food index based on their unit values and weights. We also matched every food category used in the ACCRA COLI index with the same category of UPCs in the ACNielsen data and built a food index based on the average unit values of these UPCs and the ACCRA

reported output of firms whose primary business is food manufacturing, and not restaurants and retail stores that also produce barcoded products that appear in our sample. The tables below, therefore, report results using population, our preferred measure of city size.

weights. We refer to these two constructed indexes as the ACCRA food index and ACNielsen food index.

Table 1 presents cross city correlations between these various unit value indexes and city size. The first column demonstrates that it is not just the aggregate COLI index that is highly and positively correlated with city size, but grocery sub-indexes are also highly correlated with city size. The correlation between the aggregate COLI and log city population is 0.68 overall and 0.55 for food items. Similarly, the correlation between log population and the ACNielsen food index is 0.56 – almost identical to the ACCRA food index. If we look at the correlations between the different indexes in columns 2 and 3, we see that that correlation coefficient tends to hover around 0.8, indicating that food prices tend to be high whenever aggregate prices are high. In other words, it is not just indexes containing land unit values that indicate large cities are more expensive, grocery unit values are also higher.

Stylized Fact 2: Consumers Appear to have “Ideal Types” of Each Variety

Our dataset includes every food UPC purchased by each household in our sample. Table 2 shows that the typical household purchases only 341 distinct UPC’s during a continuous 250 day period.⁶ If we focus on one-person households, we see that these households buy, on average, only two different UPCs in a module conditional on making a purchase in that module. This suggests that they do not purchase the very diversified set of goods that love of variety models postulate.

One possible explanation for this behavior is that package sizes are too large to allow low levels of consumption of many goods. For example, consumers may want to consume every

⁶ We define a period as “continuous” if it does not include any periods of more than 14 days over which we do not observe the household making a purchase.

variety of soda available to them but they are constrained by the fact that it is difficult to purchase less than 12 ounces of soda. If this were true and consumers had a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) style taste for variety without quality differences, one would not expect to see many repeat purchases of the same good by the same household. However, the data indicates that, on average, a one-person household that purchases at least one unit of a UPC actually purchases 4 units of the same UPC. Moreover, if we broaden the definition a good to include all the UPC's in a brand within a module (e.g. count 6-packs of diet Coca-Cola and one-liter bottles of diet Coca-Cola as the same good), a one-person household purchases 5 units of each good they purchase. This implies that the limited number of varieties each household purchases cannot be explained by packages being simply too large for consumers to purchase several different varieties in a 250 day period.

The flip side of these repeat purchases is that households that purchase a particular variety of a good tend not to purchase many other varieties of the same good. If we again define a variety as a particular brand-module, we find that, in 60 percent of the cases, consumers only purchase one brand-module in a module. In other words, the raw data suggests that consumers, on average, repeatedly purchase the same types of goods. Consumer behavior at the module level seems to follow an ideal-type structure more closely than a love of variety structure.

Nevertheless, the heterogeneity in tastes across consumers seems to suggest that the love of variety model is not a bad depiction of *aggregate* consumer behavior. We can see this by examining the degree of overlap in the set of varieties purchased across households. If we randomly select a sample of households from the same city corresponding the smallest sample size collected any city (116 households), we find that typically 42 percent of the UPCs purchased by a household in a city are not purchased by *any* of the other 115 households in the sample.

These features of the data suggest that one should think of households as having heterogeneous ideal-type preferences, as opposed to the identical CES preferences that form the theoretical foundation for the variety-adjusted exact prices indices used in this paper. This discrepancy, however, is not a problem for our analysis if we think of consumers as having a logit demand system. In particular, Anderson, De Palma, and Thisse (1987) have demonstrated that a CES demand system can arise from the aggregation of ideal-type logit consumers. We will therefore follow Anderson, De Palma, and Thisse (1987) and use the CES structure to evaluate *aggregate* welfare even though we know that the discrete choice model is a better depiction of reality at the household level.

Stylized Fact 3: Consumers in Larger Cities Consume More Varieties

One simple way to see if households in larger cities have access to more varieties is to count them. Because ACNielsen tends to sample more households in larger cities, we need to make sure that the sample size is constant across cities. We therefore restrict ourselves to only looking at cities in which ACNielsen sampled at least 450 households and compare the number of varieties purchased by a random sample of 450 households in each of these cities. We plot the aggregate number of *different* UPCs purchased by all of these households against the size of the city in which the households live in Figure 1. The results show a clear positive relationship between the variety of UPCs purchased in a city and the population of the city. This is certainly suggestive of the notion at the center of NEG models that the number of varieties available in a location rises with number of inhabitants in that location. However, it leaves open the question of whether these differences are likely to matter for consumers; that is, does the city size variety

effect drive down the consumer price index in larger cities relative to small? We now turn to assessing this question.

III Empirical Strategy

Our main objective is to examine the relationship between city size and consumer costs by answering three separate, but related questions: 1) are traded goods prices lower in larger cities, 2) are more varieties available in larger cities, and 3) do the city size effects on prices and variety abundance combine to result in the “price index effect” predicted by the Krugman (1991) model?

III A. The Variety-Adjusted Price Index

Feenstra (1994) developed the variety-adjusted price index for the CES utility function. Here, we will modify it so that it can be used with our data. We begin by modeling the aggregate utility function as a nested CES utility function. To do this, we need to establish some notation. Let $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ denote the set of product groups, which we define in the same way as ACNielsen, *i.e.*, sectors like “Crackers”, etc. As in Broda and Weinstein (2010), the product group of “Crackers”, would contain brand-modules like “Nabisco-Premium-Flaked Soda Crackers” and “Pepperidge Farm Goldfish-Cheese Crackers.” We let $b_g \in \{1, \dots, B_g\}$ denote the set of “brand-modules” within a product group.

We define U_{bgc} the set of all UPCs that have positive sales in city c in brand-module b , in product group g ; U_{bg} the set of all UPCs that have positive sales *nationally* in brand-module b , in product group g ; B_{gc} the set of all brands that have positive sales in city c in product group g ; and B_g the set of all brands that have positive sales *nationally* in product group g .

It turns out that it is useful to measure the importance of a UPC's sales relative to several benchmarks. First, let s_{ubg} be the *national* expenditures on UPC u as a share of *national* expenditures on brand b in product group g , and let s_{ubgc} be a *city's* expenditures on UPC u as a share of the *city's* expenditures on brand b in product group g . We next define the *national* market share of city c 's available UPCs in that particular brand-module (*i.e.*, $u \in U_{bgc}$) as

$$s_{bgc} = \frac{\sum_{u \in U_{bgc}} s_{ubg}}{\sum_{u \in U_{bgc}} 1}.$$

Thus, s_{bgc} , which we call the “UPC-share,” tells us the expenditure share of UPCs within a brand that are available in a city using *national* weights. In other words, if the UPCs that constitute a large share of a brand's national sales are available locally, then s_{bgc} will be large. It will also be useful to define an analogous measure computed using *local* weights:

$$\tilde{s}_{bgc} = \frac{\sum_{u \in U_{bgc}} s_{ubgc}}{\sum_{u \in U_{bgc}} 1}.$$

Just as we defined shares of UPCs within brands, we also need to measure the importance of various brands. We do this in an analogous manner below;

$$s_{gc} = \frac{\sum_{b \in B_{gc}} s_{bg}}{\sum_{b \in B_{gc}} 1} \text{ and } \tilde{s}_{gc} = \frac{\sum_{b \in B_{gc}} \tilde{s}_{bgc}}{\sum_{b \in B_{gc}} 1},$$

where s_{bg} , which we call the “brand-share,” is the *national* market share of brand-module b in product group g , and s_{bgc} is the local market share of brand-module b in product group g .

We can now modify Broda and Weinstein's (2010) Proposition 1 as follows:

For $g \in G$, if $B_{gc} \neq \emptyset$, then the exact price index for the price of the set of goods G in city c relative to the nation as a whole that takes into account the differences in variety in the two locations is given by,

$$\text{EPI}_{\mathbf{p}_c, \mathbf{x}_c, U_g} = \frac{\text{CEPI}_{cg}}{\sum_{g \in G} \text{CEPI}_{cg}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{g \in G} \frac{1}{s_{gc}^{1-\frac{a}{g}}}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{g \in G} \frac{w_{bgc}^{w_{gc}}}{s_{bgc}^{1-\frac{w_{gc}}{g}}}},$$

where w_{bgc} and w_{gc} are log-ideal CES Kazuo Sato (1976) and Yrjo Vartia (1976) weights defined as follows:

$$w_{gbc} = \frac{\frac{\tilde{s}_{bgc}}{\ln \tilde{s}_{bgc}} \frac{s_{bg}}{\ln s_{bg}}}{\frac{\tilde{s}_{bgc}}{\ln \tilde{s}_{bgc}} \frac{s_{bg}}{\ln s_{bg}}} \text{ and } w_{gc} = \frac{\frac{\tilde{s}_{gc}}{\ln \tilde{s}_{gc}} \frac{s_g}{\ln s_g}}{\frac{\tilde{s}_{gc}}{\ln \tilde{s}_{gc}} \frac{s_g}{\ln s_g}},$$

\tilde{s}_{bgc} is the elasticity of substitution across brand-modules in product group g , s_g is the elasticity of substitution among UPCs within a brand-module, s_g is the share of product group g in national expenditures, and CEPI_{cg} is the conventional exact price index associated with the CES utility function for product group g and city c relative to the national sample.

This index has been used extensively in the literature (see Feenstra (2010) for a survey of its use), so we will only briefly discuss its properties here. While the CEPI_{cg} measures the prices of products available in city c relative to their average price nationally, the second and third terms within the brackets adjust the exact price index to account for the fact that not all varieties, respectively defined as brands and UPCs, available nationally are available in city c . Each variety adjustment is calculated using an elasticity of substitution parameter and the national expenditure share of unavailable varieties. One of the properties of this index is that the variety adjustments and, therefore, the price level will fall as more UPCs and brands are available in a city, and will fall faster when these additional varieties and brands are popular nationally. This property is due to the fact that the index gives more weight to the availability of non-common varieties that comprise a larger share of expenditure in the market where they are available, in our case, the national market. The elasticity of substitution parameter weights varieties by how differentiated they are. As a result, the availability of more differentiated varieties matters more than the availability of varieties that are close substitutes to existing varieties. We obtain the elasticities of substitution computed for UPCs within a brand-module and across brand modules within a product group from Broda and Weinstein (2010).

III B. Adjusting Prices for Amenities and Buyer Characteristics

Our first challenge in identifying the “price index effect” is to measure the prices of goods consumed in more than one city – *i.e.*, “common goods.” One of the complicating factors associated with measuring these prices is that store amenities and shopping behavior might vary systematically across locations. If, for example, bigger cities feature nicer stores, we might systematically bias our results against the NEG model. Similarly, wealthier households pay more for the same goods in the same stores (presumably because the opportunity cost of time spent shopping is higher) and per capita income is increasing in city size. Finally, since urban population is positively correlated with land prices in models such as Helpman (1998), the non-traded, land price component of grocery prices might drive a positive correlation between population and prices and one may want to strip this component out to evaluate the pure impact of population on tradable goods prices. This suggests that we should purge the data of these effects, but in the interests of understanding which effects are critical, we will neutralize these confounding factors one at a time.

We begin by letting P_{uzcrh} be the price of UPC u , purchased in zip code z , in store r , by household h in city c . We will refer P_{uzcrh} as the “unadjusted price.” We also define p_{uzcrh} as $\ln(P_{uzcrh})$. The simplest way to purge the price data of amenities and other effects that are not in the model is in a two step process, the first of which is to run a regression of the form:

$$(1) \quad p_{uzcrh} = \alpha_u + \alpha_r + \sum_i \alpha_i Z_{ih} + \beta_1 \ln Pop_c + \beta_2 \ln Income_z + \beta_3 \ln Land_c + \epsilon_{uzcrh},$$

where Z_h denotes a series of household characteristics; Pop_c denotes the population of the city in which the UPC was purchased; $Income_z$ is the per capita income in the zip code where the UPC was purchased; $Land_c$ is the price of land in the city where the UPC was purchased; and Greek symbols denote parameters to be estimated.

Equation (1) enables us to make a number of adjustments to the prices to control for various characteristics that can affect prices but are outside of the canonical Krugman model.

We construct the log demographic-adjusted price as

$$(2) \quad \ln \tilde{p}_{uzcrh}^D = \ln p_{uzcrh} - \sum_i \hat{Z}_{ih}.$$

\tilde{p}_{uzcrh}^D corresponds to prices purged of effects of demographic characteristics of the buyers. This will be useful when we want to control for the fact that wealthier people tend to locate in larger cities.

We then purge prices of store effects in the log store-adjusted price defined as:

$$(3) \quad \ln \tilde{p}_{uzcrh}^{DS} = \ln p_{uzcrh} - \sum_i \hat{Z}_{ih} - \hat{\alpha}_r.$$

For stores with more than \$100,000 in sales, which includes national chains such as *Wal-Mart*, *Kroger*, and *CVS*, we estimate $\hat{\alpha}_r$ for each chain and purge prices of chain-specific store amenities. For smaller stores, however, we restrict $\hat{\alpha}_r$ to be the same for all stores of the same type, where type is defined in one of seven categories: Grocery, drug, mass merchandiser, supercenter, club, convenience, and other. Here, we are accounting for the fact that products might be distributed through different channels in larger cities than smaller cities, *e.g.* through convenience and grocery stores as opposed to super centers and club stores.

Broda, Leibtag, and Weinstein (2009) found that stores in more expensive neighborhoods charge more for the same UPCs presumably because consumers may enjoy shopping in nicer neighborhoods and/or workers in high income neighborhoods may offer more amenities. We account for this possibility defining the following income-adjusted price:

$$(4) \quad \ln \tilde{p}_{uzcrh}^{DSI} = \ln p_{uzcrh} - \sum_i \hat{Z}_{ih} - \hat{\alpha}_r - \hat{\alpha}_2 \ln Income_z$$

These prices will be useful when we want to consider the shift in utility that would occur if a household with a particular set of demographic characteristics living in a particular type of neighborhood moved to a comparable neighborhood in another city.

Finally, since even the prices of tradables contain a non-traded component, we may also wish to consider prices that have also been purged of land values as well. We define land-value adjusted prices as

$$(5) \quad \ln \tilde{p}_{uzcrh}^{DSILV} = \ln p_{uzcrh} - \sum_i \hat{\alpha}_i Z_{ih} - \hat{\alpha}_r - \hat{\alpha}_2 \ln Income_z - \hat{\alpha}_3 \ln Land_c$$

These prices will give us a sense of how the prices of purely traded goods vary across cities before land rents are included in the retail prices.

III C. Measuring Variety Availability in Cities

Measuring the brand-share, s_{gc} , and the UPC-share, s_{bgc} , provides a particular challenge because we do not observe all of the varieties available in each city. Our estimates of s_{bgc} and s_{gc} are likely to be affected by a downward bias on our estimates of the size of sets U_{bgc} and U_{gc} . The bias is likely to emerge from two sources. First, some cities have smaller samples of households than other cities, so there will be a natural tendency for the counts of UPCs purchased in each city to vary with the sample size in the city. Second, even if the sample sizes were identical in every city, the sample count of UPCs will be below the true count of UPCs because some goods will not be purchased by our sample of households but will be purchased by other households in the city.

Our approach to this problem is to break it into two components. We begin by developing two methodologies for estimating the number of UPCs and brand-modules available in a city, the size of the sets U_{bgc} and U_{gc} respectively, using purchase records for only a sample of households

in the city. The first method is parametric and the second is non-parametric, but we will show that both methodologies yield very similar estimates for how the number of varieties and brands varies across cities, which is a critical component in understanding whether the NEG model is valid.

Unfortunately, there is not a theoretical underpinning for parametrically estimating s_{gc} and s_{bgc} . Nevertheless, these can be estimated using a non-parametric approach. We therefore rely on the fact that, in the standard NEG models (with no quality variation across varieties), s_{gc} and s_{bgc} are proportional to the number of varieties available and the fact that both parametric and nonparametric estimation yield very similar estimates of the counts of varieties to motivate our use of nonparametric estimates for s_{gc} and s_{bgc} .

The parametric methodology that we will employ for estimating the number of products available in a city was initially developed by biostatisticians for estimating the number of distinct species in a region. Since this methodology is largely unfamiliar for economists, it is useful to go through some of the intuition here before presenting the full statistical model. Initially, let us assume that each household selects only one UPC out of the S UPCs available in the market. If we also assume that each UPC is purchased with a probability that is identical for all UPCs in the market, then it follows that $p = 1/S$.

Our task, now, is to estimate S using the number of different UPCs purchased by a sample of H households. To do this, we make one additional assumption: stores have sufficient inventories of goods so that the purchase of a UPC by one household does not reduce the probability of another household buying the same UPC. If household purchases are independent in the cross-section, then the probability that we observe one of the H households in our sample selecting a particular UPC is equal to one minus the probability that none of the H households

selects the UPC, or $1 - (1 - 1/S)^H$. The number of different UPCs that we expect to observe in the purchase records of the H households is simply the sum of these probabilities across all of the S available UPCs,

$$(6) \quad S(H) = \sum_{i=1}^S (1 - (1 - 1/S)^H)$$

It would be straightforward to obtain an estimate for the number of varieties in the market in this simple case. By equating $S(H)$ to the sample UPC count, $\tilde{S}(H)$, we can derive an estimate for the number of available UPCs, \hat{S} , which satisfies equation (6). Note that the distribution of $S(H)$ should follow the negative exponential function,

$$(7) \quad S(H) = \sum_{i=1}^S (1 - e^{-\ln(1 - 1/S)H})$$

This simple approach cannot be applied to the data for two reasons. First, households purchase more than one UPC in the course of a year. And second, some UPCs, like milk, are likely to be purchased at higher frequencies than other UPCs, like salt. Hence the probability that we observe the purchase of a UPC will vary across UPCs. We can deal with the first problem by allowing the purchase probability to differ from $1/S$. The second problem, however, is more complicated because solving it requires us to know the purchase frequencies not only of every observed UPC but also of the UPCs that we do not observe in our sample.

In order to understand how we can solve this problem, let's consider another simple case in which there are two possible purchase frequencies, α_1 and α_2 . We will refer to goods purchased at frequency α_1 as being in the first "incidence group" and goods purchased at frequency α_2 as being in the second incidence group. Without a loss of generality, we assume that the probability that any household purchases one of the UPCs indexed $1, \dots, S_1$ is α_1 and the probability that any household purchases one of the UPCs indexed S_1+1, \dots, S is $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$, where S

$= S_1 + S_2$ and $S_1 + S_2 = 1$. The probability that we will observe any one of the UPCs indexed $1, \dots, S_1$ in a sample of H households' purchases is now $(1 - (1 - \pi_1)^H)$ and the probability that we will observe any one of the UPCs indexed $S_1 + 1, \dots, S$ is $(1 - (1 - \pi_2)^H)$. We can now write the total number of different UPCs that we would expect to observe in the purchases of H households as

$$(8) \quad S \approx H \left(S_1 \left(1 - (1 - \pi_1)^H \right) + S_2 \left(1 - (1 - \pi_2)^H \right) \right),$$

where $\pi_1 = S_1/S$ and $\pi_2 = S_2/S$ are shares of UPCs that fall in the two incidence groups. In this case, if we could obtain estimates for π_1 , π_2 , and H , we could estimate the total number of UPCs available in the market according to the following formula:

$$(9) \quad \hat{S} \approx \tilde{S} H \left(\pi_1 \left(1 - (1 - \pi_1)^H \right) + \pi_2 \left(1 - (1 - \pi_2)^H \right) \right).$$

Unfortunately, solving equation (9) for \hat{S} requires the sample value for $\tilde{S}(H)$ (as in with equation (6)), as well as, estimates of π_1 , π_2 , and H . Estimating the π 's and H 's is not straightforward; they need to be obtained from the mixture distribution governing the probability of jointly observing all of the UPCs in the sample. We will describe how we estimate this distribution in the context of the more general case that we consider in our analysis.

Following Mao, Colwell, and Chang (2005) we assume, as we did in the examples above, that groups of UPCs share the same selection probability. Suppose that each UPC u has a probability of $\pi_{c,u}$ of being selected by any one household in city c , and that there are K different incidence groups, or values that $\pi_{c,u}$ can take in each city c , such that $\pi_{c,u} = \pi_{c,k}$ for each UPC u in category k . We define $\pi_{c,k}$ as the proportion of UPCs in city c that are selected with probability $\pi_{c,k}$. For example, when residents of a particular city choose to buy a particular good,

one might observe one purchase probability for dry goods, another one for perishable goods, a third one for cleaning supplies, etc.

We can now write the following equation relating the shares of each incidence group, the probability a UPC in that group is selected, and the total number of UPCs in the city as

$$\sum_{k=1}^K s_{c,k} = 1.$$

The number of UPCs we expect to observe in a sample of H_c households is

$$(10) \quad S_c(H_c) = \sum_{k=1}^K s_{c,k} (1 - (1 - s_{c,k})^{H_c}),$$

where Colwell, Mao, and Chang (2004) note that equation (10) can be re-written as:

$$S_c(H_c) = \sum_{k=1}^K s_{c,k} (1 - \exp(-C_{c,k} H_c)), \text{ where } C_{c,k} = -\ln(1 - s_{c,k}).$$

It is straightforward to see that equation (7) is a specific case of equation (10) in which the selection probability is identical for all UPCs, *i.e.*, $K = 1$ and $s_{c,k} = 1/S$. Equation (10) is therefore referred to as the “generalized negative exponential” (GNE) model.

Mao, Colwell, and Chang (2005) show how one can use maximum likelihood estimation to estimate S_c . The starting point is to realize that the number of households purchasing product u in city c , $h_{c,u}$, follows a binomial distribution with probability:

$$(11) \quad P(h_{c,u}) = \binom{H_c}{h_{c,u}} s_{c,u}^{h_{c,u}} (1 - s_{c,u})^{H_c - h_{c,u}},$$

where H_c is the total number of households in the sample for city c ,

$$\binom{H_c}{h_{c,u}} = \frac{H_c!}{h_{c,u}! (H_c - h_{c,u})!},$$

and once again $h_{c,u} = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{c,k} h_{c,u}^{(k)}$ for each UPC, u , in category k . Let $\{h_{c,u}\}_{u \in U_c}$ be the observed *counts* of each UPC purchased by our sample of households in a city c , where U_c is the set of UPCs observed in the city c sample. Now, we can define the binomial mixture distribution as follows:

$$h_{c,u} = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{c,k} h_{c,u}^{(k)}; \quad \pi_{c,k} \in [0, 1].$$

This distribution tells us the probability of observing $h_{c,u}$ purchases of any UPC u in our data, regardless of its incidence group, given the size and purchase probabilities of each of the incidence groups.

Mao, Colwell, and Chang (2005) derive a maximum likelihood methodology for estimating the $\pi_{c,k}$'s and $\pi_{c,k}^{(j)}$'s for a given K using data on the number of samples (in our case, households) in which each variety is observed. The variable $n_{c,j}$ is defined to be the number of products that are purchased by j households in the dataset for city c , *i.e.*, for which $h_{c,u}$ equals j . In other words, if 100 UPCs are purchased by no households, 50 UPCs are purchased by 1 household, and 25 UPCs are purchased by 2 households, then we would have $n_{c,0} = 100$; $n_{c,1} = 50$; and $n_{c,2} = 25$. The joint likelihood of the total number of products available in the city, S_c , and the parameters of the mixture distribution is

$$L(S_c, \pi_{c,k}, \pi_{c,k}^{(j)}; \mathbf{h}_{c,u}) = \frac{S_c!}{\prod_{j=0}^{H_c} n_{c,j}!} \prod_{j=0}^{H_c} (j!)^{n_{c,j}}$$

Note that from equation (10), we know that the number of available products, S_c , is a function of

the number of observed products, $S_c(H_c) = \sum_{j=1}^{H_c} n_{c,j}$, and the parameters of the mixture

distribution, $\pi_{c,k}, \pi_{c,k}^{(j)}$. Therefore, we only need to estimate the parameters of the mixture

distribution to derive an estimate for the number of available products. To do so, we will

maximize a conditional likelihood function. Let $\tilde{h}_{c,u}^{(j)}(h_{c,u}; n_{c,u})$ be a zero-truncated binomial density, *i.e.*, the probability that a product is purchased by j households conditional on it being purchased by more than one household, and $\tilde{h}_{c,k}^{(j)}(h_{c,k}; n_{c,k})$ be the mixture distribution over these densities for K incidence groups. If we denote the total number of UPCs that are purchased by at least one household in the sample $n_{c,+}$, the conditional likelihood function is

$$L_{c,k} = \frac{n_{c,+}!}{H_c} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{n_{c,k}!}{n_{c,j}!} \tilde{h}_{c,k}^{(j)}(h_{c,k}; n_{c,k})^{n_{c,k}}$$

We estimate the parameters of mixture distributions for a range of values for K using the conditional likelihood function. Each distribution implies a different estimate for the total number of UPCs available in a city. We then compute the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) for each value of K in each city. We choose between the distributions by selecting the number of incidence groups for all cities equal to the K that maximizes the sum of the AICs across all cities⁷.

Once we have our estimates for the $\hat{h}_{c,k}$'s and $\hat{h}_{c,u}$'s, we can use equation (10) to obtain an estimate of the total number of varieties as follows:

$$(12) \quad \hat{S}_c = \tilde{S}_c(H_c) \prod_{k=1}^K \hat{h}_{c,k} (1 - \hat{h}_{c,k})^{H_c}$$

where variables with circumflexes represent parameter estimates and $\tilde{S}_c(H_c)$ is equal to the sample count of distinct varieties in the city. It is useful to note that when the number of sampled households in the city, H_c approaches infinity, the fact that the $\hat{h}_{c,k}$'s sum to one implies that our

⁷ We also assume that the sampling is sufficient so that we observe some UPCs purchased in each incidence group. We need this assumption because we cannot say anything about the number of goods in an incidence group that are purchased with such low a probability that no one in the sample ever buys them. In other words, we can only discuss the number of available varieties for observable classes of goods.

count of the number of distinct products purchased by these households becomes our estimate of the number of varieties.

The above approach is parametric in the sense that we assume the distribution of the count of varieties depends on the underlying probabilities and shares of the various incidence groups. There is also a nonparametric approach that is often used for the same purpose based on the estimation of “accumulation curves” (see Mao, Colwell, and Chang [2004, 2005]). If we define an accumulation curve, $S(n)$, as the number of distinct UPCs purchased by a sample of n households, then the total number of different varieties available equals the asymptote of the accumulation curve.

We follow a well-developed methodology for estimating these curves. We first randomly order the households in our sample for a given city. We then count the number of unique UPCs purchased by the first household in the random ordering for a city and denote this count $S(1)$. Next, we take the data for the second household in our ordering and add it to the data for the first household in a hypothetical sample and count the number of unique UPCs in this sample, denoting it $S(2)$. We continue to add households to the hypothetical sample creating a series $(S(1), S(2), S(3), \dots, S(H_c))$, where H_c is the total number of households in our sample for city c .

One of the problems of this approach is that each accumulation curve will be sensitive to the random order in which households are added to the curve due to both random error and sample heterogeneity. Colwell and Coddington (1994) note that the random error can be reduced by randomizing the sample order R times and generating an accumulation curve, $S_{c,r}(n)$, for each random ordering indexed by r . The random error-adjusted accumulation curve is the mean of the species accumulation curves over the different randomizations,

$$\bar{S}(n) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R S_{c,r}(n).$$

We can adjust for random error by using mean accumulation curves over 50 randomizations, *i.e.*, $R = 50$.⁸

An important feature of accumulation curves is that their value in the limit when n approaches infinity is an estimate of the total number of different goods available in the city.⁹ Unfortunately, theory does not tell us what the distribution will be for these accumulation curves. Therefore, we will follow Jimenez-Valverde *et al.* (2006) by estimating the parameters of various functional forms and use the AIC goodness-of-fit test to choose between a range of functional forms that pass through the origin and have a positive asymptote.

We use this accumulation curve methodology to estimate the “brand-share,” s_{gc} , and the “UPC-share,” s_{bgc} . Just as we build an accumulation curve corresponding to the count of the different goods represented in a sample, we can also build a curve corresponding to the national market share of the different goods represented in a sample. We estimate the asymptotes of the two different *share* accumulation curves for each product group in each market. The first curve is used to estimate the national market share of the brand-modules that are available in a city within

⁸ To determine how sensitive the adjusted accumulation curve is to sample heterogeneity, Colwell and Coddington (1994) suggest comparing the adjusted accumulation curve with the accumulation curve that we would expect to draw if all of the UPCs purchased by the households in the city sample were randomly assigned to households. We use the random placement method to calculate this expected accumulation curve and its variance as:

$$\tilde{S}(n) = S_{TOT} \sum_{u=1}^{S_{TOT}} \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right)^{n_u}, \text{ and } \sigma^2(n) = S_{TOT} \sum_{u=1}^{S_{TOT}} \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right)^{n_u} \left(1 - \frac{n}{N}\right)^{2n_u}$$

where S_{TOT} is the total number of UPCs recorded in the sample, n_u is the total number of households that purchase that UPC u , and N is the total number of households in the sample. If the expected curve, $\tilde{S}(n)$, rises more steeply from the origin than the mean curve, $\bar{S}(n)$, the sample heterogeneity is greater than that which could be explained by random sampling error alone. Coleman *et al.* (1982) state that the hypothesis of random placement will hold if the expected curve does not deviate by more than one standard deviation from the mean curve for more than one third of the sample sizes, n , and the deviations are distributed randomly across n . We checked that this is true in our data.

⁹ One might think that it would be more appropriate to use the total number of households in the city instead of the asymptote to compute the number of goods available. This would be true if every good available in a city were purchased by at least one household, but not otherwise. In practice, since the number of households in a city is quite large, it does not matter whether one focuses on the asymptote or sets n equal to the number of households.

a product group, s_{gc} . The second is used to estimate the national market share of the UPCs that are available in a city within each brand-module that is available in the city, s_{bgc} .

Unfortunately, we are unable to estimate one value of s_{bgc} for each brand-module b in each product group g for each city c because household samples are sometimes too small to allow us to observe more than a few purchases of UPCs within many of the brand-modules available in a city, *i.e.*, every b in B_{gc} . Since we do not want to estimate accumulation curves for brand-modules in which there are very few purchases, we pool the data in each city and estimate a common s_{bgc} for all brand-modules within each product group in a city, which we denote \bar{s}_{gc} . This “average” UPC-share is an estimate for the national sales of UPCs available in a city divided by the national sales of all brand-modules available in the city, *i.e.*, the weighted average within-brand national market share of the UPCs available in a city conditional on the brand-module being available in the city. We calculate this estimate using an accumulation curve of the national sales of the UPCs available in a hypothetical sample of H households as a share of the national sales of brand-modules available in the city as a whole. For the denominator, we use national product group sales multiplied by our estimate for s_{gc} . This simplifies the variety adjustment in Proposition 1, so we can calculate the EPI for city c relative to the national sample as:

$$EPI_{\mathbf{p}_c, \mathbf{x}_c, U} = \frac{CEPI_{cg}}{s_{gc}^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{a}{g}}}} \frac{1}{\bar{s}_{gc}^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{w}{g}}}} w_{gc}.$$

By rearranging terms, we can decompose the exact price index into a common exact price index for a city $CEPI_c$ and a variety adjustment, VA_c which we define below:

$$(13) \quad EPI_{\mathbf{p}_c, \mathbf{x}_c, U} = CEPI_c VA_c \frac{CEPI_{cg}}{s_{gc}^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{a}{g}}}} \frac{1}{\bar{s}_{gc}^{\frac{1}{1-\frac{w}{g}}}} w_{gc}.$$

Equation (13) will be useful for discussing the role played by new varieties in our analysis.

IV. Results

We begin our analysis by exploring how prices vary with city size. One way to benchmark our results is to compare them to the unit value results we presented in Table 1. If we regress the log of the ACNielsen food unit-value index level in a city on the log of its population, we obtain a coefficient of 0.04 (s.e. 0.01) indicating a one log unit rise in city size is associated with a four percent rise in the unit value of groceries. Table 3 presents results from estimating equation (1) where now the key difference is that we are now gauging price differences between identical products, or UPCs, sold in different cities. The first column of the table demonstrates that if we simply regress prices on city size, the coefficient on city size falls to only one quarter the magnitude obtained in the unit value regression and is only significant at the 10 percent level. This result indicates that most of the positive relationship between prices and city size in the unit value index reflects the fact that people in larger cities buy different, higher-priced varieties of goods.

These results, however, overstate the positive association between prices and city size because the prices of identical goods are likely to vary systematically with the store in which they are purchased (presumably because some stores offer better amenities) and the buyer's responsiveness to sales. Controlling for store amenities and purchaser characteristics tends to further weaken the link between city size and prices. Most of the apparently higher prices of identical goods in larger cities is due to the fact that people in larger cities shop in nicer stores.

Most surprisingly, we find that the relationship between city size and prices turns negative (although again not significantly so) once we control for zip code income and city land

prices. These results are not conclusive in part because we have not aggregated the data appropriately to build a price index, but they strongly suggest that the result that prices rise with city size is an artifact of nicer stores locating in larger cities.¹⁰

We now turn to estimating the number of varieties available in a city based on our structural GNE approach. With 49 cities, the GNE approach involves the estimation of several hundred parameters, so we do not report all the values here. The AIC indicates that UPCs tend to fall within 10 incidence groups in terms of their purchase frequency.¹¹ Table 4 summarizes these estimates across our sample of 49 cities. We see that in all cities there are few UPCs that are purchased with very high frequency – on average, one in ten thousand UPCs are purchased with a frequency of 0.5 by a household. This would correspond to about 8 UPCs in the typical city having a purchase probability of 0.5 over the course of a year by a typical household. However, we also see that the vast majority of UPCs have extremely low purchase probability. 49 percent of UPCs have a purchase probability of approximately 1 in a thousand. Thus, the product space is characterized by a few UPCs with high purchase probabilities and a vast number of UPCs that are rarely purchased.

¹⁰ One possible problem with these results is that we measure the size of cities by their population, but it could be the case that food production might not be highly correlated with population. We only have data on urban food manufacturing for 34 of our 49 cities, so shifting to food manufacturing as our measure of city size reduces the number of cities in our sample by 30 percent. For the cities with food manufacturing data, the correlation between food manufacturing and population is 0.6, with the three largest population centers New York, Los Angeles, and Chicago being the three largest producers of manufactured food products. This probably understates the true correlation because many food products manufactured by retailers (whose output Bernstein and Weinstein (2002) have shown are highly correlated with population) are probably not counted in food manufacturing output. Nevertheless, we obtain qualitatively similar result if we measure city size with food manufacturing.

¹¹ The incidence groups do not map directly into the product groups or product modules. The estimated purchase frequency associated with each UPC within a product group or brand-module will vary with the popularity of the UPC, which may be correlated with its brand, container, size, and other characteristics. The UPCs in the high frequency incidence group tend to be the most popular varieties of products that are frequently purchased, *e.g.* 12-packs of Coke cans, which are purchased by almost a third of the households in our sample. Less popular varieties of soda tend to fall into the lower purchase frequency incidence groups. These incidence groups will also be populated with the most popular UPCs in less frequently purchased product categories, *e.g.* Fleischmann's fresh cake yeast along with the more obscure varieties of soda as well as the less popular varieties of yeast.

Another way of summarizing the estimates is to examine how the probability that a UPC is purchased varies with city size. We would expect that the probability that any consumer purchases any one UPC would go down as the range of available UPCs in the city increases. Fortunately, this is easy to examine given that our GNE structure enables us to estimate the probability that a household purchases a UPC by simply calculating

$$c = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{c}_{c,k} \hat{c}_{c,k}.$$

In Figure 2, we see that the estimated average probability of purchase (which uses no population data in its estimation) decreases sharply with city size. A UPC sold in our smallest city, Des Moines, has three times the probability of being purchased by any individual household as a UPC sold in New York. The fact that households in larger cities are much less likely to buy any individual UPC is strongly suggestive of the fact that the range of UPCs available in a city is increasing with city size.

We test this directly by using the GNE parameter estimates to calculate an estimate for total number of varieties in each city and considering how this varies with city size. Figure 3 plots how the log estimated number of varieties in each city varies with city size. It is interesting that the relationship between city size and the number of varieties in a city is similar but much stronger than the one we observed in Figure 1. The data seem to strongly suggest a relationship between the size of a city and the number of varieties available as hypothesized by Krugman. Residents of New York have access just over 97,000 different varieties of groceries, while residents of small cities like Omaha and Des Moines have access to fewer than 32,000.

We test this relationship between city size and variety abundance formally in Table 5. Table 5 presents the results from regressing the log estimated number of varieties in a city from the GNE procedure on the log of the population in the city. The first three columns of the table

present regressions of the log sample counts of varieties in each city on the log of the city's population. The next columns present regressions of the log estimate of number of varieties based on the GNE asymptotes on city size, and the final three columns repeat these results for our Weibull estimates. As one can see, the elasticity of variety with respect to population is less using the GNE estimates because these correct for the correlation between sample size and population in the AC Neilson data. What is most striking, however, is that we observe a very strong and statistically significant relationship between the size of the city and the number of estimated varieties. Our estimates indicate that a city with twice the population as another one typically has 20 percent more varieties.

One concern with these results is that they might be biased because larger cities might have more diverse populations. In order to control for this we constructed a number of Herfindahl indexes based on the shares of MSA population with different income, race, and country of birth. These indices will be rising in population homogeneity. In addition, we include the per capita income in each city. As one can see from Table 5, controlling for urban diversity does not alter the results.

Finally, we were concerned that our results might be due to a spurious correlation between city population and urban land area. If there are a constant number of unique varieties per unit area, then more populous cities might appear to have more diversity simply because they occupy more area. To make sure that this force was not driving our results, we include the log of urban land area in our regressions. The coefficient on land area is not significant in any of the specifications, while the coefficient on population remains positive and very significant. These results indicate that controlling for land area and demographic characteristics does not qualitatively affect the strong relationship between city size and the number of available varieties.

The R^2 of around 0.5 to 0.6 indicates that city size is an important determinant of variety availability. This is the first time anyone has documented that the number of tradable goods varies systematically with city size as hypothesized by New Economic Geography models.

Unfortunately, our structural estimation techniques cannot be applied to the estimation of the shares because our theory of the probability of purchasing a good does not map into a theory for the probability of spending a particular share of income on a good. As we mentioned earlier, this forces us to use a non-structural technique. However, before doing so, we will first provide some intuition for the methodology and then demonstrate that non-structural methods yield almost identical results as structural methods on count data and fit share data extremely well.

We begin by plotting accumulation curves, which are a graph of the number of distinct varieties we obtain on average in a random sample of n households against the number of households. The intuition for the approach arises from the fact that if households in a city choose more disparate sets of goods than households in a second city, the accumulation curve for the first city will lie above that of the second city because n households in the first city will tend to consume more varieties than n households in the second city. One can then obtain an estimate for the total number of goods available in each city based on the asymptote of the accumulation curve for that city.

We plot these accumulation curves for the twelve cities for which we have the largest samples in Figure 4. These curves reveal that the four highest curves – corresponding to the cities with the greatest variety of goods purchased – are for New York, DC-Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Boston. These cities are all among the five largest cities in our sample. This raw data plot is yet another indicator that residents of larger cities consume a broader set of varieties than those in smaller cities.

We can examine this more formally by estimating the asymptotes of the accumulation curves. Since we are not sure how to model these accumulation curves, we try five different functional forms – Clench, Chapman-Richards, Morgan-Mercer-Flodin, Negative Exponential, and Weibull. We choose among these based on the Akaike Information Criterion. The Weibull was a strong favorite with the lowest AIC score in the majority of cities for which we modeled UPC count accumulation curves, and so we decided to focus on this functional form.

Figure 5 plots the raw data and the estimated Weibull accumulation curve for our largest city, New York. A typical sample of 500 random households buys around 45,000 unique UPCs, and a sample of 1000 households typically purchases around 65,000 different goods. Since there is some overlap between the consumption baskets of different households in the sample, the number of unique UPCs that in the sample increases at a decreasing rate with the size of the sample. This factor produces a monotonically rising, but concave UPC accumulation curve. As one can see from the plot, the estimated Weibull distribution fits the data extremely well. The estimated asymptote is approximately 112,000 varieties, which is 35,000 more than we observe in our sample of 1500 New York households.

Figure 6 presents a plot of the log of the estimated Weibull asymptote against the log population in a city. As one can see, there is a clear positive relationship between the two variables: the accumulation curves imply that larger cities have more varieties than smaller ones. Despite the fact that the Weibull indicates more varieties for New York than the GNE, overall Weibull asymptotes tend to be around 20 percent lower than our GNE structural estimates. Visual inspection reveals that the relative relationship between the estimated number of varieties and city size using the GNE and plotted in Figure 3 is almost identical to that obtained with the Weibull. We can see this even more clearly in Figure 7 where we plot the Weibull asymptotes

against the GNE asymptotes. The correlation between the two is 0.99 and the slope is 1.07 indicating that both methodologies yield essentially the same relationship between city size and the number of available varieties.

Just as we constructed accumulation curves for the number of different UPCs in cities in the previous section, we also construct these for the share of common brands in each product group, s_{gc} , and the average share of common UPCs in each brand in each product group, \bar{s}_{gc} . We then estimate the asymptotes of the fitted Weibull curve to each of these. Figure 8 plots these estimates for one of the largest product groups in terms of sales and the number of varieties available nationally, bread and baked goods, for two cities with large samples in the ACNielsen data but very different populations, New York and Little Rock. Panel A shows the s_{gc} accumulation curve while panel B portrays the same curve for \bar{s}_{gc} . As one can see from the plots, the Weibull fits the share accumulation curves extremely well.¹² By examining the asymptote of the Weibull distribution in the first panel, we can see that New Yorkers have access to a set of bread brands available that constitute 79 percent of national expenditures on bread. By contrast, residents of Little Rock, with a population less than a tenth as large, have access to bread brands that constitute 74 percent of national expenditures. Panel B shows that the within-brand-module market share of UPCs available in a city, conditional on that brand-module being available in the city, is, on average, lower than the within-product group market share of brand-modules available in the city. Firms sell UPCs that account for 53 and 47 percent of their national sales in New York and Little Rock, respectively. This indicates that knowing that a firm sells a product in a city does not necessarily mean that all varieties of that product are available there. In summary, New Yorkers have access to 5 percent more of the bread market, in terms of brands,

¹² The AIC favors the Weibull distribution when computing share accumulation curves as well.

than residents of Little Rock and, conditional on a brand being available in their city, New Yorkers also have access to 6 percent more of the market for each brand, in terms of UPCs, than do Little Rock residents.

To demonstrate how these differences in the market shares of UPCs and brands available in the two cities translate into a discount on the exact price index in New York relative to Little Rock, we can calculate the variety adjustments for bread in each city from equation 11. The elasticity of substitution between UPCs within brand-modules in the bread product group is 17.2, so the UPC variety adjustment for New York is $0.53^{1/(1-17.2)}$, or 1.04. The across-brand elasticity of substitution for the bread product group is 9.6, so the brand variety adjustment for New York is $0.79^{1/(1-9.6)}$, or 1.03. The fact that there are fewer bread varieties available in New York than nationally means that someone restricted to only consume those varieties available in New York would face a price index that is 7 percent higher than someone with access to all national varieties. A similar calculation shows that the variety adjustment for the bread product group in Little Rock is equal to 9 percent. The variety adjustment for New York relative to Little Rock is equal to $1.07/1.09$, or 0.98, implying that if the prices of commonly available varieties are the same in the two cities, people living in New York face 2 percent lower costs for bread because they have access to more varieties.

Figures 9A and 9B plot the average asymptotes of the share accumulation curves (estimated using a Weibull distribution) in each city against the log of the population in each city to show that the results for bread in New York and Little Rock are representative of the sample as a whole. As one can see from the figure, there is a strong positive relationship between our estimates for the national market share covered by varieties available in each city and the city's population. Nationally, consumers spend 5 percent more on brands and UPCs available in the

largest cities than they do on those brands and UPCs available in the smallest cities. Once again we see that people in larger cities have access to the more and/or more popular varieties, while those in smaller cities have more limited access.

The asymptotes, in conjunction with our price data, enable us to estimate the exact price index for each product group. Table 6 presents our estimates for how the conventional exact price index, the variety adjustment, and the exact price index vary across cities. The first three columns in the table use unadjusted prices to compute the index. As we saw in Table 3, unadjusted prices are higher in larger cities, and these results translate into a common exact price index that rises with city size. These higher prices, however, are offset by the variety adjustment to prices arising from the greater availability of varieties in larger cities leading to an exact price index that is invariant to city size.

The unadjusted prices, however, are problematic because they do not correct for the store in which the goods are purchased or the type of household making the purchase. We therefore use adjusted prices in the subsequent columns. This yields two striking results. First, when we adjust for household characteristics in columns 4 through 6 – which control for the fact that some types of households purchase at larger discounts than others – we see that the positive relationship between city size and price ceases to be significant and the sign flips. This suggests that one important reason why we observe a positive relationship between price indexes and city size is due to the fact that wealthier households congregate in large cities, and these households react less to sales.

Columns 7-9 present results in which we also control for the amenities present in the store in which the goods are purchased. This adjustment increases the economic and statistical significance of the result. If we adjust prices further for the fact that people are likely to prefer

shopping in nicer (*i.e.*, high income) neighborhoods, the results become even stronger. If we purge prices of the impact of land costs and thereby look only at the tradable goods component of the price, we see in column 15 that all indexes fall very sharply with city size and this result is significant at the 1 percent level.

One possible concern about these results is that people who live in large cities might not shop in all of the neighborhoods within the city's borders. This might bias our variety adjustment downwards because we may be counting varieties in, say, suburbs that are irrelevant for people who live downtown. Alternatively, if people who live in sparsely populated neighborhoods with low variety counts often shop in densely populated neighborhoods, we might bias our variety effect upwards because measurement error leads to attenuation bias. Which bias dominates is an empirical question.

An easy solution to this problem is to make use of the fact that the ACNielsen data records the household's county and the zip codes of the stores in which they purchase each UPC. We first assume that a household is located in the zip code in their county where their grocery expenditures are the highest. We then construct the population of the market where households in each zip code can choose to shop. For a set of households living in the same zip code, we sum the populations of the zip codes where we observe the set of households purchasing UPCs. This sum tells us the population of the market that is available to households located in the zip code. We average these market populations across the zip codes in each city to yield the average population of the neighborhoods where households in the city can choose to shop. We refer to this number as the relevant population.

Table 7 presents results in which we replace the city's population with the relevant population in the neighborhoods in which households actually shop. The results are quite similar

to the results using urban population as the measure of city size. The fact that the results are so similar indicates that understanding where households shop within cities is not important for understanding the relationship between city size and prices. The key finding is that the exact price index falls with city size, and this relationship is significant whenever we adjust prices to take into account store amenities and buyer characteristics. About two-thirds of this effect appears to be due to the fact that individual goods prices are lower in larger cities, while the remainder is due to there being more, and more important, varieties available in larger cities. The economic significance of this result is fairly substantial. The demographic-store-adjusted prices in New York are 10 percent lower than those in the smallest city in our sample (Des Moines). This suggests a potentially very important role for new economic geography affecting the cost of living in cities.

V. Conclusion

Krugman (1991) hypothesized that market prices drive agglomeration and the new economic geography literature which has followed rests on the same foundations. Previous empirical work using the CPI or housing costs as a cost of living measure has found that the cost-of-living is, in fact, a dis-amenity of large cities and, as such, a force of dispersion in a model of economic geography. The results presented here suggest that Krugman's result, as well as both the price and variety mechanisms underlying it, are correct. Specifically, these results support the extensions to Krugman's model in which the two primary components of the cost of living index – housing costs and product prices – move in opposing directions as agglomeration occurs.

The analysis presented here has shown that the variety-adjusted cost of grocery products decreases with city size and preliminary robustness checks using one quarter of all purchase data

for a sample of 300 households in 10 cities suggest that this pattern extends throughout the traded consumer goods sector. Further work on a larger set of household purchases could confirm that the patterns identified here are not specific to grocery products.

References

- Anderson, S., De Palma, A., and Thisse, J-F. (1987) "The CES is a Discrete Choice Model?" *Economic Letters*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 139-140.
- Asahi, C., Hikino, S., and Kanemoto, Y. (2008) "Consumption Side Agglomeration Economies in Japanese Cities," CIRJE Discussion Papers, No. CIRJE-F-561, April.
- Bernstein, J. and Weinstein, D. (2002) "Do Endowments Predict the Location of Production? Evidence from National and International Data," *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 56, pp. 55-76.
- Bils, M. and Klenow, P. (2001) "Quantifying Quality Growth," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4, pp. 1006-1030.
- Brakman, S., Garretsen, H., and van Marrewijk, C. (2009) *The New Introduction to Geographical Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broda, C. and Weinstein, D. (2008) *Prices, Poverty, and Inequality: Why Americans are Better Off than You Think*, Washington, DC: The AEI Press.
- Broda, C. and Weinstein, D. (2010) "Product Creation and Destruction: Evidence and Price Implications," *The American Economic Review*, June.
- Broda, C., Leibtag, E., and Weinstein, D. (2009) "The Role of Prices in Measuring the Poor's Living Standards," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Spring, pp. 77-97.
- Colwell, R. and Coddington, J. (1994) "Estimating Terrestrial Biodiversity through Extrapolation," *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences*, Vol. 245, No. 1311, July, pp. 101-118.
- Colwell, R., Mao, C., and Chang, J. (2004) "Interpolating, Extrapolating, and Comparing Incidence-Based Species Accumulation Curves," *Ecology*, Vol. 85, No. 10, pp. 2717-2727.
- Combes, P., Mayer, T., and Thisse, J-F. (2008) *Economic Geography: the Integration of Regions and Nations*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Combes, P., Duranton, G., Gobillon, L., Puga, D., and Roux, S. (2010) "The productivity advantages of large cities: Distinguishing agglomeration from firm selection," CEPR Discussion Paper, 7191.
- Davis, M. and Palumbo, M. (2007) "The Price of Residential Land in Large US Cities," *Journal of Urban Economics*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 352-384.
- DuMond, J.M., Hirsch, B., and Macpherson, D. (1999) "Wage Differentials Across Labor Markets and Workers: Does Cost of Living Matter?" *Economic Inquiry*, Vol. 37, No. 4, October, pp.

577-598.

- Einav, L., Liebttag, E., and Nevo, A. (2008) "On the Accuracy of Nielsen Homescan Data," USDA Economics Research Report Number 69.
- Feenstra, R. (1994) "New Product Varieties and the Measurement of International Prices," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 84, No. 1, March, pp. 157-177.
- Feenstra, R. (2010) *Product Variety and the Gains from International Trade*. MIT Press.
- Fujita, M. and Mori., T (2005) "Frontiers of the New Economic Geography", *Papers in Regional Science* 84(3), 377-405.
- Helpman, E. (1998) "The Size of Regions," in Pines, D., Sadka, E., and Zilcha, I., eds., *Topics in Public Economics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-54.
- Jimenez-Valverde, A., Mendoza, S., Martin, J., Cano, J., and Munguira, M. (2006) "Comparing Relative Model Fit of Several Species-Accumulation Functions to Local Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea Butterfly Inventories of Mediterranean Habitats," *Biodiversity and Conservation*, Vol. 15, pp. 163-176.
- Krugman, P. (1991) "Increasing Returns and Economic Geography," *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vo. 99, No. 3, June, pp. 483-499.
- Mao, C., Colwell, R., and Chang, J. (2005) "Estimating the Species Accumulation Curve Using Mixtures," *Biometrics*, Vol. 61, June, pp. 433-441.
- Prize Committee of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (2008) "Scientific background on the Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 2008," http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/economics/laureates/2008/ecoadv08.pdf
- Ottaviano, G., Tabuchi, T., and Thisse, J. (2002) "Agglomeration and Trade Revisited," *International Economic Review*, Vol. 43, No. 2, May, pp. 409-435.
- Roback, J. (1982) "Wages, Rents, and the Quality of Life," *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 90, No. 6, December, pp. 1257-1278.
- Sato, K. (1976) "The Ideal Log-Change Index Number," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 223-228.
- Suedekum, J. (2006) "Agglomeration and Regional Costs of Living," *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 529-543.

- Tabuchi, T. (2001) "On Interregional Price Differentials," *The Japanese Economic Review*, Vol. 52, No. 1, March, pp. 104-115.
- Tabuchi, T. and Yoshida, A. (2000) "Separating Urban Agglomeration Economies in Consumption and Production," *Journal of Urban Economics*, Volume 48, pp. 70-84.
- Vartia, Y (1976) "Ideal Log-Change Index Numbers," *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 121-126.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8A




Figure 8B




Figure 9A




Figure 9B




Table 1

| Correlation Coefficients | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Log(Population _c) | ACNielsen Food Index | ACCRA Food Index | ACCRA Composite Index |
| Log(Population _c) | 1 | | | |
| ACNielsen Food Index | 0.56 | 1 | | |
| ACCRA Food Index | 0.55 | 0.77 | 1 | |
| ACCRA Composite Index | 0.68 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 1 |

Table 2

Summary Statistics for Number of Purchases

| Number of Households | All Households 18570 | | Households with: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|
| | | | One Person 4594 | | Two People 8141 | | Three People 2627 | |
| | Mean | Median | Mean | Median | Mean | Median | Mean | Median |
| Number of Unique UPCs Purchased, Conditional on Purchasing One | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 364 | 341 | 243 | 228 | 354 | 339 | 430 | 414 |
| Within Each Product Group | 8 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| Within Each Product Module | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Brand-Modules Purchased Conditional on Purchasing One Good in a Module | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 250 | 240 | 173 | 165 | 247 | 239 | 291 | 284 |
| Within Each Product Group | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| Within Each Product Module | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Number of Units Purchased of Each: | | | | | | | | |
| UPC | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Brand-Module | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Probability of Purchasing Only One Good Per Module, Conditional on Purchasing One Good in a Module | | | | | | | | |
| UPC | 0.47 | | 0.51 | | 0.48 | | 0.45 | |
| Brand-Module | 0.60 | | 0.63 | | 0.60 | | 0.58 | |

Notes:

[1] Including only 250 consecutive days for each household, where consecutive is defined as any period without gaps between household purchases lasting 14 days or more. Any household without 250 days of consecutive 2005 purchase data is not considered in this table.

Table 3

| | Ln(Price _{uzcrh}) | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Ln(Population _c) | 0.0107* | 0.0105* | 0.00449 | 0.00445 | 0.00369 | -0.00151 |
| | [0.00564] | [0.00567] | [0.00347] | [0.00344] | [0.00338] | [0.00385] |
| Ln(Income _z) | - | - | - | - | 0.00906*** | 0.00888*** |
| | - | - | - | - | [0.000696] | [0.000642] |
| Ln(Land Value _c) | - | - | - | - | - | 0.0112*** |
| | - | - | - | - | - | [0.00352] |
| Household Demographic Dummies ^[2] | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Storename Dummies ^[3] | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 12,700,000 | 12,700,000 | 12,700,000 | 12,700,000 | 12,700,000 | 12,700,000 |
| R-squared | 0.928 | 0.928 | 0.935 | 0.935 | 0.935 | 0.935 |

Robust standard errors in brackets. Standard errors are clustered by city.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes:

[1] Price_{uzcrh} = average price paid for UPC u in store r in zip code z by household h living in city c .

[2] Household controls include dummies for household size, male and female head of household age, marital status, race, and hispanic.

[3] Regressions with storename du

Table 4**Summary Statistics for GNE Parameter Estimates**

| Incidence Group (k) | Probability of Purchase ($\pi_{c,k}$) | | Share of UPCs ($\alpha_{c,k}$) | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 1 | 0.496 | 0.096 | 0.00009 | 0.00006 |
| 2 | 0.332 | 0.103 | 0.00041 | 0.00029 |
| 3 | 0.226 | 0.085 | 0.00116 | 0.00071 |
| 4 | 0.152 | 0.066 | 0.00300 | 0.00181 |
| 5 | 0.102 | 0.052 | 0.00757 | 0.00470 |
| 6 | 0.065 | 0.035 | 0.01953 | 0.01045 |
| 7 | 0.038 | 0.022 | 0.05083 | 0.01821 |
| 8 | 0.019 | 0.011 | 0.12115 | 0.01879 |
| 9 | 0.008 | 0.004 | 0.30803 | 0.03277 |
| 10 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.48823 | 0.03465 |

Table 5

| | Sample Count | | | ln(GNE Asymptote) | | | ln(Weibull Asymptote) | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------|
| Ln(Population) | 0.312*** | 0.338*** | 0.281*** | 0.278*** | 0.300*** | 0.261*** | 0.281*** | 0.303*** | 0.275*** |
| | [0.0432] | [0.0678] | [0.0971] | [0.0364] | [0.0572] | [0.0821] | [0.0340] | [0.0534] | [0.0769] |
| Ln(Per Capita Income) | - | -0.155 | -0.043 | - | -0.137 | -0.060 | - | -0.129 | -0.074 |
| | - | [0.341] | [0.369] | - | [0.288] | [0.312] | - | [0.269] | [0.292] |
| Income Herfindahl Index | - | -0.952 | -0.289 | - | -0.630 | -0.178 | - | -0.321 | 0.000 |
| | - | [3.132] | [3.246] | - | [2.641] | [2.745] | - | [2.466] | [2.568] |
| Race Herfindahl Index | - | 0.064 | 0.115 | - | 0.074 | 0.109 | - | 0.111 | 0.135 |
| | - | [0.411] | [0.417] | - | [0.347] | [0.353] | - | [0.324] | [0.330] |
| Birthplace Herfindahl Index | - | 0.006 | 0.029 | - | -0.012 | 0.004 | - | -0.028 | -0.017 |
| | - | [0.282] | [0.285] | - | [0.238] | [0.241] | - | [0.222] | [0.225] |
| Ln(Land Area) | - | - | 0.087 | - | - | 0.060 | - | - | 0.042 |
| | - | - | [0.106] | - | - | [0.0898] | - | - | [0.0840] |
| Constant | 6.158*** | 7.474** | 6.275* | 6.912*** | 8.057*** | 7.240** | 6.937*** | 7.962*** | 7.381** |
| | [0.632] | [3.391] | [3.704] | [0.533] | [2.860] | [3.132] | [0.498] | [2.670] | [2.930] |
| Observations | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 49 |
| R-squared | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.60 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Standard errors in brackets.

Table 6

| | <i>Unadjusted Prices</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Store Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Store-Income Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Fully-Adjusted</i> | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>Household Effects</i> | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Store Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Zip Income Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Land Value Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | |
| | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c |
| Ln(Population) | 0.012** | -0.0082** | 0.0049 | -0.014 | -0.0053** | -0.020* | -0.020** | -0.0051** | -0.027*** | -0.026*** | -0.0037 | -0.032*** | -0.027*** | -0.0050* | -0.034*** |
| | [0.0051] | [0.0038] | [0.0074] | [0.0095] | [0.0025] | [0.011] | [0.0084] | [0.0025] | [0.0094] | [0.0081] | [0.0025] | [0.0091] | [0.0084] | [0.0025] | [0.0092] |
| Constant | 0.83*** | 1.21*** | 1.02*** | 1.32*** | 1.14*** | 1.49*** | 1.41*** | 1.14*** | 1.59*** | 1.52*** | 1.12*** | 1.67*** | 1.52*** | 1.14*** | 1.70*** |
| | [0.076] | [0.056] | [0.11] | [0.14] | [0.037] | [0.16] | [0.13] | [0.037] | [0.14] | [0.12] | [0.038] | [0.14] | [0.13] | [0.037] | [0.14] |
| Observations | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| R-squared | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.012 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 0.059 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.28 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Standard errors in brackets.

Notes:

[1] The dependent variables in the above regressions are indices. These indices are calculated using unadjusted prices or prices that have been adjusted as indicated above.

[2] Random weight goods have been dropped from the sample.

[3] $EPI_c = CEPI_c VA_c$ which implies that $\log(EPI_c) = \log(CEPI_c) + \log(VA_c)$. Note that the dependent variables in the above regressions are in levels, not logs, so the coefficients on log population in the $CEPI_c$ and VA_c regressions do not add to the coefficient on log population in the EPI_c regression.

Table 7

| | <i>Unadjusted Prices</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Store Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Demographic-Store-Income Adjusted</i> | | | <i>Fully-Adjusted</i> | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>Household Effects</i> | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Storename Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Zip Income Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | | Included | | | Removed | | |
| <i>Land Value Effects</i> | Included | | | Included | | | Included | | | Removed | | | Removed | | |
| | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c | CEPI _c | VA _c | EPI _c |
| Ln(Relevant Pop.) | 0.0079* | -0.012*** | -0.0032 | -0.011 | -0.0079*** | -0.021** | -0.016** | -0.0077*** | -0.025*** | -0.021*** | -0.0067*** | -0.030*** | -0.021*** | -0.0076*** | -0.031*** |
| | [0.0045] | [0.0028] | [0.0064] | [0.0082] | [0.0018] | [0.0091] | [0.0073] | [0.0018] | [0.0079] | [0.0072] | [0.0019] | [0.0076] | [0.0074] | [0.0019] | [0.0078] |
| Constant | 0.87*** | 1.29*** | 1.15*** | 1.31*** | 1.20*** | 1.54*** | 1.38*** | 1.19*** | 1.62*** | 1.48*** | 1.17*** | 1.70*** | 1.48*** | 1.19*** | 1.72*** |
| | [0.076] | [0.048] | [0.11] | [0.14] | [0.031] | [0.15] | [0.12] | [0.031] | [0.13] | [0.12] | [0.033] | [0.13] | [0.13] | [0.031] | [0.13] |
| Observations | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 |
| R-squared | 0.081 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.31 | 0.19 | 0.33 | 0.31 |

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Standard errors in brackets.

Notes:

[1] The dependent variables in the above regressions are indices. These indices are calculated using unadjusted prices or prices that have been adjusted as indicated above.

[2] Random weight goods have been dropped from the sample.

[3] $EPI_c = CEPI_c VA_c$ which implies that $\log(EPI_c) = \log(CEPI_c) + \log(VA_c)$. Note that the dependent variables in the above regressions are in levels, not logs, so the coefficients on log population in the $CEPI_c$ and VA_c regressions do not add to the coefficient on log population in the EPI_c regression.